Linguistic Contact in Prehistoric Italy: The Origins of the Place Name Imola

Cacciafoco, Francesco Perono; Andrea Nanetti

2015

Cacciafoco, F. P., & Nanetti, A. (2015). Linguistic Contact in Prehistoric Italy: The Origins of the Place Name Imola. *Names: A Journal of Onomastics*, 63(3), 158-170.

<https://hdl.handle.net/10356/82871>

<https://doi.org/10.1179/0027773815Z.000000000111>

© 2015 American Name Society. This is the author created version of a work that has been peer reviewed and accepted for publication in *Names: A Journal of Onomastics*, published by Taylor & Francis on behalf of American Name Society. It incorporates referee's comments but changes resulting from the publishing process, such as copyediting, structural formatting, may not be reflected in this document. The published version is available at: [<http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/0027773815Z.000000000111>].

Downloaded on 26 Apr 2023 22:03:12 SGT

Linguistic Contact in Prehistoric Italy: At The Origins of the Place Name *Imola*

by **Andrea NANETTI** and **Francesco PERONO CACCIAFOCO**

This paper explores possible connections between the Indo-European roots **yem-* / **jem-* and **am-* (**me-*) and the Etruscan stem *am-* through the analysis and reconstruction of the pre-Latin etymology of the Italian place name *Imola* (Bologna, Emilia-Romagna). The evaluation of plausible links between Indo-European (Italic and, especially, Celtic) and Etruscan in this area, in the specific field of Toponomastics, could allow relevant considerations inherently in the notions of reuse and refunctionalization of roots pertaining to different languages and linguistic families in the (mainly Prehistoric or Proto-historic) Toponymy of border areas. The place name *Imola* is, therefore, reconstructed through a 'convergent' methodology that takes into account the possibility of different and heterogeneous influences in the naming process. The work starts from the analysis of the Indo-European root **yem-* / **jem-* inferring the possibility of contacts between Indo-Europeans and Etruscans in the area of the inhabited center. The proposal of possible linguistic interexchange envisages the hypothesis of a semantic alignment between the Indo-European root **yem-* / **jem-* and the Etruscan stem *am-* or an analogy between the two bases and the Indo-European theme **am-* (**me-*). The conclusions (a plausible contact and alignment between Indo-European and Etruscan in a border area) of this paper could be relevant also in the field of historical semantics and in the re-interpretation of Etruscan stem *am-*. The study, therefore, highlights the possibility of contacts and interexchange, in border areas, between different languages and linguistic families.

Key Words: *Imola*; Indo-European roots **yem-* / **jem-* and **am-* (**me-*); Celtic; Italic; Etruscan stem *am-*; reuse and refunctionalization of word-roots and (loan)words; linguistic contact and alignment.

Introduction

Imola (geographic coordinates 44°21'12"N 11°42'51"E) is an Italian town in the Province of Bologna (region Emilia-Romagna), situated along the ancient *Via Æmilia*, at the point where the Apennine valley of the Santerno river joins the Po valley (Montanari 2000, *passim*; Nanetti 2008, *passim*; Nanetti-Giberti 2014, *passim*).

The area where the present-day city is located was already inhabited in Prehistoric and Proto-historic times (between 8000 and 3000 years ago, during the Neolithic and the Metal Ages, but the origins of the settlement of the area can be traced back to the Upper Paleolithic). A Villanovan village is attested in the Pontesanto locality, on the *Via Æmilia*, after the archaeological excavations that date back to the 1999-2000 biennium. Umbrian populations settled in Romagna and Umbria between the VI and V centuries BC, also in the territory of Imola. The area of Monte Castellaccio (d'Imola) is a testimony of these settlements (perhaps chronologically dating back, at least in part, to the most remote ages), while the seventy-seven graves of the Montericco necropolis represent the most extreme advancing point of Umbrian people towards the West (Montanari 2000, 35-52).

It can be traced back at least to the Etruscans, dating it between the fifth and fourth centuries BC, the use of a road that, for unavoidable or traditional functional reasons, connected Rimini (*Arimna*) with Bologna (*Velzna/Felzna*) at the foothills of the Apennine Mountains at the intersection of the rivers and paths of Apennine valleys with the waterways of the Po valley. However, one can not speak of origins, when it is increasingly accepted by the data cross of historical linguistics and palaeoanthropology that the piedmont, foothills, and other paths along waterways are a characteristic feature of the human movements in the Indo-European area, and furthermore archaeology confirms that

humans usually established settlements at the confluence of two or more of them (Facchini 1993; Layton and Ucko 2004). During the same V and IV centuries BC, among other things, Celtic populations (perhaps moving from Central Europe) settled along the whole Cispadane Italy, extending their presence to the borders of Picenian and Umbrian territories.

The consolidation of this path as a road acquires historical visibility only in the framework of the Roman interregional road infrastructure. In 220 BC the construction of the military road *Flaminia* from Rome to Fano was completed and allowed faster access to the Po Valley. Its continuation to *Placentia* (Piacenza), for reasons related to the Second Punic War, was suspended and resumed only after the 189 BC when *Bona* (Bologna) was founded after having won the last stands of the Gauls, the *Boii*, in 191 BC. The viability of the new road was provided in a very short time, just two years later, in 187 BC, when the consul Marcus Æmilius Lepidus received credit of it by its new given name of *Via Æmilia*, which the road still carries today (Marini Calvani 2000, *passim*).

The *Via Æmilia* was linked to the re-establishment or foundation of Roman settlements like *Caesena* (Cesena), *Forum Popilii* (Forlìmpopoli), *Forum Livii* (Forlì), *Faventia* (Faenza), *Forum Cornelii* (Imola), *Claterna* (†), *Bononia* (Bologna), *Mutina* (Modena), *Regium Lepidi* (Reggio Emilia), *Tannetum* (Taneto di Gattatico), *Fidentia* (Fidenza), *Placentia* (Piacenza), and the structure of the relevant municipal districts. ¹

Thus, in Roman times the town was denominated as *Forum Cornelii* or, less commonly, *Forum Corneliū*. In 403 ca., Prudentius linked the toponym to Lucius Cornelius Sulla («Sylla Forum statuit Cornelius; hoc Itali urbem/ voc{it}ant ab ipso conditoris nomine») ². But this is commonly believed as an incorrect attribution, because of the very ‘late’ age, around 82 BC, to which the foundation of the forum should be accordingly referred, even if the most ancient mention of *Forum Cornelii* dates back only to the *Epistulae ad familiares* (XII, V) by Marcus Tullius Cicero (I century BC) and the archaeological findings do not preserve evidence that can be dated earlier than the I century BC (Nanetti 2008, 90-97; Nanetti and Giberti 2014, Ch. 1 and Ch. 4, Doc. 1). Nevertheless, *Forum Cornelii* is commonly believed to have been founded by Publius Cornelius Scipio Nasica (who defeated the *Boii* in 191 BC), or, with relatively less confidence, by Gaius Cornelius Cethegus (consul in 197 BC, who fought against the *Boii*, the *Cenomani*, and the *Insubres*), or by Publius Cornelius Cethegus (consul in 181 BC, who managed the land division in the territory of Imola in 173 BC). The decline of the Roman town of *Forum Cornelii* seems to start in the III century, if after 255 AD historical sources don’t indicate anymore the name of the *Curator Viæ Æmiliæ* (Nanetti 2008, 92).

In any way, the Roman foundation of *Forum Cornelii* did not cause the disappearance of the pre-Roman settlement in the area of present-day *Castellaccio*, which was possibly called *Imola* since pre-Roman times. In fact, the existence of human settlements in the area where now stands the city of Imola is the result of one single factor: it is the place where the ancient foothills east-west road crosses the river Santerno that flows from south to north. To facilitate the passage of the river it was used seamless a natural ford, known as *Le Lastre* (The Slabs), which attracted two more streets coming one from the neighbouring valley of the river Senio and the other coming from the valley of the river Santerno. The role played by this natural ford in pre-Roman times was re-established during Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, when the stretch of the Roman road towards Faenza close to *Forum Cornelii* became mire, unenforceable, and was finally deleted by the river Santerno (Nanetti and Giberti 2014, *passim*). This meeting place was the aggregator of the human settlement;

as it is demonstrated also by the following etymological reconstruction of the origins of the place name Imola.

Etymological Reconstruction of the Place Name *Imola*

The current (highly questionable and, in a way, ‘volatile’) etymology (DTI, 328; Galassi 1999, *passim*) of the place name *Imola* (*Jômla* in the *Emiliano-Romagnolo* dialect) derives the denomination from an unspecified Germanic anthroponym *Immilo*, crossed (without a valid historical-linguistic explanation in support of this hypothesis) with the name of *Via Æmilia* (Violi 1982, 252-69; Gamillscheg 1934-36, II, *passim*).

The ancient form of the *Santerno* river name, *Vatreno*, Latin *Vatrenus* / *Vaternus*, is a pre-Latin (Italic or, more likely, Celtic) hydronym, derived from the root **uat-* (Pokorny 1959-69, 1113, 2), ‘to bend’, ‘curve’ + **(s)reu-* (from which, for example, the ancient Greek verb *ῥέω*), ‘to stream’, ‘to flow’ (Pokorny 1959-69, 1003), and, in fact, it bends in the vicinity of a sandstone massif of prehistoric origins – between 5 and 2 million years ago – just outside the town of Imola in the area called *Le Lastre* / The Slabs (Nanetti and Giberti 2014, Abstract in English). The hydronym’s etymological reconstruction sequence, therefore, could be the following, *Vatreno* < **Uat-reu(-o)* → **Uat-re(u)(-o)* → **Uat-re(u)-o* → **Uat-re(u)-n-o* (euphonic ‘n’) = **Uat-re-n-o* > **Uatreno* > *Vatreno*, Lat. *Vatrenus* / *Vaternus* (with change *-tre-* → *-ter-*), meaning ‘(flowing) bending river’. The later transformation *Vatrenus* → *Vaternus* → *Santernus* / *Saternus* (*Santerno*)³ could be explained on the basis of the assimilation of the river name to a Roman (but, in origin, Etruscan) gentilitial family name attested in that area, *Santernius* (CIL XI 6689), when speakers had already lost the original meaning of the same river name. Etymology, historical semantics, and hydro-geo-morphological analysis of the territory converge in the explanation of this hydronym and we can safely assume that – if we don’t follow the unscientific and undocumented widespread reconstruction – the place name *Imola* is also pre-Roman.

The local language immediately preceding Latin (and, therefore, pre-Latin) in the area was the Gaulish of the *Boii*, *Senones*, and *Lingones*. This was a language that, at its turn, was conceivably preceded by an Italic – specifically Umbrian – substratum. Anyway, the first official (written) attestation of the place name is *Castrum Imolas* (maybe a regular plural or, rather, an archaic / Celtic genitive also due to the form *Castrum Imolæ*), reported by Paul the Deacon (*Historia Langobardorum*, II, 18) at the end of the VIII century AD, but referring to the territory before the Lombard conquest (Thomsen 1947, 253-256; Nanetti and Giberti 2014, Ch. 4, Doc. 7). As demonstrated by Andrea Nanetti and Mario Giberti (2014, Ch. 3.2) the toponym *Imola* is linked to the settlement that was in the area of the present-day *Monte Castellaccio* (to be considered as the pre-Roman Imola), on the right bank of the *Santerno* (*Vatreno*) river near the above mentioned natural ford called *Le Lastre* / The Slabs, used by the path coming from the right side of the valley of the river *Santerno* (*Vatrenus*), as well as by the tracks coming from the valley of the river *Senio* and by the pre-Roman foothills path. This track remained in use until the end of the medieval period (even after the demolition of *Castrum Imolae* in 1222), and is still visible in the local historical maps of the modern times beginning with the map of Imola possibly drawn by Danesio Maineri in 1473 and used with some updates by Leonardo da Vinci in 1502 in proposals for strengthening the fortifications of Imola.

The subsequent spellings / writings *Immola*, *Imula*, *Emola* can be explained respectively as vulgarism 4, cultism, and dialect form (in the *Emiliano-Romagnolo* dialect the Latin long stressed /i:/ becomes /e:/). The Dissimilatory Lateralization of Nasal Sequences, a Romance phonetic law, provides a simple passage /n/ → /l/ between Latin and Italian, for example *uenēnum* > *veleno*, ‘poison’, *Bōnōnīa* > *Bologna*, *Hieronymus* > *Gerolamo* (*Geronimo*), ‘Jerome’. It is, however, subject to debate whether this is also true for /n/ when this comes after a /m/, because it is difficult to exactly understand if *Gemolo* (Saint’s name) may be derived from *Gēmīnus* (as stated in some Biographies, *Gēmūlus* is also attested as an alternative form, not in the meaning of ‘plaintive’, but as a variant of *Gēmīnus*, ‘twin’, ‘geminous’) or from *Hiemulus* or *Gemmulus* (forms attested for the same Saint’s name) or from other (Polloni 1966, 157).

It is necessary to consider that in Cisalpine Gaulish the initial word sequence /#je-/ becomes /i-/, assumed in (Vulgar) Latin as [i] (not a rounded high front vowel) and then equalized to the Latin phoneme /i:/ (long). If the just-mentioned Romance phonetic law is valid, the only possible source – in this position (beginning of a word not followed by palatal consonants) – of the Italian accented /i/ would correspond to /e/ in the *Emiliano-Romagnolo* dialect. Therefore, a Celtic etymon of <*Imola*> would be very likely **Jemonā*, ‘twin’ (> Cisalpine Gaulish **Imonā*), female of **jemono-s* > Irish *emon* (the female of which, *emuin*, has an antecedent with a different theme, that is always Indo-European, **jemonī*). Unless this is not the equally regular corresponding form of ablauting / apophonic reduced radical degree, **imono-s* (in this case **jemono-s* would be ‘equable’ of *emon*, rather than its ‘equate’, therefore partially corresponding – but still regular – rather than totally corresponding). The *sema* linked to the meaning of ‘twin’ may derive from the presence of more than one settlement (at least two), homologous and connected to each other in Prehistoric and Proto-historic ages in the territory of Imola, where archaeological excavations provided evidence of human settlements in the areas of Montericco, Pontesanto, and Monte Castellaccio (Montanari 2000, 35-52; Nanetti 2008, 87-89).

Jemonā* is a secondary derivative of the Indo-European stem **yemo-* (yem-* / **jem-*), ‘twin’. If the Dissimilatory Lateralization of Nasal Sequences law was not working in the context of the nasal /m/ - /n/ , the Indo-European **yemo-* would remain valid to explain the first part of the name, while the final part of the same name could be interpreted as the second element of the compound, always Celtic, **olā*, ‘curve’, ‘turn’, ‘twist’, ‘bend’, ‘fold’, ‘loop’, ‘spiral’ (> Irish *‘ol*), from Indo-European **h₃olah_a* ← √**h₃el-*, ‘to bend’, or **h₃olh_aah_a* ← √**h₃elh_a-*, ‘to push in one direction’, ‘to move’, ‘to go’. It is a possible reference – as it appears self-evident – to the river Santerno (*Vatreno*) flowing in the territory of Imola and ‘bending’ just in front of the Monte Castellaccio settlement, which was called *Imola* (Nanetti and Giberti 2014, Ch. 3.2).

It should be noted that this Indo-European compound **yemo-h₃olah_a*, or **yemo-h₃olh_aah_a*, ‘twin curve’ (both forms become in late Indo-European **yemolā*), would have produced even in the Italic **Jemolā* that the Cisalpine Gauls adopted, regularly transformed in **Imolā*, and that, at its turn, became, in Vulgar Latin, **Imola*.

The Etruscan Hypothesis (or the Adolfo Zavaroni Proposal) and its Evaluation (by Francesco Perono Cacciafoco)

The Etruscan hypothesis, proposed by Adolfo Zavaroni (2001, 281-306), does not directly imply a reconstruction of the place name *Imola*, but a sort of interpretation of the

yem-* / **jem-* root that would be juxtaposed or, rather, entirely replaced by the Etruscan ()am-* (< **H₂e-mbh-*, prefix + stem), changed in its semantics (not ‘to be’, but ‘twin’ and/or ‘curve’) and in its function and aligned to the meaning of **yem-* / **jem-*. The Indo-European root **yem-* / **jem-*, in fact, in this proposal, seems to be completely replaced, indeed, by **H₂e-mbh-* > **amb(h)-* > **am-* = Etruscan *am-*.

Zavaroni's reconstruction shows some epistemological problems and contraindications, because it is difficult to connect the Indo-European root **yem-* / **jem-* with the Etruscan *am-* and, even if it would be possible, the direction would start from Indo-European to Etruscan and not vice versa.

The linguistic Prehistory preceding Indo-European seems to demonstrate the impossibility of a passage ***/a/* > **/ye/* (Mailhammer 2011, 671-82; Vennemann 1989, *passim*). It may be useful to clearly repeat again that it could be difficult also to propose a derivation from the Indo-European **yem-* / **jem-* to the Etruscan *am-*, but, theoretically, if they were linked, the hypothetical sequence would start always from Indo-European to Etruscan (also for chronological reasons).

It is relevant, anyway, to analyze some aspects of Zavaroni's proposal, with all the hermeneutical precautions that have been just reported. According to Zavaroni, the Etruscan words *ame*, *amu(c)e* / *amuke* > *amce* would not be related to a ‘hypothetical’ Etruscan verb (**)am-* in the meaning of ‘to be’, as it is in accordance with the traditional reconstruction, but to a root expressing the *sema* of ‘to redouble’ and/or ‘pair’, ‘couple’. This, in principle, seems to link, in the reconstruction of the place name *Imola*, the Indo-European *milieu* with the Etruscan one, in a dialectics providing linguistic interexchange and contacts according to the interpretative key of reuse and refunctionalization of toponymic and hydronymic word-roots in an area (the present-day Emilia-Romagna) where Etruscan and Indo-European languages in a certain time period had to coexist, perhaps interpenetrating (at least within some limits) each other.

Alessandro Morandi has proposed an Indo-European stem for the words *ame* and *amce*, assuming that they are voices of the verb ‘to be’ (Morandi 1984, I, 10-11; 1991, 79). But it seems difficult to link the Etruscan *am-* with a root **es-*, because it appears as unknown, in Etruscan, a hypothetical passage *-s-m-* > *-m-* either with lengthening of the preceding vowel or with redoubled consonant. The *sm* group, not uncommon, seems stable, in a language in which even *zn*, *sn*, *zr* > *sr* appear, at their turn, stable. In addition, the preterit *am(u)ce* < **es-m-ce* would have a *-m-* that could derive only from a first person (*mi*) or from a hypothetical Osco-Umbrian infinite **es-um*. In any case, the ‘sequence’ *ame*, *amuce*, *ama* does not justify, in itself, the automatic assumption of the meaning ‘to be’ (all these notations have always followed the specific analyzed proposal).

According to Adolfo Zavaroni, it is possible to hypothesize that *amce* is associated in particular with the words *puia*, ‘wife’, and *zilaθ*, a position / rank – in the Etruscan society – that involves more people (Maggiani 1996 [1998], 95-138), because it means ‘co-, iunctus, -a’ (Zavaroni 2001, 288).

The term *am(u)ce* may indicate, following this reconstruction, ‘to be united’, ‘to make a pair with’, ‘co-’. And this may be the explanation of the really frequent above-mentioned connection of *amce* with the words *puia*, ‘wife’, and *zilaθ*, magistracy, as discussed above, constituted by two or more persons. In extant inscriptions the word *ame* appears twice connected to *puia*, yet in most cases *ame* is a particle placed after the verb, where it seems to fulfill the same function of the Latin pre-verb ‘cum’, ‘co-’.

In the *Tabula Cortonensis* the words *epirus ame* could mean ‘co-operantur’, ‘(they) sacrifice together’. Moreover, we have the testimonies of five occurrences of the particle *ama* connected with the word *ipa* (Zavaroni 2001, 296-301). According to Adolfo Zavaroni, *ipa [...]* *ama* can be interpreted as ‘*simul [...]* *cum*’ = ‘*pariter [...]* *cum*’.

Further Etruscan words beginning with (*)*am-* seem to belong to the same root of *ame*, *am(u)ce*. It is possible to mention, for example, *amθuras*, *amavunice*, *amnu*, *aminθ*. There is also a personage represented in several engravings on mirrors called *amuke*, a plausible echo of Greek *Ἀμυκος*. Nonetheless, *amuke* should have an Etruscan meaning.

The Indo-European root **yem-* / **jem-*, ‘to pair’, ‘to match’, ‘couple’, ‘to hold’, ‘to defeat’, ‘to geminate’, ‘twin’, has been used also in order to explain some Germanic words as Gothic *ibns*, ‘eben’, Anglo-Saxon *efn*, *emn*, and Latin *imitor*, *æmulus*, for example. In Zavaroni’s reconstruction it could be replaced with a hypothetical root **mbh-*, ‘united’, ‘pair’, ‘together’ > **H₂e-mbh-* (prefix + stem) > **amb(h)-* > **am-* > *am-*, that might also explain words as Latin *amb-*, Greek *ἄμφ-*, Gaulish *amb-*. Moreover, this theme could be connected to Etruscan *ame*, *amce*, Latin *amussis*, *amuletum*, *Amulius* etc., together with words like Etruscan *ipa* and *inpa*, Umbrian *ife*, *ifont*, Faliscan *efiles* and Latin *ip(se)*.

The comparison between the terms with stem *amu-* and those with stem *ama-* does not show significant differences. It could be plausible to hypothesize that *amu-* expresses more frequently ‘to be equal’, ‘to be similar’, and *ama-* ‘to join’, ‘to pair’, ‘to be companion / mate’, but other evidences of proof would be necessary. It is, in fact, even impossible to determine if *amce*, ‘joint’, ‘conjunct’, ‘united’, derives from *amake* or *amuce*.

Pokorny (1959-69, 505) reconstructed the Latin *gēminus* (that “hat wohl das g- von der Wurzel gem ‘greifen’, ‘zusammenpressen’ bezogen”) from the Indo-European root **yem-* / **jem-* (/ **iem-*). Zavaroni (2001, 296-97) proposes a derivation from **g₂ / (m)-* + **H₂mino-* > **g₂mmino-* > *gemino-*. **H₂mino-* would be composed by a stem **H₂m-* resulting from a **mbh-* pre-nasalized consonant (using the symbology of André Martinet). Latin *ambo*, Greek *ἄμφω*, Gothic *bai*, Lithuanian *abù*, Italian *ambo*, German *beide* are linked with some particles (that have the value of prepositions), Latin *amb-*, Greek *ἄμφί*, Gothic *bi*, Gaulish *ambi-*, Old Irish *imb-*, *imm-*, Breton *am-*. It is necessary to note, however, that the root **ambhi* / **mbhi* (Pokorny 1959-69, 34-35) seems to have the original meaning of Latin *par*, ‘companion’, ‘consort’, ‘coupled’, ‘equal’, ‘at both sides’, ‘around’.

Gothic *ibns*, ‘eben’, Norse *jafn*, *jamn*, Anglo-Saxon *efn*, *emn*, Old High German *eban* are connected by Pokorny (1959-69, 505) to the Indo-European root **yem-* / **jem-*, following the passage *ibna* * < **imná-* < **jemnó-*, while Norse *Ymir*, commonly understood as ‘Zwitter’, could come from Germanic **jumijáz* < IE **iem(i)jós*. According to Zavaroni, the stem **mbh-*, ‘equal’, ‘joint’, could be attributable both to Germanic **ibna*, **imna* (Gothic *ibns*, ‘eben’) and to Germanic **ba-* (Gothic *bai* and *bi*). The pre-nasalized initial **mbh-* may assume a form **H₂embh-* > **amb(h)-* that could explain the Latin *amb-*, Greek *ἄμφ-* and Gaulish *amb-*. **mbh-* could also be considered as the root of other words. The Germanic **ina-* has been connected to the Latin *imitor*, *imago*, *æmulor*, whose original meaning is ‘make equal’, ‘make similar’. For this reconstruction to be valid, in Latin it would be necessary to assume a reduction **mbh-* > **imbh-* > **im-* (it could be difficult to explain the diphthong in *æmulus*, perhaps due to the influence of *æquus*).

According to Zavaroni, if the fall of *b_h-* to *m-* occurs in **imbh-*, then a homologous ‘fade’ of *b_h-* even in the parallel form **H₂embh-* > **ambh-* > **am-* > *am-* could be plausible. Through this hypothesis it should be possible to explain the etymology of some Latin words

as well as the Etruscan *ame*, *am(u)ce*. In *amussis*, ‘level (useful for the *Ein-ebnung*)’, *am-* would correspond to the Germanic **ib-n-*, ‘to equalize’ > ‘to level’. It would be possible to postulate Etruscan origins (< **amust-is*) inherently in *amussis*. And it could be plausible to reconstruct from the stem (**)am-* also *amita*, ‘father’s sister’, and with this figure, in the Roman family, the brother’s wife and her children probably had a special relationship (Italian *comare*, ‘godmother’ < ‘*cum matre*’, ‘godmother’, for example, in christenings). Also the name of the mythical *Amulius* could be analyzed according to this interpretation. He is either the ‘uncle’ < Latin *par*, *coniunctus*, ‘*cum patre*’, Italian *compare*, of Romulus and Remo and/or the ‘pretending’ usurper. Therefore, *amul-ētum* would define the object that ‘simulates’ a person, from which one must not be separated, as if it was a sort of ‘double’ and secret ‘protector’. At the same time *amāenus* could derive from **ame-venos*, ‘*complacens*’, or, alternatively, from the Etruscan *amavun-*, ‘to compensate’ (Zavaroni 2001, 293-95). The Latin *amīcus* would be a synonym of the Latin *par*, ‘companion’, ‘partner’, ‘joint’, ‘equal’, and the original meaning of *amāre* would have had to be ‘be companions’, before shifting to indicate ‘to wish the company of (someone)’, then ‘to love someone’. The original *sema* of *dēmum*, *dēmus* < *dē* + *amu-* (or < *dē* + *emu-*), ‘precisely’, ‘exactly’, could be ‘away from the group’. At its turn, the ancestral meaning of *iam* < **e(i)-am* would be ‘together with that’ > ‘at that time’. The stem **yem-* / **jem-* has been connected with *redimiō* (< **red* + *amiō*), ‘sheaf’, ‘interlacement’, already by Pokorny (1959-69, 505). Through another vocalism, according to Zavaroni, it could be possible also to reconstruct *omnes*, ‘everyone’ < ‘those who are together’, ‘those who are united’. The same notion is showed by the Armenian *amēn*, *amēn-ein* that is connected to **sem-* / **semo-* “in eins zusammen, samt, mit” (Pokorny 1959-69, 903).

We have just described, so far, the substance of Adolfo Zavaroni’s proposal. In order to try to analyze this position, without taking into account the ‘extreme’ interpretations of the same (the ‘not-existence’ of **yem-* / **jem-*), thoroughly considering the two roots, Indo-European **yem-* / **jem-* and Etruscan *am-*, and interpreting the second through the meaning proposed by Zavaroni, we can attempt to link the two stems in a ‘convergent’ way, without one excluding the other. Inherently in the root **yem-* / **jem-* it could be possible to talk, in fact, about an Indo-European hereditary linguistic ‘coinage’ shared by Italic and Celtic. Even if the Etruscan *am-* was connected to **yem-* / **jem-*, the naming process of the place name *Imola* would concern only **yem-* / **jem-* and the derivation would be only from Italic and/or Celtic, without (for chronological reasons) the intervention of Etruscan. Etruscan, in fact, would not be involved in any case in the naming process, because it would be too ‘recent’ for this kind of ‘coinage’ and ‘obsolete’, at this point, for a transmission to Latin. The right sequence of the onomastic composition of *Imola* should be 1) Indo-European ‘coinage’ → 2) Italic evolution → 3) passage through the Celtic, starting from Italic (if the ‘coinage’ is not only and directly Celtic) → 4) passage in Latin, from Celtic.

At the basis of – and before – Italic and Celtic we have to consider their common ancestor, the Italo-Celtic (Late Western Indo-European), which was a regional Western Late Indo-European assuming the form of a singular collective linguistic ‘collector’. Before the Etruscan, on the other hand, in the area, the substratum was constituted by Italic and Celtic, from the already differentiated Italo-Celtic.

In any case, the Celtic ‘mark’ for *Imola*’s etymology, the Indo-European root **yem-* / **jem-* (**iem-*), may have been associated, in the ‘sensitivity’ and perception of speakers of that time, to the Etruscan *am-*, if we accept the semantics of *am-* proposed by Zavaroni. The

naming process would have been Indo-European – Italic and Celtic or only and directly Celtic –, but, through the semantic relevancy and similarity, the place name could have been ‘clear’ and ‘understandable’ also according to Etruscan.

Conclusions

The reconstruction of the etymology of the place name *Imola* offers an interesting opportunity to test the most relevant aspect of the Convergence Theory about the possibility, in border areas, of linguistic contacts and interexchange between Indo-European and other languages, according to the point of view of the mutual reuse and refunctionalization, in the different systems of the various linguistic families (or languages), of word-roots and/or (loan)words (Perono Cacciafoco 2013a, 7-25; 2013b, 91-107).

The territory of Imola, in Emilia-Romagna, was occupied by the Celts and the Indo-European ‘mark’, in local Toponymy, seems really strong. It is possible, however, to hypothesize, also in the naming process of the places of that area, an Etruscan influence (and/or sharing, and/or participation), due to the proximity of Etruscan towns and centers and to the mutual cultural, social, political, and economic relationships between Celts and Etruscan in that territory.

It seems plausible, therefore, if not to assume a sort of ‘double naming process’ of Imola (Indo-European and Etruscan) or the possibility of the presence of two names (Celtic and Etruscan) for the town, to postulate, at least, a natural common participation in the final fixing of the place name (and in the perception of its meaning starting from different roots – pertaining to different languages – similar and aligned in their semantics). This Indo-European reconstruction of *Imola* takes into account also the analysis of the hydro-geomorphology and historical topography of the territory (Nanetti and Giberti 2014) with the semantic developments linked to the root(s) involved in the naming of the place.

In Zavaroni’s proposal the discretion (or arbitrariness) moments in the *iudicium* are two, the lexical interpretation of the texts and the recognition of inter-linguistic segments (synonymous words in different languages) on which to reconstruct (and to build) the historical phonetics.

The difficulties connected to the ‘Etruscan hypothesis’ (certainly open to new developments) about *(*)am-* = ‘to pair’, that could imply relationships between Indo-European and Etruscan in a possible ‘common’ origin (naming process) of the place name *Imola* (**yem-* / **jem-* & **am-* [**me-*]), reside also in two facts: 1) the pre-nasalization, in Indo-European, is a highly hypothetical phenomenon, quite uncertain, so it is very difficult to base the ‘rewriting’ and the reinterpretation of a root on this linguistic postulate; 2) the interpretation of Etruscan texts and documentation is strongly debatable and absolutely not confirmed (Etruscan is still an undeciphered language, although some scholars could disagree) and this is, with the current available philological bibliography, really an unbridgeable gap.

If Zavaroni’s semantic interpretation of the Etruscan *(*)am-* was confirmed, without the elimination of the root **yem-* / **jem-*, it would be possible, in any case, to compare this stem with the same root **yem-* / **jem-* and this fact, as discussed earlier, would be an enormous breakthrough in the study of the naming process of *Imola* by considering it as the product of a natural common ‘participation’ or ‘perception’ (by Celts and Etruscans) in the final fixing of the place name.

If we would accept Zavaroni's *sema* 'cum', 'with', for *am-*, moreover, the same Etruscan *am-* might be connected to the Indo-European root **am-* (**me-*), in the meaning of 'grab', 'seize' < $\sqrt{*h_3amh_3-}$, 'to proceed with vigor', 'to front', 'to catch', 'to grab', 'to seize', 'to firmly insist on something', 'to establish', 'to confirm by oath', 'to suffer', from which the Latin *amō* (Pokorny 1959-69, 35).

The possibility of mutual linguistic contacts and interexchange in that specific area of the Emilia-Romagna region is, in any case, really high, and the probability of a double influence (and/or sharing, and/or participation) in the naming process of places appears plausible. The linguistic link between Celts and Etruscans in that territory seems to be reasonable also according to the evidence of cultural, social, political, and economic contacts between the two populations.

In conclusion, the analysis presented in this article points to a natural reuse and refunctionalization (by speakers in the area) of roots and/or (loan)words between the different linguistic systems involved in this process. This 'convergent' dialectics demonstrate how to elaborate and provide a pattern finalized to return the right etymology of Prehistoric and Proto-historic place names.

Notes

1 See Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis Historia*, III, 115 ff.

2 *Peristefanon* IX. *Passio Cassiani Forocorneliensis*, vv. 1-2.

3 *Vatrenus* in Martial, *Epigrammata*, III, 67, 2; *Vatrenus* / *Saturnus* in Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis Historia*, III, 120; *Santernus* in Frontin, *Stratagemata*, 3, 14, 3.

4 Cf., e. g., *camera non cammara* in the *Appendix Probi*, l. 84 (Baehrens 1922, 5-8, *passim*; Rohlf's 1969³, 16).

5 According to André Martinet "Le même élément **mbhi* apparaît dans le grec *a-mphi* avec un préfixe *H₃e-* et, avec un degré zéro du préfixe, dans le vieil-anglais *ymb* (**H₃/bhi*). Dans le latin *ambo*, le *-i* a été remplacé par la finale *-o* du duel. Les équivalents germaniques d'*ambo*, supposent un degré vocalique plein **mbhey* de la particule, qui est suivie, en germanique occidentale, d'un élément démonstratif, d'où angl. *both*, all. *beide*" (Martinet 1987, 176).

References

- Agostiniani, Luciano, and Francesco Nicosia. 2000. *Tabula Cortonensis*. Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider.
- Baehrens, Willem Adolf. 1922. *Sprachlicher Kommentar zur Vulgärlateinischen Appendix Probi*. Halle (Saale): M. Niemeyer.
- Baldi, Philip. 2002. *The Foundations of Latin*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Beekes, Robert S. P. 2002. "The Origin of the Etruscans". *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 59: 206-42.
- Bonfante, Larissa. 1990. *Etruscan*. Berkeley / Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Buck, Carl Darling. 2005 (1904). *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian. With a Collection of Inscriptions and Glossary*. Bristol (PA): Evolution Publishing.

- CIL. Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum (<http://cil.bbaw.de/>). 1847- . Berlin: Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- DTI. *Dizionario di Toponomastica: Storia e significato dei nomi geografici italiani* (edited by Marcato, Carla, and Giuliano Gasca Queirazza, Giovan Battista Pellegrini, Giulia Petracco Sicardi, Alda Rossebastiano, with the collaboration of Papa, Elena). 1990. Torino: U.T.E.T.
- Facchetti, Giulio Mauro. 2005. "The Interpretation of Etruscan Texts and its Limits". *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 33 3-4: 359-88.
- Facchini, Fiorenzo (Ed.). 1993. *Paleoantropologia e Preistoria. Origini, Paleolitico, Mesolitico*. Milano: Jaca Book
- Galassi, Nazario. 1999. *Origine del nome Imola: Formazione di una città atipica*. Bologna: Bologna University Press.
- Gamillscheg, Ernst. 1934-36. 3 vols. *Romania Germanica. Sprach- und Siedlungsgeschichte der Germanen auf dem Boden des Alten Römerreiches*. Berlin / Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter & Company.
- Layton, Robert and Peter Ucko (Eds.). 2004. *The Archaeology and Anthropology of Landscape: Shaping Your Landscape*. London: Routledge.
- Maggiani, Adriano. 1996 (1998). "Appunti sulle magistrature etrusche". *Studi Etruschi* LXII: 95-138.
- Mailhammer, Robert. 2011. *The Prehistory of European Languages*, in Kortmann, Bernd, and Johan van der Auwera (Eds.). *The Languages and Linguistics of Europe: A Comprehensive Guide*, I. Berlin / Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Marini Calvani, Mirella (Ed.). 2000. *Aemilia: la cultura romana in Emilia Romagna dal III secolo a. C. all'età costantiniana*, catalogo della Mostra tenuta a Bologna nel 2000. Venezia: Marsilio [2000].
- Martinet, André. 1987. *Des prénasalisées en indoeuropéen?*, in Aristoteleio Panepistēmio Thessalonikēs - Tomeas Glōssologias - Synantēsē. *Studies in Greek Linguistics. A Festschrift for John Chadwick*. Thessaloniki: Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki.
- Merlini, Franco. 1999. *Archeologia a Imola: Breve storia della ricerca nella città e nel territorio*. Milano: Federico Motta Editore.
- Montanari, Massimo (Ed.). 2000. *La storia di Imola: Dai primi insediamenti all'Ancien Régime*. Imola: La Mandragora.

- Morandi, Alessandro. 1984. 3 vols. *Le ascendenze indoeuropee nella lingua etrusca*. Roma: Gruppo Archeologico Romano.
- _____. 1991. *Nuovi lineamenti di lingua etrusca*. Roma: Massari.
- Nanetti, Andrea. 2008. *Imola antica e medievale nella cronachistica cittadina di età moderna: Indagine esemplare per una ingegnerizzazione della memoria storica*. Imola: Editrice La Mandragora.
- _____ and Mario Giberti. 2014. *Viabilità e insediamenti nell'assetto territoriale di Imola nel Medioevo. Sperimentazione esemplare di mappatura e visualizzazione del dato storico*. Imola: Editrice La Mandragora.
- Perono Cacciafoco, Francesco. 2013a. "Ancient Names Origins: Water Roots and Place-Names in the Prehistoric Ligurian Context". *Review of Historical Geography and Toponomastics* VIII 15-16: 7-25.
- _____. 2013b. "Water Place Names in the Pre-Latin Ligurian Context: A Study in Prehistoric Toponomastics and Semantics". *Voprosy Onomastiki / Problems of Onomastics* 2 15: 91-107.
- Pokorny, Julius. 1959-69. *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern / München: Francke.
- Polloni, Antonio. 1966. *Toponomastica romagnola* (introduction by Tagliavini, Carlo). Firenze: Leo S. Olschki.
- Rix, Helmut. 1998. *Rätisch und Etruskisch*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Rodríguez Adrados, Francisco. 1989. "Etruscan as an IE Anatolian (but not Hittite) Language". *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 17 3-4: 363-83.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1969³. *Sermo Vulgaris Latinus (Vulgärlateinisches Lesebuch)*. Tübingen: M. Niemeyer.
- Steinbauer, Dieter H. 1999. *Neues Handbuch des Etruskischen*. St. Katharinen: Scripta Mercaturæ Verlag.
- Thomsen, Rudi. 1947. *The Italic Regions from Augustus to the Lombard Invasion*. København: Glydendalske Boghandel.
- Vennemann, Theo. 1989. *The New Sound of Indo-European: Essays in Phonological Reconstruction*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Violi, Franco. 1982. *I nomi locali d'Emilia Romagna*, in Alfieri, Nereo, and Maria Bollini, Francesco Coco, Vito Fumagalli, Lucio Gambi, Roberto Greci, Guido Achille Mansuelli, Alba Maria Orselli, Antonio Ivan Pini, Giancarlo Susini, Augusto Vasina, Franco Violi. *Cultura popolare nell'Emilia Romagna: Le origini e i linguaggi*. Milano: Silvana Editoriale d'Arte / Amilcare Pizzi.

Zavaroni, Adolfo. 1996. *I documenti etruschi*. Padova: Sherpa.

_____. 2001. "Le parole etrusche *ame*, *amce* e la revisione di IE **yem*-, 'paaren'". *Emerita. Revista de Lingüística y Filología Clásica (EM)* LXIX 2: 281-306.