FOURTH INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON COMPUTATIONAL LATIN DIALECTOLOGY

IN MEMORIAM JÓZSEF HERMAN

1924-2005

28th March – 29th March 2019
Conference Room
Research Institute for Linguistics (RIL) of the Hungarian
Academy of Sciences (HAS)
Benczúr utca 33
1068 Budapest
Hungary

Programme

Thursday, 28th March

09:00–09:15 Opening remarks (Prószéky G. — Kiss S.)

First session (chair: Kiss S.)

09:15 The transformation of the vowel system in African Latin with a focus on vowel mergers as evidenced in inscriptions, and the problem of the dialectal positioning of Roman Africa (Adamik B.)

09:50 Orthography as described in the Latin grammars and the spelling in the Latin epigraphic texts (Gaspar C.)

10:25 Remarks on vowel deletion in Latin inscriptions from Sardinia (Tamponi L.)

11:00–11:30 Coffee break

Second Session (chair: Ittzés M.)

11:30 *Sic illi* – Comparative clauses with malicious intent in Greek and Latin Inscriptions (Urbanová D.)

12:05 Phonetic changes in the Latin of Noricum Frameworks of reference in the identification of Latin dialects (Gonda A.)

12:40 Parallel phrases and interaction in Greek and Latin magical texts – curses and amulets (Barta A.)

13:30–14:30 Lunch break

14:30 *Minitrae et Numini eius.* A Celtic deity and the vulgar Latin in Aquincum (Vágási T.)

15:05 Demonstration of the Computerized Historical Linguistic Database of the Latin Inscriptions of the Imperial Age: new developments and some case studies of data collection issues (Adamik B. in active collaboration with the data collectors: Honzl J., Melounová M., Gachallová N., Černoch R., and Šmerda M.

Friday, 29th March

First Session (chair: Adamik T.)

09:00 Linguistic peculiarities in the Latin inscriptions from Potaissa (Dacia) (Beu-Dachin E.)

09:35 CIL III 9527 as evidence of spoken Latin in sixth-century Dalmatia (Kunčer D.)

10:10 Mainz curse tablets: a linguistic investigation (Cotugno F.)

10:45–11:15 Coffee break

Second Session (chair: Cser A.)

11:15 A preliminary investigation on the <ae>/<e> graphemic oscillation in Latin inscriptions from Rome: the relationship between vowel alternations, lexical stress and syllabic structure (Papini A.)

11:50 A comparative analysis of the weakening of the word-final *-s* and *-m* (Paulus N.)

12:25 Geminate consonants and degemination in Latin: A problematic issue (Tantimonaco S.)

13:00–13:10 Closing remarks (Adamik B.)

OPENING REMARKS – 28th March, 09:00–09:15

PRÓSZÉKY Gábor (Director, RIL/HAS, Budapest)

KISS Sándor (Professor emeritus, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest)

FIRST SESSION – 28th March, 09:15–11:00

Chair: KISS Sándor (Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest)

ADAMIK Béla (LRGCLD, RIL/HAS, Budapest)

The transformation of the vowel system in African Latin with a focus on vowel mergers as evidenced in inscriptions, and the problem of the dialectal positioning of Roman Africa

Over the years, several studies discussed the transformation of the vowel system in African Latin, especially vowel mergers in relation to the problem of the collapse of distinctive vowel quantity and the reorganization of vowel quality. The first exploration of the vowel system of later African Latin based on a selection of Christian inscriptions (ILCV) was carried out by Omeltchenko 1977, who concluded that the Latin of Africa was characterized by the extreme conservatism of its vocalism. His main arguments included the scarcity of *e-i* and *o-u* mergers, indicated by the extreme rarity of E/I and O/U confusions. This showed a strong resemblance to the Latin of Sardinia (where the vowel system lost the phonological length distinctions but kept the original vocalic qualities, reflected by both the extreme rarity of relevant spelling confusions in Latin inscriptions and by the vocalism of Sardinian Romance),

and a sharp contrast to the Latin of Gaul (where the vowel mergers were in an advanced state, reflected by both the great number of relevant spelling confusions in Latin inscriptions and by the vocalism of Gallo-Romance).

These results of Omeltchenko were supported by Adams 2007, who analysed the spelling errors of the Bu Njem ostraca and the Albertini tablets (both from Africa) not only regarding vowels but also consonants, with special attention to the *b-w* merger reflected in B/V confusions. Adams pointed out that in these documents E/I and O/U confusions were very rare or even absent, while B/V confusions were very frequent, all this in sharp contrast to Gaul, where the situation was the opposite. Adams also concluded that African Latin had the same type of vowel system as Sardinian.

Nevertheless, these substantial investigations could not present a full picture since they did not use extensive epigraphic corpora but narrow selections or small corpora of inscriptions, while almost entirely overlooked the huge Pre-Christian epigraphic material (Adams only involved the tiny corpus of Bu Njem ostraca from the 3rd century).

Accordingly, in our proposed paper, above the comparative analysis of the later epigraphic material of the Cristian period, we will include in the analysis the huge inscriptional corpus of the Pre-Christian period of the Empire. With the help of the LLDB-Database we will try to draw the phonological profiles of Latin Africa (i.e. of the provinces Africa Proconsularis including Numidia and Mauretania Caesariensis) in both the early and the later period. Then by comparing these profiles to those of six more territorial units (i.e. Sardinia, Hispania, Gallia, Dalmatia, Rome, South-West Italy) chosen for survey we will try to better describe the dialectal position of Latin Africa regarding vocalism in both periods than ever before.

References:

Acquati, A. (1971). Il vocalismo latino-volgare nelle iscrizioni africane, *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università degli studi di Milano* 24, 155–84.

Adams, J. N. (2007). *The Regional Diversification of Latin 200 BC–AD 600*. Cambridge.

Herman, J. (1982=1990). Un vieux dossier réouvert: les transformations du systèm latin des quantités vocaliques. In: J. Herman, *Du latin aux langues romanes. Études de linguistique historique.* (réun. S. Kiss) Tübingen 217–231.

ILCV = Diehl, E. (1925–1931). *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae ueteres* 1–3. Berlin.

LLDB = Computerized Historical Linguistic Database of the Latin Inscriptions of the Imperial Age (http://lldb.elte.hu/)

Loporcaro, M. (2011). Syllable, Segment and Prosody, in *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages: Volume 1, Structures*, edd. M. Maiden, J. C. Smith and A. Ledgeway, Cambridge, 50–108, 684–689.

Mancini, M. (2001). Agostino, i grammatici e il vocalismo del latino d'Africa, *Rivista di linguistica* 13, 309–38.

Omeltchenko, S. W. (1977). *A Quantitativ and Comparative Study of the Vocalism of the Latin Inscriptions of North-Africa, Britain, Dalmatia and the Balkans*, Chapel Hill.

Petersmann, H. (1998), Gab es ein afrikanisches Latein? Neue Sichten eines alten Problems der lateinischen Sprachwissenschaft, in B. García-Hernández (ed.), *Estudios de lingüística latina: Actas del IX Coloquio internacional de lingüística latina (Universidad Autonóma de Madrid 14–18 de abril de 1997)*, I (Madrid), 125–36.

Schmitt, Ch. (2003). Die verlorene Romanität in Afrika: Afrolatein / Afroromanisch. In: Ernst G. / Gleßgen M.-D. / Schmitt Chr. / Schweickard W. (edd.): *Romanische Sprachgeschichte. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen. 1.: Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 23.1.* Berlin–New York, 668–675.

Catarina GASPAR (University of Lisbon)

Orthography as described in the Latin grammars and the spelling in the Latin epigraphic texts

This paper relies on the question of Latin orthography in Late Antiquity. To raise this, we propose the analysis of the ideas about writing on Latin grammarian works and the examples of their use in the epigraphic inscriptions. This allows us to perceive the relationship between the grammatical description of the language and its dialectal variation the Roman Empire. We shall also try to discern how data on Latin orthography may help us to understand the way in which chronology kept a balance with spelling and its evolution in epigraphic texts.

As sources for studying and reconstituting 'vulgar' Latin, the kind of writing witnessed in the epigraphs was the object of an analysis that sought to find in them everything that had escaped the grammatical norm, the grammarian canon which was deemed to be 'correct'. In his research about the territorial differentiation of Latin, J. Herman stated that: "nous avons par conséquent relevé toutes les graphies contraires à la norme et que l'on peut considérer comme témoignant d'une différence phonétique entre le parler représenté par l'inscription et la prononciation classique à laquelle correspond, grosso modo, l'orthographe traditionnelle". (1990, 14)

Orthography is something associated with a paradigm, that is transmitted. So, the difference between the written medium and the spoken form of a language is inevitably connected to its teaching and learning and to language contexts. These questions make us handle cautiously in what regards how orthographical peculiarities may be

assessed and interpreted when we try and reconstitute Vulgar Latin by resorting to epigraphic sources.

References:

Adamik, B. (2012), In Search of the Regional Diversification of Latin: Some Methodological Considerations in Employing the Inscriptional Evidence, in Biville Fr. *et al.*, (edd.): *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif IX. Actes du IXe colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Lyon, 6 – 9 septembre 2009*. Lyon, 123–139.

Ax, W. (2011), "Quintilian's 'grammar' (*Inst.* 1, 4–8) and its importance for the History of Roman Grammar", in S. Matthaios, F. Montanari, A. Rengakos (eds.), *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar. Archetypes, Concepts, and Contexts*, Berlin, 331–346.

Bodel, J. (2015), "Inscriptions and literacy", in C. Bruun, J. Edmondson, *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Epigraphy*, Oxford, 745–763.

Desbordes, F. (1990), *Idées Romaines sur l'écriture*, Lille.

Eyre, J. J. (1963), Education in the Late Republic and Early Empire, *Greece and Rome*, 10, 1, 47–59.

Funaioli (1907), *Grammaticae Romanae fragmenta,* Leipzig.

Herman, J. (1990), "Aspects de la différenciation territoriale du latin sous l'Empire", *Du Latin aux langues romanes. Études de linguistique historique*, Tübingen, 10–28.

Hoyo, J. del (2011), 'El grafema X ayer y hoy. Polivalencia y ambigüedad. Su representación en la epigrafía latina de Hispania', *Studia Philologica Valentina* 13, 69–89.

Irvine, M. (1994), *The making of textual culture. Grammatica and Literary Theory 350–1100*, Cambridge.

Keil, H. (1822-1894). *Grammatici Latini.* Leipzig.

Tantimonaco, S. (2017), *El latín de Hispania a través de las inscripciones. La provincia de la Lusitania*, PhD thesis, Barcelona.

Versteegh, K. (2002), "The status of the Standard Language", in J. N. Adams, M. Janse, S. Swain, *Bilingualism in Ancient Society*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 52–74.

Lucia TAMPONI (University of Pisa)

Remarks on vowel deletion in Latin inscriptions from Sardinia

Vowel deletion is widespread in the Romance languages. As is well known, the phenomenon targets unstressed vowels, being less prominent (Lausberg 1971, 252). In the Romance languages, the distribution of the phenomenon is unequal: vowel deletion is more frequent in the West than in the East, in particular in Gallo-Romance (Adams 2013, 91; see also Lausberg 1971, 253; Loporcaro 2011, 64). The targeted vowel can be either pretonic or post-tonic. Interestingly, vowel deletion, and especially the so-called 'late syncope', can be found with variable degrees of frequency in non-literary Latin texts, such as the inscriptions from Roman Gaul, Rome, Central Italy (Gaeng 1968, 267–272), Northern Italy and Dalmatia (Herman 1984=1990; Adamik 2016) as well as the Vindolanda tablets (Cotugno in press). However, up to date a detailed analysis of vowel deletion in the Latin inscriptions from Sardinia has not been carried out, with the partial exception of Lupinu (2000) qualitative study. This analysis would nevertheless be relevant, given the conservative outcomes of unstressed vowels in the Sardinian varieties with respect to the other Romance languages (Lausberg 1971, 252–270; Wagner 1984, 43 ff.).

Therefore, we conducted a quantitative and qualitative analysis of vowel deletion in a corpus which contains the available Latin inscriptions from Sardinia (with the dated ones belonging to the 1st century BC – 7th century AD). In particular, the occurrences of the phenomenon have been examined with reference to the amount of other vocalic and/or consonantal misspellings in the epigraphic texts, the

dating and the type of the inscriptions involved, as well as context and lexical stress.

The results how a low frequency of vowel deletion in Sardinia, which is consistent with the Romance evolution of the Sardinian varieties. In particular, late syncope is infrequent, and some of the few cases of vowel deletion could not be considered to be phonetic spelling. Finally, our data reinforce the conclusions put forward by Adamik (2016), according to which the allegedly high frequency of syncope in late Latin and the assumption of a pan-Romance core of Romance syncope is not supported by inscriptional evidence.

References:

Adamik, B. (2016), *The frequency of syncope in the Latin of the empire: a statistical and dialectological study based on the analysis of inscriptions*, in P. Poccetti (ed.), *Latinitatis Rationes, Descriptive and Historical Accounts for the Latin Language*, Berlin / Boston, De Gruyter, 3–21.

Adams, J.N. (2013), *Social Variation and the Latin Language*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Cotugno, F. (in press), *The linguistic variation of Latin in Roman Britain.*

Gaeng, P.A. (1968), *An Inquiry into Local Variations in Vulgar Latin as Reflected in the Vocalism of Christian Inscriptions*, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press.

Herman, J. (1984 = 1990), *L'évolution du latin dans les provinces de l'Empire. Problèmes et perspectives*, in Herman, J. (1990), *Du latin aux langues romanes. Études de linguistique historique (textes réunis par S. Kiss)*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 55–61.

Lausberg, H. (1956), *Romanische Sprachwissenschaft*, Berlin: De Gruyter; translated by Nicolò Pasero (1971). Linguistica Romanza. Milano, Feltrinelli.

Loporcaro, M. (2011), *Syllable, Segment and Prosody*, in Maiden, M., Smith, J.C. and Ledgeway, A. (2011, eds.), *The Cambridge History of the*

Romance Languages, vol. 1. Structures, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 50–108.

Lupinu, G. (2000), *Latino epigrafico della Sardegna. Aspetti fonetici*, Officina linguistica 3, Nuoro, Ilisso.

Wagner, M.L. (1984), *Fonetica storica del sardo (ristampa con traduzione, introduzione e appendice di Paulis, G.)*, Cagliari, Trois.

COFFEE BREAK – 28th March, 11:00–11:30

SECOND SESSION – 28th March, 11:30–13:15

Chair: ITTZÉS Máté (Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest)

Daniela URBANOVÁ (Masaryk University Brno)

Sic illi – Comparative clauses with malicious intent in Greek and Latin Inscriptions

In this contribution, made in collaboration with Juraj Franek, we present a corpus of the *similia similibus* formulae attested in ancient Greek and Latin curse tablets or *defixiones*. Despite the inherent randomness of our epigraphical documentation, the data available to us show clearly that since the 5th cent. BCE, the nations inhabiting the Mediterranean area practiced a sort of a magical *koiné* – a shared repertory of magical prescriptions, rituals and formulae. These are attested not only in Greek and Latin, but also in Hebrew, Oscan, Etruscan, Demotic and even Celtic language, spanning the area of the entire Roman Empire in the time of its greatest geographical extent, from Syria and Northern Africa to Britannia and the shores of the Black Sea. Simile formula is introduced in context of

sympathetic magic and in contradistinction to literary similes as a performative utterance that is based on a persuasive analogy. This analogy operates in the general form of "just as X possesses property P, let also Y possess property P", in which Y's are unequivocably targets or victims of the curses while X and P change in accordance with the intended results. We provide provisional taxonomy of the simile formulae, offer new readings and interpretations of some *defixiones* and mutually compare Greek and Latin documents.For the purposes of this study, we have collected 60 formulae (28 Greek and 32 Latin) attested on 56 tablets (26 Greek and 30 Latin, one tablet occasionally contains more than one simile formula). Most of the Greek tablets are dated to the centuries before the Common Era (16, of these 11 were written as early as 5th – 3rd cent. BCE), while the clear majority of Latin tablets (26) belong to the first three centuries of the Common Era.

GONDA Attila (LRGCLD, RIL/HAS – Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest)

Frameworks of reference in the identification of Latin dialects

After the incomplete and erroneous approaches of scholars like P. Gäng and J. N. Adams, a functioning methodology for statistical analyses in inscriptional Latin dialectology was devised by J. Herman and improved by B. Adamik, which resulted in the establishment of the Computerized Historical Linguistic Database of Latin Inscriptions of the Imperial Age or LLDB. In the previous years, various studies proved that the Herman-methodology is capable to produce plausible and verifiable results in the field of Latin

dialectology, but certain inherent problems in this methodology presented themselves, as well. In linguistic analyses conducted according to the Herman–method, a certain misspelling within a given territory is measured and compared to other types of misspellings in the same territory or in several other territories. In certain cases, the misspelling is also compared to the technical errors of engraving committed by the *lapicida*. However, since the proportions of a certain misspelling may be greatly varied in different territories of the empire and can further vary through time, a significant problem emerges regarding our point of reference in comparisons: what degree of the proportion of a certain misspelling in a given territory can be considered low or high, weak or intensive? Which geographical areas and which periods of time should be the point of reference in comparisons? Which types of errors can a linguistic phenomenon be measured against? Does the average proportion of that certain phenomenon,if counted from the totality of the data of the entire empire, suffice as an "imperial average" to serve as a neutral point of reference? The question is of highest importance, because in the study of Latin dialectology the linguistic variations and changes always manifest themselves over the course of time, and the researcher needs to know not only whether a certain phenomenon was prominent in a given period, but also whether it is prominent in comparison to other periods and to the other territories of empire.

References:

Herman, J. (2000) Differenze territoriali nel latino parlato dell'Italia tardo-imperiale: un contributo preliminare. In: Herman, J. – Marinetti, A. (edd.). *La preistoria dell' Italiano. Atti della Tavola Rotonda di Linguistica Storica. Universita Ca' Foscari di Venezia 11–13 giugno 1998*. Tübingen, 123–135.

Adamik, B. (2009) In Memoriam József Herman: von der Late Latin Data Base biszur Computerized Historical Linguistic Database of Latin Inscriptions of the Imperial Age. *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 49 (1). 11–22.

Adamik, B. (2005) "Fehlerhafte" lateinische Inschriften aus Pannonien. In: Kiss, Sándor; Mondin, Luca; Salvi, Giampaolo(edd.). *Latin etlanguesromanes. Études de linguistiqueoffertes à József Herman à l'occasion de son 80ème anniversaire.*Tübingen, Max Niemeyer Verlag 257–266.

Adamik, B. (2012) In Search of the Regional Diversification of Latin: Some Methodological Considerations in Employing the Inscriptional Evidence. In: Biville, Fr. et al. (edd.). *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif IX. Actes du IXecolloque international sur le latinvulgaire et tardif, Lyon, 6–9 septembre 2009.* Publications de la Maison de l'Orient e la Méditerranée, Lyon 123–139.

Barta Andrea (LRGCLD, RIL/HAS, Budapest)

Parallel phrases and interaction in Greek and Latin magical texts – curses and amulets

Magical archaeological findings with Latin inscription, such as curse tablets and amulets, can considerably differ both in technical and linguistic elaboration. Beside correct standard texts, a wide range of partly or entirely uninterpretable, meaninglesss cratches were produced, too. The context and the individuals involved in the act of cursing or protecting are usually unknown for us, only intrinsic arguments can help to detect, by whom and by what circumstances these objects were made. In certain cases, technical elements (personal names or letters) refer definitely to Greek sources and effects.

The scope of this paper is limited to the Greek pieces of evidence in Latin magical texts. It aims to take a measure of

the specific vocabulary attested both in Latin and Greek. Starting from a newly published obscure amulet from Carthage, my study surveys the loan phrases of Latin magical texts, taking in account all those expressions (1) which are undoubtedly proved to be borrowed, (2) which were possibly translated and (3) which have no parallels and seem to be innovations in the creative language usage of Latin speaking *magi*.

References:

Adams, J.N., *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge, 2004.

Barta, A., Mala bestia forasdato. Spelling mistakes and loan phrases as means of interpretation of a Latin magical text. *ActaClassDebr* 2019 (inpress).

Kropp, A., *Magische Sprachverwendung in vulgärlateinischen Fluchtafeln (defixiones)*. Tübingen, 2008.

Marco Simon, F., Power and Evocation of the Exotic. Bilingual Magical Texts in the Latin West. In: *Contesti magici, Atti del Convegno Internazionale (Roma, 4–6 novembre 2009)* a cura di M. Piranomonte, F. – Marco Simón, Roma, pp. 135–145.

Mullen, A. – Patrick, J. *Multilingualism in the Graeco-Roman worlds*. Cambridge, 2012.

Urbanová, D. – Cuzzolin, P., Some linguistic and pragmatic remarks on the tabellae defixionum. *Journal of Latin Linguistics*, 15/2 (2016) 313–345.

LUNCH BREAK – 28th March, 13:30–14:30

SEMINAR SESSION – 28th March, 14:30–16:15

Chair: BARTA A (LRGCLD, RIL/HAS, Budapest)

VÁGÁSI Tünde (Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest)

Minitrae et Numini eius. **A Celtic deity and the vulgar Latin in Aquincum**

The subject of this presentation is a curious and somewhat problematic inscription on an altar from Aquincum. The altar made of limestone was found in district XXI of Budapest, Gyár street 157, at the house of a gentleman named Balogh at the beginning of the 20th century. Among the many features of this inscription that are interesting for our study, the most striking one is the beginning of the text: the name of the god or goddess is controversial. Who exactly was Minitra? A Celtic goddess or someone much more well-known from Roman religious life? According to Géza Alföldy, the native gods of Pannonia were venerated still in the 3rd century A.D., including Teutates, Sedatus, Ciniaemus and Minitra, etc. Since the inscription in question contains many vulgar Latin phenomena, it becomes questionable whether the name of the deity is written correctly, especially because while the names of the classical gods rarely appear in misspelled forms, the names of the gods of so-called 'eastern' cults and mystery religions appear in a number of faulty variations. In my presentation, I try to identify the deitythrough the analysis of vulgar Latin phenomena.

ADAMIK Béla (LRGCLD, RIL/HAS, Budapest)

Demonstration of the Computerized Historical Linguistic Database of the Latin Inscriptions of the Imperial Age: new developments and some case studies of data collection issues

In active collaboration with the data collectors: Jiří HONZL from the Czech Institute of Egyptology, Charles University, Prague; Markéta MELOUNOVÁ, Natália GACHALLOVÁ, Radek ČERNOCH and Martin ŠMERDA from the Department of Classical Studies, Masaryk University, Brno.

FIRST SESSION – 29th March, 09:00–10:45

Chair: ADAMIK Tamás (Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest)

Eugenia BEU-DACHIN (National History Museum of Transylvania, Cluj-Napoca)

Linguistic peculiarities in the Latin inscriptions from Potaissa (Dacia)

From Potaissa we got around 200 Latin inscriptions. Some of them disappeared, and we know their texts exclusively from publications. Most of the still existent inscriptions are located in the History Museum of Turda. The subject of this study is their linguistic examination, following the peculiarities and deviations from the classical norms of the language. All these will be related to data on the donors, the provenance of the epigraphs, their type, and other information that can contribute to shaping the cultural-linguistic profile of the Roman town.

References:

M. Bărbulescu, *Potaissa. Studiu monografic.* Dissertationes Musei Potaissensis 1, Turda, 1994.

M. Bărbulescu, *La colonisation à Potaissa et ses effets sur le développement de la ville*, in *La politique édilitaire dans les provinces de l'Empire romain. Actes du IIe colloque roumano-suisse*, Bern 1995, p. 119–130.

M. Bărbulescu, *Inscripțiile din castrul legionar de la Potaissa. The Inscriptions of the Legionary Fortress at Potaissa.* București, 2012.

Eugenia Beu-Dachin, *The Latin language in the inscriptions of Roman Dacia.* Cluj-Napoca, 2014.

Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. Vol. III.

H. Mihăescu, *La langue latine dans le Sud-Est de l'Europe.* București-Paris, 1978.

S. Nemeti, I. Nemeti, F. Fodorean, *Territorium Potaissae*, Revista Bistriţei, 17, 2003, p. 69–75.

C. C. Petolescu, *Inscripţii latine din Dacia.* Bucureşti, 2005.

Dragana KUNČER (Institute of History, Belgrade)

CIL III 9527 as evidence of spoken Latin in sixth-century Dalmatia

The epitaph of Priest John, dated AD 599 or 603 (CIL III 9527), written in hexameter, is one of the latest Latin inscriptions originating from Salona. According to its most recent editor Nancy Gauthier, it is considered that this inscription represents the reflection of the 'living language' spoken at the time in the capital of Dalmatia. The aim of this presentation is to verify the reliability of this statement by making a comparison of the data in the inscription and the results of the studies on Latin in Dalmatia conducted to date, and also by making a comparison of the data in the inscription and the results of the statistical analysis conducted using the online database – *Computerized Historical Linguistic Database of Latin Inscriptions of the Imperial Age* (lldb.elte.hu). A special part of the presentation will be dedicated to the different readings proposed – simultaneously with the readings of Gauthier – by Thomas Drew-Bear. The 'linguistic probability' of these readings will also be verified by the statistical analysis conducted using the online database.

References:

Mullen, A. (2017) 'Transformation of the Roman West' *Pan European Networks: Science & Technology* 23, 98–99. Adamik, B. *In Search of the Regional Diversification of Latin: Changes of the Declension System According*

to the Inscriptions. In: Molinelli, P. – Cuzzolin P. – Fedriani, C. (éd.), Latin vulgaire – Latin tardif X. Actes du X° colloque international sur le latinvulgaire et tardif (Bergame, 5–9 septembre 2012), Bergame 2014. 2014, 641–661.

Desmulliez, J. – C. Hoët-Van Cauwenberghe (éd.), *Le monde romain à travers l'épigraphie: methodes et pratiques. Actes du XXIV e Colloque International de Lille 2001*, Lille, 2005.

Herman, J. *Le datif possessif dans la latinité balkanique.* In: Herman, J. *Du latin aux langues romanes I. Etudes de linguistique historique*, Tübingen, 1990, 315–20.

Karlsson, K. E. *Syntax and affixation: the evolution of "mente" in Latin and Romance* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, св. 182), Tübingen, 1981.

Salona IV Inscriptions de Salone chrétienne IV e – VII e siècles, (éd.) E. Marin, Rome – Split, 2010.

Francesca COTUGNO (University of Nottingham – University of Oxford)

Mainz curse tablets: a linguistic investigation

The sanctuary of Mainz (*Mogontiacum*), in Germania superior, represents a valuable area for the sociolinguistic investigation of non-classical linguistic features, i.e. those forms that diverge from Classical Latin as we know it through the Classical texts. The sanctuary, where these curses have been found, was dedicated to Isis and Mater Magna and it is important for the study of social and religious history of Germania Superior, also in the perspective of a comparison between the north-western provinces of the Roman Empire.

The aim of this paper is investigating the corpus of curse tablets from Mainz: it is composed of 34 tablets, and

represents the biggest corpus of curses from the Germanic area so far.

The approach followed aims at tackling the non-classical evidences according to phenomena concerning vocalism and consonantism. In this corpus, the majority of non-classical forms concern cases of consonantism (with 28 cases for the vocalism and 50 for the consonantism). This is similar to what has been already noted for Roman Britain.

Among all the collected non classical features, a few selected case studies will be discussed focusing on specific phenomena: timbric alteration and syncope for the vocalism, whereas for the consonantism all the cases of final consonant deletion will be taken into account.

References:

Blänsdorf, J., Lambert, P., &Witteyer, M. (2012). *Die defixionum tabellae des Mainzer Isis- und Mater Magna-Heiligtums: Defixionum tabellae Mogontiacenses (DTM).* Mainz.

Tomlin, R. S. O. in Cunliffe, B., Davenport, P., Care, V., & Tomlin, R. (1985). *The temple of Sulis Minerva at Bath (Tab. Sulis).* Oxford.

Urbanová, D. (2018), *Latin Curse Tablets of the Roman Empire.* Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck, Innsbruck.

COFFEE BREAK – 29th March, 10:45–11:15

Alessandro P<small>APINI</small> (Ghent University)

A preliminary investigation on the <ae>/<e> graphemic oscillation in Latin inscriptions from Rome: the relationship between vowel alternations, lexical stress and syllabic structure

The graphemic oscillation between <ae> and <e> isparticularly attested in Latin epigraphy; for not only is the grapheme <e> often used to render the Classical Latin (henceforward CL) /ae̯/ diphthong in inscriptional evidence from (firstly) Italy, the city of Rome (Wachter 1987; Adams 2007) and the Provinces (Galdi 2004; Galdi 2011; Adams 2013), but the digraph <ae> is also used hypercorrectly to render both the CL long and short *e* (cf. Väänänen 1966). According to the traditional view, the first hypercorrection (i.e. <ae> for /ē/) would point to the only temporary existence of a new (both long and open) phoneme (/ɛː/ < /ae̯/) within the phonemic inventory of CL, while the use of <ae> for /ĕ/ would suggest that this particular phoneme had eventually undergone shortening (Adams 2013). Along the same lines, the fact that <ae> is used to render the CL short (and open) /ĕ/ much more often than the corresponding long (and close) vowel, is usually explained by asserting that "*ĕ*was altogether much more frequent" in Latin "than *ē*" (Loporcaro 2015). During the past edition of this same workshop, I have tried to advocate an alternative explanation for this spelling variation. In particular, the study of the <ae>/<ē> and <ae>/<ĕ> graphemic oscillations in

a corpus of both synchronic and syntopic – but diaphasically (and diastratically) different – inscriptions from the city of Rome (cf. Mancini, 2012)made it possible to highlight the factthat these two phonemes (i.e. /ĕ/ = [ɛ] and /ɛ:/) could be freely associated on the basis of their similar quality (regardless of their difference in length),above allwithin inscriptions adhering to the diaphasically (and diastratically) lowest varieties of the Latin language (Papini forthcoming). Therefore, an early'weakening' of the CL vowel-length contrast might be possibly assumed, at least as far as those varieties are concerned(Vineis 1984; Marotta 2017).Within the frame of this 4th edition of the International Workshop on Computational Latin Dialectology, the same problem will be addressed by taking into account the position of the aforementioned graphemic oscillation as respect to both 1) lexical stress (distinguishing between misspellings occurring in stressed and unstressed position) and 2) syllabic structure (which is, open vs closed syllables). In particular, the aim of the present research is to verify whetherthe relationship between the investigated spelling variations and these two variables might be regarded as simply due to chance.

References:

Adams, J. N. (2007). *The regional diversification of Latin, 200 BC – AD 600*. Cambridge, University Press.

Adams, J. N. (2013). *Social variation and the Latin language*. Cambridge, University Press.

Galdi, G. (2004). *Grammatica delle iscrizioni latine dell'Impero (province orientali). Morfosintassi nominale*. Roma, Herder.

Galdi, G. (2011). Latin inside and outside of Rome. In J. Clackson (Ed.), *A companion to the Latin language* (pp. 564–581).Malden, Wiley-Blackwell.

Loporcaro, M. (2015). *Vowel length from Latin to Romance* (First edition). Oxford, University Press.

Mancini, M. (2012). Su alcune questioni di metodo in sociolinguistica storica. Le defixiones sannite. In G. Borghello & V. Orioles (Eds.), *Per Roberto Gusmani. Linguistica storica e teorica* (pp. 239–271). Udine, Forum.

Marotta, G. (2017). Tra fonologia e sociofonetica. Il tratto di lunghezza in latino. In G. Marotta & F. Strik Lievers (Eds.), *Strutture linguistiche e dati empirici in diacronia e sincronia* (pp. 57–81). Pisa, University Press.

Papini, A. (forthcoming). Some preliminary remarks concerning sociolinguistic variation within the ''Vulgar'' Latin vowel system. As evidenced by the inscriptional data. *ACD,* 55.

Väänänen, V. (1966). *Le latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes* (3rd edition). Berlin, Akademie-Verlag.

Vineis, E. (1984). Problemi di ricostruzione della fonologia del latino volgare. In E. Vineis (Ed.), *Latino volgare, latino medioevale, lingue romanze.* Pisa, Giardini.

Wachter, R. (1987). *Altlateinische Inschriften. Sprachliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Dokumenten bis etwa 150 v. Chr.* Bern, Lang.

PAULUS Nóra (Eötvös Loránd University Budapest)

A comparative analysis of the weakening of the word-final -*s* and -*m*

In the literature on the late Latinphonological changes, we can find almost everywhere that the measure and the chronology of the word final weakening of the two consonants which occur often in this place (the –*m* and the –*s*) are highly different. This fact is not surprising if we take in account that while the position of the word final –*s* seems to be fixed in the spoken language in the classical period, that of the final –*m* was unstable throughoutthe history of the language. The modern romance languages also attest the major solidity of the word final –*s*, seeing

thatit is conserved in the modern languages north and west of the Massa-Senigalia line, as opposed to the final –*m*, which isabsentfrom all of them.Based on this fact, linguists generally claim that the weakening of the final –*s* started only after the intensive dialectal diversification of Latin, simultaneously with the birth of the romance languages.

However, nobody has studied in detail the relative distributionof the weakening of the two consonants standing in final position. The epigraphical arguments concerning the topic are generally based on the inscriptions of Pompei, which is a chronologically and geographically limited corpus. Still, we must suppose that the linguistic processes were not parallel everywhere in the empire. In addition to that, the data of the LLDB do not verify the generally accepted differences between the improvement of the two phonemes under investigation. We can find almost as many examples of the lack of word final –*s* as that of –*m*. The aim of the present paper is to explore thereasons behind the inconsistency between the scholarly consensus and the epigraphical data.

References:

Adams, J. N. (2003) *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge.

Deman, A. (1981) Le terme de parenté germanique *svecerio / socerio* dans les inscriptions latines. *L'Antiquité Classique* 50, 198–208.

Green, D. H. (1998) *Language and history in the Early Germanic world*. Cambridge Adamik, Béla (2017) *The problem of the omission of word-final -s as evidenced in Latin inscriptions*. Graeco-Latina Brunensia, 22 (2). 5–21.

Adams, J. N. (2013) *Social Variation and the Latin Language*. Cambridge.

Belardi, Walter (1965) *Di una notizia di Cicerone (Orator 161) su -s finale latino*. In: Alfredo Schiaffini, Studi in onore di Alfredo Schiaffini, Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo. 114–142.

Giannini, Stefania (1986) *Un problema di fonosintassi in latino: la consonante -s finale*, Studi e saggi linguistici 26(1), 111–136.

Herman, József (2000). *Vulgar Latin* (transl. R. Wright). University Park, Pa: The Pennsylvania State

Marotta, Giovanna – Tamponi, Lucia (2018) *Omission of Final -s in Latin Inscriptions: Time and Space* Transactions of the Philological Society, 116. 1–17.

Väänänen, V. (1966) *Le latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes*. Berlin.

TANTIMONACO Silvia (LRGCLD, RIL/HAS, Budapest)

Geminate consonants and degemination in Latin: A problematic issue

In Latin epigraphy, the phenomenon of consonantal degemination is very frequently attested. However, to find out the reason for such 'mistakes' seems to be a problematic issue, for they might not have an equivocal explanation. Indeed, despite the loss of a system of orthographic rules in Latin, there was a tendency to note geminated consonants in official inscriptions from the beginning of the 2nd century BC onwards. Nevertheless, low alphabetization levels might not be the only cause for degeminated or duplicated spellings, a point that has been suggested by other scholars, who connect such spellings with sociolinguistic or dialectological variables in Latin.

The aim of this paper is to focus on the principal interpretations given in the scientific literature of previous years about the phenomena of gemination and degemination, and to provide a systematized analysis of the possible causes which might produce misspellings in inscriptions. Selected case studies from the epigraphical domain will be gained by means of the *Computerized Historical Linguistic Database of Latin Inscriptions of the Imperial Age* (lldb.elte.hu).

References:

Adrados, J.-V. (1984), 'Geminadas latinas = ¿grafemas acentuales?', *Estudios Clásicos* 26, 88, 125–128.

Benedetti, M., Marotta, G. (2014), 'Monottongazione e geminazione in latino: nuovi elementi a favore dell'isocronismo sillabico', in Molinelli, P., Cuzzolin, P., Fedriani, C. (eds.), *Latin Vulgaire – Latin Tardif X: Actes du Xe Colloque International sur le latin vulgaire et tardif. Bergamo, 5–9 septembre 2012*, Bergamo, 25–43.

Giannini, S., Marotta, G. (1989), *Fra grammatica e pragmatica. La geminazione consonantica in latino*, Pisa.

Graur, A. (1929), *Les consonnes géminées en latin*, Paris.

Kiss, S. (1972), *Les transformations de la structuresyllabique en latin tardif*, Debrecen.

Sánchez Salor, E. (1984), 'Antroponimia cacereña en la epigrafía latina: la geminación', *Anuario de Estudios Filológicos* 7, 323–338.

Sen, R. (2015), *Syllable and Segment in Latin*, Oxford.

Veiga, A. (1997), 'La geminación consonántica en latín clásico: realidad fonética y análisis fonológico', *Moenia. Revista lucense de lingüística e literatura* 3, 519–540.

CLOSING REMARKS – 29th March, 13:00–13:10

ADAMIK Béla (LRGCLD, RIL/HAS, Budapest)

NOTES

Momentum
program

RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR LINGUISTICS

This document was edited by Daniel Seres, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest.