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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 Gǝ’ǝẓ. 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 Gǝ’ǝẓ texts that will be used in the creation of the digital Gǝ’ǝẓ lexicon, including discussion of the digital tools that have been created for this work: E. Sokolinski’s ‘The TraCES project and Gǝ’ǝẓ 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 Gǝ’ǝẓ 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 Gǝ’ǝẓ 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 Goʿaz 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 Goʿaz 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 Goʿaz, focusing primarily on the historical development of vowels. The paper displays an impressive depth of understanding of Goʿaz 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 Goʿaz yəʾǝ_CE ze (‘now’) from a putative *Vḏay (‘when’, ‘then’), comparing Arabic ʾid (‘when’). I, however, think that it is more likely that the final element goes back to a substantive *ʾiḏ (‘instant’, ‘moment’), in light of the multiplicative suffixal morpheme -ʾiḏ in both Ugaritic and Sabaic, for instance Ugaritic šbʾ(i)d (‘sevenfold’) and Sabaic šʾltʾiḏ (‘three times’). A substantive *ʾiḏ (‘instant’, ‘moment’) could easily grammaticalize in various ways (Goʿaz yǝʾǝ_CE ze; 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. Such disagreements, however, in no way detract from what is an important contribution to the historical grammar of Goʿaz.

The next three papers in the volume deal with language contact. S. A. Frantsouzoff’s ‘Sabaic loanwords in Goʿaz and borrowings from Goʿaz into Middle Sabaic’ (pp. 141–147) discusses, as the title suggests, lexical interaction between Goʿaz and Sabaic in different directions depending on the time period: Sabaic into Goʿaz in the Pre-Aksumite period, and Goʿaz 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 Goʿaz
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sänbät, ‘Sabbath’, is a loanword directly from Greek Σάββατον and not, as is usually held, from Hebrew or Aramaic. K. M. Heide’s ‘New Ge’ez 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 Ge’ez 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 Ge’ez.

The final three papers in the volume form a more disparate group that is fittingly entitled ‘Ge’ez 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 Ge’ez from their beginnings in Europe in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries up until the present digital age. M. Kropp’s ‘Sergew Hable Selassie’s Fragment eines Ge’ez-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 Ge’ez 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 Ge’ez 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 Ge’ez lexicography.

This volume is essential reading for anyone interested in the Ge’ez 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 Ge’ez 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