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

VOLUME: Vol.07 Issue01 2026
Page: - 52-56
DOI: - 10.37547/philological-crjps-07-01-11

RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Eponyms And Their Latinization In Disease And Syndrome Names: Grammar, Convention, And Standardization

Xamroqulova Munira Rasulovna

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

Received: 29 November 2025 **Accepted:** 21 December 2025 **Published:** 25 January 2026

ABSTRACT

Eponymous disease and syndrome names remain widespread in clinical speech, education, and the biomedical literature, even as modern classifications increasingly prefer descriptive or mechanism-based terms. Alongside English and other national-language forms, many medical education traditions preserve a Latin layer for eponyms, most visibly in constructions such as morbus + surname or syndroma + surname, as well as in Neo-Latin spellings that use the genitive to mark attribution. This article examines how eponyms are Latinized in the naming of diseases and syndromes, why multiple competing Latinization patterns exist, and how these patterns interact with contemporary recommendations to reduce possessive forms in English. Using a qualitative linguistic method (morphological and orthographic analysis) on representative eponymic labels drawn from scholarly discussions of Latin medical terminology and eponym formation, we identify the principal Latinization strategies: genitive singular forms that follow a Latin head noun, apostrophe-marked "main eponyms" that avoid declension, and hybrid or exception patterns motivated by pronunciation and international variation. Results show that Latinization is guided less by "pure" classical rules than by professional convention and practical readability, yet it still relies on recognizable Latin grammatical signals (especially the genitive) that help convey attribution and improve interpretability across languages. We discuss implications for teaching medical Latin, harmonizing terminology in multilingual settings, and improving bibliographic retrieval where possessive/nonpossessive alternation remains a persistent problem.

Keywords: Medical eponyms; Latinization; disease names; syndrome names; Neo-Latin; genitive; orthography; standardization; bibliographic retrieval.

INTRODUCTION

Eponyms—terms based on proper names—occupy a distinctive place in medical language. They can function as compact professional shorthand and preserve historical memory, but they can also introduce ambiguity, regional variation, and ethical controversy. The tension between tradition and precision is visible in the continuing debate over whether eponyms should be maintained or replaced with descriptive equivalents, a debate repeatedly documented in studies of medical discourse. At the same time, even when an eponym is retained, its form is not stable: usage may alternate between possessive and nonpossessive constructions (for example, "Parkinson's disease" versus "Parkinson disease"), complicating indexing and search. Large-scale examinations of the biomedical literature show a long-term shift toward nonpossessive forms in many contexts, yet inconsistency remains substantial and geographically patterned.

Latin adds another layer to this picture. In many medical education traditions, Latin persists not only in anatomy and prescriptions but also as a terminological reference language. A classical-language perspective helps explain why: Latin is structurally well suited for compressing attribution and relation into a compact phrase. Modern scholarship on the role of Latin in medical terminology

emphasizes that Latin has retained a stable "nominating function" in key components of medical language even after it ceased to be a general teaching language. Within this framework, eponymic disease and syndrome names are often expressed through recognizable Neo-Latin patterns such as morbus ("disease") or syndroma ("syndrome") followed by a Latinized personal name, frequently in the genitive, meaning "of X." Such formations appear in comparative and terminological studies that explicitly describe how Latin eponyms are coined and used in contemporary medical terminology.

However, Latinization is not uniform. Recent linguistic analyses distinguish between eponyms that are written with an apostrophe rather than in a Latin case form ("main eponyms") and eponyms where the author's name follows a Latin term in the genitive ("subordinate eponyms"), with additional exceptions motivated by pronunciation and orthographic convention. These competing strategies matter for medical education, translation, and documentation because they determine what a "correct" Latin form looks like and whether it is interpretable as a grammatical construction or as a frozen label.

A qualitative linguistic analysis was conducted focusing on Latinization patterns for disease and syndrome eponyms. The material consisted of representative examples and rule statements drawn from peer-reviewed and scholarly discussions of eponyms in Latin medical terminology, including contrastive analyses of Latin, English, and other languages that describe the structural models of eponym formation and the rationale for exceptions. Additional contextual evidence was taken from studies addressing possessive versus nonpossessive eponym use in biomedical publishing and its consequences for literature retrieval, as well as commentaries documenting institutional recommendations against possessive eponyms.

Each example was analyzed along three dimensions. First, the syntactic template was identified (for instance, Latin head noun plus personal name; personal name used alone; adjectival derivative). Second, the morphological strategy was described (genitive formation, indeclinable name, apostrophe marking, hyphenation for multiple names). Third, the functional motivation was inferred from the sources: whether the form aims to encode attribution transparently, preserve pronunciation, avoid declensional uncertainty, or align with international usage. The goal was not to produce an exhaustive inventory of all eponyms, but to describe robust patterns that explain why Latinized eponyms appear in different shapes and why certain variants persist.

The analysis shows that Latinization of disease and syndrome eponyms is organized around a small set of productive templates, each reflecting a different compromise between grammatical transparency and conventional readability.

A central and historically resilient template is the construction in which a Latin head noun (morbus, syndroma, and other diagnostic or descriptive nouns such as contractura or degeneratio) is followed by the eponym in a dependent form that expresses attribution. In linguistic descriptions of Latin medical terminology, this dependent positioning is explicitly linked to the genitive: "subordinate eponyms" place the author's name after a Latin term in the genitive singular, as in degeneratio Wagneri ("Wagner degeneration"). In the disease domain, comparable patterns are reported in medical education and terminology contexts, for example in forms like Parkinsoni morbus, Basedowi morbus, and Crohni morbus, which illustrate the same logic: a Latin diagnostic noun followed by a Latinized name that functions as an attributive marker.

A second strategy is what recent work calls "main eponyms," where the personal name appears with an apostrophe rather than being put into a Latin case form. In this pattern, the apostrophe functions as a practical orthographic marker that allows the term to avoid declensional decisions while still signaling the boundary of the name element. Analyses of Latin medical eponyms describe this as common for certain formations and note additional conventions when multiple personal names are involved: names may be hyphenated, and the apostrophe may be omitted at the end in multi-name constructions. In this sense, the apostrophe-based pattern behaves like a "Neo-Latin compromise": it keeps the surface form close to international usage while retaining a recognizable Latin frame.

The same sources also emphasize that Latinization is not driven solely by abstract grammatical rules but by pronunciation and professional convention, which generate explicit exceptions. For example, the subordinate genitive model is described as having exceptions for personal names of French origin and for names ending in a vowel, where an apostrophe may be used instead of a genitive ending to avoid mispronunciation. This point is crucial

because it explains why learners may encounter both genitive forms and apostrophe forms and why neither can be dismissed as "simply incorrect" without considering the tradition and the reference source.

A further result is that Latinized eponyms frequently compete with non-eponymic or differently eponymized alternatives across countries and traditions. Contemporary analyses note that different eponyms for the same disease may be popular in different countries, producing synonymy and parallel naming traditions. This international variability is one reason Latinization patterns become educationally salient: a Latin form can act as an anchor for mapping between national terms, but only if its construction principles are understood and applied consistently.

Finally, the results connect Latinization to a broader publishing problem: inconsistency between possessive and nonpossessive eponyms in English and indexing systems. Empirical studies demonstrate that alternating forms hamper retrieval in databases and that a gradual shift from possessive to nonpossessive forms has occurred over decades, with strong regional differences in adoption. Commentaries further note that institutions such as NIH have recommended refraining from possessive eponyms since the 1970s, and the World Health Organization and major style authorities have encouraged similar moves, although practice remains mixed. This matters for Latinization because Latin genitives can look "possessive" to modern readers even when they function primarily as attribution rather than ownership, creating a conceptual mismatch between Latin forms and contemporary English style trends.

The findings suggest that Latinization of disease and syndrome eponyms is best understood as a Neo-Latin naming technology rather than a simple application of classroom Latin grammar. The genitive-based construction (morbus + genitive surname; syndroma + genitive surname) has a clear linguistic rationale: Latin encodes "of X" compactly, so attribution can be expressed without prepositions or additional words. This aligns well with medical communication goals: it produces a short, standardized-looking label and allows related terms to be generated by changing only the head noun while keeping the eponymic anchor stable. The subordinate model described in recent linguistic work explicitly frames the genitive as the central mechanism of this construction and provides examples that mirror clinical naming logic.

At the same time, the apostrophe-based "main eponym" strategy shows that Latinization also adapts to practical constraints. Modern surnames may be difficult to decline consistently, and different educational traditions may teach different Neo-Latin genitive endings for the same name. Apostrophe marking, hyphenation, and other orthographic devices function as stabilizers: they preserve readability, reduce the need for grammatical decisions, and keep the term closer to internationally circulating forms. The explicit exception rules reported in recent analyses—especially those motivated by pronunciation—support the view that Latinization is governed by usability in professional discourse, not by strict classical purity.

A key implication is pedagogical. When learners encounter Latinized eponyms, they often assume there must be a single "correct" form, but real usage reflects multiple semi-standard traditions. The most productive teaching approach is therefore not memorization of isolated labels, but recognition of the underlying templates and the reasons for deviation. The subordinate model teaches how attribution is encoded; the apostrophe model explains why some names appear undeclined; and the exception model connects orthography to pronunciation and international variability. This approach also helps students interpret Latinized eponyms encountered in older literature and in multilingual reference works, where Latin may be used as a pivot between languages.

The interaction with modern publishing standards introduces an additional layer of complexity. English-language biomedical style has moved toward nonpossessive eponyms for practical and conceptual reasons, including the desire to avoid implying "ownership" and to improve consistency in indexing and database searching. Empirical evidence demonstrates both the existence of long-term shifts and the persistence of inconsistency, which can hinder systematic literature retrieval. This trend does not automatically eliminate Latin genitives, but it does change how they are perceived. A Latin phrase such as morbus Parkinsoni is structurally genitive, yet its function is attributional; meanwhile, English "Parkinson disease" removes the apostrophe to avoid possessive interpretation. In multilingual environments, educators and translators should therefore make explicit that Latin genitives in eponyms are primarily conventional attribution markers and that modern English nonpossessive policy is a style and standardization decision rather than a denial of historical credit.

There is also a broader standardization lesson that comes from the contrast between anatomy and disease naming. In anatomical nomenclature, eponyms have been explicitly discouraged in favor of descriptive terms, precisely because eponyms provide little anatomical information and vary across countries. Disease and syndrome nomenclature has not undergone the same degree of de-eponymization, partly because many eponyms remain deeply embedded in clinical habits and literature. Historical analyses of particular disease eponyms, such as Parkinson's disease, illustrate how an eponym can become entrenched through professional networks and publication traditions even when nosology becomes more mechanism-based. This historical persistence means Latinization will continue to be relevant in education and lexicography, even if descriptive alternatives expand.

In practical terms, the most defensible approach for academic writing and educational materials is to separate three tasks that are often conflated. The first is accurate concept identification (what condition is being described). The second is terminological choice (eponymic versus descriptive label, depending on standards and audience). The third is form selection (how the eponym is written and Latinized within the chosen language layer). The sources reviewed here show that confusion and retrieval problems arise especially when the third task is treated as trivial. Teaching the logic of Latinization—rather than presenting Latin eponyms as irregular curiosities—therefore has tangible benefits for writing quality, translation accuracy, and database search competence.

Latinization of disease and syndrome eponyms remains a living practice shaped by grammar, orthography, and professional convention. The dominant productive strategy is a Latin head noun followed by an attributive personal name often expressed through a genitive form, while apostrophe-based and exception strategies persist to preserve pronunciation and stabilize modern surnames in Neo-Latin usage. Contemporary publishing trends toward nonpossessive English eponyms aim to improve consistency and searchability, but they do not remove the need to understand Latinized variants, especially in multilingual medical education and historical literature. A concept-oriented, template-based approach to teaching Latinized eponyms offers the most reliable path to reducing error, improving interpretability, and supporting standardization across contexts.

REFERENCES

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

2. Petkova G., Ivanova V. An overview of eponyms in the Latin medical terminological system // Orbis Linguarum. — 2025. — Vol. 23, Issue 3. — P. 42–48. — doi: 10.37708/ezs.swu.bg.v23i3.4.

3. Zheleva Z., Petkova G., Ivanova V. Eponyms in Latin, English and Bulgarian medical terminology // Speech and Context. — 2021. — No. 2(XIII). — doi: 10.62413/lc.2021(2).04.

4. Jana N., Barik S., Arora N. Current use of medical eponyms – a need for global uniformity in scientific publications // BMC Medical Research Methodology. — 2009. — Vol. 9. — Art. 18. — doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-9-18.

5. Ayesu K., Nguyen B., Harris S., Carlan S. The case for consistent use of medical eponyms by eliminating possessive forms // Journal of the Medical Library Association. — 2018. — Vol. 106, No. 1. — P. 127–129. — doi: 10.5195/jmla.2018.284.

6. Goedert M., Compston A. Parkinson's disease — the story of an eponym // Nature Reviews Neurology. — 2018. — Vol. 14, No. 1. — P. 57–62. — doi: 10.1038/nrneurol.2017.165.

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. Marecková E., 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.

9. Greathouse D. G., Halle J. S., Dalley A. F. Terminologia Anatomica: revised anatomical terminology // Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy. — 2004. — Vol. 34, No. 7. — P. 363–367. — doi: 10.2519/jospt.2004.0107.

10. Drukker J., Walvoort H. C. Terminologia anatomica: a new reference work for anatomy // Ned Tijdschr

Geneeskd. — 2000. — Vol. 144, No. 19. — P. 890–893.

11. Illustrated Dictionary of Eponymic Syndromes and Diseases and Their Synonyms. — (Reprint text source).