



Aethiopia 27 (2024)

International Journal of Ethiopian and
Eritrean Studies

JAMES R. HAMRICK, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

Dissertation Abstracts

*A Critical Text Edition, Translation, and Analysis of a Gə'əz Tərg'ame to the
Book of Daniel*

Aethiopia 27 (2024), 352–354

ISSN: 1430-1938; eISSN: 2194-4024

Edited in the Asien-Afrika-Institut
Hiob-Ludolf-Zentrum für Äthiopistik
der Universität Hamburg
Abteilung für Afrikanistik und Äthiopistik

by Aaron Michael Butts

in cooperation with

Bairu Tafla, Ludwig Gerhardt, Hewan Semon Marye,
Susanne Hummel, and Alexander Meckelburg

Editorial Team

Sophia Dege-Müller, Karin Ghion-Hamadu

the most prominent being the interrelation between the *Aksimaros* and the *Ṭāntā haymanot*. An appendix is provided in which I list all 171 titles of texts that are mentioned in the dissertation, where applicable with CAe ID.

In this dissertation, I show that the *Aksimaros* literature is an extraordinary literary genre, which has incorporated traditions from multiple languages, regions, eras, and religions to form a new and independent tradition. The characteristics of the *Leitmotiv* and its adaptation and adoption in the recipient texts are, however, unique to Ethiopia and Eritrea.

JAMES R. HAMRICK, *A Critical Text Edition, Translation, and Analysis of a Gə'əz Tərg^wame to the Book of Daniel*, PhD Dissertation in Philology of the Christian Orient, Faculty of Cultural Studies at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, defended on 4 July 2023.

This dissertation offers a critical text edition, English translation, and comprehensive analysis of a *tərg^wame* (Gə'əz textual commentary) to the Old Testament Book of Daniel. There are multiple extant *tərg^wame* to Daniel in the Gə'əz manuscript tradition. I designate the most extensive of these as TDan1, which is attested in three different forms: TDan1a (MS Təgray Province, Gundä Gunde Monastery, C3-IV-45 = G2; MS Təgray Province, Gundä Gunde Monastery, C3-IV-115 = G1; MS Goğğam Province, Dima Giyorgis Monastery, UNESCO 10.47/EMDA 392 = U1; MS Šäwa Province, Äddis Aläm Maryam Church, EMLL 6269/EMIP 1074 = E1; MS London, British Library, EAP 336/2/3), TDan1b (MS Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. Aethiop. 16; MS Wällo Province, Betä Maryam Church, EMLL 7069), and TDan1c (MS Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Éthiopiens d'Abbadie 157). TDan1a and TDan1b are likely independent translations of the same Arabic work, and TDan1c is an intra-Gə'əz abbreviation of TDan1a. Earlier European scholars, including Oscar Löfgren and Roger Cowley, have engaged TDan1b and TDan1c in limited ways, with Löfgren including the lemmata from TDan1b in his edition of Gə'əz Daniel. To this point, western scholarship has given no meaningful attention to TDan1a. The primary focus of my work is an edition, translation, and analysis of TDan1a.

TDan1a includes the complete text of Daniel, including the *Prayer of Azariah* and the *Song of the Three* (in abbreviated form in some of the manuscripts) and *Bel and the Dragon*, but without *Susanna*. Lemma sections of varying lengths are followed by Gə'əz commentary. The version of Daniel in TDan1a is a fresh translation that is ultimately based on the Syriac Peshitta rather than the Greek/Theodotion-based version of Daniel otherwise attested in Gə'əz manuscripts. This provides us with something relatively rare in the Gə'əz 'biblical' tradition, where the dominant practice is to make revisions of the Greek-based text through consultation of other versions rather than to create a new, independent translation.

The commentary sections have a historical and literary focus, with some theological and spiritual reflections. The interpretations of Danielic visions tend to take the historicizing approaches common in the Syriac interpretive tradition, arguing, for example, that many of the events related to the fourth kingdom in Daniel 2 and the fourth animal in Daniel 7 were first fulfilled by Antiochus Epiphanes and the Maccabees in the second century BCE. The commentary presents itself as relying on the opinions of earlier commentators, some of whom are named and some of whom remain anonymous. There are extensive citations of Hippolytus of Rome's commentary to Daniel, providing the first Gə'əz textual evidence for this early Christian commentary known to western scholarship. There are significant parallels to Isho'dad of Merv's Syriac commentary to Daniel, though he remains unnamed. The commentators mention Theodoret of Cyrhus, Origen, John Chrysostom, and Gregory Nazianzus by name.

In the dissertation's first 13 chapters, I present TDan1a in a verse-by-verse format, offering the critical text of a verse immediately followed by the apparatus of variants, English translation, and analysis. For the commentary sections, I have created my own versification system. The critical text is based on a full collation of four of the five manuscripts known to me. Sample collations of the fifth manuscript (EAP 336/2/3), for which the image quality is poor and for which access was a challenge, show a very close relationship to E1. Based on shared errors, G2 and G1 share a textual ancestor, with U1, E1, and EAP 336/2/3 sharing another ancestor. In the critical text, I prioritize the readings from the latter group of witnesses, as they tend to more closely reflect the Peshitta, making them a potentially more accurate reflection of the earliest form of the text and more useful for analysis of the *tərg'ame* in light of the Peshitta.

The apparatus is mostly a negative apparatus and includes only non-orthographic variants. I list the orthographic variants in their own chapter at the end of the dissertation.

My verse-by-verse analysis of the lemma and commentary sections gives attention to a wide range of issues, with particular focus on (1) comparisons of the Gə'əz lemmata with the Leiden edition of the Syriac Peshitta and (2) the citations of Hippolytus of Rome.

Many *Gəbrä Həməmat* manuscripts (the Gə'əz lectionary for passion week) contain a fragment of TDan1a's commentary on Daniel 7:2-14. I have created a separate collation of 18 *Gəbrä Həməmat* manuscripts against a modern, printed church edition. I include the text of the modern edition, an apparatus with the variants from the 18 manuscripts, and an English translation. I intersperse these with their parallels in TDan1a to aid comparison of the two texts. I address similarities and differences between them in my notes.

Some Gə'əz manuscripts of Daniel include brief marginal comments. An open research question is the relationship between such comments and the *tərg'ame*

tradition. As an initial probe into this question, I present and offer brief analysis to all the marginal comments to Daniel 8 from MS Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Éthiopiens d'Abbadie 35.

MARIO LOZANO ALONSO, *La destrucción patrimonial durante la guerra entre el sultanato de Bar Sa'ad ad-Dīn y el reino cristiano de Etiopía (1529–1543)*, PhD Dissertation in History and Archaeology, Faculty of Geography and History, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, defended on 6 March 2024.

The war between the Bar Sa'ad ad-Dīn Sultanate and the Christian kingdom of Ethiopia (1529–1543) is considered the event marking the end of the Middle Ages in the Horn of Africa. *Imām* Aḥmad b. Ibrahīm managed to galvanize a diverse mix of nomadic and sedentary peoples for his jihadist project, which began with border raids in 1527 and eventually evolved into the conquest of the Christian country in 1531. From that year onwards, *Aṣe* Ləbnā Dəngəl decided to retreat and escape from the advancing army of 'Adal, which aimed to Islamize the region. However, in 1541, the Portuguese military intervention changed the situation, defeating *Imām*'s army on several occasions. The participation of the Ottomans, who assisted the Muslim army with 900 musketeers, was key to defeating the Ethiopian-Portuguese army in 1542, during which their leader, Christovão da Gama, was killed. However, the *Imām*'s decision to dismiss most of the Ottoman musketeers proved to be a mistake, as the Christian army quickly reorganized and confronted the Muslims in 1543 at Zāntāra (Wāyna Dāga), the battle in which Aḥmad b. Ibrahīm was killed.

This PhD Dissertation, supervised by Professor Víctor M. Fernández (Universidad Complutense de Madrid), aims to study the phenomenon of heritage destruction—mainly monuments and settlements—during the war on both the Christian and Muslim sides. In the Christian Ethiopian kingdom, there was a deliberate destruction of buildings of religious significance, primarily churches and monasteries under royal patronage. Ninety-one such structures have been documented, but there were likely many more, as at least 18 medieval monasteries remain unaccounted for. The reason behind it is clear, as *Imām* Aḥmad b. Ibrahīm sought to erase the traces of the Solomonic dynasty as a preliminary step toward establishing a Muslim state on the historical site of the Christian kingdom of Ethiopia. The destruction of these buildings is recorded in the *Futūḥ al-Ḥabaša*, the main Muslim chronicle of the conflict, which can be compared with data from the Christian *Māṣḥafā Səddāt*, as well as later Portuguese and Jesuit sources. The Christian kingdom persisted as a rural state without urban centres, though it was weakened by the emergence of Oromo migrations, which took advantage of the aftermath of the conflict to occupy large regions of the Ethiopian massif.