

# КРАТКИЕ СООБЩЕНИЯ

UDC 81'373.21 + 81'373.6 + 81-112.2 + 81'373.217(23)

[https://doi.org/10.15826/vopr\\_onom.2024.21.1.009](https://doi.org/10.15826/vopr_onom.2024.21.1.009)

---

---

## Luka REPANŠEK

PhD, Assistant Professor, Department of Comparative and General Linguistics, University of Ljubljana (Aškerčeva 2, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija)

E-mail: [luka.repansek@ff.uni-lj.si](mailto:luka.repansek@ff.uni-lj.si)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6530-7597>

## OCRA — AN ETYMOLOGICAL PROPOSAL

### Abstract

The ancient name of the mountain (pass) that lies at the junction of the Julian and Dinaric Alps (nowadays Mt Nanos and the adjoining Razdrto Pass in southwestern Slovenia) is attested as *Ocra* in Latin (Pliny) and Ὀκρά in Greek sources (Strabo, Ptolemy). The name is surely Italic and is argued to go back to Proto-Indo-European  $*H_2okreH_2-$  (to  $*H_2ek-$  'to be/become/make sharp'). Given that an *o*-grade root is not expected in a deverbal adjective in *-ro-* (i.e.  $*H_2ek-ró-$  'sharp'), such a formation is only interpretable as a substantivized feminine form of the possessive adjective  $*H_2ok-r-ó-$  'sharp,' derived from an acrostic heteroclitite neuter abstract noun  $*H_2ók-r-/H_2ék-n-$  'sharpness.' As such, *Ocra* ~ Ὀκρά is the only unambiguous evidence for the existence of a deverbal abstract with *o* : *e* ablaut in Proto-Indo-European. In the addendum a brief etymological account is given of the place-name *Acumincum* ~ *Acimincum* from Pannonia Inferior, which likewise goes back ultimately to the PIE root  $*H_2ek-$ , arguing in favour of the Ptolemaic variant with *Acu-* (as opposed to *Aci-*) as the *forma difficilior*. The proposed etymology starts from PIE  $*H_2ek-ḡn-o-$  >  $*akumno-$  'rock' +  $*-enko-$  ( $*akumnenko-$  'rocky (place)'), from which  $*akumenko-$  >  $*akuminko-$  would then be produced by simple regressive dissimilation.

**Keywords:** *Ocra* (Nanos); *Acumincum*; etymology; Proto-Indo-European word formation; toponymy, Slovenia

### Acknowledgements

The author acknowledges the financial support from the Slovenian Research Agency (research core funding No. P6-0218).

© Repanšek L., 2024

**For citation**

Repánšek, L. (2024). *Ocra* — an Etymological Proposal. *Voprosy onomastiki*, 21(1), 187–197. [https://doi.org/10.15826/vopr\\_onom.2024.21.1.009](https://doi.org/10.15826/vopr_onom.2024.21.1.009)

*Received on 11 July 2023*

*Accepted on 25 December 2023*

**Лука РЕПАНШЕК**

PhD, доцент кафедры сравнительного и общего языкознания, Люблянский университет (Aškerčeva 2, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija)

E-mail: luka.repansek@ff.uni-lj.si

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6530-7597>

**К ЭТИМОЛОГИИ ТОПОНИМА *OCRA*****Аннотация**

Древнее название горного перевала, отделяющего Юлийские Альпы от Динарского нагорья (сейчас гора Нанос и прилегающий перевал Раздрто на юго-западе Словении), фиксируется как *Ocra* в лагинских источниках (Плиний Старший) и *Окра* — в греческих (Страбон, Птолемей). Данный топоним, несомненно, имеет италийское происхождение и считается восходящим к праиндоевропейскому  $*H_2okreH_2-$  <  $*H_2ek-$  ‘быть / становиться / делать острым’. В отглагольном прилагательном на *-ro-* ( $*H_2ek-ro-$  ‘острый’) трудно предполагать *o-* ступень чередования в корне, поэтому подобную форму можно объяснить только как субстантивированную форму женского рода притяжательного прилагательного  $*H_2ok-r-o-$  ‘острый’, восходящую к абстрактному существительному гетероклитического склонения среднего рода с акростатической парадигмой  $*H_2ok-r-/H_2ek-n-$  ‘острота’. Таким образом, *Ocra* ~ *Окра* является единственным недвусмысленным свидетельством существования отглагольных абстрактных наименований с корневым чередованием *o* : *e* в праиндоевропейском. В дополнение к статье предлагается краткая этимологическая интерпретация топонима *Acuminum* ~ *Acimincum* в Нижней Паннонии, которое можно сходным образом объяснить как восходящее к праиндоевропейскому корню  $*H_2ek-$ , что говорит в пользу употребляемого Птолемеем варианта с *Acu-* (а не с *Ac-*) как *forma difficilior*. По мысли автора, *Acuminum* можно интерпретировать как сочетание  $*H_2ek-mn-o-$  >  $*akumno-$  ‘скала’ +  $*-enko-$  ( $*akumnenko-$  ‘скалистая (местность)’), откуда  $*akumenko-$  >  $*akuminko-$  получается путем регрессивной диссимилиации.

**Ключевые слова:** *Ocra* (Нанос); *Acuminum*; этимология; праиндоевропейское словообразование; топонимия; Словения

**Благодарности**

Исследование выполнено при финансовой поддержке Словенского исследовательского агентства (грант № P6-0218).

**Для цитирования**

Repánšek L. *Ocra* — an Etymological Proposal // Вопросы ономастики. 2024. Т. 21, № 1. С. 187–197. [https://doi.org/10.15826/vopr\\_onom.2024.21.1.009](https://doi.org/10.15826/vopr_onom.2024.21.1.009)

*Рукопись поступила в редакцию 11.07.2023*

*Рукопись принята к печати 25.12.2023*

Strabo, Ptolemy and Pliny, the earliest available written records to mention *Ocra*, use this place-name to refer to three closely associated geographical entities at the junction of the Julian Alps and the Dinarides:<sup>1</sup> a) the plateau: τῆ Ὀκρα (Strabo, *Geogr.*, IV.6.1), ἡ Ὀκρα (Ibid., IV.6.10), τῆς Ὀκρας (Ibid., V.1.3), ἡ δ' Ὀκρα ταπεινότατον μέρος τῶν Ἄλπεων ἐστὶ (Ibid., VII.5.2), τῆ Ὀκρᾶ ὄρει (Ptolemy, II.12.1), τῆ Ὀκρᾶ (Ibid., III.1.1); b) the pass that lies directly at its foothill: ὑπερθεῖσι τὴν Ὀκραν, ὑπερθεσίς ἐστι διὰ τῆς Ὀκρας (Strabo, *Geogr.*, VII.5.2); and c) an erstwhile settlement of the Carni: *Ocra* (Pliny, *Nat. hist.*, III.19.131), apparently already abandoned by Pliny's time. The three can be identified in that order with Mt Nanos, the Razdrto pass, and — probably — the iron-age hillfort Grad near Šmihel pod Nanosom. The name of the settlement represents an obvious case of typical transonymization (oronym → oikononym), while the fact that the *Ocra* pass was being generally referred to by the name of the mountain on which it was geographically dependent is banal enough to safely assume that in the case of *Ocra* we are most certainly dealing with an oronym. *Ocra* (Nanos) is one of the most prominent orientation points of the Notranjska (Inner Carniola) region in southwestern Slovenia and a place of utmost strategic importance in Roman and pre-Roman times. Located in the lowest part of the Alps (cf. ἡ δ' Ὀκρα ταπεινότατον μέρος τῶν Ἄλπεων ἐστὶ τῶν διατεινουσῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ραιτικῆς μέχρι Ἰαπόδων “*Ocra* is the lowest part of the Alps such as extend from the land of the Rhaeti to that of the Iapodes” — Strabo, IV.6.10), the *Ocra* pass for a long time represented the easiest and most accessible route between sub-Mediterranean Italy and the continental East. The plateau is an impressive 12 km long and 6 km wide karstic massif characterized by precipitous slopes and a prominent steeply cut edge that slopes down towards the *Ocra* (Razdrto) pass.

This conspicuous feature of the plateau is, following the aetiological principle, also the most likely naming motive, given that the root etymology of the oronym more than apparently goes back to the Proto-Indo-European root *\*H<sub>2</sub>ek-* ‘(to be/become/make) sharp.’ This, of course, is not a novel idea, which, given the obviousness of the etymological connection, is unsurprising [see, e.g., Holder 1904: 829–830; Kretschmer 1932: 112–113; Pellegrini 1961: 15; Šašel 1974; Prosdociami 1978: 33; Calzecchi Onesti 1981: 168; Crevatin 1990: 72; Vedaldi Iasbez 1994: 99–100]. The problem remains, however, that given the comparative linguistic data from the different Indo-European languages in which the derivatives of this root survive, none really matches *Ocra* precisely.

<sup>1</sup> Strong arguments against dissociating Ptolemy's *Ocra* from the Strabonian evidence are offered by [Vedaldi Iasbez 1994: 98; cf. also Šašel 1977: 158, 160].

Following the widely-held view [see Schindler 1980: 390, and Nussbaum 1999: 399; cf. Nussbaum 2004; Widmer 2004: 129; Wodtko et al. 2008: 296], the root formed the standard verbal adjective in *-ró-*, so  $**H_2\hat{k}r\acute{o}- > *H_2\acute{e}\hat{k}r\acute{o}-$  ‘sharp’ (with a restored *e*-grade of the root as a strategy to avoid the initial consonant cluster  $*H_2\hat{k}r$ ) and was, apparently, marked by secondary barytonization ( $*H_2\acute{e}\hat{k}r\acute{o}-$ ), which must be assumed on the strength of Proto-Slavic  $*\tilde{a}stras > *ostrb\acute{}$  ‘sharp’ (cf. OLith.  $\tilde{a}štras$ ,  $-\tilde{a}$  ‘sharp; strict’)<sup>2</sup> and Ancient Greek ἄκρος (however, Frisk [1938: 113–114] and Vine [2002: 335, 340, 343]<sup>3</sup> see in ἄκρος ‘highest, foremost, -top, -end’ a syntactically revalorized substantive).<sup>4</sup> From this a nominalized deadjectival abstract noun  $*H_2\acute{o}\hat{k}r\acute{i}-/*H_2\acute{e}\hat{k}r\acute{i}-$  ‘sharpness (as the characteristic trait of anything that is sharp)’ with an acrostatic *o/e*-ablaut was derived, which survives in Lat. *ocris* ‘jagged, rugged mountain’ ( $< *H_2\acute{o}\hat{k}r\acute{i}-$ ), matching Gr. ὄκρις ‘jagged point,’ and Gr. ἄκρις ( $< *H_2\acute{e}\hat{k}r\acute{i}-$ ) ‘hill-top, mountain peak.’ From this it very clearly follows that the only source of the *o*-grade in the root of any sort of derivative from  $*H_2\acute{e}\hat{k}r-$  that also contained a *r* in its suffixal morpheme (chain) must be the strong form of the feminine *i*-stem nominalization. As attested in the ancient sources, however, *Ocra* ~ Ὀκρᾶ most obviously mirrors a feminine  $\tilde{a}$ -stem (adapted to fit the Latin 1<sup>st</sup> declension and the Greek  $\tilde{a}$ -purum pattern), co-occurring with an *o*-grade root. That the *o*-vowel in *Ocra* ~ Ὀκρᾶ might go back to  $*a$ , suggesting PIE  $*H_2\acute{e}\hat{k}r\acute{o}-$  [ $*\chi\acute{a}kro-$ ], is as good as excluded, given that the onomastic material of at least the western part of the wider South-Eastern Alpine region seems to be Italic in nature,<sup>5</sup> so that a coalescence of PIE  $*o$  and  $*a$  is not at all a probable solution. Rather, a direct retrojection of the mountain name strongly suggests a preform  $*H_2\acute{o}\hat{k}r\acute{e}H_2-$ .

Since, as was pointed out above, such a PIE starting point is problematic, at least under the standard view of things,  $*H_2\acute{o}\hat{k}r\acute{e}H_2-$  can only be accounted

<sup>2</sup> Secondary transferal of accent type I/2 (= 2) adjectives (matching the Proto-Slavic accent type *b*) to accent type II/2 (= 4) is a productive process in Lithuanian, so that  $\tilde{a}štras$  may be implicitly understood as a direct match of the Slavic comparandum.

<sup>3</sup> Contrary to Vine’s [2002] proposal, Ancient Greek ἄκρα ‘highest/furthest point (of something)’ → ‘headland, summit, crest, height, extremity’ should in my view rather be seen as ultimately reflecting a deadjectival nominal abstract  $*H_2\acute{e}\hat{k}r\acute{e}H_2-$  ( $= *H_2\acute{e}\hat{k}r\acute{e}H_2-$ ) ‘sharpness’ rather than the other way around.

<sup>4</sup> Old Irish *ér* ‘noble, great, high’  $< *axrah < *axrah < *akros$  is, of course, silent as to the placement of the accent.

<sup>5</sup> See [Repanšek 2016: 34–38, 255] and [Prósper 2019a] for the latest views. To propose that *Ocra* goes back to Celtic (or more specifically Gaulish) toponymic heritage as is implied by the entry in [Delamarre 2023: 152] is of course entirely improbable, not least for the fact that in areas only secondarily colonised by Celtic/Gaulish, place-names referring to prominent geographical locations tend not to get renamed, and since in this particular area of the South-Eastern Alpine region there are no overt onomastic traces of Gaulish at all anyway [see Repanšek 2016]. Supporting the assumption on the element  $*okri-$  (and its derivative  $*H_2\acute{o}\hat{k}r\acute{i}-i-n\acute{o}- > *okri-no-$  ‘having  $*okri-$ ’ → ‘sharp, pointy’), however, even if the latter could at least theoretically be Celtic, is beside the point, since  $*okri-$  continues an entirely different Proto-Indo-European formation.

for convincingly if assumed that what we are actually dealing with is a thematic possessive derivative of an underlying  $*H_2o\acute{k}-r-$ , so  $*H_2o\acute{k}-r-\acute{o}-\acute{e}H_2-$  ‘having/possessing  $*H_2o\acute{k}-r-$ .’ In its turn,  $*H_2o\acute{k}-r-$  is only understandable as the strong-grade of a heteroclite neuter abstract (*nomen qualitatis*)  $*H_2\acute{o}\acute{k}-r-/H_2\acute{e}\acute{k}-n-$  ‘sharpness.’ The preform of *Ocra* ~ \*Okrā, i.e.  $*H_2o\acute{k}-r-\acute{e}H_2-$  is then interpretable as the substantivized feminine form of the externally derived possessive adjective ‘having/possessing sharpness’ → ‘sharp.’ That such a secondary derivative would start from the *o*-grade stem is unproblematic in view of cases such as Gr. ὄχυρός ‘firm, strong, lasting’ (on this see [Nussbaum 1998: 534–555]). Alternatively, and only under the supposition that we are dealing with a derivative of an already concretized *nomen attributivum*  $*H_2\acute{o}\acute{k}-r-/H_2\acute{e}\acute{k}-n-$  ‘that which is sharp’ → ‘a steep slope’ *vel sim.*,  $*H_2o\acute{k}-r-\acute{e}-H_2-$  would potentially also be analyzable as an externally formed collective of the  $*ud-n-\acute{e}-H_2-$ -type (PIE  $*u\acute{o}d-r-/u\acute{e}d-n-$  ‘water’ →  $*ud-n-\acute{o}-$  ‘having/possessing water’ → collective  $*ud-n-\acute{e}-H_2-$  ‘a body/mass of water’) [see Nussbaum 2014: 291], so  $*H_2o\acute{k}-r-\acute{e}-H_2-$  ‘a collection of sharp/steep slopes’ *vel sim.* On aetiological principle (see above), however, the latter possibility is infinitely less likely.

Be that as it may, the underlying derivative  $*H_2o\acute{k}-r-\acute{o}-$  demanded by the formal properties of the ancient oronym is positive proof of the existence of a Proto-Indo-European heteroclite neuter  $*H_2\acute{o}\acute{k}-r-/H_2\acute{e}\acute{k}-n-$  ‘sharpness.’ Note in this respect that on the basis of PGerm.  $*axurna-$  ‘acorn’ <  $*H_2\acute{e}\acute{k}-r-no-$ , Danish *ær* ‘id.’ and Lat. *acer* ‘id.’ <  $*H_2\acute{e}\acute{k}(e)r$  (in reality  $*H_2\acute{e}\acute{k}-er-i-$ , for which see [Harðarson 2014: 106]), Oettinger [1994: 80–84]<sup>6</sup> already proposed the existence of an erstwhile PIE neuter heteroclite, but in consideration of Hittite <sup>GIS</sup>*hikkarz(a)* (for the etymological connection see [Puhvel 1991: 305]) assigned it type II acrostatic ablaut ( $*H_2\acute{e}\acute{k}-r-/H_2\acute{e}\acute{k}-n-$ ), claiming that “Da wir beim Wort für ‘Ahorn’ keine Spur von *o*-Stufe, wohl aber von Langstufe finden, kommt nur die Möglichkeit C [i.e. N-A. Sg.  $*H_2\acute{e}\acute{k}-r$ , G.  $*H_2\acute{e}\acute{k}-r-s$ ] in Frage.” Regarding the Hittite *hi* <  $*H_2\acute{e}$ , however, see now [Rieken 1999: 277], who offers a far more convincing proposal that starts from the *vṛddhi* derivative of the commonly reconstructed deverbial adjective in *-ro-*, thus removing the only potential evidence for a lengthened *e*-grade in this deverbial abstract. Note, furthermore, that neither  $*axurna-$  <  $*H_2\acute{e}\acute{k}-r-no-$  nor the Proto-Germanic precursor of Danish *ær* (see [Harðarson 2014: 106, fn. 13] for the possibilities) or Lat. *acer* (and, for that matter, *ācer* ‘sharp, piercing’ <  $*\acute{a}kri-$ , an obviously post-PIE *vṛddhi* formation to  $*H_2\acute{a}\acute{k}-r-i-$  <  $*H_2\acute{e}\acute{k}-r-i-$ , the oblique stem of the deadjectival abstract  $*H_2\acute{o}\acute{k}-ri-$

<sup>6</sup> Cf. also [Pettersson 1909: 269ff.] and [Wodtko et al. 2008: 292, fn. 15].

\* $H_2\acute{e}k\text{-}ri\text{-}$ )<sup>7</sup> need to be derived from the heteroclite neuter, but can easily be based on the deverbal adjective \* $H_2\acute{e}k\text{-}r\acute{o}\text{-}$ .<sup>8</sup> It is in fact only *Ocra* ~ \* $\text{O}\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}$  that unambiguously speaks in favour of PIE \* $H_2\acute{o}k\text{-}r\text{-}$ /\* $H_2\acute{e}k\text{-}n\text{-}$ .<sup>9</sup>

*Addendum*

### A short etymological note on the ancient place-name *Acumincum*

The name of the Roman station in Pannonia is attested twice as Ἀκούμινκον in (Ptolemy, II.16.2, II.16.5), while the majority of the other available sources report the name as *Acimincum* (*Amm. Marc.*, 19.11.8; *Itin. Ant.*, 242.2; *Not. dign. occ.*, 32.7). The only epigraphical attestation of the place-name unambiguously reads *Aciminci*,<sup>10</sup> strongly implying that the Ptolemaic Ἀκούμινκον might have arisen under the influence of the vocalism of Ἀκούινκον (*Aquincum*).<sup>11</sup> The generally aberrant *Acunum* in the *Tabula Peutingeriana* and in *Rav.*, IV.20,<sup>12</sup> however, seems to at least marginally support *Acumincum* as the *forma difficilior*, given that *Acimincum* would less likely trigger the obvious association with *Acunum* = *Acaunum* (Montélimar), through which the mistake is most easily explicable. Additional, although hardly decisive argument in favour of *Acumincum* as the original form of the oikonym would be the fact that in Latin unaccented syllables the weakened vowel followed

<sup>7</sup> But cf. [Weiss 2020: 341].

<sup>8</sup> On \**axurna*- < \* $H_2\acute{e}k\text{-}r\text{-}no\text{-}$  < \* $H_2\acute{e}k\text{-}r\text{-}n\acute{o}\text{-}$  < \* $H_2\acute{e}k\text{-}r\acute{o}\text{-}$  see especially [Harðarson 2014: 106], though the lack of the *e*-grade in the suffix such as is normally attested in these kind of deadjectival derivatives (most famously, perhaps, in \**tig-er-nó*- ‘sharp’) could potentially speak in favour of \* $H_2\acute{e}k\text{-}r\text{-}no\text{-}$  being a possessive adjective in *-no*- derived from a levelled-out stem \* $H_2\acute{e}k\text{-}r\text{-}$  (for the desubstantial possessive function of *-no*- cf., e.g., Lith. *krūvinas* ‘bloody’ < \**kruH<sub>2</sub>-i-nó*- < \**króuH<sub>2</sub>-i-/\*kréuH<sub>2</sub>-i*- ‘blood, gore’). I do not share the opinion expressed in [Hock et al. 2015: 62] that apart from Celtic and Balto-Slavic the comparanda do not really speak in favour of a PIE deverbal adjective \* $H_2\acute{e}k\text{-}ro\text{-}$  but are supposedly to be explained as secondary derivatives of an underlying *r*-stem. That is, of course, possible, but would not solve much, especially as the semantically problematic/complicated Gr. ἄκρος (see above) would still have as its starting point an adjectival derivative \* $H_2\acute{e}k\text{-}r\text{-}ó\text{-}$ .

<sup>9</sup> Very probably supported by the so far unconvincingly explained Proto-Iranian \**afŋga*- (Old Persian *aθa<sup>n</sup>ga*-, Young Avestan *asəŋga*- ‘stone,’ which in my view (to be properly laid out and evaluated in a separate etymological study) goes back to a thematic velar extension of the oblique stem of the underlying heteroclite, so \* $H_2\acute{e}k\text{-}en\text{-}g\acute{o}\text{-}$  (cf. Ved. *patāṅgá*- ‘bird; flying’ < \**pet-en-gó*- to PIE \**pót-r-/\*pét-n-* ‘wing’).

<sup>10</sup> See [Szabó & Tóth 2003: 123, No. 19; AE 2003: 01426; EDCS: 30100912; HD: 036280; lupa: 10304; Szabó 2021: 243]. Although one finds *Aciminci* in all the editions of the inscription, the first letter is not actually visible due to a severely damaged frame.

<sup>11</sup> This much seems to be implied by the remark in [ Prósper 2019a: 34, fn. 3]. There are other cases, however, of *u* being spelled *i* in Latin epigraphical sources. Consider in this respect [*S*] *inuco* [CIL 13: 1882], *Sunic* [RIB: 430], *Sunicor[um]* [AE 1914: 293] for \**Sunuko*- (cf. *Sunucorum* [CIL 16: D69, A16] etc.; see [Sitzmann & Grünzweig 2008: 259] for the full list of attestations).

<sup>12</sup> On the relationship between the different itineraria cf. [Fodorean 2016]. Scepticism as to the reliability of the linguistic data harvested from secondary sources like the Roman itineraries (as opposed to epigraphic attestations) is expressed by Prósper [2018: 16; 2019a: 34, fn. 3].



by a labial regularly appears as *i* when an *i* follows [see Leumann 1977: 87–90], so that *Acimincum* < *Acumincum* could easily be explained as a secondary variant formed in the process of phonetic adaptation to the generally established pattern.<sup>13</sup> As an alternative, *Acumincum* > *Acimincum*, which seems to have been at least a genuine variant of the place-name, could also be a case of regressive assimilation.

Building on [Krahe 1955: 101], the etymology proposed by Anreiter [2001: 23] sees in the presuffixal part of *Acumincum* a derivative in *\*-m(o)-* of an *u*-stem, connecting the proposed *\*akum-* with Lat. *acūmen* ‘a point; sharpness, acuteness.’ The latter, however, is a late, internally Latin deverbative formation that rests on a secondary verbal stem *acū-* ‘to sharpen,’ extracted from the reinterpreted denominative *acūtus* ‘sharp(ened), pointed,’ itself resting on *acus* ‘needle’ < PIE *\*H<sub>2</sub>ék-u-* ‘sharp.’<sup>14</sup>

A much more promising approach would therefore be to start from a thematic external derivative *\*H<sub>2</sub>ék-ḡn-o-* (to PIE *\*H<sub>2</sub>ék-mon-/\*H<sub>2</sub>ék-mn-* ‘rock, stone’ < *\*‘the sharp one’*) such as is attested in Celtic (PCelt. *\*akamno-* > Gaul. *akauno-* ‘rock’), meaning either ‘rocky, stony’ (with subsequent substantivization to ‘rock, stone’), if this is a possessive adjectival derivative, or simply ‘rock, stone’ if the thematization is merely structural. The latter possibility seems likelier in view of the fact that a PIE possessive adjective *\*H<sub>2</sub>ék-mn-ó-* would otherwise be expected to yield *\*H<sub>2</sub>ék-n-ó-* by the so-called *ašnō*-rule (*m* > Ø / VC\_\_nV̄, e.g. Gen. Sg. *\*H<sub>2</sub>ék-mn-és* > *\*H<sub>2</sub>ék-n-és* > Ved. *ásnas*, Av. *ašnō*). Assuming that Anreiter is correct in claiming that PIE syllabic resonants systematically yielded *uR* in epichoric

<sup>13</sup> Cf. in this respect the variant spellings of the epichoric divinity *Aequorna*, worshipped in Emona and its territory. The name is attested on six inscriptions as *Aequor(na)* (1<sup>st</sup> c. BC), *Aecorna* (1<sup>st</sup>–2<sup>nd</sup> c. AD) and, in a late inscription, *Aecurn(a)* (2<sup>nd</sup>–3<sup>rd</sup> c. AD) [see Šašel Kos 1999: 47–49]. Both variants attested on later monuments seem to represent *formae faciliores*, phonetically adapted to the predominant pattern, given that in Latin itself inherited *\*k<sup>w</sup>* (*qu*) does not normally appear in front of *o* or *u* (cases such as *aequor* ‘level surface’ are of course analogical creations).

<sup>14</sup> Delamarre [2012: 39; 2017: 277; 2019: 24; 2023: 103] proposes an alternative etymology and sees in *Acu/imincum* a dithematic Gaulish personal name (with zero conversion to a neuter place-name, proposed as one of the standard means of onymization in Gaulish in [Delamarre 2012: 17]), which he segments as either *ācu-minco-* (subsequently omitted from [Delamarre 2019] and [Delamarre 2023] in favour of *Acimincum*) or *aci-minko-*, matching *\*ācu-* ‘fast’ to the first member of *\*āku-ūinko-*, which he recognises in *Aquincum* [see Ibid.: 26], and *\*aci-* ‘sharp, pointy, piercing’ to the initial element in names like *Acimarius*, *Acisonius*, *Acisius* (cf. Cisalpine Gaulish *aKisios*), on which see further [Ibid.: 24], but cf. [Meid 1989: 12] and [Villar & Prósper 2005: 271]. Solid proof for a Gaulish etymon *\*āku-* ‘fast’ as the first member of compounded names is lacking, while the existence of a proterodynamic adjectival stem *\*aki-* < *\*H<sub>2</sub>éki-* or a Caland variant of *\*akro-* (= an acrostic feminine abstract) is not impossible theoretically but does not actually find any real support in the comparanda [cf. Wodtke et al. 2008: 287–300]. Nor is the idea behind zero onymization on the basis of personal names at all convincing, since none of the examples adduced so far in support of this process are actually probative [see Repanšek 2014: 207, fn. 65].

place-names of Pannonia [Anreiter 2001: 11–12 *et passim*],<sup>15</sup> *\*H<sub>2</sub>ek̑-mn-o-* would expectedly yield *\*akumno-*, which joined with the productive possessive suffix *\*-enko-* (cf. *Aquincum*, i.e. *\*ak<sup>u</sup>o-* + *\*-enko-* ‘(place) possessing water’) would then undergo regressive dissimilation from *\*akumnenko-* ‘rocky, stony (place)’ to *\*akumenko-*.

### Abbreviations

#### Languages

Av.	Avestan	OLith.	Old Lithuanian
Gaul.	Gaulish	PCelt.	Proto-Celtic
Gr.	Ancient Greek	PGerm.	Proto-Germanic
Lat.	Latin	PIE	Proto-Indo-European
Lith.	Lithuanian	Ved.	Vedic

#### Sources

Amm. Marc.	Ammianus Marcellinus, <i>Rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt</i>	Not. dign. occ.	<i>Notitia dignitatum omnium tam civilium quam militarum in partibus Occidentis</i>
Geogr.	Strabo, <i>Geographica</i>	Ptolemy	Claudius Ptolemaeus, Γεωγραφικὴ Ὑφήγησις ( <i>Geographia</i> )
Itin. Ant.	<i>Itinerarium Antonini</i>	Rav.	<i>Ravennatis Anonymi Cosmographia</i>
Nat. hist.	Gaius Plinius Secundus, <i>Naturalis historia</i>		

#### Grammar forms

Gen. Sg.	genitive singular	N-A. Sg.	nominative-accusative singular
----------	-------------------	----------	--------------------------------

### References

- AE — Cagnat, R. et al. (Eds.). (1888–). *L'Année Epigraphique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Anreiter, P. (2001). *Die vorrömischen Namen Pannoniens*. Budapest: Archaeolingua.
- Calzecchi Onesti, G. (1981). *Ocr- e acr-* nella toponomastica dell'Italia antica. *Studi Etruschi*, 49, 165–189.
- CIL — Mommsen, T. et al. (Eds.). (1862–). *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Crevatin, F. (1990). Storia linguistica dell'Istria preromana e romana. In E. Campanile (Ed.), *Rapporti linguistici e culturali tra i popoli dell'Italia antica, Pisa, 6–7 ottobre 1989* (pp. 43–109). Pisa: Giardini editori e stampatori in Pisa.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. [Repanšek 2016: 33–44], but see recent critique by Prósper [2019a: 34–36; 2019b: 18], claiming that *u* in *Pultovia* (Stražgojnca), derived from *\*p<sup>h</sup>lH<sub>2</sub>-u-iH<sub>2</sub>-* by [Repanšek 2015: 785], which in her opinion is a Venetic place-name, is explicable along the lines of rounding of *\*o* after a labial (*Pultovia* < *\*Poltovia*, i.e. with the expected Italic reflex of the syllabic liquid *\*ɔL* < *\*L*). This is of course possible in terms of historical phonology, but to see linguistic traces of Venetic (or, more generally, Italic for that matter) in an area that archaeologically is unambiguously divorced from the (north-)western part of the South-Eastern Alpine region is thoroughly unconvincing. See [Repanšek 2016: 33–42, 254–256] on the areal stratification of the corresponding linguistic territory.



- Delamarre, X. (2012). *Noms de lieux celtiques de l'Europe ancienne (-500/+500): Dictionnaire*. Paris: Éditions Errance.
- Delamarre, X. (2017). *Les noms des Gaulois*. Paris: Les Cent Chemins.
- Delamarre, X. (2019). *Dictionnaire des thèmes nominaux du gaulois: I. Ab-/Ixs(o)-*. Paris: Les Cent Chemins.
- Delamarre, X. (2023). *Dictionnaire des thèmes nominaux du gaulois: II. Lab- / Xantus*. Paris: Les Cent Chemins.
- Fodorean, F.-Gh. (2016). Ripa Pannonica in the Peutinger Map and in the Antonine Itinerary. A Comparative Approach. *Latomus*, 75(4), 995–1012.
- Frisk, Hj. (1938). II. Kleinere Beiträge. *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 56, 113–118. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110242973.29>
- EDCS — *Epigraphik Datenbank Clausss-Slaby*. Retrieved from <http://www.manfredclaus.de>
- Harðarson, J. A. (2014). Das Wort für ‚Eisen‘ im Keltischen un Germanischen und die indogermanischen *-erno*-Bildungen. In N. Oettinger, & Th. Steer (Eds.), *Das Nomen im Indogermanischen. Morphologie, Substantiv versus Adjektiv, Kollektivum. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 14. bis 16. September 2011 in Erlangen* (pp. 103–112). Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- HD — *Epigraphic Database Heidelberg*. Retrieved from <https://edh.ub.uni-heidelberg.de>
- Hock, W. et al. (2015). *Altltawaisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Vols. 1–3). Hamburg: Baar.
- Holder, A. (1904). *Alt-celtischer Sprachschatz II*. Leipzig: Verlag von B. G. Teubner.
- Krahe, H. (1955). *Die Sprache der Illyrier*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Kretschmer, (1932). Die Herkunft der Umbrier. *Glotta*, 21(1–2), 112–125.
- Leumann, M. (1977). *Lateinische Grammatik I: Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- lupa — Harl, F., & Harl, O. *Ubi erat lupa* (Bilddatenbank zu antiken Steindenkmälern). Retrieved from [www.ubi-erat-lupa.org](http://www.ubi-erat-lupa.org)
- Meid, W. (1989). *Zur Lesung und Deutung gallischer Inschriften*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Villar, F. & Prósper, B. M. (2005). *Vascos, Celtas e Indoeuropeos. Genes y lenguas*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.
- Nussbaum, A. J. (1998). Severe Problems. In J. Jasanoff, C. Melchert, & O. Lisi (Eds.), *Mir curad. Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins* (pp. 521–538). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Nussbaum, A. J. (1999). \**Jocidus*: An Account of the Latin Adjectives in *-idus*. In H. Eichner, & H. Ch. Luschützky (Eds.), *Compositiones Indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler* (pp. 377–419). Praha: Enigma corporation.
- Nussbaum, A. J. (2004). Cool *\*-ed-*: The Latin *frīgēdō* and Greek ἀλγῆδών, τηκεδών, and ῥῖγεδανός Types. Paper read at the 23<sup>rd</sup> East Coast Indo-European Conference (Virginia Polytechnic Institute).
- Nussbaum, A. J. (2014). Feminine, Abstract, Collective, Neuter Plural: Some Remarks on Each (Expanded Handout). In S. Neri, & R. Schuhmann (Eds.), *Studies on the Collective and Feminine in Indo-European from a Diachronic and Typological Perspective* (pp. 273–306). Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Oettinger, N. (1994). Der Ablaut von ‘Ahorn’ im Indogermanischen. *Historische Sprachforschung*, 107(1), 77–86.
- Pellegrini, G. B. (1961). Panorama di storia linguistica giuliano-carnica: il periodo preromano. *Studi goriziani*, 29, 73–97.

- Petersson, H. (1909). Zur indogermanischen Wortforschung. *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 24, 250–278.
- Prosdoci, A. L. (1978). Il lessico istituzionale italico. Tra linguistica e storia. In *La cultura italica. Atti del Convegno della Società Italiana di Glottologia* (p. 2974). Pisa: Giardini Editori e Stampatori.
- Prósper, B. M. (2018). Review of *Les noms des gaulois* by X. Delamarre. *The Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 47(1–2), 10–19.
- Prósper, B. M. (2019a). Language Change at the Crossroads: What Celtic, What Venetic, and What Else in the Personal Names of Emona? *Voprosy onomastiki*, 16(4), 33–73. [https://doi.org/10.15826/vopr\\_onom.2019.16.4.044](https://doi.org/10.15826/vopr_onom.2019.16.4.044)
- Prósper, B. M. (2019b). Celtic and Venetic in Contact: The Dialectal Attribution of the Personal Names in the Venetic Record. *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, 66, 7–52.
- Puhvel, J. (1991). Hittite Etymological Dictionary (Vol. 3). Berlin; Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Repánšek, L. (2014). Prispevek k sistematizaciji strukturnih tipov starokeltske toponimije [Old Celtic Toponymy: A Contribution to Its Systematization]. *Jezikoslovni zapiski*, 20(1), 199–211.
- Repánšek, L. (2015). Καλαμάντια (*Ptol.* II.11.15). In N. N. Kazansky (Ed.), *Indoeuropeiskoe iazykoznanie i klassicheskaia filologiya XIX. Materialy chtenii, posviashennykh pamiati professora Iosifa Moiseevicha Tronskogo, 22–24 iyunia 2015 g.* [Indo-European linguistics and classical philology XIX. Proceedings of the 19<sup>th</sup> Conference in Memory of Professor Joseph M. Tronsky, June 22–24, 2015] (pp. 780–790). St Petersburg: Nauka.
- Repánšek, L. (2016). *Keltska dediščina v toponimiji jugovzhodnega alpskega prostora* [Celtic Legacy in the Toponymy of the South-Eastern Alpine Region]. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU.
- RIB — Colingwood, R. G. et al. (1990–1995). *The Roman inscriptions of Britain I–II*. Stroud: Sutton.
- Rieken, E. (1999). *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.
- Schindler, J. (1980). Zur Herkunft der altindischen *cvi*-Bildungen. In M. Mayrhofer, M. Peters, & O. E. Pfeiffer (Eds.), *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie. Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft* (pp. 386–393). Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Sitzmann, A., & Grünzweig, F. E. (2008). *Die altgermanischen Ethnonyme. Ein Handbuch zu ihrer Etymologie*. Wien: Fassbaender.
- Szabó, Á. (2021). Ara Pannoniában. In P. Kovács, & Á. Szabó (Eds.), *Studia Epigraphica Pannonica XII: Felirattani közlemények és történeti tanulmányok 2020-ból* (pp. 239–278). Budapest: Történelmi Ismeretterjesztő Társulat Egyesület.
- Szabó, Á., & Tóth, E. (2003). *Bölcske. Römische Inschriften und Funde*. Budapest: Ungarisches Nationalmuseum.
- Šašel, J. (1974). *Ocra*. *Kronika*, 22, 9–17.
- Šašel, J. (1977). Strabo, *Ocra* and Archaeology. In V. Markotić (Ed.), *Ancient Europe and the Mediterranean. Studies presented in Honour of Hugh Hencken* (pp. 157–160). Warminster: Aris and Phillips.
- Šašel Kos, M. (1999). *Pre-Roman Divinities of the Eastern Alps and Adriatic*. Ljubljana: Narodni muzej Slovenije.
- Vedaldi Iasbez, V. (1994). *La Venetia orientale e l'Histria. Le fonti letterarie greche e latine fino alla caduta dell'Impero Romano d'Occidente*. Roma: Edizioni Quasar.
- Villar, F., & Prósper, B. (2005). *Vascos, celtas e indoeuropeos: Genes y lenguas*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.

- Vine, B. (2002). On Full-grade \*-ro- Formations in Greek and Indo-European. In M. R. V. Southern (Ed.), *Indo-European Perspectives* (pp. 329–350). Washington, D. C.: Institute for the Study of Man.
- Weiss, M. L. (2020). *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Ann Arbor; New York: Beech Stave Press.
- Widmer, P. (2004). *Das Korn des weiten Feldes. Interne Derivation, Derivationskette und Flexionsklassenhierarchie: Aspekte der nominalen Wortbildung im Urindogermanischen*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- Wodtko, D. S., Irslinger, B., & Schneider, C. (2008). *Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.