

# Rome and the Malabar Church

(By K. N. Daniel)

I read Fr. Schurhammer's paper in *Gregorianum* (Vol. XIV, pp. 62-86) and the one given *supra* the MS. of which was sent to me for my reply by the editor. The Rev. Father has tried to prove in these papers that the Church of Malabar was Roman Catholic before the advent of the Portuguese to India, & the Chaldean Church, with which Malabar was in communion, was also Roman Catholic.

This theory which had been put forward by the late Fr. Nidiry was rejected by all the European Roman Catholic scholars. But Fr. Schurhammer has adopted it now.

Before proceeding to review the position advanced by him along with the Romo-Syrians of Malabar, I must offer my heartfelt thanks to him for the documents he has brought to light. What we want is a real picture of our forefathers, not a beautified one, but false. Any document which reveals their merits or faults is quite welcome. Seeing our forefathers as they were, we will try to emulate their merits & avoid their faults. I, therefore, request Fr. Schurhammer to make further researches and contribute to this journal as many articles as possible on the history of our community.

As to the position he has advanced he was, I think, persuaded by the following books which he mentions: *The Syrian Church in Malabar* by Fr. J. C. Pan-

jikaran, M. A., Ph. D., D. D., D. C. L., and *A Brief Sketch of the St. Thomas Christians* by Fr. Bernard of St. Thomas, T. O. C. D.

I propose to write below a pretty long article on the subject, inviting to it the special attention of the learned Fr. Schurhammer.

## Part I

### *The Malabar Church.*

*Evidence to show that the Malabar Church was not Roman Catholic*

Before giving my arguments it would be well to cite a few words to show how the new theory advocated by Fr. Panjikaran and others is regarded by the scholarly members of the Roman Catholic Church. "It becomes necessary", says the Catholic Encyclopaedia. "to fix the historical truth clearly, because during this decade some of the young generations in Malabar have begun to deny the historical facts. They would wish people to believe that all the Portuguese missionaries, Bishops, priests, and writers were completely mistaken, when they styled them Nestorians in belief, and because of this false report all subsequent writers continued to call them Nestorians. The reader, who has gone through the statement of facts above related, must be conscious that such an attempt at distorting or boldly denying public facts is utterly hopeless. They maintain in support of their false view,

that there always had been a small body among the Chaldaeans in Mesopotamia, who remained attached to the true faith and from them they received their bishop's. This plea is historically false, for the bishops they received all came to them from the Nestorians, and as to the hypothesis of the existence during all these centuries back of a Catholic party among the Nestorian Chaldaeans, it is too absurd to be discussed." (Vol. XVI, p. 682). This is the studied opinion of the Rev. Fr. H. Hosten, S. J., who recently visited Malabar & made a thorough research into the question.

Let us now proceed to the evidence (1) Friar Jordanus visited Quilon during the first quarter of the XIVth century & returned home. (*Mirabilia*, pp. 26—41.) "In 1328", says Mr. Mackenzie, "Pope John XXII at Avignon consecrated Friar Jordan as Bishop of Quilon, and in 1330 sent him forth with two letters, which are given in *Oriens Christianus* III, 1371—1376. One letter is addressed to the Christians of Molephatam, a town in the Gulf of Mannar. The other letter is addressed to the Chief of the Nazarene Christians at Quilon. In these letters Pope John XXII, says 'Praying we beseech that divisions cease and clouds of error stain not the brightness of faith of all regenerated by the waters of baptism; and that the phantom of schism and wilful blindness (*perfidia intemeratae fidei*) to faith unsullied, darken not the vision of those who believe in Christ and adore his name.' The same ideas are repeated in varying form, urging to unity with the

Holy Catholic and universal Church of Rome. The Pope also commends to their kindness Bishop Jordan and the Friars Preachers and Friars Minors living among them or coming thither. At the close of the letter the Pope thanks the people for the hospitality already shown to the missionaries. Bishop Jordan set out with these letters, but it is not known if he reached his destination or if he had any successors in the See of Quilon." (*Travancore State Manual*, Vol. II, pp. 145—146).

The Pope wrote as above on the information given by Jordan who visited these Christians. It is evident from this letter of the Pope that the Christians of Malabar were not in union with the Roman Catholic church, but in schism, as well as in error, provided we are not prepared to dismiss the evidence of Friar Jordan: as utter falsehood.

(2) Durte Barbosa who visited Malabar during the early part of the XVth century says in a book written in 1516 that the St. Thomas Christians "are very devout Christians, only they are deficient in doctrine" (*A Description of the Coast of East Africa and Malabar in the beginning of the Sixteenth century*, p. 154).

(3) Do Couto, who lived in India from A. D. 1557, speaks of these Christians several times as heretics & schismatics. For instance he says:—"After the death of the apostle St. Thomas, the Christians of Malabar & Mylapore were in communion with the prelates sent by the bishops of Edessa till from Babylon Nestorian

bishops, as a pestilence, infected all those parts with their heresies & perverted doctrines." (*Da Asia*, Decada XII, Liv. III, Cap. V, p. 251).

Again Do Couto says:—"They (Cardinal D. Henrique & the Queen of Portugal) granted him (Mar Joseph) all that he requested upon his promising to bring all these Christians to the obedience of the holy Catholic Roman Church." (*Decada XII, Liv. III, cap. V, pp. 292, 293*).

(4) De Souza also, who wrote his book relying on the manuscript of Fr. Sabastian Goncalves, who came to India as a monk in 1553, speaks of them again and again as heretics and schismatics. For instance he says:—"Fr. Vincent..... desiring to bring the old Christians of St. Thomas throughout Malabar to the obedience of the Roman Church, established a seminary in Cranganore wherein the sons of these Christians infested with the errors of Nestorians were instructed in the Latin rite". (*Oriente Conquistado*, Pt. I, C. I, Div. I, S. I., p. 1). And again, "He (Mar Joseph) had promised to the cardinal Infente to bring the Church of Malabar to the obedience of the Roman Church" (Pt. II, c. I, D. II, S. 23, p. 74).

(5) Here is a portion of a letter written by the Jesuits: "The priests of the Society of Jesus that are in East India humbly pray your Holiness to deign to write to the above named Archbishop and Archdeacon (of Ankamali in Malabar) showing them how much gladness is felt in the Lord from their letter and obedi-

ence, as well as from the profession of Catholic faith mad by them, and from the desire they show to reduce those people to the same faith and to the devotion of the Roman Church with the help of ours." *Genuinae Relationes*—Giamil, p. 79. Italics are mine. It was only a mere pretence on the part of the Archbishop (Mar Abraham) and Archdeacon. Anyhow the Jesuit missionaries say that Mar Abraham and the Archdeacon George showed a desire "to reduce those people to the same faith and to the devotion of the Roman Church."

(6) De Souza, while speaking about a synod held at Ankamali in North Travancore, says that the prelates of the St. Thomas Christians "requested them (Jesuit Missionaries) to declare to them their errors and the things contrary to the use of the Roman Church in order to emend and conform themselves to the true and Catholic doctrines." (Pt. II, C. I, D. II, S. 24, p. 74).

Referring to the above Synod Mar Abraham wrote to the Pope under date 15th January 1584:—"The same priests (Jesuits) made us and our Archdeacon know this year about correcting the errors and manners of our Christians, in order that they might be conformed to the Apostolic Roman Church." (Giamil, p. 97).

We see from these that Mar Abraham and Archdeacon George declared that St. Thomas Christians were not Roman Catholics.

(7) Mar Abraham wrote to the Pope about a certain misbehaviour of the Roman

Catholic missionaries, which would pave the way for the St. Thomas Christians to undo the little that has been done. He writes:—"So a gate is open to many to go back from the good beginning of their reduction." (Giamil, p. 98). In fact no reduction to the Roman Church had begun. He was only giving false hope to the Pope. But by these words he signifies that the Church of Malabar was not under the Pope. Were it under the Pope, Mar Abraham had nothing to gain by representing otherwise.

Let me again quote the words of Pope Pius IV. which he wrote on the last day of February 1565:—"Following his (Chaldean Patriarch's) example Abraham too received the faith of the Roman Church, and promised by a document written with his own hand that he would perpetually keep it and hand it over to his subjects." (Giamil, p. 73). If Mar Abraham and his Malabar Christians were Roman Catholics, would he execute a document such as the one mentioned by the Pope? There is no gainsaying the fact that such a document was executed by Mar Abraham, since it is the Pope who says so. For a detailed account of Mar Abraham see my last paper (*K. S. Papers*, Vol. II, pp. 271-273). It is rather regrettable that Fr. Schurhammer has ignored the unanswerable evidence against him drawn from the case of Mar Abraham.

(8) Fr. Franciscos Roz, S. J., who had been many years in Malabar during the XVIth and XVIIth centuries wrote a book in 1587 on the errors of the Malabar Christians. He says:—"Although the

Nestorians who dwell in Oriental India have professed the Roman Catholic faith, their books are nevertheless full of doctrines of Nestorius, Deodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia. And as Mar Abraham the Archbishop of the District, is quite aware of these facts (for he is familiar both with the Roman and the Nestorian doctrines) certainly it gives us the greatest suspicion of heresy. When he was living at Goa, he promised to amend the Syriac books and confirmed his promise with an oath. But he did not keep his word; has no thought of doing so. However Almighty God grant that he may come to his senses and embrace the Catholic faith in heart, word and deed." —(*De Erroribus Nestorianorum Qui in hac India Orientali Versantur*, P. 15).

Roz gives several Syriac quotations from the liturgy of these Christians to prove their heresy. Since the printers of this Journal have no Syriac types I cannot give the Syriac quotations here.

In "*Nativity*" Christ is spoken of as having two *knoma*<sup>1</sup> (hypostases) (*Ibid.*, P. 22).

In "*Nativity of the Virgin*" it is sung:—"Mary did not bring forth God as the heretics say, nor did she give birth to a man as Arius says, but she brought forth

1. Latin translation:—"Christe Deus super omnia, duae naturae et duae hypostases et unica representatio."

Christ."<sup>2</sup> (Ibid., P. 24). This was exactly the teaching of Nestorius.

Roz has given two quotations from the liturgy of these Christians where Deodorus, Theodorus, and Nestorius are highly praised.<sup>3</sup> (Ibid., P. 28),

It was Roz who took Mar Abraham to the third council of Goa where the latter promised to correct the errors of the liturgy used in Malabar. And Roz tells us that Mar Abraham did not fulfill his promise. Out of the fortythree Syriac quotations given by Roz I have pointed out only four, and they unequivocally tell us that the Church of Malabar rejected the *theotocos* of the third ecumenical

2. Latin translation given by Roz:—"Non genuit, inquit, Deum MARIA, quemadmodum dicunt haeretici, nec genuit hominem sicut dixit Arius, sed genuit Christum."

3. Latin Translation:—"Benedictus ille est, cuius charitate, sacerdotes vicerunt et haeredes gloriae ipsius crediderunt: Diodorum et Theodorum et Nestorium, verbis suis praedicasse veritatem. Benedictus est cuius charitate in Ecclesia veri vicerunt, et confessi sunt, dixeruntque Deum non mori."

"Caelestis pastor constituit pastores congregationi ovium suarum et firmavit post primos, tres probatos doctores, Diodorum et Theodorum cum Nestorio, filio dexteræ gloriae virtutis suae. In Ecclesia victoriam sunt consequuti."

Council, accepting the *Christotocos* of Nestorius, and held Nestorius as a saint. Will anybody contend that the Syriac quotations given by Roz are entirely false? Here the controversy comes to an end, provided Fr. Schurhammer is not prepared to go to the length of making Roz an audacious liar.

(9) I must bring to the notice of my readers the decrees of the Synod of Diamper which met in the year 1599. It is said in these decrees that the doctrine of transubstantiation, the practice of auricular confession, extreme unction, masses for the dead, image worship, etc., were quite unknown in this church, (Sess. 3, Dec. 15; Sess. 6, Dec. 1; Sess. 6, Dec. 15; Sess. 5, Dec. 15; Sess. 3, Dec. 5.) Grant for a moment that the position advanced by the Romo-Syrians is true, viz., the Christians of Malabar in the 16th century were Roman Catholics acknowledging the superemacy of the Pope, worshipping images, practising auricular confession and extreme unction, saying mass for the dead, and believing in transubstantiation. Then come a Roman Catholic bishop and a few missionaries, and they convene a Synod. In that Synod representing the whole Church of Malabar, they ask the 813 representatives present, to sign a paper, in which it is said that many a Roman Catholic doctrine and practice were quite unknown to the church of Malabar, though they were, in fact, accepted there from time immemorial. Is this possible? Archbishop Meneses and the other Portuguese

Missionaries, if they could be supposed to have had some common sense, would not venture to do this, and show themselves audacious liars. Everybody could know that it would be a very easy thing to expose these falsehoods before the Pope. A glance at their Liturgy would carry conviction. Suppose the Roman Catholic Chaldean Patriarch goes to the Pope and exposes the fraud, what would be the fate of this Archbishop and Missionaries? If the Pope could not be thus convinced, the Patriarch could request His Holiness to send a commission to Malabar. To say that this Archbishop and his Missionaries would dare to commit such a fraud which could be easily exposed, is the same as saying that they had an extremely low opinion about the Papal authority. No such authority can possibly be so low as to screen such culprits, and that at the expense of a considerable section of the Church. I wonder how a Roman Catholic can maintain that the love of truth and justice which was in the Papal authority was such as to create so low an opinion about that authority in the minds of these Portuguese Missionaries.

The Synod, while enumerating the erroneous books used in Malabar speaks as follows:—"Also the book of Orders; .....there are also prayers in it for those that are converted from any other sect to Nestorianism, in form of an absolution from the excommunication they had incurred for not having followed Nestorius." (Sess. III, Decree XIV).

"Also the book of Synods,..... they say likewise, that the Roman Church is fallen from faith, having perverted the canons of the apostles..... and that the Romans are heretics." (Sess. III, Decree XIV).

(10) Gouvea, a Portuguese Friar, in his *Jornada* published in 1606 while describing the Archbishop's visit to Kadutturuty (an ancient church within 15 miles of Kottayam) reports the following exclamation of Fr. Roz afterwards a Bishop of Malabar. "Coming up to the Archbishop, he gave thanks to God, saying 'Is this Carturte which I know to well! only a few months ago when I came to halt here they shut the door of the church in my face and I had it opened by the Police. When in saying mass, I elevated the most Holy Sacrament, they all covered their eyes. They thrashed one of my pupils, because in the Church he named the Pope. and a few years ago, when I showed them an image of our Lady, among the same people many closed their eyes, crying out to take away that filth, that they were Christians and did not worship idols or pagods, which they considered all images to be. The good Father seeing such a change embraced all, saying 'Is it possible. Is this Carturte! Is Carturte no longer schismatical!" (Jornada, Liv. I, Cap. XIV. Were these the words of Fr. Roz or the invention of Gouvea? Any man of common sense will say that these exclamations do not look spurious.

Gouvea under the inspiration of Archbishop Menezes says:—"A lad wao was being educated in the College of Vaipikota went at this time to Carturte, his native place, and began to read together with others the divine office, as he was accustomed to, in a church; they bade him say a certain prayer which they used, for the schismatic Patriarch of Babylon. From what he had been taught in the College, the lad named first of all the Pope. For the priests who were educating them, finding that the prelates of Malabar would not allow the pupils of the College to omit the name of the Patriarch, taught them at least to put first that of the Pope. The Casanars who were then praying, became so enraged at hearing his name, that they all rushed at him, slapped and beat him all over, cast him out of the church, and sent word to his father to have him whipped saying that in the churches of St. Thomas they did not name the Pope of Rome who was not their Prelate, and that they had nothing to do with him, but with the Patriarch of Babylon to whom they were subject. As soon as the Archbishop was informed of this, with much feeling and in all haste he wrote to the Archdeacon to punish this insolence and heresy, specially a certain Casanar, his cousin, who in his devilish zeal had gone beyond the others. But the Archdeacon did nothing of the kind, and far from punishing or censuring him, actually honoured him as a man zealous for their customs; and he defended him before the Archbishop with frivolous excuses, which made it quite

clear how he stood in matters of faith." (*Jornada*, Liv. I, Cap. V).

Will anybody contend that this is utter falsehood?

Gouvea.—"In the evening there came to visit him (Menezes) a Casanar with a venerable grey beard, eighty years of age, the oldest of the people, a man of good life, and, as he showed, careful of his salvation. Taking the Archbishop aside, he in the name of Jesus Christ adjured him to answer truly what he wished to ask, holding him responsible before God:—If it was true that the Pope of Rome was the head of the Universal Church and Vicar of Christ on earth; if Christ has attached to his chair as that of the chief apostle, supreme power over His faithful; if no one could be saved who would refuse him submission, as the Archbishop had preached; and if this was mere rivalry between the Romans and the Babylonians as oft he had heard his Bishops preach. Though eighty years old and one of the oldest priests of Malabar, he had never heard anything of the kind so far, nor had given a thought to it. On his soul he trusted him to undeceive him, and if he erred in his doctrine, God might take it to his (Archbishop's) account." (Liv. I, Cap. XI).

(11) There is evidence to show that the Christians of Tana (Near Bombay), Coromandel coast, Socotra, and China were Nestorians.

Friar Odoric who visited India during the first quarter of the XIVth century,

says: "Here (Tana) there be fifteen houses of Christians, that is to say of Nestorians, who are schismatics and heretics" (*Cathay and the Way Thither*, Vol. II, p. 117). "In this realm," says he while speaking about the Coromandel coast, "is laid the body of the blessed St. Thomas, the Apostle. His church is filled with idols and beside it, are fifteen houses of the Nestorians, that is to say Christians, but vile and pestilent heretics." (Ibid, p. 142). "Here" says Odoric while speaking about a town in China, "be three churches of the Nestorians." (Ibid, p. 210). John of Monte Corvino who visited China during the last quarter of the XIIIth century, speaks of the Christians as follows:—"The Nestorians a certain body who profess to bear the Christian name, but who deviate sadly from the Christian religion, have grown so powerful in those parts, that they will not allow a Christian of another ritual to have ever so small a chapel, or to publish any doctrine different from their own." (Ibid, Vol. III, p. 46). According to another authority "These Nestorians are more than thirty thousand dwelling in the said Empire of Cathay (China) and are passing rich people." (The Book of the Estate of the Great Caan, set forth by the Archbishop of Soltania, circa A. D. 1330, Ibid, p. 102). Nicolo Conte, a Venetian, who spent two months in the Island of Socotra during the early part of the XVth century says that the island "is for the most part inhabited by the Nestorian Christians" (*India in the Fifteenth Century*, p. 20). He says

again:—"Polygamy prevails very generally excepting among the Christians who have adopted the Nestorian heresy, who are spread over the whole of India and confine themselves to one solitary mate." (Ibid, p. 23).

"Here", he says while speaking about Mylapore, "the body of St. Thomas lies honourably buried; it is worshipped by heretics who are called Nestorians and inhabit the city to the number of a thousand. These Nestorians are scattered over all India, in like manner as are the Jews among us." (Ibid, p. 7).

Fr. Panjikaran cannot ascribe motives to Friar Odoric, John of Monte Corvino, Nicolo Conte and others. So he must admit that Nestorians had their missions in Socotra, Tana, Coromandel Coast and China.

But he wants us to believe that they did not enter into Keralam (Malabar) and that the contemporary writers who speak of the presence of Nestorians in Keralam are all liars.

(12) Though the Nestorians had their missions in Socotra, Tana, Coromandel Coast and China, they, according to our author, did not enter into Keralam but once. When was it? It was in the middle of the XVIth century. The Nestorians, who are said to have avoided Malabar, and allowed the Roman Catholic Chaldeans to work unmolested for so many centuries, found a most convenient time to begin work here, and that convenient time was no other than the middle of the XVIth century, when the all-power-



ful Portuguese were severely persecuting Mar Joseph and Mar Abraham, who were, in the opinion of our friends, true Roman Catholic Bishops, and that simply because of their different rite. This is what we are asked to believe. It is, I think, very difficult to find men who can swallow such stuff. Since there are overwhelming evidences to prove the Nestorianism of Mar Simon, who was here during the middle of the XVIIth century, Fr. Panjikaran could not but admit that he (Mar Simon) was a Nestorian, but added that he was the first Bishop of that persuasion. It is, however, reasonable to say that had it not been for the fact that Malabar was a field, where the Nestorian Bishops were working, Mar Simon a Nestorian, would not have even dreamt of coming to Malabar at a time of such severe persecution.

(13) "Lately," writes Pope Clement VIII, "we have heard... that Mar Abraham... who formerly had embraced the Catholic doctrine... had treated of the whole of that diocese to the Catholic faith... recently miserably fell into his former errors of the Nestorian heresy." (Giamil p. 172). Here it is clearly said that the Church of Malabar was to be reduced to the Catholic faith. "We learned," writes Pope Clement again on the 10th May, 1601, "that our venerable brother, the Archbishop of Goa, held among you a Synod... in which Synod... the errors of the impious Nestorius were by you rejected,

anathematized and condemned... ..  
... ..but which is of the utmost importance, that you acknowledged and professed that the Roman Pontiff, the common Father of the faithful, is the head of the whole Church." (Ibid, p. 178). This is the opinion of the Pope recently expressed. "Indeed," so runs the Brief, "the Malabar people abjured the Nestorian heresy, all the priests... .. met together in a Synod, held at Diamper by the authority of our predecessor Clement VIII of happy Memory, in the year 1593, promised and swore loyal obedience to the Pope or Roman Pontiff," (Brief "Speculatores Super" of Pius IX, 1874, quoted by Dr. Xavier, p. 25).

(14) The opinion among the Malabar Christians half a century back, was quite different from what is now held. "Our community" they say, "dates its existence in this part of the Peninsula from the first century of the Christian era, having been governed from time to time by the Bishops of our own rite, till in later ages, our ancestors, through the sympathy of the then sovereign Pontiffs, were brought within the fold of the true and lawful shepherd, under whose fostering care we have continued to thrive in the unity of the Catholic faith for which we unceasingly praise the Almighty God" ("Appeal" to the Delegate Apostolic of India from the Syro-Chaldean-Roman-Catholics of Malabar, dated Jan. 7th, 1887, quoted by Dr. Xavier, *Some Elucidations*, p. 26).

If these pieces of evidence fail to convince Fr. Schurhammer, I shall be

extremely glad to learn how he meets them.

Before reviewing the papers of Fr. Schurhammer I should like to show him the nature of the compositions of Fr. Panjikaran, and Fr. Bernard which brought him to his present view.

I reviewed Fr. Panjikaran's pamphlet (*Y. M. I.*, March and April 1923) and he could not see his way to meet it. Take one instance.

Fr. Panjikaran: "Another interesting incident given by the same author (Manuel de Faria y Sousa) shows that, at this time the Christians had images in their Churches and so they could not have been Nestorians, for the veneration of images is strictly forbidden to the Nestorians. The Portuguese were taken to see one of the Churches of these Christians. "In the middle was a round chapel of good structure with brass gates; within it was the statue of a woman, which, by reason of the darkness, could not be perfectly discovered. The Portuguese looking upon it and asking what it was, the Malabars answered aloud with a joyful reverence, 'Mary, Mary, Mary,' and prostrated themselves on the ground. Our men did the same judging that to be the image of our Lady, nor were they deceived, for it could be no other. those people many ages before having professed Christianity." (P. 38 of the edition of 1914).

To an ordinary reader this would look a very strong argument.

Before examining the portion quoted above, the reader should be informed that

this very author Faria has clearly said that the Christians of Malabar had no images, "The Christians called of St. Thomas," says he, "who inhabit from this city (Cranganore) to Coromandel and Meliapore, the place where the Apostle was buried, have churches like ours in Europe; on the altars and walls crosses painted, but no other images." (*Portuguese Asia* by Manuel de Faria y Sousa, translated by Cap. John Stevens, Vol. II, pp. 504-505). What then is meant by the same author's saying about the image of St. Mary?

In reply to this I need only quote a few lines preceding the passage quoted by Fr. Panjikaran. When Vasco da Gama arrived in Calicut, he was taken to the Zamorin in a palanquin conducted by a governor sent by him. On their way to the Zamorin's palace the following incident took place. "Thus," says Faria, "they (Gama and his men) were carried many flocking about them, to a pagoda or temple equal, including all its offices, to the greatest of our monasteries. On the top of the front were five bells, and opposite to it a high pillar of brass, with a cock on the top. Within the gate attended four Brahmans, covered from the waist to the knees with cotton cloths; and for a badge of their profession each had three threads across his shoulders, banging like a shoulder belt. They sprinkled them with water, and gave powder of sandal to put on their foreheads, all with great ceremony, and no less reverence than is used among us in taking the holy water in the church-

About the walls were painted several horrid figures of monsters and wild beasts. In the middle was a round chapel of good structure with brass gates, within it was the statue of a woman, which by reason of the darkness could not be perfectly discovered," etc. (Ibid, Vol. I, pp. 45-46). Faria does not say that Gama was taken to see *one of the churches* as Fr. Panjikaran says. Faria says in unequivocal language that Gama was taken to see a temple, where there were Brahmans wearing sacred threads, who gave powder of sandal to put on their foreheads in accordance with the Hindu custom, and that the walls thereof were painted with several horrid monsters, and that in the middle was a chapel. He does not say that there was any Christian in Calicut at that time. On the other hand he says that Calicut "was then inhabited by Pagans." (Ibid, Vol. I, p. 44). Moreover in a letter written by four bishops in Malabar in the year 1504 we read the following:—"Our province," they say, "in which the Christians dwell is called Malabar and has about twenty cities of which three notable and firm cities are Carangol (Cranganore) Palor (Palur) and Colam (Quilon) and others nearly come up to them. In all these, the Christians live and churches have been built. Near by, there is a large and rich city, Calicut, which the infidels inhabit." (quoted by Mackenzie *Trav. State Manual*, Vol. III, p. 149). "Those people many ages before having professed Christianity;" These words of Faria do not mean that they were Christians at

that time. He supposed that they professed Christianity many ages before, not then. What is meant by the above-said portion is simply this: Faria presumed that the people of Calicut were Christians many ages back, and when they turned heathens they made the chapel and the monastery into a temple, but did not remove the image of St. Mary. "It may reasonably be believed," says he, while speaking about the ancient churches of Malabar, "that pagoda, where Gama entered as he went from Calicut to Zamorin's palace, was of this foundation, because the image of our lady was there, called Mary by the heathens.....  
.....The heathens yearly celebrate a feast to St. Thomas to preserve their ships." (*Portuguese Asia*, Vol. II, p. 231).

The round chapel referred to is the *Sri Kovil*. Every Hindu temple in Malabar has a round shrine called *Sri Kovil* in the middle, where the idol is dedicated.

Faria y Sousa is not a contemporary historian, but he wrote his book in 1695, i. e., two centuries after the event. He does not tell us where he got this information from. A contemporary author, John de Barros, who was born in 1496 and wrote his book in 1552, speaks about this incident. He was specially deputed by the king of Portugal to write a history and all the records were placed at his disposal.

John De Barros thus describes an incident that took place on Gama's way to the Zamorin's palace. "They contin-

ued the journey and reached a great heathen temple of the place well built of masonry with a summit covered with bricks, and at the gate there was a big brass column (pillar) with a cock on the top. Inside the body of the temple, there was a portal whose gates were of metal through which there was a passage to a ladder leading up to the summit and at the bottom of the ladder was a recess in the shape of a niche containing some images for adoration. Some of our people, who were under the impression that the local people were the descendants of those converted by Apostle St. Thomas, the tradition of whom they had heard from the Moors also, bent their knees in prayer before the images thinking them to be worthy of adoration. At this the heathens were greatly pleased, as they thought us to be inclined to the adoration of images unlike the Moors they had seen" (*Da Asia*, Decada I. Parte I, Livro IV, Cap. VIII, pp. 332—3)

De Souza also says that the image worshipped by Gama and his companions was that of a Hindu Goddess (Parte I, C. I, D-1, § 19, p. 15).

We have a very interesting report of the incident by one who accompanied Gama. The reporter and Gama were all under the impression that the Zamorin and his subjects, except the Muhammadans, were Christians. Gama told the Zamorin that the king of Portugal "sent out vessels.....as they knew that there were Christian kings there like themselves." "The captain said that King Camolin (Zamorin) had sent him

back to his ships and that..... he should return to the king who was a Christian like himself." (*A Journal of the First Voyage of Vasco da Gama, 1497—1499*, translated by E. G. Ravenstein, pp. 58, 65). "On the following morning," so goes the report, "which was Monday, May 28th, the Captain Major set out to speak to the king, and took with him thirteen men of whom I was one..... ..Attended by all these people we took the road to Qualecut..... ..When we arrived (at Calicut) they took us to a large church, and this is what we saw:—The body of the Church is as large as a monastery, all built of hewn stones and covered with tiles. At the main entrance rises a pillar of Bronze, as high as a mast, on the top of which was perched a bird, apparently a cock. In addition to this, there was another pillar as high as a man, and very stout. In the centre of the body of the church rose a Chapel, all built of hewn stones, with a Bronze door sufficiently wide for a man to pass, and stone steps leading up to it. Within this sanctuary stood a small image, which, they said, represented our lady. Along the walls by the main entrance, hung even small Wells. In this church the Captain Major said his prayers and we with him. We did not go within the Chapel, for it is the custom that only certain servants of the church called quasees (kazi, Arabic, meaning judge) should enter. These quasees wore some threads passing over the left shoulder and under the right arm, in the same manner as our deacons wear

the stole. They threw holy water over us and gave us some white earth, which the Christians of this country are in the habit of putting on their foreheads, breasts, and around the neck, and on the forearms.....many other saints were painted on the walls of the church, wearing crowns. They were painted variously with teeth protruding an inch from the mouth, and four or five arms... ..After we had left the place and arrived at the entrance to the city we were shown another church, where we saw things like those described above." (Ibid. pp. 52—55).

Castenheda, a XVIth century Portuguese historian says (I, p. 57) that Joao de Sa who knelt down by the side of Vasco da Gama, said "If these be devils I worship the true God," at which his chief smiled. (Ibid. p. 52. foot note).

Gama and the Zamorin did not understand each other. The Portuguese were quite new to the Malayalees and the Malayalees to the Portuguese. Gama took the Zamorin for a Christian and the latter the former for a Hindu. That is why Gama was allowed to enter the temple.

Now let us turn to the words of Faria:—"Malabars answered aloud with a joyful reverence, Mary, Mary, Mary, and prostrated themselves on the ground." What they said was probably *Mari* which in Malayalam as well as in Tamil means *Kali* the Goddess of small-pox, worshipped by Hindus.

One cannot but observe that it is quite unpardonable on the part of the Rev. Fr. Panjikaran to have made such a garbled quotation. Fr. Bernard, a Roman Catholic Syrian priest, who is considered by them to be an authority on the history of Christianity in Malabar, in his history written in Malayalam, simply says that the Portuguese found and worshipped the image of St. Mary in the church of Quilon, and refers to the above page of *Portuguese Asia*. He took the information from Fr. Panjikaran. Fr. Panjikaran did not mention the place; Fr. Bernard guessed that it must be Quilon. I told Fr. Bernard about it and he answered that he would correct the mistake in the next edition, which he did not do when he published his second volume several years after his promise. These are the two authors relied on by the learned Fr. Schurhammer.

Now let us turn to Fr. Schurhammer's paper. His first evidence (supra) is only a copy of Fr. Panjikaran's which I had refuted in April 1923 (*Young Men of India*).

Fr. Panjikaran: In the year 1348 Pope Clement VI sent the Franciscan Bishop, John de Marignoli as his legate to these Christians. Marignoli says (Travancore State Manual, Vol. II, p. 145) that the Christians of St. Thomas are "the masters of the public weighing office, from which I derived as a perquisite of my office as Pope's Legate, every month, a hundred gold fanams and a thousand when I left." "It is absurd to believe that the Pope would send his Legate to

a Nestorian people, and that they would gladly receive him, and pay him monthly as a perquisite of his office, 100 gold fanams, and ten times that sum when he left." (pp. 34, 35).

It is not said that Marignoli was sent to the Christians of Malabar. He says: "I.....was sent with certain others in the year of our Lord 1338 by the Holy Pope . . . to carry letters and presents from the Apostolic See to the Kann (of China),.....We navigated the Indian sea until Palm Sunday, and then arrived at a very noble city of India called Columbum" (Quilon). (*Cathay and the Way Thither*, Vol. III, p. 216). Here it is plainly said not that Marignoli was sent to the Christians of Malabar, but that he visited them on his way to China. Let it be granted that the St. Thomas Christians of Quilon gave a few thousand fanams to the Papal Legate in the middle of the XIVth century. Will it falsify the Pope's letter dated 5th April 1330 and addressed to the same Christians of Quilon to the effect that they were in clouds of error, phantom of schism and wilfull blindness, and that on the authority of Friar Jordanus who visited Quilon a little before this Papal Legate?

But as a matter of fact Marignoli does not tell us that he was paid anything by the Christians. His words are as follows:—"And these latter (Christians of St. Thomas) are the masters of the public weighing office from which I derived, as a perquisite of my office as Pope's Legate; every month a 100 gold fanams and a thousand when I left." (*Cathay*

and the Way Thither Vol. III, p. 216, or Travancore State Manual, Vol. II, p. 146).

Marignoli received money from the public weighing office, certainly a department of the Government of Venadu (Quilon). The St. Thomas Christians were the masters, not the owners of that office. The payment must have been recommended by them. Even now prominent persons, such as the Jacobite Patriarch or the Papal Legate, are entertained by the Travancore Government as state guests.

Even if these Christians paid the amount themselves there is nothing strange in it.

The people of Malabar, especially the Christians, are noted for their hospitality. There is nothing strange in their giving a foreign bishop some money to defray his expenses when he was living among them, and a donation on the eve of his departure. They were then quite strangers to the party feeling that existed in other places.

Even when party animosity was strongest between the Mar Thoma Syrian Church and the Jacobite Syrian Church, the members of these Churches of Malabar have entertained the bishops of the opposite party, and given presents and donations to them. So the hospitality extended to a Roman Catholic bishop by the Christians of Malabar is no proof that they were Roman Catholics.

The next point is that which deals with Mar Jacob. We shall do well to examine his arguments in the paper under discussion

together with that of his in *Gregorianum*.

First he takes the letter of the four bishops including Mar Jacob. The argument which Fr. Schurhammer draws from this letter is only a copy of Fr. Panjikaran's. This too was refuted by me in "the Young Men of India," 1923. I shall quote it below.

Fr. Panjikaran:—Chaldaean bishops who arrived here in 1504 wrote a letter to their Patriarch. A portion of that letter is given below:—"About twenty Portuguese live in the city of Cannanor -- We presented ourselves to them, said that *we were Christians and explained our condition and rank*. They received us with great joy, gave us beautiful garments and twenty drachmas of gold ..... We remained with them for *two and a half months*, and they ordered us that on a fixed day we also should perform the Holy Mysteries.....They had prepared a proper place for prayer, which they called the Oratory, and their priests offer sacrifices every day and complete the Holy Oblation; *for that is their custom and rite*. Whereof on Nosardel Sunday, *after their priests had celebrated, we also were admitted and performed the holy sacrifice, and it was greatly pleasing in their eyes.*" "It cannot be maintained that the Portuguese priests ..... would allow these foreign bishops to offer their Oblation on the sacred altar, if they were Nestorians. How could they, moreover hear it through and tell the bishops that they were greatly pleased with the

oblation, unless they were perfectly sure that these prelates, who were offering the Holy Mysteries in a language unknown to them, were Catholic Bishops." (pp. 36, 37.)

These bishops, our author contends, would not have been allowed to use the sacred altar in the case of their not being Roman Catholics. It is not said that they were allowed to use the sacred altar. Here there was no church but an oratory. They were, perhaps, given a table in the oratory, which they used as an altar. Our author in a subsequent page says that in the above report these bishops are said to be "admitted by the Portuguese to say mass in their churches." (p. 59). They were allowed to say mass not in a church or churches, but in an oratory, and that only once. My friend converted an oratory not into one church but into churches. We should bear in mind that the Portuguese and the Nestorian bishops were in a foreign country. It is natural that the Christians should forget much of the denominational difference when they are in a foreign country where Christians are few. It is not known whether there was any Christian in Cannanor except these few Portuguese Christians. Friar Odoric who visited India during the first quarter of the XIVth century says that the Roman Catholic friars were given shelter in the house of a Nestorian Christian in Tana. "Here," says he, "there be fifteen houses of Christians, that is to say of Nestorians who are schismatics and heretics. And the friars having first come hither found harbour in the house of one of these

Christians." (Cathay and the Way Thither, Vol. II, p. 117).

Fr. Holms and others of the Anglican Church were allowed to administer the Lord's supper in some of the churches of the Jacobites in Travancore. Their services were attended by the Jacobites both clergy and laity. Does this prove that Fr. Holms was a Jacobite? Our author again does not understand how the Portuguese could be pleased with the service of these bishops if they were Nestorians.

The Portuguese did not understand a word of Syriac in which the service was conducted. They were pleased with the beautiful Syriac music and the form of the service.

On the other hand the whole tone of the letter shows that the writers of the letter and the Portuguese were of different denominations. These bishops were with the Portuguese for two months and a-half. But they were allowed to administer the Lord's supper only once while the Portuguese priests were having their mass daily, and that is mentioned as a great favour. It is not said that any of the Portuguese received the "mysterics" from their hands or took part in any way in this mass performed by the prelates.

Now let me quote Fr. Schurhammer: — "The foregoing letter is interesting for many reasons. Here we point only to one fact. The four bishops and their syro-Malabar Christians did not consider themselves schismatics or separated brethren, or a church different from that of Rome, but they considered the

*Portuguese their brethren in the faith, their Latin Church, though of a different rite with different customs, part of their own church, and the same was the attitude of the Portuguese priests towards them. This mutual conviction found its clear expression and public confirmation, when the four bishops invited by the Portuguese offered the holy sacrifice in their own rite in the Portuguese church of Canannor after the mass said by the Portuguese priests.*" (Gregorianum, p. 69). This is exactly what Fr. Panjikaran said and was refuted twelve years back. Fr. Schurhammer writes in Italics "Portuguese their brethren in the faith." The above Bishops did not speak of the Portuguese as brethren *in the faith* but only as brethren. Why did he add "in the faith"? "Brethren" need not necessarily mean "brethren in the faith."

Fr. Schurhammer too converted "a kind of Oratory," (see his own quotation of the letter under consideration: Gregorianum, p. 68) into "the Portuguese church of Canannore," but it is a great consolation to note that he converted it only into one church, and not into "churches," as Fr. Panjikaran had done.

The statement that the Portuguese and the Portuguese priests considered the Malabar Christians not "schismatics or separated brethren, a church different from that of Rome but they considered" them their brethren in faith is in flat contradiction to the following statement of his:—"We know that the Portuguese of his (Mar Jacob's) time, missionaries and laymen, did not know much of the



Chaldaean Rite, that they often called heretical whatever was different from the Latin rite." (Supra p. 302).

In conclusion let me quote the words with which the Catholicos is addressed in the letter under consideration:—"To the other Simeon, the Papas of our days ..... to whom has been given power in heaven and on earth to feed the flock of Christ with the staff of Peter.....to Mar Elias the Catholic Patriarch of the Orient the mother of the world." (Quoted by Fr. Schurhammer, Gregorianum, p. 65).

That the letter is addressed to the head of the church, and not to a subordinate, is evident from the words "power in heaven and on earth to feed the lamb of God with the staff of Peter," and "Catholic Patriarch of the Orient the mother of the world." According to Roman theology only one person, the Pope of Rome, is "given power in heaven and on earth to feed the flock of Christ with the staff of Peter," and only one place, Rome, can be called "the mother of the world." If the Orient is the mother of the world, then Rome is a daughter of the Orient not the mother.

Now let us consider Mar Jacob's letters addressed to the King of Portugal, which are published by Fr. Schurhammer. In the letter dated 1523 He says:—"It may be four years since a Father Master Jdam Caro came to this country. From him I received many instructions for my salvation and that of this my people." (Gregorianum, p. 72). Here he confesses his

ignorance of many important doctrines necessary for salvation, and his having received "many instructions" from the Roman missionary. Could there be any Roman Catholic Bishop under the canopy of heaven, who does not know what is necessary for salvation, and requires many instructions for his salvation? Could these be anything else than the Pope's supremacy, private confession, and other doctrines of the Roman Church? Was it possible for such an ignorant man to be promoted to the episcopate in the Roman Catholic Church? It is, therefore, evident that he was a convert to the Roman Church.

Since he was getting from the king "30 milreis yearly and the ordinary allowance of the Portuguese priests in India" (Gregorianum, p. 77) and was expecting many favours from the king and was ready to do anything to please the king, he says:—"I shall take them (Portuguese missionaries) with me.....that the Christians may get acquainted with them and the said Fathers shall in the meantime instruct them in the things of the faith, and I shall introduce them, that they after my death may receive them in my place." (Gregorianum, p. 77). Italics are mine.

He is prepared to Romanize the Church. He does not want any more bishops to come from his country and look after this church.

In his second letter to the king of Portugal dated 1530, he speaks of a tour which he made together with the Father Commissary with the intention of Romanizing the church of Malabar.

"They (the enemies) favour some," writes Mar Jacob, "who are hard of heart and others, that have good will to go over to the usage of the church of Rome, but have not the courage to do it for fear of them." (Ibid p. 79). It is evident that Mar Jacob in collusion with the Roman Catholic missionaries was fighting hard to Romanize the church of Malabar. Fr. Schurhammer says this church was Roman Catholic in doctrines, and the fight was only to convert them from one Roman Catholic rite to another. The Roman missionaries, it is contended, fought for the change of rite thinking that it was erroneous. What about Mar Jacob? Did he know that he and his Patriarch were Roman Catholics, and their rites were not against the doctrines of Rome? If the answer is in the negative, it follows that neither the Portuguese missionaries nor Mar Jacob knew that the latter and his Patriarchs were Roman Catholics and their rites orthodox. Fr. Schurhammer, then, is making Roman Catholics of Mar Jacob and his Patriarch without their knowledge. If Mar Jacob knew that himself and his Patriarchs were Roman Catholics and their rites quite sound, why should he fight hard to convert his people from one rite to another? Fr. Schurhammer in the last paper has offered an explanation for this. "Communication was also impossible between the Chaldaean Patriarch.....and the Syro-Malabarian Christians in India. The Turks' power was constantly increasing in the East and West, the hope of opening a way seemed excluded for ever.

So we understand that Mar Jacob saw no other way of providing his Christians than to put them under the protection of the Portuguese and their bishops in Goa and his Latin missionaries, to take care of them after his and his companion's death.....This seems to us the only reasonable and possible explanation and at the same time also a full justification of the attitude of the saintly Mar Jacob, and Mar Thoma his companion."

To begin with, it must be noted that the way from the Chaldaean Patriarch to Malabar was never closed except by the Portuguese. After Mar Jacob, came Mar Joseph, Mar Abraham and Mar Simon without any obstruction from Mohammadians. It was the Portuguese that stopped the communication between the Chaldaean Patriarch and the Malabar Church. So there is no ground whatever for a guess that Mar Jacob feared that the way from his country to India might be closed. Even granting that he entertained such a fear, he could have consecrated a successor or else let the Church, till the opening of the way to the Patriarch, be governed by the Portuguese Bishops. No change of rite was necessary for that. The Romo-Syrian Church in Malabar was ruled for centuries by the Bishops of the Latin rite without any change of rite. If the missionaries were under a false notion that the rites of the Malabar Church were heretical, Mar Jacob could have disabused their minds either by argument, or by a reference to the Pope.

From the letter of Mar Jacob we understand that the Romanizing movement was resisted by these Christians and they were "helped in their resistance by the native Hindu Kings" "for political reasons." (Greg. p. 8). If the difference were only in the matter of rite, Hindu Kings would not have interfered for political reasons. When Archbishop Menezes was carrying on his campaign to reduce these Christians to the obedience of Rome, the Hindu Kings, for political reasons, were at heart against it. The Archbishop himself expressed it in his conversation with the King of Cochin. Gouvea narrates:—"But the Archbishop retorted that.....he could not understand how His Highness..... interfered in that (faith) of Christians..... favouring those who were rebellious to it (Rome), asking them not to desert their Patriarch of Babylon nor to obey Rome, when His Highness knew not what Rome was, what Babylon" (*Jornada*, Liv., I, Cap. XVI). Certainly it was a matter of supremacy, else the Hindu Kings would have nothing to do with it on political grounds.

Mathew Diaz a Latin Malabar priest who studied and was ordained in Portugal wrote to the King of Portugal under date January 22, 1550 as follows:—"There came men from Babylon as Bishops to instruct them (St. Thomas Christians) in the Catholic faith, which they did, *not without some errors*.....And now there are here two from the said Babylonia, who first did all after the manner of Babylon, until your Highness

sent Fr. Alv. Penteado, who with much diligence and zeal brought the said two Babylonians *to the obedience of the Holy Mother the Church*, and obtained for them a salary from your Highness, and now they no longer do anything after the Babylonian custom, and they are very honest and *obedient towards the Holy Mother the Church*. One, however, of those ordained by one of the Babylonians above mentioned, is going about teaching these St. Thomas Christians the Babylonian custom without fear of God, or the Holy Mother the Church, nor has he permission of his Babylonian prelates, and he has already *created much confusion amongst them*." (Quoted by Fr. Schurhammer, *Gregorianum*, pp. 82, 83). Italics are mine.

It is clearly stated that the Babylonian Bishops taught "the Catholic faith" with "some errors." Their fault therefore was error in faith, not a faulty rite. Further it is said that a certain missionary "with much diligence and zeal brought the said two Babylonians (Mar Jacob and Mar Thomas) to the obedience of the Holy Mother the Church." It is therefore evident that they were out of the pale of the Roman Church till a missionary brought them in.

Last of all it is said that a certain priest of the Malabar Church "without fear of God or the Holy Mother the Church" worked against this Romanizing movement, and "already created much confusion amongst them" (Malabar Christians). Though Mar Jacob and Mar Thomas were brought "to the obedience

of the Holy Mother the Church," there was a great agitation against them in the Church.

After quoting the above letter the learned Father does not say a word either about the errors in faith, which Mar Jacob and Mar Thomas taught, or the diligence and zeal with which a missionary brought them to the obedience of the Roman Church, but he goes on to explain the Babylonian custom. He quotes the authority of Bishop Roz to prove that some harmless customs of the Malabar Christians were taken as injurious by the Portuguese missionaries. Very well. Does Bishop Roz say that the Malabar Christians were free from errors, and they were Roman Catholics all through the Christian centuries? No, by no means. He says that they were dead against the authority of Rome, and they were infected with many a heresy. But he adds that some of the sound customs were also condemned by his co-missionaries owing to ignorance. It is violent in the extreme to take this last statement of Bishop Roz to mean that Malabar Christians were free from errors.

Fr. Schurhammer speaks of Mar Thomas, saying:—"In 1536 we hear, that he had helped little, had taught 'heresies' but that he had now repented, had publicly gone to confession and communion and called the Franciscans." (Gregorianum, p. 71). So Mar Thomas relinquished his heresies and joined the Roman Church in 1536 or earlier. Mar Jacob might have done it earlier. There-

fore in 1550 when Diaz wrote his letter to the King of Portugal, or in 1549 when St. Xavier wrote, both these bishops had already become Roman Catholics.

Ante de Eredia, S. J., in 1552 wrote:—"They (Malabar Christians) have many erroneous doctrines, because they were instructed by two bishops who came from the Preste (sic)." "They have very good churches, many of their children are in the college of the late Frey Vicente. I visited two of their villages: they obey in all things the Roman Church and are instructed by one of the two Malabarian priests, who studied at Coimbra." (Fr. Schurhammer, Gregorianum, p. 83). He speaks of "many erroneous doctrines" not of erroneous rites or customs. One wonders whether the churches of the two villages where there was a Malabarian priest who was educated at Coimbra, were not those of the new converts, Latin churches.

"From Roz we hear also," says Fr. Schurhammer, "that Mar Jacob introduced the sacrament of confession, which he saw in use among the Portuguese, translating the formula of absolution from Latin into Chaldaean." (Gregorianum, pp. 83, 84). And again:—"we know also from bishop Roz..... that Mar Jacob introduced the private confession according to the Roman custom." (Supra p. 302).

The learned Father seems to admit that private confession was unknown to both the Chaldaean and the Malabar churches. Does he take it as a mere

difference of custom which does not affect the doctrines of the Church?

"In this manner," says Gouvea, "were the casanars administering the other sacraments of baptism and Eucharist..... all of them approaching the communion table without confessing, as the sacrament of confession was disliked by them, as by all Chaldaeans." (Liv. I, Cap. IV).

And again:—"For confession and penance they had a peculiar hatred and abhorrence, though in a very few churches close to the Portuguese, a few used to confess, seeing it being done by the Portuguese. But throughout this land of Christians confession was abhorred nor did they have it in any way." Liv. I, Cap. XVIII).

Now let us take into consideration the letter of St. Xavier regarding Mar Jacob. In my last article I followed the translation of Coleridge, which Fr. Schurhammer says is not correct. But according to the correct translation given by the learned Father himself my conclusions hold good: I shall re-write my remarks in the last article quoting the translation of Fr. Schurhammer instead of that of Coleridge.

"Now let us turn to Mar Jacob. It is true that St. Xavier speaks of Mar Jacob as a saintly Armenian bishop. But he has given us to understand that Mar Jacob was a convert to the Roman Church. "And now," St. Xavier writes, "in his old age, he is very obedient to the customs of the holy mother the Church of

Rome." Then it follows that Mar Jacob underwent a change. It may be argued that the change was only from one Roman rite to another. Is it praiseworthy in the scholarly and saintly eyes of St. Xavier? If the Syriac rite was not so good as the Latin rite, the Roman Church would not have sanctioned it. Then what is the good of abandoning one rite and accepting another? Is it not disloyalty to his own Patriarch? Why should St. Xavier praise Mar Jacob for changing the rite and thereby proving himself disloyal to his immediate superior? There is no gainsaying the fact that St. Xavier mentions it by way of praise. It is therefore evident that he speaks of the conversion of Mar Jacob to the fold of the Roman Church and of his life of piety even before his actual conversion. One more extract from St. Xavier's letter should be noticed. 'He is only favoured by the Fathers of St. Francis.....And if it was not for them, the good and holy old man would already be resting with God.' Why is it that the St. Thomas Christians who were celebrated for their hospitality, especially to foreigners, entirely neglected in his old age, a foreigner, who was a bishop of their own, and who, according to St. Xavier, was a holy man? It cannot but be for his apostasy. 'He is only favoured by the Fathers of St. Francis.' That he was entirely abandoned by the church of Malabar is as clear as anything. The only possible explanation for this entire neglect of an old bishop is his apostasy."

The first para is practically ignored. I wish to hear from him on that point also.

His reply to the last para :—"Secondly Xavier does not say that 'the St. Thomas Christians ..... entirely neglected the bishop in his old age,' as he does not speak of the St. Thomas Christians at all in this letter. He does not even say that the bishop suffered want and was in need of the help of these Christians. On the contrary he tells us expressly, that he did not need their alms at all, as the Franciscan Fathers gave him abundantly all he needed. *Thirdly* Xavier does not say that without the help of the Franciscans the bishop 'would have long ago breathed out his soul worn out by affliction'. This is a wrong translation of Possinus-Cole-ridge. What he wants to tell the king, is, that if it was for the Portuguese officials, who were... .. very careless in paying the king's rents, then the bishop 'would already be resting with God."

"He is only favoured by the Fathers of St. Francis." Does it mean that he was favoured by the St. Thomas Christians also? "Only" excludes all, not only the Portuguese officials. "He did not need their alms at all," says the learned Father, "as the Franciscan Fathers gave him abundantly all he needed." Why? Why should the bishop of the Malabar Christians be maintained by the Franciscan Fathers? He was entirely maintained by the Malabar Christians for some time. How was it

that that duty was transferred to the shoulders of the Franciscans, if he was not abandoned by the St. Thomas Christians?

"If it was not for them (Franciscans) the old man would already be resting with God. Xavier does not say if it was not for them and the St. Thomas Christians, Does it not mean that there was nobody except the Franciscans to maintain him, and that had it not been for them he would have already breathed his last? The statement excludes all, the St. Thomas Christians not excepted.

Fr. Schurhammer advances two pieces of evidence to prove that Mar Jacob was not abandoned by the St. Thomas Christians. The first is this. There were about 100 students belonging to the St. Thomas Christian community in the Franciscan college at Cranganore. They, therefore, were very much attached to the Franciscans & also to Mar Jacob who lived in the Franciscan convent at Cochin.

In reply I need only quote Gouvea, who wrote his book in 1606 on the information supplied to him by Archbishop Menezes, who spent about a year in Malabar & visited almost all the churches. He says:-"And the Religious, who, moved by their ignorance & errors first worked among them, were the sons of the seraphic St. Francis; one of them, Friar Vincent... ..went & stationed at Cranganore; & thence went frequently to preach in their churches.....But seeing that no labours of this nature were capable of withdrawing them from their errors, he founded .....a college

in the year 1546 in which were brought up & taught the sons of these Christians, to the end that trained in the literature & customs of the Roman church, & ordained priests they might preach the true doctrine to their own people, & by this means the people would throw off their errors, & render obedience to the church of Rome. They did not refuse to give him their children to be brought up in the college; but neither from the teaching of their sons nor from their sacred ministry, were they willing to reap any benefit, because none of them brought up in the college in the Latin rite, was allowed to officiate in their churches, nor even to live there.....so that the servant of God did not attain his end in this respect." (Jornada, Liv. 1, Cap. 1).

He further tells us about two priests: "Its inhabitants (those of Parur) are very devout to their false Patriarch, as was shown in the case of two priests, natives of the place, D. Jorge da Cruz & D. Joao da Cruz, who had been sent by the Portuguese to Rome at the time of Pope Gregory XIII (A. D. 1572-1585). He treated them with great honour, & gave many indulgences to their church, & a privileged altar in it. But the people refused the indulgences & the privilege of the altar, nor would they allow the priests to officiate in their churches, though they were the noblest in the land, & gave them so much trouble & vexation, their own brothers & relatives driving them away that they went to live at Cranganore, where they built a church of St. John. There they spent their life as exiles, D.

Joao being the last to die on St. John's day in 1598, a year before the meeting of the Synod at Diamper, when all these Christians gave up their heresies & offered submission to the holy Roman church, which the good Father could not see, though longing for it all his life" (Liv. I, Cap X).

The fact that there were in the Franciscan college some young men belonging to the St. Thomas Christian community, does not prove that these Christians were Roman Catholics, & that is testified to by Gouvea, a contemporary historian.

The second evidence of Fr. Schurhammer is this: "In Cranganore," so wrote St. Xavier, "there are two churches, one in honour of St. James & the other of St. Thomas. The St. Thomas Christians have a great devotion to the church of St. Thomas, Frey Vincente would like to have some indulgences for these churches for the consolation of these Christians..... & also a Plenary Indulgence for the Vigil of St. Thomas." Further he says that the Indulgences asked for "would help to increase the devotion of the native Christians" i. e. St. Thomas Christians.

This is a copy of Fr. Panjikaran's argument, which had been raised by some Romo-Syrians & refuted by Bishop Xavier, afterwards Patriarch of Goa, much before Fr. Panjikaran wrote his thesis. The latter brought forward the very same argument without noticing the answer already given. I repeated the reply long ago. Now I am forced to repeat it once more. The Church of St. James referred to was, according to the letter quoted by

Fr. Panjikaran himself, one "adjoining the college" and "built by Fr. Vincenzo," i. e. one which served the purpose of a chapel attached to this college. "Friar Vincent," says Gouvea, "..... built some (churches) in their midst, after our style, since all their old churches were built after the fashion of heathen pagodas." (Quoted by Dr. Xavier: *Some Elucidations*, p. 13.) So the church of St. James adjoining the college of Fr. Vincenzo must have been built by Fr. Vincenzo himself after the Western style, unlike the old churches of Malabar which were built after the fashion of heathen pagodas.

We find the following account in *Lendas da India*. "And to the Vicar of the said Cranganore.....And to George of St. Peter. Malabarese cleric who abides in the said Cranganore 50,000 reis per annum.....And for wax, wine and oil which are also given to the Vicar of the said Cranganore... .. And also for the said college and church of St. James, 6 candies of wheat .....oil .....wine.....154 pardaos and 2 tangas per year". (quoted by Dr. Xavier, *Ibid.* p. 19). Since we find in the Portuguese account an expenditure under the head of wax, and oil which are given to the vicar of the church of Cranganore, we must conclude that they had a parish church there, in addition to the church of St. James adjoining the Portuguese theological college, the expenditure of the church of St. James being given separately. There were only two churches in Cranganore at the time. The

parish church of Cranganore mentioned above, therefore, must be the church of St. Thomas. Faria (17th century) speaks of the church of St. Thomas in Cranganore as one "now standing within our fort." (*Portuguese Asia*, vol. II, p. 231). "At Cranganore," says St. Francis Xavier, "there are two churches: one of St. Thomas which is very piously frequented by the Christians of St. Thomas and another of St. James, adjoining the college" (Quoted by Fr. Panjikaran, p. 40). Here the church of St. Thomas is said to be piously frequented by the St. Thomas Christians. It is clear from these words that this church was not in their possession.

"The Portuguese having been Lords of Cranganore & Quilon" De Souza says, "many of these Christians came down to reside in our fortress; but as they were of diverse rite & schismatics, & as we wished to compel them to eat fish on the days of fasting, & to begin Lent on Ash-Wednesday, & as we did not permit their priests to say mass in fermented bread, they again went up into the mountains to live among the heathens." *Oriente Conquistado*, Pt. II, C, I, D. II. 17). So there were none of these Christians in Cranganore at the time of Xavier. The church of St. Thomas was frequented by these Christians, because it was their ancient church, "The church which today belongs to the fort", says Gouvea, "is the one the Christians had in olden times" (*Jornada*, Liv. I, Cap. XVI). By securing Plenary Indulgence for this church, which was frequented



by them, Xavier hoped to attract them to the fold of the Roman church—some of them might have been already inclined to that church.

## PART II

### *The Chaldaean Patriarchate*

Since it cannot be denied that the ancient church of Malabar was in communion with the Patriarch of Babylon, those who wish to connect it to Rome, are trying to prove that the Patriarchs of Babylon, who sent bishops to Malabar, were all Roman Catholics.

Fr. Panjikanan has adduced six pieces of evidence to prove the Roman Catholicism of the Chaldaean church. Fr. Schurhammer mentions or alludes to five of them and advances an additional argument. Let us examine them.

*Fr. Panjikanan:*—“When Nestorians spread in the Eastern countries, the language of the people, which was then Syro-Chaldaean, underwent certain modifications of character and pronunciation, and came to be known by the name of Nestorian. Nestorian and Chaldaean were therefore used as convertible terms. Consequently, historians have indiscriminately called all those who used this modified character of Estranghela....., Nestorians. But it can be easily proved that, at the beginning and even at the heyday of the Nestorian heresy, there were Syro-Chaldaeans in those parts, who vigorously opposed the spread of these pernicious doctrines” (The Syrian Church in Malabar, p. 16).

The fact that the language too received the name Nestorian, shows that almost all people who used that language, were Nestorians, and the non-Nestorians, if any, were quite insignificant. The few who were the opponents of the Nestorians also, according to our author, were called by the same name. When there are two contending parties they cannot be called by the same name. It is impossible. That the non-Nestorians were called Melkites (King's party) by the Nestorians, is admitted by our author himself. He has given three pieces of evidence to show that the Chaldaean Roman Catholics too were called Nestorians. He says: “In 1445 these Catholics improperly called Nestorians, sent a petition to Pope Eugenius IV. and the Pope ordered under pain of excommunication, that in future they should not be called Nestorians, but Catholic Chaldaeans. Again, in 1553, Cardinal Maffeus, in his declaration on the state of the Chaldaean Church made before the cardinals assembled in Rome to witness the conferring of the *pallium* on Simon Sulaka, said, “The Chaldaeans seem to have had but the name of Nestorians, but not to have held any Nestorian error.” In 1580..... Mar Elia, Archbishop of Amed, in a letter to Cardinal Carafa at Rome, begged His Eminence to obtain an order from the Holy See to abolish the improper practice of addressing the Syro-Chaldaeans as Nestorians, and to call them Oriental Chaldaeans or Assyrian Catholics.” (p. 17).

It is clear to a careful reader that the above references are to the Nestorians, not to Roman Catholics. The second reference is the clearest. If the Chaldaean Roman Catholics were called Nestorians by some misinformed people, it could not be said that they seemed to have had but the name of Nestorians. Who called them Nestorians? Nestorians? No, they called them Melkites. Did the Roman Catholics of other nationality call them Nestorians? If so, did they call them so knowingly or unknowingly? How can a Roman Catholic call another Roman Catholic by the name Nestorian, which means a heretic, knowing that he is orthodox? If they called them so unknowingly, it means only that they did not know that they seemed to have had but the name of Nestorians.

He ought to have said that some misinformed people call them Nestorians. "They seemed to have had but the name of Nestorians" means that Nestorians, seemed to have abandoned the Nestorian errors, but were still called Nestorians. Further Cardinal Maffeus, it must be observed, could not say positively that they were Nestorians only in name, & that they held no Nestorian error, though he had before him a Chaldaean Patriarch. The Nestorians believe in the Nicene creed as Rome does.

Some Nestorians have taught erroneous doctrines. But Nestorius does not seem to have taught any heresy. What the Cardinal says is that the so-called Nestorians are no heretics. The first and the third references are of the same nature. I

shall give a parallel instance which occurred recently. At a meeting of the Mar Thoma Syrian Students' Conference held at Kottayam there was a hot discussion about a telegram to be sent to the Jacobite Syrian Students' Conference. One party argued that since now the Jacobites of Malabar do not like to be called by that name, we should address them "Syrian Students' Conference" in accordance with their wish. The other party contended that they were called Jacobites till very lately in all their official records and therefore there is no reason why they should be offended at the name Jacobites. Does this prove that the Jacobites of Malabar are no Jacobites? Just in the same way the Pope out of courtesy, perhaps with the hope that they would come to his fold, complied with their request, and ordered that they should be addressed by the name they liked to be called by.

The letter of the Chaldaean Christians quoted by Fr. Schuhammer reads:—"We Oriental Nestorians thy servants are orphans." (Supra p.297). Even in the letter they addressed to the Pope they called themselves Nestorians. Can it be believed for a moment that some Roman Catholics, in their letter to the Pope will miscall themselves Nestorians? This letter, therefore, proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that these were Nestorians, who sought admission to the Roman Church.

*Fr. Panjikaran*:— The Catholicos of Seleucia became Nestorian in 498. "Le Quien says:— 'Although the Nestorian

heresy had spread itself in all the regions of the Persian Empire, yet there were not wanting in those places, persons who preserved the Catholic faith free from both Nestorian and Jacobite heresies, and they were called by those two sects Melkites. Joseph Asseman asserts that in 528 the greater part of the Christians of Persia were Catholics. Not only were there Catholics in those places, but we have also some indications of the existence, at least for a time, of a line of Catholic Metropolitans in Seleucia, under the authority of the Melkite Patriarch of Antioch. Le Quien, for instance, quotes the testimony of Barhebraeus and other eminent writers to show that the Nestorian Patriarch Abraham III had obtained from the Sultan an order that the Primate of the Melkites . . . should not be called Catholicos and should not consecrate bishops for the provinces under him. The Catholicos of the Melkites, on account of this noxious order of the Sultan, had to consecrate bishops and archbishops for the provinces under him, in secret and during night. When in 911 A.D. the Melkite Catholicos was consecrating a bishop, the Nestorian Patriarch came to know of it by means of his spies, and had them both taken before the Sultan, who imposed heavy fines on them" (pp. 20, 21).

Here it is admitted that the Nestorians were all powerful in the Persian Empire, and the Melkites were an insignificant, persecuted body. He has shown that there was in A.D. 911 a Melkite Primate; but we know no line of Melkite Bishops.

Perhaps this man was the first and the last of his line. Who is expected to send a mission to the distant India—a nominal sect consisting of a handful of men, or a powerful church? Further, it should be observed that if a man in the Nestorian regions renounced Nestorianism and returned to Christian orthodoxy, that "implied only a renewal of union with the Melkite Church of Antioch and the East, by no means a recognition of the Pope of Old Rome" (Catholic Encyclopaedia, Vol. III, p. 559).

### PART III

*Fr. Panjikaran:*—"Jesujabus Adjabenus, who was the Nestorian Patriarch of Seleucia from 650—660, in his letter to Simon, the Primate of Persia ... says: (Since the gift of God has been flowing through the narrow ways of the canons, and through lawful messengers allow it to flow, Behold, the earth is full of bishops, priests and faithful, who like the stars of heaven, are increasing every day. But in your country from the time you have revolted from the canons of the church, the succession of priesthood has been cut off from the people of India; nor from India alone, which extends from the shores of Persia as far as Colon (Quilon) — a space of more than twelve hundred parasangs — but also your own country of Persia lies in darkness deprived of the light of divine doctrine, which shines forth through bishops of the truth'. ... This letter clearly shows that, when the Catholicos of Seleucia became Nestorian, the Primate of Persia,

true to his religion, refuse? any longer to obey a head, who had strayed away from the ancient faith. And the Nestorian Patriarch did not succeed in winning over the Persian Metropolitan, before the ninth century ..... During all this time, then, the Indian Church remained Catholic through the Catholic Metropolitan of Persia, " (pp 24, 25).

From the letter quoted above we find that Bishop Simon revolted against his Patriarch. We do not know why. But our author says that the cause is clearly shown in the letter. This is indeed strange. Further he says that the revolt began at the Patriarch's turning Nestorian. The Patriarch embraced Nestorianism in 498 according to our author himself. But this letter was written 150 years later. How did Fr. Panjikaran conclude that the letter refers to a revolt, which began 150 years before?

Again our author says: "The Metropolitan, seeing that he had no immediate Catholic superior ... continued independent of Seleucia for a century and a half, " (p. 25).

If the Bishops of Persia, on account of their allegiance to the Roman Catholic church, refused to acknowledge the Patriarchs of Seleucia, they (the Bishops) and their people must have been enjoying "the gift of God flowing through the narrow ways of the canons and through lawful messengers," Nestorians never denied the validity of the Roman Catholic orders. So it is quite clear that the revolt in question was one against the

canons, and Bishop Simon was not under the Pope, but remained independent.

#### PART IV

*Fr. Panjikaran:*—"Here I may be permitted to bring together a short list of the Chaldaean patriarchs from 1490—1600, with a special view to bring out the fact ... that the Portuguese were mistaken in styling him (the patriarch of 1599) a Nestorian. We have seen that in 1490 Mar Simon V sent two bishops and that his successor Mar Elias had despatched three more bishops to India. We have read the report they submitted to the Patriarch in 1504, in which they say that they were admitted by the Portuguese to say mass in their churches. We have in a previous section established the orthodoxy of these bishops, and consequently of the two Patriarchs who sent them to India. We may infer that Simon Mama, the predecessor of John Sulaka who ruled the church about 1550, was a Catholic, because ..... the Pope uses the significant and orthodox expression 'of good memory', when speaking of this Patriarch, and surely there is not a single instance where the Pope has made use of this appellation when speaking of schismatic or heretical bishop or patriarch. Moreover, one of the five MSS. books of the Chaldaean Pontifical in the Vatican Library was transcribed in Mesopotamia in 1529, with the translation of some portion from the Latin Pontifical by the Patriarch Mar Simon Mama. On these grounds we infer he was a Catholic Patriarch." (pp 58, 59).

The first point our author brings forward to show the Roman Catholicism of Simon Mama, had already been advanced and refuted even before our author wrote his book. "These words" 'of good memory,' says Dr. Xavier, "have not the weight they (the authors of a note published in Mackenzie's Christianity in Travancore) would give them. They occur invariably in all Papal documents, when reference is made to a deceased bishop. It is a mode of speech common to the Papal Secretariate—polite & charitable to the deceased. It has less reference to the character, orthodoxy or virtue, than to signify the late or lamented, the well remembered, &c. &c." (Some Elucidations, p. 23). No Roman Catholic will reasonably contend that no man "of good memory" lived outside his own church.

The second point is that Simon Mama translated "some portion from the Latin Pontifical." If this will make him a Roman Catholic, Mr. K. C. Joshua the Retired District Judge, a staunch adherent of the Mar Thoma Syrian Church, is also to be classed as a Roman Catholic, because he published a revised translation of the Roman Catholic Syriac Liturgy & that with the imprimatur of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Ernakulam.

It is regrettable to observe that the Reverend Father overlooked the fact that in the very same sentence where, according to himself, the Pope uses the significant and orthodox expression "of good memory" when speaking of this

Patriarch, says that he died outside the Roman Curia.<sup>4</sup> "Roman Curia strictly speaking, the ensemble of departments or ministries which assist the sovereign pontiff in the government of the universal Church. These are the congregations, the tribunals and the officers of curia." (Catholic Encyclopaedia, vol. XIII, p. 147). To be out of the Roman Curia therefore simply means to be out of the Papal rule or the pale of the Roman Church.

#### PART V

*Fr. Panjikaran* :— "The Orthodoxy of ..... John Sulaka, who assumed the reins of Government in 1551, has not so far been called in question by any writer. He visited Rome, and submitted to Pope Julius III his profession of faith, and received the *pallium* from His Holiness. His successor, Mar Ebed-jesus went to Rome, assisted at the last session of the Council of Trent, and was according to Giamil, one of the most celebrated patriarchs of the Catholic Chaldaeans." (p. 59).

4. Postmodum vero ecclesia patriarchali de Musal in Syria Orientali cuius memoriam Simon Maria (Mamma) Patriarcha de Musal et insulae Tigris ac caeterarum civitatum et terrarum orientium eidem Patriarchae subjectarum, necnon monasteriorum ejusdem nationis in sui Massin et Calicut ac tota India existentium eidem etiam Patriarchae subditorum dum viveret praesidebat per obitum ejusdem Simonis Patriarchae qui extra Romanam Curiam debitum naturae persolvit pastorem solatio destituta.

After the death of Simon Mama, 90th Patriarch, there arose a new line of patriarchs acknowledging the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff. The first of this new line is Simon Sulaka (A.D. 1552—1555). The cause of the schism was the following. The patriarchate remained hereditary for a long time, and the patriarchs were always consecrating only their relatives as Metropolitans. When Simon Mama died in A.D. 1551, the only bishop left in the church was his nephew who as usual assumed the reins of the church. Being exasperated with such a system of hereditary ecclesiastical aristocracy, some of the clergy and laity of the church met in an assembly and elected one Sulaka for the patriarchate. Since they had no bishop to consecrate Sulaka, they sent him to Rome, where he was consecrated. At the instigation of the Nestorian Patriarch he was imprisoned by the Pasha; and later on put to death. (Catholic Encyclopædia, Vol. III, p. 559; Missionary Researches in Armenia by Eli Smith and H. G. O. Dwight, p. 367) As to his successor, Ebedjesu, I need only quote the words of Dr. Medlycott, sometime Vicar Apostolic of Trichur:—"He was succeeded by Ebedjesu who, in 1562, went to Rome, submitted a profession of faith to Pius IV, was confirmed and was present at the Council of Trent; of his profession of faith, Le Quien observes (II, 1159): the latter words betray a Nestorian meaning. He has left written three poems; two on the journey to, and return from Rome, of his predecessor Sulaka, whom he calls

John; and third in honour of Pius IV. In the first he puts in the mouth of Sulaka the following, in his profession of faith. After the union (of the Godhead and humanity in Christ) there remained two Natures and two Persons absolutely inseparable for ever, which is open Nestorianism; in the second he bestows high praise on Nestorius, and rejects St. Cyril of Alexandria, the great defender of the Catholic faith at the Council of Ephesus against Nestorius' heresy. Further he compares Bar-Mama, his opponent the Nestorian patriarch, to Cyril the Egyptian, and Sulaka to Mar Nestorius, who was confined in the lonely desert. Assemani (B. O., I. 541 seq) tries to cover this by the suggestion that the MS. was falsified by the copyist, but has to admit that the text is the same in two copies found at Rome. Le Quien (II, 1160) does not mince matters but says plainly: 'Thus indeed were the Roman theologians imposed upon by these crafty Easterns . . . . . they being insufficiently acquainted with the phraseology and the tricks of the older heretics.' (Some Elucidations, pp. 29, 30). This pamphlet was published in 1903 at Ernakulam, Cochin. Fr. Panjikaran, who published his pamphlet in 1914, did not try to meet the arguments adduced in the above by Dr. Xavier and Dr. Medlycott.

The suggestion that the MS. was falsified by the copyist, is quite unreliable when we find the same text in two copies preserved in Rome. This suggestion will be only worth considering when a manuscript with a different text is brought

out. To suggest without any evidence that an ancient manuscript is a falsified one, is very easy.

#### PART VI

*Fr. Panjikaran:* - He (Ebedjesu) was succeeded by Abdalla Simon who, on account of the successive wars that were being waged in his country, was not able to procure confirmation from the holy Apostolic See. On his death in 1582 Simon Denha was elected patriarch-Pope Gregory XIII, who examined his profession of faith, was satisfied with his orthodoxy, and gave him the *pallium* confirming him as patriarch. Le Quien gives him a place among the Catholic patriarchs, and asserts that owing to Turkish persecution, he transferred his patriarchal See to Urumiah in Persia. He died in 1600. "Hence we see that the patriarch Mar Simon Denha who was governing the Church in 1599 was a Catholic, and yet the portuguese had ordered the people to condemn, reject and anathematise him as a Nestorian heretic." (p 60).

As to Simon Denha Dr. Medlycott says: "Strozza, the authority quoted by Assesmani, says that Denha Simeon ..... removed his residence to the confines of Persia—to Urmi, in fact, in Kurdistan—yielding to the power of his opponent, the Nestorian patriarch, and was found by the Apostolic Nuncio not qualified for the office either by age or learning. This branch sunk back into Nestorianism and represents the present line of Patriarchs holding the Nestorian heresy." (Some

Elucidations, p. 30). Mar Simon is the name of the Nestorian line of Patriarchs in Kurdistan.

"Another Nestorian Patriarch," Dr. Medlycott goes on, "Elias, of the older line, was brought about under Paul V in 1616, and from him the succession of the Catholic Patriarchs is continued to our days." (Ibid, p. 30).

Anyhow there is no doubt that there were two lines of Patriarchs during the second half of the XVIth century.

The names of the Patriarchs of these two lines as given by Joseph Asseman are shown below:—

#### *Nestorian Patriarchs*

91. Simon Bar-Mama, A. D. 1552-1559
92. Elias, A. D. 1559-1591

He sent a monk with his profession of faith to Rome in 1586 but the Pope rejected it, because it was full of Nestorian errors.

93. Elias, A. D. 1591-1618.

#### *The new line of Patriarchs*

1. Simeon Sulaka, A. D. 1552-1555
2. Ebedjesu, who made his profession of faith in 1562
3. Ahatalla, ob. A. D. 1580
4. Simeon Denha.

(Bibliotheca Orientalis, Vol. III, pp. 621, 622).

Though the Patriarchs of the new line were nominally Roman Catholics, their orthodoxy is called in question. That this line sunk back into Nestorianism and represents the present line of the Nestorian Patriarchs is unquestionable.

As to the conversion of the Nestorian Patriarchs, the words of Dr. Medlycott are worth quoting: "There were quite a number of paper conversions of this sort, recorded in Raynalds 'Annalles,' then taken perhaps to be genuine but, since the discovery of the Eastern archives, known to be quite fictitious, as the Bishops and Patriarchs whom the Friars, sent out to the East and farthest East among the Mongols, induced to write such letters which they took on to the Papal court, never changed the course of their lives or the tenets of their belief, remained staunch Nestorians or Jacobites, as they were before at the head of their people." (Some Elucidations, P. 29)

*Fr. Schurhammer's evidence*

He adduces an evidence to prove the Roman Catholicism of the Chaldaean church. It is derived from the "Travels of Joseph the Indian." Thomas Astley in his collection of "Voyages & Travels" (London, 1745) speaks of it as unsatisfactory, and adds:—"Nor is this any wonder, since Grynæus, or whoever took the relation from Joseph's mouth, tells us he could scarce understand him" (Vol. I, P 48).

This is corroborated by the quotation given by the learned Father. "There are many other sacrifices, but as Joseph did not know the language well enough & had not had much conversation with the gentiles so he could not explain all."

Joseph did not know the language of the interviewer well enough to explain all the sacrifices of the gentiles. Nobody

will take it to mean that Joseph did not know Malayalam, his mother tongue & that of the gentiles. He was with the Portuguese for about a year. So he might have had a smattering of Portuguese.

Indians, who have spent many years in studying a European language, & Europeans who have spent many years in studying an Indian language, find it often very difficult to express themselves in the language they have studied. Then how much of a language could be studied within a year?

The speaker's meaning could not have been grasped on account of his bad Portuguese & very bad pronunciation, and he must have found it extremely difficult to express himself in Portuguese. And this is abundantly evident from the quotations given in the article under consideration.

"These aforesaid Christians have in spiritual things as their head a pontiff 12 Cardinals & Patriarchs bishops & Archbishops." That this statement is wrong is admitted by Fr. Schurhammer in a foot note. He had neither Cardinals nor Patriarchs under him.

"The said Joseph told that he departed from the said town of Cranganore with a bishop his superior."

The learned Father admits that this also is wrong. "Here the author of our relation", says he, "mixed up things, perhaps because he misunderstood Joseph, or because his memory failed, Joseph's companion from India was George, who was ordained priest, not bishop."



Now let us come to the portion on which Fr. Schurhammer unhesitatingly relies. "Our Pontiff Alexander..... asked him (Joseph) who had given this authority to his Catholicos. And Fr. Joseph answered him.....St. Peter was Pontiff in Antiochia. And as the Christians in the parts of Rome were molested by the craft of Simon Magus .....they sent to St. Peter entreating him to transfer himself to Rome, So he left a vicar behind in his place & went to Rome. And this is the one who at present is called Catholicos & he rules in the name of Peter. And as regards the creation of the said Pontiff or Catholicos, the 12 aforesaid Cardinals .....create their Pontiff, which authority they say they have from the Roman Pontiff."

The Catholicos is here identified with the patriarch of Antioch, which is an obvious mistake which the learned Father cannot but admit; because the Catholicos had no pretention to that title.

Though there are so many obviously incorrect statements in the document under discussion, Fr. Schurhammer wants us to give ready credence to the statement that the Catholicos derived his authority from the Roman Pontiff, though it was not known to that Pontiff. Pope Alexander "asked him who had given this authority to his Catholicos". This Catholicos received his authority from the Pope without the Pope's knowledge; & the Pope learned that intelligence only from an Indian. Will the learned Father persist in maintaining such a position? Will he find fault with us if we say that

in this too the interviewer "misunderstood Joseph" or "his memory failed,"?

Since we learn from this document that the Pope was unaware of any relation subsisting between himself and the Chaldaean Catholicos, it proves, if it proves anything, that the Catholicos had nothing to do with Rome.

Having disposed of the above arguments one by one, I shall proceed to give a few pieces of evidence to prove the opposite.

1. From 1552 we find two lines of Patriarchs. Fr. Schurhammer will call one Roman Catholic and the other Nestorian. Till 1552 we find only one line of Patriarchs and that line, it is contended, was Roman Catholic. So the beginning of the Nestorian Patriarchate must be ascribed to 1552, and consequently the beginning of the Nestorian Church. But the learned Father will not go to such a length. If there was a Nestorian Church before 1552, it follows that they had their Patriarchs; because a church cannot exist without bishops. Fr. Panjikaran admits that the Catholicos (or Patriarch) became Nestorian during the last quarter of the fifth century, and the Nestorians were all powerful in the Persian Empire during the succeeding centuries, and the Orthodox party was quite insignificant. It is admitted on all hands that the Nestorians were highly favoured by the Persian Government. The first Patriarch of the Melkite line in the XVIth century was thrown into prison and subsequently murdered by the Government authorities at the instigation of the Nestorian Patriarch. Till the middle of the XVIth century there was only one line of Patriarchs.

Being such a powerful body, the Nestorian church cannot, for a moment, be supposed to go without a Patriarch for centuries, while the persecuted weaker body, the Melkites, as our friends say, were having a succession of Patriarchs. Will Fr. Schurhammer dare to advance such a position? In my last article in this paper this argument was adduced. Fr. Schurhammer does not say a word in reply. As it is a very important point I invite his attention once more.

(2) The Chaldaean Christians, who sent Sulaka to Rome to be consecrated Patriarch, wrote to the Pope saying "We Oriental Nestorians". They confessed they were Nestorians.

3. The Pope says that Patriarch Sinion Mama died out of the Roman curia, i. e. out of the papal rule.

4. "And so you ought to accept and carry out his healthy advice," so wrote Pope Pius IV. to Abed Jesu (Abdiso) the second of the new line of Patriarchs regarding his nuncio, "as though it were ours, just as you also promised you would do; so that the faith of those over whom you are may clearly agree with the faith of the Holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church, nor differ in anything or in nothing, at any rate, which is necessary for salvation. For with regard to what belongs.....to rites and ceremonies, although it were desirable that the two should agree, nevertheless we intend to allow you to retain your ancient customs and rites such at any rate as shall be capable of approval provided only that in the sacraments and other things pertaining to faith and necessary for salvation you follow, as we said, the Roman Church." (Giamil, p. 69).

The same Pope wrote to the Archbishop of Goa in the same year, 1565, regarding the Patriarch Abed Jesu:—"In which matter injury could occur to this holy seat also, and to ourselves who when the Patriarch..... came about three years ago right from Assyria to the apostolic seat for the purpose of obtaining communion with the Roman Church, confirmed him when he had duly professed the reverence & obedience due to this seat ..... receive him into our faith." (Giamil, p 71).

The same Pope wrote under the same date to the Bishop of Cochim:—"We received him (Mar Abraham) ..... for the sake of his Patriarch, who, when he came about three years ago to offer obedience to the Apostolic seat & obtain confirmation of his priesthood, duly, with great devotion professed faith in the Holy Roman Church, was confirmed by us ..... By his example Abraham also accepted the faith of the Roman Church." (Giamil, p. 73).

These letters of the Pope make it abundantly evident that Patriarch Abed Jesu & his people were converts to the Roman Church. "Patriarch..... came..... for the purpose of obtaining communion with the Roman Church." It is as clear as daylight that he was not in communion with the Roman Church. "Received him into our faith." If this does not mean that he became a convert to the Roman Church, what on earth can it possibly mean?

5. Patriarch Abed Jesu in one of his poems, two copies of which are found at Rome, bestows high praise on Nestorius & rejects Cyril of Alexandria. (Supra)

It is, therefore, overwhelmingly evident that the Church of Malabar & that of Chaldaea were not under Rome.

— K. N. D.