CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES (ISSN: 2767-3758)

VOLUME: Vol.07 Issue01 2026
Page: - 47-51
DOI: - 10.37547/philological-crjps-07-01-10

RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Gender, Case, And Plural Forms In Latin Anatomical Terms: Grammar As A Tool For Precision

Rasulova Zamira Turdibayevna

Lecturer at the Department of Uzbek and Foreign Languages No. 2 at Tashkent State Medical University, Uzbekistan

Received: 27 November 2025 **Accepted:** 19 December 2025 **Published:** 23 January 2026

ABSTRACT

Latin anatomical terminology is more than a historical tradition: it is a controlled linguistic system that encodes meaning through grammatical form. In standardized nomenclature, especially Terminologia Anatomica, Latin remains the reference layer for naming structures and expressing relationships between them. This article examines how three grammatical categories—gender, case, and number—shape the formation and interpretation of Latin anatomical terms, using well-known examples such as vertebra–vertebrae and bacterium–bacteria to illustrate frequent patterns and common sources of misunderstanding. A qualitative morphological–grammatical analysis was applied to representative Latin terms and multiword collocations in anatomical nomenclature and in contemporary medical discourse where nonassimilated Latin phrases preserve agreement and inflection. The results show that gender governs adjective agreement and stabilizes term structure; case endings encode part–whole and specification relations (most prominently through the genitive); and plural formation follows declensional logic that is highly regular yet capable of producing ambiguity when identical forms serve different functions. The discussion highlights practical implications for teaching, translation, and documentation accuracy, arguing that grammatical literacy is essential for safe and standardized anatomical communication.

Keywords: Latin anatomical terminology; gender; case; number; declension; nominative; genitive; plural formation; agreement; Terminologia Anatomica.

INTRODUCTION

Anatomical language has to perform a demanding task: it must name structures unambiguously, show how they relate to one another, and remain stable across textbooks, curricula, and international professional communication. For this reason, modern anatomical nomenclature preserves Latin as a reference language and provides standardized terms in Latin alongside vernacular equivalents. Terminologia Anatomica is widely described as the international standard for human anatomical terminology and presents Latin terms as the backbone of the system.

The efficiency of Latin in anatomy is not only lexical but grammatical. Latin uses inflection to encode relationships that English often expresses with prepositions or word order. This feature is clinically useful because a compact term can carry layered information: a head noun names the primary structure, adjectives add relational properties, and genitive forms specify "of what" or "belonging to what." In contemporary medical discourse, many multiword Latin expressions persist precisely because they preserve "original features of the Latin grammatical system," including agreement in gender and inflection rules, as noted in analyses of Latin usage in medical texts.

Yet the same grammatical richness that makes Latin precise can cause predictable errors among learners and even among professionals when terms are transferred into other languages, abbreviated, or learned only as isolated

labels. A common challenge is that grammatical categories are treated as decorative rather than semantic. In reality, gender determines adjective endings and thus the correct form of many standard names; case endings encode the internal structure of multiword terms; and plural formation is not optional—it is essential for accurate description of multiple structures and for interpreting texts where plural forms appear in diagnoses, imaging descriptions, and surgical reports. A further complication is that some forms are ambiguous by shape: the same spelling may correspond to different grammatical functions depending on context, which is particularly visible in the first declension (as in vertebrae).

This article addresses these issues by focusing on three core categories—gender, case, and number—and by showing how they operate in Latin anatomical terminology as a practical system. The aim is not to reproduce full declension tables, but to explain how grammatical logic supports meaning, where ambiguity arises, and how standardization sources help maintain consistency in use.

A qualitative grammatical analysis was conducted on representative Latin anatomical terms and term-like collocations. The primary reference frame was the standardized approach reflected in Terminologia Anatomica and its scholarly discussion as an international standard for anatomical terminology. Additional material included nonassimilated Latin expressions and multiword terms used in modern medical discourse that preserve Latin agreement and inflection (for example, expressions comparable in structure to os ischii or musculus latissimus dorsi), as documented in discourse-based analyses of Latin terminology in medical writing.

Each selected term was examined for (1) grammatical gender of the head noun, (2) declensional behavior and key case forms used in term construction (with emphasis on nominative and genitive), and (3) plural formation patterns relevant to anatomical description. The analysis also tracked ambiguity points where identical surface forms can represent different grammatical categories, and it compared such cases with guidance from educational medical Latin materials that explicitly teach dictionary forms (nominative and genitive) and their role in recognizing declension and number. The intention was to describe stable, high-yield patterns that explain how Latin grammar contributes to terminological precision and standardization.

The analysis indicates that Latin anatomical terms behave as a structured system in which grammatical form contributes directly to meaning. Gender controls agreement and thus the internal cohesion of multiword names; case endings organize relations between structures; and plural forms follow predictable declensional rules while occasionally producing ambiguity through form overlap.

Gender in anatomical terms is grammatical rather than biological, but it is not arbitrary in practice because it governs the agreement of adjectives and participles that are essential for standard naming. Educational medical Latin materials emphasize that dictionary presentation typically includes the nominative and genitive forms along with gender, precisely because this information allows the user to decline the noun and to form correct agreements. In anatomical naming, a head noun such as vertebra is feminine in the first declension, and this fact determines the correct adjective endings in combinations like vertebra thoracica or vertebra prominens as used in structured anatomical description. Even when learners recognize the meaning of the adjective, failure to match gender and case produces nonstandard or incorrect forms that can undermine clarity and violate the conventions of standardized terminology.

Case is the key mechanism by which Latin encodes internal relationships in multiword anatomical terms. The nominative typically names the structure as the head of the term, while the genitive often specifies a related structure, producing an "X of Y" relation without an explicit preposition. This is not merely stylistic: the genitive indicates a conceptual link such as part–whole, belonging, or specification. In common anatomical patterns, a structure may be named as a part of another structure through genitive dependence, as in expressions structurally analogous to caput femoris ("head of the femur") or collum costae ("neck of the rib"). Discourse-based research on Latin expressions in medical writing underscores that such collocations preserve Latin grammatical relationships and agreement, maintaining a compact representation of anatomical relations that remains internationally recognizable.

The importance of case is also visible in debates about nomenclature "pitfalls." Scholarly discussion of Terminologia Anatomica usage notes that some Latin terms contain two nouns in the nominative (apposition), which may appear as compound nouns to non-Latin

readers, and argues that many such terms could be simplified by shifting toward a genitive construction (for example, replacing a nominative apposition with a genitive that more transparently encodes relation). This observation reinforces a broader result of the present analysis: when terms rely on nominative–genitive structures, the relational meaning is often clearer to learners and translators because the genitive ending signals dependence in a way that a second nominative may not.

Plural formation is the third major area where grammar shapes terminological competence. Two examples highlight the interaction between declension class and plural endings. The first is vertebra–vertebrae. In classical Latin declension logic, the nominative plural of many first-declension feminine nouns ends in -ae, yielding vertebrae. The second is bacterium–bacteria, which illustrates a common neuter plural pattern: many second-declension neuter nouns form the nominative (and accusative) plural in -a, giving bacteria. Educational medical Latin materials explicitly include both vertebra, vertebrae and neuter patterns that produce -a plurals, illustrating how learners are trained to recognize and generate such forms through dictionary entries and declensional inference.

A crucial finding is that plural formation can generate ambiguity when surface forms overlap with other grammatical categories. The form vertebrae can represent either nominative plural ("vertebrae") or genitive singular ("of the vertebra") because both endings coincide in the first declension. In purely lexical learning, this ambiguity is invisible; in real term reading, it is resolved by syntactic context and by the presence of agreement markers. For example, if an adjective or participle is plural and agrees with vertebrae, the form is nominative plural; if vertebrae follows a head noun and functions as a dependent specification, it is typically genitive singular. This is exactly the type of situation where grammar is not optional decoration but the mechanism of interpretation.

Another recurring observation concerns the way plural forms influence perceived meaning in clinical reading. Neuter plurals in -a, such as the pattern exemplified by bacteria, are often encountered as reminders that Latin number marking does not necessarily align with English intuitions, where an -a ending might be misread as singular by those unfamiliar with Latin. In anatomical contexts, similar neuter plural patterns occur widely in terms naming multiple openings, septa, or structural subdivisions, and the ability to recognize the neuter plural ending supports accurate interpretation of imaging findings and operative descriptions.

Finally, the results confirm that standardized anatomical references and their commentary treat grammar as central to nomenclature usability. A review discussion of Terminologia Anatomica notes that the decline in Latin teaching can make it difficult for doctors and scientists to interpret plural forms and adjective–noun agreement, thereby increasing reliance on vernacular terms and potentially increasing misunderstanding in multilingual environments. This observation aligns with the present findings: grammatical competence is not a purely academic goal but a practical requirement for keeping anatomical communication stable and interoperable across contexts.

The findings show that gender, case, and number form a tightly integrated "semantic grammar" of Latin anatomical terminology. This grammar supports three outcomes that are essential in medicine: standardization, precision of relation, and interpretability across languages.

Gender functions as an organizing mechanism because it stabilizes agreement. In anatomical Latin, the head noun's gender determines the morphology of adjectives and participles that encode relational meaning. This is why a learner who knows only the lexical gloss of a word may still produce nonstandard terms if they ignore gender. Medical Latin teaching materials place emphasis on dictionary form (nominative + genitive + gender) precisely because these elements allow the user to predict agreement and declension. When this information is used consistently, it reduces variation and supports the principle that one structure should correspond to one standardized name in a controlled nomenclature system.

Case is the most conceptually informative category in multiword terms because it expresses relations without additional words. The genitive, in particular, is central to anatomical naming because anatomy is fundamentally relational: structures belong to systems, parts belong to wholes, surfaces belong to organs, and branches belong to vessels and nerves. Latin encodes these dependencies efficiently through inflection. In modern medical writing, nonassimilated Latin phrases persist because they preserve this efficient encoding of relationships and agreement, providing a compact, internationally interpretable layer within texts.

At the same time, case is the main source of hidden

difficulty. Unlike vocabulary, which can be memorized as labels, case must be interpreted in context. The ambiguity of vertebrae illustrates a larger issue: Latin often uses the same ending for more than one grammatical function, and only syntactic structure reveals which is intended. This is why teaching term formation solely through "word lists" under-prepares students for real reading and writing. A clinically relevant competence is the ability to see which word is the head and which word is dependent, and to use case endings as cues to that hierarchy.

Plural formation is sometimes treated as a minor mechanical skill, but in practice it affects comprehension and correctness. In anatomy, pluralization is frequent because descriptions often refer to paired structures, multiple segments, and repeated elements. Errors in plural recognition can lead to confusion, especially with neuter plurals in -a, which may appear unintuitive to those trained only in English plural patterns. Conversely, correct plural usage supports clarity and can even affect patient safety indirectly by ensuring that documentation accurately reflects whether a finding is localized or multiple.

The discussion of nomenclature pitfalls in Terminologia Anatomica usage adds an important nuance: even within standardized terminology, grammatical choices matter for usability. The observation that some terms contain two nominative nouns (apposition) and might be clearer if expressed through genitive dependence highlights that grammar is part of nomenclature design, not merely a legacy feature. In digital environments, where terms are searched, coded, and mapped across systems, grammatically transparent structures can reduce ambiguity and improve machine-assisted interpretation, while nontransparent structures can increase variability in practice.

For multilingual education and translation, these results imply that Latin grammar should be taught as a meaning system rather than as a set of abstract rules. When learners understand that gender is a trigger for agreement, that case encodes dependence, and that plural endings carry number information that may not "look English," they can decode unfamiliar terms more reliably and can produce standardized forms with fewer errors. The broader literature on Latin in medical terminology emphasizes that Latin continues to offer terminological continuity and an internationally shared framework, especially in anatomical vocabulary. In this sense, grammatical competence supports not only classroom success but also professional interoperability.

Gender, case, and plural formation are not peripheral features of Latin anatomical terminology; they are the mechanisms that make the system precise, compact, and standardizable. Gender stabilizes adjective agreement and thus the internal correctness of multiword terms. Case endings, particularly the genitive, encode structural relationships that are fundamental to anatomical naming. Plural forms follow declensional rules that are highly regular but can be ambiguous in surface form, requiring contextual interpretation. Standard references such as Terminologia Anatomica and its scholarly commentary demonstrate that grammatical literacy remains essential for interpreting plural terms, maintaining agreement, and avoiding confusion in multilingual professional environments. Strengthening grammar-based terminology instruction can therefore improve both educational outcomes and the quality of clinical documentation.

REFERENCES

1. ГОСТ Р 7.0.5–2008. СИБИД. Библиографическая ссылка. Общие требования и правила составления. — М.: Стандартинформ, 2008. — 24 с.

2. Federative Committee on Anatomical Terminology. Terminologia anatomica: international anatomical terminology. — Stuttgart: Thieme, 1998. — x, 292 p.

3. Allen W. E. Terminologia anatomica: international anatomical terminology and Terminologia Histologica: International Terms for Human Cytology and Histology // Journal of Anatomy. — 2009. — Vol. 215, No. 2. — P. 221. — DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-7580.2009.1093_1.x.

4. Chmielewski P. P., Domagała Z. A. Terminologia Anatomica and its practical usage: pitfalls and how to avoid them // Folia Morphologica. — 2020. — Vol. 79, No. 2. — P. 198–204. — DOI: 10.5603/FM.a2019.0086.

5. Lysanets Y. V., Bieliaieva O. M. The use of Latin terminology in medical case reports: quantitative, structural, and thematic analysis // Journal of Medical Case Reports. — 2018. — Vol. 12. — Art. 45. — DOI: 10.1186/s13256-018-1562-x.

6. Marecková E., Simon F., Červený L. Latin as the

language of medical terminology: some remarks on its role and prospects // Swiss Medical Weekly. — 2002. — Vol. 132, No. 41–42. — P. 581–587. — DOI: 10.4414/smw.2002.10027.

7. Wulff H. R. The language of medicine // Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine. — 2004. — Vol. 97, No. 4. — P. 187–188. — DOI: 10.1177/014107680409700412.

8. Titiyevska T., Gordiyenko O., Kulichenko A., Martianova M. Latin and Fundamentals of Medical Terminology: Handbook for the 1st year English-Speaking Students of the Medical Faculties. — Zaporizhzhia: ZSMU, 2016. — 141 p.

9. Budzowska M. Medical Latin Course. — Łódź: Medical University of Łódź, 2007. — 63 p.