The Etymology of Generosity-Related Terms
A Presentation of the EtymArab© Project – Part III

Abstract
This article is a presentation of the EtymArab© project, a start-up (“zero”) version of an etymological dictionary of Modern Standard Arabic. Taking the etymology of some generosity-related lexical items as examples, the study introduces the reader to the guiding ideas behind the project and the online dictionary’s basic features.
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This article continues from where part II, published in FOr 53 (2016): 59–104, had stopped.

After (1) a general introduction and (2) a description of the article’s structure, part I had started to discuss the etymology of generosity-related terminology with (3) the main terms for ‘generosity’, ‘liberality’, ‘magnanimity’, ‘open-handedness’ etc. themselves (karam, ğūd, saḥāʔ, qirā, zakāʔ, ṣadaqaʔ). Part II continued, in section (3), with some verbs for ‘to give liberally, generously’ (?aʕṭà, ?ahdà, wahaba, saʔala) and two counter-concepts of generosity (buḥl, luʔm), as well as, in section (4), with some ethical concepts under which we may subsume generosity as a sub-concept, such as ‘manliness’, ‘tradition passed on from the forefathers’, etc. (murūʔat, ḥurriyyat, ġiwār, diyāfāt, sunnaʔ, ḥadāb). Section (5) will now deal with some beneficiaries of generosity and hospitality and (6) with frequent ‘markers’ of hospitable places, to conclude, in Part IV [FOr 55 (2018)] with section (7) with rituals performed and objects magnanimously given, and (8) metaphors that we often meet in generosity discourses.
5. The beneficiaries of generosity and hospitality

Given the centrality of generosity as an ethical concept, both in pre-Islamic society and later, the beneficiaries of generosity are as many as the ways of showing one’s liberality, largehandedness, magnanimity, or munificence. The present article picks out the guest/stranger, the one asking for protection/neighbour, the captive, the widow, and the orphan.

5.1. ḏayf (+ ḏiyāfaī)

As hospitality is one major occasion to give proof of one’s generosity, the words for ‘guest’, ḏayf, and, derived from it, ‘hospitality’, ḏiyāfaī, have to be the first to be looked at in this section. With ḏayf we meet again the difficulty to decide what was first, the hen or the egg. The author of the entry on “ḥayf” in the 2nd edition of the Encyclopedia of Islām holds that the word is derived from a verbal root ḏYF meaning, originally, ‘to incline towards, to set (of the sun), swerve, glance off (of an arrow)’ and later developing into ‘to turn aside (from one’s road)’ (cf. ḏīf ‘side’) and ‘to halt (on a visit to someone)’, »whence for the noun the sense of ‘guest’« (J. Lecerf, art. “Ḍayf”, in EI²). In addition to the values ‘guest’ and ‘to incline; to turn aside’ (the latter obsolete in MSA), we have to account for yet another value of ḏYF (the most present in MSA): ‘to take in, add’. Although at first sight ‘guest’ and ‘to add’ do not seem to have much in common, they are probably related. In spite of a considerable degree of uncertainty, I will treat both under the lemma ḏayf, assuming that ‘to take in, add’ is secondary, a semantic extension of ‘to welcome, take in as a guest’. But it could be the other way round as well: *‘to take in, add’ > ‘person who comes in addition, is taken in (as a guest)’. – The value ‘to incline, approach, draw near’ that we meet in ClassAr and that may well lie at the basis of both ‘guest’ and ‘to add’, does not help to decide which of the two would be the primary derivation. The meaning ‘to fear’, also encountered in ClassAr (but obsolete in MSA), can be interpreted as a specialisation in meaning: *‘to turn away’ > *‘to turn away from fear’ > ‘to fear’. Should this be correct, a ḏayf ‘guest’ may originally have been either *‘s.o. who has turned away (in fear?) (and is now seeking refuge)’ or ‘s.o. who has turned away (from his path) (and is now approaching, drawing near)’. – Here is how the above considerations ‘materialize’ in two EtymArab entries:

**LEMMA**  ḏYF  ضيّف

**GRAM**  “root”

**ENGL**  
* ḏYF₁ ‘guest, hospitality’ → ḏayf  
* ḏYF₂ ‘to add’ → ḏayf
»From the basic meaning ‘to incline towards, to set (of the sun), swerve, glance off (of an arrow)’, the verbal root comes to mean ‘to turn aside (from one’s road)’ and ‘to halt, on a visit to someone’, whence for the noun the sense of ‘guest’ [...]« – J. Lecerf, art. “Ḍayf”, in EI².

Although at first sight the two values do not seem to have much in common, they are probably related. Both are treated under the main lemma → dayf ‘guest’, assuming that DYF₂ is secondary, a semantic extension of DYF₁: *‘the one who is taken in as a guest’ > ‘to take in (in general), add’. But it could be the other way round as well: *‘to take in, add’ > ‘person who comes as addition, is taken in (as a guest)’. In ClassAr, also the values ‘to incline, approach, draw near’ and ‘to fear’ occur. Of these, ‘to incline, turn away’ could be the original value (cf. †ḍīf ‘side’), while ‘to fear’ could be explained as a limitation in meaning: *‘to turn away (from fear)’ > ‘to fear’. Should this be correct, then a dayf ‘guest’ may originally have been either *s.o. who has turned away (in fear?) (and is now seeking refuge)’ or ‘s.o. who has turned away (from his path) (and is now approaching, drawing near)’. Cf. Lecerf’s suggestion in EI² quoted in the CONCISE section.

**CONCISE**

- **LEMMA** Ḍayf ضَيْف, pl. ḍuyūf, ṭadyāf, dīfān
- **META** ID 532 • C • SW – • BP 1454 • √ḌYF
- **GRAM** n.
- **ENGL** 1. guest; 2. visitor – Wehr/Cowan 1979.
- **CONCISE**
  - »From the basic meaning ‘to incline towards, to set (of the sun), swerve, glance off (of an arrow)’, the verbal root comes to mean ‘to turn aside (from one’s road)’ and ‘to halt, on a visit to someone’, whence for the noun the sense of ‘guest’ [...]« – J. Lecerf, art. “Ḍayf”, in EI².
  - Orel/Stolbova 1994 #584 derive the word from a reconstructed Sem *šayp- ‘guest’ < ? AfrAs *cayVp- ‘stranger, guest’. Should this be correct then the AfrAs reconstruction with its dichotomy of ‘stranger’ and ‘guest’ would parallel very well a similar ambiguity in other cultures, cf., e.g., Grk xénos ‘(potentially dangerous) stranger; guest, friend’, Lat hostis ‘enemy’ vs. (from the same Idg root) hospes ‘host; guest’ (cf. also Fr étranger, Engl stranger vs. Fr étrange, Engl strange).
  - For the concept of diyāfāt, see s.v.
COGN

- Orel/Stolbova 1994 #584: Ḥrs Mhr ḏayf. – Outside Sem: WCh *ṭay(V)p- ‘friend; pilgrim, stranger; guest’, CCh *mi-šip- ‘guest’.
- Militarev/Stolbova 2007: Qat ḏayf ‘to ask to make a trading journey’, Mhr ḏayf/ ḏiṣon ‘guest, wedding guest’, Jib eḏef ‘to give hospitality’, Ḥrs ḏayf ‘guest’, Soq ḏayf ‘guest, wedding guest’, Jib ḏef ‘to give hospitality’, Ḥrs ḏayf ‘guest’, Soq ḏef ‘recevoir qq’un comme hôte’. The forms in the modSAr languages may be Arabisms. – Outside Sem: ṣapa, nzàf ‘friend’ in 2 WCh languages; ṱép, mos ‘stranger’ in 3 WCh idioms; mì-zèp, mì-sìp ‘stranger; guest’ in 4 WCh idioms; mì-zèp, mì-sìp ‘stranger; guest’ in 2 WCh idioms; mì-sìbì, mì-sìpì, mì-sìbì, mì-sìpì in 4 CCh languages; and čap- ‘to pay bridewealth’ 1 SCush language.

DISC

Orel/Stolbova 1994 and Militarev/Stolbova 2007: From Sem *ṣ̂ayp- ‘guest’. Because of the WCh (*ṭay(V)p- or *ṭay(V)f- ‘friend; stranger; guest’), CCh (*mi-šip- or *mi-šipì ‘guest’) and SCush (*čap- ‘pay bridewealth’) cognates, a common AfrAS origin can be assumed, the most probable reconstruction for which is *ṭayVp- ‘stranger, guest’. The authors assume also a denominative vb. Sem *ṭayVp- ‘guest’. Because of the WCh (*ṭay(V)p- or *ṭay(V)f- ‘friend; stranger; guest’), CCh (*mi-šip- or *mi-šipì ‘guest’) and SCush (*čap- ‘pay bridewealth’) cognates, a common AfrAS origin can be assumed, the most probable reconstruction for which is *ṭayVp- ‘stranger, guest’.

DERIV

ḍāfa i (diyāfa), vb. I, to stop or stay as a guest: denominative (?).

ḍayyafa, vb. II, to take in as a guest, receive hospitably, entertain: D-stem, denom., caus.

BP#291 ṭaḍāfa, vb. IV, 1. = II: *Ṣ-stem, denom., caus.; 2. to add, subjoin, annex, attach; to adminx; 3. to connect, bring in relation (ʔilà with); 4. to ascribe, attribute, assign (ʔilà to s.o.): fig. use (?).

インドέ, vb. VII, to be added, be annexed, be subjoined, be attached (ʔilà to): N-stem, pass. of I, fig. use (?).

BP#3942 ḡistāḍāfa, vb. X, to invite s.o. to be one’s guest: *Ṣt-stem, denom., requestative.

diyāfaī, n.f., hospitable reception, entertainment as guest, accomodation; hospitality: vn. I. – For the concept see → s.v.

midyāf, adj., hospitable; n., hospitable host: ints. formation.

maḍāfaī, n.f., hostel, guesthouse, inn: n.loc.

maḍyafaī, n.f., guest room; guesthouse: n.loc.

BP#382 ṭiḍāfaī, n.f., 1. addition, apposition; 2. subjunction, annexation, appending, attachment, augmentation, supplementation; 3. assignment, allocation; 4. ascription, attribution (ʔilà to): vn. IV, fig. use; 5. genitive construction (gram.): specialised meaning | ~ ʔilà ṭiḥal, limitation (of a legal transaction; Isl. Law).

BP#2419 ṭiḍāfī, adj., 1. additional, supplementary, auxiliary, contributory, extra; 2. secondary, subsidiary, tributary, accessory, incidental, side-, by (in compounds): nisba formation from ṭiḍāfaī; 3. relative (philos.): dto., from ṭiḍāfaī
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ʔiḍāḥīyyaṭ, n.f., relativity (philos.): n.abstr. in -iyyaṭ from ʔiḍāṭi < ʔiḍāfaṭ. – In contrast, Einstein’s “relativity” is consistently rendered in MSA as → nisbiyya, cf. Monteil 1960: 194, 203.

BP#1956muḍīf, n., host: lexicalized PA IV.

muḍīfaṭ, n.f., hostess; air hostess, stewardess: specialization, lexicalized PA IV, f.

muḍāf, 1. adj., added, subjoined, adjoined, apposed: PP IV; 2. n., construct state (gram.): nominalized PP IV.

5.2. ǧār (+ ǧiwr)

In pre-Islamic Arabia, the neighbour, ǧār, held a position that was of equal importance as that of the guest, ḍayf, and just like ḍiyāfāṭ ‘hospitality’ also ǧiwr ‘neighbourhood’ was a key concept in that time’s society and culture because it also was a legal institution: it implied the *‘treatment like a neighbour’, i.e., giving certain guaranties and granting ‘protection, asylum’.

As a noun with a long -ā- between R₁ and R₃, ǧār could – theoretically – be from a root with R₂ = W or Y. While this often creates some ambiguity, in our case it is easy to hold ǦWR apart from ǦYR and focus exclusively on the former.¹ There is not so much variety in ǦWR as in other roots either. Yet, we still have five major themes, three of which obviously are borrowings. The corresponding disambiguation entry therefore looks as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEMMA</th>
<th>ǦWR</th>
<th>جور</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRAM</td>
<td>“root”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>• ǦWR_1 ‘neighbour, to protect, grant asylum’</td>
<td>→ ǧār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ǦWR_2 ‘to deviate; to oppress, tyrannize, be unjust, despotic’</td>
<td>→ ǧāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ǦWR_3 ‘pit, hole’</td>
<td>→ ǧūraṭ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ǦWR_4 ‘jury’</td>
<td>→ ǧūrī (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ǦWR_5 ‘damask rose; crimson’</td>
<td>→ ǧūrī (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCISE Out of the 8 values DRS registers for the root GWR in Sem, only 4 are represented in Ar. DRS #GWR-3 (Ar ‘attaquer’) does not seem to differ essentially from #GWR-2 (Ar ‘être injuste envers qn., pécher’). Given the many cognates of #GWR-1 and #GWR-2, these are without doubt genuine Sem (for #GWR-1 = ǦWR_1, Kogan 2015 reconstructs

¹ Under √ǦYR, Wehr/Cowan has only the strange – and obviously already very old – adv. ǧayri ‘surely, truly, verily’, of obscure etymology, as well as the nouns (both with deriv.s) ǧīr ‘lime’ (perh. < Aram ǧīrāṭ), and ǧūrāṭ ‘endorsement (fin.)’ (< It giro); one should perh. also add EgAr ǧīr ‘gear’ (< Engl).
Sem *gwr ‘to dwell together, be a neighbour’). – As for #GWR-6, the obsol. ġuwār ‘caverne’ given by DRS seems to correspond to our ĠWR_3 ġūrat ‘pit, hole’, which Rolland 2014 thinks is a Pers borrowing. – ĠWR_4 and ĠWR_5 are clearly non-Sem.

COGN


DISC

• ĠWR_1: From Sem *gwr ‘to dwell together, be a neighbour’ (Kogan 2015). For the semantic ambiguity found within this value in many languages – both ‘seeking protection’ (as a neighbour) and ‘providing protection (to a stranger, treating him as neighbour)’ – cf. below, entry → ġār.

• ĠWR_2: According to DRS (and ClassAr lexicography), ġāra ‘to do injustice’ and ‘to attack’ are perhaps related to ĠWR_1 ‘protected stranger’: If one assumes a basic meaning of ‘s’écarter du chemin, être à côté’, we get a constellation that is similar to the one discussed in the DYF and dayf entries: the one who deviates from his path and inclines to s.o. else’s direction can become both a ‘neighbour’ and an ‘attacker’.

• ĠWR_3: According to Rolland 2014, Ar ġūrat ‘pit, hole’ is from Pers gor ‘tomb, grave’, an etymology not given in DRS ( #GWR-6) where the word ġuwār is paralleled, though not without hesitation, with nHbr m‘gūrā ‘granary, storehouse, reservoir’, an item that for Klein 1987 is »of uncertain origin; perhaps formed from gwr (= to sojourn, dwell)«.

• ĠWR_4: From Engl jury, < oFr juré ‘jury’ < oFr jurer ‘to swear, endorse law by swearing an oath’ < Lat iurare, from ius (iur-) ‘law’.
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▪ ĞWR_5: After a town named Ĝur in Iran (the one in Kerman?) (Rolland 2014).

LEMMΑ Ĝahr ٣، pl. Ĝirān

META C • SW – • BP 1550 • √ĜWR

GRAM n.


CONCISE The n. which originally meant s.o. forming part in a mutual relationship of protecting and protection (an important cultural institution), belongs to the Sem root *GWR ‘to dwell together, be a neighbour’ (Militarev/Stolbova: Sem *gūr- ‘to live; to be close by’ < AfrAs *gir- ‘to live’; Dolgopolsky: WSem *-gūr- ‘to dwell’ < Nostr *gū\‘w’RV ‘(roof of a) hut; to dwell’).


▪ Outside Sem, Militarev/Stolbova 1995 #932 compare (LECush) Som gir-, Or gir, Rend *gir-, u.a. ‘to be, exist’; Dolgopolsky 2012 #663 juxtaposes evidence from Sem languages with (LECush) Som gūr ‘house, home’, Rend gūra ‘to move to a new dwelling place’, Sid gare ‘tribe, people, village’ and (WChad) Hau Ĝārī, ‘town, inhabited environment’.

1 Cf. also Mhr šagēwār, Jib sāgēr ‘to become neighbour; to ask (God) for protection’ and Soq gārheten ‘female neighbours’; but these are likely to be borrowed from Ar – Kogan 2015.

DISC ▪ Like → ḏayf, also Ĝār may ultimately be *‘s.o. who has deviated from the path and inclined towards the side’. This – unattested – hypothetical basic meaning must be assumed if we try to see Sem *GWR ‘to dwell together, be a neighbour’ together with *GWR ‘to be hostile, attack, oppress’; the *stranger (who has lost his way) may both ‘ask for protection as a neighbour’ and ‘attack’, become a ‘foe’; see disambiguation entry → ĜWR.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Complemented with data from Kogan 2015: 117 (values given in Engl or Lat).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Irrespective of the preceding, ģār is treated in ClassAr lexicography as one of the ḥaddād (sg. ḍidd), i.e., words that, apart from one meaning, may take another that is – or at least seems to be – its exact opposite. Even in MSA, the two values [v1] ‘neighbour’ and [v2] ‘refugee’ still seem to be contradictory. [v3] ‘protégé, charge’, however, gives the modern speaker a hint as to how [v1] and [v2] are related: a refugee is s.o. who asks for and/or is granted protection like/as a neighbour. In ClassAr, the neutral value ‘neighbour’ and the passive ‘foreigner, seeker of protection’ or ‘protected one’ are complemented by the active ‘giver of protection, one who grants refuge, protects, preserves, an aider, assister, confederate’ (Lane). As Nöldeke has shown in his famous study on the ḥaddād (Wörter mit Gegensinn, 1910: 72–73), the semantic “riddle” can be explained through a change of perspective: primarily, the ģār is neither the ‘protector’ nor the ‘protected’ (or ‘seeker of protection’) but a person who is involved, as either the giver or the recipient, in a ġiwār, which is a mutual relationship (known also from Eur languages, cf. e.g. Lat hospes, It ospite, Fr hôte ‘host; foreigner, guest’), an institution of customary law that includes rights and obligations on both parts, cf. art. “Djiwār” (J. Lecerf), in EI².

Militarev & Stolbova 1995 #932 reconstruct Sem *gūr- ‘to live; to be close by’ and LEC *gir- ‘to be, exist’, both going back to AfrAs *gir- ‘to live’. Very similarly, Dolgopolsky 2012 #663 reconstructs WSem *-gūr- ‘to dwell’, which he thinks is derived, together with the ECush and WChad (*garV ‘town’) vocabulary as well as some alleged Dravidic and Altaic cognates, ultimately from Nostr *gū(w) RV ‘(roof of a) hut; to dwell’.

Alongside with ‘neighbour’, the Qurʔān still has also the value ‘protector’: (neighbour) Q 4:36 wa’l-ḡāri ḏī ‘l-qurbā ‘and unto the neighbour who is of kin’; (one who protects, grants asylum or sanctuary) Q 8:48 lā ḡāliba la-kumu ‘l-yawma mina ‘l-nāsi wa-ʔinnī ḡārun la-kum ‘no man shall conquer you today for I am a protector for you’.

• ǧāwara (vb. III, to dwell in the neighbourhood of, be become adjacent to, be a neighbour of) Q 33:60 ūmma lā yuḡāwirīna-ka fī-hā ḍillā qalīlan ‘then they will not be your neighbours in it but for a short time’. • ẓaḡāra (vb. IV, to protect, grant asylum or sanctuary) Q 72:22 ḍinnī lan yuḡīrā-nī mina ‘l-lāhi ḍahadun ‘no one will protect me against God’. • istaḡāra (vb. X, to ask for protection, seek asylum, seek sanctuary) Q 9:6 wa-ʔin ḍahadun mina ‘l-mušrikīna ʾstaḡāra-ka fa-ʔāgīr-hu ḥattā yasmaša’ kalāma ‘llāhi ‘And if anyone of the idolaters
should seek your protection (O Muhammad), then protect him so that he may hear the Word of God’.

**DERIV**

*ǧāwara*, vb. III, to be the neighbour of s.o. (DO), live next door to; to be adjacent, be next (DO to s.th.), adjoin; to be in the immediate vicinity of, be close to; to border (DO on): L-stem, denom., associative.

*ʔaḡāra*, vb. IV, to grant asylum or a sanctuary (DO to s.o.); to protect (DO s.o., *min* from), take (s.o.) under one’s wing; to stand by s.o. (DO), aid: *Š*-stem, denom., caus. (*to make s.o. one’s protégé*)

*taḡawara*, vb. VI, to be neighbours; to be adjacent; to have a common border: tL-stem, intr.

*ʔistaḡāra*, vb. X, to seek protection, seek refuge (*bi-* with s.o., *min* from s.th.), appeal for aid (DO to s.o., *min* against s.th.): *Št*-stem, requestative.

*ʔārāf*, pl. -āt, n.f., neighbouress: f. of ǧār.

*ʔāraf*, n.f., neighbourhood: quasi-vn. I.

*ʔiḡwār*, n., neighbourhood, proximity: vn. III; *bi-* prep., in the neighbourhood of, in the vicinity of, near, close to | ʔiḥār ~ʔi-hā, adv., beside him, at his side

*muḡwaraṭ*, n.f., neighbourhood, proximity: vn. III.

*ʔiḡrār*, n.f., protection, granting of asylum: vn. IV.

*taḡawur*, n., neighbourhood (reciprocal); contiguity, relationship (of several things): vn. VI.

*muḡwir*, 1. adj., neighbouring, adjacent; near, close by; 2. (pl. -ūn), n., student (esp. of Al Azhar University; living in the vicinity of the Mosque): PA III.

*muḡr*, n., protector: PA IV.

*mutaḡwir*, adj., having a common border; adjoining, adjacent, contiguous: PA VI.

### 5.3. ʔasīr

As the example of the ǧār, the stranger who is granted protection within a ǧiḡwār agreement, shows, the typical beneficiary of a noble Arab’s generosity is not necessarily a “normal” guest (*ḍa/yf*) on equal social level with the donor, but often somebody in a rather precarious situation. This holds especially true also for the next three beneficiaries: widows, orphans, and prisoners or captives.

To start with the latter, ʔasīr belongs to √ʔSR for which *DRS* 1 (1994) s.v. gives three values in Semitic. Of these, however, only the first is relevant for Arabic. Since the root does not display a larger semantic heterogeneity I allow myself to skip the disambiguation entry here and instead focus on the verb from which ʔasīr obviously is derived:
**LEMMA** ʔasar-، i (?asr)

**META** sw –/171 (to tie) • BP ... • √ʔSR

**GRAM** vb., I

**ENGL** 1. to bind, fetter, shackle, chain; 2. to capture, take prisoner; 3. to captivate, fascinate, hold spellbound, absorb, arrest (the attention) – Wehr/Cowan 1979.

**CONCISE**

- The values ‘to take as captive, prisoner’ and ‘entirety, wholeness, body, constitution; family’ (→ ʔasr, → ʔusraẗ) are dependent on the original meaning, giving ‘to bind/tie a person’ and ‘what is bound/tied/held together’, respectively.

- Orel/Stolbova 1994 reconstruct Sem *ʔVsir- ‘to bind, join; to hobble [an animal]’ and, on account of some extra-Sem vb.s that may be cognate, see even an AfrAs dimension, reconstructed as AfrAs *ʔacir- ‘to bind, tie’.

**COGN**


- Orel/Stolbova 1994 #12: Akk esēru, Ug ḍsr, Hbr ḍsr ‘to bind, join’, Hrs Mhr wesēr, Ṣḥ ḏssor ‘to hobble [an animal]’. – Outside Sem: CCh Mofu sasər ‘to plait, weave’, Mafa cacar ‘to tie’; ECh Tum hīr, Kbl sa:rr, Lele saar; HECush Sid Kmb usur ‘to tie’.

**DISC**

- Orel/Stolbova 1994 #12 reconstruct Sem *ʔVsir- ‘to bind, join; to hobble’, CCh *ca-car- (with partial reduplication) ‘to plait, weave; to tie’, ECh *sa?ir- (with metathesis) ‘to tie’ and HECush *ʔusur- (unexpected *s- and irregular vocalism) ‘to tie’, all ultimately from AfrAs *ʔacir- ‘to bind, tie’.

- Apart from the vb. ḍasara, Ar also has the n. ḍasr ‘strap, thong’ from which the vb., theoretically, could be denominative. The research literature I found does not consider this possibility.

**SEMHIST**  

**eC7 ḍasara** Q 33:26 farīqan taqtulūna wa-taʔsirūna farīqan ‘Some ye slew, and ye made captive some’.  

**ʔasr** (physique, build, bodily structure; constitution) Q 76:28 nāḥnu ḥalaqānu-hum wa-šadadnā ḍasra-hum ‘We it is who have fashioned them and strengthened their constitution’

**DERIV**  

istaʔsara, vb. X, to surrender, give o.s. up as prisoner: *Št-stem, requestative.
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ʔasr, n., 1. (leather) strap, thong; 2. capture: perhaps the etymon proper; 3. BP#2268 capture: vn. I | ʃiddat al-ʔasr, n., vigor, energy

BP#664 ʔusra, pl. ʔusar, -ʔat, n.f., family; dynasty; clan, kinsfolk, relatives: see → s.v.

BP#2268 bi-ʔasrihi, adv., entirely, completely, altogether, ǧāʔū bi-ʔasrihim all of them came, they came one and all: lit., as a coherent body, held together by some bond; cf. also → ʔusra.

ʔisār, n., 1. (leather) strap, thong: the etymon proper, or derived from ʔasara ?; 2. captivity; 3. captivation, enthrallment: vn. I | waqaʕa fī ʔisārih, expr., to be subjected to s.th., fall into the clutches of s.th.

BP#1292 ʔasir, pl. ʔusar riʔ, ʔasār, ʔasārā, n., prisoner, captive, prisoner of war: quasi-PP; see also → s.v.

ʔasīra, pl. -ʔat, n.f., female prisoner, slave girl: f. of ʔasīr, quasi-PP.

ʔāsir, adj., winning, captivating, fascinating: PA I; n., captor: nominalized PA I.

maʔsūr, adj., captivated, fascinated, enthralled: PP I.

5.4. ʔarmalaʔ (+ murmil)

The standard word for ‘widow’ belongs to a root to which a large variety of different meanings is attached in MSA and even more so in classical Arabic. This calls for a rather detailed disambiguation entry:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEMMA</th>
<th>RML رمل</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRAM</td>
<td>“root”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>• RML_1 ‘sand’ → raml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• RML_2 ‘(to be/become) a widow(er)’ → ʔarmalaʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• RML_3 ‘ramal’ (a metre in classical poetry) → ramal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For other values, now obsolete, cf. disc below.

CONCISE

• A rather complex root in ClassAr, √RML today shows only three major values. Of these, ‘(to be/become) a widow(er)’ is said to be dependent on ‘sand’ by indigenous lexicographers, but this seems to be wrong.

• The root is only scarcely represented in Sem (only ‘sand’ in modSAr), and not at all in AfrAs. It seems to be an Ar innovation.

COGN

• Classical dictionaries make RML_2 depend on RML_1, the notion of ‘be(com)ing a widow(er)’ being regarded as a secondary value, developed from an earlier *‘to be(come) poor, needy’, thought to be a metaphorical extension from ‘sand’ (< *‘to look like s.o. who is creeping in the sand’, because s/he is near starvation). But Kogan 2011 gives another etymology, see → ʔarmalaʔ.
In contrast, RML_3 ‘ramal’, the term for one of the metres of classical poetry, is said to derive from †ramala, u (ramalān, ramal, marmal), vb. I, now extinct, with the meaning of (inter al.) ‘to go in a kind of trotting pace, between a walk and a run; to go quickly’ or from RML_4, see below and → ramal.

Other notions attached to √RML and found in ClassAr include:

- RML_4 †‘to weave (thinly, a mat of palm-leaves, or the like)’: †ramala u (raml), vb. I, ? hence also: ‘to ornament with jewels, precious stones, gems, etc.’

- RML_5 †‘to have little rain’: †ramila a (ramal), vb. I, in ramilat al-sanaː, perhaps fig. use of ‘to run short (of provision), become poor’, but it may also be denom. from ramal, pl. ʔarmāl, n., ‘weak rain, little rain’. Connected to RML_1 ‘sand’?

- RML_6 †‘to lengthen, make long, wide (rope, cord)’: one of the many values of ʔarmala (vb. IV); cf. also †ramal ‘redundance, excess (in a thing)’.

- RML_7 †ramal ‘(black/white) lines, or streakes, upon the legs of the wild cow’; †rumlaː, pl. rumal, ʔarmāl ‘diversity of colours upon the legs of the wild bull; black line, or streak (upon the back and thighs of a gazelle)’; ʔarmalu ‘(= ʔalbaqa) black and white’. – Connected to RML_1 ‘sand’?

- RML_8 †ʔurmūlaː ‘stump of (the plant, tree, called) ʕarfāq, stock, stem’.

Also from RML_1 ‘sand’ or, more precisely, the denom./caus. vb.s II rammala ‘to put sand into s.th. (food)’ (and hence ‘contaminate’) and IV ʔarmala ‘to become sandy; cleave to the sand’ are such specialised meanings as (II) ‘to smear (with blood)’ (probably < *‘sprinkle blood on s.th. like sand’), ‘to adulterate, corrupt, render unsound (speech)’ (< ... like contaminating food by putting sand into it) and (IV) ‘to be smeared with blood (arrow, the claws of a lion, etc.)’. – The value ‘geomancy’ derives from the fact that a kind of divination was practised by means of figures or lines in the sand.

For the sake of conciseness I will not treat the lemmata raml (‘sand’) and ramal (the poetical metre, 6 times fāsilātun – – –) here3 nor in any way touch upon the other, now obsolete values. Instead, it is indicated to concentrate on ‘widow(er)’. Since it seems probable that the masc. form ʔarmal is secondary,

3 For raml and ramal the reader is kindly referred to the respective entries in the current EtymArab© test version in the Bibliotheca Polyglotta, see intro to Part I, FO 52 (2015): 173–4.
derived from the fem., I have made the latter the main entry to deal with the semantic complex:

**LEMMA** ʔərmalaẗ أرَمْلَة, pl. ʔərāmilˤ, ʔərāmilatˤ

**META**  SW – • BP ... • √RML

**GRAM**  n.f.

**ENGL**  widow – Wehr/Cowan 1979.

**CONCISE**  If Kogan 2011 is right, the word derives from Sem *ʔalman-at- ‘widow’. In this case, indigenous Ar etymology which makes the word dependent on → raml ‘sand’ should be dismissed. Ar lexicographers regard ‘widow’ as a semantic extension: ‘sand’ > ‘to cleave to the sand’ > ‘to look (so poor and needy) like s.o. who is cleaving to the sand because his/her traveling provisions are exhausted’ > ‘to be in need of s.o. who provides for o.s.’ > ‘to be a widow’ (because widows are in need of s.o. to provide for them).

An explanation of this evidence could be that with the gradual mutation, in Ar, of a Sem *ʔalman-at- to ʔərmal-aẗ, the original value of *LMN ‘to be without support, be in need of support’ began to overlap with Ar RML ‘sand’, ‘be covered with sand’, ‘creep in the sand’, ‘look sandy’, etc., so that the explanation of ‘being in need of support’ as derived from ‘being destitute, look poor like s.o. covered with sand’ seemed plausible to the Arab lexicographers.

**COGN**  Akk almattu,⁴ Ug ʔalmnt, Hbr ʔalmānā, Syr ʔarmaltā ‘widow’ – Kogan 2011.

**DISC**  • Classical dictionaries make ʔərmalaẗ depend on → raml ‘sand’: for them, the notion of ‘be(com)ing a widow(er)’ seems to be a secondary value, developed from an earlier †‘to be(come) poor, needy’. For the vb. IV ʔərmala, for example, Lane iii (1867) gives ‘to become sandy’, hence (!) ‘to become poor’ [as though cleaving to the sand], ‘to become s.o. whose travelling-provisions became difficult to obtain’, [... or] exhausted, or consumed’, and hence (!) ‘to become an ʔərmalāt (said of a woman), i.e., without a husband’ »because of her being in need of one to expend upon her«.

• Kogan 2011 reconstructs PSem *ʔalman-at- ‘widow’ and thinks that the Syr and Ar forms (showing -r- instead of *-l-) »must be related with a mutation of sonorants.«

• Given, on the one hand, the wider Sem dimension and the old age of the meaning ‘woman without support, widow’ proper, and,

⁴ CAD: ‘woman without support, widow’.
on the other hand, the abundance of instances in ClassAr where the lack of support is associated with the “creeping in the sand” of those miserable who have come in a situation of need, we may be confronting a case of semantic overlapping and contamination here in which two originally distinct roots, *LMN and *RML, have merged, with *LMN mutating, phonologically, to RML and the sense of ‘lack of support’ intersecting and eventually being integrated into that of ‘sand’.

**SEMHIST**
For the ClassAr dictionaries, the primary value of ʔərmal (as well as the PA IV, †murmil) is (Lane iii-1867) ‘a man whose provisions, or travelling-provisions, have become difficult to obtain, or exhausted, or consumed, and who has become poor’, hence also the more general meaning ‘needy, needing, in want’ and even ‘destitute, indigent’, the pl. ʔərmil in and ʔərmilat being applied also to ‘men without women, or women without men, after they have become in need or want’. While the m. does not seem, in ClassAr, to be used (in the sg. at least) with the specific meaning ‘widower’, the f. ʔərmala can mean ‘woman having no husband’ (in general) and, more specifically, ‘widow’. Wherever ʔərmal nevertheless means ‘widower’ this is regarded by many authorities to be »cases of deviation from the usual course of speech [...] because the man’s provision does not go in consequence of the death of his wife, since she is not his maintainer, whereas he is her maintainer« (ibid.).

**DERIV** ʔərmala, vb. IV, to become a widower or a widow: *Š-stem, denom. (?).
   tarammala, vb. V, = IV.
   ʔərmal, pl. ʔərəmil, n., widower: (secondary?) m. of ʔərmala. 
   tarammul, n., widow(er)hood: vn. V.

5.5. yatīm
Unlike the ‘widow’ (or, rather, ‘person in need for somebody who provides for her/him’), the ‘orphan’, who in generosity narratives often appears together with the former, is much easier to treat, etymologically spoken. We do not need a disambiguation entry and can go right into the matter:

**LEMMA** yatīm يَتِيَم، pl. ʔaytām, yatāmā
**META** SW – • BP 3236 • √YTM
**GRAM** adj., n.
**ENGL** 1. n., orphan; 2. adj., unique of its kind, unequaled, unmatched, incomparable; 3. adj., single, sole, one only, isolated – Wehr/Cowan 1979.
(Following Kogan 2011:) from WSem *yatVm- ‘orphan’.

- DRS 10 (2012) #YTM, -1. Ug Phoen ytm, Hbr yātōm, TargAram yatōmā, Syr yatmā, Mhr (ḥā-)ytim, Jib ʾōtim, Soq āʔtim ‘orphelin’.
- Ar yatima ʿêtre las, fatigué’.

-2. Ar yatima ‘être las, fatigué’.

Kogan 2011: (Ug Hbr Syr as in DRS, the modSAr forms in slightly different transliteration:) Mhr ḥə-ytim, Jib ʿottim, Soq ʿʔtim ‘orphan’.

Kogan 2011 reconstructs WSem *yatVm- ‘orphan’, not without adding that although the root is usually thought to be missing from Akk and Eth, one has perhaps to compare Akk watmu ‘small young animal or man’ and Sod tam’yā ‘orphan’.

The value ‘to be tired, unable to continue with s.th.’ (DRS #YTM-2) is attested only in ClassAr and may have to be treated separately.

In contrast, ‘(to be) unique, incomparable’ and ‘(to be) single, sole, isolated’ [v2, v3] are interpreted here as extensions of ‘orphan’.
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DISC

SEMHIST

IC6 ʿAntara b. ʿṢaddād 130,10 taḍūqgu ʾl-nisāʿu min ḥifāʿī ʾl-sabyi wa-tabkī ṣalāʾ ʾl-sīgārī ʾl-yatāmā ʿthe women cry out of fear of being taken captive and they weep over (the destiny of) the little orphans’ (Polosin 1995)

eC7 Ḥuṭayʿa 31,1 ʿḥinnahā ṭimálu ʾl-yatāmā ṣīṣmaʿān fī ʾl-mahālīki ‘he is the refuge/support of the orphans (and) a defender in the state of perdition’ (Polosin 1995)

eC7 Q 6:152 wa-lā taqrahbū māla ʾl-yatīmi ṭillā bi-ʾl-latīh hiya ṭahsanu ‘and do not come near the property of the orphan except with the best [of intentions] until they reach their strength’ (Badawi/AbdelHaleem 2008)

DERIV

yatama i, yatuma u, and yatima a, vb. I, to be or become an orphan, be bereaved of one’s parents: denom.⁵

ʔaytama, vb. IV, to orphan, deprive of his parents (s.o.): *Š-stem, caus.

tayattama, vb. V, = I.

yatm, var. yutm, yatam, n., orphanhood: vn. I.

maytam, pl. mayātim², n., orphanage: n.loc.

muyattam, adj., orphaned, parentless: PP II; n., orphan: nominalization

5.6. muqtarī → qiran (det. qirā), treated in part I of this study, see FOr 52 (2015): 186–191.

⁵ Cf. the fact, mentioned in DRS 10 (2012) #YTM, that also »[l]a plupart des langues [sémites] (mais pas l’hébreu) forment des verbes à partir des bases nominales«.
5.7. ḫalīl

The entry on the ‘friend’ is still to be written. Given the enormous diversity within the root HL: (ḤLL), both within Ar and Sem, any assumption about the etymology of the term must remain preliminary. DRS 10 (2012) gives not less than ten basic values for the root in Sem, five of which are represented in Ar (#1 ḥillā‘fourreau’, ḥalla ‘appliquer un drain, un sèton’; #2 ḥalla ‘percer, trouter, forer; pénétrer dans l’intérieur’, ḥallā‘fente, brèche’, ḥilāl ‘intervalle’; #5 ḥalla ‘diminuer de volume, maigrir, devenir indigent; être dérangé’; #6 ẖill, ẖull, ḫalīl ‘ami intime, véritable’; #7 ẖall ‘vinaigre’). There are theories that derive ḫalīl ‘friend’ (an Ar idiosyncrasy according to the grouping in DRS) ultimately from ‘to pierce’; if there is some truth to this, then also the ḫalīl ‘friend’ is, etymologically, a *‘person in need’: ‘to pierce > to have holes > to be deficient > to be in need’. But this is still to be studied in detail, and the reader of the present article is kindly requested to look up the term in EtymArab on the Bibliotheca Polyglotta platform.

6. Markers of hospitable places

Given that hospitality, as a cultural institution, followed certain standardized “rules”, we can see a structural parallelism between this normativity and the more or less standardized set of attributes with which generosity “events” are narrated. I have dealt with the few and little variegated plot patterns of these narratives in my study “Aesthetics of Generosity – Generous Aesthetics” (Guth 2015) and will therefore focus here on the etymology of only some standard markers of hospitable places: the fire and the smoke that can be seen from afar, the copious ashes that remain after generous treatment of guests, etc.

6.1. nār

Interestingly enough, the first of these terms in Ar, nār, is not the word for ‘fire’ in many other Sem languages. These have preserved reflexes of the more original word, *ʔiš(-āt)- (e.g., Akk išātu, Hbr ðēš, Gz ðēsāt). In Ar, as also in many Aram idioms, *ʔiš(-āt)- has been replaced, for unknown reasons, by terms going back to Sem *nwr ‘to be bright’. As Kogan rightly remarks, this type of replacement is much more common in Ar than we are used to believe, so that the case of nār can serve as an example of the fact that quite a number

---

of »deeply rooted PS [= protSem] lexemes persisting in the majority of Semitic languages are either completely lost in Arabic or deprived of their basic status« and that we thus are »faced with a peculiar kind of tension between the extreme conservativeness of the Arabic vocabulary as a whole and the highly innovative nature of some of its most basic segments« (Kogan 2015: 174).

In order to adequately “anchor” the entry on nār itself, EtymArab will need an entry on →nūr (where the whole complex based on Sem *nwr ‘to be bright’ is treated), and a “root” entry →NWR (serving the disentanglement of the main values attached to the root: 1. ‘light’ →nūr, 2. ‘fire’ →nār, 3. ‘blossoms’ →navr, 4. ‘gypsies’ →nawr, 5. ‘lime’ →nūraī, 6. ‘maneuver’ →munāwarat). Due to restriction in space these entries will not be reproduced in the present article. 7

| LEMMA | nār ﻦآر, pl. nīrān |
| META | sw 82/48 • BP 498 • √NWR |
| GRAM | n.f. |
| ENGL | 1. fire; 2. rifle fire, gunfire; 3. conflagration; 4. al-nār, Hell – Wehr/Cowan 1979. |
| CONCISE | • Akin to →nūr ‘light’, from Sem *nwr ‘to be bright’
• Ar nār replaced the more original Sem *ʔiš(-at)- ‘fire’. This shift in terminology is one of several cases in which Ar, otherwise known to be rather conservative, behaves astonishingly innovative (cf. also →ʔaṣl, →baḍr, →ḥaḍar, →ʔaḥḍara, →ṣaḍara, →ʔaḍḍa, →ṣilm, →qṣada, →qalb, →qamar, →iṃraʔat). |
| COGN | See →nūr. |
| DISC | See above, section CONCISE. |
| SEMHIST | C6/7 The word is present all over pre-Isl poetry. It is of frequent occurrence also in the Qur?ān (cf., e.g., eC7 Q 21:69 qulnā yā nāru kūnī bardan wa-salāman ʕalā ʔibrāhīma ‘We said: O fire, be coolness and peace for Abraham’), where it often takes the meaning ‘Hell (fire)’. |
| DERIV | ġabal al-nār, n., volcano
šarīṭ al-nār, n., slow match, fuse
šayḥ al-nār, n., the Devil
nār ʕalā ʕalam, n., a leading light or celebrity | ʔašharu min n.ʕ.ʕ., adj., very famous |

kāna Ṣalā nār, vb., to be on pins and needles

nīrān ḥāmiyāti, n., heavy fire, drumfire (mil.)

nūrī, adj., 1. fiery, igneous, fire (in compounds); 2. burning, blazing, red-hot | ḥayāʿī, n.f., (in popular usage) motor, any motor-driven device; darrāgaṭī, n.f., motorcycle; silāḥī, n., firearm; saḥmī, n., rocket; ṭalāqī, n., shot (from a firearm), rifleshot, gunshot; alṣābī, n.pl., fireworks; maqḍūfī, n., projectile (of a firearm), bullet, shell

nāẓirāti, n., hatred, flame of war: morphologically a PA from a hypothetical vb.

I ‘to take fire, be in flames’

6.2. duḥṭān

Like the fire, visible from afar, so also the smoke raising from a cooking place announces a place where the guest is welcome.

Since the root shows two major values, a disambiguation entry is needed:

**LEMMA**  DḤN

**GRAM**  “root”

**ENGL**

- DḤN₁ ‘millet’  →  duḥṭ
- DḤN₂ ‘smoke’  →  duḥṭān

**CONCISE**

Some scholars assume a dependence of ‘millet’ on ‘smoke’, due to the plant’s colour, but this is doubtful.

For further etymology, cf. individual entries → duḥṭ and → duḥṭān.

**COGN**


**DISC**

- DRS 4 (1994) #DḤN-1. According to some, the name of the plant derives from its colour, which would relate it to DḤN₂; but many do not accept this etymology. – 2. Cf. the Ar nouns, now obsolete, ḏaḥṭaḥ ‘couleur noir, foncé’, ḏuḥṭ, ḏaḥṭ ‘fumée’ (not in Lane!). – The forms in Jib Śḥ Mhr show metathesis.

- Kogan 2011 reconstructs Sem *duḥṭ- for ‘millet’ (DḤN₁). For details see → duḥṭ.
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- Orel/Stolbova 1994 and Militarev/Stolbova 2007 see an AfrAs dimension for both DḪN₁ and DḪN₂; for details cf. → duḥn and → duḥān, respectively.
- Can there be a connection between the value ‘health, healthiness’ of DḪN in EthSem (i.e., DRS #DḪN-3) and ‘to smoke, fumigate’ (DRS #DḪN-2)?
- And is possibly also the Akk magic formula diḥnu diḥnu (DRS, or diḥun diḥun, as in CAD, where it is qualified as standard Bab) related to DḪN-2? The formula is said to have been »used in incantations« (CAD). Smoke may have had a magical function...
- If DRS #DḪN-1, #DḪN-3 and #DḪN-4 could be proven to depend on ‘smoke’, then #DḪN-2 would be the primary etymon.

For the purposes of the present article, we can pass over ‘millet’⁸ and proceed immediately to ‘smoke’:

**LEMMA** duḥān دُحَان, var. duḥḥān, pl. ḫadḥinaī
**META** sw 81/142 • BP 2269 • √DḪN
**GRAM** n.
**CONCISE**
- The word seems to be Sem, but given the different position of n – final in Ar, initial in modSAr –, reconstruction is difficult. Orel/Stolbova 1995 go for Sem *dWḥan- ‘to be smoked; ‘dark-colored’, Militarev/Stolbova 2007 suggest Sem *duḥḥān ~ *nidāḥ- ‘smoke’.
- There may also be some CCh cognates, and if these are genuine, the word may have AfrAs origins. Orel/Stolbova 1995 reconstruct AfrAs *deḥan- ‘smoke’ (derived from AfrAs *daḥ- ‘smoke’), and Militarev/Stolbova 2007 have AfrAs *dah- (?) ‘smoke’.
- One could think of ‘smoke’ being the origin of other meanings of DḪN (‘millet’ as *‘the dark-coloured [plant]’, ‘healthiness’ as the result of a treatment with – magical? – smoke, and the Akk incantation formula as conjuring up the healthy spirits/power of smoke). But these have to remain, for the moment, pure working hypotheses that still have to be corroborated by textual evidence, cf. → DḪN.
- [v2] is transferred from the smoke that is emitted to the product that emits it when burning.

---

⁸ References unanimously reconstruct Sem *duḥn- ‘millet’. A hypothetical AfrAs ancestor is reconstructed as *dohVn- ‘millet, grain’ (Orel/Stolbova 1994) or *duḥVn- ‘sorghum, corn’ (Militarev/Stolbova 2007).
COGN


- Militarev/Stolbova 2007 #1109: Mhr *nīdeḥ*, Jib *mə-ndoḥ*, Hrs *nədeḥ*. – Outside Sem: (CCh) Lame *deākū*, Peve *dēoka*, Mesme *deu* ‘smoke’.

DISC

- **DRS 4 (1994) #DHN**: According to some, the name for ‘millet’, *duḥn*, derives from ‘smoke’, due to its dark colour, which would make DHN a more uniform root in Ar; but many do not accept this etymology.

- Is also the magic formula Akk *diiḫnu diḫnu* (or *diiḫn diḫnu*, as in *CAD*), mentioned in **DRS 4 (1994) #DHN-4**, related to ‘smoke’? It is said to be »used in incantations« (*CAD*). Smoke may have had a magical function there...

- **DRS 4 (1994) #DHN-2** also points to the Ar nouns, now obsolete, *†daḥāh* ‘couleur noir, foncé’, *†duḥḥ*, *†daḥḥ* ‘fumée’ (not in *Lane*!), which do not show final -n.

- If the Ar form reflects the Sem situation, then Jib Šḥ Mhr show metathesis. But see below Militarev/Stolbova 2007’s reconstruction of Sem where the Ar and modSAr forms are treated on equal terms.

- Orel/Stolbova 1995 #675 reconstruct Sem *dVḥan*- ¹to be smoked; ²dark-colored’ and CCh *dyaHVn*– ‘smoke’, both from AfrAs *deḫan-* ‘smoke’. The latter, they say, is derived from #630 AfrAs *daḥ-* ‘smoke’, which gave Sem *duḥ(h)-* ‘smoke’ → Ar *daḥḥ-, duḥḥ-* (with secondary -u-), and CCh *dyaH-* (*daHi-*) ‘smoke’. Cf. the obsolete nouns lacking final n mentioned by DRS (see above).

- Similarly also Militarev/Stolbova 2007 #1109: Sem *duḥḥān ~ *nidāḥ- ‘smoke’, CCh *dyaHu- ‘smoke’, both from #630 AfrAs *daḥ-* (?) ‘smoke’.

SEMHIST

IC6 齑Antarah b. Ṣaddād 9,4. (Polosin 1995).

DERIV

dāḥina a, vb. I, to be smoky; to taste or smell of smoke: denom.

dāḥana a u, vb. I, to smoke, emit emoke (fire): probably denom.

dahḥāna, vb. II, to fumigate, fume (s.th.); to smoke, cure with smoke (foodstuffs); to smoke (a cigarette, tobacco, a pipe): D-stem, denom., caus.

ʔadḥana, vb. IV, to smoke, emit smoke (fire): *Š-stem, denom., caus.

tadahḥāna, vb. V, to be smoked, be cured with smoke; to be fumigated: tD-stem, pass. of II.
daḥan, n., smoke, fume, vapor: alongside with ḏuḥ(h)ān another candidate for
the position of the etymon proper.

duḥnaṯ, n.f., 1. smoke color; 2. a kind of incense (Calamus aromaticus): ?

daḥnaṯ, pl. daḥāʔnə, n.f., cigarette: quasi-PP.

daḥāḥnī (eg., tun.), n., tobacconist: nisba formation.

madḥnaṯ, pl. madāḥinə, n.f., chimney, smokestack, funnel: n.loc.

BP#2333 tadhīn, n., 1. fumigation; smoking (e.g., of fish); 2. (tobacco) smoking:
vn. II.

dāḥnai, pl. dawāḥinə, n.f., chimney, smokestack, funnel: a neologism, lit. a f.
PA I, meaning 'the smoking one'.

mudāḥḥin, pl. -ūn, n., smoker: PA II.

mudāḥḥan, adj., smoked (foodstuff): PP II.

### 6.3. ramād

Like the smoke (6.2.) over the fire (6.1.), so also the huge amount of
ashes remaining after the generous treatment of an invité bears eloquent witness
of the host’s overwhelming hospitality and, hence, his nobleness. Because
the association between ashes and generosity was so common, the attribute
kaṯīr al-ramād ‘having copious ashes’ became synonymous with ‘generous,
hospitable’, and as if wanting to dwell on the picture ClassAr also knows the
expression ramād †rimdid (or †rimdad, †rimdīd), with intensifying reduplication
of the final -d, for ‘very fine and copious ashes’.

Etymologically, the Ar word does not seem to have direct/genuine cognates
other than such borrowed from ramād itself, that is, curiously enough, the root,
if Sem at all, does not seem to have left traces in any other Sem language
(except those dependent on Ar). Is there perhaps a relation between RMD and
RMD or (with metathesis) *MDR, both roots that are more widespread in Sem?

The semantic spectrum covered by Ar √RMD can be explained rather
plausibly as the result of diversification from one of two basic meanings –
‘ashes’ and †‘to be extinguished, perish’ – , but given the lack of cognates in
Sem it is difficult to decide which of the two might have developed from the
other: are the ‘ashes’ originally **‘s.th. extinct (sc. the remains of a fire)’, or is
the vb. ‘to be extinguished, perish’, etymologically spoken, **‘to become like
ashes’? We tend to believe the latter (denom. dependence of the vb. on the n.).
– There is also ramad ‘ophthalmia, inflammation of the eyes; eye disease’,
but this does not seem to represent an original basic value since it is probably

---

9 Cf. also the (denom.) ramida a (ramad), vb. I, ‘to have sore eyes; to be inflamed (eye)’ and
the adj.s ramid and ʔarmad, ‘sore-eyed’ as well as the mustašfā ‘l-ramad ‘eye clinic’ and the (tabīb)
based on ‘ashes’, from *‘to be bleary-eyed, have eyes as if covered by, or as dusty as, ashes’. Thus, we have a rather slim entry:

**LEMMA**  
ramād (ﺭَمāﺩ), pl. ʔarmida‘

**META**  
sw 83/4 • BP 3471 • √RMD

**GRAM**  
n.

**ENGL**  

**CONCISE**  
Etymology obscure. Further research needed.

**COGN**  
▪ Kogan 2015: Ar ramād, (Mhr rəmēd, Jib rūd, Soq rimid) ‘ashes’

**DISC**  
▪ Kogan 2015: The modSAr (Mhr, Jib, Soq) terms are probably borrowings from Ar because they don’t have cognates outside Ar.
▪ Is ramād in any way related to †ramiḍa (with ḏ !) ‘to be burning (day); to heat the sand (sun); to be scorched by the ground (foot); to be blasted by the sun (flock)’? Cf. Militarev 2006 #3007, Tropper 2008: Ug rmst ‘Röstopfer’, postBiblHbr rāmaṣ ‘to roll or bake in hot ashes’, rāmaṣ ‘hot ashes, embers’, (JudAram rimšā ‘hot ashes, embers’ <Hbr?), Syr ramos ‘‘ashes’, Ar rmd ‘to burn, be scorched’, Gz ramaḍa ‘to scorch, burn (intr.), be burning’, Te rāmmāḍa ‘to be kindled’, rāmmā ‘hot ashes’, Tnā rāmaṣā ‘to heat, cook’, Amh rāmmāṭa ‘to bake in ashes’, Mhr ramž, Jib remč, from Sem *ramš-‘ashes’.
▪ ramād has been suggested to be a metathetical variant from the root *MDR, cf. Militarev 2006 #3004: Sem *midr- ~ *ramad- ‘dust, dirt, ashes’ > postBiblHbr mādār ‘ordure (material used for vessels)’, Syr medrā ‘gleba (terrace), terra, lutum, pulvis’, Ar ramād ‘cendre’, madar ‘boue sèche et tenace, sans sable’, LevAr rmod, MecAr rumād, Malt ʔormit ‘ashes’, Mhr m₇dr ‘Lehmziegel’ (Ḥrs remēd, Soq rimid < Ar?). Kogan 2015 does not seem to share this view, but separates ramād (as above) and madar ‘lumps, clods of dry clay’ (< Sem *mVd(V)r-‘soil, clod of earth’), cf. also Syr medrā ‘gleba (terrace), terra, lutum, pulvis’, Sab mdr ‘territory, ground’, Mhr mder ‘Lehmziegel’; Gz mdr, Tnā mdri, Amh mdr < EthSem *mVdr- ‘earth’.)

**SEMHIST**  
E7 (dust, ashes) Q 14:18 ʔašmālu-hum ka-ramādin īštaddat bi-hī ʔl-riḥu ‘their works are as ashes which the wind bloweth hard upon’

---

10 ClassAr ramāḏāʾ ‘ostrich’ is called after its ashen colour, and the vb. IX ʔirmada which not only means ‘to be ash-coloured’ but also ‘to run fast’ has its latter value from the fast-running ash-coloured ostrich. – The vb.s ʔarmmda and ʔarmda ‘to have milk before bringing forth (female)’ which hardly can to related to ‘ashes’ or ‘to become extinguished’, do however not corrupt the picture because they seem to be just “mis-pronunciations” of rabbada and ʔarbada (with shift among the labials, b > m).
6.4. kalb

Another marker of hospitable places is the dog whose barking, heard by the stranger from afar, tells him that he will find generous treatment in the place the voice is reaching him from.

The word for ‘dog’, like that for other common animals, is widely attested in Semitic and already studied extensively by previous research. I will therefore content myself with the presentation of the “basic” entry on kalb, leaving it to the interested reader to inform him/herself in the digital EtymArab about other values attached to √KLB in Ar and Sem. The latter is particularly important for kalb because it would be difficult to decide, from the Ar evidence alone, what was first: the ‘dog’ (kalb) or ‘rabies’ (kalab). Given that ‘rabies’ does not seem to be a value of √KLB outside Ar it is quite probable that it is a secondary development, peculiar to Ar.11

LEmma kalb كَلْب، pl. kilāb
Meta SW 21/30 • BP 1267 • √KLB
Gram n.
Concise From Sem *kalb- ‘dog’. The fact that the word can be traced back in time until protSem shows that the domestication of wolves (9th–8th millennium BC) must have been completed already then.

11 Apart from ‘dog’ (kalb) and ‘rabies; madness, lust, fury’ (kalab), Ar √KLB also contains such items as kūlāb (< Aram kullābāh ‘hook; cramp; nail, bolt, pin’ or kallāhai ‘tongs’ (according to Rolland 2014 perh. from Pers kalab ‘bird’s bill, beak’), plus values developed by figurative extension such as ‘to rage, show enmity against’, etc.).

DISC
• See also √KLB for kalab ‘rabies’.
• Most sources reconstruct Sem *kalb- ‘dog’.
• As the Berb, Chad and Cush evidence makes clear, Sem *kalb- seems to be somehow related to biconsonantal themes with *KL. This made Diakonoff 1998: 214 think that kalb might be segmented into *kal- plus an AfrAs suffix (»key consonant«) *-b for strong and/or dangerous animals (cf. also → ʔarna, → dub, → ḍiʔb, → ḍubāb, labb, → ḍaqrab, → ḏlab), still before their domestication. Sima 2000: 103-4 (fn. 338), argues against this idea: an ‘undomesticated dog’ is nothing else but a wolf, for which protSem had a different word (*ḏiʔb-).
• Dolgopolsky 2012 #1031 puts Sem *kal,a,b- ‘dog’ together with (among others) IndEur *kʷol-/*kul-, *kʷelb-/*kʷolb- ‘(young?) dog’ (Grk kýlla ‘young dog’; Germ *xʷelpo-z, *xʷalpo-z ‘whelp, young dog’12 > oNo hvelp, Dan hvæl, Swed valp, oHGe welpf, mHGe welf, nHGe Welf, AS, oSax hwelp, nEngl whelp) and reconstructs a common Nostr ancestor as *kōLV(bA) ‘dog/wolf, whelp’.

SEMHIST
• eC7 kalb (dog) Q 7:176 ja-maţalu-hū ka-maţali ’l-kalbi: ʔin taḥmil ʕalay-hi yalḥat, ʔaw tatruk-hu yalḥat ‘so his likeness is as the likeness of a dog, if you attack him, he pants [with his tongue out], and if you leave him alone, he pants [with his tongue out]’
• eC7 mukallib (one who trains animals or birds or keeps them for hunting) Q 5:4 ʔuḥilla lakum-u ’l-ṭayyibātu wa-mā ʕalintum mina ’l-ğawārihi mukallibīna ‘permitted to you [for food] are all good things and [the catch of] such predatory creatures as you train to hunt’

12 Another etymology is given in De Caprona 2013: 436: Germ *hwelpa-, perh. originally ‘the whimpering one’, from IndEur *(s)kʷel- ‘to whimper, yap, yell, woof’.
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DERIV
(Only the semantically closest derivatives are given here; but cf. also → kalab and → kullāb.)

al-kalb al-ʔakbar n., the constellation Canis Major with its main star Sirius
al-kalb al-ʔaṣghar, n., the constellation Canis Minor with its main star Procyon
kalb al-bahr, n., shark
kalb al-māʔ, n., 1 otter; 2 beaver
kalbaṯ, pl. -āt, n., bitch: f. of kalb
kalbī, adj., canine: nsb-adj.

For other values of the root, cf. → kalab, → kullāb, and, for the general picture, → KLB.

6.5. qidr

Like the fire and smoke that are seen from afar, the dogs that announce a hospitable camp, and the ashes that give proof of a busy cooking place, also the cauldron, or cooking pot, qidr, in which the meal is prepared for the guest, is a current attribute of hospitality and generosity settings. The “root” under which qidr is to be found in the dictionaries, √QDR, is too extensive to be treated here in some detail. Suffice it to remind ourselves of the large variety of meanings attached to it both in ClassAr and MSA, as, e.g., summarized by Badawi/Abdel Haleem 2008: »[a] power, strength, ability, to have power; [b] fate, to decree, pre-ordain; [c] to reckon, measure; [d] extent, worth, sum; [e] destruction, to strain, to straiten; [f] cooking pot«. We are still waiting for the volume of DRS containing the Semitic roots with initial “Q”, but one can be pretty sure that there will be even more values in Semitic than in Arabic alone. While some of the Ar values are, with all probability, etymologically related (e.g., ‘fate’ as s.th. ‘measured, apportioned’, or ‘straitening‘ as a sort of ‘measuring’, etc.), the ‘cooking pot’ seems to lead a life of its own. A closer look into the word’s history confirms this first impression: qidr does not seem to be akin to either of the values [a] through [e], listed by Badawi; rather, it is probably a loanword from Aram which is likely to be based on a Sem root meaning ‘to be dark, dirty’.

LEMMA qidr ﻦِﺭ, pl. quḍūr
META SW – • BP ... • √QDR
GRAM n.f. (or m.)
ENGL cooking pot; kettle – Wehr/Cowan 1979.
CONCISE Probably a loan-word from Aram qidrā, Syr qedrā ‘pot’, which is perhaps akin to Hbr gādar ‘to be dark, be gloomy’ (which in turn seems to be akin to Ar → qādira ‘to be dirty’). Zimmern considered it likely that the Aram words depend (with metathesis) on Akk
diqāru, a kind of ‘bowl with round bottom, for serving and heating’ (CAD). Others do not mention this idea, reconstruct a Sem *kidr- ‘earthenware’ and, on account also of some (though doubtful) ECh ‘cognates’, reconstruct AfrAs *kVdur- with the likely meaning of ‘clay vessel’ as the word’s ultimate origin. The latter, however, may be related to a hypothetical AfrAs *kVda/ur- ‘to be dirty’ (the cooking pot being called after its bottom which is ‘dirty’ from the fire).

**Cogn**
- Zimmern 1914: Akk diqāru ‘(bowl with round bottom, for serving and heating)’, Aram qidrā, qedrā ‘pot’.
- In addition to the items given by Zimmern 1914, Zammit 2002 mentions also Hbr qāďēr ‘pot’.
- Orel/Stolbova 1994 #1618 (and Militarev/Stolbova 2007 #277): Hbr qōdērā, Aram qidrā, Ar qidrā, Hrs qeder, Mhr qādēr. – Outside Sem: gōdōryā ‘clay pot’, gūdūr ‘big pot’ in 2 in ECh languages. – Cf. also Orel/Stolbova 1994 #1630: Ar qdr (IPFV a, u), with outside Sem cognate in goder ‘faeces, silt’ in 1 ECh language (no longer listed in Militarev/Stolbova 2007).

**Disc**
- Zimmern 1914 thinks that Akk diqāru »probably« is the source of Aram qidrā, qedrā, which was borrowed into Ar as qidrā, qidraī.
- Klein 1987 lists (all post-BiblHbr) qāḏērāh ‘pot’ (from this the dimin. nHbr qāḏērīṯ ‘small pot’), qaḏrā ‘pot’ (from Syr qaḏrā, related to Hbr qāḏērāh), qaddār ‘potter’ (n.prof., properly back formation from qāḏērāh; from qaddār is qaddārūṯ ‘potter’s craft, pottery’). Perhaps akin to Hbr qāḏar ‘to be dark, be gloomy’ (related to Ar → qaḏira ‘to be dirty’).
- Orel/Stolbova 1994 #1618: From the evidence in Sem, the authors reconstruct Sem *kidr- ‘earthenware’; from the ECh items they assume ECh *gudur- ‘(big/clay) pot’; as an ancestor of both they suggest AfrAs *kūdür- ‘vessel’. In the internet version, Militarev/Stolbova 2007 #277 retain the reconstruction of Sem *kidr- ‘earthenware’ but add the remark »correspondences doubtful« and set a question mark behind their (slightly modified) reconstruction of AfrAs *kVdur- ‘clay vessel’.
- Orel/Stolbova 1994 #1630 relates Hbr qdr ‘to be dark’ to Ar qdr (IPFV a, u) ‘to be dirty’, on account of which they hypostasize Sem *kVdar-/ *kVdur- ‘to be dirty’. The latter, they say, is cognate with ECh *gVʒwar- ‘faeces, silt’. On account of the Ar and the ECh items they reconstruct AfrAs *kVʒor- ‘dirt, to be dirty’. In the updated internet version, there are no longer AfrAs reconstructions, but only
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#950 Sem *kVdVr- ‘to be dirty’ (on account of Hbr qdr ‘to be dark’) and #1793 Sem *kVdar- / * kVdVur- ‘to be dirty’.

SEMIST eC7 Q 34:13 yašmalūna la-hū mā yašāʔu min maḥāribā wa-tamāgilā wa-ḡifānin  wa-ḡawābī wa-qudūrin rāsiyātin ‘they made for him whatever he wanted: palaces and statues, basins as large as water troughs, and cauldrons hard to move’

DERIV qidrā', pl. qidar, n.f., pot; jug: clearly related to qidr, but perhaps borrowed directly from Aram qidrā, Syr qedrā ‘pot’ rather than derived from Ar qidr.

6.6. samn

Like the fire, the smoke and the dog that signal a hospitable place from a distance, and like the ashes of the cooking-place over which, and the cauldron in which, the meal for the guests is prepared, the delighted guest also always remembers the huge amount of meat with which he was treated and the smell of freshly roasted fat, particularly camel humps. The noun samn, the corresponding adjective samīn, and the denominative verb samīna are all attested in pre-Islamic poetry, with samn having taken, already then, the specialised meaning of ‘clarified butter, (hardened) fat’ that it has preserved over the centuries, as we see it in MSA.

LEMMA samn سَمْنَ, pl. sumūn
META sw 32/4213 • BP ... • √SMN
GRAM n.
ENGL clarified butter, cooking butter – Wehr/Cowan 1979.
CONCISE ▪ Ar samn ‘melted purified butter’ seems to be a specialisation from a Sem *šamn- that denoted ‘oil, fat’ in general. Ar derivatives show the original wider meaning.
COGN ▪ Kogan 2011: Akk šamnu, Ug šmn, šmt, Hbr šāmān (mostly) ‘vegetable oil’, (rarely also) ‘animal fat or cream’, Aram *śumnā (mostly) ‘(animal) fat, fatness’, Ar samn- ‘(clarified) butter’, Jib šēn ‘fat, fatness (?)’
▪ For outside Sem, Militarev/Stolbova 2007 give (Berber) Ghat isim ‘graisse (de tout animal)’, Tahaggart èsim ‘graisse fondu’, Tawllemmet

13 In the Swadesh list of 1952, this item is ‘fat, organic substance’, in that of 1973 it is given as ‘grease’. The second figure is that of ‘fat (substance)’ in the extended Swadesh list (200-word basic vocabulary) as given in Bennett 1998: 40.
ē-šim ‘liquid fat; broth’, Taqbaylit (Ayt Mangellat) āa-ssām-š ‘graisse animal’, Canarian achemen ‘milk’; O Eg smy (med.) ‘fat milk, cream’; (WCh) šivena, sinama, sin; (ECh) swāñ, swāñī, sōn-gō, sūwānē, sūwānê, sēwēn, séwēn, sūnu ‘oil’, sūwān-gō, sōn, sīwīn ‘oil, fat’, sōane ‘melted butter/oil’, sēwēy ‘fat’ (n.), sūnē ‘fat’ (adj.); (Warazi/ Dullay) šiinān-ko, pl. šiinam-aane ‘butter’, šiinan-ko, pl. šinam-aane ‘fat’; perhaps also s’āmēn ‘thick’ in a CCh language, but this is said to be semantically problematic.

**DISC**

- Huehnergard 2011 reconstructs Sem *šamn-* ‘oil, fat’.
- Kogan 2011: »The main protSem term for ‘fat’ as a foodstuff seems to be *šamn-, although exact semantics of its reflexes are rather diverse [...] The meaning ‘(clarified) butter’ is typical of Ar [...] whereas [the Akk, Ug and Hbr terms] mostly denote ‘vegetable oil’ and are only rarely applied to animal fat or cream. ComAram *šunnā mostly denotes ‘(animal) fat, fatness’ [...]. The exact meaning of Jib [...] remains to be ascertained.«
- Militarev/Stolbova 2007 reconstruct Sem *šam(-an)- ‘fat, oil’, Berb *-sim(-an)- ‘(liquid) fat, milk’, O Eg smy (med.) ‘fat milk, cream’, WCh *sin(-am)- ‘oil’, ? CCh *sVmVn- (?) ‘thick’, ECh *siwan- (< *siman-) ‘oil; melted butter/oil; fat (n.); fat (adj.)’, Warazi (Dullay) *šinam- ‘butter; fat’. All from AfrAs *sim-an- ~ *sim-am- ‘oil, fat, (fat) milk’.

**SEMHIST**

IC6 ʿUrwa b. al-Ward 23,2: wa-faḏlaʾi samnatin ḏahabat ʿilay-hi ‘and the rest of a piece of butter/fat [n.un.] that went to him’ (Polosin 1995)

eC7 samn itself is not in Q, but we find the vb. IV ʿasmana ‘to fatten, benefit, nourish’ and the adj. (pseudo-PP) samīn ‘fat, well-fed’: Q 88:6–7 laysa la-hum ʿašāmun ʿillā min ḍarīʾīn lā yusminu wa-lā yuğnī min ǧūʿin ‘with no food for them except bitter dry thorns that neither nourish nor satisfy hunger’; 12:43 ʿinnī ʿarā sabʿa baqarātūn simānin yaʾkulu-hunna sabʿun ʿīḡāfun ‘I see [in my dreams] seven fat cows being eaten by seven lean ones’.

Apart from Ar zakāʾi which gave the relatively young loan Engl zakat (see Part I, section 3.5), Ar samn is the first among the items treated in the present article that is interesting also on account of its European connection:

**WESTLANG** Although Ar samn is not the origin of Engl sesame, both are relatives nevertheless: According to Huehnergard 2011, the Engl word is »from Grk sēsāmē sēsamon ‘sesame’, from a Sem source akin to Ug ššmn,
Phoen ššmn, Aram šumšômâ, Ar simsim ‘sesame’, all probably from Akk šamaššammû ‘sesame’, back-formation from *šaman šammî ‘oil of plants’, from [Akk] šaman, bound form of šammu ‘oil’ (šammî, gen.pl. of šammu ‘plant’, Sem šmm). It is possible that the Akk form represents a folk etymology for an original form šamšamu, from a root *šmšm.«

DERIV

**samina** a (siman, samânât), vb. I, to be or become fat, corpulent, obese, stout, plump, fleshy, put on weight: denom.

**sammana**., vb. II, and ðasmana, vb. IV, to make fat or plump, fatten: D-stem, denom., caus.

**siman**, n., and BP#4632 **simna**, n.f., fatness, plumpness, fleshiness, stoutness, corpulence; obesity: vn. I and abstr. in -aî, respectively.

**summun**, n.coll. (n.un. -aî), pl. samâmîn, quail (zool.): *‘the fat one (bird)’?

**samîn**, pl. simân, adj., fat; corpulent, plump, fleshy, stout, obese: quasi-PA (or -PP).

**summân**, n.coll. (n.un. -aî), quail (zool.): *‘the fat one (bird)’?

**sammân**, n., butter merchant: n.prof.

**samânât**: ~ al-riği, n.f., calf of the leg: vn. I.

**sumânà**, n.coll. (n.un. sumânâî, pl. sumânayâît), quail (zool.): *‘the fat one (bird)’?

**musamman**, adj., fat: PP II.

References (incl. those for Part I and II)


BDB → Brown/Driver/Briggs 1906.


*Bibliotheca Polyglotta*: an Internet portal, hosting several projects. <https://www2.hf.uio.no/polyglotta/index.php>.

BP → Buckwalter/Parkinson 2011.


DRS = *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques*... → Cohen 1970–.


WKAS = Wörterbuch der klassischen arabischen Sprache → Ullmann 1970–.
WOLD = World Loanword Database → Haspelmath/Tadmor.