

A Moroccan Arabic Vocabulary from the Atlantic Coast, ca. 1600

Mike Turner¹

Abstract

LJS 46 is a codex that was bound in the early 17th century and is presently held within the Lawrence J. Schoenberg Manuscripts collection at the University of Pennsylvania. It consists of two component manuscripts, the first an illustrated herbal of Italian origin dating to the early 16th century, and the second a series of herbological, geographic, and linguistic notes on Morocco that are contemporary with the binding. The most significant component of these notes is an alphabetized, albeit incomplete, glossary comprising 254 Spanish headwords and providing, for each, a Latin-script rendition of the Moroccan Arabic equivalent(s). This primary lexical reference is accompanied by an account of the spoken Arabic numerals and scattered references to the local names of several botanical species, which are given in either Moroccan Arabic or Tashelhiyt Berber. The current study introduces the codex, outlines its significance as one of the earliest European sources on Moroccan Arabic, and presents the vocabulary contained within in an annotated format with reference to features of dialectological interest.

Keywords: Moroccan Arabic, North African Arabic, Seventeenth Century Arabic, Historical Dialectology, Arabic Lexicography

0. Introduction

The historical dialectology of Moroccan Arabic is a quickly advancing subfield of Arabic dialectology more broadly. In recent years, research into two distinct but complementary types of written sources has added significantly to our knowledge of historical Moroccan Arabic varieties. The first of these is texts composed by native Arabic speakers in Middle Arabic, which intersperse more classical linguistic forms with various elements of spoken origin, and from which the latter can be extracted as a means of profiling the spoken

1 The University of North Carolina Wilmington, USA. Email: turnerml@uncw.edu.

language.² The second type of written source is the accounts of European captives, diplomats, priests, and travelers who spent time in Morocco and learned or studied, to varying degrees, the local dialect.³ Many of these sources have long been known to the field,⁴ but others are only now coming to light. The current study introduces one such new source of the second type: a unique codex containing a manuscript Arabic vocabulary and associated notes, composed by an English author around the year 1600, and representing one of the earliest explicitly Moroccan lexical references identified to date.

The codex is held in the Lawrence J. Schoenberg Manuscripts collection at the University of Pennsylvania under the call number “Oversize LJS 46,” and has been digitized and made publicly available in high resolution.⁵ Bound in parchment and consisting of 102 leaves, on its spine it is simply labeled “HERBAL,” an apt description of much of its content, which consists of two original manuscripts that were ultimately bound together. The first of these manuscripts (ff. 2-52) is an illustrated herbal of early 16th-century Italian origin that includes 104 distinct drawings of botanical species, nearly all of which are labeled in Latin and simply colored. The second manuscript (ff. 1, 53-102), which is on paper of slightly smaller dimensions and which (with the exception of the first leaf) follows the Italian herbal, is a collection of herbological, geographic, and linguistic notes on Morocco dating to the early 17th century.⁶ Although these two component parts—henceforth the “Italian herbal” and “Morocco notes,” respectively—were produced roughly a century apart, the fact that they were deliberately collated suggests an integrated use case, with the bound codex most likely having been intended as a working reference for the identification and procurement of medicinal herbs and other trade goods from Morocco’s Atlantic coast.

The herbological interests of the binder are clear in not only the inclusion of the Italian herbal, which could presumably be used throughout the Mediterranean region, but also throughout the Morocco notes themselves. Several consecutive folia (54r-70r) provide written English or Latin descriptions of individual plants and minerals, many times with explicit references to locations in Morocco and their Arabic or Tashelhiyt names

2 See, e.g., VICENTE (2003; 2012), TURNER (2022), GUERRERO (2023a; 2023b), FRANCISCO (2024), KITLAS & TURNER (2024) on Moroccan texts, as well as MEOUAK (2005; 2016) and LARBI (2024) on those from neighboring Algeria.

3 For detailed studies of this sort see HOPKINS’s (2015) edition of George Borrow’s notes from Tangier and GUERRERO ET AL.’s (2024) edition of Germain Moüette’s French-Arabic glossary.

4 For example, DOZY’s (1927) dictionary drew extensively from European travel accounts, many from Morocco; see source list in v. 1, pp. xvii-xxix.

5 Images are available at <https://openn.library.upenn.edu/Data/0001/html/ljs46.html>.

6 These are the dates proposed by the archivists; evidence discussed in this article further corroborates them for the Morocco notes.

indicated.⁷ Some of these descriptions are accompanied by uncolored sketches.⁸ In addition, there are two page-length lists of flora, the first (f. 70v) an unorganized one labeled “Samples of herbs found in Barbary Sus the mountaynes of the country of Morocus,” and the second (f. 97v) a sort of index that cross-references the individual plant descriptions and categorizes them (alongside some added entries) by column into trees, shrubs, and herbs.⁹

However, what makes LJS 46 more than just a herbological reference is its incorporation of supplementary geographic and linguistic information on Morocco. The geographic content is most clear in ff. 72r-93r, which is a series of handwritten notes derived from the second volume of MÁRMOL CARVAJAL’S (1573) *Descripción general de África*.¹⁰ This section opens on f. 72r with a list of provinces and population centers in the Kingdoms of Fez and Tlemcen, following the order in which they are presented in the fourth and fifth books of Mármol.¹¹ But most prominent is the Kingdom of Marrakesh, about which several lengthy excerpts (either in the original Spanish or translated to English) appear from Mármol’s third book, seemingly corresponding with the manuscript author’s interest (and likely presence) in western Morocco. These selected extracts from Mármol are of limited scholarly value on their own—the work is well-known—but they are significant in context because they speak to the copyist’s aims and orientation, tending toward physical geography and agricultural production as running themes.

The linguistic data on Morocco in the codex, on the other hand, is of a hereto unknown provenance and represents a significant new source on the history of Arabic (and to a lesser extent Berber) in North Africa. Most prominent is a freestanding glossary labeled “Nomina substantiva” on ff. 98r-101r that provides 254 mostly alphabetized Spanish headwords and, for each, a Latin script approximation of its Moroccan Arabic equivalent(s). In addition to this glossary, f. 1r provides a list of spoken Arabic number names (“Numeronum nomina”) from 1 to 10 and then multiples of 10 up to 100.

7 For example, the entry for “Bastard Rheubarb” (*Rumex hippolapathum*) on f. 58r states that it is “in gardens about Morocus”, “Browme” (*Cytisus* sp.) on f. 57r is “At Saphia” (Asfi), and “Wild Barberry Shrub” on f. 56r is “on the way to Taradant.” Several entries mention “the play,” i.e., shore.

8 Namely, *Euphorbia* sp. on f. 54r, indigo (*Indigofera tinctoria*) and an apparatus for refining it as a dye on f. 54v, indian fig (*Opuntia ficus-indica* on f. 62r), and eggplant (*Solanum melongena*) on f. 65r. There are several unlabeled plant sections on f. 1v, as well as an illustration of a North African brooch.

9 Two minor lists are on pp. 96v and 97r, the former labeled “Subterran” and mentioning mineral elements such as salt and iron, and the latter unlabeled but containing fungi and plants such as agaric (tree-fungus) and colocynth.

10 A direct reference to Mármol is at the top of f. 73r. This second volume of his 1573 work is divided books 3-6, following books 1-2 in the first volume.

11 See ff. 74-171 in MÁRMOL (1573: v. 2) for corresponding descriptions of the Kingdom of Fez, and Fo. 171-210 for those of the Kingdom of Tlemcen. The author only included a single province of the latter, having reached the end of the page.

Finally, we may count toward the codex's linguistic content several plant names that are given in Arabic or Tashelhiyt Berber either alongside individual plant descriptions or in the second, ordered botanical index. Taken together, this corpus of over three hundred phrases provides a window into not only the lexicon of the Arabic spoken along Morocco's western coast at the beginning of the 17th century, but also several aspects of its phonology and morphosyntax.

For the purposes of the current article, each instance of relevant linguistic data has been given a unique identifier consisting of a capital letter and a number (e.g., A133, B5, C23, etc.). The letters A, B, and C refer to the section from which the data was derived and accompany items from the Spanish-Arabic glossary (A), the list of numbers (B), and the botanical section (C), respectively. Numbers are assigned sequentially in order of appearance of each term in its associated section. For a few terms in section A alone, a lowercase letter follows the number (e.g., A169a), indicating that multiple Arabic terms are given for a single headword. These identifiers are used for internal cross-references throughout the remainder of the article, which proceeds with a discussion of the manuscript's provenance and authorship, an overview of grammatical points of interest, and finally an annotated presentation of the vocabulary in full.¹²

1. Provenance and authorship

The history of LJS 46 prior to its admission to the Lawrence J. Schoenberg manuscript collection is known only in part. Its first modern appearance was at auction at Bonhams in 1995, where it was acquired by London art dealer Sam Fogg Ltd. and thereafter sold in 1996 to the eponymous collector, who ultimately gifted it to the University of Pennsylvania libraries.¹³ The primary clues as to its earlier ownership are a crest on the front cover, apparently that of the Latham family of Lancashire, and a cursive inscription by a certain "Thomas & Edward Syddell" on f. 1r. On the same folio one encounters the first Arabic data (the list of numbers; B1-B19), which was penned at a different time; however, two instances of the word "Dictionarium"—one apparently inked alongside the inscription, and another alongside the numbers—are similar enough in form to suggest that the penman may be one and the same. Although I have not been able to locate any directly corroborative records of the named individuals having been involved in trade with Morocco during the 17th century, the Sydells (etc.) are a known family

12 I would like to thank Jairo Guerrero for his insightful comments on an earlier version of this paper.

13 This summary is extracted from the manuscript description by the University of Pennsylvania Libraries.

in Lancashire, and several records of “Thomas Sydall” and “Edward Sydall” are found in Manchester Cathedral’s registers between the years 1573 and 1616.¹⁴

Regardless of whether one of the inscribed Sydells was the actual author-compiler of LJS 46, the full codex can be no less than the work of two individuals, as the Italian Herbal and the Morocco notes were clearly composed in different hands, for different purposes, and up a century apart. For our present purposes the origins of the Italian herbal are not particularly important—it contains no relevant linguistic data—and it suffices to say that it is of anonymous authorship and visually similar to other illustrated herbals from the late medieval period.¹⁵ The novel nature of the Moroccan notes, by contrast, makes the author’s cultural background and method of composition immediately relevant. Whoever the immediate author-compiler was, it is near certain that he was an Englishman who lived in the early 17th century, as is evident in the use of a type of secretary hand consistent with the time period and several seemingly original passages in early modern English. Further evidence for the early date includes a focus on western Morocco consistent with the opening of its ports to the English during the reign of Aḥmad al-Manṣūr,¹⁶ and the fact that all pre-existing works referenced are from the 1500s.¹⁷

While the Morocco notes were penned by a single writer, it is not immediately clear how much of the text was original to him. The geographic descriptions excerpted from Mármol are the clearest example of the penman having simply copied another text, as the Spanish text is verbatim and Mármol is directly attributed on f. 73r. No other such attributions are present for other parts of the manuscript, nor can these can be co-identified with other known works. The draft-like format of the botanical descriptions on ff. 54r-70r, which are spaced as if the composer was intentionally planning to add

14 See LANCASHIRE PARISH REGISTER SOCIETY (1908). Possible matches are the apparent brothers Thomas (c. Apr. 14 1584; p. 41) and Edward (c. Sep. 17 1581; p. 34), sons of Thomas Syddall.

15 See STANNARD (1974) for an overview. To my eye, the herbal is somewhat unsophisticated, being neither alphabetized by Latin name nor furnished with further descriptive text, but it deserves review by a specialist.

16 The chartering of the Barbary Company in 1585 and Elizabeth I’s subsequent dispatch of an ambassador to Morocco (CAWSTON AND KEANE 1896: 236) is evidence of this evolving relationship. Asfi, mentioned several times in the codex, was the port providing access to the capital of Marrakesh until the 1760s, when Mogador (Essouaira) was founded by Mohammed III and superseded it.

17 In addition to MÁRMOL CARVAJAL’s 1573 description of Africa, these include TURNER’s 1568 Herbal (referenced on f. 57r) and GERARD’s 1597 Herbal (on f. 57r and 63r, the latter text continued from a torn f. 62r). In addition, PERCIVALE’s 1591 *Bibliotheca Hispanica* was the uncited basis for the Spanish-Arabic lexicon (see below).

more details at a later date (and which show evidence of just that),¹⁸ suggest that this component of the text—including the Arabic and Berber terms interspersed (C1-C34)—was indeed original to the writer. The 254-headword Spanish-Arabic vocabulary that provides the bulk of the Arabic data (A1-A254), however, is far more uniform and tightly spaced, calling its originality into question.

In fact, there are several pieces of evidence to suggest that the Spanish-Arabic glossary in the manuscript was copied from a pre-existing and possibly more complete work by a different author. The first clue is that it is alphabetized by Spanish headword,¹⁹ but stops abruptly after having given only those beginning in “A” and “B,” as if the copyist paused with the intention of resuming from “C” at a later date. One might retort that the copyist was in the process of organizing his own lexical notes, now lost, into a more orderly finished product, but this does not comport with the draft-like nature of other parts of the manuscript. More significant still is evidence from the Arabic data itself. Several apparent miscopyings seem to have resulted from the penman misinterpreting or transposing another writer’s Latin script renditions of unfamiliar Arabic words; for example, in A40 <Etcadem> was probably originally “Elcadem” (*al-qādām* ‘military officer’), in A154a <Alcathem> “Alchatem” (*al-xātām* ‘ring’), in A162 <Tekeemesh> “Tekemeesh” (*takmīš* ‘wrinkles’), in A195 <Albaughta> “Albaughla” (*al-baġla* ‘mule’), in A174 <Alphu> “Alpha” (*aṣ-ṣfa* ‘reel for thread’).

In addition, there are significant differences, both on the orthographic and implied phonological levels, between the Arabic lexemes in the Spanish-headed glossary (A1-A254) and those given in the list of numbers (B1-B19) and botanical descriptions (C1-C34). These again suggest two different authors who encountered and recorded the language in disparate ways. The hypothetical author of the glossary seems to have documented a more phonologically conservative “variety A” that maintained interdental fricatives and allowed for short vowels in open syllables (see evidence below), whereas “variety B/C” is much more akin to modern koine dialects in having lost the interdentals and elided most short vowels. Meanwhile, in the case of segments that were likely to have been comparable in varieties A and B/C, the two authors operate on different orthographic principles: the A author represents final -a, for example, with <a>, <au>, or <aw>, but the B/C author uses instead <ah>, <oh>, and <augh>.²⁰ The A author—as one might expect

18 For example, on f. 63r the author has expanded the description of “Wild Barberry Shrub” in a different color ink.

19 With some exceptions that are explained by the way in which the vocabulary was compiled; see below.

20 E.g., <ximutia> ~ *šamūtiya* (A52), <Alchatau> ~ *al-xāṭa* (A204a) v. <Meah> ~ *mīya* (B19), <Tikkedah> ~ *tikiḍa* (C22). Similar comparisons can be made for final -u (A: <o>, <u>; B/C: <ough>) and -in (A: <in>, <eene>; B/C: <ing>, <yn>, <eyn>, <ein>, <eine>).

of an aspiring lexicographer—is on the whole more consistent and exacting, assigning Arabic phonemes such as /x/ discrete graphemic representations (here <ch>) and employing them consistently. The B/C author, who seems to be the copyist and immediate scribe of the Morocco notes, is more variable in his transcriptions, in keeping with the more limited and marginal role of the linguistic content that he composed.

While it is therefore likely that the Spanish-Arabic glossary was not original to this manuscript, the current copy is the only one known at present, and even in its potentially incomplete state it is one of the most substantial known records of Moroccan Arabic during the 17th century.²¹ Moreover, certain unique characteristics of the glossary allow us to extrapolate aspects of *how* it was composed with a degree of certainty. Namely, throughout the glossary there is an apparent contradiction between orthographic representations of Arabic words, which follow *English* spelling conventions (such as “ee” for *ī* and “sh” for *š*), and the fact that the corresponding headwords are instead in *Spanish*. The Arabic spellings are strongly suggestive of an English-speaking author, but why would such an author have not simply headed the glossary in English? The likely answer to this question is that the compiler of the glossary had access to *another* Spanish-headed lexical work, and was using it as a sort of model for the Arabic one. This would have had the benefit of keeping headwords alphabetized from the start and ensuring a relatively broad thematic range, both aspects that are visible in the actual Spanish-Arabic glossary.

Fortunately, this proposal need not be merely speculative, because evidence abounds that this uncited model work was none other than the Spanish-English-Latin dictionary in Richard PERCIVALE’s 1591 *Bibliotheca Hispanica*.²² Nearly every headword in the LJS 46 glossary is present in Percivale’s dictionary in the same order,²³ although it does seem that the compiler of the former recorded only a selection of items that he felt were

21 The first published lexicon of Moroccan Arabic was Germain Moüette’s *Dictionnaire François-Arabe*, provided as a sort of appendix to his 1683 captivity narrative (see GUERRERO ET AL. 2024 for a recent re-edition). Moüette’s dictionary contains 854 headwords, whereas the current lexicon has 254; had the author continued in the same manner to the letter Z it would have been a far longer work.

22 A digital version, provided by Brown University’s John Carter Brown Library, is available at <https://archive.org/details/bibliothecahispa00perc/>. An “enlarged and amplified” edition of Percivale’s work was published by John Minsheu in 1623, but this later edition is unlikely to have been the model, as it lacks some of the organizational aspects of Percivale’s original that are reflected in LJS 46.

23 One may add to this that the headwords are largely identical in spelling at a time, prior to the founding of the Royal Spanish Academy in 1711, when a greater degree of variation was present within the language. A salient example is that both works have singular “Alqueria” (A122) but plural “Alcarias” (A91). A few spelling differences, which could have been introduced by either the compiler or the copyist, are evident (e.g., Percivale’s “Albarrada” v. <Albarada> in A79).

most important, as most dictionary entries are not present in the glossary. One of the peculiarities of the glossary is that, while it is clearly alphabetized in the broad sense, several individual headwords are out of alphabetical order (e.g., in A151 <Congoxa> falls between the alphabetized <Antojos> and <Año>). Such discrepancies are explained by the fact that Percivale's dictionary sometimes gives synonyms beside correctly alphabetized headwords (in this case "Anxia, congoxa"), with the compiler of the glossary having seemingly chosen the more familiar term for the headword while keeping its original order.²⁴ Yet another oddity in the glossary is the presence of entries for which the Spanish headword has no apparent relation to the given Arabic gloss (e.g., in A141 <Anciano> 'old' is given as Arabic <El el am> ~ *al-ʿalām* 'flag, banner'). These puzzling mismatches are resolved when Percivale's English glosses are viewed as an intermediary (here, English "ancient" was understood instead in its now-archaic sense of 'flag').²⁵ That the compiler was on the one hand using Percivale's Spanish headwords for organization, but on the other relying primarily on his English glosses for the actual meanings to be elicited in Arabic, may find further support in the fact that some of these headwords are themselves miscopied (e.g., <Alarifse> rather than "Alarife" in A76).²⁶

While the means by which its original compiler organized the glossary are thereby clear, how the Arabic data itself was collected is more speculative. One could imagine the English author and his Moroccan informants communicating with difficulty and having to rely on gesturing, pointing, and paraphrasing. This collection process might account for unexpected glosses such as <An nama> ~ *an-naʿma*, which is usually a generic term for 'food', but given here for <Alcharchofa> 'artichoke' (A90). Other indications of the compiler's restricted knowledge of Arabic include plural entries for singular headwords,²⁷ instances of mistaken segmentation,²⁸ improper control of the

24 For other such cases of misalphabetized headwords that be explained as synonyms of correctly ordered ones in Percivale see A22, A29, A97, A170, A237, A240, and A247. A somewhat different case is the occurrence of entries where the Spanish headword is alphabetical, but in the wrong column in the manuscript because it and the Arabic gloss have been switched for position. Such errors again suggest copying; the order has been corrected here, but relevant entries marked with a star (cf. A74, A75, A91, A94, A175, A180, A247).

25 A similar case is in A97, where Percivale's "ftocke" was interpreted by the compiler as <Arrafemel> ~ *ar-rāsmāl* 'capital, value of goods' rather than 'progeny, descendants' as implied by the headword <Alcuñia>.

26 See also <Antillo> (= "Autillo") in A183 and <Boçero> (= "Bocezo") in A228. Such miscopyings may have been original to the compiler of the lexicon or later introduced by the copyist who incorporated it into the Morocco notes; in either case, they indicate gaps in that party's knowledge of Spanish.

27 E.g., <El melleica> ~ *l-mālāyka* for <Angel> in A143.

28 E.g., <Elgo lila> ~ *al-ḡulila* in A116. See also A55, A59b, A123, A141, A187, and A249.

construct state,²⁹ and provision of verbs in a list labeled “Nomina substantiva.”³⁰ This is not say that the compiler was unconcerned with accuracy; to the contrary, once one accounts for orthographic variation along the lines of that already present in English, representations of Arabic sounds are remarkably consistent.³¹ Underscoring this observation is the coincidence that many Spanish entries beginning in “A” are themselves of Arabic origin, yielding a large number of gloss-headword doublets of shared etymology that the author was nonetheless deliberate in distinguishing, e.g., Sp. <Darga> v. Ar. <Darca> ~ *dārqa* ‘buckler (shield)’ (A38), Sp. <Albarda> v. <Albartha> ~ *al-bārḏa* ‘packsaddle’ (A78), Sp. <Aljofofor> v. Ar. <Aljouhar> ~ *al-ḡawḥar* ‘pearl’ (A110), and so on.³²

It is just as speculative how the penman of the Morocco notes, to whom the B/C items are presumably original, collected his lexical data. Unlike the A items, which appear to have been systematically elicited and organized for the specific purpose of constructing a glossary, the scattered Arabic/Berber plant names and list of numbers seem to have been recorded more spontaneously and in a support function for the author’s herbological research (and perhaps related purchases). They are also less linguistically accurate as a record. At the same time, they complement the A items in that they too are by an apparent English author, and one who was very likely physically present in Morocco at that. These items are furthermore significant as one of the earliest known lexical records of Berber by a European author.³³

To summarize, a hypothetical sketch of the Morocco notes’ origin is as follows:³⁴ They were penned by an Englishman living in the early 1600s, himself perhaps a Syddall brother. He travelled to Morocco on an English ship that anchored at Asfi, the chief Atlantic port serving newly invigorated trade with England. Over the course of a few months in the country, he took notes on local flora, and for several plants recorded their local names in Arabic or Berber. In support of this herbological research, he consulted existing works

29 For example, in A153 the word *ṣḥwa* ‘appetite’ is given as construct <Xauat> ~ *ṣḥwāt* despite being freestanding, and in A139 <Alkefel alassan> reflects an ungrammatical **al-kafāl al-ḥaṣān*.

30 E.g., <yefemau> ~ *yasmā* ‘he hears’ in A182.

31 For example, the variable use of <c>, <k>, and <ck> to represent Arabic /k/ parallels spellings of the same phoneme in English, and seems to have been carried over to representations of /q/. Meanwhile, the lexicon uniformly differentiates the voiced phoneme /ḡ/ (represented as <g>) from the unvoiced /x/ (<ch>), despite there being no such phonemic distinction in English.

32 In a very few cases (e.g., A85, A87, A117), a missing headword seems to imply that the author did think the Arabic and Spanish terms fully co-identifiable.

33 STROOMER (2000: 303) calls Jezreel Jones’s 1715 “Dissertatio de Lingua Shilhensi” the “earliest earliest European source for Tachelhit Berber, perhaps the earliest European source for Berber languages in general,” but LJS 46 predates it by roughly a century.

34 Any given detail of this sketch might be inaccurate, but the goal here is to paint a general picture of how the current data may have been collected.

on Morocco, among them Mármol and an unpublished Spanish-Arabic glossary by another English author. He excerpted the parts of Mármol that were most relevant—namely, those about the Kingdom of Marrakesh—and began the process of copying the glossary. However, it was never completed, leaving us with the current 254-headword version. The English author-copyist eventually returned to England with his notes, which were preserved and ultimately bound together with an older, but thematically related, herbal of Italian origin into the present codex.

2. Grammatical Observations

Having established their likely provenance and made the argument that the Arabic data in LJS 46 are likely from two different sources, we now turn to their dialectological value. As the “variety A” of the glossary is best represented and was most systematically recorded, remarks here refer to it unless otherwise indicated; “variety B/C” is primarily brought into the discussion as a point of contrast.

One of the key advantages of European sources on historical Arabic dialects is that, in using Latin script, they can provide phonological information that would have been obscured were the same material in Arabic script. At the same time, and as is the case for LJS 46, orthographic idiosyncracies and inconsistencies mean that the record itself is only partly instructive, and is best understood in a comparative light. Even though several emergent orthographic conventions are apparent in the Spanish-Arabic glossary, there are also cases in which the same underlying Arabic term is given more than one spelling, e.g., <Elmalem> (A76) v. <Malim> (A163a) v. <Malleme> (A164).³⁵ This degree of imprecision means that relying on any single token for a phonological generalization is unwise, but taken together a general picture can be drawn. While phonology is the domain to which the bulk of the following discussion is dedicated, some brief remarks on morphosyntax and lexical content are in order as well.

2.1 Consonants

A significant feature of the glossary variety is its preservation the interdental fricatives /t/ and /d/ in several items, where the English-speaking lexicographer represented them with <th>: <Athum> ~ *at-tūm* ‘garlic’ (A70), <Albartha> ~ *al-bardʿa* ‘packsaddle’ (A78), <Elmethred> ~

35 Note also <Alcosam> (A209a) v. <Elchosom> (A245); <Alborack> (A138) v. <Elborack> (A148); <Ajumar menta anor> (A171) v. <Gemara emta nor> (A244). However, <Atimock> (A149, A237) occurs twice with the same spelling, as does <Asenia> (A35, A147a), <Matamora> (A105, A225), and <Enhas> ~ <En has> (A75, A249), showing a degree of systemization as well.

al-matrād ‘bowl, basin’ (A118), <Thaure> ~ *tawr* ‘bull’ (A251), <Thiran> ~ *tīrān* ‘bulls’ (A252).³⁶ At the same time, the rather unexpected reflex of the pharyngealized phoneme(s) *ḏ/ḏ̣ is exclusively a stop /ḍ/: <El cadj> ~ *al-qāḏi* ‘jurist’ (A10), <edurru> ~ *yəḏurru* ‘to hurt [s.o.]’ (A17), <Ecadee> ~ *yəqāḏi* ‘to conclude’ (A19), <Dyfee> ~ *ḏifi* ‘my lord, master’ (A67), <An nadaurat> ~ *ən-nəḏḏārāt* ‘eyeglasses’ (A150).³⁷ There are a few cases in which etymological *ṭ or *ḏ are reflected as apparent stops, perhaps showing dialect mixing or borrowing: <matalta> ~ *mātallta* ‘diversion dam along a watercourse’ (A35b); <*muṭallata ‘triangle’), <Draw> *drā* ‘arm’ (A242; <*ḏirā). Unlike the glossary, The B/C items show no sign of interdental fricatives at all, and instead have consistent stop reflexes: <cleta> ~ *tīlata* ‘three’ (B3), <Demaneah> ~ *tmānya* ‘eight’ (B8), <Cleting> *tīlātīn* ‘thirty’ (B12), <Demanein> ~ *tmānīn* ‘eighty’ (B17).

Reflexes of *q in the glossary are predominantly an unvoiced stop /q/, indicated with <c>, <ck>, or <k>: <Alcatifa> ~ *al-qatifa* ‘mat, rug’ (A92), <Atimock> ~ *at-tāmāq* ‘gaiters, leggings’ (A149), <Azouke> ~ *az-zāwāq* ‘mercury, quicksilver’ (A197), etc. In a rather few cases the reflex is a voiced /g/: <Lagab> ~ *la-ḡāb* ‘eagle’ (A60), <galag> ~ *ḡalāḡ* (A209b) ‘uproar, commotion, discord’, <Algarne> ~ *al-ḡarṇ* ‘horn (musical)’ (241a); this idiosyncratic distribution is comparable to modern koine varieties, and suggests that such lexicalization of /q/ v. /g/ is a relatively old phenomenon.³⁸ Nonetheless, on the whole the combination of a predominant /q/ with the presence of interdentals makes for a phonological configuration that is rare in modern Moroccan varieties.³⁹

The chief reflex of *ḡ in the glossary is a non-affricate palatal fricative /ʒ/, which is in most cases represented as <j> or <g> (the latter before <i> or <e>), and very clearly has the non-affricate value in <Afsaherīḡ> ~ *as-saḡrīḡ* ‘pool, reservoir’ (A81).⁴⁰ It triggers assimilation of the definite

36 The preservation of interdentals is known in modern dialects further up the coast; see, e.g., KAMPFFMEYER (1912: x) and LOUBIGNAC (1952: xii). While in most cases <th> is clearly /t/ or /ḍ/, in two cases it may correspond with a different consonant; see entries A36 and A145 for discussion.

37 To have plain interdental fricatives but not the emphatic one is a unique arrangement, as in almost all modern Arabic varieties these pattern together.

38 The same is evident in Mouïette’s vocabulary from the later 17th c.; cf. GUERRERO ET AL. (2024: 174). No instances of *q are in the B/C items from which to draw a contrast.

39 See TAINE-CHEIKH (1998: 31–35) on the patterning of these two “macro-discriminants.” The present combination is best attested in the eastern Maghreb (starting in Algeria), though for Morocco /q/ is attested (with a lesser frequency) alongside interdentals for the Zaër (LOUBIGNAC 1952) and in the Chaouia region (KAMPFFMEYER 1912).

40 See GUERRERO (2019) on reflexes of *ḡ in maghrebi dialects at large. Two possible exceptions to the palatal realization are <izdud> ~ *əḏḏūd* ‘ancestors’ (A16) and <nataz> ~ *nātāḏ* (?) ‘adversity, hostility’ (A47), where <z> may indicate a merger to /z/ as is known from Jewish dialects; on the other hand, these could also simply have been miscopied. No instances of *ḡ are in the B/C items.

article *al-*, as is evident in <Eginah> ~ *əḏ-ḏanāḥ* ‘wing’ (A71) and <Ajumar> ~ *əḏ-ḏamar* ‘embers’ (A171). There is no evidence of sibilant harmony as is common in modern dialects, i.e., etymological *s is *not* palatalized when it precedes it /ʒ/: <ferge> ~ *sarḏ* ‘saddle’ (A32), <Lefphinge> ~ *l-əsfənḏ* ‘fritter’ (A235), <Elphorgil> ~ *as-sfərḏal* ‘quince’ (A247).⁴¹ However, the opposite phenomenon does seem to be present, with two tokens of the word ‘tree’ showing depalatalization of *š before /ʒ/: <Sejera> ~ *səzra* (A114, A155; <*šağara).

2.2 Vowels and Diphthongs

The vocalic phonology of the glossary variety is a more speculative matter, and one complicated by both the transcriptions in the record itself and a lack of consensus for even modern Moroccan varieties.⁴² The core questions here are the phonemicity of short vowels and syllabic constraints on their occurrence, for which the glossary representations are suggestive but not entirely reliable.⁴³ In regard to the former, the preservation of the etymological short vowel triad *a, *i, *u is doubtful, and the variety instead seems to show a merger of *a and *i to an intermediate /ə/. This is not to say that both <a> and <i> are not distinguished orthographically, but rather that when they are used for short (as opposed to long) vowels they follow an apparent allophonic distribution, with <a> predominant and <i> occurring only in the vicinity of liquids /m, n, l/: <Eginah> ~ *əḏ-ḏanāḥ* ‘wing’ (A71), <Asimmat> *as-səmāt* ‘saddlebag’ (A102), <Elmišque> ~ *əl-māšk* ‘musk’ (A117), <El mišh malh> ~ *əl-māšmāš* ‘apricot’ (A127), <Agil> ~ *‘əḏəl* ‘calf’ (A221), <Lefphinge> ~ *l-əsfənḏ* ‘fritter’ (A235).⁴⁴

In contrast with the neutralization of *a and *i, etymological *u seems to have been more definitively maintained as a phoneme /u/: <Aduf> ~ *əd-duff* ‘tambourine’ (A45b), <Luban> ~ *lubān* ‘frankincense’ (A22), <Albošhare> ~ *əl-bušāra* ‘reward for bringing good news’ (A84), <Ad dušhore> ~ *əd-dušūr* ‘hamlets, villages’ (A91), <Alours> *əl-‘urs* ‘wedding’ (A229). It has morphological significance as part of the participle-forming prefix *mu-*: <Mucreh> ~ *mukrəḥ* ‘detestable’ (A11), <Muhayar> ~ *muḥayyar* ‘confused, perplexed’ (A151a), <Muchanacau> ~ *muxənnəqa* ‘collar’ (A189b; i.e., ‘thing that chokes’). In addition, some instances of /u/ are not etymological *u but rather due to the rounding effect of /x/ on /ə/

41 See HEATH (2002, 133–34) on sibilant harmony.

42 See HEATH (1997) and AGUADÉ (2010) for an overview of this debate.

43 For example, there are several tokens that show vowels in positions where they cannot (on a historical and comparative basis) have actually occurred: <Mefsono> ~ *mašnū* ‘handicraft, artifact’ (A166a), <yefemau> *yəsmə* ‘to hear’ (A182), <Mahalul> *məhlūl* ‘open’ (A6), <Matamora> *mətmūra* ‘cistern’ (A105), <Lucoma> *luqma* ‘morsel, bite’ (A227). Such cases reflect the author’s tendency to interpret certain segments through the phonotactic and orthographic rules of English.

44 This allophony parallels that of modern koine varieties.

(< *a, i>: <Almugh, chyat> ~ *əl-muxyāt* ‘needle’ (A59B; < *mixyāt), < mughtef> ~ *muxṭāf* ‘hook, anchor’ (A88; < *mixṭāf), < Almohadda> ~ *əl-muxadda* ‘cushion, pillow’ (A113; < *mixadda), < Alchotar> ~ *əl-xuṭār* ‘bet, wager’ (A154; < *xiṭār), < Alchozana> ~ *xuzāna* ‘cellar, storehouse’ (A230; < *xazāna).

A notable aspect of the glossary variety is its preservation of etymological diphthongs *ay and *aw, which are often monophthongized in modern varieties. The resulting sequence /əy/ (< *ay) is evident in several tokens, among them < tayre> ~ *ṭayr* ‘bird’ (A186), < el li neyn> ~ *əl-ʿinayn* (A187), < zeite> ~ *zayt* ‘oil’ (A194), and < elceire> ~ *əl-qayr* ‘penis’ (A212b).⁴⁵ The same can be seen for /əw/ in < Aljouhar> ~ *əl-ṣawḥar* ‘pearl’ (A110), < louze> ~ *lawz* ‘almond’ (A115), < Arrauz> ~ *ar-rawz* ‘rice’ (A161), < Alcous> ~ *əl-qaws* ‘crossbow’ (A205), and < Thaure> ~ *ṭawr* ‘bull’ (A251).⁴⁶ Somewhat relatedly, there is evidence that the etymological sequence *wa is preserved as /wə/ (rather than modern /ū/) in the entry < Mabuela> ~ *məbwəla* ‘bladder’ (A220; cf. modern *nbūla*).

2.3 Syllable Structure

The syllabic structure of the glossary variety also shows important differences from those of modern Morocco, which disallow short vowels in an open syllable.⁴⁷ Instead, the Latin script transcriptions repeatedly indicate that short vowels /ə/ and /u/ were in fact heard in such environments, as in the following:

	<u>Transcription</u>	<u>Apparent</u>	<u>Modern Koine</u>	
(A121)	< Alfutoure>	<i>əl-fuṭūr</i>	<i>lə-ftūr</i>	‘breakfast’
(A172)	< Al hamar>	<i>əl-ḥamār</i>	<i>lə-ḥmār</i>	‘donkey’
(A196)	< Elmeded>	<i>əl-mədād</i>	<i>lə-mdād</i>	‘ink’
(A224)	< Elmarau>	<i>əl-məra</i>	<i>lə-mrā</i>	‘woman’
(A230)	< Alchozana>	<i>əl-xuzāna</i>	<i>lə-xzāna</i>	‘cellar, store’

Accompanying this less restrictive syllable structure is the relatively stable form of the definite article *əl-*, which need not be restructured to *l(ə)-* to accommodate it. However, notable exceptions to this trend are apparent. Nouns that begin with an initial consonant /ʿ/ have a tendency to parallel modern koine forms with *lə-*: < Ladu> ~ *lə-ḍu* ‘enemy, adversary’ (A46), < Lagab> ~ *lə-ḡāb* ‘eagle’ (A60), < La amara> ~ *lə-māra* ‘crew of a ship’

45 Cf. <ei> for /āy/ in <El melleica> ~ *əl-məlāyka* ‘angels’ (A143).

46 Cf. <ou> for /āw/ in <Azouke> ~ *əz-ṣāw(ə)q* (A197). For ‘almond’, note contrasting <luz> ~ *lūz* in A114.

47 See AGUADÉ (2010), who contends that “common to all Moroccan dialects is that short vowels do not occur in open syllables or word-finally.”

(A158), <Lades> ~ *la-ˈdās* (A169a), <Laxia> ~ *la-ˈʕiya* ‘evening’ (A223b).⁴⁸ Nouns that would have begun with an etymological glottal stop show similar behavior, and never assimilation of the article to the following consonant: <lebrau> ~ *l-əbɾa* ‘needle’ (A59a), <Alemfat> ~ *l-ənɸāt* ‘cannons’ (A168), <Lefphinge> ~ *l-əsfənʒ* ‘fritter’ (A235), <Lomfar> ~ *l-ənɸār* ‘musical horns’ (A241c).⁴⁹ Both cases prove that, while the variety has a wider range of allowable syllables than modern ones, it is not entirely devoid of the elision and restructuring and that characterizes the latter.⁵⁰

A special case is the syllabification of simple triconsonantal nouns corresponding with the etymological shapes *CvCC and *CvCvC. In modern Moroccan varieties, these are syllabified as either CvCC or CCvC, depending on whether the second or third consonant is more sonorous, respectively.⁵¹ However, if one takes the glossary representations at face value, CvCvC is instead the predominant form: <Fejer> ~ *fəʒər* ‘dawn’ (A82), <Algaddare> ~ *əl-ġadər* ‘treachery’ (A99), <Adeɕhar> ~ *əd-dəʕər* ‘village, hamlet’ (A122), <Atabal> ~ *ət-ɬəbəl* ‘tambourine, small drum’ (A178), <Albaton> ~ *əl-bətən* ‘belly, stomach’ (A212a). It is tempting to dismiss some of these orthographic vowels as insertions by the author under the influence of English orthography and phonology, and this is probably indeed the case for forms such as <Gomock> ~ *ġumq* ‘depth’ (A9), where the CvCC shape is etymological (*ġumq) and unchanged in modern varieties (ġ^wamq). On the other hand, the fact that many historical *CvCC nouns have modern CCvC patterns means that at some point they must have gone through a transitional CvCvC phase (else they be vowel-less),⁵² and one possible interpretation of the current data is that many such tokens reflect precisely that.⁵³

48 Though contrast <Al allam> ~ *əl-ˈālām* ‘flag’ (A207).

49 See HEATH (2002: 447–48) on Moroccan reflexes of *al-iṭnayn ‘Monday’, which presents the same issue.

50 Other instances of elision and syllabic restructuring include <izdud> ~ *əʒdūd* ‘ancestors’ (A16; < *ġudūd), <Stah> ~ *ʃtəh* ‘flat roof’ (A34; < *suṭh), <Smit> ~ *smid* ‘semolina’ (A25; < *samid), and <Enfire> ~ *ən-nɸir* ‘musical horn’ (A241B; < *naɸir). However, contrast maintenance of short vowels in <Asimmat> *əs-səmāt* ‘saddlebag’ (A102; < *simāt) and in <Saṇeene> ~ *sanin* ‘years’ (A152b; < *sinin), even when the initial clusters /sm/ and /sn/ would pose no difficulty for an English speaker.

51 See BOUDLAL (2001: 88–89) for a succinct description of this rule.

52 This CvCvC phase is, in fact, the end point for later Andalusian varieties (cf. FERRANDO 2004: 44) and Maltese (cf. VANHOVE 1998: 104). I thank Jairo Guerrero for this observation.

53 For this reason, I have settled on the policy of representing these orthographic vowels as actual short vowels *unless* they can be ruled out as unlikely due to both etymology and the aforementioned sonority rule.

2.4 Morphosyntax

In comparison to phonology, only a very few generalizations on morphosyntax can be drawn from the Arabic data in LJS 46. The use of pronominal elements is limited and unremarkable, and the only verbal inflection is the typical 3MSG *yā-* evident in a few verbs used to gloss a nominal headword (see A17, A19, A48, A135, A136). There is no evidence of a preverb *kā-* or *tā-* in these verbal glosses, which should theoretically reflect a habitual aspect, but for lack of evidence we cannot rule out that one was used in this variety.

Within the nominal system, one finds two abstract patterns of note. The first is the Berber-derived circumfix *tā...-t* in <Taja bereet> ~ *tāžābrīt* ‘alchemy’ (A123). The second is the use of the suffix *-īya* to extend verbal nouns, as in <Hocroñia> *ḥaqrāñīya* ‘dejection, humiliation’ (A2) and <ximutia> *šāmūtīya* ‘untrustworthy behavior’ (A52). The former is widely productive in modern varieties, whereas the second is more lexicalized. Other nominal patterns adhere closely to those of Old Arabic and show little innovation.⁵⁴

Probably the most significant syntactic structure in the glossary is the genitive particle *mātāʿ* (variants *āmtāʿ*, *āntāʿ*), which is well represented: <Gubara enta ferge> ~ *gubāra āntāʿ ās-sarž* ‘rim of a saddle’ (A32), <Etcadem enta> ~ *āl-qādām āntāʿ* ‘military officer [of]’ (A40), <menta annes> ~ *mātāʿ ān-nās* ‘belonging to someone else’ (A54; lit. ‘of the people’s’), <El lucad emta leed> ~ *āl-ʿuqād āmtāʿ l-idd* ‘knuckle’ (A165; lit. ‘joints of the hand’), <Almohaca emta l’halsan> *āl-muḥassa āmtāʿ āl-ḥašān* ‘currycomb’ (A120; lit. ‘comb of a horse’), <Ajumar menta anor> *āž-žamār mātāʿ ān-nār* ‘embers of a fire’ (A171), <Ellood emta emz-rock> *l-ʿūd āmtāʿ āmzrāq* ‘shaft of a lance’ (A176), <Gemara emta nor> *žamra āmtāʿ ān-nār* ‘ember of a fire’ (A244). One instance of this particle shows it to be inflected for gender: <Sejera m̄tata luz> *səžra m̄tāʿāt āl-lūz*. That no reflex of the other widespread Moroccan genitive particle, *d(yāl)* ~ *d(yāl)*, is present among these many constructions suggests that it was not in regular use in the variety.

The glossary author’s limited control of other syntagms—for instance, the ungrammatical structure <Alkefel alassan> ~ **āl-kefāl āl-ḥašān* ‘rump of a horse’ (A139)—means that little more can be said with certainty. The lack of agreement for definiteness in <Alcarnif mutaraz> ~ *āl-karnif mutarraz* ‘buoy’ (A231; lit. ‘fastened cork’) is reminiscent of modern combinations of generic nouns with adjectives, e.g. *l-fālfla ḥārṛa* ‘hot peppers’ (PROCHÁZKA 2022: 542); on the other hand, it may simply reflect imperfect acquisition.

54 This is true of both singulars (the majority of the nouns) and plurals (see A68a, A143, A152b, A160, A168, A241c, A252).

2.5 Lexicon

As the full set of interpreted lexical data from LJS 46 is given below, it suffices here to summarize its general value to the discipline. Several items in the Spanish-Arabic glossary (Part A) are noteworthy for their absence from modern lexical references, and hence represent new material for future works.⁵⁵ Among these are <Gubara> ~ *ġubāra* ‘rim [of a saddle]’ (A32), <Asiat> ~ *as-sayyāt* ‘whip’ (A33), <Attafereef> ~ *at-tasrif* ‘oak gall’ (A53), <Allacakef> ~ *al-‘aqāqaf* ‘halberds’ (A73), <Allohaya> ~ *al-luħya* ‘valuables’ (A107), <Azubeca> ~ *az-zubqa* ‘trap, snare’ (A159), and <Elharifh> ~ *al-ħarīš* ‘spear’ (A190). The archaism of the glossary is further evident in its relative lack of loanwords, only a few of which are attested: <Atimock> ~ *at-tamāq* ‘gaiters, leggings’ (A149/A237) <Brocado> ~ *baṛkādu* ‘brocade (fabric)’ (A248), <Bubaħh> ~ *būbāš* ‘venereal lesion’ (A254), <kicar> ~ *kikar* ‘chickpeas’ (A169c), perhaps <Aḥphu> ~ *aḥ-ṣfa* ‘reel for thread’ (A174).⁵⁶ Despite this, much of the its lexicon still bears a strong resemblance to modern Moroccan Arabic when one looks past the phonological conservatism described above.

The remaining vocabulary items (i.e., those that were probably recorded by the penman of the Morocco notes himself) are restricted to two primary domains. The list of numbers (Part B) is remarkable mainly for the fact that it lacks the modern forms *zūž* ~ *žūž* ‘two’ and *tas‘ūd* ‘nine’, instead giving <Knino> ~ *tnīn* (*w-?*) (B2) and <Saw> ~ *tas‘a* ‘nine’ (B9), respectively. The plant names (Part C) are of scholarly value primarily for the fact that they are given in a mix of Arabic and Tashelhiyt Berber, and hint at a high degree of lexical borrowing and interchangeability between the two languages in this domain.⁵⁷

3. The Vocabulary

The following is an account of the Moroccan language data in LJS 46 in full, divided into Parts A (the Spanish-Arabic glossary), B (the list of numbers on f. 1r), and C (plant names, etc., dispersed throughout ff. 54r-70v and 97v). Entries are numbered in the order they appear in the respective section of the

55 In most such cases vocalizations and meanings of these novel lexemes can be confirmed against other sources further afield, including classical ones, though for some entries a question mark indicates remaining uncertainty.

56 Contrast the somewhat greater frequency of loanwords in Moüette’s vocabulary from further east during the latter half of the same century (GUERRERO ET AL. 2024: 177).

57 It is difficult to know whether some of the Berber-origin items should be understood as solely Berber (i.e., there was a different Arabic term in circulation) or fully borrowed into Arabic. I have opted for a more Arabist-facing transcription in regard to vowel representations (e.g., *āslif* in C6 rather than *asllif*) in order to allow for the latter possibility.

manuscript, and each follows the same basic conventions. Bolded text represents the verbatim source data directly from the manuscript, i.e., a headword or definition (if present) followed by the corresponding transliterated Arabic in its original orthography. Following the source data is a phonemic reconstruction of the Arabic (or Berber) term and a gloss in modern English, alongside lexicographic references where deemed useful.⁵⁸ Lexemes that are sufficiently common such as to be present in most dictionaries, and known to most speakers, are not given explicit citations.

3.1 Part A: Spanish-Moroccan glossary from ff. 98r-101r⁵⁹

{f. 98r}

A1. Abarranada: *Soubte* ~ *ṣāḥabti*
'my girlfriend' [as euphemism for
prostitute] (RP: "a leman, a trumpet").
Cf. the same in A133.

A2. Abatimiento: *Hocroñia* ~
ḥaqrāniya 'dejection, humiliation' (RP:
"ftouping, throwing downe").

A3. Abaximiento: *Tahabbit* ~ *təḥbīt*
'dejection, humiliation'. Not in PRÉMARE;
implies verb *ḥabbat*.

A4. Abejas: *Anahal* ~ *an-nəḥəl* 'bees'.

A5. Abejon: *zambor* ~ *ʒənbūr* 'wasp,
hornet' (RP: "a droane Bee"). Cf.
PRÉMARE (v. 6, p. 381).

A6. Abertura: *mahalul* ~ *məḥlūl* 'open'
(RP: "opening, cleft, or ryuing of any
thing").

A7. Abestruz: *Nama* ~ *n'āma* 'ostrich'.

A8a. Abildad: *Xatar* ~ *ṣātər* 'skilled,
refined' (RP: "abilitie, fitnes, aptnes").
Sp. headword is a noun, but here and
below the forms are adjectival.

A8b. Abildad: *keeis* ~ *kīyas* 'skilled,
refined'. Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 10, p. 672).

A9. Abifmo: *Gomock* ~ *ḡumq* 'abyss,
depths' (RP: "bottomleffe pit").

A10. Abogado: *El cadj* ~ *əl-qādi* 'jurist'
(RP: "an aduacate, a lawyer").

A11. Abomination: *Mucreh* ~ *mukrəḥ*
'detestable' (RP: "detefting").

A12. Abreuadero: *Mutfiah* ~ *maṭfiya*
'trough' (RP: "a poole, a watering pit").
Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 8, p. 311).

A13. Abridor: *El buab* ~ *əl-bəwwāb*
'porter, doorman' (RP: "he that
openeth"). Cf. the same in A214.

A14. Abstinencia: *Ca'nau* ~ *qəməʕ*
'abstinence'.

58 The most frequently cited of these is PRÉMARE's (1993–1999) *Dictionnaire arabe-français*, which is by far the most comprehensive lexical resource for Moroccan Arabic; as such, note has also made where items here are absent from it.

59 No attempt has been made to bring the Spanish headwords in Part A into line with modern spelling; they are given verbatim. Where it is useful for clarification or comparison, Percivale's English translation of the Spanish headword is provided under the label "RP" (but if it differs only in spelling or is a common synonym, e.g. "garlicke" for "garlic," it is not). For a few entries in the glossary, the columns are interchanged so that the Spanish headword precedes the Arabic; in such cases, their order has brought into line with others, but the entry is marked with an asterisk (*). Finally, on the occasion that a word or phrase is spread over two lines, the line break is indicated with a slash (/).

A15a. Abuelo: Sidj el cibir ~ *sīdi al-kābir* ‘my grandfather’.

A15b. Abuelo: juddi ~ *d žəddi* ‘my grandfather’.

A16. Abuelos: izdud ~ *əždūd* ‘ancestors’.

A17. Abufion: edurru ~ *yəduṛṛ-u* ‘to hurt [s.o.]’ (RP: “abuse”).

A18. Abutarda: Anecer ~ *nəsər* ‘great bustard’ (RP: “a Buftard”).

A19. Acabador: Ecadee ~ *yəqādi* ‘to conclude’ (RP: “a finisher”).

A20. Acorde: El tehempt (?) ~ *əl-fəhāmət (?)* ‘accord’. Last 2-3 characters of transcription unclear; proposed reading would require that <t> be a miscopying of “f” and etymological *tā’ marbūta* be pronounced as if construct state.

A21. Acorro: Avano ~ *‘āwn-u* ‘he helped him’ (RP: “helpe, succour”).

A22. Açension: Luban ~ *lubān* ‘frankincense’. Headword is out of order and absent from RP; author seems to have misidentified the Sp. headword (meaning ‘ascent’) as En. ‘incense’.

A23. Açada: Elmifhau ~ *əl-məšha* ‘hoe’ (RP: “a pickaxe”).

A24. Açafran: Zaafran ~ *zə‘frān* ‘saffron’.

A25. Acemite: Smit ~ *smīd* ‘semolina’ (RP: “flower of meale”).

A26. Aceña: Rehau ~ *ṛəḥa* ‘mill’.

A27. Aceñero: Rehauj ~ *ṛəḥwi* ‘miller’.

A28. Axequia: Axequia ~ *sāqya* ‘irrigation ditch’ (RP: “a trench, a pit, a ditch”). The <x> in the transcription usually represents /š/, but here orthography may be influenced by the headword.

A29a. Çevada: Naafed ~ *nāšəḍ (?)* ‘malt’? Not in PRÉMARE, but cf. *našaḍ* ‘to sprout’ in IBN MANẒŪR (p. 4429). Out of alphabetical order; in RP as “Cevada,”

but here corresponds with “Acevadado” in order.

A29b. Çevada: Afhire ~ *əš-šə‘īr* ‘barley’. See above on headword.

A30. Acidia: Agatab ~ *gəṭəb (?)* ‘bitterness’ (RP: “fharpness”). Not in PRÉMARE, but cf. *qaṭab* ‘he ... grinned, or displayed his teeth, frowning, or contracting his face ... by reason of drink’ in LANE (p. 2541).

A31. Aciones: Sumtach ~ *šəmṭa (?)* ‘leather stirrup strap’. Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 6, p. 191). Final letters <ch> in transcription suggest a consonant /x/ (but *šəmtāx* unattested).

A32. Acitara de filla: Gubara enta ferge ~ *ğubāra əntā‘ əs-sərž* ‘rim of a saddle’. First term not in PRÉMARE, but cf. KAMPFFMEYER (1912: 109).

A33. Açote: Asiat ~ *əs-səyyāt* ‘whip’. Not in PRÉMARE, but cf. DOZY (1927: v. 1, p. 702) and modern *mšūta*.

A34. Açotea: Stah ~ *šṭəḥ* ‘flat roof’.

A35a. Açuda: Asenia ~ *sānya* ‘well in which a waterwheel is installed’ (RP: “a trench, a pit, a ditch”). Cf. the same in A147a and PRÉMARE (v. 6, p. 216).

A35b. Açuda: matalta ~ *mətalṭta* ‘diversion dam (along a watercourse)’.

A36. Achaque: Aloktha ~ *əl-q“ḍa (?)* ‘excuse, pretext’ (RP: “an errand, an excuse”). Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 10, p. 355), “nom euphémistique d'une calamité / d'une maladie / d'une anomalie.”

However, <th> is curious given it is elsewhere an interdental; if understood as such, one might consider a reflex of *qaḍā* ‘something that falls into the eye’ in IBN MANẒŪR (p. 3562), i.e., a minor annoyance used as an excuse.

A37. Adalid: Adalil ~ *dəlīl* ‘leader, guide’ (RP: “a captaine”).

A38. Adarga: Adarca ~ *dərqa* ‘shield’ (RP: “a buckler, a target”).

A39. Adrame: Dram ~ *dārham* ‘dirham (monetary unit)’.

A40. Adelantado: Etcadem enta ~ *al-qādām antā* ‘military officer [of]’ (RP: “a lieutenent”). Apparent miscopying of an original “Elcadem.”

A41. Ademanes: Mofaaf ~ *musāʿaf* ‘having a favorable disposition’ (RP: “behaviour, demeanor”). Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 6., p. 103).

A42. Aderefo: Muiuda ~ *muʿadda* ‘preparation’. Not in PRÉMARE, but from widespread root ʿ-d-d.

A43. Aduana: Dewan ~ *diwān* ‘customs authority’.

A44. Adware: Dware ~ *dawwār* ‘nomadic camp’ (RP: “a village of tents removable, as in Barbarie”).

A45a. Adufe: Attar ~ *at-tār* ‘tambourine’.

A45b. Adufe: Aduf ~ *ad-duff* ‘tambourine’.

A46. Aduerfario: Ladu ~ *la-du* ‘enemy, adversary’.

A47. Aduerfidad: nataz ~ *natāž* (?) ‘adversity, hostility’. Cf. *n-ntāž f-l-bārūd* “être brillant et efficace au combat” in PRÉMARE (v. 11, p. 310).

A48. Adultero: yackhob ~ *yāqhub* ‘adulterer’.

A49. Afiladura: mylock eskin ~ *mīlaq as-sakkīn* ‘stone for sharpening a sabre’ (RP: “the edge of a weapon”). Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 11, p. 290) on the former term.

A50. Aforro: battan ~ *battān* ‘blanket, covering’ (RP: “furre”).

A51. Afrecho: Annochal ~ *nuxxāl* ‘bran’.

A52. Afrenta: ximutia ~ *šamūtiya* ‘untrustworthy behavior’ (RP: “fame, reproch, perill, danger”).

A53. Agalla: Attafereef ~ *at-tasrif* ‘oak gall’ (RP: “gaules”). Not in PRÉMARE, but

cf. the gall-producing insect *surfa* in LANE (p. 1351); implies verb *sarrāf* ‘to produce a gall’. Oak gallnuts from *Quercus lusitanica* were a commercially viable item, used in dyeing and ink production.

A54. Ageno: menta annes ~ *matāʿ annās* ‘belonging to someone else’ (RP: “(f)range, another mans ...”).

A55. Agonia: jea , hel ~ *žāhāl* (?) ‘suffering from rabies?’ (RP: “agonie”). Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 2, p. 155). Transcription might suggest a pseudo-plural *žyāhāl* (unattested).

{f. 98v}

A56. Agorero: Sauhar ~ *sahhār* ‘diviner’.

A57. Agua: Elmau ~ *al-ma* ‘water’.

A58. Agūamanil: Attas ~ *at-tās* ‘ewer’ (RP: “a basen”).

A59a. Aguja: lebrau ~ *l-abra* ‘needle’.

A59b. Aguja: Almugh,chyat ~ *al-maxyāt* ‘needle’.

A59c. Aguja: el emfisau ~ *al-maššisa* ‘thread, twine’ (as pulled by needle; note headword). Cf. *miššis* in Dozy (1927: v. 2, p. 597).

A60. Aguila: Lagab ~ *la-gāb* ‘eagle’ (RP: “an eagle”).

A61. Aguinaldo: chod , chockco ~ *xūd haqq-u* (?) ‘take his reward?’ (RP: “a reward, handfel”). If this identification is correct, though, the use of <ch> for /ḥ/ (elsewhere <h>) is atypical.

A62. Aguzadera: Athan ~ *at-tahhān* ‘whetstone’. Corresponding headword in RP is “Aguzadera piedra.”

A63. Agua ardiente: Mahaya ~ *māhya* ‘alcoholic drink’. Headword not in RP, but would fall in the vicinity of “aguamiel,” perhaps prompting author to insert it.

A64. Ahechaduras: Alhaufaula ~ *al-ḥaṣāda* ‘chaff’.

A65. Ahinco: Fīṣa ~ *fīṣā* ‘right away’ (RP: “hafte”).

A66. Aya: Iella ~ *lālla* ‘mistress’.

A67. Ayo: Dyfee ~ *ḍifī* ‘my lord, master’. Cf. FRANCISCO (2024: 292) on the use of this archaic term in the same region.

A68. Ayre: reha ~ *riḥa* ‘pleasant smell, perfume’ (RP: “pleafantnes, beautie, comelines”).

A69. Aiuda: Avano ~ *‘awn-u* ‘he helped him’ (RP: “helpe ...”).

A70. Ajos: Athum ~ *at-tūm* ‘garlic’.

A71. Ala: Eginah ~ *əž-žənāḥ* ‘wing’.

A72. Alabança: Shucron ~ *šukrān* ‘praise, thanks’.

A73. Alabarda: Allacakef ~ *al-‘aqāqaf* ‘halberds’ (RP: “an halberd”). Not in PRÉMARE, but cf. *‘uqqāfa* “a piece of wood ... crooked [or hooked] at the head thereof, which which a thing is ... pulled, towards one” in LANE (p. 2112). Headword is singular, but transcription suggests plural.

A74*. Aladar: Tatebatu ~ *təḥt əbāt-u* ‘[under his] armpit, underarm’.

A75*. Alambre: En has ~ *ən-nḥās* ‘copper, brass’ (RP: “Copper”). Cf. the same in A249.

A76. Alarīse: Elmalem ~ *al-m‘allām* ‘a master carpenter, surveyor’. Cf. the same in A163a and A164. Shows miscopying the of headword “Alarīfe” in RP.

A77. Alaton: Elcazdeer ~ *al-qəzdīr* ‘alloy of copper and tin’ (RP: “Latton, a kinde of mettall fo called”).

A78. Albarda: Albartha ~ *al-baṛḍ‘a* ‘packsaddle’. Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 1, p. 180).

A79. Albarada: Elcudia ~ *al-kudya* ‘mound’ (RP: “a ftone wall, a bulwarke”).

A80. Albarana: El menze ~ *al-mənzəḥ* ‘turret, parapet’ (RP: “a turret on a wall”).

A81. Alberca: Afsaherīḥ ~ *as-səhrīḥ* ‘pool, reservoir’.

A82. Albor: Fejer ~ *fəžər* ‘dawn’.

A83. Alboroto: Alcholat ~ *al-xulāt* ‘disorder, tumult’ (RP: “a tumult, ftur, hurly burly, fedition”). Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 1, p. 125) and same root in A209c.

A84. Albricias: Albofhare ~ *al-buṣāra* ‘a reward for bringing good news’. Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 1, p. 237); final <e> may be a miscopying of “a.”

A85. [no entry]: **Alcafaba** ~ *al-qəṣba* ‘casbah (fortified quarter)’ (RP: “a castel or fstrong house”). In order in RP as “Alçaçaba” despite no headword.

A86a. Alcawheta: Cahueta ~ *qəwwāda* ‘madam, procuress’ (RP: “a bawde”). In RP headword is “Alcahuete.” May alternatively be read as the plural of below.

A86b. Alcawheta: cawed ~ *qəwwād* ‘pimp, procurer’.

A87. [no entry]: **Alcayd** ~ *al-qāyəd* ‘governor, administrator’ (RP: “a captain of a fort”). In order in RP as “Alcayde de forta leza” despite no headword.

A88. Alchayta: mughtef ~ *məxtāf* ‘hook, anchor’.

A89. Alcaparea: Alcapar ~ *al-kəbbār* ‘capers’ (RP: “capers”).

A90. Alcharchofa: An nama ~ *ən-nə‘ma* ‘food’, lit. a ‘blessing’ from God (RP: “an artochock”). Author may have unintentionally elicited a more generic term rather than the intended ‘artichoke’ given as a headword.

A91*. Alcarias: Ad dufhore ~ *əd-dušūr* ‘hamlets, villages’ (RP: “cottages”). Cf. singular in A122; the same spelling discrepancy between of singular and plural headwords is in RP.

A92. Alcatifa: *Alcatifa* ~ *al-qāṭifa* ‘mat, rug’ (RP: “a rug for a bed”).

A93. Alcoba: *Alcobbau* ~ *al-qubba* ‘chamber, compartment’ (RP: “a closet, a clofe roome for a bed”).

A94*. Alcornoque: *Alcarnife* ~ *al-karnif* ‘cork oak (*Quercus suber*) and its bark’. Cf. the same in A231. Present use is limited to the pseudobark of a palm tree as per PRÉMARE (v. 10, p. 568), with *fārši* instead used for ‘cork’.

A95. Alcorque: *Sherbeel* ~ *šarbīl* ‘slipper (shoe)’ (RP: “a pantofle”).

A96. Aḡuffre: *Alcabreet* ~ *al-kābrīt* ‘sulfur’ (RP: “brimstone”). Headword follows the order of “Alcruite” in RP.

{f. 99r}

A97. Alcuñia: *Arrafemel* ~ *ar-rāsmāl* ‘capital, value of goods’ (RP: “a ftocke”). The Spanish headword indicates ‘progeny, descendants’, but the author seems to have interpreted English “ftocke” in RP to instead mean ‘capital’. Cf. A141 for a comparable case.

A98. Alegria: *Elfrah* ~ *al-fārḥ* ‘joy, happiness’.

A99. Aleue: *Algaddare* ~ *al-ġaddār* ‘treason, treachery’.

A100. Aleuso: *Gauddar* ~ *ġaddār* ‘treasonous, treacherous’ (RP: “a traitor”).

A101. Alferez: *Allem* ~ *allām* ‘ensign, standard-bearer’ (RP: “an ancient bearer”).

A102. Alforgia: *Asimmat* ~ *as-samāt* ‘saddlebag’ (RP: “a wallet”). Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 6, p. 191).

A103. Algalia: *Algalia* ~ *al-ġālya* ‘civet, civet musk’ (RP: “ciuet”). Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 9, p. 412).

A104a. Algarbe: *Algaure* ~ *al-ġār* ‘cavern, pit’ (RP: “a den, a hole, a pit”).

A104b. Algarbe: *Assebau* ~ *aš-šāba* ‘vaulted passageway covered by buildings’. Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 8, p. 3); <e> may be a miscopying of <a>.

A105. Algibe: *Matamora* ~ *maṭmūra* ‘vault, crypt’ (RP: “a cefsterne, a prifon under ground”). Cf. the same in A225.

A106. Algodon: *Alcoton* ~ *al-qūṭan* ‘cotton’.

A107. Alhaia: *Allohaya* ~ *al-luhya* ‘valuables’ (RP: “houfhold ftuffe”). Not in PRÉMARE, but cf. sense ‘gift’ in IBN MANẒŪR (p. 4091).

A108. Aliçafe: *Alifes* ~ *al-āsās* ‘foundation’.

A109. Aliox: *Arrocham* ~ *ar-ruḡām* ‘marble’.

A110. Aljofor: *Aljouhar* ~ *al-žawḥar* ‘pearl’.

A111. Alma: *Arough* ~ *ar-rūḥ* ‘soul’ (RP: “the foule, the mind, the spirit”).

A112. Almaden: *Elmaden* ~ *al-mā’dan* ‘mine’ (RP: “a mine of mettall”).

A113. Almadraque: *Almohadda* ~ *al-muxadda* ‘cushion, pillow’ (RP: “a bolfter or a pillow”). Perhaps shows orthographic influence from Spanish in <h> for /x/ (rather than <ch>).

A114. Almendro: *Sejera m̄tata luz* ~ *sažra m̄tāt al-lūz* ‘almond tree’. Cf. A155 and next entry.

A115. Almendra: *louze* ~ *lawz* ‘almond’.

A116. Almilla: *Elgo lila* ~ *al-ġulila* ‘type of upper garment’ (RP: “a waftcoat”).

A117. [no entry]: *Elmifque* ~ *al-mašk* ‘musk’. Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 11, p. 201). In order in RP as “Almizque” despite no headword.

A118. Almofia: *Elmethred* ~ *al-maṭrād* ‘bowl, basin’ (RP: “a diñ”). Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 2, p. 43).

A119. Almohada: Vfada ~ *wasāda* ‘cushion, pillow’.

A120. Almohaça: Almohaca emta l’halsan ~ *əl-muḥassa əmtā’ əl-ḥaşān* ‘currycomb’.

A121. Almorzar: Alfutoure ~ *əl-fuṭūr* ‘breakfast’ (RP: “to break fast”).

A122. Alqueria: Adefhar ~ *əd-dəṣr* ‘village, hamlet’ (RP: “a ferme”). Cf. plural of the same in A91.

A123. Alquimista: Taja bereet ~ *tāžābrīt* ‘alchemy’ (RP: “an Alchimist”). Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 2, p. 144), where it is given instead as the art of counterfeiting.

A124. Alteza: Almacam ~ *əl-məqām* ‘Excellence (of royalty)’ (RP: “highnes, loftines, highnes in eftate”).

A125. Alumbre: Ash fheb ~ *əš-šəbb* ‘alum’ (RP: “Alume”).

A126. Alua: Soba bequirj ~ *šubḥ bəkri* ‘early morning, daybreak’.

A127. Aluarcoque: El miṣḥ maṣḥ ~ *əl-məšmāš* ‘apricot’. Cf. the same in C23.

A128. Amador: Azizee ~ *‘zizi* ‘my beloved’ (RP: “a louer”).

A129. Amara: Atual ~ *ət-təwāl* ‘rope, cord’.

A130. Amafsador: Aijan ~ *‘əžžān* ‘baker’. Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 9, p. 36).

A131. Ambar gris: Lambar ~ *l-‘ənbər* ‘amberggris’.

A132. Amigo: Sahaubee ~ *šāḥabi* ‘my friend (m.)’ (RP: “a friend, a louer”).

A133. Amiga: Sahaubatee ~ *šāḥabti* ‘my friend (f.)’. Cf. the same in A1.

A134a. Amiftad: Elmaarfa ~ *əl-mə’rfa* ‘friendship, acquaintance’ (RP: “friendship, goodwill”).

A134b. Amiftad: Asohoba ~ *əš-šuḥba* ‘friendship, acquaintance’.

A135. Amonestacion: yehaddee ~ *yəḥḍi* ‘to warn’ (RP: “warning”).

A136. Amparo: yalcaf ~ *yəlqəf (?)* ‘to take into one’s hand?’ (RP: “defence, protection”). Proposed verb is widespread with meaning ‘to catch, to grab’, but not ‘to protect’. The author may have attempted to demonstrate the latter sense by extending a hand, instead eliciting the former.

A137. Ampolla: Albocall ~ *əl-būqāl* ‘carafe’ (RP: “a drinking glasse ...”). Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 1, p. 354).

{f. 99v}

A138. Anade: Alborack ~ *əl-burk* ‘waterfowl’ (RP: “a ducke, or drake”). Cf. the same in A148.

A139. Anca: Alkefel alafsan ~ *kəfəl əl-ḥaşān* ‘rump of a horse’ (RP: “the hips, or horfes buttocke”). Article indicated on first word with <Al> is ungrammatical.

A140. Ancla: Elcaba ~ *əl-kə’ba* ‘ankle?’ (RP: “an anker”). Sp. headword means ‘anchor’ (of a ship); the author may have conflated this with ‘ankle’. Alternatively, *kə’ba* may have been used metaphorically for ‘anchor’; cf. the sense “nom donné à divers objets ayant la forme d’un croissant” in PRÉMARE (v. 10, p. 95).

A141. Anciano: El el am ~ *əl-‘əlām* ‘flag, banner’ (RP: “ancient”). Cf. the same in A207. Though the Sp. headword here means ‘old, ancient’, the author of the vocabulary interpreted “ancient” in RP in its archaic sense of ‘flag, banner’. See the word “ancient” in A101, as well as A97 for a similar case.

A142. Anchura: Mu wafsa ~ *muwəssə’* ‘having width, breadth’ (RP: “breadth, largenes”).

A143. Angel: El melleica ~ *əl-mələyka* ‘angels’ (RP: “an angel”).

A144. anguilla: Annun ~ *ən-nūn* ‘eel’.

A145a. Anillo: Alcatem ~ *al-xātəm* ‘ring’. Perhaps shows miscopying of an original “Alchatem,” with <h> transposed.

A145b. Anillo: El chorfa ~ *al-xurṣa* ‘earring’ (RP: “a ring”). Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 4, p. 54) and the plural in A160.

A146. Animal: El beheima ~ *al-bāhīma* ‘animal, beast’.

A147a. Anoria: Afenia ~ *as-sānya* ‘well in which a waterwheel is installed’ (RP: “a well or engine to draw water”). Cf. the same in A35.

A147b. Anoria: Anaúra ~ *an-nā’ūra* ‘waterwheel’.

A148. Anfar: Elborack ~ *al-burk* ‘waterfowl’ (RP: “a goofe”). Cf. the same in A138.

A149. Antiparas: Atimock ~ *at-tāmāq* ‘gaiters, leggings’ (RP: “bootes, bukkins”). Cf. the same in A237.

A150. Antojos: An nadaurat ~ *an-naḍḍārāt* ‘eyeglasses’ (RP: “Ipectacles ...”).

A151a. Congoxa: Muhayar ~ *muḥayyər* ‘confused, perplexed’ (RP: “greefe, cares”). Corresponds with order of headword “Anxia, congoxa” in RP.

A151b. Congoxa: Carena ~ *qārīna* ‘nervous breakdown’. Cf. “crise de nerfs, fureur, rage provoquée par qqch. que l'on ne peut supporter” in PRÉMARE (v. 10, p. 310).

A152a. Año: Añee ~ *ām(āyən?)* ‘two years?’ (RP: “a yeere”). The final <ee> is perhaps a dual suffix, as the below entry for this singular headword is also plural.

A152b. Año: Sañeene ~ *sənīn* ‘years’.

A153. Apetito: Xauat ~ *šahwāt* ‘appetite’. In construct state.

A154. Apuesta: Alchotar ~ *al-xuṭār* ‘bet, wager’. Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 4, p. 106).

A155. Arbol: Sejera ~ *səžra* ‘tree’ (RP: “a tree”). Transcription suggests dissimilation of /š/ to /s/; cf. the same in A114.

A156. Arena: Romela ~ *ramla* ‘sand’.

A157. Argadija: El maruṃa ~ *al-məṣamma* ‘framework, contraption’ (RP: “the frame of any thing”). Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 5, p. 214) and the same in C4.

A158. Armada: La amara ~ *la-māra* ‘crew of a ship’ (RP: “a fleete”). Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 9, p. 235).

A159. Armadijas: Azubeca ~ *az-zubqa* ‘trap, snare’ (RP: “fnares or traps to catch birds or beafts”). Not in PRÉMARE, but cf. the verb *zabaqa* ‘he made fast, or bound or tied fast or firmly, a sheep or goat... round the neck, with a cord’ in LANE (p. 1212).

A160. Arracadas: Allacharas ~ *al-axrās* ‘earrings’ (RP: “earings”). Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 4, p. 54) and the singular in A145b.

A161. Arroz: Arrauz ~ *ar-rəwz* ‘rice’.

A162. Arruga: Tekeemesh ~ *təkmīš* ‘wrinkles’. Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 10, p. 620); perhaps a miscopying of an original “tekemeesh.”

A163a. Arte: Malim ~ *m'allām* ‘skilled, talented’ (RP: “art, science, cunning, craft, deceit”). Cf. the same in A76 and A164. Here and immediately below, an adjective is given rather than the noun in the headword.

A164b. Arte: Shatter ~ *šātər* ‘skilled, talented’.

A164. Artero: Mallem ~ *m'allām* ‘crafty, skilled’ (RP: “cunning, craftie, deceitfull”). Cf. A76 and A163a.

A165. Artejo: El lucad emta leed ~ *al-uqad əmtā* ‘l-idd’ ‘knuckle’, lit. ‘joints of the hand’ (RP: “the ioint of the finger”). Cf. modern ‘aqda’ ‘knot’ (f.) and the same with a different sense in A239.

A166a. Artificio: Mefsono ~ *məʃnūʕ* ‘handicraft, artifact’ (RP: “workmanship, cunning”).

A166b. Artificio: Mudabar ~ *mudəbbər* ‘handicraft, artifact’.

A167. Artinana: yetlehau ~ *yətlāha* ‘to play a trick’ (RP: “deceit”). Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 11, p. 94).

A168. Artilleria: Alemfat ~ *l-ənfāt* ‘cannons’ (RP: “artillerie, ordinance”). Cf. DOZY (1927: v. 2, p. 704).

A169a. Arveja: Lades ~ *lə-ʔəs* ‘lentils’ (RP: “pease”).

A169b. Arveja: jilban ~ *ʒəlbān* ‘peas’.

A169c. Arveja: kicar ~ *kikər* ‘chickpeas’. Cf. Tashelhiyt Be. *ikikr* < La. *cicer*. In modern varieties is typically *ħamməs*.

A170. oportunidad: mennee / tacanat ~ *mnīn təqənnət* (?) ‘when you find an [advantageous] angle?’ (RP: “... occasion, opportunity”). Across two lines; cf. the same verb in A188. Headword corresponds with order of “Afa” in RP. The proposed verb *qənnət* is denominal from *qənt* ‘corner, angle’, which can also be used metaphorically in the sense of gaining an advantage, e.g., “coupe de tête donné dans la lutte à son adversaire” in PRÉMARE (v. 10, p. 432).

A171. Afcua: Ajumar menta anor ~ *əʒ-ʒəməʁ mətāʕ ən-nār* ‘embers of a fire’ (RP: “hot coals”). Cf. the singulative in A244.

A172. Afno: Al hamar ~ *əl-ħamār* ‘donkey, ass (m.)’.

A173. Afna: hamara ~ *ħəməra* ‘donkey, ass (f.)’.

A174. Afpa: Afphu ~ *əʃ-ʃfa* ‘reel for thread’. Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 8, p. 84), who gives for Zaër *ʃfāt* “les deux poutres plates horizontales du métier à tisser, l'une en haut et l'autre en fas;” here is

presumably the singular form. The final <u> may be a miscopying of “a.” A romance origin is probable.

A175*. Assadero: Safud ~ *səffūd* ‘spit, skewer’.

{f. 100r}

A176. Asta: Elloud emta emz-rock ~ *l-ʕūd əmtāʕ əmzrāq* ‘shaft of a lance’.

A177a. Astronomia: Enaujam ~ *yənəʒʒəm* ‘to stargaze, astrologize’ (RP: “Astrologie”). Headword replaces “Astrología” in RP.

A177b. Astronomia: tanijm ~ *tənʒīm* ‘astronomy, astrology’. The sequence <ij> may have been miscopied from its inverse.

A178. Atabal: Atabal ~ *ət-təbl* ‘tambourine, small drum’.

A179. Atadura: Marbit ~ *mərḥəṭ* ‘tether, tie’.

A180*. Atanquia: Allacod ~ *əl-ləqqāt* ‘pincers, tweezers’. Full headword in RP is “Atanquia para arrancar pelos.”

A181. Ataud: Anafhe ~ *ən-nʕāʃ* ‘bier, coffin, casket’ (RP: “a tombe, a beere for dead men, a coffine”).

A182. Auditor: yefemau ~ *yəsməʕ* ‘to hear’ (RP: “an hearer”).

A183. Antillo: Elhema ~ *əl-ħāma* ‘owl’. Cf. the same in A250 and PRÉMARE (v. 6, p. 12); headword is miscopied from “autillo” in RP.

A184. Autoridad: Azik [im?] ~ *əs-səkkīn* (?) ‘saber?’ (RP: “authoritie”). The headword here is clear, but expected root is *ħ-k-m*, which is marginally tenable if the <z> were an instance of miscopying. If the <z> is correct as is, it may reflect ‘authority’ as instituted through “the force of the sabre.”

A185a. Auritia: *xeh* ~ *ṣəḥḥ* ‘greed, avarice’. Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 7, p. 36). On same line as below.

A185b. Auritia: *tamau* ~ *təməʕ* ‘greed, avarice’. On same line as above.

A186. Ave: *tayre* ~ *təyr* ‘bird’.

A187. Aveñolas: *Enjufan el li neyn* ~ *əʒfān əl-ʕnəyn* ‘eyelids’ (RP: “the eyelid”).

A188. Avelenteza: *Cañot biya* ~ *qənnət (?) biya* ‘it yielded me an [advantageous] angle?’ (RP: “opportunity”). Cf. A170 for discussion of the same verb.

A189a. Axorca: *Elmekeas* ~ *əl-məqyās* ‘collar’ (RP: “a brafelet, fetters”). Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 10, p. 482).

A189b. Axorca: *Muchanacau* ~ *muxənnəqa* ‘collar’. Cf. *mxiŋqa* with the same meaning in PRÉMARE (v. 4, p. 165).

A190. Azagaya: *Elharifh* ~ *əl-ḥərīš* ‘spear’. (RP: “a moores weapon”). Not in PRÉMARE, but cf. Central Atlas Tamazight *āḥriš* ‘goad to drive cattle’ (Taïfi 1992: 257).

A191a. Azaleia: *Zif* ~ *zif* ‘handkerchief, scarf’ (RP: “a towell”).

A191b. Azaleia: *mandil* ~ *məndil* ‘handkerchief, scarf’.

A192. Azar: *El felmao / ducan* ~ *əl-fāl* (...?) ‘bad omen’ (RP: “an ill token, an ill figne”). Across two lines. The basic noun *fāl* is near certain given the headword, but the remainder of the phrase is unclear.

A193. Azitono: *Azetun* ~ *əz-zəytūn* ‘olives’ (RP: “an oliue tree”).

A194. Azeite: *zeite* ~ *zəyt* ‘oil’.

A195. Azemila: *Albaughta* ~ *əl-bəḡla* ‘mule’ (RP: “a mule”). The <t> is clearly a miscopying of “l.”

A196. Azige tinta: *Elmeded* ~ *əl-mədād* ‘ink’.

A197. Azogue: *Azouke* ~ *əz-zāwəq* ‘mercury, quicksilver’.

A198. Baçin: *Elcor* ~ *əl-qəʕ (?)* ‘basin, tray’. Not in PRÉMARE, but cf. *qaʕ* “bottom or behind of a vase” in DOZY (1927, v.2, p. 382).

A199. Bagaje: *Adurd* ~ *ət-tərd (?)* ‘army equipment’ (RP: “baggage”). In PRÉMARE (v. 8, pp. 279-280) the root is associated with military ensigns and their bearers, not generic equipment, but cf. *tard* ‘package, parcel’ in HINDS & BADAWI (1986: 535).

A200a. Bafo: *El nephes* ~ *ən-nəfəs* ‘breath’. (RP: “vapor”). In RP alongside alphabetical “Baho.”

A200b. Bafo: *Bughar* ~ *buxār* ‘vapor, fume’.

A201. Baya de mar: *Al marsa* ~ *əl-mərša* ‘anchorage’ (RP: “a baie, a creeke”).

A202. Balas: *Alcovar* ~ *əl-kuwār* ‘cannonballs, projectiles’ (RP: “a bullet”).

A203. Balança: *Elmizan* ~ *əl-mizān* ‘scale’ (RP: “a balance”).

A204a. Baldon: *Alchatau* ~ *əl-xəta* ‘curse, rebuke’ (RP: “a scoffe, a taunt”).

A204b. Baldon: *Dawa* ~ *dəʕwa* ‘curse, rebuke’. Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 4, p. 286).

A205. Balesta: *Alcous* ~ *əl-qəws* ‘crossbow’.

A206a. Balfamo: *Adua* ~ *əd-dwa* ‘salve, balm’.

A206b. Balfamo: *Barham* ~ *baḥḥam* ‘salve, balm’.

A207. Bandera: *Al allam* ~ *əl-ʕlām* ‘flag, banner’. Cf. the same in A 141. Not in RP, but alphabetical here.

A208. Bañño: *El hamam* ~ *əl-həmmām* ‘bath’.

A209a. Barahamuda: *Al cofam* ~ *əl-xuṣām* ‘uproar, commotion, discord’ (RP: “a tumult, a turmoyle”). Cf. the same in

A245 and PRÉMARE (v. 4, p. 91).

Headword in RP is "barahunda".

A209b. Barahamuda: *galag* ~ *gəlāg* 'uproar, commotion, discord'. Cf. *qlāq* in PRÉMARE (v. 10, p. 408).

A209c. Barahamuda: *cholta* ~ *xulṭa* 'uproar, commotion, discord'. In PRÉMARE (v. 4, p. 125) sense is different, but *xlāt* has the same meaning; cf. same root and sense in A83.

A210. Baraton: *Trudgeman* ~ *tuṣṣamān* 'dragoman', encountered as 'one who deals in trade' (RP: "a broker"). Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 2, p. 42).

{f. 100v}

A211. Barca: *Alcarb* ~ *al-qārəb* 'boat' (RP: "a boate, a barcke, a flkiffe").

A212a. Barriga: *Albaton* ~ *al-bəṭən* 'belly, stomach' (RP: "the paunch, the belly, the womb ..."). This and the below entry give different senses of the same headword.

A212b. Barriga: *elceire* ~ *al-qəyr* 'penis' (RP: "... the priuie parts"). Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 10, p. 478).

A213. Barva: *Lahya* ~ *lahya* 'beard'.

A214. [no entry]: *El buab* ~ *bəwwāb* 'porter, doorman'. Cf. the same in A13. In order in RP as "Bastaje" despite no headword.

A215. Bastardo: *wold ajjina* ~ *wəld əz-zəna* 'bastard'.

A216a. Batel: *Laxeria* ~ *lə-šāriya* 'ten-oared rowboat' (RP: "a fhip boat, a flkiffe"). Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 9, p. 114); full headword in RP is "Batel de nave".

A216b. Batel: *Azwerca* ~ *əz-zwārqa* 'rowboat, skiff' (RP: "a fhip boat, a flkiffe"). Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 5, p. 412), where it is called a classicalism (unlikely here).

A217a. Labia: *shufau* ~ *šaffa* 'lip'.

A217b. Labia: *xerb* ~ *šārəb* 'lip'.

A218. Beldad: *lemilt* / *assora* ~

žəmilət (?) *əš-šūra* 'beauty' (RP: "beautie"). Across two lines, but perhaps a single phrase, with letter <l> a miscopying of "J."

A219. Befo: *Busfa* ~ *būsa* 'a kiss'.

A220. Vexiga: *Mabuela* ~ *məbwəla* 'bladder' (RP: "bladder"). Cf. *nbūla* in PRÉMARE (v. 1, p. 365), confirming speculation there on source form.

A221. Bezerro: *Agil* ~ *əžəl* 'calf'.

A222a. Bienes: *mal* ~ *māl* 'property' (RP: "goods").

A222b. Bienes: *afal* ~ *əs-səl* 'wares' (RP: "goods").

A223a. Vefperas: *Elaafar* ~ *əl-əṣər* 'evening'.

A223b. Vefperas: *Laxia* ~ *lə-šīya* 'evening'.

A224. Viuda: *Elmarau haiela* ~ *əl-məra hažžāla* 'widow'.

A225. bobeda: *matamora* ~ *mətmūra* 'vault, crypt'. Cf. the same in A105.

A226. boca: *El phum* ~ *əl-fumm* 'mouth'.

A227. bocado: *Lucoma* ~ *luqma* 'morsel, bite'.

A228. Boçero: *tiphuah* ~ *tafwāh* 'yawning' (RP: "gaping"). Headword a miscopying of "Bocezo" in RP.

A229. Bodas: *Alours* ~ *əl-ʿurs* 'wedding' (RP: "a mariage").

A230. Bodega: *Alchozana* ~ *əl-xuzāna* 'cellar, store'. Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 4, p. 72).

A231. Boya: *Alcarnif* / *mutaraz* ~ *əl-kərnif mutarrəs* 'buoy', lit. 'fastened cork' (RP: "a booy, a corke for a net or angle"). Across two lines. Not in PRÉMARE; cf. 'cork' in A94.

A232. Bolfas: *Tfcharat* ~ *(əš-)škārāt* 'sacks, bags' (RP: "a purfe"). Initial <T> may be a miscopying of "E," representing the article.

A233a. Bondad: mencheare ~ *mən xyār* ‘the best [of]’ (RP: “goodnes”).

A233b. Bondad: milata ~ *mālāḥa* (?) ‘goodness, kindness’. Here < t > may be a miscopying of “h.”

A234. Boneta: Xixia ~ *šāšiya* ‘cap, hat’. Not in PRÉMARE, but cf. CORRIENTE (1997: 271), which also supports an alternative reading as *šišiya*.

A235. Bonuelo: Lefphinge ~ *l-əsfənž* ‘fritter’ (RP: “a cake”). Full headword in RP is “Boñuelo Almojavana.”

A236. Boraſca: Elhouxa falbor ~ *əl-həwša fə-l-bəḥr* ‘squall, storm at sea’ (RP: “a tempest”).

A237. tomaka: Atimock ~ *ət-təmāq* ‘gaiters, leggings’ (RP: “a buskin”). Cf. the same in A149; headword replaces “Borzegui” in RP.

A238. Boske: Algaba ~ *əl-ġāba* ‘forest’ (RP: “a wood, a groue, a coppesse”).

A239. Boton: Alacod ~ *əl-‘əqad* ‘button’ (RP: “a button, a bud ...”). Cf. the same with a different sense in A165.

A240. vozes: Eli [en] t ~ *əl-‘ayāt* ‘yelling, shouting’ (RP: “to crie out”). Headword in RP spelled “Boces,” hence order.

A241a. Bozina: Algarne ~ *əl-ġarn* ‘musical horn’ (RP: “a trumpet ...”). Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 10, p. 311).

A241b. Bozina: Enfire ~ *ən-nfir* ‘musical horn’. Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 11, p. 418) and plural in next entry.

A241c. Bozina: Lomfar ~ *l-ənḥār* ‘musical horns’. Cf. singular above.

A242. Braço: Draw ~ *drā‘* ‘arm’. Lacks interdental /d/.

A243. Bragas: Asarawil ~ *as-sərwāl* ‘pants worn under outer covering’ (RP: “breeches”).

A244. Braça del fuego: Gemara emta nor ~ *žəmṛa əmtā‘ n-nār* ‘ember of a fire’ (RP: “a cole”). Cf. the collective in A171. Headword in RP is “Brafa” alone; the clarification “del fuego” is by the author.

A245. Brega: Elchofom ~ *əl-xuṣām* ‘argument, quarrel’ (RP: “frife”). Cf. the same in A209a.

A246. Brezna: Angiar lowed ~ *ənžār l-‘ūd* ‘wood chips’ (RP: “a chip”).

A247*. majun: Elphorgil ~ *əs-sfəržəl* ‘quince, preserved as a jam (*mə‘žūn*)’ (RP: “marmelad”). Headword, which is itself Arabic, replaces “Brimbillada” in RP.

{f. 101r}

A248. Id.: Brocado ~ *bərkaḍu* ‘brocade (fabric)’ (RP: “cloth of gold”). Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 1, p. 204).

A249. Bronze: Enhas ~ *ən-nḥās* ‘copper, brass’ (RP: “braffe”). Cf. the same in A75.

A250. Buarro: Hama ~ *hāma* ‘owl’. Cf. the same in A183.

A251. Buy: Thaure ~ *təwṛ* ‘bull’ (RP: “an ox”). Cf. plural below.

A252. Bueys: Thiran ~ *tīrān* ‘bulls’. Cf. singular above.

A253. Buelo: Tar ~ *tār* ‘he flew’ (RP: “flight”).

A254. Buba: Bubafh ~ *būbāš* ‘venereal lesion’ (RP: “a botch, a boile, the french pockes”). Cf. DOZY (1927: v. 1, p. 50); from Sp. “bubas.”

3.2 Part B. Arabic numerals from f. 1r

B1. 1: *wahad* ~ *wāḥad* ‘one’.

B2. 2: *Knino* ~ *tnīn* (*w*?) ‘two’.

B3. 3: *cleta* ~ *tlāta* ‘three’.

B4. 4: *Vrbah* ~ *ṛab’a* ‘four’.

B5. 5: *Humsah* ~ *xamsa* ‘five’.

B6. 6: *stah* ~ *satta* ‘six’

B7. 7: *Subaugh* ~ *sab’a* ‘seven’

B8. 8: *Demaneah* ~ *tmānya* ‘eight’.

B9. 9: *Saw* ~ *tas’a* ‘nine’.

B10. 10: *Asheroḥ* ~ *ʿašra* ‘ten’.

B11. 20: *Ashring* ~ *ʿašrīn* ‘twenty’.

B12. 30: *Cleting* ~ *tlātin* ‘thirty’.

B13. 40: *Vrbyn* ~ *ṛab’in* ‘forty’.

B14. 50: *Humseyn* ~ *xamsīn* ‘fifty’.

B15. 60: *Stein* ~ *sattīn* ‘sixty’.

B16. 70: *Subein* ~ *sab’in* ‘seventy’.

B17. 80: *Demanein* ~ *tmānīn* ‘eighty’.

B18. 90: *Sein* ~ *tas’in* ‘ninety’

B19. 100: *Meah* ~ *mīya* ‘one hundred’.

3.3 Part C. Plant names (etc.) as they appear in ff. 54r-70v, 97v⁶⁰

C1. Euphorbia: *Tecuite* {f. 54r}, *Tecute* {f. 97v} ~ TB *tīkiwt* ‘*Euphorbia* sp.’. Description and illustration on f. 54r; classed as an herb on f. 97v.

C2. Anteuphorbia: *Ashebardough* {f. 54v} ~ TB *āšbārḡu* ‘*Kleinia anteuphorbium*’. Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 1, p. 53). Description on f. 54v; classed as an herb on f. 97v.

C3. Anel, Anil {f. 54v} ~ *an-nīl* ‘indigo, *Indigofera tinctoria*’. Long description on f. 54v.

C4. marumma {f. 54v} ~ *māṛamma* ‘framework, contraption’, here for producing indigo dye. Illustration present; cf. the same lexeme in A157.

C5. Fitch: *Taddute* {f. 55r} ~ *tāddūt* ‘Acacia, *Senegalia* sp.’. Name alone on f. 55r; short description on 97v, where it is classed as a shrub. The co-

identification with “fitch” (modern vetch) is probably due to similar foilage.

C6. Dolone shrub: *Asleliph* {f. 56r} ~ *āslīf* ‘*Periploca angustifolia*’ (TB). Description on f. 56r; classed as a shrub on f. 97v.

C7. Sug: *Tahamud* {ff. 56r, 97v} ~ (?). Apparently TB. Unidentified; descriptions on both 56r and 97v.

C8. Chondrilla, Gum Succory: *Aphsaz* {ff. 57r, 58r} ~ (?) ‘*Chondrilla* sp.’. Apparently TB. Description, illustration, and a reference to Gerard (1597, 224) on f. 57r; classed as an “herbe” on f. 97v. Name and description are struck through on f. 58r.

C9. : Ingill {f. 58r} ~ *nzil* (?) ‘bermuda grass, *Cynodon dactylon*’? Description on f. 58r, classed as a shrub on f. 97v. A reference to it killing camels can

⁶⁰ Unlike the items in Parts A and B above, these do not appear consecutively in a list, but are rather scattered throughout the manuscript. Only a portion have English glosses, and descriptions vary from none at all to several lines. Other species are described in the manuscript, but only those for which apparent Arabic or Berber names are given are included here. Note the abbreviation “TB” for Tashelhiyt Berber.

perhaps be explained as the result of contamination with *ergot*.

C10. Tasserough {ff. 58r, 97v} ~ TB *tāslġa* ‘Alypo globe daisy, *Globularia alypum*’. Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 2, p. 11). Description on f. 58r; classed as a shrub on f. 97v.

C11. Indian Figg: Tezeteromeine {f. 62r}, **Tezeteromine** {f. 97v} ~ TB *tāzārt iṛūmmīn* ‘Indian fig, prickly pear, *Opuntia ficus-indica*’. Lit. ‘Christian fig’ and calqued in modern Ar. *karmūš n-nṣāra*. Description and illustration on f. 62r.; classed as a shrub on f. 97v.

C12. Alhany {ff. 64r, 97v} ~ *al-ḥanna* (?) ‘henna tree, *Lawsonia inermis*’. Described as similar to privet (*Ligustrum* sp.) on f. 64r and classed as a tree on f. 97v.

C13. Rongke {ff. 65r, 97v} ~ *rənd* (?) ‘laurel, *Laurus nobilis*’. Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 5, p. 220). Described as the morphologically similar lilac on f. 65r and classed as a shrub on f. 97v.

C14. Goros {f. 65r} ~ *kərrūš* ‘holm oak (*Quercus rotundifolia*)’. Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 10, p. 553).

C15. Alkakenj {f. 70v} ~ *al-kākanž* ‘Chinese lantern (*Alkekengi officinarum*)’. In unorganized “simples of herbes” list; one of two apparent Arabic terms.

C16. salmia {f. 70v} ~ *sālmīya* ‘*Salvia officinalis*’. In unorganized “simples of herbes” list; the other apparent Arabic term.

C17. [T?]ilday {f. 97v} ~ (?). Apparently TB. Classed alongside fruit-bearing trees; possibly TB *tildāy* ‘rope made of palm fiber’ given position above next entry.

C18. Date tree: [S?]hee / fhee {f. 97v} ~ *šiši* (?) ‘type of date palm’. Across two lines; initial character uncertain. Not in PRÉMARE, though

proposed reading is a known type of date in the Arabian peninsula.

C19. Pomegranate: Romane {f. 97v} ~ *rummān* ‘*Punica granatum*’.

C20. Orange: simboah {f. 97v} ~ *zənbu* ‘*Citrus* sp.’. Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 5, p. 381).

C21. Locuste tree: Tikkedah {f. 97v} ~ TB *tikiḍa* ‘carob, *Ceratonia siliqua*’.

C22. Belingenios: bendlejan {f. 97v} ~ *bdālžān* ‘eggplant, *Solanum melongena*’. Description and illustration on f. 65r; classed alongside fruit-bearing trees (?) on f. 97v.

C23. Apricocke: mifhmašh {f. 97v} ~ *māšmāš* ‘apricot, *Prunus armeniaca*’. Cf. the same in A127.

C24. Vine tree grapes: Lanib {f. 97v} ~ *lā-nəb* ‘*Vitis vinifera*’.

C25. Organ {f. 97v} ~ TB *ārgān* ‘*Sideroxylon spinosum*’.

C26. Tamarik: Tammayd {f. 97v} ~ TB *tāmmāyt* ‘*Tamarix* sp.’

C27. Quinces: Sphirgill {f. 97v} ~ *as-sfəṛžəl* ‘*Cydonia oblonga*’. Cf. the same in A247.

C28. Wowreret {f. 97v} ~ *wəwrārət* (?) ‘castor bean, *Ricinus communis*’. Cf. several similar terms (“awreywīr,” “*auriur/aorēor,” “*wāugīrt,” “*wāulgrīt”) for same species in TAINE-CHEIKH (2021). Classed as an herb and described as smelling like marjarom.

C29. Time wild: pirginge {f. 97v} ~ (?) ‘wild thyme’. Classed as an herb.

C30. [E?]lhabbock {f. 97v} ~ *al-ḥabəq* ‘basil (*Ocimum basilicum*)’. Classed as an herb, but description mentions “knotty berries,” so perhaps a different species.

C31. plantaine: Lemfufesa {f. 97v} ~ *l-məššāša* ‘*Plantago* sp.’. Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 11, p. 216). Classed as an herb.

C32. Clouér: Lefelsa {f. 97v}~ *l-fəṣṣa* ‘clover (*Trifolium* sp.)’. Classed as an herb.

C33. fennell: Crowide {f. 97v}~ *kərwīyat-* (?) ‘caraway, *Carum carvi*’? Cf. PRÉMARE (v. 10, p. 570). Classed as an herb; was perhaps heard in the construct state, implying different sub-types.

These might include *Foeniculum* sp. (the ‘fennel’ of modern English, which is modern MA *bəsbās*).

C34. Tazite {f. 97v}~ (?). Apparently TB. Classed as an herb and described as a long-leaved flowering plant with a “seed like fenn[el]” and an unsavory taste.

4. References

- AGUADÉ, J. (2010): On Vocalism in Moroccan Arabic Dialects. In: AL JALLAD, N. – MONFERRER-SALA, J.P. (eds.): *The Arabic Language Across the Ages*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 95–105.
- BOUDLAL, A. 2001. Constraint Interaction in the Phonology and Morphology of Casablanca Moroccan Arabic. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- CAWSTON, G., – KEANE, A. (1896): *The Early Chartered Companies (A.D. 1296-1858)*. London; New York: Edward Arnold.
- CORRIENTE, F. 1997. *A dictionary of Andalusī Arabic*. Leiden; New York: Brill.
- DOZY, R. (1927): *Supplément Aux Dictionnaires Arabes* (2nd ed.). 2 vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- FERRANDO, I. (2004). Andalusī Arabic in Its Linguistic Setting. *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 29, 41–54.
- FRANCISCO, F. (2024): Old Vernacular Features of Moroccan Arabic under the Light of Their Portuguese Translation (16th Century). In: OLIVIERI, S. – TALAY, S. (eds.): *Current Research in Semitic Studies: Proceedings of the Semitic Studies Section at the 34th DOT at Freie Universität Berlin*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 283–296.
- GERARD, J. (1597): *The Herball, or, Generall Historie of Plantes*. London: Iohn Norton.
- GUERRERO, J. (2019): Reflexes of Old Arabic */ğ/ in the Maghrebi Dialects. In: *Arabica* 66(1–2), 137–169.
- GUERRERO, J. (2023a): Analyse linguistique d’un corpus épistolaire en moyen arabe: Les lettres luso-marocaines conservées aux archives nationales de la Torre do Tombo. In: *Arabica* 70(1–2), 69–112.
- GUERRERO, J. (2023b): Towards a Diachronic Study of Moroccan Arabic: On Some Vernacular Dialectal Features of the Sixteenth-Century Arabic Materials Preserved in the Arquivo Nacional Da Torre Do Tombo. In: *Al-Qanṭara* 44(2), e16.
- GUERRERO, J., – TURNER, M. – BENÍTEZ FERNÁNDEZ, M. – GONZÁLEZ VÁZQUEZ, A. (2024): The First Published Vocabulary of Moroccan Arabic: A ‘Re-Edition’ of Germain Moüette’s 1683 Dictionnaire François-Arabe. In: *Kervan – International Journal of Afro-Asiatic Studies* 28(2), 171–216.
- HEATH, J. (1997): Moroccan Arabic Phonology. In: KAYE, A. – DANIELS, P. (eds.): *Phonologies of Asia and Africa (Including the Caucasus)*. University Park: Eisenbrauns, 205–217.
- HEATH, J. (2002): *Jewish and Muslim Dialects of Moroccan Arabic*. London; New York: RoutledgeCurzon.

- HINDS M. – BADAWI, E. (1986): *A Dictionary of Egyptian Arabic: Arabic-English*. Beirut: Librairie du Liban.
- HOPKINS, S., 2015. *George Borrow's Moorish Vocabulary (Tangiers 1839)*. Warborough, Wallingford, Oxfordshire: Lavengro Press.
- IBN MANZŪR, M (n.d.): *Lisān Al-ʿArab*. AL-KABĪR, M. – ḤASAB ALLĀH, M. – AL-SHĀDHILĪ, M. (eds.). 6 vols. Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif.
- KAMPPFMEYER, G. (1912): *Marokkanisch-arabische Gespräche im Dialekt von Casablanca: mit Vergleichung des Dialekts von Tanger*. Berlin: G. Reimer.
- KITLAS, P. – TURNER, M. (2024): Dialects of Diplomacy in Eighteenth-Century Morocco: Middle Arabic in the Correspondence of Ambassador Aḥmad al-Ghazzāl. In: *The Journal of North African Studies* 29(6), 1016–51.
- LANCASHIRE PARISH REGISTER SOCIETY (1908): *The Registers of the Cathedral Church of Manchester: Christenings, Burials, and Weddings 1573–1616*. Cambridge: John Clay at the University Press.
- LANE, E. (1863): *An Arabic–English Lexicon*. LANE-POOLE, S. (ed. vols. 6–8). London: Williams and Norgate.
- LARBI, E. (2024): Notes sur l'arabe de Tlemcen au XVI^e siècle à partir d'une lettre zianide. In: BERLINCHES RAMOS, C. – GUERRERO, J. – BENÍTEZ FERNÁNDEZ, M. (eds.): *AIDA Granada: A Pomegranate of Arabic Varieties*. Zaragoza: Prensas de la Universidad de Zaragoza, 301–312.
- LOUBIGNAC, V. (1952): *Textes arabes des Zaër: transcription, traduction, notes et lexique*. Paris: Librairie orientale et américaine M. Besson.
- MÁRMOL CARVAJAL, L. 1573. *Primera Parte de La Descripción General de África*. 2 vols. Granada.
- MEOUAK, M. (2005): Un texte algérien en arabe dialectal du xv^e siècle: édition critique, transcription vocalisée et observations linguistiques. In: *Estudios De Dialectología Norteafricana y Andalusí* 9, 115–23.
- MEOUAK, M. (2016): Lettres algériennes en arabe dialectal du XVI^e siècle : le registre no 58 de l'Archivo general de Simancas. In: *Études et Documents Berbères* 35-36(1), 331–343.
- PERCIVALE, R. (1591): *Bibliotheca Hispanica: Containing a Grammar, with a Dictionarie in Spanish, English, and Latine, Gathered out of Diuers Good Authors: Very Profitable for the Studios of the Spanish Toong*. London: Iohn Iackson, for Richard Watkins.
- PRÉMARE, A. (1993–1999). *Langue et culture marocaines: dictionnaire arabe-français*. 12 vols. Paris: Editions l'Harmattan.
- PROCHÁZKA, S. (2022): Towards a Typology of Attributive Adjectives in Arabic Dialects. In: *STUF - Language Typology and Universals* 75(4), 525–53.
- STANNARD, J. (1974): Medieval Herbals and Their Development. In: *Clio Medica* 9(1), 23–33.
- STROOMER, H. (2000): An early European source on Berber: Chamberlayne (1715). In: CHAKER, S. (ed.): *Etudes berbères et chamito-sémitiques: mélanges offerts à Karl-G. Prasse*. Louvain: Peeters Publishers, 303–316.
- TAÏFI, M. (1992): *Dictionnaire Tamazight-Français: Parlers Du Maroc Central*. Paris: L'Harmattan-Awal.
- TAINE-CHEIKH, C. (1998): Deux Macro-Discriminants de La Dialectologie Arabe (La Réalisation Du Qâf et Des Interdentales). In: *Atériaux Arabes et Sudarabiques (GELLAS)* 9, 11–51.

- TAINÉ-CHEIKH, C. (2021): *Dictionnaire Ḥassāniyya - Français (Dialecte Arabe de Mauritanie)*, Vol. 11 : Nūn – Hāʾ – Wāw – Yāʾ. Preprint: <https://hal.science/hal-03503349>.
- TURNER, M. (2022): The Arabic of Malʿabat Al-Kafif Az-Zarhūnī (Morocco, 14th Century). *Zeitschrift Für Arabische Linguistik* 75(1), 40–67.
- TURNER, W. (1568): *The First and Seconde Parties of the Herbal ... Corrected and Enlarged with the Thirde Parte*. Cologne: Arnold Birckman.
- VANHOVE, M. (1998): De quelques traits préhilaliens en maltais. In: AGUADE, J. – CRESSIER, P. – VICENTE, Á. (eds.): *Peuplement et Arabisation au Maghreb Occidental*. Madrid - Zaragoza: Casa Velazquez - Universidad de Zaragoza, 97-108.
- VICENTE, Á. (2003): Un ejemplo de árabe medio en la correspondencia hispano-marroquí de los siglos XVI-XVII. In: *Al-Andalus Magreb* 10, 317–332.
- VICENTE, Á. (2012): Sur La Piste de l'arabe Marocain Dans Quelques Sources Écrites Anciennes (Du XIIe Au XVIe Siècle). In: MEOUAK, M. – SÁNCHEZ, P. – VICENTE, Á. (eds.): *De Los Manuscritos Medievales a Internet: La Presencia Del Árabe Vernáculo En Las Fuentes Escritas*. Zaragoza: Universidad de Zaragoza, 103–120.