RAM
RY
J63
C28
00051872

Reference

Not to be taken Out

2245

XII/32

THE CATHOLICITY OF THE ST. THOMAS CHRISTIANS

CONTAINING

SOME CORRESPONDENCE

AND

REVIEWS

CONCERNING

The Syrian Church in Malabar

EDITED BY

Rev. C. J. George Cathanar.

DHARMARAM COLLEGE LIBRARY BANGALORE-29

TRIVANDRUM:

Printed at the "Malabar Mail" Press

1904.

Price 4 As.

DHARMARAM COLLEGE LIBRARY
Ac. No 51872
Call No J63/C28
AR.

(Some Correspondences and Reviews)

ON THE HISTORY

OF

The Syrian Church, Malabar.

Dear Sir,—I happened to read in many papers, the address delivered by the Hon'ble Mr. G. T. Mackenzie, British Resident in Travancore and Cochin, on the occasion of the distribution of prizes, on the 22nd May 1903 to the pupils of St. Berchmans' High School, Changanacherry.

Your readers are perhaps aware of the fact that Mr. Mackenzie is the author of a Pamphlet "Christianity in Travancore." Note No. 116* of this pamphlet has evoked much criticism. Among the many attempts made to refute the statements contained therein reference may here be made to those of "Historicus Philalethes" whose contributions filled the pages of "The Mylapore Catholic Register" (April and May 1902), to the articles published in the "Voice of Truth" a vernacular paper hailing from Ernaculam, from the pen of one "P. P. M." & Co., to some elucidations issued from the same press, Ernaculam, and to the article in "The Bombay Catholic Examiner" of the 9th May headed "The St. Thoma's Christians" by Dr. Criticus.

This controversy excited my curiosity and led to a search after the facts in which I was considerably assisted by the publication, sometime back, of a dialogue between

* Only the first part of the note has evoked criticism

Fr. Vanerello and Mr. Raggio, a perusal ofwhich would convince any unbiased mind, that the St. Thoma's Christians were Catholics even before the Synod of Diamper which was held in 1599 and that the Portuguese did not convert them from Nestorianism but only brought them under the jurisdiction of the Latin Bishops. An impartial writer like Mr. Mackenzie who has made a special study of the subject cannot but be struck with the fact, that the St. Thomas Christians were Catholics at the time when St. Francis Xavier came in contact with them and their Bishop Mar Jacob Abuna, and whose catholicity, during the 45 years hey were under Mar Jacob, is testified to by the Saint in his letter dated 26th January 1549 to John III, King of Portugal.

The denial of the catholicity of the St. Thoma's Christians at least at the time of St. Francis Xavier evidently launches the holders of the opposite theory into the horns of a dilemma, either that St. Francis Xavier Apostolic Nuncio in India, even after close contact with St. Thoma's Christians for so many years was unable to distinguish a Catholic from a heretic Bishop or that the second Apostle of the Indies was a falsifier of truth. From the letter above referred to, it is evident that St. Francis Xavier eulogises Mar Jacob as a Saintly Catholic Bishop. Here then we have two contrary statements. St. Francis Xavier, an eye-witness bearing evidence to the fact that St. Thoma's Christians were Catholics ; and "Historicus Philalethes & Co." after the lapse of about four centuries denying the fact and basing their contention on mere suppositions and conjectures.

Historicus Philalethes & Co. have been busy inventing arguments in support of their contention and their excited imagination has given birth to the astounding revelation

that Mar Jacob was in his old age, converted by the Portuguese and to bear out their statement adduce the following words of the Saint: "And now in his all but decrepit old age he conforms himself most obediently to all the rites and customs of our Holy Mother the Roman Church." The Latin Text for "and now" in this translation of the Saint's letter is *et nunc* which must be interpreted even now like *et nunc* in the response of *Gloria Patri.* This correct interpretation is corroborated by the following passage from the Saint's letter above referred to—:"It is now five and forty years (from his very arrival in India) that a certain Armenian Bishop by name Abuna Jacob *has served God* and Your Highness in this country." Is it not erroneous to surmise that the Saint referred to services rendered to Satan as services rendered to God? '*Nemo Malus praesumitur Nisi probetur*' "nobody is presumed bad unless he is so proved."

Mr. Mackenzie's address was, no doubt, interesting and instructive to students. But his words "After the Portuguese made the passage of the Cape of Good Hope and opened the road to Europe you (St. Thoma's Christians) came into communion with Rome, but still maintaining your own Syrian rites. Since then you have been members of the Catholic Church, holding the whole Catholic faith," are a surprise to many; for in his 'Christianity in Travancore" he refers to the fact that Mar John Archbishop of the Syrians, and afterwards Patriarch went with his suffragan Bishops to Rome, and received the pallium from the Pope in the 12th century (vide page 92 of his book; also Raulin page 435). The St. Thoma's Xians are also spoken of as having paid the expenses of Marignoli, the Papal Delegate in the 14th century (Vide page 93). Records as to the authenticity of which there is not even the

slightest shadow of doubt prove that in the 16th century Mar Abedjesus, the Catholic Patriarch of Babylon with the approval of Rome sent to Malabar Mar Elia, Mar Joseph and Mar Abraham as Bishops of St. Thoma's Christians without any intervention on the part of the Portuguese but with their characteristic persecution. The authorities and arguments mentioned above would convince any unbiased mind that the claim of the Portuguese to have rescued the St. Thoma's Christians from Nestorianism falls to the ground. Mr. Mackenzie's attempts, therefore, to attribute to the fallen nation of Europe the glorious task of having rescued from perdition so many millions of souls has only to be considered a fruitless task unwarranted and unsustainable.

Again what does Mr. Mackenzie mean by the addition of a qualifying phrase "holding the whole Catholic faith" to "since then you have been members of the Catholic Church ?" Are there members of the Catholic Church who do not hold the whole Catholic faith ? Does not the learned chairman contradict himself when he says "since then you have been members of the Catholic Church holding the whole Catholic faith; and I see no good reason why you should not continue to believe that venerable tradition that this Church on the Malabar Coast was founded by St. Thomas the Apostle?" Does Mr. Mackenzie, a model Catholic gentleman, mean that all Missionaries and Evangelizers of the first five centuries on the Malabar Coast including the Apostle St. Thomas before the condemnation of Nestor as a heretic in 431 A. D. were not Catholics ?

Mr. Mackenzie's aim, therefore, seems to have been to spur the Syrians of Malabar to greater activity in adducing further evidence, if they have any, to prove their catholicity

before the arrival of the Portuguese in India and that the Portuguese did not convert them from Nestorianism.

A SYRIAN.

(See the *Malabar Mail* July 4th 1903 and The Madras *Catholic Watchman* 3rd July 1903, &c.)

From the following letters, impartial readers can clearly understand that the Editor of the *Mylapore Catholic Register* holds the opposite theory and declines to consider the arguments which support a view contrary to his and his companions and so he refuses to publish them in his paper.

Copy of the Type-written reply. To Very Rev. Fr. E. A. Nidiry.

From "The Editor of *Catholic Register*."

San. Thomé, Madras.

28th Jan. 1903.

Dear Very Rev. Father Nidiry,

Had you not acknowledged it, I would have declined to believe that you had had anything to do with the pamphlet you have sent me, and I will tell you why.

You are perfectly correct in supposing that I take an interest in questions affecting the by-gone history of the Syro-Malabar Church. Accordingly I am always happy to receive communications that help to elucidate questions connected with such history. Nor is the question whether the Christians of St. Thoma were orthodox or Nestorian previous to the coming of the Portuguese, the only one that is of any particular interest to me. For a matter of fact, I am still more interested in determining whether at the time of the Apostle's coming to India, the

people of Southern India were Brahmins, Budhists, Jains, or Animists. So could I bring myself to consider the pamphlet as a serious contribution to the literature of the history of the Syro-Malabar Church, I would welcome it. But this I regret I can scarcely do ; for on the face of it, it bears the impress of an attempt to bloster up a preconceived theory, by, to say the least of them, tortuous means. Thus, the pamphlet ignores the success of the 50 years' endeavour of the Portuguese Missionaries to bring the Syro-Malabar Church in line with their ideas, of which successful endeavour the Synod of Diampur, was merely the last and crowning act; and so makes the inference possible that Arch-Bishop Menezes had allowed a missal to be used on one day, which he condemned as heretical and corrected the very next day.

It was for such reasons that I decided to ignore the pamphlet when it was sent to me for publication some weeks back, and such also was my advice to "Historicus Philalethes" who happpened to simultaneously send me a refutation of it.

Believe me,
Yours truly,
(Sd.) JAS DOYLE,
Editor, Catholic Register.

You may rest assured that no one will know from me that you had had anything to do with the pamphlet.

J. D.

Copy of very Rev. Fr. E. A. Nidiry's reply to the above letter.

Koravalangad,
13–4–03.

Dear and Rev. Fr. Doyle,

I duly received your reply of the 28th January 1903 and communicated it to my co-operators in compiling the pamphlet. They requested me to ask you the following questions:—

1. What did make you not to believe (before seeing my admission) that I had anything to do with the pamphlet ?

2. Did you think that I believed in the histories of De Sousa, Gouvea, and Raulin, who had not personal knowledge of the Syrians, and who do not prove the assertions they make by quotations from any history?

3. Did you think me to be so tenacious and incapable to be persuaded even by the strongest evidence against a thing, which I once believed as a historical fact, or that I hold historical points just like 'Dogmas'?

4. Who, except those who read only the Portuguese histories and others whose foundations were the said histories, believe that the fifty years' labours of the Portuguese Missionaries in Malabar, were to convert the St. Thoma's Christians to the Catholic Faith, and not to cut off their dependance on the Catholic Patriarch of Babylon, changing their ancient Chaldean Rite into Latin, and make their Arch-Bishop, Suffragan to the Portuguese Arch-Bishop of Goa?

5. Is it not your duty as a journalist or as a gentleman, to publish our arguments as you did publish those against us ?

6. What did make you add the word " By-gone," before " the History of the Syro-Malabar Church," in your reply, which changed the meaning of the history which I expressed in my letter ?

7. What earthly benefit could have been conferred upon the public by the informations about the anti-christian caste and creed of the St. Thoma's Christians?

8. As you did ask (in a subsequent issue of your paper to the said reply to me, *i. e.* January 31, 1903) Mr. E. M. Philip to give his evidence to prove the Nestorianism of St. Thoma's Christians, I think it my duty to inform you that the said Mr. E. M. Philip once published, " that at the back of the so-called St. Peter's Chair, were found by a keen observer the following Arabic words :—

" Lai, Lai, il, Alla, Mahomed Razuhli Halla" and this was reported to the reigning Pope and he immediately ordered to remove that and substitute another old chair in its place. Moreover the same Mr. E. M. Philip published in a Jacobite magazine that as Mahomed propagated the Koran with his sword, so, the Portuguese propagated the Roman Catholic faith in Malabar with their sword and money. The Judges of the High Court of Travancore express in some of their judgments that Malabar was created by Parasu Rama, an incarnate Hindu Deity, and was given by him to the Brahmins as a free gift and therefore their tenants are obliged to pay the Brahmins, the rent of landed properties. If you ask the evidence on both the subjects, I believe that for the former Mr. Philip would send to ayou copies of the books of Alvarez, the Apostate Goanese, and of one P. Ittup, a Jacobite historian. The Judges of the High Court of Travancore would likewise refer you to a Hindu Book called Keralolpatty and to the depositions of some sworn

Hindu witnesses. Would these be sufficient to convince you that the story of the change of St. Peter's chair and the violent introduction of Catholic religion into Malabar and the creation of this country by Parasu Rama is true?

(9) If Historicus Philalethes sent a copy of the pamphlet and the refutation thereof, what reason had you not to publish them if not, the weakness of the arguments used in refuting the pamphlet? If not, did you not deprive the public of the opportunity of knowing the arguments, and evidence against those contained in the pamphlet. Is it becoming to the duty of a public writer like yourself, to deprive the public of such important evidence in behalf of history. A reply would oblige me.

(Sd.) E. A. NIDIRY,
Vicar, St. Mary's Church,
Koravalangad.

[For aught I know, no reply has been given as yet to the above questions.]

(From the *Catholic Herald of India* conducted by Jesuit Fathers, Calcutta, "February 17th 1903.")

"We have received a copy of a pamphlet "Were the St. Thomas Christians Nestorians?" The St. Thoma's Christians in Malabar are said to be the most ancient Christians in India, and their forefathers to have received the true faith from the Apostle St. Thomas himself. In 1901, Mr. G. T. Mackenzie, the British Resident in Travancore and Cochin, published at the request of the Government, a history of these Christians under the title "Christianity in Travancore". It is known that he took great trouble to make his work a reliable source for future historians, and we are told that Mr. Mackenzie may be considered as

an authority on the matter. Some of his assertions however, have been traversed and the point to which the pamphlet refers is one of those discussed even in newspapers. After reading this little contribution to the discussion, we are of opinion that the arguments brought forward there to prove that the St. Thoma's Christians wese not Nestorians cannot be ignored. Whether it is possible to come to a conclusion by a simple reading of the pamphlet is a different question. It appeals to the historian, and to him we heartily recommend it. Short, without useless developments, in the form a dialogue—perhaps not the best form in the case—it can be read in a couple of hours, and as we said, the arguments seem worth examining. *The Catholic Register* (Mylapore) published recently a contribution the writer of which takes the opposite view; we suppose that he will hasten to see what his opponents have to say. The ordinary reader would hardly be able to derive much benefit from the reading of this otherwise useful publication, unless he happens to be well acquainted with the history of this Christian Community."

(From the *Cochin Argus*. July 25th 1903.)

(It seems that Rev. Fr. Ernest Hull. S. J., the present editor of the *Bombay Catholic Examiner* published in the *Examiner* the article of 'Doctor Criticus' without examining it.)

DEAR SIR,—In the *Bombay Catholic Examiner* of the 9th May last there appeared an article headed "The St. Thoma's Christians" by one Doctor Criticus, in reply to which allow me to make the following remarks:

The first point adduced by Dr. Criticus is that all the writers who have treated of the Syrians, viz, DeBarros,

Gouvea, Souza, Assemiani, Jos. Simon, Paulinus A. S. Bartholomeo, Raulin, LeQuien, German, Hergenrother and others* are agreed that the St. Thoma's Christians in Travancore and Cochin were Nestorians until they were converted to the Catholic faith by the efforts of the Portuguese Missionaries. This is tantamount to saying that the St. Thoma's Christians from the time of the Apostle, whose evangelization gave them their nomenclature, to the time they were brought within the fold of the Catholic Church, by the efforts of the Portuguese Missionaries, not even excepting the centuries prior to the birth of Nestor, were Nestorians, and consequently the Blessed Apostle himself preached Nestorianism to the forefathers of the Syrians of Malabar ! This statement of Dr. Criticus is sufficient proof that either the authors whom he quotes have erroneously misrepresented facts, or he himself maliciously and wilfully twisted their statements to serve his end or that the foul air of a school-hall of philosophy inhaled by Dr. Criticus has affected his brain. The Doctor's knowledge of history appears also to be a confusion of history. The very heading of the Doctor's article 'the St. Thoma's Christians' contradicts his Nestorian hypothesis.

The Doctor next states that the reasons given by the writers of the manuscript which Mr. Mackenzie has condensed in his Note No. 116 of his booklet "Christianity in Travancore" have been peremptorily refuted by Bishop Medlycott in 'The Voice of Truth' and by one Historicus Philalethes in the Mylapore 'Catholic Register' in favour of the Nestorian theory. The writer of the 'Dialogue' has proved that the arguments adduced by Dr. Medlycott and Historicus Philalethes are weak and shallow. The Doctor,

* Doctor Criticus cites many authors. The multitude of the authors proves nothing; but the value of their opinions must be examined by the worth of the arguments. Opinions must be treated like coins which are esteemed not by their number but by their current value.

therefore, in adducing the same arguments of Historicus Philalethes* importunately plays the role of heretics, who, arguments failing, shamelessly bite the marrowless dry bones of arguments eschewed by sharp refuters. We do not, for fear of space, propose to refute here, the (5) five arguments of Dr. Criticus, but refer the impartial readers to 'the Dialogue.' The critical eyes of Dr. Criticus condemn the arguments in the 'Dialogue' as fallacious and sophistical and its author as ignorant of history and logic. The Doctor's statement is not substantiated by examples. To the Doctor, I have only to say in reply "Quod gratis affirmatur, gratis negatur." As to his groundless assertion that the Portuguese Missionaries converted the Syrians before the Synod of Diamper, I have only to ask the Doctor to quote the passages which record these conversions if the statement is not a mere outcome of his fertile imagination. Should he fail to quote the passages referred to, your readers cannot but conclude that, like other birds of the same feather, the Doctor's power of imagination has been made use of to misguide the world at large.

The Doctor walking in the footsteps of his worthy model historians, failing to find out arguments to prove that Archbishop Menezes converted the Syrians at the Synod of Diamper, creates some Portuguese Missionaries unknown to historians and credits them with having done the work of conversion. Any one who reads the pastoral letter of Archbishop Menezes, *re* the convening of the Synod of Diamper† will immediately be convinced that Archbishop Menezes did not threaten the converted

---

* Perhaps Dr. Criticus is the same person as Historicus Philalethes in another mask.

† See Gouvea Synodo Diocesano &c. Fol. 1–2. edited Coimbra 1606. Raulin page 59–64 and Bullarium Patronatus, Portugalliae appendix Tom. I page 150–155 edited Olisipone 1872.

Syrians with excommunication but the Archdeacon George together with all the Syrian clergy and laity.

The resistance which the Syrians showed to admit Archbishop Menezes was not due to any difference of faith, but is mainly attributable to their unwillingness to cut off their adherence to the Catholic Chaldean Patriarch and to admit a Latin Bishop instead of a Catholic Chaldean Bishop who should govern them according to their ancient rite. The foregoing shows plainly that the Doctor has studiously avoided to read about the Catholicity of the Syrians on the pages of the authorities he mainly relies on, viz, De Barros, Gouvea, Raulin &c. or has omitted to mention these passages from the pastoral letter referred to.

Portuguese Original.

" Pera o que mandamos em virtude da sancta obediencia, e sob pena de excommunhão *latae sententiae* ao reverendo arcediago deste bispado, e a todos os mais sacerdotes delle, que nao tiverem legitimo impedimento de enfermidade, idade, ou outro inevitavel ocupacão, se achem presentes aos ditos vinte dias do mez de Junho na igreja de Todos os Sanctos do dito lugar de Diamper, per a comnosco celebrarem o dito Synodo diocesano, conforme aos sagrados canones."

Latin version by Raulin.

" Insuper praecipimus in virtute sanctae obedientiae et sub poena excommunicationis latae sententiae, rev. hujus episcopatus archidiacono, et omnihus aliis sacerdotibus ejusdem, legitimo ob valetudinem, aetatem vel alio inevitabili officio non impeditis, ut die 20 Junii absint, ut ab iis nobiscum congregratis praedicta Synodus dioecesana juxta sacros Canones celebretur."

English Translation.

" We besides command in virtue of holy obedience and under penalty of excommunication *latae sententiae* the Rev. Archdeacon of this Episcopate and all the other priests of the same who are not legally impeded by infirmity, old age or other inevitable occupation, to be present on the 20th day of June in All Saints' Church at Diamper to celebrate with us the said diocesan synod according to the Holy Canons"

As to the Doctor's opinion that " the Melchites followed the Greek rite of the Church of Antioch," I have to observe that the term "Melchite" is the adjective form of the Syriac substantive " Malka" meaning king. It originally designated all those who followed the Catholic faith, professed, maintained and supported by the Catholic King of Constantinople in contradistinction to Nestorians and Euthicians, and hence 'Melchite' was a synonym for Catholic. In order to be in union with the Catholic Church, it was not necessary for the Syrians of Malabar to be governed by the Greek Melchite Patriarch of Antioch, who did not exist prior to 1686, the year in which the Catholic Hierarchy was separately established for the Greek Melchites.

As to the Doctor's supposition " The Catholic Syrians, follow still their former Nestorian rite in Chaldaic language from which Archbishop Menezes removed only heretical passages." I have only to state that the Doctor is utterly ignorant of the matter, for he has never, as it appears, compared the decrees of the Synod of Diamper and the liturgy, as it is said, corrected by Archbishop Menezes with the liturgy which is still in use among the Catholic Syrians of Malabar. The Latin translation of the so-called corrected Syrian liturgy and the decrees of the Synod are

found printed in Gouvea (Part II fol. 1-2-64 &c.), Raulin (Page 293 333 &c.). If the Doctor would compare them with each other he will be compelled to admit that many ceremonies and practices of the ancient Syro-Chaldean rite condemned by the Portuguese as heretical under pain of excommunication incurred *ipso facto* are still found in the Missals of the Catholic Syro-Chaldeans of Malabar as well as of Babylon both printed at Rome with the approbation of the Holy See, and are also even today observed by them. Of these the former Missal was edited also twice, first in 1784, and secondly in 1884, with the diligent care of the Carmelite Bishops of Verapoly, who then governed the Syrians. From this it is clear that the changes, innovations and decrees of the Synod were not only not approved but, on the other hand, as many of those were quite contrary to the decisions and constitutions of the Catholic Church, were disapproved by the Holy See. This fact moveover proves sheer ignorance of the authors of the Synod, regarding the oriental rites and customs and this together with other acts and decrees of the Synod, itself leads us to conclude that the Missal used by the Syrians before and after the Synod, are not the same as that corrected by Archbishop Menezes. In the Latin version of Menezes (of which no Syriac text is found anywhere in Malabar), the names of the Patriarch has been deleted, and it is clear from the very decrees of the Synod that all the Patriarchs of Babylon (who were even in communion with Rome) were also condemned in general as Nestorians.

The Doctor's information that "it was Father Stephen of St. Thomas, who in the Roman Post, 12th September 1896, first expressed publicly this novel theory," will be proved erroneous by the following documentary evidence:—

1. Two addresses of the numerous Catholic Syrian Priests in Malabar, dated Mannanam 31st August, and Ambazhakatt, 15th September 1887, directed to H. E. Monsignor (now Cardinal) Ajuti, then Delegate Apostolic of India, a passage of which runs as follows : " Though it is assumed by the Portuguese that they converted our forefathers from the Nestorian heresy and *reduced* (brought back) them to the union of the Holy Catholic Church, yet we offer our grateful homage to the Almighty for having kept us away as a body from all heresies and preserved us in the union of the Holy Catholic Church from the time of the Apostle St. Tomas." &c.

2. Declaration by an assembly of the Syrian clergy and laity of Malabar, both Catholic and Jacobite (dated Holy Cross Church, Alleppey 20th May 1799) presided over by Mar Abraham Paul and Mar Dionysius (Mar Thoma) stating that the Syrians of Malabar were Catholics before and after the Synod of Diamper till 1653, when the Portuguese made Mar Ignatius Ahatalla, a Syrian Bishop, disappear &c.

3. A letter of Doctor Joseph Cariati' a native Syrian of Malabar educated in the Propaganda College, Rome, afterwards Archbishop of Cranganore, addressed to Pope Pius VI. in 1780.

The above documents are confirmed by the following words of Archbishop Menezes who is accredited by the Doctor, Historicus Philalethes and Co, with having converted the St. Thoma's Christians.

Translation of the original (Portuguese).

" We being moved also by the piety of these people and by seeing *the mercy, which God our Lord had shown*

to this Christian community in conserving so many thousands of souls in the Faith of our Lord Jesus Christ from the time of the Holy Apostle St. Thomas who preached to them till the present time, notwithstanding their being put in the midst of so many infidels and their people being dispersed in so many and so different places and their Churches and people subjected to so many and so different idolatrous Kings and Lords surrounded by so many idols and pagan temples without having communication with any other Christians till the arrival of the Portuguese to these parts, and we being at the same time desirous that *the labours of the Holy Apostle St. Thomas which still remain* should not be allowed to perish by want of instruction, nor should be ineffective to the mandates of the Apostolic See, we determined and disposed to start from our Church for some time" &c.

1. "Commovidos tambem da piedade desta gente, e de ver a mercê que Deos nosso Senhor tinha feito a esta Christandade em conservar tantas mil almas na fé de nosso Senhor Jesu Christo desde o tempo que o sagrado apostolo São Thomé lhes pregou ate agora estando metidos no meio de tanta gentilidade, e espalhados seus povos por tantas, e tão diversas partes, e sogeitas suas igrejas, e as pessoas dellas a tantos, e tão diversos reys e senhores idolatras, rodeados de tantos idolos e pagodes, sem terem communicacão com outros christãos alguns ate a vinda dos portuguezes a estas partes. Desejando nós juntamente que se não perdessem por falta de doutrina os trabalhos do sagrado apostolo São Thome, que ainda duravão, nem ficassem em vão os mandados da se apostolica, determinamos, e nos disposemos a nos apartar por algum tempo da nossa propria Igreja."

2. "Vehementer nos commovebat commiseratio gentis illius, cujus magna pars a tempore, quo ipsi S. apostolus

Thomas evangelium promulgaverat, ad haec usque tempora in Christi Domini fide constans perseverabat, in ipso infidelitatis gremio et en tanta christianorum illorum dispersione, cum diversäs regiones incolerent, et eas quidem ditioni regum idololatrarum subjectas, quodque comulum addebat sine ulla cum reliquis christianis communicatione, quae plane a primis illis temporibus interrupta fuit, usque dum Lusitani huc pervenerunt. Post diu turnam deliberationem tandem, ne quos gloriosus apostolus Thomas suis sudoribus irrigaverat fructus catholicae doctrinae, deficiente alimento penitus arescerent, utque apostolica S. sedis mandata executronem haberent, decrevimus a nostra Ecclesia discedere."

1. If Archbishop Menezes thought that the Syrians were Nestorians how could he see the *mercy of God in conserving them in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ from the time in which the Holy Apostle St. Thomas preached to them till now* (até agora) ?

2. If they were Nestorians how could Dom Menezes, a Catholic Bishop, say that the labours of the Apostle which still remain (ainda duravaõ) or even now was remaining, *with the mercy of God* ?

3. Will *God* ever show *mercy* to any people to conserve heresy in them ?

But I regret to observe that Raulin in his work " Historia Ecclesiae Malabaricae cum Diamperitana Synodo " edited Rome, 1745, page 59-64 translated the above quoted passage into Latin in which he made some important additions and subtractions which would change the real sense conveyed by the original. The following words in Portuguese *De ver a merce que Deus nosso Senhor tinha feito a esta Christandade em conservar* &c. (of seeing the

mercy which God our Lord had shown to this Christian community) were deleted by Raulin. He interpreted the Portuguese word *piedade i. e.*, piety into *commiseratio*, meaning pity. *Por falta de doctrina* meaning for want of doctrine or instruction, he interpreted into 'deficiente alimento penitus' *i. e.*, the entire deficiency of nourishment. The labours of the Holy Apostle St. Thomas which are still remaining—*queainda duravão*—which were still remaining, he omitted.

In conclusion we hope that impartial readers will be able to understand how some subsequent historians have laboured hard to corrupt the real history of the Syrians and to falsify it like modern writers, the Doctor, Historicus Philalethes and Co.

CRITICUS CRITICI.

Translation of a Malayalam document taken from the ancient mss. kept in the Archives of the Mannanam Convent.

The Re-union of the new party (Puthenkuttucar) with the old one (Pazhekuttucar).

"By the grace of God and by the order of the Holy Roman Church, Mar Dionysius, Metropolitan of Malabar with the representatives of the churches under his jurisdiction, Mar Abraham, Bishop appointed by His Excellency the Most Revd. Patriarch of the Chaldeans in obedience with the Holy Roman Church, the Governor (Vicar General) who governs the Arch Diocese of Cranganore with the representatives of the churches under his jurisdiction and Praesbiter Hormisdas, Deputy of the Patriarch, assembled in the Holy Cross Church at Alleppey and having heard

and disposed of all the contraverted points of both the parties made under Oath this document of solemn contract that all in future might be united together."

"From the time of our ancient forefathers till the year 1599 A. D. we were observing the Syro-Chaldean rite of those who were in communion with the Holy Roman Church, but owing to the inter-ruption of the Syrian Bishops who are in communion with Rome we were deprived of Episcopal dignitaries. Then Don Alex., Arch-Bishop of Goa, by the order of His Holiness the Pope, arrived in Malabar and convoked a Synod at Diamper, the decrees of which we all obeyed and unanimously observed till the year 1653. At that time a Syrian Bishop came here whom the Paulists, through the help of the Portuguese Commandants of the Fort of Cochin, managed to kill. Whereupon the representatives of the Syrian parishes in Malabar assembled in Mattancherry Church and took an Oath that they never more would accept the Paulists as their ecclesiastical superiors. After this they proceeded to Alengatt church, where assembling without the assistance of any Bishop they proclaimed Arch-Deacon Thomas as their Bishop. Subsequently some disputes having arisen among ourselves we accepted two different ecclesiastical heads and rites in our community. And now we of both the parties unitedly agree on Oath to join together as our forefathers did, submitting ourselves to the Holy Father the Pope, performing the Mass, reciting the breviary, observing the fasts and other rites as they were prescribed by the Synod of Diamper and to report accordingly to Holy Father the Pope with the view of obtaining his permission to conduct all ceremonies according to the Syro-Chaldean rite of those who are submissive to the Holy Roman Church. Moreover we agree that those who observe at present the Jacobite creed and rites shall abjure them and make the

profession of the faith prescribed by Pope Urban VIII, for the orientals and submit to the orders of His Holiness the Pope. And so agreed on Oath on this 20th day of May (Edavam) 1799 A. D.; we of both the parties have declared and signed this contract at the Church of the Holy Cross at Alleppey, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

The agreement of both the parties being over, Mar (Thomas) Dionysius on 21st June 1799 abjured Jacobitism, made his profession of the Catholic faith on Oath at St. Michael's Church, Thathampally. The cause of the non-execution of the contract has been, as it is said, that perhaps Mar Dionysius was ordered by the authority to remain as a simple priest, so, after some six months, the Jacobite party withdrew their contract with the permission of the Travancore Government.

[See Malayalam history of the Catholic Religion in Malabar by a Carmelite Missionary, (Marcellin) afterwards Co-adjutor Bishop of Verapoly, edited Cunamau 1872 page 251.]

The article of 'Criticus Critici' was sent to the Editor of the 'Bombay Caholic Examiner' in which appeared the article of 'Doctor Criticus'. But we regret to state that the Editor, without regarding the journalistic etiquette, declined to publish it saying:—

(Cochin—St. Thomas Christians) "In the *Cochin Argus* of July 25th, appears a long letter signed 'Criticus Critici' controverting the article contributed by Dr. Criticus to the *Bombay Catholic Examiner* of May 9th. Those who are interested in the discussion will be able to obtain a copy of that paper and read for themselves; but

DHARMARAM COLLEGE LIBRARY
BANGALORE-29.

we are so full of matter at present that we cannot open our columns to a controversy which has been thrashed out over and over again, until some really new and startling data are discovered to put an end to all dispute on the point." (*B. C. Examiner* August 1st 1903). But he has reproduced in the *Examiner*, June 6th, the speech of Mr. Mackenzie from the 'Bombay Gazette,' May 28th, and he did not reproduce from the same 'B. Gazette,' June 30th, (or from the *Catholic Herald*, Calcutta July 1st or the *Catholic Watchman*, Madras July 3rd or the *Cochin Argus* June 29th or from any other paper) an article of a Syrian who made some remarks on the same speech. So Rev. Fr. Ernest R. Hull S. J. the new Editor, seems to be too economic regarding the Syrians. But we are at the same time glad to say that another remarkable English Jesuit Father in India expressing his opinion on the question has said that whatever be the merits of our claim it is more to the glory of the Church than the view of our opponents.

(From the Catholic Watchman, 24th July.)

(The Syrian Church in Malabar) "We received the following from the Cochin correspondent: Cochin 7th July 1903.

"Dear Sir,—As you copied from the *Cochin Argus* of June 27th the article entitled 'the Syrian Church in Malabar,' I ask you to publish also the answers to it, issued in the same paper of 4th and 11th instant, in which the veracity of the facts is established, under the same titles. The reference is to your paper *The Catholic*

Watchman, of 3rd July 1903 p. 9. I remain, yours sincerely, (the signature is here illegible—ED. C. W.)."

"Our correspondent has made a mistake. The letter in question was recieved in manuscript from "*A Syrian.*" Had it been otherwise, the Communication would not have found a place in our "correspondence" columns. If we are not in error, we read the identical letter, referred to as an *Article*, in several Catholic exchanges, which means that the author favoured each with a copy."

"Our present correspondent would possibly have found space at his disposal in our journal, if he had forwarded us copy ; as he did not, he cannot very well complain because we failed to notice or make a cutting of his contribution to the *Cochin Argus*."

How remarkable is our correspondent in his guess works? It completely outbears the historical suppositions and fantoms of his comrades &c.

Another Critic refutes the article of 'Doctor Criticus' as follows:—

[THE ST. THOMAS CHRISTIANS.]

A correspondent calling himself "Doctor Criticus" lately made his appearance in the *Bombay Catholic Examiner* of the 9th May 1903, and he feigns to have refuted the argumentary and historical evidences advanced in the Dialogue published by the Romo-Syrians last year (1902) in defence of their catholicity and written against one

'Historicus Philalethes' and 'the answer' of Bishop Medlycott. According to this 'Doctor Criticus' all the arguments adduced in the said Dialogue are fallacious and sophistical and consequently they would never weaken the arguments of his friend H. Philalethes or rather himself now disguised as 'Doctor Criticus.' In proof of his assertion he argues thus :

(*a*). 'There were converted Syrians before the Synod of Diamper. Now Archbishop Menezes threatened only these Syrians with excommunication for their attendance in the Synod of Diamper. Consequently Dom Menezes did not call other Syrians for the said Synod with threat of excommunication. Our 'Doctor Criticus' by setting down the authors of the Dialogue who have ably refuted H. Philalethes and the answer of 'Bishop Medlycott' as ignorant and their arguments as fallacious shows only his own ignorance and fallacy which I shall point out here. The *major* of his argument is false. For although he quotes Mr. Mackenzie's Christianity, p. 13. in support of his argument that during the space of 100 years before the Synod of Diamper, the Portuguese Missioneries converted many Syrians, yet the right-seing will find there nothing of the converted Syrians ; on the other hand, those who carefully read that page quoted (or any other page) will find there many particulars in support of the catholicity of the Syrians. As soon as the Portuguese arrived on this coast, the Syrians understood the former to be their co-religionists and so they accepted the Portuguese king as their own, just in the same way as the oriental Catholics of the present day in Turkey, considering the French Government to be Catholic take its protection, but they never take that of Russia or of England. Further they presented to the King the sceptre which their

5 1872

late Syrian King had used and moreover the Syrians at Quilon asked the Portuguese priests to give baptism * to some of their number at their (Portuguese priests) first landing in that part (Commentarios do Grande Alfonso de Albuquerque III edit. T. 1). All these facts are evident proofs of the Catholicity of the Syrians at the time of the arrival of the Portuguese on this coast. The *minor* of the argument also is false and it is proved by the following:—1st. The pastoral letter or circular of Dom Menezes dated Channot (Chennamangalam or Vaipicotta) the 14th May 1599, published for the convocation of the Synod of Diamper can be found, in Raulin, Gouvea, Geddes, Bullarium Patronatus &c. In that letter, Arch-bishop Menezes gave orders to the whole Clergy of the Syrians under *pain of excommunication* to come for the Synod. This is an ample proof for the orthodoxy of *all the Christians* of St. Thomas. 2nd. Four months before this *i. e.* in February 1559, Dom Menezes prohibited the whole Syrian Clergy under *pain of excommunication* to commemorate the Patriarch of Babylon in Divine offices (Raulin 22, 23) and fearing their separation from the Communion of the Catholic Church, the Syrian clergy complied with that prohibition as can be made out from Actio III Decree VIII Synod of Diamper. Further evidences in support of the orthodoxy of the St. Thomas Christians can be found narrated in the Dialogue p. 3-9. If our 'Doctor' himself believes that in 1598 all the

---

* I have to note here that the priests and Bishops of the oriental Church have no other means for their support than the alms given them by the faithful for the Sacramental services which has been a custom from time immemorial and which is still in use in that Church. But the case is otherwise in the Western Church. When the Portuguese saw these customs, they (except St. Francis Xavier) blamed the Syrian priests and Bishops for the same; but this was only the result of their ignorance in matters of the Oriental Church and we can find many examples of *this ignorance* in the decrees of the Synod of Diamper.

DHARMARAM COLLEGE LIBRARY
BANGALORE-29.

Christians were heretics by reason of their declaration made, as he says, in that year in a great Synod at Angamali at which, by solemn oath, they resolved not to change their Nestorian faith &c, how could those who were heretics in 1598 *be Catholics* about the same time so that they may be threatened with excommunication by Dom Menezes ?

Under this supposition that the said declaration made by the Syrians was to abandon the Catholic faith and to adhere to the Nestorian Creed, it is clear that they were till then or before the said declaration, not of Nestorian profession but of Catholic. The Catholics who publicly profess any heresy incur excommunication *ipso facto;* so if they were willing to profess the Nestorian faith in 1598 they had already incurred the excommunication. Had they been out of the Church for the above mentioned guilt they would have had no motive to fear the excommunication threatened afterwards for another reason by Archbishop Menezes ; (never for the above supposed declaration). On the contrary for fear that they could be cut off from the Communion of the Catholic Church the Syrians obeyed the commands of Dom Menezes who threatened them with excommunication. It is, therefore, obvious that the resistance which the Syrians showed to Dom Menezes was not on account of any difference of faith but it was only due to the changes and innovations in the ancient Syro-Chaldean Rite. The Portuguese who intended to reduce the Syrian Church of Malabar to the Roman (Latin) Rite, removing the ancient disciplines and customs of the Syro-Chaldean Rite, at last threatened them with excommunication. But the resistance of the Syrians was misinterpreted by some historians as heresy &c.

(b). In order to show that after the introduction of the Nestorian heresy, there were no orthodox or Catholic

Chaldeans (Melkites) either in Persia and Mesopotamia or in India, "Doctor Criticus" reasons thus. There were, under the Melkite Patriarch of Antioch or his deputies called Catholicos, Melkites of Greek Rite in Syria and Egypt, but there was not any *Catholicos*, of the Orthodox Chaldeans. Consequently the Syrians of Malabar were never Catholics under any orthodox Chaldean Catholicos in union with the Melkite Antioch. The fallacy of this argument, I shall expose by the following facts and proofs. Those who are well versed in historical knowledge will never admit the first part of the *Major* that there were under Melkite Patriarch of Antioch * Catholicos for the Melkite Greeks in Syria and Egypt, while on the other hand, the second part that there was not under that Patriarch any Catholicos for the orthodox Chaldeans is quite against truth and history. According to all oriental Church historians, chiefly Assemani and Le Queen, and as all ecclesiastical Encyclopedias testify, only the Episcopal Head of the Armenian Church and the Bishop of Seleucia as the Head of the Chaldean Church, were honoured with the title of *Catholicos* and both were *anciently* subject to the Patriarch of Antioch. There was for a time another Chaldean

* I have to note that whatever I assert here about the Patriarch of Antioch is to be understood to be about the Catholic Patriarch of Antioch and not about the Jacobite Antioch. The Jacobites were, as history testifies, cut off from the communion of the Catholic Church when they separated themselves from their true Patriarch Maximus who together with the fathers of the council of Chalcedon in 451, anathematized Entyches and his great supporter Diascorus of Alexandria and thus since that time the Jacobites formed a separate body uuder a Patriarch of their own creation and sect, just in the same way as the Nestorians, some 20 years earlier, became a separate sect when they were anathematized at the council of Ephesus in 431. Of these two sects, the older is the Nestorian and both are inveterate enemies and have their own Patriarchs independent of each other. After the council of Chalcedon, according to all histories of general councils, the Meltkite or Catholic Patriarchs of Antioch, as their predecessors had done before them, attended the general councils, held in the orient at subsequent periods, at Constantinople in 553 and again in the same City in 680 and at Nicea (second) in 787 and at Constantinople in 869.

Catholicos in Persia who was either independent of or subject to the see of Seleucia and similarly for the Ethiopian Church there was one who had the title at a time but he was either independent or subject to Alexandria. Such is the brief sketch of those Ecclesiastics who have the title of *Catholicos*. An impartial reader can now see the fallacy of our "Doctor" in asserting that there were Melkite *Catholicoses* in Syria and Egypt. I refer the reader to the Dialogue pages 20-21-22 for further evidences which our "Doctor" passes over in silence. His statement that the Melkite were only of Greek Rite is false, as must be evident to all those who have acquired some knowledge of Church history. Let our "Doctor" who sides with Bishop Medlycott carefully read the latter's *answer* where the Bishop acknowledges that there was "a special section of Syrian Catholics styled Melkites." Here one can see that the term Melkites in those days embraced not only Greeks but also Syrians, Oriental and Occidental (and even Armenians, of whom, for brevity's sake I do not quote here) as is evident even from Bishop Medlycott's confession that "the Melkites were loyal to the Catholic faith of the Emperors (of Constantinople) in contradistinction of the larger section that had embraced the Nestorian and the Entychian heresies." The writers of the ancient Liturgies say that in Syria and Palestine two Liturgies Syriac and Greek were in use in the first Centuries of the Catholic Church. But it is unquestionable that there was only one sole Patriarch in the See of Antioch for a long period until and even after the Jacobite sect arose in the fifth century. The sole Greek line of present Melkite Patriarchs arose in that See only at a very later period as can be pointed out from historical facts ; but he had never under him a Greek Melkite *Catholicos*. What was then the obstacle that under a Melkite Patriarch even if he was a Greek, as our Doctor

argues, there should be a Chaldean Catholicos with a Chaldean Liturgy *

The Melkite Patriarch of Antioch after the Nestorian heresy claimed India as a part of their Patriarchate as is narrated in the Dialogue p. 20–21–22 and they claimed it not directly, but only indirectly through their Chaldean Catholicos as is proved from the quotations and facts narrated in the Dialogue.†

(*c*). The assertion of our 'Doctor' that "the Catholic Syrians follow still their former Nestorian Rite in the Chaldaic Language from which Arch-bishop Menezes removed only heretical passages" is quite false. I can point out, as the learned Assemani has done, that more than

* I have to note here that (Chaldean) *Catholicos* of Seleucia in the 4th Century received the plenitude of his jurisdiction over all the countries under him as to institute dioceses and appoint Bishops and Archbishops and thus he had all the Patriarchal privileges except the name and rank. The Nicene canons vulgarly called the Arabic (rather Chaldaic according to *Khayyaths Syri Orientales*) which having very great weight in matters affecting the Oriental Church were, as the same *Khayyath* testifies, often quoted by the great Saints of that Church gives prominence to the See of Seleucia owing to its Apostolic origin and fixes for its *Catholicos* the sixth place in general councils next to the Patriarch of Jerusalam.

† Historicus Philalethes, among others, asserted in the Mylapore *Catholic Register* May 10th 1902, that Sabor and Proth two Chaldean Bishops who came to Malabar in the beginning of the 9th Century were sent by the Nestorian Patriarch Timotheus who lived at that time. But according to Assemani Tom. III part II p. 442–444 Thomas Marg. Historia Monast. Lib. V. Cap. 7. Cod. Syr. Vat. N. 165 and other grave authors, the Bishops sent by the Patriarch Timotheus to India and China were only Thomas, Zache, Sem., Ephrain Simeon, Ananias and David and among these we do not find Sabor and Proth. This shows that Sabor and Proth were not sent by the Nestorian Patriarch but by the Orthodox Catholicos in Communion with the Catholic Church. Moreover even these adverse Historians admit the *fact* of the miracles attributed to them (as is mentioned in the Dialogue p. 12) though with the addition of their own interpretations which is quite against the well known principle of logic "contrafactum nullum argumentum." Mar John who came to Malabar in the 12th Century is proved in the Dialogue p. 19, to have been a Catholic. Now was he sent by the Nestorian Patriarch or by the Orthodox *Catholicos*? What is the opinion of our 'Doctor'?

100 passages or points condemned by Dom Menezes as Nestorian heresies were only venerable customs and points of the Liturgy of the ancient Syro-Chaldean Church which have the canonical sanction of the Apostolic ages of the Catholic Church, as Ebediesus V. Khayyath, the late Catholic Patriarch of Babylon in his circular letter to the Nestorians under date the 24th April 1895 testifies and also according to the Rev. James Conway S. J. in the *Messenger of S. Heart* May 1899 p. 422.

(*d*). Another contention of our 'Doctor' is that there are numerous authors who speak of the Nestorianism of the Syrians ; but let our 'Doctor' consider well that it was the Portuguese that first wrote this history of this Syrian Church and that other European historians, even Assemani, an orientalist, took the Portuguese historians as their historical guides and sources. Wherever the Portuguese or their *copied* historians speak of the Nestorianism of the Christians of St. Thomas, their assertions are always contradictory. An impartial reader can find numerous examples of this in the Dialogue of the Syrians already often quoted and many more can be given if called for.*

I conclude this article with a few words for the consideration of our 'Doctor Criticus.' The nature of fraternal charity is such that it must be universal, *i. e. without respect of persons* and must be defensive of others and not offensive. What we assert of the Orthodoxy of our Fore-fathers and their Bishops in the past is not without foundations, but with strong evidences and trust-worthy eye-witnesses, as St. Francis Xavier. 'Doctor Criticus' himself admits the facts, proofs and argumentary evidences

* Add to this that in accusing, condemning and exiling the Chaldean Bishops for their supposed heresy, only one party i. e. the Portuguese was the accuser, witness and judge and that even then their accusations were never proved.

adduced in the Dialogue by his passing over them in silence. What then is the object our 'Doctor' has in view in attacking us unless he has the *Boeric pertinancy* ? Is this Catholic charity ? Even a civil court of judicature never pronounces judgment against a party unless the charges brought upon that party are proved to its full satisfaction. If our 'Doctor' is really a Doctor in Theology it is his duty to know what fraternal charity is and in what it consists of. In the absence of such knowledge, he is not a *Doctor* at all.

CATHOLICISM IN TRAVANCORE.

A Querry.

Dear Sir,

In the columns of your widely circulated paper (Malabar Mail) I came across the following lines from a Catholic Correspondent in your impression of the 8th July:—"There is no doubt that the first propagation of Catholicism in Travancore was carried on through the agency of Catholic Missionaries from Europe" (of what nationality?)

Both history and the traditions testify to the fact that St. Thomas the Apostle was the first propagator of Christianity in Travancore. Will you or the numerous readers of your journal kindly inform me through its columns whether any of the Apostles was a European, and whether the faith of the Apostles was not Catholic?

Trivandrum
12–8–03.

A CHRISTIAN.

(See 'Malabar Mail' August, 15-1903)

CATHOLICISM IN MALABAR.

Dear Sir,

I happened to read in your esteemed paper (Cochin Argus) of the 29th August and 5th and 12th Instant a review on the Travancore Census Report by Mr. N.

Subrahmanya Aiyer, M.A. &c., the Census Commissioner of 1901 in Travancore. Please permit me to make the following observations on the same :—Under Christianity, the *Cochin Argus* of 5th September 1903, says :—"The Commissioner has a good deal to say, but wisely disarms criticism by simply remarking that " the Christians of Malabar strongly believe that the seeds of their faith were sown by St. Thomas, one of the twelve disciples of Christ." As regards the Catholics we read that "though with the name of the Portuguese is generally associated the introduction of Roman Catholicism into Malabar, they were not the earliest Catholics that visited this Coast. To John, of Montecorvino, the Pope's Emissary at the Court of Kublai Khan of Mongolia, who visited the Coast between 1288 and 1294 and converted a hundred souls, is probably due to the beginning of Catholicism."

In the case of a Hindu writer a misconception of what Catholicism is may be excused, considering his personal inexperience with it. But as regards a Catholic, a remark on such misinterpretation can never be, in my opinion, out of place. Were all the Eastern Missionaries, who preached in Malabar from the earliest centuries of the Church, not Catholics? And how can we Catholics accept that even the faith of an Apostle (St. Thomas) was not Catholic? Is not the opposite view one dishonoring the dignity of the Church and one failing in its prerogative of Catholicity?

If the Commissioner intends to speak of those Catholics, regarding only the introduction of the Roman (Latin) rite in Malabar, exclusive of any other Catholic rite, he is right.

16th September, 1903. A Catholic.

(Vide Cochin Argus, 26—9—1903)

THE SYRIAN CHURCH IN MALABAR.

Dear Sir.

In your impression (Cochin Argus) of the 15th August I happened to read a letter by a "A Friend of Syrians" which has moved me to write the following few lines :—

Our friend, who is not a friend, quoting the passage of Dom Menezes referred to by "Criticus Critici" (in the Cochin Argus, 25th July), viz."God, Our Lord, shown mercy to this Christian community in conserving so many thousands of souls in the faith of Our Lord Jesus Christ, from the time of the Holy Apostle St. Thomas who preached to them till the present time," says: "As if it were not the mercy of God that the Syrians were still Christians (Catholics or otherwise) instead of heathens or Mahomedans."* Is it not a shameless commentary and at the same time against common sense—impartial and Catholic readers may judge it—to say such and such Christians were not heathens or Mahomedans when it is confessed that they were in the faith of Jesus Christ preached by the Apostle? Does it become the duty of a Catholic to comment in this way? Was it possible for Dom Menezes, a Catholic Bishop, to cleanse such Christians from errors, heresies and false doctrines when he himself says "God, our Lord had shown mercy to this Christian community in conserving so many thousands of souls in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, from the time of the Holy Apostle St. Thomas who preached

* The Correspondent seems to assert his opinion as infallible. Perhaps he thinks to compare the calamities and disgrace which his fore-fathers suffered by saracen captivity and its evil consequences with those of the St. Thomas Christians. We pity him.

to them till the present time." With all this it seems that Dom Menezes contradicts himself.

Secondly, our friend seems to justify Raulin saying that *commovidos da piedade* does not mean anything else, but *having pity*.* I frankly admit his scholarship in Portuguese and at the same time I am glad to see that he could not find an excuse to justify Raulin in his other passages refuted in the article of "Criticus Critici" in your issue of the 25th July 1903.

As to the article of our friend regarding the present liturgy of the Syrians, which appeared in your issue of the 29th August, I remind the readers the story of four blind men who went together to an elephant. That blind man who touched the leg of the elephant gave out that the elephant is like the trunk of a tree ; he who touched the ear said that the elephant is like a sieve ; the one that touched the tail contended that the elephant is like a broom and so on' and all of them seem to be right. So our friend and his comrades in explaining the history of the Syrians make many different suppositions. Our friend seems not to have touched any part of the elephant at all ; but only some trees near the elephant. *Criticus Critici* has asked *Dr. Criticus* to compare the liturgy corrected by Menezes with the present liturgy of the Syrians. But our friend bites only the bark not the substance. I ask him again and again to compare both the above said liturgies. However it is a consolation to see that our friend admits that the liturgy in question before its printing was examined and approved by the Sacred Congregation of Rites. Our friend asks first " Whom does *Criticus Critici* write for?

---

* Hough in his history of Christianity in India has translated the said pastoral letter into the English in which we find the word piety for *piedade* in question i. e. " and being also moved by the piety of the people," (Vide Hough Vol. II. page. 3). (See also Geddes' history.)

Is it for the men in the moon"? And again he asks "Is it for the inhabitants of Mars"? What kind of a man is this friend who is not a friend? Is he a man come out from the moon or Mars? Is this writer a man of charity with religious habits ? It is clear "Criticus Critici" has not written for such men (or to any lunatic).

As to our friend's article which appeared in your issue of the 12th instant, I have only to observe at present that it is also a consolation to see that our friend admits at least now that the opinion expressed by Dr. Criticus in the *Bombay Catholic Examiner*, 9th May, was erroneous. (It would seem that Dr. Criticus and "Friend of Syrians" is the same person), and our friend confesses: "In fact the Syrians were not converted in the Synod of Diamper as many say inadvertently," and "It was certainly absurd to imagine the reunion of a Synod composed heterogeneous *fraternal* mixture of Catholics and schismatics ."

I see our friend has changed many of the historical opinions already conceived ; and if he would study more carefully and remove all prejudices, he will, I hope, be able to correct also many more of his erroneous views.

AN OBSERVER.

See *Cochin Argus*, September 26, 1903.

THE SYRIAN CHURCH IN MALABAR.

Dear Sir,

Through the kindness of a freind of mine, I was fortunate enough to read an article in the *Cochin Argus* of the 6th July 1903 by "a freind of Syrians" in which the

writer asserts that Mar Jacob, the Syro-Chaldean Beshop of the St. Thoma's Christians 1504-1550, was first a Nestorian and latterly became a Catholic through the efforts of the Franciscan Friars at Cochin. The writer proves his assertions by the following :—

1. In the collective letter which Mar Jacob and his companion Bishops wrote to their Patriarch, they used the phrases " Virga Petri" (as the Popes) " the Catholic Patriarchal See in the East *quae est* Mundi pars caeterarum Mater" (the centre of the Catholic world).

11. The Nestorian Patriarchs appropriated for themselves the title of Catholics as the Greek Schismatic Patriarchs called themselves Orthodox.

111. From the time of Nestorius till 1552-there was not in the eastern countries any Roman Catholic Patriarch much less any established Catholic Hierarchy. John Sulaka was appointed the first Roman Catholic Patriarch and this is evident from the Bull " Divina disponente clementia" of Julius III, dated 21st Feb. 1552.

1V. The Patriarch Mar Elias (by whom Mar Jacob and his companions were sent to Malabar) and his immediate successors were Nestorians as attested by Assemani in his B. Orientali.

V. Since Mar Jacob was a virtuous man he put a stop to the practice of making Christians for money's sake as John DeBarros, a Portuguese historian testifies.

V1. "St. Francis found him(Mar Jacob) illfavoured almost by every one in India and fovoured only by the friars of St. Francis". The Saint concludes :—"Now in his old age, he is very obedient to the practices of the Holy Mother the Roman Church."—What does this mean?

Without tricks and subterfuges, it means only that Mar Jacob was a good and simple man, naturally virtuous, first a Nestorian but of good faith latterly brought to better knowledge of the Catholic faith by the Franciscan Friars, and fed and maintained by them (in whose Convent at Cochin he died) and very probably it is to be concluded that for the very fact of his being *dissident* from the common ideas of St. Thoma's Christians, he was illfavoured and abandoned by those among whom he worked much to instruct and perhaps to recall them to the Church of Rome."

Now let me begin to admit those statements of the writer which are admissible and deny what are to be denied, adding at the same time those evidences which will greatly help an honest inquirer of facts to gain better knowledge of truth.

1. The interpretation of the writer of the phrase "Virga Petri" as meaning Papal Primacy is quite wrong. Even the Nestorians themselves admit (as their synodical canons testify) the Primacy of Peter. Their canons clearly indicate that among the four Patriarchs (Rome, Alexandeia, Antioch, Babylon or Orient) the first Patriarch and the first See is of Rome, who is the sole successor of Peter and who is also the Head of other Patnarchs. "Virga Petri" is only an expression used by the Eastern Christians to indicate the plenitude of the Patriarchal Jurisdication, and certainly the Patriarchal Jurisdiction is not of divine but only of ecclesiastical origin and consequently this Jurisdiction comes from the plenitude of the Jurisdiction of Peter, as Pope St. Gregory the great attests. Either the orthodox or the heterodox Chaldeans have never believed that their Patriarch was the successor of Peter, Consequently "Virga Petri" only shows their belief in the

Primacy of Peter from whose plenitude of Jurisdiction their Patriarch receives a part to govern those under him. The Oriental Patriarchs still exercise a great sway over those under them as was the case in the early ages of the Church, whence arose this jurisdiction.?

In the Chaldean Breviary for 'Commune Confessorum' who are bishops a similitude to Peter is used, and this is only to indicate the plenitude of Epsiscopal Jurisdiction with that of Peter and not to show that they have any primatial jurisdiction. The passage from the Breviary is as follows:—" Our glorious father should be justly called as a second Simon, for he assimilated himself to the example of Peter, Head of the Apostles." So in the collective letter the Patriarch is entitled second Simon, "*Simeoni Alteri*": Moreover the expression *Virga Petri* in the Syriac original text is read in a slightly different sense *i. e. Bhutra Patrosaya i. e.* 'Virga Petritica,' means by the *Peterous Crosier* in the adjective form of Peter.

"To Mar Elias, the Catholic Patriarch of the Orient which is that part of the world, which is the mother of the rest." It means first that the orient is the mother of the other parts of the world regarding the creation of mankind and that from the orient originated the religion of both the old and the new testament ; and secondly means that the East is the mother See, or head-quarter of the Chaldeans. Therefore the interpretation of our writer the orient is the centre of the Catholic world in a Nestorian sense is quite wrong.

II. The Titles "Catholic "used by Nestorian Patriarchs,and "Orthodox "used by the Greek Patriarchs are only those kept by them while they were in Communion with the Catholic Church, and not after their separation from her as our writer erroneously thinks. The Bishop of

Seleucia had the Title 'Catholicos' from the very beginning and unquestionably from the 4th Century. From the time of Eutychians or rather Monethelite heretics, the Greek Patriarchs of Constantinople who were then in communion with Rome took the Title Orthodox which they still retain as our Sovereign of England still retain the Title "Defender of the Faith."

III. That there were from the time of Nestorius up to 1552 Roman Catholic Patriarchs in the Eastern countries I shall prove by the following historical examples.

(*A*) From the Eutychian and Nestorian periods, the Emperors of Constantinople took special steps to preserve the Catholic Faith in the countries where the Nestorian and Entychian sects had spread their false doctrines and the See of Constantinople, by *usage* and *practice* being second in the Christendom, the Patriarchs of that See, through the influence of the Emperors exercised a great sway over all the Eastern Catholics and especially in the Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem which were, to some extent, subject to Constantinople. This was why Mar John who was once the Arch-bishop of the Syrians in Malabar in the 12th century went first to Constantinople to have his Patriarchal election or dignity confirmed out. But that See being in open revolt with Rome (which took place about the middle of eleventh century, he (Mar John) left Constantinople for Rome to be there confirmed in his Patriarchal dignity. *The fact* of his having first gone to Constantinople and thence to Rome is unanimously admitted by historians although some of them are misled in their opinion about his speech.

(*B*) When the Crusaders in the eleventh century occupied the Eastern cities, Edessa in Mesopotamia, Antioch in Sysria &c., they found many Oriental Catholics in those cities and in the neighbour-hood.

(*C*) In the turbulent times of the great schism of the West in the fourteenth century, the Eastern Patriarchs (except of Constantinople who were in revolt with Rome) of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalam were in obedience to the real Pope in Rome and not with the Anti-pope of Avignon.

(*D*) The Bull "Devina disponente clementia" of Pope Julius III of the 21st February 1552 does not attest as our writer argues that John Sulaka was the first Roman Catholic Patriarch. What the Bull says about it is this:— "Post-modum vero Ecclesia Patriarchali de Muzal in Syria Orientali, cui bo-me: Simon Maria Patriarcha de Muzal, et insulae Tygris, ac ceterarum civitatum et terrarum Orientalium eidem Patriarchae subiectarum, necnon monasteriorum eiusdem nationis in Sin-Massin et Calicuth, ac tota India existentium, eidem etiam Patriarchae subditorum dum viveret presidebat per obitum eiusdem Symonis Patriarchae qui extra Romanam Curiam debitum naturae persolvit, Pastoris solatio destituta, Nos vacatione huiusmodi fide dignis relatibus intellecta, ad provisionem eiusdem Ecclesiae celerem, et felicem, de qua nullus praeter Nos hac vice se intromittere potuit, sive potest, reservatione et decreto obsistentibus supradictis, ne Ecclesia ipsa longae vacationis, exponatur imcommodis".....See Giamil's 'Genuinae Relationes' page 17—18.

Pius IV in his Brief "Superna disponente clementia" on the confirmation of Mar Abdjesus Patriarch (17th April 1562) says:—"Postmodum vero ecclesiae Patriarchali De Muzal in Assyria orientali cui bonae memoriae Simon Sulaka Patriarcha de Muzal dum viveret presidebat, per obitum eiusdem Symonis Patriarchae, qui extra Romanam Curiam debitum naturae persolvit, pastoris solatio destituta. Nos vacatione huiusmodi fidedignis relatibus intellecta, ad provisionem eiusdem ecclesiae celerem et

fidelem de qua nullus preter nos hac vice se intromittere potuit sive potest reservatione et decreto obsistentibus supradictis, ne ecclesia ipsa longe vacationis exponatur incommodis (Giamil pag. 32–33).

The documents as yet discovered in the Vatican archieves prove atleast that Mar Sabarjesu and Mar Jaballaha , both, Chaldean Patriarchs, were in communion with Rome, the former obtained his confirmation from Pope Innocent IV. in 1248 and the latter from Pope Benedictus XI in 1304. Mar Timotheus the Chaldean Metropolitan of Cyprus was received into the communion of Rome by Pope Eugene IV in 1445 (Vide Giamil pp. 1–11).

IV. I admit that, according to Assemani and some other historians, the Patriarch Mar Elias by whom Mar Jacob and his companions were sent to Malabar and the immediate successors of that Patriarch were Nestorians ; but what I say about these historians is that they are not contemporary writers and are not eye witnesses and that they are only of a very later period, say about two centuries later. On the other hand, the facts and practical proofs of the period during which Mar Jacob and his companions lived entirely refute their assertions. So how can we believe their statements about the Nestorianism of Mar Jacob and his Patriarchs without contradictions? This I shall point out more clearly later on. Let our writer who is a "friend of Syrians" ponder well that in the annals of the Roman Church mention is made that in the least many Chaldean Bishops and their St. Thomas Christians were Catholic *children*, although the case is otherwise in the annals of historians.

V. The assertion of John de Barrows a Portuguese historian regarding the Syrian Bishops making christians for money's sake, is entirely erroneous. The Bishops

and priests of the Oriental Church have no other means of support than the alms given them by the faithful for the sacramental services and this is a custom prevailing from time immemorial still in use in that Church ; but the case is different in the Western Church. When the Portuguese saw this custom, they blamed the Syrian Bishops and priests for them, but this was only their ignorance in matters of the Oriental Church and examples of this ignorance we can find in the decrees of the Synod of Diamper. If John de Barros had lived now, he would have ventured to blame the present priests and Bishops of Malabar for making Christians for money's sake and if any one of the Bishops had stopped the custom as Mar Jacob did he would have gained the friendship of John de Barros.

VI. (A) The sixth assertion of our writer already quoted is (*a*) that Mar Jacob was first a Nestorian but of good faith, (*b*) that he was latterly brought to better knowledge of the Catholic faith by the Franciscan fathers, (*c*) that he was fed and maintained by them, (*d*) that he becoming a Catholic was dissident from the common ideas (Nestorianism) of St. Thomas Christians and (*e*) that he was consequently abandoned by his own Christians. The writer found this conclusive assertions of his on the following passage of St Francis :—"Now in his old age, he (Mar Jacob) is very obedient to the practices of the Holy Mother the Roman Church." Alas ! what an illegiti mate conclusion is this? and I shall prove the conclusion to be such by the following evidences.. The Bishop of Cochin in his recently published pamphlet, 'Some Elucidations' p. 11 says that the Portuguese, during the first half century of their residence in India *i. e.* till the refusal of Mar Joseph to ordain some Syrian candidates of Cranganore Seminary for the want of their knowledge in syriac, did not consider the Christians of

St. Thomas as schismatics or heretics. This assertion of his Lordship can be corroborated by the behaviour of the Portuguese towards the St. Thomas Christians during the first half century of their residence in India of which mention is made in the former's histories. Our writer himself admits it by saying that "The Potuguese took them (Mar Jacob and his companion bishops) for true Catholics and had no means then to judge otherwise." The Potuguese began to suspect the Catholicity of the St. Thomas Christans duly not before the time of Mar Joseph in Malabar.

(B) How could the Portuguese Franciscan Friars at Cochin convert Mar Jacob to the Catholic Faith, who had been considered by them to have been a Catholic *ab initio*? until his death. Mar Jacob treated the Franciscan Friars as his Coreligionists who also reciprocally did so with him. Further, if the Franciscan Friars converted Mar Jacob to theCatholic Faith, it would have been surely entered in the Portuguese chronicles, where we read everything minutely described, except this novelty discovered only in 1902.

(C) St. Francis Xavier has never written that the Franciscan Friars ever fed and maintained Mar Jacob ; nor did they ever do so. What St. Francis wanted the Portuguese to do was to show Mar Jacob " Honor, hospitality, and treat him with favour and attention." This shows that, in general, the Portuguese in their dealings with Mar Jacob acted quite against the principles of the Holy Catholic Religion which enjoies on every Catholic to respect and honour Her Pastors ; and St. Francis himself clearly tells us that they acted so by complaining that Mar Jacob was " neglected and despised by all who have any power in India," *i. e.* the Portuguese and further St. Francis wanted the Portuguese to give him protection, succour and aid, as they were rulers especially of Cochin.

where he (Mar Jacob) commonly resided and as Catholics, moreover, they were bound to do it according to the principles of the Catholic Religion which St. Francis felt bound to put into their minds. These are the two requests made by St. Francis Xavier to the King of Portugal in behalf of the Venerable Bishop Mar Jacob. By the first request, he asked the King to command his officers in India never to molest or persecute Mar Jacob and by the second, to give him protection, succour and aid and as Mar Jacob commonly resided in Cochin which was then under the Portuguese control, he stood in great need of these helps at the hands of the Portuguese. This led St. Francis to write in his behalf by saying "espeially when he (Mar Jacob) asks for or is in need of any thing." Of all the Portuguese in India, it was only at the hands of the charitable Franciscans that Mar Jacob received these helps. Our writer erroneously interprets that these helps recieved by Mar Jacob at the hands of the Franciscans were food and clothes and other necessaries of life. If it was really food and clothes and other necessaries of life that Mar Jacob recieved from the Franciscans, it was unnecessary and useless that St. Francis wrote to the King of Portugal to command his officers in India to give him such helps of food and other necessaries of life, these having been already supplied by Franciscans. Respect and honour, protection and succour were the things or helps recieved by Mar Jacob at the hands of the Franciscan Friars and St. Francis wrote to the King of Portugal to command his other Portuguese people in India to do such helps to Mar Jacob as the Franciscans did, as can be made out from the tone of the letter and as is evident from the quotations just given.

(D) What our writer says that Mar Jacob was dissident from the common ideas (Nestorianism) of St.

Thomas Christians is unfounded and wrong. The Bishop of Cochin in his recently published pamphlet 'Some Eluci dations' page 21 quoting many reliable Authors, candidly admits that the indulgence asked and obtained by St. Francis for the Church of St. Thomas in Cranganore was "to increase the devotion of the Christians of *these parts* who are the descendants of the St. Thomas converts." The clause "Christians of *these parts*" shows that from different parts of Malabar, the Christians of St. Thomas were accustomed to visit the Church of St. Thomas in Cranganore for gaining indulgences. Again on page 20 of the same pamphlet, quoting St. Francis, the Bishop says :—"on the out-skirts of this college there are many Christians from the time of St. Thomas—more than 60 villages, and the *students of the* College, are the sons of the *Chief Christians*" and certainly this is a good testimony that the Chief Christians of St. Thomas from different villages sent their sons to the Franciscan Seminary at Cranganore to be educated in the Catholic piety and for the Catholic priesthood. If the Christians of St. Thomas were really dissident from the religious ideas of Mar Jacob, as our writer says, how could, they who were thus dissident from the *Catholic faith* of their Bishop Mar Jacob who is *now* according to our writer a Catholic, send their sons to the Seminary of Cranganore which was *Catholic* and how could they also gain indulgences of a foreign faith, by embracing which their Bishop became an enemy to them ? It is therefore self-evident that in both these, they acted in conformity with the wishes and commands of their Bishop who was a true Catholic as they themselves were.

(E) The Christians of St. Thomas never abandoned Mar Jacob as our writer falsely asserts. Not a single word of such abandonment of Mar Jacob by them can be

found in the letter of St. Francis, but the Saint in that letter expressly complains of the *abandoning of Mar Jacob* by the Portuguese by saying that Mar Jacob "*is neglected and despised by Your Highness and in general by all who have any power in India.* God thus rewards his great deserts himself and does not think us worthy of the honor being the instruments whom he uses to console his servants."

(The letter of St. Francis often quoted in this article is taken from the *Life and Letters of St. Fracis Xavier* by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S. J. page 82 edited London, Quarterly Series, Mauresce Press).

Lastly I have to adduce here that Cochin at the time when Mar Jacob lived was one of the Syro-Chaldean Dioceses, Abediesu the Chaldean Patriarch testifies in his *professione fidei* and that Mar Jacob had his Syrian Church there and consequently this was why he resided therein. The Syrian records make mention that of the four Bishops who came in 1504, (Mar Jacob and his companions), three were buried in the Church of Diamper and the fourth in Cranganore. Even if Mar Jacob died at Cochin, that would never mean that he was *abandoned* by his Syrian Christians; and even if, at his death bed, he recieved the hospitality of the Franciscans as he did during his life, and as Mar Abraham recieved the hospitality of the Jesuits at his death bed, that also would never mean that he was *abandoned* by his own, who as well as he were Catholics, as I have already proved.

Now let us suppose that St. Francis meant that Mar Jacob was in good faith and had done good work and so only he praised and recommended Mar Jacob to the King of Portugal. The following great obstacles stand in the way of such supposition and reasoning. The heretic who

is in good faith *(bona fide)* is only in the soul and not in the body of the Catholic Church and thus he is still a material though not a formal heretic. Now all material heretics are out of the communion of the body of the Catholic Church ; consequently a Catholic Theologian and more especially a Doctor in Theology and a Papal Nuncio as St. Francis Xavier could not say that "quinque et quadraginta jam anni sunt ex quo Episcopus quidam Armenus, nomine Jacobus Abuna Deo hic et Majestati Tuae inservit." The word *inservit* is the present tense and means *serves*, that is to say, Mar Jacob serves God and the King of Portugal in this country for forty-five years, *i. e.* from his very arrival in India, who, according to our friend, was then a material heretic and was thus out of the communion of the Catholic Church. Neither could St. Francis obtain indulgences for the Christians of St. Thomas who were, from different parts of Malabar, accustomed to resort to St. Thomas Church in Cranganore to earn those indulgences, as has been already proved. Lastly, Syrian students from different parts of Malabar were sent to the Seminary of Cranganore, not by the Portuguese but by the advice and consent of their Pastors and parents. Why were they sent to that Seminary ? To be educated as Catholic priests and in the Catholic doctrines. Is it possible that such Christians were heretics even material ?

These three great obstacles as immovable rocks stand in the way of all those who explian away, as they like, the attitude of St. Francis towards the Christians of St. Thomas.

In conclution, I would bring the following fact to the consideration of kind and inpartial readers. St. Francis is an eye-witness of what he saw and wrote. All those historians who dispute the fact in question are not eye-witnesses

and are, besides, of a much later date. Moreover St. Francis is a trustworthy witness and impartial too, and so his testimony is more valuable than that of a thousand historians of later date.

I appeal to the impartial readers to examine and ponder over the evidences I have given here with unbiased mind. It is wonderful indeed that our esteemed "friend of Syrians" takes the testimony about Mar Jacob and his Patriarchs by Assemani who lived two centuries later, as infallible and that of St. Francis Xavier who is an eye-witness of this controversy and most trustworthy man in the world as fallible and liable to deception.

A CRITIC.

N. B.—(Though the above article was written in reply to that of the 'Friend of Syrians,' it was not sent for publication in the *Cochin Argus*, being too long.)

Appendix.

An Italian's description of Malabar:—

As a simple instance of the notorious way in which certain Western authors handle a subject foreign to them, we have here an Italian's description of Malabar

Father Ottavio del Bambino Jesu C. D. of the province of Toscan in Italy who was for some ten years a Missionary at Varapoly during the second half of the last century, on his return from India, wrote in Italian a small descriptive work of forty pages and published it at Pisa in 1873. The title of the book is 'Breve notizia dei Popoli del Malabar' (Brief note on the people of Malabar). Among various curious observations in this little book, I give here some two or three in an English dress, for the reader's amusement, no less than for a lesson to many who are a prey to what may be called a 'mania' for book making.

On P. P. 20. 21. describing the form and features of the people of Malabar, he says "now what about their form? Are they pretty or ugly?..... .In appearance most of the people are more allied to monkey than to man." This will certainly sound rather strange to all who have always heard of Malabar as the land of beauty.' The author continues the same description and finally makes a happy exception "but don't you think that all are so ugly ; for there are faces to be seen, the beauty of which even Europeans might envy, for example in the *Cion* caste (evidently the Chekon or Elava) or those who climb trees; on account of bad water how even they are found with one leg fatter than the other." Taste of course is not a matter to be

discussed, but Father Ottavio's would be a special one, but for this view of elephantiasis.

On P. P. 22. 23. in the description of the cocoanut, the author says "the trunk of the tree is hallow inside." Perhaps he wants to speak of the pithy substance inside or perhaps he must have seen a trunk made artificially hollow and must have made a fallacious, generalisation like the blind men of old who inspected the elephant. Following the same description, he says 'the cocoanut is enclosed within a shell which being cut through or perforated you get a liquid which affords a refreshing drink. If you keep this liquid in a vessel and leave it to ferment you get what is called *kallu* (Toddy), the wine of the country, and easily intoxicates ; or you may make vinegar out of it, according as the degree of the fermentation." It is a pity that our toddy climbers don't follow up the valuable invention of Father Ottavio, and easily make toddy from cocoanut water instead of from the flower-bud of the same tree.

On P. 26 in describing the leaves of the palm tree, the author exhibits again his ingenious power of observation. These are his words "There are the leaves of a tree called *pana*, the leaves of which are used for making umbrellas (evidently he means the taliput) From its fruit is taken sugar, and a kind of wine called (thagarom arrack)." Here again the unhappy author confounds the taliput (Kudapana) and the palm tree proper *Karimpana*, from the latter of which are taken the so called sugar (jaggery) and the arrack, and not from taliput, and even these not from the fruits but from the toddy taken from the palm.

The remaining pages of this little book are equally pregnant with such misrepresentations of facts, the

explanations of which would be worth the while of any one interested in the study of the History of mistakes. We are, however, glad to see that this valuable production has not seen the light of day in the form of any further edition and let us hope that the few surviving copies of this work will seek their final reward in some waste-paper-basket and thus be buried in oblivion.

CORRIGENDA.

On Page	Line	For	Read
2	12	hey	they
5	25	St. Thoma	St. Thomas'
8	29	a you	you
11	1	Assemiani	Assemani
18	3	en	in
,,	5	comulum	cumulum
,,	8	diu turnum	diuturnum
27	17	Le Queen	Le Quien
29	23	Jesusalem	Jerusalem
,,	37	contrafactum	contra fatum
34	30	aud	and
,,	31	saracen	Saracen
41	33	fidedignis	fide dignis

APPENDIX

I	8	Varapoly	Verapoly
,,	28	how even	however
II	2	this	his
,,	15	degree	degrees
,,	25	thagarom	thacaram


DC Archives
00051872
J63 C28
DA