

Territories, ecclesiastical jurisdictions and centralization process: the improvement of the Ethiopian Patriarchate Authority (1972-1983)

Stéphane Ancel*

In June 1983, the Patriarchate General Assembly of Parish Council took place for the first time at the central headquarter of the Ethiopian Patriarchate in Addis Ababa under the chairmanship of Patriarch Täklä Haymanot (1976-1988).¹ This assembly represented the higher level of the new ecclesiastical administration, gathering members of the ecclesiastical decision-making body of the Ethiopian Orthodox Täwahedo Church (EOTC) and their executioners. The EOTC had been trying to establish this new administration linking parishes with the decision-making body since 1972.² Thus, this event in 1983 represented the last step of the administrative building process. The authority of the bishops was the basis of the new administration. Under the supervision of the Patriarch, they became both members of decision-making body and executioners. Bishops exercised their authority over their diocese. And within each parishes of the diocese was established a council, gathering clergymen and parishioners which should execute decisions of the bishop. From then on dioceses and parishes were delimited by clear frontiers and these territories embodied clear ecclesiastical jurisdictions. In fact, ecclesiastical jurisdictions for which territorial limits defined alone extent of authority represented something new in Ethiopia. And I will show, through this communication, how and why this situation was a repercussion of the ongoing centralization process of the Ethiopian Church. Aiming to centralize Church administration, Ethiopian political power and higher authorities of the Church changed in 1972 criteria of jurisdiction's definition. Limits of a territory became the only one criterion which defined the extent of ecclesiastical jurisdictions.

* Ludolf Centre for Ethiopian Studies, Universität Hamburg, Germany & Centre d'Études des Mondes Africains (CEMAF, UMR 8171, CNRS, Université Paris-I, EPHE, Université de Provence), Paris, France.

¹ In 24-28 *genbot* 1975 E.C. Cf. EOTC, 1979 E.C.: 9-13.

² Haile Leul Siyoum, 1990; Essubalew, 1980: 22-32.

The first steps of the centralization process of the Ethiopian Church

Between 1924 and 1959, *ras* Täfäri Makwännen, as Haile Selassie was known before becoming king of kings of Ethiopia in 1930, strove to persuade the Coptic authorities to allow an Ethiopian monk to be consecrated archbishop of Ethiopia and to entitle the latter to consecrate bishops³. In fact, the issues at stake were: firstly, the creation of a central ecclesiastic authority, constituted by the archbishop; secondly, to allow this archbishop to consecrate his agents, the bishops, and to send them to the regions; and finally, to enable the royal power to control the nomination by proposing Ethiopians for the posts. The main steps of the establishment of Ethiopian bishopric are well-known by historians actually.⁴

After some years of negotiations with Coptic authorities, Täfäri Makwännen succeeded in obtaining an agreement with them. In 1929-1930, five Ethiopian monks were consecrated as bishops (*pappas*). However, they stayed under the authority of the Coptic metropolitan (*liqä pappasat*) Qerlos (1929-1950). Between 1936 and 1941, this system collapsed because of the Italian occupation of Ethiopia. Italians broke off unilaterally the bond uniting the Coptic Church and the Ethiopian Church. They chose an Ethiopian as archbishop and gave him authority to consecrate Ethiopian bishops. However, the Ethiopian archbishop and all of the new Ethiopian bishops were promptly excommunicated by the Coptic authorities. After 1941, Haile Selassie did not want to take charge of this Italian heritage. So he pursued negotiations with Coptic Church. In 1948, a second agreement with Coptic Church was signed. Coptic Church accepted again to consecrate Ethiopian monks as bishops. And again the latter had to stay under the authority of metropolitan Qerlos. Among new Ethiopian bishops was the *echägé* Gäbrä Giyorgis who took the name Baselyos (1948-1970). In 1950, the Coptic metropolitan Qerlos died and in 1951 Baselyos became the first Ethiopian archbishop (*liqä papassat*). He could exercise the real archbishop's power and he himself consecrated Ethiopian bishops. In 1959, Baselyos became finally the first Patriarch of Ethiopia.

But in providing Ethiopia with Ethiopian bishopric, Haile Selassie tried also to create an ecclesiastical decision-making body. In 1931, he established an ecclesiastical central authority around a college composed by the Coptic metropolitan and the five Ethiopian bishops. They exercised authority over priests and deacons ordinations, over consecration of the churches, and also they could give ruling about dogma and discipline.⁵ But as it is saying before, this system collapsed with the Italian invasion. In 1942, waiting for an agreement with Coptic Church about bishopric, Haile Selassie decided to entrust to the *echägé* Gäbrä Giyorgis the management of the new ecclesiastical council of the EOTC. This council had authority to propose and to choose the ecclesiastical chiefs of all religious institutions of the Ethiopian Church and to supervise all secular affairs of

³ *Ras* Täfäri presented for the first time his proposals to the Coptic authorities in 1924 during his visit to Cairo. Cf. Erlich, 1998: 64-84.

⁴ Murad, 1950-1957: 1-22; Adugna Amanu, 1969; Shenk, 1972; Mara, 1972; Gärima Täfära, 1949 E.C.: 90-91; Erlich, 2000: 23-46; Wudu Täffätä, 2010: 15-27.

⁵ Mähtämä Sellasé, 1942 E.C.: 549.

the Church.⁶ The same decree established a treasury centralizing the income of the churches. In 1948, Ethiopian bishops became members of the ecclesiastical council in adding to it traditional duties of bishops in Ethiopia.

Centralisation and new diocese's frontiers

During the centralization process, the extent of bishop jurisdiction changed. And within the Ethiopian kingdom, the authority of bishops is becoming confined on clear territorial limits. Ethiopian bishops received territories to exercise their duties in Ethiopia. But the delimitation of dioceses did not reflect the ecclesiastical situation. It reflected only the political context.

In fact, the need to grant territorial jurisdictions to bishops within Ethiopia came up for the first time in 1883 during the reign of king Yohannes IV (1872-1889). Three Coptic bishops received one individual diocese in 1883: Pétros (1881-1921), Luqas (1881-1899/1900) and Matéwos (1881-1926).⁷ Each bishop was associated to the most powerful princes at that time. And their ecclesiastical jurisdiction was confined to the territory under the control of "their" prince.⁸ In giving in 1931 dioceses to the new Ethiopian bishops, Haile Selassie pursued Yohannes's plan: to reflect the political context, not the ecclesiastic one, in the dioceses limits. But Haile Selassie avoided to model limits of one diocese on limits of one prince's territory. The diocese's limits included territories controlled by many different princes. In other words, this situation guaranteed that agreements between regional power and bishopric could not be a threat to Haile Selassie's power.⁹ Limits of dioceses changed again after the end of Italian occupation. When Baselyos was consecrated as archbishop of Ethiopia in 1951 and could consecrate himself Ethiopian bishops, the frontiers of dioceses followed the frontiers of the new administrative regions.¹⁰ Each administrative province accommodated a bishop between 1951 and 1953.¹¹

From 1948, bishops joined the central ecclesiastical council of the EOTC. In theory, bishops' duties increased. In addition to their traditional duties, they could hope to supervise secular affairs of the Church. But also, bishops acted as agents of the central authority within the diocese frontiers. From then on, in theory, the management of secular and religious affairs was based on a territorial logic. But

⁶ *Nägarit Gazéta*, 30 November 1942 (21 *bedar* 1935 E.C.).

⁷ Simon, 1885: 344-345; Pollera, 1926: 165-166; Guébré-Sellassié, 1930, vol. 1: 303. See the map n°1.

⁸ At their arrival, the four Coptic bishops had got the same rank. They were metropolitan (*pappas*). Because he was the bishop of the king of kings Yohannes, Pétros ensured the title of *liqā pappasat*. But he had not real authority over the other bishops. Luqas and Matéwos exercised exclusive authority over their land. Cf. Borelli, 1890: 118; Perini, 1905: 340.

⁹ Mahtämä Sellasé, 1942 E.C.: 551-554. See the map n°2.

¹⁰ EOTC, 1950 E.C.: 206-207; Märsha Aläheñ, 1997 E.C.: 41-61, 121-152, 158-168; Adugna Amanu, 1969: 63; Mara, 1972: 79-82. See the map n°3.

¹¹ Except Balé province which accommodated a bishop, Märqoréwos I, in 1960. For the other provinces: Eritrea: Marqos I, Tegray: Yeshaq I, Gondär: Mika'él II, Wällo: Gäbre'él II, Goğğam: Marqos II, Shoa: Baselyos I, Harärgé: Téwofelos I, Wälläga: Ya'eqob I, Ilubabor: Tadéwos I, Käffa: Gorgoryos I, Gamo Gofa: Säwiroos II, Sidamo: Timotéwos I, Arsi: Luqas II.

during the 1950s and the 1960s, the new policy was not a success. Bishops had not real means to supervise the management of the income of all churches located within their dioceses and the EOTC was showing an enormous deficit.¹² The difficulties of the EOTC during that period can be explained by its administrative situation. In establishing bishops all over Ethiopia, Haile Sellassie included a new type of authority without removing the old system. But the previous system was an extremely complex one in which bishopric had only a weak authority and for which a territory did not define alone the limits of an ecclesiastical authority.

Before the Haile Selassie's policy, the only bishop of the country was an Egyptian metropolitan archbishop whose nomination depended exclusively on the authority of Patriarch of Alexandria.¹³ But the metropolitan could not use powers related to his position. He could not consecrate bishops and thus he could not create an episcopal administration.¹⁴ Besides, his role was far from any real ecclesiastical power. He could only ensure a sacramental role.¹⁵ But he could not appoint ecclesiastical chiefs of churches or monasteries.¹⁶ Also, his authority over discipline and doctrine was extremely limited. The ecclesiastical authority of the Coptic bishop was a weak one. In that situation how bishops could claim more power even being Ethiopian?

Haile Selassie tried to solve this problem in using his sovereignty over the EOTC. In fact, the kings of Ethiopia claimed a hegemonic position within the Church. At first, kings could appoint the ecclesiastical chiefs of the churches and monasteries which they founded themselves. In founding churches, kings created this way their own ecclesiastical network throughout the country.¹⁷ Also, kings of Ethiopia could control the appointment of some regional ecclesiastical chiefs and high abbots of great monastic networks. This situation enabled kings to control the appointment of the powerful abbot of the Däbrä Libanos monastery, the *echägé*, who claimed authority over many monasteries in Ethiopia.¹⁸ But, numerous types

¹² Shenk, 1972: 235-238; Göricke and Heyer, 1976: 196.

¹³ According to a pseudo-canon of the council of Nicea, Ethiopians could not be consecrated as metropolitan archbishop for Ethiopia. See Guidi, 1897: 23-24 (text); Guidi, 1899: 29 (tr.); Mauro da Leonessa, 1942: 50 (text), 78 (tr.); Vööbus, 1982: 62 (text), 55-56 (tr.).

¹⁴ Still now, we don't really know if before the 13th century the Coptic metropolitan could consecrate bishops in Ethiopia. Cf. Munro-Hay, 1997: 181-182 and 189. But, from the 13th-14th centuries, in the Coptic Church, the Patriarch of Alexandria became the only one who could consecrate bishops. Cf. Périer, 1922: 746. From then on, the metropolitan archbishop of Ethiopia, coming from Egypt, could not thus consecrate bishops like his counterparts officiating in Egypt.

¹⁵ About his role in the ordination process, see: Alvares, 1961, vol. 2: 348-359; Lobo, 1728: 341-343; Bruce, 1790, vol. 5: 664-666; Kur, 1968: 6-7 (text), 5 (tr.); About his role in the consecration of the churches, see: Kur, 1968: 43-44 (text), 33 (tr.); Conzelman, 1895: 54 (text), 153 (tr.); Basset, 1882: 45 (text), 152-153 (tr.). About his role in the coronation ceremony, see: Sciarrino, 1994: 150-151; Peirera, 1892-1900: 123-124 (text), 95-96 (tr.); Basset, 1882: 36 and 77 (text), 148 and 193 (tr.); Guidi, 1910-1912: 171-172 (text), 181-182 (tr.).

¹⁶ Nevertheless, he could play a role in the foundation of a church. Cf. Wion, 2004: 269-278.

¹⁷ Crummey, 2000: 29; Derat, 2003: 272-283.

¹⁸ No ecclesiastical position had a hegemonic jurisdiction. The *echägé* had authority over all monasteries which claimed a spiritual link with the saint Täklä Haymanot (d.1313). This jurisdiction represented a really wide one over monasteries but not the only one. The *echägé* was elected by monks but many

Territories, Ecclesiastical Jurisdictions and Centralisation Process

of political and religious forces could in the same time disturb the ecclesiastical sovereignty of kings actually. At first, regional princes could also control the appointment of important ecclesiastical positions.¹⁹ Secondly, the independent feeling of monastic communities was a brake on the authority of kings. Abbots and members of powerful monastic networks tried to keep their independence and to preserve their traditional jurisdiction from the royal power.²⁰ Less than an example of a “natural” sovereignty, kings’ authority over churches was the result of an agreement with each religious institution. If the royal ideology claimed an omnipotent authority over the Church, we can tell that this hegemonic power did not exist by fact.²¹ The ecclesiastical system at that time was an extremely complex one which could be seen more as a decentralised system rather than a centralised one. Each component of the ecclesiastical society had to stay in its jurisdictional limits as determined by agreement or tradition. The jurisdictional limits were extremely fluid, not only determined by a territory but also by the relationship between a religious institution and another one. An abbot could supervise institutions located in different regions.

Haile Sellasie tried to impose the idea that bishopric could embody the ecclesiastical authority in creating the ecclesiastical council in 1942 as the central decision-making body. Also, he improved his own sovereignty over the EOTC.²² But apparently, it was not enough. The ecclesiastical council in Addis Ababa could control the appointment of the heads of all churches in Ethiopia. But nothing obliged the heads of religious institutions to be supervised by a bishop, even less when an ecclesiastical chief as authority over numerous institutions not located in the same diocese. Because of the complexity of the previous system, we can understand that in establishing dioceses as jurisdictional limits of the bishop, the latter could not efficiently supervise and control the management of all religious institutions located in it.

1972-1983: creation of parish councils

So, the higher personalities of the Church wanted to improve the authority of bishops over the regional clergy. They decided, with the help of the political power to create a new administration linking the parishes to the ecclesiastical council in Addis Ababa. And this new administration aimed at establishing the territory as the only criterion to define all ecclesiastical jurisdiction extents.

times the kings could dismiss him. See Rossignol, 2004: 130-134. See the case of *echäggé* Segä Krestos, dismissed by king Iyasu I in 1682. Cf. Cerulli, 1944: 178-179; Guidi, 1903: 63 (text), 61-62 (tr.).

¹⁹ Conti Rossini, 1907: 189-190; Guébré-Sellassié, 1930, vol. 1: 66 (footnote n°6), 112; Nosnitsin, 2007: 578-579.

²⁰ Derat, 2003: 137-173.

²¹ I am aware of the evidences pointed out by scholars about the hegemonic power of the king over the Church. Cf. Shiferaw Bekele, 2001: 103-111. But the study of the limits of this power permits to reserve judgement about the hegemonic kings’ role in Church administration.

²² Haile Sellasie could promulgate all types of regulation about ecclesiastical affairs. See the article 127 of the Ethiopian Revisited Constitution of 1955 published in M. Perham, 1969: 461.

The second Patriarch of Ethiopia, Téwofelos, signed in 25 October 1972 a decree, called *Qalā Awadi*.²³ This decree aimed at establishing, in all parishes, a council gathering priests and parishioners in charge of managing the Church's property and organizing parish life. The Patriarch put parish councils under the control of the diocese. The election of the council members, their decisions and the budget of the parish should be submitted to the diocese and approved by it.²⁴ Thus, the bishop could hope to play a central role in the spiritual and secular management of the parishes of his diocese. However he did not become an independent regional authority and stayed an agent of Addis Ababa. He was also involved in an administrative chain linking the parishes with the central decision-making body.²⁵ And for the first time in Ethiopia, a central authority had a say about the management of all the parishes: the Ethiopian Patriarchate in Addis Ababa.

The reform of 1972 caused a great upheaval in ecclesiastical jurisdiction's definition. For the first time in a legal text, a definition for a parish was proposed in Ethiopia. And the criterion of residence within a territory became the only one criterion of parish membership. To be considered as parishioner of a church, the decree established that a person had to live within a territory.²⁶ Before this decree, the parish membership was defined by many criteria. Faithful had two types of bonds linking them to their church: a spiritual one and a fiscal one. This situation created two different spaces, spiritual and fiscal. So, the notion of parish territory was extremely fluid. A church had rights on lands (*rest*, *rim* and *gull*).²⁷ And these lands created a territory under the fiscal jurisdiction of the church. But of course, churches' influence was not defined only by its land ownership. People had also a spiritual bond with a church. And the establishment of this spiritual bond did not depend only on a residence criterion. The parish membership could be conditioned only by participation to religious services in a church and the payment of a financial contribution.²⁸ So, in theory, the spiritual influence of a church was based on personal bonds linking individuals with the church rather than on spiritual authority over a specific territory. Of course, in many cases, a territory could be the embodiment of the spiritual influence of a church. People living near the church established spiritual bonds with it easier than people living far away. And most of the time, a strong affiliation between the church and the community of people living in the same territory was established.²⁹ But, the "spiritual territory" did not create the personal bonds, but at the contrary, the personal bonds created the spiritual space. And because the residence within a territory was not the only

²³ *Nāgarit Gazēta*, 25 October 1972 (15 *Teqemt* 1965 E.C.). Quoted below as *N.G.* 1972.

²⁴ *N.G.* 1972: articles 6 and 8.

²⁵ The Patriarchate created three other types of councils gathering clergymen and laymen at the level of the *awraǧǧa*, the diocese and the Patriarchate. Each grade of the administration had to give account to their hierarchical superiors. Cf. *N.G.* 1972: articles 13, 14 and 15.

²⁶ *N.G.* 1972: article 3.

²⁷ About the land ownership of the churches during the 20th century, many studies are available. Cf. Hoben, 1973; Mantel-Niecko, 1980; Berhanu Abebe, 1971.

²⁸ Result of interviews carried on Goǧǧam, Dābrā Marqos, about parishioner status before and after the establishment of parish councils. Cf. Ancel, 2006: 276-353.

²⁹ Hoben, 1973: 66-68.

criterion of parish membership, parish territory was extremely fluid and its frontiers were not clearly defined.

So in explaining the new parishioners' role, the decree of 1972 had to define clearly what the limits of the parish territory are. To translate the notion of parish territory, the authors of the decree decided to join together two preexisted notions: the notions of *säbäkä* and *atbya*. On the one hand, *säbäka* was used to define the spiritual influence of a church. But it was not a legal notion. On the other hand, *atbya* represented a civil jurisdiction (the neighborhood). The decree of 1972 assimilated these two notions to create the new notion of parish territory. The jurisdiction of the parish council was supposed to be the *säbäka* of the church.³⁰ But to be considered as parishioner, a person had to live within the frontiers of the *atbya*.³¹ So the *atbya* define the extent of the spiritual influence (*säbäkä*) of a church and define the parish's territory. The authors of the decree decided to contain the spiritual influence of a church within the *atbya* frontiers. Then the criterion of residence became the condition of parish membership. But there was an important consequence. The jurisdiction of all ecclesiastical chiefs in Ethiopia was contained and limited by clear territorial frontiers. Basically, this situation brought to the end the network system linking churches located in different region.

This reform had been very difficult to set up.³² And the Patriarchate expended a lot of energy to establish it. Urgent dispatching of emissaries from Addis Ababa at both diocesan and parish level, were required to convince, submit and impose the reform. Lack of communication, difficulties of access to regions could explain this situation. But also resistance could be observed from the local clergy. The lack of goodwill among the clergymen, who saw themselves as losing their prerogatives, was one of the factors slowing down the establishment of the reform. And finally, the Ethiopian revolution in 1974 delayed the establishment of the parish councils.

Nevertheless, the new Patriarch Täklä Haymanot (1976-1988) continued to focus on the establishment of parish councils, despite the discharge of its main instigator, Téwofelos in 1976. Since the land reform of 1975, the Church had lost all its income. So it became important for the Church to rationalize the management of parish income. Parish council reform was seen as an absolute necessity.³³ Patriarch Täklä Haymanot announced in May 1978 a new *Qalä Awadi* which proposed new regulations concerning the parish council reform.³⁴

In fact, we have to admit that the *Qalä Awadi* of 1978 did not propose really new things. The involvement of the laymen had been of course increased and more seriously codified. But the definition of the parish council was the same than the one given in 1972.³⁵ Also, the *Qalä Awadi* of 1978 placed the parish under the

³⁰ N.G. 1972: article 3.

³¹ N.G. 1972: article 8-3b.

³² Ancel, 2009: 925-952.

³³ Däbrä Marqos, East Goğgam Archives, *Patriarchate to all the dioceses*, letter n°9949/762/68, 18 August 1976 (12 *Nabasé* 1968 E.C.).

³⁴ Däbrä Marqos, East Goğgam Archives, *Patriarchate to all dioceses*, letter n°612/70, 4 May 1978 (26 *Mijazya* 1970 E.C.).

³⁵ EOTC, 1970 E.C.: 8.

authority of the diocese and each ecclesiastic chief had to exercise authority within a specific territory. Again different levels were established to link the parishes to their diocese and to the Patriarchate in order to improve the centralization. The highest level of this administrative structure was the general assembly of the Patriarchate, chaired by the Patriarch himself. And the Patriarchate assembly had the power to establish regulations concerning parishes.

Writing a text depicting regulations was not enough to ensure its application and the Patriarchate was aware of it. The Patriarchate organized a series of instructive seminars to explain the reform. In each diocese, the faithful and the priests could meet officers from the Patriarchate main office.³⁶ Discussions undertaken during these meetings pointed out that the *Qalä Awadi* of 1978 needed to be amended. A new text was thus published in December 1981.³⁷ The *Qalä Awadi* of 1981 reasserted the total authority of the bishops over the elections at the different levels below him.³⁸ The authority of the Patriarchate had also been reaffirmed.³⁹ From 1983, the administrative system was ready. The elections for each grade were organized and the general assembly of the Patriarchate could, for the first time, be gathered, in June 1983. From then on, the authority of the Patriarchate over all church affairs was established. Its agents, the bishops could exercise a real ecclesiastic authority over the local clergy and could execute the decision taken by the central ecclesiastical authority.

Thanks

The first draft of this paper was presented during the international conference entitled “Territories of Ethiopia: Histories, Spaces and Powers”, organised by Claire Bosc-Tiessé and Marie-Laure Derat in December 10 to 12, 2008, at the French Centre for Ethiopian Studies, Addis Ababa. I am grateful to all participants for their comments and critics.

Bibliography

- Aduḡna Amanu, 1969, *The Ethiopian Orthodox Church Becomes Autocephalous*, Bachelor Essay of Art, Addis Ababa University.
- Alvares F. = Beckingham C.F. & Huntingford G.W.B., 1961, *The Prester John of the Indies. A true relation of the lands of the Prester John being the narrative of the Portuguese Embassy to Ethiopia in 1520 written by Francisco Alvares*, Cambridge, 2 vol.
- Ancel S., 2006, *Épiscopat et encadrement des pratiques religieuses en Éthiopie chrétienne contemporaine: caractéristiques et évolution*, Thèse de doctorat, INALCO, Paris.
- Ancel S., 2009, L'Église orthodoxe d'Éthiopie à la veille d'une révolution (1971-1974): réforme et mainmise sur la gestion des paroisses, *Cahiers d'Études Africaines*, 196, 925-952.

³⁶ Cf. Yāmanā Berhan, 1980.

³⁷ EOTC, 1974 E.C.

³⁸ EOTC, 1974 E.C.: 7-8.

³⁹ EOTC, 1974 E.C.: 10-11.

Territories, Ecclesiastical Jurisdictions and Centralisation Process

- Basset R., 1882, *Études sur l'histoire d'Éthiopie*, Paris.
- Berhanu Abebe, 1971, *Évolution de la propriété foncière au Choa, du règne de Ménélik à la constitution de 1931*, Paris.
- Borelli J., 1890, *Ethiophe méridionale, Journal de mon voyage aux pays Ambara, Oromo et Sidama de septembre 1885 à novembre 1888*, Paris.
- Bruce J., 1790, *Voyages aux sources du Nil, en Nubie et en Abyssinie, pendant les années 1768, 1769, 1770, 1771 et 1772*, Paris, 5 vol.
- Cerulli E., 1944, *Gli abbati di Dabra Libanos, capi del monachismo etiopico, secondo la lista rimata (sec. XIV-XVIII)*, *Orientalia*, 13 (1), 137-182.
- Conti Rossini C., 1907, *Historia Regis Sarsa Dengel (Malak Sagad)*, Paris (CSCO 20-21, Script. Aeth. 3-4).
- Conzelman W. E., 1895, *Chronique de Galawdevos (Claudius), roi d'Éthiopie*, Paris.
- Crummey D., 2000, *Land and Society in the Christian Kingdom of Ethiopia*, Addis Ababa.
- Däbrä Marqos, Est Goğğam Archives, *Patriarchate to all dioceses*, letter n°612/70, 4 May 1978 (26 *Miyazya* 1970 E.C.).
- Däbrä Marqos, Est Goğğam Archives, *Patriarchate to all the dioceses*, letter n°9949/762/68, 18 August 1976 (12 *Nabasé* 1968 E.C.).
- Derat M.-L., 2003, *Le domaine des rois éthiopiens (1270-1527). Espace, pouvoir et monachisme*, Paris.
- EOTC, 1950 E.C., ፲፮፡ ባስልዮስ፡ ሊቀ፡ ጳጳሳት፡ ኢትዮጵዛዊ።, Addis Ababa.
- EOTC, 1970 E.C., ቃለ፡ አዋዲ፤ የሰባ፡ መንፈሳዊ፡ ጉባኤ፡ ደንብ።, Addis Ababa.
- EOTC, 1974 E.C., ቃለ፡ አዋዲ፤ የሰባ፡ መንፈሳዊ፡ ጉባኤ፡ ማሻሻያ፡ ደንብ።, Addis Ababa.
- EOTC, 1979 E.C., የሰባ፡ መንፈሳዊ፡ ጉባኤን፡ ለማቋቋምና፡ ለማጠናከር፡ የተደረገ፡ የአራት፡ ዓመት፡ ጥረትና፡ ውጤት, Addis Ababa.
- Erlich H., 1998, Ethiopia and Egypt, Ras Tafari in Cairo, 1924, *Aethiopica*, 1, 64-84.
- Erlich H., 2000, Identity and Church: Ethiopian-Dialogue: 1924-1959, *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 32 (1), 23-46.
- Essubalew, 1980, Toward the Democratization of the Church, in *The Gospel of Development/Yälemat wängäl*, (2), 22-32.
- Gäräma Täfära, 1949 E.C., *Gondäré bägashaw*, Addis Ababa.
- Göricke F. and Heyer F., 1976, The Orthodox Church of Ethiopia as a Social Institution, in *International Jahrbuch für Wissens-und Religionssoziologie*, 10, 181-239.
- Guébré-Sellassié, 1930, *Chronique du règne de Ménélik II, roi des rois d'Éthiopie*, Paris.
- Guidi I., 1897, *Il Fetba Nagast o Legislazione dei Re*, Roma.
- Guidi I., 1899, *Il Fetba Nagast o Legislazione dei Re, codice ecclesiastico e civile di Abissinia*, Roma.
- Guidi I., 1903, *Annales Iobannis I, Iyasu I et Bakaffa*, Paris (CSCO 23-25, Script. Aeth. 6-8).

- Guidi I., 1910-1912, *Annales Regum Iyasu II et Iyo 'as*, Louvain (CSCO 61-66, Script. Aeth. 28-29).
- Haile Leul Siyoum, 1990, *The Ecclesio-Social Role of the Parish Council in the Reorganization Process of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church*, Department of Sociology and Social Administration, Senior Essay, Addis Ababa University.
- Hoben A., 1973, *Land Tenure Among the Amhara of Ethiopia: The Dynamics of Cognatic Descent*, Chicago.
- Kur S., 1968, *Actes de Samuel de Dabra Wagag*, Louvain (CSCO 287-288, Script. Aeth. 57-58).
- Lobo J., 1728, *Relation historique d'Abissinie*, Paris.
- Mähtämä Sellasé Wäldä Mäsqäl, 1942 E.C., ጠከራ ገጦር።, Addis Ababa.
- Mantel-Niecko J., 1980, *The Role of Land Tenure in the System of Ethiopian Imperial Government in Modern Time*, Varsovie.
- Mara Y., 1972, *The Church of Ethiopia, The National Church in Making*, Asmara.
- Märsha Aläheñ, 1997 E.C., ሆና ጳጳሳት ኢትዮጵያውያን።, Addis Ababa.
- Mauro da Leonessa P., 1942, Le versione etiopica dei canoni apocrifi del concilio di nicea secondo i codici vaticani ed il fiorentino, *Rassegna di Studi Etiopici*, 2 (1), 29-89.
- Munro-Hay S. C., 1997, *Ethiopia and Alexandria, the metropolitan episcopacy of Ethiopia*, Wiesbaden.
- Murad K., 1950-1957, La dernière phase des relations historiques entre l'Eglise copte d'Egypte et celle d'Ethiopie (jusqu'en 1952), *Bulletin de la Société d'Archéologie Copte*, 14, 1-22.
- Nägarit Gazéta, "Regulation for the Administration for the Church", 30 November 1942 (21 *bedar* 1935 E.C.).
- Nägarit Gazéta, "Kale Awadi", 25 October 1972 (15 *Teqemt* 1965 E.C.).
- Nosnitsin D., 2007, Liqä kahanat, in S. Uhlig (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Aethiopica*, vol. 3, Wiesbaden, 578-579.
- Periera E., 1892-1900, *Chronica de Susenyos, rei de Ethiopia*, Lisboa, 2 vols.
- Perham M., 1948, *The Government of Ethiopia*, Londres.
- Périer J., 1922, *La perle précieuse (Patrologia Orientalis, vol. 16)*, Paris.
- Perini M., 1905, *Di qua dal Marèb*, Florence.
- Pollera A., 1926, *Lo stato etiopico e la sua Chiesa*, Rome/Milan.
- Rossignol E., 2004, *L'aqqabé sa'at et l'eççägé : deux hauts dignitaires éthiopiens entre l'Eglise et l'Etat (16^{ème}- 18^{ème} siècles)*, Mémoire de maîtrise, Université Paris I-Sorbonne.
- Sciarrino J.-F., 1994, *Le "Ser'atä Qwerhät"*, recherche sur le cérémonial éthiopien du sacre des rois des rois avant le XVI^{ème} siècle, Mémoire de D.E.A., Université Paris I-Sorbonne.

Territories, Ecclesiastical Jurisdictions and Centralisation Process

- Shenk C. E., 1972, *The Development of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church and Its Relationship with the Ethiopian Government from 1930 to 1970*, Ph. D. thesis on Religion, New-York University.
- Shiferaw Bekele, 2001, The Shadowy Bishops of the Ethiopian Church in the First Millennium of its History (4th to 14th Centuries): a Review Article, *Journal of Ethiopian Studies*, 34 (1), 103-111.
- Simon G., 1885, *L'Éthiopie, ses mœurs, ses traditions, le négouss Iohannès, les églises monolithes de Lalibéla*, Paris.
- Vööbus A., 1982, *The Canons Ascribed to Mārūtā of Maipherqat and related sources*, Louvain, (CSCO 439-440, Script. Syri. 191-192).
- Wion A., 2004, Why Did Fasilädäs Kill His Brother? Sharing Power in the Royal Family in Mid-Seventeenth Century Ethiopia, *Journal of Early Modern History*, 8 (3-4), 259-293.
- Wudu Täffätä, 2010, የኢትዮጵያ ኦርቶዶክስ ተዋሕዶ ቤተ ክርስቲያንን ከቅብጥ ቤተ ክርስቲያን ጎጥኝነት ነጻ ለማወጣት የተደረገ ጎግል፣ ከ፲፱፻፲፰-፲፱፻፶፩ ዓ.ም., *Journal of Ethiopian Church Studies*, 1, 15-27.
- Yämanä Berhan, 1980, [Unpublished report], Parish Council Department, Ethiopian Patriarchate Main Office, Addis Ababa.

Abstract / Résumé

Ancel S., 2011, Territories, ecclesiastical jurisdictions and centralisation process: the improvement of the Ethiopian patriarchate authority (1972-1983), *Annales d'Éthiopie*, 26, 167-178.

The Ethiopian Orthodox Täwahedo Church (EOTC) knew great upheavals during the 20th century. At first, Ethiopian bishops could be consecrated in bringing to the end the old agreement with the Coptic Church. Secondly, a central ecclesiastical making-decision body could be created. All religious and secular affairs of the EOTC could be like that supervised as a whole. Thirdly, parish councils could be established in each parishes of the country, improving like that the supervision of the properties and the income of the EOTC. These three great upheavals aimed at establishing a centralized administration and participated to the creation of a totally new ecclesiastical administration. The destiny of the old ecclesiastical jurisdictions during this process is still difficult to estimate. So, this paper aims at establishing the consequences of the centralization process of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church in the ecclesiastical jurisdiction definition in Ethiopia. As a preliminary study led by the author, it showed that, thank to the centralization process, the territory became the only criterion to define the extent of an ecclesiastical jurisdiction in Ethiopia.

Keywords: church, territory, jurisdiction, bishop, parish council.

Territoires, juridictions ecclésiastiques et processus de centralisation : amélioration de l'autorité du patriarcat éthiopien (1972-1983) – L'Église orthodoxe d'Éthiopie a connu de grands bouleversements durant tout le xx^e siècle. En premier lieu, des évêques éthiopiens purent être consacrés, ce qui mit fin à l'accord qui prévalait jusqu'alors avec l'Église copte. Deuxièmement, une autorité centrale put être créée et ainsi, toutes les affaires religieuses et séculières de l'Église purent être supervisées comme un tout. Troisièmement, des conseils de paroisse furent installés dans toutes les paroisses du pays afin d'améliorer la gestion des biens et des revenus de l'Église. Ces bouleversements sont à compter parmi les étapes qui jalonnent le processus de centralisation de l'Église orthodoxe d'Éthiopie, processus qui amena la création d'une toute nouvelle forme d'administration ecclésiastique en Éthiopie. Mais le destin des anciennes juridictions ecclésiastiques lors de ce processus reste encore difficile à appréhender. Cet article se propose d'étudier les conséquences du processus de centralisation sur la définition même de ce qu'était une juridiction ecclésiastique en Éthiopie. Ne s'agissant que d'une étude préliminaire, cet article montre que durant le processus de centralisation, le territoire devint le seul et unique critère définissant l'étendue d'une juridiction ecclésiastique.

Mots-clefs : Église, territoire, juridiction, évêque, conseil de paroisse.