KRISZTINA FODOR

CHANGES OF THE LATIN LANGUAGE IN AQUITAINE AS REFLECTED BY THE INSCRIPTIONS[*]

Summary: The aim of this study is to demonstrate what kind of changes took place in the Latin language in Aquitaine according to the inscriptions. All of the relevant inscriptions were examined up to this time, so we can form an opinion on the remarks made by József Herman, who was the first to deal with the development of the Latin of the Three Gauls in detail and who intended to write the history of this language. The categories of the computerized database are used for the analysis of the changes and some examples for the changes found are mentioned.

Key words: Vulgar Latin, linguistic changes, mistake, inscription, syllable, consonant, vowel, Gaul

Within the project Historical Linguistic Database of Latin Inscriptions of the Imperial Age I have examined the inscriptions of the Tres Galliae, which consist of three provinces: Aquitania, Belgica and Lugdunensis. First, I started to deal with the inscriptions of Aquitaine, and I have examined the latest edition containing these inscriptions in six volumes: *Inscriptions Latines d'Aquitaine* (henceforth *ILA*), Vuilleumier's collection, the *Inscriptions Latines des Trois Gaules*, the relevant inscriptions in the *L'Année Épigraphique*, the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* and the *Recueil des inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule 8.* (*Aquitaine Première*). However, there is a great problem with these collections: except for the *ILA* and the *Recueil des inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule 8*, they do not date the inscriptions (439 of the 950 data cannot be dated up to this time), although it would be necessary to establish when the linguistic changes took place in the Latin of Gaul. So far, 2834 inscriptions have been found, which are examined in the present study.

Before presenting what kind of Vulgar Latin features appear in these inscriptions, we have to establish some important factors. Firstly, the number of the inscriptions preserved in the territory of the Three Gauls is very small compared to other Roman provinces. While Italy shows a value of 13 inscriptions/100 ha, Africa 12, Gallia Narbonensis 6.1, Aquitania and Lugdunensis show values of only 1.1 inscriptions, and Belgica a value of 1.9.[1] These low values are due to the extremely irregular distribution of the inscriptions. The density of the inscriptions, which is an index of Romanization, is influenced by various factors. Firstly, there are geographical factors, especially mountains and river valleys, which had an effect on the distribution. Concentrations of inscriptions tend to be larger in river valleys, as in the Rhône valley, but there are very few inscriptions in the mountains, which had been areas of low population in every period.[2] The second major factor seems to have been the Roman communication system. Towns, which were situated at key points on the road network, and usually were administrative and cultural centres, produced much more inscriptions than other towns of similar size with fewer connecting roads and those of less importance.[3] Thirdly, the Roman colonial and military establishment accounts for many of the details of the distributions.[4] Along the line of the frontiers, the concentration of inscriptions is larger than in the demilitarized areas.

Furthermore, it is important to emphasize some general facts concerning the Latin language of Gaul. First and foremost, because of the paucity of the people represented in inscriptions we cannot draw conclusions from the grammatical mistakes regarding the everyday usage of Latin in the whole population of Gaul. We are only able to inspect what kind of changes took place in the spoken Latin in the background of the texts. In addition, Celtic dialects that were spoken by the inhabitants co-existed with Latin and as a result a different kind of bilingualism could develop here. It is possible that the use of Latin and Celtic was functionally separated in a community: Celtic was used at home and in private life, while Latin was the language of administration.[5] In one of his articles, József Herman describes the characteristics of the Latin in Gaul: he states that consonants were relatively stable, while vowels were quite apt to change.[6] He also claims that the changes of the vowels *e* and *i* are more frequent in this province than in the others, but the changes of the vowels *o* and *u* are rare and isolated compared to the changes of *e* and *i*. Moreover, Gaul preceded the other regions since here not only the vowels in unstressed syllables were subject to change, but also those in stressed syllables.[7] The omission of final consonants, especially *m*, *s*, *t* is comparatively rare here, although it was general elsewhere. The inconsistent use of the consonants *b* and *v* is almost non-existent in

---

[1] WOOLF, G.: *Becoming Roman: The Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul.* Cambridge 1998, 83.
[2] E.g. WOOLF (n. 1) 88.
[3] E.g. WOOLF (n. 1) 88–89.
[4] E.g. WOOLF (n. 1) 90.
[5] HERMAN, J.: La langue latin dans le Gaule romaine. In *ANRW* II.29.2. Berlin–New York 1983, 1045–1060, here 1051.
[6] E.g. HERMAN: La langue latin (n. 5) 1055.
[7] E.g. HERMAN: La langue latin (n. 5) 1055.

this province.[8] The declensions and conjugations were relatively well preserved apart from the elimination of the fourth declension.[9] To sum up, he claimed that the changes penetrated into Gaul slowly, so that the classical norm could survive here for a long time.

In the present study I would like to present the linguistic phenomena found in the inscriptions and added to the computerized database that deviate from the so-called classical norm.[10] Furthermore, I intend to examine whether we can confirm Professor Herman's statements on the grounds of these data. In what follows I will use the categories of the database for presenting the linguistic data and I will also add some examples for the changes found. Naturally, there are instances which have an alternative code, too, and there are some data that are to be evaluated rather as ortho-graphic errors (like *k* used for *c*) than as linguistic ones.

It is difficult to distinguish purely orthographic errors from mistakes showing real linguistic changes. However, the grammarians of the Imperial Age may help us with this problem. Although they rarely remark on pronunciation, it can be useful to mention their observations. A grammarian called Sacerdos (3rd century) presents the errors of the length of the vowels in final syllables[11] and condemns it as *"barbaris-mus nostri temporis"*.[12] A century later another grammarian, Sergius extends the ob-servation to the vowels that are long by nature: *"Syllabas natura longas difficile est scire, sed hanc ambiguitatem sola probant auctoritatis exempla, cum versum poetae scandere coeperis"*.[13] The grammarian Consentius[14] in the fifth century adds an es-sential aspect to the description of this change: stressed vowels became long, while unstressed vowels were shortened even if they were long by nature.[15] As Herman notes,[16] the changes of short and long vowels were always considered errors and even barbarisms, while the fusion of timbre was described neutrally, without any condemning remarks added.[17] These two kinds of changes had never been mentioned

---

[8] E.g. HERMAN: La langue latin (n. 5) 1056.

[9] E.g. HERMAN: La langue latin (n. 5) 1056–1057.

[10] HERMAN, J.: *Late Latin Data Base: Guidelines for Data Collection.* (Institute for Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences; manuscript) Budapest 1990, 199.

[11] HERMAN, J.: Un aspect de la transition du Latin au Roman: les changements de la langue et leur reflet dans la conscience métalinguistique de la communauté. *Aemilianense* 1 (2004) 271–287, esp. 278.

[12] *Grammatici Latini* VI 493–494.

[13] *Grammatici Latini* IV 522.

[14] *Grammatici Latini* V 392, 3 and 12.

[15] HERMAN: Un aspect (n. 11) 278.

[16] HERMAN: Un aspect (n. 11) 281.

[17] Servius: *Vocales sunt quinque, a e i o u. Ex his, duae, e et o, aliter sonant productae, aliter cor-reptae. Nam o productum quando est, ore sublato vox sonat, ut Roma, quando correptum, de labris vox exprimitur, ut rosa. Item e quando producitur, vicinum est ad sonum i litterae, ut meta, quando autem correptum, vicinum est ad sonum diphthongi, ut equus. Grammatici Latini* IV 421, 16–21.

Pompeius: *dicit ita Terentianus: quotienscumque e longam volumus proferri, vicina sit ad i litte-ram. Ipse sonus sic debet sonare, quomodo sonat i littera. Quando dicis evitat, vicina debet esse, sic pressa, sic angusta, ut vicina sit ad i litteram. Quando vis dicere brevem e, simpliciter sonat… Gramma-tici Latini* V 102.

together by the grammarians; the differences of timbre were regarded as additional elements of the pronunciation in the normative description of the vowel system.[18]

In the 2834 inscriptions examined there were 115 non-linguistic mistakes. These are the following: *litterae perperam incisae* occurred 66 times, for instance *ft* for *et* or *eilia* for *filia*; *litterae omissae* occurred 37 times, for example *ceta* for *certa* or *pondum* for *ponendum*; and there were only three examples for *abbreviationes insolitae*: *hots* for *hostiis* and *meme* for *memoriae*. *Litterae superfluae* appeared only seven times: *dismisit* for *dimisit*, *votuum* for *votum*, *huiius* for *huius* (according to Pirson[19] it was a relatively frequent phenomenon to insert an *i* (pronounced *j*) into the hiatus, but this is the only instance of this in Aquitaine), *exanimen* for *exanime* (it can be also regarded as *masc. pro neutr.* with *n* for *m* at the end of the word), *uhic* for *hic* (it can also be regarded as prosthesis, but surprisingly here a *u* is inserted instead of the most frequently used *i*), *siuis* for *suis*. Finally, *syllaba perperam adiuncta*, that is, dittography occurred only twice: *fifilia* for *filia* and *locucum* for *locum*.

There were 835 linguistic errors, 754 of which were phonetic. In 473 cases vowels changed and in 281 cases consonants. Among the vowels errors 51 were made in the stressed syllable. We can provide only one example from the 2nd century where short *é* became *i* in *Siline* pro *Selenae*, but there are 15 examples (most of them from the 6th century) where *é:* became *i*, for instance *requiiscit* for *requiescit* (4 times), *rigno* for *regno* (3 times), *minsis* and *minses* for *menses*, *tris* for *tres* and *ti* for *te*. This occured mostly in closed syllables. Short *i* became *e* only six times: *Dumetio* for *Domitio*, *septuagenta* for *septuaginta*, *sene* for *sine*, *ponteficis* for *pontificis*, *megrans* for *migrans* and *prencepe* for *principe*. There is only one example where *o:* became *u* in *amature* for *amatore*, while short *u* became *o* 20 times (dated from the sixth century) in *tomolo* for *tumulo*, once in *com* for *cum*, once in *iovenem* for *iuvenem* and once in *tolit* for *tulit*. We have one example where *u:* became *o* in *pedatora* for *pedatura*. The diphthong *ae* became *e* in five instances in a stressed syllable: *quero* for *quaero*, *Cnei* for *Cnaei*, *prestitit* for *praestitit*, *que* for *quae*, *seclis* for *saeclis* (they are from the 1st, 2nd and 3rd–6th centuries). In *aeres* for *heres*, which occurred twice and can be dated to the first century, the long *e* became a diphthong *ae*.

422 mistakes were made in the unstressed syllable. There are only four examples of *a* becoming *e*, in one instance it was a long *a*: *Adnametos* for *Adnamatus*, *Lectore* for *Lactorae*, *tribunicie* for *tribunicia* and *Musice* for *Musica*. (As Pirson notes,[20] *a* weakened to *i* and because of the merging of long *e* and short *i* it could be written with an *e*.) The changes of *e* and *i* are frequent, there is *i* for *e* in 22 cases, for example *cintenario* for *centenario*, *tenit* for *tenet*, *divota* for *devota*, *filiciter* for *feliciter* (in these two latter instances the *e* is long, it occurred in the inscriptions 9 times altogether). There is *e* instead of *i* in 38 cases, for instance *solvet* for *solvit*, *transiet* for *transiit*, *morebus* for *moribus*, *fragele* for *fragile* etc. The merging of

[18] HERMAN: Un aspect (n. 11) 282.
[19] PIRSON, J.: *La langue des inscriptions Latines de la Gaule.* Bruxelles 1901, 74.
[20] PIRSON (n. 19) 28.

long (and short) *o:* and short *u* leads to the changes of *o* and *u*, which occur many times in the inscriptions. There are 9 examples where *u* was written instead of short *o*, for example *amatur* for *amator*, *doctur* for *doctor*, *senatur* for *senator*, *Theudoberti* for *Theodoberti*, *Dumetio* for *Dometio* and there are 28 examples where long *o:* changed, but all of them occurred in the plural accusative form of *annus* (*annus* for *annos*). *O* for *u* was also frequent, it occurred 30 times, for instance *eorom* for *eorum*, *famola* for *famula*, *tomolo* for *tumulo*, *abstolit* for *abstulit*, etc.[21]

The most frequent change (occurring 111 times) was *e* used instead of *ae* for example in *maxime* for *maximae*, *memorie* for *memoriae*, *bone* for *bonae*, *nature* for *naturae*, etc.[22] The reason for this phenomenon is that the diphthong *ae* became a monophthong that sounded similar to *e*.[23] On the other hand, *e* instead of *ae* occurred only 5 times: *pacae* for *pace* (twice), *diae* for *die*, *salutae* for *salute* and *daeo* for *deo*. There is only one example in Aquitaine where the diphthong *au* became *o*: *copo* for *caupo*. There was some hesitation in the use of *au* as early as the archaic period and although Classical Latin restored this diphthong as a norm, words with a monophthong like *copo* lingered on in the vernacular. Greek *υ* was written with *u* or *i* in Latin as an orthographic tradition, the former was more frequent in the archaic age, and the latter in the classical period. Nevertheless, we can find both of them in the Gallic inscriptions. There are 7 instances of *i*, 5 times in *nimphis* for *nymphis*, and twice in *Eutichi* and *Eutiches* for *Eutychi* and *Eutyches*, and there are two examples of *u* in *numphis* for *nymphis* and in *presbuteria* for *presbyteria*. As Pirson notes,[24] the language of epigraphy is in close connection with archaic Latin because the unstressed *i* often becomes *u* next to a labial consonant, which occurred 17 times: 4 times in *Legitumus* for *Legitimus*, 8 times in *Maxumus/Maxuma* for *Maximus/Maxima*, twice in *Maritumus/Maritumae* for *Maritimus/Maritimae*, once in *lubens* for *libens*, *Zmunthio* for *Zminthio*, *Optuma* for *Optima* (they can be regarded as archaisms and indicated with this alternative code).

I for *u* occurred 10 times, but only in *monimentum* for *monumentum* and in its different forms. There were 31 examples of syncope, for instance *humlis* for *humilis*, *domni* for *domini*, *Mascli* for *Masculi* etc., and 27 examples of apocope, for example *matr* for *matri*, *Roman,* for *Romani*, *fratr* for *fratri* etc. The contraction of double *i* for example in *Antoni* for *Antonii*, in *fili* for *filii*, *Iuli* for *Iulii* was also frequent according to the inscriptions, it occurs 59 times, whereas the contraction of double *u* was quite rare, there are only four examples for this phenomenon: *sum* for *suum*, *Ingenus*

---

[21] "En syllable atone et devant *l*, la langue archaïque et vulgaire prononçait *o*, alors qu'on écrivait *u* dans le latin classique et littéraire. Cet *o* a persisté pendant toute la période impériale et notamment dans les inscriptions; il a survécu en italien dans des conditions identiques. Dans certains mots, cette voyelle est pour ainsi dire devenue normale." PIRSON (n. 19) 44.

[22] The monophthongization of *ae* took place already at the beginning of the Imperial Age, but the diphthong was restored in writing (and in the pronunciation) by educated persons as a standard. Therefore it cannot be regarded as a real phonological change of the Imperial Age. Instead, it reflects tendencies in orthography.

[23] HERMAN, J.: *Vulgar Latin*. University Park, PA. 2000, 31.

[24] PIRSON (n. 19) 37.

for *Ingenuus*, the latter three times.[25] There are two examples for the omission of *i* followed by *e* in *requescet* for *requiescet*. The omission of *i* followed by a vowel occurred 11 times in the inscriptions, for example *Aurelus* for *Aurelius*, *memorae* for *memoriae*, *conugi* for *coniugi*. For the elimination of *e* and *u* in the same position there is only one example each: *Thodorici* for *Theodorici* and *Febrarias* for *Februarias*. The elimination of another vowel followed by a vowel occurred twice: *Mais* for *Maias* and *Ilias* for *Iulias*.

Concerning the changes of vowels, we can point out that the proportion of errors made in stressed syllables are much lower than in unstressed syllables; of all the errors the most frequent one was *e* used instead of the diphthong *ae*; *i* became *e* almost as many times as *e* became *i*. There were fewer examples for using *o* for *u* had than for using *u* for *o*. Consequently, we may modify Professor Herman's statement, because the confusion of *o* and *u* was more frequent in the inscriptions than the confusion of *e* and *i* in unstressed syllables, and actually there were more instances altogether for the former than for the latter. Thus it seems that the confusion of *o* and *u* was not an isolated phenomenon in this region, even if some of these errors can be considered as archaisms, too. Most of the confusion of *i~e* can be dated to the sixth century (the earliest instance to the first), but as for the confusion of *o~u* there were as many examples from the first and second centuries as from the sixth. There were also isolated changes in Aquitaine like *é > i* that might have been the mistake of the engraver or they might show the language use of a member of the deceased person's family rather than a real linguistic change in this area of Gaul.

As for the consonants, there was only one example for *d* for *t* between two vowels: *condeda* for *condita*. Intervocalic *c* became *g* once in *Segundinus* for *Secundinus*. There is only one instance for the elimination of intervocalic *g* in *Cintuenae* for *Cintugenae*. *Sonorisatio ante consonantem* occurred three times in the inscriptions: *Lezbiae* for *Lesbiae*, *Abrili* for *Aprili* and *Ghlotharii* for *Clotharii*. We have only one example for the *desonorisatio consonantis finalis* in *set* for *sed*. The *desonorisatio consonantis intervocalis* occurred 23 times in the inscriptions: of these *tauropolium* for *taurobolium* occurred 20 times (it could have been affected by the Greek word *Ταυροπόλια*); two examples concern *g*: *Recinus* for *Reginus*, *Toci* for *Togi*, and one example concerns *d*: *cupeta* for *cupida*. The confusion of *b* and *v* occurred 7 times altogether: *Vivio* for *Vibio*, *oviit* for *obiit* twice, *devetum* for *debitum*, *plevique* for *plebique*, *boto* for *voto* and *bixit* for *vixit* (the dated examples are from the third and the next three centuries). The omission of intervocalic *v* occurred 18 times: *vius* for *vivus* (14 times), *Flainus* for *Flavinus*, *Lascius* for *Lascivus aunclus* for *avunculus*. The elimination of *v* between a consonant and a vowel occurred twice: *conserus* for *conservus* and *serus* for *servus*.[26]

---

[25] Like the monophthongization of *ae*, the contraction of *i* and *u* can also be regarded as an orthographic change because it took place earlier than the Imperial Age. Double vowels were restored in writing as a norm.

[26] "Et ce qui prouve clairement que l'emploi du signe *V* pour *VV* pouvait n'être qu'un procédé graphique. … Cependant il parait bien établi que la généralité de ces graphies sans *v* représentait la prononciation réelle." PIRSON (n. 19) 63.

The labial element of *qu* disappeared and gave way to the following form: *reqescet* for *requiescet* (*q* without *u*). In Vulgar Latin, *t* before *i*, which sounded *j* in the spoken language, became an affricate [ts], which is attested by the changes of *t* and *c* in the following examples: *distancia* for *distantia*, *tercio* for *tertio*, *nacione* for *natione innocencius* for *innocentius* (from the sixth century) and *deposicio* for *depositio*. *D* before the same *i* was eliminated as we can see in *aiutit* for *adiutet*. *Q* for *c* shows that after the elimination of the labial element of *qu* these two graphs marked the same sound. There are three examples for this: *quius* for *cuius*, *Pequliaris* for *Peculiaris* (twice). There are three examples for *q/c/k* for *qu*, too: *reqescet* for *requiescit* (twice) and *qinta* for *quinta*. As for the instances where word-initial *h* is eliminated, we regarded them as data irrespective of whether they are only orthographic phenomena or not. It occurred 18 times like in *eredes* for *heredes*, *umanis* for *humanis*, *oc* for *hoc* and it can also be seen in Greek words without the aspirate like *Eutici* for *Eutychi*, *nimpis* for *nymphis*, *Zmintio* for *Zminthio*, etc. Greek *ph* became a voiceless labiodental fricative during the fourth century[27] and was preserved as *f* in the inscriptions: *neofiti* for *neophyti* (from the fifth century). *K* for *c* is an orthographic change going back to the archaic period. There are 17 instances for it: *karissimae* for *carissimae* (14 times), *vikanis* for *vicanis*, *Karinae* for *Carinae*, *Volkno* for *Vulcano*. *N* instead of *m* occurred twice at the end of the word: *annorun* for *annorum* (it could be also the mistake of the engraver), *exanimen* for *exanimem*.

As for word-final consonants, there are 12 examples where *m* was eliminated, for instance *arce* for *arcem*, *arula* for *arulam*, *septe* for *septem* etc. The omission of *s* occurred 16 times, for example *Sabinu* for *Sabinus*, *regi* for *regis*, *civi* for *civis*, etc (the last two examples can be *dat. pro gen.*). *T* disappeared at the end of the words 7 times: *posui* for *posuit*, *feci* for *fecit*, *sin* for *sint*, etc. There are other examples for the elimination of consonants in the following instances: *nct* became *nt* twice in *defunta* for *defuncta* (this was frequent in Vulgar Latin), but we can find words where *ct* was written instead of *nct*, for instance *defuctus* for *defunctus*; *ct* became *t* once in *strutores* pro *structores*. *S* disappeared from the sequence *ns* five times, see *traspecti* for *transpecti*, *trasiit* for *transiit*, *Masueta* for *Mansueta*, *Masueti* for *Mansueti* and *Masueto* for *Mansueto*. There is one example where a simple *s* became *ns* in *nepotins* for *nepotes*. The most frequent change concerns the graph *x*; in 57 examples *x* was written with two letters: mostly with an *x* and an *s* (sometimes with double *x*) as in *Maxsimus* for *Maximus* (7 times), *uxsor* for *uxor* (19 times), *vixsit* for *vixit*, *Divixxti* for *Divixti*; once *x* was written with a simple *s* in *escepit* for *excepit* (the former instances show rather orthographic changes while the latter one can also represent a phonological change). *N* followed by a consonant (mostly by a dental) disappeared in 9 instances: *ponedum* for *ponendum*, *Fracorum* for *Francorum*, *Advetinis* for *Adventinis*.

There are five examples for dissimilation: *inlustria* for *illustria*, *adfectione* for *affectione*, *conmilitiones* for *commilitiones*, *Ponponiae* for *Pomponiae*, *conlet* for *complet*. We can find some examples in the inscriptions where simple consonants

---

[27] PIRSON (n. 19) 80.

were geminated or, on the contrary, double consonants became simplified. Some-
times the engraver could make this kind of error but we can assume with good reason
that this orthography reflects a feature of the spoken language, because it can be
found in some inscriptions of other provinces. It mostly affects the following conso-
nants in Aquitaine: *l, r, n, s*. Firstly, double consonants became simple ones in *cole-
gis* for *collegis*, *Apolini* for *Apollini*, *Eriapo* for *Erriapo* (for *r* this is the only ex-
ample occurring 5 times), *anorum* for *annorum* (9 times), *Succesa* for *Successa*,
nobillisimo for *nobilissim*, and there are two examples where double *t* was simpli-
fied: *quatuor* for *quattuor*, *Ulatios* for *Ulattios*, and there is one instance where it
happened to the graph *c*: *ecl* for *eccl*(*esiae*). Secondly, simple consonants were gemi-
nated in the following words: *Gallerius* for *Galerius*, *fillie* for *filie*, *nobillisimo* for
nobilissimo, *Tautinni* for *Tautini*, *Anicianni* for *Aniciani*, *incisso* for *inciso*, *possuit*
for *posuit*, *vissu* for *visu*, *transsiit* for *transit*. And there are some examples where
other consonants were geminated: *Germaniccus* for *Germanicus*, *Erriappo* for *Erri-
apo*, *obblata* for *oblata*.

      It is clear from what has been said above that Professor Herman's statement
that vowels were more affected by the changes than consonants proves to be right:
there are 473 examples for the former and 281 for the latter. The changes of the
graph *x* were the most frequent, followed by devoicing in intervocalic position, the
elimination of intervocalic *v*, and the disappearance of *h*. (The changes concerning *x*
and *h* are orthographic rather than phonological.) The diagram shows that some of
the changes, like *desonorisatio consonantis finalis*, were sporadic. The omission of
final consonants was not frequent but it obviously existed in Aquitaine already in the
first century. To sum up, it can be stated that the changes of consonants were not so
considerable, because apart from some cases the examples are sporadic and isolated.

      We have 81 examples for changes classified as *morphosyntactica* etc., but for
most of these there are only a few instances. There are 17 examples for changes of
cases altogether: accusative for nominative in *Iulia Titiolam* for *Titiola*; nominative
for accusative in the Greek *diathesis* for *diathesin*; nominative for genitive in the
name *Onesicrate* for *Onesicratis*; nominative for dative in the name *Romulus* for *Ro-
mulo*, *uxor* for *uxore*, *Iuno* for *Iunoni* (the examples of the last three categories can
also be regarded as *vocabula indeclinata*); dative for genitive in *nato* for *nati*; geni-
tive for dative in *defuncti* for *defuncto* and in the name of a Gallic god *Leherenni* for
Leherenno; accusative for ablative in *nepotins* (*nepotes*) for *nepotibus*, *pro salutem
suam* for *pro salute sua*, *in pacem* for *in pace*; ablative for dative in *matre* for *matri*
(but it may also have been caused by the confusion of *e* and *i*); genitive or dative for
ablative in *pecuniae suae* for *pecunia sua*; dative or ablative for accusative in *moni-
mento* for *monumentum* (it may also have been caused by the elimination of final *m*
and the confusion of *o* and *u*); accusative for genitive in *memoriam* for *memoriae*.

      As for the changes of the genders there are three examples where masculine
was used instead of feminine: *deo* for *deae*, *sui* for *suae*, *qui* for *quae*, and masculine
is used for neuter in one instance: *exanimen* (= *exanimem*) for *exanime*. There were
two inscriptions in which the suffix *-is* was replaced by *-abus* and *-ibus*: *libertabus*
for *libertis* and *dibus* for *diis*. We can find one example for the confusion of the sec-

ond and the fourth declensions, where the second was used instead of the fourth: *ex viso* for *ex visu*. There are three examples in the category of *vocabula indeclinata*: *Veria* for *Veriae* (it can also be a nominative for genitive), *deae Diana* for *deae Dianae*, *gremium* for *gremio*. Although we have 23 examples for the change in the form of the superlative, in most of the cases this concerns one word, namely the adjective *pius*: *piissimae/piissimo* and *pientissimae/pientissimo* for *maxime piae/pio* (22 times), and *umilissimus* for *humillimus*. There is only one example for the change of the numerals: *ter* was written with a Roman number instead of the right Roman numeral adverb. The preposition *cum* became *con* only in one inscription. The form *coiugi/coiux* for *coniugi/coniux*, which occurred 7 times, can altogether be regarded as *variatio praefixorum*.

There were three examples for *recompositio*: *consacravit* for *consecravit* occurring three times. There are 4 words in the category of *lexica*: the adjective *bone memorius* (twice), which was formed from the well-known formula *Dis Manibus et bonae memoriae* as a Christian adjective in the fourth century; *coniuga* which is a feminine form to *coniux*, and *Viennis* for *Viennensis*. There was one example for a *Graecismus* in a metrical inscription: *dabount* for *dabunt*. According to the *ILA*[28] *ou* instead of simple *o* can emphasize that this syllable is long. As for archaisms, they occurred 8 times: *faciundum* for *faciendum*, *conservos* for *conservus*, *vivos* for *vivus* (four times), *adoptivos* for *adoptivus*, *servos* for *servus*, but we can also regard forms like *Maxumus*, *tomolo*, etc. as archaisms. And finally, there were some errors which could be regarded as *hypercorrectio*: *thomolo* for *tumulo*, *hara* for *ara*, *hex* for *ex* all of them with an *h* added (so they can also be *litterae superfluae*), *sribtis* for *scriptis*, *collabsa* pro *collapsa*, and one of the forms of the irregular verb *fero* was once formed as regular: *ferit* for *fert*.

As can be seen from what has been said above, the proportions of morphological and syntactic errors are very low compared to the errors made altogether, and for most of them we have only one or a few examples, so it seems that they are isolated, and sometimes they reflect the incompetence of the engraver or the ordinator rather than changes of the spoken language. Only the change of the superlative occurs more than 10 times, but this is not representative because in most of the cases it concerns only one word, namely *pius*.[29] To sum up, we can state that although there were signs of changes in morphology and syntax, they were sporadic at this time, the classical norm was relatively well preserved in the inscriptions.

Krisztina Fodor PhD Student
Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE) Budapest
Ancient Studies Doctoral Program

[28] BOST, J-P. – FABRE, G.: *Inscriptions Latines d'Aquitaine – Pétrucores.* Bordeaux 2001, 269.
[29] Mostly we find *piissimo/piissima* or *pientissimo/pientissima* in the inscriptions, so they can be regarded as changes of *lexica*.

Vocalismus

Consonantismus 1.

Consonantismus 2.

Morphosyntactica etc.