



Classification of word formation categories in Latin adjectives

Vasyl Shynkaruk*

Doctor of Philology, Professor

National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine

03041, 15 Heroiv Oborony Str., Kyiv, Ukraine

<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8589-4995>

Oksana Chaika

DSc in Pedagogy, PhD in Linguistics, Associate Professor

University of Luxembourg

L-4365, 2 de l'Universite Ave., Esch-sur-Alzette, Luxembourg

<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4317-9456>

Maria Teleky

PhD in Linguistics, Associate Professor

Bukovinian State Medical University

58002, 2 Teatralna Sq., Chernivtsi, Ukraine

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4161-4386>

Abstract. In contemporary Ukrainian classical philology, the class of Latin adjectives is represented only fragmentarily. Analysing Latin adjectives through the lens of modern word formation theory enriches existing research in the theoretical grammar of classical languages. The objective of this study was to identify the word formation categories of Latin adjectives and elucidate the mechanisms of their derivational representation. The research employed selective, the word formation approach, descriptive and valence-distribution methods to analyse, systematise, classify and study the syntactic features of Latin adjectives. It is substantiated that the functional features of adjectives, which reflect its ability to express a static feature of an object, are fundamental for understanding its semantic and grammatical characteristics as a part of speech and the author distinguishes between primary adjectives that convey a qualitative feature, have a root and an ending and secondary adjectives that reflect a complex feature, are derivative in nature and contain prefixes or suffixes. The findings revealed that the cornerstone of Latin adjectival word formation is the derivative adjective. New lexical meanings in these adjectives are primarily

Suggested Citation:

Shynkaruk, V., Chaika, O., & Teleky, M. (2024). Classification of word formation categories in Latin adjectives. *International Journal of Philology*, 28(4), 21-34. doi: 10.31548/philolog/4.2024.21.

*Corresponding author



Copyright © The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

conveyed through suffixes, while prefixes provide additional semantic shades. Word formation categories unite various derivative adjectives that share a common base and derivational meaning, formed through suffixation, prefixation, or a combination of both. Suffixes and prefixes function to modify the intensity of the attribute expressed by the adjectival root, indicating either an augmented or diminished degree of the attribute's manifestation. Eight word-forming categories of Latin adjectives are distinguished: insufficient degree of feature expression; excessive intensity of feature; subjective quality assessment; visitativity; temporal attributivity; locative attributivity; order; degrees of comparison. The degrees of comparison stand apart from the other categories, as they span three grammatical levels: word formation, syntax, and morphology. This study deepens the understanding of the Latin system of adjectival word formation, shedding light on both the formal mechanisms of its realisation and the semantic interpretations of the derived lexical units. The results of this research can serve as a foundation for further theoretical inquiries into the derivational processes of Latin

Keywords: degrees of attribute manifestation; word formation; derivative adjectives; word formation methods; suffixation; prefixation

Introduction

In the current phase of humanities scholarship, the study of the grammatical structure of the Latin language holds a distinguished place. Analysing the word-formation categories of Latin adjectives is particularly relevant to contemporary research, as it provides deeper insights into the mechanisms by which meanings were constructed in classical languages, i.e., languages that have significantly shaped the development of modern European languages and scientific terminology. The examination of Latin adjective word formation enhances the understanding of linguistic processes, including the systematisation of vocabulary, the creation of terminology, and the conceptualisation of abstract ideas, thereby advancing the field of linguistics. Moreover, the analysis of Latin adjective word-formation processes informs the development of models for morphological analysis in modern computational linguistics. These models can be adapted to investigate other languages with analogous morphological structures, contributing to the creation of multilingual linguistic resources and automated translation systems. The study of Latin adjectives is also indispensable due to their pivotal

role in constructing meaning and conveying stylistic nuances in literary and philosophical texts. Investigating their use deepens the researchers' appreciation of the stylistic and semantic dimensions of Latin works, which is of great importance to classical philologists and translators alike. Latin's profound influence on the evolution of Romance and other European languages further underscores the importance of studying its word-formation processes. This research not only enriches the historical understanding of grammar but also reveals universal patterns of word formation that persist in modern languages.

The study of Latin adjectives has been a subject of interest for many linguists across various historical periods. In the contemporary era, the analysis of Latin adjectives was part of broader linguistic and classical studies that focus on the Latin language and its grammar. Modern scholars, particularly S. Polyuga (2021), have argued that the theory of parts of speech, originating in ancient Greece first as a philosophical concept and later as a philological one, was subsequently applied to Latin. Over the following centuries, theoretical grammar of the

Latin language has been enriched with new approaches and theories concerning morphological units and categories.

The scholarly interest in the adjective is driven by its defining semantic characteristic, which conveys the categorical meaning of a non-processual property of an object, expressed through syntactic categories of gender, number, case, and suffixes (structure, function, and meaning). Over the past few decades, research on Latin adjectives has been enriched by publications from European scholars. The Czech researcher L. Pultrová (2023) explored which Latin adjectives and adverbs allow for comparative and superlative forms, establishing the theoretical foundations and methodology of the category of comparison. However, further investigation is needed into the category of degrees of comparison of adjectives as a specific type of word-formation category in Latin adjectives. In addition, the professor of historical linguistics P. Cuzzolin (2021) described various prefixes that the Latin language uses to express negation, marked in nouns and adjectives. The author examined the semantic role played by these prefixes, which alter the meaning of adjectives with which they combine, shifting it from positive to negative. Nonetheless, there is a need to supplement existing descriptions of the nature of Latin adjectives within the framework of the categories employed in contemporary linguistics.

Ukrainian scholars have made a significant contribution to the study of the Latin language within the field of linguistics. Notably, B. Cherniukh (2022) substantiated the initial gender differentiation of the adjective, identifying the emergence of masculine and feminine forms in the early stages of its development. According to the scholar's observations, at a later stage, the formation of the gender system in adjectives resulted in a form with three distinct endings. The formal differentiation of masculine and feminine genders in some Latin adjectives occurred subsequently, alongside the appearance

of third-declension adjectives with three endings and the development of the comparative degrees of adjectives. In analysing the formation of comparative degrees in Latin, B. Cherniukh described specific morphemes, suffixes, and suppletive forms used in the creation of Latin adjectives in various degrees, offering a substantiated explanation for the formation of superlative degrees based on different stems and suffixes found in Classical Latin. It is worth mentioning that these studies are crucial for a deeper understanding of historical changes in the Latin language and the development of vocabulary within the Indo-European language family. However, it is argued that further investigation is needed into the morphological and syntactic features of adjectives that express the static attributes of objects.

Further, S. Antonyuk (2015) analysed the Latin adjective as a distinct part of speech, categorising it into primary and secondary forms. However, derivative word-formation adjectives were not addressed. Numerous studies have focused on the issues of grammatical adjective semantics. A comparative analysis of the semantics of diminutivised adjectives and adverbs in Ukrainian and Latin has been explored in linguistic research. For instance, N. Ruda (2011) established that diminutive adjectives in Ukrainian are primarily used to convey diminutive semantics, as well as evaluative-emotional attitudes and/or expressions. In contrast, in Latin, the same formations are typically distinguished (though not always clearly) in terms of expressing objective gradation of reduction or enhancement of a specific attribute, as well as evaluative-emotional meaning and/or expression. Nonetheless, further research is needed to explore the semantic-functional dimensions of these formations in both languages. Later, I. Sai (2019), in her investigation of the lexical status of adjectives such as *bahuvrihi* (based on the first twelve books of Homer's *Iliad*), argued that the meaning of the resulting unit is neither identical to the concept nor to the object

denoted by each of its components. The parts of the word maintain specific defined relationships, which are consolidated in the overall meaning of the whole word. However, the word-formation meaning of these constructions has not been adequately addressed.

The semantic-structural features of Latin colour adjectives, including various shades, have been studied by Ukrainian linguists. Thus, V.G. Synytsia *et al.* (2023) examined the representation of the colour component “red” and its nuances in Latin medical terminology. It was established that in adjectives with a chromatic component, the lexical level is inherently linked to the semantic one. The nomination of a denotate based on an external characteristic, specifically colour, directly highlights the visual attribute of a disease. Considering the said, the analysis of word-formation processes in Latin adjectives with the colour component ‘red’ and its shades remains underdeveloped and requires further exploration.

While word-formation categories of Latin adjectives have been partially examined, they have not been fully explored and demand further investigation. The aim of this study was to analyse the word-formation of Latin adjectives and its influence on modern languages. The research objectives included systematising and classifying the word-formation categories of Latin adjectives, identifying their primary types, and analysing their structural and semantic characteristics to gain a deeper understanding of Latin morphology and its impact on contemporary languages.

Materials and Methods

The source base for this study included the following works: Latin-Ukrainian and Ukrainian-Latin Dictionary (Churakova, 2009), Latin-Ukrainian Word-Formation Dictionary (Petrova, 2010), and Ukrainian-Ancient Greek-Latin Dictionary (Boyko & Myronova, 2012). To achieve the objectives and goals of the research, several methods were employed in a structured

and sequential manner. The first stage of the study began with a sampling method, crucial for analysing and systematising Latin adjective lexemes. This method involved identifying and selecting specific adjectival lexemes from various sources, including the above-mentioned dictionaries and electronic databases. The focus was placed on selecting adjectives that would be representative of different morphological models, ensuring a broad sample for maximal analysis. The observation method was then used to track the functioning of these adjectives in Latin texts, providing a solid foundation for subsequent research. The selected adjectives were systematically categorised according to their morphological structure.

After the selection and systematisation of adjectives, the word-formation method was employed to understand the creation of new lexical meanings within the structure of adjectives. According to the aims and objectives of the research, derivative adjectives were compared with their base forms, analysing how the addition of prefixes, suffixes, or other morphological elements led to the emergence of new meanings. At this stage, a detailed analysis of the morphological components of each adjective was carried out, focusing on roots and affixes, to explore how these elements contributed to the formation of new lexemes. The word-formation analysis allowed for the identification of clear patterns in the development of meaning in adjectives, emphasising how derivational processes shaped the Latin lexicon.

The next method applied was the descriptive method, which served as the primary approach for classifying the selected material. At this stage, adjectives were classified according to their morphological and semantic characteristics. The descriptive method provided a clear and systematic classification of adjectives into various linguistic categories, such as regular or irregular derivation, or specific semantic groups. This classification was essential for interpreting the broader linguistic functions of

adjectives, as it highlighted their integration into the structure of Latin. The interpretation of these categories contributed to the understanding of the evolution of adjectival forms and their role in communication, which helped draw conclusions about their linguistic significance.

For further analysis of the structure of word-formation categories, valency-distributive analysis methods were used, focusing on understanding the syntactic behavior of adjectives, particularly their combination with other elements in sentences. The valency of each adjective was analysed, determining its ability to take complements or modify nouns, which helped clarify the syntactic roles of adjectives. Moreover, distributive analysis facilitated the examination of the functions of adjectives in various syntactic structures, and their analysis emphasised their positional flexibility, establishing rules for the placement of adjectives in Latin syntax. This stage provided a deeper understanding of the functional capabilities of adjectives in context.

The structural framework of adjective meaning was investigated using componential analysis and the contextual method, which were employed to explore the meanings of adjectives on a deeper semantic level. Componential analysis involved breaking down the meaning of each adjective into its core semantic components, which allowed the study to reveal even subtle shifts in meaning when comparing derivative adjectives with their base forms. The detailed analysis of adjective meanings was further enriched by the contextual method, examining how adjectives were used in textual contexts. Considering the usage of adjectives in various sentences and literary works, the results led to identifying the impact of context on the meaning and functions of adjectives.

All stages, from the initial selection and systematisation of data, word-formation analysis, and classification of adjectives to the study of their syntactic behavior and semantic

analysis, enabled a comprehensive study of the formation and functions of Latin adjectives. Each method played a crucial role in achieving the primary goal, isolating the word-formation categories of Latin adjectives within the linguistic model and illuminating the means of word-formation representation

Results and Discussion

In the morphological theory of the Latin language, Greco-Roman linguistic traditions, which established principles for the classification of parts of speech, are clearly reflected. The systematisation was rooted in the Stoic and Alexandrian schools (late 4th century BCE), whose scholars distinguished grammar as an independent discipline, delineating its object and method of research, and creating specialised terminology. According to L. Zvonska et al. (2017), the scholars of these schools classified word classes into parts of speech, varying in number from five to eight, though adjectives were not initially included. In subsequent centuries, the study of languages was based on the classification systems developed by these schools, applying semantic, morphological and syntactic criteria, i.e., a methodological approach still upheld by modern grammarians.

It is agreed with A. Sihler (2008), who observed differences between Greek and Latin morphology and lexicon, arguing that the forms in the systems of Latin and Greek adjectives “vary differently” from their common beginnings. Over the centuries, adjectives were integrated into the parts of speech category, functioning to express attributes of objects either directly or through their relation to other objects. These attributes include colour (e.g. *caesius* “blue or grey-blue”, *flavus* “yellow”, *violaceus* “violet”), quality (*clarus* “bright”, *grossus* “thick”, *flexilis* “flexible”), tactile features (*asper* “rough”, *acer* “sharp”), size (*magnus* “large”, *parvus* “small”), smell (*aromaticus* “aromatic”, *floreus* “floral”), taste (*acerbus* “bitter,

sour", *dulcis* "sweet"), age (*senex* "old", *juvenis* "young"), physical and intrinsic properties of living beings (*pulcher* "beautiful", *crudelis* "cruel"), material (*ferreus* "iron", *querceus* "oak"), associations (*bellicus* "military"), shape (*rotundus* "round", *quadratus* "square"), possession (*Hectoreus* "of Hector"), time (*aeternus* "eternal"), and space (*supernus* "high", *inferus* "low"). From these characteristics, it becomes apparent that adjectives encompass diverse features. It is found that some attributes act as inherent qualities, while others acquire semantic and morphological significance in specific syntactic positions.

The morphological and syntactic characteristics of adjectives are closely linked to their syntactic behaviour. The syntactic functioning of adjectives, given their varied interpretations, becomes fundamental in understanding their semantic-grammatical features. The defining semantic property of adjectives is their expression of static attributes of objects. Unlike other parts of speech, adjectives agree with their governing nouns in gender, number and case. Shared categories for adjectives and nouns include case, number and gender, with the case category being particularly significant. The adjectival case category is grammatically dependent on the case features of the noun, as adjectives do not possess more cases than nouns. The syntactic position of adjectives is primarily attributive, meaning they accompany nouns, depend on them and replicate their grammatical forms. Adjectival categories of number and gender are morphologically inflectional and determined by the noun. Masculine, feminine and neuter adjectival forms reflect the respective grammatical features of the noun, structuring the syntactic relationship between the governing noun and the dependent adjective.

Next, S. Antonyuk (2015) argues that adjectives do not form homogeneous functional-semantic groups. They are divided into two subclasses: primary and secondary. Primary adjectives generally convey a qualitative attribute

(independent of any relationship) and morphologically consist of a root and an ending, e.g. *purus* "pure", *ruber* "red". Secondary adjectives reflect complex attributes (through relations to objects, actions or places) or derived qualities. Secondary adjectives exhibit a distinct derivational nature, containing prefixes and suffixes in addition to a root and inflection, e.g. *sub-surdus* "slightly deaf", *ex-animis* "lifeless", *glaesarius* "amber-like", *nigriculus* "darkish".

The grammatical specificity of adjectives as a word class, along with the interplay between primary and secondary adjectives, is grounded in their morphological and derivational categories (Greek *katēgoria* "attribute, assertion, judgment"). Morphological categories, such as gender, number and case, are abstract concepts that express syntactic subordination of the adjective to the noun. These categories are realised through inflections, characterised by regularity and obligatoriness. For example, A. Zagnitko (2020) defines derivational categories as encompassing groups of derivatives with a common base, meaning and formation method within the same part of speech.

Adjectival derivational categories comprise groups of derived adjectives sharing a common derivational meaning and formed using identical methods. In the adjectival class, derivational pairs consist of base and derived adjectives: e.g. *tacit-us* "quiet" – *tacit-ul-us* "rather quiet". According to H. Schmid (2015), the main methods of forming derivatives in Latin include suffixation and prefixation (or prefixal derivation). A. Zagnitko (2020) further refines these methods as techniques for modifying the morphological structure, phonetic composition and lexical meaning of base words, resulting in new derived forms. Derived adjectives are formed by attaching suffixes and prefixes to the base. Besides, M. Fruyt (2011) identifies six types of word formation in Latin: nominal and verbal compounding, preverbalisation, agglutination and recategorisation, often grouped into three main types: suffixation and

prefixation, compounding and recategorisation. Derivational categories exhibit grammatical specificity, lacking the regularity and obligatoriness of morphological categories. Suffixes and prefixes specify varying degrees of the attribute expressed by the adjectival

root (Table 1). These affixes indicate intensification or diminution of the attribute, typical of qualitative adjectives. Suffixes formally represent excessive or insufficient degrees of the attribute, enabling the identification of adjectival derivational categories.

Table 1. Methods of Word Formation for Latin Adjectives

Word Formation Method	Prefix/suffix	Root	Adjective	Meaning
Prefixation	in-	justus	injustus	unjust
Prefixation	prae-	clarus	praeclarus	outstanding
Prefixation	sub-	ditus	subditus	subjugated
Prefixation	re-	novus	renovus	restored
Prefixation	per-	fidus	perfidus	treacherous
Suffixation	-alis	natur-	naturalis	natural
Suffixation	-osus	gloria	gloriosus	glorious
Suffixation	-ilis	mob	mobilis	mobile
Suffixation	-aris	milit	militaris	military
Suffixation	-eus	aur	aureus	golden

Source: authors development

Categories of insufficient degree of quality expression. This adjectival category indicates a relatively small degree of quality, where the manifestation is insufficient compared to the standard. It is found that derived adjectives formed by the modification type have meanings that differ from the meanings of their base adjectives by subtle nuances of insufficient degree of quality. The simple (synthetic) form of adjectives of this degree is derived from the base of a regular adjective with the suffixes *-ül-(-cül-)*, *-öl-*. The *Latin-Ukrainian Word-Formation Dictionary* (Petrova, 2010) contains a significant portion of such adjectives: *albus* “white” – *albidulus* “whitish”, *austerus* “harsh” – *austerulus* “slightly harsh”, *durus* “hard” – *duriusculus* “hardish”, *ravus* “hoarse” – *ravulus* “slightly hoarse”, *gravis* “heavy” – *graviusculus* “rather low”, *luteus* “yellowish” – *luteolus* “yellowish”.

According to D. Dinu (2012), the classical period of Latin saw the activation of new word-formation processes through prefixation. The combination of prefixes and lexemes is generally based on a semantic principle. Thus,

C. Iacobini (2023) noted that prefixes fulfil a word-formation function and express functional-relational meanings, acting as modifiers of the base lexeme. To convey an incomplete quality of an object, prefixes are added to the regular degree adjective: *sub-* (slightly, a little) as in *austerus* – *sub-austerus* “slightly harsh”, *dulcis* – *sub-dulcis* “slightly sweet”, as well as both a prefix and a suffix: *crassus* – *sub-crassulus* “thickish”; *ex-* to indicate a change in quality: *albīdus* – *ex-albīdus* “whitish”.

The category of **excessive intensity of quality** is represented by a greater range of methods for creating adjectival forms. Intensity (Latin *intensio* “intensification”, < *in-tendo*, *intendēre* “to increase, strengthen”) is manifested when comparing the quality of one object or phenomenon to another. A significant increase or surpassing of the normal degree of quality indicates an intensification of the attribute. The semantics of excess are conveyed by several suffixes and prefixes. In forming adjectives with excessive or intense quality, the suffixes most used are: *-ōs-*, *-lentus-*, *-īd-*: *copiōsus*

“abundant”, *gloriōsus* “famous”, *argentōsus* “full of silver”, *frontōsus* “having a prominent forehead”, *luxuriōsus* “luxurious”, *lutulentus* “muddy”, *opulentus* “rich, wealthy”, *candidus* “dazzling white”, *avidus* “greedy”, *madidus* “damp”. Suffixal forms of excessive quality are formed from adjectives already indicating an excessive concentration of a given quality. The diminutive suffixes *-ūl-*, *-ōl-* convey expressive meanings: *nudus* – *nudūlus* “bare” – “slightly bare”, *parvus* – *parvōlus* “small” – “tiny”.

In *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages* (Maiden et al., 2010), it is argued that excessive intensity is expressed by prefixes. However, unlike suffixes, these prefixes do not carry evaluative force. Prefixes generally indicate gradational distinctions within the intensity. Examples include the prefixes *per-* (1) intensification, (2) completion, *prae-* “high or of a higher degree”, *e-*, *ex-* intensification, *extra-* “beyond measure”, *super-* “over, excessive”. These prefixes supplement the expression of excessive intensity: *senex* – *per-senex* “old” – “very old”, *asper* – *per-asper* “rough” – “very rough”, *amārus* – *per-amārus* “bitter” – “very bitter”, *frigīdus* – *prae-frigīdus* “cold” – “very cold”, *gravis* – *prae-gravis* “heavy” – “very heavy”, *longus* – *prae-longus* “long” – “very long”, *validus* – *e-validus* “strong, healthy” – “powerful”, *gelīdus* – *e-gelīdus* “cold” – “very cold”, *arīdus* – *ex-arīdus* “dry” – “extremely dry”, *artus* – *ex-artus* “narrow, tight” – “very tight”, *altus* – *ex-altus* “high” – “extremely high”, *ordinarius* – *extra-ordinarius* “ordinary” – “extraordinary”, *naturālis* – *extra-naturālis* “natural” – “supernatural”; excessive, *adultus* – *super-adultus* “mature” – “overripe”, *vacuus* – *super-vacuus* “empty” – “superfluous, unnecessary”.

Adjectives of **the subjective evaluation category of quality** not only convey the characteristic of a subject in terms of its degree or intensity but also reflect a sensory or emotional attitude towards its quality or state. Adjective forms of subjective evaluation are created with the suffixes *-ūl-(-cūl-)*, *-ōl-*, *-llus*. In

adjectives such as *ampliuscūlus* “quite significant, considerable, decent”, *argutūlus* “quite witty, sharp-tongued”, *acutūlus* “figuratively, quite clever, not devoid of wit”, and *longiuscūlus* “quite long, rather lengthy”, the suffixes convey evaluation without connoting diminishment. In some adjectives, these suffixes bring out a clear emotional nuance, reflecting a subjective attitude towards the subject: *blandūlus* “quite tender”, *ebriōlus* “quite tipsy”, *curiosūlus* “quite curious, marked by some curiosity”, *sordidūlus* “somewhat sordid”. In some adjective forms with the suffixes *-c(ūl)-*, *-llus-*, we observe nuances of diminishment: *flaccūlus* “somewhat wilting”. According to L. Brucale & E. Moccia-ro (2024), adjective formation with *-llus* is seen as gradual adjectives that show the weakening of either quantity or quality, whether positive or negative, indicated by the base, e.g. *misellus* “poor little thing” < *miser* “poor”, *pulchellus* “pretty” < *pulcher* “beautiful”, *pusillus* “tiny” < *pussus* “small”). It is observed that the suffixes indicate a subjective evaluation of quality when there is a strong concentration of a particular trait in the lexical meaning of the adjective. These adjectives are typically used for qualities of taste and colour, such as *acidus* “sour” – *acidūlus* “somewhat sour”, *russus* “wine” – *russeōlus* “reddish, rusty”.

In these morphological categories, adjectives demonstrate phenomena of modification, acquiring new attributes. However, within these word-formation categories, some of the means of word-formation perform the function of indicating opposite characteristics, giving derived adjectives a negative meaning. According to P. Cuzzolin (2021), it is difficult to specify the exact number of prefixes in Latin that convey a negative meaning to nouns and adjectives or change positive terms into their negative counterparts. The scholar identifies seven prefixes, i.e. “bound morphemes, ... that perform this”, although to varying degrees: *dē-*, *dis-*, *ex-*, *in-*, *nē-*, *sē-*, *uē-*, seven prefixes that “serve this purpose, albeit to varying extents”. This study

focused on the most productive ones. These include the following prefixes: *in-* (*im-* before *b*, *p*, *m*), *il-* (before the initial *l* of the base word), *ir-* (before the initial *r*), in Ukrainian *bez-* (*bez-*), *voz-* (*voz-*), *npu-* (*pry-*), corresponding to *dis-* (indicating disjunction, separation), *e-*, *ex-* (indicating liberation, completion). Adjectives with opposing meanings formed by the prefixal method create a category of opposites: *felix* – *infelix* “(1) fertile, (2) happy” – “(1) infertile, (2) unhappy”, *agitabilis* – *in-agitabilis* “movable, light” – “immovable”, *potens* – *im-potens* “(1) strong, powerful, (2) capable” – “(1) powerless, weak, (2) incapable”, *possibilis* – *im-possibilis* “possible” – “impossible”, *laetabilis* – *il-lae-tabilis* “joyful” – “sad”; *rationālis* – *ir-rationālis* “(1) based on reasoning, (2) reasonable, capable” – “(1) unreasonable, (2) unconscious”, *reverens* – *ir-reverens* “respectful” – “disrespectful”; *similis* – *dis-similis* “similar” – “dissimilar”, *junctus* – *dis-junctus* “(1) close, (2) connected, smooth” – “(1) distant, (2) unconnected, opposite”, *dentatus* – *e-dentulus* “having teeth” – “toothless”, *osseus* – *ex-ossis* “bony” – “without bones”, *odoratus* – *ex-odoratus* “fragrant, aromatic” – “lacking scent”.

To sum it up, an adjective is a specialised tool for grammatical representation of description and can function as a prepositional part of a sentence or as a semantic attributive component. In terms of syntactic and word-formational clarity, it is necessary to identify several additional word-formational categories.

The category of possessiveness reflects characteristics of a subject through its association with a person. In the system of grammatical forms of the adjective, the characteristic is highlighted through possessive adjectives, whose suffixes serve a morphological rather than a semantic function: they transform the lexeme from the noun category to the adjective category. A. Cser (2016) substantiates that the transition from a noun (name of a person) to a possessive adjective is related to the phenomenon of morphological adjectivisation. The

transition to an adjective confirms the systemic grammaticalisation of the corresponding source word and occurs with word-formation affixes.

The structure of the content of the base forms in adjectives varies. According to F. Rainier (2021), some of them denote persons (proper nouns – from names of famous people or mythological characters, and general names). In the Latin-Ukrainian and Ukrainian-Latin dictionaries (Churakova, 2009), it is recorded that the base forms in adjectives combine with the suffixes *-ian(us)*, *-ān(us)*, *-ēs(us)*, *-ī(us)*, *-n(us)*, *-īc(us)*: *Cicero*, *ōnis* m – *Ciceroniānus* “Cicero’s”, *Cleopatra*, *ae* f – *Cleopatr-ānus* “Cleopatra’s”, *Ariadna*, *ae* f and *Ariadne*, *ēs* f – *Ariadna-eus* “Ariadne’s”, *Pluto(n)*, *ōnis* m – *Plutoniū* “Pluto’s”, *Machaon*, *ōnis* m – *Machaon-īcus* and *Machaon-ius* “Machaon’s”, *Plato(n)*, *ōnis* m – *Platon-īcus* “Plato’s”; *soror*, *ōris* f – *soror-ius* “sisterly”, *pater*, *tris* m – *pater-nus* “fatherly”, *dominus*, *i* m – *domin-īcus* “lordly, masterly”.

A separate group of adjectives is derived from the names of animals, birds, insects, and reptiles, occupying an intermediate position between possessive and relative adjectives. These adjectives express possessive relationships. In terms of content, the semantic feature of possession is reflected, with word-formation being carried out through the suffixes *-in(us)*, *-ān(us)*, *-ēs(us)*: *vaca*, *ae* f – *vaccīnus* “cow-like”, *ciconia*, *ae* f – *cicon-īnus* “stork-like”, *apis*, *is* f – *api-ānus* “bee-like”, *anguis*, *is* m – *angu-ēus* “snake-like”.

The category of temporal attributiveness (Latin *temporalis* “temporal”) includes adjectives that denote the temporal characteristics of a subject: simultaneity, asynchrony, precedence, succession, and duration. Adjective forms are formed through suffixal or prefix-suffix types of word-formation and are semantically equivalent to the bases, performing the syntactic function of defining the subject. Adjectives are derived from adverbs and nouns using the suffixes *-ān(us)*, *-tern(us)*, *-ern(us)*, *-in(us)*, *-urn(us)*, *-turn(us)*, *-tīn(us)*. The examined dictionary by H. Petrova (2010)

records a significant number of such adjectives: *meridies* – *meridiānus* “noonday”, *heri* – *hesternus* “yesterday’s”, *hodie* – *hodiernus* “today’s”, *cras* – *crastīnus* “tomorrow’s”, *diu* – *diuturnus* and *diutinus* “long-lasting”, *nox* – *nocturnus* “nightly”, *perendie* – *perendīnus* “the day after tomorrow’s”, *vesper* – *vespertīnus* “evening”, *Matūta* (the ancient Italian goddess of dawn) – *matutīnus* “morning”. Some derived adjectives form constructions with prefixes: *inter-* “inside, between”, *ante-* “before, earlier”, *post-* “after”: *inter-diānus* < *inter+dies* “day” – “daytime”, *ante-meridiānus* < *ante+meridiānus* “noon” – “before noon”, *post-meridiānus* < *post+meridiānus* “noon” – “afternoon”.

Derived adjectives that denote a locative (Latin *locūlus* < *locus* “place”) characteristic of a subject form the word-formation **category of locative attributiveness**. These adjectives are derived from prepositional-case forms with prepositions: *inter* (praep. cum acc.) “between, in”, *extra* (praep. cum acc. (*exter*)) “outside”, *sub* to indicate location (praep. cum acc. et abl.) “under”: *inter* – *internus* “within” – “internal”, *extra* – *extrarius* “outside” – “external”; *sub oculo* – *sub-oculāris* (loco sub cava terrae) “under the eye”, *sub cavo* – *sub-cavus* “hollow place”.

Adjectives indicating the order in which a noun appears by number belong to the word-formation **category of ordinality**. Typically, derived adjectives with this meaning are formed from cardinal numbers (*numeralia cardinalia*) that function with supporting nouns to specify the quantitative definition of subjects. In the dictionary material (Boyko & Myronova, 2012), the components of these adjectives are the formative elements *-cīus*, *-cīmus*, *-(e) sīmus*–: *ter* – *ter-cius* “three” – “third”, *undeviginti* – *nonus-decīmus* “nineteen” – “nineteenth”, *duo-et-viginti* – *duo-et-vicesīmus* “twenty-two” – “twenty-second”, *centum* – *centesīmus* “hundred” – “hundredth”, *mille* – *millesīmus* “thousand” – “thousandth”.

Specific categories include **the category of comparative degrees**, as it combines features

of morphological, syntactic, and word-formation categories. As a morphological category, it is based on morphological tools related to the categories of gender, number, and case. From a syntactic perspective, the adjective is attached to the noun in the role of an attribute and serves as a semantic attributive component. The word-formation level is based on the modification of word-formation and word-formation morphemes. The category of comparative degrees of adjectives is based on two degrees: the comparative and the superlative. Thus, P. Cuzzolin (2011) argued that the comparative and superlative degrees remained stable throughout the history of Latin syntax, thus being conveyed by the same morphological techniques and syntactic models throughout the centuries, as evidenced by the earliest written Latin documents. According to L. Pultrová (2019), they are not all adjectives that form comparative degrees, and they are found in fewer than 14% of Latin adjectives, with both the comparative and superlative degrees occurring in fewer than seven percent of adjectives, such as *fraternus* “fatherly”. The degrees are related to the modification type of derivation, in which the derived adjective conveys an additional meaning compared to the base form. The comparative degree indicates a higher degree of quality in comparison with another object. The comparative degree involves a transformation of the categories of gender, number, and case. The *gradus comparativus* is formed from the *genetivus singularis* form by replacing the ending: *-i* for second-declension adjectives, *-is* for third-declension adjectives, with the suffix *-ior* for masculine and feminine genders, and *-ius* for neuter: *latus* “wide” – *latior* “wider”, *ruber* “red” – *rubrior* “redder”, *viridis* “green” – *viridior* “greener”, *simplex* “simple” – *simplicior* “simpler”. The indication of the highest degree of a quality compared to other objects is expressed by the superlative degree. Superlative degree also undergoes transformations in the categories of gender, number, and case. The

gradus superlativus of the majority of adjectives is formed from the *genetivus singularis* form by replacing the genitive ending with the suffix *-issim-* and adding the ending *-us* for masculine, *-a* for feminine, and *-um* for neuter: *venustus* “charming” – *venust-issim-us*, *-a*, *-um* “the most charming”, *felix* “happy” – *felicissim-us*, *-a*, *-um* “the happiest”. In the Latin–Ukrainian and Ukrainian–Latin dictionaries (Churakova, 2009), six adjectives with the suffix *-ilis-* are recorded, which in the *gradus superlativus* have the suffix *-lim-* < *-sim-*: *similis* “similar” – *simil-lim-us*, *-a*, *-um* “very similar”, *dissimilis* “dissimilar” – *dissimil-lim-us* “very dissimilar”, *humilis* “low” – *humil-lim-us* “the lowest”, *difficilis* “difficult” – *difficil-lim-us*, *-a*, *-um* “very difficult”, *gracilis* “beautiful” – *gracil-lim-us* “the most beautiful”, *facilis* “easy” – *facil-lim-us* < *facil-sim-us*, *-a*, *-um* “the easiest”. Masculine adjectives with the ending *-er* in the nominative singular form create the *gradus superlativus* by adding the suffix *-rim-* and the respective gender endings: *acer* “sharp” – *acer-rim-us*, *-a*, *-um* “the sharpest”, *miser* “miserable” – *miser-rim-us*, *-a*, *-um* “the most miserable”.

In summary, the word-formation categories of Latin adjectives, which are defined by grammatical specificity, are diverse and endowed with semantic richness, allowing the expression of a rich and multifaceted meaning. The lack of regularity and obligatory use indicates the flexibility of the Latin language in conveying conceptual meanings. The use of suffixes and prefixes to specify and vary the degree of expression of qualities opens new possibilities for analysing both qualitative and quantitative characteristics of adjectives. Through word-formation affixes, it becomes possible not only to identify adjective word-formation categories but also to gain a deeper understanding of linguistic processes.

Conclusions

The research conducted allows the following conclusions to be drawn. The Latin system of

adjective word formation is multifaceted and structurally varied. The types of word formation categories not only create new derivative adjectives but also reflect the complex interaction between morphological, syntactic, and semantic aspects of the language. The natural Latin system of adjective word formation is a set of various types of word formation categories. Each of the described word formation categories unites different derived adjectives, which share root bases and common word formation meanings. Word formation adjective categories of insufficient degree, excessive intensity of expression, and subjective evaluation of quality form adjectives with suffixal and suffixal-prefixal types of word formation, through which a derived adjective is formed and reflects, together with its ending, its word formation meaning. The word formation category of opposites includes derived adjectives with the prefixes *in-* (*im-*), *il-*, *ir-*, *dis-*, *e-*, *ex-*, which are added to a grammatically formed adjective, giving it an opposite meaning. The word formation categories of locative and temporal attributiveness have properties of syntactic-word formation phenomena.

The category of comparison degrees in adjectives, unlike the others, exhibits three grammatical levels: word formation, syntactic, and morphological. The category is linked to the suffixal type of word formation, indicating the higher and highest degrees of the manifestation of the quality of an object in comparison to another object, and consists of two grammatical forms – the comparative and superlative degrees. Each of the described word formation categories offers a unique approach to forming adjectives, emphasising the flexibility and dynamism of the Latin language. The influence of prefixes on the meaning of adjectives is particularly significant, as it allows the formation of antonyms, enriching the lexicon of the language. Moreover, the category of comparison degrees in adjectives demonstrates the importance of the interconnections between different

grammatical levels, opening new horizons for the study of morphological and syntactic features. The research does not claim to provide a comprehensive description of the word formation categories of Latin adjectives. In subsequent studies, it is necessary to focus on the description of adjectivisation types (transition of parts of speech into adjectives) and their impact on the development of the Latin language,

which will allow for a deeper examination of the mechanisms of word formation and their role in shaping language structures.

Acknowledgements

None.

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

- [1] Antonyuk, S. (2015). Linguistic traditions of studying the adjective as an independent part of speech. Word, sign, meaning: Problems, innovations, solutions. In *2nd All-Ukrainian (annual) scientific and practical conference* (pp. 1-5). Lviv.
- [2] Boyko, N., & Myronova, V. (2012). *Ukrainian-ancient Greek-Latin dictionary*. Kyiv: Publishing and Printing Center "Kyiv University".
- [3] Brucalé, L., & Mocciaro, E.A (2024). Cognitive-pragmatic description of evaluative suffixes in latin letters: The case of -llus. In *Recent trends and findings in Latin linguistics* (pp. 331-348). Boston: De Gruyter. doi: [10.1515/9783110722116-019](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110722116-019).
- [4] Cherniukh, B.V. (2022). *Folk Latin*. Lviv: Ivan Franko National University of Lviv.
- [5] Churakova, L.P. (2009). *Latin-Ukrainian and Ukrainian-Latin dictionary – more than 25 thousand words and phrases*. Kyiv: Chumatskyi Shliak.
- [6] Cser, A. (2016). *Aspects of the phonology and morphology of classical Latin*. Budapest.
- [7] Cuzzolin, P. (2011). Comparative and superlative. In *Complex sentences, grammaticalization, typology* (pp. 549-660). Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. doi: [10.1515/9783110253412.549](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110253412.549).
- [8] Cuzzolin, P. (2021). Negative adjectival morphology in Latin. *Journal of Latin Linguistics*, 20(1), 53-74. doi: [10.1515/joll-2021-2020](https://doi.org/10.1515/joll-2021-2020).
- [9] Dinu, D. (2012). *Prefix derivation in Latin*. Retrieved from https://cis01.central.ucv.ro/revista_scol/site_ro/2012/lexicologie/dinu.pdf.
- [10] Fruyt, M. (2011). Word-formation in Classical Latin. In *A companion to the latin language* (pp. 157-175). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. doi: [10.1002/9781444343397.ch11](https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444343397.ch11).
- [11] Iacobini, C. (2023). Prefixation (nouns and adjectives) in Romance Languages. In *Oxford research encyclopedia of linguistics*. doi: [10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.458](https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.458).
- [12] Maiden, A., Smith, J.Ch., & Ledgeway, A. (2010). *The Cambridge history of the Romance languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [13] Petrova, H. (2010). *Latin-Ukrainian word-formation dictionary*. Ternopil: Bohdan Publishing House.
- [14] Polyuga, S. (2021). Origins of the concept of part-language theory in the scientific ancient world. In *International scientific and practical conference "Advanced discoveries of modern science: Experience, approaches and innovations"* (pp. 153-155).
- [15] Pultrová, L. (2019). *Correlation between the gradability of Latin adjectives and the ability to form qualitative abstract nouns*. In *Proceedings of the second international workshop on resources and tools for derivational morphology* (pp. 25-34). Prague: Charles University.
- [16] Pultrová, L. (2023). *The category of comparison in Latin*. Leiden and Boston: BRILL.

- [17] Rainer, F. (2021). Adjectival suffixes: From Latin to Romance. In *Oxford research encyclopedia*, (pp. 1-24). Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi: [10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.690](https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.690).
- [18] Ruda, N.V. (2011) [Semantic and functional features of diminutivized adjectives and adverbs in Ukrainian and Latin](#). *Studia Linguistica*, 5, 173-177.
- [19] Sai, I.V. (2019). The lexical status of adjectives of the bahuvrihi type (Based on songs I-XII of Homer's poem "Iliad"). *Scientific Bulletin of the International Humanities University. Series: "Philology"*, 43(3), 60-62. doi: [10.32841/2409-1154.2019.43.3.13](https://doi.org/10.32841/2409-1154.2019.43.3.13).
- [20] Schmid, H.-J. (2015). The scope of word formation research. In *Word-formation* (pp. 1-21). Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. doi: [10.1515/9783110246254-003](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110246254-003).
- [21] Sihler, A.L. (2008). [New comparative grammar of Greek and Latin](#). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [22] Synytsia, V.G., Teleky, M.M., & Myronyk, O.V. (2023). Representation of the red color component and its shades in Latin medical terminology. *Bulletin of Science and Education*, 1(7), 245-259. doi: [10.52058/2786-6165-2023-1\(7\)-245-259](https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2023-1(7)-245-259).
- [23] Zagnitko, A. (2020). [Modern linguistic dictionary](#). Vinnytsia: Works.
- [24] Zvonska, L.L., et al. (2017). [Encyclopedic dictionary of classical languages](#). Kyiv: Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv.

Різновиди словотвірних категорій латинських прикметників

Василь Шинкарук

Доктор філологічних наук, професор
Національний університет біоресурсів і природокористування України
03041, вул. Героїв Оборони, 15, м. Київ, Україна
<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8589-4995>

Оксана Чайка

Доктор педагогічних наук, кандидат філологічних наук, доцент
Університет Люксембургу
Л-4365, просп. Університетський, 2, м. Еш-сюр-Альзетт, Люксембург
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4317-9456>

Марія Телеки

Кандидат філологічних наук, доцент
Буковинський державний медичний університет
58002, Театральна пл., 2, м. Чернівці, Україна
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4161-4386>

Анотація. У сучасному українському просторі класичної філології частиномовний клас прикметників латинської мови відображений фрагментарно. Аналіз латинських прикметників у термінах сучасного словотворення доповнює розвідки у сфері теоретичної граматики класичних мов. Метою дослідження було виокремити словотвірні категорії латинських прикметників та висвітлити засоби їхньої словотвірної репрезентації. У дослідженні застосовано вибірковий, словотвірний, описовий та валентно-дистрибутивний методи для аналізу, систематизації, класифікації та вивчення синтаксичних особливостей латинських прикметників. Обґрунтовано, що функційні особливості прикметників, які відображають його здатність виражати статичну ознаку предмета, набувають

принципового значення для розуміння його семантико-граматичних характеристик як частини мови та розмежовано первинні прикметники, які передають якісну ознаку, мають корінь і закінчення та вторинні, що відбивають складну ознаку, мають похідний характер і містять префікси чи суфікси. З'ясовано, що у латинській мові визначальною одиницею прикметникового словотвору є похідний прикметник. Носіями нового лексичного значення для похідного прикметника слугують суфікси. Префікси надають додаткових семантичних відтінків похідним прикметникам. У словотвірні категорії об'єднуються різні словотвірні похідні прикметники, що мають твірні, спільне словотвірне значення й утворені суфіксальним, префіксальним, префіксально-суфіксальним способами словотворення. Функцію конкретизації виконують суфікси і префікси, які варіюють кількісний вияв ознаки, що міститься у прикметниковому корені та вказують на інтенсивний чи неповний ступінь вияву ознаки. Виокремлено вісім словотвірних категорій латинських прикметників: недостатнього ступеня вияву ознаки; надмірної інтенсивності ознаки; суб'єктивної оцінки якості; посесивності; темпоральної атрибутивності; локативної атрибутивності; порядковості; ступенів порівняння. Категорія ступенів порівняння прикметників відрізняється від інших за належністю до трьох граматичних рівнів: словотвірного, синтаксичного і морфологічного. Проведене дослідження розширює уявлення про природну латинську систему прикметникового словотвору й інтерпретує не тільки формальні засоби його реалізації, але й семантичне трактування похідних лексичних одиниць. Результати дослідження прикметникових словотвірних категорій можуть бути використані у наступних наукових теоретичних розвідках з погляду дериваційних процесів латинської мови

Ключові слова: ступені вияву ознаки; словотвір; похідні прикметники; способи словотворення; суфіксація; префіксація