

# Articles and notes

## Exegesis and Lexicography in the Ethiopian Tradition: The Role of the *Physiologus*\*

Massimo Villa (*Università di Napoli 'L'Orientale'*)

The Ethiopian native lexicographic corpus (the so-called *sawāsəw*) and the traditional commentaries (the *'andəmtā* corpus) are intended to explain, with different strategies and expectations, the meaning of poorly understandable Gə'əz words and canonical or non-canonical passages. This paper intends to offer an unprecedented evaluation of the role of the *Physiologus* as a literary source for both traditions. The influence of the small naturalistic treatise on the *sawāsəw* compilations appears far less significant than previously believed. Several pieces of evidence prove that for most zoonyms treated in the native vocabularies a derivation from the Scriptures is to be privileged. It is known, by contrast, that a variety of accounts from the *Physiologus* were embedded into several Amharic commentaries. A thorough look at their textual features displays a certain closeness to one particular recension of the *Physiologus*, i.e. Et-α. The survey has also highlighted the repeated and intentional reuse of the same literary material in newly-composed commentaries, a phenomenon that might have implications for understanding the historical development of the traditional exegetical literature.

It is a well-known fact that the attitude towards the canonical and quasi-canonical texts in Ethiopia did not remain passive throughout the centuries. A variety of strategies developed in order to clarify the text of the Scriptures and other books, and help the reader understand them. On the one hand, the Bible underwent an extensive process of revision and 'conflation';<sup>1</sup> on the other, a rich set of complementary tools emerged with the purpose of interpreting obscure words and passages. Lexicographic compilations and exegetical expositions are among such tools.

\* An earlier version of this paper was read on the occasion of the workshop 'Beyond the Physiologus – animal stories and representations in Oriental manuscript' held at the Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures (CSMC, Hamburg University) on 28–29 June 2018. The research was partially funded by the long-term project 'Beta maṣāḥəft: Die Schriftkultur des christlichen Äthiopiens und Eritreas: Eine multimediale Forschungsumgebung' (2016–2040), headed by Prof. Alessandro Bausi at the Hiob Ludolf Center for Ethiopian Studies (HLCES), Hamburg University, and funded within the Academies' Programme, under survey of the Akademie der Wissenschaften in Hamburg.

1 Zuurmond 1989, 73–81; Uhlig 1991, 1590–1591 and 1595–1596.

It is claimed that native lexicographic compilations, called *sawāsəw* (literally ‘ladder’),<sup>2</sup> were traditionally transmitted orally and received a standardized written form in the seventeenth century, during the so-called Gondarine Age. They typically consist of a grammatical section on morphology, and a vocabulary, which accommodates lists of lesser known Gə‘əz words. Words are indexed according to the book of provenance or the subject, and each is given a Gə‘əz or Amharic equivalent. In subject-based lists the source of a lexeme is typically missing, thus making the task of recognizing the text of provenance particularly hard. *Sawāsəw* have been regularly used in modern local and Western dictionary-compiling initiatives, yet very rarely explored with reference to their own text history, spread, and transmission.

Commentaries are subdivided into *tərgwāme* and *‘andəmtā* commentaries. The former represent an early stage of the Ethiopian traditional exegesis. They are in Gə‘əz and are attested from the fourteenth century onwards. They constitute a heterogeneous corpus since different manuscripts admit different interpretations of the same passage.<sup>3</sup> The decline of the *tərgwāme* corpus is linked to the rise of the *‘andəmtā* commentaries. The Amharic *‘andəmtā* corpus, originating in the Gondarine Age and committed to writing only in recent times, intends to explore in depth the true meaning of a given text, verse by verse.<sup>4</sup> Commentaries have generally escaped the attention of the scholars due to several factors. First, they are rife with abbreviations, elliptic or laconic sentences, difficult syntax, and use of rare words. Furthermore, very few scholarly editions of the commentaries have been published, even though a number of them are available in Ethiopian printed editions.<sup>5</sup> Finally, the source of the material used is as a rule seldom indicated. This makes determining the textual source of an explanation often challenging, as it requires a profound knowledge of the religious literature.

- 2 A word calqued on Arabic *sullām*, i.e. the ‘scalae’ or vocabularies. This, together with the structure and some of the grammatical terms adopted, betrays a distant Copto-Arabic derivation of the entire genre.
- 3 An updated overview on the *tərgwāme* tradition is in García 2010; see also Mersha Alehegne 2011, 2–7. The transmissional itinerary of numerous Greek and Oriental (Syro-Copto-Arabic) sources into the Ethiopic *tərgwāme* corpus is explored in Cowley 1983 (which also contains the translation of the commentary of the Book of the Revelation) and Cowley 1988.
- 4 The Amharic word *‘andəm*, meaning ‘and (there is) one (who says)’ (from which the term *‘andəmtā* is derived), is typically used to introduce the hidden explanation of a canonical passage.
- 5 Despite the high number of commentaries published in Ethiopia, especially in the last decades (see Tedros Abraha 2007), few of them have been hitherto critically edited. For an updated state of the art, see in particular Mersha Alehegne 2011, 13–20.

In this paper I will focus on the role of the Ethiopian version of the *Physiologus* as a possible source of interpretation of zoonyms and animal-related biblical passages respectively in the *sawāsəw* and *'andəmtā* literature.<sup>6</sup>

### The *Physiologus* and the Ethiopian lexicography

It is believed that many zoonyms explained in the *sawāsəw* originate from the *Physiologus*, or that many difficult animal and stone names appearing in the *Physiologus* were later explained in the *sawāsəw* lists.<sup>7</sup> This assumption, however, has never undergone a proper scrutiny.

It is difficult to assess with clarity the direct impact of the *Physiologus* on the lexicographic compilations. A preliminary and immediate way to estimate the share of influence of the small naturalistic treatise on the *sawāsəw* is by singling out all the Ethiopic names of animals, plants, and stones treated in the *Physiologus* and also incorporated in the *sawāsəw* lists. The total amount is not insignificant. The words are *karādyon* (caladrius), *finəkəs* (phoenix), *ḥalastəyo* (wild donkey), *qahm* (ant), *q'ənsəl* (fox), *mā'naq* (turtledove), *q'arnana'āt* (frog), *hāyyal* (deer), *'admās* (diamond), *'arodyon* (heron). Other words are attested in slightly different spelling forms: *ḥepōpos* (hoopoe), and *gālen* (weasel).<sup>8</sup> Nevertheless, this argument alone is not sufficient to predicate a provenance from the *Physiologus*. The same words might in fact originate from different pieces of literature. In order to remove interference from other textual sources, we need to isolate those words, or even glosses matching exclusively the *Physiologus* context. Admittedly, none of the above words meets this requirement. All of them also occur elsewhere, specifically

6 The Gə'əz version of the *Physiologus* (ፊሳልጎስ ፣ *Fisalgos*, or ፊሳ'ልጎስ ፣ *Fisə'algos*) was translated in the Aksumite Age (fourth to seventh century) from a Greek model. It therefore belongs to the oldest layer of the literary heritage of Christian Ethiopia. Place and authorship of the translation remain unknown. The work survives in at least nine relatively recent manuscript copies. Dated to the 18th–20th century, these copies were executed more than one millennium after the work made its way into the Horn of Africa. The work is transmitted into three recensions, called Et-α, Et-β, and Et-γ. Only Et-α is sufficiently known to scholars, thanks to the 1877 edition by Fritz Hommel (Hommel 1877; Italian translation in Conti Rossini 1951; English translation in Sumner 1982). For an updated presentation of the text history and the manuscript tradition, see Villa, forthcoming.

7 Weninger 2005.

8 Transcribed in the *sawāsəw* as *ḥepōpā* and *gāle*. Names are given according to the reasonably earliest extant orthography as provided by the available documentation. Since a number of them are loanwords from Greek, they have undergone, not unexpectedly, a proliferation of formal variants over the text transmission.

in the Bible.<sup>9</sup> Provided that the biblical books undoubtedly had a far broader circulation than the *Physiologus*, one is inclined to assume, as a privileged hypothesis, that their legacy in the subsequent lexicographic literature was more conspicuous than that of the *Physiologus*.

An illuminating evidence to this statement comes from a list of bird names contained in MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Éth. 150 (f. 47ra–b), an eighteenth-century copy of a *sawāsəw*. Under the section አ[ጌቀ] ጸ : ነገረ : አዕዋፍ : the *sawāsəw* lists the following species:

*Finaks*, i.e. a large vulture-like bird; *gepā*, i.e. a bird of prey; [...] *'arodoyon*, i.e. the heron; *qāqāno*, i.e. the stork; *'ibən*, i.e. the cross-bird (ibis); [...] *herodyanos*, i.e. a fish-eating bird; *seneresaros bədyon*, i.e. the partridge.

Four names are significant: the *finaks*, the *gepā*, the *'arodoyon*, and the *'ibən*. They indeed recall the Greek forms of four species of birds described in the *Physiologus*, respectively the phoenix, the vulture, the heron, and the ibis. However, the provenance of at least three lexemes of them from the *Physiologus* is unlikely due to their spellings. In fact, *gepā*, *'arodoyon*, and *'ibən* are exactly the accusative-based forms inherited from γῦπα, ἐρωδιόν, and ἴβιν, and attested in biblical lists of clean and unclean animals (Lv 11, 14–19 and Dt 14, 12–16). By contrast, the *Physiologus* styles them respectively as *gipos* (from the genitive form γυπός), *'arodyon*, and *'abisor* (perhaps from ἴβις ὄρνις]). Therefore, a derivation from the Old Testament lists of animals appears philologically more grounded. The same argument can be extended to the *hepōpā*, ‘hoopoe’ (in Lv 11, 19 and Dt 14, 17, and in the *sawāsəw*), which originates from the accusative form ἕποπα, versus the genitive-based form *hepōpos* transmitted in the *Physiologus* (from ἕποπος).<sup>10</sup> As the example above efficaciously shows, one must not underestimate the pervasive role played by the biblical books. In view of these examples, the real influence of the *Physiologus* on the *sawāsəw* tradition remains an open question.

9 Six names out of twelve are genuine local words (*halastəyo*, *qahm*, *qʷənsəl*, *mā ʿnaq*, *qʷarnana ʿāt*, *hāyyal*), the remaining six are Greek loanwords. In all cases the animal names are spelt in an identical or very close way both in the *Physiologus* and in the Bible. Concerning the *gālen* (weasel), coming from Greek γαλή, it is worth mentioning that the word appears in Lv 11, 30, in the list of unclean reptiles and other species that crawl on the earth. As already noticed by Hiob Ludolf, in this list the Greek word is simply transliterated rather than translated (Ludolf 1691, 210). Interestingly, the reptile-like appearance of the *gāle* survives in its *sawāsəw* explanation, as quoted in August Dillmann’s *Lexicon linguae Aethiopicæ*: here *gāle* is described as ጋሌ : ዘ : ሕባበ : ዘ : ጀ : አፋሁ ።, i.e. a monstrous two-mouth snake (Dillmann 1865, 1138).

10 Hommel 1877, xxix; Conti Rossini 1951, 15 and 22.

### The *Physiologus* and the 'andāmtā corpus

Echoes of animal stories from the *Physiologus* have been more solidly identified in a number of 'andāmtā explanations. The merit goes to Roger W. Cowley, who devoted much efforts to investigate and document the traditional Ethiopian exegesis. He properly addressed the question of the complex and abundant literary background behind it, and managed to identify a number of biblical and non-biblical explanations sourced from various chapters of the *Physiologus*. Among the published commentaries, references are extant to the lion (Rev 5, 5), the caladrius (Mt 8, 17; *Waddāse Māryām*), the eagle (Is 40, 31), the viper or echidna (Mt 3, 7; *Fāṭha nagaśt*), the snake (Mt 10, 16), the panther (Hos 5, 11), and the unicorn (Ps 21, 22).<sup>11</sup> Cowley's work, although pioneering in some respects, is a solid starting point for our purpose. I will examine in this paper some passages containing references to the stories of the eagle, the viper or echidna, and the caladrius.

The commentary explanation of Is 40, 31 (እለስ ፡ ይሴፈውዎ ፡ ለእግዚአብሔር ፡ ይሔድሱ ፡ ጎይሎሙ ፡ ወይበቀላ ፡ ክፈሆሙ ፡ ስመ ፡ ንስር ፡, 'those who hope in God will renew their strength; and their wings will sprout like eagles') is as follows:

ንስር ባረጀ ጊዜ ዐብዶ የሚባል ጭቃ አለ ያነን ተቀብቶ እንጨቱን ከምሮ ወያህተጣጣፊ ክፈሁ ክንፍና ክንፉን ያማታዋል ፤

ወይወፅእ እሳት እምአካለ ዝኩ ያፍ ፤ እንዲል ጊዮርጊስ ወልደ አሚድ ፤ ከአካሉ እሳት ወጥቶ እንጨቱን ያቃጥለዋል ፤ እሱም አብሮ ይቃጠላል ፤ በግብፅ ዝናም ዘንጦ አያውቅም ፤ ባምስት መቶ ዘመን ለሐድሶተ ንስር እንደ ካፊያ ያለ ይዘንጣል ፤ በመጀመሪያ ቀን ትል ይህላል ፤ በሁለተኛው ቀን ያፍ ይህላል ፤ በሦስተኛው ቀን በሮ ይሄዳል ፤<sup>12</sup>

When the eagle grows old, it secretes the so-called 'abdo. After smearing itself with it and after collecting firewood, it fits closely its wings and flutters them.

'Fire comes out of the body of that bird' (*Gə'əz*), as Giyorgis Walda 'Amid says: fire comes out of its body. Then, it burns the firewood and burns down itself together with the wood. In Egypt it has not rained for five hundred years; however, as soon as the eagle has renovated itself, it drizzles. The first day (the eagle) is a worm; the second day [it becomes] a bird; the third day, (having the sky) cleared up, it goes away.

The chapter of the *Physiologus* on the eagle also narrates a story on rejuvenation; but it is quite different from the one retold in the 'andāmtā. According to the *Physiologus*, the eagle, grown old and become blind, flies towards the heat of the sun, burns its wings and its blindness, and plunges three times into a source of pure water, thus becoming young once more.<sup>13</sup> The two stories

11 Cowley 1983, 44. For the reference to the panther in the 'andāmtā commentary on Hos 5, 11, see Weldetensae Andeberhan 1994, 124, and Villa forthcoming.

12 'Andāmtā commentary on Isaiah, 270a–b.

13 Hommel 1877, 6–7 (text of Et-α), 51–52 (German translation); Conti Rossini 1951, 21 (Italian translation); Sumner 1982, 16–17 (English translation).

have little in common. By contrast, the passage from the *'andāmtā* displays a striking resemblance with another well-known tradition, that of the legendary phoenix. According to the *Physiologus*, the phoenix, when it has reached the age of five hundred years, enters the forest of Lebanon and fills its wings with the scent called *'abdu*, then it enters the city of the sun, i.e. Heliopolis, and burns itself above the altar. When the priest examines the ashes, he finds a worm, which turns then into a big bird. The phoenix then greets the priest and comes back to its place.<sup>14</sup>

The mention of the *'abdu* is significant and demands for a plus of attention. It does not appear either in the Greek or in two of the three recensions of the Ethiopic *Physiologus* (i.e. Et-β and Et-γ). As it is only mentioned in Et-α, it seems to be an innovative reading. Also the *'andāmtā* commentary attests the word *'abdo* which, despite minor discrepancies, equals the *'abdu* fragrance in form and function. This supports a connection between the eagle story in the commentary and the phoenix chapter as transmitted in Et-α, because both share a non-polygenetic secondary variant which, technically speaking, is a 'conjunctive error'. One is therefore inclined to assume that the exegete learnt the story of the prodigious self-burning bird according to Et-α. As to the confusion between the phoenix and the eagle, it might be conjectured that the exegete did not have the source text nearby and, while retelling the legend from memory, he deliberately replaced the rare and perhaps obscure word *finaks* with a more familiar bird name. However, other explanations cannot be ruled out.<sup>15</sup>

In Mt 3, 7 Jesus calls the Pharisees 'brood of vipers': **ወደቤለሎሙ ፡ አትውልደ ፡ አራዊተ ፡ ምድር ፡ መኑ ፡ አመረክሙ ፡ ትጉሃዩ ፡ እመቅሰናት ፡ ወእመንሱት ፡ ዘይመጽእ ፡**, 'and (Jesus) told them: 'you brood of vipers! Who warned you to flee from the punishment and the coming wrath?'. The Amharic commentary to that passage is as follows:

**ትወልደ አራዊተ ምድር ያላት አርጭ ገሞራዊት ናት አፈ ማኅፀኑዋ ጠባብ ነው ዘሩን ባፏ ትቀበለዋች አባለ ዘሩን ቆርጣ ታስቀረዋለች ። በፅንሰ ጊዜ እባት ሥጋዋን በልተው ሆደን ቀደው ይወጣሉ ። በዚህ ጊዜ እናት ትሞታለች ። እኒህም እንዳባት የሚሆኑዋቸውን ነቢያት እንደ እናት የሚሆኑዋቸው ሐዋርያት ገድለዋና ።**<sup>16</sup>

14 Hommel 1877, 7 (text of Et-α), 52–53 (German translation); Conti Rossini 1951, 21–22 (Italian translation); Sumner 1982, 17–19 (English translation).

15 For instance, that a parallel story on the eagle circulated in a very different form than that transmitted in the *Physiologus*. Hard to explain is also the reference to Giyorgis Walda 'Amid, author of a historical treatise (*Tārika Walda 'Amid*), where, however, no reference to the myth of the self-burning bird seems to be found. Further investigation is needed to clear up this point.

16 *'Andāmtā* commentary on the Holy Gospels, 36b.

‘Brood of vipers’: (the viper) is a snake of Gomorrah, and the opening of her womb is tight. (The female) receives the semen from her mouth. After cutting off the (male) organ, she abandons him. At birth the sons eat the flesh (of their mother), lacerate her belly, and come out. Thus, she dies. The prophets, which are like the fathers (of the vipers), and the apostles, which are like the mothers (of the vipers), were likewise killed.

This passage is certainly indebted to the chapter of the *Physiologus* on the viper, or echidna, which contains the same narrative. Comparison with the multiple-version text of the *Physiologus* evidences once more a closer affinity to Et- $\alpha$ . Such an affinity emerges with clarity in the conclusion of the *’andamtā* explanation. Here, the reference to the ‘prophets’ and the ‘apostles’ parallels the conclusion of the Et- $\alpha$  recension, which reads ከግሁ፡ ጸሎ፡ ጉ፡ ፎ፡ ተ፡ ለ፡ አባቶቻቸው፡ ነቢያተ፡ ጳጳሳት፡ አባቶቻቸው፡ ወአርዳኢሁ፡ ።, ‘so they killed their fathers, the prophets, and also our Lord, their father, and his disciples’ (‘apostles’ in the *’andamtā* evidently continues ‘disciples’).<sup>17</sup> Conversely, Et- $\beta$  only has ቀተልዎ፡ ለእግዚአብሔር፡ አባቶቻቸው፡ ክርስቶስ፡, ‘they killed our Lord, Jesus Christ’, and Et- $\gamma$  only has ይቀትሉ፡ አባቶቻቸው፡ ነቢያተ፡ ።, ‘they killed your fathers, the prophets’.

Remarkably, a very similar account is also found in the *’andamtā* commentary of a renowned Arabic-based compilation of law, ‘The Law of Kings’ (*Fāṭha nagašt*).

The womb of this snake of Gomorrah is tight. (The female) receives the semen from her mouth. After cutting off the (male) organ, she abandons him. The male dies. When the time of the birth has come, the sons lacerate her belly and come out, and she dies. Thus, they kill their own fathers during conception, and their own mothers at birth.<sup>18</sup>

The collation of the two texts shows that they are no doubt two version of one and the same story. Several explanations can be invoked. The most viable explanation is that one version is based on the other. The version from the commentary of Matthew is more likely to be earlier for several reasons. First, it is textually more complete, because it retains the mention of the prophets which, as seen, is also found in the Greek *Physiologus* and in two Ethiopic recensions. Moreover, the reconstruction fits well with the expected process of development of the *’andamtā* tradition: most probably, commentaries were initially produced to cover the most pre-eminent New Testament books. At a later stage they were extended to prestigious yet non-canonical books such as

17 Hommel 1877, 10 (text of Et- $\alpha$ ) 56 (German translation); Conti Rossini 1951, 24 (Italian translation); Sumner 1982, 23 (English translation).

18 *’Andamtā* commentary on the *Fāṭha nagašt*, 163c.



the *Fāṭha nagaśt*, presumably by learned men well acquainted with the exegetical literature already in existence.

That of the echidna is not the sole instance of a verbatim or slavish reuse of material based on the same animal story. The same strategy also affects another account from the *Physiologus*, that on the caladrius. The caladrius is a miraculous all-white bird with diagnostic powers: placed in front of a sick person, the caladrius reveals if he will live or die, depending on whether it looks directly at the face of the sick person or turns away from him.<sup>19</sup> The legend of the caladrius is found in two exegetical passages, the former embedded in the commentary of Matthew (Mt 8, 17, here on the left), the latter in the commentary of a non-biblical text, ‘The Praise of Mary’ (*Wəddāse Māryām*, here on the right):

Story of the caladrius: it is a white bird which is brought and dwells in the royal palace. When someone is ailing, (the caladrius) is brought forth and is put near to him. If he remains sick, (the caladrius) turns its face away; if he survives, it comes close and receives his breath. With the breath (the bird), which was white, becomes black and goes out to the air.

After three hours ..., it enters into the sea. After being three days and three nights in the sea, it replaces its old feathers, it renovates, and comes out.

The white bird is the Lord, and it is white because of his divinity.<sup>18</sup>

Story of the caladrius: it is a white bird which dwells in the royal house. When someone is ailing, (the caladrius) is brought forth and is placed in front of him. If he remains sick, (the caladrius) turns its face away; if he survives, it comes close and receives his breath. (The bird), which was white, becomes black and goes out to the air.

After three hours ..., it enters into the sea. After three days and three nights in the depths of the sea, it replaces its old feathers, it renovates, and comes out.

The white bird is the Lord, and it is white because of his divinity.<sup>19</sup>

Here again the similarity between the two explanations supports the assumption that one stems from the other. Other instances of the same phenomenon are certainly in existence in the *ʿandəmtā* literature,<sup>22</sup> most probably also outside the domain of the *Physiologus*.

19 Hommel 1877, 3–4 (text of Et-α), 48–49 (German translation); Conti Rossini 1951, 18–19 (Italian translation); Sumner 1982, 13–14 (English translation).

20 *ʿAndəmtā* commentary on the Holy Gospels, 76b–c.

21 *ʿAndəmtā* commentary on the *Wəddāse Māryām*, 155–156.

22 By way of example, the commentary on the *Wəddāse Māryām* contains a further reference to the centuries-old drought in Egypt and the legend of the eagle (i.e. the phoenix), which corresponds to the above-mentioned explanation in Is 40, 31 (*ʿAndəmtā* commentary on the *Wəddāse Māryām*, 102).



### *Some conclusions: A multifaceted impact?*

The case studies presented here show that the dissemination of echoes of the *Physiologus* in the lexicographical and exegetical literature is far from allowing easy-made conclusions.

Evidence from the *sawāsəw* compilations is not uncontroversial: contrary to what is generally claimed, *Physiologus*-related names do not seem to have received extensive treatment in the native vocabularies. Observations based on the orthography of some bird names show tangibly that it is much safer to attribute the latter's provenance to scriptural readings.

The impact on the 'andəmtā corpus is more firmly grounded. It is demonstrated that several accounts from the *Physiologus* were incorporated into the Amharic traditional commentaries. This provides a valuable information on the transmission of the text, since it proves that the latter circulated and was read in the monastic centers where the 'andəmtā tradition emerged. Besides, a dependence from a text type which is closer to Et-α (the most conservative recension) sporadically surfaces from independent text-critical observations, even though more evidence would be required to make solid generalizations.

Even though studies on the sources and the development of the traditional exegesis are still in their infancy, a brief look has revealed clear phenomena of reuse of the literary material. On the one hand, some legendary properties were attributed to a different animal (e.g. the eagle replaces the phoenix as the self-burning bird in the commentary on Is 40, 31) for reasons which are still overall unclear. On the other hand, material from existing commentaries was reused for newly-composed exegetical treatises. This holds true for at least two explanations in the commentary of Matthew that are paralleled by nearly identical passages in the commentaries of two non-biblical books, the *Fəṭḥa nagašt* and the *Wəddāse Māryām*. This corroborates the idea that the 'andəmtā corpus, despite being a complex body, possesses its own integrity. Studies on this topic might be very inspiring in the coming years, as they provide information on the process of historical development of the Amharic exegetical literature. Obviously, a prerequisite for more precise statements in this respect is the availability of a reliable text edition of the *Physiologus* on the one hand, and of the commentaries on the other, taking into due consideration that the latter existed for a long time as an oral tradition.

### *References*

'Andəmtā commentary on the book of Isaiah: ትንቢተ ኢሳይያስ ከቀድሞ አባቶች ሲወርድ ሲሞረድ የመጣው ንባብና ትርጓሜው (በአንድምታ) (*Tənbīta 'Isāyāyyās* [...]), 'The Prophecy of Isaiah [...]') (Addis Ababa: Tənsā'e māsāttamiyā dərəḡḡət, 1997 A.M. [2004/2005]).

- <sup>1</sup>*Andəmtā* commentary on the *Fəṯha nagašt*: *ʿalaqā* Gabra ʿAb, *ʿalaqā* Tābqe, and *grā getā* Waldayās, eds., **ፍትሐ ነገሥት ንባቡና ትርጉሜው** (*Fəṯha nagašt nəbābunna tərgʷamew*, ‘The Law of Kings, Text and Commentary’) (Addis Ababa: Tənsāʿe yamašāḥəft māsəttamiyā dərəḅḅət, 1958 A.M. [1965/1966]).
- <sup>2</sup>*Andəmtā* commentary on the Holy Gospels: *mamḥər* Walda Rufāʿel an)d *ʿalaqā* Gabra Madḥən, eds., **ወንጌል ቅዱስ ዘእግዚእነ ወመድኃኒ ኢየሱስ ክርስቶስ ። የጌታ ችን የመድኃኒታችን የኢየሱስ ክርስቶስ ቅዱስ ወንጌል ።** (*Wangel qəddus za-ʿəgziʿna wa-madhānina ʿIyasus Krəstos* [...]), ‘The Holy Gospels of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ [...]’) (Addis Ababa: Bərḥānənnā salām qadāmāwī Ḥāyilā Śəllāse mättamiyā bet, 1916 A.M. [1923/1924]).
- <sup>3</sup>*Andəmtā* commentary on the *Wəddāse Māryām*: **ውዳሴ ማርያም ቅዱስ ኤፍሬም የደረሰው ። ከቀድሞው አባቶች ጀምሮ ሲወርድ ሲዋረድ የመጣው ንባቡና ትርጉሜው** (*Wəddāse Māryām qəddus ʿEfrem yadarrasaw* [...]), ‘The Praises of Mary, interpreted by saint Ephraim [...]’) (Addis Ababa: Bərḥānənnā salām mättamiyā bet, 1963 A.M. [1970/1971]).
- Conti Rossini, C. 1951. ‘Il fisiologo etiopico’, *Rassegna di Studi Etiopici*, 10 (1951), 5–51.
- Cowley, R.W. 1983. *The Traditional Interpretation of the Apocalypse of St. John in the Ethiopian Orthodox Church*, University of Cambridge Oriental Publications, 33 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).
- 1988. *Ethiopian Biblical Interpretation: a Study in Exegetical Tradition and Hermeneutics*, University of Cambridge Oriental Publications, 38 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
- Dillmann, A. 1865. *Lexicon linguae aethiopiae, Cum indice latino. Adiectum est vocabularium tigre dialecti septentrionalis compilatum a W. Munziger* (Lipsiae: T. O. Weigel, 1865).
- García, M.A. 2010. ‘Tərgwame’, in S. Uhlig, ed., *Encyclopaedia Aethiopia*, IV: O–X, (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010), 921a–923a.
- Hommel, F. 1877. *Die aethiopische Uebersetzung des Physiologus nach je einer Londoner, Pariser und Wiener Handschrift* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1877).
- Ludolf, H., 1691. *Ad suam Historiam Aethiopicam antehac editam Commentarius...* (Francofurti ad Moenum: Sumptibus Johannis David Zunneri, 1691).
- Mersha Alehegne 2011. *The Ethiopian Commentary on the Book of Genesis: Critical Edition and Translation*, Aethiopistische Forschungen, 73 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011).
- Sumner, C., 1982. *The Fisalgʷos*, Ethiopian Philosophy, 5 (Addis Ababa: Commercial Printing Press, 1982).

- Tedros Abraha 2007. 'Una versione Tigrina (popolare?) degli *andämta* sui quattro Vangeli: un altro passo nelle edizioni degli *andämta* nell'ultimo ventennio', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 73/1 (2007), 61–96.
- Uhlig, S. 1991. 'Text-critical questions of the Ethiopic Bible', in A.S. Kaye, ed., *Semitic Studies: In honor of Wolf Leslau, On the occasion of his eighty-fifth birthday, November 14th, 1991* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1990), II, 1583–1600.
- Villa, M. forthcoming. 'The Ethiopic Tradition', in C. Macé, ed., *The Physiologus: Multilingual History of an Early Christian Text*, *Studies in Manuscript Cultures* (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, forthcoming).
- Weldetensae Andeberhan 1994. *Commentari etiopici sul libro del Profeta Osea: edizione critica da mss. inediti, principi ermeneutici, temi teologici*, *Äthiopistische Forschungen*, 40 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1994).
- Weninger, S. 2005. 'Fisalgos', in S. Uhlig, ed., *Encyclopaedia Aethiopica*, II: *D–Ha* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2005), 549b–550a.
- Zuurmond, R. 1989. *Novum Testamentum Aethiopicum: The Synoptic Gospels. General Introduction. Edition of the Gospel of Mark*, *Äthiopistische Forschungen*, 27 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1989).

