

# VOCABULAIRE

## Domaine européen en général.

### A European Substratum Word.

Contents : 1. introduction, 2. λέπω - ὀλόπτω - ὀλουφῶ not IE, 3. Lith. *lùpti* etc. cognate, 4. Lith. *lioba* etc., 5. Lat. *liber*, 6. Goth. *laufs* etc. ; coppice-economy, 7. other Baltic forms, 8. a central and southern European substratum, 9. κολάπτω etc.

1. The etymology I am going to defend is not new. But it has apparently been discarded, because it could not be Indo-European. I think the last is true, but this does not mean that the etymology is not right. At present it is not even mentioned by FRISK (*Griech. Etym. Wb.*) or FRAENKEL (*Lit. Etym. Wb.*).

2. The facts are these. The Greek verb for 'to bark' (a tree) is λέπω. Its meaning is quite general, 'to strip off the rind or husks, to peel', also 'give a hiding, i.e. thrash' and in comedy 'to eat' (also λέπτει (sic) κατεσθίει in Eupolis according to Photius). It is evidently cognate with ὀλόπτειν 'pluck out, tear out, stripp off' ('abschälen, abreißen, ausrupfen'), which Hesychius glosses as λεπίζειν, τίλλειν, κολάπτειν, and with ὀλουφεῖν, which Photius equates with ὀλόπτειν, Hesychius with τίλλειν.

Now it is also evident that the latter group cannot be Indo-European. This is demonstrated by 1. prothetic vowel ὀ- ; 2. ε/o : ου ; 3. π : φ. Though there are a few cases where a Greek 'prothetic vowel' of PIE origin (i.e. developed from a laryngeal) is absent in cognate forms within Greek, these constitute a very small group, while forms with prothetic vowel alternating with forms without that vowel are well established for the Greek substratum language (see my *Development of the PIE Laryngeals in Greek*, p. 72f. and 74-6) ; together with the other points this proves the non-IE origin of the word(s).

3. Lith. *lùpti* and its cognates have the same range of meanings. I cite from FRAENKEL, for *lùpti* 'schälen, abhäuten, schinden, prügeln, verhauen, mit Schlägen züchtigen, herausreißen, herausgraben, heraus-

schlagen, (Geld) herausschinden, herauspressen'; for the cognates in Balto-Slavic: Lett. *lūpt* 'schälen, kahl machen', scherzhaft 'essen' (!), *lūpināt* 'schälen, klauben, nagen, kauen, zausen, zupfen, rupfen, plündern', Russ. *lupit* '(ab)schälen, aufpicken (Eier)', Polish *lupić* 'abschälen, herabhauen, berauben, plündern, Augen aufreissen, tüchtigen Schlag versetzen'. There can be little doubt that the original meaning was the more concrete and detailed one, e.g. 'to bark'. It is therefore not right to connect it with Skt. *lumpāti* 'breaks, injures, suppresses, removes', a connection rightly rejected by MAYRHOFFER (*Etym. Wb. d. Altind.*).

Four essential moments can be discerned in these meanings: 1. to bark, 2. to tear out, 3. to beat, 4. to eat. It is not easy to see the connection between these actions (which will be shown below). Now it is essential, I think, that both the Greek words (cf. 1. λεπίζειν, 2. τίλλειν, 3. κολάπτειν) and the Balto-Slavic ones show all these factors. This makes the conclusion that they are cognate almost unavoidable, on the assumption that they are not IE. The relation \*lep- : \*lup- has its parallel in ὀλοπ(τ)- : ὀλουφ-.

4. The interchange π/φ, probably from p/bh, seen in the Greek words makes it possible that the Lithuanian forms with b belong to the same root: (FRAENKEL s.v. *laubėnė, lubà*) *liūba* '(Baum)rinde, Schale', *laūbti* 'graben, scharren, abschälen, herunterstreifen', *lubėna* 'abgeschälte Haut, Schale (verschiedener Früchte)', cf. Lett. *luðbt* 'schälen, klauben, ablösen', Russ. *lub* 'Borke, Bast', Polish *lub* 'Borke, Baumrinde'.

5. With the last group Lat. *liber* has been rightly connected. I cite the meanings given by ERNOUT-MEILLET (*Dict. étym. de la langue lat.*): « 1. pellicule qui se trouve entre le bois et l'écorce extérieure (cortex), le *liber*, sur laquelle on écrivait avant la découverte du papyrus; ... 2. le « livre » lui-même ... » The authors virtually reject the connection with Lith. *lūpti* etc., since these words are isolated in IE. This is true, but it is no objection against the etymology. They also object that there is no trace of *u* for this word in Latin. Here they are too sceptical, I think, as regards *delūbrum*, which was explained in antiquity as « fustem delibratum, h.e. decorticatum » and « effigies, a delibratione corticis » (of course, the two statements may go back to the same source). It is evident that many 'etymologies' of antiquity are nonsensical (as is « sicut locum in quo figerent candelam candelabrum appellatum, ita in quo deum ponerent nominatum delubrum »), but this one is not very likely to have been invented without some support in fact. But even if there were no evidence for *u*, this 'missing link' would not make the etymology impossible: I see no serious objections, and the agreement in form and meaning strongly suggests a common source.

6. In Germanic OHG *louft* 'Baumrinde, Bast' must derive from the same root.

Less evident is that the Germanic words for 'foliage' also belong here: Goth. *laufs lauf*, OHG *loub* (MHG *Laub*), OS *lōf*, OE (ModE) *leaf*, Dutch *loof*, OIcel. *lauf*. To see this one should have some idea of what is called in German «Niederwaldwirtschaft», which might be translated by coppice(wood)-economy, which also enables us to see the connection between the meanings of λέπω / *lūpti*. My idea is based on J. TRIER, *Holz* (Münster/Köln 1952). The basic fact is that the forest was an important factor in certain economies and was used for various purposes. Essential of a coppice is that the trees, not having the same height everywhere, are 'polled' or cut back, so as to produce a thick close growth of young branches. "Im allgemeinen ist die Lode und ihr Laub, die Stange oder ihre Rinde das Ziel der Wirtschaft" (p. 9). The very young branches with the leaves on them (which is the oldest meaning of *Laub*) are torn off and given as fodder to the animals; "Im Futterlaubwald werden alle zwei bis drei Jahre die voll ergrünzten Laubzweige gerupft oder geschnitten und entweder frisch oder für den Winter getrocknet dem Vieh verfüttert" (p. 9). Now 'tear off' is one of the meanings of δλόπτειν / δλοφείν (cf. τίλλειν) and the same meaning is given for Lith. *lūpti* (herausreissen) (1). This explains the connection between these verbs and Germ. *Laub*.

Also the idea of 'cutting back', which is essential in coppicewoods, is evidenced for δλόπτειν by κολάπτειν (and probably in 'give a thrashing' for λέπω), for Lith. *lūpti* by 'prügeln, verhauen, mit Schlägen züchtigen, herausschlagen'. Cf. for 'beating' δένδρον ἐπικεκομμένον, which is the technical term for such a tree.

Further both the Greek and the Lithuanian words have the meaning 'to bark'. Now of course TRIER is right when he says: "Rupfen und Schälen sind zwei recht verschiedene Arbeitsvorgänge" (p. 128), but throughout his book it appears that the two are closely associated (as in the words cited above, where the bark is called one of the products of coppicewood): in coppice some twigs are used as fodder, others — those of oaks, which must preferably be eighteen years old — are

(1) That λέπω originally did not only mean 'remove the bark' but also 'the twigs and leaves' appears from the only place where it occurs in Homer, A 236:

σκήπτρον - τὸ μὲν οὐ ποτε φύλλα καὶ ὄζους  
φύσει, ἐπεὶ δὴ πρῶτα τομὴν ἐν ὄρεσσι λέλοιπεν,  
οὐδ' ἀναθηλήσει· περὶ γάρ ῥά ἐ χαλκὸς ἔλεψε  
φύλλα τε καὶ φλοιόν.

where φύλλα are expressly mentioned, referring probably to φύλλα καὶ ὄζους in 234.

For λεπρός 'aussätzig, rauh', of which the relation with λέπω is to my mind far from evident, I might refer to TRIER p. 110, where OIcel. *loðenn* 'bewachsen, haarig, rauh' is connected with *Lode* 'sprout': "Rauh und haarig ... wird der Stumpf des Baumes, wenn er wieder ausschlägt".

barked, the bark being used for tanning, the stakes themselves for other purposes.

It appears then that (1) to bark, (2) to tear out, and (3) to beat, to hack, to cut are closely associated in coppice-economy. It need not surprise, then, that we find words covering this whole range of activities. Beside the verbs we find words for the objects of these actions: to bark — bark, to tear out — foliage (rupfen — Laub).

I think the fourth meaning-aspect is now also understandable. Both Gr. λέπ(τ)ω and Lett. *lūpt* also have the (comic) meaning 'to eat'. This seems quite understandable, but may find its explanation in the fact that the twigs-with-leaves (Germ. *Laub*) served as fodder. For the fact that one would rather expect 'to feed' (transitive) than 'to eat' one needs only compare Eng. *to feed*, which is used both transitive and intransitive. Not only is the idea of eating explained in this way in its connection with the other notions of these verbs, even its comic effect (attested for both Greek and Lettish) becomes clear: it was properly used of animals.

7. There are quite a few other words that belong to this group. Not the most evident is Lith. *lėpti* 'verzärtelt, verwöhnt, verweichlicht werden', which has been connected with λέπω. In FRAENKEL we find under *lāpas* '(Pflanzen)blatt' many words that can now be easily connected: *lapýnas* 'Laubwald'; Lett. *ļēpata* 'abgerissenes Stück, Haut mit dem daran hängenden Fleisch', which can be easily connected with 'to bark'; *ļēpa* (amongst other things) 'unförmig zusammengeballte Masse, Klumpen' and from this *lēpata* 'Fuss eines Elefanten oder eines anderen Tieres, das grosse Pfoten hat', then *lōpa* 'Pfote, Tatze, Klaue', is understandable from the lopped tree (one need only think of pollard-willows); *lāpsta* 'Spaten, Schaufel, breites Ruderende', Russ. *lopta* 'Schaufel, Ruderblatt, flaches am Ende breiter werdendes Ding' may well derive from the instrument used for barking (TRIER, p. 40: "mit dem *Schewwel*, einen Art kleinen, aber langstieligen Löffels"). Most convincing is the fact that *all* these meanings can be easily explained on the basis of the concept of coppice-activity.

8. But it is not the meaning of the present article to trace all possible cognates. Nor — as has been said in the beginning — do I claim that all this is new; in fact, most connections are e.g. given by TRIER (though not the majority of the Baltic forms), but he also was certainly not the first; see the literature in BOISACQ s.v. λέπω. However, TRIER and others have thought the group was Indo-European, and what I want to stress is that it cannot be so. To show this it is sufficient to cite the principal forms of which above has been shown, as I believe, that they are cognate: Gr. λέπ(τ)-ω, ὀλόπτ-ω, ὀλουφ-ῶ, Lith. *lūp-ti*, *lėp-ti*, *lāp-as*, *lūb-à*, *lūob-a*, for which the following basic forms must be posited (the

prothetic vowel neglected): \**lep-* / *lop-*, \**luþ-*, \**l(ō)ubh-*. For, though \**luþ-* and \**loubh-* could be considered as different enlargements of a root \**leu-*, it is impossible to connect this with \**lep-*. Moreover there is the prothetic vowel in Greek, which is not fixed, and therefore probably does not represent a laryngeal; for otherwise one might think of \**H<sub>3</sub>el-*, \**H<sub>3</sub>lep-*, \**H<sub>3</sub>leu-þ-*, \**H<sub>3</sub>leu-bh-*. Such a series of root-forms would not be entirely without parallel, but it fails to convince. It is much more probable that this group is a substratum element.

Two things are then important. First, it is found in Greek, Latin, Balto-Slavic and German, which either points to one substratum language in central and southern Europe, or to the fact that these languages got these words when they were spoken in central (or eastern) Europe. The first is more likely, since the Greek words are typical for most Greek substratum words, which most probably were introduced in Greece itself (see for such words my *Development*, Index II s.v. substratum elements). Second, there is the prothetic vowel. If other languages than Greek do never show a prothetic vowel in such words, then it seems that this substratum language had a kind of laryngeal sound, which was vocalised only in Greek (just as the PIE laryngeals were — in this position — vocalized only in Greek of the languages mentioned).

Finally we may conclude that coppice economy existed in central and southern Europe before the arrival of the Indo-Europeans, i.e. at least before 2500 B.C. This is not very surprising; indeed, what is surprising is that we are able to demonstrate it.

9. There are other words in this semantic sphere that make the impression of being non-IE, as e.g. *φύλλον* (whether it is cognate with Lat. *folium* or not).

Without discussing all problems I would like to add some remarks on the group around *κολάπτω* (TRIER, p. 44-7). I do not discuss such remote possible cognates as *σκάλλω*, *σκύλλω*, Lat. *scalpo*, Lith. *skleĩpti* / *skleĩbti*; if the last belongs to it, the nasalization shows non-IE origin (see e.g. *Development* p. 13 with lit.). When *κλάδος* belongs to it, *κολάπτω* cannot represent a disyllabic root, as \**k<sub>l</sub>H<sub>2</sub>-d-* would give \**κ<sub>l</sub>āδ-* (unless one posits \**kel-d-* beside \**kel-H<sub>2</sub>-*), but this connection is far from sure.

I think there are good reasons — in the light of the above — to connect *κόλος* *κολούω* *κολάπτω* *κόλαφος* *κολλαβίζω* *κολοβός* and perhaps *κόλλοψ* (when ‘Wulst am Querholz der Lyra’ and ‘Wulst am Halse der Rinder und Schweine’). As for *κολλαβίζω*, it means “*κόλλαβος* spielen, dh. einer versetzt dem anderen, der seine Augen mit der Handfläche zuhält, einen Schlag und fordert ihn auf zu raten, mit welcher Hand er geschlagen wurde”. FRISK gives it s.v. *κόλλαβος* ‘a kind of bread’ and adds “Grund der Benennung dunkel”. I think we are allowed to connect it with *κόλαφος* *κολάπτω*. (I have no opinion on the bread, but see TRIER, p. 45 on

κολλύρα; κόλλαβος can also have the same meaning as κόλλοψ). We note λ/λλ and β/φ; though expressivity always opens new possibilities, one gets the impression that the group is non-IE. This is confirmed by a form as κολοβός (and κόλλοψ; note ο/α).

With regard to the semantic relations discussed in the previous paragraphs I think one is right in adding σκόλοψ 'Spitzpfahl'. This is confirmed by σκολύπτω, which is not connected with κολάπτω by FRISK. I cite his description: "σκολύπτειν· ἐκτίλλειν, κολουέιν; σκολύψαι· κολουῖσαι, κολοβῶσαι; ἀνασκολύψας· γυμνώσας H(esychius); öfter mit ἀπο- 'abhäuten, abstreifen, beschneiden' ". As to the form it should be remarked that an s movable in the (Greek) substratum language is well known (1). The identity with κολουῖω κολοβός is stressed by the glosses. When we compare κολάπτω : σκολύπτω the impression of a non-IE word is strengthened. It should be noted that all the meanings (except eating) found for the group \*lep/bh-, \*lup/bh- are present: 1. to bark, 2. to tear off (ἐκτίλλειν), 3. to beat, cut back (in its in this connection essential notion of κολουῖσαι κολοβῶσαι). Surprising is the appearance of the notion of circumcision ('beschneiden'). It was suggested by TRIER, p. 167-79 (who did not know this word) that there was a relation between coppice and circumcision. I cite: "Die Beschneidung am Menschen hat die Wirkung, die sie am Schnittelbaum, ..., Laubrupfbaum, ..., im Niederwald hat. (...) Der Schnitt weckt den Nachwuchs wie am Baum" (p. 168f.). Cf. specially p. 174f. on the Dschagga. (In this connection it is noteworthy that the Indo-Europeans did not know circumcision.) It would be overconfident to say that this confirms the supposed origin of circumcision, but it confirms at least that the association existed in Europe in antiquity.

*University of Leiden.*

R.S.P. BEEKES.

(1) Cf. (σ)κιδάφη (σκίνδαφος, κινδάφη), (σ)κιμβάζω, (σ)κίμπτομαι, (σ)κινδαψός, (σ)κνήψ, (σ)κόρυζα (κνύζα), (σ)κορδύλη, (σ)μήριγξ, (σ)μίλαξ, (σ)μῶδιξ,-ιγγες.