

## Research Notes

### ***On the Errors of the East Syrians* (by Francisco Ros SJ, 1586): An Introduction with English Translation of a Latin-Syriac Treatise from Early Modern Malabar**

Antony Mecherry SJ\*  
*Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome*

This article provides an extended introductory essay and critical English translation of the 1586 manuscript preserved at ARSI, *De Syrorum orientalium erroribus*. This treatise was recently uncovered during the ordering of the *Fondo Tacchi Venturi* at ARSI. It has been identified by the current author as having been written by the Jesuit missionary in India, Francisco Ros. Some background explanation of this manuscript, its authorship, and its historical context are provided in the introduction in three parts, followed by the presentation of the translation of the text itself.

#### ***On the Errors of the East Syrians: Historical and Interpretive Background***

Joseph Anton Schwane († 1892), a pioneer of the theological scholarship in the Catholic Church, who inaugurated a systematic discipline of the History of Dogma, introduced a method for the classification of key periods in the Christian era. He arranged these periods under four headings: the age of apologies (up to the I Council of Nicaea: 325 AD), the age of heresies (up to the II Council of Nicaea: 787 AD), the age of theologians (up to the Council of Trent: 1545–63 AD) and the contemporary period of the reciprocal relations between Church(es) and individual(s), between Church(es) and so-

\* Antony Mecherry SJ is Professor of Oriental Church History at the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome, and received his PhD in Church History in 2016 from the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome. His recent publications include *Testing Ground for Jesuit Accommodation in Early Modern India* and the edition of *De Syrorum orientalium erroribus Auctore P. Francisco Ros S.I.* All translations into English – including the treatise presented in this article – are by the author unless otherwise stated.

ciety(ies) – up to the nineteenth century.<sup>1</sup> The first three periods are particularly relevant with respect to the text under consideration, *On the Errors of the East Syrians*. Within the Catholic Church's tradition, according to the Schwane schema, in each period, apologists, polemicists and theologians ardently defended, first, the real and eternal divinity of the Second Person of the Trinity against the subordinationist and adoptionist teachings; second, they defended the true humanity of the Second Person of the Trinity against the monophysitic and monothelitic positions; third, they defended the unity of the personal identity of the Second Person of the Trinity against classical 'Nestorianism'<sup>2</sup> and its generally attributed dyophysitic tendencies – constituting the distant origins, it might be said, of the "errors" – and those who held them – to which the sixteenth-century treatise in question objected.<sup>3</sup>

Historically, these origins lie with the independent emergence of the Church of the East located in the Mesopotamian plain and its extensive mission undertaken in the early centuries. For its part, in today's South India, the Saint Thomas Christians welcomed into their Church Syriac-speaking prelates from the East; through these prelates, furthermore, the East Syrian liturgical rite and the Syriac language were introduced and incorporated into Christianity in India, evolving to become integral parts of the ecclesial identity of the ancient Malabar Church in South India.<sup>4</sup>

During the first decades of the sixteenth century, the Iberian missionaries, who began to function in the region under the aegis

1 Schwane, *Dogmengeschichte der Vornicänischen Zeit*, 18–19.

2 In this work, I place the terms related to *Nestorianism* within inverted commas responding to the methodological, historical and theological caveats pointed out by Brock in "The 'Nestorian' Church", 23–35.

3 In common parlance, these theological conflicts could be generally expressed as follows: while the Trinitarians (Catholics) tended to defend the threefold nature (consubstantial) of God as Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit, the Unitarians reportedly opposed an equality or identification of this threefold nature in their theological exposition regarding the Holy Trinity. And ultimately these theological debates revolved around the nature of the Christological Union of the divine and human natures in the Second Person, the Son.

4 For a general understanding of the history and traditions of the Thomas Christians, see Mundadan, *History of Christianity in India*. The other names given to the Church of the East are the Church of Mesopotamia, Church of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, Persian Church, Babylonian Church, Assyrian Church (of the East), Nestorian Church, and Chaldean Church. The adjectives Mesopotamian, Persian, Babylonian, Chaldean and Assyrian are in reference to the geographical plain of Mesopotamia (the parts of today's Iraq and western Iran), the cradle of the Church of the East. The term "Nestorian" is employed in reference to the alleged

of the Portuguese Padroado, gradually got to know about the Thomas Christians, from whom the Europeans discovered – despite their resistance to accepting – that Thomas Christians held in high esteem the Syriac language, their bequeathed East Syrian liturgical traditions and the Malabar customs. Syriac was their liturgical language, while their ecclesial customs were flavoured both with the local cultural milieu and the East Syrian elements traditionally belonging to the ‘Babylonian’ Church and the ‘Nestorian’ Church, as the missionaries preferred to call the Church of the East.<sup>5</sup>

Centuries before, and following Schwane’s chronological schema, in the ages of ‘heresies’ and ‘theologians’, the Church in the West had invested great energy in addressing the ‘Nestorian’ question by defending in dogmatic terms the unity of Christ, God and man. We find the heated zenith of this defence in the first Council of Ephesus (431 AD) held during ‘the age of heresies’, in which St. Cyril, the Patriarch of Alexandria (ca. 376–444), successfully deposed Nestorius, the Patriarch of Constantinople (ca. 386–ca. 450), who stood at the opposite Antiochian camp of the theological battle of the century.<sup>6</sup>

theological identity attributed to the Church of the East. The name Chaldean, geographically speaking Lower Mesopotamia, is used in reference to the entire Mesopotamian plain, although this southern portion lies chiefly on the right bank of the Euphrates. In 1553, a branch of the Church of the East entered into Catholic communion, and the name Chaldean Church was widely employed from then on in reference to the newly born Catholic patriarchate and to a later offshoot of the Church of the East, the present branch of the Catholic Church in full communion with Rome. From 1553 onwards, the Catholic East Syrians under the banner of the Chaldean Church claimed ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the Malabar Church, leading in turn to an underlying jurisdictional conflict in India between the agents of the Church of the East and the Chaldean Church. Although Mar Abraham of Angamaly, the early modern metropolitan of the Thomas Christians, initially represented the traditional Church of the East (1556–65), technically speaking a ‘Nestorian’, he became a Catholic in 1565 primarily with a view to ensuring his undivided jurisdiction over the Malabar Church, which was found to be at stake given the Padroado administration of the Indian mission. For a short exposition of these jurisdictional complexities, see Mecherry, ed., *De Syrorum orientalium erroribus*, 3–6. For a general understanding of the wider context and consequences of this shift of ecclesial allegiances, see Parker, “The Ambiguities of Belief and Belonging”, 1420–45.

- 5 For an understanding of the starting point of the rite conflicts which emerged in the first decades of the sixteenth century out of the encounter between the Western missionaries and the East Syrian bishops governing the Thomas Christians, see Mundadan, *The Arrival of the Portuguese in India*, 82–116. For the history of the Malabar Church from the arrival of the Jesuits in India until the third decade of the seventeenth century, see Mecherry, *Testing Ground for Jesuit Accommodation in Early Modern India*.
- 6 For a critical exposition of this theological conflict, see Bevan, *The New Judas*.

As a consequence, the classical forms of 'Nestorianism' and its textual testimonies that persisted in the Church of the East – and which later were incorporated into the Christian environment of India – had over time developed into an apparently polemical doctrine. This was facilitated by the ecclesial and hierarchical separation of the Church of the East from the rest of the Western and Latin ecclesiastical world. In reference to the Antiochian traditions of the Syriac West, this separation meant that over the centuries two distinct theological streams developed that entailed parallel and hermeneutically different Syriac literatures – monophysitic on the one hand and 'Nestorian' on the other hand,<sup>7</sup> characterised by variant meanings attributable to the same Syriac terms by their respective exponents.<sup>8</sup> The attributability of abstract and concrete senses to those Syriac terms, depending on the context in which they were employed, indirectly contributed to heated theological polemics inaugurated by the Latin Church of the West, which later impacted the Christian religious and mission environment of early modern India, where *On the Errors of the East Syrians* was produced.

Well before the treatise was written, and in response to the terminological intricacies that the Syriac language had acquired over time in their theological usages, the Latin Church began to attribute definite meanings to the crucial terms of the Syriac theological matrix. Its attributions were in line with those established during the 'age of heresies' – through the Chalcedonian formula of faith,<sup>9</sup> concerning terms such as *kyānā*, *qnōmā*, *paršōpā*, *'itūtā*, *'ityā* and *usiā*. These attributions led to the production of crucial interpretational variants of the Syriac theological terminology and these variants were in turn employed by the Latin West to respond to its understanding of the question of classical 'Nestorianism'.<sup>10</sup>

7 In describing the general theological thrust attributed to classical 'Nestorianism' the term *Dyophysitism* is commonly employed with a view to bringing out the question of the two Persons in Christ, a position allegedly held by the Church of the East.

8 For the terminological confusions and clarifications revolving around crucial Syriac terminologies, see Brock, "The 'Nestorian' Church", 23–35.

9 Against the reported heresies related to the (Unitarian) Monophysitism, the Council of Chalcedon (451 AD), the fourth Ecumenical Council, decreed its teachings on the consubstantial Union of the Person of Christ. Despite the Chalcedonian condemnation of Monophysitism, it prevailed in Egypt and in Syria, the cradles of the Jacobite Church of the Antiochian tradition.

10 For example, the Latins generally employed *Person* for both *Prosopon* and for *Hypostasis*. For the complexities in understanding the crucial terms prevailing in the Syriac theological matrix, see Chediath, "The Three Crucial Terms in Syriac

In addition, it is worth noting that in the course of the different 'ages' identified by Schwane's schema, the Western understanding of Christology underwent its own phases of evolution, leading to a number of consequences for its interactions with different Christian traditions. The confusing interpretational variants of the crucial theological term like *physis* is one such example. Along with a certain ambiguity, it is possible to trace first a Cyrillian approach (focusing on the divine nature of Christ and named after St. Cyril's defeat of the 'Nestorians' at the Council of Ephesus), and then the Chalcedonian approach (focusing on the true humanity of the Second Person of the Trinity (Christ), affirmed at the Council of Chalcedon). In later centuries, the medieval scholastic method took up the Chalcedonian approach, which in turn was adopted by the Latin missionaries as they set out for the Orient for their evangelization mission in the sixteenth century.

#### **European missionaries and the Malabar Church of Sixteenth-Century India: The Case of Francisco Ros SJ**

Against the backdrop of the doctrinal disputes of earlier centuries and the subsequent thrust for theological and liturgical uniformity promoted by the Council of Trent (itself fuelled by the events of Reformation in Europe), the Iberian missionaries who worked in India in the first half of the sixteenth century generally looked down on every tradition that the Thomas Christians in Malabar had inherited from the Church of the East. It was only after the arrival in India, in 1584, of Francisco Ros SJ,<sup>11</sup> a Catalanian from the Jesuit province of Aragón, that the missionaries, especially the Jesuits in India, came to know in detail that Syriac books produced in abundance in Mesopotamia had been integrated into the religious patrimony and practice of the Malabar Church. In his capacity as the official consultor to Mar Abraham of Angamaly, the Chaldean Metropolitan of the Thomas Christians, Ros found that the Malabar Church had long held in high esteem the Syriac books containing the theological expressions promoted by Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428 AD), Diodore of Tarsus (d. ca. 390 AD) and Nestorius. Following the Council of Chalcedon (451 AD) the Western Church had already labelled

Theology," 59–65; Brock, "The 'Nestorian' Church", 26–28; Dickens, "PRO: Nestorius did not intend to argue that Christ had a dual nature", vol. 1, 145–62.

11 Francisco Ros, \* 1557 Girona (Spain), SJ V.1575 Aragón, +18.II.1624 Cranganore (Malabar, India) (DHCJ IV, 3410).

these theological exponents honoured by the Church of the East as reprehensible heresiarchs.

The traces of allegedly condemnable and foreign theological positions found in the Syriac books owned by the early modern Malabar Church naturally stirred the theological sensibility of the Latin missionaries, who tended to act on the spirit of uniformity nurtured by the Council of Trent.<sup>12</sup> Such a general spirit of dogmatic defence revealed the legacy of the 'age of theologians' beyond the age's chronological end-point (the Council of Trent) and beyond its traditional geographical borders (in India, where Latin Christianity was arriving for the first time in history in a systematic way).

The persistent thrust for dogmatic purge on the part of missionaries from Europe partly explains the rationale of two versions of extant treatises presented in Latin-Syriac on the question of 'Nestorianism'. Composed by Ros, they are: *De Syrorum orientalium erroribus*, written in 1586 (the treatise under consideration here) and *De erroribus Nestorianorum qui in hac India orientali versantur* (= *On the errors of the Nestorians who dwell in this Oriental India*), completed in 1587 and sent in 1588. Equipped with an exclusively Western formation based on medieval scholastic theology, through these texts Ros endeavoured to objurgate the theological positions and expressions promoted by the Church of the East that were present in their textual and liturgical forms in the Malabar Christianity of India.

At the same time, the Rosian treatises echoed an immediate and political function that he was called to fulfil: to end the age-old East Syrian (Chaldean) jurisdiction in India,<sup>13</sup> and to introduce the Padroado administration over the Church of the Thomas Christians. This aim to end Chaldean jurisdiction was despite the fact that, earlier, in 1553, the Chaldean Church had united with Rome. With the aim to dissolve this arrangement and replace it with direct oversight

12 On the question of the thrust of uniformity brought about by the Council of Trent, see Emminghaus, *The Eucharist*, 83–88.

13 "During the Jesuit mission in the Malabar Church, its faithful exclusively comprised the Thomas Christians of the East Syrian rite, who held in high esteem the spiritual care of their Syriac-speaking bishops hailing from the Chaldean Church, a [C]hurch born in 1553 from the ecumenical rapprochement of a branch of the Church of the East with the Catholic Church. From that year onwards, the Chaldean patriarch claimed legitimate jurisdiction over the Malabar Church, because of his ecclesial communion with the Roman Church." Mecherry, *Testing Ground for Jesuit Accommodation in Early Modern India*, xi. However, the Padroado missionaries in general portrayed the East Syrian bishops in India as "Chaldeos incognitos". See Wicki, ed., *Documenta Indica* [hereafter *D.I.*], vol. XIV, 455.

from the Padroado (by papal delegation, according to the arrangement in Portuguese territories), Ros sent the two polemical treatises to Europe, the first in 1586 and the second in 1588. Specifically, the treatises were part of a plan to oust from his role and from India Mar Abraham,<sup>14</sup> at the time the Chaldean (Catholic) metropolitan of the Thomas Christians († 1597), and the last to hold the role in the capacity as metropolitan, or ecclesiastical leader, of the Malabar Church. Yet after preparing, writing and sending his treatises, Ros began to observe that a few of the East Syrian and Malabar components, including liturgical, social and linguistic, that had already become an integral part of the Malabar Church over the centuries, were in fact cultural and nonessential in terms of Catholic faith (and therefore in his view might be retained); these, he reasoned, did not pertain to essential theological questions over which there could be no compromise according to the European mindset.

Ros's view that distinguished cultural practice (which was permissible) from theological dogma (which was not if it was judged to be in error) prompted him to promote, from 1588 onwards, the Jesuit mission praxis of *accommodatio* among the Thomas Christians. This approach identified that a few important but nonessential elements of the Malabar Church, in contrast to dogma and theology, were not to be *prima facie* condemned, including the Syriac language, liturgical and ecclesial customs like rigorous fasting, and culturally transmitted components like the participation of the Thomas Christians in the social mores of Malabar. Ros rightly understood that the Christians were not ready to submit to a direct dogmatic disciplining and reduction at the expense of their ecclesial identity. The opponents of Ros on the other hand argued that all these nonessential elements constituted the very doors of heresy. Serious disagreement ensued among the Jesuits in India that lasted for more than a decade over the role and place of *accommodatio* of the nonessential elements in the early modern Church of the Thomas Christians.<sup>15</sup>

The diocesan Synod of Diamper, which was convoked in 1599 by Aleixo de Menezes OSA, the Latin Archbishop of Goa, did not address this dilemma of *accommodatio*, instead it primarily aimed at bringing the Malabar Church politically under the Padroado jurisdic-

14 On Mar Abraham's mission in Malabar, see Thevarmannil, "Mar Abraham"; Mecherry, *Testing Ground for Jesuit Accommodation in Early Modern India*, 19–168.

15 For the complexities regarding the dilemma of *accommodatio* faced by the Jesuits in Malabar, Mecherry, *Testing Ground for Jesuit Accommodation in Early Modern India*, 110–15, 412–26.

tion and ecclesiastically under the Latin Church. Several aspects of the social matrix and ecclesial identity of the Malabar Church were seriously thwarted by the Synod, although through the efforts of Ros, the Synod established that at the very least the *status quo ante* was canonically possible regarding the nonessential element of Syriac, the liturgical language of the Malabar Church.<sup>16</sup> It is true that Ros played a central role in the formulation of the synodal decrees that insisted on upholding all theological expressions and teachings of the Catholic Faith in the scholastic terminology of the Latin Church (against the perceived ‘Nestorian errors’ of the East Syrians); yet immediately after the Synod he objected to the exaggerated stipulations about what he saw as the synod’s efforts to suppress regional and nonessential customs prevailing in the Malabar Church, which he considered detrimental to the souls of local Christians unwilling to adhere to those stipulations at the expense of their ecclesial identity. For this reason, he attempted to soften the Synod’s final rulings and language by successfully convoking the Synod of Angamaly in 1603.<sup>17</sup>

However, despite the temporary acceptance of the Syriac language for the sake of an effective mission and final ‘reduction’ of the Malabar Church, for the most part, missionaries in India continued to portray the East Syrian traditions as ‘Babylonian weeds’ to be strategically removed in the end phase of *accommodatio*, a praxis which was widely understood and accepted after 1599 as a mission method whose anticipated end was envisaged as full incorporation of the Malabar Church into the Latin Church and its rites<sup>18</sup>. In this project, “[t]he mission praxis of accommodation in the Malabar Church aimed at achieving a distant reduction of the Thomas Christians within their own Chaldean garb and Syriac trimmings”.<sup>19</sup> In this understanding of *accommodatio*, methodologically limited to the accidental and nonessential elements of a mission field, Ros expressed his awareness of the psychological rationale behind the playful tendency of human nature that “always tend[s] towards forbidden

16 In 1601, Alberto Laerzio, the Jesuit provincial of Malabar, agreed with the mission praxis of Ros and wrote to Rome that it was impossible to remove Syriac and introduce Latin among the Thomas Christians: “è impossibile, havendola [lingua Caldea] loro sempre usata, et è tanta l’affettione che portano, che questa seria causa di gran rumori tra di loro, et si esporria à pericolo evidenti da perderli tutti”. See Rome. Archivum Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, *Miscellanea Diverse*, vol. 21, f. 25.

17 Mechery, *Testing Ground for Jesuit Accommodation in Early Modern India*, 216–23.

18 Rome. Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu [hereafter ARSI], Goa. 15, f. 23.

19 Mechery, *De Syrorum orientalium erroribus*, 8.

things and look[s] forward to obtaining what we are denied".<sup>20</sup> The method of *accommodatio* primarily aimed at working at the level of long-standing customs and traditions, which made its methodological applicability universally possible irrespective of the nature of the potential converts, whether they were Christians or non-Christians. From this methodological perspective derived the popular and classical definition of *accommodatio* among missionaries: "entering through their door and then coming out through ours".<sup>21</sup>

After his episcopal consecration in 1601, held in Goa on the Memorial Day of St. Cyril of Alexandria (famed as having theologically defeated the 'Nestorians', celebrated on 28 January),<sup>22</sup> Ros began to govern Angamaly, the ecclesiastical See of the Thomas Christians, as their first Latin bishop. Soon afterwards, Ros witnessed a growing opposition led by a group among the Thomas Christians against the surreptitious reduction of their ancient See into a suffragan diocese of the primatial Latin see of Goa governed at the time by Archbishop Aleixo de Menezes OSA (r. 1595–1612), the organizer of the Synod of Diamper (1599).<sup>23</sup> Ros perceived that the dissident group wanted to restore Chaldean jurisdiction to the See of Angamaly – where that jurisdiction had been forcibly severed in favour of the Latin one – to which he responded by identifying the opponents' behaviour with a Scriptural passage describing the dormant tendency in them to return to the "garlic and onions of Egypt".<sup>24</sup> By this he was referring to the Chaldean vestiges of the prior jurisdictional affiliation that he considered unacceptable in early modern Malabar.

20 Here Ros cited the often-quoted words of Publius Ovidius Naso (43 BC–17 or 18 AD), Roman poet, from his *Amores*, III, 4, 17; "Nitimur in vetitum semper, cupimusque negata" in ARSI, *Goa*, 17, f. 249. For understanding the specific context to which Ros applied this aphoristic verse from Ovidius, see Mecherry, *Testing Ground for Jesuit Accommodation in Early Modern India*, 312.

21 Ignatius of Loyola's notable instructions given to the Jesuit papal legates to Ireland, Salmeron and Broët, alluded to the mission praxis of *accommodatio*. See Ignatius of Loyola, *Letters of St. Ignatius of Loyola*, 51–52.

22 For the polemical implications behind the choice of this day for the consecration of Ros, see Mecherry, ed., *De Syrorum orientalium erroribus*, viii–xii.

23 Archbishop Menezes mostly acted in his own interest during his Malabar mission held in 1599, see Mecherry, "Archbishop Aleixo de Menezes OSA", 8–34. Menezes took the initiative to suppress the metropolitan status of Angamaly, the most ancient Church in India, primarily with a view to safeguarding his own primacy in the Orient. For a critical evaluation of this question analysed against the backdrop of archival sources, see Mecherry, *Testing Ground for Jesuit Accommodation in Early Modern India*, 236–37.

24 ARSI, *Goa*, 15, f. 95. For the scriptural reference to the "garlic and onions of Egypt." Cf. Numbers 11:5.

Such a view was already reflected in Ros's earlier theological treatises that aimed at abolishing the Chaldean/East Syrian ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the Malabar Church. In addition, the Synod of Diamper had practically abolished this age-old jurisdiction in India. However, within this adversarial approach towards the East Syrians in general, Ros did advocate retaining traditions that did not pertain to jurisdictional matters and essentials of faith according to the principle of *accommodatio*. He set out an unprecedented and clear-cut difference between the role of long-standing ecclesial traditions and customs, which Ros considered acceptable, and jurisdictional and religious vestiges of a 'Nestorian' past, which Ros and his contemporaries viewed as completely intolerable to the Catholic Church's aims for the region, especially in its newly forged ecclesiastical setting of early modern India. In its applied form, one can trace the quite original and subtle differentiation that Ros identified between essentials and nonessentials of mission in the works both of Ros himself and of Ros's fellow Jesuit promoters of *accommodatio*; for example, Roberto de Nobili SJ similarly made a clear distinction between civil rites and religion in his *accommodatio* among the Brahmins of Madurai.<sup>25</sup>

Enlisting the biblical analogy reminiscent of the liberating mission of Moses and the murmuring Israelites,<sup>26</sup> Ros depicted the end of the Chaldean jurisdiction over the Thomas Christians as their freedom from the slavery of the 'Babylonian Church',<sup>27</sup> which had been tainted, in his eye, by the heresy of 'Nestorianism'. Ros viewed the efforts of the small group among the Thomas Christians to restore the Chaldean jurisdiction over their Church as the plight of the murmuring Israelites who wanted to return, even after their miraculous escape, to the secure pleasures they enjoyed during their slavery in Egypt.

25 Roberto de Nobili, \* IX.1577 Rome (Italy), SJ.1596 Naples, +16.I.1656 Madras (Tamil Nadu, India) (DHCJ II, 1059). On the crucial importance of the need of distinguishing the concepts like Church, rite, customs and traditions, see Nedungatt, "Forward" (unpaged, in Thazhath, *The Quest for Identity*). According to Ros, the Church of St. Thomas in Malabar and the Church of the "Nestorians" in Mesopotamia were two different realities, without excluding the possibility of sharing some common elements of these two Churches at the level of customs. For a comparative understanding of the mission approaches of Ros and Nobili that primarily worked at the level of customs and traditions, see Chapter 5 of Mecherry, *Testing Ground for Jesuit Accommodation in Early Modern India*, 351–437.

26 Cf. Numbers 11:5.

27 For a subtle and underlying motive behind the upright condemnation of the 'Babylonian' Church on the part of the early modern Jesuits, see Mecherry, *Testing Ground for Jesuit Accommodation in Early Modern India*, xxviii–xxix.

In response, Ros styled himself the new Moses in Malabar destined to guide the temporarily disturbed Thomas Christians to a promised future. By contrast, according to the protesters in Angamaly, the newly imposed Latin hierarchy over the Thomas Christians was their 'desert experience' devoid of their Chaldean bishops, the traditional metropolitan heads of their Church in India. For his part, Ros viewed the protesters in Angamaly as disobedient schismatics who troubled their leader for liberating them from serving the Chaldeans during their 'Babylonian captivity'. Ros's principles of *accommodatio* never tolerated the East Syrian jurisdiction over the Malabar Church, although at the peak of the conflicts, in 1597 and in 1609, he had recommended to bring to the Malabar Church a Chaldean or Maronite archbishop trained in Rome, with a view to placating the Thomas Christians.<sup>28</sup>

In 1611, Ros was faced with a further serious threat to the Jesuit mission among the Thomas Christians, this time apparently from the non-Jesuit missionary bishops of Malacca, Mylapore and Cochin. In his capacity as archbishop of Angamaly-Cranganore, Ros wrote to the superior general in Rome justifying the mission praxis of *accommodatio*. He argued that the praxis required a deep involvement in the languages and customs of the mission territories on the part of the missionaries. On this occasion he depicted *accommodatio* as an exclusive patrimony of the Jesuits, and as a necessary practice on account of the particular characteristics of the Christians to whom they were ministering in India. Specifically, he identified the Malabar Church within the broad group of the Oriental Churches, which, according to his judgement commonly shared a sort of "disturbed disposition".<sup>29</sup> In other words, in Ros's view, the Jesuit *accommodatio* and its *modo soave* aimed at taming an unyielding and disturbed ground of mission that was already Christian, with a view to 'reducing' them to 'correct' doctrine and jurisdiction through retaining their own cultural, ecclesial and social garb and trimmings.<sup>30</sup> In his approach towards the mission among the Thomas Christians, Ros's Chalcedonian and scholastic grounding as a Latin missionary thus continued to play a crucial role in maintaining a defensive approach

28 ARSI, Goa. 14, f. 357<sup>v</sup>. In 1609, Ros had asked the Jesuit General to send a few Maronite Jesuits to the Malabar Church. ARSI, Goa. 16, f. 228.

29 ARSI, Goa. 17, f. 62<sup>v</sup>.

30 The term *reduce*, etymologically from the Latin roots *re* ("back") + *dūcō* ("lead") was employed by the Jesuits in Malabar in the sense of "leading/bringing back (the potential converts) to the Catholic fold".

towards the Oriental Churches in general, especially the Church of the East, which enjoyed its long-standing jurisdiction over the Church in India.

While Ros limited his judgement to the case of the Oriental Churches in particular, Francisco de Sousa, an eighteenth-century Jesuit historian writing in support of the Jesuit praxis of *accommodatio* in the Malabar Church, extended this judgement over the oriental nations in general. He wrote: "These oriental nations are inordinately passionate about their customs. The efforts to impose our [customs] on these nations as if they are the commandments of God or as the precepts of the Church is tantamount to making the yoke of the Gospel very heavy to them and to adding difficulties in the conversion of the pagans".<sup>31</sup> Two centuries prior, Bishop Ros had sensed this problem and wrote about its possible solution to the Jesuit curia in Rome. In his letter, he was attempting to convince his superiors that the decrees of the Synod of Diamper should not reach the pope's hand:

[I]f His Holiness confirmed the above-said synod he would be placing all these Christians in a state of mortal sin, as they would not keep it; if His Holiness approved, I say, what has to do with practices (*costumbres*) in such a way as to make a law[?] As great evils would follow from such procedure, I request Your Paternity for the love of our Lord, on receiving this information, to use your influence in the court of Rome so that this step, ruinous to souls, may be averted and let the Holy Father be informed of it; let not these Christians say that we have duped them.<sup>32</sup>

This letter illustrates clearly Ros's position: he accepted the Diamperitan decrees that dealt with the Catholic Faith (Session III) and the sacraments of the Church, but he openly rejected the exaggerated stipulations laid down by the synod on the regional customs (*costumbres*) of the Thomas Christians. At the same time, in the development of Session III of the Synod of Diamper, Ros's pro-Chalcedonian positions on the errors of the 'Nestorians' played a central role.

As we have noted, on his arrival in India in 1584, Ros began his mission deeply equipped with the theological matrix of the Council of Trent (1545–63); he subsequently went to Malabar in 1585 armed with Jesuit Visitor Alessandro Valignano's prejudicial stances

31 Francisco de Sousa, *Oriente Conquistado*, vol. 2, 72 (trans. mine).

32 ARSI, Goa. 15, ff. 155–55v. (trans. Thaliath, *The Synod of Diamper*, 130–31).

against the East Syrians and the Oriental Churches in general.<sup>33</sup> At the very start of his Indian mission, Ros thus found himself as a polemicist in the making. During his crucial sojourn that lasted for a year (from December 1584 to December 1585) in the Jesuit professed house in Goa, away from the Malabar Church, he was reported to have sufficiently mastered Syriac, the liturgical language of the East Syrians and the Thomas Christians, with “exceptional calibre and remarkable application and inquisitiveness” and “without the help of a teacher”.<sup>34</sup> During Mar Abraham’s stay in Goa from the first week of April 1585 as an invited participant to the third provincial council scheduled for June that year, Ros was able to read, albeit with a Chalcedonian theological lens, and translate into Latin an important East Syrian theological treatise on Incarnation owned by Mar Abraham and reportedly written by Bar Kaldun Yohanan.<sup>35</sup>

As expected of Ros, then, his translation and interpretation of the East Syrian texts and theological terms exclusively relied on the Chalcedonian formula of the dogma of Incarnation, as explicitly demonstrated by his later treatises on the errors of the ‘East Syrians’ and the ‘Nestorians’. This crucial academic exercise undertaken by the young Ros represented the first phase of his formation as a polemicist. Making use of his newly acquired skill in Syriac, he polemically identified the reportedly incongruous but strategic theological conclusions and textual testimonies upheld by the ‘Nestorian’ Church, with a view to employing them specifically against Metropolitan Mar Abraham. The metropolitan was generally looked down on by the Portuguese missionaries as a dispensable leader of the age-old East Syrian jurisdiction over the Malabar Church.<sup>36</sup> Yet there was an obstacle to be overcome first: earlier, Pope Pius IV (r. 1559–65) and the Chaldean patriarch Audishu IV Yukhannan (r. 1555–70), had sent Mar Abraham to India in 1565, canonically naming him the metropolitan of Angamaly. From the Roman perspective, therefore, Mar Abraham was a legitimate leader of the Church there. Thus, in order to legitimately claim Portuguese jurisdiction over the Thomas

33 Alessandro Valignano, \* 7.II.1539 Chieti (Italy), SJ 29.V.1566 Rome, † 20.I.1606 Macao (China) (DHCJ IV, 3877).

34 *D.L.*, vol. XV, 206–07 (trans. mine).

35 Bar Kaldun Yohanan (sec. X). Ros in his polemical treatises often referred to the work of Kaldun, who is thought to have been influenced by the writings of Evagrius of Pontus (345 AD–99 AD) who is condemned as an Origenist.

36 For the political interests behind the Portuguese rejection of Mar Abraham’s ecclesiastical jurisdiction in India, see Mecherry, ed., *De Syrorum orientalium erroribus*, 4–7.

Christians, as accorded and understood by the rights enjoyed by the Portuguese Padroado, it was necessary first for the missionaries to reverse the prior arrangement and orchestrate that “the Supreme Pontiff [in Rome] deprive [Mar Abraham] of his ecclesiastical position [as the Metropolitan of Angamaly] and the See of the archbishop”.<sup>37</sup>

Given this complex circumstance created by two possible and legitimate jurisdictions (Roman-Chaldean and Padroado) over the Malabar Church, the Portuguese project of ousting Mar Abraham from his role and from India needed a well-grounded reason. A textual approach seemed to be the most effective way: to achieve the desired ends, it was deemed expedient to identify Mar Abraham as a representative in India of the same line of the alleged heresiarchs of ‘Nestorianism’, depicting him in turn as a disguised promoter (‘lupus’) of heresy in the Church of the Thomas Christians (‘oves’).<sup>38</sup> This strategic position constitutes the general context of the Rosian treatise, *On the Errors of the East Syrians* (referring here to those Christians in Mesopotamia and their representative leaders who had settled in East India).

### **Two Rosian Treatises: *De Syrorum orientalium erroribus* (1586) and *De erroribus Nestorianorum* (1587)**

Until recently, scholars of the field had maintained that Ros had written only one Latin-Syriac treatise on the question of the heresy allegedly upheld by the Church of the East. The second treatise, *De erroribus Nestorianorum qui in hac India orientali versantur*, was commissioned by Ros’s regional superiors; it was composed and completed by Ros in haste, in 1587, and sent to Europe in January 1588. Jean Castets SJ (1858–1936), a missionary in South India, discovered a copy of it and Irénée Hausherr SJ (1881–1978), a specialist in Greek patristic and monastic spirituality and a professor at the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome, edited and published the text with essential annotations, in 1928.<sup>39</sup>

37 These are Ros’s words from his *De erroribus Nestorianorum*, sent to Europe in 1588. ARSI, *Goa*. 50, 214f.

38 ARSI, *Goa*. 50, 214f. Ros defined the Malabar Church and the Thomas Christians as “the faithful of St. Thomas”, “the sheep”, “the Church of St. Thomas”, and “the witnesses against the wolf”. See Mecherry, ed., *De Syrorum orientalium erroribus*, 19.

39 Francisco Roz, “De Erroribus Nestorianorum”, 1–35 [hereafter *H*]. For the original manuscript, see ARSI, *Goa*. 50, 198f–214f [hereafter *G*]. The title in English is *On the errors of the Nestorians who dwell in this Oriental India*.

However, a set of sixteenth-century manuscript folios recently surfaced at ARSI in the *Fondo Tacchi Venturi*. After a careful identification process, the manuscript was found to be an earlier work on the same theme, but with some notable differences. Since its composition four hundred and thirty-four years ago, this version of the Latin-Syriac treatise, entitled *De Syrorum orientalium erroribus* (= *On the errors of the East Syrians*) has finally been confirmed as having been written by Ros, and that it was completed by him and sent to Rome in 1586.<sup>40</sup>

Unlike his second treatise sent in 1588, Ros's earlier treatise on the reported errors of the East Syrians did not entirely fulfil its immediate polemical purpose of ousting Mar Abraham from India. However, *De Syrorum orientalium erroribus* clearly reflected Ros's academic enterprise and difficulties as a fresh learner of Syriac to understand the complex system of the East Syrian theological matrix and its terminology. Yet in the title of the treatise, he introduced the faithful of the Church of the East and its representative leaders living in India as 'East Syrians' in today's terminology and not as 'Nestorians', as with the second treatise. A relatively open approach in the earlier work towards understanding a theological tradition unfamiliar to him apparently urged Ros to explore different possibilities of meanings in Latin that could be ascribed to crucial theological terms employed in his Syriac sources found in India. At the same time, *De Syrorum orientalium erroribus* clearly reflected his intensive year of preparation at Goa in 1584–85. Notwithstanding his attempt in this earlier treatise to employ variant possibilities of meanings attributable to the crucial East Syrian theological terms, Ros generally read the dogmatic positions and sources of the Church of the East through a Chalcedonian lens, of course being faithful to the immediate polemical motive behind the treatise, as expected of him by his religious superiors.

40 This newly identified document is catalogued as ARSI, *Fondo Tacchi Venturi*, *Serie Miscellanea, Sottoserie Collectio Historica*, b. 26 fasc. 27, ff. 10<sup>r</sup>–19<sup>v</sup> [hereafter T]. My sincere thanks are due to Brian Mac Cuarta SJ, the former Academic Director of ARSI, who provided me with the digital copies of the newly-discovered document in the process of its identification and permission on the part of the Society of Jesus to publish it for the first time since it was composed in the sixteenth century. Thanks also to ARSI Archivist Sergio Palagiano who played an important role in recovering this historically relevant document. For the first critical edition and summary of this original manuscript along with a detailed contextual setting presented as a historiographical critique, see Mecherry, ed., *De Syrorum orientalium erroribus*. I am grateful to IHSI Publications Editor Camilla Russell for the careful editing work that has gone into the study's publication here.

By contrast, *De erroribus Nestorianorum*, sent to Rome two years later in 1588, did not allow room for wider possibilities in interpreting the theological positions held by the East Syrians, with respect to those taught in the West. Specifically, the treatise does not countenance interpretations of theological terminology traditionally employed by the East Syrians to explain the incarnational Union of the divine and human natures in the Second Person, the Son.<sup>41</sup> Accordingly, while *paršōpā* is consistently rendered as *person* (*and figure*) in the first treatise of 1586, that is, in its explicit sense, the second treatise ascribed a definite and theologically strategic meaning to *paršōpā*, that is, *representation*.<sup>42</sup> The strategic attribution of meanings in the second treatise polemically functioned according to the Chalcedonian reinterpretation of the Syriac term *qnōmā* as *person* (*qnōmā* = *persons*, divine suppositum and human suppositum), in turn opening the possibility of blaming the ‘Nestorians’ for dividing Christ into two persons.<sup>43</sup> Rosian treatises rendered the word *qnōmā* in Latin as *suppositum* and *hypostasis* with the same polemical rationale explained above.<sup>44</sup>

Another notable feature of the earlier treatise is its title, *On the Errors of the East Syrians*, in which Ros employed the term *East Syrians* (conspicuously avoiding ‘Nestorians’): interestingly, this is today’s terminology employed to represent the ecclesial families of the Church of the East and the Chaldean Church, and in hindsight an insightful choice on the part of Ros. Instead, the second treatise, in its title strategically defined the Chaldeans – despite having united with Rome in 1553 – pejoratively as “*the Nestorians who dwell in this Oriental India*”. By means of this calculated shift in rendering the title of the second treatise, Ros wanted to place the Chaldean Catholics, represented in India by Mar Abraham of Angamaly, in the same line of the ‘Nestorians’, in terms of their allegedly shared theological identity, which for Ros was heretical.

41 For a compact explanation of the underlying theological conflicts, see Weinandy, “The Doctrinal Significance of the Councils of Nicaea, Ephesus and Chalcedon”, 549–67, especially the pages 556–66.

42 For an exposition of the translation strategies employed by Ros in his polemical treatises, see Chapter 2 of Mechery, ed., *De Syrorum orientalium erroribus*, 29–54. For understanding the general background of the Syriac terminological traditions in reference to the Western Church, see Chediath, “The Three Crucial Terms in Syriac Theology”, 59–65; Brock, “The ‘Nestorian’ Church”, 26–28; Dickens, “PRO: Nestorius did not intend to argue that Christ had a dual nature”, 145–62.

43 See text 10 of the edited document.

44 It is worth noting that the East Syrians attributed wide range of meanings to the theological terms like *qnōmā* (but generally understood as the Syriac equivalent to *hypostasis*) and *paršōpā* (Syriac equivalent to Greek *prosopon*).

The allegations raised in the Rosian treatises were replicated in 1594 in the *Information about the Bishop [Mar Abraham] of the Serra*, a document redacted by Ros's superiors in India with a view to turning Mar Abraham over to an inquisitorial inquiry.<sup>45</sup> Again, a secret judicial and preliminary inquiry held in Malabar (1596) under the aegis of the Inquisition of Goa into the faith and life of Mar Abraham brought together in the form of thirty interrogatories the crucial allegations found in the Rosian treatises against Mar Abraham and the East Syrians.<sup>46</sup>

Subsequently, despite the Rosian treatises having lost their immediate contextual relevance in India after the death of Mar Abraham in 1597, the third Session of the Synod of Diamper (1599) – concerning true Faith – appropriated the theological and polemical content of both works, updating their content by avoiding the personal references made in the texts to the late Mar Abraham. The third Session condemned the reported 'Nestorian' precepts in general and outlined how they must be replaced with Catholic dogma.<sup>47</sup> Whatever Ros's personal views and opinions regarding missionary approaches stated in his correspondence and writings sent before and after the synod of 1599, his earlier treatises from the 1580s were influential sources in discrediting the theological foundations of Mar Abraham and the East Syrians in general and in ending the Chal-dean jurisdiction in India.

### **Concluding Comments about the *De Syrorum orientalium erroribus* (1586)**

In approaching the earlier of Ros's two known versions of polemical treatises, it is important to note that most of his theological positions articulated in 1586 clearly reflect his lack of adequate formation in the basic eastern way of presenting theological formulations, a field now being extensively explored by scholars in the field today.

45 The report redacted in 1594 is generally attributed to Ros. See Ros, "Information about Mar Abraham", 283–94; for the edited and annotated Portuguese original, *D.I.*, XVI, 1029–39. For a critical analysis of this report in its contextual setting, see Mecherry, *Testing Ground for Jesuit Accommodation in Early Modern India*, 140–45.

46 For the original document, Lisbon. ANNT, *Tribunal do Santo Ofício, Inquisição de Lisboa, proc. 4941*, ff. 28<sup>r</sup>–37<sup>r</sup>; for its contextual setting, Mecherry, *Testing Ground for Jesuit Accommodation in Early Modern India*, 150–55, and for a summary of the interrogatories, see Mecherry, ed. *De Syrorum orientalium erroribus*, 102–09.

47 The elaborate project of the Synod of Diamper [hereafter *S.D.*] consisted of nine elaborate sessions divided into several decrees. See Hough, ed., "A Diocesan Synod of the Church" (reproduced from the edition of Geddes, *The History of the Church of Malabar*, 511–683). For the Session III on the Catholic Faith presented against the backdrop of the 'Nestorian' question, see 525–57.

Against the backdrop of this contextual setting, below this introductory essay is the text of the manuscript, which has been translated into English for the first time. This recently-identified earlier version of Ros's two known Latin-Syriac works on the errors of the East Syrians, is presented here under four headings. The translation does not reproduce the Syriac texts of the manuscript, since of relevance here is the translation of their Latin renditions provided by Ros for understanding the features of the Rosian hermeneutics concerning the 'Nestorian' sources.<sup>48</sup> The information given within square brackets is not in the original manuscript, and it is placed as part of the present translation of the work, to facilitate reading. It is to be noted that an uncertain number of folios are missing at the end of the original manuscript, although this limitation does not affect the structure of the entire treatise. The aim of presenting here the translation of this newly identified treatise is to offer a key for understanding Ros, his works, and his contexts: the manuscript shows how an early modern Latin missionary in India polemically approached the question of 'Nestorianism', textually represented in the Syriac books produced in the Church of the East and found in sixteenth century Malabar.

### Summary

This documentary exposition features a recently uncovered and identified treatise from the early modern period. Translated into English here in full for the first time, the work was written in Latin and Syriac by Francisco Ros SJ with the title, *De Syrorum orientalium erroribus*. Principally of a theological nature, the manuscript is preserved at ARSI under *Fondo Tacchi Venturi*. Written and dispatched from India in 1586 by the Catalonian missionary from the Jesuit province of Aragón, the work and its author represent a crucial transitional juncture in the history of Latin Catholic mission, at the time directly managed under the aegis of Iberian monarchies. In an age of Catholic Reformation and the dogmatic priorities nourished by the Council of Trent, in general missionaries from the Latin West did not promote awareness of the potential for legitimate coexistence between different rites and theological expressions within the Catholic Church. In the Indian context, this meant that Latin missionaries focused on eradicating the 'er-

48 For the edited document in its entirety with essential annotations, see Mecherry, ed. *De Syrorum orientalium erroribus*, 55–93, and for the internal features and translation strategies employed by Ros, see 21–54.

rors' of the Chaldean Church in the early modern Malabar Christianity of the Thomas Christians. They did this with a thrust for dogmatic, linguistic, liturgical, hierarchical and sacramental purge and uniformity, operating primarily in the face of the jurisdictional upper hand held in India by the East Syrian representative leaders of local Christians. A long-standing definition given by the Latin West to the question of classical 'Nestorianism' played a major role in this missionary endeavour. This study and the translation of the original document outline the underlying dynamics of these conflicts against a wider backdrop of the history of dogma and of the linguistic and cultural sensibilities of different Churches, without losing sight of the political motives that worked behind the scenes.

### Sommario

Questo contributo presenta un trattato della prima età moderna soltanto recentemente scoperto e identificato. Tradotto qui interamente per la prima volta in inglese, il *De Syrorum orientalium erroribus* è stato scritto in latino e siriano da Francisco Ros SJ. Il manoscritto è conservato presso l'ARSI nel *Fondo Tacchi Venturi*, e ha natura eminentemente teologica. Il missionario catalano, originario della provincia gesuita di Aragona, lo scrisse in India nel 1586. L'opera e il suo autore rappresentano un momento cruciale di transizione nella storia della missione cattolica latina, all'epoca sotto l'egida delle monarchie iberiche. Durante la Riforma cattolica e con le priorità dogmatiche proclamate dal Concilio di Trento, i missionari dell'Occidente latino non erano soliti sostenere la legittimità della convivenza tra i diversi riti e le espressioni teologiche all'interno della Chiesa cattolica. Ciò faceva sì che i missionari latini, nel contesto indiano, si concentrasero sull'eliminazione degli "errori" della Chiesa caldea nel cristianesimo malabarico dei cristiani di S. Tommaso. Questa spinta all'epurazione e all'uniformità dogmatica, linguistica, liturgica, gerarchica e sacramentale, poteva avere luogo grazie alla preminenza giurisdizionale goduta in India dai capi rappresentativi e siro-orientali dei cristiani locali. In questo sforzo missionario ha svolto un ruolo importante la definizione di lunga durata fornita dall'Occidente latino alla questione del "nestorianesimo" classico. Il presente saggio e la traduzione del trattato di Ros delineano le dinamiche di questi conflitti in uno sfondo più ampio della storia del dogma e delle sensibilità linguistiche e culturali delle diverse Chiese, senza perdere di vista le motivazioni politiche ad esse sempre legate.

## IHS

## On the Errors of the East Syrians

**[A. Preamble to the treatise]<sup>49</sup>**

The Saint Thomas Christians who dwell in Oriental India perpetually use Syriac in matters concerning divine worship. Since the Syrians have been the pastors here and they have drunk in their zeal the destructive heresy, the great poison, they have lost their pristine faith<sup>50</sup> in such a way and they have ended in unbelievable wreck in spiritual matters and divine worship. Nevertheless, it brought about by divine mercy in this manner that they have finally recovered their senses and subjected themselves to the Supreme Pontiff.<sup>51</sup> Despite this, they are not so good in the knowledge of divine matters. From this came forth their own ignorance, and their pastor's negligence,<sup>52</sup> and even dissembling souls, just as until now their books keep on the old heresies and indeed, they have held them back entirely unimpaired and chant them publicly. Moreover, it led to the corruption of faith and even up to the corruption of the sacred scriptures.<sup>53</sup> It is said that when the Council of Chalcedon<sup>54</sup> was celebrated, and in it, Nestorius had taken away the verses from the first *Letter of John*, which were openly tearing down his heresies.<sup>55</sup> They are the following:

49 The treatise begins on *T. f. 10*°.

50 Ros here strategically maintains that the Thomas Christians, the faithful of the Church of St. Thomas, were led astray by the errant East Syrian prelates.

51 Ros does not specify here whether he is speaking about the Catholic profession of the Chaldean patriarchate separated from the traditional Church of the East in 1553. From the very beginning of the Catholic communion of the Chaldeans, the patriarchs of the new Church successfully claimed direct ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the Malabar Church. The Thomas Christians and their metropolitan, Mar Abraham, officially expressed their allegiance to the Roman Church for the first time in the first Synod of Angamaly (1583) organized by the Jesuit missionaries. In that synod Mar Abraham accepted some of the Catholic traditions and the canons of the Council of Trent. See *D.I.*, XIII, 499. For the major decisions made in the synod of 1583, see Mecherry, *Testing Ground for Jesuit Accommodation in Early Modern India*, 77. Ros reached India a year after the first Synod of Angamaly.

52 By mentioning the negligence of the Chaldean prelate, Ros is aiming at portraying Mar Abraham as the culpable person for the alleged degradation of the Malabar Church.

53 The preamble in *T* blames the Syrian bishops in general without specifically mentioning the name of Mar Abraham for allegedly leading the Malabar Church to a deplorable state. This generalized approach is one of the features of *T*.

54 Chalcedon [sic] (pro.) Ephesus.

55 The *S.D.* held the view that the 'Nestorians' rejected 1 John on the assumption that its author was not the Apostle John. See *S.D.* Sess. III, dec. 14.

**[B. Five scriptural passages falsified in a Nestorian sense]**

[Text 1]: That is: [1 John 4:3 of L.V:]<sup>56</sup> *Every spirit which dissolves*<sup>57</sup> *Jesus is not the one from God, but he is Antichrist.* And in its place, these are substituted, and it is available from the Syriac version:

[follows P version in Syriac]<sup>58</sup>

[1 John 4:3: Latin Translation of P:] That is: *And every spirit who confesses not that Jesus has come in the flesh, is not from God.*

[Commentary:] In addition, the Nestorian sects consider that attributing death to God is a great scandal. And also, in line with this position, they were able to falsify these [verses], as their scriptures demonstrate [f. 10<sup>v</sup>]. For indeed, it is said in the *Letter of John* mentioned above:

[Text 2: I John 3:16 of L.V:] *In this we know God's love, because he has laid down his life for us.* In Syriac, we in fact read in this way:

[follows P version in Syriac]

[I John 3:16: Latin Translation of P:] That is: *In this we know his love for us, that he gave up his life for our sake.*

[Commentary:] Behold, in the place of *God* they put *his*, and they speak of the death of Christ, but not of God. Indeed, they hold this view and say that it cannot be spoken of the death of *God* but [only] of *Christ*.<sup>59</sup> And in this way, in the *Acts of the Apostles* we read:

[Text 3: Acts 20:28 of L.V:] *Take heed therefore to yourselves and to the whole flock, over which the Holy Spirit has placed you as bishops to rule the Church of God, which he has purchased with his blood.* In Syriac it is written as follows:

[follows P version in Syriac]

[Acts 20: 28: Latin Translation of P:] That is: *Keep watch over yourselves and over all the flock over which the Holy Spirit has placed you as bishops to shepherd the Church of Christ which he gained by his own blood.*

[Commentary:] Thus, they place *Christ* in the place of *God*. Moreover, for them *Christ* means two supposita:<sup>60</sup> one is divine, the Word of God, and the other is human, Jesus and Emmanuel, and of the human they say that it is the temple of the Word of God, and who is

56 In *T*, Ros quotes first from *Latin Vulgate* [hereafter L.V.] and then from the *Syriac Peshitta* [hereafter P].

57 "Solvit Iesum" (*T*. f. 10<sup>v</sup>).

58 The Syriac sources cited by Ros are excluded from this translation.

59 Regarding the respective scriptural verse, *S.D* blamed the 'Nestorians' for replacing *God* with *Christ* and for denying that "God to have died for us" (*S.D*. Sess. III, dec. 3).

60 Ros translates the Syriac term *qnōmē* as *supposita* but understands the term as *persons* in Chalcedonian sense.

worshipped with God, and the Son is not *kyānāyt* by nature,<sup>61</sup> but *b-ṭaybūtāh* by grace and love.<sup>62</sup> [f. 11<sup>r</sup>] In this regard, among us, we read of Christ in Paul's *Letter to the Philippines*:

[Text 4: Phil 2: 6 of L.V.]: *did not consider it robbery to be equal with God.*

The same [verse] they read in this way:

[follows P version in Syriac]

[Phil 2: 6: Latin Translation of P:]

That is: *did not deem it robbery that he was similar to God.*

[Commentary:] I really do not know in which sense the interpreter translates *phmā* as *equal* in the Syriac translation, because the word *phm* does not mean *equal* or *to be equal* but *to compare* and *to be similar*.<sup>63</sup> However, the word *šwā* means *to be equal* and the interpreter mentioned above employs the same in the Gospel of John.<sup>64</sup> Strictly speaking, therefore, *phmā* means *similar*, not *equal*.<sup>65</sup> The *Letter to the Hebrews* also most clearly and explicitly mentions of the two supposita, as if they want of Paul to confirm it. In fact, we read there:

[Text 5: Heb 2: 9 (L.V.):] *But we see Jesus, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour, that, through the grace of God he might taste death for all.* The families of the Syrian Nestorians (with whose way we are occupied with) read as follows:

[follows P version in Syriac]

[Heb 2:9: Latin Translation of P:] That is: *We see Jesus himself crowned with glory and honour because of the death he suffered; for he tasted death for everyone except God.*<sup>66</sup>

[Commentary:] The one who may not see something Nestorian in the words of Paul himself have pleased to construct their opinion or rather heresy.

### [C. Theological formulas tainted with Nestorianism] [f. 11<sup>v</sup>]

And they seem to assert that there are two sons, as held by the heresies mentioned above: two are the supposita, Word and Jesus united in one person. Moreover, they maintain that all the actions of Christ are to be of the one person and life of Christ, in whom are united the human and divine supposita by his will and power, just as explicitly stated by the doctor of the heretics in his treatise on the

61 *Kyānāyt* rendered in Syriac.

62 *b-ṭaybūtāh* rendered in Syriac.

63 *phmā* and *phm* are rendered in Syriac.

64 John 5:18. *Šwā* rendered in Syriac.

65 The word *phmā* could mean also *equal*, *similar*, *like* etc. See Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*, 441.

66 For an exposition of the problem represented in this verse, see Brock, "Hebrews 2:9B in Syriac Tradition", 236–44.

Incarnation of the Word,<sup>67</sup> and it will be exposed below. I have indeed read and understood the entire book, from which I have selected the passages that I shall write below. And may the followers of the Roman Church know that the Syrians, the Nestorian sects, have not fully submitted to the Catholic faith.<sup>68</sup> Instead, as we hear, if it be genuine that their pastors truly understand the faith of the Roman Church which they professed, why did they not at all judge the heresies, their pest, which is to be abolished from the books of the Church? At the same time, it is true that none of these [in Malabar], who are called the Christians of St. Thomas, may want to mention the heretics directly, Nestorius and the rest. Until now, nevertheless, the vestiges of those pestilent doctrine are persisting in their books. I hold my tongue of those books which are from Babylon and of Simon Sulaqa, who is their head and about whom I know nothing of certain.<sup>69</sup> I merely affirm that they may have the same books and the same doctors who are not at all esteemed according to the norms of the Catholic faith. Adhering to the former errors is obviously gross ignorance whether it is by affection or by understanding. I write below a few things that I could select from their books. [f. 12<sup>r</sup>] From the writing of certain authors:

[Text 6: Syriac text and Latin translation:]<sup>70</sup> [f. 12<sup>v</sup>]

That is: *Which Apostle said that God died? No one can perfectly demonstrate this. For this reason, we do not affirm that the Blessed Mary gave birth to God, lest the Jews and the pagans say that if she gave birth to God, then God died also; for one who is born, dies. But we assert that she gave birth to Christ, who is God and died in the body but lives in the spirit. Thus, too, the angel at the time of the Annunciation, accosted her: Behold, you shall conceive and bring forth a son, and you shall name him Jesus.<sup>71</sup> And John says:<sup>72</sup> there was a feast, in Cana of Galilee, and the Mother of Jesus was there. He does not say: the Mother of God was found there. Paul*

67 Ros implies the treatise on Incarnation by Bar Kaldun Yohanan that he read and translated while he was in Goa in 1585.

68 The treatise here explicitly speaks about the Catholic profession of the Chaldeans held in 1553. Although the title of the treatise calls the Chaldeans *East Syrians*, Ros makes a subtle shift here in the definition of the Chaldeans as *the Syrians, the Nestorian sects*.

69 Ros mistakenly thinks that Simon (Shimun VIII) Yohannan Sulaqa (d. 1555) was the patriarch of the Chaldean Church. In fact, Shimun IX Denkha (r. 1580–1600) was the ruling Chaldean patriarch in 1586, when Ros completed his first treatise.

70 The 20<sup>th</sup> (penultimate) line of the Syriac text begins on f. 12<sup>v</sup>.

71 Lk 1:31

72 Jn 2:1

also says that God sent His Son, born of a woman;<sup>73</sup> he does not say that God sent God. For God did not send His Word, because the suppositum [qnōmā] of the Word is not sent, and therefore, he is equal to the Father in essence [usiā], and fills heaven and earth. On account of these reasons, we see none of the holy Apostles who has called the Virgin, the Mother of God. We too do not challenge this apostolic position by any means.<sup>74</sup>

[Commentary:] In the writing by a certain person, you find this written after the authority of the sacred scripture, with which it is perceived to argue that the suppositum of Jesus is human, not the real suppositum of the Word of God; in Christ the two [supposita] are indeed mingled, the one, suppositum of man, and the other, of the true Word of God. On the alleged authority of the scriptures, they hold the view that the suppositum of Jesus is human and not the suppositum of the Word of God. Here and [f. 13<sup>v</sup>] in a certain hymn of the first Sunday of Advent, it has the following [verses]:

[Text 7: Syriac text and Latin translation:]

That is: *Without relationship, Mary brought forth Emmanuel, the Son of God, and from her the Holy Spirit formed a body united, as it is written, in such a way that it might become the dwelling place and adorable temple for the splendour of the Father in one Filiation. From the moment of his admirable conception, he united it (body) with himself in one honour. And again: In the one person [paršōpā] of one Filiation, the natures[kyānē] are preserved in their supposita [qnōmē].*

[Commentary:] However, they address the one person of Filiation [as if] of a certain accidental matter just as expressly exposed from the treatise of a certain John<sup>75</sup> from whom the Nestorians draw on their opinion on the Union of Incarnation:

[Text 8: Syriac text and Latin translation:]

That is: *The entire life of Christ is in one person and figure [paršōpā].* [f. 13<sup>v</sup>]

[Commentary:] And he speaks of the Word of God and Jesus. These are two supposita, in each the works [will] of Christ are always concurred. For that reason, *person* among the Syrians is not understood in a *substantial* sense, but in *accidental*, as said by their well-known doctor:<sup>76</sup>

73 Gal 4:4

74 This final verse is only in *T*. In the case of the texts common to both the version of the Rosian treatises, like *T* text 6, I have consulted and made use of C. M. George's translation of *De erroribus Nestorianorum*: Ros, "De Erroribus Nestorianorum", 143–62 [hereafter C.M.G.].

75 Bar Kaldun Yohanan.

76 It seems that Ros refers to the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia. For an understanding of the widely misrepresented understanding of Theodore's position on the Union in Incarnation, see Küng, *The Incarnation of God*, 515–18.

[Text 9: Syriac text and Latin translation:]

That is: *And Person [paršōpā] is not fixed as suppositum (qnōmā). It is given and taken, like seal in the wax and like the image of the king in the coin.*

[Commentary:] Accordingly, in the mystery of Incarnation they do not maintain substantial union, but accidental. And in this way, they call Christ or Jesus, infant or the Son by will and the clothing of divinity, as follows:

[Text 10: Syriac text and Latin translation:]

That is: *The Angels called you Lord; [the shepherds] called you Child (or Son) (or by will) (or of favour); the clothing of king, we adore your mysteries of hidden sanctity, Christ God, above everything, two natures [kyānā], and two hypostases [qnōmē] and one person (paršōpā).<sup>77</sup>*

[Commentary:] [f. 14<sup>r</sup>] Furthermore, they claim that Jesus is not God by nature, but *b-ṭaybūtāh*<sup>78</sup> by grace. And [he is] to be the temple of the total divinity and of the three persons, and the union of Incarnation [is] to be common. So, they falsely affirm that it is not possible to assume nature. For this reason, a certain Syrian doctor says:

[Text 11: Syriac text and Latin translation:]

That is: *The nature [kyānā], however, is not given and assumed, not even, in the same way, the suppositum [qnōmā].*

[Commentary:] Thus, they teach these things that the human suppositum to be the temple and the dwelling of the entire Trinity, and so the union of incarnation is to be common to the Father, to the Son and to the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless, they maintain peculiar notion of the union of the Word:

[Text 12: Syriac text and Latin translation:]

That is: *neither let there be no mingling*

[Commentary:] Just as said by the John mentioned above, by means of whom diffused all these impious devises. In line with these customary teachings, the Syrians sing, on the day of the Nativity of the Lord, saying:

[Text 13: Syriac text and Latin translation:]

That is: *[It is] not like this, the impious! You err, because you do not understand the Scriptures nor the power of God. [f. 14<sup>v</sup>] God [’ityā] is not*

77 A variant reading of this text in the *De erroribus Nestorianorum* of 1587: “The Angels called Thee Lord; the shepherds named Thee Child; the Persians called Thee King; we adore the mysteries of your hidden Sanctity, Christ God, above everything, two natures, and two qnome [hypostases]in one Parsopa [person]”. See text 11 in C.M.G. 149.

78 This is the transliteration of the Syriac original found in the manuscript.

*made flesh in the womb of the Mother as you think wandering in corruption. It is a dwelling place that he chose for himself and he was concealing his splendour lest the whole human race may not perish by his sight. And again:*

**[Text 14: Syriac text and Latin translation:]**

*That is: The daughter of David brought forth the wonderful child, Christ, the Holy of Holies, the power of the Most High, and the temple, and he founded the temple, the dwelling place, and he lives in it, and is one person [paršōpā]. And afterwards:*

**[Text 15: Syriac text and Latin translation:]**

*That is: With great glory Mary carried in her womb the temple of the Word of God and became the Mother of Jesus, the Saviour of all. And again, the book of the Petition of the Ninevites has this:*

**[Text 16: Syriac text and Latin translation:]**

*That is: That he is the temple of God and the glorious dwelling of the (Divine) substance [itūtā]. And again:*

**[Text 17: Syriac text and Latin translation:]**

*That is: He who assumed from us the temple built it [f. 15<sup>r</sup>] and perfected it in every justice. And again:*

**[Text 18: Syriac text and Latin translation:]**

*That is: (translated word by word) If your dominion had made him (Christ) the Lord above everything created, who will not subdue his soul at the servitude of his life? And if your wisdom has designated (him), you have confirmed him in sublime position, who will not confess that his grade is true and his power is great? And if your mystery has revealed to your servants by his apparition, who will not recall his freedom from everyone, and will surrender to his bond? And if by him you [f. 15<sup>v</sup>] spread the great mystery of the Son and the Holy Spirit, who will not approach wisdom that is concealed in his own name? And if Word itself begets out of you, dwells in you by love, who will not invoke him holding the end of the heavens and the abysses? And if by him it is about to come the judgement of the earth at the end of the time, who will not be afraid of the trial that has been in his hand? And in another place, it is like this:*

**[Text 19: Syriac text and Latin translation:]**

*That is: I have seen the name of your substance ('itūtā) in him (Christ) as in a temple. Besides, it is written elsewhere:*

**[Text 20: Syriac text and Latin translation:]<sup>79</sup>**

*That is: Lazarus from Bethany heard the voice of the Son, and he responded*

79 The final part of this text ("then the will taught...") is present in the later treatise. See H Text 22.

*and said: here I am, [f. 16<sup>r</sup>] and the graves of the dead were dismayed, and the dead howled. And the foundations of the hell were shaken, every creature was astonished by remarkable admiration. What has indeed been done? Behold, the living one calls the dead, and look, the dead responds alive, then the will taught them that it is JESUS Son of David whom the Word from the Father put on and made him (Jesus) Lord and Judge in the high and in the abyss.*

[Commentary:] And in this way they always speak of JESUS and the Word and as if there were two supposita, and they recognize no Union except that of honour, virtue and power.

[Text 21: Syriac text and Latin translation:]<sup>80</sup>

*That is: O Lord, your people (your diocese) give thanks to You, since you have showered your mercy upon them, and you assumed from our race the Prince [f. 16<sup>v</sup>] (pearl, expectation) of peace (he is expected of peace) because of your love and made him for you a chosen home for the will of your conversation [economy], and the glorious image of your invisible nature [kyānā] and the beautiful mark of your divinity and the mediator of your love before your Son, and the high pontifex, in whom are dispensed of our sins by his grace.*

[Commentary:] Below the week of the Prayer of the Ninevites has this way:

[Text 22: Syriac text and Latin translation:]<sup>81</sup>

*That is: He who sanctified our nature by the holy first fruit (it is in singular) (that is, Christ) which he took from us (Jesus) and joined with himself in the glorious union, of power, and of his filiation, and of domination. And thereafter:<sup>82</sup> He who lighted up the lamp of his human suppositum [qnōmā] in the glorious splendour of his own divine suppositum [qnōmā].*

[Commentary:] (Petition of the Ninevites).

Elsewhere in a certain book, the followers of Nestorius specifically claim that Christ is to be called *God* or Jesus is to be called *God* [f. 17<sup>r</sup>] just as once Moses was called *God of Pharaoh*.<sup>83</sup> There it is said of Christ:

[Text 23: Syriac text and Latin translation:]

*That is: Just as Moses is honoured.*

[Commentary:] Besides, in a certain hymn on the departure of Adam from Paradise, it has a discourse of JESUS the Lord as if He be the other suppositum from the Word.

80 The first part of this verse is present in the later treatise. See *H* Text 15.

81 Cf. *H* text 19.

82 Follows Latin rendition of *H* Text 12.

83 Cf. Ex: 7:1

[Text 24: Syriac text and Latin translation:]

That is: *You clothe the light of my substance [‘itutā] by the image that came from you at the end of time. And in him I will pay off your sins, he will endure suffering, he will carry the cross, he will taste death, he will descend to the grave, I dwelling in him.* A certain Syrian doctor has the following impious verses:

[Text 25: Syriac text and Latin translation:]

That is: *It is the one who descended, and it is another who ascended in heaven.* And elsewhere [we read] the similar way:<sup>84</sup>

[Latin translation of a Syriac text:]

*The glorious Son about whom the Archangel announced showed forth his glory in the four regions of the world and among all the people. The legions of the Angels [f. 17<sup>v</sup>] cry out without ceasing: Holy, Holy, Holy is the Father who sent You, and the Holy Spirit who anointed you, and the Son who dwelt in you and made you the Lord of all [things] created, and placed your enemies a footstool for your feet.*<sup>85</sup>

[Commentary:] These [verses] are in a certain book of prayers that I saw earlier<sup>86</sup> and from itself I had, to some extent, made a selection translating them in Latin in the right manner. The book is not with me [at the moment] and for that reason, I am not able to transcribe the same in Syriac.<sup>87</sup>

Likewise, [when] these same texts are found written, I faithfully translated them last year word by word. Thus, it is said there:<sup>88</sup>

[Latin translation of a Syriac text:]

*Blessed are you, O Mary, who marvellously brought forth Christ, the Son of God, adored by all, whom the Holy Spirit formed in you, and the Word dwelt in him by a union without mingling, the natures are preserved wi-*

84 Follows *H* text 26 Latin.

85 Cf. Psalm 110:1

86 In 1585, Ros was able to read a few Syriac books of Mar Abraham, when the Metropolitan was staying in the professed house of the Jesuits in Goa.

87 In the margin of the manuscript, Ros mentions a Syriac codex, possibly owned by Mar Abraham, of a book of prayer that he secretly consulted while he was in Goa, from which he selected the verses which seemed to him problematic in terms of his theological positions. Ros translated those verses into Latin and included the Latin rendition in his first treatise sent in 1586. However, after sending the first treatise, Mar Abraham handed over his personal books to Ros for making correction, as ordered by the third Provincial Council of Goa (1585), and accordingly Ros could add also the Syriac verses of the text 25 in his *De erroribus Nestorianorum*, sent in 1588. For the corresponding verse in this later work, see *H* text 26.

88 Cf. the texts following *H* text 29.

thout confounding, and their *supposita*, in one person of filiation, of divinity and of humanity, one Lord, one virtue, one power. And again:<sup>89</sup>

[Latin translation of a Syriac text:]

*[He] dwelt in the Virgin and formed out of her a man, whom [he] united to his hidden will. And again:*

*In the Mother whom he chose from our race, he founded his dwelling temple and dwelt in it by will, and in itself is adored.*

[f. 18<sup>r</sup>] [Commentary:] In this way, who will not see [that] these [texts] bring forward two sons, and indeed two anointed. With *two* they declare that in Christ to be two *supposita*, united by will, love and power; not true hypostatical. They truly maintain, [it would have been] necessary to be asserted that [God] suffered, had they acknowledged the *suppositum* of the Word as God. [There is] a certain prayer in which they say:

[Latin translation of a Syriac text:]<sup>90</sup>

*Brought about the Word from the Father and the man from us; proclaimed the truthful, Diodore and Theodore and Nestorius, who kept up their own Christ from insults. In the terrible judgement of your justice, their vengeance was exercised over those who ascribed suffering to your *suppositum* and Theodore and Diodore and Nestorius are to be the winners who raised your *suppositum* above suffering. These [words] are there.*

[Commentary:] Along with these all, they call the Blessed Virgin not as God's mother but to be Christ's. Last year,<sup>91</sup> I heard certain priests singing these [lines] in the churches, in praise of the Virgin:

[Latin translation of a Syriac text:]<sup>92</sup>

*Mary did not give birth to the cause (God) as the accursed heretics claim; nor did she give birth to a man as Arius said; but she brought forth Christ.*

These I found written in a certain book of prayer, and I translated it afterwards. However, I remember a place in which it is said: *Mary did not give birth to God*, in the place of *God*, to be another name of God [f. 18<sup>v</sup>] '*ityā*, means *cause*, which often usurping the place of *alāhā God*. But I think it is done among the heretics towards catching the attention of the ignorant and truly offending the ears of the pious men. They explicitly mention that Mary not to have given birth to God. Thus, they employ the word which means both *cause* and *God*. Not true *essence* from the word *hwā*, which means *to be [to exist]*. Because '*ityā* itself agrees with the Greek word *aitia* [*aitiā*] or *cause* and

89 *H* text 28.

90 The final part of this verse is available in *H* text 39.

91 Ros started his mission in the Malabar Church in December 1585.

92 Follows *H* text 17.

is not deduced from the word *hwā*. Furthermore, the Syrians do not call *essence* 'ityā but 'it and 'itutā.<sup>93</sup> Moreover, on the day of the Sunday of Ascension, at the end of a certain collect they cry out saying: [Latin translation of a Syriac text:]

*Let our race be rejoiced in the Son of our race who is honoured with God. To end, nowhere you will find JESUS as God and Mary as the Mother of God; but the Mother of Christ or of JESUS, otherwise they call the Blessed Mother.*

**[D. Commemorations dedicated to heresiarchs]**

With great honour the followers of the Nestorian Syrians describe their doctors. Along with Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodore of Tarsus and among the other they mix up the praise of their honour to those who are most famous among them, and of the praise of many saints.

**[Text 26: Syriac text [f. 19<sup>r</sup>]<sup>94</sup> and Latin translation:]<sup>95</sup>**

*That is: Mighty towers and strong walls to the Church and her children were my<sup>96</sup> Lord Diodore who destroyed fears and my Lord Theodore who interpreted the scriptures, with my Lord Nestorius, a zealous person of truth as well as a living martyr who suffered persecution by the envy of the followers of Cyril, of the agent of Satan. Let us praise Christ who offered them victory; they kept him up from insults, and he exalted the horn of his Church through their hands, glory to him.*

[Comments]: It is not enough for them to have praised the impious men, rather with the other saints, they have called Saint Cyril, 'the operator of Satan.' At the same time, they may count the other holiest men with the notorious ones. In fact, after the words mentioned above, they may add:

**[Text 27: Syriac text (f. 19<sup>v</sup>)<sup>97</sup> and Latin translation:]**

93 'Essence' and 'Being', the equivalent Syriac terms derived from the particle of existence ('it), do not have corresponding terminology in the Greek philosophical (and theological) system, of course, the only system with which Ros was familiar. While the later Syriac tradition used 'ityā as an epithet for *God*, some authors maintain that 'itutā is the later form synonymous with 'ityā. At the same time, while 'ityā gives room for a plural form ('ityē), 'itutā, a singular term, does not have a plural form, possibly reserved accordingly to denote the Essence of God. For these explanations, see Possekel, *Evidence of Greek Philosophical Concepts*, 55–57. These terms are rendered in Syriac and Greek original respectively in the manuscript.

94 The third line of the Syriac text begins on f. 19<sup>r</sup>.

95 Latin rendition of this text is available in *H* following the text 40.

96 The corresponding word to *my* is not in the Syriac text. This note is also applicable to the other instances of *my* in this text.

97 The fourth line of the Syriac text begins on f. 19<sup>v</sup>.

That is: *May we eagerly honour the days of commemorations of the holy priests and doctors of truth, Ephrem<sup>98</sup> and Barçau<sup>99</sup> and Narsay and Abraham, with my<sup>100</sup> Lord John<sup>101</sup> and Job and Michael, who followed the footprints of the family of Diodore,<sup>101</sup> who revealed the mysteries. And they have walked according to the work of the family of Theodore,<sup>103</sup> who explained the scriptures.*

[Commentary:] Behold, they count the holiest Ephrem with the heretics.<sup>104</sup> About the others, whom they commemorate in this place,<sup>105</sup> I do not know. I know that the Christians of Saint Thomas honour [a certain] bishop and bishops as saints, who were living during the time when the dogma of Nestorius was flourishing.<sup>106</sup> And we know that until the present time Diodore and Theodore, the associates of Nestorius, were publicly honoured as saints. No one has retained the mention of Nestorius, whose mention they had formerly abandoned.<sup>107</sup> It could be, and some of them, who are enumerated above will be from the family of Nestorius, as they themselves affirm. These [pages] I have secretly ripped off from their public books; however, I have not seen their private books, with the exception of those [books] the archbishop showed me at Goa.<sup>108</sup> If these are found out in the public books then what is to be thought of the private ones? Among these, I read one that as [...]

98 Mar Ephrem the Syrian (ca. 306–73). Cf. G. f. 211<sup>r</sup>; H. 32.

99 Barçau of Nisibis (Rabban Bar Şawma, ca. 1250–94).

100 The corresponding word to *my* is absent in the Syriac text cited by Ros.

101 Ros mistakenly translates *nwh* (Noah) as John.

102 Diodore of Tarsus (d. 392 AD).

103 Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428 AD).

104 H. 32; G. f. 211<sup>r</sup>.

105 In Malabar.

106 The same allegation is found in G. f. 213<sup>r</sup>.

107 Ros placed this information also in his later 1587 treatise and rendered it as follows: “And indeed when they recite the Divine Office, while they slur over the names of these heretics, they merely read, sing and recite the above mentioned commemoration, without any mention of Nestorius and his friends” (C.M.G. 160).

108 Mar Abraham stayed (from the first week of April 1585) in the Jesuit professed house in Goa, in the same community to which Ros was assigned at the end of 1584.

## Cited works

### Manuscript Sources

Lisbon. Arquivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo (ANTT)

*Tribunal do Santo Ofício, Inquisição de Lisboa, proc. 4941.*

Rome. Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu (ARSI)

*Goa.* 14; 15; 16; 17; 50.

*Fondo Tacchi Venturi, Serie Miscellanea, Sottoserie Collectio Historica, b. 26 fasc. 27.*

Rome. Archivum Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide (APF)

*Miscellanea Diverse*, vol. 21.

### Primary Sources

Hausherr, Irénée, ed. “Roz, Francisco, *De erroribus Nestorianorum qui in hac India orientali versantur Auctore P. Francisco Ros S.I.* Inédit latin-syriaque de la fin de 1586 ou du début de 1587, retrouvé par le P. Castets S.I., missionnaire à Trichinopoly. *Orientalia Christiana* 11/1 (40) (1928): 1–35.

Hough, James, ed. “A Diocesan Synod of the Church and Bishoprick of Angamale, belonging to the Ancient Christians of St. Thomas in the Serra or Mountains of Malabar”. (Reproduced from the edition of M. Geddes, *The History of the Church of Malabar. London: Smith & Walford, 1694*). In *The History of Christianity in India from the Commencement of the Christian Era*. 2 vols. London: Seeley and Burnside, 1839: Appendix A., 511–683.

Loyola, Ignatius of, *Letters of St. Ignatius of Loyola*, ed. William J. Young. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1959.

Mecherry, Antony, ed. *De Syrorum orientalium erroribus: Auctore P. Francisco Ros S.I.* A Latin-Syriac Treatise from Early Modern Malabar (1586). Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2021.

Ros, Francisco. “De Erroribus Nestorianorum’ of Franciscus Ros S.J”, trans. C. M. George. *Christian Orient* 10/4 (1989): 143–62.

———. “Information about Mar Abraham”. In George Nedungatt, ed., and Jacob Kollaparambil, trans., *The Synod of Diamper Revisited*. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2001: Appendix II, 283–94.

Sousa, Francisco de. *Oriente Conquistado a Jesu Christo pelos Padres da Companhia de Jesus*. 2 vols. Bombay: The Examiner Press, 1886.

Wicki, Joseph, ed. *Documenta Indica*, vols. 14–16, in *Monumenta Historica S.I.* Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 1948–88.

### Secondary Sources

Bevan, George A. *The New Judas: The Case of Nestorius in Ecclesiastical Politics, 428–451 CE*. Leuven, Paris: Peeters, 2016.

Brock, Sebastian. "Hebrews 2:9B in Syriac Tradition". *Novum Testamentum*, 27/3 (1985): 236–44.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The 'Nestorian' Church: A Lamentable Misnomer". *Bulletin-John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 78/3 (1996): 23–35.

Chediath, Geevarghese. "The Three Crucial Terms in Syriac Theology: Kyana, Qnoma, and Parsopa". *The Harp* 15 (2002): 59–65.

Dickens, Mark. "PRO: Nestorius did not intend to argue that Christ had a dual nature, but that view became labelled Nestorianism". In Steven L. Danver, ed., *Popular Controversies in World History: Investigating History's Intriguing Questions*. Santa Barbara, Ca: ABC-CLIO, 2011: vol. 1, 145–62.

Emminghaus, Johannes H. *The Eucharist: Essence, Form and Celebration*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1997.

Küng, Hans. *The Incarnation of God: An Introduction to Hegel's Theological Thought as a Prolegomena to a Future Christology*, trans. J.R Stephenson. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1987.

Mecherry, Antony. "Archbishop Aleixo de Menezes OSA, A Portuguese Fidalgo: Behind the Curtain". *Vidyajyoti Journal of Theological Reflection* 82/1 (2018): 8–34.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Testing Ground for Jesuit Accommodation in Early Modern India: Francisco Ros S.J. in Malabar (16th–17th Centuries)*. Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2019, vol. 79.

Mundadan, A. Mathias. *The Arrival of the Portuguese in India and the St. Thomas Christians under Mar Jacob, 1498–1552*. Bangalore: Dharmaram College, 1967.

\_\_\_\_\_. *History of Christianity in India: From the Beginning up to the Middle of the Sixteenth Century (1542)*. Bangalore: Church History Association of India, 1984, vol. 1.

Nedungatt, George. "Foreword". In *The Quest for Identity: The Syro-Malabar Church and its Rite*, by Andrews Thazhath. Kerala: Thrissur Institute of Theology, 1992: n.p.

Parker, Lucy. "The Ambiguities of Belief and Belonging: Catholicism and the Church of the East in the Sixteenth Century". *English Historical Review* CXXXIII/565 (2018): 1420–45.

- Payne Smith, Jessie (Mrs. Margoliouth). *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1903.
- Possekel, Ute. *Evidence of Greek Philosophical Concepts in the Writings of Ephrem the Syrian*. CSCO, Subsidia, v. 580. t. 102. Lovanii: Peeters, 1999.
- Schwane, Joseph Anton. *Dogmengeschichte der Vornicänischen Zeit*. Münster: Theissing'schen Buchhandlung, 1862.
- Thaliath, Jonas. *The Synod of Diamper*. Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1958.
- Thevarmannil, Cyriac. "Mar Abraham, The Archbishop of St. Thomas Christians in Malabar (1508? -97)". PhD diss. Gregorian University, Rome, 1963.
- Weinandy, Thomas G. "The Doctrinal Significance of the Councils of Nicaea, Ephesus and Chalcedon". In Francesca A. Murray and Troy A. Stefano, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Christology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015: 549–67.

214
St
Pap. Lib. T. 10  
2143  
 De syrorum ~~erroribus~~ orientalibus  
 erroribus  
 Divi Thomae fideles qui in India Orientali versantur, in  
 rebus suis quae ad divinum cultu spectant, lingua syriaca  
 perpetuo utuntur: syros namq. sibi imperit pastores: qui  
 et orientale Sacrosanctum uero magno illos studio operantur,  
 quo fidem pristinam amiserunt, reruq. spiritualiu, divinituq.  
 cultus, incredibile scire naufragium. Divina tamen  
 benignitate effectus est, ut resurgere tandem et summo  
 potissis subderent. Ceterum quia divinaru reruq. ydolia  
 non ita valent; p. ignoantia, seu ingratia pastorum  
 injuriam, vel fidem animu, euenit, ut scilicet in ipsos  
 libros pristinae hereses libere sint eraratae, et omnino  
 ita tate retineantur: imo et publice deantur. peruen-  
 nit autem haec fidei corruptio usq. ad totam Liberaum  
~~Corruptionem~~: que et eo in epist. temporis quo Con-  
 stit. Chalcedonense celebrandum erat. Unde et eo in  
 Concilio Divi Nestoriani ex p. Epist. Joannis, ea fidei  
 abstulim, quibz aperte ipsi scriptis demoliebant.  
 sunt autem hae. Conno spiritus qui soluit Jesum  
 ex deo non est et sic est dicitur. et hoc est  
 hoc haec sunt substituta ut patet ex syriaco exem-  
 plari ~~et sic~~ ~~et sic~~ ~~et sic~~ ~~et sic~~  
 et omnis spiritus. ~~et sic~~ ~~et sic~~ ~~et sic~~  
 qui non confitetur q. Jesus uenit in carne, non est ergo.  
 et cetera, quae Nestoriani sectatores, nuntium deo tri-  
 buere maxime sola existimant: ea etia scripturae testis

ARSI, Fondo Tacchi Venturi, Serie Miscellanea, Sottoserie Collectio Historica, b. 26 fasc. 27, f. 10r.