KINDENEH ENDEG MIHRETIE, Addis Ababa University

Article

“The Eighteen Million Tawahdo Victims of Martyr-Saint Adyam Sagad Iyasu”: Towards a Better Understanding of Lasta-Tigray Defiance of the Royal Centre of Gondarine Ethiopia (1630s–1760s)

Aethiopica 16 (2013), 45–73
ISSN: 2194–4024

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

by Alessandro Bausi
in cooperation with
Bairu Tafla, Ulrich Braukämper, Ludwig Gerhardt,
Hilke Meyer-Bahlburg and Siegbert Uhlig
“The Eighteen Million Ṭawḥādo Victims of Martyr-Saint Adyam Sâgâd Îyasu”: Towards a Better Understanding of Lasta–Tagray Defiance of the Royal Centre of Gondârine Ethiopia (1630s–1760s)

KINDENEH ENDEG MIHRETIE, Addis Ababa University

I. Introduction and Thesis Statement

The stories of two hagiographies, called Ḡâdlà Ḥstûnstà Kûrstos and Ḡâdlà Adyam Sâgâd Îyasu stand out as curious anomalies in comparison to most of what we know about late 17th century Ethiopia. Ḡâdlà Ḥstûnstà Kûrstos, has just come to light and is introduced to scholarship in this article.1 Ḡâdlà Adyam Sâgâd Îyasu is known to us since a variant of it is published by Carlo Conti Rossini.2 The extant copies of Ḡâdlà Ḥstûnstà Kûrstos no doubt await detailed study and critical edition. For now, what needs to be highlighted as outlandish in its story, for the purpose of this study, is the sting-

1 The Encyclopaedia Aethiopica has no entry for Ḥstûnstà Kûrstos. So far, I am aware of three variants of the ġâdl. 1.) One is a 93 folios long Gǝsz manuscript in parchment, written in two columns, each column has 20 lines and is in a monastic library. Honoring the request of the community, the name of the monastery cannot be disclosed here. However, I would like to thank the monastic community for allowing me to photograph the manuscript in its entirety during a visit in February 2009. 2.) An abridged version of the Gǝsz text on the verso of an Amharic translation is published by Qsâba Maryam monastery in 2000 E.C., under the rather long title Ḥw’rštûnstà Kûrstos. Qsâba Maryam is a small monastery found not too far from the famous Dâbrà Libanos Monastery in Šawa. Every year on Ganbot 9 (May 17), people come to this monastery from near and far to attend the commemorative feast of Ḥstûnstà Kûrstos’ death. There are two variants of this published version that I am so far aware of. The first one, which I came across in Šambarmà monastery, in East Goǧgàm, has 115 pages and will be identified here as A. 3.) The other, identified here as B, has 110 pages and has been available in most church bookstores in Addis Abàba. According to his vita, Ḥstûnstà Kûrstos was born in Šawâni Abbay, a place in the district of Dâwânt, present day northern Wállo, in the later years of Fasilâdis’ reign (r. 1632–1667). After attending his early education in the famous Ḥaŷq Ḩístifanos monastery, he received his monastic habit from the abbot of a lesser known monastery called Dâbrà Dâba. At the age of 33 he became the abbot of Dâbrà Asâgå. Both Dâbrà Dâba and Dâbrà Asâgå are affiliated to Ḥaŷq Ḩístifanos. According to the chronology of his vita, most of the spiritual activities that earned Ḥstûnstà Kûrstos sainthood took place during the reign of Yohannas I (r. 1667–1681) with the climax set in the reign of Îyasu I (r. 1681–1706); see, Ḥw’rštûnstà Kûrstos, pp. 4, 39, 54–77 (the pagination is according to B).

ing critic on Iyasu I. According to this most strange hagiography, Iyasu I was guilty of terrorizing 18 million people into submission to, what was to the author, the *sost ladät* (lit. three births) also called *Sägga Läg* (lit. Son by Grace) heresy. The literal rendering of

3  The literal rendering of

4  The literal rendering of *Waldá Ab Waldá Maryam, bätäwahdo kábará, halát ladät*. This is the Alexandrian Orthodox doctrine of the Ethiopian Church on the mystery of the incarnation, called *Täwahado* (lit. union, oneness) in Go’az. The ratification of this formula, polemically referred to as *Karra* (lit. Knife), at a synod held in Boru Meda in 1878, settled the Christological controversy involved in the controversy, called *Qabat* (lit. Unction/Ointment) and *Sägga Läg* as heresies. In effect, Gädllä 3stonfasä Karstos accuses therefore Iyasu I of being a *sost ladät* or *Sägga Läg* heretic.
In sharp contrast, Gädlä Adyam Sägäd Iyasu is dedicated to the veneration of Iyasu I as a martyr-saint. To our knowledge, this hagiography is the only one of its kind dedicated to a ‘Solomonic’ king. In other words, Iyasu I is the only one among the monarchs of the Solomonic dynasty to have a hagiography composed to his name. Enumerating the spiritual exploits that earned Iyasu I his sainthood and martyrdom, the author of Gädlä Adyam Sägäd Iyasu lists ten wrongdoings Iyasu I was charged with at the hands of his assassins. The third in the list states that his tormentors charged Iyasu I of heresy for adhering to Shägga Lağ. Gädlä Astnasasa Korsos and Gädlä Adyam Sägäd Iyasu clearly belong to the partisans of Karra and Shägga Lağ, respectively. Needless to say, the two groups were arch-rivals. Yet, the two hagiographies corroborate each other in portraying Iyasu I as a Shägga Lağ partisan, Gädlä Astnasasa Korsos denounces him and institutes a curse against him while Gädlä Adyam Sägäd Iyasu praises him and bestows the honour of, not just martyrdom, but also sainthood upon him.

Needless to say, historical accuracy is not the strength of hagiographies. As a rule, one should therefore guard against any rush to reconstruct historical truth based on them. All the same, it is extremely puzzling that, of all rulers, the authors of the two gädlar should pick Iyasu I as the villain and hero of their respective stories. What makes Iyasu I the last candidate one can think of for both roles is the fact that his Täwahado record is impeccable. In fact, few facts are as secure and firmly established in Ethiopian historiography as Iyasu I’s stalwart championship of Täwahado. Based on more reliable contemporary sources, historians have affirmed that it was during his reign that Täwahado became the unrivaled official doctrine of the royal court. Before that, the balance of power was shifting and turning between Täwahado and Qōbat.

So why would Gädlä Astnasasa Korsos single out Iyasu I, the one ruler who deserves all the credit for establishing Täwahado as the uncontested orthodoxy of the Ethiopian Church, for the most vicious attack denouncing him as the enemy of the adherents of Täwahado? Or, better put for the conversant in Early Church history, why would Gädlä Astnasasa Korsos make a Diocletian out of precisely the Constantine of the Ethiopian Church? Similarly, why would Gädlä Adyam Sägäd Iyasu commemorate Iyasu I as the most stalwart defender of Shägga Lağ? To resolve these enigmas, this study argues

6 Three Zag’e kings, Lalibälä, Nääkk’sto Lääb and Yamrahanna Krostos have Gädlis; see Tadesse Tamrat 1970: 13, n. 4.
7 This detail is available only in the Dima Giyorgis version of the gädli; see Gädlä Iyasu, UNESCO, IES, Microfilm, Series 10, no. 62, Dima Qosddus Giyorgis Church, Goğgam.
8 Tadesse Tamrat 1970: 12–18.
that the dominant Tawahdo teaching of Iyasu I’s days was Sägga Loğ. This means, contrary to the claim of the Ethiopian Church today, which scholarship also uncritically endorses, Tawahdo has never been synonymous with Karra. It was a contested title and prior to 1878 the adherents of Karra were the group with the least claim on it.10 Viewed in this light, the hagiographies cease to be bizarre anomalies. In other words, to put inexcusable numerical exaggerations aside, Gâldâ AستOpensé Kôrstos had a reason to punish Iyasu I, for Iyasu I was indeed hostile to the partisans of Karra. The author of Gâldâ Adyam Sâgåd Iyasu is also right in being highly indebted to Iyasu I, for the Tawahdo teaching Iyasu gave official recognition to was indeed Sägga Loğ. And with slight revision, its claim that Iyasu I lost his life defending Sägga Loğ can be corroborated. As this study will demonstrate, the partisans of Karra were indeed the group responsible for the assassination of Iyasu I.

However, neither rendering the accounts of the two hagiographies intelligible nor exhaustive interrogation of the meaning of the term Tawahdo are the primary objectives of this study. These are issues pursued here as a necessary first step towards reconstructing the history of armed resistance, the adherents of Karra put up against the royal centre during Gondârine Ethiopia. The rebellion was not a flash in the pan in what was otherwise, as some historians suggest, a relatively peaceful period.11 It was a history of defiance and armed uprising that lasted for the entire duration of the Gondârine period, from the 1630s all the way to the 1760s, interspaced though it was, with relatively calm periods. The resistance movement was also impressive in its geographical breadth. As this study will show, it encompassed several districts of what are today northern Wällo and southern Tôgray.

It is astonishing that a resistance movement of such scale and magnitude should elude half a century of modern Ethiopian historiography. It is not for dearth of sources that historians remained unaware of it. Rather failing to see

10 This is not an original claim of this study; see for example Kidana Wåld Kifile 1948 E.C.: 743. Getatchew Haile dismisses Kidanà Wäld as dishonest along with his teacher Käflå Giyorgis; see Getatchew Haile 1986: 207–208, with corresponding notes and 242, n. 13; see also Ayyâlà Tàklà Haymanot 1955 E.C.: 133–176. Ayyâlà’s work is however marred by serious errors such as his consistent assertion that Karra and Qobat were one and the same. What is ironic is that even those scholars who are adamantly against the notion of Sägga Loğ being the Tawahdo teaching of the Betå Tàklà Haymanot community nonetheless repeatedly come across strong evidences suggesting it. However the unspoken convention is to suppress these clues to the footnote, as quickly as they are encountered, and proceed with the assumption that Tawahdo was a term that exclusively belongs to the Karra group; see for example Crumme – Getatchew Haile 2004: 15f. n. 31 and Getatchew Haile 1990: ix n. 5.

11 Crumme 2000: 93.
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the phenomenon in its totality, that is, as a sectarian resistance movement which lasted nearly a century and a half, historians tried to explain its various episodes and manifestations as isolated incidents. This is due to the wrong but firmly entrenched assumption that Karra was the Ṭawḥado teaching endorsed as official orthodoxy for most of the duration of the Gondārīne period. No historian could thus entertain the possibility of a long lasting sectarian resistance movement in the name of Karra, as this doctrine was seen to be the pillar of the center’s legitimacy. That is why putting such erroneous assumption to rest is a necessary first step towards reconstructing the rebellion of the adherents of Karra. In other words, as this study will show, throughout the Gondārīne period, far from being the party which had the favour of the royal court, the adherents of Karra were engaged in one of the most protracted rebellions in Ethiopian history against the royal centre.

In all of the relevant primary sources, the spokesmen of the rival factions, who made up the opposing sides in all the decisive royal synods convened to resolve the controversy on unction are identified as spokesmen of the Betā Ewosatean and Betā Tāklä Haymanot communities. It is also clear from the same sources that the teachings maintained by the two parties were Qṣbat and Ṭawḥado. Based on this, scholars assume that until the appearance of a third party some time in the 18th century, the rival faction that conducted the unction debate were only two: The Ewostateans who advocated Qṣbat and the community of Betā Tāklä Haymanot who defended Ṭawḥado. According to the received view the Ṭawḥado teaching championed by the Betā Tāklä Haymanot community, was Karra and at the conclusion of the Boru Meda synod in 1878, became the official doctrine of the Ethiopian Church ever since. The dominant view further asserts that Šāgga Loğ was a late 17th century or early 18th century third addition. It owed its origin to the internal split of the Betā Tāklä Haymanot community.

Contrary to what the conventional view summarized above asserts, this study will unequivocally demonstrate that there were three rival parties

12 For example Richard PANKHURST (1984: 213–230) has a study dedicated to the case of the rebellion of Lasta against the Solomonic dynasty. DIMITRI (2004: 665–680) is also devoted to the unruly nature of Lasta’s relation with the monarchial centre of Gondārīne Ethiopia. However both authors fail to show that the rebellion included most of southern Tagray besides Lasta. Also, they do not show the sectarian nature of the conflict instead mainly focusing on its political dimension.

13 For the assumption that the Ṭawḥado teaching in the name of Karra was maintained by the Betā Tāklä Haymanot community throughout the 17th century, see MERID WOLDE AREGAY 1971: 551, 555, 574; CRUMMEY 2000: 83, 92, 100; ID. 2006: 478ff. and ID.– GETATCHEW HAILE 2004: 9.

throughout the duration of the controversy. Furthermore, Karra had little or nothing to do with the Betä Täklà Haymanot party. Throughout the Gondärine period, Karra was the teaching of a third group who defied the centre using southern Togray and Lasta as their safe-heavens and was far from being the Täwahdodo teaching. The Täwahdodo teaching defended by the Betä Täklà Haymanot party was rather Sägga Log, that is, the origin of which is wrongly pushed to the 18th century.

To reconstruct the details of Karra resistance against the monarchial centre in the period from the 1630s to the 1760s means to challenge most of the givens of the history of Gondärine Ethiopia. As it is well known, Orthodox Christianity was the dominant religion of the highland kingdom of Ethiopia for most of its history. One of the assertions the Ethiopian Church has been boldly making throughout the last century, along with the above indisputable fact, is that its Christological foundation in its post-1878 Karra form is also set in stone. This is what mainstream Ethiopian historiography also endorses with little scrutiny. Nothing, as this study will show, could however be further from the truth. The Ethiopian Church defines Karra as the pillar of its Christology and cannot be a partaker of the glories of Gondärine Ethiopia. It can only be identified with the agonies and tragedies of the period, both as a victim and perpetrator. Hence, for example, Yohannas I, whom tradition holds as righteous, earned such title in recognition of the brutal punishment he meted out to the adherents of Karra. Such a story line also recasts Iyasu I as unsuspecting victim of Karra revenge. That Iyasu I lost his life due to gruesome assassination is well-known. It is also well-known that his assassination had a lot to do with the sectarian strife of the time. What is not even remotely possible for any historian thus far is that the masterminds of the plot behind his assassination could be Karra zealots.

The remaining sections of this study will address the issues outlined above. The first section will provide a brief assessment of the teaching of the three rival groups. The aim is to demonstrate that the Täwahdodo teaching championed by the Betä Täklà Haymanot party throughout the Gondärine period was Sägga Log not Karra. The second part will relate the history of sectarian resistance movement to the adherents of Karra put up against the royal centre of Gondärine Ethiopia.

II. Sägga Log Being the Täwahdodo Teaching of the Betä Täklà Haymanot Community

As is well known, for two and a half centuries starting in the early 17th century to the last quarter of the 19th century, the Ethiopian Church went through grueling doctrinal controversy. The essence of the controversy that
divided its clergy into three factions called Qǝbat, Sǝggǝ Lağ and Karra, was the anointment of Christ. As will be explained shortly, the issue was a leftover from the Christological debate the local clergy conducted with Jesuit missionaries during the first three decades of the 17th century. The main objective of this section is to show that the Tǝwahdǝdo teaching (championed by the representatives of the Betǝ Tǝklǝ Haymanot party against the Qǝbat formula of the rival Betǝ Ewǝstǝtewos community) was Sǝggǝ Lağ. The evidence for this is unequivocal and quite conclusive. However, such documentary proof is hardly self-evident for an unfamiliar reader with this topic. That is why it needs to be preceded by a brief account of the origin of the controversy and the basic differences that set the teachings of the three factions apart, as presented below.

From its foundation in the 4th century to 1959, the Ethiopian Church was a diocese of the Alexandrian See. This had serious episcopal and doctrinal implications. Episcopally, it meant that throughout the mentioned period, the Ethiopian Church had to secure its bishops from the Coptic Church of Egypt.15 What is even more important for this study is however the fact that the Alexandrian subordination also permanently determined the doctrinal orientation of the Ethiopian Church.16 The Chalcedonian Creed, ratified in 451, is what brought about the lasting separation of the Alexandrian See from the Roman Catholic Church. The Creed affirms that in Christ there were/are two natures and one person. The basic notion behind this formula is the assertion that the human and divine natures of Christ operated and co-existed in distinction (though not in complete separation) to each other after the incarnation. This formula reserves all the miracles, Christ did during his earthly sojourn, to His divine nature, while restricting His passion and inferior attributes to His human nature alone.17

Along with Churches that came to be known as Non-Chalcedonian Oriental Orthodox Churches, the Alexandrian See rejects the Chalcedonian creed in favour of the formula that in Christ there was/is only one (unified divine-human) nature and one person. Antithesis of Chalcedon, the essence of this formula, called Tǝwahdǝdo in Gǝǝz, is the contention that the union, the divine and human natures of Christ affected during the incarnation was an absolute one. It is therefore improper to speak of the two natures of Christ, that is the divine and human natures, operating in distinction to each other after their union. According to the adherents of the one-nature Chris-

17 For a good discussion of this from the perspective of the Jesuits, see ibid., pp. 321–346; for the Ethiopian side of the story see Cerulli 1958: 235f.; Id. 1960: 139–158.
tology of Alexandria, with the exception of sin, the divine nature of Christ partook in every human act Christ did during His earthly sojourn. Likewise, due to its absolute union with divinity, the human nature participated in all the wonders and miracles Christ did.\textsuperscript{18}

Ironically, Soteriology and preserving the reality of the incarnation is at the heart of both Christologies. This is clear from the Monophysite versus Dyophysite charge the adherents of the rival creeds often label each other with. Chalcedonians accuse the adherents of one-nature Christology as Monophysites. The essence of the charge is that the union, the divine and human natures of Christ affected at the moment of the incarnation was absolute, and Alexandrians rendered the reality of the human nature of Christ hallow. According to Chalcedonains, limited and inferior human nature is not capable of effecting absolute union with transcendent and perfect divinity, without human nature’s qualities getting lost and dissolved in the process. If that were the case, Christ was human only in appearance, not in reality. In the end, that will render the whole notion of the incarnation invalid. Chalcedonians also warn that their rival’s unqualified insistence on the view that the union of the divine and human natures of Christ was absolute, did not allow for any distinct mode of operation and afterwards also had the danger of Patripassianism.\textsuperscript{19} On their part, the adherents to one-nature, Tawabado, Christology of Alexandria label their opponents as Dyophysites. What the charge signifies is that Chalcedonians’ insistence on the view that the two natures need to be kept apart, rendered the whole notion of the incarnation and ultimately Soteriology hallow. According to the adherents of one-nature Alexandrian Christology, unless the divine nature participated in all the things Christ did from birth to death, it is impossible to say that mankind was redeemed of original sin through the death of the Son of God.\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid.; the chief advocate of the one-nature Christological formula, who is commemo-rated as martyr-saint by the followers of Alexandrian Christology including the Ethiopian Church, is Dioscorus. However, for the Catholic Church Dioscorus is a heretic, see Boavida – PenneC – Ramos 2011: II, p. 301, where according to P. Paez, one of his prominent converts in the court of Susnayos, said, “what great torment Dioscorus must be suffering in hell for all the people that he led to perdition through his doctrine”.

\textsuperscript{19} Patripassianism, (Latin, father-suffering), is the heresy of saying Christ died in his divinity. Since the divinity of the three persons of the Holy Trinity is one, such idea would also imply that the Father and the Holy Spirit suffered and died along with Christ, see Boavida – PenneC – Ramos 2011: I, p. 338, for the fact that the Jesuit missionaries made such accusation against their Ethiopian counterparts.

\textsuperscript{20} In order to drive this point home, during their debate with the Jesuits the Ethiopian clergy went to the extent of saying things which might easily be interpreted as saying Christ died in his divinity; see for example Cerulli 1960: 15.
In their endeavour to convert members of the Ethiopian Church to Roman Catholicism, the Jesuit missionaries of the early 17th century concentrated their effort in convincing the local clergy to reject one-nature Christology in favour of Chalcedon. To that end, the Jesuits barraged the local clergy with scriptural proof texts that highlight the passion and inferior human attributes of Christ, such as birth, growing in stages, worshipping, expression of fear, crying for help and ultimately, death. The objective was to impress it upon their counterparts that these acts need to be reserved to the human nature alone, hence the need to understand the union (the two natures of Christ affected at the moment of the incarnation) as a limited one. In other words, according to the Jesuit missionaries, as the inferior attributes of the human nature and the passion of Christ listed above attest, the two natures of Christ co-existed and operated in distinction (though not in complete separation) to each other after the union. The Jesuits warned, that to involve divinity in the above acts, would be to fall into a grave abyss of Trinitarian heresies such as, introducing ignorance to omniscience, limitation to omnipresence and/or transcendence, and ultimately death to eternal God.21

Scholars correctly trace the origin of the unction controversy to the Jesuit episode.22 However, only Guidi tried to give theological explanation as to how the Christological controversy with the Jesuits might have evolved into the subsequent unction debate within the Ethiopian Church. Guidi speculates that the Jesuits might be the ones who cited the mystery of unction to their advantage during the Christological debate with the Ethiopian clergy.23 To appreciate the plausibility of his speculation, it is important to understand how the Jesuits interpreted unction within the context of Chalcedon. According to them, the meaning of the unction that Christ received from the Holy Spirit that Scripture alludes to is the grace of the Holy Spirit. Such grace of the

21 See Boavida – Pennec – Ramos 2011: I, pp. 309–358. One of the most eloquent and strong rejoinders the local clergy used to make against such challenge and in support of their one-nature Christology was the circumstances of Christ’s conception and birth. Unless divinity effected perfect union with the flesh, Christ took from Mary, the Ethiopian clergy argued, it would not have been possible for the Virgin Mary to be found pregnant while being a Virgin. What was born of Her was however at the same time Jesus the man, since otherwise She could not have held divinity in Her womb for nine months and five days, since the whole world was incapable of holding divinity, let alone of a woman’s womb. At the same time, the fact that what was born of Her was the divinity of Christ can be attested from the fact that the Virgin Mary remained virgin after giving birth; see Cerulli 1960: 153ff.


Holy Spirit was in turn “firm at the scene of martyrdom and the upright strong at the time of their struggle with the devils in the wilderness and which helps the preachers in their sermon.” For the fact that Susnios solicited the assistance of the Jesuits in formulating such a ruling at the conclusion of Fogāra synod in 1620, see Merid Wolde Aregay 1971: 552, n. 2.

25 See Boavida – Pennec – Ramos 2011: I, pp. 313–320, for the fact that the Filioque (Latin, and [from] the Son), was an important issue in the debate between the Jesuits and the Ethiopian Clergy. The latter, never a signatory of the filioque, steadfastly upheld the view that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone.


27 “It is in their effort to make sure that they always steered clear from the teaching of two natures, (and one person in Christ) in their respective ways that the Ethiopian (Church)
pears to be a radical “Monophysite” response that addresses the challenge by quite literary turning the Jesuit logic on its head. The strategy also appears to be one of ‘killing two birds with one stone’. According to Qobatoč (the adherents of Qobat) far from irrefutable proof to the distinct co-existence of the two natures of Christ after the incarnation, the Uction of the Holy Spirit that Christ received was what affected the absolute union or oneness of His divine and human natures during the incarnation. This is what their formula, bāQobat wāld bahrī, which means by uction the (human nature of Christ became) natural son (of the Father), signifies. According to this view, in his preincarnate state, as one of the three persons of the most Holy Trinity, Word or God the Son, was natural son of God the Father. In line with this and their one-nature Christology, the adherents of Qobat argue that their teaching of the divine and human natures of Christ affected absolute union or became indistinguishably one at the moment of the incarnation, meaning that Word in his preincarnate state, the human nature also partook and became natural Son/yābahrī log of God the Father. This is therefore an adamant “Monophysite” reaction, strictly within the framework of one-nature Alexandrian Christology. As such it gives no ground whatsoever to the Chalcedonian Creed. Indeed the upholders of this view seem to be oblivious of the Monophysite charge, which their bā-Qobat yābahrī log formula explained above only strengthens. That means, if the uction made the flesh or human nature of Christ natural Son of the Father, there would be nothing left of the human nature, since God the Son in his preincarnate state would not have a complete human nature, among other things with corporal body. The adherents of this view also uphold the notion scholars appear to be quarrelling each other. Otherwise not one among the parties confesses (the teaching of) two natures (in Christ) in support of the Catholic Church” (ADMASU JĂMBĂRE 1954 E.C.: 282). The dominant view in the secondary literature thus far is however that Qobat and Sāgga Lōg owed their origin to an attempt to appease the Jesuits by partial or full embrace of the Chalcedonian Creed; see CRUMMEY 1972: 14–27; GETATCHEW HAILE 1990: x; MERID WOLDE AREGAY 1998: 51. The current EOTC also depicts Qobat and Sāgga Lōg as local agents of Chalcedonians, see for example ETHIOPIAN ORTHODOX TĂWAHEDO CHURCH (EOTC) 1995–1996 E.C.

This is for example what the Qobat teaching defended at the famous Aringo synod held in 1654 reflects; see GETATCHEW HAILE 1990; see also, Wāldā Ab, MS, Dābrā Wārq Monastery, East Goğgām, foll. 36v–51v. Wāldā Ab is the Qobat theological compendium. Most Qobat monasteries today have Wāldā Ab in their collection. An extended version of Haymanot Māsiḥawit is also part of Māsiḥaş Mašṭir, MS, Dābrā Wārq Monastery, East Goğgām, foll. 36v–56v. Māsiḥaş Mašṭir is another important Qobat composition which purports to narrate the early phase of the controversy up to the 1780s; see also KINDENEH ENDEG 2004: 77–34 for extended analyses of the Qobat teaching.

See for example Māsiḥaş Mašṭir, foll. 61r–62v, 64v, 67r, 72r–73v, 91r–92v where the Qobat author complains that the rival school accused the adherents of Qobat of deny-
that each person of the Holy Trinity played a role in the mystery of the incarnation; God the Father as anointer, God the Son as anointed, that is as the subject of the anointment and the Holy Spirit as unction or unction.30

The view polemically referred to as Karra was another radical Alexandrian reaction to the Jesuit challenge explained above. The adherents of Karra, who refer to themselves as Tawâhadawoc/Unionists, argue that what enabled the flesh or humanity of Christ to overcome its limitations and imperfections so that it became worthy of absolute union with divinity was its union with the latter. This is what their formula bâ-Tawâhad wakâbârâ, which means (the human nature of Christ) was enobled/glorified by (means of its) union (with the divinity of the Son), signifies. The adherents of Karra are also known for totally rejecting any notion of unction as a distinct act that took place at any point during the incarnation or afterwards. They argue that all scriptural references to the anointment of Christ are allusion to the union of the human nature of Christ with divinity, by which it (the human nature), was ennobled and glorified. According to Karoç, unction therefore simply means union and the anointer was the divinity of Christ (that is God the Son) and the subject of the unction was His humanity. According to this view, the divine nature of Christ ennobled and glorified the flesh or humanity with which it was united. This is what their formula lâibhu qâbây tâgâbây qâb, which means (Christ) Himself the Anointer, the (One) Anointed and the Unguent, signifies. This formula also reflects their contention that Christ did not need the involvement of the other two persons of the Holy Trinity in the process of ennobling and glorifying the flesh He took from Mary. Another slogan which reflects the above contention of the adherents of Karra is Wâld qâb, which means the Son Unction. Wâld qâb, as the slogan of Karoç, deserves special attention here. It is what marked out the partisans of Karra from their Qbat and Sâgga Lâg rivals who propagate Mânfaq Qaddus Qâb/the Holy Spirit Unction in common.31

30 For the way Qbatoc elaborate this in reference to their understanding of the meaning of the Trinitarian formula that the most Holy Trinity are one in divinity and three in person, see KINDENEH ENDEG 2004: 111–120.

31 See GETATCHEW HAILE 1986: 205–209 for a good discussion of the Karra teaching. There are also several manuscripts where the Karra teaching is expounded. MS nos. 253, 255–258, 458 and 755 of the National Library in Addis Ababa, are for example Karra Ammastu A’madâ Mosîr (lit. ‘the Five Pillars of Mystery’). This is a literary genre that started after the unction controversy, in which the three factions expound
The adherents of the third view, polemically referred to as Šágga Lağóč, share the formula, ḅāṬāwāḥādo kābārā with Karoč. This means, like Karoč, the adherents of Šágga Lağ address the central Jesuit challenge by arguing that its union with divinity was what ennobled and glorified the human nature or flesh of Christ, thereby making it (the human nature) worthy of union with the divine nature. However, unlike Karoč, the adherents of Šágga Lağ do not proceed from there to total rejection of unction. Noting that the occasion had several scriptural proof texts, they recognize unction/anointment as a separate act Christ underwent during the incarnation. On the other hand, unlike Ḍabātoč, they do not attach a central role to the incident, that is, they do not adhere to the notion that the anointment that He underwent through was central to the process by which the human and divine natures of Christ affected union at the moment of the incarnation.

As mentioned above, to the adherents of Šágga Lağ, its union with divinity was what ennobled and glorified the flesh Christ took from Mary, thereby making it worthy of union with it, that is, with divinity. Hence against their Ḍabat rivals, Šágga Lağóč argues that having no significance whatsoever for himself, Christ underwent unction for our sake. They observe that everything Christ did and underwent during his earthly sojourn was for the sake of humankind. Likewise, He also received the unction of the Holy Spirit, not for His own sake, but rather for the sake of humankind. According to Šágga Lağóč, the anointment of Christ was therefore part of Soteriology, the economy of salvation.

The Christological and Trinitarian issues at stake in the unction controversy are too complex to be exhaustively treated by the above brief summary. However, for our purpose here of the thick and impenetrable Trinitarian and Christological haze, that makes the controversy appear rather forbidden, what we need to zoom into is the issue of accepting or completely rejecting unction. Accordingly, of the three views, Ḍabat and Šágga Lağ accept the notion that Christ received the Unction of the Holy Spirit. Karoč on the other hand reject any notion of unction. It is also important to highlight here that, against Karoč’s “lāliḥu qābāy tāqābāy, qab”, that is “Himself (Christ) Anointer, Anointed and Unction/Ointment”, which signifies their rejection of any notion of unction as a separate act from the union (of the two natures of Christ their respective teachings on the five fundamental issues of Christian doctrine; the doctrine of the Trinity, Incarnation, Eucharist, Baptism and Reincarnation; see also GĀBRĀ IGĪZĪ‘ABHER ABRĪHA 2005 E.C., which is a book length defense of Karra published by Betā Ṭama, the Karra section of Waldāba Abrānant; see also GORGORIWOS 1991 E.C.: 86–92, 69–72.

33 Ibid.
during the incarnation), Qbat and Sägga Läg propagate the common formula, “Ab Qäbäy, Wald Täqäbäy, Mänfäs Qoddus Qäb”, i.e., the Father Anointer, the Son Anointed and the Holy Spirit Unction/unguent”. Wald qäb/the Son Unction versus Mänfäs Qoddus Qäb/Holy Spirit Unction were also the widely known formula by which the above difference between Karoč on the one hand and Qbatoc and Sägga Lägoč on the other were popularized. It is also important to stress here that notwithstanding their common Holy Spirit Unction position vis-à-vis the Son Unction formula of Karoč, there was no love lost between Qbat and Sägga Läg. Their difference revolves around the meaning and relevance of the unction of the Holy Spirit which both received acceptance from Christ.34

When we turn to the primary sources with the above distinction in the teaching of the rival factions in mind, it becomes visible that in almost all the royal synods held during the 17th century to resolve the unction controversy, the fact that Christ received the unction of the Holy Spirit was never an issue. What was an issue was the meaning and relevance of such unction. This suggests that the rival sides were the partisans of Qbat and Sägga Läg. In this regard, of particular interest for us here are the synods held during the reign of Iyasu I. These synods were concluded by declaring the Täwaṭdo teaching of the Betä Täklä Haymanot side as official orthodoxy. The formula of the rival Ewoštatean side that was renounced as heresy was bäQbat yäbahory Läg.35 What needs further emphasis here is the content of the winning Täwaṭdo teaching. As can be seen from the excerpts quoted below, the Täwaṭdo teaching which was endorsed as official doctrine at the conclusion of both synods did not reject unction altogether as Karoč, and since the 1878 Boru Meda synod, the Ethiopian Church do. Rather the dominant Täwaṭdo teaching of Iyasu I’s reign interpreted unction as an act Christ underwent for the sake of humankind. As explained above, that was Sägga Läg in its purest form. The central part of the ruling of the decisive Gondär synod held in 1686 on unction reads as follows, “母校لح : [ … ] ك١٠٠٠ : ه١٠٠٠ : ي١٠٠٠ : ك١٠٠٠ : ه١٠٠٠ : ي١٠٠٠ : ك١٠٠٠ : ه١٠٠٠ : ي١٠٠٠ : ك١٠٠٠ : ه١٠٠٠ : ي١٠٠٠ : ك١٠٠٠ : ه١٠٠٠ : ي١٠٠٠ : ك١٠٠٠ : ه١٠٠٠ : ي١٠٠٠ : ك١٠٠٠ : ه١٠٠٠ : ي١٠٠٠ : ك١٠٠٠ : ه١٠٠٠ : ي١٠٠٠ : ك١٠٠٠ : ه١٠٠٠ : ي١٠٠٠”.36 The synod of Yibaba held in 1699 was the other decisive synod held during the reign of Iyasu I. The central statement of the decision of the synod on the issue of unction reads as follows “母校لح :

34 See above.
35 GUIDI 1903: 94f., 203f., 240f.
36 Ibid., p. 95, “with the exception of Sin, Word inherited everything that belongs to Man […] with this Unction of the Holy Spirit He became the Son of God”.
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Ibid., p. 204, “And about His anointment it says, He was anointed because He became Man. God anointed Him with the Holy Spirit and power”.


40 See fn. 38 above.

41 Guidi 1903: 95, 204, 241.
As Sāgga Lağoc did. For them, the subject of unction was God the Son, onza tāsābo’a, because He became man, not bā-tosḥatu, that is Christ in his humanity, as the Jesuits contend. And, the gulf that separates bā-tosḥatu and onza tāsābo’a is as wide as the gulf that separates one-nature Alexandrian Christology from Chalcedon.42

III. Defiance and Rebellion of Lasta and southern Tigray against the Royal Centre of Gondārine Ethiopia (1630s to 1760s)

Lasta has a long history of defiance and rebellion against the Solomonic dynasty. The cause is usually ascribed to the ambition of the wag Šum members of the local ruling house, who trace their descent to the Zag’e if not to reclaim royal power, at least to attain greater regional autonomy.43 However, many features of the rebellion run counter to such assertion, suggesting instead that the major driving force of the rebellion was sectarianism. The first point that needs to be highlighted in this connection is the fact that the so called Lasta rebellion had in fact a wider geographical breadth. Besides Lasta, it involved several districts of what is today southern Tigray. Adherence to Karra was what these areas had in common. This allowed them to form a common front against the royal centre of Gondārine Ethiopia. Secondly, for all the attempt to stretch the origin of Lasta’s rebellion to the very moment when the Zag’e lost power to the Solomonic dynasty,44 our sources trace the origin of the most known case only to the reign of Susneyos, when Lasta served as the centre of the nationwide anti-Catholic uprising.45 The rebellion of Lasta and southern Tigray raged unabated for the next century, outliving the restoration of Alexandrian Orthodoxy in 1632. Then it drew to a close at the least expected time in the 1760s.46 If the goal had been to attain regional autonomy, then the 1760s,

42 This difference is very clear for example when we compare the pro-Chalcedonain definition of unction made at the conclusion of the Fogāra synod by the influence of the Jesuits with the rulings of the synods held during Iyasu I’s reign; s. PEREIRA 1892: 237f.; GUIDI 1903: 95, 204, 241. In the case of the former, Christ received unction in his humanity, hence it was the human nature of Christ after the incarnation, in the case of the latter it was God the Son who underwent unction, hence divinity because He became man; see also KIDANÆ WÄLÐ KÆFLE 1948 E.C.: 780, where he explicitly says, “ LOGGER : ʔbɨ : ʔbɨ : ḲAQ : ḲAQ : ḲAQ : ḲAQ : ḲAQ n”.


44 See for example PANKHURST 1984: 213–229; out of the 17 pages, he dedicates only one page to the long period from the 14th century to Susneyos’ reign, compared to 16 pages for the century and half after.


46 PANKHURST 1984: 226f.
the eve of the Zāmānā māsafont/Era of Princes, was the most opportune time to realize it. It is also remarkable that the ṣawg ṣiums were just one among several sources of leadership for the rebellion. Had the goal been attaining autonomy for Lasta, then one would expect them to be the constant source of leadership. Another strong clue to the sectarian nature of the rebellion is that the surrender of the military leaders never brought about the submission of the rebellious districts. Rather, as we shall see, the rebels would propose their own terms for peace, which is the centre’s acceptance of Karra as official doctrine at the expense of Qobat and Šāgga Lağ. As will be shown, the incorporation of Lasta and South Tigray to the monarchical centre in the 1760s came when this condition was met.

Our sources for the reign of Fasil are incomplete and fragmentary. However even from the limited evidence therein, it is clear that the doctrinal rivalry assumed its lasting nature through the expulsion of the Jesuits, both in terms of the identity of the parties involved in it and the balance of power in their rivalry. Accordingly, on the one hand there were Ewostateans and the Betä Täklä Haymanot communities fighting it out for the control of the centre, championing the teachings of Qobat and Šāgga Lağ respectively. The adherents of Karra on the other hand defied the centre using Lasta and southern Tigray as their safe-heavens. Qobat and Šāgga Lağ were the views debated by the representatives of the Ewostatean and Betä Täklä Haymanot parties respectively at the two major synods held in 1654 and 1663 at Aringo, a royal camp in South Gondär.47

Māshfä Ṣmastir, the Qobat ms that narrate the early history of the controversy until the last decade of the 17th century, is further helpful in enlightening us about the whereabouts of the Karra partisans during the early stage of Fasil’s reign. It says that in the run up to the first synod of Aringo held in 1654, in addition to those who propagate the Šāgga Lağ view, there were those who propagated “lālību Qābey, tāqābey, Qob”, clearly the Karra teaching, as explained in the previous section. However, after suffering repeated setbacks and rebuff, including excommunication by the bishop at the time, as advocates of heresy, they took flight to the north. It says “(bs. : ṣobḥ : ṣabḥs : ṣabḥs : ṣabḥ : ṣabḥ : ṣabḥ : ṣabḥ : ṣabḥ : ṣabḥ : ṣabḥ : ṣabḥ : ṣabḥ : ṣabḥ : ṣabḥ : ṣabḥ : ṣabḥ : ṣabḥ : ṣabḥ : ṣabḥ)”.47

47 This is partly evident from the fact that the Qobat and Šāgga Lağ versions of the history of the controversy identify each other as the rival sides while the same claim by the major Karra source is uncorroborated; for Qobat see Māshfä Ṣmastir, foll. 36v–56v and Wältä Ab, foll. 36v–51v; for the Šāgga Lağ version see GUIDI 1893: 599ff.; for Karra see Nāgārā Haymanot, MS, Mandaba Monastery, North Gondär, foll. 10r–13r.
Indeed while Qobat and Sağga Log partisans vied for control of the centre, the adherents of Karra were in constant rebellion mobilizing Lasta and South Tigray. During the first five years of Fasil’s rule, their leader was a certain Mālk’a Karstos. A man with a royal pedigree, Mālk’a Karstos, was also the main leader of the anti-Catholic uprising during the last decade of Susenyos’ reign. Under Mālk’a Karstos’ leadership, the Tigray–Lasta faction managed to briefly control the palace in Gondar, though shortly afterwards, Fasil managed to retake the palace by defeating and killing Mālk’a Karstos. As would be the case throughout the succeeding decades, the death of the leader did not ensure the end of the rebellion. Indeed, Fasil continued to carry out very costly campaigns against Lasta throughout the remaining years of his reign. Lasting victory however eluded him to the end.

The rebellion of southern Tigray and Lasta continued throughout the reign of Yoḥannäš (1667–1681), Fasil’s son and successor. The gruesome details of the repeated campaigns the royal centre carried out to put down the rebellion is extensively covered in the chronicle of the period. Even more important for our purpose here is that the royal chronicle makes the sectarian nature of the rebellion unequivocally clear. As will be shown shortly, the people of Lasta and southern Tigray were repeatedly denounced as heretics for denying the mystery of Unction. The Chronicler also makes it clear that on their part, the rebels of Lasta and South Tigray proposed the royal centre’s acceptance of Karra as the ultimate condition for peace.

However, for the first few years of his reign, Yoḥannäš was too busy unifying the pro-Holy Spirit Unction base to pay enough attention to the Tigray–Lasta problem. That meant unifying the Ewostateans and the Betä Täklä Haymanot communities that accepted the doctrine that Christ received the unction of the Holy Spirit. That to a certain degree Yoḥannäš succeeded in doing so is partially evident from the composition of his ecclesiastic retainers. His court was always frequented by the big names of the

---

48 Māshařa Māṣṭir, fol. 34vb, “They all left and took flight northwards to the country of Wag. As soon as they set foot to Wag, they started to teach and disseminate there heretical books ... And all the people of Lasta, from the confluence of River Täkäze to the end of Zimädo, became heretics”.
50 PERRUCHON 1897: 364, 369; BASSET 1882: 30, 32ff.
51 GUIDI 1903: 19–46.
52 Ibid., pp. 40ff.
53 See pp. 54ff. above.
Ewostatean and the Betä Täklä Haymanot communities. This was partly also a result of the fact that the two central parties, i.e., Ewostateans and the Betä Täklä Haymanot communities, came out of his father’s reign more or less balanced. Yohannas therefore made it the corner stone of his policy not to disturb this status quo. This reflected by the decision of the two synods held in the 1670s, in places called Lazâbësha and Q*ara Anbâsa. Both were held to condemn the people of Lasta as heretics for refusing to adhere to the teaching that Christ received of the unction of the Holy Spirit. After securing the condemnation of Lastans on that account, both synods refrain from explaining the significance of the unction of the Holy Spirit that Christ received, lest the Ewostateans and the representatives of the Betä Täklä Haymanot community quarrel. This was in line with Yohannas’ effort to secure the bipartisan support of the Ewostatean and Betä Täklä Haymanot communities in his effort to put down the Tägray–Lasta rebellion.

Yohannas launched the first of what would become repeated campaigns against Lasta in 1678. A synod held in a place called Zângârač sanctioned the ensuing battles as crusade against heretics. Citing canon law, the synod exhorted the faithful to fight “heretics by the sword”. That seems to have given the army, which was personally headed by Yohannas, a free hand to treat the rebels with utmost brutality. The chronicler tells us that the army defiled churches on its way to the rebel country and set entire villages ablaze. The slain, who fell in battle were emasculated, while women and children were carried off as captives along with cattle. All this however did not secure the submission of the rebels. Other than rampage, the royal army returned with no clear achievement.

In the meantime, war broke out in southern Tägray. The chronicle gives us a long list of the districts involved in the armed uprising. The rebels were led by two local lords called Zâmaryam and Fares. We are told that the latter was fresh out of royal prison. On his part, the emperor fought through his surro-

---

54 Guidi 1903: 3–55; among the big names of the Betä Täklä Haymanot community who made up the ecclesiastic retainers of Yohannas’ court were the Ḫâqąges, Ḫaryaqaos and Šągqa Kørstos, and abbots of prominent Betä Täklä Haymanot monasteries specially ʿlðå Kørstos of Mąguna. The main representatives of the Ewostatean side who frequented the royal court were Ḫaww Zâ’Iyaus (Zâ’Iyaus the Blind) of Dàbsan and Tâbdan of Gonj.

55 See Getachew Haile 1990: xf., for the fact that the first synod of Aringo held in 1654 was concluded by the victory of Qabat. In contrast, the author of Mâshāfâ Måṣfir gives the impression that the second synod of Aringo held in 1663/64 ended in stalemate, Mâshâfâ Måṣfir, fol. 74v–75r.

56 Guidi 1903: 23f., 40ff.

57 Ibid., p. 19.

58 Ibid., pp. 19–23.
gate, Doblā Iyāsūs, to whom he had given the governorship of the rebellious districts. Unlike Lasta, here the initiative seems to have been taken by the rebels. The flash point of the war in southern Tagray was Sālāwā, the well defended fortress from where Fares launched his attacks. Sālāwā has the reputation of being so impregnable that it did not even give way to the infamous invasion of Ahmad b. Ibrāhīm al-Gāzī (Ahmad Graf) in the mid 16th century. A native of Sālāwā, at the beginning, Fares also had the additional advantage of fighting in his home turf. Fares and Zāmāryām were therefore able to occupy several districts before Doblā Iyāsūs had time to organize a meaningful counter-attack.

It is also interesting to mention here that in what appeared to be a response, the rebels of South Tagray also conducted themselves with extreme cruelty. We are told that they burnt several churches and villages, emasculated the slain and carried off women and children in captivity along with cattle. What is more interesting to highlight is that after controlling several districts, Fares and Zāmāryām sent a message to Mahdārō, the wag šum of Lasta, inviting him to incorporate the districts to his domain. In a latter page, the Chronicler tells us that the reason Fares was so enamored with Mahdārō was because he accepted "the accursed religion of the people of Lasta".

After a period of the receiving end for more or less two years, the royal side finally managed to reclaim some of the districts of southern Tagray in 1680. The turning point came with the surrender of Zāmāryām. The chronicler of Yohānnās tells us that Zāmāryām went to Gondār and turned himself in Yohānnās. Duly pardoned and rehabilitated, Zāmāryām was hastily redeployed to southern Tagray to fight Fares, his former comrade-in-arms. This was induced by Fares, who by then was exposed to a three pronged attack by Zāmāryām, Doblā Iyāsūs and a certain Bonyām, to take flight to Lasta to avoid capture. In Lasta, wag šum Mahdārō, the ruler of the province independent of the royal centre, offered Fares governorship of three districts. However, Fares refused to abandon his fight for his sectarian cause of the three districts in Lasta. Trading off the offer for governorship with reinforcement, he therefore hurried back to Tagray. Indeed with the help of the army he secured from Mahdārō, Fares managed to retake his Sālāwā fortress. However that proved to be a very short lived recovery. In 1680, barely a year be-

59 Ibid., pp. 25ff.; see also Berry 2005: 495a–b.
60 Guidi 1903: 25ff.
61 Ibid.
62 Ibid., pp. 26, 33.
63 Ibid., pp. 29–34; Bonyām was the brother of Zāmāryān who was also appointed the governorship of a portion of the rebellious districts in southern Tagray.
fore the death of Yoḥannās, Fares suffered another crushing defeat which forced him to surrender.64

The chronicler of Yoḥannās was elated to report the success of the royal army to occupy Sālāwa. However it was a bit too early to celebrate success. As it turned out, neither the surrender of Fares nor the occupation of Sālāwa decisively broke the will of the rebels. This became clear through the chronicle when, undisturbed by the surrender of their army heads and instead following the leadership of monks, the moving spirit behind the rebellion, the rebels approached Yoḥannās with their own terms for peace. In a letter they sent to Yoḥannās, they made it clear that they would lay down their arms and become loyal subjects of his only in return for his willingness to expel those who adhere to the teaching that Christ received the unction of the Holy Spirit. In a synod held in Qʷara Anbāsa, the spokesmen of the Ewosatean and Betâ Täklâ Haymanot communities denounced the letter as heresy. It was also decided that those who made the proposal be punished for their audacity to insult the emperor and the orthodox faith. The ensuing campaign against Lasta proved as bloody as all previous engagements. However, as usual, it did little to secure the submission of the rebels.65

Berry writes that “throughout the 1690s, Fares was the power behind Iyasu’s throne”. Berry further observes that “few noblemen ever attained the power and stature that Fares achieved in the 1680s and 1690s”.66 At the peak of his career in the 1690s, Fares was ras bitwaddād, a title that allowed him to monopolize the top military and administrative positions of Iyasu I’s court.67 Though hard to believe, this was the same Fares who, as the leader of the Tägray–Lasta rebellion, troubled Yoḥannās, Iyasu’s father and predecessor like no other. Yet, it needs to be quickly added here that Fares’ case hardly represents a major departure in Iyasu’s approach towards the Tägray–Lasta problem from that of his father. Fares’ rise to prominence in

65 *Ibid.*, pp. 39–46; that both Ewosateans and Betâ Täklâ Haymanot were represented in the synod is evident from the presence of Tābdan of Gonj, one of the prominent spokesmen of Qṣbatōĉ, who also addressed the synod; see specially p. 42. The chronicle phrased it “He was ennobled by the unction of the Holy Spirit”. This is indeed how the adherents of Karra who reject any notion of Christ receiving the unction of the Holy Spirit interpret the common Qṣbat–Šägga Lāg position, thereby also refusing to recognize the difference in the interpretation of the meaning and significance of such unction between the two groups. Because, as far as the adherents of Karra were concerned, their Qṣbat and Šägga Lāg pro-Holy Spirit Uction rivals, though constituting two groups, were one and the same.
66 BERRY 2005: 495a–b.
his court was rather a result of Iyasu I being a true son of his father. As we have seen above, it was Yohannas who introduced the policy of not just clemency but also appointment to former leaders of the Tagray–Lasta rebellion who were willing to surrender, including Fares himself. By trying to resolve the sectarian problem by co-opting the rebel leaders, Iyasu was therefore only lifting a page from his father’s administrative manual. However, as will be shown below, in Iyasu’s case, his attempt to buy the loyalty of Fares by title and appointment, turned out to be his worst mistake.

As we have seen above, following the surrender of Fares, the rebels of Lasta proposed to lay down their arms in return for Yohannas’ recognition of Karra as official doctrine. However, not only did Yohannas turn down the offer, but he ordered another wave of attack against Lasta for making such an insulting offer.68 This implies that Fares was a turncoat who betrayed the rebel cause simply for the sake of office, while the centre did not concede any ground in terms of making concession to Karra. Careful scrutiny of Fares’ subsequent career reveals a person of deep devotion to his sectarian cause. His joining of Iyasu’s court therefore seems simply a change of strategy, meant to achieve his sectarian goal from within the system. When that did not come to pass, Fares did not cave in and surrender to fate. Rather, as a man of strong will, he did the unimaginable. In a move which had little or no precedent, Fares arranged the downfall and subsequent assassination of Iyasu I.

Iyasu’s first test of Lasta’s resistance came in 1689 when, after initial sign of submission, the Lastans rejected his request for annual tribute. Though infuriated, Iyasu did not rush to the use of force. Instead, in a remarkable display of statesmanship, he sent the lords of Lasta a letter of reprimand, where he also warned them not to further test his patience. The overall tenure of his message however betrays more than just statesmanship in his patience. It seems that Iyasu dreaded nothing more than the prospect of engaging Lasta in arms, which is understandable, given his awareness of the terrible failure of his predecessors on that score.69 However, both plea and threat falling on deaf ears, he was left with no option but to declare war. Nonetheless, to his immeasurable dismay, his call for mobilization yielded only the fifth of the expected strength of his army. The reason, according to the chronicler of Iyasu, was because everyone was afraid of engaging Lasta.70

Instead of a major campaign headed by him, Iyasu therefore ended up sending Fares with a small entourage to further plead with the Lastans to

---

68 GUIDI 1903: 40ff.
69 Ibid., pp. 139ff.
70 PANKHURST 1984: 222.
comply with his request in peace which appeared to be the most unwise and
desperate move. What made it look so was, among other things, the poor
choice of envoy as the Lastans could not be expected to forget that, as far as
they were concerned, Fares was the traitor, who owed his illustrious title and
position to the royal court for betraying them. One would thus expect the
Lastans to answer Iyasu’s overture for peace through Fares, with nothing but
the worst rebuff due to a turncoat. What happened was however the exact
opposite. The chronicler tells us that the delegates of Lasta met Fares half way
saying, “your religion is our religion, your king is our king”.

They even entrusted Fares with the additional task of intervening on their behalf in a
matter which involved a dispute they had with a neighboring Oromo clan.

We do not know what must have transpired between them and Fares, for
the Lastans to restore their former confidence on him. However, it is worth
mentioning here that the previous year, Iyasu allowed two monks, a certain
Wâldà Tônsa’e and his friend Tômrte to debate their doctrine on unction
with his ecclesiastic retainers. As the spokesmen of the Ewostatean and Betà
Tâklà Haymanot communities would angrily refer back to the incident
several decades later in 1763, Wâldà Tônsa’e and Tômrte were granted the
audience in their capacity as representatives of Karra.

The occasion was therefore a seminal event for Karra to be defended in a royal synod for the
first time. That was very likely facilitated through the good office of Fares.
It is also reasonable to attribute Fares’ rare success in the subsequent mis-
sion to Lasta to the latter’s recognition of his role in advancing their sectari-
an cause at the royal centre.

For all that, the first showing of the representatives of Karra in the royal
court was not a success. The chronicler tells us that Wâldà Tônsa’e and
Tômrte were forced to desist and their teaching was denounced as heresy.
However, with their right hand man still running the show at the royal
court, the Lasta–Tâgray partisans of Karra had reason to remain hopeful for
a better outcome in the future. Nonetheless, given his steadfast loyalty to
the Betà Tâklà Haymanot community and its Sâgga Loğ teaching and their
chance to debate their doctrine in a royal synod, seemed to be the furthest
Iyasu could go in adopting an accommodative stance towards Karra. How-

71 GUIDI 1903: 207, “your religion is our religion, your king is our king”.
72 Ibid., pp. 207f.
73 Ibid., pp. 189ff., 194; GUIDI 1893: 602; Id. 1912: 199.
74 Id. 1903: 95f.; the fact that Iyasu I’s famous review of the tax system from Ëndàrta in
Tâgray all the way to the heartland of the kingdom in Wâgâra also came immediately
afterwards, is another strong indication that the events were indeed interrelated and
part of a well-thought out strategy to appease the partisans of Karra.
ever for Fares, a no less diehard Karra loyalist, it seems that nothing short of total victory would do.75

The details of the initial disagreement between Iyasu and Fares are not clear to us. What is clear is that some time in 1704 Fares was sent to Tagray to assume his governorship of the province, (which he was given earlier on top of his role in the royal administration as ras bitwäßäddä), in person. On the surface, there is nothing extraordinary in such arrangement. However, in Fares’ case it clearly amounted to banishment. Among other things, it meant he was stripped of his ras bitwäßäddä title and all the power and influence that went with it. His long career also unequivocally demonstrates that his devotion and loyalty to Karra was more important to Fares than his title and appointments. His next move was to form an anti-Iyasu coalition. It took no time for the coalition, which enlisted the support of influential provincial governors, such as däggäc Wälä Gyorgis of Samen and court officials such as blattengeta Kidane and bägrom Abatä to achieve its goals. Overthrowing Iyasu, the Fares led coalition put his eldest son, Täklä Haymanot, on the throne. The plotters followed their plan through to the subsequent gruesome assassination of Iyasu I.76

With his candidate in office, it seemed all but certain that at long last Fares had arrived at the destination of his long and arduous sectarian journey, which took him from a life of rebellion in Säläwa to the position of ras bitwäßäddä in Iyasu’s court. However, Täklä Haymanot turned out to be weak and indecisive. This was in full display in a synod held in 1707 when the representatives of Karra were left to fend for themselves against a joint Ewosatean and Betä Täklä Haymanot offense. Given the fact that he owed his office to Fares, their right hand man, Wälä Tansa’e and Tamorte, the Karra spokesmen, were counting on Täklä Haymanot to throw the full weight and influence of the royal court behind them, in a manner that would decide the outcome of the synod in their favour. Such support failed to materialize, Wälä Tansa’e and Tamorte suffered another humiliation as proponents of heresy.77 That hinted to the fact that Fares did not have the right man for his purpose in Täklä

75 Ibid., p. 189; the teaching is usually confused with the Qobat teaching of Ewosateans. However that is not the case as is evident from one of the reproaches Wälä Tansa’e suffered. According to the chronicler, he was chided for introducing a teaching he would not have learned from Ewosatewos. It is further clear from the reference Ewosateans and Betä Täklä Haymanot communities made to it in their joint rejection of the same teaching in 1763; see GUIDI 1912: 199.
77 BASSET 1882: 60f.; Getatchew Haile 1986: 229–232; Getatchew wrongly identifies Wälä Tansa’e and Tamorte, as Qobat spokesmen.
Haymanot. He therefore withdrew the all too important support from Täklâ Haymanot. His lifeline cut, Täklâ Haymanot in turn became easy target to the wrath of Qobatoč, who held no less grudge against him for frustrating the hope with his reign, that a better day would dawn for them. It was the Agâw, sympathetic to Qobat, called Gâbârmoč who killed Täklâ Haymanot while he was on a hunting trip to their country in Goğğam. The partisans of Qobat also succeeded in outmaneuvering Fares in the ensuing power struggle to enthrone a prince sympathetic to their faction. Accordingly, they enthroned Tewoflos, whose first policy measure was to issue a decree making Qobat official doctrine of the royal court.78 Tewoflos also put Fares in fetters and threw him into Mâṣraḥ, a royal prison in Lake Ṭâna. Fares, who died in 1716 without seeing the success of his lifelong mission on behalf of Karra, had the small consolation that his body was to be laid to rest in his native land Sâlâwa.79

It took the rise of another Sâlâwan ras Mika’el Sâḥul, for the adherents of Karra to revive their ambition for the centre in the 1740s. In the intervening decades from the 1710s to the early 1740s, Tagray andLASTA fell back to their former position of rebellion and defiance of the centre.80 In many ways, ras Mika’el’s career followed the path of Fares’. In fact the resemblance in their careers is so sticking and substantial that it cannot be dismissed as a matter of accident. Rather it seems that ras Mika’el was a conscious heir of Fares. To start with, both were natives of Sâlâwa, no trivial detail, since such local background must be what informed their devotion to Karra.81 Like Fares, ras Mika’el started out as a powerful regional lord and burst into the national scene to distinguish himself in the late 1760s as the most powerful man of the kingdom, ras bitwâddâd. Like Fares, Mika’el owed his ras bitwâddâdship to his personal merit as an accomplished military leader. Like Fares, Mika’el was also the one who turned the office into the effective role of king-making. When that meant assassination, like Fares, Mika’el did not shrug away. Accordingly, on May 10, 1769, he put Yoḥannas, the son of Iyasu I, on the throne. A few days after, he got rid of Iyo’as by strangling him. A few months after, Yoḥannas suffered the fate of Iyo’as, when Mika’el found him not to his liking. Mika’el put yet another prince, Täklâ Haymanot on the throne, thereby inaugurating the official onset of the Zâmâna mása’fánt.82

79 Basset 1882: 64; Berry 2005: 495a–b.
80 Pankhurst 1984: 224ff.; throughout this period the centre was pro-Qobat, see Guidi 1912: 16f., 201f.
81 Ibid., p. 213; Berry 2005: 495a–b.
Most important for this study is however the fact that like Fares, Mika’el used his office to advance the cause of Karrä. The details are interesting to relate here. Sometime in 1763/4, a monk, called abba Šäite, delivered an alleged patriarchal letter to the court of Iyo’as. When read, it turned out that the letter endorses Karrä as official doctrine of the mother, Alexandrian Church, hence implying that the Ethiopian Church should follow suit. However, the representatives of the Betä Ewoșatewos and Betä Täklä Haymanot communities, who advocated the Qbat and Sägga Log teachings respectively, were not to be easily persuaded. As they had repeatedly done in similar occasions before, they came together and secured the rejection of the letter as forgery. As such, the whole thing appeared to be inconsequential, had it not been for the fact that the messengers, who delivered the alleged patriarchal letter to the royal court, were not alone. The chronicler tells us that they had come with their supporters mainly from Lasta and Tağray. They also had sympathizers within the royal court. As such, it was with difficulty that a potential showdown between Karrä sympathizers on the one hand and the joint Ewoșatean-Betä Täklä Haymanot partisans on the other, was averted, with the removal of the former from Gondär. The official chronicle and the Sägga Log source end their account there, as though that was the end of the story.83 However, we learn from another source that after a short while, the partisans of Karrä, who were sentenced to exile returned to Gondär, accompanied by ras Mika’el. This time around, they were given royal welcome. For the next two years, when ras Mika’el was the one running the show at the monarchial centre, Karrä enjoyed the status of being official doctrine of the royal court.84

What is also remarkable here is that Lasta, as much as Tağray, was the source of ras Mika’el’s strength. For example, ras Mika’el’s army had substantial number of recruits from Lasta. Under ras Mika’el’s leadership, the Lastans also fought the wars of the royal centre. Lastans also contributed to the success of ras Mika’el by facilitating the passage of his army through their territory.85 The details therefore prove the central thesis of this study that the incorporation of South Tağray and Lasta came with the success of Karrä to become official doctrine of the centre for the first time in the history of Gondärine Ethiopia in the late 1760s and early 1770s. However, Mika’el Şohul’s dominance of central politics was a short lived one and another Tağrayan lord did not replace him in the ras bitwāddād position. The end of his career also inaugurated the onset of the Zämānā māsafint/Era of Princes, when the various provinces that hitherto made up the Christian

83 GUIDI 1912: 198–202; Id. 1893: 604f.
84 Id. 1912: 200f., n. 1.
85 ŠANKHRUST 1984: 226f.
Kingdom became more or less autonomous. That also made the sectarian rivalry for control of the centre irrelevant. Instead, throughout the period of the Zâmânâ màsafânt from the 1770s to 1855, the three factions aligned with the regional power players.
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Summary

Two gādls, briefly examined in this study, portray Iyasu I as a Sāgga Lāg partisan. Sāgga Lāg is one of two views dismissed as heresy at the 1878 Boru Meda synod. This synod settled the Christological controversy that beset the Ethiopian Church for two and a half centuries, by declaring Karra, the polemical name for Tāwahdo, as official orthodoxy. What is strange about the accounts of the two gādls is that they seem to contradict one of the doxas of Ethiopian historiography, which is that Iyasu I was a diehard Tāwahdo. This study resolves this enigma by showing that during the Gondārine period the Tāwahdo teaching, which enjoyed the recognition of the royal centre as orthodoxy, was Sāgga Lāg. Such revision of the historiography of the doctrinal controversy in turn paves the way for a better understanding of the rebellion of Lasta and southern Tagray, against the monarchial centre of Gondārine Ethiopia. So far, the history of this rebellion is poorly understood due to the wrong assumption that the Karra teaching championed by the Lasta–Tagray group at the time was the same Tāwahdo of the monarchial centre. No historian could thus entertain the possibility of a long lasting rebellion in the name of Karra. This study shows that throughout much of the Gondārine period, Karra was rather the doctrine of a third party that defied the centre using Lasta and southern Tagray as safe-heavens.