



## Aethiopia 16 (2013)

International Journal of Ethiopian and  
Eritrean Studies

---

MARIA BULAKH – LEONID KOGAN, Russian State University  
for the Humanities

### Article

*Towards a Comprehensive Edition of the Arabic-Ethiopic Glossary  
of al-Malik al-Afdal*

*Part I: New Readings from the First Sheet*

Aethiopia 16 (2013), 138–148

ISSN: 2194-4024

---

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, Ulrich Braukämper, Ludwig Gerhardt,  
Hilke Meyer-Bahlburg and Siegbert Uhlig

## Towards a Comprehensive Edition of the Arabic-Ethiopic Glossary of al-Malik al-Afdal Part I: New Readings from the First Sheet

MARIA BULAKH – LEONID KOGAN,  
Russian State University for the Humanities

In October 2009, in the framework of the fourth meeting of the *Arbeitsgemeinschaft Semitistik in der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Franz-Christoph Muth presented to the scholarly world what can be legitimately considered one of the most impressive discoveries in the modern history of Ethiopian philology and linguistics: 475 Arabic lexemes<sup>1</sup> translated into several South Ethiopian idioms and put down in Arabic letters are preserved in a late-14<sup>th</sup> century manuscript which forms part of a codex found by Daniel M. Varisco in a private Yemeni collection and published by Varisco and G. Rex Smith in 1998.<sup>2</sup>

After a short while, Muth was able to publish the results of his analysis of the Glossary in a special article (Muth 2009–2010), where the interested reader will find a highly informative summary of the general background of al-Malik al-Afdal's codex, followed by a detailed description of the Glossary, including a comprehensive description of its thematic segments. A complete transliteration of the Glossary accompanied by the German translation of the Arabic and Ethiopic entries can be found in one of the appendices.

The revolutionary impact of the Glossary on various aspects of the historical grammar and lexicography of Ethiopian Semitic was immediately recognized by Leonid Kogan, who also attended the Leipzig meeting. From autumn 2009 on, the present authors have been working on a comprehensive, monograph-format edition of the Glossary, followed by a detailed analysis of the phonological and morphological shape of the Ethiopian lexemes and their possible dialectal distribution.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mostly classical but, at times, apparently also dialectal, which provides an Arabist with a unique glimpse of the late-medieval cultural vocabulary of Yemenite Arabic.

<sup>2</sup> That we are faced with a “list of Arabic words and their Ethiopian equivalents” was clear already to the original editors (VARISCO – SMITH 1998: 15), yet, to the best of our knowledge, before 2009 this remarkable fact did not receive any explicit reaction from either Ethiopian or Semitic scholarship. In such a context, the impact and originality of Muth's presentation cannot be overestimated.

<sup>3</sup> Since 2012, the project is supported by RFH/РГНФ (No. 12-04-00092a), to which we extend our sincere gratitude.

It was in February 2012 that we became acquainted with Muth's article. By that time, our own preliminary analysis of the Glossary was completed, providing an excellent opportunity for a critical comparison between two completely independent attempts at deciphering this fascinating document.

There is no doubt that many, perhaps most of Muth's identifications are quite persuasive and betray a keen and penetrating understanding of both Arabic and Ethiopic facts. Yet it is equally certain that his publication cannot be considered the last word in the philological and linguistic analysis of the Glossary. While some of the Arabic and Ethiopic entries qualified as "illegible" by Muth, upon a closer inspection, are quite well understandable, in a few other cases alternative readings can be proposed which, as far as we can see, are superior to Muth's in terms of palaeography, phonology and/or semantics.

The present note, the first one in a series of forthcoming preliminary publications by our team, contains 34 entries from the first sheet of the Glossary where identification in Muth's article is either missing altogether or not sufficiently convincing. The compact format of this note prompts us to present our findings in a very condensed manner, leaving most of the details for the eventual comprehensive edition. This pertains, first of all, to palaeographic details, but also to the etymological evidence.<sup>4</sup>

#### 217 upper margin, gloss A

One of the two notes written on the upper margin (disregarded by Muth) reads المرءة | *al-marʿat*- 'woman' (Lane 1863–1893: 2703) = است | *ʾnst*. The ES form reflects the widely attested designation of "woman, female": Gəʿəz *ʾanəst* (Leslau 1987: 32), Tna. *ʾanəsti* (Kane 2000: 1476f.), Amh. *anəst* (Kane 1990: 1213), Har. *ənəsti* (Leslau 1963: 29), Wol. *ənəst*, Səl. Zay *ənnəst* (Leslau 1979: 74), Gaf. *ansətä* (Leslau 1956: 180), Gog. Sod. *ənəst*, Geto *anst*, Muḥ. Msq. *ansət* (Leslau 1979: 74). This gloss supplies a basic designation of "woman" which seems to be missing from the main body of the text: the ES gloss in A 3, supposed to mean "woman" by Muth (2009–2010: 98), remains obscure, but it is extremely unlikely that the Arabic equivalent (partly illegible under a blot) can correspond to such a meaning (a more probable reading seems to be فلان | *fulān*- 'so-and-so').

<sup>4</sup> As in Muth's study, each sheet will be divided into six double columns (Arabic and Ethiopic), designated (from left to right) as A, B, C, D, E, F. The number following the capital letter (A 3) refers to the position of the Arabic entry, whereas 217 refers to p. 217 of the original edition, which corresponds to the first sheet of the Glossary. Alternative ES translations for one Arabic entry will be designated as Gloss A, B, C and D.

**217 upper margin, gloss B**

The second gloss on the upper margin, also left out of consideration in Muth’s study, provides a second Ethiopic translation for the meaning “woman”: ويقال سويح | *wa-yuqālu swyḡ*. The sequence *swyḡ* likely stands for \**säwäyč*, comparable to Tna. *säbäyti* (Kane 2000: 699), Amh. *set* (Kane 1990: 530), Zay *set* (Leslau 1979: 565). While none of the attested lexemes can fully account for the phonetic shape of the ES gloss, it can plausibly be considered an early SES parallel to Tna. *säbäyti*, with spirantization of intervocalic \**b* and palatalization of \**t* in the vicinity of *y*. Admittedly, such a form cannot be considered the direct forerunner of the attested Amharic and Zay lexemes, which preserve the non-palatalized *t*.

**217 left margin, gloss A**

ويقال للشباب | *wa-yuqālu li-l-šābbi* ‘and it is said for “young man”’ وند | *wand*.

The ES gloss is identical with Amh. *wänd* (Kane 1990: 1545), Arg. *wänd* (Leslau 1997: 225).

**217 A 15**

اللحيين | *al-lahyayni* ‘cheeks’ (Lane 1863–1893: 3009)<sup>5</sup> جنط | *ḡint*.

In Muth 2010: 98, the Arabic word is read as *ḡid* ‘Hals’ and the ES gloss, as *ḥän[g]ät*. Both identifications are palaeographically unconvincing, especially the second one: the word-final emphatic *t* is very clear and the alleged loss of *-g-* has no motivation whatsoever. Our reconstruction \**gənt* corresponds to Amh. *g<sup>w</sup>ənč*, *gunč* (Kane 1990: 2017), Arg. *gunč* (Leslau 1997: 202), Har. *gunči* (Leslau 1963: 73), Səl. *günčä* (Leslau 1979: 282), Čaha Eža *g<sup>w</sup>inčä*, Ěnm. *g<sup>w</sup>inčä*, Muḥ. *g<sup>w</sup>ənčä*, Msq. Gog. *gunča*, Sod. *gunča* (Leslau 1979: 282). As long as ط is thought to represent *t* (rather than č), none of the attested ES forms can be identified as the exact parallel to the ES gloss.<sup>6</sup>

**217 A 16**

الدقن فيه يقال | *al-daqaṅ- fihī yuqālu* “chin, beard” – it is called حمت | *ḡḥmt*.

The ES gloss can be reconstructed as \**čəḥmät* on the basis of Gəʿəz *ṣəḥm* (Leslau 1987: 552), Tgr. *ṣəḥəm* (Littmann – Höfner 1962: 633), *čəḥəm* (*ibid.*, p. 622), Tna. *čəḥmi* (Kane 2000: 2498), Amh. *ṭim* (Kane 1990: 2097), Arg. *ṭim* (Leslau 1997: 223). The phonological and semantic overlap between the adduced ES forms and the ES gloss is nearly complete, only the final *-t*, absent from all the attested ES forms, is disturbing.

<sup>5</sup> Note the post-classical oblique form of the dual.

<sup>6</sup> Palatalization \**t* > č in the attested ES lexemes can possibly be accounted for by the influence of the fossilized dual marker \**-e*, a well-known phenomenon elsewhere in SES (PODOLSKY 1991: 41).

217 A 19

Gloss A: مَمْرٌ | *mamar*.

Gloss B: دَمْدَسٌ ۲ | 2 *dmdas*.

Both ES glosses can be easily identified with ES designations of ‘nape of the neck’.

\**mām(m)är*: Amh. *mär(əm)mar* ‘shoulder of the ox where the yoke rests’ (Kane 1990: 177), Har. *märmär* ‘shoulder’ (Leslau 1963: 111), Zay *marmara* ‘hump of animal’ (Leslau 1979: 422), Čaha Ḥnm. Geto *mämär*, Eža Ḥnd. Muḥ. Msq. Gog. Sod. *mämmär* ‘nape of neck’ (*ibid.*, p. 406).

\**dämdäss*: Amh. *dändäss* ‘thick neck, back of the neck and the shoulders’ (Kane 1990: 1804).

In view of the complete semantic overlap between the two ES glosses, a similar meaning is undoubtedly to be ascribed to the Arabic entry, against Muth (2009–2010: 89) who reads *kaffain* ‘Handflächen’. No semantically fitting lexeme corresponding to the graphic shape of the Arabic entry has been found, but note perhaps *mudammar*- ‘the back of the neck’ (Lane 1863–1893: 978), which could imply a reading like *الذيمر* (\**al-daymar*-?).

217 left margin gloss D

ويقال فيه خرس | *wa-yuqālu fihi ḥrs* ‘and it is said for it *ḥrs*’.

This is the second gloss for Arabic *baṭn*- in 217 A 27. The ES reconstruction is \**ḥärs*, based on well-known cognates: Gəʿəz *karś* (Leslau 1987: 294), Tgr. *karəs* (Littmann – Höfner 1962: 399), Tna. *kärsi* (Kane 2000: 1592), Arg. *kärs*, *härs* (Leslau 1997: 209), Har. *kärsi* (Leslau 1963: 94), Gaf. *ärsä* (Leslau 1956: 182), Sod. *kärs* (Leslau 1979: 351). It is noteworthy that most of the attested ES forms do not show spirantization of \**k*, which is patent in the gloss (on this phenomenon see Podolsky 1991: 32f.).

217 B 5

الظهر | *al-ḡahr*- ‘back’ (Lane 1863–1893: 1927) جِنْجَ | *ḡinḡa*.

The reconstruction \**gəṅḡä* derives from Arg. *gunž* ‘back of the body’ (Leslau 1997: 202), Eža Muḥ. *g’anžä*, Sod. *g’inžä*, *ginžä*, Gog. Msq. *g’inḡä*, Čaha Ḥnm. Ḥnd. Geto *g’išä* ‘back of body’ (Leslau 1979: 310). The reading *ḡärba* in Muth 2009–2010: 98 can be safely excluded on palaeographic grounds.

217 B 7

العجر | *al-ʿaḡuz*- ‘hinder parts, posteriors, buttock’ (Lane 1863–1893: 1960) مِرْطٌ | *mirt*.

The reconstruction \**mərṭ* derives from Amh. *murt* ‘anus; bottom, butt’ (Kane 1990: 199), Arg. *murt* ‘anus, bottom’ (Leslau 1997: 213), Sod. *murt*

‘genital organs’ (Leslau 1979: 425). Muth’s identification with *kiṭ* (with an alleged by-form *kīrt*) is unconvincing.

**217 B 17**

رَرَآث | *zarāt*.

This is the third gloss to Arabic <sup>ʾ</sup>*al-dakar*- ‘penis’ in 217 B 15. The reconstruction *\*žərat* corresponds to Amh. *zərat* ‘tail’ (Kane 1990: 1626), *ğərat*, *žərat* ‘tail, caudal appendage’ (*ibid.*, p. 1860), Wol. *zərat*, Səl. *zārāt*, Zay *zərat* ‘tail, tip of tail’ (Leslau 1979: 715). The meaning shift “tail” > “penis” is well attested, cf. Čaha Msq. Gog. Sod. *ğəwä*, Eža *ğəwwä*, Ənm. Geto *ğəwä*, Muḥ. Səl. *ğuwä*, Ənd. *ğūwä* ‘tail; penis of adult’ (*ibid.*, p. 319) which appears in the second gloss to <sup>ʾ</sup>*al-dakar*- in the Glossary (217 B 16).

**217 C 13**

الضان | <sup>ʾ</sup>*al-daʾn*- ‘sheep’ (Lane 1863–1893: 1760) | باڨڨآ | *bağğā*.

The reconstruction *\*bägga* is straightforward: Gəʿəz *baggə* (Leslau 1987: 88), Tgr. *bəggə* (Littmann – Höfner 1962: 299), Tna. *bəggə* (Kane 2000: 1205), Amh. *bäg* (Kane 1990: 940), Arg. *bägi* (Leslau 1997: 195), Gaf. *bäg* (Leslau 1956: 188).

**217 C 18**

الديك | <sup>ʾ</sup>*al-dik*- ‘domestic cock’ (Lane 1863–1893: 942) | دَرْنَقْ | *darnaq*.

The ES gloss *\*därnäḳ* corresponds to Gəʿəz *dərnəḳ*, *därnäḳ* ‘quail’ (Leslau 1987: 143), Amh. *dərnəḳ* ‘quail (Alauda cristata or Perdrix coturnix)’ (Kane 1990: 1750). The semantic difference is noteworthy, but certainly not a serious obstacle.

**217 C 23**

العروق | <sup>ʾ</sup>*al-ğurnūq*- ‘stork; crane’ (Lane 1863–1893: 2253) | قَاوْقَاڨْ | *qawqağ*.

The ES gloss *\*kəwḳäğ*/*\*koḳäğ* is likely identical to the Ethiopian designations of the francolin partridge: Gəʿəz *koḳāḥ* (Leslau 1987: 438), Tgr. *koḳāḥ* (Littmann – Höfner 1962: 248), Tna. *koḳāḥ* (Kane 2000: 972), Amh. *koḳ* (Kane 1990: 761), Arg. *koḳ* (Leslau 1997: 217), Səl. *koḳe*, Wol. *kuḳi* (Leslau 1979: 492), Gaf. *kuḳ<sup>w</sup>äğgi* (Leslau 1956: 224), Čaha Eža *koḳ*, Muḥ. Msq. *koḳa*, Sod. *kuḳä*, Muḥ. *ko<sup>a</sup>a*, Gog. *ko<sup>a</sup>a*, Ənm. Geto *koḳ<sup>w</sup>añä*, Ənd. *koḳāññä* (Leslau 1979: 492). Our reconstruction relies on the Gafat form, but if the dot in the last letter is disregarded, an alternative reconstruction *\*kawḳāḥ*, coming close to the Gəʿəz, Təgre and Təgrāñña forms, becomes possible.

**217 D 4**

العفو الصغير | <sup>ʾ</sup>*al-afw*- <sup>ʾ</sup>*al-šağīr*- ‘young ass’ (Lane 1863–1893: 2094) | وَنَطَرْ | *wanṭar*.

The ES gloss *\*wāntār* comes close to Tna. *wəranča* ‘ass’s foal of about three years’ (Kane 2000: 1729), Amh. *wəranča* ‘ass’s foal’ (Kane 1990: 1507), Har. *wāččara* ‘donkey’ (Leslau 1963: 157), Zay *wərinčä* ‘the young of a donkey’ (Leslau 1979: 663). There is no ES reconstruction in Muth 2009–2010: 99, whereas Muth’s reading of the Arabic form as *ʾal-baʿīr- ʾal-šaḡīr-* ‘kleines Kamel’ cannot be accepted.

#### 217 D 5

الهداه | *ʾal-ḥidaʾat-* ‘kite’ (Lane 1863–1893: 526) | *waḡat* .

The ES gloss can be reconstructed as *\*wāž(ž)ät* on the basis of Geto *wanzät*, Čaha Eža Muḥ. *wänžät* ‘hawk’ (Leslau 1979: 658), Ḥnd. *wanḡod* id. (*ibid.*, p. 656).

#### 217 D 13

انحاجعل | *ʾummu ḥubaynin* ‘chameleon’ (Lane 1863–1893: 507) | *ʾangāḡaʿal* .

The ES gloss, likely to be reconstructed as *\*ʾančāčāʿal*, can be compared to Amh. *ənšašəllit* ‘chameleon’ (Kane 1990: 1214). The alternation between č and š is attested in ES (v. Leslau 1979: lxii) including Amharic, cf. such free variants as *täčäggarä/täšäggarä* ‘to be hard-pressed’ (Kane 1990: 660, 1014) or *čəfal/šəfal* ‘eyebrow’ (*ibid.*, pp. 666, 1015).

#### 217 D 23

اللوبيا | *ʾal-lūbiyā* ‘a species of kidney-bean’ (Lane 1863–1893: 2677) | *ʾadunḡurā* .

The ES gloss is identical to the widely attested designation of bean: Tgr. *ʾadunḡwəra* (Littmann – Höfner 1962: 384), Tna. *ʾadagwəra* (Kane 2000: 1535), Amh. *adängwəarre* (Kane 1990: 1308), Arg. *adunḡure* (Leslau 1997: 189), Zay *adangura* (Leslau 1979: 17), Gaf. *adängwəarä* (Leslau 1956: 172), Muḥ. *adängwəarre* (Leslau 1979: 17). The *ʾalif* rendering the initial *a-* seems to be, peculiarly, written as a small vertical stroke above *ḡim*.

#### 217 E 10

الجزر | *ʾal-ḡazar-* ‘carrot’ (Lane 1863–1893: 418–419) | *dannik* .

The ES gloss can be reconstructed as *\*dännək* on the basis of the ES designations of potato: Tna. *dənnəš* (Kane 2000: 2122), Amh. *dənnəčč* (Kane 1990: 1801), Arg. *dənnəč* (Leslau 1997: 199), Har. *dinničča* (Leslau 1963: 57), Səl. Zay *dənnəčča*, Wol. *dənnəččü* (Leslau 1979: 212), Muḥ. Msq. Gog. Sod. *dənnəčča* (*ibid.*), Eža *dənničča*, Čaha *dəničča*, Geto *dinčča*, Ḥnd. *dinčča*, *dinččü*, Ḥnm. *dinčča* (*ibid.*). All these forms display word-final č (Tna. š), which can well result from *k* via palatalization. The semantic difference is unproblematic.



217 E 13

البلس | <sup>o</sup>*al-balas*- ‘figs’ (Ibn Maḍḍūr 2003, VI, 36, Behnstedt 1992–2006: 106, Steiner 2003: 53) سَبَلَة | *sablāb*.

The ES gloss <sup>o</sup>*sābla* reflects the widespread designation of the fig tree in SES: Amh. *šola* (Kane 1990: 603), Arg. *šola* (Leslau 1997: 221), Har. *sōbla* (Leslau 1963: 136), Wol. *soblā*, Səl. *sōble*, Zay *sūblā* (Leslau 1979: 532), Msq. Gog. Sod. *sobla*, Čaha Eža *šābra*, Geto *šābra*, Ěnm. *šābra*, Muḥ. *šābaya*, Ěnd. *šāwra* (ibid.).

217 E 16

الاجاص | <sup>o</sup>*al-iğğās*- ‘plum’ (Lane 1863–1893: 24) انحية | <sup>o</sup>*inḡih*.

The ES gloss is likely to be reconstructed as <sup>o</sup>*ənči* on the basis of Amh. *ənkoy* ‘a large tree which produces a tasty, yellow fruit (*Ximenia americana*)’ (Kane 1990: 1227), ‘a kind of wild plum’ (Gankin 1969: 542). The attested Amharic forms show no trace of palatalization, which could, however, easily take place in the vicinity of *y*.

217 E 17

المشمش | <sup>o</sup>*al-mišmiš*- ‘apricot’ (Lane 1863–1893: 2716) خوسم | <sup>h</sup>*būsam*.

The ES gloss has to be reconstructed as <sup>h</sup>*bošām* on the basis of Amh. *košām* ‘tree or thorny bush of the temperate highlands which bears a fruit that puckers up the mouth (*Dovyalis abyssinica*)’ (Kane 1990: 1412), Wol. *košām*, Səl. *kōšām* ‘kind of tree’ (Leslau 1979: 355). For the spirantized *ḥ*- in the ES gloss as opposed to *k*- in the modern forms see above in connection with 217 left margin gloss D.

217 E 18

التوت | <sup>o</sup>*tūt*- ‘mulberry’ (Lane 1863–1893: 321) عحاتم | <sup>o</sup>*aḡām*.

The ES reconstruction <sup>o</sup>*agam* derives from Tgr. <sup>o</sup>*agām* ‘*Carissa edulis*, ein Busch mit schwarzen Beeren’ (Littmann – Höfner 1962: 487), Tna. <sup>o</sup>*agām* ‘evergreen thornbush having very fragrant clusters of florets and edible black berries (*Carissa edulis*)’ (Kane 2000: 1930), Amh. *agam* ‘a thorny bush that bears edible fruit (*Carissa edulis*)’ (Kane 1990: 1321), Har. *agām* ‘kind of berry’ (Leslau 1963: 21), Wol. *agam*, Səl. *agām* ‘kind of tree’ (Leslau 1979: 25), Msq. Gog. Sod. *agam* ‘kind of tree’ (ibid.). The reconstruction *əngorre* proposed in Muth 2009–2010: 99 (corresponding to Amh. *əḡorre* ‘raspberry, strawberry’, Kane 1990: 1243) is palaeographically less likely.

217 E 21

حشيش الدينار | <sup>h</sup>*šašišu l-dīnāri* ‘hop’ (Dozy 1881, I, 288) سِنَعَر | <sup>o</sup>*sin<sup>o</sup>ar*.



The ES gloss *\*sən<sup>c</sup>ar* is identical with Amh. *sinar* ‘a kind of oat (*Avena abyssinica*) used as horse fodder which grows among barley’ (Kane 1990: 535); see Strelcyn (1973: 175f.) for its use in preparation of *ṭälla* (local beer).

217 E 22

العجور | *al-<sup>c</sup>ağūr-* ‘Hirsestengel, von denen der Fruchtkolben und der Wurzelstock abgetrennt sind; Futter’ (Behnstedt 1992–2006: 804, Piamenta 1990: 316) | بزغ | *bar<sup>c</sup>a*.

In his treatment of this entry, Muth (2009–2010: 99) departs from the meaning ‘grüne Melonenart’, characteristic for *agūr-* in Classical Arabic (Lane 1863–1893: 1959), but is unable to provide any suitable interpretation for the ES gloss. However, the dialectal Yemeni meanings adduced above are well compatible with a reconstruction *\*bār<sup>c</sup>(a)* ‘reed; stalk’, based on Gəʿəz *bər<sup>c</sup>* ‘reed, reed pen, branch of a chandelier, stalk, stem of fruit, stubble’ (Leslau 1987: 101), Tna. *bər<sup>c</sup>i* ‘pen (for writing); stubble of wheat or barley’ (Kane 2000: 1132), Amh. *bər* ‘stubble, stalks of wheat or barley, stalks of grass used for thatch; pen, reed pen’ (Kane 1990: 875).

217 E 23

الشجر | *al-šağar-* ‘trees’ (Lane 1863–1893: 1507) | دبر | *dibir*.

The ES gloss *\*dabər* is certainly identical with Gaf. *dabrä* ‘forêt’ (Leslau 1956:195), Čaha Eža Muḥ. Msq. Gog. Sod. *dabər*, Ənm. Geto *dabər* (Leslau 1979: 197). Clearly related forms with loss of *b* are Amh. *dur* ‘wood, forest’ (Kane 1990: 1732) and Ənd. *dər* ‘forest’ (Leslau 1979: 197). Further etymological background of these lexemes is discussed in Leslau (1987: 121).

217 E 24

الطول من الشجر | *al-ṭulu mina l-šağari* ‘the highest of the trees’ | رجب | *ziğb*.

The ES gloss *\*zəgb* must be related to Gəʿəz *zagbā* ‘podocarpus’ (*ibid.*, p. 633), Tna. *zəgba* ‘zegba tree (*Podocarpis gracilior*)’ (Kane 2000: 2023), Amh. *zəgba*, *zəgba* ‘*Podocarpus gracilior*, a large tree resembling the cedar’ (Kane 1990: 1678), Səl. *zəgba*, Wol. *zəgbä* ‘kind of tree’ (Leslau 1979: 704), Čaha Eža Muḥ. Msq. Gog. Sod. *zəgba*, Ənm. Geto *zəğəba*, Ənd. *zəğəwa* ‘kind of tree’ (*ibid.*); see further Strelcyn 1973: 242, no. 298.

217 E 26

عود القطران | *ūdu l-qaṭrāni* ‘the tar wood’ (Lane 1863–1893: 2543: *qaṭirān-*, *qaṭrān-* ‘tar or liquid pitch; what exudes from the juniper’) | طيد | *ṭid*.

The ES gloss *\*ṭəd* renders a designation of the juniper tree: Amh. *ṭəd* ‘juniper (*Juniperus procera*)’ (Kane 1990: 2177), Zay *ṭədä*, Wol. *ṭid*, Səl. *ṭid* ‘juniper’ (Leslau 1979: 612), Gaf. *čədä* ‘génévrier’ (Leslau 1956: 192), Sod.

*tädä*, Muḥ. *däd*, Eža Msq. Gog. *dädd* ‘juniper’ (Leslau 1979: 612). A more archaic shape of this common ES term is attested in Gəʿəz *ṣəḥd*, *ṣəḥ<sup>w</sup>d* ‘juniper, cedar’ (Leslau 1987: 554). Muth’s identification with what he adduces as “*dur* (Holz)” (Muth 2009–2010: 99) can be safely excluded both palaeographically (the first letter of the ES gloss is a clear *tā*) and semantically (Amh. *dur* designates ‘wood, forest’, not ‘wood, timber’).

217 E 27

الميدان | *al-marʿā* ‘pasturage, place of pasture’ (Lane 1863–1893: 1110) | *al-mīdān*.

The ES gloss likely corresponds to Har. *mēdān* ‘plain’ (Leslau 1963: 103). The diachronic background of the Harari word remains to be elucidated. As recognized by Leslau, it looks like an obvious borrowing from Arb. *maydān*-, *mīdān*- (Lane 1863–1893: 2746), but the only meaning attested for this word in Classical Arabic seems to be ‘race ground, hippodrome’. Although Dozy 1881, II, 635 gives ‘plaine en général’ for some post-Classical sources, one may wonder whether the general meaning ‘plain’ in Harari might have rather arisen by contamination with Tgr. *meda* ‘plain, meadow, field’ (Kane 2000: 504), Amh. *meda* ‘plain, field’ (Kane 1990: 320), *meda* ‘plain’ (Leslau 1997: 211), Wol. *medä* ‘plain, field, meadow’ (Leslau 1979: 390), Sod. *mida*, *meda*, Čaha Eža Muḥ. *mida* ‘plain, field, meadow’ (ibid.). Note that the Arabic article, present in the ES gloss, is missing from the attested Harari form.

217 F 01

الحنثا | *al-ḥinnā*(-) ‘*Lawsonia inermis*’ (Lane 1863–1893: 654) | انسسلاه | *ənsuslah*.

The ES gloss *\*ənsosəla* corresponds to Amh. *ənsosəlla* ‘henna (*Impatiens tinctoria*)’ (Kane 1990: 1213), Muḥ. Sod. *ənsosəlla* ‘red fruit similar to potatoes’ (Leslau 1979: 75); see further Strelcyn (1973: 62, 170).

217 F 10

الكثير | *al-kaṭīr*- ‘much; many; numerous’ (Lane 1863–1893: 2593f.) | أَحَمْدُ | *ahamd*.

The ES gloss may be compared to Amh. *amäd* ‘large quantity’ (Kane 1990: 1137), Īnd. Geto *amäd*, Īnd. *hamäd* ‘abundant, much, many’, Muḥ. *amad* ‘time of abundance’ (Leslau 1979: 47). According to Leslau, these ES forms go back, with a metaphoric semantic development, to common ES *\*ḥamad* ‘ashes, soil, dirt’, albeit the presence of *h* in Īndägañ is unexpected in such a case (the instances of Īndägañ *h* corresponding to ES *ḥ* are rare and mostly belong to loanwords, see *ibid.*, p. lxiv). We have to admit that the validity of our identification is to some extent weakened by the presence of *ʿalif* as the first letter of the ES gloss (*\*ahamäd*), which has no parallel in any of the comparable ES terms.

217 F 12

رانح | *zānḥ*.

The second gloss to Arabic *ṣubḥ*- ‘morning, dawn’ is identical to Arg. *zāñña* ‘dawn’ (Leslau 1997: 227), Har. *ziñāt* ‘dawn’ (Leslau 1963: 167), Zay *zāñāt* ‘dawn, early morning, daylight’ (Leslau 1979: 712), Muḥ. Msq. Gog. Sod. *zāññāt* ‘dawn, early morning, daylight’ (ibid.). While none of the comparable ES forms displays the final guttural as the ES gloss, a trace of it can be seen in the palatalized *ñ*, which could well have emerged as a consequence of the loss of the guttural (Podolsky 1991: 38f.).

217 F 14

الرعد | *al-raʿd*- ‘thunder’ (Lane 1863–1893: 1105) رُجْمُحَامٌ | *ruḡumḡām*.

The ES gloss *\*rugumgam* comes close to Amh. *tārg<sup>w</sup>äg<sup>w</sup>mäg<sup>w</sup>ämä* ‘to grumble, mutter complainingly, to rumble, e. g. thunder’ (Kane 1990: 413). Phonetically similar designations of thunder are attested elsewhere in Southern ES, note especially Arg. *gurmumta* (Leslau 1997: 203) and Zay *gəmgəmət* (Leslau 1979: 277). The reconstruction *\*näg<sup>w</sup>ädg<sup>w</sup>ad* proposed in Muth (2009–2010: 100; for the corresponding ES forms see Leslau 1987: 182) is practically excluded on palaeographic grounds.

217 F 17

الخليج | *al-ḥaliğ*- ‘canal’ (Lane 1863–1893: 783) طَرْطَرٌ | *tarṭar*.

The ES gloss can probably be reconstructed as *\*tärtär* on the basis of Čaha Eža Ənm. Geto *čərčər(ə)yä*, Čaha Msq. *čərčəryät*, Muḥ. *ənčərčər*, Čaha Eža *ənčərčəryät*, Ənm. *ənčərčəryäd* ‘small stream of water, source’ (Leslau 1979: 188).

217 F 19

حُمٌ | *ḡum*.

This is the second gloss to Arabic *saḥāb*- ‘cloud’ in 217 F 18. It is to be reconstructed as *\*ḡum*, which corresponds to ES designations of ‘fog, cloud, mist’: Gəʿəz *gime*, *gum* (Leslau 1987: 193), Tgr. *gim* (Littmann – Höfner 1962: 566), Tna. *gəmə*, *gime*, *gimä* (Kane 2000: 2236), Amh. *gum* (Kane 1990: 1906), Arg. *gəmo* (Leslau 1997: 201), Ənd. Geto *gūwä*, Ənm. *gōwä* (Leslau 1979: 302).

Abbreviations of language names

Amh.	Amharic	Gog.	Gogot	Sod.	Soddo
Arg.	Argobba	Har.	Harari	Tgr.	Təgre
Ənd.	Əndägañ	Msq.	Məsqañ	Tna.	Təgrəñña
Ənm.	Ənnämor	Muḥ.	Muḥər	Wol.	Woläne
ES	Ethio-Semitic	Səl.	Səlṭi		
Gaf.	Gafat	SES	South Ethio-Semitic		

## References

- BEHNSTEDT, P. 1992–2006, *Die nordjemenitischen Dialekte*, Teil 2: *Glossar*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- DOZY, R.P.A. 1881, *Supplement aux Dictionnaires Arabes*, Leyde: E.J. Brill.
- GANKIN, E.B. 1969, *Amharsko-russkiy slovar'* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Sovetskaya entsiklopedia" 1969) [Ганкин, Э.Б. 1969, *Амхарско-русский словарь*, Москва: Издательство «Советская энциклопедия»].
- IBN MANḌŪR 2003, *Lisān al-ʿarab*, Beyrouth: Dar Al-Kutub al-ilmiyah.
- KANE, T.L. 1990, *Amharic–English Dictionary*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- 2000, *Tigrinya–English Dictionary*, Springfield, VA: Dunwoody Press.
- LANE, E.W. 1863–1893, *Arabic–English Lexicon*, London: Williams and Norgate.
- LESLAU, W. 1956, *Étude descriptive et comparative du Gafat (éthiopien méridional)*, Paris: C. Klincksieck.
- 1963, *Etymological Dictionary of Harari*, Berkeley, CA – Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- 1979, *Etymological Dictionary of Gurage (Ethiopic)*, III: *Etymological Section*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- 1987, *Comparative Dictionary of Geʿez (Classical Ethiopic)*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- 1997, *Ethiopic Documents: Argobba. Grammar and Dictionary*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- LITTMANN, E. – M. HÖFNER 1962, *Wörterbuch der Tigrē-Sprache: Tigrē–Deutsch–English*, Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.
- MUTH, F.-C. 2009–2010, "Frühe Zeugnisse des Amharischen und der Gurage-Sprachen in einer polyglotten Wortliste von Al-Malik Al-Afḍal (gest. 778/1377)", *Folia Orientalia* 45–46, pp. 87–109.
- PIAMENTA, M. 1990, *A Dictionary of Post-Classical Yemeni Arabic*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- PODOLSKY, B. 1991, *Historical Phonetics of Amharic*, Tel-Aviv: University of Tel-Aviv.
- STEINER, R.C. 2003, *Stockmen from Tekoa, Sycomores from Sheba: A Study of Amos' Occupations* = The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 36, Washington, DC: The Catholic Bible Association of America.
- STRELCYN, S. 1973, *Médecine et plantes d'Éthiopie*, II: *Enquête sur les noms et l'emploi des plantes en Éthiopie*, Naples: Istituto Universitario orientale.
- VARISCO, D.M. – G.R. SMITH (eds.) 1998, *The Manuscript of al-Malik al-Afḍal al-ʿAbbās b. ʿAlī b. Dāʿūd b. Yūsuf b. ʿUmar b. ʿAlī Ibn Rasūl (d. 778/1377)*, Warminster: Gibb Memorial Trust.

## Summary

The paper presents the preliminary results of a thorough palaeographic and etymological analysis of the first sheet of the al-Malik al-Afḍal's 14<sup>th</sup> century Arabic–Ethiopic Glossary, undertaken by the team of Russian scholars in the framework of a project on edition and publication of the whole Glossary. The results are compared with the identifications offered recently by Franz-Christoph Muth. For the 34 entries from the first sheet of the Glossary, whose identification in Muth's publication is either missing altogether or not sufficiently convincing, new identifications are offered and discussed.