

Getatchew Haile (editor and translator), *The Homily of Zār'a Ya'əqob's Māṣḥafā Bərhan on the Rite of Baptism and Religious Instruction* (= CSCO 653–654 *Scriptores Aethiopici* 114–115), Leuven (Peeters) 2013, Vol. 1: xix, 117 p.; ISBN 978-90-429-2752-0; vol. II: viii, 85 p.; ISBN 978-90-429-2753-7, 79,00 €

The *Māṣḥafā Bərhan* (Book of Light)¹ is a bulky apologetic and disciplinary composition. Like most Ethiopian theological treatises its main characteristic is a strongly worded discussion, aimed at asserting, justifying and propagating the Orthodox Tāwāḥədo Faith. The *Māṣḥafā Bərhan* has also proved to be a brilliant political tool, instrumental in bringing under the control of the court the various centrifugal souls of the reign. It can be considered the *Magna Charta* of Zār'a Ya'əqob's two-faced regime: appeasement, for instance, with the monastic "house of Ewostatāwos", and all-out war against presumed or real pretenders of the crown (including his own children and wives), against the Stephanites, the Michaelites and against traditional religious practices. The settlement of the controversy around the "Sabbaths" (in 1451) which split the Church down the middle for more than a century is one of the greatest accomplishments of Emperor Zār'a Ya'əqob. The theologico-political template which brought together the intractable players and that sorted out the speciously thorny issue of a double Sabbath (labeled "48 hours Sabbath") observance is laid down at length in the *Māṣḥafā Bərhan*. Carlo Conti Rossini and Lanfranco Ricci, editors of the *Māṣḥafā Bərhan* rightly consider the book an important source of information for the theological debate of that time as well as providing historical facts. Professor Getatchew Haile brings back to the fore a landmark of Gə'əz literature. A long standing acquaintance with the literature that goes under the name of Zār'a Ya'əqob as well as with related issues, and not least, easy access to the rich patrimony of EMLL are vantage points that enable Professor Getatchew Haile to offer editions of texts which are primary sources. As I have repeatedly said in the past, he deserves sincere gratitude from the community of researchers for his tireless, prolific, life-long scholarly commitment. In the "Acknowledgement", Professor Getatchew thanks "the authorities of CSCO for accepting this study for their prestigious series", adding: "my special thanks go to Professor Dr. Alessandro Bausi, who as the editor of the Ethiopic section, read thoroughly my translation against the text and corrected several errors and mistakes". *The Homily of Zār'a Ya'əqob's Māṣḥafā Bərhan on the Rite of Baptism and Religious Instruction* is a title selected by Professor Getatchew Haile, the editor and translator of the material which according to internal evidence can be placed together with the vast *Corpus* featuring under the name of Emperor Zār'a Ya'əqob (1434–1468). The text begins with a message from the Egyptian bishops Mika'el and Gäbrə'el, duly highlighted on pp. 1–2 (tx.) and p. 1 (tran.). The title of the book under review reflects an ample portion of the contents of the volume. The Preface says that "the text presented here is one more homily or *dərsan* of the same Emperor of the *Māṣḥafā Bərhan*, microfilmed by the Ethiopian Manuscript Microfilm Library (EMML): EMML 200, fols. 9v–82v (A), out of 139 fols.; EMML 691, fols. 11r–71v (B), out of 113 fols.; and EMML 1192, pp. 26–163 (C), out of 273 pp" (tx. p. VII). There is a *lapsus* on p. X (tx.) whereby it is written EMML 1196 instead of EMML 1192. All three manuscripts were copied in the 20th century. The peculiarity of the text is that it does not appear in Carlo Conti Rossini and Lanfranco Ricci's edition of the *Māṣḥafā Bərhan*. In footnote n. 2 (tx.), the editor states that "none of the two copies of the *Māṣḥafā Bərhan* known after Conti Rossini-Ricci's publication, Cerulli 250 and EMML 7001, contains the present homily". The three manuscripts are described in pp. VIII–XI. The editor declares: "When a letter or more of an expression is missed in all the three manuscripts, I have taken the liberty to restore them in the body of the text, putting the restorations in brackets" adding immediately after: "These could be individual letters or words or even more than a sentence". Co-authorship? In fact, there are two types of brackets: square brackets [] and braces { }. The reader is not told in advance the reason for employing the two. From the history of textual transmission we learn that often marginal glosses were liable to be gradually incorporated into the text by copyists. Here they are already in the text, albeit with brackets that can easily be dropped. Manuscript EMML 1192 is deemed as "the richest of all in having erroneously copied words and in providing senseless corrections" adding "any note I made on these could be wrong" (p. X). Concerning manuscript A "the base for editing this text", the editor says that "it is un-

1 *Māṣḥafā Ṣəlmāt* (Book of Darkness) for dissidents who were persecuted by the king of Ethiopia Zār'a Ya'əqob (1434–1468).

fortunate that A's *Vorlage* has not been traced to this day". A few lines below we read: "The language of the text in all three manuscripts is definitely that of the post eighteenth century" (p. XI). The method of the editor's intervention in the grammar of the text is laid down in the following two statements: "Since dropping the object marker 'ä' when the noun is in the possessive case (e. g. ትኅሥእ : ዕሜትኸ : , for "ትኸ : A, fol. 9r) has become so common in post seventeenth-century Gə'oz, I have not attempted to make a note on such occurrences. Furthermore, the copyists do not consistently distinguish *aw*, from *aw*. In this edition, they are reproduced as the grammar allows" (p. XI). Which grammar? Spelling promiscuity is found virtually everywhere in Gə'oz manuscripts. Editors of the caliber and experience of Professor Getatchew Haile can easily provide a fair spelling instead of forms like እድ: "hand" for ዕድ: "man"; ረሥክ "to grow old" for ረሰዐ "to forget"; ርዕዩ "to graze" for ርእዩ "to see". These are a few examples of a widespread orthographic idiosyncrasy ravaging the text. I wonder whether a Greek text with mismanaged spirits, accents or with promiscuity, for instance, of ε-η; θ-τ; κ-χ; κσ-ξ; ο-ω; or Arabic *س* for *ص*; *ذ* for *ز* etc. would be tolerated. The editor states: "Punctuation and paragraphing are mine" (p. XII). In the critical apparatus of the text, there are several orthographic variants whose relevance is not clearly perceptible. Common tachigraphies are registered as variants. P. 79 (tx.) n. 836, reads: "There could be a Christological reason for its omission: The error of Arius is said to have been based on this source". Are conjectures such as this one in their right place? And what is the input of this information in the context of this work? On the issues of authorship and authenticity, Professor Getatchew cuts the Gordian knot cryptically: "it cannot be reasonably doubted" that the homily "was part of the *Māṣḥafā Bərhan* or at least produced at Zār'a Ya'əqob's court" (p. XII). The editor's arguments to uphold these claims are basically two: the style of the text and the affinity of the issues. There is a third (unmentioned) datum which plays in favour of an original written in the 15th century. It is a long excerpt from an old recension of Acts of the Apostles which will be discussed later. While objections can be made to style as a proof of authorship, as style can be imitated at any time, the second element is compelling. The homily is a reiterated call, addressed to the clergy for a dynamic evangelizing mission to Christians and to non-Christians; a plea to preach the Gospel and fight "pagan" practices. The document is an authoritative witness to the missionary openness and zeal of the Orthodox Tāwāḥdo Church. This text together with similar ones disavows the misconception that even though it has had the privilege of being one of the earliest Christian communities in the world, the Orthodox Tāwāḥdo Church has not been a missionary church. In the Homily, pride of place is reserved to the *Didascalīa Apostolorum*, *Testamentum Domini* and *Sinodos* as sources of church legislation and supreme arbiters in cases of dissension and conflict. As in the *Māṣḥafā Bərhan*, here too there is a handsomely elaborated defense and legitimization of Enoch and Jubilees by evoking witnesses from the Bible itself, vis-à-vis dissidents who questioned their place in the biblical canon. The dissidents do not have a name or a face, a truculent ploy to deliver rivals to oblivion if not to an outright *damnatio memoriae*. The elbow rubbing did not affect dissenting clergy alone. Amenable priests and deacons too were hit hard by Zār'a Ya'əqob's threatening rhetoric: "The Apostles were not titled *nəburanā əd* nor were their heads crowned by worldly kings, nor did they receive decorative regalia of appointment. They did not preach either sitting in their residences, titled *nəburanā əd*, eating delicious food like you, O priests and deacons" (p. 53 tra.). The diatribe on the veneration of the Sabbaths is an issue which has had its apex and lasting approval during the reign of Zār'a Ya'əqob (in 1451). The "quaternarians" belong to the same fray of alleged "anti-Trinitarian" groups fiercely fought by Zār'a Ya'əqob. One other major point which locates this text in Zār'a Ya'əqob's climate of religious-cultural revival is the glowing prestige allotted to the መካነ : ትምህርት "house of teaching"², an institution that flourished even in areas far off from the heartland of political power. The regulations of the monastery of Dābrā Maryam in Sərayā (Eritrea) during Zār'a Ya'əqob's time had the same mandatory provisions to attend assiduously "the house of teaching", with sanctions (physical punishments) against deserters³. The benefit of the doubt should be accorded to the fact that there are direct speeches introduced by an oft-rehearsed formula: "I, Zār'a Ya'əqob, whose regnal name is Q^wāstāntīnos, have ordered ..." (p. 46 tra.). Last but not least is the Marian devotion which in Zār'a Ya'əqob's tenure had taken a new turn,

2 On the house of teaching, cf. Sir 51:23 which mentions the οἶκος παιδείας to be attended even without pay Sir 51:25.

3 Cf. Tedros Abraha, *I Gädl di Abunä Tāwäldä-Mädehn e di Abunä Vittore*, edizione del testo etiopico e traduzione italiana, *Patrologia Orientalis* n. 227, Brepols 2009, especially pp. 152–153.

widening the piety to the “Mother of God”. Accordingly, religious loyalty consisted in “keeping the oath in God the Father, his Son Jesus Christ, the Holy Paraclete and Mary, the virgin in two ways” (p. 70 tra.). On the other hand, there are some elements that would lead to contemplate a time of composition of the text, subsequent to Zār’a Ya’aqob’s tenure. The name of “Muḥammad” (p. 43 tx.), is not explicitly mentioned in the (edition of) *Māṣḥafā Borhan* and very rarely in the rest of Zār’a Ya’aqob’s writings. “Eating meat of animals slaughtered by Muslims in the name of ‘Muḥammad’ and fish caught by pagans” (p. 43 tx.) will be tantamount to taboo, a decisive marker of religious affiliation, especially in concomitance with Aḥmād Grañ’s campaign and even more so in its aftermath. Nonetheless, it is clear that in this Homily, as in the *Māṣḥafā Borhan* the person and the ideology of Zār’a Ya’aqob hold an overwhelming position. The document testifies to a staunch sense of collective identity. Priests are reminded that their country “is a country of Christians, and her kings and governors are Christians ... And you live in a Christian country” (p. 49 tra.). There is an ambition that would have dreamed of re-writing history: “... the gracious people of Ethiopia of the orthodox faith, who are the See of Mark” (tra. p. 57). The See of Mark is Egypt. The homily registers interaction with Rome, Greece and Constantinople. It says: “emissaries of these countries come to us – and behold, they are in our country. We question them, and they tell us about their faith. We too, send emissaries to their countries. Our emissaries tell us about their faith”. A few lines after, there is the account of a miracle that would have taken place at the Tomb of Our Lord, in Jerusalem (p. 56 tra.). Quotations and allusions from the Bible are the backbone of Gəʿəz religious writings. In the pursuit of the archetype, or of the text as it circulated in the second century, New Testament textual criticism has made a fruitful use of lectionaries. The same procedure is useful in the quest for “reconstructing” the transmission of the Gəʿəz Bible. The long passage from Acts of the Apostles, namely, from 27:2b to 28:6 (pp. 72–77 tx.; pp. 49–52 tra.) is a blessing in disguise. As stated above, it can be considered as an important clue to dating the original composition of the Homily. One of the main characteristics of this text is its concision⁴; many of its parts fall into the category of *lectio brevior*, an element which textual criticism normally considers a mark of antiquity, therefore of more reliability. There is a *homeoteleuton* from the end of 27:38 to v. 39 (from ባሕር to ባሕር). For the rest, the statement (in n. 240 p. 52) that Acts 27:2–28:6 is “quoted corruptly”, should have been based on a survey of the textual transmission of the pericope. While a detailed analysis of the passage can wait for a while, here, I limit myself to make a few points only. If the forms of proper nouns can have a say on the origin of a text, it can be assumed that the toponyms in this particular passage, such as ሲዶና for ሳይዳ (= صِيْدَاءَ) in 27:3; ቀሪጢን for አቅራቢን (= أقريطس) in 27:7 would exclude an Arabic mediation. They are reproduced exactly as they appear in the Greek, with their accusative ending: Σιδῶνα and Κορήνην. This text far from being “corrupt”, is a witness of an early translation into Gəʿəz of the Acts of the Apostles. 27:12 says: ዘአንጻረ : ባሕር : ሊባፍ “which is in front of the southern sea”. The Greek text reads: βλέποντα κατὰ λίβρα καὶ κατὰ χῶρον “facing southwest and northwest”. ሊባፍ is a perfect transcription of λίβρα, the accusative masculine singular from λίψ, λιβός (a *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament) “the southwest”. ሊባፍ is registered in Gəʿəz lexica. Dillmann⁵ says: “ሊባ: nomen peregrinum, scilicet λίψ, Acc. λίβρα, i. e. africanus. Deut. 1,7. 33,23; Jos 15,2; Kuf 13; forma ሊባሰ: (λιβός) Jos. 15,2”⁷. There is an entry in Kidanā Wäld Kəfle’s grammar and dictionary⁸ as well: ሊባፍ (ጽርእ # ዕብ : ኔጌብ ፤ ዳሮም # ዐረ : ጅኑብ)፤ የማእዘን : ስም ፤ ንኡስ : ማእዘን ፤ ደቡብ ፤ ከዚያውም : የደቡብ : ምሥራቅ ፤ በደቡብና : በምሥራቅ : መካከል : ያለ ፣ የባሕር : ትይዩና : አንጻር # “Liba is a Greek entry ... meaning ‘south’”. Professor Getatchew Haile renders ዘአንጻረ : ባሕር : ሊባ “which is facing northwest”. There is a footnote n. 233 (tra.) which reads: “How ‘bahra liba’ stood for ‘northwest’ (χῶρος) is not clear”. It is even more unclear the translator’s decision to ignore Gəʿəz and Amharic Lexica and to

4 It is a feature observed by Montgomery in his cursory appraisal of the text of Acts of Paris, Bibl. Nat. aeth. 26 [Zotenberg 42], of the 15th century. J.A. Montgomery, “The Ethiopic Text of Acts of the Apostles”, *Harvard Theological Review* 27 (1934), pp. 169–205, here p. 181.

5 This reading is attested in the above mentioned Paris manuscript, cf. Montgomery, p. 182.

6 A. C. F. Dillmann, *Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae*, Lipsiae 1865, col. 40.

7 Dillmann does not mention Acts 27:12.

8 Kidanā Wäld Kəfle, *Māṣḥafā sāwasaw wāgəs wāmāzəgābā Qalat Haddis* “A Book of Grammar and Verb, and a new Dictionary”, Addis Ababa 1948 (EC), p. 555. Cf. also, W. Leslau: “south, southwest, sirocco”, *Comparative Dictionary of Geʿez (Classical Ethiopic)*, Wiesbaden 1987, p. 304.

choose the path of a radical autarchy, at the expense of the text's truth. Montgomery's English translation of Acts 27:12–17, from a 15th cent. manuscript of Acts, corresponds perfectly to the text of the Homily⁹. As far as the figure of the shipwrecked persons in Acts 27:37 is concerned, the witnesses do not speak with one voice. The overwhelming majority of the manuscripts reads διακόσια ἐβδομήκοντα ἕξ “two hundred seventy six”. Among these, there are old and authoritative uncials, like the codex *Sinaiticus* (X, of the 4th cent.), codex *Ephraemi rescriptus* (C, of the 5th cent.), Ψ (8th/9th cent.) and, at least 21 minuscules belonging to a period between the 9th and 14th centuries. The manuscripts of the *Byzantine* family, the *lectionaries*, eight manuscripts of *Vetus Latina*, the *Vulgate*, read “276 people”. Among the ancient translations in *Syriac*, the *Peshitta* and the *Harklensis*, almost all of the *Bohairic* exemplars, the *Gəʿəz*, the *Armenian* and the *Georgian* versions read “276 people”. One notable exception is the codex *Vaticanus* (B of the 4th cent.) which reads ὡς διακόσια ἐβδομήκοντα ἕξ “around 76”. This (mis)reading is present in the *Sahidic* version¹⁰. Professor Getatchew Haile's lapidary footnote n. 238, p. 51 (tra.), declaring that “... the source for ‘seventy-six’ is the Greek *Vorlage*” has to be compared with the data above. None of the printed *Gəʿəz* texts of the Acts of the Apostles 27:37 has the figure 76; it does not feature in the *andəmta* commentary as a variant¹¹. Acts 27:16 **ΦΑΘ·Β** (instead of the majority's form Καὺδα) appears in the codex *Vaticanus* and in the codex *Sinaiticus*. 28:3 ἔχιδνα “viper, snake” reads **ቃግሰት** “viper, serpent, horned serpent” (attested in the *Paris codex*), a native word replaced by the more common **አርጭ** : **ምድር** “snake” (in Walton), and by the arabizing **አፍፆት** “viper”, in the more recent editions (Da Bassano, Platt). The “handling” of biblical issues in this publication and in prior ones leaves much to be desired. Most of the *Gəʿəz* Old Testament derives from the Septuagint, an information that should have been given at the beginning of the work. If the text edited by Professor Getatchew Haile counts four books of the Kings (cf. p. 44 tx.), it means that it is in tune with the Greek Version of the Old Testament which names 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings (e.g. on p. 26 of the tra.). There is no need to give a double numbering to the Psalms as the *Gəʿəz* text follows the Septuagint's numeration. Some basic expressions need to be clarified either in the introduction or in the first occurrence. One of such key concepts is *Textus Receptus* referred to the New Testament. Erasmus of Rotterdam's 1516 *Textus Receptus*, the first printed edition to be known by this name, cannot be a term of comparison for the *Gəʿəz* textual transmission. There is a consensus among biblical scholars that most of the Bible was translated from Greek into *Gəʿəz* by the end of the eighth century and as such both *Novum Testamentum Graece* and the *Greek New Testament* include the Ethiopic versions among the old witnesses of the New Testament. Furthermore, unless specified, the word *Vorlage* alone, predicated to the biblical texts, remains an empty shell. The first footnote of the translation says: “Torah” is *my* [the *italics* is of the reviewer] translation of “Orit”; i.e. “the eight Books of Moses”. While the NRSV is a reliable English version of the Old and New Testament, an editor of *Gəʿəz* texts needs to consult and refer to editions (when possible, critical editions) of the Bible in *Gəʿəz*. 2 Esd (Sutu'el) in n. 144.264.275 is better known as 4 Esdra (cf. Da Bassano's 1918 edition; Michael Edward Stone, *Fourth Ezra: a commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis 1990). The English version of the Homily is a free translation. There are many additions and omissions, from the beginning throughout the homily. Most of them do not harm the integrity of the original. In the first page: **ወይእኩኒ** : **አክብሩ** : **ክልኤሆን** : **ወረሰይዎን** : **ለእግዚአብሔር** # “But now, honor both Saturday and Sunday and dedicate them to God”. Neither the “base text” nor the collated manuscripts have “Saturday and Sunday”. It is an editorial gloss. Readers would be better off with “offering the Eucharist” instead of the hyper-literal “raising Communion” (p. 33 and ff.). In fact, **ዕርጉተ** : **ቍርባን** **፤** is explained as **ቍርባንን** : **ተቀብሎ** : **መስጠት** **፤ ማቀበል** # “The celebrant first

9 Cf. Montgomery, *op. cit.*, p. 183.

10 Cf. G. W. Horner, *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect, otherwise called Sahidic and Thebaic*. With Critical Apparatus, literal English Translation, Appendix and Registers of Fragments, vol. VI, Oxford 1922, p. 636. For an attempt at sorting out the source of the numerical divergences in the manuscripts, cf. B. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart²2001, p. 442.

11 Cf. Walton's Polyglotta, p. 276; *Gəʿəz* New Testament by Da Bassano, Asmara 1918, p. 276; for the *andəmta*, *Śālāstu Māṣāḥəftä Haddisat*, p. 187.

communicates himself and then distributes the Eucharist to the assembly¹². ሮም : ሮምያ : ጽርዕ : ወቀሱስጥንጥንያ (p. 81 tx.) is rendered with: “Rom (*Rom*), (New) Rome (*Romya*), Greece (*ጸር*), and Constantinople (*Q’əstəntənya*)” (p. 56 tra.). I fail to understand the reason for the transliteration. ሮም : ሮምያ : ሮሜ are various forms of the same city, Rome (DillLex, col. 1412). *New Rome* or *Nea Rhome/Nova Roma* is the title that according to tradition, Emperor Constantine gave to Constantinople in 330¹³. “Chrim” is “explained” in n. 322 with “meron”: both terms are Greek. As already pointed out, the adamant rejection of Gə’əz lexica turns to be a disadvantage to readers. There are several instances of Gə’əz and Amharic terms (and in one case of Təgrəñña ንደብት = lords, tx. p. 84) which although available in dictionaries are put in transliteration, both in the body and in the footnotes. The Amharic terms transliterated in the body text of the translation and subjected to a needless speculation in n. 290 are present in T. Leiper Kane’s, *Amharic-English Dictionary*, Wiesbaden 1990, p. 2187. “Embalmmnt” (pp. 18–19) is a procedure aimed at preserving a corpse from decay, while ንግዘት, is simply wrapping a dead body mostly with linen but also with dried leaves. As a matter of fact, on p. 33 “embalmmnt” is rightly substituted with “shrouding”. Some biblical quotations have been identified and a few biblical allusions highlighted; many more are left out. “Isaiah did not stop preaching until they cut him with a saw” (p. 55 tra.), is drawn from the *Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah*, chap. 5:11–13¹⁴. P. 25, n. 109 refers to Jubilees 4:32 rather than 3:27. Typing errors are not many, though not as few as one would have expected: on p. 33 adoration is twice used for adornation and on p. 44 *Paternicon* is used twice for *Patericon* (probably due to computer automatic “correction”). Both volumes have a General Index at the end. In the translation there is also an “Index of Scriptural Citations” which include the *Testamentum Domini*, *Didascalia* and the *Synodicon*, texts which are included in the Canon of biblical books in the Ethio-Eritrean Orthodox Täwäḥdo Churches even though they have never been published together with the New Testament. The Bibliography consists of six books in the text, and of eight books in the translation.

Tedros Abraha

La vita e i miracoli di Libānos. Editi e tradotti da Alessandro Bausi. Lovanii: Peeters, 2003. (Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium. 595. 596. = Scriptores aethiopici. 105. 106.). ISSN 070-0398. [Textus:] XXX, 225 S. ISBN 90-429-1160-3. 90,00 €. [Versio:] XXXVII, 137 S. ISBN 90-429-1161-1, 70,00 €

Die hier publizierten Texte sind der editorische Versuch, die drei bisher bekannten Versionen des gädl »Vita« des Heiligen Libanos zusammen mit den beiden bekannten Sammlungen seiner tä’ammər »Wundertaten« und einer der ihm gewidmeten mälkä’ »körperbeschreibende Lobeshymne« in einer komplexen Edition zu präsentieren.

Die inhaltliche und historische Bedeutung der Texte läßt sich wie folgt umreißen (vgl. Libanos Encyclopaedia Aethiopica. 3. 2007. 558b–560b (Alessandro Bausi)): Libanos, mit anderen Namen Māṭa’ oder Yəsrin zählt zu den wichtigen Missionaren und Begründern des äthiopischen Mönchtums in aksumitischer Zeit. Neben den Kloster in Šəmāzana, Akkälä Guzay, Eriträa, das seinen Namen trägt, soll er weitere Kirchen und Klöster begründet haben. Der räumliche und zeitliche Rahmen, die Umstände seines Wirkens in Verbindung mit seinen Zeitgenossen werden in den verschiedenen Versionen seiner Biographien einerseits unscharf und stereotyp im vorgegebenen Schema eines Heiligenlebens dargestellt. Andererseits widersprechen sich die Texte des öfteren, schon was den zeitgenössischen äthiopischen König von Aksum angeht. Libanos soll in Qwəstəntənya »Konstantinopel bzw.

- 12 Kidanä Wäld Kəfle, *Məṣḥafä säwasəw wägəs wämāzəgäbä Qalat Ḥaddis* “A Book of Grammar and Verb, and a new Dictionary”, Addis Ababa 1948 (EC), p. 709. Cf. also, W. Leslau, p. 304.
- 13 In official sources one of the earliest attestations of the name *Nea Rhome* is canon 3 of the Council of Constantinople I (381), cf. P.P. Joannou (ed.), *Discipline Générale Antiquie* (II^e–IX^e s.), Codification canonica orientale. Fonti, t. I, I, fasc. 9, Grottaferrata (Roma), 1962, p. 48.
- 14 P. Bettliolo et alii (eds.), *Ascensio Isaiae. Textus*, Corpus Christianorum, Series Apocryphorum 7, Turnhout 1995, p. 75.