



Aethiopica 13 (2010)

International Journal of Ethiopian and
Eritrean Studies

ALESSANDRO BAUSI, Universität Hamburg

Review of

TEDROS ABRAHA, *I Gädl di Abunä Təwäldä-Mädehn e di Abunä Vittore. Edizione del testo etiopico e traduzione italiana*

Aethiopica 13 (2010), 244–253

ISSN: 1430–1938

Published by

Universität Hamburg

Asien Afrika Institut, Abteilung Afrikanistik und Äthiopistik

Hiob Ludolf Zentrum für Äthiopistik

TEDROS ABRAHA, *I Gädl di Abunä Tāwäldä-Mädehn e di Abunä Vittore. Edizione del testo etiopico e traduzione italiana* = *Patrologia Orientalis* 51/2, fasc. 227, Turnhout: Brepols, 2009. Pp. 175 [= 85–255]. Price: € 62.–. ISBN-13: 978–2–503–53405–3.

One year after the publication of the *Gädlä Dəmyanos*,¹ Tedros Abraha proposes in a new fascicule of the *Patrologia Orientalis* the edition and translation, with a substantial introduction and a rich commentary, of the unpublished hagiographies of Tāwäldä Mādḥən² and Fiqəṭor (*Gädlä Tāwäldä Mādḥən* and *Gädlä Fiqəṭor*), two abbots of the famous Ewostəatean abbey of Däbrä Maryam, Qoḥayn, Sära'e, in Eritrea, who were in charge between the end of the 14th and the middle of the 15th cent. Already known after short mentions in a few hagiographical and documentary texts, the former was abbot already in 1390/91, and the latter was succeeded by Gäbrä Krəstos not later than 1446.

Confirming an established trend of the last fascicules of the *Patrologia Orientalis* devoted to Ethiopic texts, the edition is preceded by an introduction not only on preliminaries to the text edition, but also on the main historical questions.³ The latter had already been approached by the Editor in a contribution of 2008⁴ on the two well known controversies of Ethiopian Christi-

¹ Cp. TEDROS ABREHA, *Il Gädl di Abuna Demyanos santo eritreo (XIV/XV sec.). Edizione del testo etiopico e traduzione italiana* = *Patrologia Orientalis* 50/2 (fasc. 223), Turnhout: Brepols, 2007; cp. the review by the present reviewer in: *Scrinium. Revue de patrologie, d'hagiographie critique et d'histoire ecclésiastique* 5 (2009) = ANDREI ORLOV – BASIL LOURIE (eds.), *Symbola Caelestis. Le symbolisme liturgique et paraliturgique dans le monde chrétien*, Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press – Axiōma, 2009, pp. 429–436.

² The name of the saint is always given as “Mādḥən”, except for the volume title – where it is not clear why “Fiqəṭor” has been Italianized in “Vittore” – which the Editor intended to make as simple as possible in view of facilitating the referring to it. The correct form is undoubtedly “Mādḥən” (cp., e.g., WOLF LESLAU, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1987, p. 128a), as appears in other names quoted in the volume (e.g., p. 86: “Täṭəmḳä-Mādḥən”). If, as it is likely, the form “Mādḥən” intends to render the phonetic aspect of the Tigrinya pronunciation – not a commendable practice in the transcription of centuries-old written texts – the same practice should have been followed in many other cases. Transcriptions betray several inconsistencies: “*Hamle*” (p. 85, n. 2), but “*ḥədar*” (p. 87) for the names of the months; “*Mātyās*”, but “*Däbrä Maryam*” (p. 86, n. 9), etc.

³ A less extensive introduction, however, has been proposed in a subsequent fascicule by OSVALDO RAINERI, *Vita del santo monaco etiopico Malke'a Krestos (sec. XVI–XVII)* = *Patrologia Orientalis* 51/3 (fasc. 228), Turnhout: Brepols, 2009, pp. 1–130 [= 257–388].

⁴ Tedros has argued that the second of the two texts provides evidence for the conflict between two different eschatological conceptions: that of an eschatological realization

anism connected with the hagiographies under review, i.e. (a) the observance of the two Sabbaths, main point of the Ewoṣṭatean monastic movement and on which especially the *Gädlä Tāwäldä Mädhən* insists, and (b) the controversy on the “Banquet of Mount Ṣəyon”, which is a large part of the narrative texture of the *Gädlä Fiqətor*. The participation of Fiqətor in a council on the millenaristic controversy (probably held between 1434 and 1439⁵) was known from another text at least, i.e. the *Short work of Yoḥannes*, a text of a mixed documentary and hagiographical character, dating to 1453, immediately after the council took place.⁶ The *Gädlä Fiqətor*, besides confirming the episode, evidences its high relevance within the historical memory of the Ewoṣṭatean community. It remains to be evaluated why the involvement of the Ewoṣṭateans in the millenaristic controversy – where they had as main opponents the Ḍṣṭifanosites – is not attested by any sources outside the strict Ewoṣṭatean environment (e.g., non-Ewoṣṭatean hagiographies and especially chronicles). One can not exclude that this is related to the process of tormented and gradual reconciliation between the clergy of Däbrä Ḥayq Ḍṣṭifanos and the monarchy on the one side, and the Ewoṣṭateans on the other, which only at the middle of the 15th cent. came to a conclusion. That the role of the Ewoṣṭateans in the millenaristic controversy is ignored in the

in the present, maintained by the Ḍṣṭifanosites, and that of a future eschatological projection, cp. TEDROS ABRAHA, “Controversie sul Sabato e sul Millennio secondo i *Gädl* inediti di Tāwäldä-Mädhən e di Fiqətor”, in: *Scrinium* 5 (2009) (cfr. sopra), pp. 79–102. On millenarism in Ethiopia see also MERID WOLDE AREGAY, “Millenarian Traditions and Peasant Movements in Ethiopia 1500–1855”, in: SVEN RUBENSON (ed.), *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference of Ethiopian Studies. University of Lund, 26–29 April 1982*, Addis Abeba: Institute of Ethiopian Studies – Uppsala: Scandinavian Institute of African Studies – East Lansing: African Studies Center, Michigan State University, 1984, pp. 257–262; ID., “Literary Origins of Ethiopian Millenarism”, in: ANATOLY ANDREEVICH GROMYKO (ed.), *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Ethiopian Studies, Moscow, 26–29 August 1986*, USSR Academy of Sciences Africa Institute, Moscow: Nauka Publishers, Central Department of Oriental Literature, 1988, VI, pp. 161–172; WILLIAM A. SHACK, “On anti-millenarian elements in Medieval Christian Ethiopia”, in: ALAIN ROUAUD (ed.), *Les orientalistes sont des aventuriers. Guirlande offerte à Joseph Tubiana par ses élèves et ses amis* = Bibliothèque Peiresc 12, Saint-Maur: Éditions SÉPIA, 1999, pp. 91–95. I can only mention here that the forthcoming publication by Getatchew Haile of hagiographical texts emanating from the inside of the Ḍṣṭifanosite community provides new elements, if not incompatible with, certainly complementary to the eminently theological interpretation of the controversies advanced by Tedros.

⁵ On this basis the date of death of Fiqətor could be fixed to February 12th, 1441, cp. p. 86.

⁶ Cp. of the present reviewer, “Su alcuni manoscritti presso comunità monastiche dell’Eritrea [I. Dabra Māryām]”, *Rassegna di Studi Etiopici* 38 (1994 [1996]), pp. 13–69, esp. pp. 47–57 (*Operetta di Yoḥannes*).

sources emanating from the crown might be due to a lasting censorship, and that it is exalted in the Ewosṭatean ones might be due to the intention of claiming the importance of their own role in an obstinate and probably difficult attempt at accrediting themselves at court, witnessed, e.g., by the impressive panegyrics of Zār²a Ya⁶qob (cp. index on p. 251 *s.v.*) disseminated in the two *Gädlät*: fiercely hostile only few years before, the king is exalted for his victory in Adal in 1445 (cp. pp. 234/235, § 99), and seems to be still alive at the time when the text was written down (cp. pp. 218/219, § 76). The very scarce circulation of the texts under examination – attested by a *codex unicus* of the 15th cent. preserved in Däbrä Maryam – seems to fit in well with this historical context.

As usual, the Editor proves extremely skilful and competent in the annotation, particularly in discovering echoes, allusions and quotations, not only of biblical and patristic writings, but also of liturgical and devotional texts, with which he is remarkably well acquainted (cp. p. 99). Honestly, if his statements can also sometimes be criticized, one can only impute to him not to have always drawn the extreme consequences from his own identifications, e.g., in the case of a purported quotation from the *Fəṭḥa nägäšt* (p. 185, n. 85), which would fix the date of its translation to the 15th cent., or from the *Haymanotä ʾAbäw*: in both cases one should verify whether different explanations can lead to different identifications, all the more since the names of the works are not explicitly quoted, and in one case the passage is attributed to the *Sinodos* (cp. *Gädlä Fiqətor*, pp. 178.23/179.28, cp. p. 181, n. 66). Allusions to less frequent texts, such as the *Testament of Our Lord in Galilea*, or very rare, such as the *Shepherd of Hermas* (pp. 216.38/217.31–219.1),⁷ demonstrate the richness of the library of Däbrä Maryam, at least at the time, and the well known bibliophilia of the Ewosṭatean monks, magnificently condensed in the wonderful episode of the *Gädlä Fiqətor*, where the holy abbot resolutely sets out for the monastery of Däbrä Ḥayq Əṣṣifānos, a fierce enemy in a not distant time, in search for the *Book of Baruc* (pp. 188/189, § 38).

Other aspects of the work, unfortunately, are much more problematic. The material description of the codex evidences some drawbacks (pp. 89–90): (a) it is not clearly stated that fols. 26–27 have been later inserted – interestingly enough – to host an additional note: initially written on fols. 24–25, and then exceeding the blanks at disposal, the note has been continued on added folios

⁷ Not by chance quoted in a manuscripts inventory dating to the middle of the 15th cent. of the monastic community of Däbrä Maryam, cp. BAUSI, “Su alcuni manoscritti”, pp. 36–37, 43, which evidently owed one exemplar at least of the extremely rare work.

which were later inserted;⁸ (b) the codicological description (p. 89) does not consider the 4 initial folios (mentioned by the Editor on p. 87 as containing text and translation of an Amharic note of some interest), even though in the list of contents similar texts are considered; (c) the definition of “recisi” (“cut”) folios (*ibid.*) is misleading: the codex actually consists at the origin not only of bifolios, but also of single leafs: an interesting, already well known, and relatively frequent, codicological feature of the Ethiopian manuscript culture; (d) fols. 24–27 properly contain an additional note, not an “interpolazione” (i.e. an “addition to the transmitted text of elements not belonging to the original text”); (e) it would have been better to say that “the text is mutilous”, rather than “Il testo termina bruscamente” (p. 89), even though it is not clear if this is due to a material loss or to some other reasons. On the basis of the information provided by the Editor, the material structure of the manuscript can be represented by the following simple descriptive string: $a^4 + I^8$ (fols. 1–8) + II^8 (fols. 9–16) + $II^{10(-1)}$ (fols. 17–25) + b^2 (fols. 26–27) + IV^8 (fols. 28–35) + $V^{10(-2)}$ (fols. 36–43) + $VI^{10(-2)}$ (fols. 44–51) + VII^8 (fols. 53–59) + c^7 (fols. 60–66: single leaves).

The introduction also includes paleographical and graphical observations (pp. 90–92), which are followed by mainly linguistic ones (pp. 92–96). On the problem of the dating of the codex paleographical considerations are mixed up with other (p. 90: “Il codice non ha colofone ma la paleografia e i contenuti ... suggeriscono il XV secolo ...”), which exclusively concern the contents of the text, not its carrier. – The paleographic and linguistic “inter-scambio” between first, fourth and sixth order are not clearly distinguished

⁸ A careful description should have considered further important elements too: the text on fol. 24^{ra-b} (§ 53, pp. 150/151) as well as that on the following fols. 24^{rb}–27^{vb} (§§ 54–62, pp. 150–158/151–159) are – says the Editor (p. 151, n. 85) – written by a second hand: it is not clear, however, whether the “altra mano” is the same for all the §§ 53–62, because only § 53 (fols. 24^{ra}–24^{rb}) seems to have been written by “caratteri ... molto più piccoli rispetto al resto del codice” and ends “con due righe finali nella colonna a fianco”, which is indicated with the cryptic “24^{rb/b}” (p. 150.14). Whatever this might mean, it appears that the text of § 53, probably written on a “raschiata e ripulita” column, “riciclata per scrivere il testo attuale”, has been secondarily inserted between what preceded and followed: the text, however, contains nothing else but a short and generic mention of the rule of Ewostatewos and Absadi. In the following §§ 54–62 (ff. 24^{rb}–27^{vb}) instead, there follows a monastic order of the greatest interest, on which the Editor has scarcely drawn the attention of the reader by shortly mentioning it on p. 89: “Interpolazione di un’altra mano con norme della comunità di abunä Ewostatewos”. In conclusion, the additional texts are two, probably of different age: the first in §§ 54–62 and the latter in § 53. The frequently mentioned ‘*abunä Mär’awe Krastos*’ (pp. 154.16, 156.11, 158.12–13, §§ 57, 59, 62), seemingly successor of Fiqaṭor and on whom we know very little (the Editor says nothing on him) provides a further important historical element.

(pp. 90–91). – The Editor declares that he will consider in the critical apparatus the phenomenon of the usual graphical indifference (better than “promiscuità”) in the use of sibilants and laryngeals, according to a critical and editorial procedure which is not further defined: as a result, however, perfectly regular forms of the manuscript, sometimes only of an archaic character, even frequently attested, are relegated in the apparatus, while arbitrary conjectures appear in the text (without any other signal than the exponent of the footnote): in such a simple, *codex unicus*-based edition, the critical apparatus mainly consists of such odd conjectures. Some examples: p. 134.2: **ወአብዮቲሁ** and n. 90: **ወአብዮቲሁ**; p. 134.3: **ወአብዮቲሁሙ** and n. 92: **አብዮቲሁሙ**; p. 134.3 **ፍረዮት** and n. 93: **ፈረዮት**; p. 134.4–5: **ለርእይ** and n. 94 **ለርኢይ**; and one could go on. – Not particularly relevant cases are subsumed under the category of “*usus scribendi* dell’epoca” (p. 91), restrictively understood as “graphic uses”, contrary to the normal understanding of “stylistic and linguistic phenomena”: e.g., **እመዐር** is not a “forma contratta” (linguistic phenomenon) for **እም ፣ መዐር** but the normally expected spelling, against the analytical one.

In a section devoted to linguistic observations (pp. 92–94), the Editor looks at his text with a strongly prescriptive attitude (“la costruzione dovrebbe essere”, the text would be stained by “stravolgimenti”, there would be “discutibili” forms, etc.), which reveals a linguistic and philological methodology⁹ that can be styled “personal” at best: obviously every editor has to look critically at the text, but conjectures and emendations must be rigorously justified, and the critical evaluation must consider the phenomena of linguistic variation and stylistic intention. The “discutibili” verbal forms (**ትእረር** for **ትእርር**) are subjunctive/jussive forms of transitive verbs which are calqued on the forms of the transitive verbs, as it often occurs: these forms could have been noted, but without any censory remark. – The Editor has faithfully followed the punctuation of his *codex unicus*, of which he provides a short description (p. 92), with the useful indication that the text is often articulated and structured by different means, such as the “ben nota formula” **ንግባእኩ**: which, however, does not properly mean “ci addentriamo dunque”, as usually in the translation, but “let’s come back”, i.e. “let’s resume our topics” (the Editor has confused here Amharic **ገባ**, “to get in”, and Gəʕəz **ገባእ**, of a different meaning: “to get in” in Gəʕəz is **ቦእ**). – The “totale oscurità espressiva” (p. 94) becomes even more obscure when the quoted text (**እአመ ፣ ከመገ**) differs from the edited one (**እምአመ ፣ ከመገ**, p. 168.16–17, cp. ll. 15–17: **ጥንት ፣ ዘእንበለ ፣ እምአመገ ፣ ወቅድመ ፣ ዘእንበለ ፣ አምነበገ ። ወትካት ፣ ዘእንበለ ፣ አምአመ ፣ ከመገ/**

⁹ Concerning philology, hopefully only to *lapsus calami* is due the transformation of the *Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* of the Accademia dei Lincei into that of *scienze morali storiche e filosofiche*, cfr. p. 107, “RRAL”.

p. 169.16–18: “Principio senza un ‘in quel tempo’, e inizio senza un dove, e antico senza un ‘prima che fosse così’”), which is sound: it is not necessary to think of an omission, against what the Editor maintains on n. 37, because the passage has a precise and strong stylistic and rhetoric characterization. – Some cases of missing gender agreement are noted, a widespread feature of Gəʿəz: but the “emended” passage (p. 92, “a”) contains in turn an error of the same kind: **ዘትሰርር** for **እንተ ፡ ትሰርር** (**ኮነ ፡ ከመ ፡ ሆኖ ፡ ዘትሰርር ፡ እንተ ፡ ባቲ ፡ ክንፍ**). – The observations on the occurrence of the construction **ኮነ ፡ ቀተለ** (almost certainly an Arabism, at the time already normalized even in original texts) and accusative construction with **አልቦ** (p. 93, “c” and “d”) are important. – The Editor, once again, condemns the use of “pleonasmī” (cp. p. 94) with a prescriptive and laconic tone (“è sufficiente uno dei due avverbi”): but what is criticized here are the legitimate stylistic choices of the author, which the Editor has simply to respect: in **በኩሉ ፡ ወበኩላሂ ፡ ህልው** the expression **በኩሉ** is not an adverb, and it actually means: “in all”, and therefore **በኩሉ ፡ ወበኩላሂ ፡** is: “in all and everywhere”. – On the other hand, **ቃለክሙ** (*ibid.*) is a repetition (dittography) which did not deserve any mention. – Lexical and morphological observations seem to have been hurriedly amassed, with the expected consequences: the same term **ምፍጻም** is twice commented upon, once as a case for lexicon not registered in the dictionaries (p. 94, “m”) and once as Tigrinism (p. 95, “n”). – The construction with **ቦእንዘ** etc. (p. 95 “o”, cp. p. 114.18) is sound as it is and must not be emended (cp. for the same construction p. 114.25). – The form **ሐሊዎ** for **ኅልዎ** (*ibid.*) seems really due to phonetic exchange. – The observation (pp. 95–96, “o”) that the verbs **ጠየቀ** and **ለበወ** are irregularly conjugated seems erroneous: text pp. 138.23–25: **ቀዲሙሰ ፡ መዋዕል ፡ ሶባ ፡ ተጋባእነ ፡ ኀበ ፡ መካነ ፡ ትምህርት ፡ ይብል ፡ አምጽኡ ፡ አሐደ ፡ እመጸሕፍተ ፡ ነቢያት ፡ ከመ ፡ ንሰማዕ ፡ ትንቢቶሙ ፡ ወይጤይቅ ፡ [ms. ወይጠይቅ ፡] ግብሮሙ ፡ ወይሌቡ ፡ [ms. ወይለቡ ፡] ትምህርቶሙ ፡ ወይኤዝዝ** ecc./139.26–28: “Nei primi tempi, quando ci radunavamo nel luogo della scuola diceva: ‘portate uno dei libri dei Profeti cosicché possiamo ascoltare la loro profezia’. E capiva il loro operato e comprendeva il loro insegnamento e comandava ecc.”: but nothing prevents from understanding and translating: “... ‘portate uno dei libri dei Profeti’, cosicché potessimo ascoltare, e capisse il loro operato e comprendesse il loro insegnamento, e comandava ecc.”. Even in the case of a different interpretation, it would be better to view the phenomenon as a case of exchange between indicative and subjunctive, more than as a morphological feature. – Also erroneous is the observation on **ተአምነ**, which is not only “fu creduto, fu affidabile”, but primarily “*fidum* vel *verum se praeberere; fidere, confidere*” etc. (cp. August Dillmann, *Lexicon linguae aethiopicæ*, Lipsiae: T.O.Weigel, 1865, cc. 736–737, with the meaning of “*credi*” only on c. 737).

The approach to the properly hagiographic problems, in literary and historical sense, would deserve specific remarks. To note that Tāwāldā Mādḥən is represented in his *Gädl* as “un monaco austero che conduceva un severo regime di vita ascetica: un uomo con convinzioni solide, non negoziabili neanche nelle circostanze più rischiose e travagliate” does not add much to our understanding of the literary and ideological structure of the text. Neither is particularly useful to remind that the Gəʿəz literature feeds on the Bible (pp. 98–100). It would have been much better to evidence which are the specific motifs of the two hagiographies in comparison with the general Christian hagiography, the Gəʿəz hagiography, and the specifically Ewosṭatean hagiography in particular: but very little of all this is to be found in the volume, even in the evocative paragraph entitled “Auto-coscienza della comunità monastica di Däbrä Maryam” (p. 98), where the intention of the hagiographers of sketching an ideal picture of the community of Däbrä Maryam is remarked at the beginning. Elements for the thematic and even textual relationships among various Ewosṭatean *Gädlät*, however, are to be found confined in the footnotes, without any hermeneutic or philological effort being exerted on the matter: parts of the preamble of *Gädlä Fiqətor*, §§ 1–2, 4, 7–8 (pp. 160–163, 165–167; cp. p. 161, n. 2; p. 163, n. 18; p. 65, n. 26) appear in the same form in the *Gädlä Absadi*, and § 1 even in the *Gädlä Buruk Amlak* (p. 161, n. 7), but this does not necessarily mean, as the Editor maintains, that the less extended preamble of the *Gädlä Absadi* is the result of a secondary reduction. Curiously interpreted as a phenomenon of “Stile” (pp. 96–98), the Editor notes the occurrence of some “doppioni” (“duplicates”, i.e. twofold versions of the same episode: the *Gädlä Fiqətor* reports two versions of the travel of the abbot to the king Zärʾa Yaʿqob), which should have been discussed a bit more in detail as important elements on the basis of which a convincing hypothesis on the genesis of the texts could have been founded (a second “doppione” on the investiture of Fiqətor, cp. § 43 of the *Gädlä Tāwāldä Mādḥən*, pp. 142–143, and § 93 of the *Gädlä Fiqətor*, pp. 230–231, does not appear as such). Other essential elements for the understanding of literary context have not been enough evidenced: the *Gädlä Fiqətor* certainly presupposes the *Gädlä Ewosṭatewos*, which is quoted and alluded to (cp. pp. 200/201, nn. 28–32, § 53). Finally – and this is not a detail – the two texts seem to have been written on the initiative of the abbot Gäbrä Krəstos (pp. 244.23.24/245.25, § 113), who is also the successor of Fiqətor, and already mentioned and known from the *Short work of Yoḥannes*, the affinity of which with salient features of the two *Gädlät* had to be furtherly underlined.

Some punctual observations to the text follow, which due to space constraint are limited to the first pages of the text and to some exemplary cases: p. 108, n. 4: በኢሳይያስ against በኢሳይያስ of the ms.: the Editor has arbitrarily

conjectured, what was not needed: as a consequence, a perfectly transparent archaic spelling has been concealed. – p. 108.15: የዋህ “meek” (§ 2), is omitted in the translation. – pp. 108.26: እስመ ፡ ለ-መ-ኒ ፡ ይምሕርዎሙ-/109.28: “perché anche ad essi concederanno la misericordia” (§ 2): instead of a more clear: “perché anche di essi avranno misericordia”. – pp. 110.3, 111.9: አባ/111.4 (2 volte), 111.10 etc.: “Abunä” (§ 3). – pp. 110.27: ዘአባ ፡ ኤዎስጣቴዎስ ፡ ተክል ፡ አባ ፡ አብሳዲ ፡ ሰቀየ/111.26–27: “Virgulto di Abba Ewostatewos, che Abba Absadi ha innaffiato” (§ 5): the transl. (“che Abba Absadi”) is not justified by the text: but the ms. has actually ዘአባ (cp. p. 110, n. 13): therefore the correct text has been emended, but the transmitted text, confined in the apparatus, has been translated instead. – pp. 112.4: በዝ ፡ ሰየ ፡ ወበዝ ፡ ሞገሰ/113.4: “Da una parte il dolore, dall'altra gioia” (§ 5): an obscure text (the saint is not a *bohémien* who alternates joy and pain), based upon a farfetched hypothesis (cp. p. 113, n. 11), on the basis of a probably corrupted text; yet it does not make sense to write ሰየ in the text, when the ms. has ሠየ, while then (*tertium datur*) the Editor says: “Il ḡəʿəz dice ሰይ” (p. 113, n. 11): in such a mass of inaccuracies it becomes impossible to realize which is the actual reading of the ms. – pp. 112.9: ውንቦ ፡ ቤተ ፡ ክርስቲያንሂ ፡ ያፈጥን ፡ ገዴሰ/113.9: “Si affrettava anche ad andare in chiesa”: but actually: “si affrettava anche ad andare presto in chiesa”. – pp. 112.11: ቦ ፡ ኤይወት ፡ ዘለዓለም/113.11: “ha la vita eterna”: ኤይ ወተ (possible accusative) of the ms. could have stayed (cp. p. 112, n. 16). – pp. 112.13.16: ወእንዘ ፡ ይነብር ፡ ውስተ ፡ ደብረ ፡ ማርያም ፡ ... እንተ ፡ ውስቲታ ፡ ትን ቢት ፡ ውንቤሃ ፡ ስብከተ ፡ ቃለ ፡ መለኮት ፡ ወውስቲታ ፡ አንብቦ ፡ .../113.14–15: “Mentre stava a Däbrä Maryam, ... nella quale (c'è) la profezia e in essa (c'è) la proclamazione della parola della divinità. In essa (c'è) la lettura ...”: the relative clause has been erroneously interrupted: it had to go on with: “e in cui c'è la lettura ...”. – pp. 114.7: ይብሉ-/115.9: “hanno detto”, but pp. 114.17: ዘይቤ/115.18: “che dice”: it is not clear how the tenses have been translated. – pp. 114.8: ወአብደረ ፡ ገቢረ ፡ ቦቲ/115.9: “che sceglie di operarvi”: but it is: “to work” more than: “to operate”. – pp. 115.26 (and n. 27), 119.17: ገርሳ is undoubtedly to be understood as a fruit: on the term, which occurs in the monastic and Ewostatean hagiographic literature, cp. of the present reviewer “La versione etiopica della *Didascalia dei 318 niceni* sulla retta fede e la vita monastica”, in: Enzo Lucchesi – Ugo Zanetti (curr.), *Ægyptus Christiana. Mélanges d'hagiographie égyptienne et orientale dédiés à la mémoire du P. Paul Devos bollandiste* = Cahiers d'Orientalisme 25, Genève: Patrick Cramer, 2004, pp. 225–248, esp. pp. 244–245. – pp. 116.2: አባስ ፡ ዐቢይ/117.2: “il grande Abba”: ḳ*abbas*, attested but certainly not very frequent, seems a term especially used within the Ewostatean community: it is rendered by Tedros with “abba”, cp. pp. 130.24: ወአባስ/131.29: “E l'abba” (also on pp. 142.10/143.12 etc.); but elsewhere (pp. 148.21/149.23) also with the proper name: “Abbas”. –

pp. 116.16–17: **ወአቡነ ፡ ተወልደ ፡ መድኅን ፡ እንዝ ፡ ይከውን ፡ ቅድመ ፡ በውስተ ፡ ስደት**/117.15: “E durante la persecuzione, Abunä Tāwäldä-Mädəḥn era all’avanguardia”: it is not certain that **ቅድመ** here means “davanti, all’avanguardia” etc., as it could simply mean “prima” (i.e. “earlier”); cp. also pp. 116.23–24/117.23. – pp. 116.21: **ወይትወሀቦ (ms. ይትዋሀቦ) ስእለቱ**/117.20: “la sua richiesta gli viene esaudita”: one would expect **ስእለቱ** but the accusative is probably correct here, due to attraction and *ad sensum* construction. – pp. 118.3: **ወእለ ፡ ይሰግዱ**/119.4: “E si prostravano”: “E coloro che si prostravano”. – pp. 118.8: **ወአስተጋብአ ፡ አብድንቲሆሙ ፡ ለ፩፩**/119.9: “E raccolsero ciascuno dei loro corpi”: assuming that everyone has only one body, it shall be translated: “E raccolsero il corpo di ciascuno di essi”. – pp. 120.26: **ወለአራዊት ፡ ሲሲተ**/121.27: “mangime per gli animali selvatici”: “cibo per gli animali selvatici”. – p. 122.25: **ከመ ፡ ይኩኑ ፡ ድልዋነ ፡ ለመዊት ፡ በእንተ ፡ ሕጉ ፡ ወትእዛዙ ፡ ለእግዚአብሔር**/123.25: “perché si tenessero pronti per la morte, per la legge e per il comandamento di Dio”: “perché si tenessero pronti a morire per la legge ecc.”. – pp. 122.33: **ጳጳስ**/123.34: “vescovo”: but it would have been better: “metropolitan” (so also in other cases, e.g., p. 127.6). – pp. 124.4–5: **ለትሰር ፡ ይእቲ ፡ ነፍስ ፡ እምሕዝባ**/125.3–4: “venga sradicato dal suo popolo”: “venga sradicata quell’anima dal suo popolo”. – pp. 124.16–17: **ወአብጽሐ ፡ ወናየ ፡ ኂሩቶ**/125.18: “e raccontò la sua tenera bontà”: “e fece pervenire ecc.”. – pp. 124.10: **ወልታ ፡ ሃይማኖት ፡ መገለ**/125.11: “lo scudo della fede il vangelo”: the Editor admits (p. 125, n. 46) that the text (**መገለ**, lett. “emettere pus”) “in questo contesto non avrebbe nessun senso per cui si è preferito emendare”: but actually here, where it is needed, there is no emendation in the text, but in the translation, basing on a not explicitly emended text (*scil.* **ወንጌል**). – p. 127.8–9: “che è stato comandato da Dio al monte Sinai (tramite) le due pietre della legge”: “(tramite)” is not in the text, and the apposition has to be translated in a different way. – p. 127.16: “difettoso e vile”: forse meglio: “diminuito e inferiore”. – pp. 128.19: **ወማሳሌት ፡ ጥዑም**/129.22: “e melodici canti”: “e soavi canti”. – p. 131.18: “ed entrò”: “ritornò”: the transl. reflects the confusion between Amharic **ገባ** and Gəʿəz **ገብአ** (cp. above on **ንግባእኬ**). – pp. 132.7: **ስደታት**/133.8: “la persecuzione”: but the text is plural. – pp. 138.3: **አጸንዕ ፡ ሐቄየ**/139.5: “rafforzavo i miei fianchi”, but it is rather: “serravo [i.e.: “I tightened”] i miei fianchi”. – pp. 138.7: **ጴሜን**/139.9: “Pemme”, but n. 66 identifies him with “Poimen”, therefore: “Poimen”. – pp. 142.10: **አዘዘ** in the text, while the ms. (n. 36) has: **ወአዘዘ**/143.12: “e ordinò”, with the conjunction that does not provide a grammatical sense in Italian: the conjecture is not necessary and the text could stay as it was transmitted, cp., e.g., again p. 140.4 and n. 21: **ለክሳድከ**, where the variant reading in apparatus is identical with the text. – pp. 142.24–25: **ጸሎተ ፡ ጸልዩ ፡ ወተማሕለሉ ፡ ዘይደሉ ፡ ወዘይበቀሱ**/143.29–30: “Fate preghiere e suppliche (perché possiate trovare) colui che è idoneo e utile!”:

but, more simply, it will be: “Fate preghiere e suppliche, il che è opportuno e utile!”. – pp. 144.5: ጸድቃን/144.5: “santi”: “giusti”. – pp. 144.30–31: ወሰምዐ ፡ ማኅሌተ ፡ እምአዳም ፡ ልደተ ፡ አበው ፡ አልዐለ ፡ እስከ ፡ ሲም ፡ አብጽሐ/145.30–31: “E udì il cantico da Adamo, la nascita dei padri menzionò e giunse fino a Sem”: the interesting passage, as rightly noted by Tedros (n. 81), contains an obscure allusion. – p. 148.29: ብራና: the rare term for “parchment” occurs in the colophon of the *Gädlä Fiqətor* (so also in the *Gädlä Dämyanos*, p. 228.6). – pp. 156.6/157.7: ወርቆ ፡/“il suo tesoro”: “il suo oro”. – pp. 11፡11ከሮተ ፡ ስምክ/167.25: “al cui nome”: but actually: “alla menzione del cui nome”. – pp. 172.8 ምልክናዌ/173.8: “regno”: a not attested term, as noted by the Editor, probably appositely created for the necessity of the rhyme (with ግጻዌ and ህላዌ), as in some other cases in the text. – pp. 172.32: ባሕርይ/173.25: “mia perla”: but it is only: “perla”. – pp. 192.9/193.9: በፍትሕ is more: “in punta di diritto”, than: “con la giustizia”. – pp. 194.1: ወእምነ ፡ አውፅእምሙ ፡ እምይአቲ ፡ ፍኖተ ፡ ወደቢልምሙ-/195.1: “E dopodiché li fecero uscire da quella via del brigantaggio”: it appears that something is missing in the text (even though it was emended, cp. p. 195, n. 13). – *ibid.* and pp. 202.14: ቀትል/203.16 and n. 38: “brigantaggio”: “assassinio”. – p. 207.21: “perché li ritornasse a casa”: “perché li facesse ritornare a casa”: one of the few, yet present, solecisms in the Editor’s Italian. – pp. 206.34: እንተ ፡ ድኅሬሁ ፡ ወእንተ ፡ ቅድሜሁ ፡ #/207.35–36: “quelli di dietro e quelli davanti a lui”: “di dietro e davanti”.

After the fundamental contributions by Gianfrancesco Lusini¹⁰, especially devoted to the origin of the Ἐωσῆται movement, the publication by Tedros of the *Gädlä Täwäldä Mädhən* and of the *Gädlä Fiqətor*, as already before of the *Gädlä Dämyanos*, opens new and important perspectives of research on the history of the Ἐωσῆται in the periods after the controversy on the Sabbath and the contrast with the monarchy, and, above all, on their hagiographic and literary reflexes. While commentary and interpretation of the text, if not always impeccable, demonstrate a remarkable familiarity of the Editor with the Gəʿəz texts, from which precise and very precious observations derive – the introduction and sometimes also the translation, but especially the edition, do not always conform to the required standard, due to the methodological uncertainties and the many inaccuracies, which are not justified by a *codex unicus*-based edition of very modest technical commitment.

Alessandro Bausi, Universität Hamburg

¹⁰ GIANFRANCESCO LUSINI, *Studi sul monachesimo eustaziano* = Studi Africanistici. Serie etiopica 3, Napoli: Istituto Universitario Orientale, Dipartimento di Studi e Ricerche su Africa e Paesi Arabi, 1993; ID., *Il “Gadla Absādi” (Dabra Māryām, Sarāḗ)* = Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 557–558/Series Aethiopica 103–104, Lovanii: In aedibus Peeters, 1996; and many others.