

Notes on a Recent Edition of a Morisco Pharmacological MS.

Federico Corriente

The miscellaneous ms. N° 5181 in the catalogue of the Madrid Biblioteca Nacional contains a pharmacological glossary of great interest as, being dated at the beginning of the 17th century and having a considerable extension, it stands as one of the last important documents of the Morisco scientific literature and enriches our knowledge of both Romance and Arabic names of plants and drugs used in the Iberian Peninsula during a long period of several centuries stretching from the Early Middle Ages up to more than a one hundred years after the end of the *Reconquista*.

This glossary, occupying the sheets 83v to 118r of that ms., has been recently edited by Andreas Karbstein and published by the Romance Seminar of Cologne University in a nicely printed volume¹ including the original texts of the entries, whether Arabic or Romance, with their Latin transcription, contextual interpretation and much needed enlightening annotations. We must commend the author for his truly impressive work as, being well aware of its many difficulties, he has patiently dealt with them and carried out this task with a high degree of success attributable to his undoubtedly great efforts and mastery of such kindred subjects as botany, pharmacology, medicine, Classical, Romance and Semitic

¹ *Die Namen der Heilmittel nach Buchstaben*, Geneva, Droz, 2002.

languages².

However, it is no secret that Islamic botany, medicine and pharmacology rank high among the areas where scholars endeavouring to edit their sources are confronted with most intricate problems of interpretation of written texts containing hundreds of foreign words, often wrongly attributed to one or another language and badly corrupted by successive scribes, totally unfamiliar with them, not to speak of problems posed by the very identification of items.

Therefore, it should come as no surprise that, in our perusal of this important book, we have come across some passages in which our readings or interpretations of the original text³ differ to some extent from those by Karbstein or add something to his commentary. We find it honest and fair both to him and to any future user of his work to point to such cases, in the hope of helping him and them in future works or in their use of these materials, as much as he has helped us all by publishing this ms. Following is the list of our remarks, arranged after the order of the Arabic alphabet:

1) *abrrāshkah* (118r 8), defined as "honey as it comes out of the beehive", not recognized by the editor, is Cs. and Ct. **bresca** "honeycomb".

2) *ablāluh* "tree house leek" (92v 10-12), for which the editor relies on Asín's (1943, p. 328, n° 608) interpretation as a Rom. diminutive of Lt. *uvula*, would benefit from our remark in Corriente 2001: 209 to the effect that such an actual pronunciation was a corruption of UBÉLLA "little grape".

3) *ublanka bashinasyah*, after *qālamah armāṭiqah* "sweet flag" in 108r 3, is a riddle which the editor tries to solve by hesitatingly suggesting the addition of the adjective "white" (Cs. **blanco** and Ct. **blanc**) to a plant known to have yellow or greenish flowers, and giving up the interpretation of the second element as an enigmatic hapax. Considering the frequent confusion of >k< and >ṭ< in West Ar. script and the fact

² In this article we are using the following siglae of language names: And(alusi), Ar(abic), Arg = Aragonese, Br = Berber, Gr(eek), Cs. = Castilian, Ct. = Catalan, Gr(eek), Lt. = Latin, Pr. = Persian, Rom(ance), Pt. = Portuguese.

³ Which we have consulted and collated thanks to the efficient services of the Biblioteca Nacional. In our task we have derived some help from a parallel list contained in the sheets 142r to 176v of the same manuscript, but not mentioned by Karbstein. This new list will be dealt with in detail in a next issue of *Suhayl*.

that this is a characteristically fragrant plant, we suggest that this may be an additional Rom. synonym, *PLÁNTA ENSHÉNCYO⁴.

4) *abalyādhūn* (85r 14) "henbane" is indeed a hapax, but appears to reflect Cs. and Ct. **belladona** (*Atropa belladona*), with loss of the final /a/, regularly metanalyzed as the morpheme of *nomen unitatis*. As often in these materials, this identification is not accurate, but both plants are poisonous Solanaceae. The same item appears as *balū andiyū* (88r 8, i.e., Cs. **palo indio** "Indian wood"), wrongly identified by the editor with *bullānyuh* (= Cs. **beleño**), of that same meaning. Curiously enough, this hitherto unknown reflex of Low Lt. *bella domina* ("beautiful lady") might explain And. Ar. *bayḍamūn* "henbane", in an early stage when /d/ retained its lateral articulation in some areas⁵, through haplology of a hypothetical And. Rom. form endowed with the augmentative suffix, *BELL(A) DOMN + ÓNA.

5) *abuyādrā alabāl / lāntāl* (94r 14-15) "lapis lazuli" contains a second element which may be, in our view, LAPÉL, a And. Rom. reflex of Lt. *lapillus* "gem".

6) *ubayāssah* (98 r 14) "alexanders" is indeed a derivate of Lt. *apium*, exhibiting, however, an augmentative suffix, i.e., *APY + ÁCO.

7) *atriyyah* (85v 1) is probably no cognate of Gr. *athēra* "porridge", but a reflex of better attested And. Ar. *a/iṭrīyya* "kind of vermicelli"⁶.

8) *arjīl* (84v 4) "maiden hair" is a corruption of And. Rom. ÁRČE QAPÉLLO⁷.

9) *arjīlakah* (89v 3) and *arjīlākkah* (105r 5) "furze", a cognate of Ct. **argelaga** and related forms in Arg., as well as of And. Rom. YILÁQA⁸, does posit certain etymological problems, which have been treated at some length in Corriente 1999: 223.

10) *arfān* (85v 7) "henna" would not be a rather unlikely and

⁴ Both items attested in Corriente 2001: 168 & 197, and the second one also in this ms., 97v 11 & 99r 18. Such a Rom. designation is not recorded for this particular plant, but there are comparable cases such as that of Cs. **sándalo** "sandalwood", also applied to a variety of mint.

⁵ Corriente 1977: 46.

⁶ With no less than three witnesses in Corriente 1997: 20. About its etymon, see now Corriente 1999: 150.

⁷ About which, see Corriente 2001: 110.

⁸ While Cs. has preferred **aulaga**, **aliaga**, etc.

complicated corruption of *yarannā'* but, much more simply, a slight graphical alteration of its alternative synonym *arqān*.

11) The editor is at a loss to explain *il'arūsh* as a synonym of *shabūqah* "elder tree" in 94r 4. Chances are that this is only a distorted reflex of Lt. *ebulus* or Ct. *évuls*.

12) *armasitrinnah* (86r 9) "sweet basil" rather than a derivate of Low Lt. *ocimastrum* appears to continue Lt. *mentastrum* "water mint", of which there are several reflexes in And. sources⁹. In our view, the original word, And. Rom. MASHTRÁNTO has received the Ar. article, which was subsequently agglutinated and assimilated into AR-.

13) *astūfās* (94r 9) "bezoar" is probably a ghost-word. The sequence in the aforementioned parallel list, included in the same ms., is *whw talwi fi'lshami 'stwfīd.s*, which suggests "and it ranks in scent next to *astūkhūduš* 'lavender'".

14) *ashtarrān* (95v 5-6), given as synonymous with *ṭayṭān* and *kurrāth barrī* "wild leek", is possibly a reflex of Cs. **ajotrino**.

15) *ishtfnā shqryh* (99r 14) cannot be identified with *muql* "bdellium", as the editor pointedly says. Such an obvious mere distortion of (*Delphinium*) *staphisagria* "lousewort" is extant again with more or less correct shapes in 93r 14-15 and 101r 15, in this latter case just before another instance of *muql al-yahūd*, simultaneously identified with "bdellium" and "lousewort", with the characteristic scarce accuracy of these materials. It is true that *Umdah* 495 also counts *muql al-yahūd* as just another variety of bdellium, but Dozy II 613 reflects a more restricted version of the facts, according to which bdellium could only be Indian, Arabic or Sicilian. Considering that the Ar. adjectives *makkī* "Meccan" and *yahūdī* "Jewish" were often and respectively attached to top or lowest quality brands of certain products, it would not be surprising that "Jewish bdellium" could have been a designation of lousewort.

16) *asqurjūn* (108r 18) clearly identified as "hedgehog" with the equivalences Ar. *qunfud*, Cs. **erizo** and Ct. **eriço**, is the definitive confirmation of the meaning of that item, still considered doubtful by Griffin 1961: 228 and Corriente 1997: 18-19. It is also a witness to the survival of And. Rom. items, felt as such by the speakers of And. Ar., as it cannot be identified on phonetic and semantic grounds with its cognate Ct. **escurçó** "viper".

17) Thanks to the parallel list, it can be ascertained that *ashqū qūliryah*

⁹ About which, see Corriente 1997: 512.

is only a mistake for "scrophularia", unrelated to "collyrium". In the text of 95r, the editor has not understood the Ar. >wy^crfnh ^cmt shjryn bl'shqytn<, which stands for wa-ya^crifūna-hu¹⁰ ^cāmmatu sh-shajjārīna bi-l-'ashqīṭun "and most botanists call it *ashqīṭan*". As for the next *qāla*, it is an ultracorrection of *qīla* "it was said", triggered by And. Ar. strong *imālah*¹¹.

18) *al-sa/innah* "flowering moss" (83v 17-20 and 117v 16) does not appear to reflect any Rom. derivat of Lt. *absinthium*, as the author of ^cUmdah warns that *shayb al-^cajūz* ("the old woman's grey hair") simultaneously means "absinth" and "moss", it being unquestionable that the author is dealing here with the latter. Therefore, what we have here is an alteration of *ushnah*, an arabized reflex of Lt. *usnea*, which opens the heading of this entry.

19) *ashhadyah* (84r 21) has probably nothing to do with pharmacology. As in other instances, it seems to be a mere personal annotation, slightly corrupted from And. Ar.: *āsh hādha yākhi* = "what is this, brother?"

20) *ashhasiyah* (85r 16), given as an equivalent of *aṣṭūkhūdūsh* "French lavender" is likely to be a corruption of *arshimīṣah*, its Lt. name according to *Tafsīr* 220¹².

21) *aṣṣābi^c* "swallow-wort" (85r 18) needs not be corrected into ^curūq aṣ-ṣabbāghīn "dyers' root", as *aṣābi^c al-malik* "the king's fingers", is synonymous (e.g., in ^cUmdah 407) with *kurkum*, an equivalent of *māmīrān (ṣīnī)* "Chinese swallow-wort".

22) *aḡhlāshah* (95r 13) is wrongly interpreted as *ḡandarūs* (misspelt for *khandarūs* "spelt wheat"), which happens again with *qallāshshah* (115r 7). The approximately correct meaning is found in 110v 7 and 11v 14 for the variants *aqlāshah* and *aqullāshah*, matching Ar. *sandarūs* "sandarach", although the Rom. equivalent (cf. Cs. **glasto**) is rather "indigo-dye".

23) *afshirraj* "syrup" (85r 12), with the variants *afsharjī* and *afrraj* (110r 15), deserves some comment, as they are more faithful to the original Pahlavi **afshurag* than the *fashūr* extant in the *Vocabulista in*

¹⁰ With the characteristic Neo-Arabic agreement, called by the native grammarians *luḡhatu akalūni l-barāghīth*.

¹¹ About which, see Corriente 1977: 24.

¹² About which, see also Corriente 1997: 11.

*arabico*¹³.

24) It is not easy to ascertain the correct reading of the term transcribed by the editor as *adultinī* in 84v 21, in the lack of any helping synonym or Rom. equivalent. The parallel list suggests that the distorted plant name may be *alūsun* "golden tuft".

25) The given Ar. synonym of *aghārīqūn* "agaric" (84r 17) can only be read in the ms. as *alṣifṣaf*, not as **al-^carīf*. But since that word is merely a slight corruption of *ṣafṣāf* "willow", by no means identifiable with any kind of mushrooms, it must be assumed that the original reading has been even more seriously altered. It could have been *qaṣīṣ*, a variety of mushroom mentioned in *Umdah* 426, not the same as *aghārīqūn*, but then the editor himself points to the fact that the only linking connection between agaric and caper-spurge, closing this entry, is their laxative effect.

26) In the entry *wajj* "sweet flag" (90v 14), the next synonym reads *alāmayrāyaqūn*, against the editor's proposal, who transcribes **il'aqayrā* and suspects a misspelled *yakūn*, hardly explainable here in syntactic terms. There might lay a corrupted *aqārūn*, from Gr. *ákoron*, graphically contaminated by *amārayqūn* "white camomile", a different plant, while the closing Rom. *ESPADÁNYA* and *ESPAṬÉL(LA)* match well with *wajj*.

27) *amal* (84r 18), defined by the author as "a very hot grease" and vaguely interpreted as "oil" by the editor, posits serious problems of identification, and its given Rom. equivalent *asyūs* casts no light on a solution, while the derivations from Lt. *amylum* "starch" and Ct. **uncions** suggested by the editor seem unlikely on semantic and phonetic grounds. The former term might be a haplological outcome of *alā'umālī* (< Gr. *elaiómeli* "sweet sap from the Palmyra palm", described in *Tafsīr* 120 as a honey-like grease), and the latter is phonetically identical with Gr. *ássios*, reflected in Ar. as *asyūs*, described in Benmrad 1985: 81 as a certain white powder. However, both proposals are highly hypothetical.

28) *nārmushk* "a kind of pomegranate" (103r 8-11), in fact a reflex of Pr. *anārmeshk*, is mentioned here only because of its phonetic likeness to *narjamushki* (corrupted for *afranjimushk* "sweet basil"). Both species are thus linked together under one heading, but there is no confusion in the author's mind. At the end of the entry, he gives the Rom. equivalence for **narjamushki*, Ct. **alfābega** "**giroflada**", i.e., "clove-scented basil".

29) **antī shubūqqah* (85r 19-20) is not a corruption of *ḥandaqūqà*

¹³ See Corriente 1989: 230, and Benmrad 1985: 97, where the older shape is attested.

"trefoil", it being remarkable that these words are correctly edited in 94r 4 as *aqṭī* and *shabūqah*, the Gr. and Rom. names of "elder tree". Furthermore, that passage exhibits two reading mistakes in the edition, namely, **ḥumad* instead of *ḥumà* (vs. *ḥamà* in 94r 4), for *khumān* "elder tree", and **>shnn* < instead of *shall*, "dwarf elder"¹⁴; and besides, the editor has linked this entry together with a second one, which may be a patchwork of segments, since *an-nifal huwa duwāyajri* (i.e., *an-nafalu huwa dawā'un yujri* "trefoil is a flushing remedy", "diuretic" in *Umdah* 511) should not be immediately followed by "*anzarūt* is sarcocolla".

30) **kār* (115v 11), given as the Rom. name for "gold", is not what the ms. actually bears, as the correct reading is *>ur* <, for *ÁWR* or *ÓR(O)*, accounted for in Corriente 2001: 141 and 165.

31) *bādāsh laghashtām* (91v 12), once its second constituent is restored as *lughushṭārum*, is the obvious Lt. translation (*pedes locustarum*) of Ar. *rijl al-jarād* "locust feet", which is not so strange as the author of this glossary often resorts to Lt. terms alien to the traditional Rom. terminology of al-Andalus, culled from Lt. treatises translated from Ar. or Gr. and used by the Christian physicians of the Modern Age. It should also be noted that the identification of *zarnab* or *rijl al-jarād* with *FĚLČO* or *FĚLČE* "fern" is mistaken, and caused by the confusion of this latter Rom. term with *falanjah* "a fragrant seed resembling mustard", of Pr. origin¹⁵.

32) The entry *ḥabu al-maṣṭakà* "mastic seeds" (95r 7) has an enigmatic equivalent *bādilūlā*, which the editor rightly pronounces unattested as a botanical term. It appears to be a close relative of Cs. *pıldora*, from Lt. *pillula* "pill", another frequent technical equivalence of Ar. *ḥabb(ah)*.

33) In the entry *bāzard* "galbanum" (88r 11-12), the editor has unnecessarily corrected a second line *>whdh hw 'ṣḥ mwjd bhdh* < (= *wa-hādha huwa aṣaḥḥu mā wujida bi-hādhā* "and this is the most correct opinion found about that"), by altering *>'ṣḥ* < into *aṣ-ṣamgh* "resin", which does away with the true meaning of the assertion, namely, that the foregoing equivalences are correct, while *qinnah* would be the same as *>qlnbh* < "colophony" (see N° 160).

34) *bāṣal hindī* (87r 5) "Indian onion" is indeed unrecorded and suspicious of containing some corruption. However, the editor's proposal

¹⁴ See Corriente 1997: 289.

¹⁵ See Corriente 1997: 406.

to emend it as *baṭṭīkh hindī* "watermelon", because of the likeness of the Rom. rendering given next, an enigmatic *bādhughur* (rather than *bādhughun*) to **badechan** (cf. Cs. **badea** "melon of poor quality") is, in our view, wide of the mark. In our opinion, the former term is *ball hindī*, preceded by a failed attempt at writing *ball*, which happens sometimes in these materials, and the latter is a slight alteration of Rom. YÉDHGHO "dwarf elder", described in *Umdah* 104 as characteristically Indian.

35) *bash shiyāt* and *bishajāt* (111r 19) as renderings of "skink" reflect the Ct. **peix seget**, Low Lt. *pisca sageta*, about which see Bramon 1991: 234-5. Regardless of the actual appearance of the skink, still used by North African quacks from Morocco to Egypt and sold in their shops as an aphrodisiac drug¹⁶, descriptions like that of *az-Zuhrī* speak of an animal without bones, looking like a piece of meat, which reminds us of the fish called *raḍrādī* ("having much meat"¹⁷). There is also a confusion with *saqanqūr*, a kind of spindle-shaped Nile lizard, which may be at the origin of its designation by Lt. *sagitta* "arrow".

36) *bāṭrah admish* (94v 6), given as Rom. equivalent of Ar. *sunbādhaj* "emery" does not answer to Gr. *smúris*, but to *adámas* "diamond", a quite different stone, but also hard, with the characteristic inaccuracy of these materials.

37) *bālasan kurshād* (99r 10), supposed by the editor to be a hapax meaning "coriander", is probably wide of the mark. To begin with, *kurshād* is no doubt a mistake for Pr. *kūshād* "gentian"¹⁸, which probably gives away that this is not a single entry, but one of the frequent cases of coalescence of two or more in these materials: the first one would be integrated by Ar. *kuzbar* and its Rom. rendering *saliyandirī* (= Ct. **cilandre**), and the second one, ending with that corruption of *kūshād*, probably began with Rom. BASHLÉSHKO "gentian"¹⁹.

38) In the entry *bālsāni*, rendered by unequivocal Ar. *ʿadas* "lentils" (86r 13), the editor has not properly read and understood the closing annotation, written by a different hand, > *w'znh ghyry ṣḥḥ lntjsh* < "they are generally considered healthy, *lntjsh*". The actual reading is *wa-*

¹⁶ See *Sharḥ* 63, corroborated by personal observation on the spot.

¹⁷ See Corriente 1997: 210.

¹⁸ See N° 179.

¹⁹ About which see Corriente 2001: 115 and *Sharḥ* 41; see also N° 51.

'*aẓunnu-hū ghayra*²⁰ *ṣaḥīhin*, *Intjsh*, i.e., "and I think it is not correct, (but it should be) lentils", implying that the author considers the main entry, *bālsāni*, the usual word for "balsam", corrupted from *lintijash* "lentils". However, this is only the author's comment, and the editor is right in assuming that the initial text contained *bulsun*, synonymous with *adas*, e.g., in *Tafsīr* 179.

39) In the entry *bahmān* "behen" (86v 14), the Rom. equivalent of its white variety is given as *ba'ān al-buyūt*, i.e., "behen of the houses", although this term is probably a mere corruption of Rom. *ÁLBO* "white", as suggested by the editor.

40) The Rom. equivalents of Ar. *zuwān* "darnel" appear in these materials under the different shapes *bānāyilah* (92r 8), *bayāl* (92r 13) and *unayālah* (117v 13), reasonably identified by the editor as one and the same distorted item, difficult to recover. To make matters worse, it is known that Ar. treatises often mix up darnel (*Lolium temulentum*) with other Gramineae, such as rye-grass and canary-seed. From the phonetic viewpoint, a Rom. diminutive **UNYÉLLA* "little nail" would be acceptable, since *ÚNYA* is found in several plant names²¹, so called in the folk speech on account of a physical or metaphorical affinity to the nails of some animals, which would be appropriate in the case of darnel.

41) The obviously Rom. *bibiniyālluh* "gherkin", given as a last equivalent of *bukhūr maryam* "bleeding nun" (87r 1) is, of course, a mistake. However, it cannot be a corruption of Cs. **pamporcino** for graphic reasons; chances are that it is instead a phonetic mix-up with **pimpinela** (Ct. **pimpinella** "great brunet"), a word which Corominas explains precisely as a derivate of that name of gherkins, on account of a tinge of their taste in its leaves.

42) *butārī* (111v 13), given as Rom. rendering of Ar. *saman*, bears no relation to quails, as there is no reason to correct that And. variant of Classical *samm* "butter", perfectly matched by the Rom. reflexes of Lt. *butyrum*. Curiously enough, the editor has perfectly understood the same Ar. item in 92r 16 and 112r 7, where it is translated by Rom. *mantāqah* or *mantikah*.

43) The synonym given for *baṭ* "duck" (87v 15) is clearly spelt in the ms. as *burrāq*. But the good reading would be *burāk*, not *barrāt*, as the

²⁰ The spelling > *ghyry* < reflects the characteristically And. Ar. invariable shape of this word, *gháyri* (see Corriente 1977: 73 and fn. 236).

²¹ See Corriente 2001: 209 and Simonet 1888: 557.

editor has registered, fancying an alteration of Ar. *barriyyah* "wild"²².

44) It is unlikely that $>b.rb.sh<$ (87v 13) be actually corrupted for Rom. BERBÁSHKO "mullein", since the And. Ar. text does not unequivocally contain *miknasat al-'andar*, as surmised by that proposal. Literally read, the utterance *wahíyya alladhí taḥmál al-makánis* "and it is what brooms carry", probably refers to brooms with beards in the botanical sense of both terms, i.e., Rom. BÁRBA, often attested as are its derivatives in these treatises²³.

45) In the entry *kurrath barī*, i.e., *kurrāth barrī* "wild leek" (98r 15), the editor suggests that the second element of its Rom. equivalent, *biwārash bardūsh* could reproduce a syntagm like Cs. **ajos pardos**, literally "brown garlic", or be perhaps connected to **prados** "meadows". There is, however, a much simpler solution, namely, Cs. **pueros bordes**, i.e., "bastard leeks", as a loan-translation of the Ar. entry.

46) The entry *buzdhī* "papyrus" (in 87v 3, i.e., *bardī*, as the editor has rightly corrected²⁴), contains several textual corruptions, which the editor has emended silently in his German translation, as he does usually in this work, with results not always altogether plausible, in our view. Such is the string *alatī fī ilfam qanī sāyirra il'āḍā*, rendered as "a staff from which the remaining parts spring up at its opening", which does not agree with the facts. The descriptions of papyrus, like that of *Umdah* 97-98, suggest the need to correct that string as *allatī fī l-qāmati fawqa sā'iri l-'āḍā'i*, i.e., "which is in stature taller than the remaining parts". There is yet another corrupted passage reading *maḥ m.hā* (not *m.jā*) *al-khal*, rendered as "diluted in vinegar", but most likely to be better corrected into *maḥ muḥḥi l-khall*, i.e., "with vinegar of the best quality" (cf. Cs. **vinagre de yema**). Finally, *tikāl al-'asnān* is vaguely translated as dental care, while the Ar. term, restored as *ittikāl* "corrosion", refers to a treatment for cavities.

47) The Rom. equivalent of Ar. *buqūl* "greens" in 88r 4 is $>bārs'sh<$ in the ms., not *bārsaqash*, as the editor registers, which requires the etymon of Cs. **berza**, reported by him in the second place.

²² That word is the common term for wild or domestic ducks in Andalusí and North African Arabic (see Corriente 1997: 48 and Dozy I: 76, Colin I: 75, Prémare I: 204, Aquilina I: 137, etc.).

²³ See Corriente 2001: 114.

²⁴ Of which *būzā* is a variety, according to *Umdah* 98, fn. 20.

48) *barshīq* (92r 6-7), as a Rom. equivalent of Ar. *zabarjad* "chrysolite" and *zumurrud* "emerald", is quite unlikely on phonetic grounds to reflect Gr. *bérullon* "beryl" or its Western descendants. This matter requires further investigation, as is often the case with the old names of gems, but a possible starting point could be to think of the adjective "Persian" (Lt. *Persicus*), applied to several products from the East.

49) *barmalyūn* would be the correct reading of *qarqalyūn* (92r 20), given as the Rom. equivalent of Ar. *zirnīkh* "orpiment"²⁵, cf. Cs. **bermellón**, Ct. **vermelló**.

50) The word *burūluh* after a supposed figure "2", taken by the editor as synonymous with Ar. *zubdu* "butter" in 92r 16, is in fact a corruption of the phrase *fī burūdah*. The text reads "butter = *samn* is fresh with some coldness".

51) The entry *bashalishkah* "gentian" (84v 16-19) ends with a string, > *whw ynf lkthr* (not 'kthr!) *mn 'dwyh* <, rendered by the editor as "it is very useful among remedies", when in fact it reads *wa-huwa yanfa'u li-kathīrin mina l-'adwiyah*, i.e., "it is useful for the preparation of many remedies".

52) *bushūn* (89v 13) "pestle" is not derived from Lt. *impulso*, as the editor propounds, but from *pison(em)*²⁶, the vocalic change been triggered by assimilation to the preceding bilabial consonant.

53) The entry *baṣal al-khānzīr* "squill" (87v 17-18, literally "pig onion", where the second constituent is not a plural, as the editor thinks) calls for some comments. The enigmatic word which follows, transcribed by the editor as *warsā*, and silently translated as "red", is clearly *yarsā* in the ms., a slight corruption of *īrasā*, from Gr. *iris* "iris", also in the family of Liliaceae. On the other hand, *baṣal al-faḥṣ* needs not be corrected into *baṣal al-fa'r*, as both terms appear again side by side in 105r 13-14, it being understandable that this wild plant came to be known as "field onion".

54) The word *baqātum* (104r 17), which the editor has unduly corrected to match the Gr. *pēganon*, has led him in the wrong direction, towards an identification with "rue" and this, in turn, has caused another mistake, namely, fancying that (*ṣamgh*) *al-malik* should match the Gr. for

²⁵ See Corriente 1997: 229.

²⁶ See Corriente 1997: 38 under {*pjn*}.

"rue", *mōlu*. The Ar. heading, *ṣamgh al-qardī*, i.e., *alqaraq*, makes it sufficiently clear that the author is talking about gum arabic, obtained from the Arabian acacia²⁷, apparently also called *ṣamgh al-ḥilk*, i.e., "chewing gum" (see N° 137), while *baqāṭum* really answers to Gr. *kágkamon* "shellac", often very distorted, as reported in *Tafsīr* 118. Surprisingly, the same word appears again, distorted as *baqānūn* (100r 9), but this time attributed by the editor to a Lt. etymon, also inaccurate.

55) *baqsh* (116v 3-4), Rom. rendering of Ar. *ghār* "laurel" declared unidentifiable by the editor is, of course, a reflex of Lt. (*lauri*) *baccae*, exhibiting the Rom. plural morpheme.

56) In the entry *ḥabbu bilsām* "balsam grains" (93r 20), for its Rom. equivalents *qūrunī balshamayī* and *qarnū abalshamū*, the editor posits Cs. **grano** "grain" as the first constituent of both syntagms, but chances are that it is rather **cuerno** "horn", as a loan-translation from And. Ar., since in this language *qarn* means both "horn" and "pod" or "bunch"²⁸.

57) *bulandī*, *fuliṭ*, *fūlī* y *fūl* (111r 6-7) as Rom. equivalents of *sādaj hindī* "Malabar cinnamon" are indeed related to Gr. *phúllon*, but are all in fact more or less corrupted and mutilated reflexes of the original *phúlla Indikā* "Indian leaves", better preserved in other texts as *falwāntiqah*²⁹.

58) The entry *bān* (88r 8), rendered by the Rom. *balū* ' *ndyū* has been misunderstood by the editor. The Ar. term is correct, not a corruption of *banj* "henbane", while that Rom. term is to be read as PÁLO ÍNDYO "Indian wood", apparently a late designation of the ben tree.

59) The item *būrajish* (107r 5), given as Rom. equivalent of *fūqus*, correctly attributed by the editor to Lt. *fucus*, and of *khuwayar*, which is probably a corruption of Ar. *ḍarf*, cannot derive from French *varech*, only marginally accepted in Cs. It is most likely a mistake for **fūrajish*, related to Ct. **foragitar** "to expel" and Cs. **forajido** "outlaw", from Low Lt. **fora agitare* "to drive out", appropriate for seaweeds which are seen most often only after being washed ashore.

60) The Rom. translation *būsh bishtirish* (105r 10) of Ar. *ʿaṣà r-rāʿī* "knot grass", literally "the shepherd's staff", does not contain a reflex of Lt. *buxus* "box tree". It makes more sense to assume that in the Lt. name

²⁷ See *Tafsīr* 142.

²⁸ See Corriente 1997: 425. *ʿUmdah* 105 specifically says that the grains of balsam come in little bunches.

²⁹ E.g., *ʿUmdah* 706.

of this plant, *virga pastoris*, the first constituent has been taken to mean "penis" and replaced by the more common And. Rom. *pí/úsh(sha)*³⁰.

61) *barsād* "turnip" (87v 10), of Pr. origin, should be corrected as *būshād*, not *būssād*, in spite of Leclerc's view, as done, among others, by Benmrad 1985: 249.

62) *būlighāryūs* "fern" (106v 20) can hardly be a reflex of Cs. **polígala** "milk-wort" or Lt. *policaria* "louse-wort", both completely different from that former plant. We are most likely confronted here with a corruption of *būlūbūdhyūn*, from Gr. *polupódion*, extant in *Sharḥ* 36, *Tafsīr* 313 and *Umdah* 128.

63) The word *tu/ūdharān* or *tawdarān* "poppy" (87v 12, 112v 2 and 114r 4) certainly has a Br. appearance, but cannot be connected with the *tārakhīrā* of *Sharḥ* 401. It might be a reflex with metathesis and rotacism of *taludat* or *tilidut*, of the same origin and meaning in *Shafīq* I 322.

64) The entry *turbāsin* (113r 11), declared unidentifiable by the author, is a slight deturpation of *tīrfās* "truffles"³¹.

65) The word *tazghīr*, included immediately after the Br. equivalent *tāzart* of Arabic *tīn* "figs" (113r 1-2), is possibly distorted from also Br. *tergelt*, a small variety of figs³².

66) The entry *tamr mūs* (112v 7), followed by the note "the same in Rom.", is bungled and has led the editor astray. The original must have said *turmus* "lupin", which was borrowed as **tramús** in Ct. and **altramuz** in Cs.

67) The word *talbīnna* (102r 19), given as a Rom. equivalent of *nashā* "starch", is surprisingly declared by the author to be unidentifiable. In fact, the **(a)talvina**, from the Ar. *talbīnah*, a kind of porridge, is widely attested in Cs. and Ct.³³

68) The variants *tamtam* and *tastam* (85v 9), given as alternative names for sumac, are corrupted from Pr. *tatom*. The identification of this plant with Ar. *ḍarw* "lentisc" is a good example of the inaccuracies found so often in these materials.

69) The editor is right when he says that *tūk/qah* or *tukah* (94v 13, 98v 1-2 and 105r 8-9), the given Rom. equivalent of *kākanj* "Cape

³⁰ About which, see Corriente 1997: 53 and 1993b: 283.

³¹ About which, see Corriente 1997: 77.

³² According to *Shafīq* I 196.

³³ As can be seen in Corriente 1977: 237-8.

gooseberries", is not attested, but anybody can understand this metonymy who has seen these small fruits, almost entirely wrapped up by bracts, like a burrow or a wimp, meanings of Pt., Cs. and Ct. **toca**.

70) The editor does not provide any explanation for the aberrant shapes of *thawfahar* or *thafāhar* "watercress" (in 93r 12-13 and 113v 3, while *thuwafa* in 113v 8 is a less surprising spelling deviation for a Morisco text from Classical Ar. *thuffā'*). That final addition reflects Ar. *ākhar* "another", since *thuffā'* also means "mustard" in Arabic dictionaries.

71) In the entry *thīl* "dog's tooth grass" (113v 4) there is an enigmatic > *tāḥlḥ* 'ldwāb <, which the authors has taken for an unidentifiable plant name. But in fact it should be read with the ms. as *ta'kulu-hu d-dawābb* "it is eaten by beasts", which allows us to identify this plant as the third variety of *thīl* or *thayyil*, the only one that is not poisonous, according to 'Umdah 254.

72) The word *jadānnah*, given as synonymous with *markashūthā* "marcasite" (101r 2-3), can hardly be connected with Cs. **cadmía**. It might be wiser to consider it a variant of *shādinah* "hematite" (117v 5), another mineral, within the range of accuracy expectable in these materials, and yet much closer phonetically to the ms.

73) The entry *jarad* = *radār* (89r 6) posits more problems than the editor has been aware of upon identifying the former word with Ar. *jarād* "grasshoppers", and saying that the latter is not extant in his sources as the name of any species of such insects. There can be little doubt that this second item is a reflex of Lt. *radere* "to scrap", which is also the meaning of the Ar. verb *jarad*, but this is a glossary of pharmacological terms, and an entry in the infinitive or other citation forms would be exceptional. We could think of And. Ar. *júrd* "rat", but this word would be ill-matched with that Lt. verb, even with the meaning of "gnawing", or of *juráda* "scrapings", and then one would expect also a verbal noun on the Lt. side of the pair. However, since scraping certain substances is a common process in the elaboration of remedies, we are inclined to believe that, exceptionally, the glossary has given the Ar. verb in its perfective citation form, and the aforementioned Lt. infinitive or rather, with a slight correction, its Cs. reflex **raer**.

74) The entry *jaft* "acorn-cups" (88v 16) contains a faulty lecture *ilrraqqati* for *ar-raqqah*, which does not affect its meaning. It is repeated in a more extended way in 114r 6-12, misplaced under the letter *khā'* on account of the faulty variant *khafit*, with some passages not rendered properly by the editor. First, *ar-rubū* means "asthma", not "breast

bleeding"; next, *idhā ajasu* (read *ujlisa*) *fī-hi* means "if the patient takes a hip-bath with it", not that that water cures constipation. Finally, *wa-jaddahu fī °admmahi wa-waraqa at-turunjān* is a bungled text, to be corrected as *wa-badalu-hū fī °adami-hī waraqa t-turanjān*, and translated "it can be replaced when lacking by lemon-balm leaves", not "it is found in case of lack of lemon-balm leaves". As for the Rom. equivalents *kibalrum* and *ghalnadiyulmi*, which the editor declares unidentifiable, the former appears to be a reflex of Low Lt. *cupelarum*, with loss of a preceding noun ("...of the little cups"), and the latter, of Low Lt. **glandeolum* "little acorn".

75) The item *jalm*, synonymous with *jilbāni* "chick peas" (89r 5), might be corrupted from *khullar*, another Ar. equivalent often occurring in botanical treatises.

76) The word *jandarīsh*, given in 101r 2-3 as a synonym of *markashīthā* "marcassite" and then of *jaddānnah* "hematite"³⁴, is probably corrupted from Gr. *sidērītis* "magnetite", but also "diamond" in Lt., with the kind of loose identification characteristic of these materials.

77) The editor is taken aback by the semantic distance between *khūlanjān* "galingale" and *maywīzaj* "louse-wort" (89r 9), which is his interpretation for *jawzi mūkhar / mwḥr*. But the author is not to blame on this occasion, since this last item is corrupted from *jawz sūdār*, an exact synonym of *khūlanjān*, e.g., in *°Umdah* 186.

78) Some names of stones have also caused problems of edition and interpretation in this treatise. To begin with, in 94r 10, *ḥajru l-bawādī*, literally "meadow stone", is corrupted for *bijādī* "agate", with a red variant, *bijādī aḥmar*³⁵. Next, in 94v 3, *ḥajru burāq*, naively connected by the editor with "borax", appears to be better read as *barrāq* "bright", which semantically matches the synonymous *talq* "talc" much better. Again, in 94v 9, *ḥajru jāḥatīs*, described as a black stone, bears no relation to the Kaabah but is simply corrupted from *ghāghātīs*, standard Ar. reflex of Gr. *gagátēs* "jade"³⁶: the item reappears correctly spelt in this ms., and properly transcribed and translated in 95r 11, although identified here with the And. Ar. term which means "jet". Curiously enough, the Classical Ar. name of this latter mineral, *sabaj*, is bungled as

³⁴ About which, see N° 72.

³⁵ About which, see Corriente 1997: 37.

³⁶ See Benmrad 1985: 552.

shaylaj in 94v 14, which understandably puzzles the editor. Once more, in 94v 10, where the talk goes around a light stone floating on the water, the editor has not detected in *hajru qushūrah* the corruption of *qayshūr* "pumice-stone"³⁷. Finally, in 117v 5 it is obvious that *hajra al-rūmi* "stone of the Rūm" is just a mistake for *hajaru d-dam* "hematite".

79) The Ar. equivalent *hurayq*, given to *murddāsanji* "litharge" (101v 1-2), is a fault for *harīq* "burnt", which has bewildered the editor. It suffices to read descriptions of the preparation of this substance, like that of Benmrad 1985: 742, to understand why it was so called.

80) In the entry *ḥuḍaḍ* "Africa tea tree" (93r 7), the editor has silently skipped the second corrupted word of its explanation as *ushāratu ildamyaru*, which is not reflected in his German translation, where he merely has "juice". The good reading is *ṣabir* "aloe".

81) In 93r 4, Ar. *al-ḥamddah*, given as equivalent of *ḥiltīt* and *anjudhān* "asafoetida", unaccountable for in the root {*ḥmd*}, as the editor says, is easily corrected to *ḥamḍah*, a generic name for plants having sour juice. A similar correction must be introduced in the synonymous entry *ḥumādah* (94v 1), followed by a bungled *wa-qad dhukiya*, which the editor has rendered as "it has a strong smell", again repeated in 100v 8, but requiring to be corrected to *wa-qad dhukir* "aforementioned", which is true of both instances.

82) The long entry *ḥanḍal* "colocynth" (92v 4-8) contains several unsolved cruces. First, the bungled Ar. *wa-'aslahu kā-shabru*, for which the editor has ventured a translation "and its staff is like the wild petty spurge", must be corrected into *wa-'aṣluhū ka-shibrin* "and its root is about one span long". As for the following terms, *aṣāba-hu walkabisni*, the editor identifies them rightly as synonymous with the main entry, but their standard forms are *ṣābah* and *kabast*. The same plant name eludes the editor's competence again in 117v 17-18, under the entry *shahmi al-ḥanḍal* "colocynth fat", where he has connected the next incomplete entry *shāyīnah bwiraqu-hā* "millet with its leaves" with the foregoing text and translated it as a puzzling "it is falsified with its leaves", instead of "millet with its leaves".

83) In the entry *ḥawk* = *bādhārūj* "sweet basil" (95r 10), the enigmatic word *burunah* would not be a further unidentified synonym, but only a mistake for *waraqū-h*, thus completing the phrase *al-ḥabaqu l-'arīḍu waraqū-h* "basil with large leaves", mentioned in *Umdah* 200 as

³⁷ About which, see Corriente 1997: 411 and 429.

the equivalent of *bādhārāj*.

84) In the entry *ḥayu l-^cālim* (for *ḥayyu l-^cālam*) "stonecrop" (92v 10), the editor has not realized that the ms. *ilā* must be corrected to *lā*, as the meaning requires "it does not lose its leaves", not "until it loses its leaves".

85) The word *khamar*, given as synonymous with *aṣqaf* "caperbush" (86r 8), cannot obviously be connected with the root {*ḥmr*} in order to make it mean "red". As a matter of fact, such is the name of any bush tall enough to hide a person in the act of relieving oneself.³⁸

86) For the word *khirāj* of the ms., "Cape gooseberries" (115r 6), the editor suggests its correction to Ar. *khurāj* "abscess", though aware that such a word is not registered as any plant name. However, the appearance of its fruits, about which see N° 69, would justify such a metaphor.

87) The entry *khurwi aldhībun*, rendered into Rom. as *ḥardijinnah* (114v 12) is short, but treacherous. The editor has chosen to correct it as *jarwu dh-dhi'b* "wolf cub", forgetting that this is a glossary of pharmacological terms and that such a displacement of entries from one to another letter would be quite anomalous, and has given up any attempt to identify the second item, supposedly Rom. But this is, in fact, the key to the whole entry, though a key quite hard to find, as we shall see. Initially, Ar. *ḥirdhawn* "lizard", pronounced *ḥardūn* in And. Ar., entered the Rom. dialects, mostly with metanalysis of its final segment as an augmentative suffix {+ÓN} and subsequent substitution of {-ÁĀ} for it (e.g., Arag. *fardacho* and Ct. *fardatxo* o *fardaix*³⁹). Next, and still in And. Rom., to judge from the preservation of the phoneme /h/, this reshaped word has received the suffix {-ĪNA}, found in some names of different animal excrements (e.g., Cs. *canina* "dog dirt", *palomina/o* "pidgeon droppings"). Consequently, there was in And. Rom. a word ḤARDAĀĪNA "lizard excrement" attested here, which would be matched by Ar. *khur'u d-dabbi*, corrupted in this ms. as *dh-dhibi*, i.e., "wolf excrement". This does not answer the question of whether such a substance is meant literally, which would not be surprising in the medicine of the day and is supported by the next entry *ḥarwi al-kalbi* "dog dirt", or there was some plant so called, as in the case of *kharā'u n-nawātiyah* "French hartwort" and *ziblu l-ḥamām* "mangosteen tree" (literally,

³⁸ See *Umdah* 270.

³⁹ See Corriente 1999: 157.

"sailors' excrement" and "pidgeon droppings", respectively)⁴⁰.

88) The entry *khumayqi* "dwarf elder" (115r 19) is not corrupted from the Ar. reflex *khāmā aqṭī* of the Gr. *chamaiáktē* of the same meaning, as the editor believes, but from the Granadan pronunciation *khumín* of Ar. *khumān*⁴¹, and the supposed Rom. *ibulshi* is perhaps rather Lt. *ebulus*, as both Cs. **ébulo** and Ct. **évuls** are extremely rare. The Gr. term appears split into two parts in 94r 4, spelt as *ḥamà... aqaṭaya*, but it is noteworthy that Ar. plant names of Gr. origin including that first element are indifferently spelt with >ḥ< or >kh<.

89) In 86v 12, the editor is not aware that two entries, "poppy" and "cucumber" have coalesced into one, as happens occasionally in these materials. Consequently, it is no wonder that *khiyār* "cucumber" and its Rom. rendering, *bibiniyālluh* (Cs. **pepinillo**) have so little in common with the preceding terms. It remains unclear why *bādarūj* "sweet basil" appears here as synonymous with *būdhariḥ* or *khashkhāsh aḥmar* "red poppy", and again in 114v 4 as synonymous with *khiyār*: in the former instance, the reason might be its graphic likeness to *būdhariḥ*, in the latter and considering that this term is sometimes identified with *nuyiyāllah*⁴², there could have been a graphic confusion with *bibiniyālluh*.

90) In 89v 2, *dhardān*, given as synonymous with *diflah* "oleander" is a corruption of *dawdar*⁴³, and bears no relation to *dardār* "ash-tree".

91) In 97v 6, *kashūthā* "clover dodder" is defined as *darbu ilkitāni*, which the editor has rendered as "a kind of flax", as if he had read *ḍarb*, but the ms. clearly has *jarab* "scabies", quite understandable metaphorically, because of the appearance of the plants so plagued.

92) The editor tries in vain to find an explanation for the final consonant of the variant *rāba/iq* of more standard *rānaj* "coconut" in 88v 3, 103r 17 and 110r 6. However, assuming that /b/ is a mistake for /n/, that final /q/ is not so strange, as it represents the oldest stage of Ar. transcriptions from Pahlavi, followed by younger /j/, and finally by a mute >h< in Pr.

93) The Rom. equivalent given for Ar. *jullinār* in 89r 10, *rujhā bulushtiryah*, is correctly explained in its second constituent by the editor

⁴⁰ See Corriente 1997: 151.

⁴¹ About which, see Corriente 1997: 167.

⁴² E.g., in *Umdah* 506.

⁴³ See *Umdah* 299.

as a derivate of Gr. *balaústion* "pomegranate flower", but we cannot agree with his etymon for the first one, Gr. *róa* or *roiá* "pomegranate" on account of both phonetic and semantic reasons. Since *ward ar-rummān*, the Ar. loan-translation of Pr. *gole anār*, "roses of the pomegranate" has circulated profusely, it is more likely that we are here confronted with Ct. **rosa**, phonetically very close to that word.

94) The synonym *ar-rukbatu* of Ar. *khirwa^c* "castor-oil plant" (114v 1-3) bears no relation, of course, to "horse sorrel" or, for that matter, to the whole root {*rkb*}, but appears to have a different story. We find a surprising *urīqanuh* in *Umdah* 265, given as an equivalent of *khirwa^c*, which can hardly be explained but as a North African reflex of Lt. *ricinus*⁴⁴, and would be at the origin of that distorted *ar-rukbatu*. In this entry it is also noteworthy that *shajaratu jihanamu* is a periphrasis of *zaqqūm*, the infernal tree mentioned in the *Qur'ān*, but also defined by *Umdah* 364 as an earthly tree similar to *khirwa^c*, and even as its synonym among deluded Andalusī physicians. Next, the expression *al-'awrām alb.l.ghiyyah*, on which the editor has forced the translation "strong swellings", is clearly in the ms. *balghamiyyah* "phlegmatic"; finally, the ending phrase *wa-huwa sharru-hū* is no plant name, but a comment on the last variety mentioned (*qāqabūs*, unidentified), about which the author says that it is the worst of them all.

95) In the entry *khawlān* "boxthorn" in 115r 8, wrongly identified with *kathīrā* "tragacanth", the next phrase, *yujadi fī alzzaj*, has been interpreted by the editor as "it is found in vitriol", which makes little sense. We suspect a corruption of (*bilād*) *az-zanj*, i.e., Eastern Africa, according to *Umdah* 401, which says that tragacanth is not a local plant, although frequent in Arabia and Ethiopia.

96) The supposed Rom. equivalent *zārūlash* of *umm ghaylān* "wild Egyptian acacia" (84r 19) is, as it appears, Cs. **azarola** or **acerola**, Ct. **atzerola** "hawthorn; mountain ash, etc.", etc., from And. Ar. *za^crūr*⁴⁵. The only similarity between both plants is their being thorny, but such superficial identifications are frequent in these materials.

97) In the entry *zūfā*, the expression *fanshiq wagharrāz* (91v 8-9, only *alfānashq* in 17) is not, in principle, any plant name, but the And. Ar. phrase *anshāq wa-gharrāz* "inhale and plant (it)", which then apparently

⁴⁴ Cf. the parallel case of *riqmāl* vs. *rajīm* in the *Vocabulista in arabico*, discussed by Griffin 1961: 195-6.

⁴⁵ About which, see Corriente 1997: 230 and 2001: 85.

became a popular designation of the common hyssop, known for its scent and sometimes erroneously taken for thyme⁴⁶. This is the reason why it is identified with *ghubayrah* in 91v 17, a common designation of penny-royal, another strongly scented herb.

98) It is surprising that the editor declares *sābrūm* "sedge" (111r 8) as unidentifiable, as this supposedly Rom. term is simply the Lt. *cyperum*, which appears in the heading of the entry as its botanic identifying Lt. name, though in the masculine.

99) Under the entry *sabār*, duly corrected by the editor as *samār* (111r 9), a generic designation of Cyperaceae, the Rom. equivalent *jūсах* cannot easily reflect Ct. **xufa**, Cs. **chufa** "earth almond". It is much more likely accounted for as a case of assimilation of /n/ to a following /s/ in *junsah*, after a principle enunciated in Corriente 1977: 41⁴⁷.

100) The entry >syj< (112r 20), followed by an annotation to the effect that this word is also Rom., cannot therefore be interpreted as *siyāj* "hedge". It is most likely a corruption of *sabaj* "jet (stone)", which has been borrowed by Cs. **azabache**, Ct. **atzabeja**, etc.⁴⁸

101) Rom. *sibyah*, given equivalence of Ar. *zabad il-baḥri* "sponge" or "pumice", literally "sea foam" (also *ashbūmah di mar* in 91v 11 y *ashbūmmah marinnah* in 84r 8), is obviously the same as *shibyā* or corrupted *al-shayshibyah* = *ashbūmah dā mar* in 118r 10. The editor has guessed rightly that different substances are mixed up here on account of just a few common properties, and even discovered that *shayshibyah* reflects And. Rom. ШÉPYA, whence Cs. **jibia**, but not that the same word is found under the forms *sibyah* or *shibyā*, referring not to the whole cuttlefish, but merely to its inner light shell, which was given certain industrial uses. Its confusion with *zabad al-baḥr* is reported by Dozy I 808.

102) The fish name >s.^cār.s< (112r 11) or >'.s^cār.s< (118r 18), given as synonymous with *shabbūt*, is probably a corruption of Lt. *sparus*, the generic designation of all sorts of breams. This is not so

⁴⁶ As reported by *Umdah* 365. This occasional use of whole phrases, most particularly imperatives, as plant names in And. Ar. is not isolated, as can be seen in N° 115, *fuz laqqam* "get (it) and swallow (it)", misspelled as >f.dlqm< in *Umdah* 402, And. Rom. APRE WÉLLO (Corriente 2001: 109), etc.

⁴⁷ Of which the editor himself avails himself to explain 84r 18, though not successfully in that case.

⁴⁸ See Corriente 2001: 87.

surprising, when considering that *shabbūt* in al-Andalus did not have any of the meanings included in Dozy I 721, but only meant the ray's bream (cf. Cs. **japuta**), a different sea fish with some morphological affinity⁴⁹.

103) The term **sik ar-rumān*, equivalent or *nārmushk* in 103r 8-11, is clearly in the ms. *misk ar-rummān*, exactly matching Pr. *anār meshk* "pomegranate musk", in spite of the wrong identifications contained in this entry. The same graphical mistake occurs again in the ms. in 109v 8 *alsak*, with the Rom. equivalent GHÁLYA MOSHQÁDA, repeated in 111r 18. It should be kept in mind that Ar. *ghāliyah*, whence Cs. **algalia**, was an admixture of musk and ambergris; it remains open to question whether *sukk*, a kind of pills containing musk and also called *sukk al-musk*⁵⁰ has played a role in all this.

104) The entry *>fānīd sahrī<* is correctly interpreted as *fānīd sijzī* "kind of sugar from Sistan" in 107r 6, on the authority of Dozy II 248 but, surprisingly the same correction is not introduced in an similar easier passage, *>s.k.r h.jzī<*, in 112r 14. Besides, in the preceding entry (112r 13), and then in 112r 19, the editor does not detect that *>blāb<* and *>'jlb<* are just failed attempts at writing *bi l-ajamiyyah* "in Romance", as he does next without the preposition and the article.

105) In the entry *saljam* "turnip" (111r 10-13), the phrase *alladhī yanbutu fi lm-marūji al-murba'un al-qidbān* must be slightly corrected into *fi l-murūji l-marbū'u l-qidbāni*, i.e., "the one which grows in the meadows, middle sized", not "in shady remote meadows".

106) The supposed Rom. equivalent *saljjunsā* of *sunbal barī*, i.e., *sunbul barrī* "wild nard" (110v 6) is a corruption of *mantajūshah*, a widespread alteration of Pr. *maybakhushē*⁵¹.

107) The entry *sumal* (followed by *hiya as-sardīn*, 111r 5) is badly bungled and has nothing to do with fish, as its original text must have been *sunbal hiya an-nardīn* "spikenard is *nardīn*".

108) One wonders why *shashmiryum* "water mint" is correctly identified with Lt. *sisymbrium* in 102v 10-12, while its more corrupted variant *shaytanabrium* in 106v 2-3 is not, making the editor think of an inaccurate connection with *shāh shubrum* "small leave basil".

109) The entry *shabb yamanī* "(Yemenite) alum" (118r 15-17) contains

⁴⁹ See Davidson 1972: 90 and 125.

⁵⁰ See Dozy I 666.

⁵¹ About which, see *Sharḥ* 129.

some textual corruptions with which the editor has not been able to cope. To begin with, >mkthr ḥmās< must be corrected as *mukattal ḥāmiz*, where the second word has been made out rightly as "sour", unlike the first one, which means "lumpy", not "frequent". Next, **yushbī* is in the ms. rather *yushabbab* "it is treated with alum" (cf. Cs. **enjebar**), in spite of a superfluous second dot below the last >b<, which provides a much better reading than *yushba*^c "it is steeped". Finally, the editor's lecture *>b.l.ṣ<, interpreted by him as an instance of Egyptian *ballāṣ* "jar"⁵², appears in the ms. as >bā'lblm<, probably a poor attempt at introducing the often repeated phrase *bi l-^cajamiyyah* "in Romance", as in N° 104.

110) The entry *shabath* "dill", clearly spelt in the ms. in 117v 10, has been distorted in the edition as **shabash*.

111) In the entry *ashnān*, i.e., *ushnān* "saltwort" (84r 20), for its Rom. equivalent *barbāṭah* the editor propounds a "pseudo-etymological" reading *farbāṭah*, a would-be derivate from Lt. *herba* "herb", which is entirely unnecessary and even refuted by the very Arg. **erbada**, which he quotes in support of his own hypothesis. The good reading is And. Rom. YERBÁTO⁵³, given as synonymous with SHABONÁYRA in ^c*Umdah* 848.

112) The matching of *anāghālaṭīs* "pimpernel" (85v 3) with Rom. >*shdhyh*< is indeed an outright mistake, as the Rom. and And. Ar. reflexes of Lt. *satureia* have only been applied to the "summer savory" or very closely related plants. This is the right conclusion reached by the editor himself after toying briefly with a shy suggestion of a derivate of Basque **txindar** "spark", parallel to Cs. **centella**, which must also be definitively dismissed, as there is no botanic meaning registered in Azkue 1969: II 322 for that word. However, the editor's mention of Ct. **sajolida** or **sadorija**, a reflex of *satureia*, has unexpectedly provided the solution of the And. Rom. SHORJÍDA equivalent of Ar., of Pr. origin, *marzanjūsh*⁵⁴.

113) The Rom. equivalent given to *qarāsiyā* "prunes" (108v 7), *sārāshas anghillash*, with an enigmatic second constituent, might be solved by supposing a corruption of Ct. **angleses** "English (cherries)" which, however, lacks confirmation in the attested usage.

⁵² Only reading in Hinds-Badawi 1986: 191.

⁵³ See N° 212.

⁵⁴ For which we had propounded a different Lt. etymon, in a rather desperate attempt to solve this riddle, as recently as in Corriente 2001: 201.

114) Rom. *shishbash* as a rendering of Ar. *ʿunnāb* "jube" (104v 7), rightly corrected by the author for *ʿinab* "grapes", is probably not a reflex of Cs. **jīnjas**, from Ct. **gīnjol**. In Corriente 2001: 200 we dealt with similar readings such as >*ṣihyash*<, >*shifilyash*< and >*shajbash*<, which we derive from semi-learned reflexes of Lt. *zizyphus*.

115) The enigmatic *shafrārāḥ*, given as a synonym of *aṣṭūkhūdus* "lavender" (83v 2-3), might find an explanation as a folk translation (*shāf rāḥa* "he saw, i.e. felt some rest") of the Ar. *mūqif al-ʿarwāḥ* "he who gives rest to souls", used with that meaning according to several sources, such as *ʿUmdah* 499, *Tafsīr* 220, etc.

116) There is considerable confusion in these materials and in Medieval treatises, in general, about Ar. *naṭrūn* "sodium carbonate" of Gr. origin, often wrongly identified with *bawraq* "borax", which is "sodium borate", and the Rom. reflexes of Lt. *sal nitrum* "sodium nitrate, saltpetre", such as Cs. **salitre** and Ct. **salnitre**. The editor is aware of that mix-up in 87r 8, where *bawraq* and *naṭrūn* are rendered by Rom. *shal niṭri*, thereby confusing the three substances⁵⁵, but in 102r 10 does not react against the identification of *shal niṭri* with *milḥ naḥṭ(i)*, misled perhaps by the entry *milḥ naḥṭī* in Dozy II 712, an edible salt. In fact, this *milḥ naḥṭī* "gunpowder salt" (also *milḥ al-bārūd*) is again saltpetre, totally unapt for human consumption. Loosely connected with this matter is the name of rock-salt, *milḥ hindī* or *ḥaydarānī*⁵⁶, which in 101r 10-11 is given the Rom. Equivalent *biyā biṭrāsh*, probably to be corrected as *shal biṭrāsh*, i.e., literally, "stone salt".

117) The identification of *māhīzahrah* with *shulbāsh* "globe daisy" in 101v 20 is found not only in Ibn Juljul, but also in much later sources such as the *ʿUmdah* (in an independent entry lost in al-Khaṭṭābī's edition) and *al-Mustaʿīnī*, according to Dozy II 781; however, it suffices to read Benmrad 1985: 737 to understand that this plant was unknown in the West and the East and given only approximate identifications, and this applies also to *ṭartaquh* (better than *ṭartughu*) "caper-spurge", which only shares with *shulbāsh* its being a strong laxative. But it is only fair to acknowledge that Lt. *silvanus* "from the woods", the etymon taken from

⁵⁵ Only two, *naṭrūn* and *shal niṭri* in 102v 19.

⁵⁶ Widespread corruption of *andarānī*, which receives its correct etymon in 101r 8. Such exotic terms were no longer understood by speakers of Western Ar., which explains why this rock-salt is confused with diamonds, *ḥajar al-mās* in that entry, where a correction into *ḥajar al-māʿ* seems unnecessary.

Dietrich and offered by the editor here for *shulbāsh* and its variants, *sharbānsah*, *ṣirmānsah*, *sharbātush*, etc, is far more convincing than the one given by Abu l-Khayr, the Rom. phrase ENSHÓLBESH⁵⁷, although the latter must have been developed and circulated as a folk etymology, in agreement with the therapeutic virtues of this plant.

118) The item *shalsh*, given in 106v 10-11 as an alternative Rom. rendering of And. Ar. *fāsfāṣa* "lucerne"⁵⁸, is likelier to be a plural of Cs. *zulla* "soola clover"⁵⁹, a similar fodder plant, than a corruption of Ct. *fals*, itself a derivate of that And. Ar. term.

119) The item *shamrum rūbi*, given as Rom. alternative rendering of *‘ullayq* "blackberry" (105r 20) contains a first constituent declared doubtful by the editor, and so it is in fact, as it seems to be corrupted from And. Rom. QAMRÓN "buckthorn", a relatively similar thorny bush.

120) The equivalent *yashrahu* or *yashrra*, perhaps rather *bashraṭ* in the ms., given to *māsh* "mungo bean" in 101v 7 and 9, and translated by the editor as "with epidermis" in a desperate attempt, might be corrupted from Rom. ČĚČARO "chickpea"⁶⁰, if not from *BISHÁRṬO, i.e., Arg. **bisalto** "a kind of pea", on account of a certain likeness between both. The entry ends with a strange *shantaliqush*, which seems displaced here, since the closest plant name, santonica or wormwood, is a very different herb.

121) The Rom. equivalent >as.k.r shurūbad< of *sukkar ṭabarzad* in 112r 12 reflects the Ct. **eixaropat**⁶¹, i.e., the sugar obtained from sugar cane syrup.

122) In the entry *ṣabir ḥazrramī* "a kind of aloe" 103v 11), the editor cannot make out the meaning of this adjective, "from Ḥaḍramawt", about which *‘Umdah* 527 tells us that the black kind of this substance is often produced in that region of South Arabia.

123) In the entry *ṣṣandal mīqāṣīri* "a kind of sandalwood" (104r 13), the editor is at a loss to explain the meaning of this adjective, "from

⁵⁷ Followed by us in Corriente 2001: 200.

⁵⁸ See Corriente 1997: 400.

⁵⁹ See Corriente 2001: 480.

⁶⁰ See on this Corriente 2001: 126-7.

⁶¹ About which, see Barceló 1984: 375-6.

Macassar"⁶².

124) The Ar. explanation of the meaning of *ṣṣayṣṣā*, i.e., *ṣayṣā'* "pitless date" (104r 8), contains two corrupted words, undetected by the editor, **mallā* and **dalahu*, in a phrase which must be read as *mā lā nawà la-hū* "the one not having pits".

125) The correct Ar. term in 95v 13 for a certain kind of large red figs is *ṭubbār*⁶³, not *ṭayār*.

126) In the entry *ṭarāthūth* "Maltese mushroom" (95v 18-20), the phrase *yunbat fī id-diyāc* (i.e., *yanbutu fī d-diyāc*) has been misunderstood as "they grow neglected (= wild)", which reflects a reading *ḍayāc*, when in fact it says "in land estates".

127) The Rom. equivalent *ṭurnah shūl* or *ṭurnashūl* for *sarīs* "chicory" (111r 15, corrupted into *sarīr* in 111v 18) is a distortion of *ṭarakhshaqūq*, which appears more or less correctly in 88r 2-3 and 111v 9-11.

128) The item *ṭarhiyūn*, given as synonymous with *turbid* "turpeth" in 95v 8 and as *ṭarhūyūn* in 113r 4 to the editor's surprise, is just corrupted from *ṭirifūliyūn* < Gr. *tripólion*, as reported in *Tafsīr* 310, on Ibn Wāfid's authority.

129) The most common Ar. synonym of *khamr* "wine" should be vocalized *ṭilā'* (96r 5), a word found even in And. low register sources⁶⁴, more in agreement with the spelling *ṭullā*, and not *ṭallah*, which is a rather uncommon synonym.

130) In the entry *ṭuwurā* (for *ṭūrā* "aconite", 95v 7), the editor has omitted the word *man* before *yashrabu-hu* and, therefore, somehow altered the exact rendering, which is "same (name in Romance). Whoever drinks it, dies right away".

131) *karmūn* in 93r 18-19 and *karūn* in 98r 12 as Rom. equivalents of *ḥashā* "thyme" are just corrupted from the arabized *ṭūmūn* from Lt. *thymum* < Gr. *thúmos*. In the first instance, the ms. could have the correct spelling, though garbled.

132) The item *ṭīn qūn* in 96r 10, isolated and without any equivalence, might be a failed attempt to spell the heading of the next entry, *ṭarqūn*.

⁶² About which, see Corriente 1997: 507.

⁶³ As reported by the comprehensive dictionary *Lisān al-ʿarab* on the authority of Abū Ḥanīfah ad-Dīnawarī and by *ʿUmdah* 367.

⁶⁴ See Corriente 1997: 334, parallel to Corriente 1986: 478, not 475, as quoted by the editor.

133) The item *dūlaf*, with the Rom. rendering *unqalah di bashtiyah* "beast hoof" in 107v 1, bears no relation to "oleander" and is not even a plant name, but a slight alteration of Ar. *zīlf* "cloven hoof".

134) There is no solid ground to presume that *‘atūtā* in 105v 17 is a mistake for *‘atūmah* "she-camel that yields a copious supply of milk", as such an entry would be uncommon in this glossary, and besides, the entry tells us that this term is Rom. It might be a corruption of Cs. *gatuña* "a kind of rest harrow (*Ononis spinosa*)", although this would imply a displacement from one to another letter of the alphabet, which is rare but not entirely lacking in these materials.

135) The editor has rightly concluded that *‘afaf* is corrupted from *‘afs* "gallnuts" in 85v 18, but his analysis of its given Rom. equivalent *unghullār* (not *unghullān!*) as a derivate of Cs. *agalla*, through a complex evolution of an agglutinated article, or as a reflex of Gr. *aggeios* "blood vessel", semantically farfetched, appears less likely than a slight alteration of Ct. *unglera* "in-growing nail", which is an apt metaphorical expression for gallnuts.

136) The entry *qalbi*, synonymous of *sidr* and *nabq* "Christ's thorn" or very similar thorny plants (109v 1) is an obvious mistake for *‘ulb*, as registered in Ar. dictionaries.

137) In the entry *ṣamgh al-qaraz* (not *qardī* in 104r 17, see N° 54), the printed *al-malik* is clearly in the ms. *al-‘ilk* "chewing gum", there being no reason to consider it a mistake for *mūlī* < Gr. *mōlu* "rue", as the editor propounds.

138) The entry *‘aqni*, immediately rendered as *ṣūf* "wool" and Rom. *lānah* (105v 2, i.e., Cs. *lana* and Ct. *llana*) bears no relation to Lt. *agnus* "lamb", but is simply a corruption of Ar. *‘ihn* of that sense.

139) The editor appears to be right by supposing that *‘inab al-ḥayyah* "snake grapes" is the correct reading for the equivalent of *hayūfariqūn* in 90r, with the support of *‘Umdah* 819-820, but this is a silent emendation, as the ms. clearly has *‘inab al-jin* "grapes of the jinns".

140) The entry *ghubayrah* in 116v 7 has not been correctly apprehended by the editor, who is not aware of the distortion suffered by the entries *ghubayrah* and *ghubayrrah*. As for *ghubayrah*, the parallel list makes clear that it should read *mir‘ah: ‘ajamiyyah ashbālyū dhā bithriyu*, i.e., *mir‘ah* "mirror", in Rom. ESHPÉLLO DHE BÍDHRYO.

141) The parallel list makes clear that the entry *ghubayrah* in 117r 1 is distorted and should read *gh.rā anghulūtu*, i.e., *ghirā* "glue" is Rom. *ENGLÚTO, close to Cs. *engrudo* or Ct. *engrut*.

142) Rom. *ghātūlahu* in 102v 20-21 and overleaf, described as a black

wood producing tar, is probably the same as *qāṭ.n.h*, synonymous with *ʿarʿar* "juniper" in *ʿUmdah* 562, from the same etymon as Ct. **càdec** and Cs. **cada** (*Juniperus oxycedrus*, < Low Lt. *catana*, according to Corominas) "prickly cedar", the tar of which is particularly appreciated.

143) The entry > *ghlghdsh* < in 117r 3, declared Rom. by the author, is likely to require correction into **GHLÁNDESH** "acorns"⁶⁵.

144) The word *ghalinghār*, given as synonymous with *ḥimṣ al-ʿamīr* "caltrops" in 93v 3-4, is perhaps a corruption of *kalinkār*, an alternative name of *kabar* "capers" in *ʿUmdah* 398.

145) The Rom. equivalent of *kashk ash-shaʿīr* "barley bran" in 97v 4, written as *qunāruh* and unexplainable to the editor, appears to be a corruption of Cs. and Ct. **farro**. It is noteworthy that, while the Cs. term actually means "bran", the Ct. is said of a kind of porridge prepared with it, a hesitation also present in this entry, as the given And. Ar. equivalent *dashīsh* (whence Cs. **alejija**) reflects the Ct. usage, while genuine Ar. *nukhālah* is properly bran. Again, a certain lack of familiarity with Ar. dialectology leads the editor to believe that *wallā* "or" reflects *ilā* "up to", when in fact is a frequent result in many dialects of *wa ʿillā* "and otherwise".

146) The editor is at a loss to explain the enigmatic *farrāsiyā*, rendered by And. Ar. *kazbúrat albír* "maidenhair" (106v 16). Chances are that it is just a corruption of *barshiyāwashān*⁶⁶.

147) The entry *yaqṭīn* "pumpkin" or, more vaguely, "a climbing plant" (97r 3-4) illustrates a not infrequent case of amphibology in Ar. botanic terms: this explains the presence here of *fashayj*⁶⁷ "ivy". Likewise, *qashaʿ* in 108r 6, is to be corrected also as *fashgh*, matched with *yaqṭīn*, *ghālibah* and Rom. *layadhārrah* (Cs. **hiedra**), which allows us to correct Corriente 2001: 146, where **ÍDRA** is given a wrong etymon, when in fact is only a graphical variant of **YÉDRA** in 210.

148) In 114r 2 the editor is puzzled by *faṣiṣ* "beetle" and tries to connect it with *faṣṣ* "stone of a ring", which would mean the origin of the cosmos and therefore be applied to the beetle on the basis of the tenets of

⁶⁵ About which, see Corriente 2001: 149.

⁶⁶ About which, see Corriente 1997: 46.

⁶⁷ Which, incidentally, is not a mistake for *fashīgh* (better than *bashayj*), in the quoted source (Dozy II: 269), but for *fashgh* "ivy", thus in *ʿUmdah* 644, while the double meaning is reported in 858 and *Sharḥ*.

the old Egyptian beliefs. But (*abu*) *fassís* "black beetle" is recorded as a frequent term in And. Ar.⁶⁸, derived in a less metaphysical and coarser way from *fassá/ís* "farter" on account of the smell and even noisy wind-breaking habits of some species of this gender, as proven by Cs. **alfazaque** of the same meaning⁶⁹. Also in 97r 3-4 the phrase *wa-huwa 'ldhy a'lam il-qara^c*, rendered by the editor as "and it is the designation of *qara^c*", is a silent emendation of the ms. *wa-huwa, allahu a'lam, il-qara^c* "and it is perhaps the pumpkin"⁷⁰.

149) The editor's supposition that *faltirraq* in 106r 5 is a Rom. plant name of the centaury, literally meaning "gall of the earth", is supported not only by the item FELTÉR(R)E, quoted by Mensching, but also by Cs. **hiel de la tierra** (*Centaurium erythraea*), and by the plant name YÉRBA DE FÉL, said of lesser centaury in *Umdah* 851⁷¹.

150) There is no connection between *fahar* (106v 14), given as synonymous with *mihris* "mortar" and the root {*fkhr*} in meanings related to pottery, as that word, actually misread and spelt in the ms. as *fahar*, is And. Ar. for *fíhr* "pounder of the mortar"⁷².

151) The various meanings of Ct. **botja** and Cs. **boja**, mentioned by the editor and registered in the dictionaries, make probable that *fiyalt* in 197r 3 be a corruption of *filun*, extant in *Umdah* 651, a shortened version of Gr. *phúllon arrenogónon*, "flowering moss" or another plant similar to it.

152) The entry *fawwa* "madder" (106r 4), rendered by Rom. *shalshī farrākhah*⁷³, must necessarily be corrupted, as *fawah* is listed two items later with its correct identification. It might represent the distorted

⁶⁸ See Corriente 1997: 399 and 400.

⁶⁹ About which, see Corriente 1997: 124.

⁷⁰ The same idiom, designed to convey doubt, is found again in 111v 9-11, again silently emended and misunderstood by the editor.

⁷¹ Also the second constituent TÈRRA is recorded in And. Rom., e.g., in Corriente 2001: 204.

⁷² See Corriente 1997: 407 and Corriente 1977: 75-76 for an explanation of this and similar cases.

⁷³ I.e., SHAKSHIFRÁGHA "common gromwell", about which, see Corriente 1977: 276 and 2001: 195. It is also noteworthy that the ms. clearly has *shalshī farrāqah*.

remnant of Rom. FARÁNNE FERRÍNO⁷⁴.

153) The entry *qina*^c "wood eating worm" in 108r 19 is an obvious mistake for *qata*^c, recorded in Arabic dictionaries.

154) The Rom. equivalent *qadniyāluh* of Ar. *dhanab al-khayl* in 89v 9 is a younger reflex of QATNAT(Y)ÉLLA "false horse-tail", extant in *Umdah* 583, the etymon of which is given in Corriente 2001: 183 as a diminutive of Lt. *catenata* "chained". This means that the Cs. **candalillo** of the same meaning posited by Font Quer would derive from ***cad(e)nadillo** through metathesis and dissimilation.

155) The entry *baqlah yahūdiyyah* (87r 9) "field eryngo" contains some difficulties, of which the editor is partially aware. He is right when he says that the Ar. equivalent *karsannah* is here a mistake for *qarṣa^cannah*, and when he identifies *baqlah yahūdiyyah*, literally, "Jewish herb" with field eryngo, as recorded already by Dozy I 104 on Ibn al-Baytār's authority, and not with *mulūkhiyā* "Jew's mallow" (*Corcoris olitorius*), its most frequent meaning. However, the given Rom. equivalent *qardu bi'brāl* does not really reflect Cs. ***cardo bural** ("donkey's) thistle", but is a corruption of QARDHÉLLO PEPRÁTO⁷⁵.

156) In the entry *tinkār* "borax" (112v 10), the second Rom. equivalent *burqanṭi* should not be considered as corrupted from the Ct. **baurach** of the same meaning; instead, and on graphical grounds, it would reflect *qalqant* "chalchantite" < Gr. *chalkándē* and variants⁷⁶, which is a different substance, namely "copperas" with the characteristic inaccuracy so often found in these materials. The correct data appear in 109r 17, where *qalqānti* is matched with the standard term *zāj*, and corrupted Rom. *q.ṣāq.rq.nt*, without mentioning *tinkār*.

157) The entry *qarmān* (108v 1) has been misapprehended by the editor, who thinks that the Rom. rendering *aghrannah* reflects Ct. **gra** and Cs. **grano**; at least that is what he means, as the interpretation as "grain" does not tally at all with the printed Cs. **grana** "kermes". This is, in fact, the true meaning of the entry, corrupted from And. Ar. *qarmaz*⁷⁷.

158) The entry *karawiyah* "caraway" (97v 15) gives *qarnabād* as its Rom. equivalent, but in fact *qurunbād*, of Pr. origin and by no means a

⁷⁴ See Corriente 2001: 139-140.

⁷⁵ See *Umdah* 173 and 663 and Corriente 2001: 182.

⁷⁶ About which, see *Sharḥ* 68.

⁷⁷ About which, see Corriente 1997: 425 and Corriente 1999: 207.

corruption of the *karawiyah*, as the editor suggests, is the wild caraway⁷⁸. Perhaps the next word, *dhukir*, which cannot be taken to mean that it has been mentioned before, as it has not, should be better corrected into *dhakar*, as the editor thinks, and in that case one cannot exclude that the wild caraway would have been called "male caraway", even if this has never before been recorded.

159) The word *alqarnirāh* at the end of 109r 18-20 has been considered by the editor part of the entry *q.fūr al-yahū(d)*, i.e., "asphalt", although unexplainable. But its happening in a new line, after a large empty space, preceded by the indication "Romance", raises the suspicion at least that it might be the remnant of a partially copied different entry. In fact, it answers well to Cs. **alacranera** "scorpion senne" (*Coronilla scorpioides*), it being likely that the lost entry would have been close to the Lt. designation of its gender.

160) The entry *bārzad*, thus rightly corrected by the editor from $>baz.r.d<$ (88r 9-10 and 11-12 and 109r 4)⁷⁹, is matched in those two first appearances with Ar. *qinnah*, which is the common opinion, being generally identified with the galbanum plant or its resin, although the Ar. word is also applied to the resin of wild carrots. However, in both cases, the ms. adds an alternative $>qr(\bar{a})h<$ matched by *qarrah* in the third appearance, by *qalbūnah* in the first two, and by *lashqalanshī* or *lāshqalānish* in all of them. Of which, *qalbūnah* (see N^o 165) is clearly corrupted from *qulufunyā* "colophony" of Gr. origin, i.e., pine resin, within the expectable range of accuracy in these materials. As for the other two terms, we would not advance any suggestion on $>qr(\bar{a})h< = qarrah$, but shall not fail to point to the similarity between *lāshqalānish* and Ct. **les glans**, "the acorns", which might not be coincidental, as the chapter on the diverse kinds of resins is a part of some botanical treatises (e.g. *Umdah* 530-33).

161) The editor himself is aware of the weakness in his suggestion to the effect that *ḥiyal* (95r 9) might be a mistake for *jabal* and misplaced from a syntagm **za'farān al-jabal* "mountain saffron"; in fact, this interpretation cannot be easily accepted, since such a compound name, no matter how logical, is not attested. The original word might have been one of the alternative names of saffron in Ar., such as *jasad*, *jisād* or *jādī*, but this would imply displacement in the alphabetical order of the letters,

⁷⁸ See *Sharḥ* 97, where the Lt. *carnabadium* is reminiscent of the shape found here.

⁷⁹ Of Pr. origin, according to Benmrad 1985: 175-6.

which is always a risky bet. We are presently inclined to accept that >hyl< is the remnant of *ḥabb an-nīl* "blue morning glory", another dying plant.

162) The editor has not noticed that the entry *ḥajar al-'asfanj*, beginning in 95r 4, stretches over lines 5 and 6, and that it contains some reading problems bearing on its translation. To begin with, in line 5, he has read *yuqṭaʿ al-nazaḥ* "it stops haemorrhages", when in fact the ms. has *al-maraz*, i.e., *yaqṭaʿ al-marad* "it stops the disease (i.e., the kidney stones)". Next, it appears that a meaningless *ghushārah*, of which the editor tried to make some sense by turning it into *ʿuṣārah* "juice", must be read as *qushārah* "spindle"⁸⁰. The translation runs like this: "There is on it a solid bump similar to the whirl of the spindle used in weaving".

163) The entry *qashri salīkhātu* (109r 13), given the Rom. equivalent *qashlīnayhi*, while *salīkhātu* (111v 1-2), followed by the supposed Ar. synonyms *maḥmūdah* and *ghubayrah*, has the obviously parallel Rom. equivalent *qashālqinnah* (not *qashālfinnah!*), and all this has been placed by the editor under the heading "Chinese cinnamon". But the Rom. variants reflect a distorted first constituent *qashyā*, continuation of Gr. *kasía*, through Ar. *qissiyā*⁸¹ or Lt. *cassia*, not so sure in the second case, as it could reflect Rom. QÁNNA "reed" or LÉÑO "wood", as a rendering of *qishr* "bark", or even other possibilities. On the other hand, we cannot grasp any reason for the equation with *maḥmūdah* "scammony" or "euphorb" and *ghubayrah* "penny-royal".

164) The term *qalb*, given as synonymous with *sidr* and *nabq* in 109v 1 and 112r 1 is a clear mistake for *ʿulb*⁸², which means that there has been a displacement of the item from one letter to another.

165) The term *qalbūnah* in 88r 9-10 and 11-12 is corrupted from *qulufunyā*, as said in N° 160, and the same happens, unnoticed again by the editor, with *qulūnbiyyah* in 91v 18, *qulubniyah* in 98r 8, *qulubnyh* in

⁸⁰ This item is reported as *qushīr* in the *Vocabulista in arabico* (see Corriente 1997: 429), where it was detected and first explained satisfactorily by Griffin 1961: 162. as a derivate from Lt. *cursorius*, to which we can now add the Basque cognates *kortxera* (Múgica 1987: 280), *kotxera* and *korzeiru* (Azkue 1969: 501 & 503) "winding frame", with some semantic evolution. In Corriente 1989: 246 we included the metaphorical use of this word as "buttocks" in the same work, which had eluded Griffin's keen eyesight.

⁸¹ See *Tafsīr* 115 and *ʿUmdah* 724, as an equivalent of *salīkhāh*.

⁸² See *ʿUmdah* 713.

99r 15-16 and *qlnbyh* in 109r 18-20, where the identification is with *kafr al-yahūd* or *zift al-baḥr* "tar".

166) The Rom. equivalent of *nafakhah* "rennet", given as >*fly bushṭarī*< has eluded the editor's attempts to explain it, which is surprising, as he does it with the same word in the same page (103v 1), where *nafakhah* is matched with Rom. *quwāllah*, and in 85r 11, and even corrected in *infaḥah*, all of which is absolutely right. In fact, that phrase is to be read as And. Rom. Q(W)ÁLLO PÓSTRE, i.e., "last", as the rennet is the fourth and last stomach of ruminants, also called abomasum.

167) The term *qamlu il-karmi* (>'l-karym< in Ar. script), given in 89v 6 as Rom. equivalent of *dūquh* and *jizar birī* (i.e., *jazar barrī* "wild carrot"), is obviously Ar. and probably needs no correction. Its literal meaning "lice of the vines" tallies well with *qurād* "tick", a name given to a variety of the wild carrot, also called *dūqū qurādī* "tick-like wild carrot", according to *Umdah* 165, while this same work tells us in the next paragraph that another variety thereof is called *labbāllah*⁸³, and in 303 that *dūqū rūmī* or *labb*, a third variety, grows among the vines.

168) The entry *qawqarā*, rendered by Rom. *iqramuniqā*, i.e., Cs. **agrimonia** and Ct. **agrimònia**, in 109v 3, unsolved by the editor, appears to be a corruption of *qūnīzā* "flea-wort", from the Gr. *kónuza*⁸⁴.

169) The second Rom. equivalent of Ar. *khuttāf* "swallow", namely *qūmīdiyūnnash* (114v 17) is not easily derived from Cs. **golondrina** or closely related terms, but posits an interesting etymologic problem in connection with the names of the swallow in the Iberian Peninsula. Besides the reflexes of Lt. *hirundo* as names for this bird, there is another series integrated by a basis **andor-** with a diminutive suffix, e.g., Pt. **andorinha**, Cs. **andorina**, etc., which we have explained as an early borrowing of the Ar. root {*htr*} "to chatter"⁸⁵, through a metonymical identification of this garrulous bird with chattering people, especially women. This is a long shot, but perhaps *qūmīdiyūnnash* could be a blending of Cs. **comadres** "talkative women" and **dueñas** "ladies" (= ***comad**+**dueñas**), based on a reflex of Lt. *chelidones* "swallows", of Gr. origin, if not a mere augmentative alteration of the first term into **comadronas**.

⁸³ I.e., Romance LAPÉLLA about which, see Corriente 2001: 150.

⁸⁴ About which, see *Umdah* 607, *Tafsīr* 253, etc.

⁸⁵ See Corriente 1999: 216-7, from **andorina** to **andurrial**, and Corriente 1993a: 86.

170) In the entry *qanṭarīn*, i.e., *qanṭūriyūn* "centaury" (108r 9-13), the editor has altered the ms. *yufsidu* into *yufsiḥu*, and translated "it makes room for the live foetus", when in fact the original says that it destroys it.

171) The odd-looking *kunjah* after *kasham*, i.e., *kāshim* (98r 6) is a peculiar spelling of Rom. KĀNYA "reed", with >j< instead of >y<, which happens sometimes in these materials.

172) The item *kashkāsh*, given as synonymous with *karsannah* "bitter vetch" in 97v 5, is just a corruption of Pr. *kashne*⁸⁶.

173) The editor has not noticed the coalescence of two entries in 108v 2-4, the first one being *qishru yabrūḥ* "mandrake bark", and the second one, *kamādaryūs* "ground pine". Neither could he cope with the tricky text that follows which, with the necessary corrections, reads: "the meaning of Gr. *chamaīpitus*, under **roure** (i.e., "oak" in Ct.) is *kiriyaḳush* (for Ct. **garrigues**) in Romance".

174) In the entry *kumāh* (i.e., *kam'ah*) "truffles" in 98v 8-9, the translation "places" is based on a bad reading **aqwām*, arbitrarily interpreted as *ma/uqām* or *amākin*, when the ms. actually has *a'wām* "years". Only the latter makes sense, as truffles grow mostly in years of abundance.

175) It is extremely unlikely that the string *mā kunāsāti* would reflect Cs. **conocido** "known", as the editor purports in the entry *jintawriyyah* "centaury" (88v 9-10) and in p. 28 ("Quellen der Handschrift"). To judge from *Tafsīr* 212, which tells us that this plant was called *mukaynasah* in the countryside of al-Andalus, we are confronted here with a very poor spelling of *mukaynasāt*, i.e., "little brooms", in And. Ar., for Classical *mukaynisāt*.

176) The sequence *kanyah wafarrala*, placed at the end of 98r 4-5, is a mere repetition with slight alterations of *qanah wafiyārlah* at the end of 98r 6, where it belongs in a context correctly edited and understood by the editor. Therefore, it should be excised from that passage, with no other comment. It should be noted that *kanyah* reflects Cs. **caña** "reed", while *qanāh* is closer to the almost homophonic Ar. term.

177) The entries *kahrabā* (97v 7) and *sanā ḥaramī* (better than *ḥurmī*) or *makkī* (111v 4-5), given as synonymous, in the second case with the Rom. equivalence *shānah* (cf. Cs. **sen**), raise the question of the meanings of *kahrabā*, in principle "amber", but here undoubtedly and in both places

⁸⁶ Like those registered in *Sharḥ* 92.

"true senna". There is another hint of the polysemy of that word, namely, its identification with *sandarūs* "sandarach" (*Umdah* 440). As for *khawwārīb* in the second text, which the editor, at a loss, has translated as "weak", it is clearly and correctly spelt in the ms. as *kharārīb* "pods".

178) It is difficult to be sure about the enigmatic and isolated *kawraj* in 98r 13, as it is always risky to be assertive about isolated items. On the authority of the Lt. transcription *k/hauroch* in Laguna, the editor thinks that we are here dealing with *urūq sufr* "swallow wort" (literally "yellow roots"), but he forgets that it is precisely and only the first element of this name what is being transcribed in that Lt. item, thus doing away with the witness needed to posit that *kawraj*. Perhaps the author means *kūrj* "little salted fish"⁸⁷, but this is not the only possible solution.

179) See N° 37 about the actual meaning of *kūshād*, not *kurshād*, which appear again in 97v 16, rendered into Rom. as *simini albi*, i.e., "white seed". This is somewhat surprising, as its Ar. equivalent, *ḥabbatun bayḍā'* is synonymous with *kankar* "artichoke", and not with *jintiyānā* "gentian", which is the same as *kūshād*.

180) The term *kaykalān* in 95r 8 is corrupted from *ṭṭān*, which appears spelt as *ṭayṭan* in 95v 5-6 (see N° 14).

181) The entry *kundus* "Egyptian soapwort" is unduly matched in 98v 3-4 with an Ar. transcription of Gr. *stroúthion* "soapwort", which is reasonably attributed by the editor to their immediate vicinity in Dioscorides and the *Tafsīr*. However, the equation with *lāburum* "hellebore" (cf. *lāburum ablanquh* = *kharbaq abyad* "white hellebore" in 114v 18) is ungrounded, but for their shared toxicity. On this basis, one could also suggest that *lāqurum*, given as a Rom. equivalent of *ghār* "laurel", would be corrupted from *lāburum*, but the Lt. *laurus* could perhaps be a likelier etymon.

182) The entry *lablash* (99v 4-5) contains several corruptions, which have prevented the editor from reaching an identification. By restoring *shay'* instead of *shihu*, and *mazāwid* instead of *mirrāwāda*, we obtain a text which makes sense: "*lablash* is something climbing on trees that have thin green branches, like thin French beans. It has flowers with white stems, which develop into capsules". "Mistletoe" would fit here perfectly, but the heading of the entry remains obscure, and its likeness to *lablāb* "ivy" is of no help. It might be Low Lt. *lupulus* "hops", another climbing plant.

⁸⁷ About which, see Dozy II 506.

183) The Ar. phrase *lu'abati al-ṣibyān*, given in 105r 6-7 as synonymous with And. *ʿirʿar* (Classical *ʿarʿar*) "juniper" and *abhal* "savin", two species of the same gender, together with their Rom. equivalents, posits serious problems of identification. Against the editor's opinion, there is no reflex of Rom. **sabina** here; instead, *lu'bah* "doll", which can easily have been extended with the explanatory addition *aṣ-ṣibyān* "of the children", is a well-known designation of the mandrake root, on account of its likeness to a human figure. The enigmatic *alyaʿ*, inserted between *abhal* and that phrase, appears to be a reflex of Cs. **aliaga** "furze", displaced from the preceding entry, as given away by the parallel list. It is also noteworthy that the phrase *bi-lughati il-muʿābalaḥ* (i.e., *al-muqābalaḥ*) has been correctly rendered here by "vulgar language", unlike the parallel case of *lughāti il-mughābillah* in 102r 1-2, where the editor has translated "in another language".

184) The ms. *liqāḥ* should not be corrected into *laqā'ih* in 99v 11, since that is the registered plural of *liqḥa* "milk camel". This entry is repeated in 99v 14, though misspelt as *labna al-qūq*, instead of *laban annūq* "she-camel milk", as there is no reason to expect our author to speak, even jokingly, of "raven milk".

185) The Rom. *lāqddah*, given as equivalent of *naft* and *qiṭrān* "tar" in 103r 1-2 and 108r 20, cannot be related to Cs. **alquitrán**, but to **líquido** "liquid", a term which appears in the syntagm *ashturaq liqidah* "(liquid) storax" in 84v 11, correctly interpreted by the editor. However, we cannot find an explanation for its appearance, under a slight different guise, as *laqīdah* in 90r 4, or *lāqīdah* in 116v 3-4, with the meaning of "(Indian) laurel", except as a confusion with the opoponax gum, which is listed in that last passage as synonymous with *ghār hindī* and *jawāshīr*.

186) The expression *mā al-gharnātaḥ*, given as Rom. translation of Ar. *julinar* (i.e., *jullinār*) in 88r 16-17, is rightly connected by the editor with Ct. **malgrana**, after abandoning an attempt to interpret the first element as Ar. *mā'* "water; juice, etc.", but he is disappointed by the absence of an exact match in Ct. dictionaries. He could have found it in Low Lt., where *malum granatum*, pl. *mala granata*, was the common designation of pomegranates, from which Cs. **granada** and Ct. **malgrana** derive by selecting different segments of the whole. As for the final phrase *nutawar walā tuʿqad*, once emended as *tunawwiru wa-lā taʿqid*, it clearly means "it blossoms but does not bear fruit", as is characteristic of the kind of pomegranate called wild (*barri*) or male (*dhakar*), according to *ʿUmdah* 333.

187) The entry *ṣṣalāyah* (i.e., *ṣalāyah*), in 104r 16, matched by Ar.

rukḥāmāh, is declared by the editor to be of imprecise meaning. But thanks to Ibn Rāzin at-Tujībī's cookbook entitled *Fuḍālat al-khiwān*⁸⁸ it is possible to ascertain that meaning in And. Ar., which is a slab used for kneading sweets. Unluckily, we cannot say the same about the Romance equivalent given to the Ar. names, *mālūbbah*.

188) The entry *māwhar* "bold-money" (101v 15) presents us with several problems, which the editor has not been able to tackle. First, the addition *har* made to the more standard Ar. form, *mū* or *maw*, which, in our view and by comparison with N° 70, again reflects Ar. *ākhar* "another". Next, the equivalent which follows, *mīrran*, which would not be a mistake for *murrān*, in spite of *Sharḥ* 115, where the same mistake occurs; in both cases, the author would not have detected the corruption of *mi'ūn* < Gr. *mēon* into >*myrn*<. At the end, however, we must be grateful to him for having provided an additional witness of the rare Rom. YÉNDRO, though distorted in this ms. as *yādhrāh* "ivy", in *Umdah* 500 as >*byzrh*<, and *Sharḥ* 115 as >*ydrh*<.

189) The item *mirrā* in 88r 18-19, given as synonymous with *junddabādustar* "castoreum" is more like to reflect Cs. and Ct. **mirra** "myrrha" than Cs. **marta** "marten", in spite of the semantic difference, tolerable for the accuracy levels characteristic of these materials.

190) The entry *marramah*, with its given Rom. equivalent *tillah* in 101v 11, presents the editor with unsolvable problems. However, by simply shifting gemination to the right place, we obtain the characteristically Western Ar. *marammah* "loom" and Cs. and Ct. **tela** "cloth", perhaps a mistake for **telar** "loom".

191) In 101v 19 the editor has misread *muqattar* for *mustar*, i.e., *mustār* "must"⁸⁹.

192) The item *assaqūratu*, synonymous with *zarāwund ṭawīl* in 92r 1-2, is a corruption of *masmaqūrah*, of well-established Br. origin⁹⁰, which invalidates the author's etymological hypothesis. In another related entry (101r 9), the editor has misread and misinterpreted the closing remark *waqad dhukira fī ḥarf az-zāy* "already mentioned in the letter zāy" (i.e., in 92r) as *fī ḥarf fu'āl* "and it is said to be intensively hot".

⁸⁸ See Corriente 1997: xiv and 310.

⁸⁹ About which, see Dozy II 652 and Corriente 1997: 502.

⁹⁰ As reported in Corriente 1997: 502; see also *Umdah* 353, *Sharḥ* 65, erroneously purporting its being Hispanic, *Tafsīr* 210, which asserts its true Br. origin, etc.

193) The strange description of cypress cones in 110v 8 as *jawz mushkah* ("nuts *m.*), is perhaps an alteration of *mushkāt* "musky", referring to their strong smell, by comparison with nutmeg.

194) The entry *mushqi*, explained as "cow dung from the Indian islands" in 101v 8, and annotated at the margin of the ms. as astonishing on account of its striking similarity with *misk* "musk" is, in fact, an alteration of *māwush*, described in a paragraph of *Umdah*, contained in the Madrid ms. and omitted by the Rabat ms. and their editor in p. 500 (in the entry $>mw's<$). It reads like this: "*māw.sh* is also the dung of certain wild cows of Khorasan, which is collected in the spring, kneaded with elephant gall or camel urine, and made into large balls, which are strung together and dried in order to ship them abroad. They are a remedy against arthritis, gout and abscesses".

195) In the entry *šibar saqūtrī* "Socotran aloe" in 103v 10, the word **ḥaqari* is a slight corruption of *maq(i)r*⁹¹.

196) The forms supposedly Ar. *malshamu* and Rom. *malsham* of *bilssān*, i.e., *balasān* "balsam" in 86v 15, may very well, as the editor suspects, have really existed as a consequence of the frequent exchanges of /m/ and /b/ in And. Ar.⁹²

197) The Rom. equivalent *malyah muntishīnah*, given to Ar. *qulb* "saxifrage" in 108r 5, which the editor would connect with Cs. and Arg. **millo** "millet", would make more sense if read as *malyuh muntishīnuh*, i.e., "mountain mallet", as it is characteristic of this plant to break the rocks where it grows.

198) The supposed alternative Rom. equivalent of *qīṭrān*, *mamīrrā*, in 108r 20, is perhaps another inaccurate instance of *mirra* "myrrha", as in N° 189.

199) In the entry *turunjibīn* "manna" (112v 3), the alternative equivalent *mmalībbah*, unidentified by the editor, might be corrupted from *maybah* "sugared quince juice", whence Cs. **almībar**, within the limited standards of accuracy found in these materials.

200) The item $>mywbrḥ<$, given as equivalent of *zarāwund ṭawīl* "birthwort" in 102 r 12, is not corrupted from its synonymous *masmaqūrah* and variants (see N° 192), but from *maywīzaj* "louse-wort", which the editor recognized correctly in 101r 14, in spite of the differences between both plants.

⁹¹ As reported by *Umdah* 537, *Sharḥ* 157, etc.

⁹² About which, see Corriente 1977: 33 and 1999: 28.

201) The entry *nārafasṭūn*, synonymous with *sunbal hindī* "spike nard", in 102v 1 and 103v 6, appears to be corrupted from Gr. *sampharitikē*, a variety of nard, according to Dioscorides.

202) The term **nānūfah*, given as Rom. equivalent of *qātil abīh* "strawberry tree" in 109r 5, appears to be corrupted from *nānūkhah* "bishop's weed"⁹³ in spite of their semantic divergence. This latter plant name is found in 102v 17-18 and 108v 18, defined as *ḥabbun ṣaghīrun bayna l-khuḍrati wa-ṣ-ṣufrah* "a little grain between green and yellow", where the editor has mistakenly read a dual *ṣaghīrayn*, grammatically impossible.

203) The odd-looking *nujiqnā*, supposed Rom. equivalent of And. Ar. *zarrīʿat al-qīnnab* "hemp seed" in 117v 4, might be a slight alteration of Rom. **NÚŢE QĀNNAM* "hemp nuts".

204) The word *niyāl*, given as equivalent of *abār nuḥās*, literally "leaden copper", explained as a compound of sulphur, silver and lead, is Cs. *niel* or its Ct. model *niell* "black inlaid enamel", from Lt. *nigellus* "little black", according to Corominas.

205) In the entry *naylaj* "indigo" (102r 15-16), the editor has read the ms. *yusbagh* as *yushbagh* and, silently correcting it into *yushbaʿ*, has translated "the blue colour is intensified with it", when in fact the good reading is *yusbagh* "it is used for dying in blue". Two lines below, he again misreads *al-ʿākilah* "cancer" as *il-ādakilati*, vaguely translated as "besmearing inflammations", as if from the root {*dkl*}, and finally, upon making the clever suggestion of *gueda* as the explanation of the hapax *qaynush*, he omits to add that an alteration of this into *qaydash* is graphically plausible and that the normal shape of that word in Cs. is *gualda*, unlike the French *guède*, which he probably had in mind.

206) The enigmatic *habath* of 90v 9, rendered by Rom. PÓLBO DE SHÓL has thrown the editor, who tries to find a solution in "earthnuts" and the like. However, that Rom. is simply the Cs. *polvo de sol*, i.e., the dust particles seen in the sun-rays, exactly the same as Ar. *habāʿ*, recorded in And. Ar.⁹⁴.

⁹³ About which, see Corriente 1997: 541.

⁹⁴ See Corriente 1997: 546. It is noteworthy that for this word Alcalá recorded an anomalous plural *hebixit* (= *ḥabishīt*), with a peculiar infix, perhaps a Rom. plural morpheme, as suggested in Corriente 1988: 209. This might allow us to suspect that a pl. **hab+āt* could also have created, of which the shape extant in our ms. would be a slight alteration.

207) Concerning the entry *halb* in 90v 6, given as an equivalent of *māzaryūn* "dwarf laurel", it must be signalled that, while in fact unrecorded at all as a plant name, the term *halib* "hairy" may well have come to be applied, not to *māzaryūn*, which is only a mistake, but to *marrūyuh*, which has this trait, according to *Umdah* 484. As for the synonymous *sadām il-'arḍi*, the editor has taken the wrong path by considering it corrupted from *asad al-'arḍ*, another name for the dwarf laurel; in fact, it must be read as *saddān al-'arḍ*, recorded as one of the names of the horehound in several sources⁹⁵.

208) The term *halāylāj* as synonymous with *ʿanbaqar* "plums" is not a mere metaphor, as the editor thinks. According to Dozy I 43, the people of al-Andalus used it in this sense.

209) In the entry *hindubah* "endives" (90r 6-8) the editor has not properly analysed and understood the string *ṣāru yajlū wa-yuḥallilu*, i.e., *ṣāra yajlū wa-yuḥallilu*, which means that, due to its bitterness, this vegetable has cleansing and dissolving properties.

210) The entry *yāqūt* "hyacinth" (96v 7-12) requires emendations on several points in order to restore grammaticalness or meaning. At the beginning of its second line, the ms. *wa-hum ḥijār*, a dialectal agreement for Classical *wa-hiya ḥijār* "and they are stones", has been altered by the editor into *wa-huwa*, which is worse grammar without any change of meaning, but that is already not the case two lines below, where the ms. *afatā bi-hi* makes no sense and appears corrupted for *aftāta-hū*; therefore, the meaning is not "he will see his gall decrease", but "he will escape any bitterness", in agreement with the next sentence "for that reason (ms. *li-dhālīka*, not *li-kadhālīka!*) it is said to come from the snake's head", i.e., for its being hard to hold and fast to flee. The closing notice is also obscure as, after saying that it is very scarce, to the point that there is (in al-Andalus) only a small quantity thereof brought by somebody, the Ar. text finishes with the phrase *ilā alladhīna ṣāḥabu li-dhū il-qarnayn*, where the editor has not recognized the Qur'ānic name of Alexander, *Dhu-l-qarnayn* "the two-horned". There seems to be a lacuna here to be filled with one or two words, in order to restore something like "[which had belonged] to those who accompanied Alexander", in a clear allusion to his journey through the world up to the land of Gog and Magog⁹⁶, and the

⁹⁵ E.g., *Sharḥ* 150, *Tafsīr* 247, etc. This Ar. adaptation of Aramaic *saddān arʿā* "anvil of the earth" is often distorted as *sindiyān*, *sandān*, etc.

⁹⁶ According to legends intertwined in *Qur'ān* 18, 83-98 and later versions.

treasures brought back from those faraway lands by him and his companions.

211) In the entry *yabrūh* "mandrake" (90v 4) it is probable that *shajar titūm* be corrupted for *yunawwim* "(a tree) inducing sleep", in agreement with the data of *Umdah* 837, according to which this plant is consumed by shepherds who then fall into lethargy.

212) In the entry *ashnāni bāridun* (84r 20), i.e., *ushnān bārid* "saltwort", the editor discusses possible corrections of its given Rom. equivalent *barbāṭah*, such as a hypothetical derivate from Lt. *herba*, **farbāṭah*, or Arg. **erbada**, none of which can duly account for the initial consonant. The true solution is Rom. YERBÁTO⁹⁷, matched by *shabnayrah* in *Umdah* 848, (which appears as *sabunjūlah* in the same passage of this ms., with different suffixation), with the expectable description of its detergent properties.

213) A Rom. **yūnak* after *bardhī* "papyrus" in 87r 16 is only a bad reading of *būdhī*, i.e., *būdhā* "reed-mace"⁹⁸.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aquilina 1987: Aquilina, J., *Maltese-English dictionary*, Valetta, Midsea Books.
- Asín 1943: Asín Palacios, Miguel, *Glosario de voces romances registradas por un botánico anónimo hispano-musulmán (siglos XI-XII)*. C.S.I.C., Madrid-Granada. Reprint Zaragoza, 1994, Universidad de Zaragoza.
- Azkue 1969: Azkue, R.M., *Diccionario vasco-español-francés*, Bilbao, La Gran Enciclopedia Vasca.
- Barceló 1984: Barceló, Carmen, *Minorías islámicas en el País Valenciano*, Madrid, Universidad de Valencia - Instituto Hispano-Árabe de Cultura.
- Benchekroun 1981: Benchekroun, M. (ed.), *Fann at-ṭabkh fī l'-Andalus wa-l-Maghrib. Fuḍālat al-khiwān fī ṭayyibāt at-ṭa'ām wa-l-alwān li-bn Rāzīn at-Tujībī*, Rabat, ar-Risālah.
- Benmrad 1985: Benmrad, I., *al-Muṣṭalaḥ al-'ajamī fī kutub at-ṭibb wa-ṣ-*

⁹⁷ About which, see Corriente 2001: 214-215. See also N° 111.

⁹⁸ About which, see Corriente 1997: 70 and, with a reasonable Br. etymon, as source of Lt. *buda*, Tilmatine & Bustamante 2002: 417.

- ṣaydalāh al-ʿarabiyyah*, Beirut, Dār al-Gharb al-ʿIslāmī.
- Benmrad 1989: Benmrad, I. (ed.), *Tafsīr Kitāb Diyāsqūrīdūs*, Beirut, Dār al-Gharb al-ʿIslāmī.
- Bramón 1991: Bramón, Dolores, *El mundo en el siglo XII. El tratado de al-Zuhri*, Barcelona, AUSA.
- Colin 1993: Colin, G.S., *Le Dictionnaire Colin d' Arabe Dialectal Marocain* (ed. Zakia Iraqui Sinaceur), Rabat, Al Manahil.
- Corominas 1951: Corominas, J., *Diccionario crítico y etimológico de la lengua castellana*, Berna, Francke.
- Corriente 1977: Corriente, F., *A gramatical sketch of the Spanish Arabic dialect bundle*, Madrid, Instituto Hispano-Árabe de Cultura.
- Corriente 1986: Corriente, F., *Diccionario árabe-español*, Madrid, Instituto Hispano-Árabe de Cultura (2nd ed.).
- Corriente 1988: Corriente, F., *El léxico árabe-andalusí según P. de Alcalá*, Madrid, Universidad Complutense.
- Corriente 1989: Corriente, F., *El léxico árabe-andalusí según el Vocabulista in arabico*, Madrid, Universidad Complutense.
- Corriente 1993a: Corriente, F., "Reflejos iberorromances del andalusí {ḥtr}", in *Al-Andalus-Magreb* 1, 77-87.
- Corriente 1993b: Corriente, F., "Expresiones bajo tabú social en árabe andalusí y sus relaciones con el romance", in *Vox Romanica* 52, 282-291.
- Corriente 1997: Corriente, F., *A Dictionary of Andalusí Arabic*, Leiden, Brill.
- Corriente 1999: Corriente, F., *Diccionario de arabismos y voces afines en iberorromance*, Madrid, Gredos.
- Corriente 2001: Corriente, F., "El romandalusí reflejado por el "Glosario Botánico" de Abulxayr", in *Estudios de dialectología norteafricana y andalusí* 5, 93-241.
- Davidson 1972: Davidson, A., *Mediterranean Seafood*, Middlesex, Penguin Books.
- Dietrich 1991: Dietrich, Albert, *Die Dioskurides-Erklärung den Ibn al-Baitar. Ein Beitrag zur arabischen Pflanzensynonymik des Mittelalters*. Götting, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, phil.-hist. Klasse, Dritte Folge, Nr. 202.
- Dozy 1967: Dozy, R., *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes*, troisième édition. 2 vols. Leyde & Paris, E.J. Brill & G.P. Maisonneuve.
- Griffin 1961: Griffin, D., *Los mozarabismos del "Vocabulista" atribuido a R. Martí*, Madrid, Maestre.
- Hinds & Badawi 1986: Hinds, M. & Badawi, E., *A dictionary of*

- Egyptian Arabic*, Beirut, Librairie du Liban.
- al-Khaṭṭābī 1990: al-Khaṭṭābī, M. (ed.): *Umdat at-ṭabīb fī maʿrifat an-nabāt*, Rabat, Akādimiyyat al-Mamlakah al-Maghribiyyah.
- Leclerc, 1877-1883: Leclerc, Lucien (ed.), *Traité des simples par Ibn el-Beïthar*. Paris (Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale et d'autres bibliothèques, 23,1; 25,1; 26,1).
- Meyerhof 1940: Meyerhof, M. (ed.), *Sharḥ asmā' al-ʿuqqār... Un glossaire de matière médicale composé par Maïmonide*, Cairo, Imprimerie de l'Institut Français.
- Múgica 1987: Múgica, P.M., *Diccionario castellano-vasco*, Bilbao, Mensajero.
- Prémare 1993-99: Prémare, A.-L. de (ed.), *Dictionnaire arabe-français*, Paris, L' Harmattan.
- Shafīq 1989: Shafīq, M., *al-Muʿjam al-ʿarabī al-ʿamāzīghī*, Rabat, Akādimiyyat al-Mamlakah al-Maghribiyyah.
- Sharḥ*: see Meyerhof, 1940.
- Simonet 1988: Simonet, F.J., *Glosario de voces ibéricas y latinas usadas entre los mozárabes*, Madrid, Fortanet.
- Tafsīr*: see Benmrad, 1989.
- Tilmatine & Bustamante 2002: Tilmatine, M. & Bustamante, J., "La fitonimia amazige en la *Umdat at-ṭabīb*", in *Al-Andalus Magreb* 8-9, 413-462.