

**The Ethiopian Diaspora in the UK: Material Religious  
Culture, Sentiments of Heritage, and Identity.**

Marco Pozzi - Summer 2022

## Introduction

This report will discuss the ways in which the Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo community in the UK expresses its religious identities and retains a strong sentiment of heritage despite residing outside of Ethiopia. The objectives of this research stemmed from a curiosity towards material culture so often finding itself in foreign places and carrying heavy attachments and significance to its place of origin with it. Therefore, there will be a particular focus on material heritage and how its use and conservancy have influenced members of the diaspora and their perceptions on identity, more specifically how material objects may establish a stronger connection to Ethiopia for members of the diaspora.

This report will make important use of two interviews with important members of the diaspora, Reverend Father Abate Gobena and Reverend Father Michael Hundesa. It will attempt to outline their thoughts and opinions on topics surrounding religious material culture and the conservation of a strong Ethiopian Orthodox identity amongst the Anglo-Ethiopian diaspora.

Rev. Fr. Gobena is a lecturer at Sankt Ignatios College in Stockholm School of Theology, a PhD candidate at University College Stockholm, and serves as an ordained priest in multiple Ethiopian Orthodox Churches in London.<sup>1</sup> Special acknowledgement is due to Fr. Gobena for his willingness to help me in my research, and specifically for having referred me to multiple other persons of interest for my interviewing process. In fact, it was through Fr. Gobena that I was put into contact with my second interviewee, Reverend Father Michael Hundesa. I thoroughly thank Fr. Gobena for this crucial help in my research process.

Rev. Fr. Hundesa is the head of the Ethiopian Orthodox Community Association in the UK & Ireland and also serves as an ordained priest in multiple Ethiopian Orthodox churches across London.<sup>2</sup> His position in the Ethiopian Orthodox Community Association led us to discuss broader ideas within the community during the interview, as opposed to the more specific discussions surrounding certain aspects of Ethiopian material culture I had intended to have. For opening this broader scope and for simply being one of the few to participate in my research, I must also give a special thanks to Rev. Fr. Hundesa.

It is important, before discussing anything further, to make note of certain important definitions:

---

<sup>1</sup> Rev. Fr. Abate Gobena, video conference interview by Marco Pozzi, London, 18 July 2022.

<sup>2</sup> Rev. Fr. Michael Hundesa, video conference interview by Marco Pozzi, London-Nairobi, 29 July 2022.

- Ethiopian Tewahedo Orthodoxy refers to the most followed religious faith in Ethiopia, followed by approximately 44% of Ethiopians.<sup>3</sup> This is the religious scope within which this research places itself. Whenever material culture is mentioned or discussed within this report, it should be assumed as being related or part of Tewahedo Orthodoxy, unless specified otherwise. In fact, both Fr. Gobena and Fr. Hundesa are ordained Tewahedo priests, leading the interviews to therefore approach discussions from that perspective.
- Within the context of this research, material culture, heritage, or objects all refer to Tewahedo Orthodox relics. Specifically, this report will discuss crosses, manuscripts, churches, and places of worship, as it was examples of these objects that were used to kickstart discussions during interviews and throughout research. These were selected for their cultural and religious significance as well as for their prevalence in practice, which therefore draws them close to the individuals, and hence to the diaspora. Relevant images of these examples are attached in the appendix following this report.
- Heritage is, according to Laura McAtackney, a “term that is so broadly defined that it has become a catch-all term for almost anything.”<sup>4</sup> Due to this broad nature identified by McAtackney, it seems reasonable to at least establish a working idea for heritage before continuing with this report, almost like a concept within which anyone can define it as they see fit. In this sense, *heritage is the sentiment of belonging to and actively participating in the greater historical past of whichever group one identifies with*, a definition which follows along the lines of UNESCO’s – “Our legacy from the past, what we live with today, and what we pass onto the future.”<sup>5</sup> With this more general idea, it is possible for individuals to decide what ‘actively participating’ means to them, whether a ‘greater historical past’ is expressed materially or immaterially, or even what ‘belonging’ entails. Keeping this idea of heritage so broad allows for individual definition, but also creates space for debate, as will be discussed in later sections.

---

<sup>3</sup> Central Intelligence Agency, “Eastern Africa: Ethiopia,” *The World Factbook* (19 September 2022).

<sup>4</sup> Laura McAtackney, “Part II – Relevant Pasts: Material Culture and Heritage,” in *The Cambridge Handbook of Material Culture Studies* (Cambridge: 2 June 2022), 170.

<sup>5</sup> UNESCO, “World Heritage,” <https://whc.unesco.org/en/about/>.

## Methodology and Reflections on the Research Process

This research, as aforementioned, primarily makes use of two conversational interviews conducted with ordained Tewahedo Orthodox priests currently practicing in London, as well as a certain amount of document review. These interviews took a semi-structured format which consisted of showing the interviewee a selection of images of objects belonging to Ethiopian Orthodox material culture to start conversations surrounding the importance of said objects with regards to Ethiopian heritage (this selection is found in the appendix). As previously explained, these objects were selected for their significant importance in religious practice, however, the selections can be justified further.

There were three examples of crosses; two were processional crosses and one was a priest's hand cross. The two processional crosses are differentiated by style. The early 15<sup>th</sup> century processional cross from the Lasta Region makes extensive use of interweaving through latticework, this is said by multiple sources to represent everlasting life, unity, God's everlasting presence, or even individual sacrifices.<sup>6</sup> On the other hand, the 13<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> century processional cross from the Northern Highlands has an unconventional shape in comparison to other processional cross – it lacks this element of intertwining. This important difference made this an interesting object; therefore, it was selected to potentially uncover reasons for this stylistic choice. The 18<sup>th</sup> century hand cross also lacks this pattern, however that seems to be more common in comparison to processional crosses. A hand cross was a necessary selection as it is arguably one of the most symbolic objects in Ethiopian Tewahedo Orthodox faith, normally carried by all ordained priests and used in blessings and most other liturgical practices.<sup>7</sup>

After having researched many of the Tewahedo Orthodox churches in London and having had the chance to visit Debre Genet Holy Trinity Church in Cricklewood, to whom I would also like to extend my thanks for such an opportunity, it was brought to my attention that nearly all Ethiopian congregations practice in either rented or bought Anglican churches otherwise no longer in use. It was interesting to see that little to no authentically Ethiopian places of worship existed in London despite the growing diaspora, therefore the inclusion of Genette Maryam seemed evident. Genette Maryam holds the earliest dateable wall paintings in Ethiopia and is

---

<sup>6</sup> "The Ethiopian Cross," *Seiyaku*, <https://www.seiyaku.com/customs/crosses/ethiopian.html>; Maria Evangelatou, *The Symbolic Language of Ethiopian Crosses: Visualizing History, Identity and Salvation through Form and Ritual*, (University of California Santa Cruz History of Art and Visual Culture); Fr. Gobena, interview by Marco Pozzi.

<sup>7</sup> Fr. Hundesa, interview by Marco Pozzi.

commonly known to have been built by Yekuno Amlak, the first emperor of the Solomonic dynasty.<sup>8</sup> This not only makes Genette Maryam historically significant, but it also makes it a cornerstone of Ethiopian material heritage, which inevitably places it as an important aspect of Ethiopian culture to discuss.

Finally, there are two different manuscript parchments. For simpler reasons than the other objects, both were selected, in part, for their illustrations, which are known to be quite unique in comparison to other religious illustrations globally. However, the real importance of these manuscripts is their showcase in the continued use of Ge'ez; an ancient Ethiopian language which now survives as the liturgical language for Tewahedo Orthodoxy. In this case, the use of Ge'ez as a language was used to steer interviewees towards discussing non-material aspects of culture to define their sentiments of heritage.

The interviews would then take a very simple conversational form, usually opening with a broad question regarding all pictures such as:

“Which of these images constitute or evoke your strongest personal connection to Ethiopia and could you expand on why?”

Subsequently, the exchange would take its course naturally, owing to the follow-up questions asked and the answers given by the interviewee. The challenge with this mode of interviewing was to consciously craft questions as the conversation took place to reach conclusions, all the while keeping a natural conversational flow. Another equally complicated aspect of these interviews was steering the interviewees into the right direction. Given their incredible knowledge on the topics discussed, it was easy for the conversation to divert itself from the specific discussions of heritage or even to keep them within a UK context. The interviewees would show clear passion in the interview by expanding their statements and points out of the scope of interest for this research. In no way is this a negative statement in their regard, in fact it was a pleasure to receive two wonderfully enthusiastic participants, however, given the limited time, it became a challenge to retain the discussion focused solely on this research's specific scope. This is simply a question of experience, but it is a factor of note in this research.

However, the hardest part in research came before the actual interviewing stage – a lack of connections, a certain wariness to participate amongst potential interviewees, and other simple difficulties caused real challenges. Firstly, there was a real disparity in numbers between the

---

<sup>8</sup> Paul B. Henze, “Layers of Time, A History of Ethiopia” (New York: Palgrave, 2000), 59.

number of potential interviewees contacted, and the number of productive responses received. Of the 13 Tewahedo Orthodox churches contacted a surprising 7 of them answered, but none of them resulted in an interview. Debre Genet Holy Trinity's answer did lead to my visit of their church, but the ordained priest was unfortunately unavailable for an interview. There was also an otherwise interesting experience where a Tigrayan priest responded to my proposition expressing concerns regarding the framing of this research. Unfortunately, due to the controversial potential of this topic an interview was not conducted. It was very interesting however, to have heard the passionate expression of that point of view, a true shame that clearance on this potential interview was never given. However, the point is that a lack of productive responses was most likely caused by a wariness to participate in research, especially on a topic that may concern controversy and in research conducted by a first-year undergraduate student. Further, they may have been a technology barrier. Given research was entirely conducted online, it is highly probable that this served as a deterrent to many priests who may not have a good enough grasp of technology to participate in zoom interviews. Additionally, the fact that these were brand new connections, with no prior communication, may have discouraged many from participating. Which is where my supervisor, Dr. Jacopo Gnisci, is due great acknowledgment. He got me into contact with Fr. Gobena and few other persons of interest. Only Fr. Gobena proved to offer me a productive response, but he himself then put me in contact with Fr. Hundesa, along with three additional priests, whom unfortunately did not express interest in participating. The point here is that as a new and unexperienced scholar, a lack of connections and contacts was always going to present itself as a hurdle in terms of research opportunities. It was quite a relief to be able to work through certain people, such as Dr. Gnisci and Fr. Gobena, who have pre-existing contacts in this area, but it was an importantly revealing experience to go through such a process.

Regardless of how challenging this process may have been, it must be said that the experience gained from manually finding contacts and going through a brief recruitment process was incredibly interesting and eye opening to the world of academic research. Nevertheless, given the methodology has now been outlined, it is possible to proceed with the findings of this research.

## Research Findings

### *Section I – Ethiopian Heritage Expressed in Public History*

The question of representation in public history, particularly related to museums and the curated display of Ethiopian artefacts, was met with two differing opinions. Reverend Father Gobena expressed strong feelings against the display of many Tewahedo Orthodox artefacts while Reverend Father Hundesa seemed much more lenient and accepting of the display of certain objects. The reason for this difference in opinion does in part stem from different examples used by the interviewees – specifically, this question arose following the discussion of manuscripts in Fr. Gobena’s interview, whereas it took place after discussing the hand cross with Fr. Hundesa. This is not to be overlooked, but nonetheless, two contrasting general arguments can still be discussed. However, both Fathers were somewhat agreeable on the impact of public historical displays of Ethiopia for the new young generation of Ethiopians, those whose parents/grandparents may have been born and/or raised in Ethiopia but have not done so themselves – this would more specifically be “second-generation and third-generation diaspora.”<sup>9</sup> Finally, the concept of Ethiopian exceptionality was explored with Fr. Gobena and whether it is a positive or negative lens to research Ethiopian heritage through.

Firstly, comes the discussion of artefact display in museums. Fr. Gobena was expressive of the negative aspects that stem from the display of previously sacred and holy items from Ethiopian Tewahedo churches. Firstly, just as Fr. Hundesa also explained during his interview, the value of clerical object in an Ethiopian church comes from its consecration as a holy object, simply put it is a “special prayer” after which an “object becomes [a] holy object.”<sup>10</sup> Both fathers stood firmly against the display of such “holy objects,” however, Fr. Gobena made important mention of sacred objects that do not require consecration of any sort, this being sacred/holy tablets for example. In this case, Fr. Gobena makes the argument that holy tablets are indispensable items to churches in Ethiopia, “the church without a tablet is not a church anymore,” and that therefore these items are not fit to be removed from their original resting place in Ethiopia to be brought into museums abroad. On that same point, Fr. Gobena expressed his heartbreak at the “clear theft” of artefacts and the possibility that they may be accessed by

---

<sup>9</sup> Campbell MacPherson, *Scottish Identity Overseas: An Exploration into the Identity and Experience of the Scottish Diaspora living outside the United Kingdom*, (St Andrews, Scotland: St Andrews University, 2022), <https://assets.zapnito.com/users/569705/documents/179745/bca6c9ea-20e7-4ba3-a68e-0656680f9860.pdf>, 2.

<sup>10</sup> Fr. Hundesa, interview by Marco Pozzi.

people other than the ordained priests that may.<sup>11</sup> As aforementioned, the difference in argument comes from the fact that manuscripts were being discussed at the time, hence pushing Fr. Gobena to discuss table and other written artefacts.

Fr. Hundesa on the other hand made it clear he believes that objects which have not undergone consecration are fit for display, most notably examples of hand crosses. Truth is, a great number of hand crosses are available to the public, whether that be through shops, churches, or museums, but they are inherently and characteristically different to the crosses which ordained priests carry. Fr. Hundesa made that distinction very clear, stating “my own cross, I have it in my pocket, as an ordained priest mine is already prayed over and changed, mine is now holy. I see these kinds of [hand] cross everywhere, in shops and museums, [and that] is not something I discourage because this kind of cross is a symbol.”<sup>12</sup> Fr. Hundesa then confirmed the notion that these hand crosses work as a symbol of representation, heavily associated with Ethiopia and its culture, making them objects highly charged in terms of heritage. However, Fr. Hundesa did not solely praise the inclusion of Ethiopian objects in foreign museums. In fact, he mentions that, despite having the ability to come and observe Ethiopian material culture in a public, non-exclusively Ethiopian space, is a wonderful thing in terms of representation, yet the history of these objects and their journeys should not be forgotten. He mentions, “these crosses are here because some of our ancestors maybe have been killed, looted, whatever... but you wonder why they are here, it is almost against nature.”<sup>13</sup> In this case it is clear a certain duality exists. This last point mentioned by Fr. Hundesa was interesting however, as it recalled the idea that Ethiopian representation in public history may have a notable impact on the younger UK-born generations of Ethiopians.

In fact, this was a question posed to Fr. Gobena who heavily praised the importance of material culture in educating and retaining a sense of heritage for British-Ethiopians coming of age, going as far as to say that material culture is not even used enough. The point he emphasized was that of having a large array of material heritage to be particularly proud of. For one, the Ark of the Covenant is said to reside in Ethiopia, in that sense, he says, young Ethiopians should be proud of the people they come from. This argument, in some way accompanies that of Fr. Hundesa in the previous paragraph, referring to the displaying of crosses. However, Fr. Gobena

---

<sup>11</sup> Fr. Gobena, interview by Marco Pozzi.

<sup>12</sup> Fr. Hundesa, interview by Marco Pozzi.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

emphasized the idea of uniqueness in Ethiopian culture. Although it is true that Ethiopia is an especially unique country, being the first African Christian nation, having their own liturgical language, the myth of the Ark of the Covenant etc..., Fr. Gobena did also recognize the dangers of idealizing exceptionalism. As much as he sees it as a positive to instill pride in the hearts of young Ethiopians that have not necessarily had the chance to see Ethiopia themselves, he does also recognize the fact that Ethiopian history and heritage should be studied as what it is and not simply for being unique in comparison to other countries. Meaning it should not be a situation of fascination over special characteristics, implying that if Ethiopia were not unique, not special attention would be paid for its history, “they should want to learn about their own heritage out of curiosity, not pride for being better and more unique than others.”<sup>14</sup> For instance, he mentions the focusing on exceptionalism would cause disunity with other Christian groups which would be devastating considering British-Ethiopians are a relatively smaller group.<sup>15</sup> In this case, Fr. Gobena wants to ensure that this pride for Ethiopian heritage because of its unique material culture should not stand in the way and cause tensions with other groups.

There seems to be a certain consensus surrounding the presence of Ethiopian material culture in public history and the way in which it is taught to the new Ethiopian generation. The material culture is strong and unique which pushes the youth into a certain interest for it, but its inclusion in museums and other public spaces makes learning about their own origins more available. However, there exists multiple downsides. Notably, it is important not to forget the ways in which these objects arrived where they are, as Fr. Hundesa reinforced, but it is also crucial not to get caught up in an almost nationalistic pride for Ethiopia, notably considering the context of the diaspora which is only growing now.

---

<sup>14</sup> Fr. Gobena, interview by Marco Pozzi.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

## *Section II – Language and Texts*

Ge'ez is the liturgical language of the Tewahedo Orthodox Church and forms an incredibly important part of Ethiopian identity, having been in continual use since approximately the 3<sup>rd</sup> century.<sup>16</sup> Both Fathers expressed the importance of Ge'ez in terms of understanding Tewahedo Orthodoxy and Ethiopian heritage. It is something that forms a fundamental part of Ethiopian history and can very hardly be disassociated from the Ethiopian identity, as Fr. Hundesa said, “to understand the Ethiopian Orthodox Church very well, the language is key,” and Fr. Gobena reinforces this point citing that “more than 60 million Ethiopians can listen, sense, and understand what Ge'ez is going to transmit” (for reference there are 66 million Ethiopian Tewahedo Orthodox adherents).<sup>17</sup> Once again it is important to recognize not only the uniqueness of Ge'ez as a language, but also its incredible longevity, so much so that one of the reasons Ge'ez is still commonly understood and used liturgically today, is because Amharic is unable to replace it entirely. Interestingly, the importance of Ge'ez demonstrates a way in which the expression of an Ethiopian identity and the spirit of Ethiopian heritage are not always material. It leads to wonder whether there are other intangible aspects of the Tewahedo Orthodox Church, of Ethiopian culture, or the diaspora that carry an idea of heritage and identity further than material culture.

## *Section III – Places of Worship and Intangible Heritage*

As mentioned in the introduction, the diaspora is constrained to practicing in old Anglican churches either through buying or renting the building, however there is an ideal future devoid of this situation which the diaspora seeks but there is also a way in which Ethiopian heritage is expressed despite these makeshift places of worship. Both Fr. Gobena and Fr. Hundesa discussed the prospect of eventually building their own Orthodox churches in the UK at some future time, much like other religious diasporas have done before them. However, both express the difficulties in doing so at this point due to the relatively small population of the diaspora and relatively short time spent establishing themselves in the UK. The issue is that there

---

<sup>16</sup> “Ge'ez Language,” Britannica, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Geez-language>.

<sup>17</sup> Fr. Hundesa, interview by Marco Pozzi; Fr. Gobena, interview by Marco Pozzi.

then is a situation where congregations assemble for services in buildings that may not necessarily be fit for Tewahedo Orthodox practice. For example, Fr. Gobena mentioned three prerequisites for a church building before it may be used for Tewahedo service, “it must have the capability to separate men and women in service, have a separate room for holy articles, and a separate area solely for ordained clergy”.<sup>18</sup> However, regardless of such setbacks and requirements, there is still the possibility to express a clear Ethiopian identity within these churches so clearly part of British material heritage, through intangible qualities of Tewahedo culture.

The reason for which this expression of Ethiopian heritage and identity is possible comes from the debate regarding the extent heritage is expressed by material things or intangibles. The International Council on Monuments and Sites outlines the critical heritage theory, proposing that “place, cultural significance, and fabric” amongst other intangibles form the idea of heritage (noting place and building to be two different things).<sup>19</sup> In this case it is arguable that an authentic Ethiopian identity can be born and sustained in an otherwise materially British building because the place is reborn in Tewahedo Orthodox ‘fabric,’ causing it to gain cultural significance amongst the congregation that attends such a church. Therefore, it is the intangible qualities of the place and what is done there that establishes Ethiopian identity as opposed to the material nature of the building. Further, Laurajane Smith makes a great point that “heritage is, by its very nature, intangible because it is about processes of engagement, acts of communication, and the ability to make meaning in the present.”<sup>20</sup> However, with this quote, it becomes more evident that material culture does still play a big role in establishing heritage. Keeping within the Tewahedo Orthodox example, it isn’t only Ge’ez that will establish a new ‘fabric’ to a certain place, surely the presence of crosses, manuscripts, etc... will take an important role too. Additionally, this material culture, particularly in Tewahedo Orthodoxy, is crucial to congregation’s services and other practices, making material object crucial in “making material culture indispensable in making meaning in the present”.<sup>21</sup> Further, the ideals expressed by both Fr. Gobena and Fr. Hundesa included the eventual construction of Tewahedo Orthodox churches,

---

<sup>18</sup> Fr. Gobena, interview by Marco Pozzi

<sup>19</sup> *The Burra Charter: The Association ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance* (Burwood: Australia ICOMOS, 1979), 297.

<sup>20</sup> Laurajane Smith, *Uses of Heritage* (London: Routledge, 2006), 11.

<sup>21</sup> Smith, *Heritage*, 11.

although this does not make having a material building indispensable to express identity, it does show the natural incline towards having that in order to do so.

However, it becomes interesting once both Fathers can become part of Ethiopian heritage for their knowledge and abilities. If following the 2003 UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Culture Heritage's official recognition of "practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, and skills" as part of intangible heritage, then ordained priests become part of Ethiopian heritage.<sup>22</sup> It becomes truly interesting to look at heritage in this regard, because it means that people, such as Fr. Gobena and Fr. Hundesa, can embody the heritage and identity of the people they belong to thanks to their qualities. This is simply an interesting talking point. However, still considering the current place of worship situation, this means that despite a lack of authentic churches for worship, there still exists a way to express heritage and a secure Ethiopian identity. Despite heritage very clearly being a mix of materials and intangibles, it is interesting to see how they work together in this situation.

## **Conclusion**

Overall, it is very interesting to see the interactive dynamics between the Ethiopian diaspora and the UK, in various ways that is. Through extensive material cultural presence, the Ethiopian community can establish their identity, but it is also interesting to see that they are able to do that simply through the knowledge and skills of their ordained priests. There is hope in the future for the diaspora to grow bigger and to settle itself as a greater group in the UK, in which way Fr. Gobena and Fr. Hundesa will get their wishes of building Tewahedo churches in the country. Nonetheless, hopefully, in the near future, further research will be able to show how much progress the diaspora makes on these fronts and how they develop as a community in terms of displaying their identity and remaining close to their heritage.

---

<sup>22</sup> *UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Culture Heritage* (UNESCO, 2003), 5.

## Bibliography

- Asmat Prayers*. 19th Century. The British Library, London. <https://eap.bl.uk/archive-file/EAP286-1-1-41>.
- The Burra Charter: The Association ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance*. Burwood: Australia ICOMOS, 1979.
- Central Intelligence Agency. "Eastern Africa: Ethiopia." The World Factbook. Last modified September 19, 2022. <https://www.cia.gov/the-world-factbook/countries/ethiopia/#:~:text=Religions,%2C%20Catholic%200.7%25%2C%20traditional%20>.
- "The Ethiopian Cross." Seiyaku. <https://www.seiyaku.com/customs/crosses/ethiopian.html>.
- Evangelatou, Maria. "The Symbolic Language of Ethiopian Crosses: Visualizing History, Identity and Salvation through Form and Ritual." *University of California Santa Cruz History of Art and Visual Culture*, January 2013. [https://huichawaii.org/assets/evangelatou\\_maria\\_ahs\\_2013.pdf](https://huichawaii.org/assets/evangelatou_maria_ahs_2013.pdf).
- The Four Gospels. Opening to the Gospel of Saint Mark*. 1664-65. The British Library, London. [https://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=or\\_510\\_f001r](https://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=or_510_f001r).
- "Ge'ez Language." Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Geez-language>.
- Gobena, Abate, Rev. Fr. Videoconference interview by Marco Valère F. Pozzi. United Kingdom, London. July 18, 2022.
- Hand Cross (mäsqäl qäddase or yäṭān)*. 18th Century. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City. <https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/701288?ft=ethiopia&offset=0&rpp=40&pos=17>.
- Henze, Paul B. *Layers of Time, A History of Ethiopia*. New York: Palgrave, 2000.
- Hgetnet. *Genetta Maryam*. July 25, 2010. Photograph. <https://am.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E1%88%B5%E1%8B%95%E1%88%8D:GeneteMariam1.jpg>.
- Hundesä, Michael, Rev. Fr. Videoconference interview by Marco Valère F. Pozzi. United Kingdom and Kenya, London and Nairobi. July 29, 2022.
- MacPherson, Campbell. *Scottish Identity Overseas: An Exploration into the Identity and Experience of the Scottish Diaspora Living outside the United Kingdom*. St Andrews, Scotland: University of St Andrews, 2022. <https://assets.zapnito.com/users/569705/documents/179745/bca6c9ea-20e7-4ba3-a68e-0656680f9860.pdf>.

McAtackney, Laura. "Part II - Relevant Pasts: Material Culture and Heritage." In *The Cambridge Handbook of Material Culture Studies*, by Gretchen Sullivan Sorin, 167-89. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022. Digital file.

*Processional Cross*. 13th to 14th Century. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.  
<https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/320833>.

*Processional Cross*. 15th Century. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.  
<https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/677838?ft=ethiopia&offset=0&rpp=40&pos=14>.

Smith, Laurajane. *Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge, 2006.

UNESCO. World Heritage. <https://whc.unesco.org/en/about/>.

*UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Culture Heritage*. N.p.: UNESCO, 2003.

## Appendix



13<sup>th</sup> – 14<sup>th</sup> Century Processional Cross from the Northern Highlands (Front and Back)<sup>23</sup>



Early 15<sup>th</sup> Century Processional Cross from the Lasta Region in Amhara<sup>24</sup>

<sup>23</sup> *Processional Cross*, 13<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> Century, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City, 2011.159, <https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/320833>.

<sup>24</sup> *Processional Cross*, 15<sup>th</sup> Century, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City, 2015.254, <https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/677838?ft=ethiopia&offset=0&rpp=40&pos=14>.



18<sup>th</sup> Century Hand Cross from either Tigray or Amhara (Front and Back)<sup>25</sup>



The Four Gospels, Gondar, Ethiopia, 1664-1665. Opening to the Gospel of St. Mark.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>25</sup> *Hand Cross (mäsqäl qaddase or yäätan)*, 18<sup>th</sup> Century, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City, <https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/701288?ft=ethiopia&offset=0&rpp=40&pos=17>.

<sup>26</sup> *The Four Gospels. Opening to the Gospel of Saint Mark*, 1664-65, Ethiopian Collections, The British Library, London, Or.510 f.076r, [https://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=or\\_510\\_f001r](https://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=or_510_f001r).



Genette Maryam in the Lalibela Region, probably built in 1270 by Emperor Yekuno Amlak.<sup>27</sup>



Asmat Prayer Manuscript 19<sup>th</sup> Century, in Addis Ababa<sup>28</sup>

<sup>27</sup> Hgetnet, *Genetta Maryam*, 25 July 2010, Wikimedia, <https://am.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E1%88%B5%E1%8B%95%E1%88%8D:GeneteMariam1.jpg>.

<sup>28</sup> *Asmat Prayers*, 19<sup>th</sup> Century, Endangered Archives Program, The British Library, London, EAP286/1/1/41, <https://eap.bl.uk/archive-file/EAP286-1-1-41>.