An Old Amharic poem from northern Ethiopia: one more text on condemning glory
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Abstract
This article presents a publication and translation (with linguistic and philological commentaries) of a recently discovered piece of Old Amharic poetry, possibly dating to the first half of the seventeenth century. The published text bears the title Märgämä kəbr (“Condemnation of glory”), but its content differs from that of several other Old Amharic poems (not entirely independent from each other) known under the same title. It is only the general idea and the main topics that are shared by all Märgämä kəbr poems: transience of the earthly world, the inevitability of death and of God’s judgement, and the necessity of leading a virtuous life. One can thus speak of Märgämä kəbr as a special genre of early Amharic literature, probably originally belonging to the domain of oral literature and used to address the Christian community with the aim of religious education and admonition of laymen.
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The overall number of known texts bearing witness to the early stages of the Amharic language and early Amharic literature has been gradually increasing in recent years, but we are still in the process of acquiring data, so that each new text in an older variety of Amharic is important and valuable and can lead to a revision of current views. The recent research work of the project Ethio-SPaRe in northern Ethiopia (Tigray) resulted in the finding of many

1 The features of Old Amharic have been discussed in various publications of Old Amharic texts and scholarly studies, in particular the recent book by Girma Awgichew Demeke (2014). Following this author (ibid., p. 3), we will use the term “Old Amharic” to refer to the form of Amharic spoken and written in Ethiopia before the eighteenth century (with the earliest texts possibly dating from the fourteenth century). Some evidence on the earliest known stages of Amharic is contained in the so-called Arabic–Ethiopic Glossary (Bulakh and Kogan 2016).

2 The project Ethio-SPaRe: Cultural Heritage of Christian Ethiopia – Salvation, Preservation, and Research, funded by the European Research Council under the 7th
previously unknown manuscripts with Amharic texts, a few of which are definitely older than the nineteenth century. A poetic text of this kind, contained in a parchment manuscript uncovered by the project, will be discussed below. A brief description of the manuscript will be provided, followed by the text and its translation, a thorough discussion of its language, a survey of related witnesses, and a note on its genre and literary properties.

The church where the text was found is known as Läqay Kidanä Moḥrät (wäräda Ganta 'Afäšum, East Tigray), located close to the city of ’Addigrat. The text to which the present study is devoted is contained in one of the most interesting items in the church library, the codex which has received the project signature MKL-008.

I. MKL-008 Mäṣḥafä qəddase, Missal

MS MKL-008 is a Missal, i.e. the manuscript containing Mäṣḥafä qəddase (“Book of the Hallowing”), which is a more or less fixed compilation of...
liturgical texts used in the Mass. Some of the constituent parts of the Ethiopic Missal (e.g. some of the Anaphoras) have been extensively studied, but the text organization and material structure of the text carriers, as well as individual Missal-manuscripts, have rarely been discussed in scholarly works dedicated to Geez literature. However, the Missals are omnipresent in the ecclesiastical libraries and comprise a significant part of the Ethiopian manuscript heritage.

MS MKL-008 belongs to the group of pre-eighteenth-century Missals recorded by the project team. Originally a good quality book, MKL-008 was used intensively and is thus in poor condition. The text in question (referred to here as MärKL) is an added text contained on two folia, ff. 141–2. MKL-008, previously unknown and undescribed, is a very complex manuscript. Its description below is intended to help in estimating more correctly the age and the function of both the main text and MärKL, and their relation to each other.

**Physical description**

Outer dimensions (cm): 18.0 (h) × 15.5 (w) × 6.0 (t).

Binding: The codex has the typical Ethiopian binding. It was originally composed of two wooden boards covered with reddish-brown tooled leather. The front board is now missing; it has been replaced with an improvised construction made of recent newspaper and schoolbook. The back board is split and repaired with wire; it is decorated with a recent, crudely carved cross. Only the tooled turn-ins remain from the leather covering, on the inner side of the back board.

The volume is sewn on two pairs of sewing stations.

MS MKL-008 is composed of 151 ff. in 17 quires.

Quire structure: I(10/ff. 1r-10v) – II(10/ff. 11r-20v) – III(10/ff. 21r-30v) – IV(10/ff. 31r-40v) – V(10/ff. 41r-50v) – VI(10/ff. 51r-60v) – VII(10/ff. 61r-70v) – VIII(10/ff. 71r-80v) – IX(10/ff. 81r-90v) – X(10/ff. 91r-100v) – XI(10/ff. 101r-110v) – XII(10/ff. 111r-120v) – XIII(10/ff. 121r-130v) – XIV(10/ff. 131r-140v) – XV(2+1/single leaf 3, no stub/ff. 141r-143v) – XVI(2/ff. 144r-145v) – XVII(6/ff. 146r-151v).

Almost all the surviving regular text quires of MKL-008 are “quinions” composed of bifolia; no single leaves were used except for quire XV (see below). In the current condition of the manuscript, at least one quire at the beginning is missing (see below, “Content”). The original place of quire XV, which contains the text under scrutiny, is unclear. In the present condition, it is composed of only one bifolio (ff. 141–2, leaves i and ii) and one singleton (f. 143), crudely attached with wire. Both the bifolio and the singleton could have been inserted at the end of the volume later, and put at their present place by chance, as the result of damage and improper handling of the manuscript. Probably for the same

modified accordingly. The names of languages (Geez, Tigrinya) are given in conventional English orthography (rather than in transcription).

9 See, e.g., Hammerschmidt 1987, and more recent overviews in Fritsch 2001 and Bausi 2010.

10 The Ethio-SPaRe project team has recorded a few hundred Missals, of which 93 are described in the project’s database. Of these, there are some 11 Missals which are considered to be of pre-eighteenth-century date; the oldest of them, AKM-009 (ʾAmbäsät Kidanä Mǝḥrät), has been provisionally dated to the first half of the seventeenth century.
reasons, the structure of the quires XVI–XVII is disturbed and their leaves are misplaced (cf. below).

Layout: two columns (quires I–XIV, XVI–XVII) [one column for ff. 141–2, quire XV].
Written area (cm): 9.5 (h) × 11.5 (w).

Palaeography: The script dates to the first half of the seventeenth century or slightly later;11 the writing was executed by a well-trained, very careful scribe (see Figure 1).

The script is tall, rounded, very slightly slanted to the right. The tops of the letters መ, ሙ, ገ, አ are slightly and uniformly slanted to the left. The vertical strokes strive to be parallel, but the legs of ካ or ኰ are slightly convergent (the bend of the left leg is slightly more pronounced). The “feet” of the letters are rectangular, sometimes with very short hairlines. The serifs are forked. The numerals are styled with thin red and black dashes above and below (ff. 31rb, 32ra, 34ra–b, 45vb, 47va, 52va, or 84va, 144ra–b, etc.).

Rubrication is carried out very carefully, in the main hand.12

Content
The manuscript contains a collection of texts used in the Mass of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church (Mäṣḥafä qəddase):

I) Prefatory service (Šər’atä qəddase “Order of the Mass”) (ff. 1ra–30va), incomplete, the beginning is missing13
II) Anaphoras (ff. 30vb–146rb)
   II-1) Anaphora of the Apostles (ff. 30vb–44vb)
   II-2) Anaphora of Our Lord Jesus Christ (ff. 44vb–49vb)
   II-3) Anaphora of St. John Chrysostom (ff. 50ra–63va)
   II-4) Anaphora of Our Lady by St. Cyriacus of Behnesa (ff. 64ra–77rb)
   II-5) Anaphora of St. John Chrysostom (ff. 77va–84va)
   II-6) Anaphora of the 318 Orthodox Fathers of Nicaea (ff. 84va–95vb)

11 Uhlig (1988: 425) indicates a number of manuscripts showing a stage of script development which precedes the full formation of the Gondärine script (the so-called gʷalh). MS MKL-008 can be considered as belonging to this group. The traits of the handwriting mostly fit the characteristics described for the period mid-sixteenth–mid-seventeenth century (Uhlig 1988: 425–544). In particular, the handwriting of MKL-008 shows some similarity to such samples used in Uhlig1988 as MSS London BL Or. 732 (Uhlig 1988: 467–77), Or. 644 (480–1), Or. 754 (486–7) or Or. 518 (498–9).
12 A brief reflectographic examination of the inks of MKL-008 with microscope dinolite Pro2 AD413T–I2V, carried out in May 2014, showed that the black ink of the main text is – as expected – of the most common carbon type. The red ink appears to be of plant type, possibly with very slight admixture of mineral components (cf. Rabin 2014: 302–5).
13 The beginning (f. 1ra: ...lā-ʾeqẓiʾ ʾanā wā-māḏḥaninā wā-ʾamlakānā ʾiyāsus Krəstos. Zāʾ aqāma lā-betā krəstivan... correspond to ch. 1, §1 in the “Order of the Mass” of the contemporary Missal (Mäṣḥafä qəddase 1962 A.M., Šər atä qəddase ch. 1, §1). However, a substantial portion of the text is missing, more than a few lines as compared with the modern Mäṣḥafä qəddase. The missing portion might be a single leaf or a whole quire.
II-7) Anaphora of St. Gregory of Nyssa (ff. 95vb–109rb)
II-8) Anaphora of St. Dioscorus of Alexandria (ff. 109rb–112vb)
II-9) Anaphora of St. Jacob of Serug (ff. 112vb–121ra)
II-10) Anaphora of St. Athanasius of Alexandria (ff. 121rb–135rb)
II-11) Anaphora of St. Basil of Caesarea (ff. 135rb–140vb, 144ra–vb, 148ra–vb, 147ra–vb, 146ra–b)

The set of the Anaphoras in MS MKL-008 is somewhat different from the common 14 Anaphoras in the contemporary official church editions of Ḍashaf qoddase: the Anaphoras of Epiphanius, Cyril and Gregory Thaumaturgus are missing.

Apart from the main texts, the manuscript contains a number of smaller texts added later in the blank spaces (additiones), mostly of liturgical content:

14 Cf. Ḍashaf qoddase 1962 Am.
15 Cf. Habtemichael Kidane 2003.
1) F. 63vb: Bä-
'əntä ḥəʃə’t wä-faʃsə́ht wä-səbbə́ht bä-kə́llu wä-burə́kt wä-
bə́nə́čə’ tə́gə́ iənə́ wə́lədə́tə’ amlək Maryə́m... Excerpt from the Anaphora of Our Lady by St. Cyriacus of Behnə́sa

2) ff. 141r–142r: Märgə́mə́ ƙə̀bə̀r “Condemnation of Glory”, a didactic poem [MärKL]

3) f. 143r: Three short prayers written in the same secondary hand, unidentified

3a) Şə́lət la-lá ḥəbə́sta’ awloγya, “Prayer over the blessed bread”
3b) Şə́lətə́ mə̀ ᣯdd ’əm-də́yə́ bə́l’i, “Prayer at the table after meal”
3c) Wä-’əmdə́yə́ rə́ qʷə́ári rá yə́bəl zə́ntə: ’ə́šə́lə́ ḥəbə́kə́ wä- ə́só ə́lə́kkə...,,

Prayer after the cooling down (of the Eucharistic bread?)

The rest of the additiones are presented below according to the reconstructed sequence of the leaves (iv–viii) as they would have been accommodated in a quire, probably “quaternion”, which originally might have been the ultimate one (if we assume that the quire containing MärKL was the last quire).17

4) ff. 146va–b (=leaf iv-verso), 151r–b (=leaf vi-recto): Bä-żə́ ńazzə́kkə́r ḥəsə́bə́ ḥə́ggə́ lə-’ə́gə́ iənə́ ’iyə́sə́ kə́rsə́s ’ə́nə́ ɦə́lə́nə́ bə́-zə́mə́nə́ Mateə́wos...., Prayer while burning the incense, for the sake of commemorating various saints, which contains the date of writing: 7277 Year of Mercy, 20th day according to the lunar calendar, 15th day of the solar calendard of the month of Gə́nbot (f. 146va). However, the second and third numerals in the year number were corrected. The year 7277 is equivalent to 1785 AD. In the bottom margin, there is the word ’ə́rgə́tə̀ (“His (/the) ascension”) in a thin black frame

5) ff. 151va–b (=leaf v-verso), 150va–b (=leaf vi-recto), 150va, lines 1–9 (=leaf vi-verso): Sə́ləm lə-kə́lləkə́mu ’ə́gə́ iəbə́hə́r ’ə́gə́ iə́nə́ ’iyə́sə́ Kə́rstə́s ’ə́mləkə́nə́ zə́-tə̀bəłə́ lə- fuqə́rə́kə́ Yə́hə́nnə́s... Excerpt from a liturgical text

6) f. 150va, lines 10–15 -vb (=leaf vi-verso): ’ə́llə́ mə́sə́kə́mu ’ə́llə́ tə́ģə́bə́kə́mu wä-’ə́llə́ sə́llə́ykə́mu wə́stə́ żə́tə́ qə́ddə́st ’ə́mə́nə́nə́ bə́tə́ kə̀rə́sə́tə́n...., Prayer for those gathered in the church(?)

7) ff. 149ra, lines 1–7 (=leaf vii-recto): Tə́sə́hə́lə́kə́ ’ə́gə́ iə́ mə́də́rə́kə...., Short excerpt from a prayer or hymn18

8) ff. 149ra, lines 8–14 -rb (=leaf vii-verso), 149v (=leaf vii-verso), 145r (=leaf viii-recto): Mə́stə́bə́qʷə́’ bä-’əntə́ mutə́n, “Supplication for the dead”,19 partly with musical notation signs; other supplications

---

16 See Mā́shə́fə́ qə́ddə́se 1962 AM: 18 (§§11–2).
17 In Denis Nosnitsin’s opinion, the first half of the quire had the following sequence of leaves: f. 144 = leaf i; f. 148 = leaf ii; f. 147 = leaf iii; f. 146 = leaf iv (the recto-side contains the explicit of Text II–11, see above).
18 In which St. Mary is called sə́mə́t də́gə́mit, “the second Heaven” (cf. Grohmann 1919: 308).
19 See Mā́shə́fə́ qə́ddə́se 1962 AM: 290–1.
Prayer before the liturgical reading from the Gospel

Varia and paratexts
Omitted portions of text have been carefully reintegrated in the margins in a different hand, and their places in the main text have sometimes been marked with so-called tie-marks (Amh. tämläs).

For some of the Anaphoras, indications concerning the celebration dates (names of the feasts) have been added in the upper margin. Musical notation signs have been added above the lines for a large part of the main text, most probably somewhat later, in a different hand.

Commissioners and donors: The name of the commissioner appears in the supplication formula on f. 33vb, but it is half-erased, only the second part being readable: <...> [Mä]dhən. There is no further indication concerning the identity of this person.

Dating: The dating for MKL-008 can be established on the basis of internal evidence. Several historical personalities are referred to in the book. Marqos, mentioned as the patriarch of Alexandria (see ff. 113ra, 144vb, etc.), is Mark VI, in tenure from 1645 to 1660; and Mikaʾel, the metropolitan of Ethiopia, was in office from 1650 to 1663 (see ff. 13rb, 15vb, 113ra). King Fasilädäs, mentioned on f. 13rb, reigned 1632–67. The resulting copying date of the manuscript is 1650–60.

Concerning the dating of ff. 141–2: The bifolio containing MärKL is worn, dirty and bears traces of wax, and is in some parts hardly readable. It is accommodated in a single column, the layout pattern being different from that of the main text. The irregular form of the leaves, and some disparate (erased) writing upside-down on f. 142v, may indicate that remainders of parchment (not good enough for regular text leaves) were utilized for the bifolio. The physical consistency of the parchment used for the bifolio appears somewhat different from the parchment of the textblock leaves.

The palaeographical evidence from the manuscript turns out to be essential. If one looks closely at the hand of MärKL and the hand of the main text, one notices some differences in the general appearance and in the quality of the script execution. However, these can be at least partly explained though the “auxiliary” character of MärKL, which was of lower status in comparison with the main text and hence permitted scribal work of an inferior quality. It is difficult to find substantial and persistent differences in individual

20 The reconstruction seems to be confirmed by the condition of leaf viii-verso (f. 145v), very worn and dirty, indicating that it might have been the outer leaf of the quire.
21 See Mäṣḥafa qaddase 1962: 42–3, §§186–7.
22 Cf. the traces of blood vessels in the parchment clearly discernible in the (lower) margins, absent in the regular text leaves.
23 The script of MärKL looks less elegant; the height of the letters is slightly less and some letter shapes are broader (esp. መ); the tops of the letters are parallel to the lower ruled line; the vertical lines are upright; there is a tendency to rectangularity. “Hairlines” are strongly articulated.
24 The lines of the hand in MärKL are frequently hesitant, some letters are slightly misshapen, some vertical lines are bent, there is no rubrication, the serifs are executed less clearly and are rather “flagged”, not forked, etc.
letter-shapes which would clearly demonstrate that the texts were written by two different scribes. To the contrary, it appears quite possible that both texts were executed by the same scribe. If this assumption is correct, the relationship between MS MKL-008 and MärKL can be represented as follows. The scribe copied the main text of MS MKL-008 around 1650–60; the same scribe could have copied MärKL on a separate bifolio which was later added to the textblock of MKL-008. The composition of the original text of MärKL could have taken place in the first half or around the middle of the seventeenth century (see III.8).

II. The poem in Old Amharic

The text under study is a poem in Old Amharic entitled Märgämä kəbr, “Condemnation of glory” (hence MärKL), an appellation that has become known thanks to two recent publications of Getatchew Haile. Below, the text is reproduced exactly as it appears in the manuscript (cf. photos in Figures 2, 3, and 4), and supplied with a tentative translation (some passages still remain obscure or ambiguous).

In the Amharic text column, subscripted small numbers in square brackets refer to the physical written lines; the arrangement of the Amharic text and the numbers in the translation column refer to the editors’ division of the text into verses. The square brackets in the Amharic text indicate the editors’ reconstruction of barely discernible letters (a dot under the letter means complete illegibility and physical destruction of the sign). Triangular brackets mark the editors’ reconstruction of letters/words omitted by the scribe. Dashes above and below an erroneously written letter indicate the scribe’s immediate correction. Curly brackets mark letters inserted interlinearly.

25 One rather finds hints to the contrary, sometimes in those letters where the distinctive traits of the scribal hand would be expected to be conspicuous: cf. (in both texts) the strongly accentuated vertical downstroke in ወ, with the body of the letter raised high (cf. f. 140vb, ll. 9 and 10 against f. 141r, ll. 10 and 11); the same for ሆ (f. 140va, l. 5 against f. 141v, l. 6); ኧ with the left downstroke tending to be straight, right downstroke slightly bent, and small closed “inner loop” (the marker of the sixth order) (ff. 140vb, l. 8 and 141r, l. 5); in particular አ, with the fifth-order marker (a small ring) being a rightward extension of the horizontal line below (not set up under it, and not on an additional short vertical/oblique line); the sixth-order marker (“kink”) in ከ shaped not very conspicuously (in MärKL, due to a less careful execution, the marker looks like a small “tooth”, sometimes barely discernible, cf. III.2.1); the numerals 1 (፤) and 3 (፫) are written in a similar way, and with dashes above and below (but in MärKL there are no rubricated elements at all).

26 Getatchew Haile 2005; 2014. In the translation of the title, we have followed the wording of Getatchew Haile 2005: 265.
Condemnation of glory

1) Let me tell you a little about a matter\(^27\) that appeared to me.

2) The perishable world

3) is like a shadow.\(^28\)

4) What they dreamt at night

5) will not be found in the morning.

6) The flowers of Mäskäräm

7) will not last into \(\mathcal{T}əqəmt\).

8) These are the parables

9) of a wicked world,

10) whose entirety is a snare.

11) (The world) will show you a matter\(^30\) with appointments –

12) (namely,) the world which speaks (in vain)\(^31\)

13) gold with an award,

14) a stallion with weapons,\(^32\)

15) a mule under horsecloth,

16) a cow inside a stall,

17) an ox with a nose-ring,

18) a pregnant cow with a nursing cow,\(^33\)

19) a straw vessel\(^35\) with milk,

20) a bed under a bed-cloth,\(^36\)

21) perfume on a lady,

22) a child at the breast,

23) a harvest of grain,

24) a threshing-floor with crops,

25) a table with bread –

Continued

---

\(^{27}\) Here the word \(nägär\) is used in the most common sense (“matter, thing, affair”, cf. Kane 1990: 1061).

\(^{28}\) cp. Ps. 143:4; Job 8:9, 14:2.

\(^{29}\) On the form \(\text{ለዓለም} \text{ተናጋሪት} \) cf. III.6.1.

\(^{30}\) It is not clear which sense of the word \(nägär\) is intended here: either more general “matter, thing, affair” (as above, cf. n. 27), or the specific “court case, dispute” (cf. Kane 1990: 1061).

\(^{31}\) The translation of lines 4–5 (verses 11–12) is very uncertain; the text is possibly corrupt.

\(^{32}\) Kane 1990: 2149: \(\mathcal{T}äbt\) “defensive and offensive weapons” (see Guidi 1889: 65, song XI, line 2; Littmann 1943: 498; cf. also Mersha Alehegne 2011: 678).

\(^{33}\) Kane 1990: 2183: \(\mathcal{Təgəgər}\) “milk cow (which has milk, is not dry)” (cf. III.3.2).

\(^{34}\) On the form \(\text{አስተት} \text{ታስተት} \) cf. III.6.2.

\(^{35}\) Kane 1990: 824: \(\mathcal{Qe} \text{go or \(qəgə\) “straw vessel used for milking or for fetching water”} \)

\(^{36}\) Kane 1990: 931: \(\text{ቡወት} \text{“cotton or wool which has been fluffed”}; \) cf. also Gez. \(\text{ቦኋት} \text{“linen, wool”} \) (Leslau 1987: 118).

\(^{37}\) On the form \(\text{አስተት} \text{ከወጥ} \) instead of the expected \(\text{አስተት} \text{ከወጥ} \) cf. III.2.2.
Condemnation of glory

26) with many dishes,
27) those not for fasting days,
28) fragrant from afar,
29) meat with a knife,
30) in bowls,
31) a ewer on a stand,
32) a jar with a pot,
33) (The world) will show you much joy,
34) (but) let it not appear like truth to you,
35) there is sin in it.
36) That which has profit,
37) let me tell you about its benefit:
38) fasting and prayer,
39) prostration and supplication,
40) charity and alms.

(f. 141r) ṣəḏqəṃ: hūlC

38 Kane 1990: 2089: ṭṣəluṭ “milk, butter, eggs or meat or dishes made from them which may not be eaten on fast days”.
39 On the form ṣəluṭ cf. III.1, III.6.3.
40 Kane 1990: 236: ṭəlulat “a small knife used in cutting meat”, Gondär usage. Cf. also ṭəqäləmt in Mersha Alehegne 2011: 678.
41 On the term ḋulat cf. III.6.4.
42 Kane 1990: 2300: ṭəqən, ṭəqan “ewer, container for water”; Kane 1990: 250: matot “ring of leather or grass used to support a round-bottomed vessel, stand, support”.
43 Kane 1990: 332: ṭəmətəmgə “earthenware jar”.
44 On the term ṭəmət cf. III.6.5.
45 The literal translation of verses 34–5 is: “Let not what contains sin appear like truth to you”.
46 The literal translation of verses 36–7 is: “Let me tell you about the benefit which has profit in it”.
47 On the form ṭəmət cf. III.1.
48 On the form ṭəmət cf. III.1.
49 2 sg. masc. The same form is used in verses 43 and 44.
50 The reconstruction of the final word ṭəmət is suggested by the following considerations: the rhyme in final -t is characteristic for this section of the poem; the syntax of the phrase demands an explicit direct object; the noun ṭəmət fits the context (cf. a structural parallel in verse 91, and a semantic parallel in verse 112); the similarity of ṭəmət to the next word ṭəmət suggests an omission by (quasi)homoearcton.
51 Kane 1990: 1711: dulât “assembly (to discuss rotation of office)”.
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51) (rather) it snatches like a hawk.
52) The (widowed) wife will wail, having put on a hide,
53) having put on (her) sticharion,
54) having scratched (her) face.
55) They will carry you out on two (pieces of) wood,
56) they will bring you to the tabot.
57) The priests will come, having put on (their) sticharion,
58) having taken the censers,
59) having laid you upon a bed,
60) having wrapped you in a mat,
61) having wrapped you in a mat,
62) they will say the *Pater Noster.*
63) The young men will run,
64) having taken *sahāt,*
65) While the grave is open,
66) they will dress you (with earth),
67) they will heap earth upon you.
68) Everyone returns to soil, like the plants.
69) Woe, (in death) none will have a single servant from home to entertain him,
70) woe, a servant will not protect (him),
71) woe, a son will not be ahead (of him).

Continued
An alternative interpretation implies a different division into verses, with emendation of the punctuation: "This one deserves condemnation of glory - the strength of illness will get the better of you."

91) (then) you will inherit the eternal kingdom of the Gehenna of fire.

93) illness will get the better of you.

96) I believe in God the Son,

97) I believe in God the Holy Spirit

98) three names, three persons, three faces, three images, one Lord;

| p. | E로고 | Condemnation of glory |
|----|-------|-----------------------|
| 72 | woe, the cattle will not serve as a ransom (for him). |
| 73 | (God) will make you stand in the court, |
| 74 | in the midst of the angels, |
| 75 | who are clad in fire, who do not give false judgement. |
| 76 | The devils will come, |
| 77 | they will proclaim your sin(s): |
| 78 | “(He is the one) who used to swear (and) take oaths, |
| 79 | who used to take away people’s cattle |
| 80 | and the wife of a young man who is not (even) away". |
| 81 | They will say about you: “This one deserves condemnation of glory”. |
| 82 | woe, they will have no mercy |
| 83 | on the day when the soul will wail, |
| 84 | woe, (his) father will not stand as (his) attorney, |
| 85 | woe, there will be no mother (of his there), |
| 86 | woe, they will not appeal for (his) protection to the king where he sits on the throne of David. |
| 87 | You who have heard this (warning), be persistent in generosity, |
| 88 | give alms,58 |
| 89 | do not swear, do not take oaths, |
| 90 | do not hoard gold in a sack;59 |
| 91 | (then) you will inherit the eternal kingdom of heaven. |
| 92 | Man, do not be unprepared – |
| 93 | illness will get the better of you. |
| 94 | This is what appeared to me, while I was not asleep.61 |
| 95 | I believe in God the Father, |
| 96 | I believe in God the Son, |
| 97 | I believe in God the Holy Spirit – |
| 98 | three names, three persons, three faces, three images, one Lord; |

58 Cf. Getatchew Haile 2005:260, verses 87–88.
59 Kane 1990: 782: q° namät “leather sack or bag used for carrying knives, writing implements and materials, etc.;” cf. Gez. q°namät, q° namät, q°anamat, q°anamät “money bag, purse” (Leslau 1987: 434).
60 On the form ḥḥ{ḥ} instead of ḥḥ{ḥ} cf. III.1.
61 An alternative interpretation implies a different division into verses, with emendation of the punctuation: "This one deserves condemnation of glory - the strength of illness will get the better of you. This is what appeared to me."
III. Orthography and language of the poem

The text under scrutiny is characterized by a number of peculiarities. While some of these are to be discarded as scribal errors, others are to be explained in terms of palaeographic or orthographic variation, and still others reflect the phonological, morphological and syntactic features of Old Amharic.

62 On the form ከሆድን ከDateFormat: date_in_4_digits-1974-02-12

63 Verses 95–111 are a concise presentation of the doctrine of the Trinity in Amharic. Concerning verses 101–8, we can find similar equations involving the members of the Trinity, e.g., in the “Confession of Jacob Baradaeus”, cf. Cornill 1876: 421, esp. ከሆድን ከDateFormat: date_in_4_digits-1974-02-12

99) one God, one divinity, one throne, one kingdom;

100) one authority, one power, one intention, one will.

101) The person of the Father is heart,

102) the person of the Holy Spirit is life.

103) Just as heart, word and soul are inseparable,

104) so are the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit inseparable.

105) Just as heart, word and soul do not compete with each other,

106) so the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit do not compete with each other.

107) Just as heart, word and soul do not alter,

108) so the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit do not alter.

109) They were like this when heaven and earth were created,

110) they will be like this after heaven and earth are gone.

111) I believe in this.

112) Having died and risen, I will find eternal life.
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III.1. Scribal errors

The text contains a number of obvious scribal errors and faulty corrections made in the main hand: እዋያት instead of the expected እዋርያት (f. 141r, l. 13); እንዳደ ከሚ ትም መ ትም instead of እንዳይቀዳደሙ (f. 142r, l. 9); የተየ ከмест ከሚ ትም instead of የተሐየኝ ከሚ ትም (f. 142r, l. 3). Some further cases are less clear since in principle they may reflect peculiarities of Old Amharic or be the result of palaeographic idiosyncrasies of the scribe.

In f. 141r, l. 9, the third order of ደ ለ the form ደማት (instead of the expected ደሚሸት) may be the result of erroneous repetition of the third order marker of ደሚ (but cf. III.6.3).

In f. 141r, l. 14, one finds the form የሱጋ ከሚ ትም instead of the expected ከሱጋ ከሚ ትም or ከሱጋ ከሚ ትም (cf. modern Amharic ከሱጋ ከሚ ትም). The actual presence of a form

---

64 On the spelling ከሚ ከሚ ትም instead of ከሚ ከሚ ትም cf. Cowley 1974: 604; cf. also Girma Awgichew Demeke 2014: 117–8.
አይኖራቸው in the text (f. 141v, l. 13) suggests that the 3 pl. object index was spelled as -ቸው in this text, and that the final ቸ in the form under scrutiny was omitted through negligence.

Finally, in f. 141r, l. 11, the form ሽሳይሐለት appears instead of the expected ሽሳይሐለች (cf. modern Amharic ሽሳይሐለች). The same word form in f. 141r, l. 4 (ፎፋፏ) clearly shows palatalization of the final consonant. Thus, the absence of palatalization in f. 141r, l. 11 is likely due to scribal error.

III.2. Orthographic and palaeographic peculiarities

III.2.1. ከ and ከ, ’ኽ and ከ

The kink which marks the sixth order in ከ and ከ is not always easy to discern (see above, n. 25, on the same phenomenon in the main text of the manuscript). Note especially the form of ከ in the words እ፡መክት (f. 141v, l. 8) and እምላክ (f. 141v, l. 13) in the text (f. 141v, l. 13) suggests that the 3 pl. object index was spelled as -ቸው in this text, and that the final ቸ in the form under scrutiny was omitted through negligence.

Finally, in f. 141r, l. 11, the form ሽሳይሐለት appears instead of the expected ሽሳይሐለች (cf. modern Amharic ሽሳይሐለች). The same word form in f. 141r, l. 4 (ፎፏ) clearly shows palatalization of the final consonant. Thus, the absence of palatalization in f. 141r, l. 11 is likely due to scribal error.
142r, l. 6); cf. also ካርስቶስ (f. 141r, ll. 13–4), where, however, the entire word, including the first letter, is hardly discernible. Likewise, the kink of ኪ in ከትስ in f. 142r, l. 12 is difficult to descry.

In the 2 sg. masc. subject and object index and in the sg. masc. demonstrative, no kink is discernible at all, and consequently, the reading ኪ has been preferred (cf. III.4.1, III.4.3).

III.2.2. ወ and ኰ
A distinct ወ occurs twice (f. 141r, l. 9, l. 11) and has the classical shape (the vertical stem with a kink – graphically nothing but ካ [nɔ] – and a short curved line above, directed to the left, downwards).

MärKL contains two words in which the first order of the letter apparently stands for the sixth order: f. 141r, l. 8 (ናየምስት instead of the expected እየምስት), f. 142r, ll. 11–12 (ስንይፋት instead of the expected እንዴኅ; cf. እንዴህ in f. 142r, l. 12).
III.2.3. ቸ instead of ፁ
A distinct ፁ appears in the very first line of the text. Having the form of the sign ዱ with a dash above, it differs clearly from the first order ፁ. Yet in three cases ፁ is attested instead of the expected ዱ:

f. 141v, ll. 1–2; f. 141v, l. 14: ዱለስፁ (cf. modern Amharic ዱለስፁ);
f. 142r, l. 1: እፈጃፁ (cf. modern Amharic እፈጃፁ).

The employment of the first order ፁ instead of the sixth order ዱ has been observed in other Old Amharic texts (Geta[t]chew Haile 1969–70: 70, n. 10; Strelcyn 1981: 73; cf. also Cowley 1974: 602, where it is noted that ፁ and ዱ are barely distinguished in the text).

III.2.4. ዱ instead of ፁ and ከ, instead of የ
There is one example of ዱ employed instead of ዱ, and one clear example of ከ instead of የ:

f. 141r, l. 4: ወጉል ዱ instead of the expected ወጉል ዱ (cf. modern Amharic ወጉል ዱ);
f. 141r, l. 7: ከ፣ (cf. modern Amharic ከ፣).

Such use of ዱ and ከ (as well as the use of the third order instead of the sixth order for some other palatal consonants) is well attested in Old Amharic texts (cf. Getatchew Haile 1979a: 234; 1983: 158; Strelcyn 1981: 73).

III.2.5. Separate writing of some particles or prefixes
As already noted in editions of other Old Amharic texts, some particles and affixes can be written as separate words in Old Amharic, unlike modern Amharic (cf. e.g. Richter 1997: 550, Strelcyn 1981: 74). In the present text, the relevant example is f. 141v, l. 8: እː ይው (cf. modern Amharic እː ይው).

III.2.6. Writing of the copula ኴው joined to the preceding word
The copula ኴው frequently appears joined to the preceding word in Old Amharic writings (cf. Getatchew Haile 1979b: 121; Cowley 1983b: 25; 1974: 604). In the present text, this phenomenon is found in f. 142r, l. 7; l. 8.

III.3. Phonetic phenomena
III.3.1. Preservation of the gutturals
It is well known that Old Amharic texts contain numerous examples of preservation of historical gutturals which have been lost in modern Amharic (cf. Getatchew Haile 1979a: 234; Strelcyn 1981: 75; Appleyard 2003: 114; Getatchew Haile 1991: 529; Richter 1997: 548; Strelcyn 1964: 108–9; Girma Awgichew Demeke 2014: 24–34).

Various texts show various degrees of loss of historical gutturals. Notably, R. Cowley observes that in the so-called Tract about Mary Who Anointed Jesus’

65 This section deals with Amharic lexemes and word-forms. Obvious Geez loanwords and Geez insertions (cf. III.7) are not treated here.
Feet and in *Təmḥərtā Haymanot*, the reflexes of *ʾ* and *ʿ* are dropped word-medially and sometimes word-finally, while the reflexes of *ḥ*, *ḥ* and *ḥ* are spelled out in all positions in the word (Cowley 1974: 605–6; 1983b: 21).

The spellings attested in MüRK are in the same line as those of the texts edited by Cowley. MüRK shows consistent omission of etymological *ʾ* and *ʿ* word-internally and word-finally: *ḥ* (f. 141v, l. 12; cf. Gez. nāšʾa, Leslau 1987: 404), *ḥ* (f. 141r, l. 14), *ḥ* (f. 141r, l. 15), *ḥ* (f. 141v, l. 3; l. 11; cf. Gez. māšʾa, Leslau 1987: 369), *ḥ* (f. 141v, l. 4; cf. Arg. ʾɑnīʾeʿ, Girma Awgichew Demeke 2013: 227; for comparable forms in Old Amharic and other South Ethio-Semitic languages cf. Bulakh and Kogan 2016: 285–6), *ḥ* (f. 141r, l. 16), *ḥ* (f. 141v, l. 2; cf. Gez. wāʾša, Leslau 1987: 605), *ḥ* (f. 141v, l. 16; cf. Gez. sāʾa, Leslau 1987: 501), *ḥ* (f. 141v, l. 16; cf. Gez. ʾāšnʾa, Leslau 1987: 559), *ḥ* (f. 141r, l. 6; cf. Gez. ʾɔrəy, Leslau 1987: 84), *ḥ* (f. 141r, l. 7), *ḥ* (f. 141r, l. 16; cf. Gez. ʾəl, ʾəl, ʾəlt, Leslau 1987: 84).

At the same time, word-initial *ḥ* seems to be preserved when preceded by a proclitic (a similar tendency has been observed in several editions of Old Amharic texts; cf. Cowley 1974: 603; Strelcyn 1981: 74):

f. 141v, l. 11: *ḥ* (cf. modern Amharic *ḥ*).

Note that the spelling *ḥ* does not reflect the underlying form {yā-antā-n}, but rather is the result of vowel assimilation across the guttural: *yā- antā-n > ya- antā-n.

Note also the form *ḥ* in f. 141v, l. 4, where, however, the preservation of *ḥ* at least in the written form is characteristic of modern Amharic as well.

As for the distinction between word-initial *ḥ* and *ḥ*, in Amharic words the spelling with *ḥ* seems to be preferred even in cases of historical *ʿ*: [ḥ] (f. 141v, ll. 2–3; cf. Leslau 1987: 57), *ḥ* (f. 141v, l. 6; cf. Bulakh and Kogan 2016: 152–3; cf. also *ḥ* (f. 141v, l. 4; cf. Leslau 1987: 71). This implies that no distinction between *ʿ* and *ʾ* existed at the time of the creation of the copy, the above-mentioned words being pronounced either with initial *ʿ* or with no initial consonant.

The text shows interchangeability between *ḥ* and *ḥ* (as in the verb “to swear”): *ḥ* (f. 141v, l. 11) vs. *ḥ* (f. 141v, l. 16), *ḥ* (as in the demonstrative pronoun, cf. III.4.3), *ḥ* and *ḥ* (as in the adverbial “like this”: *ḥ* (f. 142r, ll. 11–12 vs. *ḥ* (f. 142r, l. 12), *ḥ*, *ḥ*, and *ḥ* (as in the 2 sg. masc. subject and object indexes, cf. III.4.1). It is therefore unlikely that these graphemes represent different phonemes; in all probability, by the time this copy was produced, the merger of *ḥ*, *ḥ* and *ḥ* into a single phoneme (transcribed here with *ḥ*, as in modern Amharic) had been completed.

This single phoneme *ḥ*, rendered by *ḥ*, *ḥ*, or *ḥ*, is often present where expected on etymological grounds (going back to *ḥ*, *ḥ* or *ḥ*), even where it has been lost in modern Amharic. This involves the following roots and lexemes:

1) The forms of the verb “to see” (*ḥ* in modern Amharic, going back to *ḥ*), cf. Leslau 1979: 123; the spelling with *ḥ* is well-attested in Old Amharic,
cf., e.g., Littmann 1943: 484) and its passive stem: አስתבר (f. 141r, l. 15), ፤ትታብስ (f. 141r, l. 1). Note that the guttural is dropped in the causative stem, cf. below.

2) The numeral “one” (ቀን in modern Amharic, going back to *ʼahad, cf. Leslau 1987: 12; for the spelling ኧን in Old Amharic cf. e.g. Getatchew Haile 1979b: 122): ከንድ (f. 141v, l. 7).

3) The forms of the verb “to swear” (“ሮ in modern Amharic, going back to *mḥl, cf. Leslau 1987: 335): ኋርክሮ (f. 141v, l. 11), ከ القرار (f. 141v, l. 16). Note that in this case, the influence of Gez. ሥክል ላስ is not to be excluded.

4) The verb “to dream” (አለመ in modern Amharic, going back to *ḥlm, cf. Leslau 1987: 230): በርካው (f. 141r, l. 2). Again, the influence of Gez. ስል ኳ can well be imagined.

5) The verb “to pass” (አለparseFloat in modern Amharic, going back to *ḥlf, cf. Leslau 1987: 260–1): ከርእስ (f. 142r, l. 12). The influence of Gez. ስል ኳ is likely.

6) The adjective “far” (令人 in modern Amharic, going back to *ｒḥq, cf. Leslau 1987: 467): ከርቀት (f. 141r, l. 9). The influence of Gez. ግ ኳ is likely.

Note also በርእጋ (f. 141r, ll. 8–9), ዏርጋ (f. 141r, l. 11; ዏር in modern Amharic, going back to *وها, cf. Leslau 1987: 117), which, however, in both contexts is followed by a Geez lexeme and can itself be a Geez insertion (cf. III.7).

At the same time, the text contains five certain cases of lost *ḥ, *ḥ or *ḥ (despite the existence of Geez equivalents containing the guttural):66

1) ከም (f. 141r, l. 6): modern Amharic ከም (cf. Gez. lahm, Leslau 1987: 309);
2) ከምርጋ (f. 141v, l. 15): modern Amharic ከምርጋ (cf. Gez. ግንስስኔ, Leslau 1987: 335);
3) እርካስ (f. 141r, l. 12, with the particle -ስ): modern Amharic እርካስ (cf. Gez. የብት, Leslau 1987: 461);
4) እም (f. 141v, l. 4): modern Amharic እም (cf. Gez. እሆን, Leslau 1987: 14);
5) ከም (f. 141v, l. 13–4): modern Amharic ከም (cf. Gez. ከም, Leslau 1987: 468);
6) ከምርጋ (f. 141r, l. 4), ከምርጋ (f. 141r, l. 11): modern Amharic ከምርጋ (cf. the forms of the verb “to see” with the initial guttural quoted above).

Thus, the evidence for preservation/loss of ካ in the text is inconsistent. One may suspect that the examples of the preserved gutturals are due to archaic orthography (which may have been in use not only for lexemes having transparent Geez counterparts, but also for the specifically Old Amharic forms of the verb “to see” and of the numeral “one”) and do not reflect the actual pronunciation.

III.3.2. Preservation of ejective affricate ṣ

A well-known feature of Old Amharic is the preservation of affricate ṣ, which in modern standard Amharic has mostly shifted to plosive ṭ (cf. Getatchew Haile 1979a: 234; 1983: 161–2; 1991: 528; Appleyard 2003: 115; Cowley 1974:

66 A much less reliable case is ከም in f. 141v, l. 5 (cf. III.6.7), which can be tentatively related to the root *ｓከ “to pull, to draw” (for which cf. Leslau 1987: 492–3).
In the text under survey, this phenomenon is observed in the following cases:

- የፋት (f. 141r, l. 2): modern Amharic የፋት, going back to *ṣbh (cf. Leslau 1987: 545; for the Old Amharic spelling የፋት, የፋት cf. Ludolf 1698: 97);
- የጄት (f. 141r, l. 6): modern Amharic የጄት; the Geez form ወጄጤት, adduced in Leslau 1987: 550, but absent from Dillmann 1865, is probably an Amharism appearing in post-Aksumite texts;
- የቾጋት (f. 141r, l. 10): modern Amharic የቾጋት; for the Old Amharic spelling የቾጋት cf. Ludolf 1698: 98, Strelcyn 1981: 75;
- ይመስ የጻል (f. 141v, l. 3; l. 11): modern Amharic ይመስ የጻል; cf. Gez. ሊጨ የጻል (Leslau 1987: 369);
- እያወ የጻም (f. 141r, l. 16); ይ>-- የጻም (f. 141v, l. 1): modern Amharic ይ>-- የጻም; cf. Gez. የጻም የጻም (Leslau 1987: 477);
- እይማ጑ (f. 141v, l. 15): modern Amharic የሃማ጑; cf. Gez. ምሃማ጑ የሃማ጑ (Leslau 1987: 335).

III.3.3. Spirantization

Podolsky (1991: 32–3) has convincingly demonstrated that spirantization \( k > h \) was more widespread in Old Amharic than it is in the modern language (cf. also Girma Awgichew Demek 2014: 13, 49 ff.). In the text under scrutiny, however, no examples of spirantization have been detected except for those forms which have entered modern Amharic as well:

- 2 sg. (cf. III.4.1) and pl. (as in f. 141r, l. 1) subject and object indexes (the elements -\( ላ \) and -\( ላ \) go back to proto-Ethio-Semitic *-\( አ \) and *-\( አ \), respectively);  
- \( ሬታት ከ \) in f. 141r, l. 4 (modern Amharic \( ርታት ከ \); cf. Gez. \( ከ \) *\( ከ \) *\( ከ \); Leslau 1987: 281) and \( ከ ከ \) in f. 141v, l. 7 (modern Amharic \( ከ \) *\( ከ \); cf. Gez. \( ከ \) *\( ከ \), ibid.).

III.4. Morphology

III.4.1. The 2 sg. masc. suffix

Word-finally, the 2 sg. masc. object index and the 2 sg. masc. subject index appear as -\( ከ \) in all the attested occurrences listed below:

- object index: \( እታት \) (f. 141r, l. 11), \( የታት \) (f. 141v, l. 4), \( ከት ከ \) (f. 141v, l. 4), \( ከት ከ \) (f. 142r, l. 2);
- subject index: \( ካት ከ \) (f. 141v, l. 16).

These forms contrast with the vowelless ending -\( ላ \) of modern Amharic. The only attestation of -\( ላ \) in the text under scrutiny is \( ከሃ ላ \) in f. 141v, l. 6. There is, however, no reason to believe that the shape of the 2 sg. masc. index attached to the
preposition was different from the 2 sg. masc. subject and object indexes, since such an opposition is not known from any Ethio-Semitic language. Rather, we are dealing with two alternative forms of the 2 sg. masc. suffix.

Examples of word-final 2 sg. masc. object index and 2 sg. masc. subject index -̋ in Old Amharic are found in several pieces of Old Amharic poetry published by Getatchew Haile (1991: 527). Since the modern Amharic -̋ must go back to *-ka > *-kā (with subsequent spirantization and loss of the final vowel), the form -hā (rendered by ‘nī) is a plausible predecessor of the modern Amharic form.

### III.4.2. The 3 sg. masc. object index

In the form እሹርው (f. 141v, ll. 7–8), the 3 sg. masc. object index attached to the imperfect base is -əው, rather than the modern Amharic -äው (note, however, that the form -äው is also attested: የአጫውተው, f. 141v, l. 8; cf. also እስለዜኽ, f. 141v, l. 12; cf. also -äው with imperative base in ከይው, f. 141r, l. 15).

The 3 sg. masc. object index -əው attached to the verb እስኝ (but not to other verbs in Getatchew’s text) was recorded in Getatchew Haile1986: 235 (alongside the 1 pl. object index -ን). While Getatchew Haile tends to ascribe these forms to the graphic confusion between እ and ከ, the existence of a parallel in MärKL suggests rather a genuine morphological feature of Old Amharic.

### III.4.3. Demonstrative pronouns

The text contains the following forms of the 3 sg. masc. independent demonstrative pronoun, once as a bare form, and three times with three different enclitics:

- f. 141r, l. 3: የን
- f. 141v, l. 13: ይሣሽ (with contrastive -ከ);  
- f. 141v, l. 16: ይሣሽ (with accusative marker -ኩ);  
- f. 142r, l. 3: ይሣሽ (with the post-pronominal element -ክ, cf. III.5.3).

The spelling ይሣሽ, where ኣ, although not quite clear, is still discernible under the blot, indicates that we are dealing with a form identical to ይሣ in modern Amharic. The form ይሣ, which occurs in the rest of the attestations, finds parallels both in modern Amharic (mostly before suffixes and enclitics, cf. Leslau 1995: 62–3, but cf. also Girma Awegichew Demeke 2014: 194, 199) and in an Old Amharic text published by Getatchew Haile (1986: 239, example 4.1.c.: ይሣስ, ይሣት; note that in both cases, the vowel ኣ appears before an enclitic).

The combination of the demonstrative with a preposition clearly lacks a final vowel: ከትክ (f. 142r, l. 12).

The element - cazzo (contrasting -azzo in modern Amharic) finds an exact correspondent in several other Old Amharic texts (cf. Appleyard 2003: 115: ከትኽ, ከትለይ; Cowley 1974: 604: ከትክ, ከትለይ; Geta[t]chew Haile 1969–70: 74: ከተለይ; cf. Girma Awegichew Demeke 2014: 196).

### III.4.4. 3 pl. of converb

The text contains several converb forms in which the marking for 3 plural is expected, but which exhibit the ending -0 or, once, -u:

---
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As Goldenberg points out (2017: 553, n. 1), the apparent absence of number agreement results from contraction äw > o (in እኔት, sporadically shifting to -u),67 otherwise attested in Old Amharic in the 3 pl. object index (on which cf. Cowley 1974: 603, 604).

This phenomenon is known from other Old Amharic texts, e.g. Getatchew Haile 1986: 237 (ወስራ፡ እልእነሩም instead of the expected እልእነሩው...; Goldenberg 2013: 169, line 212 (ይምሉ፡እእኔ instead of the expected እምሉወ).

III.4.5. Negative imperfect in the main clause
Of the 16 examples of negative imperfect forms in the main clause, seven have the element -ም, obligatory in modern Amharic:

ለይገኝም (f. 141r, l. 2), እይለርም (f. 141r, l. 15), እይለያዩም (f. 142r, l. 9), እይለዋወከም (f. 142r, l. 11), እይለቶም (f. 141v, ll. 7–8), እይለንርው (f. 141v, l. 9), እይለንርውም (f. 142r, l. 11), እይለንርውም (f. 142r, l. 11).

The remaining forms represent prefixal negation without the element -ም:

ለመሆን (f. 141r, l. 16), እይለርው (f. 141v, l. 11), እይለርው (f. 141v, l. 11), እይለርው (f. 141v, l. 11), እይለርው (f. 141v, l. 11), እይለርው (f. 141v, l. 11).

Negated main verbs without the element -ም are found in other Old Amharic texts (cf. Girma Awgichew Demekte 2014: 132–3; for an additional example cf. Getatchew Haile 1986: 237: እወሆነ፡ እልለቹ instead of the expected እወሆነ፡ እልለቹም).

III.4.6. Relative imperfect (positive and negative)
The prefix እሆም (in modern Amharic the only marker of relative imperfect) is attested once: እሆም (f. 141r, l. 9). An example of simple imperfect, unexpanded by any special relative marker, is found in the syntactic position of a relative imperfect in f. 141v, l. 8: እሆም (modern Amharic እሆም). Similar usage of simple imperfect is known from other Old Amharic texts (cf. Cowley 1983b: 23; Getatchew Haile 1983: 163; Goldenberg 1977: 488).

The text contains two examples of negative imperfect in the relative clause:

ወወር (f. 141v, l. 11), እሆም (f. 141v, l. 11).

Since the ending -o with converb is normally the 3 sg. masc. subject index, the shift to -u (be it phonological, graphical, or merely a scribal emendation) may represent an attempt to avoid the homophony.
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In both forms, the negative prefix is attached to the relative prefix ṭä- (rather than to ṭäṃm-, as in modern Amharic). This same negative relative imperfect form is known from other Old Amharic texts (cf. Geta[t]chew Haile 1969–70: 79–80; 1979a: 235; 1979b: 121; Appleyard 2003: 115; Cowley 1974: 605; 1977: 139, 142; Goldenberg 1977: 488; Girma Awgichew Demeke 2014: 145–6).

The text under scrutiny also contains three examples of negative imperfect following the conjunction እንደ “just as, like”. In all these examples, the relative marker is absent:

\[ \text{እንዳይለያዩ (f. 142r, l. 8), እንዳይለኩ (f. 142r, l. 9; for the scribal error, cf. III.1), እንዳይለም (f. 142 r, l. 10).} \]

In modern Amharic, relative imperfect is demanded in this construction (Leslau 1995: 701–2). For Old Amharic, lack of relative marker after እንደ has been observed by Cowley (1977: 141; an obviously related phenomenon is lack of relative marker after the conjunction ኩ, cf. Cowley 1977: 141; Getatchew Haile 1983: 163).

### III.4.7. Frequentative stems

Some Old Amharic texts are characterized by lack or extreme rarity of frequentative stems (Strelcyn 1964: 110; 1981: 77). It is therefore worth observing that the text under scrutiny contains three frequentative verbs (each of them employed twice):

\[ \text{እንዳይለያየ (f. 142r, l. 8), እንዳይለም (f. 142r, l. 9); እንዳይለኩ (f. 142r, l. 9; for the scribal error, cf. III.1), እኩይለም (f. 142r, l. 10); እንዳይለማም (f. 142r, l. 10), እኩይለማም (f. 142r, l. 11).} \]

### III.4.8. Prepositions

In the sequence of paired nouns on f. 141r, ll. 4–11, the comitative preposition is mostly ላ--; only twice is ኩ- employed with the same function.

There is one example of the ablative preposition ኩ- (f. 141v, l. 7). Besides, ኩ- is once used with the meaning “towards” (f. 141v, l. 3), which likewise finds parallels elsewhere in Old Amharic (Appleyard 2003: 115).

The semantic opposition between the comitative ላ- and directional ኩ- was observed by F. Praetorius (1879: 401). However, in the modern language ላ- has become a variant of ኩ- (cf. Leslau 1995: 605, 706 with n. 1; on the dialectal distribution cf. Zelealem Leyew 2007: 455). In at least some Old Amharic texts, the semantic distinction between ላ- and ኩ- is quite prominent, with only sporadic encroachment of one on the other’s domain. This is true of the “Royal Songs” (cf. Littmann 1943: 483, 489, 493), ጪጆክ እይኔሆን (Cowley 1974, cf. e.g. ablative ኩ- in 10v, lines 1, 4 vs. comitative ላ- in 12v, lines 5–6) and ከስግት ሳገይን (Goldenberg 2013, cf. e.g. ablative ኩ- in lines 23–4 vs. comitative ላ- in lines 27–30). In the discussion of ላ- and ኩ- in Old
Amharic, the semantic aspect is usually ignored, as in Cowley 1974: 605, Richter 1997: 550, Girma Awgichew Demeke 2014: 86.68

Several authors have observed the employment of the Geez preposition እንበለ “without” in Old Amharic instead of the Amharic ሳ (cf. Getatchew Haile 1983: 163; Appleyard 2003: 115; Cowley 1974: 606–7). In the present text, too, Geez እንበለ appears in f. 142r, ll. 2–3 in this function (admittedly, the whole phrase እንበለ፡ ሳንል might be considered a Geez insertion, cf. III.7).

III.5. Syntax

III.5.1. Simple and compound imperfect in the main clause

The text contains two instances of simple imperfect in the main sentence:

ተንክ፡ ደመንታት፡ እናንገት (f. 141r, l. 14);
እንበለ፡ ደሰለት (f. 141v, l. 11).

Less certain are three other cases, where the whole phrases may be Geez insertions (cf. III.7):

ዓለም፡ ሳላ፡ ያት፡ የመስል፡ ትሎት (f. 141r, ll. 1–2);
ትዋረስ፡ ሳለዓለም (f. 141r, ll. 14–5);
ትዋረስ፡ ሳለዓለም፡ ደመንታት (f. 142r, ll. 1–2).

At the same time, the text contains 17 examples of compound imperfect:

ታሳይሐለት (f. 141r, l. 4), ተሳይሐለቺ (f. 141r, l. 11), ደመንታት (f. 141r, l. 15), ደበልለቺ (f. 141v, l. 1), ደለወሸ (f. 141v, ll. 1–2; l. 14), ደበልለቺ (f. 141v, l. 2), ደመንታት (f. 141v, l. 3), ደመንታት (f. 141v, l. 3; l. 11), ደለወሸ (f. 141v, l. 4), ደረወገል (f. 141v, l. 5), ደለኀን ሳለልሸ (f. 141v, l. 6), ደለምድርሎል (f. 141v, l. 6), ደመንታት (f. 141v, l. 7), ደምምስል ደለል (f. 141v, l. 9), ደለት (f. 141v, l. 13).

Forms of the imperfect without auxiliary in main clauses are found in other Old Amharic texts (cf. Girma Awgichew Demeke 2014: 126–7). In the “Royal Songs” they are well attested, while the compound imperfect is absent (Richter 1997: 550). In most other texts one encounters both simple imperfect and compound forms in main clauses (cf. Cowley 1983b: 25; Getatchew Haile 1980: 579; Strelcyn 1981: 80; Girma Awgichew Demeke 2014: 128).

III.5.2. Agreement

In Getatchew Haile 1986: 236, lack of number agreement is mentioned as a specific Old Amharic feature. In two of three examples quoted by Getatchew Haile, the verb is marked as singular while its subject is represented by two coordinate nouns. In the text under scrutiny, this phenomenon can be observed in the following two phrases:

According to Girma Awgichew Demeke (2014: 86), “...the distribution of እል seems very limited in O[ld] A[mharic]”. This is certainly an underestimation: እል occurs six times in the “Royal Songs” and no fewer than 11 times in የመስል ነውን ከላይ ከማን የምስላት.
III.5.3. Post-pronominal -ት

One of the most interesting features of Old Amharic is the employment of the element -ት; absent from modern Amharic. This element, appearing after independent pronouns, demonstrative pronouns, and pronominal suffixes, was discovered and examined by Goldenberg, who analysed it as a copula (Goldenberg 1974: 247; 1976; cf. also Cowley 1977; 1983a: 24–5; 1983b: 25, 31–3). For criticism of this analysis cf. Getatchew Haile 1979b: 119–21; 1983: 167–8; 1986: 238–40. The element -ት is plausibly interpreted as a focus marker in Crass et al. 2005: 30 and Girma Awgichew Demeke 2014: 180–9.

In the present text, one example of post-pronominal -ት is found: ይሬን{አ} ከግር ከእ ጝት (f. 142r, l. 3). Note that this phrase is very similar to one of the examples adduced in Goldenberg 1974: 247 (ለስ ከተሐየኝ ከት ይኽት).

III.5.4. Word order

The rigid left-branching syntax of modern Amharic is not characteristic for the text under scrutiny. One finds quite a few clear examples of right-branching order (well attested for Old Amharic, cf. Girma Awgichew Demeke 2014: 138–44):

- Verb - Subject (ጭሬ: ይሬ ከእ ጝት in f. 141v, ll. 1–2; ይመር: ከሬ in f. 141v, l. 3; ይለምሳ: ከሬ in f. 141v, l. 5; etc.);
- Verb - Object (ስሬኳኝቷት ከሬ in f. 141r, l. 1; ይተለምሳ: ከሬ in f. 141r, l. 11; etc.);
- Verb - Indirect object (ክርስቶስ ከሬ in f. 141r, l. 13–14);
- Noun - Relative clause (ጭሬ: ይሬ ከእ in f. 141r, l. 1; ከሬ: ከሬ ከእ in f. 141r, l. 9).

Instances of left-branching word order are also present in the text. Note, for instance, the preverbal subject in ከሬ ከእ ከሬ in f. 141v, ll. 1–2; ከሬ ከሬ in f. 141v, l. 3; ከሬ ከሬ in f. 141v, l. 5; etc.; the preverbal object in ከሬ ከሬ in f. 141v, l. 11; etc.; relativized verb preceding the modified noun in ከሬ ከሬ in f. 141v, l. 7; etc.; genitive modifier preceding the modified noun in ከሬ ከሬ in f. 141v, l. 12 and ከሬ ከሬ in f. 141v, ll. 12–3). Note also the equative non-verbal clauses with the order Subject - Predicate - Copula in f. 142r, ll. 7–8.

III.6. Vocabulary

As expected, MärKL contains a number of lexemes absent or rarely used in modern Amharic, or divergent in form from their modern Amharic equivalents. Some of these can be found in sections III.3.1, III.3.2. Other lexemes from this text which are missing from Kane 1990 or divergent from the forms attested there are listed below.
III.6.1. ዓመት
The form ዓመት appears once in the text (f. 141r, l. 4) instead of the expected ወመት. The graphic variant of the same form, ሁመት, is known from other Old Amharic texts (Strelcyn 1981: 78). ዓመት is apparently a derivation from ወመ “appoint”, a direct correspondent of Gez. እመ̀ “appoint” (šimät “office”, Leslau 1987: 539–40; cf. also Tna. ዆መ̀ት/መ̀ት “office”, Kane 2000: 865).

On the passive stem from the same root, ወቁመት, attested in another Old Amharic text, see Appleyard 2003: 115 (where modern Amharic ወመት “office, appointment”, ወመ “to appoint” and ወቁመት “to be appointed” are correctly explained as back-formations from ወም).

III.6.2. ወቶት
The form ወቶት in f. 141r, l. 7 (in contrast with modern Amharic ወተት) is known from other Old Amharic sources (cf. Ludolf 1698: 72; Geta[chew Haile 1969–70: 76; Cowley 1974: 606; 1983a: 25; Bulakh and Kogan 2016: 222).

III.6.3. ይሚሸት
In f. 141r, l. 9, the form ይሚሸት instead of the expected ይሚሸት (unless due to a scribal error, cf. III.1) seems to point to a specific Old Amharic verb ይች (the variation ይሚሸት/ምሸት is in accordance with the orthography of Old Amharic, cf. III.2.4). The modern Amharic ይች “to smell” is then a recent innovation. Its cognates in South Ethio-Semitic exhibit various extensions of š-t, mostly via an additional vowel or laryngeal after t (Čah. šāta, ኢን الوصول. šātā, Eža Muḥ. šatta, እን ክ setzena’a, Leslau 1979: 587). Note especially Gaf. šičča (Leslau 1956: 238), whose underlying form may be identical with that of the hypothetical Old Amharic ይች.69

III.6.4. ያንላት
The word ያንላት in f. 141r, l. 10 is to be identified with fiñalat “tasse” (this word is mentioned in Strelcyn 1981: 72, l.1.1, although we could not find it in the Old Amharic text discussed by Strelcyn). The origin of this lexeme is probably to be sought in Gez. fəyyalat, pl. of fəyyal “vial, glass, bowl, cup” (Leslau 1987: 173; Dillmann 1865: 1377, < Gr. fi álē). The phonetic aspect of this identification is, however, far from clear: the change n > y, attested in Amharic dialects of Wogera and Wollo (Zealeam Leyew 2007: 451, 454) as well as in an Old Amharic text (Cowley 1983b: 21), is apparently unidirectional. The form ያንላት may have emerged under the influence of fəŋgal “porcelain teacup or coffee cup” (Kane 1990: 2321, < Arb. finğän-, cf. Leslau 1990: 18; on its presence in Old Amharic cf. Strelcyn 1964: 263). Despite the semantic difference, folk etymology regards fəŋgal as the Amharic equivalent of Gez. fəyyal (cf. Dästa Täklä Wäld 1962 AM: 985: fəŋgal... bä˘gǜız fəyyal yəbbalal “fəŋgal is called fəyyal in Geez”; cf. also Dillmann 1865: 1377). The insertion of n into fəyyal under the influence of fəŋgal would lead to fənyal > fən(ṇ)al.

69 Further cognates, pointing towards medial -o- (some of them with insertion of -n-), are more distant from the above-mentioned forms (cf. Leslau 1997: 220; 1963: 137; 1979: 587, 565, 569).
III.6.5. መንገርበት

መንገርበት in f. 141r, ll. 10–11 does not have a direct equivalent in modern Amharic. The only comparable lexeme is rather remote in shape: መስራብ “large trough in which water or other liquid is kept…” (Kane 1990: 622, < Arb. ስራብ-, Leslau 1990: 200). Yet an exact correspondent is found in Zay: ዋስንብ’Brien “kind of jar” (Leslau 1979: 669).

The Zay term may well be an early Amharism, ultimately going back to Arb. ስንብ- “cruchon en terre” (Biberstein Kazimirski 1860: 1211).

III.6.6. እኝቶኸ

In f. 141v, l. 4, the form እኝቶኸ appears, which is the 3 pl. (cf. III.4.4) converb (with the 2 sg. masc. object index) from the verb እኛ “to cause or to assist one to lie down” (cf. Getatchew Haile 1983: 160), itself a causative to *ኣኝ (cf. እኝሉ “I sleep”, etc.) attested in Geta[ch]ew Haile 1969–70: 71. On other Old Amharic attestations of this root, as well as on its cognates in other South Ethio-Semitic languages cf. Bulakh and Kogan 2016: 285–6.

III.6.7. ከስቡት

The lexeme ከስቡት in f. 141v, l. 5 might be a derivative from the verb ከስቡ “to draw, pull, pull tight” (Kane 1990: 513; however, the meaning “gravity, gravitation” adduced in Kane 1990: 514 for ከስቡattrs hardly fits the present context). Possibly it relates to some technical details in the Ethiopian seventeenth-century funeral ritual (cf. the references in notes 53–4 and Pankhurst 1990: 196–9). Could ከስቡት in the present context refer to something like ropes (the method of transporting the dead body has been already referred to above, see verse 55; cf. traditional depiction of lowering the body, wrapped in a mat or cloth, into the grave by means of ropes, Chojnacki 1983: 324, fig. 144c)? Alternatively, the word can be seen as a derivative from ከስቡattrs “to break the soil with the plough” (Kane 1990: 524; cf. also ከስቡattrs “first furrow”, ibid.), perhaps metaphorically referring to the instruments for digging the grave. Admittedly, both interpretations are highly speculative. A deeper historical study of the funeral practices of the Ethiopian Christian highlands might shed light on this passage, a task going beyond the scope of the article.

III.7. Geez insertions

As is usual with Old Amharic compositions, the text under scrutiny is interspersed with Geez lexemes, collocations and phrases. The distinction between the two languages is not always easy to draw (as in case of ከስቡት = Gez. ከስቡattrs and modern Amharic ከስቡattrs; or in case of some phrases such as እስፋም፡ እልበት፡ በምስለ፡ ይለካት, cf. below). Furthermore, one should distinguish between Geez borrowings (such as ወንግሌ፡፡ in f. 141r, l. 14, ከስቡት in f. 141v, l. 3, etc.)70 and sporadic Geez insertions. The latter are as follows:

70 Geez expressions mentioned as such in Kane 1990 have been considered here as Geez borrowings in Amharic. Obviously, this is an artificial criterion; in reality, there is no sharp borderline between accepted loanwords and sporadic insertions.
There is one phrase whose syntax clearly indicates a Geez insertion: [አን]ተ፡ውስ፡አን葑; ከሎት (f. 141r, ll. 11–12). Some further phrases may also be treated as written in Geez:

የለም፡ኀላን፡ትውስል፡ጽላሎት (f. 141r, ll. 1–2; note, however, the lack of the accusative marker -ä in ዋላሎት, which rather suggests an Amharic sentence with Geez loanwords/insertions);

ትዋረስ፡ዘለዓለም (f. 141r, ll. 14–5);

ትዋረስ፡ዘለዓለም፡መንግሥተ፡ሰማያት (f. 142r, ll. 1–2).

Furthermore, the theological postulates in f. 142r, ll. 5–7 are apparently written in Geez.

**III.8. Linguistic traits and the dating of the text**

On the basis of the linguistic evidence one can draw conclusions as to the time of creation of the text. Among other things, the text demonstrates the following archaic features: preservation of some gutturals (cf. III.3.1), right-branching syntax employed side-by-side with head-final structures (cf. III.5.4), non-obligatory status of the postpositional element -ም in negative main clauses (cf. III.4.5), possibility of employing the simple imperfect in main clauses (cf. III.5.1). According to Girma Awgichew Demeke (2014: 3), these features are typical of pre-eighteenth-century Amharic (cf. also above, I). The estimated time of the composition of MärKL could possibly be the first half or middle of the seventeenth century.

**IV. The witnesses of the Ḫāmgāmā ḫäbr poems**

Until recently, three witnesses of the Ḫāmgāmā ḫäbr have been known (following Getatchew Haile 2005, 2014, and applying his “labels”): C, in MS EMML no. 5483; E, in MS EMML no. 7007; and J, in MS Jerusalem, JE 541. The complicated relationships among them can be summarized as follows. The end of

71 According to Kane 1990: 14, the lexeme is present in Amharic with the meaning “sacramental bread”, while the meaning “bread” (clearly intended here) is restricted to the Shoan variety.
text C (lines 325–58 ca.) is related to the last part of text E (lines 311–41 ca.). The initial part of text J73 is related to the initial part of E (lines 1–137 ca.). At the same time, each witness has extensive text portions not shared with the others. On the present occasion, we would like to introduce a fourth, formerly unnoticed, witness of Märgämä kəbr which is transmitted in MS British Library, Orient. 575.75 It is very close to text J, so we have assigned to it a provisional siglum “J1”.76 MärKL, presented above, is a fifth Märgämä kəbr text. It is different from any of the published or accessible texts, and we can assume, at least for the moment, that MärKL is an independent composition.

An archetype text of the Märgämä kəbr could have existed, being the source of some or all known Märgämä kəbr poems, but the chance that it may ever be discovered is very small. One may hypothesize how the circulation of the Märgämä kəbr poems took place. We can consider several possibilities. The great differences between the texts might have resulted from: 1) wide circulation and transmission through many copies;77 2) the great liberty which the scribes took while copying those texts – using only a certain portion of the exemplar, readily diverging from it, introducing many additional verses, etc. As a result, the differences between the texts are so substantial that in effect each one represents a different recension of the poem, or is a nearly independent work. But the straightforward copying of the poems took place as well (as we observe on the example of J and J1); 3) the important role of the oral tradition in the creation and circulation of the poems (cf. below, V).

V. Märgämä kəbr poems and early Amharic literature

The published poems mentioned in section IV share not so much the text passages but primarily the poetic form of expression and didactic mood. They all convey, of course, one essential religious idea: one should reject the temptations

72 Cf. Getatchew Haile 2014: 446.
73 Denis Nosnitsin has recently visited the library of the Ethiopian Patriarchate in Jerusalem and inspected MS JE 541 (see Ephraim Isaac 1984–86: 74) which appears to be of primary importance for understanding the textual tradition of Märgämä kəbr poems.
74 Getatchew Haile 2005: 255, “Although E and J seem to originate from one source, they are different recensions … The collation, obviously, is limited to sections where the two documents do in fact have lines in common”.
75 Wright 1877: 119–20, no. cbxxvii, the poem occupies ff. 104v–109r. The manuscript was referred to in Cowley 1983b: 23, n. 6, but it has been largely overlooked.
76 The exact relationship between J and J1 is still to be clarified. The title Märgämä kəbr does not appear in J1. The text starts: ይሎ: ዝግልኝ: ክንፋው: ይለል: ይስር፡፡, cp. Getatchew Haile 2005: 257, n. 1; there is neither an introductory formula nor a concluding formula. The text is accommodated on the end-leaves but is incomplete (at least one text folio is missing). The text is divided into 12 parts by the word መሮብ “chapter” (the same in text J), partly accompanied by a number and in four cases followed by the sentence ይሎ፡ ዝግልኝ፡ “(This) book is good!” In six cases, the chapter ends with the sentence ይሎ፡ ዝግልኝ፡ ይእኳያ፡ ይር “What remains except the agony (of death)!”, (with some variations).
77 Which would imply that most of those copies have been lost or have not yet turned up. This cannot be completely excluded, because a large number of manuscripts from the essential collections in the most relevant regions (Amharic-speaking areas of Gondär, Goğam, etc.) are still inaccessible.
of the earthly world in order to avoid eternal damnation; one should take care since one never knows when and how one’s life will end. The depictions of the temptations and sins, of death, of the eternal punishment, and of the virtues constitute the main topics of the poems. Elaborating upon them, the poems partly overlap thematically but mostly use different imagery and narrative technique.78

If we assume that MärKL is an independent composition, then it seems that its seventeenth-century author was inspired or influenced by other Märgämä kəbr poems. The one who gave it the title Märgämä kəbr (the author or copyist?) was aware of the existence of a generic group with such a "label", a few works in Amharic sharing some essential similarities. Based on the conclusions of Getatchew Haile,79 we wonder if we should consider the Märgämä kəbr poems, which are rhymed didactic speech addressed to the community of the faithful, as a specific genre of early Amharic literature.80 Despite a certain vagueness in their formal characteristics, the Märgämä kəbr poems as a whole are clearly distinct from other kinds (“genres”) of early Amharic works.81 Moreover, the Märgämä kəbr as a genre can be placed alongside some other Christian literary traditions pivoting on the same main topics, i.e. condemning the temptations and the luxury of the worldly life, preparing the soul for the life after death, etc.82

78 Only accidentally do the poems coincide (in motifs rather than in exact wording). For instance, concerning MärKL and the poem in MS EMML 5483, cf. “dead body on a wooden stretcher” (Getatchew Haile 2014, verse 35; cf. verse 55 of MärKL), or “the world deceitful like a night dream” (Getatchew Haile 2014, verse 90; cf. verses 2–5 of MärKL). Parallelism is used intensively in all the poems, but for the rest the narrative technique is not always the same. Only the narrator in MärKL develops his discourse by telling about his “vision” – what “he saw without being asleep”. Elsewhere the narrator gives “useful advice” to his listeners (Getatchew Haile 2005, esp. ll. 3–4, 129, 159; Getatchew Haile 2014, esp. ll. 25, 71, 87–88). Formalizing the appearance of the text as a literary work was not considered necessary either. Not every poem employs the (Geez) title Märgämä kəbr, and not all have the introductory formula (“In the name of the Father, and the Son...”) and concluding formula.

79 Cf. Getatchew Haile 2014: 445, 447 (“During the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century, there came a point when Ethiopian religious teachers developed three approaches for teaching morality and theology in Amharic. These teachings took the forms of “The Five Pillars of Mystery ... catechism and poetry”; “... these texts might not be poems at all, but a third type of speech that stands between prose and poetry, a style that might be called ‘Rhyming Prose’ or ‘Poetic Prose’”).

80 i.e. “genre” in the sense of “kind of work” or “literary type”, as presented in, e.g., Cuddon 1998: 342, while “prose” and “poetry” are terms referring to the mode of language use (metrically organized compositions vs. those written in “natural”, unrestricted language).

81 The Amharic “heroic praise songs” also seem to represent a distinctive genre (being even looser, from the formal point of view, than the Märgämä kəbr poems); they were composed and circulated orally, and only in rare cases written down in manuscripts (the so-called “royal songs” are the best known examples, cf. Guidi 1889; Litmann 1914; the “panegyrics” in Getatchew Haile 1979a – warlike praise songs labelled by the composer as religious qane-poems – belong to this genre as well).

82 The Märgämä kəbr poems strongly remind us of a sizeable European literary production, in both Latin and vernacular languages, that evolved around the medieval religious concept of contemptus mundi “contempt of the world”. Some of the literary devices used for
The Märgämä kəbr poems were composed with the aim of direct religious education of the people, and the poetical mode of expression and the Amharic language were the appropriate means for this. The presence of MärKL specifically in the Missal manuscript MKL-008 is not at all accidental: it would have been meant as a post-liturgical edifying addition to the Missal. However, it cannot be excluded that the Märgämä kəbr poems were created, memorized and circulated mainly orally. In such a form they could easily incorporate – according to the needs, the literary skills and the background of the composer – fitting motifs and images originating from works of “elevated” Geez literature on the one hand, and from everyday life and culture as reflected in oral Amharic literature, on the other. Only in some cases were such compositions fixed in written form (see above, IV). Building fluid textual tradition(s), the poems were written down and copied possibly as a kind of aide memoire, providing for users (educated ecclesiastics, preachers?) a ready selection of topics and rhymed passages. This might be one of the ways the nascent Amharic written literature developed.

Abbreviations

Arb. – Arabic
Arg. – Argobba
Čah. – Čaha
ǐnd. – Ĭndāgaň
ǐnm. – Ĭnnämor
Gaf. – Gafat
Gez. – Geez

Those works were exactly the poetic mode of expression and the vision-form (cf. Gnädinger 1999, Silagi 1999 and other related articles).

83 Of course, the use of the Märgämä kəbr would be expected first in the Amharic-speaking area, and not in the core of Tigray. This might be indirect evidence concerning the origin of MS MKL-008, which was possibly produced not in Tigray (but in the Goğgam or Gondär area?) and introduced into the collection of Läq̃ay Kidanä Mǝḥrät only at a much later time. In assuming this, one immediately thinks of the collection of Mägdälä Mädhane ḢĀlam, captured by the British expeditionary troops in 1868, a large part of which was distributed among the churches of northern Ethiopia. The quality of the book and its scribal work might also speak for a place of manufacture outside Tigray. However, better proofs are not available for the moment; direct indications pointing to the Mägdälä Mädhane ḢĀlam collection are missing (such as a number written in a European hand on the guard leaf, or an ownership note mentioning that church; see Ancel and Nosnitsin2014).

84 On the whole, MärKL (and other Märgämä kəbr poems?) fits chronologically into the process of the birth of Amharic literature in the seventeenth century as described by Lanfranco Ricci (1969: 852). For the moment, it is unclear whether the Märgämä kəbr poems can be assigned to what Ricci calls “la controproduzione abissina monofisita in risposta” (to Catholic propaganda), and whether the Märgämä kəbr poems had any direct or indirect links to non-Ethiopian and non-Orthodox literary traditions (cf. the surprising conclusions regarding the Old Amharic work Mašīṭrā sägevat, Goldenberg 2013: 156–7). These issues go beyond the scope of the present article and should be treated in a new history of Amharic literature, which is an obvious desideratum.
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