ECHANGES DE POINTS DE VUE – TEHTANJA IN MNENJA

Eric P. Hamp
Department of Linguistic The University of Chicago

Addenda ad LINGUISTICA XXVIII, 1988, 141-157 pgs.

At the end of my comments to Frau's *Dizionario* (p. 146) I remarked that there is practically nothing Celtic in the sources to the stems of the names there cited in *-ic(i)u-*. It was an oversight on my part that i neglected to add at the end of that paragraph what is probably obvious to any reader: The bases of the stems in these praedial names, with the unsurprising exception of those in *B-*, could easily be good and well known Latin; this does not of course mean that their possessors were native Romans. Their society was however strongly acculturated, or else it was characterized by such pretensions. The suffix may well properly have been **-k(i)o-* added to stems in *-i-*, which might also be thematized.

When i wrote my note on **Venzone** *Vençon* (ibid. 145-6) in discussing the *Dizionario* i was not aware of Frau's remarks (308-9) in his rich article "I nomi dei castelli friulani" (257-315) in G.B. Pellegrini ed., *Studi linguistici friulani* I, Udine : SFF 1969. I regret the unintended appearance of bad manners in not mentioning this valuable introduction by Frau of a principled analysis of this important name into the literature. In attributing this name and associated names to a pre-Roman source I am still inclined, on the basis both of its distribution and its morphology, to regard the etymon of this name and its base as Celtic rather than the vague entity to which Krahe ascribed such forms. In fact it is only by arguing a specific attribution, in this case Celtic, that we can solve the delicate and important question of IE morphology that I have mentioned (145-6).

To bring the discussion of this etymon and its base together and up to date we may now mention in addition to the references given in *Linguistica XXXVIII: Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 36, 1977, 9-10, footnote 4 (supplementary to *MSS* 30, 1972, 35-8); *Études Celtiques* 24, 1987, 185 (early Irish *abacc*); *Scottish Gaelic Studies* 15, 1988, 150 (Loch, River *Awe*); *Studia Celtica* 22-23, 1987-8, 7-8 (Romano-British *Abona*, *AßOU*, *Abisson*); 24-25, 1989-90, 139 (*Abisson*); 26-27, 1991-2, 15 (*Abona*, *AßOU*, *Awe*); *Scottish Gaelic Studies* 16, 1990, 193, footnote 6 (on the last three named forms). Inconveniently, this topic arises in a number of different contexts, and I apologize to my

readers for the scattered nature of these publications; i hope in the future to unify the account, but must attend to other duties at the present moment.

Both Frau (*Studi linguistici friulani* I 309) and myself (*Linguistica* XXVIII 145) have recognized that the river name Venzonassa reflects a secondary re-derivation. I think that we are now in a position to contemplate how this may have happened.

At an early time (in Celtic) the 'river' was **abon-* (nom. sg. **abu*, acc. **abonan*, gen. **abens*, loc. **aben(i)*, dat. **abnē*, derivational stem **abn-* ~ **aban-*); perhaps later a regularized feminine evolved over a wide expanse of Europe, **abonā*. At this time an adjective of appurtenance **aban-k(i)o-* existed, and the town name (fem.) **aban-kion-* (>Avançon 1100 Avanzu, in H.-Alpes on the *Avance* near *Chorges* <*Caturīges*, an obvious Celtic onomastic syndrome) ~ **aben-kion-* > *abinkion-* is simply the individuation in -n- of this adjective. But as time passed **abonā* and *abinkion* or *abinčon-* became rather removed formally from one another. Now on the basis of *Abisson* (*Studia Celtica* 22-23, 1987-8, 8) we know that we may hypothesize the presence also of derivative **aben-so-*, or perhaps **abin-so-*. If we juxtapose the feminine **abon-a* and conflate **abin-so-* with **abinkion-* we reach the feminized **abinkion-ā-sā* > *Venzonasa*. This of course results in an apparent inversion of the derivational direction for the river and town names. The sibilant suffix seems to give the key.