

Catholicus. He has at present a following of some few thousand¹ 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 development 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 development, 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

¹ 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.

a spirit of its own worthy to the full of as much consideration as has hitherto been given to the other two.

Such characteristics manifest themselves in this Church, as in the others, in a sort of contradictory fashion—novelties, innovations, in some directions; conservatism, holding fast to the inherited, in others; and possibly a certain amount of unreason in both directions. There is no need here even so much as to mention any matter in which the East-Syrian Church led the way into new things. Comparatively slight as has been as yet detailed investigation of the early history of the rites, practices, religious observances and piety—whether of a doctrinal or emotional type—of the East-Syrian Church, enough has been done already to make it clear that all these are worthy of most careful enquiry in detail, as shewing that this Church in much affords a contrast to the revolutionary spirit and methods of the Greek Churches that were its next neighbours, separating it from the Latin. I cannot do better here than adopt the words of a man who is perhaps at once the most acute, brilliant, and powerful of the younger German investigators into the early history of the Christian Churches. The particular subject-matter of his enquiry does not concern us here; but he has occasion, in dealing with certain matters of detail, to point out more than once how he finds among these far Eastern Christians what he finds also existing in the West: ‘Among the Latins this institution is known’, he says, ‘but it is the same case with the Edessene Church.’ And again in another matter: ‘This’, he says, ‘is the case in the Western Church and in the Edessene.’ Such observations lead him to make this general remark: ‘Both Churches agree in this matter, not because they have mutually influenced each other, but because both of them, in contrast with many Greek communities, preserved what was ancient’. And then further he comes to speak of these Greek Churches themselves, what they were, and what was their ecclesiastical course in the fourth century: it was a ‘revolution’, he says, and that ‘in their inner nature’. This writer has not pursued the subject of liturgy; but it is in the particular field of specifically liturgical development that his words will be found, as I believe, to have their verification, in this sense: of a conservatism in the Edessene and Latin Churches, a holding fast to the inherited, as contrasted with the ‘making of all things new’ to be found in the contemporary Greek Churches. It is precisely for want of such sort of help as a knowledge of the East-Syrian liturgy would afford that have been due, in the last century, those ideas as to ‘primitive liturgy’ which have prevailed in England, and made their appearance less than half a century ago in Germany. For whilst the liturgy of Addai and Mari, the normal liturgy of the East-Syrian Church, is quite eastern in character, it is conservative of its ancient form and spirit, and will

well enable us, thanks to the preservation (with other documents) of the liturgy of the Ethiopic Church Order, to get behind the existing Greek liturgies and to measure the wide distance that separates these last—in what is most important in their contents—from the primitive types.

At the risk of seeming importunate and saying the same thing over and over again, I repeat here that if the highly complex problem of early liturgy in its various forms and its varying local developments is to be presented and explained in a rational and intelligible manner, this end can only be achieved by steady perseverance in the preliminary work of accurate investigation of definite points of detail, or some clearly circumscribed subject-matter. The foregoing investigation of the Malabar rite is a case of this kind.

I may be allowed here to apply to the case of liturgical study words in a letter of the late Lord Acton (Letter xxvi, which, taken as a whole, I may say in passing embodies my 'scientific' *credo*): 'The Germans have a word, *quellenmässig* = *ex ipsissimis fontibus*, and another, *Wissenschaftlichkeit*, which is nearly equivalent to the Platonic *ἐπιστήμη* as opposed to *αἰσθησις*, *δόξα*, *μνήμη*, &c. When a book of . . . history or any other science is destitute of these essential qualities, it belongs to a wholly different category, and, however meritorious it is in its proper sphere, is not treated or spoken of seriously. I might have Gibbon or Grote by heart, I should yet have no real, original, scientific knowledge of Roman or Grecian history, though I might make a great show of it and eclipse a better scholar' (*Lord Acton and his Circle* pp. 55-56).

It is easy to see the application of this remark to the subject of liturgy; it does not suffice to have at one's fingers' ends the works of any number of writers on liturgy, even the most recent: what is to be desired and aimed at is personal knowledge and exercise in judgement—*recta sapere*, 'to have a right judgement in all things'. For this many must co-operate, but all by the same method. Moreover, as regards a detailed study of a specific point (and the study of early liturgy supplies an extraordinary range of possibilities), nothing is more proper to enable a writer himself to test the quality of his own work, to say nothing of the fact that it also enables other people, accustomed to investigations in other departments of learning, to recognize what is the quality of such a writer. If an advance is to be made in solving the problems attaching to early liturgy and its development, it is to the younger generation of men that we must look, and they may be trusted in the long run to correct the now rooted error of the liturgists of the Tractarian movement in taking the Greek liturgical developments of the fourth century for what was primitive.

Of course there are many things to be done, and there are not a few helps that should be put in the hands of the younger generation—helps

that are their due, and are also, as I think, overdue. A help of this kind—a piece of common work—has now for some time been in project between myself and Dom Connolly ; in fact it has already been drafted, and some progress has been made in settling its text. This is a tabular statement shewing the body of ancient texts of the kernel of the eucharistic prayer. Only those who have had experience in comparative work on the liturgical texts can duly realize the extraordinary number and minuteness of the points that have to be held simultaneously in view, kept as it were contemporaneously present to the mind, if a writer on these subjects would avoid actually misleading the readers to whom he only wishes to bring light and offer help. Those who are new to the study may at present well be excused for thinking it a hopeless tangle, and turning away from it in despair of understanding a subject which, however, should be of the deepest interest to all Christians. In my belief such a tabular statement and conspectus as is described above would do more than the most elaborate and carefully conceived dissertation to enable the young student (and, I am apt to think, also not a few students who are no longer young) to realize, even to understand, at the cost of only a certain amount of patience and intelligence, what in fact and in detail was the course of development of the eucharistic service just in those things that matter most.

And now a word as to the precise value, in regard to the normal liturgy of the East-Syrian Church, of the results arrived at through Dom Connolly's enquiry into the Malabar rite. We have two documents : (1) the liturgy found by Menezes in use among the Malabar Christians of southern India at the end of the sixteenth century. He altered this liturgy to make it according to his mind and the mind of his advisers, prominent among whom were the Jesuits of Goa ; and in the Acts of his Synod he has left a detailed record of the changes he made in the traditional text. That is one factor. The other is this : (2) very late in the day, at the end of the nineteenth century, the members of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission to the Assyrian Christians give us, for the use of these 'Assyrian' priests, the Syriac text of the liturgy of Addai and Mari, in use amongst these people on the southern shores of the Caspian Sea. It may be mentioned, by the way, that the manuscripts used by the Archbishop's missionaries seem to have been all quite late—none of them as old as the time of Menezes. This is a statement which admits of easy correction if it be mistaken ; nor is the matter of any essential importance for my purpose here—though of course the later the manuscripts the more remarkable the phenomenon, which is simply this : after having rendered to ourselves an account of the precise changes which Menezes says he made in the text of the Malabar liturgy which he found in use in southern India, and

then turning to a translation of the liturgy of Addai and Mari, which the Archbishop's missionaries found in use at the end of the nineteenth century among the poor Nestorian Christians just south of the Caspian Sea, we find this (and any one who has access to a Raulin, and to Mr Brightman's *Liturgies* vol. i, can test the matter for himself): that of the liturgy proper, apart from certain blessings and similar variable matter, the Urmi text shews throughout the readings which Menezes tells us he found in the Malabar text he corrected. Needless to say the rest of the text is concordant.

If, as *l'envoi*, we may come to the personal question, in which poor Menezes has suffered severely at the hands of the liturgists (who, it may safely be said, never themselves took the trouble really to examine the case), surely the time has come to recognize that the character of this man for truthfulness and honesty is 'good and fair'. And with this attempt to get an extension of the mantle of charity to Aleixo de Menezes, I close.

EDMUND BISHOP.

ST GAUDENTIUS OF BRESCIA AND THE *TOME* OF ST LEO.

AMONG the works of St Gaudentius of Brescia, the friend and contemporary of St Ambrose, St Chrysostom, and Rufinus, is a letter addressed to a certain Paul the deacon, whom Gaudentius addresses as 'Paule frater, carnis ac spiritus germanitate charissime'. It is uncertain who this Paul was, but possibly we may identify him with 'Paul the deacon of the holy Aemilius', who shared Gaudentius's imprisonment in the fortress of Athyra (Palladius *Dial.* iv).¹ Be this as it may for the moment, the interest of this letter lies in the fact that there is clearly some literary connexion between it and the *Tome* of St Leo.

When the following passages of the two documents are placed side by side, the parallels are very striking.

¹ The report of the Italian bishops incorporated by Palladius in the *Dialogue* is quite possibly the work of Gaudentius: cf. Amédée Thierry *Jean Chrysostome* p. 490.