

## THE WORK OF MENEZES ON THE MALABAR LITURGY.

### II

In a previous Note in this JOURNAL (April 1914) the Malabar liturgy was shewn by means of a detailed Concordance to be essentially the same as the East-Syrian liturgy of Addai and Mari. The only material difference between the two was found to lie (1) in the order of that very subordinate part of the service covered by Section II of the Concordance (embodying the lections, &c., and preceding the Creed<sup>1</sup>), and (2) in the fact that the Malabar text (in its revised form at all events) contains a formula of Institution, whereas 'Addai and Mari' has no Institution.

As the purpose of the former Note was to find out just what the Malabar liturgy was, and its relation to the other liturgies, no direct attempt was there made to deal with the question, how far Archbishop Menezes altered the text of the existing rite and introduced new features into it. The aim of the present paper is to discover, if possible, what exactly it was that Menezes did to the Malabar liturgy, and therefore how far we may be able to get behind his revision of it to the original text.

As stated in the former Note, the documents at our disposal for this purpose are mainly two: (a) the Acts of the Synod of Diamper explaining the alterations to be made; (b) a Latin version of the Malabar Liturgy (first published by Gouvea in 1606, and afterwards re-edited by Raulin in 1745), in which the corrections prescribed by the Synod are incorporated in the text.<sup>2</sup>

The value of the Acts of the Synod for our purpose lies in this: Act V<sup>3</sup> gives us not only a list of the corrections ordered to be introduced into the text of the existing Malabar liturgy of 'the Apostles', but also the original reading in each case. The general method of

<sup>1</sup> See *J.T.S.* April 1914, pp. 396-425.

<sup>2</sup> Throughout this paper 'Liturgy', with a capital, is used exclusively to denote this Latin version of the revised text.

<sup>3</sup> Raulin, following Gouvea, gives two series of decrees under Act V, a fresh numeration of decrees beginning after the first nine. It is with decrees 1 to 3 of the *second* series (commencing on p. 145 of Raulin's book) that this Note will be concerned.

proceeding is as follows: first, the original text is quoted at sufficient length to give the setting of the words or phrases in it to which exception is taken; then the passage is repeated (wholly or in part) in its emended form<sup>1</sup>; and if the doctrinal import of the change is considered not to be self-evident, its force and meaning are briefly explained. Not infrequently also the opening words of the formula in which the correction is to be made are quoted, or some other indication is given of its place in the liturgy, such as 'item, paulo infra'.

## I.

*The Purpose of the Decrees.*

When we read these decrees on the revision of the liturgy, one thing seems evident, namely, that they were not intended to be a mere *record* of the Synod's doings. In quoting the text of the passages to be altered, and in setting forth the emended form of these passages nothing, in all probability, was further from the mind of Menezes and his Synod than any idea of providing material for future generations of liturgists. The purpose of the decrees was something more prosaic: they were designed not as historical records of something already done, but as practical and authoritative directions as to something yet to be done.

To appreciate this duly it is necessary to review briefly the practical situation with which the revisers were confronted. It appears to be supposed in some quarters that the Synod of Diamper ordered *all* the old service-books to be destroyed out of hand,<sup>2</sup> and that herein we have an explanation of the fact that no copy of the old, unexpurgated, liturgy is now to be found. Had this been the case, it is evident that Menezes and his collaborators must have had ready a large stock of new and expurgated copies with which to replace the old ones, or at least must have had in view an immediate possibility of procuring them. Fortunately, from the point of view of the present-day liturgist, this was not so: they neither had any such new books, nor had they any present means of obtaining them. The state of things is clearly exposed in the first of the decrees dealing with the revision:—

'Qua de causa libri omnes Sacrificii Rituales, sive Missales, quippe qui fuerunt ab haereticis Nestorianis depravati in ignem proiici deberent. Verum cum aliorum copia desit, quibus celebrari possit, quandiu

<sup>1</sup> Even in Gouvea's Portuguese edition of the Acts the pieces of liturgical text, whether original or emended, are quoted in Latin.

<sup>2</sup> Thus Dr A. Fortescue writes in *The Catholic Encyclopaedia* (article 'Liturgical Books', 1910): 'The [Malabar] Uniats have books revised (much romanized) by the Synod of Diamper (1599: it ordered all their old books to be burned).'

Dominus noster Papa, quid agere oporteat non decreverit, aut Missalia Chaldaice conscripta, prout instanter, ac humillime Synodus supplicat, non miserit<sup>1</sup>: praecipit Synodus illa<sup>2</sup> expurgari, et quae sequuntur interferri; ceterum ante expurgationem, quam Illūsus Metropolitanus [sc. Menezes] in visitatione, simul cum doctis viris, et Chaldaicae linguae peritis, quos ad id deputaverit, perficiet, Sacerdotum nullus iis utatur' (Raulin, p. 145).

A passage to the like effect occurs in Act III decree 15 (Raulin, pp. 106-107) with regard to the Malabar Breviary and other prayer-books:—

'Quos libros omnes, et breviaria, licet digna sint quae igni tradantur . . . ; attamen Synodus emendari praecipit, eo quod in hac Dioecesi alii sacri libri non suppetant, quibus Sacerdotes utantur in celebrandis divinis officiis' (etc.).

The decree goes on to prescribe that these books be purged of certain errors, heretical names, &c., and that special offices in honour of heretical personages be cut out whole, torn up, and burned.<sup>3</sup>

Menezes, then, would have been glad enough to make a clean sweep of the old liturgical books, and to set before his Malabar converts fresh copies, wherein no trace of the expurgated passages would appear to remind them of the treatment to which their traditional formularies had been subjected. But this he could not afford to do: and we can hardly doubt that it is to this circumstance we owe the preservation of the list of original readings and the corresponding list of corrections found in the Acts of the Synod (Raulin, pp. 145-153). If Menezes had had at hand a supply of expurgated copies, such as he hoped might later on be procured from Rome, the Acts of the Synod would, in all likelihood, have contained no record of the changes made: the old books would at once have been destroyed, and the convert Nestorians would have been encouraged by all means to forget the differences between the old and the new.

The purpose, then, of these decrees was to provide an official

<sup>1</sup> This was not done before the year 1774, when the first Roman edition of the Malabar liturgy was printed.

<sup>2</sup> Sc. 'missalia' (the existing Malabar missals).

<sup>3</sup> Decree 14 of Act III gives a long list of works by Nestorian writers which were to be burned. Further, the second decree of Act V (Raulin, p. 153) orders the liturgies of Theodore and Nestorius (which we thus learn were current in Malabar as well as among the East-Syrian Nestorians) and one bearing the name of Diodore (known only through the Synod's mention of it and from Abraham Echcellensis, who professed to have seen a copy of it) to be cut out of the missals and burned. But the fact of importance here is that the missals themselves were not destroyed; and in particular the liturgy of the Apostles was preserved for use in an emended form.

direction as to how the existing copies of liturgical books were to be corrected when, shortly after the Synod, Menezes should make his visitation of the native churches in company with the 'docti viri et Chaldaicae linguae periti' who were to carry out the actual work of expurgation. Viewed in this light, the Acts of the Synod must appear as a document of the first value for the study of the Malabar rite; for, to be effective, they must have embodied *all* the changes determined upon by the revisers.<sup>1</sup> That this was actually the case is, to all intent, explicitly stated in the first of the two passages I have quoted above<sup>2</sup>: 'praecipit Synodus illa expurgari, et quae sequuntur interferri' (Raulin, p. 145). The 'quae sequuntur' are all the corrections which there follow. Can it be maintained with any show of reason that the revisers intended to make other changes, which they did not prescribe?

## 2.

*The Acts of the Synod in relation to Gouvea's text of the Liturgy.*

The passages in which alterations are decreed by the Acts are forty in number. The following table gives references (1) to the pages in Raulin on which the changes are prescribed in the Acts, (2) to the pages on which the changes are found embodied in the revised text of the Liturgy, and (3) to the pages in Brightman on which the corresponding passages occur in the liturgy of Addai and Mari. The numerals on the left-hand side shew the order in which the passages occur in the revised Malabar Liturgy.

<i>Acts of Synod</i> (Raulin).	<i>Text of Liturgy</i> (Raulin).	<i>Addai and Mari</i> (Brightman).
1. p. 147 ll. 1-10	p. 296 ll. 19-20	p. 254 ll. 20-21
2. " " ll. 11-17	" 297 ll. 16-17	" 262 l. 28
3. " " ll. 18-24	" 298 ll. 13-14	" 263 l. 36
4. " " ll. 25-30	" " l. 29	" 264 l. 17
5. " " l. 31-p. 148 l. 4	" 299 ll. 5-7	" " ll. 29-31
6. " 148 ll. 12-16	" 300 ll. 14-15	" 266 l. 9
7. " " ll. 17-24	" 301 ll. 1-2	" 251 l. 37
8. " " ll. 25-28	" " ll. 18-19	" 267 col. 1 ll. 32-33
9. " " ll. 29-34	" " ll. 23-24	" 268 col. 1 ll. 5-6
10. " " ll. 35-38	" 302 ll. 2-3	" " col. 2 l. 4
11. " " ll. 39-41	" 303 l. 1	" " col. 1 ll. 11-12
12. " 149 ll. 1-3	" " l. 3	" " col. 1 l. 15
13. " " ll. 4-7	" " l. 13	" " col. 1 ll. 28-29

<sup>1</sup> That is, the Acts must have contained all instructions necessary to secure the changes desired. There are two cases in which the details of alteration are not *all* specified; but then in these two cases what is prescribed is the simple adoption of the text of the Roman Missal (see p. 578 below).

<sup>2</sup> See p. 570.

<i>Acts of Synod</i> (Raulin).	<i>Text of Liturgy</i> (Raulin).	<i>Addai and Mar</i> (Brightman).
14. p. 149 ll. 8-19	p. 303 ll. 16-17	<i>deest locus</i> <sup>1</sup>
15. ,, ,, ll. 20-23	,, 304 l. 15	p. 267 l. 4
16. ,, ,, ll. 24-29	,, 307 l. 26	<i>deest locus</i> <sup>2</sup>
17. ,, ,, ll. 30-39(cp.p.92)	,, ,, l. 30	,, 270 ll. 30 sqq. <sup>3</sup>
18. ,, 150 ll. 1-21	,, 308 l. 8	,, 271 ll. 39-40
19. ,, ,, ll. 21-23	,, ,, l. 13	,, 272 col. 1 l. 11
20. ,, ,, ll. 28-38	,, 309 l. 4-p. 310 l. 2	,, 274 l. 25
21. ,, ,, ll. 24-27	,, 311 l. 11	,, ,, l. 32
22. ,, ,, l. 39-p. 151 l. 3	,, 314 ll. 11-12	cp. p. 286 l. 35
23. ,, 151 ll. 4-6	,, ,, l. 26	,, 287 l. 1
24. ,, ,, ll. 7-10	,, 315 l. 17	,, 288 l. 2
25. ,, ,, ll. 11-14	<i>deest locus</i>	<i>deest locus</i>
26. ,, 146 (whole page)	,, 317 ll. 13-14 and	<i>deest locus</i> <sup>4</sup>
	,, 318 ll. 4-5	
27. ,, 151 ll. 15-26	,, ,, ll. 27-28	<i>deest locus</i> <sup>5</sup>
28. ,, ,, ll. 27-36	,, 322 ll. 26-27	,, 293 col. 1 ll. 39 sqq.
29. ,, ,, ll. 37-39	,, 326 l. 5	,, 298 col. 1 l. 27
30. ,, ,, ll. 40-42	,, 327 l. 23	<i>deest locus</i> <sup>6</sup>
31. ,, 152 ll. 1-4	,, 328 l. 2	,,
32. ,, ,, ll. 5-10	,, ,, ll. 3-5	,,
33. ,, ,, ll. 11-18	,, ,, l. 29	,,
34. ,, ,, ll. 19-24	,, 329 ll. 10-11	,,
35. ,, ,, ll. 25-31	,, ,, ll. 24-25	,,
36. ,, ,, ll. 32-34	,, ,, l. 30	,,
37. ,, ,, ll. 35-39	,, 330 l. 13	,,
38. ,, ,, ll. 40-42	,, ,, l. 40	,,
39. ,, 153 ll. 1-5	,, 331 ll. 5-6	,,
40. ,, ,, ll. 6-13	,, 332 l. 25	,,

The above table shews (at no. 25) that there is one correction prescribed by the Acts which does not appear in the revised text of the Liturgy. The passage in which this correction is ordered is said in the Acts to come shortly after the Invocation. Having directed

<sup>1</sup> The passage wanting is an additional verse to the anthem beginning Br. p. 267 col. 1.

<sup>2</sup> The correction in 'Malabar' is in the text of the Gospel lesson (John v 29). No lessons are inserted in the text of 'Addai and Mari'.

<sup>3</sup> The Creed in full. Only the *incipit* is given by Raulin, though Gouvea gives the whole.

<sup>4</sup> This is the Institution.

<sup>5</sup> The correction in 'Malabar' occurs in one of several additional verses to the anthem found in Br. p. 290 col. 1; it will be discussed later.

<sup>6</sup> All the rest of the corrections occur in the four variable blessings, or 'seals' in 'Malabar'. Brightman has only one 'seal', which is not the same as any of the four in 'Malabar'. The first and third in 'Malabar' are to be found (with a number of others) at the end of the Urmi Syriac edition of the *Takhsa*, or Missal (pp. 153-154 and pp. 162-163).

an alteration<sup>1</sup> to be made in the Invocation prayer, the Acts continue :—

'Item paulo inferius, ubi dicunt Diaconus, et Clerus : *orando*,<sup>2</sup> *et pro omnibus Patriarchis, Episcopis, et Presbyteris etc.* addatur *et pro Beatissimo Papa nostro N. eum nominando, et pro omnibus Patriarchis, et Episcopis*' (Raulin, p. 151 ll. 11-14).

The formula in which these words occurred, and which was evidently a kind of diaconal litany, does not appear in the Liturgy at all. It is wanting in the East-Syrian text also. It seems probable therefore that this litany occurred in some Malabar manuscripts and not in others : it was found in the copy used by the Synod, but not, apparently, in that on which Gouvea's Latin was based.

There are also two cases in which the Acts prescribe changes in a different order from that in which the relative passages occur in the text of the Liturgy.

1. The Synod begins its corrections by proceeding at once to the words of Institution.<sup>3</sup> Having dealt with this point, which of course they considered cardinal, all the other corrections are given in the order in which the passages occur in the text of the Liturgy, except only in the following case.

2. If we look at the page and line references to Raulin at nos. 20 and 21 of the above table (the first column), we see that these two corrections are made in the Acts in the reverse order to that in which the relative passages occur in the text of the Liturgy (col. 2). But it will also be seen from the table that the order in the Liturgy (col. 2) is supported by 'Addai and Mari' (col. 3). The Synod therefore seems to have accidentally set down these two corrections in their wrong order.

### 3.

#### *The nature of the changes introduced.*

I now pass on to consider the nature of the forty changes ordered by

<sup>1</sup> This consisted merely in reading 'Christi filii tui' instead of 'Christi tui' (for the passage in 'Addai and Mari' see Brightman, p. 288 l. 2). Raulin by error omits 'tui' in the piece of original text ; but Gouvea has it.

<sup>2</sup> So Raulin : but 'orando' belongs (as appears from Gouvea) to the direction, not to the liturgical text.

<sup>3</sup> As regards the place of the recital of Institution in the service, it may be remarked that the Acts contain quite clear proof that the Synod contemplated the Institution coming just where it is found in the revised text of the Liturgy. See Raulin, pp. 146 (§ cix) and 151 (§ cxviii), where the Synod makes explicit mention of two other formulæ as coming just after the Institution. These two formulæ are found after the Institution in the Liturgy also, and at the same point in the service (just before the Fraction) at which they occur in the text of the East-Syrian 'Addai and Mari'.

the Synod. These changes may be considered from two points of view : (a) regarding the formulae in which they occur ; (b) regarding the intrinsic nature of the alterations made.

(a) Of the changes recorded in the table on pp. 572-573 above, six occur in litanies<sup>1</sup> ; seven in hymns or anthems<sup>2</sup> ; four in formulae belonging to the deacon alone<sup>3</sup> ; one in a response of the people<sup>4</sup> ; one in the text of the Gospel lesson<sup>5</sup> ; one affects the whole of the Creed.<sup>6</sup> Of those which occur in prayers said by the priest, five come before the anaphora<sup>7</sup> (*Sursum corda*) ; four within the anaphora<sup>8</sup> ; and eleven in the four variable blessings, or 'seals', at the end of the service.<sup>9</sup>

(b) Fifteen of the changes concern the manner of referring to our Lord.<sup>10</sup> The revisers suspected (or at least guarded against) Nestorianism in simple titles like 'Christ', 'Jesus', 'the Son', and amplified them in various ways ; e.g. in no. 6 they put '*Iesum Christum filium suum Dominum nostrum*' for 'Christum'. Nos. 4 and 11 give to the B. V. Mary the title 'Mother of God' instead of 'Mother of Christ'. The point of nos. 2, 3, 31, 32 may be described as 'Pope *versus* Nestorian Patriarch'. Nos. 7, 8, 9 refuse to allow the bread and wine to be styled by anticipation 'body and blood' at the time of the offertory when they are set on the altar. Nos. 5 and 33 abolish heretical names.

These instances may suffice to indicate the general character of the changes. The import of some of the remainder I fail to catch ; and in some cases the revisers appear scrupulous and suspicious of underlying heresy beyond reason.<sup>11</sup> But this very fact only supports the evidence already adduced for believing that they set down in the Acts of the Synod a direction as to every change they intended to make, however trifling. Another consideration strengthens this conclusion : when we except the recital of Institution and certain formulae of a quite secondary or variable character, which are not found in the Urmi text of 'Addai and Mari', we find that all the other pieces of original text cited by the Synod can be located in Mr Brightman's *Eastern Liturgies* (see table, pp. 572-573 above), where the words and phrases noted for correction duly appear.<sup>12</sup>

Besides the corrections just classified, two are liturgically of some

<sup>1</sup> Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 25.      <sup>2</sup> Nos. 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 27.      <sup>3</sup> Nos. 18, 19, 28, 29.

<sup>4</sup> No. 20.      <sup>5</sup> No. 16.      <sup>6</sup> No. 17.      <sup>7</sup> Nos. 1, 7, 10, 15, 21.

<sup>8</sup> Nos. 22, 23, 24, 26. Of these the first three are of a trifling description ; the fourth concerns the Institution (of which below).

<sup>9</sup> Nos. 30-40.      <sup>10</sup> Nos. 6, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 19, 21, 23, 24, 29, 30, 36, 38, 40.

<sup>11</sup> e.g. in their treatment of terms like 'the Son', 'Christ'.

<sup>12</sup> I am not stating that there are no variations of reading in these passages between the Malabar and Urmi texts : but that the offending expression is regularly found in the Urmi text also.

importance and deserve separate mention. No. 17 directs the substitution of the 'Nicene' Creed said in the Roman Mass for that in use among the Nestorians of Malabar.<sup>1</sup> No. 20 orders that instead of the words 'quod tu offers pro te, pro nobis, *et pro toto orbe a minimo usque ad maximum*' there be said 'quod tu offers pro te, pro nobis, *et pro universa Catholica Ecclesia et omnibus Orthodoxis atque Catholicae et Apostolicae Fidei cultoribus*'.<sup>2</sup> Here the words 'et omnibus . . . cultoribus' are taken from the prayer *Te igitur* of the Roman Canon.<sup>3</sup>

There remain two further items of the above table which call for detailed consideration—nos. 26 and 27.

(i) No. 26 is the correction of the Institution. Here we may recall the assertions of Etheridge, Neale, and Howard, quoted in the previous Note. Etheridge declared that Menezes imported into the Malabar liturgy 'a formulary of consecration' that was not there before; Neale and Howard, that an already existing form was removed from its position before the Invocation and placed after it.

Before the Acts of the Synod come to prescribe any specific changes in the Institution they deal briefly with the *verba consecrationis*. As the priest consecrates (they say) not by any words of his own, but by the words of Christ, no additional words, however pious and edifying, are to be admitted. Particular exception, however, is made in favour of the words *enim, aeterni*, and *mysterium fidei* of the Roman Canon, since these (they say) are received from apostolic tradition. This being so the Synod adds:—

'Verba igitur illa, quae Missae Syriacae adduntur in Calicis consecratione: *et hoc erit vobis pignus, in saecula saeculorum*; . . . praecipit Synodus in formula consecrationis non proferri' (Raulin, pp. 145-146).

The passage goes on to order that the above clause be not said until the priest has elevated the chalice and genuflected (that is to say, until it is clear that the form of consecration has been completed, and consecration is now over and past). It also orders that the terms of the clause be altered so as to read: 'Hoc erit *nobis* pignus *usque ad con-*

<sup>1</sup> From the indications given by the Acts of Diamper there can be no doubt that the Malabar Creed was identical with that traditional among the East-Syrian Nestorians and used by them in their liturgy and at baptism. On this formula see *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai* (Cambridge 'Texts and Studies') pp. lxxi-lxxvi.

<sup>2</sup> The formula in which these words occur is the people's response 'Christ hear thy prayers', &c. (Brightman, p. 274 ll. 22-25). Note that Raulin (p. 150 § cxvii l. 5 of the section) has omitted to translate some words, and instead of 'auferantur' we should read: 'auferantur ultima verba' (namely '*et pro toto orbe . . . ad maximum*')—so Gouvea.

<sup>3</sup> Apart from the Creed and the Institution (see below), this is the only passage into which words are introduced from the Roman Missal.



*summationem saeculi*': whereby, of course, the words are given to the priest himself and cease to appear as part of the formula of Institution spoken by Christ.

Before we go further it is necessary to be clear as to the exact meaning of an expression which is used by the Synod in its prelude to this revision of the formula of Institution, and which we shall presently meet with again more than once. It is to be remembered that Menezes, an Augustinian friar, and his chief advisers and coadjutors in the work of revision, the Jesuit fathers of Goa, had passed through what is called the Schools, and were thoroughly imbued with the formal scholastic theology immediately sequent on the Council of Trent. Hence in their mouth the expression *forma consecrationis*, or *verba consecrationis*, has a quite definite and limited application, denoting only those words which constitute the 'form' of the Sacrament, or are effective of the consecration. What these words are, for the Roman rite, is set out in the instructions 'de Defectibus in celebratione Missarum' at the beginning of the Missal, thus<sup>1</sup>:—

'Verba autem consecrationis, quae sunt forma huius Sacramenti, sunt haec, *Hoc est enim corpus meū. Et, Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei novi & aeterni testamenti, mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis & pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.*'

Thus it is the 'form of consecration' alone, the *verba consecrationis* (so designated in the Roman Missal which they were in the habit of using), that the revisers have in view when they proceed thus:—

'Item in consecratione Calicis, dum dicitur: *novi testamenti, qui pro vobis etc.*,<sup>2</sup> addantur Christi verba: *novi et aeterni testamenti, mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis, et pro multis etc.* Itaque verba consecrationis tam Corporis, quam Sanguinis reformatur, ac in omnibus apponantur Missalibus, iuxta Canonem, quo utitur Ecclesia Romana, et universalis; ita ut nihil addatur, vel dematur; nec non eadem adorationes, inclinationes, et ceremoniae fiant, quae in Missali Romano praescribuntur' (Raulin, p. 146).

Here we may notice in the first place that, besides textual alterations, the Synod introduces an elevation, genuflexion, &c., as in the Roman Missal: and in fact it is found that the rubrics in the revised text of the Liturgy prescribing this are taken straight from the Roman Missal.

We must now consider the above passage more in detail. On a comparison of the piece of original Malabar text with the Roman emendation, it is not quite clear whether the words *et pro multis* are to

<sup>1</sup> The copy of the Roman Missal that I here use is one 'Pii V Pont. Max. iussu editum' (C. Plantin, Antwerp, 1573): *de defectibus, &c.*, p. xxxv.

<sup>2</sup> Raulin omits the '*etc.*', but it stands in Gouvea's original print.

be regarded as part of the old text. Their absence from the piece of original text quoted—'dum dicitur: *novi testamenti, qui pro vobis etc.*'—is not conclusive, for more than once in the Acts the emended reading is given with a little more of the original text than is quoted to introduce it.<sup>1</sup> The words may well be covered by the 'etc.'. On the other hand *et aeterni* seems definitely excluded, as part of the old text, by its omission between the words 'novi' and 'testamenti qui pro vobis': it is also unexpected in an eastern formula.

Are we to understand that the changes specified in the first half of the above passage were all that the Synod intended to introduce into the *verba consecrationis*? The second half of the passage seems obviously to imply some further changes, for, whereas the corrections specified touch only the consecration of the chalice, it goes on to say: 'verba consecrationis *tam Corporis, quam Sanguinis reformentur*', and then proceeds to order complete assimilation (of the *verba consecrationis*) to the Roman text.

For help in this matter we must turn to the only other passage of the liturgy in which the Synod expressly prescribes conformity to the Roman Missal, namely the Creed. The reform of the Creed is mentioned twice, once in these decrees on the liturgy (Raulin, p. 149), and once in an earlier part of the Acts (p. 92). In both cases one or two verbal changes are specified, and then follows a clause which covers the whole and orders entire conformity to the Roman Missal. We are thus prepared to find that in the case of the 'words of consecration' also, as in that of the Creed, other changes than those specified were covered by the general direction as to conformity with the Missal. Fortunately we are enabled to say with some degree of certainty what those other changes were, and to restore the original text.

When in 1606 Gouvea printed the Latin translation of the revised Malabar Liturgy, he introduced the text by a short Preface in Portuguese. This Preface is translated by Raulin on pp. 291-292 of his book, where we read the following passage as to the Malabar Institution or, more exactly, *forma consecrationis*:—

'Cumque praeterea tam ipsi Christiani, quam ipsorum Praesules Chaldaei, qui e Babylone illuc mittebantur, summa rerum ignoratione laborarent, eo devenerunt stultitiae, ut quilibet pro suo libito, etiam consecrationis formae aut verba adiceret, aut detraheret. Antistes autem quidam,<sup>2</sup> qui rei Ecclesiasticae, Divinarumque Scripturarum

<sup>1</sup> This can be ascertained by looking up the corresponding passages in the East-Syrian (Urmi) text of 'Addai and Mari'. In the present case Dr Neale treats the words *et pro multis* as original (see his translation), while Raulin, adhering to the letter of the decree, takes the opposite view (p. 317 note).

<sup>2</sup> Of course a Nestorian bishop.

ampliori prae aliis eruditione pollebat, errores, qui formae consecrationis subreperant, sedulo expunxit, ne de veritate fidei erga Sacramentum dubium ullum suscitari posset; verum insuper consecrationis formam restituit, nonnulla etiam maioris explicationis gratia adiunxit verba, ut errorem, quo illi erant imbuti, nempe quod in Eucharistia figura tantum corporis Christi existeret, procul ab eorum animis propelleret, . . . in forma igitur consecrationis panis, ita disposuit Archiepiscopus ille verba: *Hoc est IN VERITATE Corpus meum*; et in consecratione Calicis haec alia: *Hic est IN VERITATE Calix sanguinis mei, qui pro vobis, et pro multis effundetur, in debitorum propitiationem, et in peccatorum remissionem, et hoc erit vobis pignus in saecula saeculorum*, quae quidem forma hactenus<sup>1</sup> obtinuit.

We would gladly know more about this Malabar prelate, and in particular his date. But in reality the question, what expressions he 'sedulously expunged' from the form of consecration, lies outside the scope of the present enquiry, which is concerned only with the text of the Malabar liturgy as it lay before the Portuguese revisers in 1599.

When we compare the formula quoted from Gouvea's Preface with the extract from the old text given by the Synod of Diamper (see p. 577 above), we notice, apart from the words *in veritate*, the following points:—

- (a) Gouvea's formula omits *enim*, about which the Synod is silent;
- (b) it omits *et aeterni*, with the Synod;
- (c) but it also omits *novi testamenti*, which the Synod quotes as part of an original reading 'novi testamenti, qui pro vobis';
- (d) it includes *et pro multis*, which we saw reason for supposing that the Synod also read in the old text;
- (e) it contains the words *in debitorum propitiationem, et in peccatorum remissionem*;
- (f) it supports what the Synod says as to the concluding words, *et hoc erit vobis pignus in saecula saeculorum*.

As regards (a): *enim* is found in the text of the revised Liturgy. But I have no doubt that it is correctly omitted in the version of the old text contained in Gouvea's Preface; for though its insertion is not among the changes specified by the Synod, yet it is probably covered by the general direction as to the assimilation of the words of consecration, '*tam Corporis quam Sanguinis*', to the Roman form. But further, in the preliminary statement of the Synod (see p. 576 above) *enim* is declared (with *aeterni* and *mysterium fidei*) to be one of the expressions which the Roman Church rightly includes in the form of consecration on the ground of apostolic tradition; and the defence of these three expressions there appears to me to have been undertaken definitely

<sup>1</sup> Gouvea says, 'for many years past' (*de muytos annos*). The formula itself is given by Gouvea in Latin; Raulin is responsible only for the capitals.

with a view to their insertion in the revised Malabar formula. Finally *enim* is comparatively rare in eastern formulae of Institution.

As to (c): it would appear that either Gouvea or the Synod has made a slip—the former in omitting *novi testamenti*, or the latter in quoting it as part of the old form—and here we are left in doubt. It is possible that the words were present in some copies but absent from others. The other two Nestorian liturgies, ‘Theodore’ and ‘Nestorius’, contain them. It appears to me very unlikely that the Synod could have made a mistake when it actually quoted here the words ‘novi testamenti, qui pro vobis’ as the basis of its emended reading.

The double expression in (e), *in debitorum propitiationem, et in peccatorum remissionem*, is certainly genuine. It is to be found in the Invocation prayer of the Malabar and East-Syrian rite, and also in that of Theodore. It occurs also in the Institution in several Jacobite liturgies; but there is no reason to suppose any dependence of the Malabar on such Jacobite formulae, for the expression is a Syriac commonplace.

Having dealt specifically with the *verba consecrationis*, we may now compare the whole of the old Malabar formula of Institution (so far as it is possible to reconstruct it) with that in the Roman Canon.<sup>1</sup> In the *first* column *italics* are used to distinguish those words which were either omitted from the old form or altered by the revisers. *Italics* in the *second* column mark those words in the Roman Canon which were introduced into the old Malabar text. All that appears in ordinary type in the first column is taken from the revised Liturgy, which is our only available authority for the greater part of the formula.

*Malabar.*

Dominus noster Iesus Christus  
in illa nocte, qua tradebatur,  
accepit panem hunc sanctum in  
sanctas ac puras manus suas,  
et elevavit oculos suos in caelum,  
  
et gratias egit Deo Patri, omnium  
rerum creatori,

*Roman.*

Qui  
pridie quam pateretur,  
accepit panem in sanctas ac venera-  
biles manus suas,  
et elevatis oculis in caelum ad  
te Deum Patrem suum omnipoten-  
tentem,  
tibi gratias agens,

<sup>1</sup> W. Germann, in his *Kirche der Thomaschristen* (1877) pp. 574–575, prints a Latin version of a revised formula of Institution which the French traveller Anquetil du Perron saw in a Missal at Kandanada (close to Diamper, and not far from Cochin) in 1758. The formula is one revised by insertions from the Roman Missal; but as the revision appears to me to be clearly based not on the old Malabar text but on a text of the Syriac ‘St James’ (then in use among the Jacobites of Malabar), it seems unnecessary to give more than a bare reference to it here.

*Malabar.*

et benedixit ac fregit, deditque discipulis suis, et dixit :

Accipite et comedite ex hoc pane omnes vos.

Hoc est <sup>1</sup> *in veritate*<sup>2</sup> corpus meum.

Similiter postquam coenavit, accepit hunc calicem manibus suis puris,

et gratias egit,

et benedixit, et dedit discipulis suis, dicens :

Accipite et bibite omnes vos ex hoc calice,

quotiescumque enim comederitis panem hunc, et biberitis<sup>3</sup> calicem, mei memoriam recoletis.

Hic est <sup>4</sup> *in veritate* calix sanguinis mei,

[novi testamenti,]<sup>5</sup>

qui pro vobis et pro multis<sup>6</sup> effundetur

*in debitorum propitiationem et in peccatorum remissionem ;*

*et hoc erit vobis pignus in saecula saeculorum.*<sup>7</sup>

*Roman.*

benedixit, fregit, deditque discipulis suis, dicens :

Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes.

Hoc est *enim* corpus meum.

Simili modo postquam coenatum est, accipiens et hunc praeclarum calicem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas,

item tibi gratias agens,

benedixit, deditque discipulis suis, dicens :

Accipite, et bibite ex eo omnes.

Hic est *enim* calix sanguinis mei,

*novi et aeterni testamenti, mysterium fidei,*

qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur

*in remissionem peccatorum.*

Hoc quotiescumque feceritis, in mei memoriam facietis.

It was seen earlier in this paper (p. 574, note 3) that the Acts of the Synod and the text of the Liturgy are in agreement as to the position of the Institution in the service. We have now every reason to believe

<sup>1</sup> The revised text of the Liturgy adds 'enim' from the Roman Missal.

<sup>2</sup> According to Gouvea this expression, here and in the words over the chalice, was added by a Malabar bishop to safeguard the doctrine of a real presence (cf. p. 579).

<sup>3</sup> Raulin adds 'hunc', which is not in Gouvea's edition.

<sup>4</sup> The text of the Liturgy has 'enim', from the Roman Missal.

<sup>5</sup> Gouvea's Preface omits, but the Synod quotes as part of the old text. The words must be considered doubtful (see p. 580 above).

<sup>6</sup> On 'et pro multis' see above, pp. 577-578. Gouvea's Preface contains the words.

<sup>7</sup> Altered by the Synod to 'Hoc erit nobis pignus usque ad consummationem saeculi' (see pp. 576, 579 above).

that the form in which the Institution<sup>1</sup> appears in the Liturgy is that intended by the Synod; so that when we substitute (as has just been done) the old readings recorded by the Synod, and those further ones preserved by Gouvea in his Preface, we have as nearly as may be the actual formula which lay before the revisers. It is hardly necessary to point out that the formula is an eastern one; but it is worth while to observe that it is not taken from any of the well-known Greek or Syriac liturgies, nor even, so far as I can discover, from any that is known at all. Though simple and unelaborated in comparison with many eastern formulae, it has features that are distinctive. The position of the clause 'quotiescumque enim comederitis', &c., appears to be unique, as is certainly the last sentence, 'et hoc erit vobis pignus', &c.

Whence came this formula into the Malabar liturgy? I can offer only two suggestions: (1) that it was introduced from the liturgy of Diodore, which the Synod ordered to be cut out of the service-books and burned together with the liturgies of Theodore and Nestorius; or (2) that it was proper in Malabar to the liturgy of the Apostles.<sup>2</sup>

But even if the formula were taken from the liturgy of Diodore, I can see no sufficient reason for supposing that it was introduced thence into the Malabar liturgy of the Apostles by Menezes and the Synod of Diamper. The whole purpose and character of the directions in the Acts as to revision (to say nothing of the explicit and contemporary testimony of Gouvea) seem to shew that. The Synod nowhere prescribe the insertion of a formula of Institution *ab extra*, though they must have done so had the formula been wanting; on the contrary, they speak of it not only as an integral part of the liturgy under revision, but as already occupying a fixed position in that liturgy<sup>3</sup>; and it is precisely in connexion with the Institution that they speak of preserving the ancient rite 'quantum patitur Fidei sinceritas ac doctrinae puritas'.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, if it had been necessary to supply such a formula, there could be no conceivable object in concealing this fact; and even had they wished to do so the revisers must have realized the futility of attempting it, for it would have been obvious to them that the Malabar Christians knew perfectly well whether their liturgy of the Apostles had or had not a formula of Institution. Nor is it likely that they would have taken the formula from one of the rites which they had ordered

<sup>1</sup> I here use this term in its widest sense, as covering the whole formula in col. 1 above.

<sup>2</sup> By which I do not suggest that it was 'primitive', or an integral part of that liturgy from the first, but that it was not borrowed from any other liturgy of which we have knowledge.

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 574, note 3.

<sup>4</sup> Raulin, p. 146.

to be cut out of the Missals 'whole and entire'<sup>1</sup> and burned. As in the case of the actual words of consecration and that of the Creed—also of the baptismal formula<sup>2</sup>—the revisers would have felt no sort of scruple or delicacy in taking the whole text of the Institution straight from the Roman rite, had they deemed this necessary, and in saying so plainly.

Similar considerations are, to my mind, conclusive as to the *position* of the Institution in the service. If the revisers had intended to alter its position they would not have hesitated to say so; while they could hardly have *forgotten* to mention so important a change. When the evidence is taken on its merits and prepossessions are laid aside, it must, I think, be set down as an assured conclusion that before Menezes touched the Malabar liturgy of the Apostles it had a formula of Institution *after* the Invocation of the Holy Spirit.

It will be asked: Can we then, on the evidence of the Malabar rite, restore a lost form of Institution to the East-Syrian liturgy of the Apostles Addai and Mari? Personally, I think it would be very unsafe to draw any such conclusion. No East-Syrian manuscript of 'Addai and Mari' is known which contains a formula of Institution; and the only reliable evidence that this liturgy ever had one must come, if at all, with the discovery of some early manuscript attesting it. Evidence from Malabar in the sixteenth century is too precarious to be set against the testimony of the East-Syrian manuscripts. At present it is safer to suppose that the Malabar Christians, at a date unknown, themselves supplied a form of Institution (influenced thereto by the analogy of their other three liturgies), and that, finding in their liturgy of the Apostles no context in which it could more suitably be inserted, they conceived the idea that it would aptly introduce the rite of Fraction preceding communion—for did it not contain the Gospel account of that first Fraction and Communion, when our Lord 'blessed, *brake, and gave* to His disciples'? The fact that it thus appeared after the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, which seems to have scandalized some modern liturgists, would probably not trouble people who had no views at all as to the consecratory force of the Institution; and they would see as little harm in placing it after the Invocation as in placing it before.

<sup>1</sup> 'Todas inteiras assi como estão', says Gouvea's Portuguese.

<sup>2</sup> In Act IV decree 2 (Raulin, p. 117) we are told that some of the native priests used the form: 'Baptizatus est, et perfectus est, N. in nomine Patris, Amen; in nomine Filii, Amen; in nomine Spiritus Sancti, Amen'; while others used the 'Greek' form: 'Baptizetur servus Christi, in nomine', &c. (as in the other formula). In place of these the Synod commands them to use the form 'quam approbat, et adhibet Sancta Ecclesia Romana', viz.: 'Ego te baptizo', &c. Any shamefacedness in confessing the source of Roman practices, where they are introduced, is not a symptom which can be detected in these Acts.

(ii) The second of the two changes reserved for fuller discussion<sup>1</sup> is no. 27 of the table printed on pp. 572-573. It occurs in a verse of the hymn, or anthem, which in the Malabar Liturgy (Raulin, p. 318) begins 'Ego sum panis', and in 'Addai and Mari' (Brightman, p. 290 col. 1) 'I am the bread'. In 'Malabar' this hymn follows the Institution, and in both 'Malabar' and 'Addai and Mari' it introduces, or perhaps accompanies, the Fraction. The hymn in 'Malabar' contains several additional verses after the last that is found in 'Addai and Mari'; and it is in one of these additional verses that the correction is prescribed by the Synod, and duly appears in the Liturgy. The Synod prescribes as follows:—

'Item in Hymno, qui a Clero, et Diacono alternatim dicitur, post elevationem SS. Sacramenti, in versu ubi dicitur: *Sacerdos quando ad Sanctum Altare ingreditur, manus suas pure protendit in Caelum, et invitat spiritum, qui de superis descendit, et consecrat Corpus, et Sanguinem Christi*: ubi innui videtur, Sacerdotem evocare de Caelo spiritum, qui consecrare debet, . . . legendum est: *manus suas pure protendit in Caelum, et consecrat Corpus, et Sanguinem Christi*, illa omittendo verba: *et invitat spiritum, qui de superis descendit etc.* et illa alia nimirum: *a saeculo, et usque in saeculum* (Raulin, p. 151).'

Notwithstanding the express statement of the Synod that these words occur in a verse of the hymn, Raulin, in a note to the passage (p. 318), seems to think that they actually formed a sort of second Invocation, for he says *inter alia*:—

'Synodus nostra aliquantulum immutavit verba invocationis, ne putarent Christiani illi, Sacerdotem non habere vim consecrandi, sola Christi verba proferendo, atque adeo necessum esse, denuo invocare Spiritum Sanctum, ut quam credebant fieri transmutatio [*sic*] elementorum.'

It is evidently to this note of Raulin's that Howard alludes when he says: 'This [the alteration of the terms of the Invocation "so as to make it refer solely to a fruitful reception of the Eucharist"] was done, as the Roman censors confess, in order to prevent the idea that the words of Christ uttered by the priest are not sufficient by themselves to effect the consecration'.<sup>2</sup> But Raulin makes it plain that he is not referring to the real Invocation at all—which in fact was not touched by the revisers<sup>3</sup>—but only to this verse of the hymn.

Even more remarkable than Raulin's view of this verse, and Howard's treatment of Raulin's note, is the use to which the passage was put by so eminent and alert a scholar as Dr J. M. Neale. It is to be noted

<sup>1</sup> See p. 576 above.

<sup>2</sup> *The Christians of St Thomas and their Liturgies* p. 40 note.

<sup>3</sup> See below, p. 586.



that Raulin, in re-editing Gouvea's text of the Malabar Liturgy, aims at distinguishing by the use of *italics* all passages in which alteration was made. But he employs *italics* for the rubrics also. It must have been this that led Dr Neale into the error of supposing that the verse we are dealing with was a misplaced rubric: in any case, in his reconstruction of what he believed to be the proper order of the prayers in the Malabar anaphora, he has extracted this verse from the middle of the hymn to which it belongs and placed it *as a rubric* before the Invocation. But what is stranger still, he gives it in the *expurgated* form in which it appears in the Liturgy,<sup>1</sup> not in the original form quoted by the Synod.

Dr Neale's attempt to restore the order of the prayers in the Malabar anaphora by the help of the liturgy of Theodore has probably done more than anything else to propagate the belief that Menezes and the Synod rearranged these prayers according to their own notions: though, as Dr Neale thought, 'very carelessly, if not *malâ fide*',<sup>2</sup> they omitted to mention this fact. But when it is recognized that the Malabar is the same liturgy as 'Addai and Mari', a comparison of the latter with Dr Neale's reconstruction is enough to shew how entirely mistaken he was, and how misleading is his well-meant effort to restore the original Malabar order on the basis of such a liturgy as that of 'Theodore'.

## 4.

*The Invocation.*

An important, because clearly an early, feature of the East-Syrian liturgy of Addai and Mari is its simple form of Invocation. This formula, as Dr Srawley observes, 'recalls that found in the Ethiopic Church Order, in that it contains no prayer for the change of the elements into the Body and Blood of Christ'.<sup>3</sup> In this connexion it is of interest to recall G. B. Howard's statement (already quoted), that Menezes altered the terms of the Malabar Invocation 'so as to make it refer solely to a fruitful reception of the Eucharist'.<sup>4</sup> As readers of this paper may be glad to have the texts before them I print here in parallel columns the Invocation of 'Addai and Mari', in Mr Brightman's translation (pp. 287-288), and that of 'Malabar' as it stands in Raulin (p. 315). *Italics* draw attention to textual differences.

<sup>1</sup> Namely thus: '*And the Priest stretcheth forth, purely, his hands to heaven and consecrateth the Body and Blood of Christ*' (*The Liturgies . . . translated, seventh ed.* p. 167).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 165 note.

<sup>3</sup> *The Early History of the Liturgy*, Cambridge 1913, p. 128.

<sup>4</sup> *The Christians of St Thomas and their Liturgies* p. 40.

*Addai and Mari.*

And may there come, o my Lord, thine Holy Spirit and rest upon this offering of thy servants *and bless* and sanctify it that it may be to us, o my Lord, for pardon of offences and the remission of sins and for the great hope of resurrection from the dead and for new life in the kingdom of heaven with all those who have been pleasing *before thee*.

And for all *this* great and marvellous dispensation towards us we will give thee thanks and praise thee without ceasing in thy church redeemed by the precious blood of thy Christ, with unclosed mouths and open faces lifting up praise and honour and confession and worship to thy living and holy and lifegiving name now and ever and world without end.

In view of Howard's estimate of the Malabar formula we may well ask: Did it so much as occur to Menezes and the Synod that the Malabar Invocation presented any claim to be a form of consecration? The question is important in more respects than one; for if it be answered in the negative, it is clear that the revisers could have had no motive for altering the position of the Institution.

In dealing above with the hymn verse, which speaks of the priest as inviting the Holy Spirit to come down and 'consecrate the Body and Blood of Christ', we saw (p. 584) that the Synod excised the words expressive of the consecratory action of the Holy Spirit. Looking at this matter to-day, with our sentiments and the prepossessions of the liturgiologists of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the point we should be apt to note is that the hymn and verse come *after the Institution*. But this is not a point that engages the interest of the revisers: they pay no attention to it whatever. Menezes and his friends were trained theologians, thoroughly drilled in the Theology of the Schools, and like trained theologians they go straight to the root of the matter. They object solely and absolutely to the insinuation that the consecration takes place through the action of the Holy Ghost, and this in answer to the

*Malabar.*

Veniat ergo, Domine mi, Spiritus tuus Sanctus, et requiescat super oblationem hanc servorum tuorum, et sanctificet eam, ut sit nobis, Domine mi, in debitorum solutionem, et peccatorum remissionem, et in maximam spem resurrectionis ex mortuis, et vitam novam in Regno Caelesti cum omnibus qui placuerunt.

Insuper et pro omni admirabili dispensatione *tua*, quae erga nos facta est, laudemus et glorificemus te, absque cessatione in Ecclesia tua sanguine Christi<sup>1</sup> tui redempta, apertoque ore, ac facie revelata, offerimus<sup>2</sup> *tibi* carmen, et honorem, laudem et adorationem, nomini tuo vivo, sancto, et vivificanti, nunc et semper, et in saecula saeculorum.

<sup>1</sup> The Synod adds the word 'filii' (Raulin, p. 151). As already noticed (see p. 574, note 1), Raulin is wrong in omitting 'tui' from the piece of original text quoted by the Synod, for it stands in Gouvea's edition.

<sup>2</sup> So Gouvea; Raulin has 'offeremus'.

priest's *prayer*, and not rather by virtue of Christ's words pronounced by the priest. Their words are: 'ubi innui videtur, Sacerdotem evocare de caelo spiritum, qui consecrare debet, quasi id non praestet ipse Sacerdos; cum itaque Sacerdotis sit, vere consecrare, etsi Christi verbis tantum, et non suis', &c.—let the passage be altered. It is the priest himself that consecrates (they say), but by Christ's words, not in virtue of any prayer of his. It seems certain that the revisers would equally have objected to this verse of the hymn had it come before instead of after the Institution; and further, that they did not imagine for a moment that the actual Invocation, which they allowed to stand ('Veniat ergo, Domine mi', &c., as above), embodied the doctrine which they found in the hymn verse. Had they suspected anything of the kind, they would have altered its terms no matter what its position in the service. From the fact that they left it unaltered it may reasonably be inferred that they did not regard it as pretending to any consecratory force, and consequently that they could have had no motive for altering its position relatively to the Institution.

How far developements in the Malabar rite kept pace with those in the East-Syrian liturgy, by means of borrowing, we cannot say. But the fact that the Church of Malabar adopted a number of late formularies (variable prayers, hymns, &c.) from the other Nestorian communities is not in itself sufficient warrant for denying that in the central, the really important, part of its liturgy it maintained a large measure of independence, and thus may be taken as supplying a genuine parallel tradition to that of the East-Syrian Nestorian Church. To state the matter in its lowest possible terms: the identity of the Malabar form of Invocation with the East-Syrian is important at least in this, that it shews *no different* tradition as to the text of this prayer. The Malabar text reproduces the prayer in that simplicity of form which allies it (as Dr Srawley has observed) to the earliest known example of an Invocation for the Holy Spirit in a formal liturgical text—that in the 'Ethiopic Church Order'.

#### *Conclusions.*

The results arrived at in this paper and the one that preceded it may be summarized as follows:—

1. The Malabar liturgy is essentially the same as the East-Syrian liturgy of Addai and Mari. The differences between the two are—apart from the order in an early part of the service,<sup>1</sup> and the presence in 'Malabar' of a formula of Institution—no more than we might naturally expect in the case of any rite current in two widely distant localities.

<sup>1</sup> Namely, Section II of the Concordance given in the previous note. See *J.T.S.* April 1914, pp. 413-420.

2. The Synod of Diamper nowhere interfered with the order of the text under revision ; and consequently Dr Neale's rearrangement of the anaphora on the model of 'Theodore' is wholly inadmissible.

3. All verbal changes made by the Synod are specified in the Acts except in the case of the Creed and the *verba consecrationis* of the Institution ; in these two cases any verbal changes not specified are covered by a general direction as to conformity with the Roman Missal.

4. The Invocation was left unaltered except for the insertion of the word 'fili' after 'Christi'.

5. Already before the revision the formula of Institution stood where it now stands in the prints of Gouvea and Raulin, that is, just before the Fraction.

6. The only passages into which words were introduced from the Roman Missal are the Creed, the 'words of consecration' (as already explained), and a response of the people.<sup>1</sup> To this response were added some words from the Roman prayer *Te igitur*.

7. Consequently it is misleading to say that the Synod of Diamper 'romanized' the Malabar liturgy, or to any appreciable extent 'assimilated' it to the Roman rite: all the changes made were doctrinal in purpose, not liturgical.

8. With the help of the Acts of the Synod of Diamper, of Gouvea's Latin text of the revised Liturgy and his Preface to it, of the Roman Syriac edition of 1774, and finally of the Urmi Syriac text of 'Addai and Mari', it should be possible, by employing critical methods, to reconstruct a considerable part of the Syriac text of the old Malabar rite as it stood in the copy from which the existing Latin translation was made.

My friend Mr Edmund Bishop adds below a few words on the value of the East-Syrian rite for the study of early liturgy, and on the importance of the Malabar tradition as a second witness to its text. It was he who put me in the way to write this and the former Note on the Malabar rite, he himself having some time ago examined the documents and arrived at the more important of the conclusions drawn above.

There is just one remark which it seems worth while to add here at the end. As is well known, the non-Uniat Christians of Malabar have been Jacobites (Monophysites) since about the middle of the seventeenth century. But for the last few years<sup>2</sup> there has been again a Nestorian bishop in Malabar (at Trichur), ordained by the Nestorian

<sup>1</sup> See p. 576 ; and for references to the various texts see no. 20 of the table on p. 573.

<sup>2</sup> Dr Fortescue says, since 1907 (*The Lesser Eastern Churches* p. 372).

Catholicus. He has at present a following of some few thousand<sup>1</sup> native Christians. What I wish to point out is this: that if this new Nestorian mission flourishes and continues, we should be careful not to mistake any service-books emanating from it for the true Malabar books, or to regard them as affording any fresh evidence for the liturgy of the old Malabar Nestorians. The books used by the present Malabar Nestorians are, I understand, those of their so-called 'Assyrian' co-religionists in Persia and Turkey in Asia, i. e. the 'East-Syrian' books.

R. H. CONNOLLY.

ADDITION BY E. B.

Now that the writer has drawn his conclusions from his detailed enquiry, it may be in place to add a few words as to its use and value, and deal with the thing that matters. In the liturgy of Addai and Mari we have the representative of the earliest and native liturgical forms of the East-Syrian Church, a Church with a spirit and a developement independent of the Greek-speaking Churches or the Latin-speaking Churches, but as Christian witness standing on the same ground of value and importance as the other two. So far as the liturgy and its early history and developement, say of the first four centuries, are concerned, we have hitherto been subject to one great difficulty, and liturgists have lain under one great disability: we have had two candidates for notice or favour, the Greek and the Latin, which last may for practical purposes be called the Roman. And so Greeks and Romans have in the liturgical cockpit been matched against each other; and partisans have had full opportunity for the indulgence of their prepossessions or prejudices without much expectation of seeing the contest brought to an end, or at least of seeing the best of the fun over.

But now a third candidate is knocking loudly at the gate, who deserves all the attention which has so long been withheld, an attention as full and minute as any that has been given to the Greek and Latin Churches. This is the East-Syrian Church, in regard to which, however, we are already certain of one thing: that it has characteristics and

<sup>1</sup> Dr Fortescue (*loc. cit.*) gives the number as about 8,000. Mr H. W. Codrington, writing from Ceylon, has quite recently sent me a letter from a priest at Kottayam (Travancore) in which the writer states that this Nestorian body has of late dwindled considerably, and now numbers from 4,000 to 6,000 persons, under a 'Persian' bishop named Abimelik. *The Guardian* of October 7, 1908, publishes a letter from a correspondent at Delhi in which the writer, Mr C. F. Andrews, gives an extract from a letter written to him by a Nonconformist missionary who had recently visited Malabar. The extract briefly describes an interview with the new Nestorian 'Metropolitan' at Trichur; he was, it says, 'educated in the Anglican Seminary at Urmi in Persia'. This is evidently Bishop Abimelik, just mentioned.