



Aethiopica 22 (2019)

International Journal of Ethiopian and
Eritrean Studies

AARON MICHAEL BUTTS, The Catholic University of America

Review

ALESSANDRO BAUSI, with assistance from EUGENIA SOKOLINSKI, ed., *150
Years after Dillmann's Lexicon: Perspectives and Challenges of Gə'əz
Studies*

Aethiopica 22 (2019), 289–291

ISSN: 1430-1938

Edited in the Asien-Afrika-Institut
Hiob-Ludolf-Zentrum für Äthiopistik
der Universität Hamburg
Abteilung für Afrikanistik und Äthiopistik

by Alessandro Bausi

in cooperation with

Bairu Tafla, Ludwig Gerhardt,
Hilke Meyer-Bahlburg, and Siegbert Uhlig

tions, the work is aimed primarily at the layman who has an interest in Ethiopian life and the rich culture of the country. It may also be useful for curators of museums with Ethiopian paintings in the cataloguing of their collections.

Elisabeth Biasio, Zürich

ALESSANDRO BAUSI, with assistance from EUGENIA SOKOLINSKI, ed., *150 Years after Dillmann's Lexicon: Perspectives and Challenges of Gə'əz Studies*, Supplement to *Aethiopica*, 5 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2016). xi, 238 pp. Price: €48.00. ISBN: 978-3-447-10783-9.

This interesting volume contains a selection of papers, plus one addition, from the international conference of basically the same name that was held at the Universität Hamburg on 16 and 17 October 2015. This conference was held under the auspices of the project TraCES: From Translation to Creation: Changes in Ethiopic Style and Lexicon from Late Antiquity to the Middle Ages, which has been supported by a European Research Council Advanced Grant (no. 338756).

The volume begins with a helpful Preface (by E. Sokolinski) and Introduction (by A. Bausi) that orient the reader not only to the contents of the volume but also to the broader ambitions of the TraCES project, including the development of a web-based digital lexicon of Gə'əz. These introductory pieces are naturally followed by a set of three papers that lay out in more detail the current status of the creation of an annotated corpus of Gə'əz texts that will be used in the creation of the digital Gə'əz lexicon, including discussion of the digital tools that have been created for this work: E. Sokolinski's 'The TraCES project and Gə'əz studies' (pp. 13–16); S. Hummel and W. Dickhut, 'A part of speech tag set for Ancient Ethiopic' (pp. 17–29); and C. Vertan, 'Bringing Gə'əz into the digital era: computational tools for processing Classical Ethiopic' (pp. 31–41). These papers are thrilling reading for those of us who long for the day when digital humanities tools can aide with the annotation and mark-up of Gə'əz texts, as they long have for Greek and Latin and are now doing for Coptic.

These three technical papers are followed by A. Bausi's more wide-ranging 'On editing and normalizing Ethiopic texts' (pp. 43–102). This is the only paper that was not part of the conference at the origins of this volume, and this reviewer for one is very thankful that it has been included here despite this. The paper is a programmatic history-in-brief of

how Gəʕəz texts have been edited since Ludolf at the turn of the seventeenth century up until the present. Every page of the paper is full of rich insights not only about the history of the field but also about Gəʕəz language, manuscripts, and texts as well as textual criticism (philology). This paper will be required reading for all of my graduate students in Ethiopic Studies.

It is followed by a penetrating paper by M. Bulakh entitled ‘Some problems of transcribing Geez’ (pp. 103–137). Here Bulakh addresses a number of important linguistic questions in Gəʕəz, focusing primarily on the historical development of vowels. The paper displays an impressive depth of understanding of Gəʕəz and the scholarly tradition dedicated to it. Comparative Semitic evidence also happily features throughout. Experts will have an occasional quibble here and there. For instance, Bulakh follows Kogan in deriving the final element of Gəʕəz *ɣəʕəze* (‘now’) from a putative **Vday* (‘when’, ‘then’), comparing Arabic *ʕid* (‘when’).¹ I, however, think that it is more likely that the final element goes back to a substantive **ʕid* (‘instant’, ‘moment’), in light of the multiplicative suffixal morpheme *-ʕid* in both Ugaritic and Sabaic, for instance Ugaritic *šbʕ(i)d* (‘sevenfold’) and Sabaic *šlttʕd* (‘three times’). A substantive **ʕid* (‘instant’, ‘moment’) could easily grammaticalize in various ways (Gəʕəz *ɣəʕəze*; temporal adverb ‘then’; temporal conjunction ‘when’; multiplicative suffix; etc.), but it is more difficult to see how a temporal adverb/conjunction ‘when’, ‘then’ could become a multiplicative suffixal morpheme.² Such disagreements, however, in no way detract from what is an important contribution to the historical grammar of Gəʕəz.

The next three papers in the volume deal with language contact. S. A. Frantsouzoff’s ‘Sabaic loanwords in Gəʕəz and borrowings from Gəʕəz into Middle Sabaic’ (pp. 141–147) discusses, as the title suggests, lexical interaction between Gəʕəz and Sabaic in different directions depending on the time period: Sabaic into Gəʕəz in the Pre-Aksumite period, and Gəʕəz into Sabaic in the Aksumite period. A. Soldati’s ‘Nasal infix as index of Semitic loanwords borrowed through the Greek’ (pp. 149–171) argues that Gəʕəz

¹ L. Kogan, *Genealogical Classification of Semitic: The Lexical Isoglosses* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015), 115–116. For the importance of this magnum opus, see A. Butts, ‘Review of Leonid Kogan, *Genealogical Classification of Semitic: The Lexical Isoglosses* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015)’, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 77/1 (2018), 144–149.

² For discussion, with bibliography, see A. M. Butts, *Language Change in the Wake of Empire: Syriac in its Greco-Roman Context*, Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic, 11 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2016), 176.

sānbāt, ‘Sabbath’, is a loanword directly from Greek Σάββατον and not, as is usually held, from Hebrew or Aramaic. K. M. Heide’s ‘New Gəʿəz word forms from Arabic–Ethiopic translation literature. Suggestions for lexical entries and their meanings, as demonstrated from *Secundus the Silent Philosopher*’ (pp. 173–181) provides a case study in how the language of a Gəʿəz text that is translated from Arabic can be shaped by its *Vorlage*, in this case, leading to new derivations, a widening of semantic fields of some words, and even the creation of innovative nouns. Each of these contributions is interesting and probing in its own right, and together they remind us of the vast amount of research that still can (and should) be done on language contact situations involving Gəʿəz.

The final three papers in the volume form a more disparate group that is fittingly entitled ‘Gəʿəz lexicography in comparison’. A. Ellwardt’s ‘Beyond Dillmann’s *Lexicon*. Towards digital lexicography: Lessons from Syriac’ (pp. 185–199) offers a comparative history of the lexicographies of Syriac and of Gəʿəz from their beginnings in Europe in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries up until the present digital age. M. Kropp’s ‘Sergew Hable Selassies Fragment eines Gəʿəz-Belegstellenlexikons und Abraham Johannes Drewes’ Glossare zum *Recueil des inscriptions de l’Éthiopie*. Zwei unveröffentlichte Beiträge zur äthiopischen Lexikographie und deren Bewertung und Lehren für die heutige informationstechnisch aufgerüstete Äthiopistik’ (pp. 201–217) discusses the lexicographical *Nachlass* of these two prominent scholars locating their work within the broader history of the field. S. Weninger’s ‘The use of Arabic in Gəʿəz lexicography: from Dillmann to Leslau and beyond’ (pp. 219–231) provides a necessary—and much appreciated from this reviewer’s perspective—warning about problems with how previous lexicographers of Gəʿəz have employed Arabic in their works. Weninger also offers helpful advice about how such pitfalls can be avoided so that Arabic can be used responsibly and profitably in future Gəʿəz lexicography.

This volume is essential reading for anyone interested in the Gəʿəz language, especially its lexicon. It is particularly to be commended for its many historical and comparative forays, which look to the history of the field of Ethiopic studies as well as to other allied fields, such as Syriac studies, for insights into how we should approach writing a Gəʿəz lexicon in the twenty-first century. In addition, this volume is an important resource for a broader range of scholars spread across different disciplines who are interested in intersections between digital humanities and language analysis, including especially the creation of digital lexica based on large corpora of annotated texts.

Aaron Michael Butts, The Catholic University of America