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Introduction

Märṭulā Maryam is a celebrated monastery dominating the religious topography of Ethiopia’s north-western province of Goģgam, lying within the great eastern bend of the Abbay River. The monastery’s current fame and prestige stem from its supposed fourth-century CE foundation during the earliest days of Christianity in Ethiopia. Despite its contemporary claim as one of the country’s oldest monasteries, Märṭulā Maryam was actually established in the fifteenth century CE by Queen Ǝleni (d.1524),¹ one of the remarkable female leaders in Ethiopian history. For the next four centuries, Märṭulā Maryam’s clergy used Ǝleni’s name and reputation to build their institutional identity, all the while affectionately and warmly cherishing the memory of her religious and political virtues.

During the last half of the nineteenth century, however, Märṭulā Maryam’s leaders suddenly embraced a grandiose cultivated mythical history, appropriating the legendary fourth-century CE twin kings and saints, Abraha and Aṣbaḥa, as their co-founders. To add substance to the myth, a hagiography dedicated to the twin king-saints was written during the 1880s entitled Gādlā Abraha wa Aṣbaḥa. The construction of such a glorious mythical history necessitated a radical disavowal of Märṭulā Maryam’s actual past, including its medieval royal patron. Consequently, Queen Ǝleni was suddenly regarded as having had nothing to do with the institution’s origins.²

* An earlier version of this paper was presented on 9 April 2018 as a public talk given to mark the twentieth anniversary of the founding of the Center for African Studies at Rutgers University. I would like to thank the director of the centre, Genese Sodikoff, for inviting me to present it. I would also like to acknowledge my gratitude to Samantha Kelly for her incisive comments on the earlier version of this paper.

¹ Kleiner 2009, 45. Kleiner convincingly established that Ǝleni died in 1524, rather than 1522.

² Habtamu Mengistie Tegegne 2016, §§ 1–2; Hummel 2016, 35–72.
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Susanne Hummel has recently studied the circumstances of the writing of the hagiography of Abraha and Ašbõha and the homily of the Archangel Uriel (Dorsanä Ura’el) that took centre stage in the dispute over precedence and protocol between Dima Giyorgis, Märţulä Maryam and other churches during the latter nineteenth century. However, the context in which the Märţulä Maryam myth emerged and was propagated has not been given the attention it deserves. This study builds and expands upon Susanne Hummel’s recent work on the twin kings’ hagiography and the homily of Uriel by exploring why and how Märţulä Maryam’s extravagant foundation legend came to be.

Altering and rewriting actual events, myths and myth-making—especially myths of origin—is the stuff of history. As was the case in many societies, foundation myths had played a central role in shaping Ethiopia’s culture and identity. The Kabré någást was one such powerful and consequential foundation myth. Its text was the source of many traditions and values held sacred by the majority of Christian Ethiopians for centuries. Historians and anthropologists alike have produced extensive studies on the roles of myth and myth-making in identity construction, nation building, and social life for groups and individuals around the world. Yet why churches rewrite their foundation history and often claim ancient origins is a rarely asked question, especially in the Ethiopian context.

Since most origin myths cultivated by churches were used chiefly to emphasize their religious and cultural identity and had no practical use pertaining to social and economic rights, historians have simply ignored, mocked, or dismissed them. Enrico Cerulli reported the specious foundation myth of Märţulä Maryam as early as 1933, yet there was no follow-up on the issue until quite recently. My study seeks to remedy the oversight by focusing on the historical context in which Märţulä Maryam’s origin myth emerged. I will show that such myths did in fact exert significant social impact and served as a means of claiming economic, political, and spiritual privileges.

Two essential historical contexts for the birth of Märţulä Maryam’s origin myth will be considered. First and foremost, as noted by Hummel, nineteenth-century disputes over precedence that raged between the churches of Dima Giyorgis and Märţulä Maryam inspired competitive history rewriting and myth-making. A church based its seniority on the saintly figure(s) of its founder, combined with historical longevity; thus clergy of the oldest churches

---

3 Habtamu Mengistic Tegegne 2016, §§ 1–2; Hummel 2016, 35–72.
4 Brooks 1995, 119–174.
5 Lévi-Strauss 1978, 1–20; Ashton 2000, 1–69; and Lowenthal 1985, 1–6.
6 Cerulli 1933.
held more privileges, rights, ritual authority, and spiritual power than those posted to churches of later foundation. This tradition of seniority and deference based on longer history was behind the spurious attribution of Märtulä Maryam’s foundation to Abraša and Ašbāha.

Conflict between monasteries over religious ritual and doctrine was a common theme throughout Ethiopian history. The nineteenth-century dispute over precedence between Dima Giyorgis and Märtulä Maryam was a continuation of centuries of sectarian controversy between them. As we will see, prolonged religious debate fuelled the rivalry between churches. In that context, this study also briefly reviews key monastic and sectarian disputes within the Ethiopian Church that provided a powerful backdrop to the dispute between Dima Giyorgis and Märtulä Maryam.

The rewriting of Märtulä Maryam’s origins reveals two dimensions of history: its fragility and resilience. The poorly composed hagiography, Gādlâ Abraša wā’Ašbāḥa, which Hummel dates to the second half of the nineteenth century, posits a radical break with the past. Prior to the nineteenth century, the twin kings were never officially acknowledged as Märtulä Maryam’s founders. The consolidation of Märtulä Maryam’s origin myth therefore depended on erasing an important historical agent associated with its actual foundation. It should be mentioned at this point how the Märtulä Maryam clergy planned to erase the memory of historical founder Queen Ǝlēnī. In 1897 they convinced Emperor Mānīṣk II (r.1889–1913) to write to King Tāklâ Haymanot (ruled as Ras Adal from 1874 to 1881, as king from 1881 to 1901) of Goġga‘, instructing him to ensure that church records containing information contrary to Märtulä Maryam’s current origin myth be destroyed. This incident is the best example of the mutability of history; even today, its clergy defend Märtulä Maryam’s revised history with arrivate zeal.

The case is enlightening for investigating the very nature of history, historical writing, and the understanding and attitude of contemporaries toward the past and truth. Among other things, it shows that past events were regarded as mutable in order to legitimate the present. When and if the status and privilege of a powerful institution were at stake, the clergy of churches such as Märtulä

---

7 Maḥṭūm Śallaše Wăldă Māsğāl 1969–1970, 747–748 and 752–756.
8 Habtamu Mengistie Tegegne 2016, §§ 26–50; Hummel 2016, 55–57; Ḫaylâ Śallaše ʿAlāmāyyāḥu 1996–1997, 24.
9 Bartnicki and Mantel-Niecko 1969–1970, 31–37; and Taddesse Tamrat 2009, 206–230; Kindeneh Endeg Mihretie 2013, 45–70.
10 Hummel 2016.
11 Habtamu Mengistie Tegegne 2016, § 7; Habtamu Mengistie Tegegne 1998, 1–2.
Maryam had no qualms about rewriting and reinventing their past. It was the cultural mindset of the time that prevailed during the event of the royal assembly presided over by Emperor Menilik II which convened in early 1897 to investigate the dispute between Dima Giyorgis and Märṭulä Maryam that resulted in the acceptance of the twin kings hagiography as genuine.12

At the end of the day, however, the fabricated origin myth could not completely veil the truth of Märṭulä Maryam’s actual history. Efforts to erase the memory of the church’s real founder or to change unfavourable past records were doomed to fail for several reasons. Firstly, Märṭulä Maryam’s foundation by Queen Ţleni is factually secured in the chronicles and records of other churches over which it had no control. Secondly, material in the church’s treasury store and the physical edifice named after Ţleni survive to this day. Finally and essentially, a panegyric written in verse (excerpted below) that has also survived into our time records the deeds and contributions of Ţleni to Märṭulä Maryam.13 Thus, the distortion of Märṭulä Maryam’s history and the futility of its clergy’s efforts to erase memories of its founder simultaneously affirm both the resilience and fragility of the past.

Christological Controversies and the Construction of Institutional Identity

Exactly when Märṭulä Maryam’s fabricated foundation myth originated and by whom is uncertain. As noted above, the earliest surviving evidence of a myth proclaiming the church’s ancient foundation is the late-nineteenth century document Gädlä Abraha wāʾAṣḥā. What is clear, however, is that the seniority dispute with Dima Giyorgis was central to the growth of Märṭulä Maryam’s revisionist origin myth. Dima Giyorgis and Märṭulä Maryam had always found themselves on opposite sides of a monastic and sectarian controversy within the Ethiopian Church that spanned from the fifteenth to the nineteenth century. This controversy served to cultivate an emerging idea of the historical status and institutional identity of the two churches. As this background is so important in understanding how the foundation myth emerged, an overview of their rivalry follows.

A major religious and doctrinal controversy of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries concerned the well-known issue of Sabbath observance, pitting the Ewostatewos monastic order against that of Tāklā Haymanot. Taddesse Tamrat’s research shows that the Sabbath dispute was so explosive it threat-

12 Hummel 2016, 55–57; Habtamu Mengistie Tegegne 2016, §§ 7–25.
13 Habtamu Mengistie Tegegne 1998, 5–6; and Märṭulä Maryam, Goğğam, Märṭulä Maryam monastery, Gädlä Ewostatewos, fols 1–3.
ened to cause a disastrous schism in the entire Ethiopian Church. In 1450, an edict from King Zär’a Ya’qob (r.1434–1468) was issued in an attempt to settle the matter in favour of Ewostatewos pro-Sabbath faction.\textsuperscript{14} Despite being founded shortly after the resolution of the Sabbath controversy, Märṭulä Maryam’s clergy continued to adhere to the Ewostatewos Sabbath tradition, whereas Dima Giyorgis followed the opposite monastic tradition.\textsuperscript{15}

Two centuries after the 1450 Sabbath issue resolution, a theological controversy pitting the so-called ‘Unionist’ party against a so-called ‘Unctionist’ party consumed the attention of Ethiopia’s clergy, ruling class, and monarchs. And again, Märṭulä Maryam and Dima Giyorgis found themselves on opposite sides. As a study by Kindeneh Endeg Mihretie shows,\textsuperscript{16} the Christological debate was just as explosive as the Sabbath controversy of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. As a result, it robbed the Ethiopian Church of its basic unity and spiritual peace from the seventeenth to the late nineteenth century. Members of these opposing ecclesiastical groups competed for influence at the royal court and engaged in fervent debate throughout the second half of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{17} These ongoing debates served to articulate rival doctrinal positions and consolidate the self-perceived importance and superiority of the key protagonists.

The monasteries of Märṭulä Maryam and Däbrä Wärq in Goǧǧam adhered to the Unctionist position, while Dima Giyorgis took the Unionist side. Church youth were educated to believe in the superiority of their own monastery and the error of the opposing ones. In such protracted disputes there were always violent exchanges of words, each group calling the other ‘heretical’ or ‘ignorant’, thereby hardening sectarian divisions. The controversy resulted in the writing of many polemical texts, rebuttals, even poetry, extolling one’s favoured monastery while denigrating its rivals.\textsuperscript{18}

There are still extant examples in Goǧǧam of verses penned by clergy from rival monasteries glorifying their respective doctrinal positions. Dubbed qane, the verses and sayings cited below illustrate the identity that Unctionist followers created around their position. One saying runs, እትሁለስለ እኔ የይታይታይ ያ መስከረም መድሃኒቱ ያካት, literally, ‘For a diseased

\textsuperscript{14} Taddesse Tamrat 2009, 206–230.
\textsuperscript{15} Guidi 1903, 69–70 and 72.
\textsuperscript{16} Kindeneh Endeg Mihretie 2013, 45–70.
\textsuperscript{17} Bartnicki and Mantel-Niecko 1969–1970, 31–37; Guidi 1912, 17; Kindeneh Endeg Mihretie 2013, 45–70.
\textsuperscript{18} Getatchew Haile 1986; Getatchew Haile 1990, 1–35; Guidi 1893.
heart the word of faith qǝbat (oil, or butter) is the right medicine. The author is anonymous, but this appears to have been a stock Unctionist phrase from Däbrä Wärq and Märthal Maryam. The word qǝbat carries a double-entendre that can also mean ‘unction’. Hence the intended message is that Unctionist teachings are the only way to eternal salvation.

Another reads, ይቅባት፣ልጅበመጽሃፍ፣የጦጣልጅበዛፍአይቻልም, literally, ‘A son of an Unction excels in books; like the son of an ape in climbing trees’. This saying emphasizes the pride that Unctionist scholars took in their extensive reading. Naturally, the Unionists of Dima Giyorgis also prided themselves on the sophistication of their religious knowledge and responded in kind to the polemical qone of their rivals. Their saying, ይካባትይቀትልትርጓሜየሃዩ(2 Cor. 3:6?), or ‘Reading kills, while correct interpretation saves’, inferred that the reading and knowledge of their Unctionist rivals was superficial. During the later nineteenth century, when the Unctionist faction was banned by a religious council under Emperor Yohannas IV (r.1872–1889), a woman in Goğgam reportedly composed the following poem:

‘In the market of Damot nug is expensive
In the market of Goğgam nug is expensive
The stew is alaça, oh I miss qǝbat (oil).

In her poem nug refers to a crop grown for its edible oil and used to make a spicy stew. The word qǝbat in the last line has the double meaning of ‘oil’ and ‘unction’. This and similar poems indicate how seriously such matters were taken, not only within monastic orders, but also in popular culture. The dispute continued for several centuries and came to an end only around the end of the nineteenth century. It provided a powerful backdrop to the growth of Märthal Maryam’s foundation myth.

The religious controversies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were an important influence in Märthal Maryam’s growing sense of institutional identity, consciousness, and prestige that ultimately led to the desire to invent a glorious ancient past that would exceed the status of its rivals, which in turn heightened the pre-existing centuries-old discord with Dima Giyorgis.

19 Habitamu Mengistie Tegegne 1998, 42.
20 Ibid., 15.
21 Ibid., 15.
22 Libanos Yätämäň, oral informant interviewed at Däbrä Marqos, April 2008.
The rivalry between Dima Giyorgis and Mārtulā Maryam was played out in the public arena, as well as at the royal court, banquet halls, and memorial services, as these were all influential social spaces. Strict ceremonial regulations and a rigid hierarchy were observed during public events. Meals on major Christian holidays and commemorative feasts were also highly ritualized. Lay and clerical dignitaries entered the royal banquet hall in strict order as to who would sit ‘above’ or ‘below’ their colleagues, according to their respective status. 23 Opulent banquets regularly given by Goğam’s King Täklä Haymanot for the clergy of Däbrä Marqos and the surrounding countryside provide a representative example. These ceremonial gatherings were observed and extensively written about by the Goğam historian Täklä Iyäsu Waqqara, who also partook in the meals. Täklä Iyäsu writes that the clergy of the churches in and around the town of Däbrä Marqos were admitted to the banquet hall in sequence and took their places according to their respective status. The highest-ranking clergy from senior churches, in this case Däbrä Marqos, entered the hall first and sat at the front or centre close to the king; others were placed further away from the king, while the lower-ranking clerics were generally admitted last. 24

This protocol suggests that the entrance of low-ranking individuals was delayed until the senior clerics entered. Similarly, the highest-ranking clergy were served first, followed successively by those of lower rank. Täklä Iyäsu also noted that Däbrä Marqos clergy were served using special drinking vessels according to their status. 25 The rationale underlying the banquet hall entry protocols is not stated. It is clear, however, that entering among the first was a greatly valued privilege and an indicator of higher social rank. When clerical dignitaries received deferential treatment at court, the prestige of their ecclesiastical institutions increased accordingly.

Commemorative feasts (täzkăr), religious festivals, and banquets were punctuated by prayers and recited benedictions at the beginning and end. On these occasions, clerics from the highest status churches gave the blessings and prayers before and after the meal. Mämhør Gäbrä Iyäsu, a cleric of Däbrä Marqos, led the blessing or grace during meals at King Täklä Haymanot’s court. Giving the benediction during a memorial feast was also extremely important, a matter of pride and a tribute to one’s honour and high status. 26 The

23 Kropp 1988; Maḥṭämä Śollase Wäldä Mäsqäl 1969–1970, 747–748 and 752–756.
24 Girma Getahun 2014, 244.
25 Ibid., 244–245.
26 Habtamu Mengistie Tegegne 2016, §§ 7–14; Girma Getahun 2014, 246.
entire ritual of the entrance, seating, and prayers preceding and accompanying royal banquets and religious festivities, was all designed to reflect status and rank.

Inevitably, public and state occasions brought church dignitaries into close physical proximity and contact, fuelling competitiveness leading to disputes, for instance over who was worthy to enter the royal court and banquet hall first. The roles of giving the benediction and leading prayers were just as highly prized and considered a means for exhibiting one’s social standing and were also subjects of hot dispute.27

The first recorded instance of a public dispute between Dima Giorgis and Mārtulā Maryam clergy over precedence and protocol occurred during the reign of the Goğam governor Dağgāc Dāsta (r.1865–1873). Clerical and lay dignitaries from the two rival Goğam churches had assembled at the town of Bicāna for the memorial of Dağgāc Tādla Gʷalu (d.1865), father and predecessor of Dāsta. The dispute incident was dramatic and later recorded by Täklī Iyāsus Waqgora. This encounter prefigured court battles to come over the foundation myth of Mārtulā Maryam and its supporting hagiography later in the nineteenth century as the following evidences:

Abba Qämmaw Dāsē [Dağgāc Dāsta], the ‘brigand of the throne’, was sitting on [his father’s] couch comfortably; and while he carried out the memorial service for his father, Dağgāc Tādla, in Bečāna, [the clergy of] Dima [Giyorgis] and Mārtulā Maryam quarreled [prior to the commencement of the memorial feast].

Then [intending] to arbitrate, Dağgāc Dāsta put them on the right and left [sides of the banquet hall] and suggested letting them in through two doors. Upon this Raq Masārya Gobāzé [of Dima Giyorgis], breaking into jest as was his habit, made an insulting remark, saying [to him], ‘And why do you say this to us as though you were a child?’ Dağgāc Dāsta was made an object of sarcastic remarks as there had been a rumour that he was not the son of Dağgāc Tādla; so the former spoke [of this] to him openly. Dağgāc Dāsta was incensed by Raq Masārya Gobāzé’s remark and unleashed [his] soldiers on [the clergy], saying, ‘I have blessed their turbans and clothes for you!’ Thereafter, the clergy of Dima [Giyorgis] decided not to let Raq Masārya Gobāzé follow them.28

---

27 Habtamu Mengiste Tegegne 2016, §§ 7–14.
28 Girma Getahun 2014, 125.
Commemorative feasts were among the most important religious practices of Christian Ethiopia and had deep historical roots. The essence of these observances was to commemorate the deceased with prayer and food, yet these were not simply memorial and feasting events. Täklä Iyäsus’ account does not include all the facts about the ceremony or reasons behind the quarrel between the clergy of Dima Giyorgis and Märtulä Maryam. As noted above, high-ranking officials attending commemorations used these occasions to publicly parade their exalted status and assert their influence and authority, which depended greatly on the order in which they entered the banquet hall and were seated to eat and drink.

With issues of social status and spiritual rights and privileges at stake, heated exchanges were to be expected during the feast held to memorialize Tädla G’alu. His son Dästa tried (unsuccessfully, however) to resolve the dispute by suggesting that the clergy of both churches enter the banquet hall at the same time through different entrances. Consequently, the two churches carried on a constant battle with one another throughout the rest of the nineteenth century over the rights of benediction and who was to enter the banquet hall first during commemorative feasts.29 Competition for prestige and influence at the royal court only amplified pre-existing tensions between the two institutions.

Prior to the final court battle held sometime in February 1897, the continuing controversy over the precedence of Dima Giyorgis and Märtulä Maryam inspired many chants, hymns, verses, puns, and sly retorts by rival clergy, especially when members of both groups met on public and state occasions. Each institution strove to assert its greater antiquity while at the same time seeking to prove its counterpart’s less prestigious foundation. A typical hymn composed to glorify Märtulä Maryam while denigrating its rival is quoted below. It was composed by a cleric named Mäggabi Haylu. Such hymns appear to have been composed at the height of the foundation controversy during the nineteenth century.

29 Hummel 2016, 55–69; Habtamu Mengiste Tegegne 2016, §§ 5–20.
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‘Lord of Heaven, the Trinity, created a counterpart for Adam
For the church of the (twin)-kings, verily the likeness of Adam;
They created none like unto it.
Its architecture surpasses all man-made churches that came after it.
Since all churches follow the precedent of its regulations,
It became leader of churches for the greatness of its regulations.
It received this virtue from no one, but was with it from the beginning,
derived by its nature;
Precedency was graciously bestowed upon it by (God) the Father.\(^{30}\)

The above text greatly praises the magnificence and splendour of the architecture of the church of Abraha and Asbaha. According to its author, Märtulä Maryam was truly God’s marvellous construction and the equal of his other splendid creation, Adam, the first man. However, while God created a companion to Adam, corresponding to him in virtue and beauty, the church of Märtulä Maryam was without equal in grandeur and magnificence. The beauty and spectacular excellence of its architecture were such that a more beautiful and splendid church could not be found in the entire world. As with its architecture, no other institution equalled the church of Märtulä Maryam in the greatness and soundness of its laws and regulations.

In a paper published in 1933, a more remarkable and assertive hymn attesting to the antiquity of Märtulä Maryam and critical of Dima Giyorgis’s claim of greater antiquity was published by Enrico Cerulli. According to the unknown author of the hymn, no other church could surpass Märtulä in antiquity. He therefore dismissed the claim of other churches to greater antiquity as suspicious and implausible.\(^{31}\) Thus, Märtulä Maryam not only excelled in all types of virtue and distinction over any church in the country but had far greater antiquity than any other.

At a certain point during the seniority controversy, someone representing Märtulä Maryam’s position composed the following beautiful but provocative phrase in a qǝne: ወማርለ የማለማይ ይ הזכיר የማየለ ይበቀ እንፈለት በደለለ ይቹዉ, ‘Märtulä Maryam (is) like hair growing in the middle of the head (domab)’.\(^{32}\) The word domab carries a double meaning; as domab, the head can be understood as the church of Dima Giyorgis. Thus, this qǝne suggests that Märtulä Maryam is the superior church. Naturally, the clergy of Dima Giyorgis challenged the credibility of its competitor’s claim and one of its

\(^{30}\) Ayyāhu Ǝskāzziya, oral informant interviewed at Märtulä Maryam, July 1997.
\(^{31}\) Cerulli 1933, 106–107.
\(^{32}\) Habtamu Mengistie Tegegne 1998, 43.
supporters replied ለባት ሞትሰ ይ ት ላ ጸ ይ ወ ድ ህ ሰ ይ ተ ር ፍ which literally means ‘hair could be removed (shaved), but the head (dǝmah) remains intact’. In this qǝne, the unknown cleric dismisses Märtulä Maryam’s recent foundation while asserting the deeper historical roots of Dima Giyorgis.

Legitimizing the myth of Märtulä Maryam’s apparent ancient origins required the underpinning of an acknowledged written text. Since the story of its co-foundation by Abraha and Ašbaha was not documented, it first had to be invented, then defended and promoted. The nineteenth-century creation of the hagiography concerning the twin kings Abraha and Ašbaha must therefore be understood in this context. The Dima Giyorgis clergy quickly and vehemently challenged the hagiography’s authenticity and the manner of its acquisition, as they stood to lose significant profile, prestige, and material, spiritual, and political benefits if the myth’s proclamation was successful. Remarkably, in early 1897 a royal court presided over by Emperor Manilak II decided in favour of the revised Märtulä Maryam history, despite Dima Giyorgis having a more plausible narrative and factually stronger case. That fateful royal court decision turned an essentially fabricated foundation myth into an honourable past and undisputable historical fact.

It is very likely that the Märtulä Maryam’s leadership first petitioned King Täklä Haymanot of Goǧgäm before turning to King Manilak II. Thus, Märtulä Maryam’s 1897 legal victory came at the tail end of long preparation for having the foundation myth accepted in all its particulars. The construction of this myth and the intense rivalry over primacy between the two institutions proved long-lasting and intense.

Forgetting Queen Ǝleni

The clergy of Märtulä Maryam not only worked hard to construct a fabricated account of their monastery’s mythical origins, but also intentionally set about concealing and suppressing the memory of their actual founder. One of the instructions King Manilak II sent to King Täklä Haymanot after the court ruling of 1897 was to ensure that all records in Goǧgäm which contradicted Märtulä Maryam’s revised history be expunged. ‘Since the clergy of Märtulä Maryam have said that there are records in church [collections within Goǧgäm] which assert that Märtulä Maryam was not founded by Abraha and Ašbaha’, the emperor wrote, ‘let such writing in churches be deleted’.

---

33 Habtam Mengistie Tegegne 1998, 43. See also Hummel 2016, 56.
34 Habtam Mengistie Tegegne 2016, §§ 4–9; and Hummel 2016, 55–57.
35 Habtam Mengistie Tegegne 2016, § 7.
measures the clergy of Märṭulá Maryam and Täklä Haymanot took to enforce the erasure and secure the legitimization of their invented history were not recorded. But it is certain that Märṭulá Maryam clergy carried out a number of actions and measures to destroy the legacy and memory of their true founder, Queen Ŭlēni, and perpetuate the cult of their mythical founders.

Among other things, the clergy of Märṭulá Maryam interpolated the names of the twin kings into their records by deleting and overwriting the name of Queen Ŭlēni, the original founder. A case in point is the manipulation (Fig. 1) of one of the most prized illuminated Täʾammǝrä Maryam manuscripts in the church’s possession. The manuscript’s donor, Libariyos, was abbot of Märṭulá Maryam during the late eighteenth century. In the colophon of this manuscript, Märṭulá Maryam was originally identified as being a church built by Ŭlēni. But sometime in the nineteenth century Ŭlēni’s name was erased and the name of Abroha, one of the twin kings, was interpolated. It now reads (italics
mine): “This book which belongs to Mārtulā Maryam, *church of Abraḥa*, was sponsored to be copied by Mämhǝr Libariyos.”

As noted previously, the composition of *Gädlä Abraḥa wāAṣbǝḥa* was a decisive moment in the reception and propagation of Mārtulā Maryam’s origin myth throughout Ethiopia. The clergy of Mārtulā Maryam regarded their fabricated hagiography of the twin kings as a valuable record, as shown by their continued copying of it even after the 1897 legal victory. As further corroboration, they also had copied *Gädlä Sālama*, a narrative dedicated to Sālama, first bishop of the Ethiopian Church, who was popularly believed to have converted Abraḥa and Aṣbǝḥa to Christianity. In this way, the myth rapidly became regarded as factual and a popular part of Mārtulā Maryam’s history.

Other strategies of the church included naming or renaming many places in and around Mārtulā Maryam after the twin kings or *Abuna* Sālama and celebrating the anniversaries of their deaths. Other places were named after events involving either the twin kings or *Abuna* Sālama, such as alleged visits during the construction of Mārtulā Maryam; some of these names include Sālamge, Abraḥa, Zenawo, and Adisge.

Mārtulā Maryam’s foundation myth appears in the work of the Goǧǧam historian Täklä Iyäsus. Writing a decade after the debate and court proceedings in 1897, Täklä Iyäsus repeats the story almost verbatim, including the freshly-named places referring to Abraḥa, Aṣbǝḥa, or Sālama in his genealogical book on Goǧǧam, further solidifying the spread and currency of the Mārtulā Maryam ancient origin myth among church scholars of that time. In addition, a hotel, elementary school, junior school, and senior preparatory school in the town of Mārtulā Maryam are all named after Abraḥa and Aṣbǝḥa. And even more recently, a church dedicated to *Abuna* Sālama has been built on a hilltop called Sālamge, north-east of Mārtulā Maryam. Queen Ǝleni is practically erased from any official account of the church’s history.

Given its implausibility, Mārtulā Maryam’s origin myth should have been dismissed as fake and quickly forgotten. However, with the exception of the Dima Giyorgis community, it became rapidly accepted in Goǧǧam and beyond. Many Ethiopian churches had ample opportunity to expose the fictitious foundation myth, but for various reasons lacked the motivation to do so. Firstly, they hesitated to challenge Mārtulā Maryam because they had no aspi-

---

36 Collegeville, MN, St. John’s University, Hill Museum & Manuscript Library, EMDA 00010, *Tāʾammǝrä Maryam* (= HMML EMDA 00010), fol. 248v.
37 Mārtulā Maryam, Goǧǧam, Mārtulā Maryam monastery, *Gädlä Sālama*.
38 Mǝtǝkku Dämǝle 2002–2003, 39.
39 Täklä Iyäsus Waqǧǝra 2010–2011, 26–27.
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rations of raising their own status regionally or nationally. Secondly, the church of Abraha and Aṣbaḥa in Tigray province collaborated with Mārtulā Maryam in composing its mythical history.40

Finally, Mārtulā Maryam enjoyed good rapport with churches such as Dābrā Wārq, which regarded it as its mother monastery. A verse composed sometime during the 1897 court litigation or shortly afterwards by Qesā gābāz Gobāze, a Dābrā Wārq cleric, further illustrates the rapid acceptance of Mārtulā Maryam’s origin myth.

‘Mārtulā Maryam compares with its creator (God);
In heaven without mother, on earth without father
He created all creatures in his likeness.
In like manner, it (Mārtulā Maryam) created the sacrifice Dābrā Wārq
that would glorify him (God).
The later-founded Dābrā Wārq church never opposes the first-founded church.
Based on the history we learned from our elderly fathers,
We, the learned men, will tell you (the parents) who have begotten it.
Her father is Eden Paradise (the second heaven upon earth),
Her mother is (the heavenly) Jerusalem.’41

In this poem, Gobāze enthusiastically endorses the origin myth, indicating that Dābrā Wārq accepts the seniority and primacy of Mārtulā Maryam. His poem also shows that, in the course of the twentieth century, the myth became invested with the conviction of undisputed historical fact.

40 Hummel 2016, 61–67; Habtamu Mengistie Tsegue 2016, §§ 48–54.
41 Ayyāhū ḳskāzziya, oral informant interviewed at Mārtulā Maryam, July 1997.
Fig. 2 Däbrä Marqos, Goğğam, Debre Markos University Documentation Center, Märtulä Maryam files, Zone/Ad/0309, ‘From the clergy of Märtulä Maryam to Däggazmač Šahayu Ḫone Ṣollase’ (22 November 1963).
The church of Märtulä Maryam continually promoted its foundation myth by including it with official correspondence and petitions addressed to regional and central authorities. One such petition, dated 23 November 1963, went to the then governor of Goğgam, Däğgazmač Šāhāyū Ŭnqu Śällase, requesting government financial assistance in paying the salary of teachers at the Märtulä Maryam monastery school. The letter opens with a brief account of the foundation myth, stating that while the history of Märtulä Maryam is well known among government officials, they have included it in case Šāhāyū is not familiar with it.

‘Even if your honour is familiar with the history (lit. ‘situation’) of Märtulä Maryam, we have deemed it important to include it below as it (will help to show the church’s significance and explain) the current problem we encounter. That the church of Märtulä Maryam is the most ancient and oldest of all churches in Goğgam is documented in history and is common knowledge among the kings and noblemen. Its founders were Abrahā and Ašbasha. The head of this church participates in the coronation ceremony of Ethiopian kings by presenting the globe to the king. For instance, during the coronation ceremony of His Majesty Ḥaylā Śällase I, the head of our church participated by presenting the globe to the king of kings. Besides being recorded in the Book of Coronation published contemporaneously to the (coronation of Ḥaylā Śällase) and in the book titled Zəkrā nágār, this fact was broadcast on radio and appeared in newspapers.’

42 Däbrä Markoš, Goğgam, Debre Markos University Documentation Center, Märtulä Maryam files, Zone/Ad/0309, ‘From the clergy of Märtulä Maryam to Däğgazmač Šāhāyū Ŭnqu Śällase’ (22 November 1963).
The document cited above is an example of the social and religious consequences resulting from the acceptance of Mārtulā Maryam’s origin myth. Its claim of ancient history boosted its influence, prestige, and status as a spiritual centre. The head of the monastery participated in the 1930 coronation ceremony of Emperor Ḥaylā Šollase I, which took place in Addis Abāba. During this ceremony, a sword, royal staff, spear, crown, holy oil, royal vestments, globe, and ring were presented to the king by senior clerics selected from the country’s oldest churches. The globe, which possibly symbolized the world under a Christian God, was presented to the king by the head of Mārtulā Maryam, whose participation in the coronation of Emperor Ḥaylā Šollase was the upshot of its legal success against Dima Giyorgis in which the foundation myth had been put to practical use. The efforts of Mārtulā Maryam’s clergy had invented an entertaining grand mythical-historical narrative.

The Resilience of the Past

For all the public commitment to their cause, it is tempting to suspect that the clergy of Mārtulā Maryam knew the weakness of their dispute with Dima Giyorgis. The protracted preparation time for their final legal showdown and the need for a poorly composed hagiography support this view. Despite the legal victory in Mārtulā Maryam’s favour, the invented history could not completely veil its true origins, which were securely recorded in traditions of the church and in written documents. Thus, destroying the old and actual ties between the church and Queen Ėleni proved harder than fabricating new ones between the church and Abrāha and Ašbaḥa. There were, and still are, both foreign and Ethiopian sources of written evidence countering Mārtulā Maryam’s foundation myth. Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the clergy of Mārtulā Maryam commonly attributed their church’s foundation to Queen Ėleni. Today, its ruins remain as relics of a glorious past, a memorial to Mārtulā Maryam’s true founding by Queen Ėleni during the late fifteenth century. Further to which, royal chroniclers during the reigns of King Iyasu I (r.1682–1707) and his grandson Iyasu II (r.1730–1755) recognized Mārtulā Maryam as having been founded by Ėleni.

The records and material culture of Mārtulā Maryam itself unsettle its fabricated myth of ancient origin. Not only was the tampering of unfavour-

43 Maḥṭūmā Šollase Wāldā Māsqāl 1969–1970, 747–748 and 752–756.
44 Guidi 1912, 17; 1903, 72.
able historical records easily detected, but erasing the memory of Queen Ǝleni from the minds of local people was never completely successful. And the ruins of a once formidable enclosure wall surrounding Märṭulä Maryam bears Ǝleni’s name as a constant reminder that she was the true founder. The colophon to the Täʾammǝrä Maryam manuscript of the church provides the best example of obvious tampering. The name of Abraha was interpolated by erasing the name of Ǝleni, but not without leaving traces (see Fig. 1). The same manuscript has a beautiful illustration of Queen Ǝleni, King Bäʾǝdä Maryam, and the clergy of the church of Märṭulä Maryam (see Fig. 3). Finally, although inaccessible to most people, a royal raiment (or vestment) conferred by Ǝleni to her church still exists in the Märṭulä Maryam treasury.

Fig. 3 HMML EMDA 00010, fol. 10r, King Bäʾǝdä Maryam, Queen Ǝleni, and the clergy of Märṭulä Maryam.

45 HMML EMDA 00010, fol. 10r.
What is more, the resilience of the past is demonstrated clearly through a surviving panegyric in the records of Märtulä Maryam itself, extolling Queen Ǝleni’s virtuous life. Although she enjoyed a rare popularity in late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century Ethiopia, only in Märtulä Maryam do we find a written source that so affectionately and warmly cherishes her memory. The untitled text, found inscribed in the flyleaves of a parchment manuscript of Gädlä Ewostatewos, eulogizes Ǝleni’s life and achievements. Its form and content reflect conventional features of a mälkǝ’ (literally ‘image’), written exclusively to honour people regarded as saints. A typical mälkǝ’ includes chanted prayers, supplications, and hymns expressing gratitude, love, and praise. The mälkǝ’ was and still is a daily prayer, usually recited by individuals during private devotions, but it can also be used during public worship. I have designated the document under discussion as Mälkǝ’a Ǝleni (literally ‘The image of Ǝleni’). This mälkǝ’, whose author and date of composition are unknown, contains sixty verses. It could have been written shortly after Ǝleni’s death. The fact that Mälkǝ’a Ǝleni survives at all indicates that there was perhaps disagreement among the clergy of Märtulä Maryam itself concerning the church’s fabricated origin story and the ethics of tampering with actual records of its past. The content of this work emphasizes the debts of gratitude the community owed to Ǝleni. The first lines read as follows:

46 Märtulä Maryam, Goǧǧam, Märtulä Maryam monastery, Gädlä Ewostatewos, fols 1v–3r.
47 Belcher 2015, 24–25.
'Hail your name’s blessed memory
And to the gracefully braided hair on your head.
For you have laid its foundation first,
Your church of Mārtulā Maryam bows and says this everyday:
“Queen Ǝleni, hail to you.”
Hail to your head adorned with crown,
And to your face which is fairer than lightning.
Ǝleni, pray to your omnipotent God;
In times of grief and tribulations, your children
Truly trust in you.
Hail to your eyelashes and eyes that shine like the stars.
Queen Ǝleni, you who stand observing canonical obligations,
Let not your people see before small penance,
The eye of grave and cruel death.'
Jesus Christ. She was as generous as Saint Mary and embodied the essence of righteousness and salvation. She had neither erred in her life nor ever strayed from the paths of justice and orthodoxy. She forsook the world and dedicated her life to prayer. She did good works and was of good character. As a vessel of the Holy Spirit and resident in the house of holiness, her lips knew no gossip and her speech embraced tolerance. She followed rules faithfully and the writer even salutes her shoulder that faithfully carried ‘the burden of law and regulation’ (ፀወ ር ተ ህ ግ ወ ሥ ር ዓ ት). In one verse, Ǝleni is likened to and addressed as ‘dove of mercy’. For all these inner qualities, angels glorify and salute her, for her virtues seem almost infinite.

The author of this melka thus emphasizes the deep ties that bound Märṭulä Maryam to Ǝleni and extols her intercession and prayer. He reminds the church of the great trust it had placed in the power of Ǝleni’s prayer, especially in times of sorrow and tribulation. He beseeches her to pray diligently and continually to God, asking for forgiveness and salvation on behalf of her children; that is, the community of Märṭulä Maryam. She is entreated to relieve their pain and hardship and protect them from the dread of cruel death. Significantly, the author also beseeches Ǝleni to shield him with her wings from the false speech of an evil generation and to cleanse his soul of impurities, asking that her arms support him from falling under the weight of his sin. Finally, he again expresses grateful devotion to Ǝleni for founding Märṭulä Maryam, as follows:

‘Hail to your legs and to your knees, which are well proportioned (lit. ‘united’).
Queen of rulers, Ǝleni, the happiness of the throne of the king of kings. We, the people of your house, tell news of your splendid deeds in every region; For it is apt for children to tell the splendid deeds of their mother And to commemorate her anniversary every year.’

52 Ibid., fol. 1v.
53 Ibid., fol. 2r.
Mälkǝʾa Ǝleni thus demonstrates the deep love and gratitude felt by the Märtulä Maryam monastery toward their pious royal founder, through lines such as, ‘Ties of love bound Märtulä Maryam to Ǝleni’. Indeed, the queen was the pride of the community. The work then describes how Ǝleni died at Märtulä Maryam peacefully and without pain and was subsequently buried at Däbrä Nägʷädgʷad. The author concludes by praising Ǝleni’s value as worth all the precious gifts sent by the Queen of Sheba to the biblical King Solomon.

The identity of Märtulä Maryam and the gratitude it owed to its founder as depicted in Mälkǝʾa Ǝleni is clearly impossible to reconcile with the mythical history of its origin as invented by a later generation of its monastic community. Although historians consider the twin kings Aброha and Așbǝḥa implausible as real-life figures, they nevertheless came to assume a central and prestigious place in the origin myth of Märtulä Maryam. Regarded as Ethiopia’s first Christian kings and revered as saints, Aброha and Așbǝḥa exerted symbolic and strategic influence in the nineteenth century construction of Märtulä Maryam’s antique origin. In popular folklore they were renowned as church-builders and among the most revered saints in the Ethiopian Church. Their legend gained wider popularity and ecclesiastical respectability during the twentieth century, when Aброha and Așbǝḥa were nationally venerated as saints.

Between Fiction, Myth, and History

The case of Märtulä Maryam illustrates the manifestation of a larger theme. The nineteenth-century composers of its revisionist foundation myth and supporting hagiography reveal contemporary attitudes toward the past and to factual truth. The cultural, social, and religious issues underlying the dispute between the churches of Dima Giyorgis and Märtulä Maryam can be difficult to unravel for contemporary understanding today. But there remains little doubt that winning the battle of legal precedence and historical seniority was so all-consuming that Märtulä Maryam clergy went to great lengths to completely rewrite their history and in the process disown their actual founder. Recognition of pre-eminence was critical for monastic communities, as they stood to gain increased prestige for their church institutions, which in turn ensured them of economic, spiritual, and social benefits.

54 Ibīd., fol. 3r (አምስትያ በፋር ጉልባት መርጉት የግርም እስከ ከፋ)
55 Hummel 2016, 36–40.
To what actual extent are the Märṭulä Maryam origin myth and its hagiographic underpinning works of fiction? In the Märṭulä Maryam area, the cult of the twin kings Abrǝha and Aṣbǝḥa never existed prior to, or independently of, the nineteenth-century origin myth and its composers; they were, in fact, conjured into existence from nothing. In significant ways, therefore, the origin myth and its parallel hagiography may be accurately likened to literary fiction in that they are free inventions of the human mind. Unlike modern historical scholarship, myth-makers and hagiographers are not constrained by the requirements of evidence or credibility in the sourcing and construction of their stories. In a sense, they espoused the concept of ‘alternate truth’, proving that this form of revisionism is not unique to the twenty-first century.

The historian Hayden White has noted that historical writing shares many features with literary fiction; the borderline between the genres is not sharply defined. He describes the process of constructing historical narrative as being ‘essentially a literary, that is to say fiction-making, operation. And to call it that in no way detracts from the status of historical narratives as providing a kind of knowledge.’ White and those who support his views have denied the existence of a clear distinction between historical and fictional narrative.

In the context of my discussion, however, myth-makers and hagiographers differ from novelists and historical scholars in both epistemology and methodology. Hagiography writers, while imaginative in their own right, were still limited by the norms of hagiographic structure and form. Unlike the fiction of novelists, myth-making and hagiography in the Ethiopian church tradition were acts of devotion; hagiographers did not regard their work as untrue. Thus the origin myth of Märṭulä Maryam and its hagiographic inscription should not be read as showing general indifference to historical accuracy, or seen as an abuse of the past in the service of current economic and social needs. In short, such hagiographies as that of Märṭulä Maryam should not be judged by modern standards of historical scholarship. In order to rightly understand the action of the royal court that approved Märṭulä Maryam’s revised origin myth and the attitude of the myth-makers and hagiographers who constructed it, we must accept that their standards of evidence, their notions of truth, and their attitudes toward the past radically differ from our own.

56 Habtamu Mengistie Tegegne 2016, §§ 26–28.
57 White 1978, 85.
58 Belcher 2015, 18–30.
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This is why it is important to place Mārtulā Maryam’s origin myth and its supporting hagiography within the broader context of pre-modern textual practice, within Ethiopia and beyond. In the past, history was perceived as dynamic and mutable, a narrative able to legitimize and give meaning to the present. The culture of imaginative hagiographic writing, and even forgery, in the medieval West is particularly illuminating in this case. Historian Derek Pearsall argues that, unlike their modern successors, people then had a ‘flexible attitude’ toward truth and falsehood and were more ‘fully aware than we are, perhaps, that truth is a cultural artefact, or that a truth under the guarantee of a higher Truth does not have to answer petty questions about authenticity. If it was good that something be true, people believed it was true.’ Pearsall adds that, ‘since the function of the life of a saint is to bear witness to the truth of faith in God, it could be said that in some sense their lives are always already known even if they never lived them [...] In the interest of this kind of Truth, fiction and invention are not falsehood.’ I believe this same premise also applies to the Ethiopian context of Mārtulā Maryam.

Like their medieval and later European counterparts, Ethiopians embraced flexible attitudes toward truth, which made writing down definitive lives of the saints problematic. Most hagiographies in Ethiopian church collections were written long after saints’ deaths, so the particulars of their lives were impossible to know. Some of those for whom we do have hagiographies, such as the twin kings Abrāha and Aṣbəḥa, are now known never to have existed at all as living, breathing human beings. And, as noted, those who did actually walk among us have had much of their narrative left to the liberal use of the hagiographers’ imaginations. This is a major reason why hagiographic texts are so rigidly formulaic in their norms and standards. The hagiography of twin kings Abrāha and Aṣbəḥa closely adheres to stereotypical hagiographic traditions; it abounds with miracles performed by the two saints, not only during their lifetimes but also after their deaths. In keeping with hagiographic tradition, the miracles performed by saints are ultimately attributed to God. Having grown jaded with miracles, people in nineteenth-century Ethiopia seemed to have no difficulty accepting the hagiography of Mārtulā Maryam as genuine.

Pearsall 2003, 5.
Ibid, 8.
For the most recent statement about the genre of Ethiopian hagiography see Belcher 2015, 22–30.
Hummel 2016, 43; Haftamu Mengistie Tegegne 2016, §§ 36–39
This is understandable, as cults of the royal saints Abrəḥa and Aṣbəḥa had existed in parts of Ethiopia at least since the fifteenth century. Furthermore, part of the hagiography of Abrəḥa and Aṣbəḥa concerned with Aksum is not entirely or necessarily inaccurate,\(^{63}\) as there was no authoritative source to consult on ancient Aksumite history. In this and other cases, the absence of concrete, documented information about many aspects of ancient Ethiopian church history, including that of its first Christian kings, created many opportunities for the growth of folklore. On these grounds, it would have been difficult to disprove the claims of Märṭulä Maryam’s clergy. In light of the foregoing discussion, they were simply adding substance to myth by ‘documenting’ through hagiography a story long accepted as genuine.

**Conclusion**

This study has explored the context and content of the rewritten foundation history of the church of Märṭulä Maryam which took place during the late nineteenth century. The virtually uncontested acceptance of Märṭulä Maryam’s mythic altered origins by its clergy and the royal assembly of Emperor Manilik II reveals their collective understanding of concepts such as ‘truth’ and ‘evidence’. The evidence presented in my research confirms that in nineteenth-century Ethiopia both ecclesiastical and secular authorities perceived history to be mutable and dynamic, and that the past must be shaped to serve the present. On this assumption, the clergy of Märṭulä Maryam reframed the early history of their church to fit contemporary needs of the late nineteenth century and on into the turn of the twentieth century. In doing so, they disowned Queen Ėlēnī, the actual founder of their church, and claimed in her place the legendary Aksumite kings Abrəḥa and Aṣbəḥa. However, this study also demonstrates the resiliency of the past, for Märṭulä Maryam’s constructed origin myth could never completely obliterate the factual history and legacy of its actual founder.

Although the case of Märṭulä Maryam shows people’s willingness to rewrite the past in the service of current and future needs, I have also argued that the church’s foundation myth and its supporting hagiography are not identical to modern fiction. The standards of truth and the relations between truth and fact were different then. To the clergy of Märṭulä Maryam, the foundation myth and the allied text of Gädlä Abruḥa wī’Aṣbbaḥa was anything but fiction. The myth is regarded by the church to this day as a

---

\(^{63}\) Hummel 2016, 40; Habtam Mengistie Tegegne 2016, §§ 26–29.
serious account of heritage and origin. The epistemology of hagiographic writing and writers is sharply different from the epistemology of modern historical scholarship. Unlike modern historical scholarship, which is based on the gathering of data and responsible interpretation of evidence, in hagiographic writing, miracles, for instance, are a legitimate method by which truth is established.

Märṭulä Maryam’s success in inventing, defending, and disseminating its re-imagined foundation myth was primarily due to a favourable political, religious, and cultural milieu in which the myth was generated, received, and legitimized. Without a receptive audience and permissive political and religious culture, such an extravagant claim could never have been constructed in the first place, much less have any chance of success in court. Nineteenth-century Ethiopians were very familiar with the wondrous miracles performed by saints in the very many mythical narrative texts such as the well-known epic of the Kabrā nāgāś. Having grown overly accustomed, even jaded by them, they appear to have had no qualms in accepting the fictitious account of Märṭulä Maryam’s origin.

This study has demonstrated that the nineteenth-century competition for status and seniority, preceded by doctrinal and Christological debates of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries between the churches of Dima Giyorgis and Märṭulä Maryam, framed the essential historical context from which Märṭulä Maryam’s new foundation myth and its supporting hagiography emerged. Fuelling this competition was the promise of status, prestige and spiritual influence to be gained by those churches whose seniority entitled them to participate in state, ecclesiastical, and public occasions. The rights and privileges of such participation depended on verified claims to greater antiquity. As Märṭulä Maryam lacked the genuine antique origin needed to gain or keep coveted ceremonial privileges, its clergy resorted to myth-making and outright forgery to claim its pre-eminence. Only by re-fashioning history could Märṭulä Maryam exceed its competitors as an institution that had precedence over all others. Consequently, a new originating narrative was compiled, along with the supporting hagiography of the twin kings Abruha and Aṣbəba, whose legal acceptance marked a successful outcome for the monastery church of Märṭulä Maryam.
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**Summary**

The growth of a myth of ancient origins pertaining to the church and monastery of Märtulä Maryam and the exploration of its content and context form the central focus of this study. Material related to the church’s apparent ancient origin provides appropriate data through which to illustrate at once the themes of historical fragility and resilience. Märtulä Maryam consolidated its mythical history by suppressing the memory of its actual founder, thus altering the tradition of the church itself. This study will demonstrate that efforts to completely erase the memory of Märtulä Maryam’s founder and its original history were wholly in vain. Such acts of suppression inevitably leave indelible traces of the true past, not to mention the fact that its actual history is well secured within the records of other Ethiopian churches, as well as in those of Märtulä Maryam itself.