
This first integral collection of the place names of this complex and interesting region is avowedly intended as a work for general interest — as such it does not claim to be exhaustive and has not been delayed until all Flurnamen could be collected; but in fact Frau has given us a thoroughly scholarly work. A highly informative introduction (5—24), adorned with seven reproductions of older maps and plans, is followed by the dictionary proper. The front matter includes maps (showing comuni) of the four provincie of the region, an excellent concise bibliography of 26 items, a useful brief glossary of technical terms, and some welcome remarks on the contribution of toponomastics as a discipline.

The scholarly level is high: Basic points of reference are Du Cange, Meyer-Lübke, Gamillscheg, Förstemann, as well as more local works. Apart from reference to Pleteršnik, the Slavic side is not as ample as it might be.

This region has been polyglot as far back as we know it. Today, leaving aside the national standard Italian, we have Friulian (see Frau in the *Actes* of the 1972 Sofia congress), German and westernmost South Slavic (i.e. Slovene, often specifically Resian); these of course find their reflexion in the toponyms. Moving back in time, there is a spot of Slavic from the 10th century southwest of Udine, and a wider distribution of medieval German. The Latin of the Roman Empire is represented in several aspects. An important Pre-Roman component were the Carnic Celts, who are shown by onomastic remains to have inhabited the high plain and mountains to the north of Udine in the province of that name. Then there is a substantial component of Pre-Roman non-Celtic vestiges, which embrace notably the main rivers and many mountains. Each of these components is succinctly discussed in the introduction. One wonders where the ancient Venetic speakers were. Do they lie underneath the praedia to the south of the Carnic Celtic line?

Frau will have (14—15) a small group of names as representing a Greek origin (separately from the known Greek elements borrowed by Latin). These names, e.g. *Basagliapenta* (< *Basalgiapenta*; AD 762 *duas Basilicas*), *Baséglia* = *Basélia*¹ = *Basóia*, and *Basaldella* (AD 1275 *Basalgella* < diminutive in -ella), all derive from *basilica* 'church'. Surely these reflect not Greek but periferal Latin. Frau himself refers (p. 15, footnote 7) to Romauntsch (Sursilvan) *basélgia*; I have myself heard

---

¹ Recorded 1471—91 as *Baselgia*. 

141
at Tiefencastel. But Frau overlooks the fact that Romanian attests biserică, clearly old; while Albanian, less periferal in the Balkans, has (in conservative Tosk dialects) klishe. This Romauntsch-Friulian-Romanian agreement does not point to any close kinship; they simply agree in conserving an archaic Bârtoli “lateral” feature, or else a common social stratum — see Excursus I.

Frau explicitly (5) leaves out names “di origine trasparente”, but this deprives him of some interesting content. We find no entry for San Giorgio, the first village going up the Resia Valley. Its native name is tuw Bile; the first portion is a locative element accompanying many Resian toponyms,² a strengthened preposition.

Prato (Resia) may well be the translation of the local Slavic, rather than vice versa. Gniva (Resia) is recognized locally as simply bearing the appellative for ’campo’. Coriis, the highest village in the valley, has now been abandoned (except in the summer) since the 1976 earthquake. On Oseacco and Stolvizza see my remarks made separately Sot la nape 33, 1981, 11—16; likewise Grúb(b)ia.

Some notes on individual entries: ARTEGNA. If the personal name Artenius is involved, Desinan could well be right that we have here a Celtic name, i.e. a derivative of artos ‘bear’; cf. Usago below. ATTIMIS should be considered together with neighbouring Nimis. It seems that here a local development *em > im has taken place. A base *tem- could be Celtic and nem- (nemeton) ’grove’ is certainly good Celtic. The first element would not be at-, ati- as Frau has it, but ad- ’to locative’ if not the intensive prefix of Celtic (see E. P. Hamp Studia Celtica 12/13 1977/8, 1ff.).

BELGRADO. The importance of this name in the Vastata Hungarorum is not the meaning of its two parts ‘castello bianco’ but the fact that it belongs to a deeply established tradition of Slavic toponymy. BELLÁSIO. It is likely that this Corden6ns name is that of a praedium in *-acu-? BIAUZZO = Blauz (Codroipo) is presumed by Frau to be Slavic, but without assurance. This has every appearance of being *Blagovac; for au cf. Ráune. BRÓILI. On the base seen in Gaul. brogilos cf. my study Études Celtiques 19, 1982, 143—9. BROSSANA. could result from misdivision of *ad Porta(m) Ambrosiana(m) > (schematically) *apporta(m) + brossana.

BUDÁIA is traced to *betuilea, but on the uncertain background of betula see my remarks, Comments on Etymology (Rolla, Missouri) 10, No 15, 1981, 2—4.

CARGNACO = Cjargna < Carni-acu- makes good geographic sense. The proprietor, one Carnius, would be so called in Pozzuolo del Friuli because he was displaced south from his Carnic region. CARPACCIO, Carpus is not a likely Celtic name. CASSACCO. While Casaso and Casiacco are not clear to me, Cassacco, if derived from a Latinized Cassius, would contain the important Celtic element Cassi-; see my remarks BzN 16, 1981, 217—18. CASSEGLIANO is credited to Cas(s)ellius or Cassilius; surely of the two the latter is to be preferred (cf. the preceding item). But if Cassili-anum directly gives Cassegliano, we must regard this as a short form for the man’s name, for the 1295 Casaullano suggests the well known Cassielláunos. Of course, his praedium should have been *Cassuellaun-ianum. DOLENGA is correctly related to Slovene dolenji (also cf. Dolénjsko). But Dogna is scarcely the same with syncope; su-

² The construction may perhaps be areally compared with such names of the region as Ario = Friul. Artul < ad rivulum, Adorgnano (1301 Dorgnano, 1359 Odorgnano) *udOrenianum. Angoris ~ (i)N-angóris. Aprato: Prato.
rely this is dolnji 'der untere, lower', i.e. [dojmə]. We find the antonym of Dolegna in Gorëgnawás = gorénja vás. GORIZIA. This toponym is a valuable touchstone for the Slavic of the region. Its attribution to Slovene gorica 'hill' (miswritten goriza) is perfectly clear. Therefore we have a fine early explicit reference to the presence of Slavic language in the 1015 notation medietatem unius ville que sclavica lingua vocatur Goriza. Also, for the early Slavic presence in Codròipo (see above, i.e. the Vastata southwest of Udine), the name Goricizza (1320 Guriziza) i.e. the diminutive [goričica] is important. One may wonder whether this represents a provenience for the settlers from Gorizia.

The name Gorizzo (locally guriz, 1297 Guriz) is traced by Frau to the same ety­mon, but "fatto maschile". A similar gender change is also attributed to other names, but no motivation for such change is given; the conditions need to be specified before we can accept the identity.

GORO. A Pre-Roman *gortu 'luogo chiuso' is posited, but a Celtic background for this is complicated by the vocalism of Welsh garth etc.

GRADISCUTTA (in Varmo, southwest of Udine) is interesting. As Frau points out, this contains the Friulian diminutive -utto. The assumed base actually occurs in 1289 de decima Belgradi et de decima Gradische Super Belgradum (cf. Belgrado above).

IMPONZO, locally dimpónč (Tolmezzo) has forms attested 1072 Impons ~ Impones, 1091 Imponiz. A final element *pontes is clear, but an initial *inter requires explana­tion.

IUTIZZO (Codròipo) is recorded as 1206 Jutiz, although 1356 shows de Glutic. If this is correctly equated with Slovene ljút, the phonetics are potentially interesting since we have here (in this isolated Slavic relic) the change / > / shared with the Torre and Natisone dialects (see compactly Tine Logar, Slovenska narečja, Ljubljana 1975, 105—7) and with Resia. However, this may well reflect simply an areal phonetic development of recent time in the region, as in Poiana (Poljána) and Poianis 1471 in Poglanis.

LEDRA. This river name is properly called obscure by Frau, and it is simply speculative to suggest that it is Venetic, though it can scarcely be a Latinization from Greek. Nevertheless two high probabilities remain:

1.) A connexion with Júdrio (1225 Judrii, 1456 lu gludri) in Torre (and therefo­re *Audrio or *I-judrio; cf. Iutizzzo) seems plausible; hence Ledra (1265 Ydrie, 1274 Idriæ, 1298 Ledre) may reasonably be *(a)-idria < *la-judria. 2.) A base *judr­io/a looks very much like the IE etymon ‘water’. The difference in gender would be easily understood if Ledra had passed through (though perhaps not originating in) Celtic. River names, we know, were preferably feminine in Celtic, and Ledra could reflect morphologically, like Dover in England, an old collective plural of ‘water’. Phonetically *(u)dr- cannot be Latin, with the cluster dr. LONCA (1311 Loncha) in Codròipo is important in showing the nasal vowel of Slavic loka, which the local language must have possessed before it died out. The reverse phenomenon is to be seen in Mataiur, where the Friulian mòntmaiór dissimilated to *montaiur has then undergone loss of the nasal vowel in the living Natisone Slavic. For the vowel of the first syllable, cf. Patocco (Chiusaforte) beside Slovene Pòtok ‘brook’, Paularo (Pâ­ular) < popul-ariu, Ramándolo < 1273 Romandul. MEDUNO (locally midún). This
entry requires revision. A Celtic 'grande oppidum' would be *Maglo- rather than
*Mago-dūnum; 'oppidum agrī' might be *Mages(o)-; *Mago- is not clear. IE
'medio' is *medhio-, not *medhu. MERETO, locally merēt is stated to be a collective
in -etu "dal latino malum, melum 'mela', quindi 'meleto'. "This is inexact. The atte­
estations 1031 Melereto, 1174 Melareto, 1296 Mellereti show that we have Melaretu-,
ie. Mel-ar(i)-etu-, (> 1161 Melrett, with syncope) formed on the fruit-tree name Fri­
ulian -ariu (cf. Melara), also found in Moraro, and in Nogaredo.
MIELI. It is not clear that this name must be derived from Latin Medicus.
NONCELLO. This diminutive (1056 Naunzel) and the simplex seen in Pordenone
(1232 Portunaonis) and in Cordenons (1028 Cortis Naon, 1216 Curie Naonis, 1254
Cordenons) can scarcely be from *Nau- 'nave'. Perhaps we have a Celtic Naon- <
*Napon-.
PARTISTAGNO in Áttimis (1170 Pertestejne etc.) is derived from OHG berht +
Stein. This could well have translated an earlier Slavic bel-grad-.
PASSARIANO, PERSEREANO. The claimed Latin derivation of *Perserius from Persi­
us is not clear to me.
PONTEBBA. The variants 1289 Pontebbiam, 1296 Pontebis, 1307 Poltaybe remind
one of 1350 Flebano 1068---77 Flaiбанum 1268 Flaybani for Flaiбано < Flavianu-.
Therefore a pre-form *Pontavia looks likely.
PREPOTTO. This adaptation of Slovene pradprot 'felce' (cf. Prapotnizza) must early
(1244 Prepot) have undergone a folk substitution of pre- for Slavic pra-.
RACCOLANA, in Chiusaforte, is presumed to be from Hercul(i)ana. The metathesis
might be an early Slavic adaptation. So too perhaps Redenzicco.
RÂUNE. < ráven has the simplex of the local name of Prato (di Resia), ['ravënca],
misaccented and mistranscribed as ravanza (p. 96), i.e. râvencâ.
SALANDRI. Frau allows the possibility that Sa- here is Slovene Za- 'behind', but su­
rely his alternative of Latin Su(b) is to be preferred. The entire syntactic string Sa­ländri 'sotto la caverna' is then Latin or Romance and parallels Samón and Sequáls
(1139 Sub Collibus, 1174 de Subcolles), as well as Socchieve, locally Soclèf (1000
ca. Subclebum) < Sub + clivu-. In turn, Samôns should be equated explicitly with
Samons, the local form of Sottomonte (1186 Summonte) in Meduno.
STREGNA is clearly a Romance adaptation of Slovene srednja 'middle', but the inter­
esting phonetic development deserves to be made explicit: Two non-permitted clu­
sters, [Sr-] and [dp], have been avoided by the simple displacement by anticipation
of the dental stop. The voicing was adjusted automatically by the rules of the lan­
guage; i.e. although [zdr-] is possible, [S-] implies [t-].
TAGLIAMENTO. Frau suggests a Celtic origin, and this seems easily possible. How­
ever he also rightly remarks (p. 9) that river names are likely to be among the most
persistent, and that therefore we may look for an indefinitely deep pre-Roman ori­
gin among them. We may however suppose that regardless of the ultimate origin the
Celts could have placed a Celtic interpretation on this name. The oldest known form
of the name seems to be Tiliaventum < Tiliabinte. It is not clear that the first ele­
ment was really *tilia 'tiglio', but these Celts may easily have understood it as such.
The second element could well be -abin- + a dental suffix. The stem -abin- <
*aben- 'river' has formed the object of a detailed discussion by me MSS 30, 1972,
35--8; ZCP 36, 1977, 9--10.
TARCETTA (1358 Trecenta) appears to show the same Slavic loss of the nasal vowel as has been observed for Mataiùr, S.V. Lonca above.

TARVISIO. It would be most in conformity with Celtic onomastics to see here a singular for the place back-formed from a plural totemic ethnicon *Tarvis(i)j.

TRÚIA in prato Carnico has been related to Friuli Tròi 'Sentiero' < *Troju. It would seem reasonable to derive these in turn from *trogia- and *Trogio-, which in Celtic terms would mean something like 'running, a race, a course, a path'. I have studied the Celtic base *Trog- in some detail in Études Celtiques (19, 1982, 143—9). From Resia I have the borrowing (from Friulian) Tròj (masc.) 'Sentiero'.

ÚDINE. If it is true that this is a pre-Roman name based on *(o)udh- 'mammella' > 'colle', then the heteroclite nature of the stem in -n- is clear. See my discussion of that etymon Gliotta 48, 1970, 141—5.

VEDRONZA (locally Vedronze), which has the Slavic appellation gníviza (i.e. njivica 'little field'), is supposed to be Latin Veter- 'Vecchio' + augmentative -one- + Slavic modification. Such a concatenation of suffixes is semantically and morphologically unlikely. On the other hand, in view of the special Friulian meaning of Vieri 'terreno lasciato incolto', the initial Vedr- must surely be this same element, but at an earlier phonetic stage. We therefore do better to start from an early Slavic bilingual compound *Vedro-njiy(i)ca 'Vieri (clarified by njiva)'; for the phonetics cf. Gniva. Now for the accentual reduction cf. Stupizza, which is locally Stůpza < Stópica. Thus partly by phonetics and partly by conformity to the Romance pattern *Vedrónjiyca > Vedron( )ze.

VENZONE, locally Venčon, 923 Clausas de Abincione 1001 Chusam de Aventione, furnishes a form which supports our analysis above of Tagliamento. Frau posits a base *AV- (Au-) 'corso d'acqua' and a suffix -nt-. We can be much more precise and specific. The early attested forms lead us to a clearly Celtic abink-ion-; this is to be analyzed abin-k- alongside -abin-t- in Tagliamento, unless the latter is somehow a refashioning of -abin-k-. The semantics of 'river' is well sustained by the fact that the river which empties into the Tagliamento is called Venzonassa, apparently after Venzone. But it is more likely that Venzone took its name (Abincione, with a- misdivided as if a locative preposition) from the river; then later, the river name was re-derived.

The stem abin-k- is well matched in southern French dialects *abinko- 'Sumpfiges Land, Wasserfall, Quelle, etc.' (J. Hubschmid, Praeromanica, Bern 1949, 53—6) and Catalan avenc (J. Hubschmid, Pyranienwörter, 1954, 24). Hubschmid thought (56) he saw here a "jüngere Ableitung *aben-ko-" from *abŋ-ko-. That is not at all necessary. *abinko- (→ Carnic abinkio-) < *aben-ko- is simply derivation in -ko- formed on the locative (Breton aven) or genitive (OIr. abae) state of the stem of abon- 'river'. The Gaulish *abanko- 'Weide' (Hubschmid, Praeromanica 52), morphologically equivalent to Welsh afanc 'water creature', Breton avafik 'bievre', is from the weak-case stem *aban-ko- < *abŋ-KO-; this must be the preform underlying Avenza in Forni Avoltri.

We now have *ab(e)n-ko- 'pertaining to the river' confirmed for early Celtic. This form has a further importance for Indo-European. It is seen now that the morphological analysis *Hap-Ho on- which I have proposed (MSS 30, 35—8) for
*abon-* is confirmed. The etymon for 'young' occurs with precisely two parallel stems, Skt. *yuvan- = iuvenis and yuva-sá = iuvencus Welsh ieuanc; see my analysis KZ 84, 1970, 1. The shared morphology of these two bases 'river' and 'young' with the suffix *-Kó- suggests that they both also share *-Hóon-; this in turn makes more certain the derivation of *abon- = *Hóap-Hóon- from *Hóap-.

It is of interest to inspect separately some of the names in -acu derived from praedia. These give an informative view of the Celtic presence in the region, which we have already had occasion to note in detail. Of course, not every name in -acu is derived from a base which is linguistically Celtic in origin. So, for example, Leonacco luvind (< Leo-onis), Montegnacco montagnâ (< Montanius), Novacco noác (< *Novus), Urbignacco Urbignâ (< Urbinius), Lorenzano (< Laurentius). However, some names are to all appearances markedly Celtic: Brazzano brazd (from Braccius or Brattius); to judge by the "southern" variant Brazzano brezzán 983 Bratta etc. we may prefer here a derivation from Brattius (OIr. *brat 'cloak'). Cassacco (see above). Caporiacco cjaudi (< Cavorius): cf. Welsh Cawr 'giant'. Carvacco cjarvá (< Carvus); cf. Welsh Carw 'stag'. Cazzasco cjačas and Chizzacco (< Cat(t)ius); this must be a hypocoristic apocopated from a compound in Catu- 'battle' (OIr. *cath). Lazzacco lazzá (< La(t)ius) should be from a hypocoristic, but is ambiguous. Maiaso maiás (< Mal(l)ius) is likewise ambiguous. Remanzacco remanzâz, if derived with contamination from Romiatius, could represent *ro-mati- 'very good'. Segnacco (< Senius) must reflect the well known seno- 'old'. Usago usát (< Ursus) could well reflect the naturalization of a name in Arto- 'bear'. Vergnacco vergnd is said to be from Vernius; but it could be the familiar type derived from a characterizing tree or plant, here *Verna (cf. Vernasso). Vendásio Vendās (< Vindus) would contain the well known Celtic etymon for 'white' uindo-; cf. Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies 28, 1979, 214f.

Some bases for formations in -acu are simply not clearly Celtic, but the above conservatively selected toponyms of praedia give a good representation of the ordinary Celtic lexicon which must have been in use in the region. The level and range of these lexical elements and their proportionate frequency attest to the prominence of Celtic here in the Roman period.

It is also implied by Frau (11) that derivatives in -iccio ~ -isto (and their local versions) are equally Celtic in origin. Important instances of this formation are Bicinicco bicinis (< Beccius), Bottenicco butinis (< Bultinius), Cavaleticco cjavali (< Cabalius, Ciconicco ciconins (< Ciconius, Lucinicco liciníns (< Lucinius, Orcenticco dursiníns (< Urcinius, Magnanicco Manianus (< Manius — Magnano), Malnísio Colle Malísio — Manlius, Mazzanicco Mattianus (< Mattius), Pantianicco Piantinicco Piantinis — Pantillus, Poincicco punsic — Pollentius, Redenziccio ridinjcic — Hortensius. With the solitary exceptions of Mattius, whose derivative Mattianus is surely Latin, and of Pantiius (which might be conceivably compared with Welsh Pant 'valley') none of these source names gives the slightest suggestion of being Celtic in origin. These names of Praedia in -ic(i)u appear to reflect another, non-Celtic population.
Excursus I — BASILICA

We have alluded above to the well known problem of the dual reflexes in Romance of ECCLESIA vs. BASILICA. The latter occurs notably as a common appellative in Romanian ăfserică, Vegliete basalka (and as a toponym Bassalca, Ragusan Basolche) and Romaantsch baselgia. Bátorti and Aebischer would have BASILICA the older term, surviving in the often diagnostic “lateral areas“. However J. Jud has adduced meticulous evidence to show that ECCLESIA was in early established use in highly urbanized parts of the Empire; Wartburg, Glättli, and Tagliavini have followed Jud. In that case the later BASILICA would have taken root in the more rural and less urban, or perhaps less sophisticated, parts. G. R. Solta (Einführung in die Balkanlinguistik, Darmstadt 1980, p. 150) mentions this debate, with useful references; but without coming to a clear positive position.

Solta’s conclusion is essentially that the line between archaism and innovation is a vague one. I insist on a different position. There are of course cases where we cannot decide for a number of reasons, and there may be instances where two forms are equally current; but in the last case it is quite unlikely that both forms will have been precise synonyms. Such instances of non-synonymy (i.e. of different specialized reference) may well be involved in scattered toponyms such as those mentioned by Solta for the location north of Rome, or French Switzerland, or northern France, or in Spain (loc. cit.).

But the problem of innovation must be seen ultimately as one of diffusion; and the speed or extent of diffusion must reflect density of communication. Now the model for “lateral areas“ is a purely geographic one that reflects the assumption of a homogeneous communication network. Jud had made it highly likely that ECCLESIA diffused early in urbanized centers; this would explain also the British Celtic reflexes seen e.g. in Welsh eglwys, mentioned by Solta in footnote 465 as being on the Nordwestgrenze. We see immediately that not only geography but lines of social structure are also involved. It is then quite possible that at some slightly later date BASILICA spread through a different social stratum. The two forms would not be in competition in some indeterminate fashion; they would simply correlate with different social structures.

Yet the survival of BASILICA is seen to be linked strongly with geographically peripheral areas; and ECCLESIA has spread elsewhere at its expense. We therefore find, in an averaged sense, a Bátorti “lateral area“ pattern superimposed on Jud’s urbanized network. Thus for a later date it is still not incorrect to claim that ECCLESIA became the encroaching later term, the innovation. Even Old Irish baislec, against the Welsh eglwys of Britain, conforms to this development.

We see, then, that there is no mutual exclusion between Bátorti’s and Jud’s formulations; and there is no need for Solta’s abandonment of principle.
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