

***Crumēna*, a Latin lexical isolate, and its survival in Hispano-Romance (Sp. *colmena*, dial. *cormena* 'beehive')**

YAKOV MALKIEL, Berkeley

0.0. The present paper embodies an experiment undertaken by a Paleo-Romanist who has also concerned himself with Latin. The object of my curiosity has been, at one end of a presumed evolutionary line, an etymologically elusive Latin word, transmitted in two variants; and, at the opposite end, a Luso-Hispanic word possibly even more elusive, so far as any cogent account of its ancestry goes. I assume that the Latin word actually underlies, in an almost straight line, the Romance word, which has a number of variants of its own, among which one, inconspicuously hidden away in conservative dialect speech, lends itself better to the postulated linkage to the Latin prototype than do the vastly more familiar standard forms; these, as a matter of fact, have actually misled numerous scholars.

0.1. The Latin word at issue is known either as *crumīna* or as *crumēna*, with the former variant, for a long period of time, considered philologically (i e., in terms of manuscript tradition) superior to the latter. This widely, but no longer universally, accepted hierarchy, with which my own evidence will prompt me to disagree, was established long ago by Felix Solmsen and was later subscribed to by both A. Ernout and A. Meillet in their joint *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, including the revised 4th edn. (1959–60), for which Ernout alone was responsible,¹) and by J. B. Hofmann in his single-handed revision of A. Walde's *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*—two authoritative sources, as is well known, not invariably in agreement with each other, not even on certain other relevant details of the problem under scrutiny. As regards meaning, the French team saw in *crumīna*, essentially, a purse ("bourse, ou plutôt 'sacoché,' portée en bandoulière"), whereas its German counterpart stressed (a) the small size of the object

¹) J. André's Addenda and Corrigenda to the 1967 and 1979 printings of the *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, of which the revised 4th edn. appeared originally, I repeat, in 1959–60, contain no elaborations on the entry *crumīna*, nor for that matter on *grūmus* (see below). *Crumēna* appeared, at least once, as a learned Renaissance word in Spanish; see F. Rodríguez Marín, *Dos mil quinientas voces castizas . . .* (Madrid, 1922), p. 99.

and (b) the occasional figurative meaning, favored, e. g., by Horace and Juvenal: 'Geldbeutelchen, Börse' . . . 'Geld.'²) In any event, there is available to us the definition supplied by Paulus Diaconus ex Festo: 'sacculi genus,' which may take us to 2d-century Narbona—not too far from the province of Hispania. The temporal range of active use was considerable, stretching from Plautus (who also adopted the diminutive *crumilla*) to Venantius Fortunatus, at the threshold of the Middle Ages; the latter actually used the verb (*cruminō*, *-āre* 'to fill') derived from the noun. As regards the social level and the stylistic overtone, opinions vary: The noun was "populaire" for Ernout and Meillet, while Hofmann labeled the verb, of strikingly late coinage, downright artificial or contrived ("künstlich").

0.2. On the etymology of *crumina/crumēna* opinions are divided. While working on his own, in 1930, Ernout leaned toward viewing *crumina* as a work of Etruscan parentage (see the incidental statement in *BSLP*, XXX, 100); but, in collaborating with Meillet, he toned down this assertion a few years later ("peut-être étrusque") and mentioned non-committally Gr. *γρῦμέα*—probably as a cognate rather than a source of borrowing. Hofmann, conversely, toed the line of Walde's original formulation in the rev. 2d edn. (1910) of the latter's *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, making *crumina* formally a borrowed reflex of *γρῦμε(ί)α* 'Tasche, Trödelware, Fischüberbleibsel,' a word also somehow akin, within Latin, to *grūmus*, *-ī* 'heap of earth, hillock'; for Ernout and Meillet, on the other hand, *grūmus* remained an intriguing "mot sans étymologie sûre." Hofmann rather peremptorily rejected several earlier etymological rapprochements and derivations proposed by such 19th-century pioneers as August Fick, Philipp Bersu, and Alois Vaniček, without going into details, while Ernout, starting with the rev. 3rd edn. of his, and Meillet's, dictionary, confined himself to a succinct reference to M. Pfister and in the end encompassed in his purview J. André's study of the phytonym *cromella*.³)

²) It may not be devoid of interest that the fascicle of Walde-Hofmann's *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, I (Heidelberg, 1938), in which the brief article on *crumina* figures, is the 4th (see p. 294), dated 1931, so that Ernout and/or Meillet are likely to have read it before the original edn. (1932) of their own *DÉLL* went to press. *Grūmus* is discussed in fasc. 8, of 1935, at p. 623; its analysis contains a parenthetical reference to *crumina*.

³) *Lexique des termes de botanique en latin* (Paris, 1956), p. 106, with noteworthy references to the *Corpus glossariorum Latinorum* and to Stein-

Pfister's study, published on the eve of World War II, is important, inasmuch as he combined the two preëxistent separate threads of thought. He echoed Walde's belief in the eventual Greek parentage of the Latin word, with special reference to *γομυ-έα, -εία, -αία*, but to some extent also underwrote Ernout's thinking as of 1930, endorsing the idea of, at least, mediation by the Etruscans. Pfister recognized the entire semantic field as permeated by Greek influence, citing *marsupium, pasceolus, pera, zona*, and possibly also *saccus* as having been so transmitted; and he adduced the case histories of *groma* 'surveyor's measuring-rod' and *sporta* 'basket' as illustrations of Etruscan filtering of Hellenisms. Specifically Etruscan, according to him, was the suffix *-na*, used copiously in toponymy and anthroponymy, but occasionally in designations of objects as well, witness *mal-e-na* 'mirror'; barring this mediation, one would have expected a development along a slightly different line, cf. *πλατεία* > (Plautus) *platĕa*, *χορεία* > (Catullus, Lucretius) *chorĕa*. Important for my own approach was Pfister's self-assurance in overruling Solmsen's old verdict to the effect that *crumĭna* should necessarily rank as a better graphy than its counterpart in *-ĕna*.

0.3. *Crumĭna/crumĕna*, to the best of my knowledge, does not figure in the annals of Romance etymological research; it certainly has not found its way into the major reference works so slanted. The same holds for its diminutive in *-illa* and for the first-conjugation verb (of dubious popularity). Consequently, if it could be demonstrated or, at least, made plausible that it has, indeed, left traces in some Romance vernaculars, this would represent a major gain. One aim of the present study is to accomplish just that, namely to show that a Luso- and Hispano-Romance term of apiculture, to wit Ptg. *colmeia* and Sp. *colmena* 'beehive,' represent two parallel outgrowths of *crumĕna*. One implication of this discovery, of some relevancy to classicists, is the incidental but powerful argument it provides against Solmsen's aforementioned hypothesis that the *-ĭna* variant culled from superior manuscript readings necessarily represented the more authentic tradition.

The "Western" and the "Central" forms are perfectly reconcilable and can easily be traced back to a single Luso-Hispanic prototype, which would coincide with the Spanish form. This gambit would leave a considerable distance, on the sides of sound structure

meyer-Sievers's *Die althochdeutschen Glossen*. One recognizes no link to *crumĕna*.

and meaning, between the Latin prototype and its Peninsular outgrowths. An effort will be here made to reduce this gap by a brief survey (a) of the most characteristic suffixal derivatives from *colmena/colmeia*; and (b) of some of its modern dialectal by-forms, ascertained through field-work and other styles of research. To anticipate our chances of success, any form(s) encountered in conservative areas of rural speech that bring the present-day designation of 'beehive' closer to the ideal outcome of *crūmēna*, namely **cromena*, on the assumption that Lat. *ŭ* > Hisp. *o* is a regular sound correspondence,⁴⁾ will be a step in the right direction. We shall next (c) briefly examine the semantic side, to learn whether the assumed leap from 'purse' to 'beehive' is or is not a defensible hypothesis. There exists an overabundant literature on the origin of *colmena*; it is not incorrect to sum it up by remarking that scholars, after over two centuries of continued speculation, have reached a sort of impasse, a situation conducive to a lacuna which it is, precisely, our intention to fill. Only the highlights of this long-drawn-out debate can be identified here (d). Once the balance-sheet on the Romance aspect of the problem has been drawn, the separate issue of the provenience of *crum-ēna*, *-īna*, which has for awhile been left in abeyance, will be tentatively reexamined afresh, in the perspective of Indo-European, specifically Greek, studies.⁵⁾

1.0. Latin appears to have lacked a separate word for 'beehive,' comparable in the neatness of its semantic contour to Fr. *huche*.⁶⁾

⁴⁾ In an archaic stratum Lat. *ŭ* may residually appear as a *u* in Hispano-Romance, in Rumanian fashion, cf. OPtg. *usso* 'bear', mod. *curto* 'short', Sp. *azufre* 'brimstone'; this marginal possibility will here henceforth be disregarded.

⁵⁾ See fn. 45. I am grateful to my junior colleague Dr. Donca Steriade, an accomplished Indo-Europeanist and student of general phonology, for having carefully read and discussed with me an earlier version of this manuscript.

⁶⁾ Many languages have recourse to compounds for this purpose; cf. G. *Bienenkorb*, *Bienenstand*. The advantage for most Anglophones in preferring *beehive(s)* to *hive(s)*, a word of Germanic ancestry, is the possibility thus acquired to avoid confusion with *hives*, the vernacular tag for an eruptive skin disease, known also under its scientific label, *urticaria*, and unrelated to bee stings. *Hive* 'receptacle for a swarm of bees' is traceable through oblique-case forms of OE *hīf* to Gmc. **χūf-*, which also underlies ON *húfr* 'ship's hull'; thus, the imagery is, essentially, the same as in L. *alv(e)us*. On further links to L. *cūpa*, etc. see C.T. Onions et al., *The Oxford Dictionary of Latin Etymology* (Oxford, 1966), p. 442b. The specificity of Fr. *huche* (a word of Germanic descent; related to *Hütte*, *hüten*, and alter-

The basic word available to speakers, and consecrated by writers of several periods, was *alvus*, *-ī*, which, however, fundamentally meant either 'belly, paunch, bowels' (secondarily also 'diarrhea') or 'womb.' To achieve greater specificity speakers would turn to a suffixal derivative used mostly in the plural: *alvāria*, *-ium* 'beehive,' making sporadic attempts to singularize it, thus: *alvārium*, *-ī*. *Alvus* (m., f.), which had cognates in Greek and in Lithuanian, did not survive into Romance directly, even though its offshoot *alvina* lingers on as the Rumanian word for 'honeybee' (*albină*)—a semantic development, presumably via *'swarm of bees,' long familiar to such Balkanologists as G. Meyer and S. Pușcariu.⁷) Yet this is not all: Latin also had a (possibly related) word *alveus* 'hollow, cavity, deep vessel, basket, trough, tray, hull of a ship,'⁸) which at a fairly early stage became subject to confusion with *alvus*, qualifying occasionally for the designation of a 'beehive.' In contrast to *alvus*, *alveus* did survive into Romance, though usually not in the meaning here under investigation (cf. Fr. *auge*). As with its near-homonym, there crystallized before long a suffixal elaboration: at first *alveāria*, *-ium*, later—through singularization—*alveārium*, *-ī* in the literary language. In folk speech a parallel reduction of the erstwhile plurale tantum to a singular took place, through rise of the type *alveare* (i. e., *-āris*, *-āre*), which Meyer-Lübke, epitomizing G. Bottigliioni's important onomasiological monograph *L'ape e l'alveare nelle lingue romanze* (Pisa, 1919), described thus in his dictionary entry: "It. *alveare* ist über ganz Nord- und Mittelitalien verbreitet und auch im Süden nicht unbekannt" (*REW*₃ § 390a).⁹)

nating with *hugue* in Western Old French; Latinized as *hutica*) is matched by that of R. улей, -ья. The plurale tantum construction, which briefly emerged in Latin (*alv-*, *alve-āria*) and no doubt elsewhere, was due to the prevailing pattern of supervision of several beehives by a single bee-keeper.

⁷) See § 59 in S. Pușcariu, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der rumänischen Sprache*, I: *Lateinisches Element, mit Berücksichtigung aller romanischen Sprachen* (Heidelberg, 1905), with collateral reference to Albanian. Significantly, Rum. *albie* 'trough, river bed' perpetuates *albeus*, *-a*, *-um* (*ibid.*, § 58).

⁸) The Ernout and Meillet dictionary, whose outline we are following here by and large (p. 25ab), distinguishes between 'ventre ou plutôt cavité intestinale (de l'homme ou des animaux) . . .' for *alvus*, and 'vase de bois, cuve, auge', 'cale d'un vaisseau, lit d'un fleuve, table à jeu', for *alveus*.

⁹) Through an almost unbelievable coincidence, Bottigliioni's slender book appeared only one year after J. Gilliéron's sensationally successful venture in imaginative dialect geography, namely *Généalogie des mots qui désignent l'abeille, d'après l'Atlas linguistique de la France*, which, owing to

1.1. This relatively transparent situation has not repeated itself at the Romance stage. In the onomasiological supplement to the original edition (1911–20) of his *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* W. Meyer-Lübke listed (p. 1075c), under *Bienen-korb, -stand*, references to 27 lemmata, as against only 15 in the consolidated entry for *Biene* and *Bienenschwarm*. In the revised edition (1930–35) of the same reference work the respective figures rose to 36 versus 17; and how far they would have to be further raised in any present-day substitute for that once valuable guide, provided one were available, is anyone's guess. The preliminary conclusions to be drawn from these raw facts are, first, that apiculture is highly characteristic of the Old World territories of Romance culture; and, second, that an enormous diversification occurred after the collapse of all unifying threads holding together the ailing Roman Empire.

Assuming one is prepared to credit a very mature Meyer-Lübke with over-all felicity in his etymological decisions, one recognizes at a glance that, of the 36 identified or reconstructed bases which he appealed to, one was onomatopoeic (*bis*, § 1118); at least two or three were Germanic (*būk*, Frankish; and *pikar*, Bavarian; Frk. *tīla* is doubtful); at least four, Gaulish, i.e., Celtic (**benna*, **besēna*, **buña*, **rūsca*); while three were left unidentified as to their origin (**bōlium*, **bōrna*, **buttia*).¹⁰ The remainder, after subtraction of misprints, is Latin, including one item immediately recognizable as Graeco-Latin, namely *thalāmus*, preserved in several areas, either as 'nuptial bed' or in some readily understandable derivative meaning. Rather characteristically, one hopes, it is used for 'beehive' in, of all conceivable areas, Northern Spain (Asturias: *tálmara*, with an elaboration by means of the "excrecence" or "nominal augment" '-ara').¹¹ Another base that must be set off at once is, of course, the dimin. *alveolus*, under which the author also subsumed the continuators of *alveār-ium*, *-e. The remaining Latin source words, gathered

its sparkle, eclipsed it. Judging from the 1941 version of R.A. Hall's *Bibliography of Italian linguistics*, there appeared only two fairly short critical reactions, both favorable, to the slim monograph, one by G. Bertoni (1920), the other, more substantial, by G. Rohlfs (1922). The critical passage summarized by Meyer-Lübke (see above) occupies p. 58.

¹⁰ I have emended *pihar* to *pikar*, after collating it with the actual entry, but do not find in the body of the dictionary any trace of *aplictum* and *quive*, hence assume that they involve misprints.

¹¹ For full details see my paper, "The Rise of Nominal Augments in Romance; Graeco-Latin and Tuscan Clues to the Prehistory of Hispano-Romance", *Romance Philology*, XXVI: 2 (1972), 306–34.

in alphabetic sequence, include: *apiarium*, *apicula*, *apis*, *arcella*, *bruscum*, *capanna*, *captorium*, *casa*, *castrum*, *corbis*, *cortice*, *cūpa*, *cūpella*, *exāmen*, *modius*, *quasillum*, *scortea*, *tubula*, *urna*, *vās*, *vāscellum*.¹²⁾ This enormous diversification reflects, as was to be expected with the names of a container, a good deal of variation in the size and shape of the objects at issue and in the material of which they are being manufactured.

This survey may serve to remind us that the introduction of *crumēna* as a candidate for the prototype of Sp. *colmena*, etc. entails no revolutionary deviation from earlier practice and experience, but simply represents an expansion of the inventory already available, in gross outline, half a century ago.

1. 2. If we now turn our attention from Antiquity to the medieval situation (and beyond) in the Iberian peninsula, we must state, from the outset, that *colmena*, in Spanish territory, has at all times been the standard expression, in written sources, for 'beehive' and has been surrounded by a small corona of transparent suffixal derivatives. By way of transition, the three Latin-Spanish glossaries traceable to the late 14th century, but reflecting the Latinity of dying Antiquity, render *alvear*, *alveus*, and *apiarium* either by *colmena* or by its elaboration *colmenar*, whereas *alvearius*, *apiarius* (var. *ape-*), and *apiaster* 'bee-keeper' are translated by *colmenero*.¹³⁾ Of these, *apiaster*, from *apis* 'bee,' is a Low Latin innovation which joined the traditional cluster of derivatives: the diminutive in *-cula*, the agentive in *-arius*, and the adjectives used to qualify *ūva* ('grape favored by bees') *apiānus* and *apīcius*.¹⁴⁾ Also, M. Eng. *apiarist*

¹²⁾ I have refrained from introducing any changes except for supplying, here and there, a macron. Of course, the specialization of meaning occurred in many instances at the post-Latin stage and only on a regional scale.

¹³⁾ For documentation and exegesis see A. Castro, *Glosarios latino-españoles de la Edad Media* (Madrid, 1936), s. vv. Actually, *apiaster* involves a re-interpretation rather than a straight innovation; Class. Latin used either *apiaster* or *apiastrum* for an orchard plant ('melissa, balm'), because the underlying phytonym *apium* 'parsley' was tantamount, for the Romans, to 'l'herbe aux abeilles', to quote Ernout and Meillet; cf. G. *Bienensaug*. Independently, *apiastra* did service as an ornithonym ("quia apes comedunt", Servius, *G.* 4,14), cf. G. *Bienenfresser*; here French prefers *guêpier*, lit. 'wasp-eater'. One can link this use to Sp. *oso colmenero* 'honey-sucking bear', reminiscent in turn, typologically, of R. *medved*, the familiar substitute for an I.-E. taboo word.

¹⁴⁾ Of these, *apicula* made a spectacular career in Romance; witness Ptg. *abelha*, Sp. *abeja*, and, above all, Fr. *abeille*, a borrowing from Provençal

shows a characteristic elaboration in a Neo-Latin key; German uses instead *Imker* (from obsol. *Imme* 'bee'). *Colmena* and *colmenero* can also be documented from medieval didactic and narrative texts written in the vernacular.

In Standard Spanish *colmena* stands unrivaled for 'beehive.' Its derivatives include: *colmen-ar* 'place for beehives;' *-ero* 'bee-keeper,' also used adjectivally in stereotyped phrases and, anciently, in rivalry with *-ar*; plus *-illa*, a diminutive serving to designate a peculiarly shaped, edible mushroom displaying a characteristic color pattern. It seems not to matter, so far as its labeling is concerned, whether the beehive has been manufactured of cork, wood, or osier covered with clay; this, at least, follows from the pronouncement of the latest edition (1970) of the Spanish Academy dictionary,¹⁵⁾ and this is also what the Renaissance lexicographer S. de Covarrubias led the readers of his *Tesoro* to believe as early as 1611.¹⁶⁾ The usual quota of additional figurative meanings and suffixal derivatives—regional or substandard, but not, strictly, dialectal—can be extracted from more specialized lexicographic sources:¹⁷⁾ These round out the picture, but do not affect one whit the etymological problem of the provenience of *colmena*, which alone concerns us here.

1.3. The picture changes drastically as soon as one turns his attention to Peninsular rural dialect speech; for here, in addition to numerous traces of *colmena* and of a host of competing words unrelated in origin, one also encounters certain pockets, in conservative northern zones (usually in mountainous terrain), where *cormena* has struck root. One such area is a section of Central Asturias, i.e., in or near the Cantabrian Mountains. Here a very experienced folklorist and dialectologist, namely L. Rodríguez-Caste-

which, under carefully studied conditions, at a certain point, replaced the local representative of *apis*, namely (sg.) *ef*, (pl.) *es*.

¹⁵⁾ In addition to the main entry it is profitable to consult *asiento* (or *posada*) *de colmenas* 'place in the underbrush for beehives' and *capirote de colmena* 'type of baskets used to cover beehives overflowing with honey'; depending on its shape, a *colmena* may be qualified by *rinconera* ('sloped, oblique') or *yaciente* ('stretched out on the ground').

¹⁶⁾ See the edn. by M. de Riquer (Barcelona, 1943), p. 338a. Covarrubias speaks of a box carved of cork or hollow(ed) pine. The pioneer's exceptionally intelligent and comprehensive entry also mentions the toponym *Colmenar (de Oreja)* as well as the family name ("nombre de linage") *Colmenero*.

¹⁷⁾ Here and there one finds references to the familiar (originally facetious?) use of *colmena* for 'cylinder hat', e.g., A. Alcalá Venceslada (1951); G.A. García-Lomas (1949); E. de Huidobro (1907).

llano, recorded in the Upper Aller Valley, specifically in the hamlet of Casomera, the derivative *cormenal* corresponding to standard *colmenar* and presupposing *cormena* (which, however, he fell short of catching on that occasion).¹⁸) Now, syllable-final *l* and *r* happen to be widely exchangeable in Asturo-Leonese, perhaps more so than in other varieties of Hispano-Romance, so the use of *cormen-* for the expected *colmen-* aroused no suspicion among pioneers, and since the suffixal *-al* < *-āle* alternates with *-ar* < *-āre*, depending on the occurrence of *r* or *l* in the root morpheme, the speakers, apparent goal being consonant dissimilation, the form *cormenal* in its entirety looked like a trivial variant and failed to strike V. García de Diego, who routinely recorded *cormena* as a variant in the etymological dictionary he was then working upon.¹⁹) Unworthy of special attention for both scholars was the circumstance that *cormenal*, in the local perspective, was a receding rather than an advancing or intruding form, judging from its coexistence with innovative *cañetsu*, lit. 'small box,' but here 'primitive beehive made of a tree trunk,' a word vigorously thriving in the Oviedo area, and with *ernu*, pl. *arnos* (a word whose behavior was controlled by the local rules of metaphony). Both dialectologists overlooked the fact that already in the mid 'thirties A. Kuhn, surveying the Upper Aragonese speech area to the south of the Pyrenees, had also stumbled over *cormena* in three different hamlets (Aragués, Fablo, Loarre), misinterpreting it as a banal instance of the change $l > r$; ²⁰) as if to make things worse, Kuhn, coming across deposits of, side by side, *eskerár* (Fablo) and *eskirár* (Ansó, Hecho, Biescas, Loarre) 'to shear,' a variant which was clearly at odds with the Spanish standard form *esquilar*, once more drew the wrong conclusion ($l > r$), oblivious of the fact that in this verb of Gothic parentage, the evidence of G. *scheren* and of E. *shear* alike pointed to *-r-*, rather than *-l-*, as the original root-final consonant.²¹) In addition, the *r* of the infinitival

¹⁸) *La variedad dialectal del Alto Aller* (Oviedo, 1952), pp. 110, 178; see my review of this monograph in *Language*, XXX (1954), 128–53.

¹⁹) *Diccionario etimológico español e hispánico* (Madrid: S.A.E.T.A., [1955]), § 1746.

²⁰) "Der hocharagonesische Dialekt", *Revue de linguistique romane*, XI (1935), 105.

²¹) The transition from *esquizar* to *esquilar* in Old Spanish seems to have been controlled, in essence, by lexico-associative, rather than straight phonetic, forces, including (a) the pressure exerted by *filar* (mod. *hilar*) 'to spin'—an activity which readily comes to mind whenever one is engaged in 'shearing'; furthermore, (b) by association with *esquila* 'bell carried by

suffix is most unlikely to have acted as a partner in any dissimilatory process, unlike the *-ar* of the mass-noun suffix.

A third point, namely Cartirana, again located in sub-Pyrenean Aragon (near Jaca), yielded *cormenar*, once more with the noteworthy *-rm-* consonant cluster, but apparently without any concurrent need felt for differentiating the two sonorants (that need is known to vary from one area to another). M. Alvar, who made the discovery toward the start of his career,²²⁾ again bracketed this case with that of *as-*, *es-quilar* 'to shear,' subsuming both this time under the phenomenon—often invoked by Spanish linguists—of "acoustic equivalence" (a process which overlaps in part with what other schools of thought call either "rise of an archiphoneme through neutralization of contrast" or "free variation").²³⁾ Incidentally, in a strictly phonological framework *cormenar* might be interpreted as supporting the primacy either of *cormena* or of *colmena*—but circumstantial evidence rules out the alternative.

cattle, goats, or sheep' (cf. its homonym, the post-verbal *esquila* 'act and season of sheep-shearing'), another word of Germanic (Gothic) descent (see W. Meyer-Lübke, *REW*₃, § 7992, **skilla* 'Schelle, Glocke'). To this ensemble of interferences must be added, as a separate cause, (c) the trend toward consonant dissimilation, once the hybrid formation *tras-*, *tres-quirar* 'to mis-shear, shear badly' had come into existence, involving either (a) *trā(n)s-*, *trā-* 'beyond', or (β) the bound form *tri-* 'thrice' matching *trēs/tria* 'three'; cf. the similar semantic development of *bi-*, *bis-* 'twice', reminiscent of G. *doppelzünftig*, etc. While G. Tilander's derivation of *esqui-rar*, *-lar* from a Gothic prototype akin to G. *scheren*, E. *shear* is unassailable, the details of causation to be invoked in accounting for its further change remain to be worked in. At any rate, the appeal to "acoustic equivalence" favored by some Spanish linguists definitely falls flat in this instance.

²²⁾ *El dialecto aragonés* (Madrid, 1953), pp. 206–7.

²³⁾ Alvar's mentors on that occasion were A. Alonso and R. Lida, "Geografía fonética: *-l* y *-r* implosivas en español", *Revista de Filología Hispánica*, VII (1945), 313–45, who, one gathers, did not come across *col- ~ cor-mena*, but at least found traces, on both sides of the Atlantic, of the var. *cormillo* of standard *colmillo* 'tusk' (327, 330–2), a word to which we shall yet revert. Their task, in turn, was complicated by the fact that certain predecessors, e.g., A. Zauner, concentrated on Sp. *olmo* < *ūlmu*, rather than on other sources of vernacular *-lm-*; see *Revista de Filología Española*, XVI (1929), 154–60. Alonso and Lida distinguished between pervasive convergence and sporadic interchange of *l* and *r*; recognized scattered islets of preference rather than any major, sharply delimited areas; and felt that most of the processes observed, by and large ongoing, were characteristic of the last three centuries, a conclusion obviously inapplicable to the case history under study.

One peculiarity of the three dialectal situations here so far identified has been the speakers' tendency to substitute for the primitive *cormena* a suffixal derivative in *-al* or *-ar*, from *-āle* and *-āre*, respectively, devoid of any additional information. This trend may in part have been motivated by the outlandishness of the word-final segments *-eno*, *-ena* except in a certain class of numerals where they are genuinely suffixal (e.g., *docena* 'dozen').²⁴⁾ In addition, a sort of "Einreihung," to cite Meyer-Lübke's favorite tag, has thus been effected, with, say, *colmen-ar* falling into line with *palom-ar* (rarely *-era*) 'dovecot' or, less neatly, with *gallin-ero* 'hen-coop.' Since *paloma* 'dove' (from *palumb-a* or *-ēs*) and *gallina* 'hen' (from *gall-ina*) each designated the individual occupant of such a cot or coop, it is small wonder that here and there *cormena/colmena* was reduced to the meaning of 'bee,' e.g., at Iguña in the backwoods of Santander.²⁵⁾

1.4. While the Hispanist will want to dig for other Peninsular deposits of long-overlooked *cormena*,²⁶⁾ the data brought to light in the 1935–55 period suffice to help the Classicist cast a bridge from *crūmēna* to *cormena*, given the fact that all 'regular' sound correspondences have here been strictly respected, except that the ideal counterpart, namely **cromena*, has not yet been produced, still less pinpointed on the map. The transmutation of **crom-* into *corm-* seems not to have been motivated by any such lexical process as word blend, avoidance of homonymic conflict, polarization, and the like; it is best classified as just another instance of not exactly predictable, but by no means unusual, metathesis. The major advantage of recognizing *corm-* as the variant closer to the Latin (or Graeco-Latin) prototype than the prevalent and, for centuries, standardized form *colm-* is the fact that the switch from *corm-* to *colm-* could have been stimulated by the preexistence of the verb *colmar* 'to fill to the brim' and of its satellites (*colmo* 'heap, overmeasure,' etc.) as well as of certain homonyms, e.g. *colmo* 'thatch used as a

²⁴⁾ Cf. J. Alemany y Bolufer, *Tratado de la formación de palabras . . .* (Madrid, 1920), § 68.

²⁵⁾ G. A. García-Lomas, *El lenguaje popular de las montañas de Santander* (Santander, 1949), p. 95. For a typological parallel cf. the above-mentioned probings of Balkan languages (Albanian, Rumanian) by G. Meyer and S. Pușcariu.

²⁶⁾ One handicap is the absence of the map for 'beehive' from the severely selective *ALPI*: [T. Navarro et al.], *Atlas lingüístico de la Península Ibérica* (Madrid, 1962).

roof,' whereas for any change in the reverse direction one might want to toy with, namely *colm-* > *corm-*, no independent supporting factor can be singled out.²⁷⁾

1.5. Attention has already been drawn to a Western variant of *colmena* with the foreseeable loss of *-n-*: Gal. *colmea* is well-attested,²⁸⁾ presupposing the older stage *colmēa*, and so is Ptg. *colmeia*, cf. *cheia* < OPtg. *chēa* 'full' (f. sg.) < *plēna*. The corresponding self-explanatory derivatives are Gal. *colme(e)iro*, *colmeiar* (*-iar*) and Ptg. *colmial*, with *-ar* < *-āre* and *-al* < *-āle* alternating as they often do in the Iberian Peninsula, this time with emergence of sharply silhouetted regional preferences. Far more relevant is the circumstance that at Neira de Xusá the variants *cormeia* and *cormeal* are favored; their discovery of course echoes the earlier message of Sant. and Arag. *cormena*, *-ar*, thus increasing the likelihood of *crumēna*'s candidacy.²⁹⁾ In addition, the Galician inventory of words for 'beehive' includes *abellariza* (at Asados), *albariza* (at Lalín); then, with special reference to cork as the construction material put to use, *cortiz-a*, *-o*,

²⁷⁾ The medieval Spanish kinship terms *cormano*, *-a*, from *cō* + *germānus* *-a*, cannot plausibly have exerted the slightest attraction; on the contrary As for instances of transposition of *r* from a place where it followed upon a word-initial voiceless occlusive to a position inside the root morpheme, where it could join some other consonant to form a cluster, they are not very numerous; the reverse phenomenon was more common. In *praesepe* 'stall, stable, fold' > *pesebre* 'crib', and in *crepāre* 'to burst (with a loud noise)' > OSp. *crebar* > mod. *quebrar* 'to break', the /r/ has moved to second position in the newly-formed cluster. However, *-mr-* being virtually non-existent in the target language, the rise of *-rm-*, preëxistent in *dormir*, etc., phonologically makes good sense. Noteworthy is the example of *crūsta* 'rind, shell, bark', because it shows that Spanish has actually exceeded its sister languages in this tendency toward metathesis: Over against Sp. *costra* 'scab, crust, scale' one finds It. *crosta*, Fr. *croûte*, Prov.-Cat. *crosta*, North It. *grosta*, etc. (cf. Meyer-Lübke, *REW*, § 234.)

²⁸⁾ See J. Cuveiro Piñol's vocabulary (1876) and the glossary appended to M. Lugris Freire's grammar (1922), which records *abellariza* as a synonym. Interestingly, both sources list the kinship term *corma(n)*, *curman(o)*, thus confirming our earlier suspicion that its vicinity may have contributed to the eviction of *corm-* by *colm-* for 'beehive'. The West. Ast. variant *colmia* (used in competition with *trovo de aveyes*) has been corroborated by B. Acevedo y Huelves (1932).

²⁹⁾ See J.S. Crespo Pozo, *Contribución a un vocabulario castellano-gallego ...* (Madrid, 1963), pp. 192-3, who (s.v.) expatiates on the local terminology of apiculture.

whereas *cobo* and *trobo* designate square-shaped beehives made of wood.³⁰)

1.6. There exist, furthermore, more or less diaphanous rival words in many sections of Spain. The key word in Central Asturias, *cañ(i)-ellu*, also *quiñellu*, i. e., [ka-, ki-š(j)ɛlu], clearly points to *caña* 'box' < *capsa*; *dōlium* 'very large jar' has been hesitatingly suggested as the source for Sant. *dujo*, the tag for a hive crudely manufactured from a hollowed-out dry tree trunk; dial. *cepo*, recorded in this sense at Soba and at Gurieso, involves just another of the many specializations of Sp. *cepo* 'branch, bough, block of wood, stock, clamp,' then 'charity box,' etc., transparently from *cippus* 'pale, stake, post.' *Jeto*, which García-Lomas also places in the mountain district of Santander, may be related to OSp. *seta/xeta* 'mushroom', a Hellenism (σηπτά 'excrement, rotten things') for Corominas. We have already encountered one link between the beehives and the realm of mushrooms (*colmenilla*, above). Among other resemblances, the hollow inner structure may have served as the *tertium comparationis*. In Castile proper, *escarzo* 'black comb without honey,' 'removal of honey from a hive,' has been referred to by some sources (including the usually well-informed García-Lomas) as an additional designation of the 'beehive'; it is, clearly, a postverbal, even though opinions differ widely on the exact provenience of the underlying *escarzar* 'to clear (a hive) of black combs' (< **excarptiāre*, involving *carptus* as a substitute for *cerptus*?; < **exquārtiāre*, on the evidence of It. *squarciare*?; < *castrāre*, assuming transmission through Mozarabic?). Not least noteworthy is the regional replacement of *colmena* by the m. *colmeno* precisely where *colmena* preëminently signifies 'bee' (as at Iguña) or is familiarly used for 'cylinder hat'³¹)—as a recoil from irksome polysemy.³²)

³⁰) The etymologies of *abellariza* and *albariza* are transparent; the derivational suffix seen in action is *-icea*. Space is unavailable for discussion of other synonyms.

³¹) For details see the dialect monographs by M. J. Canellada (1944, at pp. 140, 308) and, especially, by G. A. García-Lomas (1949, at pp. 89, 95, 123, plus plate 17). On the etymologies of *escarz-o/ -ar* and *seta/xeta* see J. Corominas, *Diccionario crítico etimológico* . . . (4 vols.; Madrid & Bern [1954–57]), II, 343–4, and IV, 212–4.

³²) Any prediction, on the assumption of a cause-and-effect relationship, is, of course, impossible. So far as Southern Spain is concerned, both *colmena* and *colmenar* have undergone discernible semantic extensions (cf. A. Alcalá Venceslada, 1951), without there having been felt any need, by speakers, to have recourse to *colmeno*. The interplay *colmen-a ~ -o* could not have

1.7. The controversy surrounding the ultimate provenience of *colmena/colmeia* (in the prolonged absence of anyone's awareness of the variants involving *-rm-*) can be best epitomized by dividing all participants into two major camps: those militating in favor of a Latin prototype, and those supporting some non-Latin alternative base. The Latinists, in turn, fall into, at least, three smaller clans: those endorsing *culmen* 'stalk, top, summit, pinnacle' as a base, a point of view at present abandoned;³³⁾ those favoring *columella*, the diminutive of *columna* 'pillar, post,' starting with A. Castro, or preferring to operate with a bizarre conflation of *colūmna* and *colūmēlla*, hypothesized for the sole purpose of finding some Latin model for the segment **-mēna*, pieced together through reconstruction;³⁴⁾ and those toying with *cūlmus* 'stalk, stem, straw, thatch' as the allegedly most plausible original construction material put to use.³⁵⁾ Any decision to have recourse to *cūlmen* is complicated by the fact that its abl. sg. *cūlmine* gave rise to (f.) *cumbre*, whose *u* from ancestral *ū* it is by no means easy to explain away in view of the dendronym

been so easily engaged in without the preëxistence of a powerful derivational pattern m. vs. f. in Romance (particularly for names of containers), a schema apparently traceable to Late Antiquity. See H. and R. Kahane, "The Augmentative Feminine in the Romance Languages", *Romance Philology*, I: 2-3 (1948-49), 135-75; Y. Malkiel, "Gender, Sex, and Size, as Reflected in the Romance Languages", *Studies in Romance Linguistics: Proceedings of the Fifth Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, ed. M.P. Hagiwara (Rowley, Mass., 1973), pp. 254-77; and R. Stefanini, "Il genere come marca d'alterazione alla luce della teoria psico-semantic", *Archivio Glottologico Italiano*, LXV: 1-2 (1980), 41-73 (unfortunately written without knowledge of the preceding item).

³³⁾ See the abovesited passage in S. de Covarrubias, *Tesoro*.

³⁴⁾ A. Castro, "Adiciones hispánicas al diccionario etimológico de W. Meyer-Lübke" (II), *Revista de Filología Española*, VI (1919), 340; echoed by the 19th edn. (1970) of the Academy Dictionary, p. 322c; impugned by Piel (see below); V. García de Diego, *Diccionario etimológico español e hispánico* (Madrid, [1955]), p. 175a and § 1746.

³⁵⁾ J.M. Piel, "Notas à margem do *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*: Contribuições para o léxico etimológico português", III, in: *Biblos*, X (1934), 124-40, at 136; the author adduced Ptg. *cumelo* 'tusk' < *columellu* as further proof of the vulnerability of Castro's thesis which, he claimed, Meyer-Lübke had not condemned sharply enough. Then, above all, W. Brinkmann, *Bienenstock und Bienenstand in den romanischen Ländern*, *Hamburger Studien* . . ., XXX (1938), pp. 146-7, 175, and the favorable critical reaction to it by G. Rohlfs, *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, CLXXV (1939), 126-7: "... wird zu *culmus* 'Pflanzenstengel' gestellt und als ursprünglich geflochtene Bienenwohnung aufgefaßt, wofür sachliche Anhaltspunkte gegeben sind".

ülmu > *olmo*, and the like.³⁶) *Columella* is utterly unworthy of support, inasmuch as *colūmna* produced in rural speech *coloña*, *-ondra* and similar forms, while the mechanism of consonant dissimilation would have yielded a different result; worse, we have the contradictory evidence of *colmillo* 'tusk' < **columellu*. *Culmus* seems to make better sense, on the "Sachen" side of the ledger more than on the elusive "Wörter" side. Primitive beehives have, in fact, been shown to be manufactured, to this day, as far away as the Lower Danube area, by all sorts of plaiting and braiding devices, and a name suggested by those crude, primitive techniques could of course have been secondarily transferred to more sophisticated varieties of beehives. However, the supporters of this hypothesis have so far failed to account convincingly for the *-ena/-eia* segment.³⁷) All told, the *culmus* conjecture could be salvaged in part, by using cogent arguments for the blend of *culmus* with some other word of demonstrable affinity, into which *-ena* entered rather smoothly.

The non-Latin school of thought is even less united. If one disregards some fumbling with an Arabic phrase by the pioneers,³⁸) there remain basically two Celtic conjectures, the first formulated by Mahn in the mid-19th century, adopted by Diez, and refuted by R. Thurneysen, on the occasion of his scrupulous sifting of all Celtic material admitted by Diez into his dictionary.³⁹) An independent second attempt to Celticize the prehistory of *colmena* was undertaken in our own time by J. Corominas, who, however, summoned the precaution of using the over-all label: 'word of uncertain origin.'⁴⁰)

³⁶) Scholars have thought of the influence of *-(t)ūdine* or of a merger with *(a)cūmine*, cf. Ptg. *gume*.

³⁷) Rohlf's, e.g., cited—apropos the "merkwürdige Suffix", Sp. *mor-eno*, Ptg. *mor-eio* 'pile (of wood or hay)'; Piel likened **culmēna* to *laniēna* 'butcher's stall'.

³⁸) Cited by F. Diez, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der romanischen Sprachen*, 5th edn., p. 441, s.v., without further identification of names or loci.

³⁹) See K.A.F. Mahn, *Etymologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der romanischen Sprachen* (Berlin, 1855), p. 54: Bret. *kōlōen-wēnan* 'Korb der Bienen'; Diez, *EWRS*, 5th edn., p. 441; R. Thurneysen, *Keltoromanisches* (Halle, 1884), p. 86. (The reference to Mahn was absent from *EWRS*₁, for the obvious reason that it made its appearance as early as 1853; Thurneysen's stricture had no effect on *EWRS*₅, which was posthumous, but it eventually strengthened Meyer-Lübke's skepticism.)

⁴⁰) In his *Diccionario crítico etimológico de la lengua castellana* Corominas characterized *colme(n)a* as a word typical of the Spanish-Portuguese territory, with prongs extending into Catalonia, where it rivals autochthonous *arna*,

Finally, there was a residual group of skeptics who, seeing through the weaknesses of others, either tacitly refused to make any comment, or explicitly justified their aloofness from any endorsement. Chief among these was W. Meyer-Lübke, on several occasions.⁴¹⁾

1.8. Given this rather pathetic impasse, and forearmed as we are with the newly-acquired knowledge of the widespread dialectal variant *corne(n)a*, we can enter the plea that Lat. or Gr.-Lat. *crūmēna* be accepted as the sought-for etymon, and that rapprochement with *colmo* (the local outgrowth of *cūlmus*⁴²⁾) be declared the major

buc, and *rusc*. His analysis of the record led him to conclude that *colmena* was a word of uncertain provenience, probably pre-Latin, perhaps from Celt. **kolmēnā*, based in turn on **kōlmos* or **kōlōmos* 'straw'. On the credit side of Corominas' performance was his ability to point out (a) two occurrences of *colmena* in 13th-century texts; (b) one example of OGal. *colmēa*, and (c) one of Class. Ptg. *colmea*. This is the extent of the actual usefulness of Corominas' lengthy entry. His circumstantial refutation of Castro's thesis was gratuitous, and the numerous data he assembled on scattered vestiges of the suffixes (or word-final segments) *-eno* and *-ena* may be helpful in some other context, but not in reference to *colmena*. The crucial var. *cormena* remained unmentioned, while ample space was accorded to Gasc. *caben*, *caune* 'beehive', produced by Brinkmann, which may or may not echo *cophēnu*. Basically, Corominas' entry involves an attempt at an "Ehrenrettung" of Mahn's conjecture, already punctured by Thurneysen. The revised entry in J. Corominas and J. A. Pascual, *Diccionario crítico etimológico castellano e hispánico*, Vol. II (Madrid & Bern, 1980), 137b–139a, essentially rehashes the old material and conjectures, with a few valuable addenda, such as the reference to M. Alvar's study of the Andalusian designations of the beehive, in *Revista de dialectología y tradiciones populares*, XI (1955), 250–4, an inquiry which enters into his "Encuestas del Atlas lingüístico de Andalucía" (pp. 231–54). Alvar refers to such dialect forms as *truébano* (Asturias), *trobo* (El Bierzo), *torbo* and *tojo* (Santander) and provides clues to relevant writings by A. Griera, F. Krüger, and G. Rohlfs.

⁴¹⁾ In his *Romanische Formenlehre* (Leipzig, 1894) the author cited *colmenar* without etymologizing it (§464). In the original edition of his dictionary (Heidelberg, 1911–20), he listed under *culmus* (§2378) Ptg. *colmo* 'thatch', adding in parentheses the lack of support for Diez's [i.e. Mahn's] thesis from Celtic sources; note also his comments on *culmen* (§2376) and **culmīneu* 'ridge of a roof' (§2377), a base of possible relevancy to Italianists (N. Caix, C. Salvioni). In the revised edn. (1930–35) he recorded Castro's "Einfall", accompanying it with a question mark.

⁴²⁾ The representation of *culmus* 'straw, thatch' not only by Ptg. *colmo*, but also by Sp. *cuelmo*, as if the Latin base had *ō*, brings to mind the possibility of a blend of *culmus* with *cōlūmen/culmen* 'peak, summit', the more so as thatch is used to build a roof in many rustic cabins. In addition, *culmus* is known to have been contaminated, at the post-Latin stage, by *calamus*, from *κάλαμος*; Ernout and Meillet speak of **calmus* in this context (p. 155b).

cause of its two-step deflection from the expected course. In view of the protracted and widespread Peninsular wavering between syllable-final *l* and *r* before consonant, as demonstrated by Alonso and Lida, it can be argued that *cormena* represented the first rapprochement of **cromena* to *colmo*, while the second step led to the more energetic change into *colmena*/-e(i)a. It is by no means unlikely that *colmar* 'to fill to overabundance' (which may in turn represent a compromise between *cūmūlāre* 'to heap up, pile up, overload'—cf. Fr. *comblar*—and LowLat. *culmināre* 'to (make) reach the peak') had its distinct share in the complex process we envision.

1.9. The only objection that could conceivably be raised against *crumēna* is the fact that most words for 'beehive' somehow evoke a box-like structure, whichever the material put to use,⁴³⁾ whereas *crumēna*, as we recall, referred to a purse or a bag. This stricture can be parried with the remark that in Spain there exists a tradition of covering the hive, against possible predators, when it is full of honey to the point of overflowing. It is not impossible that *cormena*/*colmena* initially designated the soft, bag-like cover rather than the box (excavated from a tree-trunk) that it served to protect, in which case we would be dealing with an instance of *pars pro toto*.⁴⁴⁾ The high probability that *cormena* was contaminated by *colmo* 'peak' and/or *colmar* 'to fill to the brim' before it became *colmena* lends point to this collateral conjecture.⁴⁵⁾

These and other blends greatly complicate one's task of cutting a swath through such heavy undergrowth, but do not directly affect the etymology of *colmena*, except to the extent that several words displaying the root-morpheme *colm-*, rather than just one, may have deflected *cormena* from its original course.

⁴³⁾ To revert to Fr. *ruche*, OFr. *rusche*, a word of Gaulish ancestry: It meant originally 'bark', because this was the material preferably used, before the Frankish model of a hive constructed of straw was introduced. See A. Dauzat et al., *Nouveau dictionnaire étymologique et historique* (Paris, 1964), p. 569b; J. Picoche, *Nouveau dictionnaire étymologique du français* (Paris, 1971), p. 589.

⁴⁴⁾ In 1955 M. Alvar (loc. cit.) reported that at Gancín (Málaga), of two designations of the beehive available to speakers, namely *corcho* and *colmena*, one referred to the full and the other to the empty object.

⁴⁵⁾ In addition to her critical reading of the entire paper (see fn. 5, *supra*), which resulted in several improvements, Dr. Donca Steriade has authorized me to append to it the following afterthought of her own:

"Pfister's etymology of the family of *crumēna*, *crumīna*, *cruminō* fails to explain the apparent hesitation between *ē*, *ī*, and *i* in the presuffixal syllable. While this does not represent grounds for rejection, alternatives should still be explored.

One such alternative runs as follows: *crumēna* has as its source the Gk. (κε)κρυμμένα 'hidden', middle perfect ptc. of κρύπτω. The lack of reduplication in the Latin form could be attributed to the incipient elimination of reduplication in the perfect ptes. On this point see M. Leumann, "Zur Form von neugr. ptc. γραμμένος", in *Studies in Greek, Italic, and Indo-European Linguistics Offered to Leonard R. Palmer*, edd. A.M. Davies and W. Meid (Innsbruck, 1976), pp. 163–8. The simplification of the geminate *mm* in the source form parallels the degemination in *mamilla* 'nipple' (cf. *mamma* 'breast', *mammula* 'little breast') and is probably due to the position of the stress: preaccentual *mm* appears to simplify to *m*.

Assuming loss of reduplication and degemination, we can then reconstruct an intermediate form **krumēna* which, from the Latin point of view, is accentually aberrant. To bring **krumēna* in line with the Latin stress rule, two possibilities were open to the Latin speakers: either to justify the penult accent by lengthening the accented vowel (hence *crumēna*), or to retract the accent onto the antepenult (hence **crúmina* indirectly attested in *crúminō*). Finally, *crumína*, a secondary form, is the likely result of a blend between *crumēna* and **crúmina*".

Liddell & Scott Greek-English Lexikon

The editor of the projected new Supplement to Liddell & Scott is grateful to the many scholars who have sent in notes in response to his request and is encouraged to make a further appeal. In doing so he would like to draw attention in particular to the Roman and early Byzantine periods down to the Lexicon's terminal date of c. 600 a.d.

Contributors are invited to send additional material or corrections to the editor, Mr P.G.W. Glare, Clarendon Building, Bodleian Library, Broad Street, Oxford OX1 3BG. They are asked to check that the material is not to be found in either the ninth edition of the Lexicon or the 1968 Supplement. Additional references to words already treated should not be sent, unless they add substantially to our understanding of these words. It would be helpful if contributions were to be written on slips measuring approximately 6 × 4 inches (15 × 10 cm). The lemma should be written in the top left-hand corner and contributors are asked to specify the edition or other source that they have used.