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

Article


Part III: New Readings from the Third Sheet

Aethiopica 18 (2015), 56–80
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
Bibliographical abbreviations used in this volume

AÉ _Annales d’Éthiopie_, Paris 1955ff.


AION _Annali dell’Università degli studi di Napoli ‘L’Oriente’, Napoli: Università di Napoli ‘L’Oriente’ (former Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli), 1929ff.


CSCO Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 1903ff.


EMML Ethiopian Manuscript Microfilm Library, Addis Ababa.


PO Patrologia Orientalis, 1903ff.


RRALm _Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche_, Roma, 1892ff.


SAe _Scriptores Aethiopici_.
Part III: New Readings from the Third Sheet

MARIA BULAKH and LEONID KOGAN
Russian State University for the Humanities

This article is the third and last in a series of preliminary publications of selected entries from the Arabic-Ethiopic Glossary of al-Malik al-Afdal (Varisco and Smith 1998, sheets 217–219). In Bulakh and Kogan 2013 and 2014, the new readings from first and second sheets of the Glossary have been discussed. The present contribution focuses on the new readings from the third sheet, updating and correcting the results previously obtained in Muth 2009–2010.1

219 A 3

| ‘at-tarkāṡ ‘carquois’ (Dozy 1881, I, 145) |
| *filāṭah |

The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *fālāṣad/fālāṭa, cf. Tna. fālāṣa ‘arrow (for a bow)’ (Kane 2000, 2648), Amh. fālāṣa ‘arrow, projectile’ (Kane 1990, 2271, Guidi 1901, 870), fālāṣṭa/fālāṭṭa id. (Gankin 1969, 863). The semantic overlap between the Arabic term (‘quiver’) and the Ethiopic gloss (‘arrow’) is not complete, but the identification appears to be reasonably certain.

219 A 4

| ‘an-nussāb ‘arrows’ (Lane 1863–1893, 2792) |
| hmāṭ |

The Ethiopic gloss, reconstructed as *ḥānāṭ, can be directly identified with Har. ḥānāṭ ‘arrow’ (Leslau 1963, 84). Further ES cognates are structurally different: Gōʾaz bāṣṣ ‘arrow, dart’ (Leslau 1987, 247), Tgr. bāṣ ‘sting’ (Littmann and Höfner 1962, 103), Amh. bāṣ ‘arrow’ (Kane 1990, 35: ‘Gōʾaz only’).

219 A 5

| ‘at-tursu l-kabīru ‘a big shield’ (Lane 1863–1893, 302) |
| *‘agri |

The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *‘agri. The spelling of the Glossary suggests initial *‘al-geq, which cannot be supported by comparable Ethi-

1 Our work on this project has been supported by RFH/RГНФ (grant no. 12-04-00092a), to which we extend our sincere gratitude.

2 The non-grammatical sukūn above the final letter of nominal lexemes is a frequent feature of the Glossary (cf. 217 D 6, 217 D 7, etc.).

pie forms as none of the languages in question preserves the etymological ‘: Amh. *aggi*re, *aggor* ‘large shield which protects the entire body’ (Kane 1990, 1324), Har. *agri* ‘shield’ (Leslau 1963, 21), Sol. *agre*, Zay *agri* id. (Leslau 1979b, 27). Go’Sz *agre* ‘large shield’ (Leslau 1987, 11, absent from Dillmann 1865) is likely an Amharism and, therefore, has no bearing on the nature of the initial guttural. According to Leslau (1979b, 27), the Ethiopian Semitic lexemes listed above are borrowed from Cushitic, cf. Had. *agira* ‘shield’ (Hudson 1989, 269).

219 A 6

While the Arabic entry remains illegible, the reading of the Ethiopic gloss is fairly certain: ḫή˴ό˴ד | *garngar*, to be reconstructed as *gârângâr*. The comparable Ethiopic terms are Amh. *gârângâra* ‘scabbard’, *gârângâre* ‘quiver; spear case; case for carrying sharp instruments’ (Kane 1990, 1937, Guidi 1901, 727; attested in Esteves Pereira 1892, 225), Wol. *gârângâre* ‘shield’ (Leslau 1979b, 295), Muḥ. Msq. Gog. *gârângâr*, Sod. *gârângâre* id. (ibid.).

219 A 9

The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *gâmnâte* on the basis of Amh. *mnât* ‘mother’ (Kane 1990, 1221; also in Old Amharic, Littmann 1944, 492, Ludolf 1698, 60). Cf. also Tna. *mnat* (Kane 2000, 1480), apparently an Amharism. Since the Amharic term has no final i or e, the ending of the Ethiopic gloss must be explained as the 1 sg. pronominal suffix (Amh. *mnate* ‘my mother’).

The reconstruction of the Ethiopic gloss is *gândot*, cf. Sol. Wol. *andât* ‘mother’ (Leslau 1979b, 18), Čaha Eza Muḥ. *adot*, Gyt. *adót*, Amn. Ånd. *adôt* (ibid.) and, perhaps, Tna. *addâ* (Kane 2000, 1529). One has to admit that none of the cognates fully corresponds to the gloss: the East Gurage terms lack the labial vowel, whereas the Gùnnân-Gurage lexemes have no -n-.

3 The *nūn* rather resembles a *lâm* in shape, but absence of ligature with the ‘âdâf’ makes it clear that *lâm* was not intended. For a similar case (a lengthened *bât*) cf. 218 F 5.
The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *ankâlis: Amh. ankâlis ‘measles’ (Kane 1990, 1224; Guidi 1901, 467; Ludolf 1698, 60).

The Ethiopic gloss, reconstructed as *donka, is to be identified with Gōẕ donkâw ‘deaf, hard of hearing’ (Leslau 1987, 138, Dillmann 1865, 1116), Har. dönka ‘deaf’ (Leslau 1963, 58), Wol. donkä, Sl. dönka id. (Leslau 1979b, 214), Gaf. dänku-š id. (Leslau 1945, 153), Šnd. dön ‘id. (Leslau 1979b, 214).

The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *nādāyâ, cf. Muḥ. nāde ‘leper whose extremities are cut’ (Leslau 1979b, 450, 1979a, 912). In East Gurage, the cognate term nādây means ‘leprosy’: Wol. Zay nādây (Leslau 1979b, 450, Leslau 1979a, 1167). According to Leslau (1979b, 450), the Gurage terms are borrowed from Kafa (cf. Kafa nadâ, nadîwô, nadyô ‘lebbroso’, Cerulli 1951, 478) or Sidaama. Interestingly, the meaning ‘leper’ is also registered for the Amharic cognate of Gōẕ ndy ‘to be poor’ (Leslau 1987, 387): Amh. nāday ‘poor, needy, destitute person, leper (euphemism)’ (Kane 1990, 1056, Ludolf 1698, 52, Guidi 1901, 394), which may be likewise a result of the influence of the terms for ‘leprosy’.

The second Ethiopic gloss has been correctly identified in Muth 2009–2010, 102 as ērguz (ərguza) = Amh. ērguz ‘pregnant, gravid’ (Kane 1990, 417). The first gloss, left undeciphered in Muth 2009–2010, can be plausibly interpreted as *lakâba (the stroke of the lâm is very short, rather like that of a bâ). The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *lakâba, compa-

4 The reading dângoro in Muth 2009–2010, 102 is paleographically difficult.
5 For -iyah corresponding to -e cf. 219 C 20: nágadayah = *nágadâyâ, cf. Amh. nággade ‘merchant’.

rable to Gaf. läkkäbay ‘enceinte’ (Leslau 1956, 212, Leslau 1945, 161), Sod. läkkäba ‘pregnant’ (Leslau 1979b, 382).

219 A 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>arabic</th>
<th>'al-wilādat- ‘bearing forth a child’ (Lane 1863–1893, 2966)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ḥarās</td>
<td>The Ethiopic gloss, reconstructed as ḥarās, is to be compared to Gaḍaz ḥarās ‘who is with child or with young’ (Leslau 1987, 264, Dillmann 1865, 588). Tna. ḥarās ‘woman in confinement, parturient woman’ (Kane 2000, 188), Tgr. ḥarās ‘woman in childbed, female animal with young’ (Littmann and Höfner 1962, 67), Amh. ḥaras ‘woman in childbed’ (Kane 1990, 1146), Arg. ḥaras id. (Leslau 1997, 206), Har. ḥaras id. (Leslau 1963, 87), Sol. ḥaras, Wol. Zay ḥaras id. (Leslau 1979b, 91), Gaf. ḥaras id. (Leslau 1956, 182). The Ethiopian Semitic terms, while structurally compatible with the Arabic entry, denote a woman in childbed rather than birth as a process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

219 B 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>arabic</th>
<th>'al-irš- ‘wife’ (Lane 1863–1893, 1999)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mūr</td>
<td>The Ethiopic gloss, reconstructed as mūr, is to be compared to Amh. mūṣāra ‘newlywed, bride, bridegroom’ (Kane 1990, 228), Zay mūṣīru ‘bride, bridegroom’ (Leslau 1979b, 434), Gaf. mūṣīra ‘betrothed’ (Leslau 1945, 164), Čaha Eža Msq. mūṣāra, Ėnm. Gyt. mūṣīra, Ėnd. mūṣīra, Muḥ. Msq. mūṣāra, Gog. Sod. mūṣāra ‘bride, bridegroom’ (Leslau 1979b, 434). Note that the meaning ‘bride’ is not registered for ūrš- in the available Classical and dialectal dictionaries: the expected shape of the Arabic entry would be ‘al-ūrš- ‘bride, newly wed girl’. Therefore, the possibility of a graphic mistake on the part of the copyist is not to be ruled out: the expected ḫwāw after the ūrš could be omitted haplographically (the two letters are often very similar in the Glossary).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

219 B 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>arabic</th>
<th>'ar-ridā- ‘sucking’ (Lane 1863–1893, 1097)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ṭāḥb</td>
<td>The Ethiopic gloss must be related to the common Ethiopian Semitic root ṭāḥb ‘to suck (breast)’: Gaḍaz ṭāḥbawā (Leslau 1987, 587), Tna. ṭāḥbāwā (Kane 2000, 2458), Tgr. ṭāḥbā (Littmann and Höfner 1962, 616), Amh. ṭāḥbā (Kane 1990, 2139), Arg. ṭāḥba (Leslau 1997, 222), Har. ṭāḥba (Leslau 1963, 151), Sol. Wol. ṭōbē, Zay ṭōbū (Leslau 1979b, 607), ṭābā (Leslau 1945, 176), Eža Muḥ. ṭāḥbā, Msq. Gog. Sod. ṭōbā, Čaha Ėnm. Gyt. ṭāḥbā, Ėnd. ṭōppā (Leslau 1979b, 607). In most languages, this root has also produced the causative stem with the meaning ‘to suckle’: Gaḍaz ṭāḥbawāt (Leslau 1987, 587), Tna. ṭāḥbawāt (Kane 2000, 2458), Tgr. ṭāḥbāt (Littmann and Höfner 1962, 616), Amh. ṭāḥbāt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maria Bulakh and Leonid Kogan


The form in the Glossary can hardly correspond to a nominal lexeme; rather, a feminine form of the causative stem (*taṭab(a) ‘she suckles’) is to be surmised.

219 B 4

'αλ-γαριατ- ‘a girl or young woman; a female slave’ (Lane 1863–1893, 416)  

The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *gafā, comparable to Har. gāfa ‘slave’ (Leslau 1963, 69), Ancient Har. gāfā, gāfi (Cerulli 1936, 416), gāfi (Wagner 1983, 286). The semantic discrepancy between the Arabic entry (‘female slave’) and the hypothetic Harari source word (with the general meaning ‘slave’) is not a serious obstacle.

219 B 11

‘αν-ναφ- ‘soul’ (Lane 1863–1893, 2827)  

The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *wāzan: Har. wāznā ‘chest, courage’ (Leslau 1963, 163), Wol. wāzan, Sol. Zay wāzanā ‘heart, chest’ (Leslau 1979b, 675). Cf. also Amh. wāzāna ‘glossy appearance of the face, attractive appearance’ (Kane 1990, 1555).

219 B 13

‘αλ-μασγιδ- ‘mosque, house of prayer’ (Lane 1863–1893, 1308)  

The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *betā ḫstān or *betâhsyān, comparable to the well-known Ethiopic terms for ‘church’: Go’sz beta kroṣṭiyān (Leslau 1987, 294), Tn. betā kroṣṭiyān (Kane 2000, 1154), Tgr. bet kṣṭān (Littmann and Höfner 1962, 294), Amh. beta kroṣṭiyān, betāksiyaṭ (Kane 1990, 912), Har. betāksiyn (Leslau 1963, 48), Gog. betā kroṣṭyaṇ, Čaha betāṣkyan, ḫnd. betāṣkān, Eža ḫtāṣkyan, Gyt. ḫtāṣkyān, Muḥ. Msq. ḫtāṣṭyan, Gog. Sod. ḫtāṣṭstan, Sod. ḫtāṣ’estan (Leslau 1979b, 162).

219 B 17

‘αλ-γίδαρ- ‘wall’ (Lane 1863–1893, 389)  

For the non-grammatical sukūn above the final letter of a noun cf. n. 2.

6 For the non-grammatical sukūn above the final letter of a noun cf. n. 2.

The Ethiopic gloss can be reconstructed as *gα.water on the basis of Čaha Eža gα.alla ‘outside part of the wall’ (Leslau 1979b, 271).

219 B 20
The Arabic entry remains obscure. The straightforward reading could perhaps be related to the verbal root ‘zr ‘to wrap’ (Piamenta 1990, 7), cf. *mayzar ‘curtain’ (ibid.).

The interpretation of the Ethiopic gloss is, however, quite certain: *dβtαh, to be reconstructed as *dβtαra. The comparable forms are Gα.z dβtαra ‘tabernacle, (royal) tent, hut, pavilion, sanctuary’ (Leslau 1987, 122, Dillmann 1865, 1106), Amh. dβtαra ‘tent’ (Kane 1990, 1786). According to Kane, Amharic dβtαra is an unadapted Gα.z word (‘Gα.z only’). The presence of a typically Gα.z lexeme with no genuine Southern cognates in the Glossary is thus remarkable.

219 B 21
The Ethiopic gloss can be reconstructed as *tαl mot/*čαl mot on the basis of Har. čαl mo’ot ‘kind of basket used as decoration of the house’ (Leslau 1963, 51).

219 B 22
The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *wαltα, comparable to Tgr. wαltα ‘round piece on the top of a round hut’ (Littmann and Höfner 1962, 429), Amh. wαltα ‘a round, flat wooden plaque of sycamore, zαgba or wαnzaa wood which is placed at the top of the central pillar and against the underside of the roof in a traditional round Ethiopian house’ (Kane 1990, 1486). Cf. also Gyt. wαnαt, ین. wαnά, ینd. wαnόd ‘central pillar of the house’ (Leslau 1979b, 658).

219 B 23
The first letter is to be interpreted as bα, despite the second dot.

61 Aethiopica 18 (2015)
The Ethiopic gloss should be reconstructed as *burkum*: Amh. borkâmma ‘wooden headrest’ (Kane 1990, 886), Wol. borkimma, Zay burkumma ‘headrest of wood’ (Leslau 1979b, 154). These lexemes are borrowed from Cushitic (cf. *ibid.*): Had. barkumma ‘head-support’ (Hudson 1989, 271), Kam. borkana ‘head-support’ (*ibid.* 311), Sid. borko ‘head-support of wood’ (*ibid.* 352), Bur. bôrk-e ‘headrest’ (Sasse 1982, 40, with further Cushitic cognates).

219 B 26
الحبل مطلق لغتان

 Both glosses are left undeciphered in Muth 2009–2010, although for bothquite plausible interpretations can be proposed.

1)  The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *wâdâr*: Amh. wâdâro ‘a thick rope of fiber’ (Kane 1990, 1564), Sol. Wol. wâdâro ‘rope, vein of a special leaf of the âsät when used as a rope, measure of land’ (Leslau 1979b, 644), Gaf. wâdâr ‘corde’ (Leslau 1956, 243), Čaha Eža ënm. Ėnd. Gyt. Muḥ. Msq. Gog. Sod. wâdâr ‘rope, vein of a special leaf of the âsät when used as a rope, measure of land’ (Leslau 1979b, 644).

2)  The Ethiopic gloss, reconstructed as *gâmâd*, is to be compared to Tna. gâmâd ‘hemp rope, cord, hawser, rigging’ (Kane 2000, 2244), Amh. gâmâd ‘rope’ (*ibid.* 1915, Ludolf 1698, 86), Arg. gâmâd ‘rope’ (Leslau 1997, 201). Cf. also Gs’sz gamad ‘cord, rope’ (Leslau 1987, 193, absent from Dillmann 1865 and probably borrowed from Amharic).

219 B 27
٣) The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *kânîbâr*. The comparable Ethiopic designations of ‘yoke’ are Tna. kânîbâr (Kane 2000, 917), Amh. kânîb, kânîb (Kane 1990, 786; kânîb: Ludolf 1698, 32), Arg. kânîb (Leslau 1997, 216), Wol. kânîbâr (Leslau 1979b, 480), Gaf. kânîbâr (Leslau 1956, 223), Čaha Eža ënm. Ėnd. Gyt. Muḥ. Sod. kânîb, Gog. Sod. kânîbâr (Leslau 1979b, 480).

219 B 28
The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *səɾi, to be identified with Arg. of Aliyu Amba əɾi = Amh. alga ‘bed, throne, loft’ (Girma Demeke 2013, 269), Har. əɾi ‘throne’ (Leslau 1963, 32; also in Ancient Har.: əɾi), Cerulli 1936, 410). The Argobba and Harari words are borrowed from Arabic əɾi ‘throne’ (Lane 1863–1893, 2000).

219 B 29

| al-bāb- ‘door’ (Lane 1863–1893, 272) | sānīq

* The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *sənək: Amh. sanka ‘board, plank, lumber, leaf of a door, door’ (Kane 1990, 536, Ludolf 1698, 25: ‘clausura’), Wol. sanka, Sol. sanka ‘door of wood’ (Leslau 1979b, 553), Ėza Eža Muḥ. Msq. Gaf. Sod. sanka, Ṣnm. Gyt. sānka, Ṣṇd. sānka id. (ibid.).

219 C 3

| rawtu l-ərə ‘dung of cattle’ (Lane 1863–1893, 226, 1177) | hubāt

* The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *həbāt: Goṣəz kəbo ‘dry cow’s dung’ (Leslau 1987, 272, not in Dillmann 1865), Tna. kəbo ‘dried cake of cow dung, used as fuel where wood is scarce’ (Kane 2000, 1623), Tgr. əbo, əbot, kebo ‘dry excrements of animals’ (Leslau and Höfner 1962, 409), Amh. kəbət, əbət ‘dry cow’s dung used as fuel’ (Kane 1990, 1421), Arg. kəbət ‘dry dung’ (Leslau 1997, 207), Wol. əbət, Sol. əbət, Zay əbət id. (Leslau 1979b, 335), Gaf. kəbət ‘excréments secs’ (Leslau 1956, 208), Gog. kəbəta, Sod. əbəta, Muḥ. Msq. xəbəta, Ėza Gyt. xəwəta, Muḥ. xəwəta, Ṣnm. xəwəda, Ṣṇd. həwəd ‘dry dung’ (Leslau 1979b, 335).

219 C 7

| al-əfədar- ‘green, verdant; of a dark or an ashy, dast-colour; applied to a man: tawny, or brownish, black, black-complexioned’ (Lane 1863–1893, 756) | təyyəm

* The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *təyyəm. The comparable ES terms are Goṣəz səllim ‘black’ (Leslau 1987, 556), Tna. səllim id. (Kane 2000, 2521), Tgr. səllim id. (Littmann and Höfner 1962, 632), Amh. təyyəmə ‘to be dark of complexion, dark brown of skin (between kəy (light brown) and əkər (black))’, təyyəm, təyyəma ‘dark brown of complexion, color of a

8 This combination appears to be pleonastic: baər- already means ‘the dung of camels, sheep and goats’. The reading baər ‘camel’ is not to be ruled out completely, which would yield the meaning ‘camel’s dung’ for the whole collocation.
mule’s coat’ (Kane 1990, 2172), Arg. ṣellāma ‘be dark’ (Leslau 1997, 197), Har. ṭay ‘black’ (Leslau 1963, 157; also in Ancient Har.: ṭay ‘schwarz’, Wagner 1983, 314), Sol. ṭēm, Wol. ārm ‘black (man, cattle, object)’ (Leslau 1979b, 619), Sol. Wol. ṭolāma ‘to be dark, to be black’ (ibid. 618), Zay ẓilāmā, ṣalāmā, Wol. ẓeilāmā id. (ibid. 180), Gaf. ẓallāmā ‘noir’ (Leslau 1956, 235), Gog. Muṣ. ṣallāmā, ṣalmā, ‘to be dark, to be black’ (Leslau 1979b, 180).

Both semantically and phonetically, the Amharic term ṭayyom, ṭayyoma is the closest to the Ethiopic gloss. In view of the semantics of the comparable ES terms, Arabic ‘aḥdar- is likely intended here as a designation of a skin colour (‘dark, black’) rather than in its primary meaning ‘green’. This makes Amharic ṭayyom, ṭayyoma the most likely candidate as the source word: it is not the basic colour term for ‘black’ (as its cognates elsewhere in ES are), but rather displays the specialized meaning ‘dark (of complexion)’.

219 C 9

The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *ḥagḡ̣is, compared to Gəz ‘ḥaddis ‘new, recent, junior’ (Leslau 1987, 225), Tna. ḥaddi, ḥaddiš, ḥaddis, ḥaddis (Kane 2000, 285), Tgr. ḥaddis (Littmann and Höfner 1962, 94), Amh. ḥədəs (ḥaddis, ʾaḡgis) (Kane 1990, 1306, 1317; Old Amh. ḡaḡis, Ludolf 1698, 8; ḡaddasa ‘neue Kraft gewinnen’, Littmann 1944, 484), Arg. ḡaḡis, ḡaḡis (Leslau 1997, 204), Har. ḡaḡis (Leslau 1963, 81), Wol. ʾaḡis, Sol. ḡaḡis (Leslau 1979b, 18), Gaf. ṣaddās ‘être neuf’ (Leslau 1963, 81), Wol. ʾaḡis (Leslau 1979b, 18). The concept ‘new’ is somewhat unexpected in the present section of the Glossary, otherwise restricted to colour terms.

219 C 14

The Ethiopic gloss, reconstructed as *molā́s, can be compared to Gəz manakos ‘monk’ (Leslau 1987, 350), Tna. mānakos-lıs ‘monk, religious, anchorite’ (Kane 2000, 437), Amh. mālakse, mālakse, mālakos-lıs, molakos-lıs, molakse, molakse ‘monk’ (Kane 1990, 156), mānakse, mālakse, mānakse, monak-so-lıs, monak-lıs, monak-so-lıs, monakse id. (ibid. 274), Wol. Sol. molokse id. (Leslau 1979b, 403), ʾin. Msq. mālak-so-lıs id. (ibid.).

The absence of spirantization of k in the attested forms is unproblematic: as is well known, this process was more widespread in Old Amharic (probably also in other Southern ES languages of the same period) than in mod-

ern literary Amharic (Podolsky 1991, 32f.). In the Glossary, Arabic ḫā’ corresponding to k in modern ES languages is indeed not uncommon, cf. 217 A 27A, 217 B 20, 217 E 17 etc.

219 C 15

The reconstruction *gədaləy corresponds to Gəɔz gədəle, gudəle ‘evil spirit; man possessed by an evil spirit’ (Leslau 1987, 182) and Amh. gudale, gədəle ‘demon; illness which renders one mentally deficient; pagan idol’ (Kane 1990, 2038). The meaning ‘priest of a pagan deity’ (best compatible with the Arabic entry of the Glossary) is present at least in some contexts of Maʃbaʃa Miläd and Maʃbaʃa Sallase, cf. Wendt 1962, 37 (tr., with n. 3) as well as Wendt 1934, 161, where the term is understood as referring to a ‘Zauberer’.

219 C 21

Both structurally and semantically, the most attractive ES parallel is Arg. kəbər ‘rich’ (Leslau 1997, 207). The meaning ‘rich’ as equivalent to ‘lucky’ in the Arabic entry is paralleled by 219 C 22, where ‘unfortunate’ in Arabic is rendered with an Ethiopic term for ‘poor’. The Ethiopic gloss can thus be reconstructed as *həbər ‘rich, prosperous’.

The Argobba term is considered by Leslau (1990, 346) to be an Arabic borrowing, together with semantically similar lexemes elsewhere in ES: Amh. kəbbərə ‘to get rich, become well-to-do, wealthy’ (Kane 1990, 1416), kəbari ‘one who prospers, gets rich, who has the chance of becoming prosperous’ (ibid. 1417), Sod. kəbbərə ‘to become rich’ (Leslau 1979b, 334). This is, however, far from evident, since the meaning ‘to be rich’ does not seem to be in any sense prominent for kbr in Arabic but, incidentally, can be easily derived from ‘to be honoured, famous’, the normal meaning of this root ES: Gəɔz kəbər ‘honoured, honorable, glorious, magnificent, famous, illustrious, noble, precious’ (Leslau 1987, 274), Tgr. kəbər ‘honoured, noble’ (Littmann and Höfner 1962, 409), Tna. kəbər ‘honourable, honoured; respectable, reputable, eminent, venerable, noble, dignified, impressive, stately’ (Kane 2000, 1628), Amh. kəbər ‘honored, respected’ (Kane 1990, 1417).

219 C 22

This form can be also derived from ‘to be prevented from obtaining good; withheld from good fortune’ (Lane 1863–1893, 551; cf. hirfən ‘famine, poverty, need’, hirfən ‘penniless, poor’, Piamenta 1990, 90 | zaygəb

219 C 27

| ‘al-hāddād- ‘a black-smith; a worker in iron’ (Lane 1863–1893, 526) | barīnyah

The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *bār’t̓ nīnā, corresponding to Gaf. bereteînīs ‘blacksmith’ (Leslau 1945, 149). The Gafat term is a derivative from *bərât ‘iron’, widespread in ES: Goʾaz bərət (Leslau 1987, 108; absent from Dillmann 1865), Tna. bərāt (Kane 2000, 1121), Amh. bərāt (Kane 1990, 884, Ludolf 1698, 39; also in Old Amh., Littmann 1944, 489), Arg. bərāt (Leslau 1997, 203), Har. bərāt (Leslau 1963, 46), Sël. Wol. Zay bərāt (Leslau 1979b, 157), Ėha Eža Gyt. Muḥ. Msq. Gog. Sod. bərāt, ënm. ënd. bɾəd, bɾəd (ibid.).

219 D 2

| ‘an-naqīb- ‘the intendant, superintendant, overseer’ (Lane 1863–1893, 2834) | ḡāytab


219 D 11

| ‘ibhaz ‘make bread!’ (Lane 1863–1893, 697) | gāğir

The Ethiopic gloss can be reconstructed as *gagar: Tna. gagārā ‘to bake angēra-bread’ (Kane 2000, 2378), Amh. gaggārā ‘to bake bread’ (Kane 1990, 2057), Arg. gaggārā ‘to bake, to cook’ (Leslau 1997, 201), Har. gāgārā ‘to bake’ (Leslau 1963, 70), Wol. gagārā, Sël. gagārā id. (Leslau 1979b, 268).

219 D 12

| 'ihla‘ ‘take off, remove!’ (Lane 1863–1893, 789f.) | gũfr

The reconstruction *gũfäř (with u instead of the expected a, likely due to the influence of the labial) implies comparison to Har. gũfära ‘to let go, to release, to loosen, to send a thing’ (Leslau 1963, 69), Sal. Wol. Zay gũfära ‘to leave, to release, to set free, to let go’ (Leslau 1979b, 266), Gaf. gũfä(f)ũfära (Leslau 1956, 201), gũfära ‘to send, to put’ (Leslau 1945, 156), Čaha ġũmn. Gyt. gũfära, Eža ġũnd. Muḫ. Msq. Gog. Sod. gũfära ‘to leave, to release, to set free, to let go’ (Leslau 1979b, 266).

219 D 13

| 'akala ‘he ate’ (Lane 1863–1893, 71); luqatāni ‘two words’

The first Ethiopic gloss (bl) has been correctly identified in Muth 2009–2010, 104 with the pan-ES verbal root *bl ‘to eat’. The second gloss has been read as bũs by Muth, with no concrete lexical identification. An alternative, better founded reading is ḥrus with the underlying reconstruction *ũrũsā. The comparable ES forms are Tna. ãũrũsā ‘to tear aũra-bread with the teeth, to take a bite of aũra or other bread’ (Kane 2000, 2259), Amh. ãũrũsā ‘to take a mouthful, to take a bit or morsel of something’ (Kane 1990, 1931), Arg. ãũrũsā ‘to take a mouthful’ (Leslau 1997, 203), Har. ãũrũsā ‘to put a mouthful into the mouth of someone else’ (Leslau 1963, 75), Zay ãũrũsā ‘to take a mouthful, to take a morsel’ (Leslau 1979b, 296), Muḫ. ãũrũsā id. (ibid.). One is also tempted to compare to these terms Ga’szũrũs ‘soft or powdery food’ (Leslau 1987, 203, Dillmann 1865, 1155), but as Alessandro Bausi (2004, 244–245) has shown, this term must go back to Greek ãros.

219 D 14

| 'umrut ‘swallow!’ (Piamenta 1990, 463, Landberg 1920–1942, 2688) | wabat⁹

The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as ḫwabat.⁹ Ga’sz wḥta, wḥata ‘to gulp down, to devour, to swallow’ (Leslau 1987, 611), Tna.

⁹ The dot below the ḫ must be unintentional.

⁹ The guttural must go back to ḫ in Proto-ES, which by the time of the creation of the Glossary must have merged with ḫ in all contemporary ES languages. In Ga’sz, the two phonemes are not distinguished in the late epigraphy of the Aksumite period (Bulakh 2013, 202); neither is the historical ḫ preserved in modern ES languages. Meyer (2011, 1180) states that ḫ and ḫ were distinguished in Old Amharic, referring to Appleyard (2003, 114), yet Appleyard evaluates the Old Amharic data with much more caution,
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\[\text{wāḥatā} \text{ (Kane 2000, 1721), Tgr. wāḥatā} \text{ (Littmann and Höfner 1962, 433), Anhm. wātā} \text{ (Kane 1990, 1592; Old Anhm. wāḥtā, Ludolf 1698, 72), Arg. wāḥatā} \text{ (Leslau 1997, 225), Har. wāḥatā} \text{ (Leslau 1963, 159; Ancient Har. inf. wāḥātōt, Cerulli 1936, 435), Wol. wātā, Sol. Zay wātā} \text{ (Leslau 1979b, 672), Ĉaha Eža Muň. Msq. Gog. Sod. wātā, Gyt. wātā, Ţnn. Ŵnd. wā'ā} \text{ (ibid.).}

219 D 15

\[\text{‘išrab ‘drink!’} \text{ (Lane 1863–1893, 1525)} \text{ | ṭatta‘}

The Ethiopic gloss, reconstructed as ṭaṭṭa’, is to be compared to Amhm. ṭaṭṭa ‘to drink’ \text{ (Kane 1990, 2185; Old Amhm. ṭaṭṭa, Ludolf 1698, 94; ṭaṭṭa, Littmann 1944, 498), Gaf. ṭiṭṭa} \text{ (Leslau 1956, 242), ṭe} \text{ (Leslau 1945, 176).}

219 D 16

\[\text{‘urqud ‘sleep!’} \text{ (Lane 1863–1893, 1135, Behnstedt 1992–2006, 456, Piamenta 1990, 186); luqatānī ‘two words’}

For both Ethiopic glosses, left undeciphered in Muth 2009–2010, reliable interpretations can be proposed.

1) \[\text{‘inya, to be reconstructed as ṣiḥn(ī)u:} \text{ Amhm. tānā ‘to sleep’} \text{ (Kane 1990, 985, Ludolf 1698, 45; Old Amhm. tānā, ṣiḥn(ī) (cf. ṣiḥlāhu ‘I sleep’ etc.), Getachew Haile 1969–70, 71), Arg. teṇṇa, ṣnā (Leslau 1997, 222), Har. ṭē’a (Leslau 1963, 120; also in Ancient Har., Wagner 1983, 306), Wol. ōnē, Sol. ōne, Zay ūnū (Leslau 1979b, 466), Ĉaha nṣya, Eža nṣyyā, Ţnn. ṣnā, Gyt. ṭē’a, Ţnn. ne‘u, Sod. ṣnā (ibid.). In Amharic and Argobba, the root can be used with the ṭā-prefix, but the more archaic basic stem is also in evidence. Interestingly, the ṭā-prefixed variant is also recorded in the Glossary (cf. 219 E 24).

2) \[\text{dqū. The reconstruction ṣdāqūs derives from Go’az dakkasa ‘to be sleepy, to fall asleep, to slumber’} \text{ (Leslau 1987, 140), Tna. dākkāsā ‘to sleep, to slumber’} \text{ (Kane 2000, 2105), Amhm. dākkāsā ‘to lie down (to sleep), to go to sleep (Geez)’} \text{ (Kane 1990, 1767, Dāsta Tākla Wāld 1962 EC (1970 CE), 381). It is noteworthy that only the ṭagṛnā verb is used as the basic term with the meaning ‘to sleep’.}

rightly surmising ‘an element of orthographic archaism’. Indeed, a perusal of Littmann’s glossary of Royal Songs (1944) suggests that the grapheme ḫ can be used indiscriminately for Proto-ES ṣb and ṣb, but etymologically correct spelling prevails in those terms which have cognates in Go’az. This trend is to be accounted for by historical (Go’az-oriented) orthography and does not reflect the contemporary Amharic pronunciation.

219 D 17

‘ithān ‘grind wheat!’ (Lane 1863–1893, 1831) | ʻafāq

The Ethiopic gloss is likely connected with Amh. ḥāččā ‘to grind grain’ (Kane 1990, 2346, Ludolf 1698, 102), Arg. ḥāčča (Leslau 1997, 199), Har. ḥāč (Leslau 1963, 60), Ssl. Wol. ḥāče, Zay ḥāč (Leslau 1979b, 227), Čaha Gyt. ḥāča, Eža Muḥ. Msq. Gog. Sod. ḥāčča, ūnm. ʻnd. ḥā (ibid.). The Ethiopic gloss suggests the reconstruction *ʻafāq, albeit the initial ʻalif is difficult to explain. One can imagine that both the Arabic and Ethiopic glosses represent 1st pers. sg. imperfect forms (‘athānu and *ʻafāq respectively).

219 D 21A

wa-yuqālu labu ‘and it is said for it’ (the second gloss to 219 D 20, ‘sit!’) | ʻrgż

The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *‘argoż: Arg. araggāza ‘to sit down; to stay; to ride’ (Leslau 1997, 218), Har. arāgāza ‘to settle (lees), to settle down, to be settled down’ (Leslau 1963, 133; Ancient Har. arāgāza, Wagner 1983, 306).

219 D 23

‘ubrāq ‘go out!’ (Lane 1863–1893, 718) | wat

The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *waḍ/dwaḍ: Gǝwɔ waṣ’a, waṣ’ā ‘to go out’ (Leslau 1987, 605), Tna. waṣā (Kane 2000, 1812), Amh. waṭṭa (Kane 1990, 1583; Old Amh. wäšša, Ludolf 1698, 74, Littmann 1944, 495; wäšša, ibid.), Arg. waṭṭa (Leslau 1997, 226), Har. waṭṭa’a (Leslau 1963, 162; Ancient Har. waṭṭā, Cerulli 1936, 436; waṭṭa’a, Wagner 1983, 317), Ssl. waṭṭa, Zay waṭṭā, Wol. waṭṭā (Leslau 1979b, 671), Čaha Gyt. waṭṭa, Eža Muḥ. Msq. Gog. Sod. waṭṭa, ūnm. ʻnd. wa’a (ibid.). The final sukūn seems to point towards the Wolāne waṭṭā (imperative waṭṭa) as a likely source word.

219 D 25

‘anṣīl ‘bring down!’ (Wehr 1980, 956) | wrd

The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *awrād: Gǝwɔ ‘awrāda ‘to make go down, to lower, to bring down’ (Leslau 1987, 617), Tna. ‘awrādā ‘to cause to come down’ (Kane 2000, 1734), Tgr. ‘awrāda ‘to cause to descend, to lead to the watering-place’ (Littmann and Höfner 1962, 436), Amh. awrārdā ‘to put down, to take down’ (Kane 1990, 1511), Har. ārāda ‘to put down, to place, to deposit’ (Leslau 1963, 161; Ancient Har. ārāda ‘hinabbring’, Wagner 1983, 316), Ssl. Wol. Zay awrārdā, Wol. ārādā ‘to bring down, to lower’ (Leslau 1979b, 662), Muḥ. Msq. Gog. Sod. awrārdā, Muḥ. ẓrrādā, ūnm. ʻnd. Gyt. awändā, Eža wandā, wannādā, Čaha andā, ʻndā id. (ibid.).
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219 D 26  
|  ěrķab ‘ride!’ (Lane 1863–1893, 1142) |  sin

The reconstruction șsmàr is supported by Tna. sàrrà ‘to climb, to mount a horse, to ride (an equine)’ (Kane 2000, 617), Amh. sàrrà ‘to cover, to serve (of a male animal); to mount an animal, to ride’ (Kane 1990, 485, Ludolf 1698, 24), Čaha ḫnm. Gyt. sànrà, Eža sànnàrà ‘to get on tiptoe and stretch to get on a horse, to stretch upward to get something from a high place’ (Leslau 1979b, 553). The phonological shape of the gloss suggests a West Gurage origin, the semantic difference being quite insignificant.

219 D 27  
|  ḫà’a ‘he sold’ (Lane 1863–1893, 284) |  qâɣ

The Ethiopic gloss can be reconstructed as șçâɣàr, to be compared to Zay çâɣàrà ‘to sell’ (Leslau 1979b, 179, 615), Sod. tîggàrà id. (ibid. 615) (cf. also Dàsta Tàklä Wàld 1962 EC (1970 CE), 541: tâggàràn sëtà malàt yàgâ orage kàankàrè nàw ‘tâggàrà means ‘to sell’ in the Gura language’). Other examples of qâf rendering ç in the Glossary are 217 F 22 csrf = șsàhàyt (csrf ‘sun’) and 219 C 6 csrf = șnàqìb = șnàçìb ‘white’.

219 D 28  
|  īstàrà ‘he bought’ (Lane 1863–1893, 1544) |  wàâqa

The reconstruction is șwàggà: Amh. wàâggà ‘to purchase, to buy in the market’ (Kane 1990, 1572, Ludolf 1698, 73), Sod. wàâggà ‘to buy’ (Leslau 1979b, 648).

219 D 29  
|  daràba ‘he beat, struck’ (Lane 1863–1893, 1777) |  màtà

The Ethiopic gloss can be reconstructed as șmàtà: Amh. màtà ‘to beat, to hit’ (Kane 1990, 241, Ludolf 1698, 13; cf. Old Amh. tâmàtà ‘wurde geschlagen’, Littmann 1944, 484), Arg. màtà (Leslau 1997, 214), Arg. of Tàllàma màtà (Wetter 2010, 34). Note that ˴àyì in the Ethiopic gloss corresponds to ˴àyì in the cognate term in Argobba of Tàllàma, but does not fit the (otherwise likely) etymological parallel in Arabic (màtà ‘to beat’, Lane 1863–1893, 2688).

219 E 3  
|  ṭàğì ‘you come’ (Lane 1863–1893, 492) |  sànyàh

The sukûn above the final letter is ungrammatical; similar cases for other verbs are 219 E 11, 219 F 8 etc.
A reconstruction $^\ast{sấn}âlb$ can be proposed on the evidence of Gaf. sâllâ ‘venir’ (Leslau 1956, 229), sâlû (Leslau 1945, 171), Muḫ. Msq. Gog. Sod. sâllâ, Čaha sânta, Eža sânta, Šnd. sânta, Ṣnm. Gyt. sântâ ‘to arrive, to reach, to be ready’ (Leslau 1979b, 543). The underlying Ethiopian form must be understood as 2nd pers. sg. masc. of the perfect (‘you came’) and is thus not fully identical to the Arabic entry (‘you come’).

219 E 7

The Arabic entry is read in Muth (2009–2010, 104) as nâla ‘geben, schenken’, whereas the two Ethiopic glosses have been left undeciphered. However, the alternative reading bâla ‘to urine’ (Lane 1863–1893, 276); luqatâmi ‘two words’ allows one to propose plausible interpretations for both Ethiopic glosses.

1) $^\ast{s}m̃b̃ât$, to be reconstructed as $^\ast{s}m̃b̃hâtâ$. The comparable Ethiopic forms are as follows: Sl. šumānâ, Wol. šumān, Zay šumânâ, Sl. šumâta ‘to urinate’ (Leslau 1979b, 579), Čaha Eža Muḫ. Msq. Gog. Sod. šumâta, Gyt. šumtâ, Ṣnm. šmâdâ, Šnd. šwdâ id. (ibid. 548). Cf. also Southern Arg. šimad ‘urine’ (Leslau 1997, 221), Sl. šumān, Wol. Zay šumān, Sl. šumât id. (Leslau 1979b, 579), Čaha Eža Muḫ. Msq. Gog. Sod. šumât, Gyt. šont, Šnd. šmâd, Šnd. šwd id. (ibid. 548). See further Har. šâbat ‘urine’ (Leslau 1963, 145), apparently from $^\ast{s}m̃b̃hât$, which would be identical to the Ethiopic gloss. In view of the meaning of the second gloss, one cannot rule out that a nominal term with the meaning ‘urine’ (rather than a verb ‘to urinate’) has been intended by the compiler.

2) Šnt, to be reconstructed as $^\ast{š}nt$. Cf. Goşoz. šont ‘urine’ (Leslau 1987, 540), Tna. šonti (Kane 2000, 866), Tgr. šant(t) (Littmann and Höfner 1962, 227), Amh. šont (Kane 1990, 641, Ludolf 1698, 30). In view of the meaning of the Arabic entry, one would expect a verb ‘to urinate’, but this is not directly compatible with the extant ES evidence: although a denominative verb $^\ast{s}̄n̄m̄t̄â$ can easily be imagined, only primary verbs directly going back to Proto-Semitic $^\ast{t}yn$ (Militarev and Kogan 2000, no. 77) are attested with this meaning in Ethiopian Semitic: Goşoz. šena ‘to urinate’ (Leslau 1987, 540), Tna. šânâ, šênâ (Kane 2000, 866), Tgr. šena (Littmann and Höfner 1962, 227), Amh. šâmna, šâmâ, šênnâ (Kane 1990, 640, Ludolf 1698, 30), Arg. šânân (Leslau 1997, 221). It is, therefore, more likely that the Ethiopic gloss corresponds to a nominal term for ‘urine’ and does not render exactly the Arabic entry.
The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *taβaβa/*taβaβa:²⁴ Gɔ̇az

The alternative reading *uskut ‘be silent’ (Lane 1863–1893, 1389); luγatani ‘two words’ provides plausible interpretations for both Ethiopic
glosses.

The composite verbs are to be identified as follows.

1) | snbal, reconstructed as *sān bāl on the evidence of Har. sām bāya ‘to be quiet, to be silent (person)’ (Leslau 1963, 140; also in Ancient Har.: sām bāya ‘tacere’, Cerulli 1936, 432). The presence of n (instead of m) in the Ethiopic gloss can be explained as dissimilation or hypercorrection.

2) | sqbl, to be reconstructed as suk bāl on the basis of Tna. suk bālā ‘to be quiet, silent, not to answer’ (Kane 2000, 689).

The Ethiopic gloss, reconstructed as *nāggād, is to be compared to Gɔ̇az

nagadā ‘to go on a journey’ (Leslau 1987, 390), Tna. nāgadā ‘to go on a

²⁴ Cf. n. 10 above.
jouney or trip’ (Kane 2000, 1374), Tgr. nagda ‘to go on a pilgrimage’ (Littmann and Höfner 1962, 342), Amh. nāggādā ‘to travel about from district to district’ (Kane 1990, 1068; cf. Ludolf 1698, 53).

219 E 18

|_thumbnail| šāham  
The Ethiopic gloss can be reconstructed as *šāham on the evidence of Arg. of Tollaha šāmo ‘gekochtes Getreide’ (Wetter 2010, 245), Har. šuhum ‘grain boiled in water’ (Leslau 1963, 145), Zay šūmu ‘boiled grain’ (Leslau 1979a, 1225, Leslau 1979b, 578). It likely represents a verbal root *šhm ‘to boil’ (from which the attested nouns derive).

219 E 22

|_thumbnail| tarrāqā  
The Ethiopic gloss can be reconstructed as *tarrākā, comparable to Go’oz ta’araka ‘to be reconciled, to reconcile oneself’ (Leslau 1987, 71), Tna. tā’arākā, tā’arkā ‘to be reconciled, pacified, to make up, to settle accounts’ (Kane 2000, 1845), Tgr. ta’arraka ‘fit la paix’ (Littmann and Höfner 1962, 459), Amh. tarrākā ‘to be straightened, straightened out; to make peace (vi), be reconciled, patch up a quarrel (vi)’ (Kane 1990, 1147), Gog. tarrō ‘to be reconciled’ (Leslau 1979b, 90).

219 E 24

| sahibra ‘he waked, was sleepless’ (Lane 1863–1893, 1451)13  
The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *altānna—a negative form of the verb *tānna ‘to sleep’. It consists of two elements.  
(1) The common SES negative element *al- (Bulakh 2012). Note the absence of the postfix -m, which accompanies the negative particle *al- in the main verb forms in the modern SES languages.  
(2) The verb *tānna ‘to sleep’:


13 An alternative reading tasahhara could perhaps be considered, although the fifth stem is not common for this root either in Classical or in Yemeni dialectal Arabic (but cf. Biberstein-Kazimirski 1860, I, 1156).

14 The shape of the nūn (without dots) rather resembles fā or qāf. The diacritical signs of the tā are displaced to the left; the diacritical signs of the yā are displaced to the right.
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219 E 26

اُسلم عَذان ‘he gave, delivered, payed in advance; he resigned, or submitted, himself’ (Lane 1863–1893, 1412f.); lugatānī ‘two words’

لاعا (the stroke of the lām is rather short; for a similar case cf. 219 A 27 above)

The ES gloss is to be reconstructed as *lākka on the evidence of Gōs lakkōba ‘to lend’ (Leslau 1987, 317, Dillmann 1865, 38f.), Tgr. lakkab ‘borrowing’ (Littmann and Höfner 1962, 36), Tna. tālakkōhe, tālakkāhe ‘to borrow, to receive as a loan’ (Kane 2000, 89), Amh. lākka ‘to lend money’ (Kane 1990, 59f.), Har. alēkāba ‘to lend’ (Leslau 1963, 101), Wol. lekā, Sol. lēkā, Zay a-liķā ‘to lend money’ (Leslau 1979b, 382).

The source lexeme, reconstructible as *gāb, is likely related to one of the derivatives of the common ES root *gbr:

(1) Har. agābāra ‘to tame’ (Leslau 1963, 67; Ancient Har. gābāra ‘unterwürfig sein’, Wagner 1983, 285)
(2) Tna. gābbārā ‘to pay tribute, tax’ (Kane 2000, 2297), Tgr. gabbara (Littmann and Höfner 1962, 583), Amh. gābārā (Kane 1990, 1973; also in Old Amh., Littmann 1944, 497), Arg. gebārā (Leslau 1997, 201), Zay gābārā, Wol. gebārā, Sol. gēbārā (Leslau 1979b, 257), Ënd. Gog. gbērā, Sod. gibārā, Çaha Ɛn. Gyt. g‘ābārā, Eža Muľ. Msq. g‘abbārā (ibid.). Cf. also Gōs gabbara ‘to pay taxes’ (Leslau 1987, 178, not in Dillmann 1865).

219 E 27

هَب ‘gift’ (Lane 1863–1893, 2969), ‘gift, present, donation, grant’ (Wehr 1980, 1102)

The Ethiopic gloss can be reconstructed as *sākāt(a), to be compared to Amh. sākāt, sākat ‘goods, merchandise, thing sold at retail’ (Kane 1990, 511, 632), Har. sākāt ‘grocery’ (Leslau 1963, 146), Muľ. sākāt, sā‘at ‘small items of merchandise’ (Leslau 1979b, 583). Cf. also Tna. sākāt ‘retail business, trade, traffic (trade); grog shop’ (Kane 2000, 836) and Tgr. sāktat ‘merchants’ (Littmann and Höfner 1962, 182). The semantic discrepancy between the Arabic entry and the ES gloss is considerable, but not irreconcilable in view of the semantic link between ‘to give’ and ‘to sell’ (cf. Russian продат ‘to sell’, derived from dat ‘to give’). The vocalic Auslaut, suggested by the diacritics of the Ethiopic gloss, is not confirmed by the etymological data.

219 E 29

حرث ‘plough!’ (Lane 1863–1893, 541)


219 F 3

qultu ‘I said’ | ḇālūḥ

The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *ḇalūḥ, the 1st pers. sg. perfect of the pan-ES verb *ḇhl ‘to say’ (cf. above on 219 E 15). The ending *-uḥ (< Proto-ES *-ku) comes the closest to the word-final forms in Wolāne and Zay (Zay nāḇālūḥ ‘I took’, Meyer 2005, 94; see Meyer 2006, 108 for the word-final ending -ḥ in Wolāne).

219 F 6

ḏakara ‘he remembered’ (Lane 1863–1893, 968) | ḡq̱at

The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *ḏakdat. The comparable ES term is Tgr. ḡakda ‘to remember, to meditate, to remember someone with a gift’ (Littmann and Höfner 1962, 664). The feminine ending -at (‘she remembered’) has no match in the Arabic entry.

219 F 10

ka(n)sa ‘he swept’ (Lane 1863–1893, 2633) | ṭṟg

The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *ṭ̱ṟgāṯgā: Tna. ṭ̱ṟgā ‘to clear a field (removing brush, stones); to clean a place, to sweep or wipe clean’ (Kane 2000, 2568), Tgr. ṭ̱rga ‘to lay a road, to clean (the road), to wipe off’ (Littmann and Höfner 1962, 638), Amh. ṭ̱ṟgā ‘to sweep, clean, to sweep away’ (Kane 1990, 2123; Old Amh.: ṭ̱ṟgā ‘sweeper’, Ludolf 1698, 97), Arg. ṭ̱ṟgā ‘to sweep’ (Leslau 1997, 224), Har. ṭ̱ṟgā id. (Leslau 1963, 156), Sal. Wol. ṭ̱ṟgā id. (Leslau 1979b, 631), Gaf. ṭ̱ṟgā id. (Leslau 1956, 237), Gog. Sod. ṭ̱ṟgā id. (Leslau 1979b, 631). Cf. also Gǝʾz ʿsaraga ‘to sweep, to cut, to tear off (a piece of bread to eat)’ (Leslau 1987, 563, not in Dillmann 1865).

219 F 11

ḥasas | ḥ̱asāt-

The expected nūn cannot be discerned, but the identification is virtually certain in view of the full semantic identity with the Ethiopic gloss.

15 The expected nūn cannot be discerned, but the identification is virtually certain in view of the full semantic identity with the Ethiopic gloss.
The Ethiopic gloss, reconstructed as *basās, is to be identified with Amh. asās ‘sweepings from the threshing floor’ (Kane 1990, 1167); cf. also asās ‘sweepings (from the griddle), dust’ *(ibid. 1180).

219 F 14

The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *tākār: Goṣ az tākār ‘soot’ (Leslau 1987, 596, Dillmann 1865, 1223), Tna. tākār ‘soot, smut, dirt’ (Kane 2000, 2445), Tgr. tākāro ‘soot’ (Littmann and Höffner 1962, 614), Amh. tākāra ‘soot clinging to the roof’ (Kane 1990, 2133), tākārā ‘soot which collects on the underside of the roof’ *(ibid. 2135; tākārša, Ludolf 1698, 93), Ḥar. tīkār ‘soot’ (Leslau 1963, 155), Sal. Wol. tākār, Sod. Muḥ. Msq. Eža Čaha Gyt. tākār, Gog. tāʾār, tāʾārša, ʾĀmm. Ḫand. dāʾār ‘soot on the roof’ (Leslau 1979b, 628).

219 F 16

The Ethiopic gloss is clearly related to the well-known terms for ‘drum’: Amh. kārābo (Kane 1990, 1389), Arg. kārābo (Leslau 1997, 208), Har. kārābu (Leslau 1963, 93; also in Ancient Har.: kārābu, Wagner 1983, 294), Sal. Wol. kārābo, Zay harābu (Leslau 1979b, 334), Gaf. kārābo (Leslau 1956, 209), Msq. Gog. Sod. kārābo (Leslau 1979b, 334). The nūn in the Ethiopic gloss has no parallel among the attested ES forms. It is either to be ignored as an accidental stroke, or a secondary insertion of -n- has to be surmised. The reconstruction of the Ethiopic gloss is thus *ḥārā(n)bo.

219 F 23

The Ethiopic gloss can be reconstructed as *zafān (which does not quite match the expected imperative form *zafān). The comparable forms are Goṣ az zafāna ‘to dance’ (Leslau 1987, 632, Dillmann 1865, 1069), Tna. zāfānā ‘to sing, to perform shoulder-shrugging in time to music’ (Kane 2000, 2027), Tgr. zafta ‘to dance the funeral dance (woman), to dance’ (Littmann and Höffner 1962, 506), Amh. zaftānā ‘to sing, to dance and sing’ (Kane 1990, 1684, Ludolf 1698, 79), Arg. zaftānā ‘to dance, to sing’ (Leslau 1997, 227), Gaf. zaftānā ‘to dance’ (Leslau 1945, 180).

16 The dot above the rāʾ is to be ignored.
17 The shape of the zayn rather resembles an ‘alif.

219 F 26

| ‘ar-rūḥ- ‘the soul, spirit’ (Lane 1863–1893, 1180) | mfs | مسح

The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *maffas, comparable to Ge'ez manfas ‘spirit’ (Leslau 1987, 389), Tna. mânfâs ‘spirit, soul’ (Kane 2000, 1401), Tgr. manfas ‘ghost, spectre’ (Littmann and Höfner 1962, 347), Amh. mânfâs ‘spirit, demon’ (Kane 1990, 1058, Ludolf 1698, 54). The form maffas, suggested by the spelling of the Ethiopic gloss, is actually attested in Epigraphic Ge'ez (mfs in RIÉ 191, 7; 192, 1), but it is hardly probable that such a form stands behind the Ethiopic gloss. It may be wise, accordingly, to reconstruct the standard form mânfâs with a graphic mistake by the scribe (the notch was intended for nün, and fâ’ was omitted).

219 F 27

| ‘al-qalb- ‘heart’ (Lane 1863–1893, 2553) | wzn | وزن

The Ethiopic gloss is to be reconstructed as *wâzân (see 219 B 11 above). Note that according to M. Bulakh’s fieldnotes of 2012, wázâna is the basic anatomic designation of heart in Harari, not unlike its cognates in East Gurage.

219 F 28

| ‘at-tâhir- ‘clean, pure’ (Lane 1863–1893, 1887) | qâl | قل

The Ethiopic gloss can be reconstructed as *sâl: Tna. asâlā ‘to filter or strain beer’ (Kane 2000, 2539), Amh. tâlālā ‘to be or become pure, clean’, tâlala ‘clear or filtered liquid, filtrate’ (Kane 1990, 2088), Har. tâllâ ‘filtered, limpid, pure’ (Leslau 1963, 153), Sol. Wol. Zay tâllâ ‘to be filtered, purified’ (Leslau 1979b, 617), Zay tâllâh, Sol. Wol. tull ‘filtered, purified, liquid, clear (liquid), light-colored (object)’ (ibid.), Msq. Gog. Sod. tâllâh, Muḥ. tâlleh, Čaha ʿānm. Gyt. tânārā, Eža ʿān. tânârā ‘to be filtered, purified’ (ibid.), Muḥ. tâllâh, Msq. tâlî, Msq. Gog. Sod. yâ-tâllâhâ, Čaha Eža ʿānm. Gyt. târârâ, ʿān. tânr, tânorâ ‘filtered, purified, liquid, clear (liquid), light-colored (object)’ (ibid.). Cf. also Ge’ez tâllâ, tâlâla ‘to be pure’, tâlul ‘pure’ (Leslau 1987, 591, not in Dillmann 1865, probably an Amharism). For the Arabic qâf rendering Ethiopic š or č cf. 219 D 27 above with further examples. Since no actual form with palatalization of t into č has been registered among the cognates of the ES *šâl, the reconstruction with š is more attractive.

18 The loop of the fâ’ is hardly visible, so the grapheme rather resembles a vertically stretched yâ’.
Abbreviations of language names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language(s)</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amharic</td>
<td>Amh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gogot</td>
<td>Gog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ethio-Semitic</td>
<td>SES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argobba</td>
<td>Arg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyeto</td>
<td>Gyt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidama</td>
<td>Sid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadiyya</td>
<td>Had.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigrinya</td>
<td>Tgr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidaama</td>
<td>Sod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kambaata</td>
<td>Kam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soddo</td>
<td>Tgr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tana</td>
<td>Tgařañña</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥar</td>
<td>Muḥor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolaine</td>
<td>Wol.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summary

In _Aethiopica_ 16 and 17, the first and the second sheets of the al-Malik al-Afdal’s fourteenth-century Arabic–Ethiopic Glossary have been analysed. The present paper offers the results of the analysis of the third—and last—sheet of the Glossary and contains all identifications which differ from those offered by F.-C. Muth in his pioneering article. This amounts to 74 entries from the third sheet of the Glossary, whose identification in Muth’s publication is either missing altogether or not sufficiently convincing.