

WERE THE ST. THOMAS CHRISTIANS  
NESTORIANS?

A DIALOGUE

BETWEEN

FATHER VANERELLO

AND

MR. RAGGIO.

---

IN TWO PARTS.

1902

*Michael*

*Stamp*

A DIALOGUE  
BETWEEN  
FATHER VANERELLO  
AND  
MR. RAGGIO.  
PART I.

*Mr. Raggio.* Good morning, Reverend Father.

*F. Vanerello.* Good morning, Mr. Raggio. When did you return from Madras?

*Mr. Raggio.* (1) Last night, Father.

*F. Vanerello.* What are the best news you have?

*Mr. Raggio.* (2) I read in these days "*Christianity in Travancore*" by G. T. Mackenzie Esquire, the British Resident in Travancore and Cochin. Oh! how much gratitude he deserves from us.

*F. Vane.* Did you read the note No. 116 taken from the manuscript sent by two Romo-syrian priests—Rev. E. A. Nidiri of Kuravilingaad and Rev. Father Bernard of St. Thomas of Mannanam Monastery?

*Mr. Rag.* (3) Yes, I read it with great interest and I congratulate those priests for their success.

*F. Vane.* Did you read the *Mylapore Catholic Register* which condem them horribly?

*Mr. Rag.* (4) Yes. I read three successive issues of that paper. *viz.* those of 26th April, 3rd and 10th May of this year. (1922).

*F. Vane.* Don't you see that those priests are silenced and crushed down by a *historicus philalethes*?

*Mr. Rag.* (5) Not the least. It is not necessary that those two priests should come forward to refute the arguments of *Historicus Philalethes*; but a simple layman like myself would suffice.

*F. Vane.* If so, show your ability first by guessing who is *Historicus Philalethes*.

*Mr. Rag.* (6) From the tone of his correspondence, he seems to be a well educated priest.

*F. Vane.* Have you anything more to say about him?

*Mr. Rag.* (7) He seems to deny the Apostleship of St. Thomas in India.

*F. Vane.* What leads you to make that supposition?

*Mr. Rag.* (8) I read in the "booklet (*Christianity in Travancore*) contains all the historical facts about Christianity in Travancore from the first dark beginnings up to the present times" leads me to suppose that he is one who denies the Apostleship of St. Thomas in India.

*F. Vane.* What makes our *Historicus Philalethes* to attack note No. 116?

*Mr. Rag.* (9) He is exceedingly mortified to find from that note that the Syro Chaldean Christians in Malabar were Catholics before the Synod of Diamper.

*F. Vane.* What does he say about their position before the Synod of Diamper?

*Mr. Rag.* (10) He says or rather tries to establish from Barhebraeus, Asseman, Le Quien, Raulin and Acts of the Synod of Diamper that they were Nestorians before the said Synod, although he discredits the same authors and numerous other writers on the *Apostleship of St. Thomas in India* which is unanimously defended by them all.

*F. Vane.* What is your opinion about the faith of the Chaldean Christians in Malabar before the Synod of Diamper.

*Mr. Rag.* (11) My opinion or rather firm belief is that their faith before that Synod was Catholic.

*F. Vane.* I think it is very thoughtless of you to assert that they were Catholics before the said Synod, while so many eminent authors stand against it.

*Mr. Rag.* (12) I can by the grace of God, prove their Catholicity from these very authors.

*F. Vane.* What are the four points put forward by *Historicus Philalethes*?

*Mr. Rag.* (13) They are these:—

“What proves that the Thomas Christians were Nestorians are the following points.

(1) The Solemn declaration of Archdeacon George made in 1598, to the effect, that he would never make a profession of faith, nor subject himself to the Pope of Rome, nor to the Archbishop of Goa who had nothing to do with the † Thomas Christians. This declaration was confirmed by a great synod in Angamale, at which, by solemn oath, it was resolved, *not to permit, any change in matters of faith, nor to acknowledge Bishops but those sent by the Patriarch of Babylon.* (Raulin cap. II see I m II) I can not imagine that the Thomas Christians would have taken such an oath if they had been good Catholics as is pretended.

(2) According to Synodus Diamperitana, act III Decree VIII. The Thomas Christians commemorated in their prayers the Patriarch of Babylon, calling him universal pastor, Head of the Catholic Church. Would they have honoured the memory of the Patriarch of Babylon if they were Catholics?

(3) According to the decree IX of Actio III they celebrated the feasts of Nestorius, Theodorus, Diadorus, and other Nestorian Saints. Who can understand that the good Catholic Thomas Christians would have done this?

(4) In the same actio III of the synod, a great number of Nestorian books are mentioned and errors contained in them pointed out. Now are we to suppose that these Nestorian books were sent to Malabar by the Pope, whose faithful children the Thomas Christians are said to have been always?.....

*F. Vane.* Do you think yourself to be able to refute these four points?

† *Historicus Philalethes* would never use the word “St. Thomas” which also shows that he denies the *Apostleship of St. Thomas in India.*

*Mr. Rag.* (14) I have already said that I can, by the grace of God, prove the Catholicity of the St. Thomas Christians from these very books which speak against them and consequently I can and will refute these 4 points.

*F. Vane.* What does *Historicus Philalethes* promise to do in these his opinions on these 4 points are refuted and proved to the contrary conclusively?

*Mr. Rag.* (15) He promises that, if these four points are conclusively proved he will change his opinion.

*F. Vane.* Prove the first point mentioned in the answer 13.

*Mr. Rag.* (16) The resolution taken and confirmed by the St. Thomas Christians in the great synod of Angamale in 1598 was, according to *Historicus Philalethes* not to change their Nestorian faith, nor to acknowledge any Bishop but those sent by the Patriarch of Babylon and this they did in spite of the advice given them by Dom Menezes. Consequently those who were such sacrilegious acts are formal heretics who are already out of the Communion of the Catholic Church. What is the attitude to be taken towards such heretics (or in other words how are Catholics to treat them? This is a question to be answered.

There are many things to be observed in this respect, the prominent are these:—

(1) Catholics can have no spiritual communion with them. (2) As they are out of the Communion of the Catholic Church, no Catholic Bishop would dare to give them a precept under pain of excommunication and by virtue of Holy Obedience, nor any heretic obey such order.

This is unquestionable. Can you contradict to what I say Father?

*F. Vane.* No. I fully agree with you in this. But what is your object in quoting this.

*Mr. Rag.* (17) My object is to affirm that (a) if this is true, St. Thomas Christians were not Nestorians as our *Historicus Philalethes* thinks them to be, but they were good Catholics and that (b) their resolution in the synod of Angamale in 1598 was only a fabrication or mis-representation of facts.

*F. Vane.* Although the above said is unquestionably true, yet how does it show that the St. Thomas Christians were Catholics?

*Mr. Rag.* (18) In a pastoral letter or circular (dated the 14th. May 1599 published 37 days before the synod of Diamper. (This letter can be seen in Raulin, Goides, Gouvea etc.) Archbishop Menezes commanded them by virtue of holy obedience and under pain of excommunication late sententia to come to the synod, although, in the same letter, he called the Chaldean Bishops that governed them till that time, *heretics, schismatics and Nestorians.* By the declaration of the pain of excommunication, Dom Menezes virtually said to the Syrians “You are members of the Catholic Church and I will put you out of the communion of it, if you would not come to Diamper for the Diocesan synod.”

Where are in the world such Christians who are both heretics and Catholics at the same time? Who would make such a useless threat of putting out of the Communion of the church those who were already out of it?

There are numerous examples in Raulin, Gouvea, and other Portuguese histories, which go to prove that the Portuguese Priests and prelates from their arrival in India, up to the synod of Diamper had spiritual communion with the Syrians. On many occasions, they came to the Syrian Churches and had their masses offered in them and in turn, the Syrian Priests also offered their masses in the churches belonging to the Portuguese and on many occasions, the Portuguese Priests heard the confession of the Syrians and gave them Holy Communion. (Oriente conqui il.) Do these facts not prove of the Catholicity of St. Thomas Christians?

What should be understood from the said pastoral letter of the Archbishop Menezes (dated the 14th. May 1599) but that the Syrians were Catholics, when that letter was published. Will the present Archbishop of Goa give a like precept of threat to the Jacobites in Malabar or to the so called Bishop Alvarez who is a native of the Portuguese territory and his sectarians in Canara and Ceylon and would they obey it?

*F. Van.* It cannot be believed that the Syrians were Catholics by the mere fact that Archbishop Menezes gave them such precepts; for his words in the said circular are to the contrary.

*Mr. Rag.* (19) Please, listen to me. Words are changeable but deeds are not so. Words are capable of different interpretations but deeds are not.

*F. Van.* What have you to say further about the deeds and words of the Archbishop Menezes and his companions?

*Mr. Rag.* (20) Their *deeds* are historical facts which cannot be changed. on the other hand, their *words* are not facts, but only misrepresentation of facts, which are the results of their passion and prejudice against the Syrians.

*F. Van.* Can you produce any further evidence in support of the Catholicity of the St. Thomas Christians?

*Mr. Rag.* (21) Yes. Four months before the said pastoral letter, that is in February 1599, the Archbishop Menezes gave a precept like the aforesaid, under pain of *excommunication, latae sententiae* (Raulin 22-23) to the Archdeacon George and his Clergy not to commemorate the name of the Patriarch in divine offices and messes Archbishop Menezes showed by *this deed* of his also that the Syrian Clergy were Catholics.

*F. Van.* Have you any further evidence to prove the Catholicity of the Syrians?

*Mr. Rag.* (22) The proofs just put forward are sufficient to show that the Syrians were Catholics; however I shall cite a few more examples. The Portuguese Clergy, before and after the death of Mar Abraham were accustomed to come and preach and celebrate their Masses in the Syrian Churches and this is a point well attested in Oriente (conquistade, Gouvea, Raulin, and other Portuguese histories). This, the Portuguese Clergy would never have done, if the Syrians were not Catholics; for the strict law of the Catholic Church forbids Catholics, and much more the Clergy, to have spiritual communion with heretics. How could it be that the Christians would be made Catholics, if their last Chaldean Archbishop Mar Abraham was Nestorian?

In a word all the deeds and actions of the Portuguese Clergy and of the Archbishop Menezes are declarations attesting the catholicity of the Syrians and consequently these actions of the Portuguese are historical facts supporting the same which are more reliable than their words which are mere breath, and consequently the name "Nestorians" given to the Syrians by the Portuguese was unjust and meaningless and was the result of their passion and prejudice. Mar Elias the Chaldean Archbishop of Amed in his letter to Cardinal Caraffa sent in 1580 complained to the Holy See against this unjust name given to the Chaldeans.

*F. Van.* What sort of a person was this Mar Elias?

*Mr. Rag.* (23) He was the contemporary of Mar Joseph and Mar Abraham and had come to Malabar with Mar Joseph but went back to Mesopotamia and he was also the contemporary of the Patriarch Abedjesu, (by whom Mar Joseph and Mar Abraham were sent to India) and of Abedjesu's immediate

successors Aethalla Simon and Simon Denha VII, who sent him (Mar Elias) to Rome as his procurator general in that city. All these facts are narrated in his letter to the Cardinal and he also gives therein a full account of the state of the Chaldeans in Malabar and of the Portuguese attempts to supersede the Chaldean Bishops and in their room, to put Portuguese Bishops which he said, would prove detrimental to the Christians of St. Thomas; as it really turned out. This letter can be seen in Bullarium Patronatus Portugalliae Tomus II and also in the Patriarchal Archives at Mossul. According to this Mar Elias, the Patriarch Abedjesu held 12 years the Patriarchal See.

*F. Van.* Are you justified in saying that the Portuguese called the Christians of St. Thomas and their Chaldean Archbishops "Nestorians" out of *passion and prejudice*?

*Mr. Rag.* (24) Yes. It is well known that, through passion and prejudice, men always err in their Judgments. The result of *passion and prejudice* is that those who are in power, whenever they see in others, anything against their inclinations, are often misled to think what is just as unjust and what is unreasonable as reasonable and vice versa. This is proved by the following example. Joan of Arc, a very celebrated and virtuous maid who rescued France from the political aggressions of the English some four centuries ago, was declared a witch by an assembly of many Catholic Bishops and by the University of Paris and she was thus burnt alive; but now her case has been brought to the notice of Rome and has been declared not to be a witch but a holy maiden. Thus it was that the Chaldean Christians and their Archbishops were made Nestorians by the Portuguese, while they were really Catholics.

*F. Van.* Can you refute the second argument of *Historicus Philoletes*, which states that the St. Thomas Christians honored the name of the Patriarch of Babylon in their prayers, calling him universal pastor, Head of the Catholic Church. (Decree VIII actio III Synod of Diamper.)

*Mr. Rag.* (25) As the St. Thomas Christians were proved to have been Catholics, it was impossible that they should have called their Patriarch *Universa-ri pastor*, Head of the Catholic Church, although they could have commemorated him (Patriarch) in their prayers.

*F. Van.* Were there Catholic Patriarchs in Communion with Rome at the time of the Synod of Diamper? and if so, who were they?

*Mr. Rag.* (26) Certainly, there were. The letter of Mar Elias the Chaldean Archbishop mentioned above in answer 23 is an unquestionable testimony, by which it has been already proved that, up to his time, there were Catholic Patriarchs Anthalla Simon and Simon Denha VII as the successors of Mar Abedjesu (by whom Mar Joseph and Mar Abraham were sent to India) in communion with Rome and that the Christians of St. Thomas were under these Patriarchs. This is also attested by Le Quien Vol. II, Aloysius Asseman 228-229 and Asseman Bib-Orient III, 722. These authors also attest that Simon Denha VII was succeeded in 1600 by Simon VIII and after him Simon IX who were all Catholic Patriarchs in Communion with Rome.

*F. Van.* How is it then that the Christians of St. Thomas commemorated the name of the Patriarch of Babylon calling him Universal Pastor, Head of the Catholic Church? Is it possible that the Christians who accepted such a Patriarch (who pretends to be Universal Pastor &c.) as their superior should have been Catholics? Decree VIII.

*Mr. Rag.* (27) I protest against the statement of this Decree and affirm that it is the result of the ignorance or prejudice of the Portuguese in matters

and language of the Oriental Church, as they erroneously interpreted St. Hormisdas, in whose name, Mar Abraham built the church at Angamale, to be the Nestorian Abbot Hormisdas.

It is also one of the many examples which go to prove that the Synod of Diamper, made numerous blunders, as Asseman admits it in his work entitled B. O. T. III Part II. 391—445 written by the order of Pope Clement XI and Le Quien II 1098.

The Synod of Diamper had never the approbation of Rome as attested by R. P. Giamil in his "Genuine Relations" printed in Rome in 1902. Quoting many authors he says "the said Synod had never the approbation of the Holy See, nor could it be approved with integrity, for, many things were done in it by the violence of the civil power and many things more against the ancient and perpetual decrees of the Apostolic See which commands that no innovations or changes should be made in Oriental Rites." The Patriarch of the East or Babylon was distinguished from time immemorial by a special Title *Catholicus* and in course of time, the word "Patriarch" was added to this Title. This is a fact accepted by all historians, prominent among them being Asseman and Le Quien. With this Title of Patriarch Catholiciens or Catholic Patriarch, his name is commemorated even at the present day. Vide, the Syro-Chaldee Missal printed in 1784 & 1844 at Rome. The Portuguese interpreted this Title as Universal Patriarch and consequently Head of Universal or Catholic Church. If the Christians of St. Thomas ever commemorated his name it was simply because he was their Patriarch. It has already been stated that Archbishop Menezes put Anathema *latæ sententiæ* on the Syrian Clergy for commemorating their Patriarch. This very deed of Dom Menezes stands against the 2nd point put forward by *Historicus Philalethes*. It is a known fact that it is useless to put pain of *excommunication* over Nestorians who are already out of the Communion of the Catholic Church. Will the present Archbishop of Goa or any other Catholic Bishop in India threaten the Jacobites in Malabar with pain of *excommunication latæ sententiæ* for commemorating their Patriarch?

*F. Van.* Can you refute the 3rd point put by *Historicus Philalethes* by which he shows that the Syrians honored Nestorius, Theodorus, Diadorus and other Nestorian Saints, (Decree IX Actio III.)?

*Mr. Rag.* (28) The said decree says that Nestorius, Theodorus, Diadorus and other Nestorian Saints were venerated among the Christians of St. Thomas and their names were recited in divine offices and Sacrifices of Mass; but the same decree forbids the clergy and the faithful by virtue of *Holy Obedience* and under pain of *excommunication ipso facto* incurred to commemorate them in the future. How can we reconcile ourselves to this decree? The former part of the decree declares that the Christians were Nestorians, while the latter part affirms that they were Catholics. As the Catholics are forbidden to venerate Heresiarchs as Saints, we should conclude that these Heresiarchs were not venerated as Saints.

*F. Van.* Your argument is not satisfactory so long as the words of the decree affirm that those Heresiarchs were commemorated.

*Mr. Rag.* (29) By the words of the decree Archbishop Menezes declares that such veneration existed among the Christians, while by his deeds he contradicts the same. Deeds are more reliable than words as has already been stated.

*F. Van.* More evidence is required in this respect and so you should prove that the celebration of the feasts of Nestorian Saints and their commemoration in divine offices and Masses did not exist among the Syrians.

*Mr. Rag.* (30) The prohibition by Dom Menezes of the commemoration of the Patriarch of Babylon in divine offices and Masses under pain of *excommunication* was probably made, owing to the simple reason that he (Dom Menezes) was the then pastor of the Syrians. Now he who gave such grave precept in such unimportant thing while the Patriarch was a Catholic, had greater reason to prohibit the celebration and commemoration of Nestorian Saints in divine offices and Masses, for this was the gravest sin and heresy; but that he did not venture to prohibit such celebration and commemoration as he did in the case of the commemoration of the Patriarch previously in February is a clear evidence that such *celebration of feasts of Nestorian Saints* and their *commemoration* did not practically exist among the Syrians and this once more *proves* and corroborates my former statements that the Syrians were not Nestorians but Catholics in communion with Rome.

*F. Van.* I am astonished to hear that you put, so many excommunications in the mouth of Dom Menezes which makes me to suspect you. If you are sure of what you say, tell me plainly how many times he threatened the Syrians with the pain of Anathema?

*Mr. Rag.* (31) Three times within five months, viz. On the very first day of the Synod of Diamper and on the very beginning of it, Dom Menezes commanded the Clergy and the faithful assembled, by virtue of *Holy Obedience* and under pain of *excommunication ipso facto* incurred, not to depart out of the synod without his special permission until the synod was over Actio I. Decree II.

The same pain of excommunications, he threatened to put on them, one month before, by his pastoral letter, (answer 18) and he did the same (answer 21) five months before in the case of the commemoration of the Patriarch and now in the case of the veneration of Nestorian Saints also he threatened to put the same pain of excommunication.

*Mr. Rag. again.* Please tell me father, what is the result of the pain of excommunication by a Catholic Bishop?

*F. Van.* The result of the excommunication is that those who are thus punished are cut off from the communion of the Catholic Church.

*Mr. Rag.* On whom is it inflicted father?

*F. Van.* (32) It is known to all that the pain of excommunication is inflicted by a Catholic Bishop on those who are members of the Catholic Church under his jurisdiction.

*Mr. Rag.* (33) Are these undeniable <sup>franchise of Rome</sup> truths established in the Catholic Church?

*F. Van.* Yes. No one can deny it; but to obey or disobey the orders is left to their will, although good Catholics would not disobey them.

*Mr. Rag.* (34) If the Syrians obeyed such extra ordinary orders of Dom Menezes, would you agree that they were good Catholics?

*F. Van.* Yes. I think I must admit; but did they really obey Dom Menezes.

*Mr. Rag.* (35) Certainly they obeyed as the adversaries themselves admit. What is the inference of these deeds of Dom Menezes in so many times threatening the Syrians by such orders, but that he believed, publicly admitted and confessed that they were Catholics, although groundlessly they were accused to be otherwise by the different names of heretics, schismatics, and Nestorians.

How is it possible that Nestorians who venerate Heresiarchs as *Saints* to be members of the Catholic Church at the same time?

*F. Van.* What do you mean by this?

*Mr. Rag.* (36) I mean to say that the Syrians were either Catholics or heretics at that time. If you admit the former you are compelled to say that those who accused them were calumniators and if you admit the latter you are compelled to say that the threats of Dom Menezes were mere farce to which he used the church as a theatre and you cannot get out of this dilemma in either way. It is therefore rightly and logically concluded that it was the unfounded accusation of the Portuguese, that the Syrians venerated Nestorian Saints and commemorated them.

*F. Van.* As the 31st point is the most important one, you should again prove that the Chaldee Missal and Breviary were orthodox and Catholic.

*Mr. Rag.* (37) It was on the 3rd day of the synod that is on the 22nd June that the decree IX Actio III was published by which Chaldee Missal and Breviary containing the names of Nestorian Saints and Nestorian errors were corrected. *This is a fact.* But two days before this that is on the 20th and then on the 21st day, the Syrian Clergy (decree IV Actio I) according to the order of Dom Menezes celebrated in his presence, their holy Masses and recited divine offices. *This also is a fact.* Now what were the Missal and Breviary they made use of those two days? Were they Orthodox or Nestorian? According to the testimony of Raulin and Gouven, all the decree were prepared previous to the Synod and consequently Dom Menezes could not have ignored that the Chaldee Missal and Breviary contained the names of Heresiarchs if they really did. It was impossible therefore that Archbishop Menezes would permit them to make use of Nestorian Breviary and Missal. So the *deeds* of their Missal and Breviary were orthodox and Catholic. So the *deeds* of the Archbishop Menezes (according to decree IV Actio I) in commanding the clergy to celebrate, in his presence their Holy Masses, and to recite their divine offices on the 20th and on the 21st June first and second days of the synod before the corrections were made on the 22nd (3rd day) in their Missal and Breviary, prove that their Missal and Breviary contained no names of Nestorian Saints and their commemoration, although by the *words* of decree IX Actio III he said to the contrary.

*F. Van.* Can you bring any more evidence in support of this (3rd) point.

*Mr. Rag.* (38) Yes. I can if you allow me to repeat a part of what I said before. Five months before this, that is in February 1590, when the Archbishop Menezes came to know that (his in sacro brique in officio Raulin 28) the Patriarch of Babylon was commemorated daily twice in Masses and twice in divine offices, he prohibited any such commemoration for the future *under pain of excommunication i. e.* that as the Syrians were members of the Catholic Church, he would put them out of the Communion of the Catholic Church, if they ventured to commemorate the Patriarch any more. The veneration of Nestorian Saints is a thing which cannot be tolerated by a Catholic prelate as Dom Menezes and it was impossible therefore that he would have tolerated such veneration and it was equally impossible also that he would have permitted the priests to commemorate the Nestorian Saints in their Missal and Breviary for so long a period of five months, at least from February, the date of the prohibition of the commemoration of Patriarch, to June 22nd. This is an undeniable fact, by which it is successfully proved that the Chaldee Missal and Breviary used by the Clergy were orthodox and Catholic and thus void of Nestorian errors and consequently the *words* of the decree IX actio III speaking of the veneration of Nestorian Saints are mere fabrications or mis-representation of facts; for these words are thrown on the back ground by the *deeds* of Archbishop Menezes.

*F. Van.* Can you refute the 4th point of *Historicus Philaletes* which shows that according to Decree IX. Actio III, there was a great number of Nestorian books among the Christians of St. Thomas, and that errors contained in them were pointed out in the Synod of Diamper.

*Mr. Rag.* (39) There might have been some Nestorian books among them; but that does not affect their Catholicity. The point to be decided is whether they made use of them and believed in their contents or not. If they made use of them and believed in their contents, they were really heretics. It has already been proved that these Christians were Catholics and they did not make use of Nestorian books nor believe in them and this has been proved by the *deeds* and *attitude* of Archbishop Menezes and his companion St. Francis knew all these and so he did not approach the Syrians with prejudices, as those after him did.

When the Portuguese got hold of some Nestorian books from among the Syrians, they took the opportunity of framing charges against them and this was done as the result of their passion and prejudice, and if they had walked in the footsteps of St. Francis Xavier, filled with heavenly clarity and thus void of passion and prejudice, they would never have done so.

*F. Van.* What have you to say to *Historicus Philaletes*, who asks you to prove that there were no Nestorian books among your Christians?

*Mr. Rag.* (40) That is an impossibility. Even *Historicus Philaletes* may keep some heretic books for references and the like. Even the Chaldee Patriarch and Bishops of the present day may have Nestorian books among them, just in the same way as the Catholics of England and Germany may have Protestant books in their possession; yet no one would venture to say that the Chaldeans are Nestorians and the Catholics of England and Germany are Protestants except the Portuguese of those days.

*F. Van.* What do you think of *Historicus Philaletes*'s assertion that "St. Francis Xavier supposed the Thomas Christians to be Catholics and that he did not approach them with prejudices."

*Mr. Rag.* (41) This is a mere surmise of *Historicus Philaletes* which he makes about 350 years after the death of St. Francis against the fact which the saint affirmed during his life attesting that *Christians of St. Thomas were Catholics* and that their Bishop Mar Jacob was a very holy and venerable man and a true Catholic prelate and complaining against the oppressions he was subjected to by the Portuguese. Coleridge's Life of St. Francis II. Now which of these two writers, *Philaletes* or St. Francis is to be believed? The truth of the testimony and attitude of St. Francis towards these Christians can be elucidated by putting the following questions

- 1st. Whether St. Francis saw the Christians of St. Thomas and their Bishop and had any experience of them.
- 2nd. Whether he was a man liable to be deceived by them.
- 3rd. Whether he was so ignorant as to be unable to make distinction between schismatics and Catholics.
- 4th. Whether St. Francis in comparison with *Historicus Philaletes* was not more educated and gifted.
- 5th. Whether the Papal Court at Rome was so ignorant as to make no distinction between Schismatics and Catholics in granting indulgences to the former?

As St. Francis Xavier came to India in 1542, he had 7 years experience with the St. Thomas Christians and it was on the 26th January 1549, seven years after his arrival, that he wrote about the then Bishop Mar Jacob of the St. Thomas Christians to the King of Portugal. So it is an undeniable fact that what St. Francis wrote about them was the result of his familiarity and experience with them for many years and consequently the first question is self evident and need no further proof. The second question is easily answered thus. The fact that St. Francis was a prudent and gifted man and was one endowed with natural, acquired, and supernatural knowledge and gifts as one of the Apostles themselves, is an unquestionable evidence that he could be deceived by none in so important a matter as this. The solution of the 3rd question runs thus. St. Francis, as is evident from the arguments given above, was a man amply qualified to make distinction between Schismatics and Catholics and further as he was the Papal legate, it was his duty, to make this distinction; and to fulfil that duty he had every facility at his disposal and so, to think and say that he supposed the heretics to be Catholics in spite of his several years experience with them, is to regard him an ignorant man and consequently the assertion of *Historicus Philalethes* making St. Francis suppose the Syrians as Catholics falls to the ground. The answer to the 4th question is easy, for St. Francis was a well-educated man and he was for a long time teaching in the University of Paris as a Doctor and professor, and had a good deal of knowledge in secular and religious sciences and further he had the gift of knowing many things which *Historicus Philalethes* lacks such as the gift of prophesying, of knowing the hidden secrets and of working miracles and so forth. It cannot be supposed that *Historicus Philalethes* possesses such rare knowledge and gifts till it is proved. The fifth question is also easy and intelligible. To say that the Papal court was in a position of ignorance in detecting heterodoxy and orthodoxy and in making distinction between Schismatics and Catholics and that the Church of Rome granted indulgences to Schismatics mistaking them for Catholics, as it had granted to the Syrians (Mr. Mackenzie's Christianity in Travancore 93) is a thing unheard of and no histories will give a single example to support *Historicus Philalethes* in this respect. Now one will see that by asserting that the St. Thomas Christians "were converted individually by the efforts of the Missionaries or jointly at the synod of Udiamperur" *Historicus Philalethes* takes away the glory which is due to God for preserving these Christians in the Catholic faith for the period of so many centuries and gives it to men who did nothing in this respect, as St. Francis Xavier the most zealous Missionary the world ever saw had to do nothing in the same direction. Passion and prejudice made *Historicus Philalethes* shut his eyes to find all these.

F. Van. What have you to say in general about other points which *Historicus Philalethes* urges here and there or elsewhere.

Mr. Rag. (42) (a) His assertion that the Patriarchs of the East were Nestorians is a weak point; for the Catholic Patriarchs also called themselves "as Patriarch of the East." Vide the letter of Simon Denha VII to Pope Gregory XIII in Bullarium Patromatus Portugalliae Tomus II.

(b) Le Quien † quotes many eminent writers and Barbaeus also among them to prove that, after Nestorian heresy, there were Chaldeans in communion with Rome under a Patriarch or Catholics Le Quien Tomus II 1086-1087-1088.

(c) I have already proved that Mar Abraham was sent to India by the Patriarch Abdedien, which is also supported by the decree X of the 3rd session

† The work of Le Quien containing 3 large Volumes was published in Paris in 1740.

of the Provincial Council at Goa 1535. This is also attested by R. P. Samuel Giamil the representative of the Chaldean Patriarch at Rome in his recently published work p. 601 "Genuinae Relationes inter Apostolicam sedem et Chaldeorum Ecclesiam" Even Raulin p. 498 writes that Mar Abraham was sent to India by the Patriarch Abdedien the successor of John Sulacca, although he makes Abdedien a Nestorian, which is a historical error of Raulin is quite against the truth and unanimous testimonies of eminent historians (vide the same work and the same page.) In the face of all these strong evidences, *Historicus Philalethes* asserts that Mar Abraham was sent to the Nestorian Patriarch that his faith was Nestorian or rather he deceived the Portuguese Bishop to praise his Nestorian Faith !!!

Is it natural that a Catholic Bishop sent by a Catholic Patriarch his superior should write to a Nestorian Patriarch who was not his superior that his faith was Nestorian?

(d) If the profession of the Catholic faith made by Mar Abraham in 1583 and in 1585 at those two synods of Vaipicotta and Goa were, according to *Historicus Philalethes*, to abjure Nestorian errors, what are we to think of the Catholic profession made by Archbishop Menezes at the Synod of Diamper, by which he abjured Nestorian errors?

(e) If what *Historicus Philalethes* says of the writers of the manuscript who are two Syrian priests "who set themselves at variance with their own fore-fathers, by denying what those avowed and solemnly abjured in the synod of Udiamperur in 1583" be true, the first Nestorian must be Archbishop Menezes who was the first in abjuring Nestorian errors and then only come the fore-fathers of the Syrians (Decree I actio II synod of Diamper.) Again, on the first day of the synod (Decree IV actio I) the priests celebrated their holy masses and the faithful made their confession and took Holy Communion.

Now, on the 2nd day, they abjured Nestorian errors and made their profession of the faith and thins they entered into the Catholic Church. Are there in the world such Nestorians, such heretics, and such schismatics, who can receive Holy Sacraments in the Catholic Church before their entrance into it by abjuring their errors and making their profession of the Catholic faith?

(f) In order to understand the nature of the corrections made in the Chaldean missal and Pontificals at the synods of Vaipicottah in 1583 and that of Goa in 1585, one should study the difference between the discipline of the Chaldean Church and that of the Western Church and then he will be able to understand the nature of those corrections. Of such corrections R. P. Samuel Giamil in his "Genuinae Relationes" P. 610 says "many errors are wrongly attributed to the Syro Chaldeans of Malabar which they have not in reality nor they are errors but peculiar Rites of the Oriental Church in administration of Sacraments as justly observed by Asseman in B. O. T 3. part 2, 391"

(g) *Historicus Philalethes* asserts that there were no Catholic Chaldeans and Patriarchs before John Sulacca in 1553, but Pope Julius III admits that there were under him Chaldean Patriarchs (Mr. Mackenzie's Travancore Christianity P. 92) which is also supported by St. Francis Xavier who, when he wrote about the Catholicity of Mar Jacob as already mentioned (Coleridge's life of St. Francis Vol. II) understood well that he was under his Catholic Patriarch in communion with Rome.

(h) *Historicus Philalethes*, as his own opinion, asserts that Sabor and Proth were sent to India by a Nestorian Patriarch, which opinion or surmise of *Historicus Philalethes* is of no value in the face of the miracles attributed to

them. (Mr. Mackenzie's *Travancore Christianity* p. 92) Instead of making any such surmise, if he had proved that the miracles attributed to them were the invention of some one or the like, his opinion would have been valued. There is a Syriac Book written about them in 1556 by a Syro-chaldean priest of Malabar, called Jacob the disciple of Mar Jacob whom St. Francis saw. This book can be found in the Vatican Library. Cod Syra Vati No. IV fol. 278 as attested by R. P. Giamil author of "Genuine Relations" etc. 584. Oriente conquistado II conq. I. Div. II para 16 attests the fact of a miracle (as it attests here those of Sabor and Proth) wrought by Mar John Archbishop of the Syrians who raised the sacrifice of the Church at Cranganore from the dead. Francis Rosa the first Latin Archbishop of the Syrians read, as Conquistado says, the fact of this miracle in a Syriac book. As there are many Johns, as the Archbishops of the Syrians, we cannot ascertain who the John referred to is. According to Visscher's letters from Malabar p. 107, there is one John who came in 988 and he may be the John who wrought this miracle or rather the John who came in 1490, 12 years previous to the arrival of Mar Jacob whom St. Francis saw.

F. Van. I thank you Mr. Raggio for your convincing and conclusive arguments.

Mr. Rag. When a Catholic writer admits a first class miracle as raising the dead, does it not follow that the writer believes, the worker of the miracle is a Catholic.

F. Van. Of course. It is well known to every reasonable man that no miracle can be wrought, where there is no finger of God, and God would never permit a heretic to do miracles through which his heresies might be propagated.

Mr. Rag. I thank you Father for your patience in hearing my arguments and expressing your opinion without prejudice or partiality.

Now I think I have intruded long upon your valuable time and so I wish you a Good Morning till we meet again.

## PART II.

F. Vanerello. Where are you coming from, Raggio? I was expecting to see you.

Mr. Raggio (1) I had to go on a trip which took about a fortnight. What led you to expect me, Father?

F. Van. In your dialogue, you have slightly offended the Portuguese.

Mr. Rag. (2) Never Father. Whatever I told about them was only to defend the Catholicity of the Syrians, and that even, not without sufficient grounds as you yourself can judge better, and further my assertion will tend to some Portuguese of those days only. You will see on page 82 of Mr. Mackenzie's *Christianity in Travancore* that the Portuguese Jesuit Bishop Vasconcellos in his letter to the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda in 1722 accused the Carmelite Bishop at Verapoly as a violator of the Cochin Bishop's jurisdiction and again, you will see on the same page that the Portuguese were equally accused by those of other Nationalities of Europe.

F. Van. Do you think, Mr. Raggio, that you have proved the Catholicity of the Syrians satisfactorily?

Mr. Rag. (3) Yes, Father.

F. Van. But I have some grave doubts about the Catholicity of Abediesu, successor of John Sulacca.

Mr. Rag. What are those doubts, Father?

F. Van. Of his profession of faith, which was submitted to Pope Pius IV, Le Quien II. 1159, says that the latter words betray a Nestorian meaning."

Again, of the 3 poems written by him the 1st, and the 2nd, as Le Quien observes, contain Nestorian errors and consequently Mar John and Mar Abraham sent by him to India together with their Syrian flock must also be Nestorians.

Mr. Rag. (4) R. P. Samuel Giamil cited in the first part of this dialogue in his work "*Genuine Relations*" page 27-75 ably defends the orthodoxy of Abediesu by numerous documents preserved in the Vatican Library against his few adversaries and asserts that he was in communion with Rome until the end of his life, and in another place, page 568, the author says that he was one of the most celebrated Patriarchs of the Catholic Chaldeans. Even Le Quien II. coll 1160. Places Abediesu in the list of the Catholic Patriarchs in communion with Rome. How could it be that he would place Abediesu in the list of the Catholic Patriarchs if he was a Nestorian? The following eminent authors stand against the above assertion of Le Quien and they all unanimously defend the Orthodoxy of Abediesu.

1st. The Council of Trent which accepted Abediesu as one of the chief pastors of the Church, who together with other fathers, present in the Council, pronounced judgments on various points of the orthodox faith.

2nd. Khayyath "Syri Orientales seu Chaldaei Nestoriani et Romanorum Pontificum Primatus" page 124.

3rd. Aloysius Asseman, page 221.

4th. Bibl. Valliellina Ms. K. Fol. 403 P.

5th. Strozza, De Dogmatibus Synodibus Chaldecorum Romae, 1617.

6th. Parvinius, in Vita P ii IV.

7th. The letter of Mar Elias, the Chaldean Archbishop of Amed in 1580 to Cardinal Caraffa, a contemporary of Abediesu. Bult. Patronatus Portu. T. II.

8th. Paulinus A. S. Bartholomeo 156, who asserts that Abediesu was well educated and very celebrated in virtues, and therefore, Asseman B. O. T. III Part II justly concludes that those manuscripts which accuse Abediesu must be falsified by the copyist.

Pope Pius IV who received Abediesu's profession of faith and confirmed him in the Patriarchal dignity is the highest authority in support of his orthodoxy and this is proved by the following arguments.

The Oriental Patriarchs, before their confirmation in the Patriarchal dignity, are required by Rome to submit their profession of faith to the reigning Pope, who, previous to their confirmation carefully examines it, to find whether it is orthodox or heterodox, and if the Pope finds it orthodox, he at once confirms their Patriarchal election, and on the other hand if he finds it heterodox, he will never give his confirmation. Again, the assertion of Le Quien that "Roman Theologians were imposed upon by these crafty Easterns" is unfounded, for, to deceive such a large body of Theologians as those of the Papal court who are the most educated and the most skilled in the world in detecting heresies is a thing impossible and consequently false is the assertion that the Patriarch Abediesu deceived the Pope by a Nestorian profession and that he wrote books which contained his Nestorian belief. Records of such falsehoods or historical lies are common in the world.



*F. Van.* Can you give any example to prove that Records of falsehoods are common in the world.

*Mr. Rag.* (5) I will give some from *Christianity in Travancore* itself written in these days.

*F. Van.* What are those falsehoods in it?

*Mr. Rag.* (6) They are these:—P. 84 of the *Christianity* in question says that "the Patriarch Joseph VI sent Antony Thondanath "to the Nestorian Patriarch of Babylon who consecrated him as a Bishop." But the truth is quite otherwise. Antony went, of his own accord, to the Nestorian Patriarch which he did, when he was to be consecrated by the Patriarch Joseph VI, who when he came to know of the departure of Antony to the Nestorian Patriarch excommunicated him, and some other Chaldeans who assisted him in this attempt. This is a fact narrated by Antony's companions who were with him and some of whom are still living and are ready to give upon oath the truth of it. This is proved also by the letter dated the 3rd March 1863 sent by the Chaldeans at Mossul to the Syrians in Malabar.

2nd. Again, the same page says that Antony had a domestic seminary and as he could not succeed to get his seminarians ordained by the Archbishop Bernardine of Verapoly, he set sail for the Persian Gulf. Here the assertion that "he had a domestic seminary" is false; he had no domestic seminary, which is a fact that can be attested by the old Syrian Priests who are still living.

(7) In the same page it is mentioned that Antony Thondanath was the leader among the Syrians to obtain an Oriental Bishop. This is not true. The leader in that movement was Kodakachira Antony a Syrian Priest. He also had no domestic seminary, although it is true that he took with him some candidates for Syriac learning to Babylon on his second journey to that country. Thither he went twice, Antony Thondanath accompanied him to Babylon only in his second voyage. Antony Kodakachira died at Mossul.

(4) On p.85, it is asserted that "the official letters of the Chaldean Patriarch recalling Bishop Mellus from Malabar, were accompanied by a private letter telling him to remain at his post." This assertion is not true. It was only a fabrication of the Mellus party at Trichur, and the Patriarch did not send any such private letter. When the Mellus party understood that the Patriarch recalled Bishop Mellus, they circulated for their defence, a false rumour that the Patriarch sent a private letter to their Bishop ordering him to remain at his post, which is a fact known to all.

It is not the fault of the Resident that these errors just mentioned are entered in his book but that of those who supplied him with such information.

*F. Van.* You proved well about the orthodoxy of Abediesh but I have grave doubts about the orthodoxy of his successor Aaathalla Simon who did not apply to Rome for Confirmation. So how could the Bishops and Christians in Malabar be Catholics under him?

*Mr. Rag.* (7) Have patience Father, be not angry with me. What you say is wrong.

Mar Elia the above mentioned Chaldean Archbishop of Amed (ans. 4. Part II.) in his letter to Cardinal Caraffa in 1580, says about him thus "After the death of the said Abediesh, Mar Aaathalla Simon, old man of holy path already Archbishop was elected Patriarch, who on account of the successive wars which were in his country (in those days) and as he did not live more than two years, was not able to procure confirmation from the Holy Apostolic See and the

petitioner (The said Mar Elia) testifies it, as he was asked by this Patriarch to go to Rome and supplicate for this" (confirmation) vide, "Bullarium Patronatus Portugalliae T. II. This letter can also be found at the Patriarchal Archives at Mossul. Theiner annal, Eccles. T. 3d. ad annum 1580 Page 701. Romae 1836 also confirms the above testimony. Le Quin T. II places him (Aaathalla Simon) 1160—1161 in the list of the Catholic Patriarchs and asserts that he was Orthodox and Catholic, which is supported also by Aloysius Asseman, [Page 227, 228 and Asseman. B. O. III part II.

*F. Van.* Can you give me an example to prove catholicity of any Oriental Patriarch, whose confirmation was, according to his own statement, not procured at Rome.

*Mr. Rag.* (8) Although it is not to the point to enter into such questions yet as your Reverence wants me to do so, I shall bring forward one example.

Mar Simon the Chaldean Bishop mentioned in P. 79 of Mr. Meekouzes *Christianity in Travancore* and who consecrated the curmudite father Angelus at the Romo-Syrian church at Alengal was sent to India, not by Joseph II the Chaldean Patriarch, as mention is made about him there but by the Patriarch Mar Elia. This Mar Elia had not his confirmation procured at Rome. This is the opinion of Asseman Le Quin and Aloy-asseman. However this Mar Elia (According to Aloysius Asseman Page 240 and others this Mar Elia held the Patriarchal See 1700—1722) before sending Mar Simon to India sent him to Rome and succeeded to procure the approbation of the Holy See. You see thus that the communication of the Oriental Patriarchs with Rome often escaped the notice of historians, who on that account inferred that such Patriarchs must be Nestorians, among whom, they include this Mar Elia; this inference is not true. This Mar Elia was a true catholic Patriarch and this is proved by the following letter of Mar Simon dated the 5th March of the Greek or Seleucian year 2012 which is A. D. 1761 written at Surat to the clergy and laity of the Romo Syrians of the Holy See preserved Auzen. First Mar Elia, Patriarch of the East whose glorious See be preserved Auzen. First I went to Jerusalem and thence to Rome, to Spain and Portugal, whence I came to the city of Goa, where I made inquiry about you and was told that those whom I sought were not there and that I should find them at Surat. So I went there but did not find any of you, and yet I saw a Jew who had with him a letter from you. I took and kissed and read the letter and was very much pleased and asked him where these Christians should be and he told me that I would find them in Cochim."

*F. Van.* How can you prove the authenticity of this letter.

*Mr. Rag.* (9) Very Revd. Fr. E. A. Nidiry, Retired Vicar-General has seen in many Syrian libraries the text of this letter and testifies that he has found it authenticated in the collection of ancient letters written about 2 century ago.

*F. Van.* Fully agreeing with you in all this, I have to ask you a long question. I have serious suspicion about the Orthodoxy of Simon Denha the 2nd. successor of Patriarch Abediesh. "Strozza, the authority quoted by Asseman 2nd. successor of Patriarch Abediesh, "Strozza, the authority quoted by Asseman 2nd. successor of Patriarch Abediesh removed his residence to the confines of Persia, 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 (of the Chaldeans thus) sunk back into Nestorianism, and represents the present line of Patriarchs holding Nestorian heresy". Consequently there were no Chaldean Catholic Patriarchs probably from the year 1580 until the year 1616, "when the conversion of the Nestorian Patriarch Elias of the older line was brought about under Paul V. and from him the succession of the Catholic

Patriarchs is continued to our days." This I read in a paper in these days. How could it be that two Syrians and their Chaldean Bishops would be Catholics without any Catholic Patriarch ever them in communion with Rome before and during the time of the Synod of Diamper?

*Mr. Rag.* (10) For the facility of answering your long question I shall divide it into two parts, the first part, containing a short sketch of Simon Denha and the line of his successors, and the 2nd part, that of the conversion of Patriarch Elias and the line of his successors.

The assertion of Strozza, that the Patriarch Simon Denha became a Nestorian as stated in the question is wrong, and this is proved to be so on the authority of the following eminent authors who unanimously affirm that the Simon Denha was, to the last, a Catholic Patriarch in communion with Rome.

1st. Le Quien II. 1161. places him in the list of Catholic patriarchs in communion with Rome, and asserts that he sent to Rome his profession of faith by his Procurator General in 1582 and removed his residence to Urmia in Persia.

2nd. Paulinus A. S. Bartholomaeo p. 157 says that, on account of the increasing vexation of Nestorians, he went and resided at Zeinalbeck in the Province of Persia and died there as a Catholic.

3rd. Aloysius Asseman Pag. 228—229 testifying his Orthodoxy, places him in the list of the Catholic Patriarchs

4th. Asseman, B. O. T. III. Pag. 720—730 standing in support of his orthodoxy places him, as the Patriarch of the Chaldeans in communion with Rome.

5th. His (Simon Denhas') own letter to Pope Gregory XIII. inserted in Bullario, Patro. Portug. T. II.

6th. The letter of Mar Elia mentioned in answer 23 of Part I of this dialogue.

7th. Theiner Annal. Eccles. ad Annum 1580 T. III. N. C. VII. Pag. 233 Romae 1856. And this author says that Pope Gregory XIII had the greatest joy concerning the person of the Patriarch Simon elect at Mosul to whom all the Oriental Christians in Assyria, in Mesopotamia, in Cochim China, and in Malabar coast, especially in the province of Angamale obeyed.

8th. The provincial council at Goa in 1585. By the Decree X Session III of that council, the fathers understood well that, at that period, there was a line of Catholic Patriarchs in communion with Rome, and that the then Patriarch was this Simon Denha, there being no Catholic Patriarch except him at the time.

All these eminent authorities stand against the assertion of Strozza and consequently his assertion is one without foundation. In 1617 Strozza published his work "De dogmatibus et synodalibus Chaldecorum" at Rome and he died long before he saw the present line of Nestorian Patriarchs and therefore his assertion that Simon Denha who sunk into Nestorianism together with his successors, represents the present line of Nestorian Patriarchs cannot be taken as true.

Also the assertion that Simon Denha "was found by the Apostolic Nuncio not qualified for the office" cannot equally be taken as true; for, the Nuncio cannot have higher authority than the Pope who found him (Simon Denha) well qualified and thus confirmed him in the Patriarchal dignity. Before concluding this part of your question, I think it would be better to place here the Catholic line

of the Successors of the Patriarch Simon Denha in communion with Rome, and this I shall do on the authority of Asserman, Le Quien and Aloysius Asseman the best authorities in the Eastern Church question.

The line of the Successors of Simon Denha VII embraces Simon VIII. Simon IX, and Simon X. This line comes down as late as the beginning of the 18th century. The answer 26 of Part I is also an evidence to prove this line.

You therefore see that it is an unquestionable fact that during the period of the Synod of Diamper there were Catholic Patriarchs and this is supported also by the numerous argumentary evidences which are contained in the first Part of this dialogue.

About the middle of the 17th century, some converts to the true faith were made among the Nestorians in Persia and in the neighbouring parts, and these had their own Patriarchs and thus another line of Chaldean Catholic Patriarchs rose into existence.

Their list according to Aloysius Asseman and Le Quien is this. Joseph I: Joseph II: Joseph III. Of these three, Joseph II who was made Patriarch about the end of the 17th century died in 1714 (of the 18th century).

The first part has been answered; must I answer the 2nd part also?

*F. Van.* Yes. You should answer the 2nd part also.

*Mr. Rag.* (11) I agree with you in what you have already said of the conversion of the Patriarch Elias, which was brought under Paul V in 1616, and also about his Catholic successors, who were in communion with Rome. But this is another body of the Chaldeans and their Patriarchal list in succession runs thus.

Elias VI who made his submission to Rome in 1616. Le Quien. II. 1157—1158.

Elias VII. Obtained his confirmation from Rome. Le Quien II. 1158.

Elias VIII. Obtained confirmation. Guriel Elementa Linguae Chaldaicae.

Elias IX. His confirmation is not mentioned by historians.

Elias X. Obtained no confirmation.

This line comes down as late as the middle of the 18th century.

From Le Quien and Aloysius Asseman we are to conclude that, this is the branch which was the opponent party of John Sulaca and his successors. Previous to Elias VI who stands at the head of the list given, his predecessor Elias was applied to Rome for confirmation but Pope Sixtus V, according to Aloysius Asseman, rejected his profession of faith as erroneous. The predecessor of this Elias was Simon VI who, at the time of John Sulaca and of his successors stood against Rome. During his time in the 16th century, Mar Simeon sent to Malabar who stood against Mar Abraham. As the Archdeacon George opposed this Simon, he had only a small party of the Syrians with him, and so he had to appoint a separate Vicar general for his party, Elias X who held the Patriarchal see from 1700—1722 was the Patriarch who sent another Mar Simon to India in the 18th century who gave episcopal consecration to the Carmelite father Angelus as is mentioned in answer 8 Part II. Most surely this Elias had his communication with Rome and this was the reason why he sent Mar Simeon to Rome before the latter was sent to India. As his communication with Rome escaped the notice of the historians, they stand against his orthodoxy, as Asserman does, in the case of the Patriarch of Mar Jacob and his companions who came in 1504.





as the mention about the Catholicism of Selencia is, as the same author notes always to be taken as of the Nestorians. From what is stated above it is, evident that there were Catholics in every century even in the midst of those countries though Persian Monarchs and Saracen Sultans, put them under severe persecution. This historical statement can be proved as supported also by other historians, while no historians come forward to prove the entire disappearance of these Orthodox Chaldeans from the world. It is rightly concluded that these Chaldeans had their separate Catholicism until the time of John Sulacea in 1551. This being so, what was the impossibility of the Christians of Malabar for having their Orthodox Bishops in communion with the Catholic Church?

*F. Van.* You deny the fact that the Nestorian Patriarchs have ever claimed India as part of their Patriarchate and so you must admit that those Bishops who governed Malabar must have been Nestorians.

*Mr. Rog.* In order to understand you I have to ask you 3 questions.

- 1st. Who were those Christians persecuted under Persian and Mahomedan Kings, and why they were so persecuted and who were those supported by them?
- 2nd. Was Malabar ever under Mahomedan persecutors?
- 3rd. Have you any evidence to show that civil power of Malabar ever persecuted the St. Thomas Christians to become Nestorians?

*F. Van.* (22) First I have to answer you that Persian Kings and the Saracens or Muhomedans after them, ever persecuted the Catholics on the sole ground that they always sided with the ecclesiastical as well as the civil authorities of the Roman Empire while enemies to themselves. On the other hand, Nestorians were always enemies to the Roman authorities and friends to the civil authorities of their countries, and on this account Nestorians were more numerous in those countries than Catholics as Le Quien testifies.

2nd. I must say that Malabar was never subject to the Muhomedan rule.

3rd. No one will assert, I believe that civil power of Malabar ever compelled or persecuted the St. Thomas Christians to become Nestorians.

*Mr. Rog.* (23) So supported by your well founded answers I have to affirm that these Christians were ever free to have their communication with the orthodox Catholics of the Chaldeans and that those persecuted Bishops and Chaldeans had Malabar as their refuge. Thus we find some colonies of orthodox Chaldeans have come to Malabar on different occasions, as some well reliable authorities testify. This statement is confirmed also by the fact that almost all the Chaldean Bishops that governed the St. Thomas Christians were either workers of miracles or who had their communication with Rome or who had the great saints of the Catholic Church as the advocates of their orthodoxy. This would convince you of the universality of the Catholic Church.

*F. Van.* From the attitude of St. Francis you have already proved the orthodoxy of the St. Thomas Christians and their Bishop as is mentioned in the answer 41. Part I, of this dialogue. But the following passage of the letter of St. Francis to John III King of Portugal taken from "Life and Letters of St. Francis" by Coleridge S. J. Vol. I, page 270 stands against you by which it can be concluded that the Syrians were Nestorians. The passage is: "The College of Cranganor, (where the Syrian students were taught) will send forth religious men who may make the whole of Malabar which is now sunk in vice and error feel a saving shame at its own state of misery and may bring the light of our Lord Jesus Christ to the benighted minds of the people."

*Mr. Rog.* I cannot believe that St. Francis by this passage speaks of the Nestorianism of the Syrians while he stands against it by his publicly and directly declaring their orthodoxy and so I beg you will point out to me those words and phrases in the passage which mak mention of it.

*F. Van.* (24) They are "error" and a "saving shame".

*Mr. Rog.* If, with "error" and a "saving shame", you are going to establish that the Syrians were Nestorians, I have serious doubts about it and so I beg you will kindly answer the following questions.

- 1st. You will give me at least some examples to prove that those who have "error" and feel a "saving shame" are Nestorians or other heretics.
- 2nd. You will give me to understand what is meant by the clause "the whole of Malabar which is now sunk in vice and error". Were all the people of Malabar Syrians? If all were not Syrians, who were those other people? Were they more numerous than the Syrians?
- 3rd. What is meant by "the light of our Lord Jesus Christ to the benighted minds of the people."
- 4th. Where were those Syrian students of the College from? Were they natives of Cranganor only? or were they also from the different parts of Malabar?
- 5th. Were those students sent to the College by their parents or by some others?
- 6th. Will the heretic parents send their children to Catholic Seminary to be educated and ordained there as priests?
- 7th. To whom did St. Francis write the letter in question and if the saint had made use of the term "heresy" instead of "error" to point out the fancied heresy would it wound their feelings?

*F. Van.* (25 A.) My answers are these:—

1st. Those who have errors and feel a saving shame cannot, on that account be Nestorians or other heretics, if you say to the contrary, the whole world will stand against us. Take the decrees of the council of Trent concerning Catholic Seminaries and the education to be given to the inmates as examples. You will find numerous quotations to prove what I said. Even worldly education will dissipate the errors and ignorance from the minds of the people, who will thus abstain from doing shameful things which they were before accustomed to do.

2nd. The clause "the whole of Malabar which is sunk etc." points out to all the inhabitants of the country, be they Christians or Hindus, and I must say that the Hindus were, at that period, and are even now far more numerous than the Syrians and other Christians of different classes taken together.

3rd. As a priest, I must say that the true meaning of the clause "bring the light of our Lord Jesus Christ to the benighted minds of the people" is to preach the Gospel to the Pagans of the country. These Pagans do not know the true "light who is our Lord Jesus Christ" and thus they worship the Pagan deities contrary to the true worship of Christ our Lord.

4th. About the Syrian students who were educated in the College of Cranganor I have to answer that these were sent to that College from different parts of Malabar and this can be proved from the wording of St. Francis Xavier himself.

5th. It cannot be otherwise than that these students were sent by their parents and their pastors who were Catholics and not by the advice of any other.

6th. It must be admitted that heretics would never send their children to any Catholic College to be educated and ordained there as priests so long as the students are taught, not according to their Creed but according to that which is quite different from theirs.

7th. It was to King John III of Portugal that Francis sent the letter in question and so if he had therein stated distinctly that what these errors were it would have never wounded the feelings of the Syrians.\*

Mr. Rag. (25 B) supported by your authority and admission of the truth I have to conclude that the wording of the letter of St. Francis quoted above would never stand against the orthodoxy of the Syrians, but would only tend to support it.

F. Van. I have still serious other doubts about Mar Jacob who came to Malabar in 1504. he must have been a Nestorian when he came but most probably by the kind and zealous efforts of the Franciscan Fathers, he must have embraced Catholicism and so was deserving in his old age of every support and so St. Francis recommended him to the King of Portugal.

Mr. Rag. (26) That is only your supposition. A few months ago, the Editor of the *Mylapore Catholic Register* made another supposition which was that all what St. Francis wrote about this Mar Jacob regarded only his personal qualities, and his posthumous claim to orthodoxy, and one *Historical Philalethes* made a third which was that St. Francis supposed the Syrians and their Bishop as Catholics while they were really heretics. Now I have a fourth supposition quite different from all these. It is this that when Mar Jacob and his companion Bishops arrived at Ormuz on the Persian Gulf on their way to India, an Angel from heaven appeared to him and his companion and gave them instruction on Catholic truths and they were thus all converted and the Angel immediately flew to their Patriarch and succeeded to convert him also and then the angel appeared to the Pope and informed him of all that had happened and so the Pope received them all into the communion of the Catholic Church, their excommunication having been absolved by the angel. The angel also corrected their missal and Breviary etc. My supposition has the following supports. 1. This correction of the books censed Mar Jacob not to commemorate the Nestorian Saints in Divine offices and Sacrifices of mass until the day of his death, and thereafter those books were taken by the angel and this was why the Portuguese were compelled to correct the Syrian books afterwards.

2. This was the reason why the Portuguese priests had their spiritual communion with Mar Jacob and his companion Bishop at Cannanore on the latter's way to Malabar as their letter under date 1504, to their Patriarch quoted by Mr. Mackenzie in his booklet P. 12 testifies. The letter says.— "We remained with them (Portuguese) for two and a half months and they ordered us that, on a fixed day, we also should perform the Holy mysteries that is should offer the oblation (mass). They had prepared a fitting place for prayer and their priests every day sacrifice and complete the Holy oblation for that is their custom and rite. Wherefore, on Nozardel Sunday, after their priest celebrated, we were also admitted and performed the holy rite (sacrifices) i. e. as the Syrian text testifies) and it was very pleasing in their eyes."

F. Van. You are inventing things, or making a fun of me.

Mr. Rag. (27) Never Father. What I said is only to make you understand the truth. You see from my statements four different suppositions about

Mar Jacob, which are purposely brought forward to make the testimony of St. Francis about his orthodoxy as weak as possible. But what I have to say in this respect is that St. Francis is the invincible authority in what he wrote about Mar Jacob. What he wrote was the *fact*, while what others interpret now three centuries after, are mere *suppositions*. If you are still in doubts, I will clear them away, in case you agree to answer the questions I put below.

F. Van. What are those questions?

Mr. Rag. They are these:— St. Francis wrote about Mar Jacob thus:— "It is now five and forty years that a certain Aramian Bishop, by name Abuna Jacob, has served God" (1) It must be admitted that (Mar Jacob) were converted to the Catholic faith, by the Franciscans, that is by some years before the arrival of the saint in India in 1542. Would St. Francis, in that case, note that his services of offering holy Sacrifices of mass etc. as a Nestorian, were acceptable to God?

(2) His supposed conversion must be no doubt effected before 1542, when St. Francis came to India. At the time of his writing, seven years after, the saint affirmed that Mar Jacob "has spent much labour in attending to the Christians of St. Thomas." Would St. Francis reckon his labours in attending to the Nestorians under him as praise worthy before God?

(3) You must admit as a priest, that if Mar Jacob was converted by the Franciscan fathers, they should have communicated the matter to the Pope, and His Holiness after due consideration should have, through the medium of an Apostolic letter, authorised the said fathers to receive his abjuration of the Nestorian heresy and his profession of the Catholic faith and to absolve him from the excommunication he fell into as a Nestorian and should have given another Apostolic letter to Mar Jacob, granting him jurisdiction to govern his flock converted with him if any. Can you show me any Papal document of such authorization and again point out any historical support for all these?

(4) What is your opinion of the spiritual communion which the Portuguese Priests had with Mar Jacob and others at Cannanore?

F. Van. 1st. I cannot think that St. Francis will count the divine services of a Nestorian Bishop as meritorious and praiseworthy before God.

2nd. It cannot be thought that the labours of a Nestorian Bishop (before his conversion) in attending to his Christians will be praised by a saint as meritorious in such glowing terms.

3rd. There is no historical support for his conversion by the Franciscans, nor any Papal document authorising them to absolve him from his excommunication and receive him into the communion of the Catholic Church, nor even any Apostolic letter granting him jurisdiction to govern the Christians converted with him.

4th. No Catholic Priest could have spiritual communion with the heretics. Mr. Rag. (28) From your first and second answers, I have to affirm that Mar Jacob was, from the very beginning, a Catholic Bishop and not a Nestorian as supposition is made about him. This supposition is already refuted by the answers 41 and 42 of part I of this dialogue. Your 3rd. and 4th. answers are candid admissions of truth which stand against all those who presume to assert that Mar Jacob was once a Nestorian and then was converted by the Franciscans. All those who come forward to attack St. Francis who supported the Orthodoxy of the Syrians will be attacked by themselves.

\* From his very arrival in India in 1504.

*F. Van.* You cannot assert that the Syrians were Catholics on the ground that St. Francis obtained indulgences for a Syrian Church, for, this Syrian Church though probably ministered by a Syrian Priest, was practically under the influence, if not direction, of the missionary Friars, no doubt Catholic doctrine and practices were there observed and taught."

*Mr. Rag.* (29) This is also your own supposition which is already refuted by the answers 25, 26, 27, 28 of Part II of this dialogue. To clear away all doubts you will be kind enough to answer the questions stated below.

1st. Was the Syrian Priest who ministered the said Church at Cranganore a Nestorian or a Catholic?

2nd. If a Nestorian, would he permit his people to be instructed in Catholic doctrine and practices?

3rd. If a Catholic, was he so by birth or conversion and if he was so by conversion, who converted him?

4th. Can you give me an example to prove that indulgences could be granted to heretics, whenever they were under Catholic influence?

5th. If the Syrian Church at Cranganore was made Catholic by the simple reason that it was under the Portuguese authority, should not the Syrian Church at Cochin which was equally under the Portuguese authority be made Catholic?

6th. Who were those Syrian Priests who ministered the Church at Cranganore to gain indulgences?

*F. Van.* I cannot comply with your request. As often as I have answered you you have taken advantage of my answers and defeated me by them. So let us begin another subject.

*Mr. Rag.* What is that?

*F. Van.* You cannot deny that Mar Abraham was a Nestorian, for, after his return from the council of Goa in 1585, when he had voluntarily assumed the name of the priests who had been improperly ordained by him, and he refused to discharge the other obligations imposed upon him by the council. Then he wrote to his Patriarch that "he had brought with him a book of profession of faith which was approved and much praised by the Bishops assembled at the synod which he was willing to sell to the Patriarch as a genuine specimen of his false faith (which he simulated) to the Bishop of India."

*Mr. Rag.* (30) Wait a while and I shall answer you. You ask me three things of which the first is the re-ordination by Mar Abraham of the priests already ordained. These who compelled him to give such reordination are justly to be blamed. For, even at the present day, the Chaldean Bishops, according to the ancient Rite, give the ordination as Mar Abraham did, by the imposition of hands only and not by making the candidates touch the Chalice etc. for the just omission of which Mar Abraham was unjustly accused. This was an innovation compulsorily introduced in the Chaldean Rite which was quite against the mind of the Roman Pontiff. The other obligations imposed upon Mar Abraham at the Council of Goa were also innovations in the Chaldean Rite, which were equally unjust as can be proved by comparing the contents of the Decrees of the Council regarding the Syrians with the points of the discipline of the Chaldean Church. That the letter, in question, alleged to have been written by Mar Abraham to "his Patriarch", was false is already proved by the answer 42 of Part I of this dialogue. The quotation "as a dogmatic specimen of his false faith to the Bishops of India" gives ample proofs that it is a fabri-

cation only; for it is quite unnatural that one should write of his faith as false in the same state and at the same time. If the quotation is only the expression of the writer and not the letter itself, that also must be false, for, it is equally unnatural that a Catholic Bishop sent by a Catholic Patriarch his superior should write to a Nestorian who was not his superior, that his (Mar Abraham's) faith was Nestorian. The Orthodoxy of Mar Abraham has been already defended in part I of this dialogue first, by the argumentary evidences, secondly by historical proofs and testimony of his contemporaries, thirdly by the attitude and action of Menezes, fourthly, by the decrees of the synod of Diamper and lastly by the Decree X. Session III of the Council of Goa in 1585.

*F. Van.* You have already proved in answers 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 that the Syrians were Catholics by their having paid the expenses of Mar Abraham to the Papal Legate. But the letter of Pope John XXII to the Syrians stands against you. The Pope says, "we beseech praying that division 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 to faith untainted darken not the vision of those who believe in Christ."

*Mr. Rag.* What are those words and phrases in the passage quoted showing the Nestorianism of the Syrians?

*F. Van.* They are—"Division cease" and "Clouds of error" and "phantom of schism".

*Mr. Rag.* (31) If, with these 3 phrases, you are going to make the Pope say that St. Thomas Christians were Nestorians, the actions of the Syrians who acknowledged the Pope as their Common Father and Superior in the person of his legate Marignoli, who was supported by them, stand against you, on the other hand, if you leave out those phrases in the passage of the letter, Pope the author of it, who speaks of the Syrians as having "clouds of error" "division", and

\* N. B. There are three documents recently taken from the Vatican Archives (Archiv. Vat. see Archiv. de Castello, Armad. VI. caps. V. N. 9.) with the signatures of Petrus Wenzel-subarhista. Of these, the first dated the 23rd Feb. 1565 is directed by Pope Pius IV to the Patriarch Abdiess ordering him to place Mar Abraham in Malabar; the second and the third each under date the last day of Feb. 1565, are directed by the same Pope to the Archbishop of Goa and the Bishop of Cochim recommending Mar Abraham to the Patriarch Abdiess fixed for him. There are, besides, numerous documents more taken from the same Archives with the signatures of the same Peter Wenzel, of which the following three are added here. 1st document (Archiv. Secret. Vaticano—Nuntiatura Lisbon to recommend Mar Abraham and his Archdeacon to the Hierory and Latin Bishops of India and to grant a plenary indulgence to the Church of St. Hourusda at Anganale of India and by Mar Abraham. 2nd document (Archiv. Secret. Vati. Greg. XIII. lately built by Mar Abraham. Oct. Nov. Decemb. MDLXXIX. To XXIV. Vol. 40. 157) under *Brevium minuta*, Oct. Nov. Decemb. MDLXXIX. 3rd. Document (Arch. Arcis S. Aug. Arm. VII. caps. V. N. 24.) is a letter of Mar Abraham dispensing some of his people from *Restitutio indistio modo contracta*. 4th. Document (Arch. Arcis S. Aug. Arm. VII. caps. V. N. 24.) is a letter of Mar Abraham to confirm the election which he lately made, with the faculty received from his Patriarch, of creating his Archdeacon George Bishop of Ialau. This letter is dated the 13th. January 1584.

All these documents are printed by R. P. Samuel Giamil in his "Genuine Relations of the particulars of the happy death of Mar Abraham in the Catholic Faith and of his last ad monition to his flock to persevere in the same faith are narrated by Jari S. J. in his Thesaurus rerum Indiarum T. I. Lib. 2. p. 614; published in 1805.

"phantom of schism, will also stand against you. The difficulty of this dilemma can be overcome by putting the following questions.

1st. In what sense the phrases "Phantom" of "Schism," "Division" and "clouds of error" quoted must be understood."

2nd. Whether these phrases point out any real schism or heresy?

3rd. Whether what the Pope wrote was from his personal knowledge of the Syrians or from the reports of other?

4th. If it were from the reports of others, who were those reporters?

5th. If the Syrians were real heretics, how was it that the reporters refused to mention it to the Pope?

6th. Who induced the Pope to make use of such phrases?

7th. Whether even if there existed any division, clouds of error etc. among the heretics, would any foreigner refer the matter to the Pope to quell it?

8th. Whether even if the Pope interfered in it, those heretics would obey him?

9th. Whether the Bishops and other superiors of those heretics would allow or suffer such interference of the Pope in among their Christians?

10th. Whether there is any evidence to show that the Syrians obeyed the admonition of the Pope?

11th. Whether there is any evidence to point out that, in case the Syrians were Nestorians, they were converted before obeying the Pope and whether there were such in Malabar who could keep records of their conversion.

*The answers on the questions are these:—*

1st. Any one who ponders well on the phrases, "Phantom of schism," clouds of error" and "division" will readily understand that they cannot be taken in a heretical sense, for, "phantom of schism" means only the likeness and not the real schism and "clouds of error" do not point out any heretical errors and the application of the phrases therefore in general terms regards any errors in common.

2nd. There are no words in the phrases which clearly point out the heresy or the schism as is evident to all unprejudiced minds, and further schismatics are not heretics and heretics are not simply schismatics.

3rd. It was impossible for the Pope to have written to the Syrians such a passage as mentioned, from his Personal knowledge minutely about their conditions and therefore what he wrote must be from the reports of others.

4th. The reporters must have been Friar Jordan and his companion missionaries. It was on the 14th. year of the Pontificate of John XXII *i. e.* in 1330 that he wrote to the Nazaranis (Syrians) of Quilon and the bearer of the letter was Friar Jordan who had been in India once before he came with the letter.

5th. As heresy essentially stands against the doctrine of the Catholic Church, it was the duty of those Missionaries to tell the Pope clearly about it if it had really existed among the Syrians and if the missionaries had thus fulfilled their duty, the Pope would have exposed it to the Syrians.

6th. It was the report of Friar Jordan that made the Pope make use of such phrases. That which moved the missionaries to make such reports must be either the vast difference which existed among themselves and the Syrians in points of their ecclesiastical discipline or some difference of opinion on the part of the

Syrians which the missionaries judged important, as the Portuguese after their erroneously judged about the Chaldean Bishops and accused them before the Pope.

7th. No one would venture to say that whenever any division or phantom of schism or clouds of error exist among the heretics, a foreigner would refer the matter to the Pope, to interfere in it and to quell it. It is the same as to assert that the Pope assists heretics in quelling the quarrels, divisions and the errors among them.

8th. It would appear impossible that, if the Pope interposed in the internal or external matters of the heretics they should obey him.

9th. It is unnatural to think and say that the Patriarchs and the Bishops of the heretics should allow or suffer such interference of the Pope in matters regarding their Christians.

10th We have ample proofs to show that the St. Thomas Christians obeyed the Pope in the person of his Legate Marignoli, when he came to Quilon as his representative, some ten or twelve years after.

11th No one has ever ventured to prove by historical quotations that the alleged Nestorian Christians of St. Thomas were converted before the arrival of Marignoli so that, they might have obeyed him when he came, although there were Missionaries in Malabar at that period to write such records of the conversion.

Now Father Venerello, let me take your leave. Have you anything more to question me?

*F. Van.* No. I have nothing to ask you.

*Mr. Raj.* Please show me those papers which I see with you.

*F. Van.* Take and read them if you like.

*Mr. Raj.* (After having taken and read them.) Ah. This is an answer written by His Lordship Dr. Medleycott to the contents of the note number 116 of Mr. Mackenzie's *Christianity in Travancore* and printed lately in the "*Voice of Truth*" at Ernakulam a trimonthly journal under the direction of the Carmelite Fathers of the Arch diocese of Verapoly. Now I understand that all the questions you had put in Part II. of this dialogue are taken from this answer, and happily, by your questions, I have cleared away all the dark clouds brought forward by it against the orthodoxy of the St. Thomas Christians. Deo-Gratias. I think that His Lordship would have never ventured to write such an answer. I had made a critical examination of those histories which contain numerous had been made a critical examination of those histories which contain numerous contradictions, and so those who led His Lordship to write it are gravely mistaken. Bishop Medleycott's assertion "All Malabar besides knows and admits that (Nestorianism) notwithstanding any vain attempts to falsify history" is quite against the contents of the documentary letter under date the 15th. September 1833, which was submitted by the Bishops of Malabar to T. Rama Row Esqr. the then Dewan of Travancore. In that letter, representing the evils of the internal marriage regulation, the Bishops say:—"2 No case has been made out calling for any special regulation affecting Native Christian marriages of Catholics. These have, in the past, been solemnized according to the rules, rites, ceremonies and customs" of the Catholic Church, which makes ample provision for the proper celebration of marriages by duly ordained and appointed ministers, for the registration of every marriage and these registers are kept at every Catholic Parish Church whether of the Latin or Syrian rite. 3 From the first centuries of the Christian era, this Church has been established in this land of Malabar and she remains ever eighteen centuries of continuous existence long in fact before



the formation of the present state of Travancore." The letter is signed in the following order.

- + Fr. Leonard Mellano o. c. d. Archbishop of Varapoly.
- + Fr. Ferdinand Ossi o. c. d. Bishop of Quilon.
- + John Gomes Pereira Bishop of Cochin.
- + Charles Lavigne Bishop of Milevis. Vicar Apostolic of Kottayam.
- + Adolphus E. Medlycott Bishop of Tricomia Vicar Apostolic of Trichur.
- + Fr. Marcellinus Berardi o. c. d. Coadjutor to Archbishop of Varapoly.

Now I shall close his answer with the following. When a man is attacked with passion and pride and seeks his private good and glory, he will be always forward to represent the evils and injustice done to his brethren as right and just. One P. P. M. in the "Voice of Truth" at Ernakulam of the first July is an example of this. He says therein:—"Idibus Jannarii hujus anni apud Coci-um, ubi Episcopum repereram, exequisque conspectu atque usu magnum animi fructum ceperam; animadvertens quanta charitate ingentis corporis labores sustineat, obeundo singillatim *arees intra suam dioecesim sitas* et ad eundem excolendis Christianis S. Thomae." The exact English translation is this. "On the 13th. January of this year, I arrived at Cochin, where I saw a Bishop, from his sight and intercourse I took great profit of soul, seeing him undertake hard bodily works, in going to the villages situated within his diocese and visiting and improving the Christians of St. Thomas." And then P. P. M. explains that the Bishop referred to in the above quotation was the Portuguese Bishop of Cochin whom St. Francis by that quotation of his letter to John III King of Portugal praises for his holy works in converting the St. Thomas Christians from their Nestorianism, although the diocese of Cochin was erected only in 1557, five years after the death of St. Francis. According to this P. P. M. the Latin word *excolere* must be understood by all as converting Nestorians or pagans, in spite of there being no such meaning for it.

In order to confirm the reader in his opinion, P. P. M. says: "If the St. Thomas Christians were Catholics and their Bishop (of the Diocese of Angamaley) was also Catholic, how could St. Francis praise as he does, the Bishop of Cochin (who was not in the world then as stated above) who in this case could not intrude himself to work in the Catholic diocese of his neighbouring Catholic Bishop?" But those who have right understanding will easily understand that the Bishop referred to was no other than Mar Jacob and his holy works were within the limits of his diocese and not without it, as our P. P. M. falsely interprets, which is evident from the text of the quotation.

The diocese of Cochin was erected by Pope Paul IV by the Bull "Pro excellenti praecminentia" dated the 4th. February 1557. Vide Bullarium, Patronatus Portugalliae Tomus I p. 193. This was five years after the death of St. Francis. How could St. Francis see the Bishop of Cochin during his lifetime, when there was no such Bishop in the world. After the erection of the diocese, the Bishop of Cochin, in violation to the canons of the Catholic Church, gave holy orders to the Syrian students studying in the seminary of Cranganore and of Vaipicotta without the permission of the Chaldean Archbishops of Angamale. This being unjust and illegal, he was forbidden to do so in the future by the proceedings of the session III of the Provincial council of Goa in 1585.

*An appeal to the Readers.* It is hoped that the readers of this Dialogue will pay more attention to the facts narrated in it than to the elegance of the style, and they are kindly requested to overlook the errors they may chance to meet with any where in the pamphlet.