
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

as St. Peter expresseth it, "Who His own self carried up our sins in His body to the tree" (1 Peter ii. 24, margin R.V.). Two considerations here should not be overlooked: 1. Jehovah and Jesus are one, so that Jehovah laying our iniquity upon Him, was Jesus voluntarily assuming it. 2. Sickness, which is virtually death begun, is of the penalty of sin. When, therefore, our Lord healed diseases, He is stated to have taken them upon Himself, afterwards to pay the penalty on the cross, and there to offer the atonement in the presentation of His blood. Thus St. Matthew (viii. 16): "He healed all that were sick, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying, Himself took our iniquities and bare our diseases." This is the doctrine of the blood—of the substituted life—according to the Scriptures.

THEOPHILUS CAMPBELL.

(To be continued.)

ART. III.—THE CHRISTIANS OF ST. THOMAS.

TWO works have lately been published which between them may serve to enlighten a dark page in Church history, and may give a clearer conception of the Christians of St. Thomas than that which is generally entertained. The Rev. Alex. J. D. D'Orsey's "Portuguese Discoveries, Dependencies, and Missions in Asia and Africa"[1] appeared a few months ago, following upon Mr. G. M. Rae's "Syrian Church in India."[2]

The first thing to do is to realize the geographical position of Malabar. All educated Englishmen know that it lies on the west coast of the Indian Peninsula, and few know more. If they would glance at the map—which Mr. Rae gives them no opportunity of doing—they would see further that it lies about as far south of Goa as Bombay lies north of that city, and that it is nearly opposite to Madras, which is situated on the east coast of the peninsula. How did Christianity make its way there? If we listen to local traditions, we shall believe that the Apostle Thomas planted it. These traditions are more or less accepted by Mr. D'Orsey, who gathers from them and other notices that St. Thomas converted a colony of Jews settled on the coast of Malabar, which thus became the cradle of Christianity in India. Mr. D'Orsey thinks that it may be true that the Apostle was so successful a Christian missionary as to have stirred up the hatred of the Brahmins, and to have been martyred by them at Meliapoor. He thinks

[1] London: Allen and Co., pp. 434.
[2] Edinburgh: Blackwood and Sons, pp. 388.

that it was to this part of India that the famous Alexandrian catechist, Pantænus, was sent by the Patriarch Demetrius, and that it was from thence that he brought back the Hebrew or Aramaic version of St. Matthew's Gospel, which he found in India. He thinks that the "Bishop of Persia and Great India," present at the Council of Nicæa, might have had to do with Southern India, and that it might have been hither that St. Athanasius sent Frumentius to labour. He allows that great uncertainty hangs over all this supposed history, but quotes Bishop Heber, Archdeacon Robinson, and Dr. Buchanan as "favouring the claims of the Syro-Malabarian Church to this Apostolic origin" (p. 71). We think that Mr. Rae is more judicious in rejecting the whole account as a story that has originated partly from the necessity felt of connecting an ancient Church with the name of an Apostle, partly from a confusion of the various countries which once went under the name of India. If St. Thomas went to India, he holds that it was to Northern India or to Afghanistan that he went; that it was to that country that Pantænus' visit was paid, and that Frumentius' "India" was Abyssinia. We believe Mr. Rae to be right in these conjectures.

Then how did Christianity enter the peninsula of Madras, and why was the name of St. Thomas attached to the Christians of the Malabar coast rather than that of Bartholomew, to whom Eusebius and Jerome attribute the apostleship of India (in connexion with the Pantænus story), or, indeed, that of any other of the Apostles? Mr. Rae explains the process very clearly. St. Thomas, owing to a supposed connexion with Edessa, became the favourite Apostle in the East, as St. Peter was in the West. The time came when the Church of St. Thomas was as far extended and as powerful in its spiritual relations as the Church of St. Peter in its palmiest days. For when Nestorianism was persecuted out of the Roman Empire it took refuge in Persia, where it was welcomed, not as Christianity, but because it was antagonistic to the religion embraced by the Empire. Tolerated, and even more than tolerated, by the Persian sovereigns, it spread with extraordinary rapidity. In the year 498, the Persian or Chaldæan Church constituted itself as an independent Church under the rule of the Patriarch of Babylon, and its missionary efforts were so successful that by the beginning of the eleventh century the Patriarch "had under him twenty-five metropolitans, who ruled from China to the Tigris, from the Lake Balkal to Cape Comorin" (Neale).

During the flourishing period of this Church of the far East, before Turks and Mongols had crushed it and had driven the few remnants of it into Kurdistan, where they still linger, its

missionaries, probably at the beginning of the sixth century, brought Christianity to the southern peninsula of India. This is the origin of the Church of the Malabar coast. But why, then, do its members bear the name of St. Thomas, and why are they called Syrian Christians? Not because St. Thomas converted them, nor because they have Syrian blood in their veins, but because they were an offshoot of the Church of Babylon, which traced itself to St. Thomas, and because, like their parent Church, they used the Syrian Liturgy. We will quote Mr. Rae on both these points:

> The phrase "Christians of St. Thomas" means merely that the Church to which they belonged, their mother Church on the Tigris, derived the grace of Apostolic succession from St. Thomas. If St. Thomas planted the Church in Southern India, he did so not by a personal visit, but by the agency of the Church which had adopted him as its patron saint. The Church was planted in Southern India by Christians, whose priesthood received their ecclesiastical "orders" in the last resort from St. Thomas. Their Church standing was ultimately traceable to that Apostle (p. 128).

On the term Syrian:

> The members of the Church of Malabar are not of the Syrian nation, but of the Syrian rite. The name in this case is not an ethnological or geographical designation, but is purely ecclesiastical. As Syriac was the sacred language of the mother Church in Persia, so it became the sacred language of her daughter in Malabar, just as the services in the Church of England were conducted for centuries in Latin. So the Christian Dravidians of Malabar have, and not inconsistently with ecclesiastical usage, been called Syrians (p. 167).

The history of this little body of "Syrian" Christians in the Indian Peninsula is for the most part a blank for nearly a thousand years. Then they appear, through coming in contact with the Portuguese adventurers, whose discoveries and missions Mr. D'Orsey recounts. The Portuguese on their arrival in India, after passing the Cape of Good Hope, sailing up the east coast of Africa and boldly crossing the open sea to India, were delighted to find, in the strange land which they had reached, a body of some 200,000 Christians. The Christians, oppressed by Mohammedans and Pagans, were equally delighted at finding co-religionists in the invaders. Each thought to derive benefit from the other, and they gladly welcomed one another. In 1501 Cabral persuaded two native Christians to return with him to Lisbon, whose presence raised a *furore* in Europe. Thirty thousand Syrian Christians declared themselves willing to accept the sovereignty of Emmanuel, and in return Vasco da Gama offered them alliance and protection. All seemed *couleur de rose*—but only for a short time. Each found that the other's Christianity was not theirs. Their Bibles were not the same, for the Syrians had not Esther or Tobit or Wisdom in theirs; they did not acknowledge the same number

of Œcumenical Councils, for the Syrians accepted only two; the Portuguese Sacraments were seven, the Syrian only three —Baptism, the Eucharist, and Orders; the Syrians held the single, the Portuguese the double procession of the Holy Ghost; the Syrians administered in both kinds, the Portuguese in one only; the Syrians had wooden, the Portuguese stone altars; the Syrians knew nothing of transubstantiation; the Syrian clergy were married men; matrimony, penance, and extreme unction were not regarded by the Syrians as sacraments; the Syrians abhorred image and saint worship; they knew nothing of purgatory. "'These Churches belong to the Pope,' said the Portuguese. 'Who is the Pope?' said the Syrians. 'We never heard of him'" (Buchanan). It is only necessary to be acquainted with the love of domination which characterizes the Roman Church to feel assured of what must follow. Every nerve would be strained in Rome, in Portugal, in Goa, to reduce these semi-Protestant Christians to submission to the Papacy. And how were they to resist?

The first effort to convert the Syrians was made by Franciscans, sent in 1545 from Goa by Archbishop Albuquerque. Argument failing to have any result, they established a college at Cranganore, at the expense of the Portuguese Viceroy, for the training of young Syrian candidates for the ministry in the Romish faith and ceremonies; but the native Christians refused to have anything to say to these hybrid priests, and all that they could effect was a feeble schism. Then the Jesuits took up the case. They, too, established a college at Vaipacotta, where all the externals of the Syrian Church, such as language, dress and method of life, were observed, and Roman doctrine was sedulously inculcated. Still, they were as little successful as the Franciscans. The young men they turned out were found to be, after all, in heart Syrians and not Romans. But the Jesuits were not men to be easily baffled. Persuasion failing, they had recourse to force. Mar Joseph, the Syrian Bishop, was arrested and shipped off to Lisbon, and the passes were watched to prevent any bishop coming from Babylon to succeed him. The kidnapped bishop, finding himself a forlorn prisoner at Lisbon, besought an interview with Cardinal Henrique, then Inquisitor-General for Portugal, and promised that if he was allowed to return he would do his utmost to bring about the submission of the Syrian Church to Rome. On these terms he was sent back with honour. Meantime, the Syrian Church had got a new bishop, Mar Abraham, from Babylon, in spite of the efforts of the Jesuits to stop him on the way. The return of Mar Joseph, therefore, caused a schism among the Syrians, some holding to Mar Joseph and some to Mar Abraham. The Archbishop of

Goa thereupon urged the Portuguese Viceroy to arrest Mar Abraham, which was done, and he, like Mar Joseph before him, was shipped off to Europe. Arriving in Rome, he followed the example of Mar Joseph at Lisbon, abjured the Syrian faith, and was sent back as a Roman prelate, room being made for him by Mar Joseph (who had once more professed the Syrian tenets) being arrested and again shipped off to Lisbon, whence he went to Rome, where he died. Mar Abraham, now bearing also the Latin title of Bishop of Augamale, resumed the oversight of his flock, but being suspected of still holding the Syrian tenets, he was summoned to a synod at Goa, where he was compelled to swear allegiance to Rome and belief in all Roman doctrines. Returning to his diocese, he wrote to the Bishop of Babylon, declaring that he had yielded through "the long and unintermitting persecutions of the Portuguese," and asking for a coadjutor. This coadjutor was sent, Mar Simeon, but he, too, was persuaded, soon after his arrival, to go to Lisbon and Rome "for consultation," the result of his journey being that he was imprisoned for the rest of his life, first in a Franciscan convent, then in the dungeons of the Inquisition.

Rome had now sufficiently disorganized and disintegrated the native Church to make her great *coup*. For this Alexis de Menezes was selected as the proper instrument, and he was appointed Archbishop of Goa for the purpose. His first step was to condemn Mar Abraham once more, to declare him deposed, and to take care that no successor should be allowed to arrive from Babylon by guarding the passes and the seaboard.

Every expedient was adopted to elude his vigilance. Disguised as Indians they came by land, as sailors they entered the port of Cochin, but were always stopped, sent home, or imprisoned, and thus the dioceses remained without a head (D'Orsey, p. 186).

Next, the Archbishop undertook a visitation of the district. The Portuguese writers represent this as an act of marvellous courage. It was not that. He knew that he had the Portuguese to back him, and that the native princes were, or wished to be, allies of the Portuguese, and that therefore the Syrian Christians would not dare to touch a hair of his head except they were driven to madness by assaults upon their faith. It was a contest of dissimulation between him and Archdeacon George, the representative of the Syrian Church. In those arms the Archbishop and the Archdeacon were about equal, but the Archbishop had behind him a reserve of force which the poor Archdeacon did not dare to oppose, and to which he tremblingly gave way whenever the Archbishop exerted it. Menezes held a visitation with great pomp at Vaipacotta, Paru,

Chegurec, Molandurte, Diamper, Carturte and other places, ordaining or re-ordaining according to the Roman rite, confirming, ordering, browbeating, and, above all, destroying every Syrian liturgy that could be found.

The third act of the drama now began. The Archbishop drove the Archdeacon into consenting to a synod being held at Diamper to settle the points at issue between the two Churches. It met on January 20, 1559, and sat for seven days. What its character was to be is made plain by the opening address of the Archbishop:

> Does it please you that for the praise and glory of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and for the increase and exaltation of the Catholic faith, and the Christian religion of the inhabitants of the bishopric, and for the destruction of the heresies and errors which have been sown therein by some heretics and schismatics, and for the purging of books from the false doctrines contained in them, and for the perfect union of this Church with the whole Church Catholic and Universal, *and for the yielding of obedience to the supreme Bishop of Rome, the universal pastor of the Church, and successor in the chair of St. Peter, and vicar of Christ upon earth, from whom you have for some time departed*, and for the extirpation of simony, which has been much practised in this bishopric, and for the regulating of the administration of the Holy Sacraments of the Church and the necessary use of them, and for the reformation of the affairs of the Church, and the clergy, and the customs of all the Christian people of this diocese, we should begin a Diocesan Synod of this bishopric of Serra? Does it please you?

To this question the poor cowed Syrian priests could only answer, "It pleaseth us." And then the farce of the Council of Florence was acted over again on a smaller scale. The Western canon of Scripture, the Western form of the Creed, the seven Sacraments, transubstantiation, purgatory, indulgences, invocation, worship of relics, the Papacy, the Jesuits—all was accepted; the married priests were commanded to put away their wives, the Syrian liturgies were burnt, a Latin bishop was imposed upon the Syrian community.[1] Menezes was rewarded by the Vice-Royalty of Portuguese India, and soon afterwards by the Archbishopric of Braga and the Vice-Royalty of Portugal.

Was Menezes' work to last? It lasted for nearly a hundred

[1] Before the acceptance of this Synod's decrees, Mr. D'Orsey enumerates the following doctrines as held by the Church of Malabar: "(1) She condemned the Pope's supremacy; (2) affirmed that the Roman Church had departed from the faith; (3) denied transubstantiation; (4) condemned the worship of images; (5) made no use of oils; (6) denied purgatory; (7) would not admit spiritual affinity; (8) knew nothing of auricular confession; (9) never heard of extreme unction; (10) permitted the clergy to marry; (11) denied that matrimony and confirmation were sacraments; (12) celebrated with leavened bread and consecrated with prayer" (p. 233).

years; then it dissolved in foam, like so many other works which have owed their origin to Jesuit intrigue. The Roman yoke became intolerable, and the Syrians "assembled one day in thousands round the Coonen Cross in a village near Cochin, and took an oath that they were done with Portuguese bishops and would never again acknowledge them. This was in 1653" (Rae, p. 259). The immediate occasion of this spiritual revolt of the Syrians was the treatment of Attala, or Theodore, who had been sent by the Patriarch of Babylon for their bishop, and had been seized by the Portuguese on landing and consigned to the dungeons of the Inquisition at Goa. (The Inquisition had been established there in accordance with the request of Xavier some hundred years before.) The Pope despatched some Carmelite priests to soothe the angry spirits of the Syrians, but their efforts were in vain, and two-thirds of the Syrian community were permanently lost to the Roman Church.

In the same year that the Syrians defied the Portuguese and the Pope they organized themselves under their Archdeacon Thomas and waited for better times. Twelve years subsequently an Eastern bishop arrived in Malabar, named Gregory, and he, at the request of the Syrian Church, consecrated Thomas a bishop. It was true that Gregory was a Jacobite, not a Nestorian prelate, but the distinction between Nestorian and Jacobite, sharply marked as it once had been by angry partizanship, was now as nothing when compared with the chasm which separated Latins from Orientals. At least Gregory was a bishop, and he was not a Portuguese, not a Roman Catholic. So the Syrians were satisfied, and they passed over from their Nestorianism, such as it was, to their Eutychianism, such as they accepted it, without a murmur and almost unanimously. The only difference that they appreciated was that their bishop was sent them from Antioch instead of from Babylon. The line of Jacobite bishops is inglorious, consisting of nine Mar Thomases, three Mar Dionysiuses, two Mar Athanasiuses and Mar Dionysius Joseph. The English, who have been brought into contact with this ancient Church, had their attention turned towards it by Colonel Munro, British Resident at the Court of Travancore and Cochin in 1811; the result of which was that the Church Missionary Society built a college for the training of the clergy of Malabar. For about a quarter of a century the society and the Syrian Church worked together harmoniously. At the end of that time differences arose, and in 1837 a separation took place between them. But can nothing more be done? We have seen that Jesuit intrigue and Portuguese force have disintegrated this ancient Church and have brought it to the

brink of dissolution. Cannot the English still do something towards building it up again? At least liberty of conscience is now guaranteed it, and cannot sufficient life-blood be poured into its veins to enable it to cast off the excrescences and disfigurements of Nestorianism, Jacobitism, Jesuitism and Romanism, and to take its place in the great federation (now forming) of non-Roman, Christian Churches?

F. MEYRICK.

ART. IV.—THE BIRDS OF DANTE.

AMONG the many aspects of Dante's writings which have received attention of late years, there is one point which has not been treated with the fulness it deserves. We refer to the study of Dante's bird-life, which reveals to the student the divine poet's love of nature.

The "Commedia" is an autobiography. We see in it the life's history of the great Florentine. We recognise in its scenery "the gorges of the Alps and Apennines, and the terraces and precipices of the Riviera." Indeed, the whole idea of the poem was conceived, as Dean Church well puts it, "not under the roof-tree of the literary citizen, but when the exile had been driven out to the highways of the world, to study nature on the sea, and by the river, and on the mountain-track." And it is impossible to read the "Commedia" in the most perfunctory manner without being struck with the poet's marvellous faculty of observation. His eye is everywhere. He notices every passing phase of nature. The minutest details of natural history are taken in and made use of in the composition of his poem. The fire-flies, or perhaps glow-worms, flitting to and fro in the twilight of a summer's evening; the frogs escaping from the water-snake on to the bank, or croaking in a pool with only their heads visible; the lizard darting like a lightning-flash from hedge to hedge; the snail drawing in its horns; the dolphins arching their backs before a coming storm; the ants meeting in the way; the bees busy among the flowers—all are noted with the eye of a naturalist, and furnish the poet with some apt similitude. Or, take his picture of the sheep in the third canto of the "Purgatorio," the most perfect passage of the kind in the world, so at least Lord Macaulay thought it, the most picturesque and the most sweetly expressed. Or his description of forest scenery in the twenty-eighth canto, of which Mr. Ruskin says that "the tender lines which tell of the voices of the birds mingling with the wind, and of the leaves all turning one way before it, have been more or less copied