

**„BABEȘ-BOLYAI” UNIVERSITY CLUJ-NAPOCA
FACULTY OF HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY
DEPARTMENT OF ANCIENT HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY**

PhD THESIS

**THE LATIN LANGUAGE IN THE INSCRIPTIONS FROM ROMAN
DACIA**

- ABSTRACT-

Coordinator:
Prof. dr. **IOAN PISO**

PhD student:
Eugenia Beu-Dachin

Cluj-Napoca
2011

**LINGUISTIC STUDY OF THE LATIN INSCRIPTIONS FROM ROMAN
DACIA. POINTING OUT SOME DIFFERENCES FROM THE STANDARD
LATIN**

Contents

Introduction	p. 3
I. Phonetics	p. 22
1. Vocalism	p. 24
1.1. Vowel <i>a</i>	p. 29
1.1.1. Using <i>e</i> vowel instead of <i>a</i>	p. 30
1.1.2. Using η in favor of α (a Ionic dialect feature)	p. 33
1.1.3. Lack of unstressed <i>a</i>	p. 33
1.1.4. Diphthongization of initial vowel <i>a</i> in <i>ae</i>	p. 35
1.2. Vowel <i>e</i>	p. 43
1.2.1. Using <i>i</i> instead of <i>e</i>	p. 46
1.2.2. Syncopation of unstressed <i>e</i>	p. 49
1.2.3. Fall of <i>e</i> in stressed syllable	p. 50
1.2.4. Using <i>ae</i> instead of <i>e</i>	p. 50
1.2.5. Epenthesis of <i>e</i>	p. 51
1.3. Vowel <i>i</i>	p. 51
1.3.1. Using <i>e</i> instead of <i>i</i>	p. 52
1.3.2. Final <i>i</i> becomes <i>e</i>	p. 54
1.3.3. <i>U</i> instead of <i>i</i>	p. 54
1.3.4. Syncopation of <i>i</i>	p. 55
1.3.4.1. Syncopation of <i>i</i> after a liquid	p. 55
1.3.4.2. Syncopation of unstressed <i>i</i> before or after the main accent of the word	p. 55
1.3.4.3. Syncopation of stressed <i>i</i>	p. 55
1.3.4.4. Fall of unstressed <i>i</i> , together with the following consonant, in an open syllable	p. 55
1.3.4.5. Fall of final <i>i</i>	p. 56
1.3.4.6. Fall of <i>i</i>	p. 56

1.3.5. <i>Ii</i> for <i>i</i>	p. 56
1.3.6. Epenthesis of <i>i</i>	p. 56
1.3.7. Writing <i>j</i> instead of <i>i</i>	p. 56
1.3.8. <i>I</i> for <i>ii</i>	p. 56
1.3.9. <i>Ei</i> instead of <i>i</i>	p. 58
1.3.10. <i>Y</i> instead of <i>i</i>	p. 58
1.4. Vowel <i>o</i>	p. 58
1.4.1. <i>O</i> / <i>u</i> variation	p. 59
1.4.2. Omission of <i>o</i>	p. 61
1.5. Vowel <i>u</i>	p. 61
1.5.1. <i>O</i> instead of <i>u</i>	p. 61
1.5.2. Epenthesis of <i>u</i>	p. 62
1.5.3. <i>O</i> instead of <i>u</i> in Greek words	p. 62
1.5.4. Syncopation of unstressed <i>u</i> , preceded or followed by another <i>u</i>	p. 62
1.5.5. Hesitation between <i>i</i> și <i>u</i>	p. 63
1.5.6. Fall of unstressed <i>u</i>	p. 63
1.5.7. <i>U</i> > <i>y</i>	p. 63
1.6. Vowel <i>y</i>	p. 63
1.6.1. Confusion between <i>y</i> and <i>i</i>	p. 64
1.6.2. <i>U</i> instead of <i>y</i>	p. 64
1.6.3. <i>Y</i> > <i>e</i>	p. 65
1.7. Diphthongs	p. 65
1.7.1. Diphthong <i>ae</i>	p. 65
1.7.1.1. <i>A</i> instead of <i>ae</i>	p. 67
1.7.1.2. Transformation of <i>ae</i> in a monophthong	p. 67
1.7.1.3. <i>I</i> instead of <i>ae</i>	p. 68
1.7.2. Diphthong <i>au</i>	p. 69
1.7.2.1. Transformation of <i>au</i> in <i>o</i> monophthong	p. 69
1.7.2.2. Transformation of <i>au</i> in <i>u</i> monophthong	p. 69
1.7.3. Diphthong <i>ai</i>	p. 69
1.7.3.1. <i>Ai</i> > <i>ei</i>	

1.7.4. Diphthong <i>ei</i>	p. 70
1.8. Vowels in hiatus	p. 70
1.9. The epenthesis	p. 71
2. Consonants	p. 71
2.1. Labials: <i>p, b</i>	p. 72
2.1.1. Confusion between <i>b</i> and <i>u</i>	p. 72
2.1.1.1. Fall of <i>u</i> consonans	p. 72
2.1.2. <i>B</i> instead of <i>p</i>	p. 72
2.1.3. <i>P</i> instead of <i>b</i>	p. 72
2.1.4. <i>V</i> instead of <i>b</i>	p. 72
2.2. Dentals: <i>t, d</i>	p. 73
2.2.1. <i>D</i> instead of <i>t</i>	p. 73
2.2.2. <i>T</i> instead of <i>d</i>	p. 73
2.2.3. <i>Ts / d</i>	p. 73
2.2.4. Fall of <i>d</i>	p. 75
2.2.5. Fall of <i>t</i>	p. 75
2.3. Gutturals	p. 75
2.3.1. <i>K</i> instead of <i>c</i>	p. 75
2.3.2. <i>Qu > c</i>	p. 75
2.3.3. <i>Qu > q</i>	p. 76
2.3.4. Fall of <i>c</i> consonant	p. 76
2.3.5. Unconventional spelling of the name <i>Caius</i>	p. 76
2.4. Aspirated <i>h</i> sound	p. 76
2.4.1. Omission of <i>h</i> when translating ϕ, θ, χ .	p. 76
2.4.1.1. <i>F</i> instead of <i>ph</i>	p. 76
2.4.1.2. <i>P</i> instead of <i>ph</i>	p. 77
2.4.1.3. <i>T</i> instead of <i>th</i>	p. 77
2.4.1.4. <i>C</i> instead of <i>ch</i>	p. 77
2.4.2. Omission of <i>h</i> at the beginning of the word	p. 78
2.4.3. Omission of <i>h</i> inside the word	p. 78
2.5. Voiced <i>s, z</i>	p. 78

2.5.1. Fall of final <i>s</i>	p. 78
2.5.2. Use of <i>s</i> after <i>x</i>	p. 78
2.5.3. <i>Vis(it)</i> for <i>vixit</i>	p. 79
2.5.4. Use of <i>z</i>	p. 80
2.6. Nasal consonants: <i>m, n</i>	p. 80
2.6.1. Fall of final <i>m</i>	p. 80
2.6.2. Nasal consonant <i>n</i>	p. 80
2.6.2.1. Fall of nasal consonant <i>n</i> before <i>s</i> sibilant	p. 80
2.6.2.2. Fall of <i>n</i> before dental consonants <i>t, d</i>	p. 81
2.6.2.3. <i>N > m</i>	p. 81
2.6.2.4. <i>N + i</i>	p. 81
2.7. Liquid consonants	p. 82
2.7.1. <i>L + i</i> (+ vowel)	p. 82
2.7.2. Fall of liquid <i>l</i>	p. 82
2.8. Geminate consonants	p. 82
2.8.1. Simplification of geminates	p. 84
2.8.2. Hypercorrection	p. 85
2.9. Final consonants	p. 86
2.9.1. Fall of final <i>m</i>	p. 86
2.9.2. Fall of final <i>s</i>	p. 86
2.9.3. Fall of final <i>t</i>	p. 86
2.9.4. Fall of final <i>n</i>	p. 86
2.9.5. Fall of final <i>r</i>	p. 87
2.10. Dissimilation	p. 87
2.11. Errors in writing	p. 87
2.11.1. Wrong hyphenation	p. 87
2.11.2. Haplology	p. 88
2.11.2.1. Contracted forms of perfect	p. 88
2.11.3. Dittology	p. 88
2.11.4. Metathesis	p. 88
2.11.5. Absence of punctuation in the inscriptions	p. 88

2.11.6. Retrograde writing	p. 88
II. Morphology	p. 89
1. Noun	p. 92
1.1. Declension I	
1.1.1. Archaic genitive in <i>-ai</i>	p. 92
1.1.2. Genitive singular in <i>-es</i> or <i>-aes</i>	p. 93
1.1.3. Dative singular in <i>-a</i>	p. 94
1.1.4. <i>Leto</i> for <i>Latonae</i>	p. 94
1.1.5. Accusative in <i>-a</i>	p. 95
1.1.6. Ablative singular in <i>-am</i> instead of <i>-a</i>	p. 95
1.1.7. Dative plural in <i>-abus</i>	p. 95
1.1.8. Transition of a noun from the III rd declension to the I st one	p. 95
1.1.9. I st Greek declension	p. 97
1.2. Declension II	p. 97
1.2.1. Nominative singular in <i>-us > u</i>	p. 98
1.2.2. Nominative singular in <i>-os</i> instead of <i>-us</i>	p. 98
1.2.3. Nominative singular in <i>us > o</i>	p. 98
1.2.4. Genitive singular in <i>i</i> instead of <i>ii</i> at the themes in <i>-io</i>	p. 98
1.2.5. Accusative instead of ablative	p. 99
1.2.6. Accusative singular in <i>-u</i>	p. 99
1.2.7. Genitive plural in <i>-orum</i> or in <i>-um</i>	p. 99
1.2.8. The dative plural <i>deis</i>	p. 100
1.2.9. <i>Socro</i> (dative singular) for <i>socero</i>	p. 100
1.2.10. Transition of some nouns from the III rd declension to the II nd one	p. 100
1.3. Declension III	p. 100
1.3.1. Nominative singular in <i>-is</i> instead of <i>-es</i>	p. 100
1.3.2. Genitive singular in <i>-e</i> instead of <i>-is</i>	p. 101
1.3.3. Genitive in <i>i</i> at the III rd Greek declension	p. 101
1.3.4. Transition from the III rd declension to the II nd one	p. 102
1.3.5. Accusative singular in <i>e</i> , after the fall of desinence <i>m</i>	p. 103
1.3.6. Ablative singular finished with <i>-m</i>	p. 103

1.3.7.	Ablative singular in <i>-i</i> instead of <i>-e</i>	p. 103
1.3.8.	Ablative singular in <i>-ae</i> instead of <i>-e</i>	p. 104
1.3.9.	Genitive plural in <i>-iu(m)</i>	p. 104
1.3.10.	Ablative plural in <i>-is</i> instead of <i>-ibus</i>	p. 104
1.3.11.	Use of the I st declension instead of the III rd declension	p. 105
1.3.12.	Transition from the III rd declension to the II nd one	p. 105
1.4.	Declension IV	p. 105
1.5.	Greek writing	p. 105
2. Adjective		p. 106
2.1.	Comparison using periphrasis	p. 107
2.2.	<i>Pientissimus</i> instead of <i>piissimus</i>	p. 107
2.3.	Excess of superlatives in colloquial Latin	p. 107
3. Numeral		p. 108
4. Pronoun		p. 108
5. Verb		p. 109
III. Syntax		p. 113
1. Noun		p. 113
1.1. Use of prepositions		p. 114
1.1.1. Prepositio <i>ad</i> with the accusative		p. 114
1.1.1.1. Express place		p. 114
1.1.1.2. Express finality		p. 115
1.1.1.3. Express relationship		p. 115
1.1.1.4. Substantival genitive attribute expressed by <i>ad</i> + accusative		p. 116
1.1.1.5. Participation in an event: <i>ad</i> + accusative		p. 116
1.1.2.	Instrumental <i>cum</i>	p. 116
1.1.3.	<i>De</i> instead of <i>a</i>	p. 117

1.1.4.	<i>In</i> preposition	p. 117
	1.1.4.1. Replacing the substantival genitive attribute with a prepositional construction	p. 117
1.1.5.	<i>Ob</i> preposition	p. 117
1.1.6.	<i>Per</i> preposition	p. 118
1.1.7.	<i>Pro</i> with accusative or with ablative	p. 118
1.2.	Cases and syntactical values	p. 119
1.2.1.	Genitive expressing the age	p. 119
1.2.2.	Dativus adnominalis	p. 119
1.2.3.	The accusative of time and the ablative of duration	p. 119
1.2.4.	The complement of place in the texts of <i>miliaria</i>	p. 120
1.2.5.	Adverbial complement	p. 121
1.2.6.	Agent complement, preceded or not by preposition	p. 121
1.3.	Peculiarities of proper names	p. 122
1.4.	Agreement	p. 123
1.4.1.	Agreement in number	p. 123
1.4.2.	Disagreement between apposition and its regent	p. 124
1.4.3.	Agreement in gender	p. 125
1.4.4.	Cases used after the expression “Dis Manibus”	p. 125
2.	Adjective	p. 126
3.	Pronoun	p. 126
4.	Verb	p. 130
4.1.	Omission of verb	p. 130
4.2.	Complements preceded by prepositions	p. 130
	4.2.1. <i>Ad</i> with accusative instead of dative	p. 130
	4.2.2. <i>De</i> with ablative instead of ablative without preposition	p. 130
4.3.	Use of tenses	p. 130
5.	Prepositions and adverbs	p. 132
6.	Conjunctions	p. 133
6.1.	Copulative coordination	p. 133

7. Ellipsis	p. 133
7.1. Omission of the noun <i>coniux</i> (or <i>uxor</i>)	
7.2. Omission of the relative pronoun <i>qui, quae</i>	
7.3. Omission of <i>posuit</i> or <i>fecit</i>	
7.4. Omission of <i>viam</i>	p. 134
IV. Vocabulary	p. 135
V. Conclusions	p. 158
Abbreviations	p. 163
Bibliography	p. 166
Contents	p. 176

Key words

epigraphy

linguistics

Latin

phonetics

morphology

syntax

vocabulary

Introduction

This study represents a linguistic analysis of the Latin inscriptions from Roman Dacia. Its object is a number of about 4500 inscriptions from the ex-province Dacia, which were published in corpora and different journals and volumes quoted at the end of this study. At least half of these inscriptions contains linguistic variations or grammatical structures which should be mentioned in a paper of linguistical epigraphy.

The introduction contains, besides a specification of the notion “vulgar Latin”, an exposure of the foreign and autochthonous bibliography related to this topic. The term “vulgar” has never been defined precisely. Its sens was understood as “popular”, “usual or customary”, sometimes as “uneducated speech”. I should emphasize that my intention was not to evaluate exclusively the colloquial Latin in the inscriptions of the province Dacia, but to do an analysis of the Latin as it results from these inscriptions.

Usually, the adequate sources for the study of „vulgar” or colloquial Latin are that kind of texts which shows the personality of their authors. These are written by private persons. These kinds of texts are engraved on: inscriptions (especially funerary and votive inscriptions), instrumenta with writing, waxed tablets, graffiti, ostraca, papyri. Very interesting texts for the study of colloquial Latin are the ostraca from Bu Njem and the Albertini Tablets (from Africa), the cursive writing tablets from Britannia and the graffiti from La Graufesenque in Gaul. These texts were studied by J.N. Adams in some papers and books: e.g. *Latin and Punic in Contact? The Case of the Bu Njem Ostraca*, in *The Journal of Roman Studies* 84 (1994), p. 87-112, respectively *The Poets of Bu Njem. Language, Culture and the Centurionate*, in *The Journal of Roman Studies* 89 (1999), p. 109-134, in *The Language of the Vindolanda Writing Tablets: An Interim Report*, *The Journal of Roman Studies* 85 (1995), p. 86-134 and by Veikko Väänänen, *Étude sur le texte et la langue des tablettes Albertini*, „*Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae*”, ser. B, tom 141, 2, Helsinki 1965.

I’ve also discussed about the so-called constancy and unity of the Latin language across the Roman Empire, that is in fact an „illusion”, because the spoken language has many tendencies and peculiarities. The impression of unity is given by the deficient aspect of the texts, by the standardized wear adopted by the Latin of these texts. The

aspects of the spoken language are rarely visible and, unfortunately, the real „face” of spoken Latin will be a mystery for ever.

The characteristics of the epigraphic Latin language have been studied by different researchers, and their conclusion is that the majority of linguistic variations in inscriptions can be found all over the Empire. The general impression is, therefore, the linguistic unity. I’ve already talked about this unity as an illusion, and, in reality, we can conclude that this cannot be maintained as long as Latin was in touch with so many vernacular languages.

I’ve made a short review of the titles devoted to the Latin language in the inscriptions from the Roman Empire. The first larger work devoted to the study of the inscriptions from a whole roman province is that of J. Pirson, titled *La langue des inscriptions latines de la Gaules*, Bruxelles, 1901. At that time, the inscriptions from the Empire were constituting an untapped source yet, and the publishing of *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* contributed to the release of researches in the field of the epigraphic linguistics. A recent work reopens the phonetic study of the inscriptions from Gallia Narbonensis: Ötvös Zsuzsanna, *The Latin of the Inscriptions in Narbonensis: Some Phonetic Characteristics*¹. The author uses a modern method in this study, a microphilological one, which was initiated by professor Herman József². The result of this work is a linguistic study which contains Latin inscriptions dated to the Imperial period. In the absence of a database this kind of microphilological study is inconceivable.

A second work related to the inscriptions of a Roman province is that of A. Carnoy, *Le latin d’Espagne d’après les inscriptions*, which was published in the second edition at Bruxelles, in 1906. This book emphasizes on phonetics. In its third chapter some morphological problems are discussed.

La langue des tablettes d’exécutions latines, the PhD thesis of Maurice Jeanneret, was published in Paris, in 1918. The book is organized in five chapters (phonetics, morphology, word formation, vocabulary, syntax). A large part of the material studied by Jeanneret was collected in Augustus Audollent’s corpus, *Defixionum tabellae quotquot innotuerunt tam in Graecis Orientis quam in totius Occidentis partibus*

¹ In *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 49, nr. 1, 2009, p. 95-105.

² József Herman, *Late Latin Data Base Guidelines for Data Collection*, Institute for Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, P.O. Box 19, 1250 (www.lldb.elt.hu).

praeter Atticas in Corpore Inscriptionum Atticarum editas collegit digessit commentario instruxit et Facultati Litterarum in Universitate Parisiensi proposuit ad doctoris gradum, Paris, 1904.

In 1959, the well-known Finnish researcher Veikko Väänänen published *Le latin vulgaire des inscriptions Pompéiennes*, and in 1965, *Étude sur le texte et la langue des tablettes Albertini*. The Albertini Tablets represents a group of 45 wooden tablets, written with ink, which were discovered at the Tunisian- Algerian border, between Tebessa and Gafsa, in 1928. E. Albertini was to establish their affiliation to the Vandal period. They are dated to the years 493-496, under the reign of Gunthamund and most of them represent acts of sale.

James Noel Adams, often mentioned in this work, is the author of many titles which refer to the vulgar Latin, to bilingualism, Romanitas or to the study of Latin in epigraphic and non-epigraphic sources. *The Vulgar Latin of the Letters of Claudius Terentianus*, Manchester, 1977, treats a group of letters addressed by Claudius Terentianus to his father. They have been found at Karanis, in Egypt, and they are dated to the IInd century. A very important source for the study of vulgar Latin is represented by the writing tablets of Vindolanda, published by Bowman and Thomas³. They come from a military outpost and they are dated to the Ist and to the IInd century A.D. Even if some of these texts are characterized by stereotypy, many of them hide a kind of individuality. Some *hapax legomena* and rarely used words can also appear in these texts. Adams studied linguistically these tablets in: *The Latin of the Vindolanda writing-tablets: an interim report*⁴.

A recent and a very well organized and documented work is that of Fehér Bence, *Pannonia latin nyelvtörténete* (The history of Latin language in Pannonia). Unlike the other works of epigraphic linguistics, this is a history of Latin in Pannonia, realized based on literary sources (Victorinus' work, the bishop from Poetovio, whose activity is dated to the IIIrd century), and on the epigraphic sources, as well. Scientifically, this is one of the most important studies in this field.

³ A.C. Bowman, J.D. Thomas, *The Vindolanda Writing Tablets (Tabula Vindolandenses II)*, 1994; *idem*, *The Vindolanda Writing-tablets (Tabula Vindolandenses III)*, London 2003.

⁴ In *The Journal of Roman Studies* 85, 1995, p. 86-134.

The study of epigraphic Latin in Dacia is represented by two titles, which are essential starting points in the research of this topic. Sorin Stati published in 1961 *Limba latină în inscripțiile din Dacia și Scythia Minor* (The Latin language in the inscriptions from Dacia and Minor Scythia). His work was structured following the classical model. Its object is represented by the inscriptions from CIL and the ones published in different journals. Today, many of Stati's examples are not in use anymore, some of them being reconsidered after the correct interpretation of the inscriptions. Neither Haralambie Mihăescu, who published in 1978 *La langue latine dans le Sud-Est de l'Europe*, have had at hand the volumes of *Inscriptiones Daciae Romanae*. He makes a study of the inscriptions from the South-Eastern part of Europe, providing also a well documented history for each province. In what regards the linguistic section of his work, the author organizes the material on grammatical levels (the compartments of phonetics, morphology, syntax, vocabulary). We should take into account the papers of the classical philologist Iancu Fischer: *Latina dunăreană. Introducere în istoria limbii române*⁵ and *Les substrats et leur influence sur les langues romanes: la Romania de Sud-Est*⁶.

This work was divided in four chapters, which respect the grammatical levels: phonetics, morphology, syntax, vocabulary.

I. PHONETICS

The existent studies on the linguistic material offered by the inscriptions of the Roman Empire reveals a preponderance of the peculiarities, respectively of the phonetic phenomena, in comparison with the morphological, syntactical and lexical problems. The best documented chapters of the Latin linguistic studies related to the inscriptions in the different provinces of the Empire are those of phonetics.

After the definition of the phonetics as a branch of linguistics, and of the terms „phoneme” and „sound”, I identified the phonetic variations and I placed them in the groups of different categories of sounds. I studied the vocalism and the consonantism in the inscriptions from Dacia, following their evolution.

⁵ Published in București, in 1985.

⁶ In *Romanische Sprachgeschichte: Histoire linguistique de la Romania*, ed. Gerhard Ernst, Martin-Dietrich Gleben, Christian Schmitt, Wolfgang Schweickard, p. 568-578.

Vocals:

The most stable of the vowels is *a*. Changes at vocalic level we will find especially in case of other vowels. In the following, I'll show some examples:

- *i* instead of *e* is a phenomenon spread across the Empire, attested in some examples in Dacia;

- hypercorrect uses of *ae* instead of *e*: *Sarmizaegethusa*, IDR III/2, 73; *salutae*, IDR III/2, 220 (for *salute*), *Raeginae*, ILD 578, Ciumăfaia, Cluj, etc.;

- *e* vowel used instead of *i*: *Deanae*, IDR III/5, 52; *Dean(a)e*, IDR III/5, 59; *Pertenacis*, IDR III/5, 153, *Mercureo* (pentru Mercurio), ILD 394, Alburnus Maior, etc.;

- *u* instead of *i*: *stupendiorum*, IDR III/5, 590; *[D]ecumum* (pentru Decimum), ILD 500, Potaissa; *co[m]/manucu/lis* (!) (for „commanipuli” or „commanipulares”), ILD 499, Potaissa, the end of the IInd century or the IIIrd century;

- *o / u* variation: *Drub[etensium]*, IDR II, 50, Drobeta, the end of the IInd century and the beginning of the IIIrd one; *Drub(eta)*, IDR II, 113, Drobeta, brick fragment; *Drub(etae)*, IDR II, 181, Iezureni, Tg.-Jiu, the IIIrd century; *Drub(etae)*, IDR III/1, 62 = ILD 185, Băile Herculane, the IIIrd century, *cunscio* for *conscio*, IDR III/1, 30, Gornea, the end of the IIIrd – the first half of the IVth one; *pus(uerunt)* for *pos(uerunt)*, IDR III/1, 161 (Tibiscum), the IIIrd century; *Napu/[cen]sium*, IDR III/1, 133, Tibiscum, the first half of the IIIrd century; *Curnelie*, IDR III/5, 520, the IInd century; *ex votum*, ILD, 56, Pontes (Moesia Superior); *ex votu*, ILD, 108, Sucidava (Celei); *Dul(i)c(h)eno*, CIL III 7625, Domnești, jud. Bistrița-Năsăud, a. 167-180;

- *o* instead of *u*: *viso* instead of *visu*, IDR II, 17, Drobeta; *colitoribus*, IDR III/2, 190 (for *cultoribus*); *Volcano* (for *Vulcano*), ILD 251, Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa; *Volk(ano)*, ILD 533, Micești, Cluj county; *con* (colloquial form for *cum*), ILD 437 = SCIVA 41/2, 1990, p. 195-201, Odorheiu-Secuiesc, the IIIrd century;

- syncopation of unstressed *u*, preceded or followed by another *u*: *Ingenu(u)s*, IDR III/2, 444; *Ingenu(u)s*, IDR III/3, 15, Călan; *Ingenu(u)s*, IDR III/4, 17, Apoldu de Jos, Sibiu; *Fla(u)us*, IDR III/5, 218; *(H)aedu(u)s*, IDR III/6, 113;

- in what regards the diphthongs, the most spread phenomenon is the transition of *ae* to *e*: *Get(a)e*, IDR II, 15; *Laudic(a)e*, IDR II, 56; *prima(e)*, IDR II, 107; *Dian(a)e*, IDR II, 158; *(A)eternal(is)*, IDR II, 635; *D(a)emon*, IDR III/1, 43; *C(a)eseri*, IDR III/1, 53.

Consonants:

- *b* instead of *p*: *ibsius*, in “venditoris ibsius”, IDR I, TabCerD VIII, p. 225; *conlabsa*, IDR III/2, 7; *dilabsas*, IDR III/3, 45; [*conl*]*absum*, IDR III/5, 398; *conscribti*, IDR III/5, 438;

- *t* instead of *d*: *at* for *ad*; *quot*, *quit* for *quod*, *quid*, IDR I, TabCerD VIII; *quidquit* for *quidquid*, IDR I, TabCerD XII, p. 236; *q]uot* for *q]uod*, IDR III/2, 241; *q(u)ot*, IDR III/5, 143; *Epicatiu[s]* instead of *Epicadius*, CIL III 920, Potaissa;

- simplification of geminates: *Marcel(l)ina*, IDR II, 135; *Cas(s)ian(us)*, IDR III/1, 2; *ul(l)am*, IDR III/1, 30; *im(m)uni*, IDR III/1, 43; *Ap(p)ul(eius)*, IDR III/2, 11; *Met(t)ius*, IDR III/2, 153; *At(t)ius*, IDR III/2, 185; *vil(l)icus*, IDR III/2, 263; *Porolis(s)u[m...]*, IDR III/2, 352; *Heren(n)iae*, IDR III/2, 399; *an(n)is*, IDR III/3, 11; *vex/il(l)atio*, IDR III/3, 39; *Ca/s(s)ius*, IDR III/3, 97; *Com(m)agen(orum)*, IDR III/3, 111, etc.;

- fall of final consonants: *ea mulierem* (for *eam mulierem*), TabCerD VIII; *ara(m)*, IDR II, 21; *forma(m)*, 229a; *ob pietate(m)*, IDR III/2, 18; *ordine(m)*, IDR III/2, 437; *ara(m)*, IDR III/3, 67; *per Antiochu(m)*, IDR III/5, 223; *Ambiuru(s)*, IDR II, 160, Vârtopu; *Cinedu(s)*, *Canididu(s)*, 611; *Sat]urninu(s)*, IDR III/4, 188; *posui(t)*, Napoca⁷; *posui(t)*, ILD 585, Pintic, Cluj county; *Cono(n)*, IDR III/3, 12-3; *Cono(n)*, IDR III/6, 148; *augu(r)*, ILD, 700, Porolissum.

II. MORPHOLOGY

As the etymology of the term suggests, morphology (gr. μορφή, gr. λόγος) represents the study of the form of the word. The variations of a word taken out from its paradigmatic environment and placed inside a syntagmatic one (language creation) compose the object of morphology. The main parts of the word are the radical and different morphemes.

I've pointed out the variations of cases at different declensions, as they follow:

- singular genitive in *-es* or in *-aes*: *Nices*, IDR III/1, 141, Tibiscum; *[...]taes*, IDR III/3, 15, Călan, Hunedoara; *Beronices*, IDR III/5, 14; *Superes*, IDR

⁷ S. Cociș, E. Beu-Dachin, V. Voișian, *Un altare votivo a Silvano, scoperto a Napoca*, în AMN 39-40 (I), 2002-2003, p. 235-239.

III/5, 242, 349; *s[c(h)o]l(a)es* (!), CIL III 830 = CIL III 7631, Ilișua, Bistrița-Năsăud county;

- accusative in *-a*: *ara(m)*, IDR II, 21, Drobeta; *forma(m)*, IDR II, 229, Sucidava (Celei); *ara(m) Soli s(acrum)*, IDR II, 509, Slăveni;

- singular ablative in *-am* instead of *-a*: *suam*, IDR III/1, 139, Tibiscum (Jupa); *[sua]m*, ILD 195, Tibiscum;

- transition of a noun from the IIIrd declension to the Ist one: *neptis*, *-is*, from the IIIrd declension, appears in some inscriptions of Dacia as *neptia*, *-ae*, at the Ist declension: *nepti(a)e*, IDR III/4, 139, Cristești, Mureș county; *neptiae*, IDR III/3, 421, Alburnus Maior;

- singular nominative in *-os* instead of *-us*: *Primitivos* (nominative), IDR III/2, 262; *Primitivos* for *Primitivus*, IDR III/3, 414, Alburnus Maior; *servos* (for *servus*), IDR III/2, 17;

- transition of some forms belonging to the IIIrd declension to the IInd declension: *patris bene/merentis* instead of *patribus benemerentibus*, IDR III/1, 72, Băile Herculane; *Dito Patri*, IDR III/2, 199;

- the adjective, periphrastic comparison: *super infelix pater*, IDR III/2;

- excess of superlatives in colloquial Latin: *Iovi summo ex/superantissimo*, IDR III/5, 231; *exaudientissima* (epithet for *Nemesis*) IDR III/5, 296.

- pronouns (very rare in inscriptions): *ego*, IDR III/4, 187 (the donary from Biertan), IVth century; IDR III/1, 30 (the brick from Gornea), the end of the IIIrd century and the beginning of the IVth one; IDR III/2, 430, the IInd century, the first half of the IIIrd century.

The verb:

- syncopated (contracted) form of perfect: *tractarit* for *tractaverit*, IDR III/2, 93; *dedicarunt* for *dedicaverunt*, IDR III/5, 313; *damnasti* for *damnavisti*, IDR III/3, 239, Germisara (Geoagiu); *cura(ve)runt*, CIL III 918, Potaissa.

III. SYNTAX

There was a tendency in Latin to change the morphological system of the language by replacing the synthetic inflection with the analytical one. This has been realized with the help of prepositions. The need to use the analytic inflection was born at the time when phonetic changes appeared in Latin, what contributed to the creation of confusions of different cases, due to a common form used for more cases. The fall of consonants at the end of the word and the confusion between *e* and *i*, *o* and *u*, due to the similarity of their pronunciation, led to the appearance of confusions between cases. This situation had to be avoid, so prepositions were used for the sake of facilitating the understanding of message. Sometimes, prepositions changed the function they had in classical Latin, therefore they were used also with other cases than the classical rules stipulated.

The texts of the inscriptions are not very rich as far as syntax is concerned. Syntactic structures are very simple and they are based on stereotypes, what restricts our possibilities of analysis. Most of the papers which studies linguistics in the inscriptions refer to the analysis of some syntactic structures which doesn't express the norms of classical Latin. These structures are included in so-called lists of errors.

Using prepositions:

- the *ad* preposition followed by accusative can express the idea of place: *rema(n)sisse ad Alb(urnum)*; *accessisse ad Alburnum*, IDR I, TabCerD I, 9 February 167 A. D. (the need of using the *ad* preposition before toponyms shows somehow a kind of unsureness in what the recognition of cases regards; express **finality**: *ad veteres cicatrices, ad impetum lippitudinis (prodest)*, CIL III 1636, Apulum; *ad caligines, ad aspri(tudines) et genas callos(as), ad clari(tatem)*, AÉ 1982, 837, Gîrbou, Sălaj county, II-III centuries (these eye recipes contain the name of illness and that of the medicine prescribed for that illness); express **relation**: *curatori ad popul(um), proc(uratori) ad alim(enta)*, IDR III/2, 89 (in the same inscription we have the expression *proc(uratori) rat(ionis) priv(atae)*, in which the attribute of *curator* is conveyed by using a genitive of relation); *proc(urator) promotus ad ducenariam provinciae Delmatiae*, IDR III/2, 225.

Examples of cases and syntactic values:

- expressing the genitive of age: *filio Claudi/o Max(imo) an[n]/orum sep/t[e]m*, IDR III/3, 351, Ampelum;

- dativus adnominalis: *quaestor collegio Isidis*, CIL III 882, Potaissa;

- use of agent complement, preceded or not by a preposition: *fuit/ vetustate conlabsa*, IDR III/2, 7; *aqua inducta colon(iae) [...] per Cn(aeum)*, IDR III/2, 8; *a vi hostium*, IDR III/2, 11; *Imperator Caesarfecit per coh(ortem)...a Potaissa Napocae m(ilia) p(assuum) X*, CIL III 1627, Aiton, Cluj county.

About agreement and disagreement:

- for example, disagreement between apposition and its regent: *Im[p(erator) C]aesari (!) Caius [[Iul(ius) [Verus Ma]]]/[[[x]i[mi]nus]]*, CIL III 8060; *Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) ... [p]ater (!) patriae*, IDR III/3, 58, Micia, CIL III 1379; *T(itus) Aur(elius) Afer Delmata princ(eps) adsignato (!)*, IDR III/3, 345, Ampelum, CIL III 1322, first half of the second century; *per Antiochu(m) sacerdos! loci*, IDR III/5, 223, the IIIrd century.

IV. VOCABULARY

The stereotypy of inscriptions gives a bare aspect to the texts which are the object of this study. On the other hand, there are some texts in which a particular style can be distinguished. They can hide words with different senses than the classical one, or, rarely, it is possible to found unattested words, so-called *hapax legomena*. An important and interesting group of texts in what concern the vocabulary is that of the waxed tablets from Alburnus Maior. These texts use cursive writing, and they represents contracts (most of them sale contracts), in which a particular free style can be distinguished sometimes.

Another group of inscriptions, which represents a higher degree of originality is that of the funerary ones, which sometimes give way to express free speech even if they follow certain patterns.

This study contains a list of words from the Dacian inscriptions, ordered alphabetically, all the explanations related to the word being placed immediately after the word. Each word has been indexed under the first dictionary form (e.g. nouns and other parts of speech from the category of nomen, in singular nominative, verbs at present indicative, Ist persone singular, etc). There is below a list of some of these words:

abstineo, apochatus, caligo, chelidonium, commanuculus, contubernium (for *contubernalium*), *diapsoricum, dioxus, danistarius, memoria, pegmarius, requies, teretrum*, etc.

Conclusions

Most of linguistic variations identified at the studied levels of language are present in other provinces of the Empire, as well. These are the characteristics which determine researchers to consider Latin as “unitary” across the Empire. It is impossible to distinguish a specific Dacian style in the epigraphic sources from Dacia.

Why is that these epigraphic sources are not suitable for demonstrate the influence of the vernacular language in Latin? First, Dacia was a Roman province for less than two centuries. For the installation of a real bilingualism in a space inhabited by different populations it is necessary that they coexist for centuries. Most inscriptions were put by persons who were strange to the Dacian space, namely settlers arrived from all parts of the Empire. Dedicators of Dacian origin are not numerous. Many times the Roman names of the characters in the inscriptions hide their origin, being almost impossible to identify a possible affiliation to the Dacian community. On the other hand, the language of the inscriptions doesn't reveal special structures which could suggest a local influency in Latin.

Influences of the Dacian substrate in the Latin of Dacia can be found only in the phonetic and lexical registers of the language (onomastics and toponymy).

This study had as object a group of around 4500 inscriptions from the territory of Dacia, published in corpora and journals. Half of these contain linguistic variations. It seemed to me useless to realize an inventory of the inscriptions of linguistic interest, because their number is very large. All these epigraphs were already published and in the text of my work I quoted all citations.

Contrary to other zones of the Empire, the Latin from Dacia is much barer. The philosophical-literary inscriptions or those that hide a personal style are quite rare⁸. In the

⁸ I counted 20 inscriptions: IDR II, 357, Romula; IDR III/1, 30, Gornea; IDR III/1, 43, Dierna; IDR III/1, 55, Băile Herculane; IDR III/1, 157, Tibiscum; IDR III/1, 173, Tibiscum; IDR III/1, 174; IDR III/2, 93,

chapters of this thesis I have presented the situation of Latin in Dacia, exemplifying each linguistic phenomenon, each feature or variation, the whole study being organized in four chapters. Going through them, it gets obvious that linguistic variations in Dacia are those that we can meet in other areas of the Empire, as well.

The four registers of the thesis, which respect the grammatical levels of the language are: phonetics, morphology, syntax and vocabulary. In what concern the linguistic variations, most of them appear in the phonetic register. This fact is valid also for the other provinces, the variations diminishing in number with the transition from one level to another.

I had no intention to demonstrate in this study the standard or non-classical aspect of the epigraphic texts from Dacia, nor the vulgar or non-vulgar character of them, but I have tried to outline an image of what Latin in Dacia once was, certainly to what extent the studied texts allowed me. Unfortunately they don't talk about the spoken language from Dacia, its spontaneous nature being hid by the standardized wear of the inscriptions.

Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa; IDR III/2, 94, UTS; IDR III/2, 241, UTS; IDR III/2, 382, UTS; IDR III/2, 430, UTS; IDR III/3, 159, Micia; IDR III/3, 239, Germisara; IDR III/4, 216, Călugăreni; IDR III/5, 136, Apulum; ILD 138, Romula (brick fragment); ILD 282, UTS; ILD, 565, Napoca; ILD 592, Gherla.