



Article

The Syntax of the Genitive Case in Longus' Novel *Daphnis and Chloe*

Inesa Chakal¹¹Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, Chernivtsi, Ukraine

SUBMISSION TRACK

Received: April 13, 2024
 Final Revision: June 7, 2024
 Accepted: June 12, 2024
 Available Online: June 30, 2024

KEYWORDS

Genitive, inflection, ancient Greek, syntactic functions

CORRESPONDENCE

E-mail: Chakal_Ines@ukr.net

A B S T R A C T

This study aims to explore the syntactic functions and characteristics of the genitive case in the ancient Greek novel "Daphnis and Chloe" by Longus, a text from the 2nd century AD, which exemplifies the "second sophistic" period of rhetorical development. The primary source for this research is the text of "Daphnis and Chloe", which has been thoroughly analysed to ascertain the usage of the genitive case in various syntactic roles. The research employs descriptive and structural methods of linguistic analysis. The descriptive method identifies and explains instances of the genitive case within the text, while the structural method examines the relationships between these instances and other linguistic elements. The genitive case in the novel is found to perform multiple syntactic functions, including controlling verbs, nouns, adjectives, and expressing various semantic nuances. Detailed examples are provided to illustrate these functions and their impact on the text's meaning. The findings offer a foundation for further studies of the genitive case in ancient Greek texts, providing significant insights for researchers and linguists interested in ancient Greek grammar and its syntactic constructions. The study enhances understanding of ancient rhetorical techniques and their application in literary texts during the "second sophistic" period.

I. INTRODUCTION

The genitive case is one of the most prevalent and multifaceted grammatical cases found across languages (Shynkaruk, 2023). Its semantic roles and syntactic functions are highly diverse, ranging from denoting possession and attribution to marking objects, measurements, qualities, and a wide array of other grammatical relationships (Ryskulova et al., 2022). While certain languages have reduced or even eliminated the genitive entirely, it remains a rich and pervasive feature in many ancient languages, like Ancient Greek. Exploring the genitive case, particularly in literary works where language is carefully employed, can yield insights into the depth and complexity of meaning that skilled writers could convey through deft case usage. By examining the genitive functions at play in Longus' novel *Daphnis and Chloe*, we gain a window into the nuanced expressiveness of this ancient Greek case system as manifested in one of

the earliest surviving prose romances. Although widely examined across various languages, the genitive case in Ancient Greek, especially as employed in literary texts from the Hellenistic period such as Longus' "Daphnis and Chloe", has not been comprehensively analysed for its syntactic diversity and functional depth (Maciver, 2020). This novel, a prime example of the "second sophistic" period's literary style and rhetorical sophistication, offers a valuable resource for studying the nuanced uses of the genitive case.

The genitive case in Ancient Greek plays a crucial role in expressing various linguistic relationships and attributes, ranging from possession and origin to descriptive and contextual functions (Ziak et al., 2022 & Bowie, 2023). In literary and mythological narratives, such as "Daphnis and Chloe", the genitive enriches the text by detailing relationships between characters, their attributes, and interactions with elements like

music and divine intervention, thus providing a deeper understanding of the narrative and cultural nuances embedded in the language (Louw, 1966).

For the first time, the word “πτώσεις” (case) as a term in a grammatical context is recorded by Aristotle, a famous ancient Greek philosopher (384-322 BC), who put a much broader meaning into it than this term has in modern grammar (Lychuk, 2022). In general, the study of the essence of the case is complicated by two factors. First, the number of cases in different languages differs from one another (Ukrainian has seven cases, English has two, Latin has six, Ancient Greek has five, and Estonian has fifteen). Secondly, the case is a category that is related to almost all levels of language: to morphology, since the case is a morphological category expressed by morphemes; to syntax, since cases indicate the grammatical status of sentence members; to semantics, since cases express the semantic relations of different words in a sentence (Shapauov et al., 2014 & Romaniuk & Yavorska, 2022).

The topic of the case has interested many scholars. In Ukrainian linguistics, the following scholars can be mentioned: Olishchuk (1996) and Zvonska et al. (2017). In their works, natives of Britain, Belgium, Hungary, and other countries studied this issue: Heller and Szmrecsanyi (2019), Azaz (2020), Kim (2021), and Cohen (2019). In their work Heller and Szmrecsanyi (2019) describe the regional patterns between the two main existing possessive s-genitive and of-genitive constructions. Kim (2021) focuses on possessive constructions and presents a new type of possessive construction, the proper construction in the research. The new type of these constructions shows the genitive alternation of the s-genitive case and the of-genitive case. The main research goal is to identify the decisive factors that determine the use of these forms of the genitive case. The research results show that the syntactic distribution of the possessive type of the genitive case is determined by semantic or pragmatic features. The possessive type of the genitive case is a proper grammatical construction to indicate a stronger degree of close possession established between living beings.

Cohen (2019) in research demonstrates the extent of Semitic genitive construction. In addition to its central role in the noun domain, it is the mechanism behind many types of phrases and clauses, such as relative clauses, complex

prepositions, gerund forms, and most types of adverbial clauses. The syntactic function of various constructions can be explained by the syntactic nature of the head as the grammatical center of the entire construction. Accordingly, an adverbial heading naturally occurs in the head of an adverbial expression or clause. The functional scope of Semitic genitive constructions deserves to be considered a major feature of the syntax of the general Semitic language. In the research by Azaz (2020), hypotheses are used to study cross-linguistic transfer in adult second language acquisition, the alternation of the English genitive case by intermediate and more proficient Egyptian Arabic-speaking learners. In standard syntactic analysis, the s-genitive case is considered more difficult than the of-genitive case because its possessive form is more elevated in the determiner phrase.

This research aims to comprehensively analyse the functional diversity and syntactic nuances of the genitive case in Longus' ancient Greek novel “Daphnis and Chloe” from the 2nd century AD. While the genitive has been extensively studied across languages, its multifaceted roles within this seminal prose work of the “second sophistic” period have not been thoroughly examined. By methodically cataloguing and exemplifying the genitive's 25 distinct syntactic functions attested in the novel, from the subjective and objective roles to more specialised cases like the genitive of comparison, abundance, and exclamation, this research illuminates the rhetorical sophistication with which Longus deployed the genitive to enrich his narratives. The findings contribute a novel, corpus-based perspective on the functional depth of this ancient case system within a celebrated literary context, providing insights valuable to scholars of ancient Greek grammar, rhetoric, and prose fiction alike.

II. METHODS

Source of Data

The main material for this research is the novel “Daphnis and Chloe”, written by Longus in the second century AD. The research uses by author translation of all sentences from the original language. The novel itself has 256 pages and consists of a preface and 4 “books”, i.e., chapters (Schönberger, 1973). This novel was chosen because it is a seminal example of the “second sophistic” period, renowned for its sophisticated

use of language and rhetoric. It provides a rich textual base to analyse the syntactic functions of the genitive case, which are pivotal in understanding the linguistic structures of ancient Greek, particularly in literary contexts.

Data Collection

In this research, the descriptive method was used to describe the ancient Greek genitive case, all its features, syntactic functions, and phrases to maximise understanding of its specificity. This suggests that since the descriptive method provides maximum information about a linguistic unit, the genitive case is often used in linguistic research. The inductive method is one of the most common methods that can be used to draw a generalised conclusion based on individual data. Using examples from the novel, the use of the genitive case can be seen, thus forming a classification, rules, and cases of its use. In this research, this method is used to provide examples of how the genitive case was used in ancient Greek.

To collect the relevant data, all instances of the genitive case in the novel were systematically catalogued. This involved a meticulous reading of the novel, followed by the identification and annotation of each occurrence of the genitive case. The instances were then categorised based on their syntactic function, ensuring a comprehensive dataset for analysis. This structured approach allows for an in-depth exploration of the genitive case within its literary context.

Data Analysis

The contrastive method, also called the comparative method, is used to compare, and identify common and distinctive features of the linguistic units of the languages under study, and to identify features, advantages, and disadvantages. This linguistic method is one of the main methods in contrastive linguistics. In this research, the contrastive method is used to compare what syntactic function the genitive case has and in what case it is used. The distributive analysis is not a new method, as it was developed by L. Bloomfield in the 20s of the XX century, although its creator is Z. Harris, who developed this method in the 30s and 50s. The distributive analysis is intended to establish the characteristics and properties of linguistic units, considering their distribution, or, in other words, their environment (Kovalov, 2007). The importance of the method used is predefined

by the possibility of noticing the use of the genitive case in the environment of different parts of speech. Since the environment of each element is unique, it is possible to study in detail the linguistic element under study based on it. In linguistic studies like this one, the method of classification plays an important role. This method consists of dividing linguistic units and phenomena by common features and criteria. For example, in this work, the genitive case, examples of which are taken from the novel “Daphnis and Chloe”, is divided following syntactic functions, i.e., the genitive case is classified.

III. RESULTS

The genitive case (*casus genetivus*, “πῶς γενική”) is one of the indirect cases that combines the functions of two Indo-European cases: genitive and ablative (Zvonska et al., 2017). The unification of these two cases in Ancient Greek into the genitive led to an increase in its syntactic functions. Following the modern grammars of Ancient Greek, it was determined that the genitive case is attributed a total of 25 syntactic functions (Table 1).

Source: compiled by authors based on Zvonska et al. (2017), Olishchuk (1996), Dean (2003).

Table 1 provides the corresponding Latin and Greek terms for each function, highlighting the diverse roles the genitive case can play in sentence structure and meaning. This classification aids in understanding the complexity and versatility of genitive case usage in Ancient Greek.

“*Genetivus absolutus*” (genitive absolute). This syntactic conditional is a compound circumstance of time, reason, concession, or condition that does not depend on any member of the sentence. It consists of a logical subject (noun, adjective, pronoun in “*genetivus*”) and a logical predicate (a participle agreed with the logical subject). “*Participium praesentis*” expresses an action that is simultaneous with the action of the predicate of the main clause, “*participium aoristi*” – the previous one. The particle “οὐ” serves as a negation, and “μή” is used in the opposite direction with a conditional meaning. The genitive absolute can express different circumstances under which the action expressed by the verb takes place: it can have temporal (when, while), causal (because, since), permissive (though, despite), and conditional (if) meanings.

Table 1. Syntactic functions of the genitive case in Ancient Greek

No.	Syntactic Function	Latin Term	Greek Term
1	subjective genitive	<i>genetivus subiectivus</i>	γενική ύποκειμενική
2	objective genitive	<i>genetivus obiectivus</i>	γενική άντικειμενική
3	possessive genitive	<i>genetivus possessivus</i>	γενική κτητική
4	characterizing genitive	<i>genetivus characteristicus</i>	γενική κατηγορηματική
5	partitive genitive	<i>genetivus partitivus</i>	γενική διαιρετική
6	genitive of separation	<i>genetivus separationis</i>	γενική τοῦ χωρισμοῦ
7	temporal genitive	<i>genetivus temporis</i>	γενική τοῦ χρόνου
8	genitive of comparison	<i>genetivus comparationis</i>	γενική τῆς παραθέσεως
9	genitive of crime	<i>genetivus criminis</i>	γενική τῆς ποινῆς
10	genitive of cause	<i>genetivus causae</i>	γενική τῆς αἰτίας
11	genitive of abundance	<i>genetivus copiae</i>	γενική τῆς πλησμονῆς
12	genitive of lack	<i>genetivus inopiae</i>	γενική τῆς στειρήσεως
13	genitive of price and value	<i>genetivus pretii</i>	γενική τῆς ἀξίας
14	genitive of quality, property	<i>genetivus qualitatis</i>	γενική τῆς ιδιότητος
15	genitive of the author	<i>genetivus auctoris</i>	-
16	genitive of origin	<i>genetivus originis</i>	γενική καταγωγῆς
17	genitive of measure	<i>genetivus mensurae</i>	γενική τοῦ μέτρου
18	genitive of material	<i>genetivus materiae</i>	γενική τῆς ὕλης
19	genitive of place	<i>genetivus loci</i>	γενική τοῦ τόπου
20	genitive of quantity	<i>genetivus quantitatis</i>	-
21	genitive of memory	<i>genetivus memoriae</i>	-
22	genitive of exclamation	<i>genetivus exclamationis</i>	γενική ἐλλειπτική
23	genitive with prepositions	<i>genetivus praepositionis</i>	-
24	genitive independent, absolute	<i>genetivus absolutus</i>	γενική ἀπόλυτος
25	genitive of genus, species	<i>genetivus generis</i>	-

Source: compiled by authors based on Zvonska et al. (2017), Olishchuk (1996), Dean (2003).

The specific meaning of the phrase “genetivus absolūtus” is determined by the context, i.e. the meaning of the participle, the verb, and the nature of the whole sentence. The phrase “Genetivus absolūtus” can be translated with an appropriate subordinate clause, a participial phrase (if the logical subject of the phrase is the same as the subject of the whole sentence), or a noun with a preposition.

“Τῆς δὲ νυκτὸς αὐτοῖς τοιαύτης γενομένης ἐπῆλθεν ἡ ἡμέρα πολὺ τῆς νυκτὸς φοβερωτέρα” (2,26,1)

“after such a night for them came a day much more terrible than the night”;

“τοῦ δὲ ὁμόσαντος μηδὲν γεγονέναι φιλήματος καὶ ὄρκων πλέον” (4,31,3)

“[Daphnis] swore that nothing more than kisses and vows had happened between them”. This sentences demonstrate the combination of “genetivus absolūtus” and “genetivus comparationis”.

The noun (or pronoun) in “genetivus absolūtus” can sometimes be omitted if it is known

from the context.

“Καὶ τὰ νῶτα δὲ ἀπολουούσης ἡ σὰρξ ὑπέπιπτε μαλακῆ” (1,13,2)

“and when she washed his back, his body seemed to her tender”.

In this sentence, the noun (or pronoun) in the “genetivus absolūtus” construction is omitted, as it is clear from the context that “Chloe” is the subject of the participle “ἀπολουούσης”.

“Τῆς δὲ ἐκπλαγείσης εἰ παιδιά τίκτουσιν αἶγες, πάντα αὐτῇ διηγέεται” (1,3,2)

“[The wife] was surprised that goats give birth to children, but he told her everything”.

Here, the noun [wife] is omitted from the “genetivus absolūtus” construction, but it is understood from the context.

“συνέθεντο θᾶπτον τὰς ἀγέλας τῆς ἐπιούσης κατελάσαι” (2,38,2)

“They agreed to drive their herds out early the next morning”.

In this sentence, the noun “ἡμέρας” is understood in the “genetivus absolutus” construction “τῆς ἐπιούσης”.

A variety of conjunctions and particles can be used in the conditionals. Thus, the conjunction “καίπερ” and the particle “πέρ” indicate a concession, the particles “ὥσπερ” and “ὡς” indicate a reason with a subjective assessment, i.e., a reason, the conjunctions “ἄτε” and “οἶον” indicate an objective reason, etc.

“Οἷα δὲ τοῦ μὲν ὑπεκφεύγοντος, τοῦ δὲ ὀργῆ διώκοντος οὐκ ἀκριβῆς τῶν ἐν ποσὶν ἢ πρόσοψις ἦν” (1,12,2)

“because neither the fugitive nor the angry pursuer looked at what was under their feet, they both fell into a pit”.

In the sentence, “οἷα” combines with the participles “ὑπεκφεύγοντος” and “διώκοντος” to form two genitive independent clauses. In addition, the sentence contains the dative case in the syntactic function of cause (dativus causae) – “ὀργῆ”.

In Latin, the construction “genetivus absolutus” corresponds to the phrase “ablativus absolutus” (ablativus independent), and in Church Slavonic – “dativus absolutus” (dative independent).

“Genetivus partitivus” (partitive genitive) means the whole from which a part is taken. The partitive function of the genitive case, which consists in naming an object that undergoes the action denoted by the verb not in its entirety but only in some part of it, is one of the most common in Longus’ novel.

This genitive case takes the predicative position and is used with nouns or substantive participles: “πληθους” (the majority, a large number), “τῶν προβάτων τὰ ἀποπλανώμενα” (“those sheep that scattered”), “τῶν ἰχθύων τοὺς ἐνδινεύοντας” (“those fish that swam around”), etc.

“τῶν βοῶν ὀκτὼ τὰς ἀρίστας ἐς τὴν ἰδίαν ἀγέλην θέλξας ἀπεβουκόλησεν” (1,27,3)

“he brought the eight best cows into his herd, charming them with singing”;

“Καὶ αὐτῷ τῶν παίδων ὁ νεώτατος εἶπετο Τίτυρος” (2,32,1)

“he was accompanied by the youngest of his sons, Tityros”;

“Ὡ πάντων ἀνοσιώτατοι καὶ ἀσεβέστατοι” (2,27,1)

“O you, the most wicked and ungodly of all!”. In these examples, the genetivus partitivus can be used with adjectives in the superlative.

“ὥστε πολλοὶ καὶ τῶν ξένων κατὰ φήμην ἦσαν” (P,1,1)

“so that many of the foreigners came because of its [the painting’s] fame”;

“Εἷς δὲ ἁμὲν τῶν προβατευτικῶν ἀμέλειαν φυλάξας, κρέας ἀρπάσας ἔφυγε” (3,7,1)

“One of the shepherd’s dogs, having been caught in a moment of inattention, stole a piece of meat and ran away”.

In these examples, the genetivus partitivus can be used with adjectives denoting quantity or measure and numerals (πολλοί, οἱ πολλοί, εἷς).

“Καὶ ὁ μὲν κινδύνου παρὰ τοσοῦτον ἐλθὼν καὶ σωθεὶς ἐκ κυνός” (1,22,1)

“having escaped such danger and having been saved from the dog”. It is possible to note isolated instances of genetivus partitivus with adverbs of place, time, or manner of action.

“Καὶ ποτε δὲ ἐκοινώνουν γάλακτος καὶ οἴνου” (1,10,3)

“sometimes they shared milk and wine”; “ὄμνου κατὰ τῶν μύρτων ἀφήσειν, ἐπιδοὺς μῆλων καὶ ροιῶν” (2,4,4)

“I swore to him with myrtles to let him go, adding apples and pomegranates”.

There are many constructions in the text of “Daphnis and Chloe” with the genitive partitive with verbs when their action does not affect the whole object but refers to some part of it. For example, after the verbs “κοινωνέω” (“to give someone a share, to share”) and “ἐπιδίδωμι” (“to give away”).

“Ἄρα φαρμάκων ἐγεύσατο ἡ Χλόη μέλλουσά με φιλεῖν”; (1,18,2)

“Did Chloe taste poison, intending to kiss me?”; “εἶτα πληροῦντι τοὺς πίθους, εἶτα πίνοντι τοῦ γλεύκου” (2,36,1)

“someone fills barrels, someone drinks grape must”.

In these examples, the verbs denoting pleasure add a peculiar shade to the meaning of genetivus partitivus: “πίνω” (to drink), “γεύομαι” (to taste). It is typical to use the genitive case for verbs such as “ἅπτομαι” (to touch), “λαμβάνω” (to take, to grasp), “πειράομαι” (to test, to try), “τυγχάνω” (to reach, to receive).

“Ἀκούοντες μὲν τῶν ὀρνίθων ἄδόντων ἦδον” (1,9,2)

“listening to the birds singing, they sang”;

“ὁ μὲν Δάφνις τὰς ἀγέλας ἐπεσκόπει, ... ὥσπερ τῶν μελῶν ἀκροωμένας” (1,13,4)

“Daphnis watched the goats who seemed to be listening to the songs”.

The examples show that the “genetivus

partitivus” control for verbs denoting sensual, spiritual perception or excitement, such as “ἀκούω”, “ἀκροάομαι” (to hear, to listen), “ἐράω” (to love) is quite characteristic.

“Ἐγώ, παρθένε, μείζων εἰμι Δάφνιδος... τοσοῦτον ἐγὼ κρείττων ὅσον αἰγῶν βόες” (1,16,1)

“I am, girl, greater than Daphnis...greater I am as goats from sheep”

“Ἄρά μου καὶ Δόρκων εὐμορφότερος ὀφθήσεται;” (1,18,2)

“Will not Dorcon appear more handsome than I?”

“Ἐδόκει τὸ λουτρὸν εἶναι τῆς θαλάττης φοβερώτερον” (1,32,4)

“washing seemed more terrible than the sea”

“τῶν ἀμπέλων δὲ τὰς ταπεινότερας ἀπετρύγα” (2,1,3)

“she cut the bunches from the lower vines”

“ἐπῆναι Φιλητᾶς αὐτὸν ὡς εἰπόντα μῦθον ᾠδῆς γλυκύτερον” (2,35,1)

“Philetas praised him, saying that stories are sweeter than songs”

“ἐζήτουν καὶ αὐτοὶ περιττότερόν τι φιλήματος καὶ περιβολῆς” (3,13,3)

“they were looking for something better than kisses and hugs”

“Τούτῳ γύναιον ἦν ἐπακτὸν ἐξ ἄστεος, νέον καὶ ὠραῖον καὶ ἀγροικίας ἀβρότερον” (3,15,1)

“a woman was brought to him from the city, young and beautiful, more charming than the villagers”

“τὴν θάλατταν ἐνόμιζε τῆς γῆς γλυκύτεραν” (3,28,3)

“the sea seemed more pleasant than the land”.

Genetivus comparationis (the genitive case of comparison) is mostly used in the superlative comparison of adjectives and adverbs instead of “ἦ” with the nominative or accusative case. In the text of the novel “Daphnis and Chloe”, the use of this genitive comparison is expanded to its fullest extent.

“Τίγεται δὲ χειμῶν Δάφνιδι καὶ Χλόη τοῦ πολέμου πικρότερος” (3,3,1)

“winter came for Daphnis and Chloe, more terrible than war”.

In this example the author of the novel uses hyperbolic comparison with the use of “genetivus comparationis”. For the main characters of the novel, winter was like a time of death, because it separated them, and prevented them from meeting, while love is their true life.

“τῆς ναυαρχίδος ἠγεῖτο δελφῖν πηδῶν ἐξ ἀλός” (2,29,3)

“the dolphin that rose from the waves guided the navarche’s ship” (showed the way)

“τῶν δὲ αἰγῶν καὶ τῶν προβάτων ἠγεῖτο σύριγγος ἦχος ἡδιστος” (2,29,3)

“the sweetest sound of the syrinx guided the goats and sheep”.

Verbs that have a superlative meaning, i.e., denoting superiority, authority or subordination, etc. “ἠγέομαι”, “καθηγέομαι” (to rule), also control the genitive case in the syntactic function of comparison.

“καὶ αὐθις αἰτίαν ἐνόμιζε τὴν μουσικὴν τοῦ κάλλους” (1,13,4)

“she again considered music to be the cause of beauty”

“καὶ τῆς ἐρωτικῆς λύπης φάρμακον τὸν κάματον ἔσχον” (1,22,3)

“they found in fatigue a cure for love’s sadness”

“οἱ δὲ αἰγῶν τρίχας ἔπεκον, οἱ δὲ πάγας ὀρνίθων ἐσοφίζοντο” (3,3,3)

“some spun goat’s wool, others made bird traps”

“Τοῦτο Ἀφροδίτη κάλλους ἔλαβεν ἄθλον” (3,34,2)

“this apple was given to Aphrodite as a reward for her beauty”.

These are the comparison of the examples from Longus’ novel. The objective genitive case is mostly used after nouns denoting the person of the actor or the action, state, or result of the action (“κάλλους αἰτίον” (the cause of beauty), “λύπης φάρμακον” (the cure for sadness), “Ἐρωτος φάρμακον” (the cure for love), “ὀρνίθων πάγη” (a bird trap), “κάλλους ἄθλον” (the reward for beauty), “ἔρωτος ἐμπύρευμα” (the flame of love), etc.).

“Ἡ δὲ ἄπειρος οὕσα τέχνης ἐραστοῦ, λαμβάνουσα μὲν τὰ δῶρα ἔχαιρε” (1,15,3)

“[Chloe] being inexperienced in the art of love, took the gifts and rejoiced”.

Here was noted the use of “genetivus obiectivus” after the adjective ἄπειρος (inexperienced).

“Ἐξελάθητο καὶ Χλόης πρὸς ὀλίγον” (4,23,2)

“even Chloe he has almost forgotten”

“Γάμου μὲν μέλει τῆς Χλόης ἄλλῳ θεῷ” (3,27,2)

“another deity cares about Chloe’s marriage”

“Ὁ Δάφνις ... Χλόης κωλυούσης ἠμέλησεν” (3,34,1)

“Daphnis... did not pay attention to the fact that Chloe was holding him”

“ἐπειρᾶτό τινα διασώσασθαι τῶν ἁσμάτων, ὡς γένοιτο τῆς σύριγγος μέλη” (3,22,1)

“[Daphnis] tried to memorize one or the other of the songs to play them on the syrinx”.

In Ancient Greek, the objective genitive case is also used for the verbs “ἐκλανθάνομαι” (to forget), “μιμνήσκομαι” (to recall), “μέμνημαι” (to remember), “διασώζω” (to keep (in memory)), “ἀμελέω” (not to worry, to neglect), “μέλω” (to worry).

Genetivus subiectivus (subjective genitive case) denotes a person or thing to which something belongs. Therefore, it resembles the genitive in its meaning. This case mostly serves as a determiner with a noun (Olishchuk, 1996).

“τὸ πᾶν σχῆμα χορεία ἦν ὀρχουμένων” (1,4,2)

“the whole picture was a dance of dancing [girls]”

“καὶ ἦν θόρυβος πολὺς κτηνῶν, οἰκετῶν, ἀνδρῶν, γυναικῶν” (4,13,1)

“and there was a great noise from domestic animals, slaves, men, women”

“καὶ τότε Χλόη πρῶτον ἔμαθεν ὅτι τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς ὕλης γινόμενα ἦν ποιμένων παίγνια” (4,40,3)

“and then Chloe learned for the first time that what was in the forest was only a game of shepherds”.

If the noun determined by the genitive case is a verbal noun that mainly denotes an action or state (“θρήνος” (murmuring), “διώγματα” (chasings), “βόμβος” (buzzing), “σκιρτήματα” (jumpings), “θόρυβος” (noise, din), “χορεία” (dancing), etc.), then the genitive case can be the logical subject of the action or state expressed by this noun.

“τὸν γαυλὸν ἀναπλήσασα οἴνου καὶ γάλακτος κοινὸν μετὰ τοῦ Δάφνιδος ποτὸν εἶχε” (1,23,3)

“having filled a pitcher with wine and milk, she drank a drink with Daphnis”

“Πολέμου μὲν τὴν ἀγροικίαν ἐνεπλήσατε τὴν ἐμοὶ φίλην” (2,27,1)

“you have filled the village houses that I love with war”.

Genitive copiae (genitive case of abundance) is used with verbs and adjectives with the meaning “to have something in abundance”, “to fill with something” (“ἐμπίπλημι”, “πληρόω”, “ἀναπίπλημι”) in a direct or figurative sense.

“Ἐχοντες δὲ ἤδη τὰς ναῦς παντοδαπῆς ἀρπαγῆς μεστάς οὐκέτ’ ἐγίνωσκον περαιτέρω πλεῖν” (2,21,1)

“Having filled the ships with various booty, they decided not to sail any further”

“καὶ τὰ φυκία ἀφελὼν εὕρισκει τὸ βαλάντιον ἀργυρίου μεστὸν” (3,28,2)

“Having raked aside the sea grass, he found a bag filled with silver coins”.

However, the figurative meaning of the adjective μεστός is also present, such as:

“Καὶ τὸ μὲν πρόσωπον ἐρυθήματος μεστὸν” (4,17,5)

“And his face is full of blush”.

The genitive of abundance is also used with the adjective “μεστός” (full).

“Λύκαινα ... πολλὰ ἤρπαζε, πολλῆς τροφῆς ἐς ἀνατροφὴν τῶν σκύμων δεομένη” (1,11,1)

“the wolf often stole, needing much food to feed her cubs”

“Οἱ δ’ οὖν οὐκ ὀλίγων κτημάτων οἱ Μηθυμναῖοι στερόμενοι ἐζήτουν τὸν νέμοντα τὰς αἴγας” (2,14,3)

“the Metimnians, who lost a lot of good because of this, were looking for someone who grazes goats”

“Ἐδόκει τὰς Νύμφας δεῖσθαι τοῦ Ἔρωτος, εἰ δὴ ποτε αὐτοῖς κατανεῦσαι τὸν γάμον” (4,34,1)

“it seemed that the Nymphs were begging Eros to finally agree to the marriage”.

Genitive inopiae (genitive case of lack) is used with the verbs “δέομαι” (to need, to ask), “στέρομαι” (to be deprived of something).

“Πένητές ἐσμεν, ὦ παῖ, καὶ δεόμεθα νόμφης φερούσης τι μᾶλλον· οἱ δὲ πλούσιοι καὶ πλουσιῶν νυμφῶν δεόμενοι” (3,26,4)

“We are poor, son, and we need a girl who will bring something more with her (as a dowry); and they are rich and need rich suitors”.

In this example, the stylistic figure of antithesis is observed (“ἀντίθεσις”, “contentio”, “contrapositum”), built on the opposition of the features expressed by the adjectives “πένης” – “πλούσιος”. The placement of such two sentences expressing opposite opinions next to each other creates a kind of contrast to achieve a certain expressive and pictorial effect.

“Genetivus temporis” (temporal genitive) corresponds to the Latin case “ablativus temporis”. This genitive indicates the time that is not fully covered by the action and denotes different periods. It answers the question “when does something happen?” and is used without a definition: “ἤρος” (on spring), “θέρους” (on summer), “χειμῶνος” (on winter), “μετοπώρου” (in spring), “νυκτός” (at night), “ἡμέρας” (at day) etc. Longus himself defines the symbols of each season.

“ἤρος ρόδα, κρίνα καὶ ὑάκινθος καὶ ἴα ἀμφοτέρα· θέρους μήκωνες καὶ ἀχράδες καὶ μῆλα πάντα” (2,3,4)

“in spring – roses, lilies and hyacinths, and violets of both varieties; in summer – poppies and wild pears, and all varieties of apples”.

Through the words of Philetas, who talks about his garden, the writer says that this garden has everything that the seasons bring.

The “genetivus exclamationis” (genitive of exclamation) occupies a special place in the classification in many aspects. It is the only “independent” genitive that does not act as a signifier for any other member of the expression, since it is a mode of expression in itself.

“ὦ νίκης κακῆς· ὦ νόσου καινῆς” (1,18,2)

“Oh, the cruelty of victory! Oh, the unknown disease!”
(The words of Daphnis, who realized the power of love after kissing Chloe).

In the sentence, the stylistic figure of homeoteleuton is built on the repetition of the inflections of the adjective “ῆς”.

“ὦ λύκων ἀλωπέκων δειλοτέρων” (1,25,3)

“Oh wolves, more fearful than foxes!”.

In this sentence two genitive cases with different meanings are seen: “ὦ λύκων” – genitive of exclamation and “ἀλωπέκων” – genitive of comparison.

A rhetorical exclamation is a stylistic figure formed by an emotional, pathos, affirmative statement (Kovalov, 2007).

“Φεῦ τῆς ῥοδωνιάς, ὡς κατακέκλασται· φεῦ τῆς ἰωνιάς, ὡς πεπάτηται· φεῦ τῶν ὑακίνθων καὶ τῶν ναρκίσσων, οὓς ἀνώρυξέ τις πονηρὸς ἄνθρωπος. ἀφίξεται τὸ ἦρ, τὰ δὲ οὐκ ἀνθήσει· ἔσται τὸ θέρος, τὰ δὲ οὐκ ἀκμάσει μετόπωρον, ἀλλὰ τάδε οὐδένα στεφανώσει. οὐδὲ σύ, δέσποτα Διόνυσε, τὰ ἄθλια ταῦτα ἠλέησας ἄνθη, οἷς παρῶκεις καὶ ἔβλεπες, ἀφ’ ὧν ἔστεφάνωσά σε πολλάκις καὶ ἑτερπόμην; πῶς, πῶς δείξω νῦν τὸν παράδεισον τῷ δεσπότη; τίς ἐκεῖνος θεασάμενος ἔσται” (4,8)

“Woe to the rose bushes, for how broken they are! Woe to the violets that have been trampled on! Woe to the hyacinths and daffodils that have been plucked by a wicked man! Spring will return, but they will no longer bloom; summer will come, but they will not bloom; (there will be) autumn, but they will not beautify anyone. Even you, Lord Dionysus, have not pitied these unfortunate flowers among which you live and look at, with which I have often crowned you and pleased you? How, how will I show the garden to the master now? What will happen when he sees it?”.

In the episode of the destruction of Dionysophanes’ garden, Lamon, both as a good gardener and as a slave who fears his master’s wrath, mourns the death of the flowers with a series of pitiful exclamations.

“Genetive possessivus” (possessive genitive

case) refers to the person or object to whom something belongs. It is combined with a noun directly (and then serves as its determiner) or with the predicate “εἶναι” (to belong to someone) (Olishchuk, 1996) (and then serves as the predicate name).

“καὶ σωθεῖς ἐκ κυνός, φασί, οὐ λύκου στόματος, ἐθεράπευε τὸ σῶμα” (1,22,1)

“[Dorcon], having been saved, as they say, from the mouth of a dog, not a wolf, healed his body”

“μίαν ᾤετο τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ἄντρου Νυμφῶν ὄραν” (1,24,1)

“he thought he saw one of the caves of the Nymphs”.

The most common use of the genitive case is to refer to a person or object to whom something belongs in the broadest and most diverse sense. The possessive genitive can be formed from both proper and common names.

“Genetive separationis” (genitive case of separation) indicated the separation of one object from another and was used with verbs of separation, and deprivation, and was quite common in ancient Greek (Olishchuk, 1996).

“ἀποσεισάμενος τῶν σκελῶν τὴν χιόνα τοῦς τε βρόχους ἔστησε” (3,6,1)

“Shaking off the snow, he set up the nets”

“ἡ δὲ Χλόη ... ἐδεῖτο φείσασθαι καὶ ὧν ἔνεμε καὶ αὐτῆς διὰ τὰς θεάς” (2,20,3)

“Chloe ... begged for mercy both for those she shepherded and for herself through the goddesses”.

Having studied the text of Longus’ novel, it can be noted that the ablative function of the genitive case is to designate the names of objects dependent on verbs with the meaning “to spare, to protect” (“φείδομαι”), “to shake off” (“ἀποσειῶ”).

“Ἄρτι πέπαντο τοῦ μυθολογήματος ὁ Λάμων” (2,35,1)

“Lamon just finished the story”

“ἀλλ’ αἰεὶ τε ἀρχόμενοι νομῆς προσήδρευον καὶ ἐκ νομῆς ἀνιόντες προσεκύουν” (2,2,5)

“but whenever grazing began, they would kneel and bow when returning from the pasture”.

The meaning of distance and deprivation is expressed by constructions with the verbs “ἄρχω” (to begin) and “παύομαι” (to cease, to end). The second sentence also contains the synonymous construction “ἐκ” + genitive with the meaning of distance.

“Ὁ δὲ ἔκειτο πληγαῖς νεανικαῖς συγκεκομμένος ὑπὸ τῶν ληστῶν καὶ ὀλίγον ἐμπνέων” (1,29,1)

“[Dorcon] lay there, barely breathing, bleeding from the wounds inflicted by the ruthless robbers”

“καὶ τσαυτὰ παθόντες ὑπὸ ποιμένων” (2,19,2)

“they suffered such [disgrace] from the shepherds”

“Ἐτράφη μὲν ὑπὸ αἰγός, ὡς κηδομένων θεῶν” (3,32,1)

“He [Daphnis] was fed by a goat, as if the gods were worried about him”

“καὶ ταχέως ὑπὸ Γνάθωνος καὶ τὰ ἀστυκὰ διδαχθῆναι δυνάμενον” (4,19,1)

“[Daphnis] can quickly be taught the customs of the city by Gnatho”.

“Genetivus auctōris” (genitive case of the author) refers to a living subject of action (Latin: “abl. auctōris”). It answers the question “by whom the action is performed”. It is used with the preposition ὑπό, which is not translated into Ukrainian.

“παίδιον εὔρεν ὑπὸ μιᾶς τῶν αἰγῶν τρεφόμενον” (1,2,1)

“[Lamon] found a baby being fed by one of the goats.

The genitive case of the author (genetivus auctoris) “ὑπ’ ἐκείνου” and the genitive case of possession (genetivus possessivus) “τῆς Δάφνιδος”, e.g:

“τῆς Δάφνιδος ἀκούων σύριγγος καὶ ὑπ’ ἐκείνου νεμόμενος” (4,16,3)

“and listening to the syrinx Daphnis to graze under his supervision” (lit. by him to graze).

Sometimes sentences contain two genitive cases with different syntactic functions. For example, the genitive case of the author (genetivus auctoris) “ὑπὸ μιᾶς” and the partitive genitive case (genetivus partitivus) “τῶν αἰγῶν”.

“ὁ Τίτυρος ἐφίσταται τὴν σύριγγα τῷ πατρὶ κομίζων, μέγα ὄργανον καὶ ἀλγῶν μεγάλων” (2,35,1)

“Tityros came running and gave his father the syrinx, a large instrument with large tubes”.

“Genetivus materiae” (genitive case of material) refers to the material of which an object is composed or made or its contents.

“Συνελθόντες οὖν οἱ κωμηταὶ νύκτωρ σιρούς ὀρύττουσι τὸ εὖρος ὀργυιᾶς, τὸ βάθος τεττάρων” (1,11,2)

“so the peasants came together at night and made several holes a fathom wide and four fathoms deep”.

“Genetivus qualitatis” (genitive case of quality) indicates a property, a quality.

IV. DISCUSSION

The main finding of this research is the identification and comprehensive analysis of the diverse syntactic functions of the genitive case in Longus’ ancient Greek novel “Daphnis and

Chloe”. The study reveals that the genitive case performs an extensive range of 25 distinct syntactic roles, including subjective, objective, temporal, comparative, possessive, and various other specialised functions. The genitive case emerges as a highly versatile linguistic tool, enabling the conveyance of a wide array of semantic nuances, ranging from possession and attribution to contextual and descriptive functions. This finding highlights the richness of the ancient Greek case system and its pivotal role in imbuing literary works with rhetorical sophistication and narrative complexity, particularly during the “second sophistic” period exemplified by Longus’ novel.

Many works, translations, and articles are devoted to this novel. For example, Makar’s (2010) monograph focuses on the Longus, the era in which author of the novel lived, i.e., the end of the second century AD, and the language of the novel “Daphnis and Chloe”. The work also describes in detail the writer’s lexical idiosystem. Another example of a study of the novel is the article by Wouters (1987). From its results, it can be concluded that Longus’ style is characterized by the phenomenon of subtle irony, which is one of the important aspects of authors’ literary abilities used in the novel “Daphnis and Chloe”. This article also demonstrates Longus’ skillful employment of irony by examining passages where the characters’ naive actions are juxtaposed with the narrator’s more knowing commentary, thereby underscoring the nuanced and ironic layers of the narrative as described by Wouters (1987). Not so long ago, scholars began to pay attention to Longus’ attitude to the ironic. The article “Longus’ narrator: a reassessment” by Maciver (2020), notes, that the narrator of “Daphnis and Chloe” is separated from the author and has an ironic attitude toward him. Longus’ narrator treats novel as if it were a simple and naive story, not paying attention to all the beauty the author has put into it. In this way, the reader develops the same attitude toward the novel. One way to describe this textual duality is to think in terms of a superficial “narrator’s text” and a deeper “author’s text”. Readers have a choice: either to accept the narrator’s text or to read around the narrator, i.e. to read the author’s text. Instances of irony in the novel, as noted in this article, reveal the narrator’s playful dismissal of the story’s sophistication, thereby inviting readers to engage more critically with the text. This approach validates the scholar’s assertion that the narrator’s seemingly naive recounting is a deliberate device

to enhance the reader's experience by contrasting it with the author's more nuanced intentions.

The novel "Daphnis and Chloe" is mentioned in the article by Goldhill (2020). The entire article is devoted to the history of the novel genre, starting with a critique that focuses on the importance of the novel as a nineteenth-century genre, ending with an explanation of why the ancient novel, which was ignored by critics for so long, has now become such a popular topic. The research on Longus' novel does not end there. Another work devoted to "Daphnis and Chloe" is a chapter in the book by Gill (2019). The scholar describes the novel's special character or tone, ethical values, or attitudes. This work is certainly unique in the surviving Greek prose. This novel, first of all, has a special bright style, which is manifested in the alternate use of a standard prose narrative and a dialog style that is even more refined. Another work that features a study of the novel is the article by Jolowicz (2021), which explores the connections between Greek literature and Latin poetry. Latin poetry is extremely important for Greek literature. That is why Greek novels flourished during the Roman Empire, offering stories of love and separation. "Daphnis and Chloe" are one such novel. Thus, this paper analyses the role of Latin literature in Greek literary culture during the empire. This research highlights how the previously overlooked ancient novel genre, including "Daphnis and Chloe", has gained popularity due to its complex narrative structures and the interplay of Greek and Latin literary traditions.

Demerre (2020) is the author of another research on the ancient Greek novel "Daphnis and Chloe". The research aimed to better understand the trial scene in the novel. It is noted that the author used modern rhetorical discussions. The insertion in the verdict is used to emphasize the difference between the means of persuasion. This allows us to see cases of elite social practice moving into the rural world of the protagonists. If we compare the two speeches, this displacement is further emphasized. Ultimately, this scene explores the notion of credibility in Longus' fictional world. This research provides detailed examples from the novel, illustrating the genitive case's role in shaping meaning and enhancing the narrative's rhetorical impact, thus reinforcing the author's conclusions about Longus' use of credibility and social dynamics in his fictional world. Following

Morgan (2020), while much of Greek literature was committed to a form of cultural purism, the novel revealed in cultural hybridity. The earliest Greek novelistic literature combined Greek and non-Greek traditions. In research, Morgan describes the origins of the Greek novel, saying that there is no consensus on its creation. Cozad (2019), in work, asserts that the original Greek version of "Daphnis and Chloe" was a Greek novel in prose. There are at least four sixteenth-century Western European translations of the adaptation: Italian (1538), French (1559), Spanish (1568), and New Latin (1574).

Waller (2022) addressed the topic of gender construction and reversible potentiality. This study enters a dialog with Foucault and Freud. They argue that within the liminality of adolescence, the formation of gender subjectivity is a condition of "reversible potentiality." The author refers to Daphnis' education to explain the alleged equivalence between male subjectivity and knowledge/power. In this case, knowledge functions as a force of immobilization. This work is significantly different from others as there has been no research on the functions of the ancient Greek genitive case based on the novel "Daphnis and Chloe". The author also presents many excerpts from the novel in the original language and their author's translation in order to better understand the essence of the study. In current research, detailed examples from the novel illustrate these functions, showing how the genitive case is used to express various relationships and attributes.

Compared to other studies that aim to identify other linguistic features, such as idioms, metaphors, and rhetorical questions, this article is significantly different, as it provides many examples, both in the original language and in English, and reveals various functions of the genitive case, its use in interaction with different parts of speech and different contexts. Also, unlike most researchers of Longus' novel who analyzed the artistic style, the peculiarities of the novel genre, and its development, although this is a common type of research on this particular work, this research focuses on the syntactic level of the language, on the presentation of the richness of the functions of the genitive case in ancient Greek. There is no description of specific scenes, moments, or parts of the novel "Daphnis and Chloe"; the features of the genitive case are analyzed based on the entire text. From the analysis of various works

on the novel “Daphnis and Chloe”, it can be seen that it has interested more than one generation of scholars, as there are both older studies from the 90s and completely new ones written in recent years. Although the novel was written in the late second century AD, it is still being studied today.

The implications of this research are significant for syntactic studies. By mapping the diverse functions of the genitive case in an ancient Greek literary text, the study reveals the expressive potential of case systems. This understanding can inform analyses of other ancient languages, enhancing appreciation for the semantic and rhetorical nuances skilled writers convey through case manipulation. Identifying specific genitive patterns and meanings also aids in teaching and learning ancient Greek, enabling more nuanced interpretations of classical texts and enriching engagement with ancient Greek literature. While the study offers valuable insights into the genitive case’s multifarious functions within Longus’ novel, its scope is necessarily limited by focusing on a single literary work. The findings may not be fully representative of the genitive’s usage across the broader expanse of ancient Greek texts, as literary styles and genre conventions could influence case employment. Future research endeavours could

fruitfully expand the examination of the genitive case to encompass a wider range of ancient Greek literary and non-literary texts, spanning diverse genres, time periods, and geographic regions. Comparative analyses across multiple corpora would yield a more comprehensive understanding of the genitive’s functional scope and any potential variations influenced by factors such as genre conventions, stylistic trends, or regional linguistic traditions.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The key finding of this research is that the genitive case in Longus’ ancient Greek novel “Daphnis and Chloe” exhibits a remarkably diverse array of 25 distinct syntactic functions, showcasing the nuanced expressive capabilities of the ancient Greek case system. This underscores the pivotal role of deft case usage in imbuing literary works with rhetorical sophistication and semantic depth, especially during the “second sophistic” period. However, the study is limited to examining the genitive case within a single literary work. Future research could extend the analysis to other ancient Greek texts, facilitating a more comprehensive understanding of the genitive’s functional versatility across different genres and time periods.

REFERENCES

- Azaz, M. (2020). Structural surface overlap and derivational complexity in crosslinguistic transfer: Acquisition of English genitive alternation by Egyptian Arabic-speaking learners. *Second Language Research*, 36(4), 529-556.
- Bowie, E. (2023). Animals, Slaves and Masters in Longus’ Daphnis and Chloe (2019). In: *Essays on Ancient Greek Literature and Culture* (pp. 863-883). Cambridge: University Press.
- Cohen, E. (2019). Semitic Genitive Constructions: An Expanded View. *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 64(1), 1-50.
- Cozad, M. (2019). Trent, Literary Theory, and Sixteenth-Century Adaptations of Daphnis and Chloe. In E. Cueva, S. Harrison, H. Mason, W. Owens, S. Schwartz (Eds.), *Re-Wiring the Ancient Novel* (pp. 61-74). Groningen: Barkhuis.
- Dean, R.J. (2003). *Greek Grammar. For Those Who Don't Know Greek*. Preston: Preston City Bible Church.
- Demerre, O. (2020). Issue-and Idea-theory in Longus’ Pastoral Trial. *A Stormy Debate*, 74(3), 423-447.
- Gill, C. (2019). Style and ethos in Longus’ Daphnis and Chloe. In K. Chew, J.R. Morgan, S.M. Trzaskoma (Eds.), *Literary Currents and Romantic Forms* (pp. 113-136). Groningen: Barkhuis.
- Goldhill, S. (2020). Finding the Time for Ancient Novels. *Daedalus*, 150(1), 26-39.
- Heller, B., & Szmrecsanyi, B. (2019). Possessives World-Wide: Genitive Variation in Varieties of English. In: N. Yáñez-Bouza, E. Moore, L. van Bergen, W.B. Hollmann (Eds.), *Categories, Constructions, and Change in English Syntax* (pp. 315-335). Cambridge: University Press.

- Jolowicz, D. (2021). *Latin Poetry in the Ancient Greek Novels*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kim, M. (2021). Genitive Alternations of the One's Own Possessive Construction. *Language and Information*, 25(1), 21-56.
- Kovalov, Yu.I. (2007). *Literary encyclopedia*. Kyiv: Academy.
- Louw, J.P. (1966). Linguistic Theory and The Greek Case System. *Acta Classica*, 9, 73-88.
- Lychuk, M.I. (2022). Grammatical valence in the structure of syntactically non-segmented word-combination. *International Journal of Philology*, 13(4(2)), 17-27.
- Maciver, C.A. (2020). Longus' narrator: a reassessment. *The Classical Quarterly*, 70(2), 1-19.
- Makar, I. (2010). *Longus and his novel "Daphnis and Chloe"*. Chernivtsi: Chernivtsi National University.
- Morgan, J.R. (2020). Dirty Love: The Genealogy of the Ancient Greek Novel by Tim Whitmarsh. *Common Knowledge*, 26(3), 438-439.
- Olishchuk, R. (1996). *Greek. Syntax*. Lviv: LBA.
- Romaniuk, O., & Yavorska, L. (2022). Complimenting behaviour in young adults' first impression scripts. *Analele Universitatii din Craiova – Seria Stiinte Filologice, Lingvistica*, 44(1-2), 168-187. <http://doi.org/10.52846/aucssflingv.v44i1-2.58>.
- Ryskulova, G., Satybaldieva, G., & Sartbekova, N. (2022). The Semantics of Morphological Means of Expressing Human Emotions. *Studies in Media and Communication*, 10(3), 34-39. <http://doi.org/10.11114/smc.v10i3.5831>
- Schönberger, O. (1973). *Longus. Hirtengeschichten von Daphnis und Chloe: Griechisch und deutsch*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Shapauov, A., Zhusupov, N., Baratova, M., Bakhytzhan, K., Zhanar, T., Aiman, A., Meyramgul, Z., & Agaliyeva, N. (2014). Dramatic effect, style and speech of characters of literary and art piece (from epos to drama). *Life Science Journal*, 11(4), 311-315.
- Shynkaruk, V. (2023). Revisiting syntax of coherent speech. *International Journal of Philology*, 14(2), 6-12. [http://dx.doi.org/10.31548/philolog14\(2\).2023.01](http://dx.doi.org/10.31548/philolog14(2).2023.01)
- Waller, E. (2022). Gender Constitution and Reversible Potentiality: The Making of the Masculine Subject in Longus's Daphnis and Chloe. *Differences*, 33(1), 92-118.
- Wouters, A. (1987). Irony in Daphnis' and Chloe's Love Lessons. *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, 26(2), article number: 111.
- Ziak, P., Sakhizhamal, U., Zeinesh, M., Tanzharikova, A., & Kulgildinova, T. (2022). The image of the lifeworld in philosophy and fiction narratives. *XLinguae*, 15(1), 194-201. <http://doi.org/10.18355/XL.2022.15.01.019>
- Zvonska, L.L., Koroleva, N.V., Lazer-Pankiv, O.V., Levko, O.V., Luchkanin, S.M., Myronova, V.M., Mykhaylova, O.G., Lefterova, O.M., Mosenkis, Yu.L., Nychayuk, S.P., Polishchuk, A.S., Ruda, N.V., Shovkovy, V.M., & Shtychenko, I. Yu. (2017). *Encyclopedic dictionary of classical languages*. Kyiv: Kyiv University.