

RESTORATION AND REFORM OF SYRO-MALABAR MISSAL

IMPORTANT DOCUMENTS
FROM 1954 TO 1969

PAUL PALLATH

RESTORATION AND REFORM OF SYRO- MALABAR MISSAL

Important Documents from 1954 to 1969

Paul Pallath



HIRS Publications

Changanacherry

2018

Restoration and Reform of Syro-Malabar Missal: Important Documents from 1954 to 1969

Author : Paul Pallath

Published by : HIRS publications
Mar Thoma Vidyaniathan
Changanacherry – 686101

First published : January 2018

© Copy right : To the Author

Printed at : St Joseph's Orphanage Press, Changanacherry

Copies : 500

Available at : HIRS publications
Mar Thoma Vidyaniathan
P. B. No. 20
Changanacherry – 686101
Kerala, India
Tel. 0481 2421891
E-mail: mnikethan@gmail.com

Price : ₹ 250/-

ISBN : 978-81-87576-92-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	14
Significance of Some Syria Words and Expressions.....	15
General Introduction.....	19

Introductory Article One

WESTERN MISSIONARIES AND SYNOD OF DIAMPER: MODIFICATIONS IN THE EUCHARISTIC LITURGY OF THE ST THOMAS CHRISTIANS

1. Some Relevant Modifications Made by the Western Missionaries and the Synod of Diamper in the <i>Qurbana</i>	24
1.1. More than Forty Corrections of a Dogmatic Character in the Missal	25
1.2. Introduction of Institution Narrative in the <i>Qurbana</i> Celebrated with the Anaphora of Addai and Mari	26
1.3. Matter of the Eucharist: Only Unleavened Bread and Grape-Wine	34
1.4. Prohibition of the Second and Third Anaphoras	38
1.5. Holy Communion under the Species of Bread Alone	39
1.6. Sign of the Cross from Left to Right	42
1.7. Western Attire and Liturgical Vestments	43
1.8. Structure of Churches and Veil of the Sanctuary	46

2. Modifications in the Eucharistic Liturgy of the St Thomas Christians after the Synod of Diamper	49
2.1. The <i>Qurbana</i> of Francis Ros	49
2.2. The Printed <i>Qurbana</i> of the St Thomas Christians (1774)	50
2.3. Principal Modifications in the <i>Qurbana</i> after the Synod of Diamper	51

Introductory Article Two

HISTORICAL, ECCLESIAL AND LITURGICAL SITUATION OF THE SYRO-MALABAR CHURCH AT THE TIME OF THE RESTORATION OF MISSAL

1. Syro-Malabar Church at the Time of the Restoration of Missal	57
2. Syro-Malabar Church and Bishops' Conference: Canonical Status at the Time of the Restoration of Missal	63
3. A Note on the General Liturgical Predicament of the Syro-Malabar Church	66
4. The Restoration of Syro-Malabar and East Syrian Pontifical and the Start of Liturgical Reform	68
5. Roman Pontiffs and the Apostolic See during the Restoration of Syro-Malabar Missal	72

**DOCUMENTS CONCERNING THE
RESTORATION AND REFORM
OF SYRO-MALABAR MISSAL
FROM 1954 TO 1969**

Section One

**CONSTITUTION OF THE LITURGICAL COMMISSION AND
COMPILATION OF THE SYRO-MALABAR MISSAL**

1. Constitution of the Special Liturgical Commission for the Revision of Syro-Malabar Liturgical Books79
2. Official Information about the Constitution of the Liturgical Commission to Syro-Malabar Bishops.....80
3. Report of the First Session of the Liturgical Commission for the Restoration of Syro-Malabar Liturgical Books83
4. Preface of the Proposed Missal Prepared by the Liturgical Commission of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church92
5. Proposed Syro-Malabar Missal: Essential Content95

Section Two

**FIRST CONSULTATION OF SYRO-MALABAR BISHOPS
CONCERNING THE PROPOSED ORDER OF *QURBANA***

6. Letter of Apostolic Internuncio Transmitting the Proposed Missal to the Syro-Malabar Bishops for Their Remarks98
7. Letter of Thomas Tharayil, Bishop of Kottayam.....100
8. Letter of Augustine Kandathil, Archbishop of Ernakulam.....103

9. Letter of Sebastian Vayalil, Bishop of Palai.....	112
10. Letter of Joseph Parecattil, Auxiliary Bishop of Ernakulam	116
11. Letter of Mathew Kavukatt, Archbishop of Changanacherry.....	118
12. Letter of Sebastian Valloppilly, Bishop of Tellicherry	122

Section Three

**OPINION OF THE ROMAN LITURGICAL COMMISSION
AND SOME EXPERTS ON THE RESPONSES OF SYRO-
MALABAR BISHOPS**

13. Report of the Meeting of the Liturgical Commission to Evaluate the Responses of the Syro-Malabar Bishops	126
14. Opinion of Fr. Edouard René Hambye SJ on the Controversial Points of the Proposed Reform of Syro- Malabar Missal.....	143
15. Letter of Chaldean Archbishop Joseph Gogu�.....	151
16. Letter of Fr. Maurus Valiapampil, Prior General of the Third Order Discalced Carmelites of Malabar	156

Section Four

**SECOND CONSULTATION OF SYRO-MALABAR BISHOPS
ON THE PROPOSED SYRO-MALABAR MISSAL**

17. Response of George Alapatt, Bishop of Trichur	160
18. Response of Joseph Parecattil, Archbishop of Ernakulam	160
19. Response of Thomas Tharayil, Bishop of Kottayam.....	162
20. Response of Sebastian Valloppilly, Bishop of Tellicherry.....	163

21. Response of Mathew Kavukatt, Archbishop of Changanacherry 163
22. Response of Sebastian Vayalil, Bishop of Palai 164

Section Five

APPROVAL OF THE MISSAL BY THE PLENARY ASSEMBLY OF THE CONGREGATION FOR THE ORIENTAL CHURCH AND BY POPE PIUS XII

23. Report on the Revision and Printing of the Malabar Missal Presented by Cardinal Agagianian in the Plenary Assembly 167
24. Decisions of the Plenary Assembly of the Congregation for the Oriental Church concerning the Proposed Doubts 190
25. Request to Pope Pius XII for Approval of the Revised Missal 192
26. Approval of Pope Pius XII for the Revised Missal 193

Section Six

PROMULGATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RESTORED SYRO-MALABAR MISSAL (1960-1962)

27. Letter of Cardinal Tisserant concerning the Translation of the Restored Missal into Malayalam 198
28. Letter of Archbishop Parecattil regarding the Committee to Prepare the Malayalam Version 200
29. *Supplementum Mystriorum* or *Propria* of Holy *Qurbana*: Preface of the Roman Liturgical Commission 202

30. Promulgation of Syro-Malabar Missal: Instruction of the Congregation for the Oriental Church *De Ritu Sacrificii Instaurato*206

31. Syro-Malabar *Qurbana* 1962: General Instructions and Decisions of the Syro-Malabar Bishops210

32. Joint Pastoral Letter of the Syro-Malabar Bishops about the Restored Missal215

33. Letter of Archbishop Parecatil to the Oriental Congregation concerning the Implementation of the Restored Missal222

Section Seven

RESTORED SYRO-MALABAR MISSAL: ATTEMPTS FOR MODIFICATIONS, PETITIONS AND LAMENTATIONS OF LAYMEN

34. Joint Letter of Syro-Malabar Bishops to the Congregation for the Oriental Church Requesting Modifications in the Order of *Qurbana*232

35. Decree of the Congregation on the Celebration of *Quddasa* in the Syro-Malabar Rite236

36. Letter of a Priest and a Layman from Kanjoor to Pope Paul VI Requesting Him to Revoke the Reformed Missal238

37. Letter of Chevalier Joseph Pettah and Other 61 Laymen from Trichur to the Oriental Congregation Requesting It to Rescind the Reformed Missal.....241

38. Letter of Msgr. Thomas Nedumkallel in Favour of the Reformed Liturgy253

39. Letter of Chevalier Joseph Vithayathil and Other Laymen to the Internuncio Disapproving the Reformed Missal	255
40. Response of Prof. Alphonse Raes SJ, President of the Special Liturgical Commission to the Three Letters Criticizing the Reformed Missal	266
41. Letter of the Prior General of the Carmelites of Mary Immaculate (CMI) in Favour of the Reformed Liturgy	290
42. Petition of Six Malabar Priests against the Restored Missal	293
43. Letter of Chevalier Dr. P.J. Thomas from Marampally in Favour of the Reformed Liturgy.....	298

Section Eight

COUNTER-REFORM: COMPILATION AND PUBLICATION OF MISSAL 1968

44. Circular of Archbishop Parecattil to the Syro-Malabar Bishops concerning the Composition of the Liturgical Committee and the State of Liturgical Reform	312
45. Letter of Cardinal De Fürstenberg to Chevalier Joseph Vithayathil Expressing His Willingness to Modify the 1962 Missal	316
46. Letter of Cardinal De Fürstenberg to Archbishop Parecattil Asking the Bishops to Receive the Suggestions of Syro-Malabar Chevaliers.....	318
47. Letter of Archbishop Parecattil to the Syro-Malabar Bishops, Convoking Them to a Meeting for the Finalization of the New Missal.....	319

48. Reply of Archbishop Parecattil to Cardinal De Fürstenberg Informing Him of the Scheduled Meeting of Bishops for the Approval of the New Missal.....	321
49. Letter of Joseph Vithayathil to Cardinal De Fürstenberg Thanking Him for Positively Considering the Memorandum.....	322
50. Letter of Archbishop Parecattil regarding the Meeting of the Bishops and Approval of the 1968 Missal	324
51. Letter of Joseph Vithayathil and Two Other Laymen to Cardinal De Fürstenberg Expressing Satisfaction for Their Meeting with the Bishops.....	328
52. Letter of Parecattil to De Fürstenberg Informing Him of the State of the New Missal.....	330
53. Letter of Archbishop Parecattil to Cardinal De Fürstenberg Requesting Approval for 1968 Missal.....	331
54. Approval of <i>Taksa</i> 1968 <i>ad Experimentum</i>	337
55. <i>Taksa</i> 1968: General Norms concerning the Order of <i>Qurbana</i>	338
56. Fr. Podipara Transmits to the Oriental Congregation the Content of Some Letters He Received from Malabar about the 1968 Missal	343
57. Letter of Fr. Placid Podipara to the Prefect of Oriental Congregation about the Revised Missal of 1968.....	347
58. Letter of the Prefect of Oriental Congregation to Cardinal Parecattil Limiting the Approval of the 1968 Missal to Two Years.....	352

Concluding Section
MISSAL 1968: MAIN MODIFICATIONS AND THEIR
CONSEQUENCES

1. The Order of <i>Qurbana</i> 1962 and 1968: A Schematic Presentation of Modifications	356
2. Some Important Modifications: A Critical Evaluation.....	362
2.1. Elimination of Nestorian Heretical Doctrines	362
2.2. Sign of the Cross from Left to Right	368
2.3. Correction of Anticipatory Expressions	372
2.4. Liturgy Facing the People.....	376
2.5. Restructuring of the Pre-Anaphora.....	379
2.6. Modifications in the Anaphora of Addai and Mari	382
3. Consequences of Counter-Reform: Liturgical Indiscipline and Anarchy	383
Conclusion.....	385
Appendix I: Instructio “De Ritu Sacrificii Eucharistici Instaurato” Ad Hierarchas Malabarenses	343
Appendix II: Decretum de celebrando “Quddasa ex ritu Syro-Malabarensi”	343
Index of Subjects:	393

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

While raising my grateful heart to God Almighty, for His infinite mercies and countless blessings, I place on record my indebtedness to those who have helped me for the realization of this project. I express my heartfelt gratitude to His Eminence Cardinal Leonardo Sandri, Prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, who graciously granted me special permission to utilize the documents concerning the liturgical reform of the Syro-Malabar Church from 1954 to 1969 preserved in the Archives of the Congregation. I am extremely thankful to Dr Giampaolo Rigotti, archivist of the same Congregation, who generously helped me to consult the documents and provided me with the photo-reproduction of relevant items.

I am very grateful to Dr. Sr. Grace Koovayil SD for her precious and sincere collaboration. I remember with gratitude Rev. Fr. Joseph Karikulam, who has read the manuscript, offering me valuable suggestions. I express my indebtedness to Rev. Dr. Joseph Kollara, Director of HIRS Publications (Mar Thoma Vidyanikethan, Changanacherry), for arranging everything necessary for the publication of this book in India. I am thankful to the manager and staff of St Joseph's Orphanage Press Changanacherry for the printing.

Rome, 6 January 2018

Feast of Epiphany

Paul Pallath

SIGNIFICANCE OF SOME SYRIAC WORDS AND EXPRESSIONS

Bema: dais, an elevated platform, traditionally at the centre of the nave for the liturgy of the Word. Currently, in the Syro-Malabar Church the *bema* is arranged outside the sanctuary, at the beginning of the nave. At the centre of the *bema* there is a small table, on which are placed a cross in the midst of two candles and the lectionary for the readings. Mainly the liturgy of the Word is conducted on the *bema* which symbolizes the earthly Jerusalem, where Christ preached and still continues his teaching through the reading of Sacred Scriptures.

Bethgazzas: are two recesses or niches in the northern and southern walls of the sanctuary, where the bread and wine are prepared, respectively. It is customary to cover them with decorated doors or curtains. Facing the sanctuary, the chalice is set at the right recess and the paten at the left.

G'hanta: inclination-prayer. It designates the prayers, which are recited by the celebrant with a slight inclination of the head, with folded hands, and in a low voice, but audible to the community. There are four such inclination-prayers in the anaphoras of the East Syrian tradition, which constitute their essential part.

Karozutha: proclamation-prayer. It includes both the supplication-litanies, recited by the deacon after the Gospel and responded to in a recurring formula by the people, and some other proclamations before important moments in the Eucharistic liturgy.

Kusapa: prayer in a low voice, supplication or earnest entreaty. In the Eucharistic liturgy it refers to the private supplications of the celebrant, recited in a low voice, before each *g'hanta*. These prayers generally reflect a sense of unworthiness as the celebrant

approaches God, and contain mainly petitions for accepting the sacrifice and forgiveness of sins.

Laku Mara: “To you, O Lord”. It is a very ancient resurrection hymn sung in the liturgical celebrations. In this hymn the Christians confess the divinity and lordship of Jesus Christ, and his victory over death.

Marmitha: the Psalmody, in the *Qurbana* usually a group of three selected psalms forms the *marmitha*. They vary according to Sundays, feast days and weekdays.

Onitha d’qanke: the hymn or anthem of the sanctuary (*qanke* means sanctuary). It is sung only in the *Raza*, the most solemn form of the Eucharistic celebration, after the psalms, during the rite of the kissing of the cross.

Onitha d’raze: anthem of the mysteries; it has two parts. The first variable part is sung by the congregation during the procession of the Eucharistic gifts from the *bethgazzas* to the altar. The second part is fixed for every celebration and is sung at present alternatively by the celebrant and the congregation.

Qurbana: offering, gift, oblation, Eucharistic celebration. It is the most common title for the Eucharistic liturgy among the St Thomas Christians in India. Though it is generally used to refer to the Eucharistic celebration as a whole, sometimes it can indicate the Holy Communion alone; for example, distribution of *Qurbana* in both species, a child’s reception of first *Qurbana*, preservation of the *Qurbana* for the sick, etc.

Raza: mystery, the plural form ‘*raze*’ means mysteries. Although any sacrament can be called *raza* in the East Syrian tradition, at present in the Syro-Malabar Church *Raza* almost exclusively designates the most solemn form of the Eucharistic celebration.

Surraya: the word means incipit or beginning. In the Eucharistic celebration it is a responsorial hymn, sung after the Old Testament readings. The hymn consists of two parts: some psalm

verses and an antiphon referring to the particular celebration of the day.

Taksa: order, the equivalent of *taksis* in Greek and *ordo* in Latin. It indicates an official book containing the prescribed order of the Eucharistic liturgy, the sacraments and other priestly offices. Among the St Thomas Christians of the Syro-Malabar Church the word *taksa* is almost exclusively used for the order of the Eucharistic liturgy as contained in the canonically approved typical edition.

Trisagion: thrice holy. The liturgy of the Word begins with this ancient hymn: “Holy God, holy mighty One, holy immortal One, have mercy on us”. This Trinitarian hymn, in fact, is a definition of God, which expresses the divine nature and its attributes.

Turgama: interpretation, homiletic hymns sung before the epistle or the gospel in the most solemn of the Eucharistic celebration called *Raza*.

Zummara: Alleluia hymn, it is composed of some psalm versicles with the addition of three Alleluias and is sung before the reading of the Gospel. It expresses the great joy of the community in hearing the Word of the Lord.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

As the title indicates, important documents concerning the restoration and reform of the Syro-Malabar Missal from 1954 to 1969 are presented in this work. Our book, *Roman Pontifical into Syriac and the Beginning of Liturgical Reform in the Syro-Malabar Church*, co-authored by Dr. Joseph Kollara, practically covers the history of the liturgical reform of the Syro-Malabar Church during the period of 1896-1953.¹ Roman documents on the Syro-Malabar Eucharistic Liturgy from 1980 onwards were collected and published by Oriental Institute of Religious Studies India (OIRSI) Publications.² The works of Cardinal Joseph Parecattil and Dr. Thomas Mannoorampampil cite or partially reproduce some of the documents concerning the reform of *Qurbana* between 1954 and 1969.³

Also the recent studies, dedicated to the liturgical reform in the Syro-Malabar Church, though otherwise authentic and erudite, treat the reform of *Qurbana* during the aforementioned period in an incomplete manner because of the unavailability of documents.⁴ Hence the scope of this work is to obviate a lacuna, publishing relevant documents concerning the reform of the Order of *Qurbana* from 1954 to 1969 and to make them available to scholars for further study and research.

¹ P. Pallath and J. Kollara, *Roman Pontifical into Syriac and the Beginning of Liturgical Reform in the Syro-Malabar Church: History of the Revision and Publication of the Chaldean and Syro-Malabar Pontifical*, Kottayam 2012.

² *Roman Documents on the Syro-Malabar Liturgy* (compiled and published by Oriental Institute of Religious Studies India), Kottayam 1995.

³ J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, Ernakulam 1987; T. Mannoorampampil, *The Historical Background of Syro-Malabar Qurbana* (Malayalam), Kottayam 1986.

⁴ F. Kanichikatil, *To Restore or to Reform? A Critical Study on Current Liturgical Renewal in the Syro-Malabar Church*, Bangalore 1992; P. Vazheparampil, *The Making and Unmaking of Tradition*, Rome 1998; G. Thadikkatt, *Liturgical Identity of the Mār Tōma Nazrāni Church*, Kottayam 2004.

After this general introduction two introductory articles are added, in order to enable the readers to comprehend and interpret the documents and to evaluate the acts and facts according to the principles of true historical-critical hermeneutics. The first article briefly demonstrates how some important items of Syro-Malabar *Qurbana* (which during the liturgical restoration became object of controversy) existed before the XVI century and how they were modified by the Synod of Diamper in 1599, indicating also other alterations and interpolations made after the said Synod during the Latin governance from 1599 to 1898. The second article is devoted to the reconstruction of the immediate historical, ecclesiastical and liturgical context of the restoration of Syro-Malabar Missal.

Then the book presents 58 documents concerning the restoration and reform of Syro-Malabar Missal. In order to facilitate continuous reading and to provide logical coherence and sequence the work is divided into eight sections, without interrupting, however, the continuous numbering of documents, which are inserted in chronological order. Each section has a historical and liturgical introduction which settles the immediate context, facilitating better comprehension and appraisal of documents. Similarly, the text of each document is preceded by a brief introduction, which elucidates its essential content and the precise indication of the source, which facilitates exact citation. The book ends with a concluding section, an appendix containing the original Latin text of two important documents and an index of subjects.

In view of the plenary assembly of 27 May 1957 the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church formulated a Report with Summary concerning the restoration of Syro-Malabar *Qurbana* entitled *Malabaresi, Liturgia: Revisione e Stampa del Messale Malabarese, Relazione con Sommario*, Tipografia Poliglota Vaticana 1957. The said Report with Summary is now found in the volume called *Ponenze Anno 1950-1959*, preserved in the Archives of the same Congregation. Many of the documents reproduced in this work

are taken from the said source which does not have continuous page numbering. Hence for the documents contained in *Ponenze*, reference is given to the aforementioned Report with Summary 1957, indicating also the number of the said Summary.

Other documents of the period under consideration are kept in the Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches in five fascicles or folders, four of which (II-IV) have the same protocol number and title: 947/48, *Liturgia Malabaresi: Stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi*. The last folder has protocol number 955/65 and is entitled: *Liturgia Malabaresi: Stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi, Roforma*, fascicle 1. Since the documents of the period are not open to the public, they are not systematically arranged and numbered; obviously no page number is found. Hence the documents are cited in this work only with the indication of protocol number, title of the file and fascicle number. In an eventual future systematization of the Archives, the documents may be re-arranged in another manner.

Introductory Article One

WESTERN MISSIONARIES AND SYNOD OF DIAMPER: MODIFICATIONS IN THE EUCHARISTIC LITURGY OF THE ST THOMAS CHRISTIANS

The Western missionaries, who reached South India from the beginning of the sixteenth century, made concerted efforts to convert the St Thomas Christians to the Latin Church and to the Roman tradition. Since they considered the sacraments of the St Thomas Christians invalid, defective or inexistent, from the very beginning they began to force the three last Chaldean metropolitans of the St Thomas Christians: Mar Jacob (1503-1550), Mar Joseph Sulaqa (1555-1569) and Mar Abraham (1557-1597) to modify the liturgy and the discipline of the sacraments in accordance with the Roman tradition or to translate Latin liturgical books into Syriac for their correct administration.¹ The Synod of Diamper, convoked by Alexis de Menezes, the Latin Archbishop of Goa (1595-1610) from 20 to 26 June 1599 was the culmination of such missionary endeavours.²

¹ Cf. P. Pallath, *The Provincial Councils of Goa and the Church of St Thomas Christians*, Kottayam 2005, 35-53; “The Sacraments of the Church of St Thomas Christians in India and the Synod of Diamper”, *Ephrem’s Theological Journal.*, vol. 11, no. 2 (October 2007) 121-146; J. Kollaparambil, “The Impact of the Synod of Diamper on the Ecclesial Identity of the St Thomas Christians”, in G. Nedungatt (ed.), *The Synod of Diamper Revisited*, Rome 2001, 155-158; G. Thadikkatt, *Liturgical Identity of the Mār Tōma Nazrāni Church*, 82-89.

² For the English version of the acts and decrees of the Synod of Diamper: M. Geddes, *The History of the Church of Malabar, together with the Synod of Diamper*, London 1694; J. Hough, *The History of Christianity in India from the Commencement of the Christian Era*, vol. 2, London 1839, 511-683; Scaria Zacharia, *The Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Diamper 1599*, Edamattam 1994.

In the book, *The Eucharistic Liturgy of the St Thomas Christians and the Synod of Diamper*,³ I have reconstructed the *Qurbana* of the St Thomas Christians before the XVI century, indicating all the corrections, modifications, interpolations and Latinization made by the Western missionaries, especially in the Synod of Diamper in 1599. For a comprehensive study of the theme the readers may consult the said work. Here I consider only some relevant and controversial points, in so far as they are helpful to understand the content of the documents. Then I proceed to a brief appraisal of modifications in the *Qurbana* after the Synod of Diamper in 1599 until the appointment of native bishops in 1896.

1. Some Relevant Modifications Made by the Western Missionaries and the Synod of Diamper in the *Qurbana*

In the aforementioned book the work of the Western missionaries and the Synod of Diamper with regard to *Qurbana* is distinguished into two categories: 1) corrections in the text of the *Qurbana*; 2) different modifications in connection with the Eucharistic liturgy. Here some relevant points are presented without such distinction, in so far as they are helpful to understand the documents.

In addition to the acts and decrees of the Synod of Diamper,⁴ this section is mainly based on the Report of Francis Ros SJ. Because of his close acquaintance with the St Thomas Christians the Report of

³ P. Pallath, *The Eucharistic Liturgy of the St Thomas Christians and the Synod of Diamper*, Kottayam 2008.

⁴ The fifth session of the Synod of Diamper was completely devoted to the doctrinal, liturgical and disciplinary aspects of the Holy *Qurbana*. In this session there are altogether 24 decrees, 9 on the doctrine of the holy sacrament of the Eucharist and 15 on the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass according to the traditional scheme. These 24 decrees provide us with a clear picture of what Menezes did in the Synod of Diamper with regard to the Eucharistic liturgy of the St Thomas Christians as a whole. In order to avoid confusion these decrees will be cited as session V, part 1 and session V, part 2, respectively.

Ros is considered reliable.⁵ After the arrival of the missionary in India in 1583 he was soon sent to Malabar, where he studied Syriac and Malayalam. Since 1584 he began to teach Syriac in the Jesuit seminary at Viapicotta. After the Synod of Diamper, Ros was nominated the first Latin bishop of the Church of St Thomas Christians in 1599. He governed the Church for 23 years, until his death on 18 February 1624.⁶

1.1. More than Forty Corrections of a Dogmatic Character in the Missal

At the end of the book *Synodo diocesano*, the Portuguese historian Antonio De Gouvea added the Latin text of the *Qurbana* (Mass), revised by Menezes, as an appendix.⁷ It has one page of preface in Portuguese, followed by 17 pages (or 9 folios according to the enumeration of Gouvea) of Latin text, without any page numbers. In the said preface to the Diamper *Qurbana* Gouvea twice stated that it was “full of errors and blasphemies”.⁸ Similarly the Synod of Diamper judged that because of the presence of many impious and heretical errors, if due order were observed, “all the missals of this bishopric ought to be burned [...], but being no other at present, they are

⁵ F. Ros, “*Relação sobre a Serra*”, written in 1604, British Library MS Add. 9853, ff. 86-99, original text with English translation, “A Report on the Serra”, in G. Nedungatt (ed.), *The Synod of Diamper Revisited*, Rome 2001, 303-367.

⁶ Cf. A. Santos, “Francisco Ros, S. J. Arzobispo de Cranganor, primer Obispo Jesuita de la India”, *Missionalia Hispanica* 14 (1948) 325-393 and 15 (1949) 79-142.

⁷ A. De Gouvea, *Synodo diocesano da Igreja e bispado de Angamale dos antigos christãos de Sam Thome das Serras do Malavar das partes da India Oriental*, Coimbra 1606 (this book was attached to *Jornada do Arcebispo de Goa* in one volume). Since Archbishop Menezes did not know Syriac, a faithful word by word Latin translation of the *Qurbana* was made, into which he introduced the corrections and modifications.

⁸ A. De Gouvea, *Synodo diocesano da Igreja e bispado de Angamale*, appendix, fol. 1.

tolerated, until such time as our Lord the Pope shall take some order therein, and there shall be missals sent by him printed in the Chaldean tongue".⁹ Since the real intention of Menezes was to provide missals printed in Chaldean or Syriac tongue from Rome, he modified only what he considered Nestorian doctrines and errors, without making any structural change in the text of the *Qurbana*. Obviously the particularities of the East Syrian tradition, simple biblical expressions and authentic Eastern theological elements were branded as tenets of Nestorian heresy and schism.

The dogmatic corrections regarded Christology, Mariology, Pneumatology, sacramental theology, eschatology and theology of non-Christian religions. In the cited book an extensive commentary has been added on more than forty corrections made in the pre-Diamper *Qurbana* of the St Thomas Christians, based on the sources and authoritative studies, demonstrating that it enshrined authentic Christian faith, and not even a single real doctrinal error.¹⁰

1.2. Introduction of Institution Narrative in the *Qurbana* Celebrated with the Anaphora of Addai and Mari

It is almost certain that the pre-Diamper *Qurbana* of the St Thomas Christians with the anaphora of Addai and Mari did not contain an explicit and articulated institution narrative, which was interpolated into it only after the reunion of John Simon Sulaja in 1553 and the formation of the Chaldean Catholic Church. Antonio de Gouvea in his preface to the Diamper *Qurbana* observed:

As these Christians were in a profound ignorance, and the very Chaldean bishops, who came from Babylon, were ignorant, not knowing the true form of consecration, all of them added to it and removed from

⁹ Synod of Diamper, Session V, part 2, decree 1.

¹⁰ P. Pallath, *The Eucharistic Liturgy of the St Thomas Christians*, 85-154; one may also consult R. H. Connolly, "The Work of Meneses on the Malabar Liturgy", *Journal of Theological Studies* XV (1914) 396-425, 569-589.

it whatever they wanted, since there was no sure form of consecration among them. However, a certain archbishop, who had more knowledge than the rest in the ecclesiastical matters and the Holy Scriptures, perceived that the form with which they consecrated contained in it some errors contrary to the truth of the divine Sacrament and hence established the true form, adding some words to it, both in the consecration of the Body and Blood in contradiction to the error and heresy of those who say that the Sacrament is only the figure of the Body of Christ our Lord.¹¹

From the circumstantial evidence, we know that the archbishop mentioned by Gouvea was Mar Joseph Sulaqa, Chaldean metropolitan of the St Thomas Christians from 1555 to 1569, who translated the institution narrative from the Latin Missal into Syriac with some characteristic East Syrian additions and introduced it in the *Qurbana*. In 1555 the Chaldean Catholic Patriarch Mar Abdiso sent Mar Joseph Sulaqa, the brother of John Sulaqa (former Catholic Patriarch) as metropolitan of the St Thomas Christians. When he reached Goa in November 1555, he was arrested and detained in the Franciscan monastery of Bassein near Bombay. During 18 months of detention he was taught Latin Mass, which he began to celebrate, before he was permitted to travel to Malabar.¹² Since he knew both Syriac and Latin, he was the apt person to translate the words of consecration from the Roman Missal into Syriac. Francis Ros, the well-informed Jesuit missionary, explicitly stated:

Mar Joseph who governed this Christianity before Mar Abraham [...] translated from Latin into Chaldean the words of the consecration,

¹¹ A. De Gouvêa, *Synodo Diocesano da Igreja e bispado de Angamale*, appendix, fol. 1; English trans., in P. Pallath, *The Eucharistic Liturgy of the St Thomas Christians*, 12.

¹² For details, G. Beltrami, *La Chiesa caldea nel secolo dell'unione*, Roma 1933, 86-94; E. Tisserant, *Eastern Christianity in India*, Bombay 1957, 38-41 & 175; P. J. Podipara, *The Hierarchy of the Syro-Malabar Church*, Allepey 1976, 65-67 & 77; P. Pallath, *The Catholic Church in India*, third (Indian) edition, Kottayam 2010, 84-86; *The Provincial Councils of Goa and the Church of St Thomas Christians*, 42-45.

although badly, there not being translators who knew both Latin and the Chaldean. He also added some other words as seemed better to him.¹³

Mar Joseph, however, introduced the institution narrative outside the Eucharistic prayer, in between the rite of fraction and the Pauline salutation, keeping intact the ancient anaphora of Addai and Mari. After the death of Mar Joseph in Rome in 1569, 18 Syriac manuscripts, together with other documents, were transferred to the Vatican Library. The Vatican Syriac Codex 66, contains the anaphora of Addai and Mari in folios 101-115, which has the institution narrative on a separate page at the beginning (f. 101), with the indication to recite it after the fraction and consignation. The institution narrative of Mar Joseph reads as follows:

Our Lord Jesus Christ, in the night He was to be delivered and on the day before the passion, took this holy bread in his pure and holy hands and raised his eyes to pronounce a thanksgiving to Thee, God the Father, Maker of all things, and ✠ blessed and broke and gave it to his disciples and said: take and eat all from this bread, this is in truth my body (*and he raises the chalice a little from the altar and says over the chalice*). And likewise after He had taken supper He took this chalice in his pure hands and pronounced a thanksgiving and ✠ blessed and gave it to his disciples and said: Take and drink all you from this chalice, for every time you shall eat from this bread and drink from this chalice, you shall commemorate my memory. This is in truth the chalice of my blood, of the new covenant, which for you and for many is shed for the remission of faults and for the forgiveness of sins. This shall be a pledge for you (rahbôna) for ever and ever. And also (*wken*): The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God the Father and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with all of you, now (and he makes the sign of the cross on himself)...¹⁴

¹³ Cf. F. Ros, “*Relação sobre a Serra*”, 331.

¹⁴ Vatican Syriac Codex 66, fol. 101; English translation as found in J. P. M. Van der Ploeg, *The Christians of St. Thomas in South India and Their Syriac Manuscripts*, Bangalore 1983, 63, with some redactional changes.

It is clear that the words of this consecration was mainly translated from the Latin formula, though not literally and “this shall be for you a pledge for ever and ever”, was added.¹⁵ According to the indication of Mar Joseph, after the institution narrative the *Qurbana* continued with the Pauline salutation: “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ [...]”. Hence the place of the institution narrative was after the fraction and consignation and before the Pauline salutation.

From the report of Francis Ros and the witness of Vatican Syriac Codex 66, it is evident that, at least from the time of Mar Joseph, the anaphora of Addai and Mari with the institution narrative began to be celebrated in Malabar and it was the universal practice even before the Synod of Diamper. Hence the Synod did not lament about the absence of the institution narrative in the *Qurbana*, but only about errors and imperfections. In the preface to the Diamper *Qurbana* Antonio De Gouvea, after referring to Mar Joseph, who “established the true form, adding some words to it, both in the consecration of the Body and Blood”, provided the following information concerning the form of the Sacrament:

The form established by the aforementioned archbishop was: THIS IS IN TRUTH MY BODY; THIS IS IN TRUTH THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD, WHICH WILL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY, FOR THE PROPITIATION OF DEBTS AND REMISSION OF SINS, THIS SHALL BE A PLEDGE FOR YOU FOR EVER AND EVER. In this form they have now consecrated for several years. But the most reverend archbishop primate, having removed the words that are not necessary, established the proper form used in the Catholic Church, as it is in the Roman Missal, laying aside diverse and sacrilegious and

¹⁵ J. P. M. Van der Ploeg, *The Christians of St. Thomas in South India and Their Syriac Manuscripts*, 64.

ignorant ceremonies also, which signified some heresies and errors that were among them.¹⁶

According to the Scholastic terminology the form of the sacrament does not mean the whole institution narrative, but only the words of consecration,¹⁷ which are capitalized in the above citation. The exact words of consecration, given by Gouvea, correspond to those of the Vatican Syriac Codex 66. This confirms the thesis that it is Mar Joseph who introduced the institution narrative in the *Qurbana* with the anaphora of Addai and Mari. In the Diamper *Qurbana* the institution narrative is not found in between the fraction-signing and the Pauline salutation, but inside the priestly prayer just before the fraction, evidently after the conclusion of anaphora. One reasonable hypothesis is that it might have been shifted back and brought to the aforementioned position by the Synod of Angamaly in 1583 held under Mar Abraham, the last Chaldean Metropolitan of the St Thomas Christians.¹⁸ Based on the Diamper *Qurbana* and the decree of the Synod of Diamper on the *Doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass*,¹⁹ the whole institution narrative with its setting which was used up to the time of the Synod, and which was subjected to the correction of Menezes, can be reconstructed as follows:

¹⁶ A. De Gouvea, *Synodo diocesano da Igreja e bispado de Angamale*, appendix, fol. 1; English trans., in P. Pallath, *The Eucharistic Liturgy of the St Thomas Christians*, 12; capitalization is mine.

¹⁷ “Verba autem consecrationis, quae sunt forma huius Sacramenti, sunt haec, Hoc est enim Corpus meum. Et, hic est enim Calix Sanguinis mei, novi et aeterni testamenti, mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum”. De defectibus formae, in *Missale Romanum*, Editio Princeps (1570), Edizione anastatica, introduzione e appendice a cura di M. Sodi-A. M. Triacca, Città del Vaticano 1998, no. 41*, page 24.

¹⁸ Cf. P. J. Podipara, “The Present Syro-Malabar Liturgy: Menezian or Rozian?”, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 23 (1957) 319.

¹⁹ Synod of Diamper, Session V, part 1, preliminary decree.

O Lord Jesus Christ, may there be glory to your holy name and worship to your Divinity for ever. For, you are the living and life-giving bread that descended from heaven and you give life to the entire world. Those who eat this bread do not die and those who receive it are saved and sanctified by it and by it are purified and live for ever. Our Lord Jesus Christ, on the night he was to be handed over, took this holy bread in his pure and holy hands, lifted up his eyes to heaven, and gave thanks to God the Father, the Creator of all, he blessed the bread, broke it and gave it to his disciples, and said: take this, all of you, and eat it, **THIS IS IN TRUTH MY BODY**. Likewise, when the supper was ended, he took up this chalice in his pure hands; he gave thanks, blessed it and gave it to his disciples, saying: take this chalice, all of you, and drink from it, for whenever you eat this bread and drink (from) this chalice, do this in memory of me. **THIS IS IN TRUTH THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD, WHICH WILL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY, FOR THE PROPITIATION OF DEBTS AND REMISSION OF SINS; THIS SHALL BE A PLEDGE FOR YOU FOR EVER AND EVER.**

As already stated, according to Scholastic theology the form of the sacrament of the Most Holy Eucharist does not include the setting or the whole institution narrative but precisely the words about the Body and Blood (the capitalized section above). Menezes corrected only the words of consecration, which constitute the form of the sacrament and not the whole institution narrative. According to the Synod of Diamper the form of the Eucharist is

the words of our Saviour, by which the sacrament is made; for though the priest pronounces many and diverse words in the Mass, and makes many prayers and petitions to God, yet when he comes to consecrate, he uses only the words of Christ, none others belonging to the substance of consecration. So the priest speaking in the person of Christ makes this sacrament, because by virtue of those words, he turns the substance of bread into the substance of the body of Christ, and the whole substance of wine into his blood, there remaining nothing of bread and wine after that, but only the accidents or species of them.²⁰

²⁰ Synod of Diamper, Session V, part 1, preliminary decree.

In accordance with this definition of form, in the correction of the “words of consecration” of the Malabar *Qurbana* the Synod acted on the principle that,

the priest does not consecrate with his own words, but with those of our Lord Christ, the author and institutor of the said divine sacrament. It is not therefore lawful to add any clause, how good so ever in itself to the form of consecration or to what our Lord said therein.²¹

According to this criterion there should only be the words pronounced by Christ in the form of the Eucharist. In the New Testament four institution narratives are found: Mathew 26: 26-30; Mark 14: 22-26; Luke 22: 14-20 & 1 Corinthians 11: 23-25, which are not fully concordant in all respects. The institution narratives in the Christian liturgy of the East and West are evidently a combination of biblical accounts with the addition of other suitable words, handed on by the sound tradition of each Church.

According to the criterion mentioned above one would presume that at least the true form of Eucharist as determined by Scholastic theology contains only words that can be found in any of the four biblical accounts. But when Archbishop Menezes began to correct the institution narrative of the Malabar *Qurbana*, in accordance with the criterion he himself established, he met with an embarrassing situation, because he found some words in the “form of consecration” of the Roman Canon itself, which are not seen in any of the New Testament accounts. They are: *enim* = for, *aeterni* = of eternal and *mysterium fidei* = mystery of faith. Hence Archbishop Menezes was compelled to adopt another practical criterion for the correction of the “words of consecration” of the *Qurbana* of the St Thomas Christians:

the words of consecration of the body and blood be reformed, and put in all their missals, according to the canon of the Roman missal used in the universal Church without the least addition or diminution, and with the

²¹ Synod of Diamper, Session V, part 2, decree 1.

same adorations, inclinations, and ceremonies as are in the Roman Missal.²²

Considering the Roman Canon as the criterion, the synod ordered to add the aforementioned three items to the words of consecration which were lacking and to remove from it two expressions “in truth” and “this shall be a pledge for you for ever and ever” which were not found in the said Canon.²³

As indicated, the Synod also introduced the adorations, inclinations and ceremonies as in the Roman Missal: before the Synod of Diamper there was only one elevation at the end of the institution narrative, which in fact corresponded to the present elevation before the fraction. According to Raulin there was nothing wrong in such a ceremony, but Menezes modified it because, in compliance with the prescription of the Roman Pontiff, he intended to adorn that Church with Latin rites after expunging from it all the ancient errors.²⁴

Hence the rubrics connected with the “words of consecration” and the elevation of the body and blood were taken from the Roman Missal in use at that time. After pronouncing the words of consecration on the bread, the celebrant “immediately genuflects in adoration of the consecrated host, rising up, he shows it to the people, places it on the altar and again he adores it. Then he takes the chalice, raises it a little and says [...]”. Similarly for the chalice the rubrics state: “After the words of consecration, he places it on the corporal, genuflects in adoration, rises and shows it to the people, places it on the altar”.²⁵ After the corrections, additions and omissions, what the missionaries

²² Synod of Diamper, Session V, part 2, decree 1.

²³ For details, P. Pallath, *The Eucharistic Liturgy of the St Thomas Christians*, 129-131.

²⁴ J. F. Raulin, *Historia Ecclesiae Malabaricae cum Diamperitana Synodo*, Romae 1745, 317, footnote.

²⁵ A. De Gouvea, *Synodo diocesano da Igreja e bispado de Angamale*, appendix, fol. 11; J. F. Raulin, *Historia Ecclesiae Malabaricae cum Diamperitana Synodo*, 317-318.

considered the form of the Eucharist, namely the “words of consecration”, fully corresponded to those of the Roman Missal.

As we have seen above, Metropolitan Mar Joseph inserted the institution narrative after the fraction (before the Pauline salutation) and the Synod of Diamper definitively fixed it inside the prayer before the fraction, evidently after the conclusion of the anaphora. From the time of the Synod of Diamper in 1599 until the restoration of the *Qurbana* and its introduction in 1960-1962 the institution narrative always remained at the same place, namely inside the prayer of elevation before the fraction.²⁶ The documents presented in this book will provide precise information concerning the transfer of institution narrative to the anaphora of Addai and Mari and its insertion inside of it, after the hymn of Sanctus.²⁷

1.3. Matter of the Eucharist: Only Unleavened Bread and Grape-Wine

Based on the example of Jesus in the Last Supper and the apostolic tradition, the early Church began to use wheat-bread and grape-wine for the Eucharistic celebration. The universal, constant and uninterrupted tradition concerning the matter of the Eucharist was clearly and officially stated after the emergence of Scholastic theology.²⁸ Leavened bread was used throughout Christendom for the

²⁶ Cf. *An English Version of Rasa or the Syriac Pontifical High-Mass* (English translation by A. Kalapura), Puthenpally 1924, 94-96; Fabian TOCD, *The Qurbana of the East Syrian Catholics of Kerala* (Malayalam), Changanacherry 1953, 233-267; A. Raes, *An Explanation of the Syro-Malabarese Holy Mass*, Changanacherry 1957, 39-41.

²⁷ See especially documents 4 and 23.

²⁸ J. Neuner & J. Dupuis, *The Christian Faith in the Doctrinal Documents of the Catholic Church* (seventh revised and enlarged edition), New York 2001, no. 1509; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum, definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum* (edizione bilingue a cura di P. Hünermann, seconda edizione), Bologna 1996, no. 1320.

celebration of the Eucharist for more than seven centuries.²⁹ Subsequently there emerged a difference with regard to the wheat-bread: the Latin Church began to use unleavened bread, while the Eastern Churches continued to consecrate with leavened bread. In the course of time both these traditions were officially approved by the Church. In 1439 the general council of Florence stated:

[...] we define that the body of Christ is truly effected with either unleavened or leavened wheaten bread; and that priests must consecrate the body of the Lord in one way or the other, namely each following the custom of their Church, either the Western or the Oriental Church.³⁰

From the unanimous testimony of the Western missionaries it is certain that before the sixteenth century leavened bread made of wheat or rice was used in the *Qurbana* in Malabar. The bread, freshly baked mixing in it salt and oil, was usually brought to the priest on a fresh leaf just before the offertory. The bread was baked by deacons and minor clerics, with great devotion, reciting psalms, hymns and prayers.³¹ As Francis Ros witnessed, one of the main reasons for the departure of the St Thomas Christians and their priests from

²⁹ Y. Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 3 (the Complete Three-Volume Work in one Volume), New York 2001, 243; K. H. Kandler, "Wann werden die Azyme das Brotelement in der Eucharistie im Abendland?", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 75 (1964) 153-155.

³⁰ J. Neuner & J. Dupuis, *The Christian Faith*, no. 1508; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum*, no. 1303; N. P. Tanner (ed.), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, vol. 1, London 1990, 527.

³¹ Cf. F. Ros, "*Relação sobre a Serra*", 305 & 331; A. Monserrat, "Información de los christianos de S. Thomé" (A Report to the Jesuit General Fr. Everardo Mercuriano, dated 12 January 1579), in J. Wicki, *Documenta Indica*, XI (1970) 517; A. De Gouvea, *Jornada do Arcebispo de Goa Dom Frey Aleixo de Menezes Primaz da India Oriental, Religioso da Ordem de S. Agostinho*, Coimbra 1606, 59; P. Malekandathil (ed.), *Jornada of Dom Alexis De Menezes: A Portuguese Account of the Sixteenth Century Malabar*, Kochi 2003, 239; F. De Sousa, *Oriente Conquistado a Jesu Christo*, segunda parte (= II), Lisboa 1710, 120; J. F. Raulin, *Historia Ecclesiae Malabaricae cum Diamperitana Synodo*, 391.

Cranganore (which in the meantime became a Portuguese centre) was the prohibition “to say Mass with the leavened bread according to the custom of the Greeks”.³²

The Eucharistic wine was prepared from dry grapes or raisins brought from foreign countries. The dry grapes were put in water and then juice was pressed out for consecration.³³ Francis Ros clearly stated that Chaldean Metropolitan Mar Joseph “introduced the hosts and wine from Portugal. Formerly they used to squeeze raisins, and with the liquid coming out of them, they used to say the Mass”.³⁴ In spite of a few sporadic references to products like wine of palms or coconut sap, based on the general opinion of the missionaries and indications of the Synod of Diamper it can be established with certainty that before the sixteenth century the St Thomas Christians generally used wine made out of dried grapes or raisins for Eucharistic celebration. According to Jacob Vellian, “In the absence of vineyards in India this looks like a typical adaptation. One may also note that Malabar does not grow wheat. And hence the use of rice flour is also understandable”.³⁵

The Eastern custom of using leavened bread was never condemned by any ecumenical council. The Roman Pontiffs also personally recognized that the Eucharist can be consecrated either with

³² F. Ros, “*Relação sobre a Serra*”, 325. He stated, “according to the custom of the Greeks”, because he ignored the fact that also all other Eastern Churches used leavened bread for the Eucharistic celebration.

³³ For more about the eucharistic bread and wine, see F. Ros, “*Relação sobre a Serra*”, 331; J. F. Raulin, *Historia Ecclesiae Malabaricae cum Diamperitana Synodo*, 387 & 391; A.Valavanthara, *India in 1500 AD: The Narratives of Joseph the Indian*, Kottayam 1984, 175; J. Hilarion, “The Sacraments of the Malabar Church before 1400 A. D.”, in G. Menacherry (ed.), *The Thōmapēdia*, Ollur 2000, 115-116; J. Vellian, “An Eastern and Indianized Liturgy”, *Christian Orient*, vol. I/2 (1980) 16-18; P. Vazheeparampil, “The *Toma Marga*, Icon of the Indo-Oriental Identity of the Thomas Christians of India”, *Christian Orient*, vol. XV, n. 1 (1994) 9-10.

³⁴ F. Ros, “*Relação sobre a Serra*”, 331.

³⁵ J. Vellian, “An Eastern and Indianized Liturgy”, 17-18.

leavened or unleavened bread.³⁶ Since the intention of the Western missionaries in India was the complete substitution of the Eastern rite with the Latin rite, they could not tolerate leavened bread as used among the St Thomas Christians, nor wine made of dried grapes. As we have already seen, under pressure from the missionaries, already Metropolitan Mar Joseph Sulaqa (1555-1569) had introduced unleavened bread of wheat and Portuguese wine for the Eucharistic celebration.³⁷ The Synod of Diamper determined that the matter of the Holy Eucharist is

bread of wheat, and wine of grape only; so that all who consecrate in bread made of rice, or of anything else but the flour of wheat, or of wine that was not pressed out of the ripe grape of the vine do not make the sacrament”.³⁸

The Synod further ordered the vicars to take care to be always provided of the flour of wheat for making hosts “which they must be sure not to mix with anything else, as is done commonly in other bread, for fear there should be no consecration therein [...]. The same care shall be taken of the wine that it be no other than that of Portugal”, and that “it be not mixed with the juice of raisins, or with any other wines of the country for the same danger”.³⁹ The Synod requested the king of Portugal to send sufficient wine annually for the celebration of the Eucharist.⁴⁰

³⁶ For example, Pope Benedict XIV, Bull *Etsi Pastoralis*, section 1, no. 2 and section 6, no. 10, in *Iuris Pontificii de Propaganda Fide*, pars prima, vol. III, Romae 1890, 59 & 63; Encyclical Letter *Allatae sunt*, no. 23, in *Codicis Iuris Canonici Fontes*, vol. II, Romae 1928, 461-462.

³⁷ F. Ros, “*Relação sobre a Serra*”, 331; cf. also F. De Sousa, *Oriente Conquistado a Jesu Christo II*, 120.

³⁸ Synod of Diamper, Session V, part 2, preliminary decree.

³⁹ Synod of Diamper, Session V, part 2, decree 7.

⁴⁰ Synod of Diamper, Session V, part 2, decree 9.

As stated above, Portuguese wine began to be used for the Eucharistic celebration several years before the Synod of Diamper. Since the wine was brought from Portugal at long intervals, some priests used to keep it for a long time in glass bottles, with the danger of the wine turning into vinegar. Hence the “Synod in the strictest manner that it can, does command, that in every church there shall be in the vicar’s keeping a sweet pipe, or small runlet of wood or a flask, in which the wine for the Masses shall be kept and that the vicars be extremely careful, that the wine do not decay or turn into vinegar, which if it should happen so as to have lost the essence of wine [...] they shall not celebrate therewith, it being a great sacrilege to do it, seeing there can be no consecration”.⁴¹

Based on the testimonies of Western missionaries, as well as on the acts and decrees of the Synod of Diamper we can rightly conclude that before the XVI century leavened bread was used for the Eucharistic celebration. Similarly in the particular circumstances of that epoch wine made out of dried grapes or raisins was used.

1.4. Prohibition of the Second and Third Anaphoras

In addition to the anaphora of Addai and Mari, there are two other “sanctifications” or “hallowings” in the East Syrian tradition, which were falsely attributed to Mar Theodore of Mopsuestia and Mar Nestorius respectively. At present the Catholics refer to them simply as the second and the third anaphoras. Traditionally the second anaphora is celebrated from the first Sunday of Annunciation to the Sunday of Hosanna inclusive. The third anaphora is used only five times a year: on the feast of Epiphany, on the Friday of John the Baptist, on the memorial day of Greek doctors, on the Wednesday of the rogation of Ninevites and on the Passover Thursday.⁴²

⁴¹ Synod of Diamper, Session V, part 2, decree 8.

⁴² Cf. Sacra Congregazione per la Chiesa Orientale, *Liturgia Siro-Malabaresi: Revisione e Ristampa del Messale Siro-Malabarese*, Prot. N. 947/48, Roma 1955; 45

The Synod of Diamper commanded that the second and the third anaphoras of the East Syrian tradition had to be taken out of the books and burnt. In fact,

the Synod does command that all such masses, entire as they are, to be taken out and burnt, and in virtue of obedience and upon pain of excommunication *latae sententiae* does prohibit all priests from henceforward to presume to use them, ordering them to be forthwith cut out of their books, and at the next visitation to be delivered by them to the most illustrious Metropolitan or to such as he shall appoint to correct their books, that so these masses may be burnt.⁴³

After the Synod of Diamper, on the occasion of the canonical visits of parishes conducted by Archbishop Menezes those anaphoras together with all other Syriac books and liturgical texts were burned.⁴⁴ Hence the aforementioned anaphoras did not appear in any of the post Diamper missals of the Catholic St Thomas Christians. From the documents presented in this book the readers will understand what happened to these anaphoras during the restoration of *Qurbana*.⁴⁵

1.5. Holy Communion under the Species of Bread Alone

In harmony with the apostolic and patristic traditions both in the East and in the West Communion was given in both species. Later there originated in the Latin Church the custom of Communion in the

& 55; F. Y. Alichoran (French trans.), *Missel Chaldéen*, Paris 1982, 121 & 145; *The Liturgy of the Holy Apostles Adai and Mari, together with the Liturgies of Mar Theodorus and Mar Nestorius and the Order of Baptism* (edited by K. A. Paul & G. Mookan), Trichur 1967, 68 & 85.

⁴³ Synod of Diamper, Session V, part 2, decree 2.

⁴⁴ Cf. Synod of Diamper, session III, decrees 14-16 & session V, part 1, decree 1; cf. also A. De Gouvea, *Jornada do Arcebispo de Goa Dom Frey Aleixo de Menezes*, 74-75 & 88; P. Malekandathil (ed.), *Jornada of Dom Alexis de Menezes*, 294-296 & 351; J. Kollaparambil, "The Impact of the Synod of Diamper", 163-164; G. Thadikkatt, *Liturgical Identity of the Mār Tōma Nazrāni Church*, 99-100.

⁴⁵ See especially documents 4 and 23.

one form of bread, which in the course of time became the general rule. In 1415 the general Council of Constance went to the extreme of condemning those who asserted that “the Christian people ought to receive the holy sacrament of the Eucharist under the forms of both bread and wine”. Based on the doctrinal principle: “the whole body and blood of Christ are truly contained under both the form of bread and the form of wine” the Council taught that “although this sacrament was received by the faithful under both kinds in the early Church, nevertheless later it was received under both kinds only by those consecrating it, and by the laity only under the form of bread”.⁴⁶

The Council of Trent reiterated the aforementioned doctrinal principle that Christ is received whole and entire under either kind alone, but forcefully endorsed the Communion under the form of bread alone. Only the consecrating priest was allowed to receive Communion under both kinds. After acknowledging the common tradition of receiving Communion under both kinds, the Council approved the Latin custom as the general rule:

Although from the beginning of Christian worship the use of both kinds was common, yet that custom was very widely changed in the course of time; and so holy mother Church [...] has approved this custom of communicating in one form and has decreed this to be its rule, which is not to be condemned nor freely changed without the Church’s own authority.⁴⁷

In accord with the spirit of the Council of Trent, the Roman Catechism of 1566 prohibited the Communion of the faithful under both kinds. The Catechism explained:

⁴⁶ Council of Constance, session 13 on 15 June 1415, N. P. Tanner (ed.), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, vol. 1, 418-419; J. Neuner & J. Dupuis, *The Christian Faith*, no. 1506; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum*, no. 1199.

⁴⁷ Council of Trent, session 21, 16 July 1562, N. P. Tanner (ed.), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, vol. 2, London 1990, 727; see also J. Neuner & J. Dupuis, *The Christian Faith*, nos. 1537-1540; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum*, nos. 1726-1729.

As to the rite to be observed in communicating, pastors should teach that the law of the holy Church forbids Communion under both kinds to anyone but the officiating priests, without the authority of the Church itself. Christ the Lord, it is true, as has been explained by the Council of Trent, instituted and delivered to his Apostles at his Last Supper this most sublime Sacrament under the species of bread and wine; but it does not follow that by doing so our Lord and Saviour established a law ordering its administration to all the faithful under both species. For speaking of this Sacrament, he himself frequently mentions it under one kind only, as, for instance, when he says: If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever, and: The bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world, and: he that eats this bread shall live for ever.⁴⁸

Evidently in the post Tridentine Roman Missal there was no provision for Communion of the faithful under both kinds. The *Ritus Servandus* explicitly stated that the celebrant consumed the whole Blood (*totum Sanguinem*) before giving Communion to the faithful.⁴⁹

The custom of Communion under both kinds was modified only in the Latin Church; the Eastern Churches continued the early practice, which the Council of Trent did not seem to abolish. Consonant with the Eastern tradition, the St Thomas Christians also received Communion in both species.⁵⁰ The Synod of Diamper prohibited this practice because

⁴⁸ *Catechismus Romanus seu Catechismus ex decreto Concilii Tridentini ad parochos Pii Quinti Pont. Max. iussu editus*, Editio critica, Editioni praefuit Petrus Rodriguez, Città del Vaticano 1989, 276-277.

⁴⁹ *Missale Romanum*, Editio Princeps (1570), no. 29*, page 18 & no. 1547.

⁵⁰ Cf. Letter of Alvaro Penteado (1528), in A. Silva Rego, *Documentação para a historia das missões do Padroado português do Oriente*, vol. 3, Lisbon 1950, 548; Report of M. Carneiro, in J. Wicki, *Documenta Indica*, vol. III, 805; J. F. Raulin, *Historia Ecclesiae Malabaricae cum Diamperitana Synodo*, 389; for details, A. M. Mundadan, *History of Christianity in India, Volume 1: From the Beginning up to the Middle of the Sixteenth Century*, Bangalore 1989, 202; J. Vellian & V. Pathikulangara, "The Eucharistic Liturgy of the Chaldeo-Indian Church", in J. Madey (ed.), *The Eucharistic Liturgy in the Christian East*, Kottayam-Paderborn 1982, 257-258.

[...] in every crumb of the host, though never so small, there is Christ entire, and in every drop of the species of wine that is separated there is Christ entire, so that in each of the species whole Christ, God and man is received, as also the true sacrament; for which reason holy mother Church does not use to communicate the faithful but under one species, because in that they receive Christ entire.⁵¹

In accordance with this decree, Communion began to be given to the faithful under the species of bread alone and in the course of time the practice of Communion in both kinds was completely abolished among the Catholic St Thomas Christians.

1.6. Sign of the Cross from Left to Right

In first millennium the sign of the cross was made from right to left in the whole of Christendom.⁵² Although the Latin Church later modified the practice, generally the Eastern Churches continued to cross from right to left. In harmony with the Eastern tradition until the Synod of Diamper the St Thomas Christians – the priests during the celebration of the Eucharist and other sacraments, and the simple Christian faithful during their prayers – also made the sign of the cross from right to left. Francis Ros confirmed:

These Christians used to bless themselves from right shoulder to the left, which it seems they received from the Greeks, who perfidiously hold that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father only.⁵³

The Synod of Diamper, desiring that the Church of Malabar, “should in all things be conformable to the Latin customs, or holy mother Church of Rome” abolished the St Thomas Christian custom of

⁵¹ Synod of Diamper, Session V, part 1, preliminary decree.

⁵² Cf. Congregatio pro Ecclesiis Orientalibus, *Final Judgement of the S. Congregation for the Oriental Churches concerning the Order of the Syro-Malabar Qurbana* (24 July 1985, Prot. N. 955/65), no. 19; in *Roman Documents on the Syro-Malabar Liturgy*, 106.

⁵³ F. Ros, “*Relação sobre a Serra*”, 341.

making the sign of the cross from the right to the left and commanded that

all children and all other people be taught to cross and bless themselves from the left to the right, according to the Latin custom, which shall also be observed by the priests in the blessings they give to the people, and in the crosses they make in the holy sacrifice of the Mass, and the administration of other sacraments.⁵⁴

Before the sixteenth century the priests and the Christian faithful always and invariably made the sign of the cross was from right to left. The Synod of Diamper in 1599 abolished this Eastern practice; after the Synod evidently the Latin practice of the sign of the cross from left to right became common.

1.7. Western Attire and Liturgical Vestments

The priests of the St Thomas Christian Church had an Indian clerical dress of their own consisting of long loose pants and long loose shirts with a sailor's collar. Their tonsure was different from that of Latins, shaving all around the bottom part of the head, with a tuft of hair on the upper part, like the *Nambudhiris* of Kerala. All grew beards.⁵⁵ Some had long beards and long hair like the Hindu *sanyasi* (religious). The Synod of Diamper granted liberty to the elderly priests who already had beards, but stipulated that the "young shall not suffer their beards to grow, but shall still keep them shaved, and they that wear them very long, shall take care to cut off the hair, that grows near their lips, so that they may not be a hindrance to their receiving the blood of the cup in the Mass, by being so long as to touch it".⁵⁶ Further

⁵⁴ Synod of Diamper, Session VIII, decree 37.

⁵⁵ Cf. P. J. Podipara, *The Thomas Christians*, London-Bombay 1970, 89; S. Vandanamthadathil, *Inculturation in Religious Life among the St. Thomas Christians in Kerala (India)*, An Appraisal, Rome 1998, 175; K. P. Padmanabha Menon, *History of Kerala*, vol. 2, New Delhi 1983, 41-42.

⁵⁶ Synod of Diamper, Session VII, decree 12.

the Synod “in virtue of obedience and upon pain of excommunication” ordered that all clerics have to wear the habit, tonsure and shaved crown like other ecclesiastics (that is like the Latin clergy) and not long hair after the fashion of the laity.⁵⁷

For the Eucharistic celebration the priests dressed in a large piece of Indian cloth in the form of an amice, a stole and a mantle. However, metropolitan Mar Joseph Sulaqa (1555-1569), constrained by the missionaries, introduced the Western liturgical vestments. With regard to this Francis Ros affirmed:

When they say Mass they put on an alb, which in the front and in the back has some crosses. Over it they put on a stole made in the form of a cross in front of the chest. Over it they put on a mantle which covers their head without blocking their eyes and face, but covers the whole body. Lifting up its brims with both hands, as in lifting the Portuguese surplice, the hands are made free; and so they say Mass. Mar Joseph who governed this Christianity before Mar Abraham removed this rite and introduced the amice and the other sacred vestments of the Roman usage.⁵⁸

From the description of Francis Ros one can easily understand that Indian-Eastern vestments were in use among the St Thomas for the liturgical celebrations. The Synod of Diamper did not explicitly order the use of Roman liturgical vestments, because from the time of Mar Joseph, the priests were accustomed to do so. However, the Synod commanded that out of the alms of the parish, Archbishop Menezes might provide all the churches, especially the poor ones, with holy vestments, so that none might be without them.⁵⁹ Evidently the vestments thus provided were of the Roman Church and hence after the Synod there was no church without such vestments.

⁵⁷ Synod of Diamper, Session VII, decree 14.

⁵⁸ F. Ros, “*Relação sobre a Serra*”, 331; almost the same idea also in F. De Sousa, *Oriente Conquistado a Jesu Christo* II, 120-121.

⁵⁹ Synod of Diamper, Session V, part 2, decree VII.

However, the Latin surplice and stole were unknown to the St Thomas Christians. Hence the Synod ordered:

[...] whereas hitherto there has been no such thing as a surplice in this bishopric, the most reverend Metropolitan having been pleased to provide such vestments as are necessary, no vicar shall go from hence without taking a surplice along with him, which he is to wear in the administration of the holy sacraments [...].⁶⁰

Antonio De Gouvea attested that on the last day of the Synod each parish priest was given a consecrated altar stone, a small box with vases of holy oils and a surplice for the correct administration of the sacraments.⁶¹

According to the East Syrian tradition subdeacons also put on the stole, while assisting at the liturgical ceremonies but in a manner different from that of the deacons. Since according to the Latin tradition “the stole is the particular Badge of the order of the deacon, it is not lawful for any person that has not taken the said order, to use the stole in the church”. Hence the Synod prohibited the subdeacons to wear the stole. Moreover, according to the Synod, “it would be decent for the deacons when they wear the stole, to be in a surplice and to have a towel [...]”.⁶² In brief, deacons and subdeacons had to dress exactly as in the Latin Church.

On the basis of what we have seen, we can rightly conclude that the subdeacons, deacons and priests had their own liturgical vestments according to the East Syrian tradition, perhaps with Indian adaptations. They were definitively abolished in the Synod of Diamper and afterwards only Latin vestments were used.

⁶⁰ Synod of Diamper, Session VIII, decree 22; cf. also Session IV, decree 14.

⁶¹ A. De Gouvea, *Jornada do Arcebispo de Goa Dom Frey Aleixo de Menezes*, 72; P. Malekandathil (ed.), *Jornada of Dom Alexis De Menezes*, 291.

⁶² Synod of Diamper, Session V, part 2, decree 6.

1.8. Structure of Churches and Veil of the Sanctuary

Once ensured the dignity of the “house of God” and the suitability for the liturgical celebration, the architecture and style of the temples of the country can be adopted for church-buildings. The St Thomas Christians acted on this principle from very ancient times. Maintaining the internal basic structure necessary for the celebration of the East Syrian liturgy, they developed an authentic church-architecture in Kerala which was so Indian that in the pre-Portuguese period, Hindu temples and Christian church buildings were hardly distinguishable from the outside except for the cross on the top of the church. The churches of this period had all the essentials of a Hindu temple.⁶³ Moreover, there were also a (granite) cross in front of the Christian churches or chapels, in order to distinguish them from the Hindu buildings for worship. With regard to the pre-Portuguese churches and the nature of the crosses Antonio De Gouvea wrote:

[...] The old churches were all built like the temples of the gentiles, but all full of crosses like those of the miracle of S. Thome (Mylapore), which they call cross of Saint Thomas, from which it can be seen how more old is the veneration of this cross, and affection and its way, than the time when it was found by the Portuguese; for the old churches built by these Christians many years before the Portuguese came out to India, were all adorned by them both with painting and with sculpture.⁶⁴

Francis Ros, the well-informed missionary and the first Latin bishop of the St Thomas Christians confirmed: “They are very pious and have

⁶³ For details P. Maniyattu, *Heaven on Earth: The Theology of Liturgical Spacetime in the East Syrian Qurbana*, Rome 1995, 140-184; P. J. Podipara, *The Thomas Christians*, 86; J. Menacherry, “Thomas Christian Architecture”, in G. Menacherry (ed.), *The Thōmapēdia*, Ollur 2000, 142-144; A. Athapilly, “Kerala Church Architecture”, in G. Menacherry (ed.), *The Thōmapēdia*, Ollur 2000, 150-152; Anantakrishna Ayyar, *Anthropology of the Syrian Christians*, Ernakulam 1926, 150.

⁶⁴ A. De Gouvea, *Jornada do Arcebispo de Goa Dom Frey Aleixo de Menezes*, 60; P. Malekandathil (ed.), *Jornada of Dom Alexis De Menezes*, 244-245.

great veneration for the cross, which they make in the manner of the legacy of St. Thomas, the ends of the four arms divided into three leaves of the lily”.⁶⁵ From the report of the missionaries it is evident that the distinguishing emblem of the ancient Christian churches was the presence of the St Thomas crosses, which were gradually replaced by Portuguese crosses and crucifixes. With regard to the internal Eastern structure of the pre-Portuguese churches Ros reported:

The temples which these Christians had built before the arrival of the Portuguese were in the style of the Greeks. The main chapel is rather narrow with a small altar in the centre built on to the wall at the East end. On the left there is a closet with a small door to the West and in this place they used to baptize. Besides they have another closet on the North side, or otherwise they have a place on the floor above the main chapel, where they make the hosts in the manner the Greeks make them, reciting a certain number of psalms while making them. Through an opening in the centre of the floor above the main chapel they would let down that bun with great solemnity. They have no chasuble. They have a veil which covers the door of the main chapel, which they open and close at certain times when they say Mass [...].⁶⁶

From this description one can understand that although the external appearance of the churches was like the Hindu temples, the internal structure was suitable for the celebration of the East Syrian liturgy. Since Francis Ros did not know the East Syrian structure of churches, he considered it as the “style of the Greeks”. Whether one likes it or not, according to the trustworthy testimony of Ros, not only there was sanctuary veil in the churches, but also it was opened and closed at certain times during the Mass.⁶⁷

Just like the Hindu temples the ancient churches had a walled-in compound with small granite lamps inside and outside the walls. The

⁶⁵ F. Ros, *Relação sobre a Serra*, 327.

⁶⁶ F. Ros, “*Relação sobre a Serra*”, 305.

⁶⁷ Obviously the competent authorities decide whether the veil is to be used today during the *Qurbana* in accordance with the signs of the times.

Christians poured oil and lighted these lamps daily. Adjacent to the church there were *ayudappura* (house of arms) *kottupura* (music hall), *uttupura* (refectory) *kodimaram* (flag staff) and pools or wells for washing feet before entering the church.⁶⁸

After the arrival of the Western missionaries the churches began to be built according to Portuguese architecture both with regard to the external structure and the internal arrangement for celebration. Already during the governance of the Chaldean Metropolitan Mar Jacob (1503-1550) churches began to be constructed in the Western architectural style with façade and tower so that they might look different from the Hindu temples built in the South Indian architectural style.⁶⁹ The Synod of Diamper did not legislate on the matter, since the Western architecture had already been introduced. The churches are built even today in the Western manner, though in some places new Indian models have begun to appear.

In this section I have presented only a few selected items, which are often objects of controversy, but are helpful to understand the documents which will be reproduced in this book. In all such items, before the XVI century the practices of the St Thomas Christians corresponded to the Eastern traditions in general and to the Syriac spiritual heritage in particular. The Western missionaries and especially the Synod of Diamper modified all such items in accordance with Western customs.

⁶⁸ Cf. A. Thazhath, *The Juridical Sources of the Syro-Malabar Church*, Kottayam 1987, 47-50; J. Menacherry, "Thomas Christian Architecture", 146-147.

⁶⁹ Letter of Fr Lourenco de Goes to the King of Portugal on 28 December 1536, in A. Silva Rego, *Documentação para a historia das missões do Padroado português do Oriente*, vol. 2, 244; J. Kollaparambil, "The Impact of the Synod of Diamper", 156.

2. Modifications in the Eucharistic Liturgy of the St Thomas Christians after the Synod of Diamper

After the Synod of Diamper in 1599, Latin bishops governed the Catholic St Thomas Christians until the appointment of native bishops in 1896. The modifications made in the *Qurbana* during such a long period of Latin governance are briefly presented in this section.

2.1. The *Qurbana* of Francis Ros

After the Synod of Diamper, Francis Ros was nominated the first Latin bishop of the St Thomas Christians in 1599. He officially implemented the Syriac translation of Latin liturgical books, prepared in the Jesuit Seminary of Vaipicotta after the third provincial Council of Goa (1585), in accordance with the norms of the Synod of Diamper. With regard to liturgy, he continued the work of Menezes and endeavoured to conform it further to the Roman tradition.⁷⁰

In 1603 Bishop Francis Ros conducted a Synod at Angamaly, in which some decrees of Diamper were altered or modified and others were abandoned. After the Synod of Angamaly, Bishop Ros wrote a letter to Jesuit General Claudio Aquaviva on 26 December 1603 in which he informed the General of the new synod as follows:

I conducted a diocesan synod at Angamaly this Advent to the satisfaction of all; they (the Christians) renewed their oath of obedience to the Holy Father and abjured their former heretical beliefs. This present synod was conducted in due form and while many things were ordained for the good of these souls, former decisions were altered (which the Archbishop of Goa had taken when he came here); this was done at the insistence of the entire Christian community, who said that

⁷⁰ For details, cf. P. J. Podipara, “The Present Syro-Malabar Liturgy: Menezian or Rozian?”, 313-322; J. Vellian, “The Synod of Diamper and the Liturgy of the Syro-Malabar Church”, G. Nedungatt (ed.), *The Synod of Diamper Revisited*, Rome 2001, 186-187.

at that time they were not consulted on any point and that they did not understand many of the things prescribed by the first synod [...].⁷¹

Based on the acts and decrees of this Synod Bishop Ros published his diocesan statutes on 16 May 1606, in which he continued the implementation of the decrees of the provincial councils of Goa and of the Synod of Diamper as well as further Westernization of the ecclesial life and sacramental discipline of the Church.⁷² The work of Ros is divided into four books, each of which contains several chapters. In Book II he deals with matters pertaining to the Eucharistic Sacrament and Sacrifice in chapters 6, 7, 8-10. It is read in chapter 10:

There is much confusion in the diocese since the priests celebrate the *Qurbana* in several ways. The *Qurbana*, therefore, shall be celebrated as it is written in the *Taksa* according as we commanded in the second Synod of Angamaly; if priests will not do like this every day, they shall not celebrate the *Qurbana*.⁷³

In fact, besides the changes made by the Synod of Diamper and Archbishop Menezes, Francis Ros further restructured the Eucharistic liturgy in accordance with the Roman Missal with several Latin interpolations and many East Syrian omissions.⁷⁴

2.2. The Printed *Qurbana* of the St Thomas Christians (1774)

As we have seen above Menezes corrected the *Qurbana* and ordered the St Thomas Christians to use it in a provisory manner,

⁷¹ Roma, Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu, *Goa-Mal.* 15, f. 176-177v; J. Thaliath, *The Synod of Diamper*, Rome 1958, 131-132.

⁷² Francis Ros, *Diocesan Statutes*, in Bibliotheca Vaticana, *Codex Borgiano Indiano*, 18.

⁷³ *Codex Borgiano Indiano*, 18, fol. 45; P. J. Podipara, "The Present Syro-Malabar Liturgy: Menezian or Rozian?", 326.

⁷⁴ Cf. P. J. Podipara, "The Present Syro-Malabar Liturgy: Menezian or Rozian?", 313-322; J. Vellian, "The Synod of Diamper and the Liturgy of the Syro-Malabar Church", 185-191.

namely until authentic printed texts were provided from Rome. However the Syro-Malabar *Taksa* in Syriac language, entitled in Latin *Ordo Chaldaicus Missae iuxta morem Ecclesiae malabaricae, Superiorum permissu editus*, was printed in Rome only in 1774, namely about 175 years after the Synod of Diamper. This is the first printed text of the Malabar *Qurbana*; until this time there were only manuscript versions. As Podipara convincingly demonstrated, after the governance of Francis Ros, significant modifications were not made in the *Qurbana* by other Latin bishops and hence the text printed in Rome was practically that of Ros.⁷⁵

A Reprint of the Missal was brought out in 1844 by Propaganda under the title, *Ordo Chaldaicus rituum et lectionum juxta morem Ecclesiae Malabaricae*. Other editions came out in India, four at Puthenapally between the years 1904 and 1931 and one at Mannanam in 1928.⁷⁶

2.3. Principal Modifications in the *Qurbana* after the Synod of Diamper

I indicate below all the important interpolations, omissions and modifications found in the printed Roman *Taksa* of 1774 and its later Roman edition of 1884 which, in spite of different Indian editions, constituted the normative text of the *Qurbana* of the Catholic St Thomas Christians until 1960-1962. In addition to the text of the *Qurbana* this presentation is based on authentic studies which are indicated only once, in order to avoid footnotes for each small item.⁷⁷

⁷⁵ See his article, "The Present Syro-Malabar Liturgy: Menezian or Rozian?".

⁷⁶ Cf. *Ritus et Libri Liturgici Syro-Malabarici*, Thevara 1933, 58; E. Tisserant, *Eastern Christianity in India*, Bombay 1957, 180-181.

⁷⁷ All these works are already cited and hence full bibliographical details are not given: A. Kalapura (trans.), *An English Version of Rasa or the Syriac Pontifical High-Mass*; Fabian TOCD, *The Qurbana of the East Syrian Catholics of Kerala*; P, J. Podipara, "The Present Syro-Malabar Liturgy: Menezian or Rozian?"; *Ritus et Libri*

Pious practices and popular devotions connected with the Eucharistic liturgy, adopted from the Latin Church in the course of time, are not taken into consideration.

1. Preparation: in the Diamper *Qurbana* there was no preparatory prayer, whereas in the subsequent versions the rites of washing and vesting, together with the respective prayers were adopted from the Roman Missal.

2. Official entrance: the Diamper text prescribed that the deacon should go before the celebrant swinging the thurible, but in the later versions the entrance with the prescribed prayers was exactly as in the Roman Missal.

3. Sign of the cross: the pre-Diamper *Qurbana* began with the angelic hymn, “Glory to God in the highest”. Menezes maintained this tradition, without any modification. However Francis Ros introduced the sign of the cross in the beginning: “In the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen”.

4. Gloria: a combination of the Latin Gloria and Sanctus hymn paraphrased according to the spirit of Roman tradition was sung after the sign of the cross.

5. Puqdarkon: your permission – Christ’s command; perhaps this item existed from time immemorial, but it was added to the text of the *Qurbana* only in the XVII century.

6. Transposition of offertory: in the Diamper text the preparation of gifts and the offertory took place during the proclamation-prayer of the deacon. The order was: *trisagion*, *karozutha* I, deacon’s proclamation-prayer (*karozutha* II), during which the priest prepared the gifts, then anthem of the mysteries and

Liturgici Syro-Malabarici; A. Raes, *An Explanation of the Syro-Malabarese Holy Mass*; J. Vellian, “The Synod of Diamper and the Liturgy of the Syro-Malabar Church”, 185-190; for understanding the modifications it is evident that one should also consult: *Missale Romanum, ex decreto sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum, S. Pii V Pontificis Maximi Jussu Editum*, Editio Princeps in 1570.

offertory, the second part of the anthem of the mysteries, *karozutha* III, concluding prayer of *karozutha*, dismissal of the unworthy and catechumens. In the Rosian *Qurbana* as appeared in the Roman and other editions all these items were placed after the creed just before the approach to the altar and the beginning of anaphora.

7. Transposition of liturgy of the Word: in the Diamper text the scriptural readings together with the accompanying prayers were after the offertory, imposition of hands and dismissal of the catechumens. In the Rosian and subsequent texts they were found in the traditional place, namely after the *Trisagion* and before the *karozutha*.

8. Institution narrative: from the time of the Synod of Diamper until 1962 the position was always after the conclusion of the anaphora, inside the prayer before the fraction and signing. Menezes changed only what he considered the form of the sacrament, namely the “words of consecration”, whereas later the whole institution narrative including its setting was taken from the Roman Missal.

9. Addition of 3 prayers from the Maronite Missal: after the fraction and the Pauline salutation, a hymn attributed to Mar Jacob of Sarug, “O Father of truth, behold your Son, the victim which reconciles you [...]”; a final blessing in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the prayer of bidding adieu to the altar, “Remain in peace, altar of forgiveness”.

10. Addition of prayers from the Roman Missal: at the end of the rite of reconciliation *Agnus Dei*, “Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world, have mercy on us”, with the elevation of the Host and chalice; *Domine, non sum dignus*, “Lord I am not worthy that you enter under my roof, but only say the word and my soul shall be healed”, at least three times before the celebrant consumes the Body of Christ, striking his heart; alteration of the prayers before the celebrant’s reception of the Blood of Christ in line with the Roman tradition.

11. The Communion rite of the faithful from the Roman Missal: the Diamper text did not contain an elaborate rite of Communion. Hence, almost the whole Communion rite was later taken from the Roman Missal.

12. Final blessing: the Diamper *Qurbana* contained four long final blessings: two for solemn days, one for ferial days and one for the commemoration of the dead. The subsequent versions substituted two of these long blessings with very short ones and added, as I have mentioned above, a Marian blessing from the Maronite Missal.

13. Rubrics: Menezes changed only a few rubrics, especially those connected with the “words of consecration”, but subsequently almost all the rubrics, gestures and postures (sitting, standing, kneeling, genuflection, adoration and veneration) were put as in the Roman Missal.

14. Roman Calendar: in the Roman *Qurbana* 1774 the division of the liturgical year and the readings from the Epistles and Gospels were as in the Roman Missal. Practically the East Syrian calendar was replaced with the Roman calendar, adding only the feasts of St Thomas (3 July and 18 December) and the Feast of the Ninivites. However, for the liturgy of the hours, which was only corrected (not substituted with the Latin one) the Syro-Oriental calendar was followed. Hence the priests had the embarrassing situation of following two calendars: Latin calendar for the Mass and East Syrian calendar for the liturgy of the hours.

15. Holy Week: the Missal printed in Rome contained translation from the Roman Missal of the services for Ash Wednesday, Palm Sunday, Maundy Thursday, Passion Friday, Candle-Mass of the second of February and the Mass of the Presanctified.

16. Obligation to use five liturgical colours: Archbishop Bernardino Bacinelli, vicar apostolic of Verapoly from 1853 to 1868, obliged the Eastern Catholics to use liturgical vestments in five colours: white, red, black, green and violet as in the Roman Church.

17. The book of rubrics: in order to ensure uniformity in the celebration of the Eucharistic liturgy Kuriakose Elias Chavara, vicar general of Verapoly for the Catholic St Thomas Christians from 1861 to 1871, published the first *Thúkása* containing rubrics and instructions. This was practically an adaptation of the *Ritus Servandus* contained in the Tridentine Roman Missal of Pius V (published in 1570) at that time in use in the Latin Church. Practically Chavara harmonized the rubrics and instructions already adopted from the Roman Missal and set them in an organic manner, taking from the same Missal whatever was lacking in the Malabar Missal.

18. Holy Saturday: as we have seen above (no. 15), the Malabar Church used the Roman liturgy from Ash Wednesday to Passion Friday, but the Service for Holy Saturday was lacking. Hence Kuriakose Elias Chavara translated the Service for Holy Saturday from the Roman Missal into Syriac.

From this presentation it is evident that at that time the Syro-Malabar *Qurbana* remained in a hybrid state, because of many East Syrian omissions, amalgamation of foreign liturgical elements and interpolation of rites, prayers and rubrics from the Roman Missal.

Introductory Article Two
HISTORICAL, ECCLESIAL AND LITURGICAL
SITUATION OF THE SYRO-MALABAR CHURCH AT
THE TIME OF THE RESTORATION OF MISSAL

In recent years I have published some studies on this theme; those who are familiar with them may find some repetitions in this introductory article. However, a brief presentation of the historical and ecclesial context of the Syro-Malabar Church is considered necessary to enable the readers of this work alone to understand the facts in the true light.

1. Syro-Malabar Church at the Time of the Restoration of Missal

After about three centuries (1599-1886) of Western governance over the St Thomas Christians, when the Latin hierarchy was established in India on 1 September 1886, the ancient archdiocese of Cranganore was definitively suppressed, the vicariate apostolic of Verapoly was elevated to the status of a metropolitan archdiocese of the Latin Church with Quilon as its suffragan see and all the Catholic St Thomas Christians became members of the said archdiocese.¹ Thus the Catholic Church of St Thomas Christians, as an individual Eastern Church, canonically became extinct.

With the apostolic letter *Quod iam pridem* of 20 May 1887, Pope Leo XIII separated the Eastern Catholics from the Latin Christians of the archdiocese of Verapoly and constituted for the former two

¹ Cf. Leo XIII, *Humanae salutis auctor*, 1 September 1886, *Leonis XIII Pontificis Maximi Acta*, vol. 5, Romae 1886, 164-179; P. Pallath, *Important Roman Documents concerning the Catholic Church in India*, Kottayam 2004, 152-173; for details, *Catholic Church in India*, 83-140.

separate vicariates apostolic, Trichur and Kottayam (later named Changanacherry).² The vicars apostolic were still Latins: Charles Lavigne, titular bishop of Milevum and vicar apostolic of Kottayam (1887-1896) and Adolf Edwin Medlycott, titular bishop of Tricomia and vicar apostolic of Trichur (1887-1896). Although Latin vicars apostolic were appointed, this event marked the rebirth of the Catholic Church of St Thomas Christians as the Syro-Malabar Church.

With the apostolic letter *Quae rei sacrae* of 28 July 1896 Pope Leo XIII reorganized the territory of the Syro-Malabar Church, erecting the three vicariates apostolic of Trichur, Ernakulam and Changanacherry (formerly Kottayam).³ Moreover, three native priests were also appointed as vicars apostolic: John Menacherry, titular bishop of Parai and vicar apostolic of Trichur, Mathew Makil, titular bishop of Tralli and vicar apostolic of Changanacherry and Aloysius Pazheparambil (or Pareparambil), titular bishop of Tiana and vicar apostolic of Ernakulam. The Apostolic Delegate for all the countries, generally called at that time East Indies, Wladyslaw Michal Zaleski, who resided at Kandy in Sri Lanka, consecrated the first three Syro-Malabar bishops on 25 October 1896 in the cathedral church of Kandy, obviously in Latin rite. Later with the apostolic letter *In Universi* dated 29 August 1911 Pope Pius X separated all the Southist parishes and churches from the vicariates of Changanacherry and Ernakulam and erected the new vicariate of Kottayam exclusively for the Southist community.⁴ As had already been decided, with two decrees dated 30 August 1911 the vicar apostolic of Changanacherry, Mar Matthew Makil was transferred to the new Southist vicariate of Kottayam and Fr

² Cf. Leo XIII, *Quod iam pridem*, 20 May 1887, *Leonis XIII Pontificis Maximi Acta*, vol. VII, Romae 1888, 106-108; P. Pallath, *Important Roman Documents*, 190-193.

³ Leo XIII, *Quae rei sacrae*, 28 July 1896, *Leonis XIII Pontificis Maximi Acta*, vol. XVI, Romae 1897, 229-232; P. Pallath, *Important Roman Documents*, 194-197.

⁴ The apostolic letter *In Universi*, in Canc. Brev. Ap. Pius X an. 1911, Divers., lib. IX, pars 2, 607; P. Pallath, *Important Roman Documents*, 198-201.

Thomas Kurialacherry was appointed the vicar apostolic of Changanacherry. On 8 December 1919 Aloysius Pazheparambil, vicar apostolic of Ernakulam died and Augustine Kandathil, co-adjutor vicar apostolic of Ernakulam from 29 August 1911, succeeded him.

After considering the progress of the Syro-Malabar Church, upon the recommendation of the 'Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church', by the apostolic constitution *Romani Pontifices* of 21 December 1923 Pope Pius XI established the Syro-Malabar hierarchy with Ernakulam as metropolitan see and Trichur, Changanacherry and Kottayam as suffragan dioceses.⁵ Vicar Apostolic Augustine Kandathil was elevated to the rank of Archbishop of Ernakulam and the other three vicars apostolic to that of diocesan bishops.

The erection of an indigenous hierarchy contributed to the phenomenal growth of the Syro-Malabar Church, and hence Pope Pius XII erected three more dioceses for the Syro-Malabar Church. The Pope bifurcated the diocese of Changanacherry and created the diocese of Palai on 25 July 1950 by the apostolic constitution *Quo Ecclesiarum*.⁶ On 31 December 1953 the Pope erected the diocese of Tellicherry for the Syro-Malabar Christian faithful who had immigrated to the northern parts of Kerala.⁷ With the erection of the diocese of Tellicherry, the proper territory of the Syro-Malabar Church, which was restricted to a small part of South Kerala was extended to the north for the first time.⁸ On 29 July 1956 the same

⁵ The apostolic constitution *Romani Pontifices*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 7 (1924) 257-262; P. Pallath, *Important Roman Documents*, 206-219.

⁶ Apostolic constitution *Quo Ecclesiarum*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 43 (1951) 147-150.

⁷ Apostolic constitution *Ad Christi Ecclesiam*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 46 (1954) 385-387.

⁸ Cf. Apostolic constitution *Ad Christi Ecclesiam*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 46 (1954) 385-387; X. Koodapuzha, *Christianity in India*, Kottayam 1998, 109.

Pope divided the archdiocese of Ernakulam and erected the diocese of Kothamangalam.⁹

Pope Pius XII accomplished another important step towards the progress and advancement of the Syro-Malabar Church when he decided to constitute the new ecclesiastical province of Changanacherry on 29 July 1956 with Changanacherry as the metropolitan see and Palai and Kottayam as suffragans. However, the apostolic constitution *Regnum Caelorum* erecting the new province was published only by his successor Pope John XXIII (1958-1963) on 10 January 1959.¹⁰ Obviously, even after the creation of the ecclesiastical province of Changanacherry, the dioceses of Trichur, Tellicherry and Kothamangalam remained suffragans of the metropolitan see of Ernakulam as before. Thus, from this time, the Syro-Malabar Church began to be governed by two independent metropolitans, who directly depended upon the Holy See.

Now the dioceses and bishops of the Syro-Malabar Church at the epoch of the reform of Missal are presented in alphabetical order.

⁹ Apostolic constitution *Qui in Beati Petri*, in V. Vithayathil, *The Origin and Progress of the Syro-Malabar Hierarchy*, Kottayam 1980, appendix VIII, 129-131; this apostolic constitution is not found in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*.

¹⁰ Apostolic constitution *Regnum Caelorum*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 51 (1959) 580-581. Even though the apostolic constitution was published on 10 January 1959, the date of the constitution of the archdiocese of Changanacherry is considered that of the decision, namely 29 July 1956. See the entry Changanacherry in the *Annuario Pontificio* of any year.

Dioceses	Bishops and Period of Governance
Changanacherry	Matthew Kavukatt, appointed bishop on 25 July 1950, promoted as archbishop on 29 July 1956, ¹¹ died on 9 October 1969.
Ernakulam	<p>Augustine Kandathil, titular bishop of Arad and coadjutor vicar apostolic of Ernakulam (29 August 1911), Vicar Apostolic (8 December 1919), archbishop (21 December 1923), died on 11 January 1956.</p> <p>-Joseph Parecattil, titular bishop of Arethusa and auxiliary bishop of Ernakulam on 28 October 1953, archbishop on 20 July 1956, cardinal on 28 April 1969, died on 20 February 1987.</p>
Kothamangalam	Matthew Pothanamuzhi, bishop on 29 July 1956, retired on 26 February 1977, died on 6 February 1982.
Kottayam	Thomas Tharayil, titular bishop of Azotus and coadjutor bishop of Kottayam on 9 June 1945, diocesan bishop on 8 June 1951, retired on 5 May 1974, died on 26 July 1975.
Palai	Sebastian Vayalil, appointed bishop on 25 July 1950, died on 21 November 1986.

¹¹ Although he can juridically be considered as archbishop from 29 July 1956, he effectively became so only with the promulgation of the apostolic constitution *Regnum Caelorum* on 10 January 1959.

Tellicherry	Sebastian Valloppilly, appointed bishop on 16 October 1955, retired on 18 February 1989, died on 4 April 2006.
Trichur	George Alapatt, appointed bishop on 11 March 1944, resigned on 4 June 1970, died on 6 November 1973.

In order to provide a clear picture of the ecclesial and sociological situation of the Syro-Malabar Church I also indicate the number of parishes (including semi-parishes), diocesan priests, religious priests, women religious and Christian faithful at the time of the implementation of the restored *Qurbana* in 1962.¹²

Dioceses	Parishes	Diocesan priests	Religious priests	Women religious	Christian faithful
Changanacherry	134	234	113	1271	322557
Ernakulam	101	167	90	1003	226738
Kothamangalam	108	112	18	949	128499
Kottayam	76	100	17	218	70204
Palai	135	293	41	1231	229937
Tellicherry	75	52	21	244	148898
Trichur	263	193	76	1451	352668
Total	892	1151	376	6367	1.416.321

This schematic presentation demonstrates that at the time of the introduction of the reformed Missal in 1962 there were only seven dioceses for the Syro-Malabar Church, which formed two ecclesiastical provinces: Changanacherry and Ernakulam. There were

¹² *Annuario Pontificio* 1962, 97, 138, 208, 209, 308, 422 & 435.

two archbishops and five suffragan bishops. The Syro-Malabar Church had 892 parishes, 1151 diocesan priests, 376 religious priests, 6367 women religious and 1.416.321 lay faithful.

2. Syro-Malabar Church and Bishops' Conference: Canonical Status at the Time of the Restoration of Missal

In 1923 the hierarchy of the Syro-Malabar Church was not constituted in the manner of an Eastern hierarchy with a common head (patriarch, *catholicos* or major archbishop) and a synod of bishops, consonant with the "sacred canons" and authentic Eastern traditions, but as a metropolitan province in accordance with the Latin *Code of Canon Law* (CIC) of 1917. Like the other metropolitan provinces of the Latin Church, the Syro-Malabar Church in 1923 remained a province directly dependent on the Holy See.

Just like the ecclesiastical province of Ernakulam, on 29 July 1956 the ecclesiastical province of Changanacherry was also constituted according to the provisions of CIC 1917, without providing the Syro-Malabar Church with an Eastern hierarchical structure. Hence, the two provinces of the Syro-Malabar Church, governed by two equal, independent and autonomous metropolitans, and directly subjected to the Apostolic See, functioned like the other metropolitan provinces of the Latin Church, without a common head and a synod of bishops for collegial governance in accordance with the authentic Eastern tradition.

Instead of a synod according to the Eastern tradition in the Syro-Malabar Church there gradually originated a kind of bishops' conference. The development of monarchic ecclesiology and the resultant concentration of ecclesiastical governance in the central organs provoked the decadence of particular councils and synods in the West and the obfuscation of episcopal collegiality. Consequently a new institute, designated bishops' conference, spontaneously emerged in the nineteenth century for the coordination of pastoral action and the

collaboration of all the bishops on a national level for affronting politico-ecclesiastical problems.

Obviously such bishops' conferences had no legislative, electoral or judicial powers. It is only with the promulgation of the decree on the pastoral office of bishops in the Church *Christus Dominus* on 28 October 1965 that national bishops' conferences obtained the official status of an ecclesiastical institution with limited legislative power on specific matters under very rigorous conditions.¹³ Even today the elected president of the national bishops' conference has no juridical powers over other bishops. He presides over the plenary meetings and those of the permanent or standing committee; after each plenary meeting he sends its minutes to the Apostolic See for information and its decrees, if any, for review.¹⁴

As we have seen, since the hierarchy of the Syro-Malabar Church was erected in the Latin model in 1923, this Church did not obtain a synod according to the Eastern tradition. Hence, the Syro-Malabar Church had to resort to a bishops' conference in the Latin model for fostering some kind of collaboration and coordination among the bishops, in spite of the fact that such conferences of recent Western origin were completely alien to the Christian East, and even unknown to Eastern canon law. Although there were non-official gatherings of bishops even before the Second Vatican Council, the statutes of the Syro-Malabar Bishops' Conference (SMBC) was officially approved only in 1970.¹⁵ According to the Statutes "The Conference is the

¹³ Vatican II, *Christus Dominus*, nos. 37-38; for details see P. Pallath, *Local Episcopal Bodies in East and West*, Kottayam 1997, 343-413. The *Code of Canon Law* (1983) further determined the juridical status of bishops' conference and regulated its functioning (CIC cc. 447-459).

¹⁴ Cf. *The Code of Canon Law* (1983), canons 452 and 456.

¹⁵ Since 1970 in the *Annuario Pontificio* a new title is found: *Sinodi patriarcali, Assemblee e Conferenze episcopali di Rito Orientale* (p. 848). Under this title appeared the new entry: "Conferenza Episcopale Malabarese, Statuti approvati ..." (p. 848). Since 1973 in the *Annuario Pontificio* (p.906) one can read: "Conferenza Episcopale

assembly to exercise the hierarchical collegiality and communion of the Syro-Malabar bishops and apostolic exarchs, through which they promote the common good of the Syro-Malabar Church".¹⁶

The Syro-Malabar Bishops' Conference always remained a consultative body "intended to facilitate co-ordinated study and discussion of such questions as are particularly concerned with the laws, customs, liturgy, activities and interests of the Syro-Malabar Church".¹⁷ Since the purpose of the conference was only "to facilitate co-ordinated study and discussion" it never enacted any juridically binding law for the entire Syro-Malabar Church, except its own statutes, whose juridical validity derived from the approval of the Apostolic See. In fact, the statutes explicitly stated that the conference "shall in no way limit, prejudice or interfere with the authority of the Hierarchs in their respective jurisdictions".¹⁸

According to the statutes, the Syro-Malabar Bishops' Conference did not enjoy even the powers of the national bishops' conferences of the Latin Church. The Syro-Malabar conference had only the status of the regional conferences of the Latin Church, which even today do not enjoy any of the powers of the national conferences determined in the Latin Code.¹⁹ Since there was no competent legislative body for the entire Syro-Malabar Church, each bishop promulgated statutes and norms for his own eparchy drawing from the common law, from the

Malabarese, Statuti approvati ad experimentum 4 giu. 1970" which was modified into "Sinodo della Chiesa Siro Malabarese" only in 1994 (see *Annuario Pontificio* p. 1090).

¹⁶ Statutes of the Syro-Malabar Bishops' Conference, in A. Thazhath, *The Juridical Sources of the Syro-Malabar Church*, Appendix N. 2, 317-320, here Art. 2.

¹⁷ Statutes of the Syro-Malabar Bishops' Conference, Art. 5 i.

¹⁸ Statutes of the Syro-Malabar Bishops' Conference, Art. 3.

¹⁹ Cf. CIC 1983, c. 434; P. Pallath, *Local Episcopal Bodies in East and West*, 354-355.

directives of the Holy See and from the customs and traditions prevalent in each eparchy.²⁰

In brief, at the time of the restoration and reform of Missal, the Syro-Malabar Church did not have a common head, who could make any decision for the entire Church.²¹ The Syro-Malabar Bishops' Conference was a mere consultative body, which did not have even the very limited legislative power of national conferences in the Latin Church and did not enjoy any electoral, judicial, administrative or liturgical powers. Obviously the president of the bishops' conference was not the common head of Syro-Malabar Church; he did not have any juridical powers over the other bishops or over the Syro-Malabar Church. At that time the Apostolic See was exclusively competent for the approval and promulgation of Syro-Malabar liturgical books and for any modifications to be inserted in them.

3. A Note on the General Liturgical Predicament of the Syro-Malabar Church

As we have already seen, at the time of the rebirth of the Syro-Malabar Church the Eucharistic liturgy (*Qurbana*) existed in a highly latinized form with many modifications, omissions and interpolations mainly made by the Synod of Diamper (1599) and then by Bishop Francis Ros SJ, the first Latin bishop of the St Thomas Christians (1599-1624). In connection with the Holy *Qurbana*, the Eucharistic bread and wine, the manner of Holy Communion, liturgical year and calendar, liturgical vestments, sacred art and architecture were all modified in tune with Western traditions and customs.²²

²⁰ Cf. A.Thazhath, *The Juridical Sources of the Syro-Malabar Church*, 287-302.

²¹ Archbishop Joseph Parecattil was only the head of the ecclesiastical province of Ennakulam, and not the head of the entire Syro-Malabar Church.

²² See Introductory Article One; for details P. Pallath, *The Eucharistic Liturgy of the St Thomas Christians*, 85-209.

In accordance with the order of the provincial council of Goa (1585) and the Synod of Diamper, the Latin Ritual was translated into Syriac and was introduced in Malabar. In fact the theology, liturgy and discipline of the sacraments were completely replaced by those of the Roman tradition. For ordinations, consecration of churches, blessing of the holy oils and other episcopal ceremonies the Roman Pontifical was used in the language of Latin, since the Latin bishops did not know Syriac.²³ Francis Ros, the first Latin bishop of the St Thomas Christians, provides a clear account of the general liturgical situation even at his time:

About twenty years back, through the diligence of the Fathers of the Society residing at Vaypicotta, the Book of the Rituals of all the sacraments including Orders, together with all their formulas, prayers and ceremonies was translated from Latin into Chaldean. All the parish priests of this Christianity are now using it in the administration of the sacraments. They differ from us in this matter only as regards the language, except that the saying of the Mass is in the ancient manner, but as corrected and approved by the most illustrious Primate of India, who reviewed and recognized the said Mass which was translated into Latin by the Fathers of the Society.²⁴

The Divine Office was of East Syrian tradition, but with the modifications and corrections made by the Synod of Diamper. Almost all the sacramentals, paraliturgical ceremonies and popular devotions were conducted with Roman liturgical books translated into Syriac, sometimes with local adaptations.²⁵ At that time the liturgical, spiritual and ecclesial life of the Catholic St Thomas Christians was almost completely in harmony with the Latin tradition.

²³ P. Pallath, "The Sacraments of the Church of St Thomas Christians in India and the Synod of Diamper", 121-146; *The Provincial Councils of Goa and the Church of St Thomas Christians*, 115-129; J. Vellian, "The Synod of Diamper and the Liturgy of the Syro-Malabar Church", 181-184 & 190-193.

²⁴ F. Ros, "Relação sobre a Serra", 335.

²⁵ For details, P. J. Podipara, *Ritus et Libri Liturgici Syro-Malabarici*, 12-58.

4. The Restoration of Syro-Malabar and East Syrian Pontifical and the Start of Liturgical Reform

With the consecration of the first three Syro-Malabar bishops in 1896 there emerged a serious problem: which Pontifical the new Syro-Malabar bishops should use for the sacred ordinations and for the consecration of churches and sacred chrism. Just after the consecration, under the guidance of the Apostolic Delegate Zaleski, the first three Syro-Malabar bishops unanimously decided to use the Roman Pontifical, translated into Syriac, because according to them, among the three Pontificals (Roman, Antiochean and Chaldean) the Roman Pontifical was the best suited to the Syro-Malabar Rite.²⁶

The Apostolic Delegate Zaleski, who considered the Syro-Malabar rite as a modified Roman rite in Syriac language, wholeheartedly supported the idea and through his letters endeavoured to obtain the permission of the Apostolic See for the use of the Roman Pontifical. With regard to the permission of Propaganda Fide, Zaleski reported:

Therefore a request was made to the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda which ordered that the Roman Pontifical be translated into Syriac for the use of the Syro-Malabar bishops, granting them in the meantime the faculty to use the Latin Pontifical until the translation was made and approved by the same Congregation.²⁷

Thus the first Syro-Malabar bishops obtained the permission to translate the Roman Pontifical into Syriac and the faculty to use the same Pontifical in Latin language until the approval of the Syriac translation.

²⁶ Report of Zaleski to Propaganda Fide, 28 April 1905, in P. Pallath and J. Kollara, *Roman Pontifical into Syriac and the Beginning of Liturgical Reform*, 47/228.

²⁷ Report of Zaleski, 28 April 1905, in P. Pallath and J. Kollara, *Roman Pontifical into Syriac and the Beginning of Liturgical Reform*, 48/229.

Even several years after the aforementioned decision, the Syro-Malabar bishops did not succeed in translating the entire Roman Pontifical into Syriac. On 1 May 1917 Pope Benedict XV erected the 'Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church' with the *motu proprio Dei providentis* and the Syro-Malabar Church came under its authority. After the erection of Oriental Congregation, especially after the constitution of hierarchy in 1923, the Syro-Malabar bishops, who had failed to accomplish even a complete translation of the Roman Pontifical, often requested the Congregation to approve the partial Syriac translation they had formerly submitted to Propaganda Fide.

The problem was discussed in the plenary assembly of the Congregation on 19 November 1934 and, in spite of careful examination and fruitful discussions, the cardinals were unable to make a unanimous resolution concerning the approval or not of the Syriac translation of the Roman Pontifical for the use of the Syro-Malabar Church. Hence only a report of the plenary assembly was presented to Pope Pius XI on 1 December 1934, who decided to restore the ancient Chaldean Pontifical for the use of the Syro-Malabar Church and to constitute a special Commission for the revision and printing of the said Pontifical. With regard to the decision of the Pope we get the following precise information:

The Holy Father, having heard the report, has deigned to observe that Latinization is not to be encouraged among the Orientals. The Holy See does not want to Latinize but to catholicize. And then, half measures are neither generous nor fruitful. So continue in *status quo*, but at once appoint a Commission for the revision of the ancient Pontifical, which can also be printed part by part (in fascicles). For the Commission the Holy Father has deigned to propose the names of Msgr. Tisserant, Fr. Korolevskij, Msgr. Graffin, and Fr. De Meester. He wishes that the works be finished in the shortest time possible.²⁸

²⁸ See the Report of the audience with the Holy Father, in *Ponenze dell'Anno 1934*, in P. Pallath and J. Kollara, *Roman Pontifical into Syriac and the Beginning of Liturgical Reform*, 158/322.

This historic and authoritative papal decision paved the way for the liturgical restoration and reform in the Syro-Malabar Church, gradually reinstating the Eastern liturgical spirit and leading to the publication of new liturgical books. In accordance with the papal decision a special Commission was constituted for the revision and publication of the Chaldean Pontifical. The Commission (in 27 sessions) examined all the important manuscripts, revised the texts, composed the entire Chaldean Pontifical and concluded its work in 1939.²⁹

Unexpected set-backs, the Second World War (1939-1945) and the difficulty to find a suitable press for printing the restored Pontifical in Syriac impeded its immediate publication. At last in 1954 the press of the St Joseph's University in Beirut undertook the printing of the Pontifical in Syriac and completed the work in 1957. The Pontifical in Syriac, entitled *Liber Officiorum Pontificalium secundum usum Ecclesiae sanctae Syrorum Orientalium* was officially published in Rome in 1957 for the use of the Churches of the Syro-Oriental tradition. Thus the Pontifical which the St Thomas Christians used until XVI century was restored.

After the elapse of several years when the Syriac Pontifical was ready for use, the tendency of employing vernacular in liturgical celebrations was already in vogue and hence there arose the need of translating it into Malayalam. On 22 November 1957 under instruction from the Congregation for the Oriental Church a few copies of the Pontifical were dispatched from Beirut to Mar Joseph Parecattil, Archbishop of Ernakulam (1957-1984) for distribution among the Syro-Malabar bishops. The Congregation sent the Pontifical to Cardinal Parecattil, directing him to translate it in six months time. On 8 July 1958, on the Great Sunday of Resurrection, the Congregation for the 'Oriental Church' applied the Pontifical to the Syro-Malabar

²⁹ For details, P. Pallath and J. Kollara, *Roman Pontifical into Syriac and the Beginning of Liturgical Reform*, 161-203/324-358.

Church by the publication of *Ordo persolvendi ritus pontificales iuxta usum Ecclesiae Syro-Malabarensis*, which contained also special instructions and rubrics for celebration.³⁰

The Congregation ordered that the new Pontifical be used compulsorily from 1 January 1959, but upon request permission was granted to continue the old system for another year.³¹ However, the Pontifical was not completely translated into Malayalam and published as an official liturgical book of the Syro-Malabar Church. Partial Malayalam translations and booklets began to be used for priestly ordinations in 1960, although the first episcopal consecration took place only in 1968.³²

Although Pope Pius XI made the authoritative decision to restore the East Syriac Pontifical for Syro-Malabar Church already in 1934 and the special liturgical Commission set up for the purpose completed the work in 1939, for various reasons the Pontifical could not be promulgated until 1957-1958. The partial Malayalam translation began to be used in the Syro-Malabar Church for ordinations only in 1960. Hence, as we see below, the efforts for the restoration and reform of the Missal started in 1954, namely before the implementation of the Pontifical. Practically both liturgical books began to be used simultaneously creating the sensation of a sudden and drastic change in the liturgical life of the Church among the clergy and the people, who had no catechetical and ecclesial preparation for sustaining such a novelty.

³⁰ Sacra Congregatio pro Ecclesia Orientali, *Ordo persolvendi ritus pontificales iuxta usum Ecclesiae Syro-Malabarensis*, Romae 1958.

³¹ Cf. J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, 40.

³² The new Pontifical was used for the first time on 24 February 1968 for the episcopal consecration of Mar Kuriakose Kunnacherry, Bishop of Kottayam.

5. Roman Pontiffs and the Apostolic See during the Restoration of Syro-Malabar Missal

The documents presented in this book cover the history of the liturgical reform of the Syro-Malabar Church from 1954 to 1969. During this period the Roman Pontiffs Pius XII (1939-1958), John XXIII (1958-1963) and Paul VI (1963-1978) who governed the universal Church, were involved in the liturgical reform process.

With the *motu proprio Dei Providentis* of 1 May 1917 Pope Benedict XV separated the Oriental section of Propaganda Fide called the “Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fide for the Affairs of the Oriental Rite”³³ and erected the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church. Pope Paul VI with the Apostolic Constitution *Regimini Ecclesiae Universae* of 15 August 1967 changed the name to Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Churches in accordance with the communion ecclesiology of Vatican II.³⁴ Hence in all the documents until 1967 the name Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church is found. The same name is also used in this work, respecting the chronological order.

Until the promulgation of the aforementioned Apostolic Constitution *Regimini Ecclesiae Universae* on 15 August 1967 the Roman Pontiff himself was the prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church.³⁵ Hence practically the head of the Oriental Congregation was a cardinal secretary. I provide a list of the secretaries and prefects of the Congregation for the Oriental Church

³³ The Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fide for the Affairs of the Oriental Rite was erected by Pope Pius IX on 6 January 1862 with the apostolic constitution *Romani Pontifices*.

³⁴ Paul VI, apostolic constitution *Regimini Ecclesiae Universae*, no. 41, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 59 (1967) 899.

³⁵ In fact, in the *Annuario Pontificio* of those years it was written: “La Santità di Nostro Signore, Prefetto”.

during the restoration and reform of Syro-Malabar *Qurbana* in the following table.

Name and Surname	Period of Administration
Eugene Tisserant	Cardinal Secretary from 1936 to 1959.
Amaleto Giovanni Cicognani	Cardinal Secretary from 1959 to 1961.
Gabriel Acacius Coussa	Archbishop pro-secretary from 4 August to 23 March 1961; Cardinal Secretary from 24 March 1962 to 29 July 1962.
Gustavo Testa	Cardinal Secretary from 2 August 1962 to 14 August 1967; first Prefect from 15 August 1967 to 13 January 1968.
Maximilien de Fürstenberg	Cardinal Prefect from 15 January 1968 to 28 February 1973.

From this table it is evident that Cardinal Gustavo Testa, who was secretary of the Congregation from 2 August 1962 to 14 August 1967, became the first prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches on 15 August 1967. After his retirement on 13 January 1968, Cardinal Maximilien de Fürstenberg became prefect on 13 January 1968 (resigned on 28 February 1973).

Normally official communications between the Apostolic See and Syro-Malabar bishops concerning liturgical reform were made through the papal representative in India. The Apostolic Delegation in India was established in 1881. On 12 June 1948 this Delegation was raised by Pope Pius XII to the rank of an Internunciature and eventually became a Nunciature on 22 August 1967 during the pontificate of Pope

Paul VI. Hence until 1967 the papal representative was called Internuncio and subsequently Nuncio. During the period of liturgical reform under consideration the papal representatives were: Martin Lucas SVD (1952-1956), James Robert Knox (1957-1967), Giuseppe (Joseph) Caprio (1967-1969) and Marie-Joseph Lemieux OP (1969-1971).

**DOCUMENTS CONCERNING THE
RESTORATION AND REFORM
OF SYRO-MALABAR MISSAL
FROM 1954 TO 1969**

After two introductory articles now 58 documents are presented; they are continuously numbered, but they are divided into eight sections in order to facilitate reading and to provide logical order and coherence. Obviously the letters and communications of the Syro-Malabar bishops, priests and laymen were written in English. Other documents are translated from Latin, Italian, French or Malayalam. The original language of these documents is indicated at the proper place. Original footnotes found in some documents are put in square brackets, while footnotes and explanations added for clarifications are inserted in the usual manner.

Section One
CONSTITUTION OF THE LITURGICAL COMMISSION
AND COMPILATION OF THE SYRO-MALABAR
MISSAL

In November-December 1953 Cardinal Eugene Tisserant, secretary of the Congregation for the Oriental Church visited Kerala and the main centres of the Syro-Malabar and Syro-Malankara Churches. During the visit he consecrated Joseph Parecattil, auxiliary bishop of Ernakulam on 30 November 1953.¹ Cardinal Tisserant had ample opportunity to personally observe the deplorable state of Syro-Malabar Liturgy which needed urgent restoration and reform.

He was really impressed by the lack of active participation of the Christian faithful in the liturgy, who recited Rosary or read devotional books during Holy *Qurbana*, something unheard in the entire Christian Orient. Because of the complete neglect of Syriac studies since the Synod of Diamper in 1599 and the subsequent appointment of Latin bishops, the faithful turned out to be mere spectators of priestly liturgical performances without understanding anything. For the same reason even the priests were unable to fully comprehend what they performed.

A few months after the visit of Cardinal Tisserant in Kerala, on 10 March 1954 he set up a special Commission at the 'Congregation for the Oriental Church', consisting of Prof. Alphonse Raes SJ (president), Prof. Cyril Korolovskij and Fr. Placid Podipara TOCD (members), for the restoration and reform of Syro-Malabar Missal, Ritual and Divine Office. A Chaldean Priest Emmanuel Delly was nominated to help the Commission (document 1). With the letter of 6

¹ Cf. Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, *Servizio Informazioni Chiesa Orientale* (SICO), n. 164 (December 1953) 59-62.

May 1954 Cardinal Tisserant officially informed Mar Augustine Kandathil, Archbishop of Ernakulam (1923-1956) and the bishops of the Syro-Malabar Church of the appointment of the special liturgical Commission (document 2).

The task of the Roman Commission was to restore the Missal, the Ritual and the Divine Office and hence altogether 42 sessions were held for the completion of the entire work. In the first meeting of the Commission the scope, nature, method and orientation-principles of the work were fixed. In the said meeting decision was also taken to start the work with the restoration of the Missal. The Commission studied the printed Syro-Malabar and Chaldean missals, Indian and Chaldean manuscripts of the *Qurbana*, important scholarly works and gave definitive form to the *Taksa* (Order) of Syro-Malabar *Qurbana*. In 1955 the proposed *Taksa*, entitled: *Syro-Malabar Liturgy: Revision and Reprint of Syro-Malabar Missal*, was printed in Latin under the auspices of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, in order to facilitate the consultation of Syro-Malabar bishops and the examination of Roman authorities.²

In addition to the two documents already indicated (1-2), in this section the report about the first meeting of the Commission is reproduced (document 3), because it highlights the paradigmatic guiding principles, the method of work and the manner of procedure. Then follows the preface of the liturgical Commission as found in the proposed Order of *Qurbana* (document 4) which can be considered as a final report of the work accomplished by the Commission with regard to the Eucharistic liturgy. Lastly I provide a general outline of the proposed Order of *Qurbana*, from which it can easily be understood that the intention of the liturgical Commission and the Congregation of the Oriental Church was to restore and reform the

² Original bibliographical details: Sacra Congregazione per la Chiesa Orientale (Prot. N. 947/48), *Liturgia Siro-Malabaresi: Revisione e Ristampa del Messale Siro-Malabarese*, Roma 1955.

authentic form of Syro-Malabar *Qurbana* with all its components: common order of *Qurbana*, three anaphoras, three forms of celebration (simple, solemn and most solemn), Eastern liturgical calendar, etc.

Document 1

Constitution of the Special Liturgical Commission for the Revision of Syro-Malabar Liturgical Books

Rome, 10 March 1954; *a copy of the letter sent to the members of the liturgical Commission by the Congregation for the Oriental Church is reproduced here. The letter officially informs the members of the constitution of the Commission, indicating the task entrusted to them* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi*, fascicolo IIIa; original in Italian).

Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, Prot. No. 947/48, 10 March 1954.

Most Reverend Lord,

This Sacred Congregation, with an ardent desire to prepare a new edition of the liturgical books of the Syro-Malabar Church, has taken the decision to establish a special Commission, which will be composed of:

Rev. Fr. Alphonse Raes, SJ, President;

Rev. Fr. Cyril Korolevskij, Member;

Rev. Fr. Placid of St Joseph TOCD, Member;

Rev. Fr. Emanuel Delly, Assistant.

I am sure that Your Most Reverend Lordship will readily accept the assignment offered to you and, while thanking you warmly, I express the fervent wish that the work of the Commission will expeditiously proceed.

With sentiments of esteem in the meantime I confirm myself,
Of Your Most Reverend Lordship,
Cardinal Eugene Tisserant, Secretary.

Document 2

Official Information about the Constitution of the Liturgical Commission to Syro-Malabar Bishops

Rome, 6 May 1954; *with this letter Cardinal Eugene Tisserant officially informed the Apostolic Nuncio in India and all the Syro-Malabar bishops about the constitution of the liturgical Commission for the restoration of Syro-Malabar liturgy. After expressing gratitude for the royal reception accorded to him during his visit in Kerala, the Cardinal also highlighted the urgent need for liturgical reform in the Syro-Malabar Church in accordance with the pronouncements of Roman Pontiffs. Already in this letter Cardinal Tisserant asked the Syro-Malabar bishops to educate the clergy and faithful “along genuine liturgical lines” (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi, fascicolo II).*

Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, Prot. No. 947/48, 6 May 1954.

Your Excellency,

I write this first of all to thank you most cordially for the enthusiastic welcome you extended to me when I was in your midst during the months of November and December last year. I am sure that you spared no pains in order to give me the most solemn reception in your power wherever I set foot in your dear land of Kerala. And I most sincerely thank the Hierarchy, the clergy, and the beloved laity for everything that was done in my regard. No doubt it was your deep faith and profound loyalty to the See of Peter that made you so enthusiastic

in according me such a truly royal reception. Your brethren of the Latin and Syro-Malankara rites were also extremely cordial in my regard. I also appreciate the good will exhibited towards me on the part of your non-Catholic and non-Christian neighbours.

I have indeed carried away an indelible impression about your Church and the intense Catholic life in your country. I was extremely pleased to witness your activities in almost all spheres – religious, educational, social and economic. But the present condition of your rite as such, as well as the condition of liturgical life and the liturgical spirit in your midst, is not in keeping with the flourishing state of your venerable Church. Your Church does not possess the Rite in its authentic form, and your laity do not participate actively in liturgical worship as do the other Orientals, including your Syro-Malankarite brethren. Your ancient Rite, which in its origin and development is connected with Edessa and Mesopotamia, is preserved among you in a mutilated and highly westernized form. In its present form it cannot help inculcate the liturgical spirit so much esteemed by Holy Mother Church. In accordance with the policy of the Apostolic See, repeatedly confirmed by the Supreme Pontiffs, Eastern Rites – yours not excluded – are not to be disfigured by mutilation or westernization, and those already mutilated or westernized are to be restored to their proper and authentic form.

This Sacred Congregation has in its program, approved by the Supreme Pontiffs, the reform of the liturgical books of Eastern Rites in such manner that they may truly represent the ancient Rites of the East in their genuine form. That yours is called the Syro-Malabar Rite, that your liturgical books were printed in Rome long ago, and that the present form of your rite has been in use for more than three centuries are not sufficient reasons for preserving your Rite and your liturgical books in their present form. The decorum required in Divine Worship, the solemn pronouncements of the Supreme Pontiffs, the profound spiritual benefits to be derived, an evaluation of the historical factors that gave shape to the present form of your Rite, the maintenance of

the good name of the Church, are all so many reasons why your liturgical books should be reformed, as has already been done with those of certain other Eastern bodies. With this end in view a Commission has been set up in Rome, and you will be happy to know that this Sacred Congregation will not be opposed to considering the question of the advisability of introducing the use of the vernacular in your Rite when the latter has been duly restored to its authentic form.

The antiquity and the flourishing condition of an Eastern Church such as yours certainly do not warrant the continuation of a mutilated and westernized rite as its medium of offering up its worship to Almighty God. Some among you who have been aware of this have approached the Apostolic See, as their forefathers did in the past, asking for a reform of your Rite suited to the laudable progress of your Church. An appreciation of matters liturgical against the background of your history will make the intelligent and highly cultured laity also enthusiastic about such a reform.

With profound hopes for an even more glorious future, I therefore bring to Your Excellency's attention the immediate need for educating the clerical students, both diocesan and religious, as well as the lay-folk, along genuine liturgical lines, giving them a new understanding and appreciation of the great treasures of your Syriac literature and of your esteemed and venerable Rite, for the re-establishment of which in its authentic form, with due consideration of modern circumstances and needs, this Sacred Congregation invites Your Excellency's earnest cooperation.

With sentiments of esteem and fraternal affection, and invoking God's blessing upon you and the clergy and faithful of your flock, I remain,

Ever sincerely yours in Christ,

Eugene Cardinal Tisserant.

Document 3

Report of the First Session of the Liturgical Commission for the Restoration of Syro-Malabar Liturgical Books

Rome, 23 March 1954; *the minutes of all the 42 sessions of the liturgical Commission are preserved in the Archives, but I publish only the report of the first meeting, which determined the basic guiding principles for the work of the Commission, sources to be used for the compilation of Syro-Malabar liturgical books and the order to be followed for the revision. Then the Commission started the work beginning with the revision of the Missal. Since this is a simple description of the proceedings of a meeting the norms and regulations of grammatical constructions are not always observed. The lively description of the first meeting of the liturgical Commission formulated in the present tense is maintained as such* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi*, fascicolo IIIb; original in Italian).

The meeting was held at the residence of Fr. Cyril Korolevskij, under the presidency of Fr. Alphonse Raes SJ, who is Professor of liturgy at the Pontifical Oriental Institute, Consultor of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church and that of the special liturgical Commission, together with the members appointed according to the letter of the Sacred Congregation dated 10 March 1954, that is, Fr. Cyril Korolevskij and Fr. Placid of St Joseph TOCD, who came from Malabar just for this purpose. For this first meeting it is not considered necessary to convoke Fr. Emmanuel Delly, the Chaldean priest who is the assistant for the technical part.

After the invocation of the Holy Spirit recited in Syriac by Fr. Placid, Fr. President begins specifying that the scope of the Commission is to prepare a new edition of the liturgical books of the Malabar Church, a reformed edition purged from all those hybridisms

which have changed the Syro-Oriental rite of this Church from the time of the Synod of Diamper. He reminds how in the Audience of 1 December 1934, the Holy Father Pius XI of the glorious memory responded, having heard the report of the plenary assembly on the often repeated requests of Malabar bishops to approve a Syriac version of the Roman Pontifical. In the plenary session some eminent Fathers of the Congregation were inclined to grant the same, while others were for the adoption of the ancient Chaldean or East Syrian Pontifical. Hence the Pope pronounced these memorable words: “Latinization is not to be encouraged among the Orientals. The Holy See does not want to latinize but to catholicize. And then, half measures are neither generous nor fruitful. So continue in *status quo*, but at once appoint a Commission for the revision of the ancient Pontifical, which can also be printed part by part (as fascicles)”.³ This provision (printing as fascicles) is to meet the most urgent needs, which are the ordinations. And he nominated three members, who were later joined by two others, and then by two Chaldean priests as assistants. The president then recalled how effectively the Commission began its work on 18 May 1936 and completed it in three years, having held twenty-seven meetings under the leadership of late Fr. James Vosté OP. Though the Sacred Congregation approved the work, the printing of the Pontifical was delayed so much by the death of Fr. Vosté on 24 February 1949, and by the failure to find appropriate Chaldean characters in Europe, despite repeated searches. Finally it was decided to entrust the printing to the typography of the University of Saint Joseph in Beirut and the printing has already been started.

Fr. President goes on to say that first of all it is necessary to determine the principles that will serve as a basis for the new edition of the books for the use of Malabars, and since the Sacred Congregation has not indicated anything, it is understood that it (the Congregation) leaves the matter to our Commission.

³ Original text and English translation in P. Pallath and J. Kollara, *Roman Pontifical into Syriac and the Beginning of Liturgical Reform*, 158/322.

The first principle is to restore the ancient rite, as Pope Pius XI explicitly asked for while speaking about the Chaldean Pontifical. Therefore all hybridisms must be eliminated.

However, there is a need to take the enrichment coming from a better knowledge of the dogma into account, but always in accordance with the rite.

It is also possible that the Malabars have well preserved some ancient ceremonies that the Chaldeans would have lost. This can be deduced from the examination of the most ancient manuscripts and commentaries, even the unpublished ones.

Fr. Cyril points out that one should be cautious of some alterations of the rite in the Latin sense, which would have been introduced among the Chaldeans in XVIII-XIX centuries. He speaks of: the innovations introduced in the rite by Catholicos Joseph IV of the Amida or Diyarbekir line, who died in Rome in 1791, the hybridisms contained in the editions of Fr. Joseph Guriel, printed by the Propaganda, and the abuse of using the Latin vestments. He adds that even the Dominicans of Mosul allowed to have some of these hybridisms in their editions, and that even the praiseworthy Lazarist Fr. Paul Bedjan was not free of Latinization tendency, as demonstrated by Fr. Vosté in the monograph about Bedjan appeared in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, vol. XI (1945), pp. 45-102.

Father President concludes saying that we should not change everything completely, but must correct it.

All are in agreement with these guiding principles.

Then we pass on to the enumeration of the sources at our disposal for this preparatory work. They are:

- The editions of Malabars themselves.
- The editions made by the Chaldeans.
- Various manuscripts: Father Cyril proposes to make an examination of various catalogues of manuscripts in: Vatican Library, British Museum, National (Library) of Paris and of Berlin, if the latter

ones are accessible. Fr. President replies that the codices were transported to Göttingen and they are still there, but Göttingen is in the Soviet zone of Germany. Nevertheless perhaps there could have been communication with one or the other, if they have not already been photographed to the microfilm, as occurred in some cases. However Baumstark gives the list of it in his *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*.

- The edition of the three liturgies and a good part of the Ritual given in Mosul in 1928 by the Nestorian priest Joseph of Kelayta.

- The edition of the Liturgy of the Apostles and of Baptism published in Urmiah by the Anglican Mission.

- The Chaldean Breviaries of Bedjan.

- The Chaldean Manual for priests by Guriel.

- The various editions by the Dominicans of Mosul: The well-known Bible, the Psalter, the *Daqdam wa'd batar*, the Missal with the Supplement to the Liturgy which contains the hymns and the list of readings, rites of Baptism, Matrimony and the Anointing of the sick, and the book of funerals.

- Fr. Cyril says that he has done futile attempts to obtain the Ritual published in the course of the XIX century by the Lazarists (Vincentians) of Urmiah, an extremely rare book; perhaps we might search for it with the help of (Msgr.) Apostolic Nuncio of Iran. It is true that it must have a poor documentary value, being filled with hybridisms.

- Vatican Syriac (Codex) 66, copied by Mar Joseph.

- The Syriac commentators.

Fr. Placid then says that with the help of all these means we have to re-establish the genuine and authentic rite, really what Pope Pius XI desired. All approve.

Then what order is to be followed in the revision of the books?

- The Pontifical is already compiled and is approved.

- The Missal, starting from the anaphora of the Apostles, to which the common Order (*Ordo communis*) is prefixed.
- The Calendar of the temporal cycle and of saints.
- The readings: Fr. Placid declares that it would be very easy if it is decided to make them in Malayalam.
- The Divine Office.
- The Ritual.
- The Book of Funerals.

Having determined these preliminaries, it is decided to begin the examination of the Missal immediately, starting with the common Order and the anaphora of the Apostles.

First of all, Fr. President asks Fr. Placid how many types of celebrations of Liturgy (namely Holy Mass or *Qurbana*) the Malabars retain at present.

Fr. Placid responds that there are five: 1. the Pontifical Liturgy, not printed but exists in manuscript form; 2. the so-called *Raza*, which is not the Pontifical *Qurbana*, but a very solemn Liturgy; 3. the solemn Liturgy with a deacon and a sub-deacon; 4. the Liturgy sung by a priest alone with a cantor (singer); 5. the simple recited Liturgy.

Fr. Placid declares that the pontifical Liturgy is none other than the solemn liturgy with some particularities taken from the Latin Rite. It is decided immediately to totally eliminate this one, and also the solemn Liturgy with a deacon and a sub-deacon, manifest hybridisms, that is, types 1 and 3. It is decided then to take into consideration type 4 that is celebrated by a priest with the service of a cantor or by a choir, but always with a minister.

Having been asked to say who this minister or cantor is, which sacred vestments he wears, what he does, is it possible to compare him to the deacon of the Byzantine Liturgy, Fr. Placid responds that he is not a true deacon, but rather a layman or a simple boy who wears no liturgical vestments. He not even presents the censor, he just brings the

wine and water to the altar, but he cannot touch the chalice or the paten; however he reads the *kározutha or ectenia*. The priest proclaims all the readings.

Fr. President observes that in this type of practice there are two unbearable abuses: reciting the part due to the deacon without being ordained a deacon and even without having received the first order, and not wearing any liturgical vestment. He points out that in the Eastern Churches it is not so: either this is a true deacon, which cannot be verified today except in seminaries or convents, because there are no more (permanent) deacons, if not among the dissidents, that too in small numbers, or it is tolerated that a priest acts as a deacon, although this is irregular and is not admitted neither by the Greeks, nor by the Russian Catholics. If there is no deacon, the priest does everything by himself. It is not permitted by anyone that the deacon exercises his ministry without wearing proper vestments: long robe called *stikhar and orarion*.⁴

Fr. Cyril then observes that when they reformed the liturgical abuses of the Ruthenians, the case of a priest acting as a deacon was foreseen; he proposed to tolerate at most this practice, but on condition that this priest does not celebrate before in the morning in order to receive Holy Communion as prescribed by the rite, and this was not demanded insistently, because in such cases the nearby parish priest acts as a deacon, and it is not possible to prohibit him from celebrating in his own church before going to another one.

For the time being no decision is taken, but Fr. President points out that we will be forced to elaborate a Ceremonial, as was done for the Ruthenians, who now observe what was promulgated, at least in the College of Rome and in many places.

⁴ The *sticharion* or *stikhar* and *Orarion* are liturgical vestments of deacons (and subdeacons) in Eastern Orthodox and Eastern Catholic Churches of Byzantine or Constantinopolitan tradition. The East Syrian equivalents are *kotina* and *urara*.

Dealing with the revision of the so-called Missal, the question arises: will we elaborate a single book, or separate books as the Byzantines: one contains only the text of the Liturgy, another is the Gospel that always rests on the altar, and the third the Epistolary, and if necessary a fourth one, a complete *Orologion* for special parts of the feasts or for different days of the week, if all these are not already inserted in the Epistolary, which is the book of the reader or singer.

Fr. Placid opts for a single volume, that is, the Missal. Fr. Cyril and Fr. President are for separate books, corresponding to the Oriental tradition. After a brief discussion it is decided that we will prepare separate books, but of the same size, so that those who so wish can bind them together. In the Syro-Oriental rite the Gospel does not always rest on the altar as in the Byzantine rite.

Which title will we give to the book of three Liturgies? That of the present Malabar Missal is too long, also that which is found in the codices. After a brief discussion the following is decided: *Taqsa d'qudâsâ* according to the use of Syro-Oriental Malabar Church.

Having decided this, the examination of the common Order and the anaphora of the Apostles has begun. For convenience, the references in this report are indicated according to the page-numbering of the Order of the Mass of format 8^o, Syriac and Latin, printed at Puthenpally in 1912.

Pages 1-2 – It is the *vestition* with related prayers, all taken from the Roman Missal except the last: *Domum tuam ingresus sum* [...].

The Nestorians do not have anything like this; not even the edition of Urmiah includes it. In the Latin Church these prayers are not compulsory, and many do not recite them. The Byzantines have special prayers, and they say them.

Fr. Cyril is apparently to suppress everything; also Fr. Placid. Fr. President too has agreed, after a moment of reflection. The suppression is decided. In the rubrics it will be possible to say that the priest washes his hands.

What vestments does the priest put on?

All are in agreement to suppress the amice and the analogue of *ma'pra* reserved only to the bishops.

The *kottina* corresponds to *stikhar* of the Byzantines and to the alb of the Latins. Fr. Cyril points out that it must be conformed to the Oriental tradition, that is, a simple tunic that falls to the feet, adorned by a few gallons, but without laces, and which can be of any colour, even different from that of the vestments. He demonstrates a sample of it. The cloth can be any, silk or cotton, or other, even velvet.

- The *zunara* or cincture, not the cord of the Latins, the cincture is a bit wider one in the Oriental Churches that attaches from behind with two cords or with a buckle of metal in front, according to the countries.

- Two eastern model *zande* or over sleeve, one for each arm.

- The *urara* or stole. It is asked whether it is put before the cincture or after and whether it crosses on the chest in the Latin manner or not? Fr. Cyril is of the opinion that it is put before the cincture so that the latter becomes straightened by it, and that the fact of crossing on the chest is a Latin hybridism: the Eastern stole, either comprises two parts of a long strip that falls to the foot, and that are joined by buttons or a wider strip alone with a hole to pass the head. It is decided to consult Fr. Delly to know how the Chaldeans make it, before taking a decision.

- The *paina* or *cappa* is opened in front, as among the Chaldeans, the West Syrians, Copts, Ethiopians, while the Byzantines have closed it and disclose it above the arms. And it is adorned with gallons and behind there is a small Greek cross, that is, with equal branches.

It is evident that for an Oriental Liturgy there must be vestments of Oriental style and not Latin. If the Maronites did not have their Lebanese Synod of 1736 which made mandatory the Latin vestments, they would have resumed the Oriental ones. Already in Aleppo they have retained *zande*, and some wear the vestments called gothic, but the latter, although they are beautiful when they are prepared with

style, they are always Latin. The transformation could be and should be done slowly.

Page 2: We arrive at the last two prayers on this page: *Introibo ad altare Dei [...]. Domum tuam ingresus sum [...]*. They are found among the West Syrians and among the Maronites.

Fr. Cyril suspects that they are Latin interpolations. At the most, it would be appropriate to retain the second: *Domum tuam [...]*, because it is not of Latin fashion and something similar is present in the Byzantine liturgy, but it comes before the vestition.

Fr. President says that all this is pure private devotion, and suggests suppressing both.

Fr. Placid says that he wants to think over it.

Thus, for time being no decision is taken on it.

Page 3: All are in agreement to suppress the initial rubric which is entirely Latin. It is decided to take that of the Chaldeans, except the genuflection which will be replaced by a deep bow before the altar. Then the priest begins: *In nomine Patris [...]*.

Fr. President believes that the Sanctus prayer which immediately follows is a lost ancient formula of the Chaldeans, but preserved by the Malabars, because it does not come from Latins, or from other Orientals. So it is preserved.

The exclamation *Mandatum vestrum* and the response *Mandatum Christi*, correspond to the *Klevson* of the Greeks and to the *Povelì Povelite* of Slaves: it is an invitation to begin the holy action.

Page 4: After the *Gloria in excelsis Deo* of the priest, the choir needs not continue with the rest of the Great Doxology, as it is done now in Malabar, but immediately after *semper in saecula, Amen*, begins the *Pater Noster* intermixed with other invocations, said alternately by the priest and the deacon, as in the Office in the beginning of the (liturgy of the) Hours and not by the choir. Then the *Pater* is recited without additions. Since time has advanced, continuation (of the work) is deferred to the next meeting.

Document 4
Preface of the Proposed Missal Prepared by the
Liturgical Commission of the Sacred Congregation
for the Oriental Church

Rome, 1955: *in line with the guiding principles established in the first meeting, the liturgical Commission revised the entire text of Syro-Malabar Qurbana on the basis of genuine Syro-Oriental sources, considering also the authentic common traditions of the Christian East. In 1955 the proposed Missal was printed in Latin in order to facilitate the consultation of Syro-Malabar bishops and examination of the Roman authorities. I reproduce here the preface of the printed Latin Missal, in which the liturgical Commission provides very precious information concerning the restoration of Qurbana, indicating the modifications, omissions and interpolations made in the Order of Qurbana from the time of the Synod of Diamper in 1599. Moreover it substantiates the work of the Commission, which transferred the institution narrative which until then remained just before the fraction and signing, to the anaphora after the Sanctus and re-established the Ordinary of the Mass with three anaphoras, the Syro-Oriental calendar and lectionary (Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, Prot. No. 947/48, *Liturgia Siro-Malabaresi: Revisione e Ristampa del Messale Siro-Malabarese*, Roma 1955, 3-5; original in Latin).*

The text of the Ordinary of the Mass with the anaphora of the Holy Apostles Addai and Mari for the Malabar Church was printed in Rome at the press of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fide in 1775, then again in 1844, afterwards frequently in India.

This text for the great part preserved the tradition of the manuscript codices; however modifications were made before and after the Synod of Diamper (1599). The following items were introduced into the first edition: formulas which the priest pronounces

when he puts on liturgical vestments, Symbol of faith redacted according to the text of the Nicaean-Constantinopolitan text, the hymn “Father of truth”, “lamb of God”, and “Lord, I am not worthy”, before the Communion of the celebrating priest, formulas used for the Communion of the faithful, kiss of altar with the formula at the end of the Mass, suppression of the second and third anaphoras, as well as the rite of consecration.

Not minor mutations appear in the gestures of the celebrant (example, genuflections, deposition of hands) in liturgical vestments (example, chasuble and maniple) and in the matter of sacrifice (unleavened bread).

It is known that all the manuscript codices, which hand on the anaphora of the Holy Apostles Addai and Mari, do not contain the institution narrative of the Eucharist with the words of consecration. Mar Joseph, Metropolitan of Malabar, in the codex written by him (Vatican Syriac Codex 66) supplied for this defect, placing this narrative, formulated in his words, after the fraction; but the Roman edition moved it to before the fraction, with the formula being taken from the Roman Missal. However, in the other anaphoras of the Chaldean rite and in all the anaphoras of other Eastern and Western rites, this narrative has always been recited and is still recited after the hymn *Sanctus* within the anaphora itself, but never after its conclusion. Moreover, it can be shown that this narrative occupied the same place in the primeval redaction of the anaphora of the Holy Apostles Addai and Mari.⁵ Indeed, it seems that the authentic text of this narrative and its connection with the prayer that precedes and follows can be faithfully restored with the help of the second anaphora, falsely attributed to Theodore of Mopsuestia, and of the Maronite anaphora of St Peter, called *Šarrar* from its opening word.

⁵ [Cf. B. Botte, “L’Anaphore chaldéenne des Apôtres”, in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 15 (1949) 259-276].

The Ordinary of the Mass with the anaphora of Holy Apostles Addai and Mari, reformed according to the traditional text is proposed in this booklet. The second and third anaphoras are added; however, in both of them any passage, redolent of false doctrines, is corrected.

A new Latin version has not been compiled, but the text found in *Ordine Missae syro-chaldaico-malabaricae* published from Puthenpally in 1912 and in *Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectione* is used and adapted for the present proposed text.

When the Ordinary of the Mass was printed in Rome, together with it the book containing the epistles and gospels to be read during the Mass was also published; these pericopes, which were taken from the Roman Missal and translated into Syriac language, follow the order and calendar of the same Missal. However, the lectionary of the genuine rite proposes four readings for each Sunday and feast day, and indeed according to the order of the traditional calendar which the Malabars faithfully preserved in reciting the Divine Office.

Today's Ordinary of the Mass lacks many hymns: it proposes only one *marmitha* and one *onitha d'raze*, but in the celebration of *Raza* two other *marmyatha* are used. Moreover (in *Raza*) *onitha d'qanke*, *surraya*, *zummarā*, *turgama* before the epistle and *turgama* before the gospel are sung, but only one single text of each these hymns is used, while the manuscript codices contain a great number of them. If they are translated into the vernacular language, there is no doubt that their variety, accommodated to the liturgical season, can concur to the active celebration of the Mass at the maximum level.

In this booklet, after the text of the Ordinary of the Mass and the three anaphoras, norms regarding the celebration of the Mass according to the three forms are given. The Malabars have well preserved the most solemn form, which is genuine and antique, when they celebrate the so-called *Raza*. However, since this form is too long to be integrally celebrated on each Sunday, it seems appropriate to propose a text which provides for solemn Mass. Moreover directives are given also for the celebration of the Mass in the simple form.

Outside of (in addition to) these three forms no other form should be admitted.

Finally the calendar is proposed in this booklet; it is divided into two parts: the *hudra* section which faithfully follows the tradition; the *gazza* section which contains a slightly augmented number of the feasts of saints, if we consider the tradition (with respect to the tradition). Not only for the ferial days of the Lent, but also for all ferial days of the entire year different readings of the Sacred Scripture are proposed, so that, as is done in some Oriental rites, the celebration of the Eucharistic Sacrifice among the Malabars will gleam with multiple variety.

Document 5

Proposed Syro-Malabar Missal: Essential Content

Rome, 1955: *in the previous document the preface attached to the proposed Syro-Malabar Missal has been reproduced. Here a schematic presentation of the entire book is offered, in order that the readers may have a glance at its essential content. Obviously this is not a real document, but my own reconstruction in the manner of a table of contents* (Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, Prot. No. 947/48, *Liturgia Siro-Malabaresi: Revisione e Ristampa del Messale Siro-Malabarese*, Roma 1955, 1-98).

Indication of Content	Page number
1) Preface of the liturgical Commission.	3-5
2) Common order (A): introductory rites, liturgy of the Word, preparation or pre-anaphora.	7-23
3) First anaphora, namely the anaphora of the Holy	

Apostles Mar Addai and Mar Mari.	24-31
4) Common order (B), rites of reconciliation, Holy Communion, thanksgiving and conclusion.	31- 44
5) Second anaphora (attributed to Mar Theodore), which can be used from the Sunday of Annunciation to the Sunday of Hosanna inclusive.	45-54
6) Third anaphora (attributed to Mar Nestorius), which can be used five times a year: Epiphany (Denha), on the Friday of John the Baptist, on the memorial day of Greek Doctors, on the Wednesday of the rogation of the Ninevites and on the Passover (Pesha) Thursday.	55-69
7) The Order of celebration of <i>Qurbana</i> :	
a) in solemn form,	70-81
b) in simple form,	81-84
c) in most solemn form (<i>Raza</i>).	84-89
8) Notes: internal structure of the churches, liturgical vestments, some important rubrics, gestures and postures, etc.	89-91
9) Liturgical Calendar:	
a) Temporal cycle (<i>Hudra</i>)	92-95
b) Sanctoral cycle (<i>Gazza</i>)	95-97

Section Two

FIRST CONSULTATION OF SYRO-MALABAR BISHOPS CONCERNING THE PROPOSED ORDER OF *QURBANA*

On 2 April 1955 Cardinal Eugene Tisserant, Secretary of the Congregation for the Oriental Church, forwarded to the Apostolic Internuncio Martin Lucas (1952-1956) eight copies of the aforementioned Latin text of the proposed Missal, one for himself and one each for all the seven Syro-Malabar bishops, asking for their observations, comments and evaluations.¹ As directed by the Cardinal, with the letter dated 28 April 1955 a copy of the proposed Missal was sent from the Apostolic Internunciature to each Syro-Malabar bishop, requiring him to send his response as soon as possible.

All of the Syro-Malabar bishops, except Mar George Alapatt (bishop of Trichur), responded to the Congregation. Generally the bishops were favourable to the vernacularization of liturgy and shortening of the Holy Mass, but manifested an evidently hostile attitude towards the restoration of Syro-Oriental *Qurbana*, since they desired to maintain the liturgy as it existed at that time, considering the Syro-Malabar rite as an independent and autonomous rite practised for more than three centuries and approved by the Roman Pontiffs. It is interesting to note that the Syro-Malabar bishops did not present any liturgically or theologically profound study or any doctrinal objections against the proposed *Qurbana*.

As I have indicated in the General Introduction the responses of the bishops are found in the Report with Summary printed in view of the plenary assembly of 27 May 1957, now kept in the volume called *Ponenze Anno 1950-1959*. Since the letters of the bishops are found in

¹ The forwarding letter of Cardinal Tisserant can be found in Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Port. No. 947/48, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi*, fascicolo IIIa.

the said source without the initial part and the final greetings, they are presented as such in chronological order. The capitalization and the punctuation marks are generally maintained as in the original.

Although the procedures for the restoration of the Syro-Oriental Pontifical started already in 1934, because of various reasons it was published only in 1957 and copies were forwarded to the Syro-Malabar bishops towards the end of the same year. However, the implementation was delayed, because after the elapse of several years, when the Syriac Pontifical was ready, it had to be translated into Malayalam, because the vernacular was permitted to be used in liturgy.² When the opinion of the bishops about the proposed Missal was sought, the efforts for the translation of the Pontifical were progressing. In this context some bishops made their observations and suggestions not only on the Missal but also on the Pontifical.

Document 6

Letter of Apostolic Internuncio Transmitting the Proposed Missal to the Syro-Malabar Bishops for Their Remarks

New Delhi, 28 April 1955; *with the letter of 2 April 1955 Cardinal Tisserant sent eight copies of the proposed Missal to the Apostolic Internuncio, one for the Internuncio and 7 for each of the Syro-Malabar bishops for their comments and suggestions. As directed by the Cardinal, from the Internunciature the proposed text was sent to the Syro-Malabar bishops with its own letter, which transcribes the content of the aforementioned Italian letter of the Cardinal. Here the letter sent to Bishop Matthew Kavukatt is presented as an exemplar (Changanacherry, Archdiocesan Archives, Section Mathew Kavukatt).*

² See Introductory Article Two, no. 4.

Apostolic Internunciature in India, No. 4975/55, 28 April 1955,
To the Right Reverend Matthew Kavukatt, Bishop of
Changanacherry.

My Lord Bishop,

Under separate cover I have forwarded to you a copy of “Liturgia Siro-Malabarese” which was sent to the Apostolic Internunciature by the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church.

His Eminence Cardinal Tisserant says that this booklet is the result of the studies of the liturgical Commission set up by the same S. Congregation for the revision and the publication of Syro-Malabar Liturgical Books. It constitutes moreover the concluding stage in the preparation of the new edition of the Syro-Malabar Missal.

The Latin version contains the “Ordinarium Missae” with the first Anaphora, that is the one of the Apostles Addai and Mari; this is followed by the two other traditional anaphoras, the ceremonial for the three forms of celebration (solemn, simple and very solemn) and the calendar. The text of the “Ordinarium Missae” which is given in this booklet is that for the solemn celebration and the modifications which are necessary for the celebration of the “Raza” are indicated. The calendar proposed at the end of the booklet necessarily requires a new series of passages from the Sacred Scripture to be read during Liturgy; the selection of these is being made and more details will be sent in due time.

His eminence moreover invites you to send it (Sacred Congregation) your remarks of liturgical and pastoral nature, adding relative and pertinent arguments. It would also be useful if you could state which parts of the S. Liturgy you would like to be recited in Malayalam.

This communication is being made to you and to the other Ordinaries of Syro-Malabar Rite confidentially and you are therefore asked not to speak about it in public. This does not prevent you,

however, from discussing the various points with one or two reliable persons, asking them too to treat the matter as confidential. It will be appreciated if you could send your remarks as early as possible so as to avoid undue delay.

With the expression of my esteem, I remain,

Yours in Christ, Monsignor John Gordon, Chargé D'Affaires.

Document 7

Letter of Thomas Tharayil, Bishop of Kottayam

Kottayam, 25 May 1955; *Mar Thomas Tharayil generally appreciates the structure of the Order of Qurbana and the vernacularization of liturgy, but desires to maintain the Latin vestments, unleavened bread and Holy Communion under the species of bread alone. He raises some objections against the use of sanctuary veil and expresses his desire that the Mass be as short as possible* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Malabaresi-Liturgia: Revisione e Stampa del Messale Malabarese, Relazione con Sommario, Ponenza del 27 maggio 1957* [in *Ponenze Anno 1950-1959*], Summary No. I, 21-22).

Referring to the letter cited above I submit the following in consultation with three Priests of this Diocese regarding the subject noted above:

1. Structure of the Mass

We feel the structure proposed is quite necessary and should be accepted. The ceremonies however, should be so adjusted that the duration of the Mass should never exceed 25 minutes, since there will be sermon, Catechetical Instruction, Parish-councils, pious associations such as the Legion of Mary, St Vincent de Paul Society

etc. to be attended to on every Sunday besides bination of Mass in many parishes.

2. Vernacularization

As regards the introduction of vernacular language, I would suggest that as many parts as possible may be vernacularized so as to enable the faithful to take more active part in the divine Sacrifice.

3. Vestments

Vestments now in use should be allowed to continue for the following reasons:

a) The present vestments have been in use for the last so many centuries and this external innovation would be a drastic change which does not appear to be necessary as it is not the essential part of any rite.

b) For the last few centuries we have been living intermingled with those of the Latin Rite and very often Priests of the Syro-Malabar Rite officiate in Churches of the Latin Rite and vice versa. Uniformity of vestments is, therefore, a great facility and want of uniformity will be inconvenient for Priests of both Rites.

c) The present vestments have been made and maintained by each Church at great cost and to do away with them will be a great financial loss.

d) In case the present vestments are to be discarded at least in course of time, the Gothic chasubles may be substituted in place of cope or Paina and thus a slow process of transition may be effected.

4. Host

Regarding the host for Mass we have been using for centuries the unleavened bread and the same may be allowed to continue since Priests of the Latin Rite who use unleavened bread officiate in our Churches and vice versa.

5. Communion to the Faithful under Both Species

We have been having since very long Communion under one species, namely the Sacred Host only. The same practice may be allowed to continue since the number of even daily Communicants in the recent past has increased considerably, and Communion in both species would cause delay and inconvenience.

6. Sanctuary Veil

In recent times some of our Churches have been so constructed that there is no provision in those Churches for a Sanctuary veil. Besides, in almost all the Churches the Blessed Sacrament is kept and the Sanctuary lamp as well. In some Churches the veil moving to and fro in the breeze caught fire from the sanctuary lamp causing thereby great damage. Moreover, out of devotion the faithful keep lighted candles in front of the Sanctuary and there is danger of the sanctuary veil catching fire.

7. Duration of the Mass

On account of our intermingled life with those of the Latin Rite, it is necessary that duration of the Mass according to our Rite should tally with that of the Latin Rite. Besides, to facilitate the attendance of daily Mass by the faithful having a busy life, it is necessary that the Mass is made as short as possible. Again, on Sundays and days of obligation we shall have to say one Mass after another and therefore, it is necessary that the Mass be short. Moreover, when the vernacular language is introduced in the Mass, by the very nature of the vernacular the passages translated into the vernacular are bound to be longer than the original and hence too the need to make the Mass short.

Document 8

Letter of Augustine Kandathil, Archbishop of Ernakulam

Ernakulam, 6 June 1955; *Mar Augustine Kandathil appreciates the admirable zeal and enthusiasm of Cardinal Tisserant for the restoration of Syro-Malabar liturgy. However, he questions the need of the reform of liturgy as intended by the Oriental Congregation and maintains that the Syro-Malabar rite as it existed at that time was an autonomous and independent rite observed for more than three centuries and approved by the Roman Pontiffs. He also prefers standard Malayalam and short ceremonies, but he is opposed to the introduction of Syro-Oriental vestments, leavened bread, Communion under both species, sanctuary veil and other Eastern traditions* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Malabaresi-Liturgia: Revisione e Stampa del Messale Malabarese, Relazione con Sommario, Ponenza del 27 maggio 1957* [in *Ponenze Anno 1950-1959*], Summary No. II, 23-30).

I. [Introductory Remarks]

I have received through the Internunciature the draft copies of the new Missal and Pontifical which have been prepared at Rome under the able guidance of Your Eminence. We are deeply indebted to Your Eminence for the admirable zeal and enthusiasm which Your Eminence shows for the progress and welfare of our rite. We deeply appreciate the paternal regard you have for us. Your Eminence's name will go down to posterity as that of one who has done immense service to the Syro-Malabar Church. May Your Eminence's noble efforts produce abundant good results. I promise Your Eminence our whole hearted support and co-operation in all your endeavours that will tend to the good of our Church and foster the religious sentiments of our people.

We are very happy that Your Eminence has taken the initiative to bring about a timely and beneficial reformation in our liturgy. We note with joy that in the draft which Your Eminence has sent us, there are so many points which will help our people greatly.

Your Eminence has tried to make our liturgy more devotional and popular.

The introduction of vernacular in the liturgy will be, no doubt greatly appreciated by all. Now the people will be able to have a liturgical worship in a language which they can understand and appreciate.

This will enable the people to take active part with the clergy in the liturgical worship for which they are clamouring.

Your Eminence has very wisely introduced a lot of singing in the liturgy. This has made it interesting, attractive and devotional and will foster the piety of the clergy as well as the faithful.

II. The Language

Your Eminence has asked to express our opinion regarding the language of the Pontifical. I beg leave to submit humbly the following remarks:

1. The Malayalam language used in the pontifical could be improved and made more classical.

2. Already there is the complaint that the Malayalam used by the Christians is very poor and antiquated. Many of the prayers written long ago and even by foreigners who knew very little of Malayalam, are still being used. A good many books of Christian literature adopt the same language. The educated Hindus look down upon us with contempt on this account, and call our language “Mapla Malayalam” i.e., “Christian Malayalam”.

3. Our Catholics are now in general very much advanced educationally. There are also thousands of graduates of various

Universities among them. If in future too we continue to use poor and antiquated language for worship, it will surely tend to lessen the devotion of the people. The educated persons may even be tempted to keep away from the divine worship on account of this. It will also hinder the conversion of the Hindus who keep a very high standard in literature and have an aversion to our present way of expressing religious ideas.

4. The Latins in Malabar too may soon have the vernacular in their liturgy. Undoubtedly they will see to it that the language they use is modern and attractive. We the Orientals alone, who are mostly high class people and in general better educated, will lag behind and will be an object of contempt and derision.

5. The Jacobite Christians of Malabar, it may be noted, had set up a committee of experts in Malayalam language including even Hindus, in order to formulate their liturgical prayers in an elegant and beautiful language. The Syro-Malankara Rite as converts also makes use of the same prayers to a great extent.

6. We feel therefore that it is good for us also that we make our liturgical prayers according to the classical style of the Malayalam language. That will be appreciated by all. Some years ago the Bishops, both Syrian and Latin had appointed a commission to see to the improvement of our language in the prayers. But it did not continue the work for various reasons.

III. Short Ceremonies

1. It is a great necessity that our religious ceremonies be short and attractive.

2. *People.* The present generation is too busy and they have no patience to attend long religious ceremonies. Unless they are short, people would try to avoid them, as far as possible, or attend only some portions coming late or leaving before the end, as some of them do at present.

3. The Latin ceremonies are even now comparatively shorter than ours.

4. We learn that they are going to be shortened still more.

5. In these circumstances, if our ceremonies are also not shortened, our people will be tempted, as at present, to attend the Latin Churches for services, notwithstanding common singing etc.

6. Thus our churches will be deserted. People will lose their enthusiasm and love for the Syriac liturgy. It will indeed be painful for us, and none the less for Your Eminence.

7. *Our Priests* in charge of souls, unlike the monks remaining in the monasteries are also overburdened with various pastoral duties.

8. They are much more than in former times.

9. Many of them have to say two and sometimes even three Masses every Sunday. In some cases, each of these Masses has to be said in churches, several miles apart. In most cases, they will have to reach the stations walking.

10. At every such Mass the priests have to preach, sermons comprising homily and catechism classes for adults.

11. After Masses, there have to be catechism classes for children.

12. The priests have to conduct various pious associations, in each parish, such as Sodalties, Legion of Mary, Catholic Action, Vincent de Paul Society, Mother's Association, Altar Boy's Association etc.

13. Much of the priests' time is also taken for the administration of the sacraments, such as Baptism, Marriages and Confessions for which they will have to spend several hours in the confessional.

14. They will have to conduct also Parish Administration Council meeting, to consult together various means of executing difficult works.

15. All these duties have to be done practically on every Sunday and almost all the week days.

16. Besides, our priests are also in charge of the parochial schools under government control.

17. They are bothered with endless correspondence with the government regarding the school.

18. There are besides, various charitable institutions such as Hospitals, Dispensaries, Home for the aged, Orphanages etc. Priests have to be in charge of these as well and also religious houses of sisters besides visiting all the houses of the parishioners throughout the year.

19. Therefore, unless the Mass and other ceremonies be short our priests and people will be put to great difficulties and their piety and devotion will be affected unfavourably. The above said necessary works will have to suffer and the faithful may drift away.

20. If the text of the Mass which has been sent to us is to be translated into Malayalam as it should be, it would take much more time than at present to say it devotionally, as expressions in Malayalam will be longer.

21. It is *not only the Mass* that has to be shortened, but the *Pontifical, Breviary and Ritual* as well; in short all *Liturgical functions*.

IV. The Language of the Present Liturgy

1. We are pure Indians, born and brought up in India.

2. We have no connections with Syrians in Syria and other places. We are racially Indians, a good part of our forefathers having been converted from high caste Hindus of Malabar by St Thomas; hence we are known as St Thomas Christians. From the time of St Thomas, our people were having their liturgy in their own national language,³

³ This is a mere hypothesis without any historical basis. Until today those who hold this hypothesis have not produced any kind of proof: legends, oral tradition or documents.

except perhaps, some essential parts in Syriac, introduced by St Thomas.

3. When the St Thomas Christians had no priests to perform their liturgical functions due to persecution and such other adverse circumstances, our people were only participating in the liturgical functions, performed by the Syrian priests who came to Malabar towards the middle of the 4th century. Still our people remained pure Indians saying their prayers in their own tongue.

4. Even when they were under Portuguese domination, they were clamouring for their own Bishops, priests and their own Liturgy.

5. The Syro-Malabar rite, as distinct from the pure Chaldean rite is about 3½ centuries old and has been recognized as a distinct rite. Through the letter to Your Eminence on 6th December 1938, all the members of our hierarchy had expressed our idea that we do not desire to have recourse to pure Chaldean rite.

6. We are Syrians only by name, just as the Latins here are Latins only in name, as they are generally Indians.

7. We do not know the Syriac language.

8. The Syriac as well as the Latin languages are entirely foreign to our people. Our priests out of necessity study these languages with great difficulty. Still many of them know very little of Syriac, as it is used only in Liturgy. Many of them do not understand the prayers etc. Hence no piety can be fostered. This is also one reason to have the Malayalam language, which idea Your Eminence has grasped.

9. Our people do want to participate in the divine worship actively and intelligently and they clamour for it. Your Eminence has taken the initiative to satisfy them both, clergy and laity, as has been done in the proposed Pontifical. Hence it is of great utility that Malayalam language be used as far as possible in the Liturgy. The essential parts alone be put in Syriac.

10. This will undoubtedly help to foster devotion of the people.

11. Your Eminence should be praised for restoring this beautiful custom of intelligible popular Liturgy.

V. The Individuality of Our Rite

1. Our rite, the Syro-Malabar rite, has been established and recognized by the Roman Pontiffs as an independent and unique rite.⁴

2. We have ceased to have any connection with the Syro-Chaldeans long ago. We were ordered so with severe injunctions, noting it as rebellion against the Church.

3. Ever since the appointment of Bishops of our Hierarchy by Pope Leo XIII we have made great progress.

4. Now we are undoubtedly far ahead of the Syro-Chaldeans educationally, culturally and religiously.

5. Therefore we want to keep up the independence and the specific character of our rite by all means.

6. If strange and unusual ceremonies are introduced in the Liturgy neither the people nor the clergy except perhaps some monks who have no duty to work outside for saving souls, would like them. It will not in any way help foster the devotion of the faithful who are now handicapped with a lot of things.

7. The Jacobite ceremonies are of late introduction. Our people hate them as heretic. But if we are to follow the same ceremonies or something similar to it, we do not think that the people would appreciate it. Our people would think that we are following Jacobites. Jacobites themselves would think so.

⁴ In spite of due research I have not yet found any document which demonstrates that Roman Pontiffs recognized or approved the then Syro-Malabar rite. At that time the Syro-Malabar Church used the Roman Pontifical and the Roman Ritual, which were obviously approved by the Roman Pontiffs for the Latin Church.

VI. Reformation of the Liturgy

1. We do admit that the reformation of the Liturgy is desirable and necessary.

2. But the most important factor that should be taken into consideration is, how far the reformation would tend to foster the devotion and religious sentiments of the people.

3. The Latin Liturgy has not failed to make convenient adaptations and modifications throughout the centuries.

4. This readiness for adaptation has helped to keep the Latin Liturgy living and dynamic.

5. We want a reformation in our Liturgy that will help it living, dynamic, and progressive; that will help conversion of Indians all over. They like oriental songs.

6. We, who are in daily contact with our people and know their sentiments and aspirations know what would serve their spiritual progress and what would not.

7. Restoring the old vestments like "Paina" etc. for Mass will not in any way help our people.

8. We live intermingled with Latins, and very often priests of our rite officiate in churches of Latin rite and vice versa.

9. Want of uniformity in vestments will cause much inconvenience to the priests of both rites.

10. There is nothing to gain by restoring the use of these antiquated vestments. On the contrary, our churches will have to suffer considerable financial loss if the present vestments are to be discarded.

11. Besides in a hot country like India, such closed vestments will cause much inconvenience during the divine worship.

12. Regarding the host for the Mass, we have been using the unleavened bread for centuries.

13. If we are now forced to use the leavened, it will cause much inconvenience and will serve no purpose.

14. Communion in both species, in such crowded churches like ours is practically impossible.

15. They are not in use here even among Jacobites.

16. Many of our churches are constructed in such a way that the use of sanctuary veil is rendered impossible.

VII. A Liturgical Committee

1. I am of strong opinion that in order to make the reformation of the present Liturgy, which is so dear to Your Eminence's heart, satisfactorily, a committee of experts including experts in Malayalam Language, should be set up.

2. If people from Malabar who are in daily contact with our people and know their ideas, aspirations and customs well and those who are well versed in Malayalam Language are included in the committee, the work can be accomplished to the entire satisfaction of all, clergy as well as laity. Pontifical, Missal, Breviary and other Liturgical books should all be reformed and as Your Eminence has shown the way should be perfected and completed as Your Eminence directs and published by Your Eminence himself.

Conclusion

1. It is the great confidence we have in Your Eminence and in Your Eminence's love and regard for us and for our rite and Liturgy that gave me the courage to point out the above mentioned facts.

2. If these points are overlooked and a liturgical reformation is brought about without regard for the above facts, we are afraid that the results may be undesirable and perhaps disastrous.

3. It may provoke some curiosity among people for some time. People may come to our churches for some time just to see what the new reformation is like. But this curiosity will fade away soon.

4. People would desert our churches in search of short and attractive ceremonies elsewhere.

5. The conversion work will be impeded.

6. Our Liturgy will lose all its attraction, and it may die away slowly, the clergy and the people disregarding it.

7. The long ceremonies may be imposed on monks in the monasteries who are not to work outside in charge of souls.

8. If the Liturgy as it is to be observed by the secular clergy who are in charge of souls, they should be given, freedom to omit a lot of them, so that it can be finished in a short time giving them time for other works; the same with the vestments.

Document 9

Letter of Sebastian Vayalil, Bishop of Palai

Palai, 7 July 1955; *Mar Sebastian Vayalil is favourable to the vernacularization of liturgy, utilising "chaste, idiomatic and elegant Malayalam language". He is against the introduction of new Oriental vestments, leavened bread and Communion under both species. He also prefers short liturgy and proposes to maintain some Western ceremonies in the Syro-Malabar Pontifical* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Malabaresi-Liturgia: Revisione e Stampa del Messale Malabarese, Relazione con Sommario, Ponzona del 27 maggio 1957* [in *Ponenze Anno 1950-1959*], Summary No. III, 30-33).

I am in receipt of the draft copies of the New Pontifical and Missal which were sent to me by Your Eminence. As I am asked to

give my comments on them, I beg to submit the following for your gracious consideration.

Vernacularisation of Our Liturgy

The present attitude of mind of our faithful is favourable towards vernacularisation. It will help our people to participate in the Liturgical functions with better attention and devotion. The more essential parts may however be retained in Syriac so as to preserve its wealth of beauty and profound sacredness. This may inspire the faithful who participate in the religious ceremonies with greater respect and reverence.

When we attempt the vernacularisation, we have to bestow very great care and attention in rendering the text into chaste, idiomatic and elegant Malayalam language. If the language that we use in the Liturgy happens to be poor or incorrect, our non-Catholic and non-Christian brethren in Malabar will look with aversion and contempt upon us and our religious ceremonies. Even our very Catholic educated young men would feel disgusted.

I am sorry to note that the language found used in the draft copy of the Pontifical does not satisfy the requirements of a chaste and elegant language. The defects may be remedied by entrusting the task to a Committee of experts set up in Malabar to function under the direction of the Hierarchy. This can be done easily as we have priests and laymen who are well-versed in Malayalam and Syriac and who can competently take up the work. What is said of the Pontifical may be applied to the case of the Missal and its vernacularisation.

The Syro-Malabar Rite

As we are all aware, we were having the Syro-Malabar rite now for three hundred years. It has its own individuality and characteristics. The Syro-Malabar Church has been growing and progressing in the spiritual, educational and economic aspects. The Rite has in no way

retarded the progress of the Church. On the other hand it has only enhanced its growth and progress in the country. If we are to make any change or alteration, it must be in view of the further progress of the Church and the spiritual advancement of the faithful and priests. But I am afraid, the changes contemplated in the drafts do not contribute to the realization of this aim.

Let me make a few comments on the proposed innovation.

1. *Vestments*. The vestments now in use need not be replaced by the new type of vestments for the following reasons:

a) Every Church has at present costly vestments. To replace them all by new type of vestments means heavy and unbearable strain on the financial resources of our churches.

b) The faithful have long been used to the present kind of vestments. The introduction of the new ones will create confusion in their minds. Further, the Schismatics who live intermingled with us will find an occasion to accuse us of having been in the wrong all the while.

c) In the territories of all the Dioceses of the Syro-Malabar Rite there are also Latins and Latin Churches. The introduction of the new type of vestments will be a source of much inconvenience to priests of both the Rites.

d) The vestments now in use are of decent and artistic pattern. The introduction of the antiquated vestments would in no way inspire more devotion nor appeal to the finer tastes; perhaps the effect may be the contrary.

2. *Leavened bread*. We have been using the unleavened bread for centuries. The use of the leavened bread serves no purpose, but would create many practical difficulties.

3. *Communion in both kinds*. We have to distribute Holy Communion to thousands in our churches. It is impossible to administer in both kinds to the huge crowds that surge in our churches. Occasions may arise of serious irreverence and even of sacrilege.

Moreover this innovation would give the non-Catholics the opportunity to make scandalous and damaging criticisms against the Catholic Church.

4. *Short Ceremonies.* The time taken for each liturgical function is a point that has also to be considered while we effect the innovations. If Mass and other ceremonies demand an unusually long time the faithful would naturally try to keep off from them. The priests would be overburdened and would be rendered incapable of attending to their various duties properly.

5. *Ordinations.* The ordination ceremonies as given in the draft of the new Pontifical consist of songs and simple prayers. The Orders are here reduced to four as against the four Minor Orders and the subdiaconate, diaconate and Presbyterate that we were hitherto having. I wonder whether any useful purpose is served by effecting such a drastic change. Also, the handing over of instruments, anointing with holy oil, the meaningful exhortations etc. are all dropped. I wish we could retain such ceremonies and exhortations, rich with deep meaning and touching the innermost hearts both of the people and the recipients. I trust, we can have the reforms made without effacing such vitally important portions.

6. *A practical suggestion.* I wish to place before Your Eminence a humble suggestion in order to have the reform of the Liturgy effected in a very satisfactory manner. A Committee should study the various aspects of the question in hand and draw up drafts under the direction of the Hierarchy. The drafts thus prepared should be submitted to Your Eminence for approval.

Document 10

Letter of Joseph Parecattil, Auxiliary Bishop of Ernakulam

Ernakulam, 10 July 1955; *the auxiliary bishop of Ernakulam appreciates the vernacularization of Liturgy, but is opposed to all other Eastern traditional items already mentioned elsewhere* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Malabaresi-Liturgia: Revisione e Stampa del Messale Malabarese, Relazione con Sommario, Ponenza del 27 maggio 1957* [in *Ponenza Anno 1950-1959*], Summary No. IV, 33-35).

I beg to acknowledge receipt of the provisional Malayalam edition of the Pontifical and the Latin text of the Missal, both intended for the use of the Syro-Malabar Church. As I also have been asked to comment upon them, I beg to submit the following remarks:

1) The idea, as it appears, of re-introducing the Syro-Chaldean liturgy into Malabar in its entirety may not be appreciated by the clergy and the people.

2) The use of the vernacular for liturgical functions will be quite welcome and in keeping with the legitimate aspirations of the people.

The Pontifical

3) The Malayalam language of the Pontifical can still be improved. It has to be made more elegant and idiomatic.

4) I am afraid that the ceremonies for the ordination of deacons and priests and for the consecration of bishops are too long, even after leaving out the portions marked as optional. It may be advisable perhaps to avoid the too frequent repetition of hymns and versicles.

5) Ordinarily it will be too difficult for the ordaining bishop to perform all the ceremonies standing all the while.

6) The prostrations by the ordinandi at each *Gloria Patri* in such a way that their forehead touches the ground are not easy to perform. This and some other ceremonies may not be fully appreciated by the enlightened congregation of today.

The Missal

7) The Mass, I think, might be reduced by half, so that it may be over within half an hour. Nowadays the people have no patience to attend long services, not to speak of practical difficulties in the part of priests, especially on Sundays.

8) If the Mass were made simpler with less of external movements and gesticulations, it would be easier for old and sickly priests to offer the Holy Sacrifice. It will have the additional advantage of creating an atmosphere more favourable to internal piety and serious prayer.

9) The use of the sanctuary veil is not practical, since many of our churches are built in cross-wise fashion.

10) The change of vestments will entail great loss on our poor churches and I think no spiritual profit is going to accrue to the faithful by this measure. It will also create practical difficulties when our priests go to Latin churches and vice-versa.

11) The use of leavened bread also is not quite practical, especially because it is unsuited for preservation in the tabernacles.

12) Communion under both the species seems to be well-nigh impossible the present day, when the number of communicants has gone up considerably. Besides, it will shake the simple faith of the Ordinary Catholics, who will easily get the impression that the custom so far prevalent has been something wrong and unscriptural, and will confirm the objection of heretics and schismatics that the Catholic church has deviated from the command of Christ and the tradition of primitive ages.

13) To communicate the faithful from the Sacred Host of the priest, I think, will be too difficult. So it may be better to continue the use of ciboriums as we do now.

14) Too frequent and profuse use of the incense may not appeal to the modern congregation.

15) I am also of opinion that it will be better and more convenient to keep the present order of prayers and ceremonies as far as possible, leaving out as many as needed for the sake of brevity.

16) To introduce the custom of making the sign of the Cross from right to left, I am afraid, will not serve any useful purpose. It may, moreover, embarrass the people, who, in common with the members of other rites, have been used to another form all along.

17) The calendar given at the end, I think, can still be made richer with the addition of the feasts of modern saints. I am of opinion that all the feasts, which we have been in the habit of celebrating, e.g., the feast of the Kingship of Christ, must be retained. The people will feel very much especially if the titular and other solemn feasts of their church are dropped out.

Document 11

Letter of Mathew Kavukatt, Archbishop of Changanacherry

Changanacherry, 25 July 1955; *in full agreement with the other bishops of the Syro-Malabar Church Mar Kavukatt is also against the introduction of Oriental vestments, leavened bread, Communion under both kinds and sanctuary veil* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Malabaresi-Liturgia: Revisione e Stampa del Messale Malabarese, Relazione con Sommario, Ponenza del 27 maggio 1957* [in *Ponenze Anno 1950-1959*], Summary No. V, 35-38).

In response to Your Eminence's kind call for comments and suggestions I beg to submit the following.

I. Vernacularization of the Pontifical and the Mass

The faithful are getting more and more liturgically minded. Vernacularization will help them to have a more intelligent following of the Liturgy and it will create in them better appreciation, attention and devotion. I would, however, suggest that the most essential parts be retained in Syriac so as to preserve the pristine beauty of the Liturgy, its sacredness and richness which would command greater religious respect and reverence from the Faithful who participate in it.

In view of the fact that the Liturgical prayers have to stand for centuries, I would humbly suggest that all possible care and attention be bestowed in rendering them into the vernacular so as to make the language most idiomatic, correct, chaste, elegant and attractive. A Committee of experts may be set up in Malabar to work at it under the control and direction of the Hierarchy. Fortunately we have at present, priests and laymen who are accredited scholars in Syriac, Malayalam and Sanskrit.

II. Integrity of the Rite

The Syro-Malabar rite has been in existence for three hundred years and has its own individuality and characteristics. This, in no way, has retarded its progress. We desire that it may not be destroyed of its individuality and characteristics. I would make a few comments on the intended innovations regarding vestments, Communion and the bread to be used for the Mass.

1. Vestments

The vestments now in use may not be replaced by new type of vestments for the following reasons:

a) Every church has, at present, costly vestments. To replace them all by new type of vestments means heavy and unbearable strain on the financial resources of the churches.

b) The faithful have long been used to the present kind of vestments. The introduction of new ones will create confusion in their minds. There is also the danger that our Schismatic Brethren who live intermingled with us will make use of this occasion to accuse us of having been in the wrong all along.

c) In the Territories of all the dioceses of Syro-Malabar Rite there are Latins and Latin churches. The introduction of a new type of vestments will be a source of much inconvenience to priests of both the Rites.

2. Leavened Bread

Under the existing circumstances as mentioned above the use of the leavened bread too will create many practical difficulties.

3. Communion in Both Kinds

The number of daily communicants is very large at the present time. On special occasions thousands approach the Holy Table. It will be almost impossible to administer Holy Communion to such large numbers.

May I in this connection make reference to a Pastoral recently published by the Catholicos of the Schismatic Orthodox Church here in Malabar. In the Pastoral the Catholicos states that Christ wanted all the Faithful to receive Holy Communion in both kinds, but that the Catholic Bishops and priests have all along been deceiving the people by administering the Sacrament in one kind only, while they, the Catholic Bishops and priests receive in both kinds.

If in the wake of this Pastoral we start administering the Sacrament in both kinds the impression created in the minds of the

non-Catholic brethren will be that we the Catholics, have been in the wrong for centuries and that we have at last admitted our mistake. This may thus open the way for the non-Catholics to make scandalous and damaging propaganda against the Catholic Church. It may also adversely affect the Re-union movement. In the minds of Ordinary Catholics, too, it may tend to create doubt and confusion.

4. Particles for the Communion

Though one may break the big host at Communion for the distribution among the faithful to keep to the symbolism, it may not be practical to prepare all the particles for the Communion of the faithful in this manner, especially because of the increasing number of communicants in our churches.

5. Three Forms of Celebration

Three forms of celebration (Simple, Solemn, Most solemn or *Raza*) are proposed in the text. The Most solemn celebration (the *Raza*) is celebrated with the assistance of the Arch-deacon, Deacons and other ministers. In many churches this solemn liturgy is practically impossible due to the deficiency of priests. The other form of the solemn liturgy too seems to demand assisting deacons and subdeacons, and consequently becomes practically impossible in many of the churches. Nevertheless, the people, on many occasions, either for devotion or for solemnity, will demand solemn liturgy. Hence I would suggest that assisting deacons and subdeacons be not made obligatory in every solemn liturgy.

6. The Sanctuary Veil

Though in olden days the sanctuary veil was common in our churches, today the sanctuary veil has come out of use among us. The restoration of the sanctuary veil may not be in keeping with the devotion of the people and hence this may not be strictly demanded.

While revising the Liturgy and reorienting it we may also consider the time taken for each Liturgical function. Every day of the week large congregations of the Faithful – students, teachers, advocates, farmers and people of the labour class – attend the Mass. If the Mass is longer than it is at present it may be an embarrassment for them.

Document 12

Letter of Sebastian Valloppilly, Bishop of Tellicherry

Tellicherry, 31 July 1955; *Bishop Valloppilly generally appreciates the reform, but makes some observations against the restoration of Oriental items already mentioned only because of practical difficulties. He indicates some prayers that could be translated into Malayalam and recited by the people* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Malabaresi-Liturgia: Revisione e Stampa del Messale Malabarese, Relazione con Sommario, Ponzona del 27 maggio 1957* [in *Ponenze Anno 1950-1959*], Summary No. VI, 39-40).

After mature deliberation and consultation with two of our experienced and competent priests we give below our impression and suggestions as desired.

The Pontifical. Since we have no Pontifical of our own, the introduction of the new Pontifical will be greatly appreciated. The desire of our people to have Malayalam introduced in the liturgy also has been very well fulfilled. A few of the rituals like making the sign of the cross from the bottom to the top and right to left (page 25 et 70) seems to be bit repugnant after contrary practice for years. So also keeping vigil the whole night (page 50, consecration of Bishops) especially in view of the following day's events, appears to be a little too hard.

The language is simple and more or less in keeping with the language we use in our prayers at present. One remark we should like to make is that shorter sentences should be used.

The Missal. A thorough change is made in everything as seen from the Missal. As far as we can say this may be a welcome change. New suggestions concerning the use of leavened bread, Communion under double species, use of ancient vestments etc. are sure to cause great inconveniences. In our crowded churches where thousands and thousands approach the Holy Table, Communion under double species is practically impossible.

More than all these, the people will get the impression that we were all these long years in the wrong. Great harm may come from this especially because there are many Jacobite and other non-Catholic Christians in Malabar who instead of being attracted to the Church will make bold to say that we – their Syrian Catholic Brethren – were having wrong practices all these years and that we are now correcting and coming closer to their ceremonies and practices.

Some prayers of the Mass have been rearranged and some of the latter additions have been omitted. This is a welcome change especially because the Mass has thereby become a little shorter. Some more of the repetitions could be safely omitted because when portions are translated into Malayalam the Mass is sure to become long. People as a rule appreciate short ceremonies.

Translation into Malayalam. The following portions could be rendered into Malayalam and recited by the faithful.

1. Initium – Prayers at the foot of the Altar including the psalms (page 7-8) (If the veil is used this may not be possible).
2. Trisagion (page 12).
3. Korozutha I (page 15).
4. Korozutha 2 (page 17).
5. Symbolum (page 21).

6. Dialogus Praefationis (page 26).
7. Sanctus (page 27).
8. Prayers said by the Deacon (page 30).
9. Prayers said by the Deacon (page 31).
10. The last two paragraphs on page 31.
11. The Cantus by the Deacon page 33 (ministri eius).
12. The responses on page 35 (Domine condona peccata).
13. Pater Noster (page 37).
14. Gratiarum actio (page 41).
15. All the small responses – Amen, Oremus, Pax nobiscum, tecum et cum spiritu tuo etc.

Section Three
OPINION OF THE ROMAN LITURGICAL
COMMISSION AND SOME EXPERTS ON THE
RESPONSES OF SYRO-MALABAR BISHOPS

The Syro-Malabar bishops did not make any objections of a doctrinal or theological nature concerning the proposed Missal. They did not submit any scholarly study even from a liturgical point of view to substantiate their objections, at least drawing arguments from the history and traditions of the St Thomas Christians, perhaps because they would evidently contradict the positions held by the bishops.

The proposals and observations of the bishops can be categorized under six main headings: 1) shortening of liturgy; 2) vernacularization or introduction of Malayalam language; 3) Syro-Oriental liturgical vestments; 4) Eucharistic bread; 5) Holy Communion under both species; and 6) the veil of the sanctuary. Hence all the subsequent discussions hinged mainly upon these points.

Since the Syro-Malabar bishops manifested a hostile attitude towards the proposed Order of *Qurbana*, the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church sought the opinion of the liturgical Commission which prepared the text, providing it also with copies of the letters of the said bishops. After studying the responses of the bishops, the Commission expressed its evaluations, comments and observations. The Sacred Congregation also obtained the opinion of three experts who knew the Syro-Oriental liturgy or the Indian situation: Fr. E. R. Hambye SJ,¹ Mar Joseph Gogu , Chaldean Archbishop of Bassorah (Basra) from 8 February 1954 to 15 January 1971 and Fr. Maurus

¹  douard Ren  Hambye SJ (3 July 1916-7 September 1990), a Belgian Jesuit missionary priest in the Indian subcontinent and a leading scholar on the history of Indian Churches, was Professor of the Kurseong Saint-Mary's Jesuit Theologate in West Bengal (India).

Valiaparampil, Prior General of the Third Order Discalced Carmelites of Malabar (TOCD, now CMI). In this section we present the evaluation of the liturgical Commission and the opinion of the aforementioned three experts.

Document 13

Report of the Meeting of the Liturgical Commission to Evaluate the Responses of the Syro-Malabar Bishops

Rome, 18 October 1955; *the liturgical Commission studied the responses of Syro-Malabar bishops and formulated its opinion on all the relevant points, concentrating on the six main themes which have already been mentioned. After considering all aspects, the Commission expressed the view that the proposed reform should be definitively approved by the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, Malabaresi-Liturgia: Revisione e Stampa del Messale Malabarese, Relazione con Sommario, Ponenza del 27 maggio 1957 [in Ponenze Anno 1950-1959], Summary No. VII, 40-55; original in Italian).*

1. The Malayalam Language

1. All the bishops declare that they are very happy with the eventual introduction of Malayalam as liturgical language in their rite. However, they wish that the essential parts of the sacred rite should remain in Syriac language.

On the latter point the opinions of the members of the Commission are divided. Fr. Cyril wants everything to be done in Malayalam, or that it would be legitimate to do so, just like the Melkites, the Slavs and Romanians who have translated all liturgical texts into their own language in its entirety. Fr. Placid and Fr. Delly agree with the proposal of the bishops. Father President proposes to

print the essential texts in two languages, Syriac and Malayalam, and leave free the use of language; perhaps the decision of languages could be left to the local Ordinary.

2. Some bishops expressed the desire for a revised translation of the text of the proposed Pontifical. The bishop of Kottayam has taken pains to provide a list of such useful corrections. Fr. Placid willingly accepts some of them, others no. In this field the other members of the Commission can only observe a dutiful silence, but, having seen the opinions of some of the bishops, they believe it necessary to revise the current text by those who know Malayalam perfectly. Fr. Placid agreed to it.

II. The Abbreviations

All the bishops ask to abbreviate the rite. We are not opposed to this request in principle; however it is necessary to be careful and see why the abbreviation is asked, and if it is accepted, how it will be carried out.

For the Pontifical, there is no difficulty. From the prayers of the ordaining bishop there is nothing to remove. But from the hymns with their numerous stanzas, it could be permitted to sing only some, perhaps only one, according to the case, or rather, as Fr. Delly thinks, two to retain the custom of two choirs, of which each would sing a stanza.

For the celebration of the Holy Mass, it is different. Fr. Placid observes that at the end of the simple Mass the Malabars recite three Hail Mary and Salve Regina with the prayers that follow. Sometimes they add other prayers also; for example, at Changanacherry it is obliged to say a prayer in honour of St Joseph, the patron of the diocese. Everyone will admit that it would be absurd to shorten regularly the liturgical prayers of Holy Mass and find time required for the recitation of other purely devotional prayers.

Fr. Placid observes again that on Sundays and feast days the main Mass is followed by exposition of and benediction with the Blessed Sacrament. Since the Malabars live dispersed in camps, we cannot expect them to come a second time on Sunday evening in the church to attend the Eucharistic benediction. Therefore everything is done in the morning and thus the function becomes very long. To this difficulty there is a radical solution: omit the extra-liturgical function that is done after the Holy Mass. A milder solution would be to draw up a very short form for the Eucharistic blessing. But we think that, when the people, thanks to the use of Malayalam, will understand better the Holy Mass and will take more active part in it, will no longer seek devotion elsewhere. At the same time the reform could be begun, giving the priest freedom to give Eucharistic blessing or not.

By getting rid of supererogatory things, the Mass designed in “simple form” does not need to be abbreviated: Fr. Placid opines that one can easily celebrate it in less than half an hour. And Fr. Delly confirms this testimony: we, Chaldean priests say (celebrate) simple Mass peacefully in 27 or 28 minutes, counting from the vestition; length depends primarily on the length of the passages of the New Testament that are read.

Based on these two testimonies we could oppose a reasonable refusal to the request of the bishops. However, Fr. President insists (stresses) and asks whether, in case the Sacred Congregation decides for a further abbreviation, can we find the locations susceptible of abbreviation. And the book is examined.

Pages 8-9: The “marmitha” comprises three psalms. It could be written in the Ceremonial that it is lawful to recite or sing a single psalm. The same would apply to the three forms of Mass.

Pages 16-18: The “karozutha”. Its abbreviation is foreseen in the Ceremonial, in number 55, for the Mass in simple form. That measure could be extended to the other two forms of the Mass.

Pages 29-30: The intercession after the consecration occupies a page and a half. We have already abbreviated it with respect to the present Mass of the Malabars. An additional abbreviation would not be convenient.

Page 31: Prayers and Psalms. In the Ceremonial, in number 27, it is written that the two Psalms can be abbreviated; and we have already omitted a third psalm entirely which some documents propose.

Page 32: The preparation to the fraction begins with a prayer of blessing on the incense. It is understood that the priest who celebrates without incense, omits this prayer. Perhaps it would be good to say it explicitly in the Ceremonial.

Page 35: The “karozutha” could be abbreviated in the simple Mass according to the Ceremonial, number 58, 6. This norm could be extended to the other two forms of the Holy Mass.

We do not really find any other way to shorten the Holy Mass without spoiling it. Once again, we are persuaded that according to the project, the Mass celebrated in simple form is not too long and thus need not be shortened.

Fr. Placid observes again that when a Malabar bishop celebrates publicly, he recites the preparatory prayers in the sanctuary according to the Latin rite, and then proceeds to the vestition imitating the Latin bishop. All this lengthens the ceremony. Indicating only three forms for the celebration of Holy Mass in our project, our clear intention was to suppress *ipso facto* that pontifical manner of celebrating it, which would be a fourth form. According to our project, like the priest the bishop recites the preparatory prayers, if he wants to recite them, in the sacristy or in private and then wears the sacred vestments in the sacristy: the Chaldean rite does not have this public vestition. And in doing so, the ceremony will be much shorter for the people.

III. The Entire Project

The bishop of Kottayam agrees with the new order of the Mass proposed in the project. To tell the truth, except for the rite of consecration, brought within the anaphora, the project does not introduce any other change in the order, according to which the rites of the Malabar Mass are performed. The Ordinary of Tellicherry evaluates that introducing a total change in the Mass would be harmful and badly seen by the people.

However, the archbishop of Ernakulam, and the bishops of Changanacherry and Palai, without opposing the project directly and explicitly, would like to discard it, because according to them the Syro-Malabar rite has its own individuality which is its possession for three and a half centuries and because that rite has not impeded the Malabar Church to make great progress in all the fields; again, that rite is established and approved by the Supreme Pontiffs as a proper rite and independent from the Chaldean rite.

With these words the three bishops clearly reveal their mind: we have a proper rite; we must keep it; the only reform desired is to shorten it.

Father President says, we encountered the same attitude with the Ruthenians, especially with the Basilian Fathers, who pretended to possess a proper rite, the Galician rite, more than two centuries old and therefore could not be touched. Now, with the typical edition of the liturgical books of the Ruthenians, the Holy See, respecting what is truly proper and ancient in the Ruthenian rite, has removed all Latinizations, to which a certain number of Ruthenians were and are still very much attached. We readily admit that those persons are unchangeable and that no historical or liturgical argument will ever change their false persuasion. There is no other means than leaving the old to die in peace and to prescribe the reform for young people who are not ill prejudiced.

Also in the present case, we will not discuss with the archbishop of Ernakulam, when he affirms that the first faithful of St Thomas in Malabar used their own national language in the liturgy except for some formulas; we do not ask him on which sources his strange affirmation is based and what would have been that national language.

The project advanced (put forward) by the Commission is based on the assumption that the present Syro-Malabar rite needs a serious reform. Moreover it must be purified from its many Latinizations to bring it back to its genuine form. If according to the mind of the three bishops the individuality of the Syro Malabar rite consists in Latinization, since the Holy See cannot accept or canonize such liturgical deformations of the Eastern rites, which in their variety render the shining testimony of the universality of the Church of Christ and the fidelity of the Holy See of Rome to its promises made to the Eastern Christians about the preservation of their rites, there is no solution other than to remove this kind of individuality or characteristic from the Syro-Malabar rite. And this measure will be for the honour of the entire Church and will not cause any harm to the faithful.

The bishops insist and say that the Supreme Pontiffs have recognized their present rite whenever they called it Syro-Malabar rite, then when they approved the Synod of Diamper, and thirdly when the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fide published the Missal (1774 and 1844) and the Ritual (1775 and 1845).

To these arguments we respond as follows: in addition to the name of the Syro-Malabar Church, a designation necessary to distinguish it from the Latin Church of Malabar, the Holy See in past centuries and in our times (cf. for example, the bull of the erection of the diocese of Tellicherry) also called its faithful as belonging to the Chaldean rite and entitled the liturgical books: Chaldean Order [...] according to the Use of the Church in Malabar (*Ordo chaldaicus [...] iuxta morem Ecclesiae in Malabar*). Besides, it would be quite difficult to prove that the Holy See approved the Synod of Diamper; in any

case, we wait for evidence.² Finally, what argument can be drawn about the fact that the Congregation of Propaganda Fide published a Missal and a Ritual full of Latinisms? It must be admitted that the Sacred Congregation examined the liturgical books in depth with regard to the doctrine, but very superficially to what relates to the liturgy; it trusted too easily of the texts that were presented to it for printing, as we can see from the four proposed doubts about the text of the Malabar Missal (cf. J. M. Hanssens, *Institutiones liturgicae de ritibus orientalibus*, t. II, p. 506). It simply printed what was in use at that time and what it was asked to print. Fr. Delly adds: even the Chaldean Missal was printed by the same Congregation in the year 1767, it was also Latinized, although much less than that of the Malabar Missal. In spite of this edition, which seems to have been published under the supervision of the Holy See, in the year 1901 a fully reformed new edition appeared in Mosul. What the Holy See permitted at that time to the Chaldeans, could be done now for the Malabars, despite the previous Roman editions.

And this way of acting certainly conforms to the mind of the Supreme Pontiffs; in this regard Fr. Placid brings two declarations of Pius XI of blessed memory. In the Motu Proprio *Sancta Dei Ecclesia* of 25 April 1938 he wrote: “If some people, compelled by too great a love for unity and concord, since they did not sufficiently know the nature and realities of Orientals, endeavoured to corrupt their rites or to reduce them to the Latin rites, the Roman Pontiffs, our predecessors, opposed these endeavours as far as possible and spared no efforts”.³

² The first scientific study demonstrating the invalidity of the Synod of Diamper was published only in 1958. J. Thaliath, *The Synod of Diamper (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 152)*, Rome 1958.

³ “Si nonnulli, nimis unitatis concordiaeque amore compulsi, cum non satis Orientalium res atque indolem cognoscerent redigere enisi sunt; at Romani Pontifices, decessores Nostri, hisce nisibus pro facultate, nullisque parcendo laboribus, obstiterunt”. *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* (1938) 154.

In refusing to give his approval to a Syriac version of the Roman Pontifical, presented by the Malabar hierarchy, the same Supreme Pontiff had the following to say on 1 December 1934: “Latinization is not to be encouraged among the Orientals. The Holy See does not want to latinize but to catholicize. And then, half measures are neither generous nor fruitful. So continue in *status quo*, but at once appoint a Commission for the revision of the ancient Pontifical, which can also be printed part by part (in fascicles)”⁴

The argument deduced from the present progress of the Malabars proves nothing, because if that progress depends on the use of a Latinized rite, one does not understand why such a progress has begun to appear only fifty or a hundred years ago and not from the time when the Portuguese Latinized the rite.⁵

It seems to us that other subjects touched only by the archbishop of Ernakulam about the example of the Latin liturgy (which is) so alive and so dynamic, about the spiritual aspirations of the faithful and their liturgical tastes, do not require a discussion; they refute by themselves.

IV. Particular Questions

1. The Liturgical Vestments

The Ordinaries of Ernakulam, Palai, Changanacherry and Tellicherry affirm that resuming the ancient liturgical vestments will not be of any benefit to the people. Fr. Placid responds: until the faithful will not have any liturgical sense, this may be true; but, once that sense is awakened, they would like to have liturgical vestments

⁴ Original text and English translation in P. Pallath and J. Kollara, *Roman Pontifical into Syriac and the Beginning of Liturgical Reform*, 158.

⁵ In fact, towards the end of Latin governance the Catholic Malabar Church became canonically extinct with the suppression of the ancient Archdiocese of Cranganore on 1 September 1886 and all the Catholic St Thomas Christians became members of the Latin Archdiocese of Verapoly.

proper to their rite, as happened in some Latin countries. Recently Fr. Placid got a letter from Malabar containing an article on the liturgy in Malayalam, written by a certain VBP (sic), in which one reads: “In the past Archbishop Menezes has found a heresy among the Christians of Malabar, because they were using the “paina” in the celebration of the liturgy. He rushed to remove the “paina” and imposed the present Latin pianeta. There is no need to change immediately the vestments and translate soon the liturgy into Malayalam. It is enough to apply the medicine directly to the disease of the heart. No one will complain if the present precious vestments are permitted to be used until they become unusable. And we can also believe that nobody will fear, as Menezes, that because of this reason the liturgy may be held invalid”.

Father President adds that the question should not be shifted: the liturgical reform does not consider the spiritual and immediate benefit of the faithful in the first place, but consider the decorum of the Catholic worship and therefore seeks to remove everything that is false and hybrid, in order to restore what is true, proper and genuine; then *ipso facto*, the whole Church and the souls will draw spiritual benefit out of it.

The Malabar bishops raise the following difficulty against the use of ancient vestments: the Malabar priests often go to celebrate in Latin churches and vice versa; each time they should carry the sacred vestments with them; on the contrary there is no difficulty today.

It could be answered that the Malankara priests also celebrate often in the churches of the other rites, and in addition to the books and the proper Eucharistic bread, they carry with them also the sacred vestments, but not the “paina”, says Fr. Placid, because they use the Latin cape (cappa) instead of “paina” (that is not right, says Fr. President in parenthesis). The members of the Commission are in agreement to tolerate the use of Latin vestments in Latin churches if there is real inconvenience to carry the proper sacred vestments with them.

In order to oppose the introduction of the ancient vestments the bishops mention the major expenditure which would require for such a restoration and wastage of many precious vestments of today without utility.

The answer is easy: the adoption of the reform will be done slowly; the present vestments can be used until they last; but the new vestments that are made or bought, must be those of the genuine rite. And in this way any unnecessary expenditure could be avoided.

The archbishop of Ernakulam sees in the adoption of the ancient vestments the disappearance of uniformity which is seen among the Catholic celebrants today, whether they belong to the Latin or Malabar rite. Fr. Placid notes that already the much desired uniformity is lacking because of the Malankara priests who use the “paina” and the long sleeve.

Last objection of the archbishop: the “paina”, which is a closed chasuble, is unbearable in this very hot country. Fr. Placid responds again with the example of the Malankara priests, and adds that the “paina” is not hotter, nor heavier than the Latin cape (cappa); in fact, the Malabar priests use that not only during the Eucharistic benediction, but also during the outdoor processions that sometimes last for several hours.

The bishop of Kottayam does not associate himself with all these complaints; he proposes that if the reform is a must, the gothic chasuble of the Latins could be introduced.

On this proposal the opinions of the members of the Commission are divided. Fr. Placid would be for tolerance; Father President would accept the gothic chasuble on a transitional basis; whereas Fr. Cyril and Fr. Delly are strongly opposed to the adoption of the gothic chasuble, even provisionally, because, although in gothic form, it is always a Western chasuble and is not an Oriental vestment, says Fr. Cyril, and that is not proper to the Chaldean rite, says Fr. Delly.

To illustrate the issue, Father President recalls that today there are three kinds of chasubles, one of which is the ancient Roman and the other two are derivations. The ancient one is closed from every part and is preserved in its genuine form only by the Greeks (the Slavs have given it a little different form by shortening it in the front). The Latins, up to the XIII century, used the closed chasuble, later they began to shorten it to the right side and the left side to give comfort to the arms for easy movements; the gothic belongs to the early periods of that evolution which was done by opening the side up to the shoulders on the Latin chasuble. In the late Middle Ages, the non-Byzantine Orientals put an opening in the front of the closed chasuble. Therefore it is reasonable to say that the gothic chasuble belongs to the Western species of chasubles.

2. The Eucharistic Bread

The bishops say that resumption of the use of leavened bread will cause many disadvantages and will not produce any benefit. Fr. Placid recalls that the unleavened bread was imposed on Malabar by the Portuguese at the time of Mar Joseph in the XVI century. The difficulty to preserve the leavened bread fresh enough for a long time is encountered in many other Churches of the East and they have dissolved the question. Another difficulty: the Malabar priests should carry with them the bread when they go to celebrate in a Latin church. And Fr. Placid responds that the Malankara priests do that regularly. After all, for them as well as for all the priests canon 816 of the Code is valid: "A priest in the celebration of the Mass, according to his own rite, must use unleavened or leavened bread whenever he says the Holy (Mass)".⁶ Contrary to the opinion of others, Fr. Cyril thinks that this canon is not valid for the Orientals. He also proposes to give the

⁶ "In Missae celebratione sacerdos, secundum proprium ritum, debet panem azymum vel fermentatum adhibere ubicunque Sacrum litet". CIC 1917, canon 816; cf. CIC 1983, canon 926.

celebrant priest full freedom to choose the bread he prefers. But the other members of the Commission propose to render the use of leavened bread mandatory in the churches of their proper rite and at the most to tolerate the Malabar priests who use the unleavened bread when they celebrate in Latin churches.

Father President adds that care must be given to the form, the thickness of the bread, the inscriptions and figures which cover it and not only to its internal composition.

3. The Holy Communion under Two Species

Since the Communions of the faithful, thanks to God, are numerous in the churches of Malabar, it is practically impossible to give the Communion also with the chalice: this is the objection of the bishops against the restoration of the genuine rite.

Probably, they did not read the Ceremonial with attention. Besides the manner of giving the Holy Communion under both species separately, the Ceremonial in number 40 indicates two other ways: the first consists in making an intinction on different breads or even on the particles deposited in the ciborium or at least on those (stay) above: it is a minimum, easily achievable. The second consists in doing like the Byzantines: they prepare pieces of bread long enough: the priest keeps them between his fingers on one end and immerse the other end a little into the chalice and give it to the communicants.

They insist: if we give the chalice to the faithful, the Jacobites will say against the Catholic Church that until now we have been wrong and they have always been right. We answer that with the second and third way of giving Communion, we do not change anything or only little in the external manner of acting; and then, even if they make these accusations, that is not a reason for not doing what should be done.

4. The Veil of the Sanctuary

One of the bishops affirms that the use of the veil is not suitable for the construction of Malabar churches that have widely opened sanctuary, another bishop says that the veil prevents the good execution of the initial psalm of the Mass, and another one still says that the veil will cause a lot of disturbance. What to answer to these least serious objections? The veil could very well be put in a widely opened sanctuary; one can see for example the Church of San Nicola di Tolentino in Rome, officiated by the Armenians.

About the use of the veil, Father President recalls that after the introduction of the reform among the Ruthenians, Kyr Andrea Szeptikyj, who was favourable to the reform, immediately asked the Sacred Congregation permission to leave the doors of the iconostasis open during the entire Liturgy; the request was answered affirmatively. It is possible to suggest to the Malabars to make such a request.

Fr. Placid remembers what he has already said on other occasions, that is, in different churches of Malabar one can still see the places where formerly was hung the veil of the sanctuary.

If permission is granted to leave the veil opened during the celebration of the Holy Mass, it is our desire that exception must be given for *Raza*, during which the regulations for the opening and the closing of the veil should be observed.

5. The Calendar

Only the auxiliary bishop of Ernakulam speaks of the proposed calendar, and he expresses the desire that “feasts”, like that of Christ the King, be preserved; the people would be very much affected by their suppression.

We answer that our calendar contains many more feasts than those of the calendar of the Chaldean Catholics. Moreover, nothing prevents to make a sermon about Christ the King on the last Sunday of

October and also to organize a procession, without the feast being included in the liturgical calendar.

6. The *Raza*

According to the project, the Mass in the most solemn form and in solemn form requires assistance of an archdeacon and deacons. Now, we do not have people with these sacred orders at our disposal, declares the bishop of Changanacherry.

But in the Ceremonial we made a clear distinction between real deacons and other deacons who are in fact assistants (servers). Therefore one can easily celebrate the solemn and most solemn Mass with the assistants, provided they are not minors but elders, for example, seminarians or also well-prepared laity. But we are contrary to the celebration of the Holy Mass with a deacon or subdeacon or as it is said, with three priests, in the Latin manner.

7. The Pontifical

The auxiliary bishop of Ernakulam detects two difficulties in the prescriptions of the new Pontifical. First, the ordaining bishop should remain on foot all the time during the ordinations. It is true that in no place the Pontifical says that the bishop sits. However, we note that in the Chaldean rite the bishop does not give the instructions to the ordained during which the Latin bishop sits on the throne; also to wear the vestments of the order received by the ordained, they do not kneel down before the sitting bishop, but, according to the Chaldean rite, the bishop comes to the ordained and, if there are many, moves along their line. On the other hand, if the bishop is tired and old, nothing opposes if he sits during the singing of hymns.

Second, those prostrations prescribed to the ordained are not convenient for educated people. But now when they follow the Roman Pontifical for ordinations, is it perhaps convenient to prostrate oneself to ground during the litany of the Saints? If truly there is some

difficulty to make the prostration, one could do it by profound inclination.

Regarding the Pontifical the bishop of Palai asks to keep all the *minor Orders* of the Latin rite and to preserve also the *anointing of the hands* and the handing over of the instruments (*porrectio instrumentorum*) in the priestly ordination. In response to those requests we can simply recall the decision of Pius XI to prescribe the Chaldean Pontifical to the Malabar Church.

V. Conclusions

There are two conclusions; one is proposed by some Malabar bishops, the other by our Commission.

Some bishops ask to establish a *liturgical Commission in Malabar*. They pretend (claim) to have specialists in Malayalam language and to have men who know the aspirations and the mentality of their faithful. A Commission composed of such men, under the control of the bishops, would be able to reform the Syro-Malabar rite.

Responds Fr. Placid: it is not enough to know Malayalam and the mentality of the faithful to be able to reform the liturgical books of Malabar. It is also necessary to know the present rite well, its history, know also the genuine Chaldean rite and have access to books, documents and sources to make a serious preparatory study. Are there such liturgists in Malabar? But, above all, it is necessary that those who want to reform the rite, know well the mind of the Holy See and are ready to take decisions according to the principles established by the Sacred Congregation. If there are not men equipped with those qualities and those dispositions of spirit, it is vain to hope for some good fruit from their work.

Father President adds: the experience of the Ruthenians taught us to what negative result a Commission formed in the country would bring, although it knows the mentality of the faithful. Because of the ignorance of their own rite and the attachment to their own views, the

two successive commissions appointed by the Ruthenian bishops, did not produce any good result and the bishops were forced to ask Rome for a typical edition of their liturgical books. Knowing that competent persons for such a work were lacking in Malabar, the Sacred Congregation took the decision to form a Commission in Rome, composed of a Malabar, a Chaldean and two specialists in Eastern liturgy.

Convinced of the uselessness of a Commission in Malabar, we are strongly opposed to the proposal of the bishops. All this could only delay a reform that becomes day by day more urgent.

Our Conclusion

The bishops of Malabar identified some external things in their letters such as liturgical vestments, the leavened bread, and the veil of the sanctuary. But they have not made a serious study of the text presented to them, nor of the Ceremonial; for example nobody mentions about the repositioning of the consecration, or makes objection against the abolition of elevation after the consecration.

Therefore we dare to propose our project to the definitive approval of the Sacred Congregation, except for some small changes to be introduced in the Ceremonial according to what the Sacred Congregation will judge about abbreviations, the use of liturgical vestments of another rite, the use of unleavened bread and other small points made in this report.

Regarding the manner of procedure we take the liberty to make some suggestions.

The first thing would be to obtain approval for the use of the Malayalam language in the Malabar liturgy. Fr. Cyril thinks that for such a serious change as the introduction of a new liturgical language, the direct intervention of the Holy Father is necessary. Fr. President thinks that, once the thing is decided by the Sacred Congregation, it

will suffice that His Eminence proposes it to the approval of the Holy Father.

It is understood that the use of Syriac is preserved (in a manner obligatory or free, the Sacred Congregation will decide) for the essential parts of the celebration of the Holy Mass and the sacraments.

We take the liberty to express our desire that the use of Malayalam be granted only if the reformed rite is introduced.

Secondly, the work on the revision of the Malayalam translation of the Pontifical is very urgent. There are two possibilities: entrust that task to the archbishop of Ernakulam, asking him to finish the work within two months (there are only 70 pages), or ask Fr. Placid to ensure the said improvement as soon as he reaches his homeland.

After the revision of the translation, that part of the Pontifical should be printed. Printing can be done only in Malabar. Fr. Placid informs us that there is choice between two printing presses, that of the Seminary at Alwaye and that of the Carmelite Fathers at Mannanam. Since the text would be useful also to the seminarians, we make the proposal to print 2,000 copies. Printing should be beautiful in two colours, on good paper of rather large format (size). On the reverse of the cover page it may be printed: "With the blessing of the Holy Apostolic See of great Rome". The adjective "great" is the current use of the Syrians to designate Rome. Finally, we propose to entrust Fr. Placid with the supervision of the printing of this book.

The reform started with the printing and the promulgation of the Pontifical, should be continued with the printing and publishing of the Missal. To this end, after the approval of the final text, it is necessary to translate it into Malayalam. In addition, for a complete celebration of the Holy Mass, we must print the table of pericopes from the Sacred Scripture that must be read; later a book containing the text of all the pericopes will be printed; the hymns and the variable antiphons of the Mass also need to be printed after translating them.

Then we would like to soon publish the offices of the Holy Week. We hope to be able to present soon in Latin the project drawn up by the Commission for those three parts: pericopes - variable hymns - Holy Week.

Later we will present the Latin text of the liturgy of the sacraments, the funerals and the ritual of blessings. And finally, a decision should be taken regarding the books necessary for the celebration of the Divine Office; Fr. Placid is still working on this matter.

After the responses of Malabar bishops it is clear that the Holy See will have to impose the new liturgical books, as Pius XI gave the example for the Pontifical. On the manner of imposing this obligation and to introduce the reform there seem to exist three possibilities: a) impose the reform immediately on all the churches and on all the priests and clerics; b) begin the reform with the priests who will be ordained after the publication of the Missal, as was decided regarding the Ruthenian reform; c) to begin the reform in all the churches and chapels administered by the Carmelite Fathers of the Third Order.

Although a decision in this matter is not urgent, we have wished to ventilate the question.

Document 14

Opinion of Fr. Edouard René Hambye SJ on the Controversial Points of the Proposed Reform of Syro-Malabar Missal

Kurseong (West Bengal), 18 January 1956; in his response first of all Prof. Hambye endeavours to provide a reasonable explanation for the negative attitude of the Syro-Malabar bishops. Then he proceeds to respond to seven specific questions formulated on the basis of the observations of the said bishops. In general he expresses favourable opinion about the proposed Missal (Rome, Archives of the

Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Malabaresi-Liturgia: Revisione e Stampa del Messale Malabarese, Relazione con Sommario, Ponzona del 27 maggio 1957* [in *Ponenze Anno 1950-1959*], Summary No. VIII, 55-62; original in French).

It is necessary first of all to make a general remark on the current attitude of the Syro-Malabars about the liturgical reform.

The laity, especially the educated laity, who want to lead a complete spiritual life, are fully in favour of the entire reform. On the contrary, the clergy are much more reserved.

There are several reasons for the positive attitude of the intellectual laity. They still remember very well the unsuccessful efforts they made in the recent or distant past to obtain the reform of their rite. Moreover, many lay people have information about the contemporary liturgical movement, and know that it partially tends to promote the active participation of the faithful. Finally, many of them realize that a real spiritual life above all must be centered on the lived Liturgy, and not on the abundance of secondary devotions.

The attitude of the clergy can also be explained in the following way. The training given to them in seminaries not only tends to “Latinize” them, but also to cut them off from their real Oriental traditions. This formation is also hardly liturgical, even from the point of view of the contemporary liturgical movement in the Latin rite. On the whole, although the Syro-Malabar clergy are excellent and zealous, they do not have the (minimum of) liturgical spirit. There are notable exceptions, both among the diocesan priests and among the religious. I believe that among the latter, the Syrian Carmelites (TOCD) have a rather strong liturgical spirit, and are in favour of the reform. The present formation of the clergy therefore greatly explains the apathy or partial hostility to the reform. It explains how the past efforts to restore the rite are now almost forgotten as the priests almost ignore the origin and development of their rite, as a result many of them have only the bare minimum knowledge to read the Syriac of their liturgies. To a

deficient formation we must add also a certain tendency to easiness, to rapidity, a trend that is of course afraid of too lengthy or simply, too “Oriental” offices. Finally, there is also a fairly widespread prejudice. One confounds very much the progress with certain Western habits, and it is believed that the fact of returning to ancient traditions will be a mark of delay (retrogression). It is possible to add that among some there is fear of resembling too much to the local dissidents (Jacobites and Nestorians of Trichur), or even to the Syro- Malankaras. But this fear is hardly widespread.

We have said that the attitude of the clergy is more reserved than that of the laity. Reserved does not mean hostile. And it is here that we are obliged to distinguish. Among the bishops of the rite, I believe that one can hardly be mistaken in saying that the young prelates (Palai, Changanacherry and Tellicherry) are rather in favour, however they do not dare to take a firm stand. Once the movement launched, I believe they will follow, or else they will lead it with enthusiasm. The bishop of Kottayam will have no objection, will even show sympathy. It is useless to talk of the archbishop, who is about to die.⁷ However he changed a bit lately. I ignore the radical attitude of his auxiliary bishop. With regard to the bishop of Trichur, certainly he was never in favour of the reform. Among the clergy it depends. Among the diocesans, the priests above 50 years are in general very closed, if not hostile, with notable exceptions. Others, especially the youngsters are either without particular opposition or indifferent, or even completely in favour.

Therefore, it is possible to conclude this remark by saying that the intellectual laity is quite enthusiastic, the young bishops are almost sympathetic and the young clergy will follow without difficulty, some even with zeal. The TOCD who form the majority of Syro-Malabar religious, seem to me to be more and more positive, in favour of the reform, especially the younger ones. This general remark on the

⁷ In fact, Archbishop Augustine Kandathil died on 11 January 1956.

attitude of the Syro-Malabars concerns the reform in general, without prejudice to the particular points, which will be examined now.

1. Whether it is appropriate to allow the use of Malayalam in the celebration of all liturgical offices of the Syro-Malabar rite.

R. I believe that there is unanimity on this point among all bishops, clergy and laity. They all agree to bring the language of the country into the liturgy. The already jubilee-example of the Syro-Malankara liturgy (means the use of Malayalam for 25 years) has been one of the principal causes of this change of mind.

2. Whether it is appropriate to extend this permission not only to the public prayers, but also to the secret ones and especially to the essential parts of sacraments, as in the byzantine rite.

R. There are different views on this point. Some lay people, but they are scarcely isolated witnesses, are in favour of extending Malayalam to all sections, even to formulas of consecration. After reflection and repeated contacts, I think that the example of Syro-Malankaras could be followed here. Everything that requires the participation of the faithful (with the exception of the formulas of consecration) could be in Malayalam language, but everything that merely pertains to the celebrant could still be in Syriac. It is not just a question of the tradition. The use of Malayalam always and everywhere risks making the offices much longer, as can be seen in the Syro-Malankara rite, which nevertheless makes use of Malayalam only in the sections related to the faithful. As regards the Breviary, I believe that widespread introduction of Malayalam will be received with joy, but will it not still diminish the knowledge of Syriac among the clergy? With regard to the Ritual of the sacraments, and that of funerals, one can certainly be generous. I believe that these remarks correspond to the views of the large part of the clergy. Therefore, wide use of Malayalam could be allowed, but with the reservations made above.

3. Whether it is fitting to restore the use of leavened bread instead of the unleavened, and – if affirmative – with what eventual reservations.

R. This question is partly connected to question 7. A true Communion under the two species, as practised in the Byzantine rite, can hardly be conceived without leavened bread, especially if the latter is mixed with the species of wine before the Communion of the people. I believe that the laity have not yet formed any opinion on this subject. But they will hardly find fault with the introduction of leavened bread. They know the practice of Syro-Malankara rite. As regards the clergy, they are opposed to it, needless to hide it: a question of tradition and also the easy way. It is possible that if the leavened bread is introduced in the present form of Syro-Malankara rite (very flat, closely resembling the unleavened), there will not be many difficulties.

4. Whether it is fitting to impose the exclusive use of the vestments of the Chaldean rite, allowing the use of present ones up to their consumption, and – if affirmative – with what eventual reservations.

R. I believe that there will not be major difficulties in introducing the Chaldean liturgical vestments, or rather Oriental ones. But, it must be psychological. Instead of the front opened Chaldean chasuble, one can take the wide and ample chasuble of the Greek Byzantines, which is very close to the Latin chasuble called “Gothic”. The clergy know very well that the latter is more and more in use in the West, and in the Latin missions of India. For the bishops, the omophorion would be a good introduction, as also the “crown” of the Byzantine rite. For the priests, it will be necessary to imagine a liturgical bonnet to replace the Latin biretta. The introduction can be done in two stages. First of all prohibit making new ornaments other than those prescribed by the reform. Then, after a period of time (10 years, for example), completely ban the old ornaments. The bishops would be required to use exclusively new ornaments from the beginning. The objection

often repeated, it will cost too much, has no importance. The Syro-Malabar community, which spends so much in firecrackers, candles, and multiple celebrations, could easily afford new ornaments. In general, objections against these entirely Oriental ornaments do not hold, and their authors know very well that they are not serious. Here again the laity are more positive than the clergy. Anyway, the practices of the Syro-Malankara rite have again changed the mentality of many, and have opened the way to a reformation of liturgical ornaments.

5. Whether it is appropriate to dispense from the use of the Chaldean rite vestments, when one celebrates in a church of a different rite.

R. The question applies almost exclusively to the churches of the Latin rite, and also outside the region where the majority of Syro-Malabars live under the jurisdiction of their bishops. It is certain that the majority of priests are hardly favourable to carry their “reformed” vestments during their journey. But to permit them (to use Latin vestments), would only further increase a kind of inferiority complex which they endure for everything that concerns their Eastern traditions. I do not believe that the eventual permission to use Latin ornaments would be really useful outside of those regions. On the contrary, it would prevent the reform from producing all its fruits. In addition, the number of priests travelling outside their regions for ceremonial purposes is not large enough to justify a general measure. Finally, the Syro-Malankara priests do not complain at all about carrying their vestments with them. The only point on which one could perhaps grant an exception would be the chasuble. The Syro-Malabar priests outside of their jurisdiction might use a Latin “Gothic” chasuble, but exclusively in such a case. Personally, I am opposed to it.

6. Whether it is appropriate to re-establish the use of the veil of the sanctuary.

R. About 60% of the churches of the rite still have the veil hanging in front of the altar. It is a two-piece veil, attached to the keystone of the arch giving access to the sanctuary. This veil remains open all the time, except in a few churches. There will be no objection to restore the use of veil during the Eucharistic Liturgy, and even during other services. But, it should be left open during the day. This last concession, justified by very sentimental reasons (to see the tabernacle, etc.) but important all the same, will permit, I believe, the reintroduction of liturgical use.

7. Whether it is appropriate to impose Communion under both species for the faithful, and, if affirmative, in what manner.

R. At first glance, all the clergy are quite unfavourable to Communion under both species. The reasons generally given are exclusively of practical order: the dangers of such usage, difficulties of distribution, length of the latter, etc. The laity, especially the educated, are in favour of the Communion under both species, and again the example of the Syro-Malankaras has been a boost for many. I believe that if such a practice is presented in a simple and concrete way, it will not be too difficult. In the rubrics given in page 80 of the Syro-Malabar Liturgy there is a fairly detailed description of the manner of giving Communion under both species. The first way indicated would be the easiest to accept: it states that the particles or “hosts” are touched with the section of consecrated bread dipped in the chalice. This intinction can hardly find any objection. As I have said earlier, this problem of Communion is in relation to the quality (type) of the bread, whether leavened or not. The leavened bread better supports the mixture with the species of wine, even when it comes to intinction.

After having tried to give some clarifications on the subject of the aforementioned problems, let me take the freedom to make a few more

remarks about the text and rubrics contained in the booklet *Liturgia Siro-Malabaresi*.

1. It seems to me that the question of the server of the Mass, in the case of “private Masses”, is hardly resolved;

2. p. 8. Will there be “marmitha” after the great feasts of the year, such as Epiphany?

3. PP. 12-13, Is “custos ritus”, the “natar takhsa”? If so, does he have a function throughout the liturgy?

4. p. 15. At the end of the Gospel, should not the celebrant say *Gloria Deo semper*?

5. p. 20. In the conclusion of the *onitha of raze*, the name of St Thomas is mentioned. Could it also be possible to add that of the Saint of the day?

6. p. 26. When the celebrant blesses the incense before the dialogue of the preface, what formula should he use, if a formula is to be used?

7. p. 33. I believe that in the text of the formula accompanying the fraction, there is a printing error. *In nomine Patris ...* has been omitted.

8. p. 34-37. I wonder whether in private liturgies it could not be omitted the series of prayers and proclamations under the title: “*praeparatio ad communionem*”.

9. In the rubrics of the *Raza*, it will be necessary to foresee the pontifical service, and to make the *Raza* the liturgy which only the bishops of the rite can utilize when they celebrate in a pontifical manner.

10. Concerning genuflexion on one knee, let it be forbidden during the liturgical services from the start.

Document 15

Letter of Chaldean Archbishop Joseph Gogué

Bassorah, 24 January 1956; *the Chaldean archbishop desires to preserve the essential part of the liturgy in Syriac. He is against Communion under both species and the use of sanctuary veil* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Malabaresi-Liturgia: Revisione e Stampa del Messale Malabarese, Relazione con Sommario, Ponzona del 27 maggio 1957* [in *Ponenze Anno 1950-1959*], Summary No. IX, 62-66; original in Italian).

The reasons that induced me to form my humble opinion on the reform of the Malabar liturgy could be reduced to the following.

I. Motives of Fundamental Principles

1. The present time requires unity not only in faith and ecclesiastical authorities, but, as far as possible, even in the liturgy, calendar, administration, etc.

2. The incidental differences among various rites of the same group are to be eliminated, in order to help better our people to attend religious functions profitably, also in churches, other than those of their own rite.

3. It is an urgent need that our people understand finally, and act henceforth, in full harmony, for their common good, retaining intangible, their respective rites and their own hierarchy. This means that first of all our efforts should be Catholic, respecting the rites with their ancient rights and privileges.

II. Particular Motives Related to the Doubts in Question

1. It is very useful that people can take an active part in the celebration of some liturgical offices with the recitation in their own

language, of certain prayers, or hymns, which in the liturgical books are assigned to the people; mostly if such functions do not stem from the rite itself, for example, the blessings with the Blessed Sacrament.

2. The liturgy, in its essential part pertaining to the celebrant, must remain fixed in the original language. The motive is to give the majesty due to the divine worship and the sacraments; and then, not to change the language of the liturgy continuously, in the excuse of the present wonderful development of the Catholic Church throughout the world, and the journey of priests and their dwelling place among countless peoples of various dialects incomprehensible among them although they belong to the same race or nation; all the more so because the celebrant cannot always make himself heard or understood by the people, even though he celebrates in their living language, as is proved by daily life (occurrence).

For the rest, this lacuna could be remedied by other means, for example, by giving the faithful booklets with the translation of the original language.

3.1. The unleavened bread is preferable since it is historically the bread used in the first Mass.

3.2. (This is also useful) to facilitate the priest to celebrate the Mass with the unleavened bread or leavened bread according to the place in which he celebrates it and thus he is freed from the scruples and the difficulty of having the bread required by his proper rite.

4. It is good to effect uniformity of vestments in the same rite: Chaldean-Malabar.

5. It is preferable to help the priest and the people, to officiate a religious function with the least possible strangeness and distraction.

6. The Church can have only one altar (sanctuary); then it is up to the Ordinary to judge whether the veil is appropriate or not. The reason is that in the supposed case, the veil should be as wide and as high as the church itself; and then, the veil would not only cost so much, if the

material is good, but also would soon become worn out and thus inconvenient.

But there is another much stronger reason with regard to the faith and devotion of the faithful. When the only altar in a church can be seen almost always hidden behind a veil, the people will be get used slowly to forget that there is a tabernacle and Our Lord is present in it. And this forgetfulness of Our Lord would be fatal for the faithful causing neglect, irreverence, irreligious conduct etc., in them. In such a case the Ordinary has to combine the use of veil for the only altar in a church with the faith and devotion of his flock towards the Blessed Sacrament.

But if there is another altar in the church, especially at the side, this should have the veil and there the Blessed Sacrament should be preserved. And in this way the people will be accustomed to practise their faith in the real presence of Our Lord and give him due adoration and veneration seeing in that veil itself the reliable sign of the permanent abode of the Lord.

7. Communion under both species for the faithful. I think I need to use all possible good means to convince those who still have this use, whether Catholics or not, to abandon it, rather than to impose it on those Catholics who for a long time have adopted the use of Communion under the species of bread alone.

By the word “impose” in the proposed doubt it can be deduced that in the Malabar Church there is the general use of Communion with the sacred Host only, or also that the use of two species is optional. There is no reason to impose this second use rather than the first. On the contrary, there are reasons of great importance and consequence in favour of the use of the single species of bread.

1) If the Communion under both species is decided for the Malabar Church, there would be no reason for excluding other churches of the Eastern rites, in which since a long time the Communion is given to the faithful under the species of bread alone.

But if it has to be effected, as the logic would require, it would definitely remove from these Churches every hope of progress and imitation of the Roman Mother Church. And then why not to renew the simple practices of the apostolic era, and to do away with an infinite number of novelties unknown in the first centuries?

2) The idea of imposing the Communion under both species would give the impression that it is the perfect one, while that under the species of bread alone would be, so to speak, obsolete. It is precisely for this reason that the use of Sacred Host only for the Communion of the faithful must be maintained where it still exists.

In fact, the Sacrament of the Eucharist contains the mystery of mysteries, the mystery of faith, living, profound and full faith in the real, total and human-divine presence of Our Lord, in each separate species. Such faith is much better corroborated in the faithful with the Communion under the species of bread alone, than that under both species, which can satisfy in a certain way, to the senses and sensitivity, as if the Holy Host alone was deficient.

3) The Communion under both species is necessarily accompanied by great material, moral and physical difficulties, both for the priest and for the faithful, especially nowadays. The Communion becomes more frequent and for many every day, on certain days numerically so many (immense). In such cases it is possible and even likely that some people, not to say many, would abstain totally from the said Communion; they would satisfy themselves by one or a few Communion per year for the simple hygienic reason. Moreover, it should not be neglected to mention the danger of dishonour to the most Blessed Sacrament rendering, in the Communion under both species, more difficult the distribution of the two sacred species and much greater possibility to see, with pain, the falling down of some holy particles on the ground.

However, the Communion in question could be tolerated for the faithful recently converted from a non-Catholic Church in which they used to receive Communion under both species. A day will come when

they themselves will voluntarily accept and ask the Communion under the species of bread alone, as has happened to other Eastern rites.

4) Because it would be convenient to insert and to recite some prayers of the liturgy in vernacular, in order to make the faithful comprehend the sense of the same, and it is now a question of imposing the Communion under both species without finding other means to make it clear to the same faithful, there is convenience and almost the moral necessity of Communion under the species of bread alone.

5) If it is thought appropriate to impose the Communion under both species, this means preserving the two species. But even then in certain types of diseases it would be necessary to administer the Communion under the species of wine alone not being possible or at least not easy, to swallow (consume) the Sacred Host.

Finally allow me to humbly propose one last observation: since this seventh doubt (question) is the most delicate and essentially the most important of the six other previous ones, would it not be preferable to leave the Communion in the *statu quo* at present to decide when this question will be better studied theoretically and practically also after a well detailed experience.

Document 16

Letter of Fr. Maurus Valiapampil, Prior General of the Third Order Discalced Carmelites of Malabar

Ernakulam (Cochin), 4 May 1956; *Fr. Maurus is favourable to the proposed liturgical reform in the Syro-Malabar Church and he offers full support to the Sacred Congregation as regards the implementation of reform* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Malabaresi-Liturgia: Revisione e Stampa del Messale Malabarese, Relazione con Sommario, Ponenza del 27 maggio 1957* [in *Ponenze Anno 1950-1959*], Summary No. X, 66-67).

I attentively followed the two volumes of the *Liturgia Siro-Malabarese*, re (sic): the Liturgy of the Mass and the ritual of the Ordinations, which was kindly sent to me via the Apostolic Internunciature.

It is really gratifying to note that the original text of the Ordinations of the Chaldean Rite is once again adopted in our rite, and that the text has appeared in the vernacular. It is equally pleasing to note that the text of the Mass is revised to get the original text and that the 2nd and the 3rd anaphora have been reintroduced into our Liturgy.

As regards the translation of the ritual of Ordination that has been prepared. I would wish to recommend it with full heart. The translation, as far as I can see, is precise and clear; will be greatly appreciated for its simple diction with the simple style of composition. The tunes employed are all simple already familiar through our breviary already in use. Therefore, I pray, may it be promulgated without delay.

As regards the text of the Mass I would hereby request that the text be made available in the vernacular for the greater benefit of the laity. Anyhow, in the case of the text of the Mass, as is destined for more common and daily use, it is desirable that the translation is

prepared by a select committee of the place (Malabar) consisting of Malayalam Pundits and some of the Ecclesiastical Dignitaries under the detailed direction and supervision of the Sacred Congregation itself.

As for the practical implementation of the proposed liturgical reforms, my humble suggestion is that a few centres be selected in the beginning where the liturgy could be executed first. The Cathedral Churches, the Sacred Heart Scholasticate of the Syro-Malabar Carmelite Congregation and one or two Monastery Chapels of the Syro-Malabar Carmelite Congregation in each Diocese may be chosen for these centres. These centres will remain an exemplar and model for the rest. The extension to the other centres could be gradually made.

I avail myself of the occasion to inform Your Eminence once again that the Syro-Malabar Carmelite Congregation will be always ready to give her full support and co-operation in the execution of the liturgical reformation thought out by the Sacred Oriental Congregation.

Section Four
SECOND CONSULTATION OF SYRO-MALABAR
BISHOPS ON THE PROPOSED SYRO-MALABAR
MISSAL

Perhaps because of the almost unanimous negative opinion of Syro-Malabar bishops concerning the proposed Order of *Qurbana*, in August-October 1956 Fr. Placid of St Joseph TOCD (Podipara), a member of the Roman Liturgical Commission, personally approached the Malabar bishops individually, explaining to them the scope of the reform. It seems that according to the mind of the Congregation for the Oriental Church he strived to conscientize the bishops on the need for restoration and reform of the then Syro-Malabar liturgy.

He received 6 brief written responses, which are presented as documents XI-XVI of the already cited *Report with Summary*. We reproduce them as they are found in the said source, without any modification. From these responses, it results that after the visit of Fr. Podipara generally the bishops mitigated their opposition to the proposed Order of *Qurbana* and adopted a rather positive attitude towards restoration and reform, though asking for permission to continue the use of unleavened bread, Latin vestments and the practice of Communion under the species of bread alone. In fact, at least some bishops started to decontaminate their memories and to disinfect their vision about the spiritual heritage of their Church.

Document 17

Response of George Alapatt, Bishop of Trichur

Trichur, 6 August 1956; *he generally approves the reform if permission for dispensations and options are given* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Malabaresi-Liturgia: Revisione e Stampa del Messale Malabarese, Relazione con Sommario, Ponenza del 27 maggio 1957* [in *Ponenze Anno 1950-1959*], Summary No. XI, 67).

Difficulties regarding the reform of the Rite concern chiefly the externals such as liturgical vestments, use of leavened bread etc. The local Ordinaries may be given faculty to dispense from these in places where they deem it necessary. Priests may be given freedom to use the bread and vestments of the churches where they say Mass. Devotions such as the 40 hours adoration etc. may be retained. With these reservations the texts of the liturgy and other services may all be put in their genuine form and setting.

Document 18

Response of Joseph Parecattil, Archbishop of Ernakulam

Ernakulam, 20 August 1956; *after the death of Mar Augustine Kandathil on 11 January 1956, Mar Joseph Parecattil, until then auxiliary bishop, was appointed archbishop of Ernakulam on 20 July 1956. With a sense of gratitude to the Oriental Congregation, which just promoted him as archbishop, Parecattil felt obliged, it seems, to give a positive response to the proposed Missal, although his subsequent acts contradicted it* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Malabaresi-Liturgia: Revisione e Stampa del Messale Malabarese, Relazione con*

Sommario, Ponzona del 27 maggio 1957 [in Ponzona Anno 1950-1959], Summary No. XII, 68).

The liturgical reform is welcome. Since the Indian Government, as I am made to understand by well-informed persons, is better disposed and more sympathetic towards Orientals compared to others, to orientalize our Church more and more is a movement in the right direction. That may also please to a certain extent the national leaders who speak of the necessity of an “Indian Church” not of course fully aware of the spiritual allegiance which, of necessity, one owes to the divinely constituted Head of the Universal Church. Moreover, vernacularization of the liturgy will certainly satisfy a long-felt need. However, in the reform of the liturgy particular care should be taken to adapt it to the enlightened Congregation that we have today. In this matter suggestions have already been sent to the Sacred Congregation by the respective Bishops. It will be advisable, I think, to set up a committee of experts in Malabar under the auspices of the Hierarchy to expedite matters and to give the final touches to the language which will have actually to be presented to the people. Before the liturgy of the Mass is finalized it seems opportune to give some hints thereof in our papers and to feel the pulse of public opinion on the matter.

Finally, I leave everything to the Sacred Congregation to decide.

Document 19

Response of Thomas Tharayil, Bishop of Kottayam

Kottayam, 19 September 1956; *Bishop Tharayil confirms his positive approach to reform already expressed in previous letters* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Malabaresi-Liturgia: Revisione e Stampa del Messale Malabarese, Relazione con Sommario, Ponzona del 27 maggio 1957* [in *Ponenze Anno 1950-1959*], Summary No. XIII, 68-69).

Regarding Liturgical reform and its application I have already informed Your Eminence of my humble suggestion in the matter as per my letters cited below:

- a) Letter No. 22/55 dated 25th May 1955,
- b) Letter No. 49/55 dated 8th Aug, 1955,
- c) Letter No. 78/55 dated 23rd Dec. 1955,
- d) Letter No. 90/56 dated 17th Feb. 1956.

I may be permitted to add that one of the two seminary buildings at Alwaye may be set apart for studies of the Oriental Rites as Your Eminence hinted to the Bishops of Malabar in the Conference held at the Archbishop's House, Ernakulam in 1954. At Alwaye seminary the seminarians of the Oriental Rite who form the majority have no chapel of their own where they could attend daily Mass and perform other liturgical functions in their own Rite. Provision must be made for the seminarians of the Oriental Rite studying in the Alwaye Seminary not only to study their liturgical language but also to practice the liturgical functions and to live and grow in the atmosphere of Oriental Liturgy.

This does not necessarily mean duplication of Professors. Just as seminarists in Rome live in different Colleges and attend common Ecclesiastical Universities, so also at Alwaye the seminarists of the Oriental Rite and the Latin Rite can have separate community life and common University life – Common Professors and common lectures.

Unless some such arrangement is made as soon as possible, even the future generation of priests of the Oriental Rite in Malabar will not derive the desired fruit of the liturgical reform Your Eminence is proposing to introduce.

Document 20

Response of Sebastian Valloppilly, Bishop of Tellicherry

Tellicherry, 19 September 1956; *Bishop Valloppilly confirms his positive attitude to the proposed Missal* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Malabaresi-Liturgia: Revisione e Stampa del Messale Malabarese, Relazione con Sommario, Ponzona del 27 maggio 1957* [in *Ponenze Anno 1950-1959*], Summary No. XIV, 69).

I agree with the initiation taken by the Holy See for reforming our Rite and reinstating it into its genuine form. But I would suggest that Bishops be given faculty to dispense from individual points that may be found difficult to put into execution. In the case of liturgical vestments Eucharistic bread etc. priests may be given freedom to use the vestments and bread etc. of the church where they say Mass.

Document 21

Response of Mathew Kavukatt, Archbishop of Changanacherry

Changanacherry, 9 October 1956; *Archbishop Kavukatt approves the reform with dispensations and options* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Malabaresi-Liturgia: Revisione e Stampa del Messale Malabarese, Relazione con Sommario, Ponzona del 27 maggio 1957* [in *Ponenze Anno 1950-1959*], Summary No. XV, 70).

While restoring our Rite to its pure form and effecting the necessary change provision may be made for granting faculties to the Ordinaries of the dioceses of the Syro-Malabar Province for giving the following permissions as and where such permissions are considered feasible:

- 1) To use vestments now in vogue for Mass and other liturgical functions;
- 2) To use unleavened bread;
- 3) To administer 'Holy Communion' to the faithful in one kind only.

Document 22

Response of Sebastian Vayalil, Bishop of Palai

Palai, 15 October 1956; *Bishop Vayalil simply confirms his position as expressed in the previous letter* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Malabaresi-Liturgia: Revisione e Stampa del Messale Malabarese, Relazione con Sommario, Ponzona del 27 maggio 1957* [in *Ponenze Anno 1950-1959*], Summary No. XVI, 70).

As to the liturgical reform and its application I have already sent my views and suggestions in my letter No. 192/55 dated July 7, 1955. I have nothing more to add at present. Your Eminence will kindly consider the suggestion I had made in that letter for the setting up of a Committee of experts here in Malabar to prepare a draft to be submitted to Your Eminence.

Section Five

APPROVAL OF THE MISSAL BY THE PLENARY ASSEMBLY OF THE CONGREGATION FOR THE ORIENTAL CHURCH AND BY POPE PIUS XII

The plenary meeting of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church held on 27 May 1957 in its assembly-room considered two questions: the proposed order of Syro-Malabar *Qurbana* and the situation of the apostolic exarchate of Asmara (Ethiopian Church), of which only the former is of our interest. Most Eminent Cardinals: Eugene Tisserant, Secretary of the same Sacred Congregation, Benedict Aloisi-Masella, Peter Fumasoni-Biondi, Gregory Peter Agagianian, Celso Costantini and Valerio Valeri were present.¹ The cardinals were given in anticipation, the proposed Order of Missal, the responses of Syro-Malabar bishops, the evaluation of the liturgical Commission, the considerations of the experts consulted and the opinion of Syro-Malabar bishops expressed on the occasion of the second consultation made by Fr. Placid Podipara for their study and evaluation.

Gregory Peter Agagianian, after a profound study of the entire material presented a detailed report on the theme: Revision and Printing of the Malabar Missal. Then followed a fruitful and lively discussion on the six doubts proposed and each Cardinal freely expressed his views on the various aspects of the proposed Missal.² At the end of the debate the Cardinals made unanimous decisions on all points. Although they preferred to restore the authentic Eastern liturgy

¹ Cf. Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Port. No. 955/65, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi*, fascicolo IIIa.

² Cf. Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Port. No. 955/65, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi*, fascicolo IIIa; the minutes of the plenary assembly,

with all its components, taking into consideration the observations and proposals of the Syro-Malabar bishops, many concessions and permissions were granted in a temporary manner.

Among the six cardinals who participated in the general assembly five belonged to the Latin Church. The only Oriental cardinal, Gregory Peter Agagianian, was patriarch of the Armenian Catholic Church, but his ministry was mainly in Rome as the president of the Pontifical Commission for the Redaction of Oriental Canon Law for a short time and then as pro-prefect and prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (1958-1970). Obviously he had no particular interest in the promotion of Chaldean liturgy in India. Hence the five Latin cardinals and one Armenian cardinal who participated in the assembly and approved the Syro-Malabar Missal cannot be branded as Chaldean advocates or persons obfuscated by “their inborn hatred towards Latin and anything connected with the Latin Rite”.³ They made decisions according to sound theological and liturgical principles, having in mind the greater good and the lasting benefit of the Syro-Malabar Church. In the same manner it is not correct to present the Syro-Malabar Missal as the product of a few Roman experts, who were members of the Roman Liturgical Commission. They only accomplished the task entrusted to them by the Apostolic See according to their expertise and conscience in accordance with established principles, but did not approve or promulgate the text.

From time immemorial, there exists a consolidated praxis and long standing canonical procedure in the Roman Curia for the papal approval of important affairs. Accordingly, after collecting sufficient information and relevant documents on a particular question and seeking the opinion of experts and all persons concerned a comprehensive report is prepared, followed by a thorough study. The said report is discussed in the plenary assembly of the members (mainly cardinals) of the concerned Congregation and the conclusions

³ See document 51.

of the assembly are presented to the Pope for the approval. Normally the Pope approves the unanimous decisions of the plenary assembly, but obviously he can also reject them or ask for further investigation and study.

Obviously the same procedure was followed in the case of Syro-Malabar Missal. After the plenary assembly of 27 May 1957, the unanimous decisions of the cardinals were presented to Pope Pius XII and he approved them on 26 June 1957. In brief, the Syro-Malabar Missal proposed by the liturgical Commission was approved both by the Congregation for the Oriental Church and by the Pope.

Document 23

Report on the Revision and Printing of the Malabar Missal Presented by Cardinal Agagianian in the Plenary Assembly

Rome, 27 May 1957; *first of all the Cardinal presented a brief profile of the Syro-Malabar Church, history of the liturgical reform after the appointment of native bishops and a succinct account of the work of the liturgical Commission for the reform of the Missal in the background of the modifications made after the arrival of the Western missionaries in the beginning of the sixteenth century. Then, based on the responses of the Syro-Malabar bishops, evaluations of the liturgical Commission and the opinion of experts, the Cardinal analysed the controversial points, proposing possible solutions. Finally he formulated six doubts for the discussion and decision of the plenary assembly* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/1948, *Malabaresi-Liturgia: Revisione e Stampa del Messale Malabarese, Relazione con Sommario, Ponenza del 27 maggio 1957* [in *Ponenze Anno 1950-1959*], 1-20, original in Italian).

Most Reverend Eminences,

1. It is well known to all, the comforting development that the Church of Malabar in India has made in recent years. Omitting to mention about the origin of these Christians, who call themselves of “St Thomas”, it is sufficient to remember that when the Portuguese arrived in India by the end of XV century, they found a good number of them there. In the first years of the Portuguese occupation they had bishops of their own rite, but later they were subjected to Latin jurisdiction, which lasted until 1896, when the first three Vicars Apostolic of Syro-Malabar Rite were appointed by Leo XIII, with sees (headquarters) in Trichur, Ernakulam and Changanacherry. In 1911 the vicariate apostolic of Kottayam was added. Finally, in 1923 Pius XI erected the ecclesiastical province of Malabar Rite with Ernakulam as the Metropolitan See with three suffragan dioceses. In 1950 the diocese of Palai was erected, in 1953 that of Tellicherry and in 1956 that of Kothamangalam followed. In that same year the see of Changanacherry was elevated to the rank of metropolitan with two suffragan sees, while three dioceses remained suffragan sees to the metropolitan of Ernakulam.

The faithful of these 7 dioceses are more than a million: the clergy are numerous and sufficient for the needs, vocations are abundant and the Latin dioceses themselves obtain many persons (elements), as well as the Latin Orders and Congregations.

The rite has substantially remained as it was received from the Chaldean Church, which used to send bishops to govern those populations. However, since the subjection of the Malabar faithful to the Latin jurisdiction in the XVI century, many Latin elements were gradually introduced into their liturgy.

Only one Eucharistic liturgy (anaphora) instead of three is used, the calendar of saints is changed to that of the Roman Church; the canonical Office is practically reduced to that of the weekdays; the Ritual is that of Goa which is very close to the Roman one, translated

into Syriac; the sacred ordinations are conferred according to the Roman Pontifical and in Latin language; the vestments are Latin; the churches have the shape and the furnishing in Latin style; the leavened bread was replaced by that of unleavened and the Communion under both species is substituted with that of one species (bread).

2. In 1925 the bishops of Malabar asked the Holy See to approve a translation of the Roman Pontifical in Syriac language, to avoid the contrast of the Mass celebrated in Syriac with ordinations celebrated in Latin language. Indeed, in 1929 the same bishops (Episcopate) sent a version (of the Roman Pontifical) made by them, rejecting the idea of reinstating the ancient Chaldean Pontifical, fallen into disuse since the Synod of Diamper (1599).

Given the importance of the matter, the Sacred Congregation asked the opinion of some experts (specialized persons): Fr. Herman SJ and the Carmelite Fr. John of the Cross (in addition to the bishops concerned and the Most Excellent Apostolic Delegate of Indies, Msgr. Kierkels) were favourable to the Syriac version of the Roman Pontifical. On the contrary Fr. Korolevskij, Msgr. Graffin, Msgr. Tisserant, Fr. de Meester OSB and Msgr. David, the Chaldean bishop of Amadiyah were opposed to the said version and favourable to the restoration of the Chaldean Pontifical.⁴

In the plenary meeting held on 19 November 1934, the Most Eminent Fathers were rather perplexed about the particular insistence of the Episcopate and the practical difficulties for the reinstatement of the ancient Chaldean Pontifical.

However, the Holy Father Pius XI of venerable memory, during the Audience of 1 December 1934, expressed his judgment in these unequivocal terms: "Latinization is not to be encouraged among the Orientals. The Holy See does not want to latinize but to catholicize.

⁴ All these votes can be found in P. Pallath and J. Kollara, *Roman Pontifical into Syriac and the Beginning of Liturgical Reform*, 70-139.

And then, half measures are neither generous nor fruitful. So continue in *status quo*, but at once appoint a commission for the revision of the ancient Pontifical, which can also be printed part by part (in fascicles)".⁵

The decision of the Holy Father was immediately communicated to His Excellency Most Reverend Msgr. Kierkels, the Apostolic Delegate of Indies, requesting him to inform the bishops of the Malabar Church. Msgr. Kierkels replied on 1 January 1935 ensuring that Metropolitan Msgr. Kandathil had welcomed the communication with maximum deference, affirming that the instructions of the Holy See, whatever they may be, would be faithfully executed.⁶

A commission of experts was set up, presided over first by Msgr. Tisserant and then by Fr. Vosté OP, which collected all the necessary materials and in 27 meetings examined them in order to establish the definitive text of the Chaldean Pontifical. On 3 July 1939 a plenary meeting of the Most Eminent Fathers was held for the examination of the text prepared by the Commission and in the Audience of 9 July 1939 the Holy Father Pius XII of happy memory granted his sovereign approval, recommending that some of the controversial points must be subjected to the scrutiny of the Holy Office, and this was regularly done.⁷

The Chaldean Pontifical, which will serve the Chaldean and Malabar Hierarchy, is currently being printed at the printing press of the Jesuit Fathers of Beirut.

⁵ Original text and English translation in P. Pallath and J. Kollara, *Roman Pontifical into Syriac and the Beginning of Liturgical Reform*, 158/322.

⁶ Documentation in P. Pallath and J. Kollara, *Roman Pontifical into Syriac and the Beginning of Liturgical Reform*, 158-160.

⁷ Documentation in P. Pallath and J. Kollara, *Roman Pontifical into Syriac and the Beginning of Liturgical Reform*, 163-203.

3. However the liturgical reform of the Malabar Church could not be restricted only to the Pontifical, but it was appropriate to extend also to the Missal, to pass then to the Ritual and Divine Office. For this, the Sacred Congregation constituted a new Commission on 10 March 1954 composed of: Fr. Alphonse Raes SJ, President, Fr. Cyril Korolevskij and Fr. Placid of St Joseph, a Malabar Carmelite, as members, and the Rev. Emanuel Delly, a Chaldean priest, as an assistant.

The Commission has held 42 meetings, compiled accurate reports for each sitting: the first liturgical book examined was the Missal. It was easy to distinguish in it the Ordinary of the Mass (*Ordinarium Missae*) from the calendar with the scriptural readings and variable parts. In the *Ordinarium Missae* itself, the text of the prayers must be distinguished from the rubrics. Now, from a detailed examination, the following were noted: 1) the text of the prayers in the Syro-Malabar Missal remained unaltered to a great extent (one important exception: the words of consecration are a version of the text of the Roman Canon); it is possible to notice some additions, as the “Lamb of God” (*Agnus Dei*), prayers before and after the Communion of the faithful, and the changes such as those of the text of the Creed, which is that of Nicene-Constantinopolitan, instead of the traditional one of the Chaldeans; 2) the rubrics were greatly altered and prescribe certain usages totally extraneous to the genuine rite, for example, the carrying of the Missal from the right to the left and from the left to the right side of the altar, the position of the hands of the priest imitates that of the Latin priest, the kiss of the altar whenever the priest turns towards the people, genuflection on one knee, the manner of incensing the altar, the use of unleavened bread, the Latin form of the hosts, Latin liturgical vestments etc.: all the external comportment of the celebrant resembles, as far as possible to that of the Latin priest; 3) this fact deserves a special mention: the consecration of the bread and wine takes place, not after the *Sanctus* as in all the Eastern and Western

liturgies, but at the beginning of the fraction, and that is followed by the double elevation in the Latin manner.

As regards the calendar, it is simply that of the Roman Missal, both for the temporal as for the sanctoral, while for the Divine Office the liturgical year of the genuine rite is preserved. Thus, the Missal begins with the First Sunday of the Advent. Consequently all the epistles and all the gospels are those of the Roman Missal; moreover, the traditional readings from the Old Testament were suppressed.

The ancient anaphora of Holy Apostles Addai and Mari has been preserved, but two other anaphoras of the rite, attributed to Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius were suppressed, precisely because they were considered to be drafted by these heretics and therefore unworthy of appearing in a Catholic Missal.

All variable hymns of the Mass also are suppressed: the hymn of the sanctuary in the beginning, the psalm and the “turgama”⁸ before the Epistle, the alleluia with the verse and the “turgama” before the Gospel, the hymn of the offertory and that of Communion (readings and chants were preserved, at least partially, only in the solemn celebration, called *Raza*).

In the Missal we find also the blessing and the procession of the candles on 2 February and the blessing of the Ashes, - these two blessings are extraneous to the authentic rite -, the blessing and the procession of the Palms, sacred rites of Holy Thursday and Good Friday according to the Roman Missal, while the Chaldean Liturgy has its proper rites for these days. The rites of Holy Saturday were recently translated from the Roman Missal, but are not yet in use everywhere.

4. Having been realized that the Missal remained sufficiently genuine in the text of the priestly prayers and in the general order of the Holy Mass, but much altered in everything else, the liturgical

⁸ It is a kind of hymn in which the apostolic activity of St Paul and the excellence of the evangelical doctrine are praised.

Commission, according to the mandate received, has prepared the draft (project) of a new Missal, trying to restore the genuine rite according to the mind so often expressed by the recent Pontiffs and with the intention to continue the reform initiated for the Pontifical by Pope Pius XI of venerable memory.

The main proposals are the result of the discussions made in the Commission and could be summarized briefly as follows:

Three different ways of celebrating the Holy Mass are distinguished: the most solemn, called *Raza*, the solemn sung form and the less solemn; for each type a ceremonial was composed. Only for the first one all the hymns and all the ceremonies will be used. For the solemn, the rite of prostration, the hymn of the sanctuary, two readings of the Old Testament, the *surraya* (similar to the Gradual of the Latins), and the two *turgama* are omitted.

The Lamb of God (*Agnus Dei*) of Latin origin and the prayer of the fraction "Father of truth" (*Pater veritatis*) of Maronite origin are suppressed.

The pericopes (readings) of the Sacred Scripture are no longer those of the Roman Missal, but those of the Chaldean rite, from which the periods (seasons) of the liturgical year and the Santoral are resumed; to the latter are added a good number of feasts of saints currently in use among the Malabars.

Instead of imitating the gestures and movements of the Latin celebrant, the Malabar celebrant will comport as prescribed by the genuine rite. The double elevation after the consecration is suppressed, but the words of consecration will be sung and the faithful will respond: *Amen*.

The preparation of the bread and the wine will be done outside of the altar and in consequence the transfer of the gifts to the altar will be conducted.

The function of the deacon is restored for the collective prayers, for the admonitions to the faithful and for the service of the celebrant at the altar, and the subdeacon in Latin manner will be suppressed.

Instead of unleavened bread the leavened bread will be retrieved and instead of Latin vestments those of the proper rite will be used. The Communion will be under two species and a veil will cover the sanctuary.

The blessing of the Candles (2 February) and that of the Ashes are eliminated from the Missal, and the rites of Holy Week are reintroduced according to the genuine rite.

In brief, little has been changed in the text of the prayers, but the external comportment of the celebrant and the visible aspect of ceremonies are corrected.

5. On 2 April 1955 the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church took care of sending the Latin version of the proposed Missal (attached separately) to the Syro-Malabar bishops (and later to Rev. Father General of the Third Order of Carmelites), asking them to examine the project very carefully and let their opinions known liberally. Except His Excellency George Alapatt, bishop of Trichur, all of them responded.

These responses,⁹ which are so similar to each other that they seem to be agreed upon, do not express neither a formal rejection, nor an explicit acceptance of the project. The mind (line of thought) of the bishops tends rather to the conservation of the current state with the sole desire for an abbreviation. However, docile to the voice of Rome, they formulate some reservations on some particular points, in case the reform is decided. These are points that are submitted now, in the form of doubts, to the examination of the Most Eminent Cardinals.

⁹ See documents 7-12.

6. To explain the attitude of the bishops it is necessary to recall certain facts happened in the past. After the Synod of Diamper (1599), some Syro-Malabar people at times expressed the desire to see restored the rite along with the hierarchy. In the last century twice, in 1861 and in 1874, under the thrust from the Chaldeans of Mesopotamia, this desire led them up to schisms. The schism of 1874 still persists in the Nestorian Church of Trichur having about two thousand faithful. The desire was partially fulfilled when the Holy See gave them an indigenous hierarchy in 1896. And from that time, the attitude towards the rite changed. The prelates, for fear of new interventions from the Chaldean Catholic Patriarch of Mossul-Bagdad, did not want to hear any more about the restoration of the rite and they themselves gave the example of a blatant Latinization when they began to use the Roman Pontifical in Latin language and took the Latin mitre and the garments (clothing) of the Latin bishops as civil costume.

In the beginning of this century some Syro-Malabar priests asked for the restoration of the rite together with the jurisdiction of the Chaldean Patriarch in Malabar. But the Malabar bishops ruled the Church so well that priests and faithful abandoned soon the idea of being subjected to the Chaldean Patriarch. And thus the question of the rite fell.

The present attitude of the clergy and the faithful towards the rite is also explained specifically by the English education they receive from the beginning of this century. Social and political ideas imported from the West and not entirely assimilated, succeeded to a certain extent to annihilate the traditional sentiments of the community. The Malabar people know well and are proud to be Syrians, but they no longer have a sufficiently refined sense of what their rite signifies and represents. Their piety is largely non-liturgical and in this without doubt a great danger is found for their faith. The devotions have multiplied, but all of them are Latin in origin and form.

It should be noted how a candidate to the priesthood is educated. In the minor seminary the boy receives an education in English model.

He learns Latin and a little of Syriac in two years; then he is sent to a major seminary, in most cases to Alwaye. All the formation is Latin. In the program of studies neither there is any place for the history of the Syro-Malabar Church, nor for the Syriac patrology, nor for the Syro-Malabar liturgy. The seminarian receives lessons on the rubrics, on the meaning of the most common Syriac prayers and then a few lectures on Syriac language follow. And this is everything what he receives, with regard to the rite. Consequently, there are only a few seminarians who understand the prayers that they recite in Syriac language.

Almost all the clergy are steeped in Latin ideas and suffer an inferiority complex about their own rite; they leave the seminary with the idea that the Latin rite is “the” rite of the Church. Students of the Third Order of Discalced Carmelites (TOCD) have better knowledge of Syriac, but do not differ from the secular priests in their attitude towards the rite. And this is a serious matter for the entire Church and for the Church in India in particular.

7. Having explained thus the comportment of the Episcopate towards the project to reform the Missal, the particular points on which the bishops have expressed their reservations are exposed herein. For a better understanding of the issues, the Commission has examined all the responses of the bishops in a special sitting proposing a solution to the controversial points and drawing up an accurate Report that is found in the Summery under number VII,¹⁰ whose reading will help the Most Eminent Fathers to form a proper idea about individual questions submitted for their wise judgement.

Moreover, the Sacred Congregation thought it also appropriate to ask the opinion of two other specialists, mainly on the most controversial points, namely to His Excellency Msgr. Joseph Goguè, the Chaldean archbishop of Bassorah, and Rev. Fr. Hambye SJ, known for his articles on the Churches of Malabar, which he knows very well

¹⁰ In this book document 13.

for having lived for a long time in India: their votes appear in numbers VIII and IX of the Summary.¹¹ In number X is given the general opinion of the Prior General of the Carmelites of Malabar.¹²

1. Use of Malayalam Language in the Liturgy

So far the Malabars have exclusively used the Syriac language in the liturgy, except the use of Latin for the Roman Pontifical. Various reasons have induced the Commission to propose the question. The first is the urgent need to conduct the faithful to a minimum understanding of the rite, that is to a real interest for the liturgical functions and not only for the extra liturgical functions, as now happens very often, to lead them to that active participation which the Holy Father wishes to the faithful when one proceeds to some liturgical reform, as that of the Holy Week.¹³ Now, with the use of the Syriac language the liturgy remains as a closed book for the faithful.

A second reason is the inability to reactivate the choir of the lay singers in the church during the liturgical functions since the text is written in Syriac characters; no one learns that alphabet. To this ignorance is due, the disappearance of all variable hymns of the Holy Mass, analogous to the *Entrance, Gradual, Offertory and Communion* of the Latin rite. Only with the use of the vernacular it is possible to restore this precious patrimony to the rite.

A third reason is the ignorance of the Syriac language from the part of priests and also of bishops. The knowledge of this language has gone very far behind in the past fifty years, perhaps because young people attending schools and seminaries have to learn a series of increasingly numerous materials.

¹¹ In this book documents 14-15.

¹² In this book document 16.

¹³ Here the reference is to the restored *Order of Holy Week* in the Roman tradition approved by Pope Pius XII in 1955 and began to be used in 1956. *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 47 (1955) 838-847.

Among all the Eastern rites the Chaldean rite is the one that has always been attached to its unique liturgical language; even when it was spread in central Asia and up to China, as well as to Socotra and India, the Syriac was always the only liturgical language and at the same time the means of unity among the linguistically different peoples practicing this rite. But the Synod of 1853 gathered in the monastery of Rabban Hormisdas said: “The Chaldean is the language of our rite, thus it is prohibited to introduce another language into it, except for the reading of the Sacred Scripture, so that the people understand it”.¹⁴

Although not approved, the Synod permitted exceptions to the strict principle of the single liturgical language. In fact, the *Lectionary*, *Epistles* and the *liturgical Gospel* were printed in Arabic in Mosul in the beginning of this century and are regularly used in the cities where the faithful no longer speak Soureth.¹⁵

Now times have changed. There is no longer any juridical or cultural tie between Malabar and Mesopotamia, the cradle of the rite. Today, the Malabar Catholics do not look toward Iraq, but toward the rest of India, and their most numerous priestly and religious vocations call them to the apostolate among the pagans of India itself. They desire to use the living language of the country where they live as their Syro-Malankara brethren do.

The Bible in Malayalam version exists; so we can affirm that it will be possible to translate the liturgical texts also into the same language.

¹⁴ [Cfr. J. Vosté, *Les Actes du Synode Chaldéen... de 1853*, in *Fonti della Commissione ...*, sezione II, fasc. 17, Roma 1942, p. 69].

¹⁵ Soureth is a Chaldean Neo-Aramaic language, developed from Syriac and now spoken throughout a large region stretching from the plain of Urmia in northwestern Iran, to the Nineveh plains in northern Iraq, together with parts of southeastern Turkey.

We may also recall that recently the Holy Father has granted permission to the Latins of India to use Hindi and other indigenous languages in a limited way.

The bishops and the two consultors unconditionally agreed to the proposal of the Commission.

2. Limiting the Use of Malayalam Language in the Liturgy

The motive of the active participation of the people cannot be invoked as a valid reason for allowing the use of the vernacular in the recitation of the secret prayers. If the Byzantines do it, they rely on the principle that each language can be a liturgical language, without limitation of any kind. This principle is not accepted in the Syrian, Maronite and Coptic rites, which use Arabic as the Melkites do, but not in all parts of the liturgy.¹⁶

It is evident that the desire to preserve the traditional language is due to a sense of conservatism proper to all the old values and a sense of the mystery that surrounds all the sacred things.

But when the priests and the bishops themselves do not have more than a minimum knowledge of the traditional language, the question arises whether it is not convenient to grant the living language even for the secret prayers, for a more intelligent, more pious and also safer celebration of the sacramental rites.

Father Cyril Korolevskij would like to apply also in the present case the principle of the Byzantines considering it valid for all the Orientals.

The bishops and the other members of the Commission and the two persons consulted believe that the limited preservation of Syriac is more convenient to give some fixity to the most essential formulas of the rite.

¹⁶ [Cfr. *Sinodo di Sciarfe*, caput III, art. 2, p. 34 sq.: *Sinodo del Monte Libano*, pars II, caput 13, n. 11; *Sinodo del Cairo*, sectio II, caput I, art. 2, p. 52].

Given therefore the legitimate custom in the Eastern rites to use the vernacular language in the liturgy and given that the Malayalam language possesses the necessary qualities for this purpose and that it is already in use among the Malankara faithful, the possible conclusions about the use of this language in the Malabar liturgy would be the following:

1) only for scriptural readings and for the variable hymns of the Holy Mass;

2) for these cases and also for diaconal litanies, for the first and last *Our Father*, in the most used hymn “Laku Mara” (*Te Dominum*, p. 11 of the project of the Missal), in *Trisagion*, in *Credo*, in *Sanctus* and in *Our Father* during the Holy Mass;

3) in all that is said or sung aloud by the priest, by the deacon, by the choir or by the people, except for the words of consecration;

4) simply for everything, even for the secret prayers of the priest and the words of consecration like the Melkites, Romanians, Georgians and Albanians, who recite everything in their own language.

The canon (786) approved by the Commission for the redaction of the Code of Oriental Canon Law (CICO) is identical to what you read in the Code of Canon Law (CIC 1917), canon 819: “The sacrifice of the Mass is to be celebrated in the liturgical language approved by the Church for that rite”.¹⁷

3. The Eucharistic Bread

It is certain that the traditional use of Syro-Malabar Church was the celebration with the leavened bread. About Mar Joseph we read that he ruled the Church as archbishop from 1558 and he put things in better order with regard to the Mass and the Divine Office, in order to “demonstrate himself a Catholic and to gain the benevolence of the

¹⁷ “Missae sacrificium celebrandum est lingua liturgica sui cuiusque ritus ab Ecclesia probati”.

Portuguese”. “He ordered to use our host and our wine because before they used to consecrate certain buns prepared with oil and salt, and sweet wine obtained by the compression of raisins soaked in water”.¹⁸

The same Portuguese historian recounts that when the Portuguese wanted to make the Malabars eat fish on the days of fasting and not allowed their priests to consecrate using the leavened bread, they returned to the mountains.¹⁹

Francis Roz, SJ, the first Latin bishop of Malabar wrote a report in 1604, in which he enumerates the causes that obliged the Syro-Malabars to leave their city of Cranganore (Kodungallur); among those causes he cites the following: because the Portuguese prohibited their priests to celebrate the liturgy using leavened bread.²⁰

Four solutions have been proposed: a) restore the use of leavened bread, because it is proper to the genuine rite and because the use of it was removed illegally and for unfounded reasons (according to the Commission); b) keep the present-day use of unleavened bread, because its use is already centuries old and because it is more convenient, especially when the Malabar priests go to celebrate in Latin churches (according to the bishops and Msgr. Gogu ); c) give the priests full freedom to choose the bread that they prefer, precisely to avoid the difficulties exposed above and because today almost no importance is attributed to the choice of unleavened or leavened bread (according to Fr. C. Korolevskij); d) restore the use of leavened bread, but give the bread a form not very different from that of the unleavened bread, like the one used by Syro-Malankara Church (according to Fr. Hambye).

Being the leavened bread prescribed in the genuine rite and having considered that its use involves so many inconveniences that in

¹⁸ [Cf. D’Souza, S.I., *Oriente conquistado*, t. I, Bombay 1881, p. 86].

¹⁹ [Cf. D’Souza, S.I., *Oriente conquistado*, t. II, p.70].

²⁰ [Cf. Manuscript Codex of the British Museum, Add 9853, fol. 90-90].

the Commission for the Revision of Oriental Canon Law (CICO)²¹ the distinction between those who use the leavened bread and those who use the unleavened bread is mitigated, the following solutions could be envisaged:

1) prescribe the leavened bread as a general rule, and tolerate the use of unleavened bread when one celebrates in a church of the Latin rite or in general because of grave inconvenience;

2) permit the Ordinaries (local bishops) to determine the cases in which the use of unleavened bread is permissible, without prejudice to the principle of the use of leavened bread;

3) grant full freedom to every priest to use leavened bread or unleavened bread.

4. The Sacred Vestments

The ancient use of Oriental vestments is certain. D'Souza, cited above, in the same passage writes that in 1558 Mar Joseph "Introduced vestments in the Roman model, because before they used to celebrate covering them with a sheet and a stole over it".²² The testimony is quite curious: during the celebration of the Mass the priests were covered of a sheet and a stole, which therefore means a white robe and a stole without chasuble or phelonion or phaina.²³

The images representing the Chaldean priests with their liturgical vestments are very rare. One traces back to the IX century, another to

²¹ [The canon (783) approved by the Commission for the Revision CICO is read as follows: "§ 1, 1°. In eucharistici Sacrificii celebratione sacerdos, secundum proprium ritum, debet panem fermentatum, vel azymum adhibere ubicumque illud celebret; 2°. Forma panis ea sit quam praescribunt liturgicae leges.

§ 2. Sacerdos in cuius ritu praescribitur panis fermentatus, hoc deficiente, uti potest, remota fidelium admiratione, azymo secundum praescripta catholici ritus confectio, et contra"].

²² [D'Souza, S.I., *Oriente conquistado*, t. I, p. 86].

²³ With regard to this point see Introductory Article One, no. 1.7.

the XII-XIII century: in both cases the image belongs to a bishop and he is covered with all the sacred vestments even with the chasuble closed like the present Greek phelonion.²⁴

History proves that in the whole of Christianity the priest celebrating the Eucharistic sacrifice wore the chasuble and that this chasuble everywhere, until the XII century, was closed from all sides. The Armenian bishops wore it until XVII century, the bishops and priests of Latin, Syrian, Maronite and Coptic rites used it at least up to the XIII century.²⁵

Different solutions are proposed: a) restore the ancient vestments, adopting those presently in use among the Chaldeans, because they belong to the authentic rite and were illegitimately abolished without sufficient reasons (according to the Commission and Bishop Gogu ); b) keep the Latin vestments, because their use is centuries old, because they are more comfortable and less heavy, much suitable in a hot country (according to the bishops); c) restore the ancient vestments and also the ancient chasuble, which is closed on all sides, not very dissimilar from gothic chasuble which is seen more in India and among the Latins of Malabar and also among the Syro-Malabars (according to Fr. Hambye).

The objection, based on large expenditure that would involve in sewing new vestments, is responded by allowing the use of existing vestments until they are damaged. The bishops, however, should provide good example by wearing the vestments of the rite immediately as suggested by Fr. Hambye.

There arises also the question of Latin mitre that the Malabar bishops use since there is an indigenous hierarchy (1896). Various solutions were proposed: a) suppress it, because it does not belong to

²⁴ [Cf. *Cahiers arch ologiques*, t. VI, 1952, p. 19, fig. 3 e *Konstantin der Grosse und seine Zeit, gesammelte Studien*, Friburgo 1913, p. 238].

²⁵ [Cf. J. Braun, *Die liturgische Gewandung*, Friburgo 1907, p. 149-247, especially pages 195, 234-239].

the genuine rite, according to the example of the new Ethiopian bishops and one of the Coptic bishops (according to the Commission) and be contented with the “masnafta”; b) retain the mitre, because all recognize a Catholic bishop in it (according to the bishops), but this is not accurate, because the Catholic Malankara bishops do not use the Latin mitre and some Anglican bishop use it; c) replace the Latin mitre with the Byzantine crown because of its Eastern form, apparently worthy and also aesthetic and because the Ethiopian bishops did so (according to Fr. Hambye and Fr. C. Korolevskij); d) replace the Latin mitre with a crown of Indian type (according to Fr. Placid).

5. The Sacred Vestments outside of Their Own Churches

The Commission was prone to grant the dispensation, solely by reason of convenience. Fr. Hambye opposes with strong protests to such concession.

Each rite is distinguished from others in its liturgical vestments and it is possible to restore the use of the vestments proper to the rite, but considering the fact that such restoration would provoke various difficulties, the following solutions could be evaluated:

1) prescribe the pure and simple use of liturgical vestments proper to the genuine rite, allowing the use of the current vestments until they are damaged;

2) prescribe the use of vestments proper to the rite, and tolerate the use of different vestments when one celebrates in a church of a different rite or generally because of grave inconvenience;

3) prescribe the use of the vestments proper and tolerate the phelonion of the Greeks (not that of Slavs) or the long gothic vestment of the Latins.

In the schema of CICO (can. 779, §§ 2, 4) we read the following provisions in this regard: “If in some places the liturgical vestments proper to the rite are absent, it is permissible to use the liturgical vestments of other Catholic rites, having removed however any

astonishment on the part of the faithful. In those rites in which the use of the proper liturgical vestments became extinct for whatever reason, the local Hierarch shall sedulously take care to restore them. It is desirable that the hierarchs agree among themselves in their episcopal bodies with regard to the restoration”.²⁶

6. The Sanctuary Veil

The existence of the veil of the sanctuary in more than half of the Malabar churches prove that the veil had a liturgical use, but today it remains always open and appears as an ornament at the entrance of the sanctuary.

Solutions proposed: a) restore the liturgical use of the veil everywhere, rigorously in the most solemn Mass called *Raza*, and in a mild form in other circumstances (according to the Commission); b) do not restore the use and do not introduce it where it does not exist because it does not correspond to the construction of the churches, and because it constitutes a fire-threat (according to the bishops); c) restore the liturgical use, but leave the veil open during the day so as not to hinder the devotion to the Blessed Sacrament (according to Fr. Hambye); d) leave the decision about the appropriateness of the veil that covers the sanctuary to the judgment of the local Ordinary; if the Blessed Sacrament is kept at a side altar, hang only there the veil, for consideration of the Eucharistic piety (according to Msgr. Gogué).

Being the sanctuary covered with the veil out of respect for the sacred place and especially for the celebration of the Eucharistic sacrifice, and for hiding the sacred species, but having to take into

²⁶ “Si in aliquo loco vestes liturgicae proprii ritus desint, aliorum ritum catholicorum vestibus uti licet, remota tamen fidelium admiratione. In ritibus in quibus usus propriarum vestium liturgicarum qualibet ex causa obsolevit, sedulo curet Hierarcha loci ut ille restituatur. Expediit autem ut Hierarchae de restitutione in collationibus episcopalibus inter se conveniant”. For the present norms, see CCEO canons 701 & 707.

account the habit of the faithful to see the sacred rites that are celebrated in the sanctuary, the following solutions are proposed:

1) keep the sanctuary always closed with the veil, except during liturgical celebrations, but when the most solemn Mass called *Raza* is celebrated, the instructions about the opening and closing of the sanctuary with the veil are to be observed;

2) keep closed with the veil only the sanctuary in which the most Blessed Sacrament is preserved;

3) permit the Ordinaries to determine the cases in which the sanctuary could be kept opened.

7. Communion under Both Species

The Communion “under both species” was the ancient use of the Syro-Malabar Church, as witnessed by Raulin: “The Eucharist under both species is given to all without any distinction”.²⁷ The annual letter of the Jesuit missionaries of the year 1581 enumerates among the errors attributed to the inhabitants of Angamaly also the following: “The custom of receiving Communion under both species”.²⁸

The Commission therefore proposes the restoration of that use, abolished without sufficient reason and without any authority. The bishops on the contrary do not want it for practical reasons: danger of pouring out of the consecrated wine, difficulty and long duration of the distribution of the Holy Communion, complication of the rite.

To these reasons Msgr. Gogu  adds a dogmatic one, that is, to affirm the doctrine that having the Communion under the species of bread alone is as valid as the Communion under both species.

²⁷ [*Historia Ecclesiae Malabaricae*, Roma 1716, 389]. Original Latin text: “Omnibus sine discrimine Eucharistia sub utraque specie porrigitur”.

²⁸ [Cf. A. Saulier and Hosten, *Letters from Malabar ... in Indian Athenaeum*, agosto 1923]. Original Latin text: “Mos recipiendi communionem sub utraque specie”.

In the Ordinary of the Mass (*Ordinarium Missae*) of the proposed Missal – in page 39 – the traditional way of giving Communion under both species, the consecrated bread and wine separately, is proposed. But in the attached *Ceremonial*, – in page 80, number 40 – two other ways are proposed: the very simple superficial intinction of the hosts with a little of the consecrated wine and then the distribution of Communion is exactly as if there is only the species of bread; then, according to the Byzantine model, which consists in the dipping in the chalice the extremity of the bread, prepared in elongated pieces, before giving it to the communicant. It seems that this number of the *Ceremonial* has escaped the attention of the bishops.

The Communion under both species is the rule in the Eastern rites, but in the *Ceremonial* three ways are provided in which it may be given: a) separately (as the priests do everywhere); b) dipping the end of the bread in the chalice at the moment of the Communion; (c) by steeping lightly in the Sacred Blood the upper side of the hosts inside or outside of the ciborium. Having these three possibilities, the questions could be responded:

1) the first way is obligatory in the Communion of the deacon at the solemn Holy Mass, in the Communion of the newly ordained starting from the lector, in the Communion of the spouses in the nuptial Mass; whereas in all other cases it is legitimate to adopt the two other ways;

2) leave freedom to use one of the three ways according to the will of the celebrant;

3) with due regard for the principle of Communion under both species, permit the Ordinaries to grant the faculty of Communion under one kind alone for serious reasons.²⁹

²⁹ [In the scheme of CICO (can. 816) approved by the Commission for the Revision of CICO we read in this regard: “Divina Eucharistia sub utraque specie praebetur, nisi in aliquo ritu praescriptum sit ut sub sola specie panis ministratur”].

8. After all this, the Eminent Fathers would like to know what was and what is at present the opinion of the Papal Representatives in India on the liturgical reform of the Syro-Malabar rite. The Most Reverend Excellencies the Apostolic Delegates who have succeeded one another in India and the present Apostolic Internuncio, without profoundly examining the concerned question in detail, but echoing the rather contrary opinion of the Episcopate, limit themselves to associate their voice to that of the bishops. It is enough to recall the words of His Excellency Mons. Kierkels on 16 December 1939: “As I had to report at that time, I immediately sent the decisions about the Pontifical to Msgr. Archbishop of Ernakulam, who in his turn assured me that he communicated it to his suffragans and expressed his adherence to the same. Since then, I did not know anything about it until the arrival of a letter that I enclose here with its faithful translation. With it Msgr. Archbishop returns to the matter and with old and new arguments pleads me to get the questions reconsidered [...]. Although some among the Malabars show themselves speculatively enticed of a kind of return to the pre-Menezian state, who has vision of the practical possibilities, as is certainly the Episcopate, even avoids the thought of such a return, of course without prejudice, it is understood, to due submission to the Holy See. It is true that the question of the Pontifical can be and has been considered separately; but the fact that it touches on a much broader historical process fills the Syro-Malabar Episcopate with apprehension. All this is said only to put the letter of the Archbishop in its context, so to speak, and to make it easier the evaluation of the effect of the question, as I had done previously according to the example of my predecessors. But if the Sacred Congregation considers the issue as closed, I do not intend to associate myself at all with the useless insistence from the part of the Hierarchy”.

And His Excellency Msgr. Lucas, Apostolic Internuncio, had this to say on 22 May 1954, in response to the communication of the Sacred Congregation about the establishment of a liturgical

commission for the reform of the Syro Malabar Rite: “When I was in Malabar recently I realized that the bishops seemed to know already that something of the kind was in the air and they expressed themselves unfavourably about the initiative. They would regret very much this renovation and they are convinced that it will do harm to the faithful. Personally I think that if we separate more the Catholics of the Syro-Malabar Rite from those of the Latin Rite, cooperation will become more difficult. Moreover, if the Syro-Malabar priests will be allowed to use the vernacular, the Latins from Malabar will ask for the same privilege. From the theoretical point of view, the idea of having this reform may be laudable, but the practical side of it may be very harmful”.

However, with the death of Metropolitan Msgr. Kandathil and the election of new bishops, the opinion of the Malabar Episcopate is gradually changing in favour of the reform, with due caution and with wide faculty to the bishops themselves to be able to dispense from the observance of more scabrous and difficult points. This is also evident from an investigation conducted by Fr. Placid of St Joseph, Carmelite Tertiary from Malabar and member of the Roman Liturgical Commission during the last summer holidays: he approached the individual Malabar bishops, explaining to them the scope of the reform. He received 6 written responses appearing in numbers XI-XVI of the Summary.³⁰ In a few words the Episcopate exposes its point of view about the reform initiated: in principle the bishops do not oppose, provided that this is done gradually, according to the possibilities and with power to dispense in particular cases.

After all this, now the Most Eminent Fathers are asked to be willing to express their authoritative judgment on the following Doubts:

³⁰ In this book documents 17-22.

1. Whether and with what restrictions the use of the Malayalam language can be permitted in the Malabar liturgy.

2. Whether it is appropriate and in what manner to restore the use of leavened bread.

3. Whether and on what conditions it is convenient to restore the use of original vestments within and outside of their own churches.

4. Whether and in what manner it is convenient to restore the Communion under both species.

5. Whether and with what limitations it is appropriate to restore the use of sanctuary veil.

6. Whether the vote (unanimous) of the Liturgical Commission that the Latin infiltrations should be eliminated from the Malabar Missal (for example, the two elevations after the consecration, the blessing of the candles and ashes ...) can be approved.

Document 24

Decisions of the Plenary Assembly of the Congregation for the Oriental Church concerning the Proposed Doubts

Rome, 27 May 1957; after the debate and discussions the plenary assembly of the Congregation unanimously responded to all the proposed doubts, thus approving the Syro-Malabar Missal prepared by the Roman Liturgical Commission. Since the six doubts are already presented above here only the responses are provided (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, Malabaresi-Liturgia: Revisione e Stampa del Messale Malabarese, Ponenza del 27 maggio 1957 [in Ponenze Anno 1950-1959], handwritten attached papers in Italian).

Response to 1: It is better to allow the use of the Malayalam language throughout the liturgy. For the canon (anaphora) two texts

must be kept: Syriac and Malayalam, granting the celebrant faculty to use one or the other text (as it is usual in the Eastern rites, for example in the Byzantine Rite).

Response to 2: The principle that the Chaldean rite prescribes the fermented (leavened) bread is to be affirmed, but permission should be given to use unleavened bread, having removed the wonderment of the faithful.

Response to 3: The following norm should be observed: if in any place the liturgical vestments of the proper rite are lacking, it is lawful to use the vestments of other Catholic rites, avoiding however the admiration of the faithful. In those places, in which the use of proper liturgical vestments, for whatever reason, has been fallen into desuetude, the local hierarchs should diligently take care to restore them. It is desirable that the hierarchs agree among themselves concerning the restoration in their episcopal meetings.

Response to 4: The Communion under both species, besides being affirmed as the norm desired by the rite, is to be practised in the solemn Liturgies at least in the following manner, touching (signing) the hosts with a host dipped in the chalice. It is recommended to give Communion under both species in the Liturgies of Holy Orders, including those in which minor orders are conferred and in the sacred rite of the marriage.

Response to 5: The liturgical use of the veil is to be re-established in the most solemn form and in the solemn sung form of the liturgy, but not for the simple form. A period of time is to be given to the bishops for the execution of the decision with prudence.

Response to 6: The elevation of the consecrated Host and the Holy Chalice shall not be removed, nor the blessing of candles on 2 February, nor the blessing and imposition of ashes. The last two sacred rites should be inserted in the Ritual (not in the Missal).

NB: The variants (differences) which are proper to the Chaldean rite in Malabar will serve to distinguish it from the same rite in the Chaldean Patriarchate (cf. Alexandrian, Coptic and Ethiopian rites).

Document 25

Request to Pope Pius XII for Approval of the Revised Missal

Rome, 21 June 1957; *Cardinal Eugene Tisserant, Secretary of the Congregation for the Oriental Church, requests the Vatican State Secretary to submit the decisions of the plenary meeting about the revised Syro-Malabar Missal for the approval of Pope Pius XII* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Malabaresi-Liturgia: Revisione e Stampa del Messale Malabarese, Ponzona del 27 maggio 1957* [in *Ponenze Anno 1950-1959*], typed attached paper in Italian).

Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, Prot. N. 947/48,

To His Most Reverend Excellency, Msgr. Angelo Dell'Acqua, Substitute of the Secretariat of State of His Holiness.

Most Reverend Excellency,

I am pleased to remit to Your Most Reverend Excellency the conclusions of the Plenary Assembly of this Sacred Congregation, held in the Vatican on last 27 May, with regard to two issues: the one concerning the revision and printing of the Missal for the use of the Syro-Malabar Church and the other on the situation of the Apostolic Exarchate of Asmara, with earnest request to be willing to submit them to the august approval of the Holy Father.

About the first question, for your information I must point out that the Liturgy of the Malabar Church has for the most part preserved its texts intact, corrected from a theological point of view. However in the course of time (some) customs and ceremonies inspired by the

Latin rite, have been introduced, which do not correspond to the practice of the original rite, which is Chaldean rite of Mesopotamia.

As the Sacred Congregation proceeded to the restitution of the original integrity of the rite practised by the Ruthenians, it has intended to do the same for the rite of the Malabar Church and the work done by the special Liturgical Commission was subjected to the examination of the Most Reverend Cardinals in the plenary session of last 27 May: the Cardinals in general have reaffirmed the principle that the Oriental rites should not be latinized; on the other hand, considering the fact that certain customs and ceremonies have been practised for a long time in Malabar, the Most Eminent Fathers were disposed to leave the Episcopate of Malabar a large initiative (margin) for the application, for which they should pay attention in their periodic conferences.

I avail myself of this opportunity, to express (the senses of) my deep respect and I remain,

Of Your Most Reverend Excellency, most devotedly in the Lord,
Eugene Cardinal Tisserant, Secretary.

Document 26

Approval of Pope Pius XII for the Revised Missal

Rome, 26 June 1957; *the Vatican State Secretary informs Cardinal Eugene Tisserant, Secretary of the Congregation for the Oriental Church, that Pope Pius XII has approved the resolutions of the plenary assembly and thus the Syro-Malabar Missal* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Malabaresi-Liturgia: Revisione e Stampa del Messale Malabarese, Ponenza del 27 maggio 1957* [in *Ponenze Anno 1950-1959*], typed attached paper in Italian).

Secretariat of State of His Holiness, N. 405261; Vatican, 26 June 1957.

To His Most Reverend Eminence, Lord Cardinal Eugene Tisserant, Secretary of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church.

Most Reverend Eminence,

Attentively fulfilling the desire of Your Most Reverend Eminence, I have had the honour of reporting to the Holy Father the conclusions of the Plenary Meeting of that Sacred Dicastery on the revision and printing of the “Malabar Missal” as also on the present conditions of the apostolic exarchate of Asmara.

You have been kind enough to let me know of these conclusions through the esteemed paper (file) Prot. No. 847/48, dated 21 of this month, and the reports attached to it.

I am therefore obliged to inform Your Eminence that the August Pontiff, having taken appropriate cognizance of what you have communicated, in the audience today has benevolently deigned to approve the resolutions of the aforesaid Plenary Meeting.

Bowing to kiss the sacred purple, I remain with sense of deep veneration,

Of Your Most Reverend Eminence, Most humble, faithful and obliged Server, Msgr. Angelo Dell’Aqua.

Section Six

PROMULGATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RESTORED SYRO-MALABAR MISSAL (1960-1962)

When the Syro-Malabar bishops were consulted about the proposed Missal, some of them suggested to the Oriental Congregation to set up a liturgical committee of experts in Kerala for the Malayalam translation of the Pontifical and other liturgical books. Cardinal Tisserant accepted the proposal and authorized Archbishop Parecattil, president of the Syro-Malabar Bishops' Conference, to form the committee. Thus the first liturgical committee or commission of the Syro-Malabar Church, charged with the translation of the Pontifical into Malayalam, was formed in 1958.

With the letter of 22 January 1958 Cardinal Tisserant asked Archbishop Parecattil to entrust the same committee with the integral translation of the Missal. A copy of the text emended in accordance with the resolutions of the plenary assembly of the Congregation was also sent (document 27). On 25 March 1958 Archbishop Parecattil informed Cardinal Tisserant about the formation of the liturgical committee in Kerala and the steps he had taken for the translation of the Missal (document 28).

In addition to the study edition of the Latin text of the *Qurbana* already printed in 1955, the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church published the *Ordo Celebrationis* (the *Order of Celebration*) in 1959.¹ In fact, the proposed Missal of 1955 already contained the Order of Celebration (pp. 70-91). This *Ordo* was updated and modified in accordance with the proposals and decisions of the plenary assembly, approved by Pope Pius XII and was published as a separate book. Moreover, an introduction was added, which provides

¹ Sacra Congregatio pro Ecclesia Orientali, *Ordo celebrationis Quddasa iuxta usum Ecclesiae syro-malabarensis*, Romae 1959.

instructions concerning the internal structure of the churches and liturgical vestments, as well as some additional rubrics (pp. 3-7). After the said introduction the *Ordo* contains detailed directives and norms for the celebration of the three forms of *Qurbana*: solemn form (pp. 8-24), simple form (pp. 25-29) and the most solemn form called *Raza* (pp. 30-37), as well as notes on bishop's *Qurbana* (pp.38-39), the prayers said by the Christian faithful (pp. 40-42) and liturgical calendar (pp. 43-70).

Moreover the Sacred Congregation published the *Supplementum Mysteriorum* (pp. viii + 267) in 1960, which contains the variable prayers, psalms and hymns for all Sundays and feast days (movable and immovable) of the liturgical year.² In the book promulgated by the Congregation for the Oriental Church, in addition to the readings, according to the Syro-Oriental tradition there are only seven variable items: psalmody, anthem of the sanctuary, *surraya* or responsorial hymn, *zummarra* or alleluia hymn, anthem of the mysteries, *onitha d'bema* or Communion hymn and *onitha d'bathe* or invitation to Communion.³ The preface of the Liturgical Commission for this liturgical book is presented as document 29, because it provides valuable information concerning the nature, content and extension of variable prayers in the East Syrian tradition.

On 12 May 1960 the Syriac *Taksa d'Quddasa*, containing the ordinary of the simple Mass with only the anaphora of Addai and

² Sacra Congregatio pro Ecclesia Orientali, *Supplementum Mysteriorum sive Proprium Missarum de tempore et de Sanctis iuxta Ritus Ecclesiae syro-malabarensis*, Romae 1960.

³ All other items which we find in the *Propria* of the Syro-Malabar Church published in 2005 (four volumes, 975 pages), namely priestly prayer after Our Father, *karozutha*, its concluding priestly prayer, two thanksgiving priestly prayers after holy Communion and the final blessing were added by the Synod. Thus, in addition to the readings there are 13 variable items for Sundays and feast days, which render the *Propria* impracticable. Consequently, according to the decision of the Synod 24 *Propria* prayers (one for each liturgical period and some important feasts) were selected and incorporated into the *Taksa* itself, which was published in 2011.

Mari, leaving out the second and third anaphoras, attributed to Mar Theodore and Mar Nestorius respectively, was published at Alwaye, with the imprimatur of Archbishop Joseph Parecattil.⁴ On 20 January 1962 the Congregation for the Oriental Churches issued the instruction, *De ritu Sacrificii Eucharistici instaurati*, addressed to the Syro-Malabar Hierarchy, by which instrument the new Syro-Malabar *Missal*, printed at Alwaye, was introduced into use (document 30).

Once the Malayalam translation of the text was completed by the liturgical committee in Kerala, the Order of *Qurbana* of the Syro-Malabar Church bearing the imprimatur of all the seven bishops was printed at Alwaye in 1962.⁵ The secret or private prayers of the celebrant, the inclination (*g'hanta*) prayers and the institution narrative are maintained in Syriac language, while the rest of the text is in Malayalam. The text contains the general instructions and the decisions of the Syro-Malabar bishops (pp. V-X), as well as the common Order of *Qurbana* and only the anaphora of Addai and Mari. At the end of the book, the entire Syriac text published in 1960 is also reproduced. The *Taksa* 1962 enshrines only the simple form of the *Qurbana*, although some special alternative prayers for Sundays and feast days are given; hence the solemn form and most solemn form were left out. In brief the entire approved text was not integrally reproduced in the 1962 *Taksa* as required by Cardinal Tisserant. At that time the variable prayers were also not adopted.

With the joint pastoral letter of 18 June 1962 (document 32) signed by all the seven bishops of the Syro-Malabar Church, they officially informed the faithful that the new *Qurbana* would be implemented on 3 July 1962, the feast of Apostle Thomas. The bishops briefly presented the *Qurbana*, underlining the great importance of the historic and happy event. Thus on 3 July 1962 by common accord and decision of bishops, the new *Missal* printed at Alwaye, in bilingual

⁴ *Taksa d'Quddasa*, Alwaye 1960.

⁵ *The Order of Qurbana of the Syro-Malabar Church*, Alwaye 1962.

edition, Syriac-Malayalam, and bearing the imprimatur of all the seven bishops officially came into force.

Document 27

Letter of Cardinal Tisserant concerning the Translation of the Restored Missal into Malayalam

Rome, 22 January 1958; *Cardinal Eugene Tisserant asks Archbishop Parecattil to entrust the committee formed in Kerala for the preparation of the Malayalam version of the Chaldean Pontifical also with the integral translation of the restored Missal* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi*, fascicolo IIIa; original in Italian).

Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, Prot. 947/48; Rome, 22 January 1958

To Most Rev. Msgr. Joseph Parecattil, Archbishop of Ernakulam,
Your Excellency,

In my previous letter of 4 January of this year, Prot. 871/49 regarding the Chaldean Pontifical, I pointed out to Your Excellency that “although Syriac remains the traditional liturgical language of Syro-Malabar rite, the Holy See intended to grant - within certain limits - the permission to use also Malayalam language both in the Missal and in the Pontifical as well as in other rites”. Therefore Your Excellency was asked to proceed to the constitution of a commission of specialists in liturgy and language, with the task of preparing the translation of the Pontifical into Malayalam. Your Excellency promptly responded on 16 January (no. 3/58) and ensured us that a commission would be composed, including a representative of each diocese, of the Carmelite Third Order, and of the Professor of Syriac in Alwaye (Seminary). While thanking you lively for your kind

communication, I am pleased to send to Your Excellency, the attached fascicle containing the “Ordinarium Missae” with some handwritten corrections, with the earnest request to submit it to the same commission mentioned above, so that they may see to its integral translation into Malayalam language (including the handwritten corrections) according to the instructions contained in the letter of 4 January concerning the Chaldean Pontifical. At present the Latin version of the “Proprium Missae” is being prepared for the printing. I think that the work will soon be ready in such a way that it be sent to Your Excellency for the same scope of translation into the Malayalam language.

All this precludes to the definitive printing of the Missal, for which the Sacred Congregation has been working since a long time, but about this I will provide you precise information in due time.

Cardinal E. Tisserant, Secretary.

Document 28
**Letter of Archbishop Parecattil regarding the
Committee to Prepare the Malayalam Version**

Ernakulam, 25 March 1958; *Archbishop Parecattil informs Cardinal Tisserant of the liturgical committee formed in Kerala for the preparation of the Malayalam version of the Chaldean Pontifical and the steps he has taken for the translation of the Missal. This document has great relevance since it provides details about the first liturgical committee of the Syro-Malabar Church (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi, fascicolo IIIa).*

From Most Rev. D. Joseph Parecattil, Archbishop of Ernakulam, No. 25/58, 25 March 1958.

To His Eminence Eugene Cardinal Tisserant, Secretary to the Sacred Oriental Congregation, Rome.

Your Eminence,

I beg to acknowledge receipt of Your Eminence's esteemed communication N. 947/48, dated January 22, 1958, and the amended form of the "Ordinarium Missae" with the direction that the Committee set up to prepare the Malayalam version of the Chaldean Pontifical should likewise prepare a translation of the Mass as well. I am glad to inform Your Eminence that the Committee had its first session on February 17, 1958 here at the Archbishop's House, Ernakulam and decided that two translations be prepared, one at the St. Joseph's Seminary, Alwaye and the other at the Dharmaram College, (The Carmelite Scholasticate), Bangalore. Both the institutions have willingly taken up the work. They are expected to finish at least the Ordination Service by June, when the Committee will meet again to examine the translations and make their choice with the necessary corrections.

The following persons are the members of the Committee:

Name and Surname	Diocese or Title
Very Rev. Fr. Mathew Vadakel	Always Seminary
Rev. Fr. Joseph Vithayathil	Ernakulam & Tellicherry
Rev. Fr. George Puthenpura	Palai
Rev. Fr. John Kunnappilly	Changanacherry
Rev. Fr. Jacob Adampukulam	Trichur
Rev. Fr. Varghese Maniatt	Kothamangalam
Rev. Fr. Abel T.O.C.D	Carmelite Congregation
Rev. Fr. Stephen Muthukattil	Kottayam

I am glad to learn that the “Proprium Missae” too will be ready shortly.

In this connection I may inform Your Eminence that the Prelates of the Syro-Malabar and Syro-Malankara Hierarchies have nominated another Committee to prepare a Malayalam summary of the Canon Law “De Personis” and formulate the details of the “jura particularia” relating to the Syrian Church of Malabar. The Committee met three times here at the Archbishop’s House, and have presented their reports to the Bishops. A special meeting of Syrian Bishops’ Conference was held on 22nd instant here at Ernakulam to examine the report and to discuss ways and means of implementing the Law. They have already written a Joint Pastoral to acquaint the clergy and the faithful of the various aspects of the Law which comes into force on the 25th instant.

Humbly thanking Your Eminence for Your Eminence’s paternal solicitude in the well-being and progress of the Malabar Church and kissing Your Eminence’s ring with profound veneration,

I beg to remain,

Your Eminence’s most humble and obedient servant,

Archbishop of Ernakulam.

Document 29

***Supplementum Mystriorum* or *Propria* of Holy Qurbana: Preface of the Roman Liturgical Commission**

Rome, 1960; *the preface of the Liturgical Commission provides us with precise information concerning the nature, content and extension of the variable prayers and hymns which ensure a rich variety in East Syrian Qurbana* (Sacra Congregatio pro Ecclesia Orientali, *Supplementum Mystriorum sive Proprium Missarum de tempore et de Sanctis iuxta Ritum Ecclesiae Syro-Malabarensis*, Romae 1960, V-VIII; original in Latin).

In the celebration of the Eucharistic Sacrifice the Syro-Malabars have always used the anaphora of the Holy Apostles Addai and Mari for the “Ordinary of the Mass”. It seems that the decree of the Synod of Diamper, which prescribed the use of Roman Mass in private celebration, was never put into execution.⁶

If they have always preserved the “Ordinary of the Mass” of the proper rite, the same cannot be affirmed with regard to the “Propria of the Mass”. In the Missal printed in Rome in 1774, besides the anaphora of the Holy Apostles Addai and Mari (namely the Ordinary of the Mass), nothing is seen except the epistles and gospels taken from the Roman Missal and arranged according to the liturgical calendar of the same Roman Missal. However, the “Propria of the Mass” of the Syro-Chaldean rite and also of the ancient Syro-Malabar rite consists of four readings and ten hymns distributed in this order:

1. *Marmitha*, namely a part of the Psalmody (2, 3 or 4 psalms) which is sung in the beginning of the Mass. The genuine rite uses ten *marmyatha*, of which the Malabars have preserved only three, one to be sung in the ordinary Mass, while the second and third in *Raza* (an

⁶ Cf. Synod of Diamper, Session V, part 2, decree 4.

example is given in Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, p. 253).

2. *Aqqaptha* and *Unnaya*: are vesicles of a certain psalm, which are immediately added to the aforementioned *marmitha*. Among the Malabars they endured the same fate as the *marmyatha*.

3. *Onitha d'qanke* or anthem of the sanctuary is a hymn of one strophe, which is repeated twice and concluded with "Glory be to the Father", following the second strophe. Its origin is the processional hymn, analogous to the "entrance" of the Roman Mass, which was sung while the clergy transited through the church to the *bema* or ambo, where they remained during the time of the Mass of the catechumens. For each Mass there is proper *onitha d'qanke*. The Syro-Malabars have preserved only one, which they use only in the celebration of *Raza* (cf. Brightman, op. cit., pp. 253-254).

4. Two readings from the Old Testament, one from the Law and the other from the Prophets: They vary for each Mass. The Syro-Malabars read only one and this too only in the *Raza*. Vatican Syriac Codices 2 and 3, written in Malabar in 1558 are respectively the Book of Law and the Book of the Prophets according to the traditional use.

5. *Surraya* is constituted from a psalm or part of a psalm and is similar to *prokeimenon* of the Byzantine rite and *gradual* of the Roman rite. The hymn, sung after the second reading of the Old Testament, varies (for each Mass). The Malabars use it as they use the readings of the Old Testament (cf. Brightman, op. cit., p. 256).

6. *Turgama* before the epistle is a hymn, in which the powerful effects of the predication of St Paul are praised. This does not belong to the ancient literary compositions. There are many turgamas (as it is seen, 18 or 20), of which the Malabars use only one for the celebration of *Raza* alone. The Chaldean Catholics completely leave out *turgama*.

7. Epistle is taken only from the epistles of St Paul. The Malabars abandon their ancient Epistle-lectionary together with the liturgical calendar and for this part simply follow the Roman Missal. Vatican

Syriac Codex 22 written in the city of Cranganore in 1301, hands over the pericopes of St Paul and the calendar according to the ancient use.

8. *Zummara* is taken from the psalms and is similar to the alleluia vesicle of other rites. The Malabars sing it only in *Raza* (a sample in Brightman, op. cit., p. 257).

9. *Turgama* before the Gospel, about it what is stated regarding the *turgama* before the epistle is to be said (a sample in Brightman, op. cit., p. 259).

10. Gospel endured the same fate as that of the epistle.

11. *Onitha d'Evangelion*: during the summer-period the clergy in Mesopotamia do not go to the *bema*, but to the main hall outside of the church, where they celebrate the Mass of the catechumens. After concluding this, they go in procession to the church, during which is sung this *onitha* after the Gospel. It does not seem that this practice existed in the Malabar Church. Therefore the Malabars do not sing this *onitha*, nor does it seem convenient to put it into use now (a sample in Brightman, op. cit., p. 261).

12. *Onitha d'Raze* or Anthem of the mysteries: formerly this was sung while the clergy went back from the *bema* to the sanctuary, but now while the priest offers the bread and wine. This is different for each Mass, but the Malabars use only one. However in *Raza* they sing another hymn while the priest performs the great prostrations in the middle of the church (sample for the first in Brightman, op. cit., pp. 267-268, for the second in pp. 269-279).

- Hymn of fraction: an example of this hymn can be found in Brightman, op. cit., p. 290, and also in Menezian Mass (cf. A. De Gouvea, *Jornada ...*, in appendix). Today it is completely obsolete both among the Chaldean Catholics and among the Malabars.

13. Canon "You are terrible" is sung while the priest receives the Holy Communion, but only on days of major festivities. The Syro-Malabars completely omit this canon.

14. *Onitha d'bema* or antiphon of the ambo: it is called like this because the singer of this hymn stands at the ambo. This is sung while the priest and the clergy receive the holy Eucharist in the sanctuary and the faithful approach to the Communion. This hymn varies for each Mass, but the Malabars make use of only one (example in Brightman, op. cit., p. 298 and 299).

From the four readings the Syro-Malabars retain only two, but in *Raza* three; however these pericopes do not pertain to the proper rite. They always omit all the variable hymns altogether, except in the celebration of *Raza*; even in it they utilize the same text, having abandoned the other texts which vary according to the cycle of the liturgical year.

The Chaldean Catholics collected all these variable parts or "Propria of the Mass" in the book which they called: *Proprium Missarum de Tempore et de Sanctis* in Latin, but *Supplementum Mysteriorum* in Syriac. They published it in Mosul in 1901.

The members of the liturgical Commission translated the said book into Latin and accommodated (adapted) it to the use of the Syro-Malabars in the following manner: 1) all the *onyatha* after the gospel, rogations after the Manifestation of the Lord, indications concerning the third anaphora, *tesbohta* after the Communion, *karozwatha* given in appendix, rite of genuflection on the day of Pentecost, some feasts (for example, St Hormizd, St Papa (sic) and the rest of the Catholics, St Eugene, Visitation of the Blessed Virgin Mary to Elizabeth) have been omitted; 2) some feasts have mutated their location in the calendar (for example, St Gregory); 3) many feasts of saints with relative variable prayers have been added in the calendar.

Document 30
**Promulgation of Syro-Malabar Missal: Instruction of
 the Congregation for the Oriental Church *De Ritu
 Sacrificii Instaurato***

Rome, 20 January 1962; *in this Instruction De ritu Sacrificii Eucharisticii instaurato, addressed to the Syro-Malabar hierarchy, the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church briefly refers to the liturgical reform in the Syro-Malabar Church, started with the restoration of Pontifical and proceeded with that of the Missal. Then the Congregation reproduces the directives and norms decided by the plenary assembly of the Congregation and approved by Pope Pius XII, on the basis of the observations and proposals of Syro-Malabar bishops* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 955/65, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi, Riforma*, fascicolo I; original Latin text in appendix).

Having been moved by the assiduous solicitude that worship, which the Holy Church renders to God, the Creator of all things, be conducted worthily and devotedly everywhere, the Supreme Pontiff Pius XI of happy memory decided that for the Malabars the Pontifical compiled according to their genuine rite should be published. The words which he said in the apostolic letter *Sancta Dei Ecclesia* of 25 March 1938 should not be overlooked, namely: “If some people, compelled by too great a love for unity and concord, since they did not sufficiently know the nature and realities of Orientals, endeavoured to corrupt their rites or to reduce them to the Latin rites, the Roman Pontiffs, our predecessors, opposed these endeavours as far as possible and spared no efforts” (AAS 1938, 154).

After a long study, often interrupted by war, under the care of the Sacred Congregation the first edition of this Pontifical in the Chaldean language was finally produced in 1957, accompanied by a booklet

entitled “Ordo persolvendi ritus Pontificales juxta usum Ecclesiae syro-malabarensis” which was to provide an explanation and directives.

However, in order to accomplish complete liturgical restoration long ago, the same Sacred Congregation entrusted to its own Commission for liturgical affairs the task of reforming the Missal for the use of Malabars. After examining the matter in the plenary assembly of the Most Eminent Fathers, with the approval of the Supreme Pontiff Pius XII of venerable memory, granted on 26 June in the same year (1957) three books were published: the first one entitled *Taksa d'Quddaša*, printed in Chaldean (Syriac), contains the Ordinary of the Mass (*Ordinarium Missae*), with the anaphora of Holy Apostles Addai and Mari; the second one in Latin, entitled *Ordo Celebrationis Quddaša iuxta usum Ecclesiae syro-malabarensis*, regulates (recounts) the three forms of celebration, and the third book, also in Latin, is entitled *Supplementum Mysteriorum sive Proprium de Tempore et de Sanctis iuxta ritum Ecclesiae syro-malabarensis*. The purpose of this last book is to restore to the celebration of Mass the calendar of the rite and the variable hymns that fell into desuetude, as well as the readings from Sacred Scriptures which are proper to the rite.

Taking into account the observations made by the bishops of Malabars on the matter, the Most Eminent Fathers, all things having been duly considered, also established norms for properly introducing reform, which the same Supreme Pontiff has accepted and ratified. The norms are as follows:

1) The use of the Malayalam language, as it is called, is permitted in the entire Divine Liturgy (holy *Qurbana*); the anaphoras, however, shall be printed in Chaldean (Syriac) and in Malayalam with permission being granted to the celebrant to use the one or the other.

2) Without prejudice to the principle of the Syro-Chaldean rite of using leavened bread, permission is given to use unleavened bread, avoiding however the consternation of the faithful.

3) If in any place the liturgical vestments of the proper rite are not available, it is lawful to use the vestments of other Catholic rites, avoiding however the consternation of the faithful. In those churches, in which the use of proper liturgical vestments, for whatever reason, has fallen into desuetude, the local hierarchs should diligently take care to restore them.

4) According to genuine rite, the Holy Eucharist should be offered to the faithful also under both species. This norm will be adhered to in the solemn Divine Liturgy and in the most solemn Liturgy called *Raza*, as described in numbers 50-53 of the “Ordo Celebrationis”. It is highly recommended that in special circumstances such as the conferral of ordination and the celebration of marriages the Divine Eucharist should be given under both species, as described in numbers 50-51 of the same book.

5) The use of the sanctuary veil is to be resumed in the most solemn Divine Liturgy, which is called *Raza*, and where the practice exists, in the solemn Divine Liturgy as well.

The Reverend Bishops should consult with one another about this matter in their episcopal assemblies and should assiduously determine all things in order to arrive happily at a uniform manner of celebrating the Divine Liturgy in all churches.

It will be very useful, if the Lectionary will be printed without delay, with passages from the Old Testament, the Epistles and the Gospels, in accordance with the norms given in “Supplementum Mysteriorum seu Proprium Missarum”. Before that, however, the same Reverend Bishops should consider, as regards the passages from the Old Testament, whether the translation into Malayalam is to be made from the Pšitta text or rather from the Hebrew text. Until the lectionaries of the Epistles and Gospels are published, the biblical readings are to be taken from the books which are now in use and according to the calendar contained therein.

With regard to the introduction of the use of the restored Missal, this Sacred Congregation has decided to propose the following norms:

1) To those who have been ordained to the priesthood before the restoration of the new Missal, permission is granted to celebrate the Divine Liturgy according to the previous custom, until the bishops provide otherwise.

2) In either minor or major seminaries, as well in colleges of scholastics and in houses of novices the Divine Liturgy is to be celebrated according to the restored Missal as soon as possible.

While instructing the faithful about the new prescriptions for the celebration of the Divine Liturgy, the solicitude of the Apostolic See for preserving all the Oriental rites in their original and genuine majesty should be opportunely illustrated, and that it does not hesitate even to reform the Roman rite as has been recently done in the restoration of the Holy Triduum and in the promulgation of a new code of rubrics.⁷

Given in Rome, from the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, on the twentieth of January in the year of our Lord 1962.

Archbishop Gabriel Acacius Coussa, Pro-Secretary,

John Baptist Scapinelli, Assessor.

⁷ With the general decree of the Congregation for Rites the *Restored Order of Holy Week*, approved by Pope Pius XII was published on 16 November 1955, which began to be used from the Holy Week of 1956 [*Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 47 (1955) 838-847]. On 25 July 1960 Pope John XXIII approved the new code of rubrics of the Roman Breviary and Missal, and prescribed its observance from 1 January 1960 [*Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 52 (1960) 593-729].

Document 31

Syro-Malabar *Qurbana* 1962: General Instructions and Decisions of the Syro-Malabar Bishops

Always, 1962; at the initial part of the *Order of Qurbana of the Syro-Malabar Church* we find two sections of directives and norms, which are respectively entitled: the matters to be generally known concerning the *Order of Qurbana* and decisions taken by Kerala Suriani Bishops' Council concerning the restored *Order of Qurbana*. An English translation of both of these items is provided, considering their historical importance (*The Order of Qurbana of the Syro-Malabar Church*, Always 1962, pages V-X; original in Malayalam).

A. Matters to be Generally Known concerning the Order of *Qurbana*

1. The bread and wine are to be prepared on the *bethgazzas* set on both sides of the altar. If *bethgazzas* are absent, small tables may be used in their stead. If this is also inconvenient, they may be prepared on both sides of the altar. But if the altar is too small or if sufficient ministers are not present or if there is any other inconvenience, the bread and wine can be prepared on the right side of the altar itself.

2. The use of incense is needed only when there are at least two ministers to assist the priest. It is not obligatory to use it if there are other inconveniences, even if two ministers are present. If the incense is not used, the prayers and ceremonies related to it can be omitted.

3. The use of sanctuary veil between the Sanctuary and *Questroma* also may be omitted if there is an adequate reason.

4. Whenever there is mention in the *Taksa* to 'hold open the hands' or 'stretch out the hands', the celebrant does so in such a way that the hands do not reach above the head, the elbows do not touch the body, and the palms are opened up.

5. Whenever the celebrant recites the *g'hantha* prayers, he bows down a bit stretching forward his hands in a supplication form without lifting them up, and keeps the palms half-closed.

6. If it is not specifically said, how the hands should be held, the celebrant is free to keep them on the altar, clasp them on the bosom or keep them down.

7. While making the sign of the cross on himself, the celebrant first places his right hand on the forehead, then moves it down to his chest, and then moves it to the right shoulder and finally to the left shoulder.

8. The celebrant and the ministers kneel down only for the '*Kushapa*' that begins with "Lord, Lord" (page 27) is recited.

9. If there is no minister to read the *Engarta* (Epistle), the celebrant himself reads it standing at the right side of the *Questroma*, facing the people.

10. Since there are separate books for the readings, the *Taksa* must always be placed on the altar at the right side of the celebrant. The book for the *Evangelion*-reading must be placed on the right side of the altar.

11. In this *Taksa*, the order of distributing Communion under both species separately is given in Syriac language. However, if the Communion is distributed under both species together or in the species of bread alone, the following order must be followed.

a) When the Communion is distributed in two species together: the celebrant bows down after receiving the Holy Blood and blesses the people saying: "May the grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ who gives us life, be made perfect in us through His mercy". He bows down again and holds the chalice in the left hand and keeps the paten in the same hand holding it with the thumb and middle finger. Then he goes to the gateway of *Qanke* and distributes Communion taking the Holy Body with his right hand and dipping it in the rest of the Holy Blood

saying: “May the Body and Blood of Christ be unto the forgiveness of sins (debts)”.

b) When the Communion is distributed under the species of bread alone: according to the order given in page 40, with the part of the Holy Host dipped in the Holy Blood he signs the part of the Holy Host on the paten and then the small Hosts consecrated during the same Holy Mass (there is no need of taking out the Hosts that are preserved in the tabernacle and signing them like this). As soon as he receives the Holy Blood, the celebrant bows down and blesses the people reciting the prayer which begins with, “May the grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ [...]”. He bows down again and goes to the gateway of *Qanke* and distributes Holy Body without dipping it in the Holy Blood. When only the Holy Bread is distributed in this manner also, he is to say: “May the Body and Blood of Christ be unto the forgiveness of sins”.

12. In this *Taksa*, wherever it is written ‘response’, the faithful are to recite the prayers. When the faithful are not reciting them, the minister has to recite them. The celebrant prays aloud all those prayers to which the faithful are to respond.

13. The feasts of Our Lord are usually known as ‘*Maranaya Thirunal*’. However, some other important feasts are also given the same name. The days we celebrate the memory of the saints are generally called *Dukrana* and other days celebrated in a solemn manner are called *Ede* or feasts (*Thirunalukal*). The ‘ordinary days’ are those on which we do not celebrate the memory of any saint.

14. In the *Taksa* mention about the north side of the sanctuary or altar is made with the supposition that the church is built facing westward. Even if the church is facing to any other direction also, the right side of the sanctuary or altar must be considered as north side.

B. Decisions Taken by Kerala *Suriani* Bishops' Council concerning the Restored Order of *Qurbana*

The rubrics (instructions) regarding the celebration of the restored Order of *Qurbana* according to the Syro-Malabar Rite are given in the *Taksa*. Common instructions are given in the beginning and particular ones are inserted at the proper place. However, besides them, certain things that are to be known for practical purposes for the time being are given below:

1. The simple *Qurbana* may be celebrated in Malayalam or in Syriac. However it is better (recommended) to celebrate it in Malayalam on those occasions when many (a greater number of) people participate. Until the separate Lectionary is ready, the Epistle and Gospel readings according to the *Qurbana* calendar may be read from any authorized translation of the Sacred Scripture (Pšitta). Even when the *Qurbana* is celebrated in Syriac, it is better to read them in Malayalam.

2. There are references in some parts of the *Taksa* about certain special prayers (*Propria*) that are to be recited alternatively on each day. They will be ready only with the Lectionary. Hence, for the time being it is enough to recite only that are present in the *Taksa*.

3. There should not be made any modification in the translation of the prayers in the *Taksa* without the special permission of the *Suriani* Bishop's Council. The episcopal permission is necessary also for the re-printing of *Taksa*, Lectionary and *Qurbana* text for the faithful.

4. According to the new Order, the instructions regarding the places to prepare bread and wine for the *Qurbana*, the use of incense, and the order of distributing Communion are given in the *Taksa*. But considering the temporary (particular) circumstances and for the sake of uniformity the following methods are to be followed:

i) There is no need of using incense for the simple form of *Qurbana*. The prayers related to it can also be omitted.

ii) It is enough to prepare the bread and wine at the right side of the altar.

iii) Even though leavened bread is to be used according to the Chaldean Syrian Rite, it is permitted to continue the present use of unleavened bread.

iv) It is enough to distribute the Communion only under the species of Bread. But on all the consecrated Hosts of each *Qurbana*, sign of the cross must be made by the part of the Holy Host dipped in the Holy Blood. It is better to give Communion under both species on special occasions like priestly ordination, marriage etc.

5. Those who celebrate the restored *Qurbana* may impart the blessing given in the Holy Mass to the newly married couple, at the end of the *Qurbana*.

Document 32

Joint Pastoral Letter of the Syro-Malabar Bishops about the Restored Missal

Kerala, 18 June 1962; *in this joint pastoral letter regarding the restoration of liturgy, the archbishops and bishops of the Syro-Malabar Church explain the nature, significance and relevance of the restored Order of Qurbana. The last part of the letter provides information about the new major seminary in Kottayam. Obviously this pastoral letter was read in all the parishes of the Syro-Malabar Church* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Liturgia-Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi*, fascicolo II; original in Malayalam).

Dear Reverend Brethren, Beloved Children,

As you all know some restoration works are going on in our Syro-Malabar Rite with regard to the order of liturgical celebrations. Consequently, a renewed Pontifical was published four years ago. The Holy See has given us permission to use Malayalam language in liturgical ceremonies so that the faithful can also understand them. In accordance with this principle, the ordination-rite has already been implemented in Malayalam language. As a result in that sacred ceremony the faithful could participate more fruitfully. But now a more important procedure is going to be adopted, which will immediately affect all the faithful. It has been decided to implement our restored *Qurbana* in Malayalam. Through this joint pastoral letter we announce the good news that it will be inaugurated on 3 July, namely on the commemorative feast day (*Dukrana* feast) of our Father Apostle Mar Thomas. It may take some time to implement it in all the churches. Nevertheless, the Holy See has recommended (directed) that as soon as possible the new Order of *Qurbana* must be implemented in all the seminaries and houses of priests (scholasticates). All the Christian faithful are obliged to duly comprehend the significance and

necessity of such procedures, which are decided and implemented by the Holy See according to some common principles for the greater glory of God, the growth of the Church and for the benefit of the souls, accepting them with due obedience and participating in them fruitfully. Although it is not possible to treat this matter in a comprehensive manner, we would like to bring to your attention some important points that all should know.

The rites, which originated in the Christian Church at the very beginning and which in the course of time have grown into perfection, primarily belong to six groups, namely Antiochian, Alexandrian, Latin, Byzantine, Chaldean, and Armenian (traditions). The diversity of Rites does not diminish the unity of the Church; on the contrary it is a glorious ornament that augments the splendour of the Church. It also expresses the antiquity of the Church. In one of his discourses in 1853 Pope Pius IX stated as follows:

“Since we have received almost all the rites from the Fathers of the Church, they all deserve special esteem by reason of their antiquity. They all should be preserved and respected [...]. Our predecessors well understood that by means of these external signs the immaculate spouse of Christ expresses her amazing diversity, which does not hinder the unity of the Church in any manner. The Church, crossing the frontiers of nations, embraces all peoples and races, as well as unites them in one faith, though they are different in language, customs and rites”.⁸

For this reason, the ideal of the Church is to preserve different rites faultlessly. That is why the Church requires that each rite should unfailingly be maintained without eliminating its particularities. This does not mean to keep the rites in a static state without allowing them to grow. Every rite and liturgy must grow according to the times. Adoration is the external manifestation of man’s obligations to God. It

⁸ No reference is given in the original. I have not yet succeeded in tracing the discourse of the Pope from elsewhere.

could be called the natural influx of innate sentiments saturated in the hearts of humans. Therefore, the liturgies in their form, nature, language, costumes, symbols and celebrations must gain timely growth. The Church supports, desires and encourages such changes.

However, the Church does not approve innovations, additions and imitations that are not in accordance with the structure and nature of the proper rite. This official position of the Church is seen very clearly in the venerable writings and proposals of the Popes. In 1743 Pope Benedict XIV in his apostolic letter to the Greek Church, *Demandatum Coelitus*, says: "What we order commonly regarding the liturgy and rituals of the Greek Church is that, first of all, no one, either patriarch or a bishop whoever he may be, should not change or innovate anything that may hinder the correct and perfect celebration of it". The same thing is evidently elucidated in the encyclicals of Popes, namely, *In Suprema Patri Apostolici* (1848) of Pius IX, *Praeclara Gratulationis* (1894) and *Orientalium Dignitas* (1894) of Leo XIII, *Orientalis Ecclesiam Dei* (1923) of Pius XI and *Orientalis Ecclesiae* (1944) of Pius XII. In the past in many places numerous unwarranted changes were made with regard to the rites precisely because this position of the Church was not adequately comprehended and implemented.

From ancient times the Kerala *Suriani* Church observed the Syro-Chaldean rite. It is also called as East Syrian rite, Mesopotamian rite or Persian rite. The Chaldean rite has many well-known characteristics. Since the primitive Jerusalem Church used Syriac language, it has very close relation with the Hebrew traditions and Scriptures. In addition, the city of Edessa, from where the Chaldean rite took its origin, was a famous centre for theological and scriptural studies in the first centuries. Edessa was also the centre of Semitic culture which was equal to the Greek and Roman cultures. Since it grew in such an atmosphere, the Chaldean-Syrian rite thoroughly reflects an eastern cultural aptitude. This is our ancient rite. But in the XVI century, when we were under the rule of foreign Latin bishops, our rite also

underwent certain changes. If we make a historical study of the proceedings of the Diamper Synod and the consequential happenings, we can understand the reasons and motivations behind the changes that are present in the liturgy we use now.⁹ In the course of time, only after the Kerala *Suriani* hierarchy was instituted, we obtained a suitable opportunity for the restoration-efforts of our rite.

The Holy See took the initiative for the endeavours of restoration in order to keep the Syro-Malabar rite in its pristine purity. At the time of Pope Pius XI, when there arose a problem regarding the preparation of a Pontifical for the Syro-Malabar Church, the Holy See itself appointed a Commission of experts for restoring the Pontifical used in the Kerala *Suriani* Church in early times. The Pontifical restored by the efforts of that Commission was approved in 1939 by the Pope. But because of the circumstances of war, its printing was impossible then. It was a Commission appointed by Pope Pius XII in 1954 that completed the work of the Pontifical and published it in 1957.¹⁰ A commission jointly appointed by all the *Suriani* dioceses of Kerala is continuing its translation into Malayalam. The part pertaining to the Ordination was already translated and implemented in 1960. The rest of the work is in progress. The next effort of the Roman Commission was to restore the rite of Eucharistic liturgy (*Qurbana*); in 1958 this was also completed. The Kerala Commission has already completed its translation also. This restored Mass (*Qurbana*) has been decided to be implemented on 3 July, on the *Dukrana* feast day of our father Apostle Thomas.

⁹ With regard to this, see Introductory Article One and my book, *The Eucharistic Liturgy of the St Thomas Christians*, already cited several times in this work.

¹⁰ This may be a misunderstanding of the bishops. The Commission constituted in 1954 (cf. document 1) did not work on the Pontifical, which had been ready many years ago, though its printing and publication were delayed.

Dear Reverend Brethren and Beloved Children,

On this auspicious occasion of the implementation of our restored liturgy, especially the Order of Holy Mass, all should know the common principles and features of this rite. According to the new rite there are three kinds (forms) of the Holy Mass: 1) ordinary *Qurbana* (simple form), 2) solemn *Qurbana* (solemn form) and 3) most solemn form (*Raza*). The first one, that is, the simple *Qurbana* alone is being implemented now in Malayalam. We believe that this new Order of *Qurbana* will be helpful to bring all meaningfully closer to the Holy Mass of the altar. Every Holy *Qurbana* offered on the altar is the same sacrifice our Saviour offered for us at Golgotha. This offering is at the same time the supreme adoration of God, thanksgiving, reparation for sins and prayer. Every faithful who takes part in it should understand clearly this reality and participates in it actively and devotedly. Every faithful who participates in it also offers the sacrifice being united with Christ, the Eternal Priest and with the priest, his representative. The more this awareness becomes lively in each one, the more fruitfully one can participate in the Holy Mass. Therefore, making use of this opportunity granted by the Holy See to celebrate our Eucharistic liturgy in Malayalam to the maximum level, enthusiastically strive to fructify the holy sacramental life in us. We exhort that, together with the implementation of this liturgy, reverend vicars must endeavour to furnish detailed information regarding the Holy Mass and holy sacramental life to our faithful and provide facilities enabling them to co-operate in it effectively. The Mass-books for the use of the faithful also have already been made ready. After learning the prayers and hymns, as a community the faithful should pray and sing aloud during the *Qurbana* along with the celebrant and the deacons (ministers or servers). The reverend parish priests must make arrangements for training the faithful for this in each parish.

In the Holy Mass according to the Chaldean-Syrian rite there are three parts: initial or pre-anaphoral part, sacramental or anaphoral part, and final or post anaphoral part. The initial part is also called the

Qurbana of the catechumens. The restored *Qurbana* is not very different from the Order of Mass presently in use. But according to the technical core principles of the rites, the changes that came into it in the interim period are obviated. The location of a few prayers and rubrics are changed. The new *Qurbana* is more similar to the order of *Raza* now in force among us, because in the *Raza* many modifications were not made during the intervening period. The prayers and rubrics that were copied from the Latin rite are given up. We will not see the practice of genuflection with one knee alone in the new *Qurbana*. The holy vestments are also different. But for the sake of convenience permission is granted to utilize the vestments that are presently in use. When the new vestments are prepared they must be made according to the new Order. All will be accustomed with such kind of changes in the course of time. What is most beneficial in the new Order is that since the prayers and readings are mainly in Malayalam, people can participate in the Holy Mass, comprehending their meaning.

We are going through (overcoming) a big transition period with regard to our liturgy. The Holy See has kindly granted us all favours and assistance to restore the ancient orders of our rite and, by introducing reforms in them in accordance with the exigencies of the time, to bring the spirit our of Christian living to perfection. Therefore let us strive to gain clear and fruitful knowledge about our rite and liturgy and to put into practice the ideals and desires of the mother Church in our sacramental life. It is not possible to implement all the reforms related to the Rite together; and that will not be desirable (preferable) either. In accordance with the directives of the Holy See, let us strive to make progress (in the said reforms) with childlike love and total obedience.

Dear Brethren and Beloved Children,

Before the conclusion of this pastoral letter, we would like to inform you of another happy news. It is about our new seminary. The bishops were seriously considering the ways to foster the ever growing

vocations in Kerala Church by the special grace of God. By the kindness of the Holy See we have got one more seminary. The St Thomas Apostolic Seminary which is under construction at Vadavathoor in Kottayam, will be started on 3 July. It may take some more time to complete all the construction works of the building and to conduct a solemn inauguration ceremony. Nevertheless, we make use of this occasion to inform you of the beginning of this great institution and to ask your sincere prayers for the success of its activities.

Wishing you a happy feast of the *Dukrana* of our father and Apostle Mar Thomas, we heartily bless all of you in the name of the Father ✠ and of the Son ✠ and of the Holy Spirit✠.

- ✠ Joseph Parecattil, Archbishop of Ernakulam,
- ✠ Mathew Kavukatt, Archbishop of Changanacherry,
- ✠ George Alapatt, Bishop of Trichur,
- ✠ Thomas Tharayil, Bishop of Kottayam,
- ✠ Sebastian Vayalil, Bishop of Palai,
- ✠ Sebastian Valloppilly, Bishop of Tellicherry,
- ✠ Mathew Pothanamoozhy, Bishop of Kothamangalam.

Document 33
Letter of Archbishop Parecattil to the Oriental
Congregation concerning the Implementation
of the Restored Missal

Ernakulam, 14 July 1962; *from this letter written after the implementation of the new Missal it results that the priests and the people peacefully received the reformed Missal and that there were some complaints only about the duration of the Mass and the omission of some feasts* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Liturgia-Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi*, fascicolo IV).

Most Rev. Dr. Joseph Archbishop Parecattil, Archbishop of Ernakulam, No. 48/62, 14 July 1962.

To His Eminence Cardinal A. Coussa, Secretary to the Sacred Oriental Congregation, Rome.

Your Eminence,

In continuation with my letter dated March 16, 1962 and with reference to the Instructions of the Sacred Congregation subsequently received in regard to the liturgical reform, I beg to submit the following.

A Conference of the Syro-Malabar Bishops was held here again on June 7, 1962 and the draft of the Joint Pastoral and practical directives to be issued by the Ordinaries of the Syro-Malabar rite was approved.

The liturgical reform has come into effect on July 3rd, 1962 and a good many priests have already begun celebrating the new mass.¹¹

¹¹ This is really surprising; this demonstrates also that the clergy generally accepted the reformed *Qurbana*, before they were provoked by responsible hierarchs. It is noteworthy that the reformed text was obligatorily prescribed only for those who were ordained after 1962.

Although the people have whole-heartedly welcomed the introduction of the vernacular in the liturgy, there is a complaint from their part that the new mass takes much longer time than the former one. There is also a complaint from the part of the priests who feel that the rich variety of feasts to which they have hitherto been accustomed is missing in the new calendar. I have told them all that it is still possible to shorten the mass and amplify the calendar after getting due permission from the Sacred Congregation.

I am saying the new mass daily, which I find more appealing, as I am now able to enter more deeply into the spirit of the sacrifice, following the meaning of the prayers in a more intelligent manner.

I hope Your Eminence has already received the new Missal, which I had asked Father Chavely of Alwaye to send to the Sacred Congregation by Air Mail. Now under separate cover per Air Mail, I am sending a copy each of the following publications:

- 1) The Joint Pastoral letter;
- 2) The new calendar;
- 3) The booklet for congregational use.

I have also made arrangements for 50 copies of the Malayalam Missal and 100 copies of the booklet for congregational use to be forwarded to the Sacred Congregation per surface mail.

I am grateful to Your Eminence for sending 1000 copies of the 'Ordo Celebrationis Quddasa' and 20 copies of the 'Supplementum Mysteriorum'. They have been distributed to the different Ordinaries in due proportion, taking into consideration the number of priests in each diocese.

In due course I will be submitting an account of the expenses incurred for the work of the liturgical committee, etc., over and above the amount realised by the sale of the books,

Now I am trying to get the prayers for the consecration of the church translated into Malayalam.

A new edition of the Malayalam Missal will be needed soon and it will conform strictly to the norm 1 of the Instructions. The present Missal was given to the press before the Instructions were received.

Humbly thanking Your Eminence for the keen interest you take in the Malabar Church and kissing Your Eminence's ring with profound veneration,

I beg to remain, Your Eminence's most humble and obedient servant,

Joseph Parecattil, Archbishop of Ernakulam.

Section Seven

RESTORED SYRO-MALABAR MISSAL: ATTEMPTS FOR MODIFICATIONS, PETITIONS AND LAMENTATIONS OF LAYMEN

Since most of the complaints against the restored Missal seem to be made by laymen (not women), we briefly indicate the probable reasons. In the ancient times the Christian faithful of the Church of St Thomas Christians jealously preserved, enthusiastically promoted and convincingly enhanced the law or way of Thomas, uninterruptedly transmitting it to the future generations. In order to protect the way of Thomas the lay people even acted against their own priests. From the very beginning the foreign missionaries believed that the best means to westernize the St Thomas Christians was to train Latin priests from among them. For this purpose, the first seminary or college was founded in Cranganore by the Franciscan missionary Fr Vicente de Lagos in 1541. As Prof. A. M. Mundadan states:

The purpose of the college was definitely to form an indigenous clergy intensely Latin in everything and through them to Latinize the whole community in attitude, in jurisdiction and rite.¹

In this seminary, financed by a royal subsidy and voluntary contributions, the number of St Thomas Christian seminarians varied from 70 to 100. With regard to the nature of the training given in the seminary, the same author writes:

The training was evidently in accordance with the purpose the founder and others had in mind when they started the college: Latinization. There is little evidence as to any attention being given to the maternal Rite of the students. All the books and religious articles, etc., which Vicente desired to get from the King for the college was designed to

¹ A. M. Mundadan, *History of Christianity in India*, 329.

mould the young minds of the students in the Latin spirit and shut out any Oriental influence. Not only was the Latin theology taught there but no liturgy other than the Latin one was taught and practised; and all the priests ordained in that college seem to have learned only the Latin Mass.²

Initially the seminary or college seemed to have been a great success since it produced a great number of well-trained and learned Western clergy, but an utter failure with regard to its purpose, namely the Latinization of the St Thomas Christians, because they did not permit such Latin priests to reside or celebrate in their churches. The Portuguese historian Antonio De Gouvea affirmed:

The Christians did not refuse to give their sons to bring them up in the college, but neither of the teaching to their sons nor of the priesthood would they ever take benefit, because none of those who were being brought up in the college in the Latin rite were admitted to perform in their churches, much less to reside in them, nor were they allowed to do anything to make change in their rites and were treated no more like the other Latin priests, whom, when they went to their churches, they protected and allowed to perform.³

The St Thomas Christians admitted foreign Latin priests and even permitted them to celebrate in their churches as guests, but expelled the St Thomas Christian Latin priests from their churches, since they abandoned the law of Thomas, the Syriac language as well as the Eastern liturgy and spiritual heritage. As Antonio De Gouvea himself indicated, these St Thomas Christian Latin priests went to the Latin diocese of Cochin and hence the seminary at Cranganore served only to bring up the sons of the St Thomas Christians as priests and parish-priests of the churches in the diocese of Cochin.⁴ With regard to this

² A. M. Mundadan, *History of Christianity in India*, 337.

³ A. De Gouvea, *Jornada do Arcebispo de Goa Dom Frey Aleixo de Menezes*, 6; P. Malekandathil (ed.), *Jornada of Dom Alexis de Menezes*, 30.

⁴ A. De Gouvea, *Jornada do Arcebispo de Goa Dom Frey Aleixo de Menezes*, 6-7; P. Malekandathil (ed.), *Jornada of Dom Alexis de Menezes*, 30-31.

question Francis Ros SJ, the first Latin bishop of the St Thomas Christians, completely agreed with Antonio De Gouvea. After briefly describing the reasons for the rejection of the St Thomas Christian Latin priests by the Malabar parishes, Ros remarked in 1604:

And because the priests formed by the said Religious were of the Latin rite and they tried to change these customs, these priests could not simply be posted anywhere in the Serra (Malabar) till now. Thus the said seminary of Cranganore has been the seminary of the diocese of Cochin until now, providing many good clerics of the Christians of St Thomas who have always administered the churches of the diocese of Cochin. But none of them has got settled in the Serra till today [...]⁵

Even Francis Ros, the first Latin bishop of the St Thomas Christians, failed to appoint any of the Oriental Latin priests in his diocese, because of the opposition of the lay people, including the parents of those priests.

After the failure of the Franciscan missionaries to westernize the St Thomas Christians through the priests trained in the Latin rite at the Seminary in Cranganore, it became evident to all that the only means to achieve the goal was to train Latin priests of the St Thomas Christians in Syriac language, erecting a seminary in Malabar itself, as the Jesuits had done at Vaipicotta in 1581.⁶ From numerous instances, only one is presented here, in order to demonstrate the attitude of the lay people concerning the Syriac liturgy, way of Thomas and the Eastern spiritual heritage at that time.

⁵ F. Ros, “*Relação sobre a Serra*”, 341.

⁶ For more information about the seminary, see D. Ferroli, *The Jesuits in Malabar*, vol. 1, Bangalore 1939, 166-167; J. Thekkedath, *History of Christianity in India, Volume II, From the Middle of the Sixteenth Century to the End of the Seventeenth Century*, Bangalore 1988, 57-58; cf. also the Letter of Alessandro Valignano, dated 12 December 1584, to the Jesuit General Claudio Acquaviva, in Roma, Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu, *Goa-Mal.* 13, f. 212; *Documenta Indica*, vol. 13 (1975) 593.

A simple glance at the history of the Catholic St Thomas Christians proves the objective and incontestable fact that from the time of the appointment of Latin bishops after the Synod of Diamper in 1599, they always and without any interruption desired bishops of their own rite, because they wanted episcopal liturgical celebrations in their own East Syrian or Chaldean rite. The schism of Chaldean Bishop Rokos (1861-1862) demonstrates that their attitude did not mutate even towards the last period of Western governance. In spite of the threat of excommunication published by Vicar Apostolic Bernardino in all the churches and the strenuous efforts of the saintly and most influential priest of Malabar, Kuriakose Elias Chavara who also sent a circular letter to all the churches prohibiting to receive any Chaldean bishop, the vast majority of the priests and the faithful followed Rokos, not because they preferred “Chaldean blood”, but only because they desired to have episcopal liturgical celebrations in their own East Syrian or Chaldean rite.⁷

However, the ideological position of the clergy and the faithful changed after the appointment of native bishops (1896), who from the very beginning manifested a hostile mentality towards East Syrian liturgy and Eastern heritage in general. Immediately after the consecration of the first three native bishops, during their first meeting itself they unanimously decided to adopt the Tridentine Roman Pontifical for the Syro-Malabar Church, instead of the Chaldean or East Syrian Pontifical.⁸ Perhaps the Syro-Malabar bishops, though they were directly placed under the Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff in their quality as vicars apostolic, were inordinately and unreasonably afraid of being subjected to the Chaldean Patriarch, if they had followed the Chaldean rite.

⁷ For full details and documentation, see P. Pallath, *Rome and the Chaldean Patriarchate in Conflict: Schism of Bishop Rokos in India*, Changanacherry 2017.

⁸ See documentation in P. Pallath and J. Kollara, *Roman Pontifical into Syriac and the Beginning of Liturgical Reform*, 25-28 & 46-49; cf. Introductory Article Two, no. 4.

In any case what the Western bishops and missionaries failed to realize during about three centuries of their governance, the Syro-Malabar bishops easily achieved within a short period of time: since they were of the same folk, it seems, they inadvertently indoctrinated the vast majority of the clergy and the faithful, inculcating in them a strong antipathy against the East Syrian or Chaldean rite, for the protection of which their forefathers had suffered excommunications, expulsions, ecclesiastical censors, schisms and divisions, as well as indescribable psychological pain and even physical harassment. The petitions and complaints of the laity against the restored liturgical books should be evaluated in this particular historical and ecclesial context.

Although against the contrary position of Syro-Malabar bishops already on 1 December 1934 Pope Pius XI decided to restore the Chaldean Pontifical for the Syro-Malabar Church, for various reasons the typical edition could be published only in 1957 and gradually began to be used for ordinations only in 1960. The Syro-Malabar bishops, who used the Tridentine Latin Pontifical for about 64 years, really loved it and a divorce appeared to be devastating and painful. The bishops were accustomed to the rites and ceremonies of the Latin Pontifical, while the Chaldean Pontifical, unfamiliar to them, appeared to be strange, retrograde and ludicrous. Although the lay faithful did not understand Latin, they watched the ceremonies as mere spectators and gradually became familiar with them. In brief two liturgical books, the restored Pontifical and Missal were almost simultaneously catapulted to the clergy and faithful of the Syro-Malabar Church, who were really unprepared for their reception, because the bishops, generally hostile to restoration, failed to educate them “along genuine liturgical lines”, as required by Cardinal Tisserant already in 1954.⁹

Notwithstanding this, gradually the great majority of the clergy and the faithful began to appreciate the reformed liturgy, because they

⁹ Cf. Document 2.

could understand the episcopal ceremonies and the Holy *Qurbana* celebrated in Malayalam, which were previously conducted in Latin and Syriac respectively, turning the faithful into dumb spectators. At the time of the introduction of the restored Missal in 1962 there were 1.416.321 Christian faithful, 1151 diocesan priests and 376 religious priests in the Syro-Malabar Church.¹⁰ Documents preserved in the archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches attest that less than 100 lay people (only two woman) signed the petitions prepared by one or two instigators (hence they cannot be considered as mass memoranda) and less than ten priests wrote against the new Missal. This demonstrates that more than 99 percent of the clergy and the faithful were either indifferent or favourable to the new Missal.

Naturally the first attempts for the modification of the restored Missal were made by the bishops and not by the clergy or laity. Just three months after the partial implementation of the Missal, the Syro-Malabar bishops, who reached Rome for the opening of the Second Vatican Council (11 October 1962), held a conference there on 18 December 1962, during which, according to Archbishop Parecattil, “a consensus of opinion was arrived at on the portions of the readings, prayers that could be dropped and actions or gestures that could be omitted. A schedule of these items was also prepared by us”.¹¹

After the return from Rome, on 27 January 1963 Archbishop Parecattil sent a circular letter to all the Syro-Malabar bishops suggesting that a meeting of the Bishops’ Conference be held to consider sending a joint letter to the Oriental Congregation regarding the changes to be made in the revised text in the light of the reactions of the priests and the faithful. With regard to the agenda Parecattil stated:

I had included in the agenda the following subjects. 1) Shortening of the duration of the Mass 2) improving the language of the text 3) Rituals 4)

¹⁰ See Introductory Article Two, no. 1.

¹¹ J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, 51.

Calendar 5) the formulation of poses to be adopted by the faithful during Mass 6) hymns during Mass.¹²

The scheduled meeting was held at Kottayam Seminary on 28 February 1963, but no conclusive decisions were taken. In continuation of the deliberations at Kottayam, the Syro-Malabar bishops met in Rome on 27-29 October 1963 on the occasion of the further sessions of the Second Vatican Council;¹³ on 27 October 1963 a petition signed by all of them was submitted to the Oriental Congregation (document 34).

With the decree of 3 December 1963 the Congregation for the Oriental Church provided for some amendments, omissions and abbreviations (document 35). The Congregation permitted especially the shortening of *marmitha* (only one psalm enough), *karozutha* until the end of the preparation of gifts, biblical readings (5 to 10 verses), as well as the omission of some prayers and repetitions. After these two documents, in this section we present the main petitions and lamentations of laymen against the restored Missal, the response of Prof. Alphonse Raes, president of the liturgical commission, which prepared the text, and a few letters favourable to reform.

¹² J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, 52.

¹³ Sessions of the Council were convened each autumn in Rome (October-December) until the work of the Council was completed on 8 December 1965.

Document 34
Joint Letter of Syro-Malabar Bishops to the
Congregation for the Oriental Church Requesting
Modifications in the Order of *Qurbana*

Rome (Collegio Damasceno), 27 October 1963; *the Syro-Malabar bishops gathered in Rome submitted this petition to His Eminence Gustao Testa, Secretary of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, requesting the shortening of the restored Mass, omission of some prayers and repetitions as well as modifications in some rubrics* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi*, fascicolo V).

His Eminence Gustao Cardinal Testa, Secretary to the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church.

Your Eminence,

We, the Archbishops and Bishops of the Syro-Malabar Rite, beg leave to present to Your Eminence our humble request for the shortening of our restored Mass when celebrated in Malayalam, and for the introduction of some changes in the rubrics of the Mass as such.

As Your Eminence knows, the restored Mass was formally introduced into our Church on the 3 July 1962, with the obligation for the future priests to say it, those ordained before that date, however, remaining free to adopt it or not. Permission also was given to celebrate the restored Mass in our vernacular Malayalam, thereby making it possible for the faithful to take a more active and intelligent part in the Liturgy. But experience has shown that the Malayalam Mass takes a much longer time than the Syriac Mass, not only because, from the linguistic point of view, Malayalam lacks the brevity of expressions which is characteristic of Syriac, but also because congregational responses with pauses naturally make the service longer, though more appealing and edifying. On an average a

congregational Mass in Malayalam will take at least 45 minutes. When the passages now kept in Syriac are also rendered into Malayalam, the Mass will become still longer. On the other hand, the conditions of modern life, the exigencies of the homily, Benediction etc., and the great number of Communion to be distributed demand that the time for the Low Mass, as a rule, shall not exceed 30 minutes. As for the rubrics and gestures, there are a few, to which the priests find it difficult to adapt themselves. So in the light of the practical difficulties experienced and of the opinions expressed by the clergy and the laity, we request permission to introduce the following changes in the Mass.

I. The following prayers and actions may be omitted when the Mass is celebrated in Malayalam. (The references are to the pages of the Malayalam Missal and the prayers are indicated in their Latin equivalent):

1. Page	2. Lines	Prayers
2	15-21	(Both inclusive) Repetition of "Pater Noster".
4	10-end	"Laudate Dominum...".
5	1-3	The continuation of the Psalm.
7	5-7	"Gloria Patri...".
9	11-15	"Christus te reddat..." (Benedictio sufficit).
12	18- end	"Misericordem Deum...".
13	1-8	Continuation of the 'Kazozutha'.
18	26-31	Response. " Edent pauperes..".
20	24-27	"Cum cordibus puris...".
23		The three kisses in the middle of the Altar and sides, after the kisses at the extremities of the Altar.
33	1-10	Server's portion: "Elevate oculos...".
34	10-19	"Benedic Domine.." with the response.
37	1-13	Psalm
38	12-16	Repetition of the prayer: "Benedic Domine...".

43	9-end	“Per quem denudasti...”.
50	16-21	“In nobis qui sumpsimus...”. Repetition of “Pater Noster”.

(ii) All Repetitions at the beginning, middle or end of Malayalam passages.

II. Since in their daily life, the people are accustomed to begin every action and especially prayer, with the sign of the Cross, it is requested that the priest may begin the Mass with a sign of the Cross, saying: “In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti” and the people responding “Amen”.

III. Permission is also requested to make the sign of the Cross from left to right as we were accustomed to do for the last three and a half centuries and more. The Catholics of the Latin Rite and of the Syro-Malankara Rite and the Jacobites make the sign of the Cross from left to right. The same is the case with the Catholics of several other Oriental Rites, including the Chaldean Rite. Moreover, if in liturgical services the practice of the signing from right to left is introduced, eventually it will have to be adopted also in the ordinary prayers and the faithful will hardly appreciate it. Apart from that, in our secular and Sunday schools, catechism classes are attended by the children of the three different Rites. To teach the sign of the Cross in two different fashions according to their Rite will be a difficult and delicate task. The same difficulty and delicacy will be experienced also by the teachers in the schools conducted by the Latin and Syro-Malankara Catholics with regard to the Syro-Malabar students. Hence for the sake of uniformity and for avoiding undue emphasis on the difference between the Rites even in such matters as the sign of the Cross, we are of opinion that the practice of signing from left to right be kept up. It may also be noted that this way of signing is more constant with the Indian mentality.

IV. Regarding the manner of holding the hands joined during the Mass, the opinion prevalent in Malabar is that it is better and more edifying to keep the palms and fingers joined against one another, which is the Indian way of saluting and of showing veneration. Hence an option may be given in this respect removing the prohibition given in the “Ordo Celebrationis ‘Quddasa’ iuxta usum Ecclesiae Syro-Malabarensis”: “...non autem ante pectus disponuntur applicando palmam ad palmam et digitos ad digitos” (page 7. Number 11. Lines 4-6).

V. It will be more practical to keep the Missal on the left side of the priest in order to give more freedom of movement on the right side. Though according to the *Ordo Celebrationis Quddasa*, the priest can take water and wine from either side of the altar, experience has shown that it is difficult to do so from the left with the right hand, having the chalice in front. Hence it is preferable to have water and wine served always from the right. In this case the position of the Missal on the right side of the priest makes it difficult to move the chalice to the middle. When the altars are small, as is the case in many churches and religious houses, there will hardly be place for both the Missal and the Chalice on the same side.

We have enumerated above some of the important changes which the priests have suggested, owing to the practical difficulties they and their flock have experienced, and which we as pastors feel must be introduced most urgently in order that the new Liturgy may be better appreciated and more widely used.

Thanking Your Eminence for the keen interest You take in the affairs of our Church and kissing Your Eminence’s ring with profound veneration,

We beg to remain,

Your Eminence’s humble and obedient servants,

✠ Joseph Parecattil, Archbishop of Ernakulam,

✠ Mathew Kavukatt, Archbishop of Changanacherry,

- ✠ George Alapatt, Bishop of Trichur,
- ✠ Thomas Tharayil, Bishop of Kottayam,
- ✠ Sebastian Vayalil, Bishop of Palai,
- ✠ Sebastian Valloppilly, Bishop of Tellicherry,
- ✠ Mathew Pothanamoozhy, Bishop of Kothamangalam.

Roma, Collegio Damasceno,

27 October 1963.

Document 35

Decree of the Congregation on the Celebration of *Quddasa* in the Syro-Malabar Rite

Rome, 3 December 1963; *in response to the aforementioned letter of the Syro-Malabar bishops, with this decree the Congregation for the Oriental Church permitted some abbreviations and omission of repetitions, but did not grant the other requests, initial sign of the cross, sign of the cross from left to right and other modifications in the rubrics* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi*, fascicolo V; Latin original as appendix II).

Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, Prot. 947/48,

Decree on the celebration of *Quddasa* in the Syro-Malabar Rite.

Having considered the requests submitted by the venerable Malabar bishops on 22 October of current year (1963), after rightly and thoughtfully examining everything, the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church has decreed to mutate the following items from the norms in the *Ordo Celebrationis Quddasa iuxta usum Ecclesiae syro-malabarensis* (Rome 1959) in this manner.

To number 15 should be added: “but it is permitted to sing the first psalm only from the *marmitha*”.

To number 25 the beginning is to be mutated thus: “when the minister sees that the priest has completed the preparation of the offerings, he says, if time urges, the last petition: ‘our souls ...’, then the veil of the sanctuary is opened”.

To number 38 after the words “he requests prayers to the brethren in a moderate voice”, should be added: “or after the deacon has said: ‘pray in your minds; peace be with you’, without the addition, the priest pronounces the prayer in a loud voice: ‘Lord, God Almighty, receive this oblation...’; but he recites the following prayer: ‘Lord Our God, according to your mercy...’ in a submissive voice; then the prayer to the brethren is requested in a moderate voice, and only the ministers respond with these words: ‘Christ hear your prayer, Christ accept your sacrifice’”.

To number 39 is to be added: “or only the first verse of the psalm, mercy on me ...”.

To number 45 is to be added what is already present at number 70, 6): “to the *karo-zutha* the minister sings: ‘let us all with fear’...until ‘and true faith’, then immediately adds: ‘in the hope of penance...’ and the faithful respond. In the meantime the priest says the prayer: ‘blessed are you...’ until ‘and you have given us immortal life’, and he concludes the final doxology of this oration”.

Moreover these two are to be noted:

1) Wherever in the Syriac text the rubrics prescribe that some words should be repeated by the priest in the beginning and end of some orations, in the Malayalam version the repetition of these words are to be omitted.

2) If the prescribed readings of the Sacred Scripture are really too long, it is permitted to reasonably shorten them, that is according to the sense of the sentences or narrations, in such a way that the reading is

protracted only to five verses, but shall not exceed much more than ten verses.

Given in Rome, from the Office of the Congregation for the Oriental Church, on 3 December 1963.

Cardinal Gustavo Testa, Secretary,

John Baptist Scapinelli, Assessor.

Document 36

Letter of a Priest and a Layman from Kanjoor to Pope Paul VI Requesting Him to Revoke the Reformed Missal

Kanjoor, 1 November 1963; *this letter addressed to Pope Paul VI is written in the name of the priests and laymen of the Syro-Malabar Church, but it is signed only by one priest and a single layman, who do not even claim to belong to any association. The letter should be considered as the private initiative of the aforementioned two signatories, although they misleadingly pretend to be representatives of the Syro-Malabar Church. In this letter they practically ask the Holy Father to abolish the reformed Missal and to introduce a Malayalam translation of the Mass already in use* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 955/65, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi, Riforma*, fascicolo I).

May it please Your Holiness,

We the priests and lay men of the Syro-Malabar Rite most humbly beg to submit the following grievances for Your Holiness' benign consideration and favourable decision:

1) We are Syro Malabarians by Rite from the year 1601 and we were having this Rite with joy, devotion, honour, love and with great spiritual benefit from the time when Bishop Francis Roz S.J., was appointed as our first Latin Bishop. He was an eminent scholar of Syriac and a great friend of the Syrians. Under his guidance and help

in consultation with and cooperation of the then ecclesiastical leaders, the Mass in the Syro Malabar Rite was formed, from the old Chaldean Mass, removing whatever were objectionable and untimely from it and taking whatever were necessary and acceptable from the Mass of the Roman Rite. And that was and is our Mass in the Syro Malabar Rite for the last four centuries.

2) When His Holiness Pope Pius XI of happy memory established our Syro Malabar Hierarchy in 1923, His Holiness confirmed the same as our own by the Bull.¹⁴ This Mass and liturgy were quite enough and we were proud of it. It contains different kinds of Masses and its high mass is very grand, its songs very melodious and its ceremonies very beautiful and devotional. We have also a special High mass named Rasa of five priests which has meaningful and impressive ceremonies.

3) This, our Syro Malabar Rite is dynamic and it symbolizes the development of the religiosity of the people. It has all the rubrics natural and conducive to the devotion of the people.

4) But very recently according to the New Liturgical Movement an opinion was growing among some of us that our Mass must be translated into the vernacular, namely Malayalam, our mother tongue, as far as possible. We were not against it. But we were under the impression that the same Mass which we were saying for the last four centuries, was going to be translated into Malayalam with the most necessary correction and modification, except of course the most important portions such as the consecration words etc., in Syriac.

5) But to our great surprise and sorrow, on 3 July 1962, our Venerable Hierarchy introduced a quite new Mass without any previous information¹⁵ and even an attempt to know whether the

¹⁴ The apostolic constitution *Romani pontifices* of Pope Pius XI, establishing the the Syro-Malabar hierarchy contains nothing about the Mass. *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 7 (1924) 257-262; P. Pallath, *Important Roman Documents*, 206-219.

¹⁵ This happened because despite the invitation of Cardinal Tisserant in 1954 to educate the clergy and the faithful “the Venerable Hierarchy” did nothing in that line.

priests and people who were using the real Syro Malabar Mass would welcome it or not. And the Mass introduced in the name of restoration, is the old Chaldean Mass, which has only a very antique untimely, unstriking and unimpressive ceremonies and rubrics which were not at all helping the devotion of the faithful. This will only impede the devotion and force us to go backwards, as it has already proved. Liturgy is a growing organism. But the old Chaldean Mass which is imposed on us does not give us any progress. To celebrate our real Syro Malabar Mass, we were using the beautiful and modern Roman Rite Vestments. But the Mass vestments introduced are very old and most inconvenient Chaldean Rite vestments, which we dislike very much and do not at all appreciate.

We, therefore disapprove and dislike the new translation of the Chaldean Mass now introduced and most humbly request your Holiness to cancel the order sanctioning the same and to introduce a Malayalam translation of the Mass of the Syro Malabar Rite. Craving Your Holiness' Paternal and Apostolic blessing which we and our families kneel down to receive,

We beg to remain,

Your Holiness' most obedient and devoted Children in Christ Our Lord,

Fr. Sebastian Koikara, Forane Church Kanjoor, Kerala State, South India,

Dr. Thomas J. Nedumthally (signed for laity).

Document 37**Letter of Chevalier Joseph Pettah and Other 61 Laymen from Trichur to the Oriental Congregation Requesting It to Rescind the Reformed Missal**

Trichur, 20 November 1963; *the petitioners from Trichur town and surrounding areas request the Congregation to repeal the reformed Missal and Pontifical and to maintain the “Syro-Malabar Rite” sanctioned by the Synod of Diamper in 1599. From the educational qualifications and positions of the petitioners indicated with their names it is evident that none of them had any competence in theology, liturgy or in other ecclesiastical sciences. At that time even catechism was not systematically taught as today. Many items indicated by them do not belong to the official liturgy of the Church, but are anti-Protestant pious practices and popular devotions originated in the Western Church after the Council of Trent. Most of the gestures, postures and liturgical actions which the petitioners wanted to maintain were taken from the Roman Missal 1570, which were altered or abandoned in the post Vatican II Roman Missal published in 1970. The history of the Syro-Malabar Church has already proved that none of the catastrophic cataclysms predicted by the authors of the letter really occurred (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 955/65, Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi, Riforma, fascicolo I).*

To the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church.

Subject: The Syro-Malabar Rite and Liturgy: Recent changes made therein (sic).

Having come to understand that the recent changes introduced into the Syro-Malabar Liturgy will come up for consideration and finalization before the closing Session of the Second Vatican Council; and considering that, before the new ‘reforms’ were ordered to be implemented, we, lay men of the Syro-Malabar Church, have had no

chance afforded us to express our views or make any representation on a matter like this with which we are closely connected; most respectfully do we place before you the following facts, with the humble prayer that they may receive your gracious consideration before the new 'reforms' were ultimately finalized and duly perpetuated.

1) For the last 360 years we have been following the Syro-Malabar Rite and Liturgy. We have been quite contented and happy over it. No request or representation for a change has so far been made from the side of the Catholic faithful, except that occasionally a stray voice has been raised for the vernacularisation of the services. What even these few individuals wanted was a Malayalam medium, without any change whatever in matter or manner, in inner substance or outward form. It is thus evident that the recent changes introduced into the Liturgy of the Syro-Malabar Rite were not in response to any request made or desire expressed by the Catholic faithful.

2) It is a patent fact that among the Eastern Rites within the fold of the Catholic Church, the Syro-Malabar Rite holds the pride of place in point of general progress, educational advancement, vigour, vitality and fullness of religious life and spiritual devotion, as well as loyalty and attachment to the Holy See. And in fairness it must be admitted that this happy result has been brought about mostly by our close contact, for the last 300 years, with the West and with the broadening and progressive trends of evolution in the Latin Rite. The reservation of the Eucharist in the Tabernacle and frequent visits to the Blessed Sacrament: the solemn exposition of the Blessed Sacrament for public adoration; the 'Corpus Christi' and the Eucharistic processions, and the consequent intensity and fervour of the devotion to the Blessed Sacrament; the invocation of "the Mother of God"; the *Angelus*, morning, noon and night; the Marian Sodalties and Legion of Mary; the Franciscan Third Order, the Vincent De Paul, and other religious associations, the Confraternities attached to almost every Parish; the Way of the Cross, and the penitential devotions of the Holy Week – all

these and much besides were unknown to our forefathers before Diamper, and would not have been ours now, had we continued rigidly and obstinately in their path. The present state of affairs among our non-Catholic brethren holds out a pointer to the dangers we have been saved from the benefits and blessings we have gained, on account of the new path we adopted after Diamper.

3) The Syro-Malabar Rite dates from 1600 A.D., and has been with us, without a break, and without a hitch or friction, for the last 360 years.¹⁶ Where is the need now to go back upon it and re-introduce the now obsolete and antiquated practices which were in vogue among our forefathers during the days of the Nestorian contact? Their re-introduction would serve no useful purpose at all, but at the same time draw us more towards the Nestorians and away from the Latin Catholic and Western influences which have been so beneficial to us in every way. In fact the Nestorians of Trichur have already begun to exult over what they look upon as a humble admission, on the part of the Catholics, of their past “errors” and a return to the “unerring” and “apostolic” Nestorian practices.

4) To refer briefly to a few details; let us take the new Mass. What do we gain by keeping the Missal all along on the right side without shifting it to the left after the reading of the Epistle, except that we can thereby do away with the time-honoured and generally accepted distinction between the Epistle and the Gospel sides of the Altar? Again what useful purpose does it serve to receive the wine and the water, and to wash the hands, on the left side, instead of on the right as has been the practice so far; and still again, to substitute the cumbersome cope for the more convenient, simple and symbolical vestments used for the Mass till now? These and other similar innovations, while they do not at all help either to increase our

¹⁶ It seems that the proponents of the petition did not know the history of the St Thomas Christians since 1600: conflicts, schisms, divisions and the splintering of the community into different groups. They even forgot the Rokos schism (1861-1862) and Mellus schism (1874-1882).

devotion or improve our understanding, have at the same time the adverse effect of giving a Nestorian colour to the ceremony of the Mass.

To make the matters doubly worse, many of the deplorable changes now introduced are psychologically calculated to militate against the respect and reverence, the awe and veneration we cherish towards the Holy Mass and the Eucharist and the discipline and decorum we are accustomed to maintain within the Church, such for instance, are 1) the Omission of the Sign of the Cross at the beginning of the Mass and other religious services; 2) the discontinuance of genuflection before the Blessed Sacrament, and of kneeling even during the Elevation of the Sacred Host; 3) the receiving of the Holy Communion standing; 4) the long responses made during the Mass by the Congregation in common, which, while helpful to some extent in the beginning towards the participation of the people in the service, would in course of time sink into a mechanical medley productive of confusion and irreverence; 5) the omission of the 'Agnus Dei' in the Mass, and of the concluding prayers for the Church and the faithful etc.

We also find that the 'reforms' have substituted new passages from the Bible for the Epistles and Gospels, in place of the time-honoured passages selected by the Universal Church and used so far in the Syro-Malabar Liturgy. We fail to realise that the new selections are in any way an improvement upon the old.

The Liturgy of the Syro-Malabar Mass, till now in vogue, works up in solemn significant stages through the preface and the Canon to the great climax of the Consecration, immediately preceded by an impressive blessing and incensing of the faithful, which prepares them for the supreme moment. Then comes the elevation announced by triple ringing of bells; and the faithful, reverentially looking up to the Sacred Host held aloft by the Priest, fervently exclaim with St Thomas, 'My Lord and My God'. There is a pervading atmosphere of

reverential awe, a certain pomp and majesty, about it all, aptly befitting the great Sacrifice of the Son of God on Calvary.

But, with the recent innovations, all this awe and reverence, all this majesty and grandeur has totally disappeared. The consecration comes up imperceptibly and almost abruptly, giving the faithful but little chance to prepare themselves for ‘saluting the Saviour’. Indeed it would seem that the innovators did not want to give unique importance to this central supreme Event of the Mass, which fact is borne out by the printing of the words of the consecration in the new Missal in ordinary type, and not in bold outstanding letters as has been done in the old Missal. Again, the giving up of the use of the ‘corporal’, the opening out of the thumb and the forefinger for free use immediately after holding the consecrated Host, the omission of genuflection before and after the Elevation, the short summary method of distributing Communion without blessing the communicants before and after and without holding up the Sacred Host for a brief while for adoration etc. will, we are afraid, adversely affect the reverential attitude the celebrating Priest himself should maintain towards the Sacred Ceremony, and naturally react on the attitude of the faithful, too.

Again, it is to be regretted that the ‘reformers’ have discarded the use of varying colours for the priest’s vestments, as well as for the tabernacle curtain, veil and antependium. This, too, is unfortunate. The use of varying colours, indicative of the varying seasons of the Church calendar or expressive of the purpose or dedication of the particular Mass said or sung, has thereby much informative and educative value for even the illiterate masses. And, after all, what have we gained by discarding these symbolical colours, except to claim one more “reform” against our ancestors?

We are also very much pained to note that almost all the solemn and meaningful ceremonies of our Sacerdotal Ordination – such as the prostration of the deacon before the Altar while the Choir chants the Litany of the Saints; the solemn and impressive imposition of *both hands* by the Bishop; the anointing; the concelebration of the

Consecration Mass by the ordaining Bishop and the ordained Priest, the kissing of the anointed hands; the last imposition of the hands by the Bishop and all the Priests present at the Ceremony – all these have been scrapped. What a grand and imposing ceremony was our Sacerdotal Ordination! How eloquently it impressed the on-lookers, who thronged in very large numbers on such an occasion, with the importance, dignity and sacredness of the Catholic Priesthood! But now all that is gone; and the ordination ceremony does not possess even so much solemnity as is usually associated with the Vestition and Profession of a Rev. Sister of one of the major Religious Orders. We are afraid it is quite possible that the new Priests, ordained in this bare and poor fashion and without the tonsure or biretta either, may be looked upon by the ill-formed common people as of a second grade quality, not worthy of the respect and reverence they have been accustomed to show towards the Priests of the old order; though we earnestly hope and pray that such a mistaken and reprehensible mentality may not develop among them. The real and effective remedy, however, will be to restore our Sacerdotal Ordination to its old grandeur and magnificence, before anymore batch of our priestly candidates are ordained in the new style and manner.

5) Some idea of the cumulative and long-range adverse effect of these changes on both our clergy and laity can be had by a comparison of the Catholics of Malabar with their brethren of some of the non-Catholic Churches in point of reverence and devotion to the Blessed Sacrament and the Holy Mass; of loving and filial attachment to the Virgin Mother of God and veneration for the Saints; the general conduct and behaviour within the Church and its premises; the respect and regard for the priests; the loyalty and obedience to the Ecclesiastical authorities; and generally in regard to the depth and fullness of faith and religious life as a whole. No close and discerning observer can escape the conclusion that the Catholics, thanks to the favourable environments they came to enjoy, are very much ahead in all the above respects. Certainly one inevitable and deplorable result of

the innovations now introduced, and similar retrograde changes further sought to be introduced, will be to reduce the Catholics of the Syro-Malabar Rite to a state of spiritual poverty, religious indifference, and stagnation and even retrogression. And that will be a sad ending to the “great expectations” held out by the sponsors of these innovations.

The only plea that can be put up by them for their “pet reforms” is that they aim at “restoring” the Syro-Malabar Rite to the pristine purity of the Chaldean Rite. But that is a plea that we can hardly appreciate. It is true that the Catholic Church is anxious that none of its ancient Rites should become extinct. But that does not preclude the natural and wholesome evolution of the Liturgy in the various Rites in response to the growing needs and changing social environments which develop with the march of time. Thus it was but natural that the Catholic Syrians of Kerala, experiencing as they did a wider and closer contact with the West since the 16th century, should have adopted into their Liturgy new ceremonials and new devotional practices and prayers, more in keeping with the growing mind of the Church and better calculated to foster a fuller and more intense spiritual life among the faithful. These wholesome and really progressive developments had from time to time the implicit approval of the Holy See, which finally instituted for the Catholic Syrians of Kerala a new Rite itself – the Syro-Malabar Rite – formally embodying all these salutary developments which had gradually evolved among them since the Synod of Diamper (1599). And by the erection of the Syro-Malabar Hierarchy in 1923, the Holy See had confirmed and set its final seal on the new rite in Kerala. What need is now there to put back the hands of the clock and revive the sectarian forms and practices which our forefathers had wisely abandoned long long ago?

Again, though it is very true that what the Church insists on is unity rather than uniformity, yet it is equally true that it would be highly desirable to have uniformity added on to unity wherever this can be done without hitch or friction, since such uniformity would not only strengthen and intensify the sense of unity among the Catholics,

but also serve to exhibit that unity to the outside world. Cardinal Gibbons, in his *Faith of Our Fathers*, gives an eloquent tribute to the grandeur and majesty of the uniformity which prevails in the Latin Church all over the world and the great appeal it makes to the non-Catholic Christians and non-Christian nations.

Now, as between the Latin Rite and Syro-Malabar Rite in Kerala there is close resemblance, or even identity, in respect of the Vestments and many of the ceremonials of the Mass; the imparting of the benediction of the Blessed Sacrament; the exposition and public adoration of the Eucharist; the Eucharistic processions; the administering of the various Sacraments; the priest's dress and tonsure, and episcopal robes, mitre and staff; the Confraternities of the Blessed Virgin; the Feasts and Processions etc. etc. But the result of the present innovations will be to do away with all these happy resemblances and to create a sort of estrangement and aloofness between the Catholic brethren of the Latin and Syro-Malabar Rites; and worse still, to draw that unthinking and unsuspecting masses among the faithful of the Syro-Malabar Rite more and more towards the Nestorians and the Schismatics. That indeed will be a great calamity, and abiding misfortune in Kerala where the Latin and Syrian Catholics live intermingled, with their churches in close vicinity; and have at the same time many Nestorian and Schismatic Christians interspersed among them. We feel that the impulsive innovators in their enthusiasm and hurry – or perhaps on account of a smouldering antagonism to the long-past Portuguese regime - have not spent much thought or bestowed any serious consideration on this aspect of the question, this unkindest cut or cruel thrust into the body of the Mother Church in India.

On the whole, we are fully convinced that the retrograde “reforms”, imposed of late upon the Syro-Malabar Liturgy, will do us no good, but on the contrary be productive of great harm. They will, certainly lead to wide-spread indiscipline and irreverent behaviour within the Church and premises; to a lowering of our devotion to the

Eucharist and the Holy Mass and other religious ceremonies; and in consequence to a lowering of our respect and esteem for the Ministers of religion, more so because of the undesirable changes introduced in the ceremonies for the conferment of the Holy Orders. They will make our religious worship, especially our participation in the Holy Mass, a dramatic display without inner feeling or individual meditateness; and reduce our prayers in the church to a mere lip-service without thought or heart in it. Men of understanding and good-will all over the world are earnestly working towards a better integration, a closer approximation, of the activities of the nations to healthy common patterns based on justice and moral integrity, so as to usher in a state of inter-communal and international peace and cordiality. Our Holy Fathers also have been encouraging and supporting this salutary move. Will it be wise or expedient on our part then to get ourselves side tracked and shunted back from this main path of healthy co-operation and constructive evolution, and to start sectarian moves and intensify separatist tendencies all in the name of “reforms” intended to restore the pristine “purity” of a long-lost past?

It is our earnest and respectful prayer, therefore, that these “reforms”, reminiscent of the unfortunate controversies of the 16th century, may be dropped; and that the Syro-Malabar Liturgy may be left free to have its *progressive evolution* in harmony with the developing environments, unhindered by regressive and retrograde innovations, dug up from a distant and unhappy past. What is desired and prayed for is only the vernacularisation of the Liturgy, adopting Malayalam as the vehicle or medium of expression, but keeping intact all the forms, observances and ceremonies of the Liturgical Services. Of course, these may be allowed to evolve progressively and fruitfully in consonance with the march of times and in response to the healthy and increasing contacts with the wider world, preserving, however, the continuity of historical development.

We beg to remain, Yours most devotedly,

(Sd.) **Chev. Joseph Pettah & Others** (sic).

1. Chevalier Joseph Pettah K.S.G.G.M.A. (Hons)
2. Chevalier I.I.Iyyappan Inchodicaren K.S.G.G.
3. Chevalier A.D. Augusthy K.S.G.G. (Hons)
4. Dr. Paul Kallucaren F.R.C.S
5. Dr. P. Kallucaren M.A., B.Sc., Ph. D., Retired Principal
6. Mr. I. M. Mani, B.A. Merchant & Commission agent
7. Mr. C. L. Mathew, Chairman Dharmaodayam Coy. and Deputy Chairman, South Indian Bnk Ltd., Trichur
8. Dr. A. Porinchu, B.A., M.B.B.S., Mental Hospital Trichur
9. Mrs. T.V. Kochuvareed, B.A., B. T. Trichur
10. Mr. P.A. Kurian, Trustee, Dharmaodayam Coy. Trichur
11. Mr. K.P. Urumees, B.A., B.O.L. Trichur
12. Mr. Chalissery Ouseph Kunjuvarred, Kshemavilasm Co. Ltd. Trichur
13. Mr. A. F. Kakkappan, B.A., B.L., Advocate, Director South Indian Bank Ltd. Trichur
14. Mr. Chalissery Lonappan Joseph, Chairman Catholic Syrian Bank Ltd., Trichur
15. Mr. C.D. Francis, Merchant, Trichur
16. Dr. A.P. Francis, M.B. & B.S. Rtd. Civil Surgeon, T.C. State, Trichur
17. Mr. V.I. Antony, Kandasankadavu
18. Mr. T.I. Chumar B.A., Rtd. Secretary to the Govt.
19. Mr. A. K. Francis, Chairman Malabar Bank, Trichur
20. Mr. George Attocaren, Retired Chief Engineer, Cochin Govt.
21. Mr. Pallan J. Kunjuvareed, Dy. Chairman Kshemavilasm. Co
22. Mr. Chandy D. Chacko, Director South Indian Bank Trichur

23. Mr. C. J. Paul, Advocate, Director, Dharmadayam Coy., Trichur
24. Mr. Pulicken Ouseph Antony, President, Chamber of Commerce, Trichur
25. Mr. Akkarapatty Chakkunny Sebastian, S. Indian Bank, Trichur
26. Mr. Chandy Thomas Chakkunny, Director Insurance and Banking Co. Trichur
27. Mr. Kurian S. Manavalan, Secretary, Chamber of Commerce Trichur
28. Mr. Kattocaren Joseph Francis, Ex-Municipal Councillor, Trichur
29. Mr. Vethucaren Kuria Joseph, Merchant F.A.C.T Agent Trichur
30. Mr. Chakola Lonappan P., Managing Director Chakola Spinning and Weaving Trichur
31. Mr. Varghese Panikulam, B.A., B.L., Advocate, Trichur
32. Mr. C. J. Antony M.B.B.S., D.L.O., Eye Specialist, Trichur
33. Mr. K.T. Varghese M.A. Trichur
34. Mr. N.D. George M.A. Trichur
35. Mr. I.T. Edmund Peters M.A. Trichur
36. Mr. A.J. Joseph, M.A. Trichur
37. Mr. K.A. Antony M.A. Trichur
38. Mr. K.V. Ignatius M.A. Trichur
39. Mr. O.J. Baby M.A. Trichur
40. Mr. Lt. Paul Joseph Parambil M.A. Trichur
41. Mr. P.J. Abraham M.A. Trichur
42. Mr. K.P. Antony M.Sc. Trichur
43. Mr. K.V. Thomas M.Sc. Trichur

44. Mr. George Menacherry M.A. Trichur
45. Mr. A.V. Itterah M.Sc. Trichur
46. Mr. M.V. Varghese Trichur
47. Mr. K.T. Antony M.A. Trichur
48. Mr. T.D. Anthappan M.A. Trichur
49. Mr. M.A. Augustine M.A. Trichur
50. Mr. E.D. Jose B.A., D.P.En. Trichur
51. Mr. P.D. Francis B.A., B.L, Advocate, Trichur
52. Mrs. Dr. E. Paul Joseph, Civil surgeon, Dt. Hospital, Trichur
53. Mr. T.R. Paul B.A., B.L. Advocate, Trichur
54. Mr. C.P. Rappgel B.A., B.L. Advocate, Trichur
55. Mr. A.M. Sebastian B.A., B.L. Advocate, Trichur
56. Mr. P. P. Thomas B.A., B.L. Advocate, Trichur
57. Mr. A.A. Davies B.A., B.L. Advocate, Trichur
58. Mr. T.G. John B.A., B.L. Advocate, Trichur
59. Mr. C.D. Varghese, Trichur
60. Mr. E.L. Johny, Trichur
61. Mr. K.P. Devassy B.A., B.L. Advocate, Trichur
62. Mr. T.A. Varkey B.A., B.L. Advocate, Trichur

Document 38

Letter of Msgr. Thomas Nedumkallel in Favour of the Reformed Liturgy

Angamaly (Ernakulam), 6 April 1964; *letter of Msgr. Thomas Nedumkallel V.C., Vicar General of the Archdiocese of Ernakulam from 1923 to 1936, to Cardinal Gustavo Testa, Secretary of the Congregation for the Oriental Church appreciating the efforts taken for the restoration of the Mass* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi*, fascicolo V).

From Msgr. Thomas Nedumkallel V. C., Vincentian House, Angamaly P.O., Kerala State, S. India.

To His Eminence Cardinal Gustavo Testa, Secretary of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Rome.

May it please Your Eminence,

Allow me to write these lines in appreciation of what the Sacred Oriental Congregation has done so far in order to restore our Rite, especially the Sacred Liturgy. We are all grateful to the Venerable Popes of recent times and to the Sacred Oriental Congregation for the interest and consideration that has been manifested with regard to the Church of Malabar though we are numerically very few.

The liturgical Commission of experts appointed by the Sacred Congregation has done a great work and I am very happy that the Pontificale and the Sacred Liturgy has been restored in accordance with the traditions of our Church.

I hope that very soon the Propria of the Mass and the Rituale which includes the Sacraments will also be put into practice so that the restoration and reform may be complete. About the Rituale I have a request that the prayers and the ceremonies for the administration of the Sacraments be short. Now we are using the translation of the

Roman Rituale. The baptismal rite is the one used in the Roman Rite for adult baptism and this is too long. The translation into Syriac is a little confusing. Especially the Baptism rite of the children could be much shorter.

I am now 86 years old. Still I have managed to study the rubrics of the new Mass and I am celebrating the Sacred Liturgy according to the restored form. I may add also that for about 13 years, i.e., from 1923 to 1936 I was the Vicar General of the Archdiocese of Ernakulam. And in my old age I am happy to see the restoration of the Rite effected on the initiative of the Holy See.

I know there are some who do not welcome the new changes or the restoration. But I should think it is because of a lack of knowledge about the traditions of the Church and the policy of the Holy See. I hear also that some petitions have been sent to the Sacred Oriental Congregation which contains exaggerated reports. Those few who may be now opposed to the restoration of the Rite, I believe, will soon begin to appreciate the work of the Sacred Oriental Congregation when they understand the mind of the Holy See and when they study the new Constitution of the Second Vatican Council on Liturgy.

Another point I wish to mention is concerning the impediment for matrimony. Some of the minor impediments seem to be too strict. The recent Apostolic Letter of Pope Paul VI, *Pastorale Munus*, grants to the Ordinaries the faculty to dispense from the minor impediments. Perhaps all these minor impediments as sixth degree of consanguinity etc. (Motu Proprio De Sacramento Matrimonii, can. 31 # 1) except the no.6 concerning *Crimen* (= crime or offence) could be removed altogether by making necessary changes in canon law. This would be a blessing to many people and they would appreciate it.

Once again thanking Your Eminence and all those who have taken pains for the restoration and reform of the Rite and traditions of our Church and most humbly requesting Your Eminence blessings on bended knees,

I beg to remain,
 May it please Your Eminence,
 Your Eminence' most devoted son in our Lord,
 Msgr. Thomas Nedumkallel V.C.

Document 39

Letter of Chevalier Joseph Vithayathil and Other 16 Laymen to the Internuncio Disapproving the Reformed Missal

(No place), 12 June 1964; *retired High Court Judge Joseph Vithayathil and other 16 laymen sent this letter to Internuncio James Robert Knox, who transmitted it to the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church. The letter signed also by Joseph Pettah, the main exponent of the previous petition (document 37), reproduces a greater part of the ideas contained in it. The pious practices and popular devotions indicated by the petitioners do not belong to the liturgy of the Church and they were not the direct object of the reformed Pontifical and Missal promulgated for the Syro-Malabar Church after the approval of the Congregation for the Oriental Church and that of the Roman Pontiff (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 955/65, Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi, Riforma, fascicolo I).*

To His Excellency, The Most. Rev. James Robert Knox,
 Apostolic Internuncio, Apostolic Internunciature, New Delhi.

May it please Your Excellency,

(1). At this most critical juncture when the recent innovations introduced into the Syro-Malabar Rite threaten to mar and mutilate it and even to destroy its very individuality and existence, we, on behalf of the afflicted thousands of that distressed Rite, beg to approach Your Excellency with the earnest request that you may be pleased to come to

our rescue and save us from this sad and desperate plight. We also entreat Your Excellency to be pleased to see that our prayer is placed before the Holy Father and His Eminence the Cardinal Secretary, as we fear that our letters and petitions in this behalf do not reach them. And in this connection we beg to place before Your Excellency the following facts.

Unwanted Innovations

2. In the first place, we beg to point out that there has been no demand from our people for these innovations. May be, in olden days our ancestors, because of their anxiety to get Bishops of their own Rite and Nationality, had sent up petitions to the Holy See, requesting for changes. But it is a significant fact, that after the establishment of the Syro-Malabar Hierarchy, in 1923, neither our revered Prelates nor the Laity have sent up any representation for a change in the existing order, except for an occasional and stray petition for vernacularisation of the Services. We have been quite contented with, and happy over, the Syro-Malabar Rite and Liturgy, and indeed, we look upon them as a great blessing conferred upon us by kindly Providence. The only people of a different view, are just a few oriental scholars who are merely interested in antiquities and who want to impose them upon the common people, without considering any other aspect of the question.

No Prior Information or Intimation

3. Secondly these drastic and unwanted innovations have been imposed upon us without any previous intimation. Neither the clergy nor the Laity have had any chance afforded them to express their views or submit any representation. As far as we know not even our revered Bishops have had an opportunity of a joint consultation over these changes, or an opportunity to make a through and patient study of the matter, or any chance for consulting either the clergy or any

representatives of the laity under them.¹⁷ This indeed was unfortunate, especially in these days when so much stress is laid upon democratic ideals even in Vatican Council II.

Syro-Malabar: A New and Independent Rite

4. It is relevant and necessary to point out in this connection that the Syro-Malabar Rite is quite a new Rite, which took shape after 1600 AD by integrating what was salutary and acceptable in the old system with several progressive and attractive features adopted from the Roman (Latin) Rite. It is not a Chaldean Rite, nor is it a Latin Rite, but a distinct and independent Rite, of our own, with its special features. We may also point out that the Syro-Malabar Liturgy was finally perfected by a most holy and learned man of our community, Fr. Kuriakose Elias Chavara, Servant of God, who was one of the illustrious founders of the Congregation of Carmelites of Mary Immaculate. And it is also noteworthy that he had done so after consulting the greatest Liturgical experts of his time. The accepted old Syrian Elements and the adopted Latin elements are both of them integral parts of the New Syro-Malabar Rite; and there is no justification or meaning in attempting to “purge” this new independent Rite of its Latin features and drag it down to the ‘pristine purity’ of an unrefined, disorganized, undevotional and barren Chaldean Rite of very ancient days.

It is a well-known fact that all the best modern civilizations and cultures have only benefitted by the adoption of what is best from one another. Similarly all modern languages have benefitted immensely from adoptions from other languages. So, too, have the different Rites within the Church become fuller and richer by adoptions and

¹⁷ The Syro-Malabar bishops were twice consulted and were given opportunity to make “thorough and patient study of the matter”, especially during the first consultation, but they did not make any theologically sound or historically founded arguments against the restored Missal.

adaptations from one another. The Maronite and Melkite Rites have borrowed much from the Latin Rite. The Byzantine Rite has been very much influenced by the Liturgies of Jerusalem and Antioch. The Armenian Rite amplified its liturgy by a fusion of the forms of the Liturgy of Jerusalem with several of the liturgical forms of the Syrian and Cappadocian Churches. It is evident, therefore, that there is no such thing as “pristine purity” of any particular Rite.

Incidentally, we are even afraid whether the lovers of the “restored liturgy” and the scholars of antiquity would be able to prove that this was the identical liturgy actually in use amongst the Syrian Catholics of Malabar in the Pre-Diamper Period; where as we have even evidence to the contrary.¹⁸

5. After the appointment of the Syrian Bishops in 1896, several very learned and illustrious Prelates have ruled over us with complete freedom and none of them has ever thought of or suggested a return to the old Chaldean liturgy, which to the civilized and cultured Catholics of Kerala, will be equal to a return to the customs of Stone Age in Liturgy.

6. Our community, thank God, is the second biggest one in population among the Oriental Churches and therefore we are perfectly justified in claiming a Rite of our own, especially so because we are Indians and not Chaldeans.

Syro-Malabar Rite: Foremost among the Oriental Rites

7. Thanks to our close contact with the West and the broadening and progressive trends of evolution in the Roman (Latin) Rite; as also to the faithful maintenance and safeguarding of our true Indian culture and traditions, the Syro-Malabar Rite now holds the pride of place among the Eastern Rites in point of general progress, educational

¹⁸ For the “liturgy actually in use amongst the Syrian Catholics of Malabar in the Pre-Diamper Period”, see P. Pallath, *The Eucharistic Liturgy of the St Thomas Christians*, 14-81.

advancement, vigour, vitality and fullness of religious life and spiritual devotion, as well as loyalty and attachment to the Holy See. The Reservation of the Eucharist in the Tabernacle and frequent visits to the Blessed Sacrament, the solemn exposition of the Holy Eucharist for public adoration; the “Corpus Christi” and other Eucharistic processions, and the consequent intensity and fervour of the devotion to the Blessed Sacrament; the invocation of the “Mother of God”, the Angelus morning, noon and night; the rosary and the scapular; the Marian Sodalities and the Legion of Mary; the Franciscan Third Order; the Vincent de Paul Society and other religious associations, and the Confraternities attached to almost every Parish Church; the Way of the Cross and the penitential devotions of the Holy Week – all these and much besides were unknown to our forefathers before Diamper and would not have been ours now, had we continued rigidly and obstinately in their path. And all these will inevitably disappear with the development of the “restored liturgy” which, in its blind and backward drive for the ‘pristine purity’ of the Chaldean model, cannot at all ‘tolerate’ such ‘Latin innovations’. That indeed would be a first-rate calamity of far-reaching consequence for the present and future generations of Syro-Catholics in Kerala.

Old And New Compared

8. A brief study of the recent innovations will certainly convince all impartial people of the seriousness of the havoc that has been wrought on the Syro-Malabar Rite by these deplorable changes. Some of these changes, however, like the accepting of bread and wine for the Mass and the washing of hands, on the Gospel side instead of on the Epistle side, as has been the practice so far; the keeping of the Missal always on the Epistle side; the placing of the Missal on a cushion; and other similar innovations are wholly meaningless and serve no useful purpose. Nevertheless they have the deplorable result of giving a Nestorian colour to our Holy Mass. Already the Nestorians of Trichur have begun to exult over what they tom-tom as a humble admission,

on the part of the Catholics, of their past “errors” and a return to the “unerring” and “apostolic” Nestorian practices. This is indeed an unmerited humiliation!

9. Other innovations are of a various and consequential character. Such, for instance are, 1) the omission of the sign of the Cross at the beginning of the Holy Mass and other religious services; 2) the regrettable deletion of the “filioque” from the Creed; 3) the discontinuance of genuflection before the Blessed Sacrament and of kneeling even during the Elevation of the Sacred Host during the Mass; 4) the complete absence of preparation for the moment of the Elevation, and the abruptness and utter want of solemnity at the time of the Elevation of the Sacred Body and Blood of Our Lord; 5) the elevation of the Consecrated Host, on the paten without giving the faithful an opportunity of getting a “view” of the Sacred Body of Our Lord; 6) the receiving of Holy Communion standing; 7) the absence of the use of the Corporal, the purificator and the Pall which, according to the Catholic mind, are absolutely necessary for handling a Sacred Species; 8) the tedious and tiresome repetitions contained in the responses by the Congregation which would in course of time and especially in crowded churches degenerate into a mechanical medley of confusion and irreverence; 9) the omission of the Agnus Dei; 10) the short and summary method of distributing Holy Communion; 11) the omission of the most impressive and solemn incensing to the priest and his magnificent blessing, before he proceeds to the Supreme moment of Consecration in the Mass – (which is a special, compulsory and most beautiful feature of even our Low Masses in the Syro-Malabar Rite) ; and 12) the giving up of the closing prayers for the church and the faithful and of the invocation of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and the Memorare. These and other changes of a like nature will undoubtedly militate against the respect and reverence, the awe and veneration we cherish towards the Holy Mass and the Eucharist, and the discipline and the decorum we are accustomed to maintain within the Church.

Loss of Veneration for the Blessed Sacrament

12. It is a well-known fact that the old Chaldean Liturgy had, very little in it of reverence for, and adoration of, the Blessed Sacrament. And one inevitable and deplorable result – in fact the most deplorable result of the recent Chaldeanising innovations – would be to deprive our Syro-Malabar Liturgy, too, of its outstanding feature of fervent, public and solemn adoration of our Eucharistic Lord.

13. To amplify a little more: One of the lamentable consequences of the restoration of the Chaldean form of Mass is that Almighty God is deprived of the highest form of corporal adoration. Man who has been commanded to love God with all his heart and soul and all his powers, must show the highest possible veneration when he moves before the Blessed Sacrament. St Paul says that ‘at the name of Jesus’ every knee shall bend in Heaven and on Earth. How much more necessary and more becoming it is that we bend our knees when the Lord of the Universe deigns to come to us in Sacramental Form! In Kerala people bend their heads before ordinary Judges and officials. To show only this same kind of respect to the Incarnate God in the Blessed Sacrament is, to say the least, the very height of impropriety and irreverence.

To replace genuflection and kneeling on both knees before the Blessed Sacrament, to which natural way of adoration we Catholics in Kerala are accustomed for several centuries, and which custom we cherish, and which custom is followed by nearly 95% of Catholics in the world, by a bowing of the head, will in the long run lead to a definite decline in the reverence to the Blessed Sacrament; and consequently the faith will diminish; and devotion to our Lord in the Holy Eucharist will die out, as amidst the Jacobites and Nestorians now in India.

The advocates of bending the head as the proper form of Eucharistic adoration, say that it is the highest form of worship and veneration ‘in the East’. This does not square with facts. In the East,

tributary kings had to prostrate before the Emperors and then to walk backwards without turning round. If, therefore, the promoters of the purity of Rite wanted to preserve the eastern form of veneration intact, they should have adopted kneeling of both knees together with bowing the head, as the Syro-Malabarese and the Latin Catholics do in Kerala before the Blessed Sacrament publicly and solemnly exposed.

14. Mention is made in the Holy Scriptures of St Peter, St Paul and St Stephen praying on bended knees. The crowning fact, however, is of our Blessed Lord Himself kneeling and prostrating in prayer before His Heavenly Father, in the garden of Gethsemane. No further argument is needed to prove the propriety and imperative necessity of bending our knees before the Eucharistic God. This will also show the importance and necessity of kneeling during the time of the Mass, and it will also show that standing during Mass is not proper.

15. We may also add that it is nothing less than a shock to us, to receive the Blessed Sacrament standing, as is enjoined by the new Liturgy. This procedure also will diminish and ultimately destroy all respect for, and faith in, the Holy Eucharist.

16. It is also reported that the “reforms” still on their way, will do away with our solemn Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, with the Sacred Host majestically installed in the monstrance; and replace it with a simple blessing with the Ciborium containing the Eucharist. If this ‘reform’ is pushed up to its logical conclusion, we shall have to give up the One Hour, the Thirteen Hour and the Forty Hour adorations, the solemn Eucharistic processions, and the like public manifestations of our awe and reverence for our Eucharistic Lord, the very soul, inspiration and support, the very roof and crown of our entire Christian life.

17. If, in the Eastern Liturgies, genuflection and bending of the knees have not been given their proper place, it is probably because the people concerned had very little faith in the Real Presence, or were very much influenced by Nestorian ideas and practices. In any case,

their faith at that time in the Real Presence could not have been very deep.

Pontifical Ceremonies

18. We are also very much pained to note that all the solemn and significant ceremonies of our Sacerdotal Ordination – such as the prostration of the postulant-deacon before the High Altar, while the Choir grandly chanted the Litany of the Saints; the solemn and impressive imposition of both hands by the Bishop followed by the collective prayer and Imposition of hands by the attending Priests on the ordinandi; the anointing; the con-celebration of the Consecration Mass by the ordaining Bishop and the ordained Priest; the giving of the Chalice and Paten; the kissing of the anointed hands; all these have been scrapped. What a grand and imposing ceremony was our Sacerdotal Ordination! How eloquently it impressed the faithful with the importance, dignity, and sacredness of Catholic Priesthood! But now all that is gone, and the Ordination Ceremony has become bare, barren and uninspiring; and the Ordained Priest has ceased to be the ‘Lord’s Anointed’. It is therefore our request that the Roman Pontificals may be retained, translated into the vernacular wherever necessary.

Vestments

19. The various vestments used for our Mass are reminiscent of the various means and methods of torture, used in connection with the Passion of Our Blessed Lord; while the varying colours adopted for these vestments indicate the different seasons of the Liturgical Calendar, or express the purpose or dedication of the Mass said or sung, silently impressing the faithful thereby of the nature and significance of the occasion. But the “reformers” have discarded all that, and introduced wearisomely uniform, uncouth and inconvenient vestments of no liturgical significance or popular appeal.

Conclusion

20. On the whole, we are fully convinced, that the retrograde “reforms”, imposed of late upon the Syro-Malabar Church, will do us no good, but on the contrary, be productive of immense harm. They will certainly lead to wide-spread indiscipline and irreverent behaviour in the Church; to a gradual destruction of our devotion to, and faith in the Eucharist and the Holy Mass; also in consequence, to a lowering of our respect and esteem for the Ministers of religion. They will flatten our faith, blunt our fervour, stagnate our sacramental life, arrest the healthy growth of our liturgy in accordance with the cultural trends of the civilized world, and ultimately sap the vigour and vitality, the fullness and plenitude, of the Syro-Malabar Church.

21. We are not in any way against a reformation and renovation of our Syro-Malabar Rite on the basis of our own cultural lines, as has been outlined by the Vatican Council. What we strongly oppose and deprecate is the unwanted re-introducing of an antiquated and foreign Chaldean Liturgy into our existing one.

Prayer

22. It is our earnest and respectful prayer, therefore, that these “reforms”, survivals of the unfortunate controversies of the past may be dropped; and that the Syro-Malabar Rite and Liturgy may be left free to have its healthy and progressive evolution, unhindered by regressive and retrograde innovations, dug up from an obsolete and unhappy past. We welcome the vernacularisation of the Liturgy, retaining, however, all the forms, observances, and ceremonies of our dearly cherished Syro-Malabar Liturgical Services.

23. We also pray that Your Excellency may be pleased to make a formal visitation of our Syro-Malabar dioceses and be personally satisfied what our priests and the laity want in this regard. We would also request Your Excellency to make arrangements for the holding of a Provincial Synod, if necessary, for this important subject. A Synod

was responsible for the Syro-Malabar Rite, and it is only proper that another Synod considers the question whether this “restored Rite” should replace the Syro-Malabar Rite.

Requesting Your Excellency to recommend our prayer to the Holy See for favourable disposal, for which act of kindness, the thousands of the faithful who belong to this Church will ever be deeply indebted to Your Excellency.

We beg to subscribe,

Your Excellency’s most obedient and humble servants,

1. Joseph Vithayathil, K.S.G.B.A.B.L. (Retired High Court Judge, Ernakulam)
2. V. J. Joseph K.S.S.M.A. (Varapetty, Kothamangalam)
3. Joseph Petta K.S.G.M.A. (Trichur)
4. I. I. Iayppan K.S.G. (Trichur)
5. Akkara Devassy Augustin K.S.G. (Ollur)
6. T. I. Mathew K.S.S.G.B.A.B.L. (Advocate, Kottayam)
7. Thomas Joseph Kottukapally (Municipal Chairman, Palai)
8. Chakola Lonappan Palu (Trichur)
9. C. C. George (Municipal Chairman, Trichur)
10. Mathew J. Kollamparambil (Thalayolaparambu)
11. V. G. George B.A.L.T. (Kuravilangad)
12. K. L. Thomas B.A. B.L (Retired Executive Engineer, Kanjirapally)
13. K. V. Thomas Kollankulam (Kanjirapally)
14. K. J. Simon B.Sc. B.L. M.B.A (Project Manager, Tata Iron and Steel, Cochin)
15. K. Jacob Thomas B.E. C.E. (Engineer, Pacific Procon Ltd., Ernakulam)
16. A. M. Joseph Anthraper (Cherthaley)
17. Alexander J. Mattom (Mohamma-Cherthaley)

Document 40
Response of Prof. Alphonse Raes SJ, President of the
Special Liturgical Commission to the Three Letters
Criticizing the Reformed Missal

Rome, 4 September 1964; *after preliminary observations and comments about the ancient Rite and the then Syro-Malabar Rite, since the petitioners accentuated “their loyalty and attachment to the Holy See”, Raes reproduces numerous statements of Roman Pontiffs, which oblige the Orientals to preserve, observe and promote their own authentic Eastern rite and spiritual heritage. Then the Author underlines the necessity to return to the sources according to the spirit of Vatican II and to uphold a sound liturgical theology which transcends the Tridentine anti-Protestant practices. Lastly he explains the need and significance of authentic liturgical reform in the Syro-Malabar Church. This response was sent to Archbishop Joseph Parecattil, who transmitted its copy to all the Syro-Malabar bishops and to the leaders of the petitioners (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi, fascicolo V; original in Italian, but citations from papal documents in Latin).*

About the Reform of the Syro-Malabar Rite,

Response to the three appeals.

After the joint (pastoral) letter of 3 July 1963 with which the Malabar Bishops introduced the reformed Ordinary of the Mass (*Ordinarium Missae*) in the rite, from the Syro-Malabar community three recourses have reached the Holy See asking for the suspension of the liturgical reform initiated by Pope Pius XI and continued by his two successors: the first one of 20 November 1963, addressed to the

Sacred Oriental Congregation, the second of 1 January 1964,¹⁹ addressed to the Holy Father, and the third of 12 July (really June) 1964, addressed to the Apostolic Internuncio of India.

Some Preliminary Observations

1) The first appeal is signed by Chevalier Joseph Pettah and 61 other persons whose names are mentioned; the second emanates from priests and faithful who are not named; the third from 17 lay people among whom at the third place figures Joseph Pettah.²⁰ Several points of the second one are found almost literally (*ad litteram*) in the third and many observations are common to the three to such an extent that one can make a well-founded hypothesis that the three appeals come from the same source. Now, among the 62 signatures of the first appeal, almost all clearly attest that the people live in the diocese of Trichur, so also, the majority of the 17 signatures of the third appeal come from Trichur. We need not therefore be too impressed by these signatures; probably all these oppositions to the reform are aroused by a small number of people.

2) One must know that in Malabar, as elsewhere, there is the custom to draw up protests and petitions and collect signatures to undersign them. This custom is undoubtedly very unhappy, not because the faithful or the laity would have nothing to say in the Church, but because the collection of signatures is a deceitful process as many of those who put the signature do not know exactly what it is, not having studied the question, or else they sign in order to please his friend who invites to undersign it so as not to break away from the group to which they belong. In evaluating the appeals one must not be

¹⁹ Really the petition was written on 1 November 1963 and hence it was the first one in chronological order. I have presented these three recourses as documents 36, 37 and 39 respecting the chronological order.

²⁰ Because of the mistakes in the date already indicated in the previous footnote, there is an inversion of order between the first and the second.

impressed neither by the number nor by the quality of the signatories, but solely by the value of the reasons contained in the appeals.

3) It is known that every liturgical reform provokes some bad reception or opposition on the part of the elderly. It is natural: they are accustomed to their habits, and do not want to change anything. The same can be observed in persons who have, as it is said, a conservative mind, seeing risks in everything new.

Before responding to each of the points raised by the redactors of the appeals, it would be helpful to explain why these good, indeed excellent Catholics do not understand the provisions of the Holy See to which they oppose. According to me this is due to the erroneous judgments that they have about the ancient rite of Malabar, about the current rite that is introduced after the arrival of the Latins among them, and about the reformed rite that has now started and should continue.

I. The Ancient Rite

For the redactors of the appeals the old rite is poor and tedious. This statement is due to ignorance, perhaps excusable, about the Chaldean rite.

It can easily be proved with the texts preserved as manuscripts before the sixteenth century that the Chaldean rite then in use in Mesopotamia and in Malabar was a perfectly complete rite in every part: Mass with three anaphoras, ritual with sacraments and blessings, divine office and funerals; this divine office was especially rich with hymns of different kinds.

But the present day Malabars do not know more than a part of that title: they have abandoned two of the three anaphoras, all the variable parts of the Mass except the readings of the New Testament, omitting two of the Old Testament readings, also the variable parts of the divine office retaining only the fixed parts which are identically repeated every fifteen days, having no longer any regard for the feasts

and commemorations of the liturgical year. As regards the Ritual and the Pontifical they have replaced these two books with the corresponding books of the Latin rite. After such an abandonment of many parts of their own rite it can be declared that the rite is poor; more exactly, it should be said that such conclusion, valid for the current state, is not at all true for the times prior to the sixteenth century.

II. The Present Rite

According to the redactors of the appeals the present rite not only gives full satisfaction but also it should be regarded as a rite in its own right among other Eastern rites of the Catholic Church. And they explain it distinguishing two parts in this rite: one is composed of what was preserved of the ancient Chaldean rite and the other contains everything that the rite has taken from the Latins. If one investigates a little more about the part taken from the Latins, one sees that the redactors, in addition to the substitution of the Ritual, the Pontifical and the liturgical calendar (but only for the celebration of Holy Mass), insist much on two things, namely on the Eucharistic worship, especially with regard to the Real Presence, and then on a series of pious practices that we call extra liturgical devotions like the visits to the Blessed Sacrament, the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, adoration of one, three and forty hours, the “Angel’s prayer”, in the morning, at the noon and in the evening, the rosary, the scapular, the Way of the Cross, novenas, the months of May and others, the Confraternity, etc.

It should be noted that in the West most of the liturgists do not consider those devotions as an integral part of the liturgy. Also the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council in its Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy does not take them into consideration. According to the Western way of speaking, it is therefore not lawful to include them in what one would like to call the Syro-Malabar rite.

But even if we take that into account according to an Eastern way of seeing things, instead of talking about absorption (assimilation) of these elements in the ancient Chaldean rite, one should speak of substitution and juxtaposition, because to deserve the title of absorption it would have been necessary to give these devotions and pious practices an Eastern form and not leave them in their original Latin form which unfortunately produces a hybrid rite, not perhaps in the consciousness of the one who practises it, but objectively speaking.

In fact among all the Oriental rites practised by the Catholics, there is none that has been so much Latinized as that of the Malabar rite, much more than that of the Maronite rite or of the Armenian rite. For the Holy Mass the calendar of the Roman Missal is simply followed, both for the Temporal and for the Santoral, gradually introducing the new feasts which the Latins introduce in it and on the same date; so also the order and the pericopes of the Epistles and Gospels are exactly the same as those of the Roman Missal. In the celebration of the Holy Mass the celebrant imitates the gestures of the Latin celebrant (genuflections, positions of the hands and fingers, kissing of the altar, etc.); the liturgical vestments are exactly those of the Latins, also the maniple. We have already spoken about the Ritual and the Pontifical; the ritual was translated into Syriac but the Ordinations were conducted in the Latin language during the Mass celebrated in Syriac; funerals are a mixture of the texts of the two rites; of the offices of the Holy Week a part has been translated from Latin into Syriac, the rest is omitted; the Divine Office is Chaldean but is limited to the fixed part, as has been said above.

Now, the redactors of the appeals do not realize that the Holy See cannot support the existence of such a rite, because the Roman Pontiffs have declared several times in solemn and most solemn manner, also in their encyclicals, that they wish and promise to maintain the Oriental rites in their integrity and genuineness. The existence of the present Syro-Malabar rite is an open contradiction to those august declarations. When that rite was celebrated almost unknown by all, in

a corner of India, it did not provoke any scandal. However, today the liturgists take care of it, the Malabar priests ever more numerous in Rome celebrate it, as also in Germany, England, and in St Peter's during the Ecumenical Council; and the surprise of those who know or expect something Oriental, increases. Objectively speaking, it is an evil, a scandal in the Catholic Church, which is no longer tolerable.

Following is a collection of texts (not complete) of the Supreme Roman Pontiffs, to whom the Malabars are very attached; these declarations may open their eyes on the attitude of the Holy See in this regard.

Benedict XIV, 24 December 1743, *Demandatum*:

“Therefore, regarding the rites and practices of the Greek Church, we especially decreed that it be generally established that no one was or is permitted by virtue of any title, position, authority or dignity, even if he shines with patriarchal or episcopal authority, to change something or to introduce anything which diminishes from the complete and exact observation of the same rites and practices”.²¹ It would be good to read the whole of paragraph 3 and paragraph 8.

Benedict XIV, 26 July 1755, *Allatae sunt*:

“This Congregation met in our presence on 13 March 1755. The Cardinals Inquisitor unanimously answered (to the questions regarding the date of Easter, calendar and abstinence) that ‘no innovations were to be made’. We confirmed the decision in conformity with a former decree of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith published on 31 January 1702; it has subsequently been renewed and confirmed several times. That decree reads as follows: ‘At the instance of its secretary, Rev. Fr. Charles Augustine Fabronus the Sacred Congregation has commanded that it be ordered, and by the present

²¹ [*Bullarium Magnum Romanum*, Benedictus XIV, Tomus 1, Prati 1845, 329].

decree it is so ordered, that each and every missionary and prefect of apostolic missions should not dare in future, in any circumstance or under any pretext, to give a dispensation to the Catholics of any Oriental nation in matters of fasts, prayers, ceremonies, and suchlike from the prescriptions of their own national rite which are approved by the Holy and Apostolic See. Moreover, the Sacred Congregation has decided that it neither has been nor is permitted for those Catholics to abandon in any respect the custom and observance of their own rite which has likewise been approved by the Holy Roman Church”²².

Afterwards in the same encyclical the Pope brings the testimony of the following Roman Pontiffs: Leo IX, Innocent III, Honorius III, Innocent IV, Alexander IV, Council of Lyons, Council of Florence, Leo IX, Clemente VII, Pius IV, Gregory XIII, Urban VIII, Paul V.

“(In the preparation of the Greek Eucology everything was examined). The work was revised scrupulously to avoid the slightest injury to the Greek rite and to ensure that this rite remained unimpaired and entire. This course was followed, even though previously, in their utter ignorance of the Oriental liturgies and rites which existed in the Eastern Church before the time of the schism, some of our theologians whose expert knowledge was confined to the western rite, used to condemn every detail which differed from this rite. In short, the chief concern of the popes in securing the return of Greeks and Oriental schismatics to the Catholic religion has ever been to pluck completely from their minds the errors of Arius, Macedonius, Nestorius, Eutyches, Dioscuros, the Monothelites, and others, into which they had wretchedly fallen. But the rites which they observed and professed before the schism and the practice which depends on these ancient liturgies and rituals have always been left unchanged. Indeed the popes have never asked those returning to the Catholic faith to give up their own rite and assume the Latin rite. For this would involve the

²² [*Bullarium Magnum Romanum*, Benedictus XIV, Tomus III, pars 2, Prati 1847, 249-250].

complete extermination of the Eastern Church and of the Greek and other Eastern rites, an objective which this Holy See has certainly never planned or striven for”.²³

Pius IX, 6 January 1848, *In suprema*:

He says to the Oriental Catholics: “However, we will completely restore and protect your particular Catholic liturgies, which we make sound (whole) in a number of things, although in many items they are different from the liturgy of the Latin Churches. That is to say, (in fact) your liturgies were held in equal value by our predecessors since they are esteemed for the venerable antiquity of their origin and are compiled in tongues which the Apostles or Fathers had used and the rites splendidly contain certain magnificent apparatus to be celebrated, by which the piety and reverence of the faithful towards the divine mysteries are fostered”.²⁴

(He says to dissidents): “Hence as regards your sacred rites, if at the time of separation some items contrary to the Catholic faith and unity might be interpolated into them, only those things will have to be extrapolated. After removing them, your ancient Oriental liturgies will remain with you restored and protected, which for their venerable antiquity and for the ceremonies suitable for fostering piety were held in esteem by our predecessors and equally by us also many things have been done as we have already declared in the previous part of this letter”.²⁵

²³ [*Bullarium Magnum Romanum*, Benedictus XIV, Tomus III, pars 2, 255]. The Pope specifically speaks about the Greek Euchologion in this part of the encyclical.

²⁴ [*Pii IX Acta*, pars I. vol. I, 81].

²⁵ [*Pii IX Acta*, pars I. vol. I, 90].

Pius IX, 8 April 1862, *Amantissimus*:

“Now, truly, a multiplicity of holy things, a variety of legitimate rites, obviously in no way opposes the unity of the Catholic Church; rather, indeed, such diversity greatly enhances the dignity of the Church itself. Moreover, none of you, venerable brothers, is unaware that there are some who are striving to deceive and lead into error especially the unguarded and the inexperienced persons by maligning this Holy See itself, saying that upon receiving the separated Orientals into the Catholic faith it required them to abandon their rite and embrace that of the Latin Church. That this is false and far from truth is clearly shown by many constitutions and apostolic letters of our predecessors regarding Eastern affairs. They not only consistently declared to the Orientals that such a condition was never intended, but also professed that it was entirely their desire that the rites of the Eastern Churches, into which no error against the Catholic Church or against moral integrity had crept, would be completely preserved [...]. Hence, venerable brothers, with solicitude you incessantly impress upon your diocesan clergy the need to be zealous at every opportunity and by every means to expose and refute the calumny by which evil men lead the inexperienced into error and attempt to incite envy and hatred against this Holy See”.²⁶

Leo XIII, 30 November 1894, *Orientalium dignitas*:

“She (the Roman Church) never overlooked the service of her vigilance so that among the peoples of the East their own customs and distinct forms for administering the sacraments, which she had declared legitimate in her wisdom and authority, be always integrally preserved and protected. Examples of this are the many decisions of our predecessors, in the first place Pius IX of happy memory, promulgated in their own pontifical acts or through the documents

²⁶ [*Pii IX Acta*, pars I, vol. 3, 427-428].

issuing from the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith”.²⁷

“In point of fact there is more importance than can be believed in preserving the Eastern rites. Their antiquity is august, it is what gives nobility to the different rites, it is a brilliant jewel for the whole Church, it confirms the God-given unity of the Catholic faith. For that very reason, even as her apostolic origin is all the more proven especially by these Churches of the East, at the selfsame moment there shines out and is made manifest these Churches’ original complete unity with the Roman Church. Nothing else, perhaps, is so breathtakingly effective for illustrating the mark of Catholicity in God’s Church than that striking sight of differing forms of ceremonies and noble examples of the tongues of the ancient past - made all the more noble by their use by the Apostles and Fathers”.²⁸

“In as much as this diversity of liturgical form and discipline of the Eastern Churches is approved in law, besides its other merits, it has redounded tremendously to the glory and usefulness of the Church. They ought not figure any less as subjects of our charge. So much is this the case that is in the best interest of all that their discipline not haphazardly borrows anything that would be ill-suited from Western ministers of the Gospel whom love for Christ compels to go to those peoples”.²⁹

Pius XI, 21 December 1934, *Quam sollecita*:

“Therefore, these sons of ours who, since a long time, what a grief, strayed from the paternal home, should consider and carefully weigh again and again that if they return to us, for them there will be the integral faculty of always preserving the entire splendour of each

²⁷ [Acta Sanctae Sedis 27 (1894-95) 257].

²⁸ [Acta Sanctae Sedis 27 (1894-95) 258].

²⁹ [Acta Sanctae Sedis 27 (1894-95) 259].

rite, which indeed on account of the antiquity of ancestral language (style) and ceremonies calls to mind those most happy times, when the entire Christian world was rejoicing with (having) one faith, one sheepfold and one Pastor”.³⁰

Pius XI, 12 November 1923, *Ecclesiam Dei*:

“In such a union all peoples will enjoy the same rights, whatever be their race or tongue, and whatever be their sacred rites; rites which the Roman Church has always venerated and religiously retained, decreeing their conservation and ornamenting herself therewith as with a precious vestment, like a queen ‘in gilded clothing surrounded with variety’”.³¹

Pius XI, 8 September 1928, *Rerum Orientalium*:

“[...] But, though the students of our seminaries, having acquired, as they should, a knowledge of Protestant errors and fallacies of later date, are able to recognize and promptly to refute them, they are not however, trained, at least generally speaking, in that particular branch of learning which would enable them to pass a sure judgment on matters pertaining to Oriental sciences and customs, and to the liturgy which is to be preserved with all reverence within the Catholic unity [...]”.³²

³⁰ [Acta Apostolicae Sedis 27 (1935) 66]. This is the motu proprio of the Pope concerning the Commission for Russia and for editing the liturgical books of the Slavic rite.

³¹ [Acta Apostolicae Sedis 15 (1923) 581].

³² [Acta Apostolicae Sedis 20 (1928) 284]. The Pope wrote this encyclical letter for the promotion of Oriental studies.

Pius XII, 9 April 1944, *Orientalis Ecclesiae decus*:

“This good will implies also a proper respect for those traditions which are the special heritage of the peoples of the East, whether these are concerned with the sacred liturgy and the hierarchical Orders or with other observances of the Christian life, so long as they are in keeping with the true faith and with the moral law. Each and every nation of Oriental rite must have its rightful freedom in all that is bound up with its own history and its own genius and character, saving always the truth and integrity of the doctrine of Jesus Christ. We would have this to be known and appreciated by all, both by those who were born within the bosom of the Catholic Church, and by those who are wafted towards her, as it were, on the wings of yearning and desire. The latter especially should have full assurance that they will never be forced to abandon their legitimate rites or to exchange their own venerable and traditional customs for Latin rites and customs. All these are to be held in equal esteem and equal honour, for they adorn the common Mother Church with a royal garment of many colours. Indeed this variety of rites and customs, preserving inviolate what is most ancient and most valuable in each, presents no obstacle to a true and genuine unity”.³³

Pius XII, 23 December 1945, *Orientalis omnes Ecclesias*:

“In this connection it should be borne in mind that the Eastern Christians need have no fear at all of being compelled to abandon their lawful rites and customs if unity of faith and government is restored”.³⁴

“From this brief historical summary it is easily seen with what care the Apostolic See has watched over the integral preservation of the Ruthenian rite, both as regards the community as a whole and as

³³ [Acta Apostolicae Sedis 36 (1944) 137-138]. The Ruthenian Synod of Zamost, Zamoytsky or Zamosc was held in 1720.

³⁴ [Acta Apostolicae Sedis 38 (1946) 34].

regards individuals. However, no one will be surprised if it has permitted or temporally approved some minor changes on account of the special circumstances of the times, provided always that the chief and essential rites remained whole and entire. Thus, for example, it has permitted no changes to be made in the rites of the liturgy, save the few decreed by the Ruthenian bishops themselves in the Synod of Zamost”.³⁵

“For the rest, far from its being the mind of the Apostolic See to change the integrity or hinder the preservation of the rite, it rather caused the Ruthenian Church to cherish most religiously the traditions in liturgical matters handed down from antiquity. An outstanding sign of this zealous favour towards the Ruthenian rite may be seen in the new Roman edition of its liturgical books begun in our pontificate and already in part happily accomplished. In this edition the Apostolic See, gladly assenting to the wishes of the Ruthenian bishops, has endeavoured to restore their liturgical rites in accordance with their venerated ancient traditions”.³⁶

The Second Vatican Ecumenical Council in its Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, which also applies to the Orientals, when the general principles are treated, speaks in the sense exposed above by the Supreme Pontiffs:

“Lastly, in faithful obedience to tradition, the Sacred Council declares that holy Mother Church holds all lawfully acknowledged

³⁵ [*Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 38 (1946) 49].

³⁶ [*Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 38 (1946) 50]. For more about the same theme and the teaching of the successive popes, P. Pallath, “The Teaching of the Popes concerning the Heritage and Identity of Eastern Churches”, in P. Pallath (ed.), *Catholic Eastern Churches: Heritage and Identity*, Rome 1994, 139-159; for a comprehensive study of the theme, *The Vatican and the Eastern Churches: Papal Encyclicals and Documents concerning the Eastern Churches* (compiled and published by Eastern Christian Publications), Virginia 1996.

rites to be of equal right and dignity; that she wishes to preserve them in the future and to foster them in every way. The Council also desires that, where necessary, the rites be revised carefully in the light of sound tradition, and that they be given new vigour to meet the circumstances and needs of modern times".³⁷

While speaking thus, although the Roman Pontiffs and the Vatican II have primarily some particular situations in mind, from the ensemble of these solemn declarations the following are quite evident:

- the clear and decisive will to maintain the liturgical rites of the Eastern Churches in their integrity;
- the persuasion that diversity in these rites is a good thing and necessary for the Catholic Church;
- the categorical prohibition of commuting these Eastern rites to the Latin rite;
- prohibition made to everyone except the Holy See to modify them.

It follows that the existence of the so-called Syro-Malabar rite contradicts these statements and that the Holy See has the right and the obligation to invigilate over it.

Therefore the affirmation that the Holy See has approved this hybrid rite, must necessarily be surprising. If one thinks that it was done when the Synod of Diamper was approved in 1599, it must be flatly denied that the Holy See gave its formal approval to this synod as it did, for example, for the Ruthenian Synod of Zamost (1720) or for the Maronite Synod of Mount Lebanon (1736).³⁸ If one thinks about

³⁷ [Vatican II, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 4]. When the author wrote this reply the decree on Catholic Eastern Churches, *Orinetalium Ecclesiarum* and the decree on ecumenism, *Unitatis Redintegratio* were not promulgated. In fact these two documents contain the most solemn declarations of the Council concerning the restoration, preservation and observation of Eastern rites.

³⁸ According to the praxis of that time the acts and decrees of these synods were sent to the Propaganda Fide, which examined, approved and published them.

the printing of the Missal in Rome in 1767, it must be said that the printing was preceded by a thorough examination as to the orthodoxy and that the *nihil obstat* was valid as regards the faith and good morals, but not at all regarding the integrity of the rite, which was not taken into consideration at that time; the same can be said about the Roman printing of the liturgical books of other Eastern Churches. Making appeal to the holiness of the man who intervened (put his hand) even in the nineteenth century, in order to justify the Latinisms that he would have introduced, is not very serious.³⁹ Saying that with the erection of a Malabar hierarchy by Pope Leo XIII the then existing liturgy also received a formal or implicit approval, obviously does not stand. Making recourse to arguments of this kind already shows how weak the position of the redactors of the appeals is. We conclude: yes, the rite was tolerated, but was never approved; and we add, today it can no longer be tolerated as a result of the scandal that it provokes. And anyone who wants to meditate on the statements of the Holy See in this regard will understand that it can and must, in accordance with its obligation of vigilance, intervene even when it is not requested by the bishops of the place.

In fact, for the Roman See it is clear that the different liturgies and the different existing rites in the Catholic Church must manifest the universality and catholicity of the Church, as founded by Jesus Christ, not only for Jews but for all the nations of the earth. The rites of the Church are not essentially linked to the single Greek-Latin culture of the Mediterranean basin, but can conform to all civilizations and evolve in them. All the great peoples of the world should have the

³⁹ Here the author refers to Kuriakose Elias Chavara who, according to the petitioners, finally fixed their liturgy. Chavara acted according to the historical and ecclesial circumstances of his time, when the Catholic St Thomas Christians were members of the Latin vicariate of Verapoly and their liturgy was predominantly Latin. There is no direct relationship between the sanctity of the person and the liturgical works which he accomplished according to the *Sitz im Leben* of that time. The Congregation for the Causes of Saints always evaluate the life and activities of a person in his own historical and socio-cultural context.

possibility to honour and pray (to) God in liturgical forms suited to their culture. Therefore the Oriental rites, linked to other cultures, are the tangible proof - and easily visible in the eyes of all - not only of the possibility of a universal Church of Christ but also of one that is really as such. Now, it is evident that the more the Oriental rites are Latinized, much less they manifest the universality of the Church of Christ. Therefore from the Latinization of the Catholic Churches of the Eastern rite ensues an immense damage for the Church of Christ, because it wounds one of its essential notes and contradicts one of the fundamental intentions of her divine Founder, who did not want a new sect within Judaism, but intended to extend (broaden) a religion born in Judaism up to the ends of the earth. Because of this, more than ever today the Holy See is jealous to maintain the Eastern rites in their integrity, even against the will of the Orientals themselves who too often do not dare to or are not able to see things from that general point of view. Moreover, they do not know how to appreciate all the richness and the whole truth they bring to the Catholic Church precisely because they are Orientals. Hence it follows that the more they are Orientals in their worship and in their rites, the more they make visible the universality of the Church, and on the other hand, the less they are Orientals because they are Latinized, lesser benefit they bring to the Church, increasing the risk of making it appear exclusively Latin.

To preserve the Church from such damages, first of all the Roman Pontiffs have endeavoured, who are vigilant guards of the mystery of salvation which the divine Founder entrusted in their hands. The Ecumenical Council, as we have noted, is in full agreement with this attitude.

III. The Restored Rite

The restoration of the Syro-Malabar rite, started by Pope Pius XI and continued by his successors is not only a de-latinization, but together a recovery of what was abandoned and, thanks to a return to the sources, the beginning of a progress and an opening for the future.

The Syro-Malabar bishops who attended the first two sessions of the Ecumenical Council have heard and experienced how the vast majority of that august assembly fully accepts the orientation given to it by Pope John XXIII and backed by his successor Paul VI, that is, the *aggiornamento* (updating). And the almost unanimous vote of the *Constitution on Sacred Liturgy* demonstrates, in which sense the *aggiornamento* (updating) must be understood: return to the centre of Christian worship which is the sacrifice of the Mass, make the faithful participate in the homiletic part (liturgy of the Word) as in the sacrificial part, and this, not according to the dictates of post-Tridentine theology and a peripheral piety, but of a theology rethought and inspired by the Sacred Scriptures and the Fathers of the Church. Seeing the culmination of the Holy Mass in the elevation of the consecrated bread and wine and in the act of faith expressed at that moment with the words of St Thomas: My Lord and my God, concentrating fully on the real presence of Jesus Christ descended among us, belongs precisely to that theology which had to fight against the Protestants who denied the real presence, and to a religious practice of the Latin faithful of the Middle Ages, who believed to obtain a special grace when they could “see” with eyes the consecrated host. Feeling today as the faithful of the Middle Ages and stick on to the anti Protestant theological propositions, which are just but only partially true, is a sign among the Latins, and even more so among the Easterners, of a non updated spiritual attitude. It is necessary to move forward.

Now, the current liturgical reform, inspired by the scriptural and patristic sources, allows that updating (*aggiornamento*), for which the entire Catholic Church yearns today. Will only the Syro-Malabars who would like to stay behind, attached to the (backward) theological and spiritual orientations and peripheral devotions, or would they also want to follow the path of renewal and progress?

The redactors of the appeals often repeat that the liturgical reform, since it proposes a de-Latinized rite, obliges the Syro-Malabars

to return to the ancient, and makes them retrograde instead of progressive, impoverishes them instead of enriching them. But precisely the Vatican II shows that to be inspired by the Sacred Scripture and the Fathers, that is, returning to the sources, is the only effective method to make progress and to be enriched. Here is an example. Above it was said how the redactors of the appeals seek first of all the real presence of the Lord in the Holy Mass. The Second Vatican Council speaks of it in a different way, thus: "At the Last Supper, on the night when He was betrayed, our Saviour instituted the Eucharistic sacrifice of His Body and Blood. He did this in order to perpetuate the sacrifice of the Cross throughout the centuries until He should come again, and so to entrust to His beloved spouse, the Church, a memorial of His death and resurrection: a sacrament of love, a sign of unity, a bond of charity, a paschal banquet in which Christ is eaten, the mind is filled with grace, and a pledge of future glory is given to us".⁴⁰

Let us see how a present Latin liturgist envisions the Holy Mass: "The mystery of salvation, that means the secret plan of God made manifest in the redemptive work of Christ, finds its fulfilment here below in the ritual of the Easter to which Christ wanted to give his full significance uniting it to his Passion and Resurrection through which he raised with himself to the Father the humanity associated with his victory on death. The Eucharistic memorial, in which the Christian liturgy finds its centre and culmination, announces the definitive union of the redeemed humanity, around the messianic banquet and operates mysteriously this union".⁴¹

New language, but it is more inspired by Saint Paul and the Eastern anaphoras than that of the scholastic concepts (correct and necessary) of true sacrifice but relative to the sacrifice of Calvary and effective as the merits earned there by Christ are distributed according

⁴⁰ [Vatican II, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 47].

⁴¹ [I. Dalmais, *Le Liturgie Orientali*, Catania 1960, 32].

to different degrees and in various measures to those who are celebrating, serving or attending the Holy Mass. Instead of bringing the soul of the faithful to a meeting with Jesus descended into the consecrated host, effort is taken to unite all the faithful to Christ who renews in the Eucharistic memorial the salvation of humanity, which affects all of us as individuals and as members of the People of God. One who progresses with these Pauline thoughts, will also understand the richness of the Oriental anaphora in which attention is not limited to the words of consecration but to the entire Eucharistic prayer that carries his thoughts to the grand picture of the creation of the world and man, the incarnation of the Son of God and of the redemption of humanity, commemorated and re-enacted in the acts and in the words repeated in the Last Supper under the sanctifying action of the Holy Spirit with the memory of the saints and for the salvation of believers living and dead in Christ. The Orientals have always so understood this, already from the time of St Justin, Hippolytus and St Irenaeus, and therefore they have never felt the need to write or print the words of consecration in literary characters or larger size typography. They have never doubted about the sanctifying transformation of the bread and wine as they never had to fight with the Protestants, who denied the Real Presence and the reality of the Eucharistic sacrifice.

With a return to the sources, the present liturgical reform aims to have a progress in understanding more profoundly the mysteries and worship left us by the Lord. To understand and appreciate this, one must often read the prayers and hymns that have nourished the souls of Syro-Malabars in antiquity and meditate on them; these prayers and hymns are close to Sacred Scripture and the writings of the Fathers. The reform is therefore not only a question of change in the rubrics but requires a deepening of the spirit and piety.

If the Syro-Malabars are now far away from such thoughts and intentions, it is not their fault. One must keep in mind the fact that from a time that cannot be determined until today their piety is exercised largely by the religious practices borrowed from the Latins

in the last three centuries. And this is easily explained: from 1600 until 1896 they had only Latins as their bishops and pastors of souls who ignored everything or almost everything related to the Oriental rite. The bishops and the priests of today were formed in the seminaries of Alwaye or Kandy, or in that of Rome, run by the Propaganda; everywhere they had teachers and professors of Latin spirit. Only in Alwaye they partially followed their rite, in other places the entire liturgy, both in practice and in study, was exclusively Latin. What the bishops and the priests had cultivated in their soul, they communicated with fervour to their faithful. And it is fair to acknowledge that today one of the most flourishing Catholic communities in the world exists in Malabar. Let us suspend the question of whether this blossoming today is due to the Latinized piety or it is obtained from other factors in spite of the former. The redactors of the appeals fear that one day the present reform will sweep away all their pious practices of Latin origin and inspiration, to which they are so attached. That danger, if it exists, is not certainly imminent. For explaining the abandonment of a pious practice, it is not necessary to resort to a precept or a prohibition; it is enough to leave it to the course of time and the emergence of new pious practices. We are witnessing in the West a decline in the practice of the Way of the Cross, the devotion to the Sacred Heart, and even the too sentimental devotion to Saint Therese of Child Jesus; the devotions to the Seven Sorrows of the Blessed Virgin is almost disappeared, which in the past was so strong that it had obtained two liturgical feasts in the year, etc. When these devotions are in use, the pastors of souls will try to bring the greatest spiritual profit possible, but when another devotion earns the hearts of the faithful and demonstrates itself spiritually fruitful, they will foster it without clinging desperately to an already dying devotion. All this is to show that the Holy See never obliges to abandon a devotional practice if it is not possible to replace it with an equivalent one; but it could demand that a devotion of Latin origin to assume an Oriental form appropriate to the faithful of that rite.

After these treaties on the method used by the liturgical reform, it is necessary to declare that so far the current reform was focused only on two books and not on the entire liturgical and devotional life as each of the three appeals implies.

The first book is the Pontifical. I do not believe that it is necessary to repeat the history of the personal and decisive intervention of Pope Pius XI in the decision taken; when the proposal to approve a Syriac version of the Roman Pontifical was placed before him (up to that time in use in Latin language), he refused decidedly, indeed he decided to give the Syro-Malabars the Chaldean Pontifical, that is of their rite, and he constituted a Commission responsible for the edition of the said Pontifical. Because of the untimely death of Rev. Father James Voste OP and the Second World War, the volume was ready only by the year 1957. Being already decided in the meantime to grant to the Malabars the use of Malayalam in the liturgy, those parts of the Chaldean Pontifical concerning the Ordination were translated (and not the entire book) in this language. To find objections against (reject) that decision of Pius XI and the work of the Holy See is not only unnecessary, ineffective, but also a lack of respect towards the Pontiff and moreover it is an evidence of the callous opposition on the part of the redactors of the appeals towards the reform.⁴² They think that because of the Ordinations made according to the Chaldean rite, the faithful would lose respect and reverence for their priests.

The second book is the Missal, that is, the celebration of Holy Mass. Since the Malabars had preserved quite well the text of the "Ordinary of the Mass" (*Ordinarium Missae*) and the first anaphora, the changes made to these texts are of little importance except the narration of the Last Supper with the consecratory words. The text (of the words of consecration) was a translation of the Latin text which was replaced with a more authentic and more Eastern text, which does

⁴² The Syro-Oriental Pontifical was restored for the Syro-Malabar Church according to the personal decision of Pope Pius XI.

not constitute any difficulty. But it was required to move the place of that narration which was located after the anaphora at the time of starting the fraction. Needless to explain here the whole history of this fact, unique in all the Latin and Eastern liturgies, to find the consecration outside (we say) the “canon”, outside the anaphora, of the great Eucharistic prayer. A reform could not but bring back that part of the anaphora to its natural, logical and traditional place. If that transfer bumps certain psychological dispositions of the redactors of the appeals, and harms their habitual devotion, I can express my regret but on account of this I cannot change the decision taken.

The rubrics were often taken from the Roman Missal, especially with regard to the gestures; the reform should of course resume gestures of the proper rite; so instead of genuflecting with one knee, inclination of the head has been recovered, as is done in all the non-Latinized Oriental rites (it is known that genuflection with one knee is the practice of medieval vassal in front of his lord and it is passed to the Latin liturgy); the position of the hands prescribed with so much minuteness by the Latins after the Council of Trent, was always more free among the Orientals and now the Latins themselves have returned to a lesser severity; then why should it be retained for the Malabars? The rite follows the kiss of the altar at the moment of the offertory when the celebrant is preparing to begin the sacrificial part, but ignores the kiss that the Latin celebrant makes every time he prepares himself to turn towards the faithful.

Instead of the Latin liturgical vestments so far in use among the Malabars, the reform proposes to resume the vestments of their own rite. Those who know the history of these vestments know that the chasuble, used until the twelfth or thirteenth century by the Christians of East and West was that long and wide one covering the whole body, and that only the Greeks preserved it in its original form. For convenience sake the Latins have opened it on two sides, to the right and to the left, while the Eastern Churches have opened it in the front part. Today the Latins themselves have the tendency to return to a

medieval form called gothic. Why could the Malabars not follow that movement waiting for the day on which they will resume the chasuble of their own rite?

In the Missal the Malabars had introduced the liturgical calendar of the Latins and also the system of pericopes for the reading of the Epistle and Gospel, but for the Divine Office such a change was not adopted. The reform prescribes the calendar of their own rite and also the system of pericopes connected to it. Grumbling about the fact that certain pericopes will no longer be read since many other passages will be proclaimed, is not serious. On the other hand, it is true that the number of saints inserted in the Chaldean calendar is much less than that of the saints inserted in the Latin calendar. But it is also true that the reformed calendar comprises many more saints than those present in the Chaldean calendar and that for the commemoration of these additional saints, the date and the pericopes of the calendar in the Latin missal have been taken. We add that the Latins in their latest reforms have sought to lighten the Santoral to give more emphasis to the Temporal. Why should the Malabars be excluded from a healthy reform? Why are they accustomed to celebrate such and such a saint on a particular day?

It must be noted that in the reform of the Missal the chants and hymns, namely the variable parts according to the feasts that the previous Missal had abandoned, have been reintroduced. The office of the deacon has also been reintroduced not only as an assistant of the celebrant but also as a conductor of the prayer of the faithful, whereas the so called Mass with three priests aligned one behind the other or all three in front of the altar was abolished; this is purely Latin and no Oriental has ever known outside of Malabar. Then one must not forget that the normal Mass is the sung one and the recited (said) Mass is a liturgically reduced form of the Mass, even if today it is the most frequently celebrated one. The Malabars have also still a third form of the Mass, the most solemn form called *Raza* (mystery) which is not the

episcopal Mass, for which are needed none other than a few rubrics, which differentiate it from the solemn Mass.

Until today, the reform has not touched books other than the Pontifical and the Missal; hence the observations made by the redactors of the appeals about other liturgical books are useless.

The Liturgical Commission has prepared the reform of these other books also, but the Holy See does not want to precipitate anything; for the introduction of the Pontifical and the Missal it has gone slowly; it also knows that the reform has been accepted by many, even by elderly priests, with full satisfaction. The reform will proceed slowly also for the fact that the celebration of the liturgy in Malayalam is desired in Malabar and that unfortunately, good and keen translators who are willing and able to undertake the work of translation, not that easy, are few, indeed very few.

A last general observation: if we want to be updated and to progress with the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, let us consider how it desires in the Latin liturgy such elasticity that it could adapt itself to all the spiritual needs of the new Christianities (mission-communities) which are formed in the countries of Africa and Asia. We are not mistaken if we assume that a similar adaptation is possible also for the Oriental liturgies and especially for the Malabar rite. In this case, instead of seeking a rapprochement with the Latin liturgical forms, it is necessary to find forms that result from the consciousness and respond to the quality of the members of the great Indian family. A liturgical adaptation, which would align with such a development, would not be hindered by the Holy See because it is already accepted and promoted by Vatican II. See the *Constitution on Sacred Liturgy* from number 37 to 40: “Norms for Adapting the Liturgy to the Temperament and Traditions of Peoples”; also number 65 regarding baptism.

Document 41

Letter of the Prior General of the Carmelites of Mary Immaculate (CMI) in Favour of the Reformed Liturgy

Ernakulam, 21 September 1964; *Prior General Fr. Maurus Valiaparampil CMI, also on behalf of the Carmelites of Mary Immaculate (CMI) informs His Eminence Gustavo Cardinal Testa, Secretary of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, that the vast majority of the Carmelite fathers have started to celebrate the Qurbana according to the reformed Missal, which is very meaningful and theologically very rich. He further observes that the faithful also have begun to participate actively in the liturgy and even some of the signatories of the memorandum against the new Mass already repented of their action* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi*, fascicolo V).

From Prior General, Carmelites of Mary Immaculate, Prior General's House, Ernakulam, 21 September 1964.

To His Eminence Cardinal G. Testa, the Secretary to the S. O. Congregation, Rome.

Your Eminence,

With regard to the reformed liturgy introduced in our Church, now already two years, I thought it would be fitting to put on record the following facts for Your Eminence's information. I record here not only my personal impressions, but also the experience I have gained in the office of the Prior General during my visitations.

On July 3rd 1962 the new liturgy was introduced through a joint pastoral of all the Archbishops and Bishops of our Hierarchy. On the very first day I began to say the Mass in the new liturgy and have found it nurturing the sentiments of my devotion.

In accordance with the desire expressed in the pastoral, the new liturgy was introduced in all our three novitiates, in our Aspirant's houses, and in our study house – the Dharmaram College. I am personally aware of the fact that all our students and novices do find the new liturgy better adapted to their sentiments of devotion and that it fosters their spiritual life centred in the liturgy. The majority of the Fathers of our Congregation are saying Mass in the new liturgy and have expressed their satisfaction in the same.

When the new liturgy has been explained to the people they too have begun to like it. It is true that the new liturgy, when celebrated in a big congregation of the faithful and when the whole congregation is made to respond to the prayers of the priest, takes a longer time. Nevertheless, in many of our churches, to tell from my personal experience, the number of those who are daily assisting at the sacred liturgy is increasing day by day as also the number of communicants. The reason, they say, "now we can follow the Mass more intelligently". In most of our monastery chapels, the conventual Mass is being said in the new liturgy; and on inquiry I have found that the faithful do find the new liturgy more inspiring and better suited to mould the Christian life in the spirit of liturgy.

The arrangement of prayers in the new liturgy with the appropriate gestures and posture do facilitate the intelligent and active participation of the liturgy. Our people who were accustomed to assist at the sacred liturgy by saying prayers not pertaining to the liturgy, such as Rosary and the like, have now begun to assist at the liturgy with the missals in hand. This is, I believe, a definite step leading to the intelligent and active participation of the liturgy.

The re-constructed structure of the text of the Mass has brought in the structural unity of the prayer of the Mass and has put in relief the doctrinal contents of the various prayers thereof. All the prayers of the Mass have now become meaningful to the common man.

The temporal cycle that has been restored in our liturgical calendar gives due emphasis to the mysteries of Christ, which were

neglected in our former Calendar. Thus, the new liturgy does serve really as the first school of Christian perfection.

The re-arranged scriptural readings selected in the perspective of the Christian perfection and joining to the spirit of the season do give points for our daily meditation and make us live the mystery of Christ.

I am not unaware of the fact that there are some both among the clergy and laity, who have been publicly expressed their dislike for the new liturgy. I also know that some fathers of our Congregation too are included in this group. But, I wish to note here that these are relatively very few. I am also aware of the fact that recently a memorandum has been submitted to the Holy See through the Apostolic Internuncio denouncing the reformed liturgy. But I think that the discontentment is more sentimental than real or rational. People who have been accustomed to one form of assisting at the sacred liturgy with devotion according to their own way, may find it hard (all the more so in the case of old people) to change the time-old customs without affecting for the time being, their sentiments of devotion. I personally believe that this is the background of the whole discontentment.

There is also, as I know from my personal contacts, a lot of misunderstanding in the matter. When the new liturgy has been explained to some of the signatories themselves of the memorandum, they seem to understand the spirit of the reform of the liturgy and expressed their sorrow for having objected to the reformed liturgy by submitting the memorandum.

Thus, I am convinced that the discontentment that has been expressed by some concerning the new liturgy will soon vanish off; and that in the long run, all will appreciate the new liturgy.

I avail myself of the opportunity to thank Your Eminence and all concerned in the matter for having enriched our Rite in this manner. I earnestly pray Your Eminence that the other parts too of the liturgy be restored in like manner and introduced as early as possible. We assure Your Eminence of our wholehearted cooperation in the matter.

Craving Your Eminence's blessing and kissing the sacred purple,
I remain; Your Eminence's devoted Son in Christ,
Fr. Maurus CMI, Prior General.

Document 42
Petition of Six Malabar Priests against the Restored
Missal

New Delhi, 2 October 1964; *this letter was sent to the Apostolic Nuncio of India, who forwarded it to Cardinal Gustavo Testa, Secretary of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church with his own letter. The letter contains most of the ideas already expressed in the previous petitions. Hence my comments and the response of Prof. Alphonse Raes are applicable also to this letter* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi*, fascicolo V).

Apostolic Nunciature in India, N. 21070, New Delhi, 2 October 1964.

To His Eminence Most Reverend Lord Cardinal Gustavo Testa, Secretary of the Sacred Oriental Congregation, Rome.

Most Reverend Eminence,

I have the honour to transmit to Your Most Reverend Eminence the enclosed request of some priests of the Syro Malabar rite about the restored liturgy.

The courteous tone of the writing and the arguments, not of minor importance, which are put forward, have persuaded me to submit the petition to the wise consideration of Your Eminence.

Bowing to kiss the sacred purple, I have the honour to profess myself with profound respect and veneration,

Of Your Most Reverend Eminence,

Your Most Humble, Devoted and Obedient Servant,
James Robert Knox.

Attached Letter (no place and date)

To His Excellency, The Most Rev. James Robert Knox, Apostolic Internuncio, Apostolic Internunciature, Niti Marg, Chanakyapuri, New Delhi.

Your Excellency,

We, the undersigned priests of the Syro-Malabar Rite wish to bring to Your Excellency's notice the impression made on the clergy and the people by the introduction of the "restored" Liturgy.

All welcome the Holy Mass in Malayalam which is certainly a step forward; but nearly 90% of the clergy and the people do not relish the return to the Old Chaldean Mass and vestments.⁴³ They had been given up for good at the Synod of Diamper in 1599. When the Portuguese authorities introduced these changes, our people unaccustomed to Latin Liturgy and our priests ignorant of Latin blindly opposed Diamper reforms; but in fact, the Latinized Syro-Malabar Liturgy was a blessing in disguise. The change brought us closer to the Holy See. The Chaldean Vestments and Chaldean Liturgy do not appeal to us. They seem to be the remnants of the old Arab civilization of the Middle East and Mussulman to the core. It is not even sure whether this was the Liturgy in use in the pre-Diamper period.⁴⁴

⁴³ This is evidently an exaggeration, which does not correspond to the truth (see documents 33, 41 and 43). Although the petitioners affirm that 90% of the clergy do not like the restored liturgy, they could collect only six signatures!

⁴⁴ There is no doubt that the St Thomas Christians used the Chaldean or Syro-Oriental Liturgy before the Synod of Diamper. See P. Pallath, *The Eucharistic Liturgy of the St Thomas Christians*, 14-81.

The pioneers of the Chaldean Liturgy with a second century education and Middle East culture could not have developed a perfect Liturgy for the twentieth century. The sponsors of the “restoration” of our liturgy have gone back for their love for pristine purity instead of going forward. When the Maronite and Melkite Rites have borrowed much from the Latin Rite,⁴⁵ when the “restored” Mass of ours itself has taken much from the Maronite Rite,⁴⁶ we do not see the harm done to a people by following the Syro-Malabar rite, which has taken a good part of the Latin rite. The Latinization has brought us nearer to Catholics of the Latin rite and this similarity between the Syro-Malabar rite and Latin rite has been responsible for a better understanding between the adherents of the two rites. With the re-Chaldeanization of our rite, the gulf between the Latin and Syro-Malabar rites have been widened.

Since the Papal Brief of 1887 which authorized the ritual separation of the Syrian Catholics and Latin Catholics in Malabar, our rite was known in pontifical documents also as Syro-Malabar rite. It has an entity of its own which has hence developed beautifully well during these three centuries and which should have been preserved. Now, this Syro-Malabar Liturgy is thrown away and we are given the old Chaldean Liturgy instead. The Chaldean rite is exotic for us. The Western culture we have imbibed under the British rule does justify the admixture of the Western Liturgy too and the harmonious blending of the best in Chaldean rite and some of the beauties of the Latin rite has been a great blessing to us. With the Syro-Malabar rite our

⁴⁵ After the Second Vatican Council the Maronite and the Melkite Churches have reformed their liturgy and spiritual heritage, in accordance with the directive of the Council, “[...] If they have fallen away due to circumstances of times or persons, they are to strive to return to their ancestral traditions”. Vatican II, *Orinetarium Ecclesiarum*, no. 6.

⁴⁶ In the restored Missal all the prayers from the Maronite rite, except the last prayer of farewell to the Altar appeared in the *Qurbana* text printed in Rome in 1774 and in all the subsequent editions, were removed.

spiritual life has strengthened more than ever before and our faith also has been deepened. We don't know whether the same is the case with those who follow the Chaldean rite in the Middle East. The discouragement of genuflection before the Blessed Sacrament and during Mass, the uncouth dress of the Deacon, and sub-Deacon at a solemn High Mass, the peculiarity of the rubrics to be followed, the lack of precision of the rubrics, the colourless Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament with the ciborium only, the eventual disappearance of the Holy Hour, Thirteen Hour's devotion and of Forty Hours' devotion will tell upon the faith of the people which is already much affected by the inroad of the rapidly growing communism. The numerous devotions so fruitfully practised by our priests and faithful, like the Rosary, Way of the Cross etc. will soon disappear with the encouragement of the new Liturgy and that will be a terrible loss. Likewise the sacramentals also will have no place in our liturgy.⁴⁷ This is not the psychological opportunity to experiment upon the liturgy.

We are Indians. The Chaldean rite has its origin not in India; its songs and rituals are not to the Indian taste. During the fourth century, Syrian merchants under Thomas Cana brought this Middle East Liturgy to India and in the absence of anything better, we had to take it. Owing to the schisms and heresies that sprang up in the Middle East, our forefathers have been branded, as Nestorians by second class historians because our Liturgy happened to be Chaldean. It is, to say the least, most distressing that we should have been forced to go back to the antiquity of a rite which kept us stagnant in spiritual life for several centuries. If there has been progress in the Syro-Malabar Church,⁴⁸ it has been achieved through our contact with the Latin rite

⁴⁷ The catastrophic predictions of the petitioners were not realized. The popular devotions and pious practices indicated by them still exist in the Syro-Malabar Church.

⁴⁸ Towards the end of Latin governance in 1886 the Archdiocese of Cranganore was suppressed and all the Catholic St Thomas Christians became members of the Latin Archdiocese of Verapoly. Hence the Catholic Malabar Church canonically became extinct.

and the gradual Latinization which everybody liked except some oriental scholars and doctors of archaeology who are few and far between and who are interested in antiquities of museums to be brought to every life. The Chaldean rite is certainly a precious treasure of antiquity which deserves to be kept in a museum than to be revived in the twentieth century. And yet it has been revived and imposed upon us. The consequence will be the decline in the growth and vitality of the Syro-Malabar Church.

As in all oriental rites, the rubrics of the “restored liturgy” has no definiteness or precision. The purificator, the corporal and the pall so necessary for handling the consecrated species are not even thought of in the new Liturgy. Very soon there will be as many rites in the “restored Liturgy” as there are priests in this rite on account of the laxity of its structure. This sheer careless way of celebrating holy sacrifice of Mass will lower the sanctity of the Mass before the people and so we fear a further decline of faith and spirituality on this score as well.

In these circumstances, it is our earnest request that Your Excellency be pleased to interfere. As a first step the clerics ordained in 1963 and those to be ordained in future may be granted also the option of using the old Mass. And then Your Excellency will see that the revived Mass soon passing into oblivion, which will be a sort of plebiscite. The next step may be the holding of a Provincial Synod of the Syro-Malabar Church to deliberate on this important matter. The Synod, we may predict, will certainly reject the reforms and will claim for a translation of the Old Mass into Malayalam, reducing the server’s part and reserving the thurible for a High Mass. No synthesis of our liturgical functions is possible keeping the New Mass.

And so we pray for the following:

1. Option for priests ordained after 1962 also to say the Old Mass.

2. Grant of a translation of the old Syro-Malabar Mass reducing the server's part and without the thurible and the prayers accompanying the thurible.

3. A provincial Synod in Malabar to be convoked to decide the question.

Requesting Your Excellency to recommend our request to the Holy See for favourable disposal,

We beg to subscribe, Your most obedient and humble servants,

Fr. George Mulanjanany, Vicar, St. Antony's Church, Kuninji

Fr. George (junior) Kochuparambil, St Mary's Forane Church, Arakuza

Fr. Joseph Mundakal, Vicar, Rajakumari Church

Fr. Abraham Kanjirathumkal

Fr. George Kochuperalil

Fr. John J. Paikatt, Vicar Forane, Arakuza

Document 43

Letter of Chevalier Dr. P.J. Thomas from Marampally in Favour of the Reformed Liturgy

Alwaye, 19 October 1964; *Chevalier Dr. P. J. Thomas, professor of economics in different universities, member of Indian Parliament from 1957 to 1962 and a historian of the Malabar Church, in the letter to Cardinal Testa, Prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Church, appreciates the reformed Mass and disapproves the memorandum sent to the Holy See through the Apostolic Nunciature (document 39). In fact this letter reveals the secrets about the said memorandum and the manner of collecting signatures. The observations and comments of Dr. P. J. Thomas about the Syro-Malabar liturgy are historically correct and correspond to the truth*

(Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 955/65, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi, Riforma*, fascicolo I).

Chevalier Dr. P.J. Thomas Marampally, Alwaye 19 October 1964.

To His Eminence Gustavo Cardinal Testa, Secretary to the S. Oriental Congregation, Rome.

Your Eminence,

Recently there appeared in the Kerala Times, a Malayalam daily paper owned by the Latin Archdiocese of Verapoly, the text of a memorandum submitted by some laymen of the Syro-Malabar Rite to the Apostolic Internuncio Right Reverend Msgr. James Robert Knox against the restoration of the Syro-Malabar Rite, especially of the Holy Liturgy. A translation of the same memorandum in Malayalam appeared also in a Jacobite daily paper, the Malayala Manorama. Since the matter of that memorandum was to be presented to the Holy See on behalf of the people of the Syro-Malabar Rite, I submit the following points, hoping that they may help towards a proper evaluation of the memorandum.

1. May I submit first of all that the above mentioned memorandum is sponsored by a few elderly priests who find it difficult to adapt themselves to the changes newly introduced and a few wealthy and influential laymen. Some of these sponsors approached me also several times to secure my signature for the memorandum. But I had to refuse to oblige and to tell them frankly that it was an ill-advised move. But I am afraid that a good number of others yielded to persuasion and signed the document without properly studying its content.

2. The memorandum alleges that the recent changes “threaten to mar and mutilate the rite and even to destroy its very individuality and existence”. But the fact is that our Syro-Malabar Liturgy had long ago lost its individuality through various unintelligent modifications and

blind imitations from other rites. We have lived with the abnormal composition for so long that many do not even feel the abnormality. The Holy Mass was Chaldean in substance, but it had several prayers translated from Latin; a number of Latin rubrics taken out of their proper context were introduced into it; the Chaldean traditional vestments were substituted with the Latin vestments. The Divine Office I learn, was always Chaldean though in an abbreviated form, but the Pontifical for about sixty years was Latin and performed in the Latin language itself, and the Sacramentary, I understand, is the translation of an old Latin *Rituale* once in use in Spain. Unfortunately this situation had lasted so long that the people almost ceased bothering about it.

3. The sponsors of the memorandum state that the innovations made in the Syro-Malabar Liturgy were unwanted both by the people and the Hierarchy. I submit that this is entirely against facts. Ever since the beginning of the seventeenth century when the Kerala Syrian Church came under the rule of the Latin Bishops, petitions were submitted to the Holy See both by the Clergy and the people against their Latin pastors, and often the main complaint was the neglect of the rite and its distortion by the suppression of the traditional elements and the additions of Latin imitations. The three centuries of Latin rule was an unhappy period in the history of the Kerala Church when the people constantly struggled to get free from the Latin pastors who did not understand their rite or customs. When in the last century the Holy See proposed to confer episcopal dignity on the Vicar General for the Syrians the principal objection raised by the missionaries was that the Syro-Malabarians were so much attached to their own rite that once they had a Bishop of their own rite they would not care at all about the Vicar Apostolic, the Latin Bishop.

Even after the appointment of Bishops from the rite itself, and the institution of the Syro-Malabar Hierarchy, the need for the restoration of the rite to its pristine purity was not forgotten. The several Memoranda submitted to the Delegates Apostolic who visited Kerala

bear witness to this fact. In the Memoranda submitted by the Clergy and the people to His Eminence Eugene Cardinal Tisserant who visited Kerala in 1954 as Secretary of the Sacred Oriental Congregation requested His Eminence to expedite the work of restoration of the Syro-Malabar Liturgy. The undersigned himself cooperated in the presentation of such petitions.

As for the attitude of the people after the introduction of the restored Pontifical in 1958 and of the new Mass in 1962, I must admit that some older members of the Clergy find it a bit difficult to adapt themselves to the changes. Among the laity also there are some who got too much attached to the old order of things to appreciate any change. But the rest of the Clergy and the people in general love very much the restored Liturgy. The undersigned is an old man. In the Church of the C.M.I. Fathers at Alwaye where I go for Holy Mass not all the fathers have adopted the restored Liturgy. But I make it a point to participate in the restored Liturgy whenever it is possible. I find that the people in general show the same preference. Especially the youth actively participate in the new Mass. I hear that this is more or less the case everywhere in Kerala.

4. The main fear expressed by the above mentioned Memorandum is that with the restoration of the Syro-Malabar Liturgy the various private and public devotions which the Syro-Malabar Church got through the contact with the Latin rite may be suppressed. I think that this is an unnecessary fear, since these devotions such as the Rosary, the Way of the Cross, Eucharistic Adoration and Eucharistic Processions and the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, which do contribute to the true piety of the faithful, may be very well retained in the restored rite also, but properly subordinated to and coordinated with the strictly liturgical functions.

5. The recent change made in the Liturgy, of which the Memorandum complains, are all accidental, and those who examine them carefully can find out that they are all calculated to eliminate the unnecessary additions, to give grater order and consistency to the

prayers and ceremonies and to encourage the active participation of the faithful. They in no way constitute a shock or scandal for the people. on the contrary with the explanations recently given by several scholars in learned articles and books about these changes, the people have begun not only to appreciate these changes properly but also got a deeper understanding of the ceremonies themselves. I am glad to note that with the present liturgical revival and especially after the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy of Vatican Council II the same or similar changes are being made in the Latin rite.

I state these points with the intention of submitting to Your Eminence the ideas expressed in the above mentioned Memorandum against the restoration of the Syro-Malabar rite represent the ideas only of a few. Therefore I beg of Your Eminence to expedite the work of restoration of the Syro-Malabar rite so that we may soon have all the parts of the Liturgical Worship revised and made consistent and intelligible to the whole Christian people.

I avail myself of this occasion to express my deepest regards towards Your Eminence,

Your Eminence's most devoted son in Christ,

Dr. P. J. Thomas

Section Eight

COUNTER-REFORM: COMPILATION AND PUBLICATION OF MISSAL 1968

On the basis of the general opinion of the missionaries we can state, without a large margin of error, that the St Thomas Christians had Eucharistic celebration only on Sundays and feast days, in accordance with the general Eastern tradition. On ordinary days there was common recitation of the liturgy of the hours (Divine Office), in which not only priests and clerics attached to the same parish, but also other Christian faithful participated especially during the periods of Annunciation-Nativity and Great Lent.¹ Since they had Eucharistic celebration only on Sundays and feast days, they always celebrated the solemn form of the *Qurbana*.²

Even the Synod of Diamper did not prescribe the daily celebration of *Qurbana*. It stipulated only that since the “Syrian Mass is too long for priests that have a mind to celebrate daily, the Synod does grant license for the translation of the Roman Mass into Syriac, desiring the reverend father Francis Ros of the Society of Jesus, to undertake the work”.³ The Synod ordered the translation of the Roman Missal into Syriac only “for priests that have a mind to celebrate

¹ Cf. A. Monserrat, “Información de los christianos de S. Thomé”, 519; F. Dionysio, “Informação da cristandade de São Thomé que está no Malavar”, 140; F. Ros, “*Relação sobre a Serra*”, 305 & 335; A. De Gouvea, *Jornada do Arcebispo de Goa Dom Frey Aleixo de Menezes*, 59; P. Malekandathil (ed.), *Jornada of Dom Alexis de Menezes*, 239; Letter of M. Nunes, Barreto (1564), *Documenta Indica*, vol. 5, Roma 1957, 416; Letter of Alvaro Penteado (1528), in A. Silva Rego, *Documentação para a historia das missões do Padroado português do Oriente*, vol. 3, 549; A. M. Mundadan, *History of Christianity in India*, 199-200.

² For the Order of *Qurbana*, see P. Pallath, *The Eucharistic Liturgy of the St Thomas Christians*, 14-81.

³ Synod of Diamper, Session V, part 2, decree 4.

daily”, without imposing an obligation in that sense. However, in the course of time gradually the daily celebration became common.

Since the Latin practice of daily celebration was adopted in the Syro-Malabar Church a simple form of *Qurbana* became necessary. Hence the Roman Liturgical Commission and the Congregation for the Oriental Church envisaged also a simple form of *Qurbana*, lasting for about thirty minutes for ordinary days, together with the solemn and most solemn forms. Perhaps because of the particularities of Malayalam language the simple form of the *Qurbana* also appeared very long to the Syro-Malabar bishops.

In the joint petition which the Syro-Malabar bishops submitted to Cardinal Gustavo Testa (head of the Oriental Congregation) on 27 October 1963 among other things they pointed out: “As Your Eminence knows, the restored Mass was formally introduced into our Church on the 3 July 1962, with the obligation for the future priests to say it, those ordained before that date, however, remaining free to adopt it or not. Permission also was given to celebrate the restored Mass in our vernacular Malayalam, thereby making it possible for the faithful to take a more active and intelligent part in the Liturgy. But experience has shown that the Malayalam Mass takes a much longer time than the Syriac Mass, not only because, from the linguistic point of view, Malayalam lacks the brevity of expressions which is characteristic of Syriac, but also because congregational responses with pauses naturally make the service longer, though more appealing and edifying. On an average a congregational Mass in Malayalam will take at least 45 minutes. When the passages now kept in Syriac are also rendered into Malayalam, the Mass will become still longer. On the other hand, the conditions of modern life, the exigencies of the homily, Benediction etc., and the great number of Communion to be distributed demand that the time for the Low Mass, as a rule, shall not exceed 30 minutes”.⁴

⁴ Document 34.

The appeal of the Syro-Malabar bishops for a short Mass in parishes on ordinary days appeared to be reasonable and hence the Oriental Congregation permitted some more omissions and abbreviations, but it rejected the other requests: initial sign of the cross, sign of the cross from left to right, as well as modification in gestures, postures and rubrics.⁵ The Syro-Malabar Chevaliers who sent petitions against the restored Missal did not receive any reply from Rome until 1968, other than the critical study of Prof. Alphonse Raes.⁶

However, since 1963 under the guidance of Archbishop Joseph Parecattil the Central Liturgical Committee (CLC) started working on a new reformed Missal, taking into account the “opinion of the people and the priests”. Many drafts prepared by the Committee were practically rejected by the Bishops’ Conference, proposing modifications, corrections and improvement of language.⁷ Finally in 1967 a comparatively acceptable text was prepared, but no definitive decision could be taken. In this context the Syro-Malabar Bishops’ Conference held on 11 January 1968 resolved:

1) All the dioceses should constitute a local liturgical commission to promote the liturgical life in the diocese and to help the Central Liturgical Committee, as laid down in the Council decree on liturgy.

2) Strengthen the present Liturgical Committee by the addition of one more member from each diocese. Such member should have practical knowledge of pastoral obligations [...].⁸

In accordance with the decision of the Bishops’ Conference the Central Liturgical Committee was enlarged with members selected from all the dioceses of the Syro-Malabar Church.⁹ However, as we see below,

⁵ See document 35.

⁶ See document 40.

⁷ Cf. J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, 56-57.

⁸ J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, 58.

⁹ See document 44.

only after the visit of Cardinal Maximilian de Fürstenberg the endeavours for a modified text could be realized.

On 15 January 1968 Cardinal Maximilian de Fürstenberg until then Apostolic Nuncio in Portugal was appointed as the prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Church.¹⁰ Just a month after his appointment, according to the suggestion of Pope Paul VI, Cardinal Fürstenberg undertook a visit in Oriental regions, in commemoration of the golden jubilee of the erection of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches. Accompanied by Peter Duprey, at that time undersecretary of the Secretariat for Christian Unity and Mario Rizzi, Official of the Oriental Congregation, the Cardinal Prefect visited India, Jordan, Lebanon, Egypt, Turkey and the Holy Land from 16 February to 24 March 1968.¹¹ After his appointment obviously he did not get sufficient time to study the history, liturgy, theology and spiritual heritage of the Eastern Churches.

He reached Bombay on 17 February 1968 and after the reception in the archbishop's house on the same day he went straight to Ernakulam staying there until 19 February. Then between 19 and 25 February he visited all the remaining six dioceses of the Syro-Malabar Church. It seems that when the Cardinal Prefect was in Ernakulam, with the support of Archbishop Parecattil, the "anti-restoration Syro-Malabar Chevaliers" were permitted to brainstorm the Cardinal. Archbishop Parecattil wrote:

¹⁰ Maximilian de Fürstenberg, a priest of the diocese of Mechelen in Belgium, was ordained titular archbishop of Paltus on 14 March 1949. He served as apostolic delegate in Japan, Australia and New Zealand, before being appointed as apostolic nuncio in Portugal on 28 April 1962. He was elevated to the rank of Cardinal-Priest on 26 June 1967.

¹¹ Cf. Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Churches, *Servizio Informazioni per le Chiese Orientali* (SICO), n. 310 (30 marzo 1968) 1-2.

The Cardinal started celebrating the 1962 Mass in English, but later discontinued it when he learnt there was opposition to it. People got a golden opportunity to submit memorandum in person.¹²

As indicated, Archbishop Parecattil and his entourage succeeded in creating such an antipathy against the Syro-Malabar *Qurbana* in the Cardinal, that he stopped celebrating it. In fact, on 18 February 1968 the Cardinal concelebrated the Syro-Malabar *Qurbana* in the cathedral church of Ernakulam. He concelebrated the Syro-Malabar *Qurbana* also in the cathedral church of Trichur on 20 February.¹³ It is reported that he also concelebrated in the cathedral churches of Kothamangalam (22 February) and Palai (22 February), but the rite is not specifically stated; on other days he celebrated private Mass in Latin rite.¹⁴ On 24 February he consecrated the coadjutor bishop-elect Kuriakose Kunnacherry in Kottayam according to the restored Syro-Malabar Pontifical.¹⁵ After consecrating the new chapel at the St Thomas Apostolic Seminary in Kottayam (25 February) and visiting Syro-Malankara dioceses of Thiruvalla and Trivandrum (26-27 February) on 28 February the Cardinal departed from India.

Cardinal Maximilian de Fürstenberg visited also other Eastern Churches in the Middle East and then reached Rome on 24 March 1968. After reading the memorandum of Syro-Malabar Chevaliers (document 39) the Cardinal wrote to Joseph Vithayathil (30 April) and to Archbishop Joseph Parecattil (2 May), expressing his willingness to modify the 1962 Missal (documents 45-46). Thus finally the golden

¹² J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, 62.

¹³ Cf. "Diario di Viaggio", in Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Churches, *Servizio Informazioni per le Chiese Orientali* (SICO), n. 310 (30 marzo 1968) 1-2, 10-12.

¹⁴ Cf. "Diario di Viaggio", 13-14; on the occasion of my visit to Kerala in August 2017 from some old priests I got the information that the Cardinal concelebrated the Mass in Latin rite in the cathedral church of Palai.

¹⁵ Cf. "Diario di Viaggio", 15.

opportunity for obtaining approval for a new Missal, acceptable also to Syro-Malabar Chevaliers, came to the fore.

The Syro-Malabar Bishops' Conference held in Ernakulam on 20 May 1968 examined the last draft finalized by the Central Liturgical Committee and approved it. On 25 July 1968 Archbishop Parecattil wrote to all the Syro-Malabar bishops: "The printing of the order of Mass approved at the bishops' conference of 20th Aug. 1968 is nearing completion. I presume that you have no objection to include your name in the imprimatur dated 20-05-1968".¹⁶ Subsequently the Archbishop inserted the imprimatur of the bishops as none of them raised objections. Thus new text in Malayalam only, carrying the imprimatur of all the seven bishops, was printed at Alwaye, before being sent to Rome.¹⁷

On 6 August 1968 Mar George Alapatt, bishop of Trichur personally presented two copies of the new printed text to the Prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches with an explanatory letter of Archbishop Joseph Parecattil dated 27 July 1968 together with an attached note concerning some modifications in the rubrics (document 53). Cardinal Maximilian de Fürstenberg immediately approved the text (submitted in Malayalam only) and on the following day (7 August 1968) asked the Secretary of State to send a telegram to the Apostolic Nunciature in India, communicating the Congregation's approval *ad experimentum* for the 1968 *Taksa* (document 54).

As desired by the Cardinal Prefect the Secretary of State sent the telegramme without delay. On 9 August 1968 the Pronuncio informed

¹⁶ J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, 65. The imprimatur was inserted with the date of the Bishops' Conference, namely 20 May 1968. In this Conference three diocesan bishops did not personally participate (cf. document 50). There does not exist any document signed by all the bishops, which demonstrates that they gave their imprimatur.

¹⁷ *The Order of Qurbana of the Syro-Malabar Church*, Alwaye 1968. The Author is indicated as the Syro-Malabar Liturgical Committee, to which all rights are reserved.

Archbishop Parecattil, that the new text was approved as an experimental measure for implementation from 15 August 1968.¹⁸ Thus on 15 August 1968 the new *Taksa* came into force. Soon complaints and petitions reached the Congregation for the Oriental Churches with regard to the modifications of prayers, structural changes, return to Western practices, etc. Hence on 9 May 1969 the Oriental Congregation sent to Parecattil a note reminding him that approval for experimentation was given only for two years and that nothing should be changed in the anaphora (document 58). But the Syro-Malabar Church used the reformed *Taksa* of 1968 for about twenty years, namely until 1986 in some dioceses and until 1989 in other dioceses.

Without considering the fact, whether one is favourable or unfavourable to the 1968 *Qurbana* and without entering into the merit of the text, any objective observer can easily understand that none of the procedures for the approval of liturgical books was observed by Cardinal De Fürstenberg. The 1962 Missal was established, duly observing all the procedures in the most transparent manner. After its compilation by the Roman Liturgical Commission Syro-Malabar bishops were twice consulted. After examining the observations of the said bishops and experts, the Missal was approved by the plenary assembly of the Oriental Congregation and then by Pope Pius XII. Then it was solemnly promulgated by the instruction of the same Congregation.

On the other hand the 1968 text submitted only in Malayalam was not examined by anyone. The approval was immediately granted by a telegram (something unheard with regard to the approval of Latin and Oriental liturgical books), complying with the request of Archbishop Joseph Parecattil, as if it was impossible to celebrate the Holy Mass in the Syro-Malabar Church due to the absence of a Missal. Since Joseph Parecattil was the president of the Bishops' Conference and practically

¹⁸ J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, 66.

acted as the “head” of the Syro-Malabar Church at that time, it seems that his letter stating that only “minor changes” were made in the 1962 Missal was considered trustworthy and hence approval was granted without any examination of the text. Moreover, the Cardinal seems to have taken seriously the statement of “Syro-Malabar Chevaliers” against the interventions of “experts in liturgy” at Rome and the demand made to him: “to counteract and nullify all such machinations and to ensure to us the early redress of our grievances”.¹⁹

Later declarations of the Oriental Congregation itself recognize the error committed and prove our aforementioned statements about the approval of the 1968 text. In the *Report on the State of Liturgical Reform in the Syro-Malabar Church* dated 12 August 1980 the Congregation affirmed:

In reality, this new text, as a result of the various changes effected in the course of translation, differed considerably from that prepared by the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Churches (1962), which had been previously submitted to the judgement of the Syro-Malabar Bishops, had been approved by the plenary assembly (1957) and by the Holy Father himself, had been published in Kerala - in Syriac -, and was intended to be freely used by the Priests and obligatorily by the alumni of Seminaries and novitiates.²⁰

In the same Report the Congregation goes on to state: “The new text (1968) gave rise to reservations and perplexity in many quarters; but the Sacred Congregation at that time thought it best to allow the experiment to take its course and, by Letter to the Syro-Malabar Bishops’ Conference, dated May 9, 1969, went no further than limit the experiment to a period of two years, while strongly recommending that *‘universi textus liturgici in linguam quoque latinam vertantur ad*

¹⁹ Cf. Document 51.

²⁰ Congregation for the Oriental Churches, *Report on the State of Liturgical Reform in the Syro-Malabar Church*, no. 10c, in *Roman Documents on the Syro-Malabar Liturgy*, 3.

usum commissionis liturgicae Sacrae Congregationis pro Ecclesiis Orientalibus iuxta praxim vigentem”.²¹

Cardinal Wladyslaw Rubin, Prefect of the Oriental Congregation, on the occasion of the meeting with the Syro-Malabar Bishops in Rome on 26 August 1980 confirmed, “As regards the text of the ‘1968 Mass’, I would like to point out that, as appears in our Report on page 3, n. 11a and 11b, the Sacred Congregation permitted its use without having had the time to submit it to examination, given the urgency of the case and the time of year (mid-summer)”.²² After this historical introduction about the context, compilation and approval of the 1968 Missal now the relevant documents are presented.

²¹ Congregation for the Oriental Churches, *Report on the State of Liturgical Reform in the Syro-Malabar Church*, no. 12, in *Roman Documents on the Syro-Malabar Liturgy*, 3-4. The Latin phrase in the citation can be translated as follows: “all the liturgical texts should also be translated into Latin for the use of the liturgical Commission of the Sacred Congregation according to the current praxis”.

²² Speech delivered by Cardinal Rubin on the occasion of the assembly of the Syro-Malabar Bishops held at the Oriental Congregation on 26 August 1980, in *Roman Documents on the Syro-Malabar Liturgy*, 41.

Document 44
Circular of Archbishop Parecattil to the Syro-Malabar Bishops concerning the Composition of the Liturgical Committee and the State of Liturgical Reform

Alwaye, 8 February 1968; *the circular letter of Archbishop Parecattil provides details concerning the membership and work of the central liturgical Committee set up in Kerala. This gives some information also regarding the liturgical reform during the years 1962-1968. With regard to the Missal it affirms that efforts have been going on for the modification and compilation of a new text* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 955/65, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi, Riforma*, fascicolo I).

Most Rev. Dr. Joseph Parecattil, Archbishop of Ernakulam, No. B/11/68, 8 February 1968.

To the Syro-Malabar Prelates.

Your Grace//Excellency,

In continuation of my letter dated January 28th, I am glad to inform you that the names of additional members for our Central Liturgical Committee have already been obtained. I am giving below a consolidated list of all the members of the Committee:

1. Very Rev. Msgr. Kurian Vanchipurackal, St Thomas Apostolic Seminary, Kottayam
2. Rev. Fr. James Chavely, St Joseph's Pontifical Seminary, Alwaye (Convener)
3. Rev. Fr. Lucas (Vithuvettickal) C.M.I., Dharmaram College, Bangalore
4. Very Rev. Fr. George Akkara, Trichur
5. Rev. Fr. Jacob Adambukulam, Trichur

6. Very Rev. Fr. Cyriac Kooplicatt, Kottayam
7. Rev. Fr. Jacob Vellian, Kottayam
8. Very Rev. Fr. Joseph Maliparambil, Changanacherry
9. Rev. Fr. Joseph Pavathil (sic), Changanacherry
10. Very Rev. Fr. Thomas Manakat, Palai
11. Rev. Fr. Alexander Cherukarakunnel, Palai
12. Very Rev. Fr. Varkey Kunnappally, Tellicherry
13. Rev. Fr. Jacob Thumkuzhy, Tellicherry
14. Rev. Fr. John Matheikal, Kothamangalam
15. Rev. Fr. John Vallamattam, Kothamangalam
16. Rev. Fr. Sebastian Mankuzhikary, Ernakulam
17. Rev. Fr. Jacob Aeranat, Ernakulam (Secretary and Notary)
18. Rev. Fr. Silas C.M.I., Representative of the C.M.I. Congregation
19. Rev. Fr. Abel C.M.I. (General Choir Master)

Though Fr. Arerenat, the additional member from Ernakulam Archdiocese, is not at present a Parish Priest, he has had sufficient pastoral experiences already and, as he accompanies me when I make pastoral visitations, he gets ample opportunities to feel the pulse of public opinion at the Archdiocesan level. Moreover his services are needed to note down the proceedings of the Commission on my behalf.

I wanted to have a meeting of the Commission next week, but owing to the visit of His Eminence, the Cardinal Prefect of the Sacred Oriental Congregation, it has to be postponed to March.

It will be good on this occasion to take stock of the work already accomplished in the translation and adaptation of our liturgical books.

1. In 1959, the Ordination Service was published in Malayalam. General opinion seems to be that it needs further revision and adaptation.

2. In 1962, likewise, the Malayalam Missal came out. Some abbreviations and other minor changes were allowed by the Sacred Congregation in the text in 1963. Efforts are now being made to render the whole Mass in elegant, modern Malayalam, updating the ceremonies and rubrics so as to cater to pastoral exigencies and to the tastes of the present-day enlightened congregation, following the guidelines presented by the Council of Vatican II. Already two texts have been prepared and they will be scrutinized and modified in our next meeting.

3. The major part of the Funeral Services was presented for public use in 1966, a signal achievement of the author Fr. Abel C.M.I. The work is very much appreciated, not only for its contents, but also for the beautiful translation, as far as I have been able to gather from several priests and laymen. The services for the funeral of children and of priests are still to be rendered into Malayalam and Fr. Abel is at present busy with them.

4. Two volumes of the Breviary were published in 1967, a welcome relief to many who had to struggle hard with the Syrian texts, even to the point of culpable neglect of the Canonical hours altogether. The above volumes too are the fruits of the strenuous and continuous efforts of Fr. Abel C.M.I. According to his plan three more volumes have to be published, and the third one was to come out before December last. But in the meanwhile Fr. Lucas C.M.I. undertook to prepare the third volume (for the Advent Season). It was more or less ready towards the end of November, but he wrote to me that the final touches had not been given and that the work still needed scrutiny by literary scholars. Hence it will take some more time for the work to see the light. However, Fr. Abel has promised to work at the fourth volume for the Season of Slea, following Lent and Resurrection. What I have been able to learn by my contact with several persons is that Fr. Abel's edition of the breviary is appreciated by far the great majority of priests, both religious and diocesan, in spite of the adverse criticism emanating from a handful of priests.

5. The Breviary for the sisters has been completed in December 1967. It has been compiled from the Breviary of the Fathers with suitable adjustments.

6. The latest work done is the translation and adaptation of the text for the Consecration of Churches. The Malayalam text has been printed 'pro manuscripto' in December, 1967. It is to be noted that a translation of the original text was sent to all the Dioceses already.

7. The Malayalam translation of the Propria of the Mass and of the Holy Week Services, etc. have already been undertaken by different persons, as directed by the Central Liturgical Commission. But they all need further scrutiny and modifications.

8. The restoration and adaptation of the Liturgy of the Sacraments have been entrusted to Very Rev. Msgr. Vanchipurackal, Rector of the Kottayam Seminary and two others of the sub-committee, especially set up for the purpose, under the chairmanship of His Excellency the Bishop of Kottayam. This was done on March 30, 1967.

9. Similarly the revision of the Pontifical was entrusted on March 30, 1967, to Rev. Fr. Lucas C.M.I. and others of the sub-committee under the chairmanship of Bishop Valloppilly of Tellicherry.

10. The revision of the Liturgical Calendar was entrusted to Fr. Lucas C.M.I. which he had to do under the supervision of Rt. Rev. Msgr. L.J. Chittoor. The work has already been accomplished, but we have still to consider the question of adding a few more popular feasts. Apart from it, the connection between some feasts and the readings being not evident, a further scrutiny by the Central and Diocesan Commissions and by the Prelates may prove helpful. So we have to wait for some time more before printing it.

The above facts clearly show that the process of our Liturgical reform is in full swing and can be completed before long, provided those who have undertaken specific tasks fulfil them in due time. Of course, the work in itself is long and laborious, the more so because we are at a transitional stage. In this connection, I am sorry to note that,

though a Post-Conciliar Liturgical Committee, among others was set up at our meeting held at Kottayam on February 10, 1966, so far I have received no report of its proceedings and findings.

Hoping that the above information will be of interest to you and conveying my respectful regards,

Yours devotedly in Our Lord,

Joseph Parecattil, Archbishop of Ernakulam,

Cc: Rev. Fr. James Chavely,

St. Joseph's Pontifical Seminary, Alwaye 2.

Document 45

Letter of Cardinal De Fürstenberg to Chevalier Joseph Vithayathil Expressing His Willingness to Modify the 1962 Missal

Rome, 30 April 1968; *as we have seen in the introduction of this section, during the visit of Cardinal Maximillian De Fürstenberg, Prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, the anti-restoration Syro-Malabar Chevaliers met him and gave him a copy of the memorandum which they had formerly sent to the Congregation through the Apostolic Nunciature in India (document 39). Once the Cardinal reached Rome, he sent the present favourable response to them (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 955/65, Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi, Riforma, fascicolo I).*

From His Eminence Maximillian Cardinal De Fürstenberg, Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Rome; Port No. 955/65, 30 April 1968.

To Chevalier Joseph Vithayathil K.S.G., President, All Kerala Catholic Congress, Ernakulam.

Dear Sir,

It is a month since I returned from my trip with a wonderful memory of the gracious and most kind reception given to my party in Kerala.

This letter is to give you the assurance that I did read the little book written in 1964, and sent to the Apostolic Internuncio. It is probably due to the fact that the Ecumenical Council was not finished that no answer was given.

Personally I understand well a number of the grievances exposed there. Not all, of course, are of the same value; we are requesting the Bishops of Kerala to study the matter and to present proposals on a number of them.

[Cardinal Maximillian Cardinal De Fürstenberg].

Document 46
Letter of Cardinal De Fürstenberg to Archbishop
Parecattil Asking the Bishops to Receive the
Suggestions of Syro-Malabar Chevaliers

Rome, 2 May 1968; *Cardinal Maximillian De Fürstenberg, Prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches writes to Archbishop Parecattil regarding the memorandum of lay people. The Cardinal Prefect asks the bishops of the Syro-Malabar Church to study their grievances and to receive their suggestions* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Port. No. 955/65, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi, Riforma*, fascicolo I).

Sacra Congregatio Pro Ecclesiis Orientalibus, Port No. 955/65, 2 May 1968.

To His Grace Most Rev. Dr. Joseph Parecattil, Archbishop of Ernakulam, India.

Your Grace,

Besides several letters on the same matter, the honourable Judge Joseph Vithayathil sent to me a copy of the "Memorandum" addressed to His Excellency, Archbishop Knox, the Apostolic Internuncio, in 1964. With this copy he included a letter. Many notables joined in the same petition expressing dislike for a large number of small or other changes in the Liturgy of the Malabar rite.

My personal feeling is that in many of those grievances they are right (such as the sign of the Cross, to keep the representation of Our Lord's body on the Cross etc.), so much the more in that there is no Orthodox counterpart to the Malabars.

With sentiments of highest esteem and every best wish, I am,

Yours sincerely in Christ,

M. Cardinal De Fürstenberg, Prefect.

We will be pleased of a study made by Their Graces the Archbishops and Their Lordships the Bishops of the Malabar Rite and to receive all their suggestions to improve the situation with stability for the future.

M. Cardinal De Fürstenberg.

Document 47
Letter of Archbishop Parecattil to the Syro-Malabar Bishops, Convoking Them to a Meeting for the Finalization of the New Missal

Ernakulam, 8 May 1968; *Archbishop Parecattil provides some information regarding the work of the central liturgical Committee on the compilation of the new Missal and summons the Bishops to a meeting of the Syro-Malabar Bishops' Conference on 20 May 1968, in order to finalize the text* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 955/65, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi, Riforma*, fascicolo I; *Ernakulam Missam*, March 1977, 9-10).

From Most Rev. D. Joseph Parecattil, Archbishop of Ernakulam, No. B57-63/68, 8 May 1968.

To the Syro-Malabar Prelates.

Your Grace/Excellency,

I hope your representatives have given you a report of our Central Liturgical Committee which had an important session from March 25th to 28th (both inclusive). The main work done was to re-examine the text of the Mass and give finishing touches to it with appropriate changes in phraseology and rubrics. The draft text prepared earlier by the Committee was taken as the basis for discussions, referring at the same time to the one now in use and the revised one prepared by Fr. Abel C.M.I. Where there was no unanimity of opinion, the issue was

decided by votes, a two thirds majority being required for any change to be introduced in the basic text. It may be recalled that this text was sent to you last year for your remarks and comments. Now it is necessary to finalise before it is given to the press. So I think it advisable to convene a meeting of the Syro-Malabar Prelates and discuss the matter. We may have to get a final approval from the Sacred Oriental Congregation for some changes suggested. In the light of the above facts I may request you to make it convenient to take part in the Syro-Malabar Bishops' Conference to be held here at the Archbishop's House, Ernakulam on Monday 20th May 1968 at 10 A.M. The Conference can be terminated by 4 P.M. If you are by no means able to come, please send at least your Vicar general as representative.

Thanking you in anticipation and looking forward to the pleasure of meeting you soon,

Yours devotedly in Our Lord,

Joseph Parecattil, Archbishop of Ernakulam.

Document 48
Reply of Archbishop Parecattil to Cardinal De Fürstenberg Informing Him of the Scheduled Meeting of Bishops for the Approval of the New Missal

Ernakulam, 11 May 1968; *Archbishop Parecattil informs Cardinal Maximillian De Fürstenberg of the meeting of the Bishops' Conference to be held on 20 May for the modification of the 1962 Missal, taking into consideration the grievances of the petitioners who signed the memorandum* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 955/65, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi, Riforma*, fascicolo I).

From His Grace Joseph Archbishop Parecattil, Archbishop of Ernakulam.

To His Eminence Maximillian Cardinal De Fürstenberg, Prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Rome; No. 62/68, 11 May 1968.

Your Eminence,

May I acknowledge with thanks Your Eminence's esteemed letter Prot. N. 955/65, dated May 2, 1968 regarding our liturgical reform. I fully agree with Your Eminence's remark that many of the grievances of the gentlemen who sent the petition to His Excellency Archbishop Knox are legitimate and I have already brought this to the notice of the Sacred Congregation (Cfr. my letter dated 18th October, 1967. Cfr. also the Memorandum of the Syro-Malabar Bishops on October 22, 1963).

In accordance with your direction, we, the Syro-Malabar Bishops will be meeting here at the Archbishop's House, Ernakulam on May 20th to discuss the matter. Already our Liturgical Committee which had a four day's session in March has suggested some modifications in the rubrics of the Mass. After forming our own opinion on the main issues, we will be submitting a report to the Sacred Oriental Congregation for

the necessary approval. When the anomalies in our reformed liturgy are thus finally rectified, it will pave the way for a brighter future for our Church and that will be counted as a beneficial result of Your Eminence's visit to Kerala.

Humbly thanking Your Eminence for the keen interest you take in the future of our rite and kissing Your Eminence's ring with profound veneration,

Your Eminence's most devotedly in Our Lord,
Joseph Parecattil, Archbishop of Ernakulam.

Document 49
Letter of Joseph Vithayathil to Cardinal De Fürstenberg
Thanking Him for Positively Considering the
Memorandum

Ernakulam, 27 May 1968; *Chevalier Joseph Vithayathil expresses his gratitude to Maximillian Cardinal De Fürstenberg, Prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, for studying the memorandum and for taking steps to remedy the grievances about the Missal 1962* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 955/65, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi, Riforma*, fascicolo I).

From Joseph Vithayathil K.S.G., B. A., B. L. Prvy Chamberlain of the Sword and the Cape, Retired High Court Judge, President All Kerala Catholic Congress.

To His Eminence Maximillian Cardinal De Fürstenberg, Prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Rome.

May it please Your Eminence,

Sub: The Syro-Malabar Memorandum of 1964 on the Liturgical changes.

Ref: Your Eminence's Letter No. 955/65, dated April 30, 1968.

I beg to acknowledge receipt of Your Eminence's gracious letter, informing us that Your Eminence was pleased to peruse our Memorandum and understand our grievances, and that Your Eminence has requested the Bishops of Kerala to study the matter and to present proposals for rectifying the mistakes.

We are profoundly thankful to Your Eminence for the pains Your Eminence has taken to study our Memorandum, and for having taken the necessary steps for remedying our grievances.

We may assure Your Eminence that this is a matter about which the community is very much concerned, and we are anxiously waiting for final orders on the matter.

We are happy that Your Eminence appreciated the expressions of devotional loyalty of our people to the Holy See and Your Eminence, and we are grateful to Your Eminence for making it convenient to come to India immediately after taking charge of your responsible office.

Requesting Your Eminence's Apostolic Blessings,

I beg to remain,

May it please Your Eminence,

Your Eminence's most obedient son in Christ,

Joseph Vithayathil.

Document 50

Letter of Archbishop Parecattil regarding the Meeting of the Bishops and Approval of the 1968 Missal

Ernakulam, 5 June 1968; *this circular letter provides information concerning the meeting of the Bishops' Conference on 20 May 1968, which approved the 1968 Missal. Main modifications made in the Qurbana are indicated; the anti-restoration Chevaliers also participated in the discussions and expressed their satisfaction. It is noteworthy that no one favourable to the restored Missal was convoked to the meeting* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 955/65, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi, Riforma*, fascicolo I; *Ernakulam Missam*, March 1977, 10-12).

From Most Rev. D. Joseph Parecattil, Archbishop of Ernakulam, No. B/70/68, 5 June 1968.

To the Syro-Malabar Prelates.

Your Grace/Excellency,

As you know, a special meeting of the Syro-Malabar Bishops' Conference was held here at the Archbishop's House on May 20th, 1968, in order to discuss matters connected with the Liturgy. All the Prelates were present except the Bishops of Kottayam, Trichur and Palai, who were represented by their Vicars General: Rt. Rev. Mar Cyriac Kunnassery, Msgr. Zacharias Vazhappilly and Msgr. Philip Valiyil respectively.²³ Rev. Fr. James Chavely, Convener of the

²³ It is surprising that three out of seven diocesan bishops did not take part in the meeting of the Bishops' Conference which approved the 1968 Missal, a matter of vital importance for the entire Syro-Malabar Church. They did not participate in the meeting, perhaps because they were convoked at a short notice or because they considered it useless, given the circumstances at that time. However, the imprimatur of those bishops who did not personally participate in the Conference was also inserted in the text with the same date.

Liturgical Committee, attended the meeting from beginning to end. The meeting started at 10 a.m. and came to a close at 4 p.m.

At the outset Fr. Chavely gave an account of the changes suggested by the Central Liturgical Committee in the liturgy of the Mass. They were all approved by the Conference. It further decided: 1) to omit the blessing of the sacred species after Consecration, 2) to modify the prayer of the offertory in such a way that the sacrifice may be declared to be offered “to the Eternal Father through Christ”, 3) to permit the use of the chasubles, especially Gothic, as well as the cope for the Mass, until better vestments, covering also the front of the body, are designed, more or less on the pattern of Gothic vestments. It was agreed that the use of Dalmatics for High Mass is not to be forbidden, nay, it may even be recommended at this transitional period.

Since a letter had been received from the Sacred Oriental Congregation in regard to the Memorandum submitted by 93 prominent laymen of our community to the Holy See in 1964, expressing their dissatisfaction at the restored liturgy, their representatives (Rev. Fr. Francis Sales C.M.I., Chev. Joseph Vithayathil, Chev. Joseph Petta, Mr. Mathew Kollamparambil) were also invited to attend the Conference.²⁴ In the letter His Eminence the Cardinal Prefect of the Sacred Congregation had said that “in many of those grievances they are right (such as the sign of the cross, to keep the representation of Our Lord’s body on the cross etc.), so much the more that there is a pluricentennial tradition and that there is no orthodox counterparts to the Malabars”. His Eminence had further asked us Bishops to study the question afresh and to present our

²⁴ The original memorandum submitted to the Holy See in 1964 was signed only by Joseph Vithayathil and other 16 laymen (see document 39). Fr. Francis Sales CMI was not a signatory. Perhaps the Syro-Malabar Chevaliers later collected other signatures and gave another list to Archbishop Parecattil!

proposals for rectifying matters and redressing the aforesaid grievances.²⁵

Towards the latter half of the meeting the sponsors of the memorandum were requested to come in and take part in the discussions. They welcomed the changes in the Mass already suggested by the Liturgical Committee and approved by the Bishops' Conference. They expressed their desire of having a few more changes e.g. putting the epiclesis before consecration, genuflexion etc. but did not insist on them in the light of the explanations given, but they insisted upon taking the host **in hand** at the consecration and elevation and transferring the last incensing to a place immediately preceding the Consecration or at least suppressing the same altogether. The Bishops' Conference unanimously agreed to those proposals and decided to present the matter to the Sacred Congregation for final approval, after hearing the opinion also of our Liturgical Committee. On May 28th, at a meeting of the Liturgical Committee held at the Pontifical Seminary, Alwaye, 12 out of the 16 members present voted in favour of taking the host in hand at the consecration and elevation and suppressing the last incensing so as to safeguard the structure of the Mass, as it was said.

With all the changes suggested a draft-text of the Mass is being printed for submission to Rome for final approval. It has the approval of the Bishops and the support of most of the members of the Liturgical Committee. The authors of the Memorandum are also satisfied with it, though all their suggestions have not been accepted.

It may be noted in this connection that the Liturgical Committee which had a session at the Alwaye Seminary from 27th to 29th May (both inclusive), made a study of a number of questions regarding the Sacraments, Karosousa and Propria of the Mass etc. The draft-texts of the Sacraments, the Karosousa of the Mass and the Propria of the Mass prepared by individuals and sub-committees were found to be not quite

²⁵ See document 46.

acceptable, because they were either too shallow in thought or too archaic in tone and contents. Sub-Committees were appointed for the up-dating and adaptation of those texts. A sub-Committee was also appointed for the updating and enriching of the Ordination Services.

As you have been informed, a member of the Committee had undertaken the preparation of the Canonical hours for the season of Advent. Though several months have elapsed already, the text has not yet been finalized and presented to the Committee.

Fr. Abel C.M.I. has been requested to compose the musical texts for the High Mass.

Thanking you for your kind co-operation for the creation of a dynamic and up-to-date liturgy responding to the tastes and aspirations of the people of God for whom it is meant, namely, the Syro-Malabarians, and conveying my respectful regards,

Yours devotedly in Our Lord,

Joseph Parecattil, Archbishop of Ernakulam.

Document 51

Letter of Joseph Vithayathil and Two Other Laymen to Cardinal De Fürstenberg Expressing Satisfaction for Their Meeting with the Bishops

(Ernakulam), 9 June 1968; *in this letter to Cardinal Maximillian de Fürstenberg, Prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, the anti-restoration Syro-Malabar Chevaliers express satisfaction about their meeting with the bishops, who assured them that most of their grievances would be redressed. They also ask the Cardinal to counteract and nullify probable machinations of the liturgical experts in Rome and to ensure them the early satisfaction of their desires* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 955/65, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi, Riforma*, fascicolo I).

To His Eminence Maximillian Cardinal De Fürstenberg, Prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Rome.

May it please Your Eminence,

Sub: The Syro-Malabar Memorandum of 1964 on Liturgical changes.

Ref: Your Eminence's Letter No. 955/65, dated April 30, 1968.

With reference to the above, we beg to inform Your Eminence that their Excellencies the Bishops of the Syro-Malabar Rite had a Conference recently at Ernakulam, at which our memorandum relating to the recent Liturgical changes in our Rite was considered. Their Excellencies were pleased to invite the signatories below as representatives of the Memorialists, and also some members of the Liturgical Committee, to take part in the discussions. Only points relating to the Liturgy of the Mass were discussed at the Conference. Although we did not succeed in getting an assurance that all our

grievances would be redressed, we were consoled to think that many of them will find redress as the result of the Conference.

Considering the attitude taken in the past by some “experts in liturgy” at Rome, who have had no pastoral experience, and who are responsible for imposing the unwanted changes in our Liturgy, and who cannot be expected to get rid of their pet ideas of the so called “pristine purity” of the Rite, and of their inborn hatred towards Latin and anything connected with the Latin Rite, we have a fear that further obstacles will be placed by them in the implementation of the decisions that may be taken by their Excellencies the Bishops of Kerala as a result of the discussions at the Conference.

We fully trust, however, that Your Eminence, as the Protector and Guardian of our Church, will use your legitimate influence to counteract and nullify all such machinations and to ensure to us the early redress of our grievances.

Thanking Your Eminence for the great paternal care Your Eminence is taking in the welfare and progress of the Church in Kerala.

We beg to remain,

May it please Your Eminence,

Your Eminence’s most obedient sons in Christ,

1. Joseph Vithayathil K.S.G., President of the All Kerala Catholic Congress, Ernakulam.

2. Joseph Pettah; K.S. G., Ex-President of the All Kerala Catholic Congress, Trichur.

3. Mathew J. Kollamparambil, (Secretary to the Memorialists), Ernakulam.

Document 52
**Letter of Parecattil to De Fürstenberg Informing Him of
 the State of the New Missal**

Ernakulam, 14 June 1968; *with this letter Archbishop Parecattil forwarded to Cardinal Maximillian De Fürstenberg, Prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, a copy of the report which he sent to the members of Syro-Malabar Bishop's Conference (document 44). He also informed the Cardinal that the revised text of the new Missal would be ready within a few weeks (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 955/65, Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi, Riforma, fascicolo I).*

Most Rev. Dr. Joseph Archbishop Parecattil, Archbishop of Ernakulam, No. 78/68, 14 June 1968.

To His Eminence Maximillian Cardinal De Fürstenberg, Prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Rome.

Your Eminence,

In continuation of my letter dated May 11, 1968 I am enclosing herewith a copy of the Report I have sent to the Syro-Malabar Bishops' conference for Your Eminence's information.²⁶ The revised text of the Mass in Malayalam will be ready within a few weeks, when I will be sending copies of the same to the Sacred Congregation for a formal approval of the few changes suggested. It is hoped that the revised text will be universally acceptable.

Humbly thanking for Your Eminence for the keen interest you take in our liturgical reform and kissing Your Eminence's ring with profound veneration

Your Eminence's most devotedly in Our Lord,
 Joseph Parecattil, Archbishop of Ernakulam.

²⁶ See documents 44 and 48.

Document 53

Letter of Archbishop Parecattil to Cardinal De Fürstenberg Requesting Approval for 1968 Missal

Ernakulam, 27 July 1968; *Archbishop Parecattil requests Maximillian Cardinal De Fürstenberg, Prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, to approve the 1968 Missal immediately, at least ad experimentum, so that it could be used from 15 August 1968. The Archbishop explicitly states that there are only “minor changes” and “changes are not of a serious nature”. Given the urgency of the case, further he asks the Cardinal to notify the approval by “cable”. After the letter I also reproduce the document, “Some Changes in the Rubrics of the Mass” attached to it by Parecattil (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 955/65, Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi, Riforma, fascicolo I).*

Most Rev. Dr. Joseph Parecattil, Archbishop of Ernakulam, No. 93/68, 27 July 1968.

To His Eminence Maximillian Cardinal De Fürstenberg, Prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Rome.

Your Eminence,

With reference to Your Eminence’s esteemed letter Port No. 955/55, dated May 2, 1968 and my letters dated May 11, 1968 and June 14, 1968,²⁷ I am forwarding through His Excellency Rt. Rev. Dr. George Alapatt, Bishop of Trichur, two copies of our Revised Malayalam Missal which contains the imprimatur of all the Bishops of our rite. I am enclosing herewith a list of the main modifications introduced in the rubrics, with indications of the reasons that prompted the changes.

The translation has been free in this edition, that is to say, efforts have been made to express the ideas in current and elegant Malayalam,

²⁷ See documents 46, 48 and 52.

paying particular attention to theological accuracy and conformity to the Scripture. Undue repetitions have been avoided and gestures have been made more meaningful and adapted to Indian mentality. But all these are minor changes and are in line with the modifications suggested in the memorandum of the Syro-Malabar Bishops dated October 22, 1963 to the Sacred Congregation.²⁸

It may be noted in this connection that there was a lot of unrest among our priests and people after the introduction of the restored Mass in 1962, the more so because our Rite is Syro-Malabar and not simply Chaldean, with a tradition of our own. The priests and people had no interest in pure Chaldean ways. But then the Council came, emphasizing the need of updating the liturgy, among other things, and updating it to the indigenous cultural patterns, of course, within the framework of traditional heritages. We are just following the guidelines given by the Council in the restoration and adaptation of our liturgy.

In the case of the text of the Mass, we have taken care to feel the pulse of public opinion by publishing it in the Catholic papers and by contacting accredited literary scholars. Our Central Liturgical Committee, consisting of 20 members representing the various dioceses, major seminaries, and religious Congregations, has prepared, scrutinized, and approved the text almost unanimously. Wherever there was difference of opinion, the issues were decided by a two thirds majority of votes. It may be noted that in our Committee there are liturgical scholars trained in Rome and at home, pastors of souls, and other priests who combine in themselves sound liturgical knowledge and long pastoral experience.

The text was approved by the Bishops on May 20, 1968, after due scrutiny and after hearing the opinion of the lay leaders who submitted a memorandum to His Excellency Most Rev. James Knox, the then

²⁸ See document 34.

Apostolic Internuncio.²⁹ They are, on the whole, pleased with the present text and rubrics of the Mass, though not fully satisfied.

We are sure that the revised Malayalam Missal will be accepted by all. The priests and people will welcome it with one voice. If there be any discordant note, it will come only from some liturgists with extreme views, who still foster a pre-conciliar idea of liturgy and who have no knowledge of and appreciation for pastoral exigencies.

In the light of the above facts, my humble request is to approve the revised Missal – after all, the changes are not of a serious nature – at least “ad experimentum”. May I further request Your Eminence to notify the approval by cable, so that we may begin using the revised Missal from August 15th 1968, the feast of the Assumption of Our Lady who is the Patroness of India and our Independence Day.

The priests are anxiously waiting for the revised text. Though the restored Mass came into vogue in 1962, even now there are a good number of priests who continue saying the pre-restored Mass.³⁰ They will gladly take to the revised Mass, which we are presenting. Thus uniformity in the Divine Liturgy will be re-established, after the laps of six long years of confusion, and the Malabar Church will ever feel grateful to Your Eminence for taking this important step in the right direction, responding to the legitimate aspirations and the requests of the people of God.

Thanking Your Eminence in anticipation and kissing Your Eminence’s ring with profound veneration,

Your Eminence’s most devotedly in Our Lord,
Joseph Parecattil, Archbishop of Ernakulam.

²⁹ See document 39.

³⁰ It was permitted by the instruction of the Oriental Congregation, promulgating the restored Missal. See document 30.

Some Changes in the Rubrics of the Mass

In order to justify the modifications, the Archbishop cites the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, Sacrosanctum Concilium numbers 30 and 50, but he does not provide a clear picture of the drastic changes made in the text. For example, the fundamental modification with regard to the orientation of the priest during the Qurbana (liturgy facing the people) is not even mentioned.

1) The Celebration of the first part of the Mass at Bemma or table near the altar rails

Art: 50. “The rite of the Mass is to be revised in such a way that the intrinsic nature and the purpose of its several parts, as also the connection between them, may be more clearly manifested and the devout and active participation by the faithful may be more easily achieved” (Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy).

The Mass as it is at present does not make sufficient distinction between its various parts, especially between the liturgy of the Word and Mass proper. People do not realize that the two parts have different functions. Celebrating the liturgy of the Word and the Eucharist in two different places will help people to understand the distinction and the connection between them.

a) It is an age old custom among the Chaldeans to celebrate the first part of the Mass in the Bemma.

b) To make the solemn entrance more meaningful.

2) Position of the ‘Creed’ is changed

As a consequence of the change no.1, ‘credo’ comes just after the dismissal of the catechumens. We do not think this change of position would affect the structure of the Mass as such, because ‘credo’ comes not in the Mass of the catechumens but in the Mass of the faithful.

After the solemn entrance wine and bread are prepared on both sides of the altar, and offertory follows immediately.

For pastoral reasons, the Apostles' creed has been suggested as an alternative text for ordinary low Mass in the place of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed.

3) Repetition of certain prayers and gestures is omitted.

Art: 34. "The rite should be distinguished by a noble simplicity; they should be short, clear and unencumbered by useless repetitions; they should be within the people's powers of comprehension, and normally should not require much explanation."

Art: 50, ii. "For this purpose (active and devout participation) the rites are to be simplified, due care being taken to preserve their substance; elements which, with the passage of time, came to be duplicated or added with but little of advantage are to be discarded" (Ibidem).

4) Sign of the cross from left to right

Mainly due to pastoral reasons. Besides, this way of making the sign of the cross is not exclusively of the Latin rite, because all the Orientals including the Chaldeans, with the exception of those who belong to the Greek Church, do likewise. Moreover the symbolic meaning and the explanations we give to the other way of signing (i.e. from right to left) do not easily convince our people.

This point was presented in the Memorandum of the Syro-Malabar Bishops on October 22, 1963 and permission was then given orally to make the sign of the cross from left to right as Catholics of other rites in Kerala do and as we were accustomed to do for three centuries.

5) Elevation of the Sacred Host without the paten

In the pure Chaldean Mass there is no Elevation of the Host and Chalice immediately after Consecration. But in our restored Mass this ceremony was introduced respecting the feelings and sentiments of people who were accustomed to it in the pre-restored Mass. This, however, did not fully satisfy them, because, instead of taking the Host in the hands, the custom of taking it in the paten and elevating it was introduced in the restored Mass. Evidently Elevation was introduced for pastoral reasons, as stated above. For the same reasons, we thought it fit to have the Elevation of Host in the hands. The people feel greater devotion and draw greater spiritual FRUIT when looking at the Sacred Host, they offer the Holy Victim to the Eternal Father as it has been the practice for centuries. The people do want that and our lay leaders insisted on it in their Memorandum and in our dialogue with them at the BISHOPS' Conference. This mode of Elevation is of greater conformity with the narration that "Christ took bread in His holy and venerable hands".

Document 54

Approval of *Taksa* 1968 *ad Experimentum*

Rome, 7 August 1968; together with the letter of Archbishop Parecattil (document 53) on 6 August 1968 Bishop George Alappatt submitted two copies of the 1968 Missal in Malayalam to Cardinal Maximillian De Fürstenberg, Prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches. On the following day (7 August) the Cardinal asked Msgr. Giovanni Bonelli, the Secretary of State of Vatican to send a telegram to the Archbishop of Ernakulam through the Nunciature of Delhi approving *ad experimentum* the *Taksa* of 1968 (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 955/65, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi, Riforma*, fascicolo I; original in Italian).

Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 955/65, 7 August 1968.

To His Most Reverend Excellency, Msgr. Giovanni Bonelli, Substitute of the Secretary of State.

Most Reverend Excellency,

I would be very grateful to you, if you would like to send to the Apostolic Nunciature in New Delhi the following communication as ciphered telegram from the part of this Sacred Dicastery (Congregation):

“Please communicate to the Archbishop of Ernakulam Parecattil that it is permitted *ad experimentum*, starting from this August 15, the use of the new Missal (text) in Malayalam, brought in these days to the Sacred Congregation by the Bishop of Trichur”.

Willingly I avail myself of the occasion to profess myself with sentiments of distinct esteem,

Yours Most Reverend Excellency, Most Devoted in the Lord,

[Cardinal Maximillian De Fürstenberg].

Document 55

Taksa 1968: General Norms concerning the Order of Qurbana

Alwaye 1968; in accordance with the wish of Cardinal Maximillian De Fürstenberg from the Secretariate of State a telegram was sent to the Nunciature in India on 8 August 1968 granting approval for the new Missal, which was implemented in some places on 15 August 1968. Considering the importance of the general norms for the history of Syro-Malabar liturgy a translation of the said norms contained in the 1968 Missal is provided here. With respect to the previous Missal this one contains norms for concelebration and provisions for the use of *Propria*. In fact, at the end of the Missal one set of variable prayers (only six items) for each of the 9 liturgical seasons and three items of variable prayers for the feasts of Blessed Virgin Mary, St Joseph, commemoration of St Thomas and commemoration of the dead are given. For the first time in the history of the Indian Eastern Churches permission was granted to celebrate the liturgy of the Word facing the people (Syro-Malabar Liturgical Committee, *The Order of Syro-Malabar Qurbana*, Alwaye 1968, i-iv; original in Malayalam).

1. It would be better to use the incense on Sundays and on other extraordinary occasions in the *Qurbana* participated by the people. If it is used, the incensing given in pages 5, 9, 25 is sufficient.

2. Regarding the holding of hands during the time of each prayer instructions are given in each place. When there is no particular instruction, the celebrant may keep his hands folded or keep them on the altar.

3. The celebrant is to stretch his hands out to both sides and keep the palms opened upwards whenever (the instruction) 'stretch out the hands' is found.

4. While making the sign of the cross on himself, the celebrant first places his right hand on the forehead, then moves it down to his chest, and then moves it to the left shoulder, and finally to the right shoulder.

5. The first part of the *Qurbana* (liturgy of the Word) may be said facing the people.

6. For the simple form of *Qurbana*, the first part should be said standing at the centre of the sanctuary or close to the rails in the sanctuary itself. It is good to use a table for that purpose on which the Gospel, and if possible, a cross and two candles should be kept.

7. On extraordinary occasions it is better to say the first part of the *Qurbana* at the centre of the nave in the midst of the people.

8. The celebrant should pray in loud voice when ministers and people are not reciting any prayer.

9. The celebrant begins the prayers commencing with 'Lord, we also your humble and weak servants' on page 29 and 'Lord our God, as Your beloved Son taught us' on page 34, only after the end of the prayers recited by the congregation.

10. It is desirable to distribute Communion under both species whenever it is convenient. If so, soon after the prayer before the reception of the Communion, the prayer beginning with 'Heavenly Spouse' also is recited. Then the celebrant receives the Holy Host. After giving Communion to the people he receives the rest of the Holy Blood.

When the Communion is distributed only under the species of Bread, according to the order given in page 40, after signing the part of the Host on the paten with the part of the Host dipped in the Holy Blood, with the same he also signs small Hosts consecrated in the same *Qurbana*. It is not necessary to take out the Hosts that are preserved in the tabernacle and sign them.

11. It is said the north or south side of the sanctuary or altar under the supposition that the church is built facing westward. Even if the

church is facing to another direction, the right and left sides of the sanctuary or altar must be considered as north and south sides respectively.

12. The consecratory words may be said in Syriac or Malayalam.

13. The prayers given in small letters in this *Taksa* may be omitted.

Concelebrated Mass

1. It is desirable that the prayers and responses set apart for the congregation in the *Taksa* may be said by the people themselves. When it is impossible for the people, the con-celebrants say them.

2. Blessing the people and the offerings, raising the hands, stretching the hands, stretching the hands towards the people, requesting the prayer of the people, making the sign of the cross on the forehead and on the altar are done only by the main celebrant. But, bending forward, bowing down, and kneeling down are done by all. All turn towards the people for the rite of peace (*Slama*) in page 24 and for the final blessing (*Hutama*). When the consecratory words are recited every one stretches the right hand towards the offerings.

3. At the time of the reading of the Epistle, if convenient, all celebrants sit down.

4. The celebrants who prepare the bread and wine bring them to the middle of the altar and hand them over to the main celebrant. It is enough that only the celebrant who brings the bread washes his hands. He must also begin the *onitha d'Raze*.

5. Prayers that the main celebrant alone recites:

Prayers	Page numbers
“In the name of the Father...”	1
Prayer before the Psalm	3
Prayer for the blessing of incense	5, 9, 25
Prayers before the reading of the Gospel	9, 10
“Peace to you”	10, 24, 46
Prayer after the <i>karozutha</i>	12
“Lord, God Almighty”	25
Beginning of the Creed	14 or 15
“Lord, Mighty God”	25
“Praising You with a loud voice unceasingly”	25
“Holy are You, O God”	27
“Lord, Mighty God”	33
“O Lord our God,”	33
“Glory to You, O Lord, for Your ineffable Gift”	40
“O Lord Jesus Christ”	42
“O Lord our God”	45
“May the gift of the grace ... who gives us life”	47
Final blessing (<i>Hutama</i>)	58

6. The con-celebrants pray the following prayers in turn:

Prayers	Page numbers
Lord our God	6
Lord of all	7

Pleasingly dwelling in the holy ones	8
Lord our God	8
How distressed is my state	28
The joy of heavenly bodies	36
Christ, our Lord, hope of mankind	48
Father, Son and Holy Spirit	51
God who sanctifies	52

7. All the celebrants together say all other prayers assigned to the celebrant in the *Taksa*.

8. For the con-celebrated Mass the bread and wine are to be prepared on the *bethgazzas*.

9. When the prayers after the Communion and *Hutama* are recited, the celebrants come down from the altar and stand at the centre of the *sanctuary*.

10. When the main celebrant requests the prayer of the people (pp. 24, 28), he says ‘our’ instead of ‘my’ and ‘for us’ instead of ‘for me’. In the response the congregation must say ‘your’ and ‘for you all’. Also in the prayer that begins with “Our Lord Jesus Christ” on page 42, instead of “me, unworthy” is to be recited “us unworthy”.

Propria according to Different Seasons

Variable parts in the *Qurbana (Propria)* according to the seasons are inserted in this *Taksa* (page 66). It is desirable to select and pray the suitable part from among them according to the seasons. The following are the said parts:

Psalm (instead of the Psalm in *Taksa* p. 4);

Karozutha (instead of ‘Let us’ in *Taksa* p. 11);

The concluding prayer of the *karozutha* (instead of ‘Lord! Mighty God’ in *Taksa* p. 12);

Onitha d'Raze (instead of 'Come let us praise God' in *Taksa* p. 20);

Onitha d'bema (when the minister finishes 'Living God' in *Taksa* p. 46, the congregation must say);

Onitha d'bate (instead of 'Brothers! With faith' in *Taksa* p. 47).

Document 56

Fr. Podipara Transmits to the Oriental Congregation the Content of Some Letters He Received from Malabar about the 1968 Missal

Rome (Istituto Damasceno), 16 November 1968; *the Missal 1968* was a surprise to many in Kerala, who wrote to Fr. Placid Podipara (since he was member of the special Commission for Syro-Malabar liturgy and a consultor of Oriental Congregation), expressing doubts and perplexity about the approval of the new Missal and about its content. Podipara transmitted the essential content of some of such letters to Cardinal Maximilian De Fürstenberg, Prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 955/65, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi, Riforma*, fascicolo I).

To His Eminence M. Cardinal De Fürstenberg, Prefect, the Sacred Oriental Congregation.

Your Eminence,

In all sincerity and filial devotion I think it my duty to bring to Your notice the contents of some of the letters I have received from Malabar. They concern the text of the revised Malayalam Mass which, it is heard, the Sacred Oriental Congregation has approved.

What I wish to communicate to You are hereto appended. I have selected only some.

Imploring Your Blessings,
I beg to remain,
Your humble son, Fr. Placid C.M.I.

Very Rev. Fr. Maurus CMI, the ex-Prior General and the actual Provincial of the St Joseph's Province of the CMI Congregation:

“There is begun here a new Mass which is entirely in Malayalam. We in Puthuppally have not begun it. Some say it is *ad experimentum*; but it is heard that after some time the same will become compulsory. Many also say that it is something very difficult. Those who have begun to use it also say that it does not appear as good as the former one. It will be beneficial if you will try all you can that at least those who have learnt and are using the former one should not be compelled to use this. It is heard that the bishops of Changanacherry and Palai are not very pleased with this new one. Ernakulam and Trichur are those who are interested. Fr. Sales too has begun to say this. To the bishop's conference in which this was discussed he and some of the chevaliers were called. Some say this is their Mass. It is also heard that the Bishop of Trichur in his recent visit to Rome got the approbation”.

Professor of Liturgy in the Vadavathoor Seminary, Kottayam:

“We don't understand why it is that the new Mass without any change has been sanctioned by Rome. It is heard that the Cardinal himself has done so directly. Many ask the reason. We have to give the reply in the class”.

Rev. Fr. Anselm CMI, secretary for the Historical Commission, the Beatification Process of the Servant of God, V.R. Fr. Kuriakose Elias:

“There is general opposition against the Mass that has come into use on August 15th. It is called the “Mass of the chevaliers” and the “Mass of Mons. Alapatt”. Fr. Sales now says it. He and the others are boasting greatly. Will the Holy See legitimize this hybrid?”

The Chancellor of the Diocese of Trichur:

“His Excellency the Bishop of Trichur on his way (to) the Bogata called upon the Prefect of the Sacred Oriental Congregation and got approved the new Malayalam translation with many changes even in the liturgy *per modum experimenti!* In the new Missal there seems to be some going back to the Latin rite... I do not say it”.

Very Rev. Fr. Norbert, Prior, CMI Monastery, Pulincunnu:

“Some have begun to say the reformed Mass. It seems many are not pleased with it. It was enough to make better the Malayalam language of the former Mass. There are those who say it was not necessary to make this great change. They say that devotion for the Mass will be lost if the Mass is occasionally changed like this according to the whims of some”.

Rev. Thomas Arayathinal, Syriac Scholar, author of Syriac-English Grammar, MOL (Master of Oriental Languages) of the Madras University:

“The plight of the rite is ridiculous and pitiable. Now they have published a new Liturgy with the imprimatur of all the archbishops and bishops. They say it was approved by the Holy See. I wonder how it happened... You might have perhaps seen the adulterated and deformed monster in Malayalam to be used in our churches... What has become of the Syriac text and its translation ordered by the Holy See? The faithful on the whole have begun to think and speak lightly of the Divine Liturgy because of the repeated changes. Now the bishops have begun to compel the clergy to say the community Mass (on obligatory days especially) in the vernacular. Some prefer the old version, while others choose this present modified version (without kissing the altar, without blessing the bread and wine at the consecration, with Gospel, Creed etc., disorderly changed...). The Oriental liturgical committee under the presidency of Dr. Pareckattil are of opinion that they are free to make any innovation on the liturgy... Archbishop Parecattil only looks for the duration of the time

for saying the Mass... Now there is no meaning of making a new liturgy... They are hurrying to publish Sacraments and Holy Week ceremonies all quite new according to the fancy of a few favoured hands. Unless some clear serious injunction on the matter of our rite is given by the Sacred Oriental Congregation, our Rite is going to remain a recorded spot in liturgy...”

Rev. Alexander Cherukarakunnel DSO (Doctor in Scientiis Orientalibus):

“...His Grace the Archbishop, the president, says that the old attitude of the Holy See is changed after the Second Vatican Council. So the replies sent earlier by the Holy See are not considered now. He is not admitting the ideas like liturgical structure, changeable and unchangeable distinction in the text etc. His idea seems to be that what is liked by the people is to be accepted and in this context he favours it seems liberally of the Latin ways. It is a pity to go back again to the old text of Bishop Ros, after doing so much...”.

Fr. Cassian CMI, quondam Master of Novices:

“The resistance against the new Mass is so great in some quarters that we do not know where it will end unless the Holy See intervenes”.

[...].

Document 57

Letter of Fr. Placid Podipara to the Prefect of Oriental Congregation about the Revised Missal of 1968

Rome (Istituto Damasceno), 25 November 1968; *from among the different critical communications concerning the 1968 Missal, I have selected only the letter of Placid Podipara CMI, the most authoritative person at that time to evaluate the text. In fact, he presents a brief history of the reform of Syro-Malabar Missal, as well as the policy of the Popes and the Oriental Congregation with regard to liturgical reform. Then he indicates the nature and extent of the modifications made in the Missal, the probable reasons which prompted them and finally provides reasonable explanations, refuting them* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 955/65, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi, Riforma*, fascicolo I).

From Fr. Placid of St Joseph CMI; Consultor to the Special Liturgical Commission attached to the S. O. Congregation; Member of the Commission appointed by the S. O. Congregation for the revision of the Malabar liturgical books; Consultor to the S. O. Congregation.

To His Eminence M. Cardinal De Fürstenberg, Prefect, the Sacred Oriental Congregation.

Your Eminence,

May I be permitted to expose the following with my humble request regarding the New Malayalam Mass which is said to have been approved by the Sacred Oriental Congregation.

The Liturgy of the Malabar Church was in a mutilated and highly Latinized condition. The Bishops were using the Roman Pontificals in the Latin language. So in 1929 they submitted to the Holy See for approbation a Syriac translation of the Roman Pontificals. Pope Pius XI refused the approbation in the following words:

Latinization is not to be encouraged among the Orientals. The Holy See does not want to Latinize but to catholicize. And then, half measures are neither generous nor fruitful. So continue in *status quo*, but at once appoint a Commission for the revision of the ancient Pontifical, which can also be printed part by part (in fascicles).³¹

In this way the text of the most ancient Pontificals was fixed by the Holy See, was approved by the Pope, was printed and was given to the Malabar bishops. The Malabar bishops now use this text.

Following the principles laid down by the Pope Pius XI and his predecessors, the Sacred Oriental Congregation took up the task of revising the Malabar liturgical books. What the Sacred Oriental Congregation did regarding the Mass, how and with what motive it did it may be seen from the following:

1. The Sacred Oriental Congregation instituted a Commission in Rome for the purpose. The Commission revised the text, ceremonies and calendar for the Mass and submitted them to the Sacred Congregation. The Sacred Congregation printed and sent them to the Malabar bishops for their suggestions. The bishops gave their suggestions which the Commission studied. Again the Sacred Congregation asked their suggestion from the bishops (sic), and again they sent their suggestions. The Sacred Congregation consulted two experts. Finally the whole thing was discussed in the Plenaria of the Cardinals who composed the Sacred Oriental Congregation. The Plenaria's findings were approved by Pope Pius XII. The text of the Mass which was in Latin was scrupulously copied into Syriac as approved by the Pope. The Sacred Congregation sent it to Malabar and

³¹ Podipara cited the original Italian text: "Non bisogna incoraggiare fra gli Orientali il Latinismo: la Santa Sede non vuole latinizzare, ma cattolicizzare. Le mezze misure poi non sono ne generosi ne fruttuose. Si continui quindi nello statu quo, ma si nomoni subito una Commissione incaricata della rivisione del Pontificale più antico, che si potrà stampare a fascicoli". The original text and the English translation in P. Pallath and J. Kollara, *Roman Pontifical into Syriac and the Beginning of Liturgical Reform*, 158/322.

had it printed at the expenses of the Sacred Congregation. Then the whole thing (not the Syriac text) was sent to the HOLY OFFICE. The HOLY OFFICE sent back the whole thing without any change.³²

2. After all these formalities had been gone through, the Sacred Oriental Congregation through the Apostolic Internuncio sent the following instruction to the Malabar bishops: Instructio “De Ritu Sacrificii Eucharistici instaurato”. [...] ³³

By a joint Pastoral the bishops inaugurated the Ordinary of the Mass on July 3, 1962. In the Pastoral they say that it was the Holy See that took the initiative to restore the Liturgy and so all should obey.³⁴

The bishops then asked the Sacred Oriental Congregation to introduce certain minor changes regarding repetitions etc. The changes that had the semblance of Latinization were not granted. The rest were granted by a DECREE of the Sacred Oriental Congregation.³⁵

From what is exposed above it is clear how the Sacred Oriental Congregation proceeded in the restoration of the Mass, what its motives have been, how solemnly and carefully each step was taken. Its chief motive was the motive of the Popes, namely not to latinize, but to catholicize; and it avoided all “half measures” which Pope Pius XI said were “neither generous nor fruitful”.

The text approved by Pope Pius XII, in spite of some opposition from certain quarters, began to be used by the new priests and also by

³² Cf. The letter of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office (present Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith) dated 10 January 1962, in Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 947/48, *Liturgia-Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi*, fascicolo IV.

³³ Here Fr. Placid Podipara completely reproduces the instruction of the Oriental Congregation, promulgating the Missal 1960-1962. In order to avoid repetition the Instruction is omitted, since its English translation is presented as document 30 and the original Latin text as appendix I.

³⁴ See document 32.

³⁵ See documents 34-35.

many of the old priests (who were ordained before 1962). Gradually even some of those who had disliked it began to use it. The opposition came from the lovers of Latinism; but “Latinization is not to be encouraged among the Orientals” - Pope Pius XI.

It is at this stage that the new text has been, it is heard, approved by the Sacred Oriental Congregation.

This new text is not an improvement, but is a deformation of the text approved by Pope Pius XII. It presents mutilations, deformations, mistranslations, arbitrary changes of ancient formulas, arbitrary changes and transpositions of ceremonies, additions, latinizations etc. The whole is cast into the Latin mould.

All these are certainly against what the Popes had indicated to be done, and what the Sacred Oriental Congregation had done in conformity with the mind and words of the Popes.

Now, what are the reasons for making such changes? I give below some with my comments:

a) Pastoral needs. But until 1962 the Malabarian faithful assisted at the Mass reciting the Rosary or reading some devotional books. They did not understand the meaning of the prayers or actions of the Mass. Even many of the priests did not understand the meaning of the Syriac prayers they were saying. How then could arise some Pastoral needs all on a sudden? Is Latinization a Pastoral need?

b) The changes are small. To this I say that if they are small, why have they been introduced? In fact they are not small.

c) The changes are made to shorten the Mass. Shortening is not to be done by deformation, and Latinization. There are other ways to shorten the Mass. The whole text as approved by Pope Pius XII has to be printed, and then the prayers that are of a later addition may be indicated as those that could be omitted. This is how the Orientals do in order to shorten long services.

d) They like this new text. Yes, since the whole of this new text is in Malayalam which all understand, while the text approved by Pope

Pius XII was given half Syriac and half Malayalam, those who do not know Syriac and liturgy (and such are very many) may like this. But this is not a valid reason to say that 'they like it'. But in fact many dislike the new text.

Under the conviction that Your Eminence will not be offended, may I be permitted to give below some of the questions that are being raised in some quarters regarding the approbation given to the new text. The questions are:

Has the Pope changed the policy of his predecessors regarding the preservation of the Oriental liturgies in their genuine form? Since Vatican II has not relaxed anything on this point, but has only reiterated the stand taken by the Popes, how could an Oriental Liturgy be deformed and Latinized like the one in question? Where is ecumenism and dialogue with the non-Catholic Orientals? Was Rome looking for an opportunity to Latinize and deform the Malabar Liturgy even against what she had done a little before? How can one trust in the promises and declarations of Rome? Did the Sacred Congregation give the approbation after studying the whole content of the new Malayalam text? Are principles sacrificed to please the sentiments of some?....

In this connection may I reveal to Your Eminence that I have kept the maximum reserve in my replies to the letters I have been receiving from Malabar. For, I am afraid that I may otherwise become an occasion for grater excitement in certain quarters. Hitherto I was the target of those who opposed the text approved by Pope Pius XII. Now the bishops and the Sacred Congregation are the target of those who oppose the new text. The latter, however, are not so open or noisy as the former for reasons that are evident.

In the light of all I have exposed above, I most humbly pray Your Eminence to be pleased to insist solely upon the use of the text approved by His Holiness Pope Pius XII.

Imploring Your Eminence's blessings,

I beg to remain,
Your Eminence's obedient son,
Fr. Placid of St Joseph, CMI.

Document 58
Letter of the Prefect of Oriental Congregation to
Cardinal Parecattil Limiting the Approval
of the 1968 Missal to Two Years

Rome, 9 May 1969; *since many petitions reached the Congregation, Cardinal De Fürstenberg writes to Cardinal Parecattil (he was elevated to the rank of cardinal on 28 April 1969) limiting the approval ad experimentum for two years and asking him not to make any change in the anaphora* (Rome, Archives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Prot. No. 955/65, *Liturgia Malabaresi: stato dei libri liturgici malabaresi, Riforma*, fascicolo II; original in Latin).

From His Eminence Maximillian Cardinal De Fürstenberg, Prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Rome; Prot.N. 955/65.

Pro-memoria, to the most eminent President of the Malabar Bishop's Conference concerning Divine Liturgy.

The use of the new Malayalam text of the Divine Liturgy approved *ad experimentum* is to be understood as granted only for two years.

In the meantime the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Churches strongly recommends that:

- a) nothing should be changed in the anaphora (rather a new one may be compiled);
- b) study and use of Syriac language should be continued (preserved) and promoted;

c) all the liturgical texts should also be translated into Latin for the use of the liturgical Commission of the Sacred Congregation according to the current praxis.

Rome, 9 May 1969,

Cardinal Maximillian De Fürstenberg.

CONCLUDING SECTION

MISSAL 1968: MAIN MODIFICATIONS AND THEIR CONSEQUENCES

In the letter of 27 July 1968 addressed to the Prefect of the Oriental Congregation requesting approval for the 1968 Missal, Archbishop Joseph Parecattil underlined that there were only “minor changes” and “changes are not of a serious nature”.¹ In this section, first of all I indicate some relevant modifications made in the 1968 text in comparison with the 1962 *Taksa* in a schematic manner. Then I make a critical evaluation of some of the important modifications which had also dare consequences on the later liturgical life of the Syro-Malabar Church for a long time.

Since numerous prayers are shortened, partially omitted or reformulated it is impossible to indicate all of them. Some prayers are rendered optional, but they are printed in such a small character that it is almost impossible to recite them. Hence, when it is indicated that a prayer is optional, one may understand that it is practically omitted and no one is expected to recite it. This is also evident from instruction number 13 given at the beginning of the Missal: “The prayers given in small letters in this *Taksa* may be omitted”.²

¹ Document 53.

² Document 55.

1. The Order of *Qurbana* 1962 and 1968: A Schematic Presentation of Modifications

No.	<i>Taksa</i> 1962	<i>Taksa</i> 1968
1.	No preparatory prayers.	Prayers for washing of hands and vesting.
2.	No special instructions for concelebration.	Directives and norms for concelebration in the manner of Latin practice after Vatican Council II.
3.	All the silent prayers of the priests and <i>g'hanta</i> prayers in the anaphora in Syriac.	The whole <i>Qurbana</i> in Malayalam, only the institution narrative in Syriac.
4.	The whole <i>Qurbana versus Dominum seu Orientem</i> .	Permission to celebrate the first part <i>versus populum</i> .
5.	All crossings from right to left.	All crossings from left to right.
6.	Beginning of the <i>Qurbana</i> with Angels' Hymn, Glory to God in the Highest.	Beginning of the <i>Qurbana</i> with the sign of the cross, In the name of the Father.
7.	Angels' Hymn, three times.	Angel's hymn only once.
8.	Only the traditional Lord's prayer with antiphon "holy", according to the East Syrian tradition.	Lord's prayer according to the Latin tradition, the East Syrian Lord's prayer is given as an option that can be omitted in all forms of <i>Qurbana</i> .
9.	Deacon's proclamation, "Let us pray, peace be with us" or	This is modified as, "Pray, peace to us".

	“peace be with us”.	
10.	Initial repetition of the same phrase in 13 prayers (example, Lord God Almighty, Lord God Almighty).	All such repetitions are omitted.
11.	In some prayers the faith proclamation of Apostle Thomas “Our Lord, (and) Our God” as in the Syriac original.	Modified as “Lord our God”, which does not give the impression or the experience of the original apostolic proclamation.
12.	<i>Marmitha</i> , consisting of three psalms: 15, 150 & 116.	The psalms 150 & 116 can be omitted in all forms of the <i>Qurbana</i> .
13.	Incense five times with their prayers, obligatory for solemn Mass.	Incense, not obligatory, but if used, limited to three times.
14.	<i>Lakhu Mara</i> , three times, in the traditional manner.	Only once, priest and assembly together.
15.	Epistle: the priest blesses the deacon with a short prayer.	The priest simply blesses the deacon without any prayer.
16.	Alleluia, three times after the epistle.	No Alleluia.
17.	Gospel: three silent prayers.	Two silent prayers.
18.	Priest’s greetings: “peace be with you”; and response “with you and your spirit”.	Modified as “peace to you”, “and also to you”.
19.	<i>Karozutha</i> I (11 invocations with the traditional “save us all”) & <i>karozutha</i> II.	Only 7 invocations of <i>karozutha</i> I, without the concluding “save us all”.

20.	<i>Karozutha</i> , traditional Eastern response: “Lord, have mercy on us”.	“Lord, hear our prayer”, as in the Roman tradition.
21.	Dismissal of catechumens.	Optional, can be omitted on all days.
22.	Order of pre-anaphora according to the Eastern tradition: preparation of the gifts during <i>karozutha</i> ; after the imposition of the hands, washing of hands; transfer, deposition and covering of gifts; anthem of the mysteries, Creed; official entrance to the altar, anaphora.	Re-structuring according to the Roman Missal: after the concluding prayer of <i>karozutha</i> , Creed, official entrance to the altar, preparation of the gifts at both ends of the altar, washing of hands, deposition and covering of gifts, anthem of the mysteries, anaphora.
23.	Preparation of bread and wine on two <i>bethgazzas</i> on either side of the sanctuary, or on two small tables or in their absence as a third alternative on the altar itself.	Preparation of bread and wine on the altar itself.
24.	Preparation of chalice and wine, three prayers.	Only one prayer, two prayers (one with anticipatory expression) optional, practically omitted.
25.	Preparation of paten and bread, one prayer.	The prayer with anticipatory expression optional (omitted).
26.	Variable part of the Anthem of the Mysteries twice: the holy body and the precious blood of Christ are on the holy altar [...].	In order to avoid calling the bread and wine, body and blood in anticipation, a new prayer, avoiding these terms, is recited once.

27.	The priestly prayer of offertory: May Christ who was sacrificed [...] accept this sacrifice.	Priest and the assembly: May God the Father, through Christ who was sacrificed [...] accept this sacrifice.
28	Private offertory, only the celebrant recites the offertory prayer.	Public offertory, also the congregation recites the priestly prayer.
29.	Anthem of the Mysteries II: only commemoration of the Blessed Virgin Mary.	After Mary, “Saint Joseph, the Just” is also added.
30.	Only Nicene Creed.	“Apostles’ creed” first; Nicene Creed is given only as an alternative.
31.	Two silent prayers for entrance to the altar.	Only one of the two prayers.
32.	Deacon’s long <i>karozutha</i> during entrance of the priest to the altar.	Short <i>karozutha</i> , dropping some elements of diptychs.
33.	Official entrance to altar, two prayers.	Only one prayer, the other is given as an alternative.
34.	Kissing the altar, twelve times.	Kissing the altar only two times.
35.	<i>G’hanta</i> prayers are said in a low voice, with a slight inclination of head and open hands in the form of a request.	<i>G’hanta</i> prayers are said aloud with folded hands.
36.	Response to priest’s prayer requests: “May Christ hear your prayers. May Christ accept your <i>Qurbana</i> . May Christ glorify your priesthood	“May God accept your <i>Qurbana</i> and glorify your priesthood in heaven”.

	in heaven”.	
37.	Three signs of the cross over the Mysteries during the institution narrative and one sign of the cross each in three other places.	All the sings of the cross over the mysteries are omitted.
38.	The priest, while pronouncing the “words of consecration”, holds the bread in the paten, which he raises at the end.	The priest takes the bread in his hands as in the Roman tradition and raises it.
39.	Deacon’s proclamation-prayer before the intercessory prayer.	It can be omitted on all days.
40.	Anaphora, <i>g’hanta</i> after the institution narrative as in the original.	Confusion of saying to the Father, “you taught us” is avoided.
41.	Anaphora, last <i>g’hanta</i> , as in the original.	Confusion of alternatively addressing the Father and Christ is avoided.
42.	After the anaphora the priest recites parts of the penitential psalms 51 & 121.	Only a few verses of one of these psalms are recited alternating with the assembly.
43.	Before the fraction the priest kisses the Host in the form of a cross, not touching it with his lips, but symbolically.	No kissing of the Host.
44.	Silent priestly prayer obligatory during the penitential <i>karozutha</i> .	This prayer can be omitted on all days.
45.	Pre-Communion Lord’s prayer with embolism.	Embolism after the Lord’s prayer can be omitted on all days.

46.	<i>Sancta Sanctis</i> : according to the East Syrian tradition with “Glory be to the Father [...]”.	A modified form, without “Glory be to the Father [...]”.
47.	Three silent prayers for the Communion of the priest and three prayers for the purification.	One prayer each for these occasions.
48.	Rites of Communion to the faithful in both species together and separately.	Only one prayer for giving Communion to the faithful.
49.	After the Communion the priest silently recites three prayers during the purification of chalice and paten.	The priest recites only one of these prayers.
50.	Lord’s prayer with “holy” as in the beginning.	Lord’s prayer according to the Latin tradition that can be omitted on all days.
51.	<i>Propria</i> published by the Congregation in 1960 is not included.	At the end of the <i>Taksa</i> , one set of prayers for each liturgical season, and for some feasts.
52.	Most of the prayers according to the spirit of East Syrian tradition.	Shortening, modifications, omission or change of theological concepts.

2. Some Important Modifications: A Critical Evaluation

Although the bishops of the Syro-Malabar Church consented to the 1968 text, granting their imprimatur, the main modifications were made according to the ideas of Archbishop Joseph Parecattil, the most influential and powerful prelate of that time, also because he was the permanent president of Syro-Malabar Bishops' Conference as well as the creator and moderator of central liturgical Committee. Hence for explaining reasons and significance of the selected modifications I depend on his book already cited many times in this work: *Syro Malabar Liturgy as I See It*.

Since Archbishop Parecattil (later some other bishops also joined him) maintained the same ideas and later endeavoured to obtain Roman approval for them during the second restoration of the Order of Syro-Malabar *Qurbana* begun in 1980, the liturgical Commission of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches studied the objections and provided its responses. For the critical evaluation of the modifications I depend on these responses contained in the documents of the Apostolic See concerning Syro-Malabar liturgy.

2.1. Elimination of Nestorian Heretical Doctrines

In any *Taksa* of Syro-Oriental *Qurbana* (Assyrian, Chaldean Catholic or Malabar) one can find some very primitive Christological prayers addressed to Christ, most probably originated even before the Council of Ephesus in 431, requesting him to accept the holy sacrifice. Evidently such Christological prayers are found also in the order of *Qurbana* 1960-1962, the most important one being the offertory prayer. As it is done even today, when the community sings the anthem of the mysteries, the celebrant brings the gifts from *bethgazzas* to the altar. Then he takes the chalice in his right hand and the paten in his left, crosses his hands and raises them, reciting the following prayer:

We will praise your most adorable Trinity, always and forever. Amen.

May Christ who sacrificed himself for our salvation, and commanded us to celebrate the memory of his passion, death, burial and resurrection, accept this *Qurbana* from our hands through his grace and mercy. Amen.³

According to 1962 *Qurbana* during the anaphora twice the celebrant turns to the people and requests their prayers: “Bless me O Lord, my brethren, pray for me that this *Qurbana* may be completed through my hands”. To the prayer-request the community responds:

May Christ hear your prayers and receive your *Qurbana*. May he make splendid your priesthood in the kingdom of heaven [...].⁴

Archbishop Parecattil was scandalized by such primitive Christological prayers, because according to him the sacrifice is offered to the Father and not to Christ. He wrote:

At the time of the offertory, Christ is requested to receive the offering. This prayer is unintelligible to all those who have been taught in Catechism: “The Holy Sacrifice of Mass is the unceasing offering in the new testament by our Lord Jesus Christ of Himself to his Most Holy Father through the hands of the priest” (Lesson 10, qn, 177, small Catechism).⁵

He even insinuated that such Christological prayers manifested Nestorian heresy, because Christ who offers the sacrifice as man is requesting Christ as God to accept it.⁶ Later the Archbishop explicitly stated:

The Christological formulas of the offertory and allied prayers reflect the Nestorian concept of dual personality in Christ, the human person offering the sacrifice and divine person accepting the same. This

³ *The Order of Qurbana of the Syro-Malabar Church* (1962), 19.

⁴ *The Order of Qurbana of the Syro-Malabar Church* (1962), 29-30 and 34.

⁵ J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, 72.

⁶ J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, 72.

theological inaccuracy and inconsistency were set right in the 1968 text, making the request to the Father to accept the Sacrifice through Christ our Lord [...].⁷

In fact, in the 1968 *Qurbana* the primitive Christological formulas of offertory and prayer-requests of the celebrant were modified according to the ideas of Parecattil. In the 1968 text the offertory prayer reads thus:

May God the Father accept this *Qurbana* from our hands in his grace and mercy, through Christ who sacrificed himself for our salvation, and commanded us to celebrate the memory of his passion, death, burial and resurrection.⁸

Similarly the responses of the people to the prayer-request of the celebrant were also changed: “May God receive your *Qurbana* and make splendid your priesthood [...]”.⁹

It is to be noted that Archbishop Parecattil is the only person in the whole of Christendom who found Nestorian heresy in the ancient Christological formulas. All these formulas existed even in the pre-Diamper *Qurbana*. The Western missionaries and Archbishop Menezes, who considered the St Thomas Christians as really Nestorians, made a very thorough and meticulous examination of the *Qurbana* text with the intention of eliminating even a slight hint at Nestorianism or at any other “Oriental heresy”, but they did not find anything wrong in the aforementioned Christological formulas, according to which Christ receives the *Qurbana*.¹⁰ The very same

⁷ J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, Appendix V, 110.

⁸ *The Order of Qurbana of the Syro-Malabar Church* (1968), 21.

⁹ *The Order of Qurbana of the Syro-Malabar Church* (1968), 28-29 & 34.

¹⁰ P. Pallath, *The Eucharistic Liturgy of the St Thomas Christians*, 30-31. As they did in other 15 places, they only amplified the simple biblical expression “Christ” with “Jesus Christ our Lord, Son of God”, without modifying the theological concept about the reception of *Qurbana*. With regard to the Christological modifications, see

formulas: “May Christ [...] accept this sacrifice from your hands” and “May Christ hear your prayers and receive your *Qurbana*” existed in all the post Diamper texts printed in Rome or in India and even in the *Qurbana* which the Syro-Malabar Church used until 1962.¹¹ Hence the accusation of Nestorian heresy in those prayers is really surprising. Since the “head” of the Church himself declared that the Missal 1962 contained Nestorian heresy, the opposition of some priests and simple faithful to the said Missal was easily explicable.

As we have already seen from the documents, the Syro-Malabar Missal 1955, the basis of the Syriac text 1960 and the Malayalam Missal 1962 was thoroughly examined and revised by a Commission of competent and trustworthy experts, appointed by the Congregation for the Oriental Church, who being faithful to the responsibility entrusted to them, would have never tolerated even a tinge of any heresy. Moreover the Syro-Malabar Missal was examined and approved by the plenary assembly of the Congregation for the Oriental Church and then by Pope Pius XII. One cannot even reasonably presume to find a heretical doctrine in a text so thoroughly examined by competent experts and approved by the plenary assembly and the Pope. It is to be also noted that before the plenary assembly, the proposed text was sent to Archbishop Parecatil and he was twice consulted, but he did not make any objections of a doctrinal character.¹²

Independently of the Malabar Church, the Chaldean Catholic Missal, containing the same Christological prayers was examined by Western missionaries and then printed and published by the Sacred

the commentary in the same book in pages 90-101. But in the response of the prayer-requests even such amplification was not made. See page 43.

¹¹ A. Kalapura (trans.), *An English Version of Rasa or the Syriac Pontifical High-Mass*, 67 &79.

¹² See documents 10 and 18.

Congregation of Propaganda Fide in 1767.¹³ The Chaldean Catholic Missal was further revised and printed by the Dominican Latin missionaries in 1901, which was considered the typical edition of the *Taksa* at that time.¹⁴ Another edition of the Missal only with the anaphora of Addai and Mari appeared in 1936.¹⁵ In all these missals of the Chaldean Catholic Church the Christological prayers addressed to Christ remained intact without any alteration.¹⁶

In the course of further liturgical reform in the Syro-Malabar Church Archbishop Parecattil even with the support of some bishops continued to maintain his position about Nestorian heresy in the *Qurbana*. Among other observations he sent his ideas about the heresy even to the Oriental Congregation. Hence the Congregation was constrained to give a strong and decisive response, which is fully reproduced here:

But such a position is untenable for one versed in the results of contemporary liturgical scholarship. Not only does the New Testament and earliest historical literature on the topic witness the early Christian prayer and hymns addressed to Christ. The latest research has also disproved Jungmann's thesis that liturgical prayer to Christ dates only

¹³ *Missale Chaldaicum ex Decreto Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide Editum*, Romae 1767.

¹⁴ *Missale juxta Ritum Ecclesiae Syrorum Orientalium, id est Chaldaeorum*, Mossoul 1901 (in Syriac); F. Y. Alichoran (French trans.), *Missel Chaldéen*, Paris 1982; R. Rabban (Italian trans., only with the Anaphora of Addai and Mari), *La Messa caldea detta degli Apostoli*, Roma 1935.

¹⁵ *Missale juxta Ritum Ecclesiae Chaldaeorum*, Mossoul 1936 (Syriac); C. Moussess (Italian trans.), *La Messa caldea detta "degli Apostoli" (collana "Liturgie Orientali" n. 2)*, Roma 1948.

¹⁶ Cf. F. Y. Alichoran (French trans.), *Missel Chaldéen*, 64; R. Rabban (Italian trans.), *La Messa caldea*, 19 (according to this Missal, to the prayer-requests of the celebrant the community prays only silently); C. Moussess (Italian trans.), *La Messa caldea detta "degli Apostoli"*, 25 & 29.

from the 4th century.¹⁷ W. F. Macomber, the recognized expert on the *Anaphora of the Apostles (Addai and Mari)*, holds that the address of that prayer to Christ is original, and certainly antedates Nestorianism in the opinion of knowledgeable scholars.¹⁸ Furthermore, A. Gerhards has shown that other pre-4th century anaphoras such as that attributed to Gregory Nazianzen, and fragments in the Acts of Thomas and John, were also addressed to Christ, and he concludes: ‘Contrary to the notion of Jungmann that prayer to Christ was gradually introduced into the liturgy only from the 4th century on, prayer addressed to Christ has always been one of the forms of Christian public prayer’.¹⁹ One can add that the Byzantine Prayer of the Cherubic Hymn, addressed to Christ, also refers to Christ receiving the offering. Before prayers and formulae approved by the highest authority of the Church and in use for centuries by countless Christians are impugned as tinged with heresy - a most grave accusation - one should have the facts straight.

The Christological texts of the Tradition are, therefore, to be kept as such. In other words even where the liturgical prayer is addressed to the Lord Jesus Christ, since it stems from venerable traditions (3rd century and later, and not only in the Eastern Christian and East-Syrian tradition...) it is absolutely not to be changed. The accusations of “heresy” and similar allegations are simply fruit of insufficient information.

It might also be added such prayers appear to have made their appearance under the influence of passages of the Epistle to the Hebrews.²⁰

¹⁷ *Die Stellung Christi im liturgischen Gebet*, LGF 7-8, Munster 1925; *The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer*, London 1965.

¹⁸ See “The Ancient Form of the Anaphora of the Apostles”, in N. Garsoian et al., *East of Byzantium*, Washington DC, Dumbarton Oaks 1982, 73-83, especially 74-75.

¹⁹ A. Gerhards, “Priere adressee a Dieu ou au Christ?”, in *Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae, Subsidia* 29, Rome 1983, 101-114, quotation from page 113.

²⁰ Congregatio pro Ecclesiis Orientalibus, *Final Judgement*, no. 29; in *Roman Documents on the Syro-Malabar Liturgy*, 108-109.

In accordance with the directives of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches the modifications made in the 1968 Missal were dropped and the prayers addressed to Christ in the offertory and the responses of the faithful to the prayer-requests of the celebrant were correctly inserted in the *Qurbana* 1986, inaugurated and celebrated by Saint John Paul II at Kottayam on 8 February 1986 on the occasion of the beatification of Kuriakose Elias Chavara and Alphonsa Muttathupadath.²¹ The same Christological prayers are maintained in the 1989 Missal, still in use.²²

2.2. Sign of the Cross from Left to Right

According to the pre-Diamper *Taksa*, the *Qurbana* began in the traditional manner with the Angel's hymn: "Glory to God in the highest".²³ Although Archbishop Menezes did not modify this tradition, later Francis Ros, the first Latin bishop of the St Thomas Christians (1599-1624), inserted the sign of the cross in the beginning as in the Roman Missal.²⁴ From that time on the Holy *Qurbana* began with the sign of the cross: In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.²⁵

As we have already seen, until the arrival of the Portuguese missionaries at the dawn of the XVI century all the St Thomas Christians made the sign of the cross according to the common tradition, namely from right to left and the practice was definitely

²¹ *Order for the Solemn Raza of the Syro-Malabar Church* (Syro-Malabar Bishops' Conference), Trivandrum 1986, Malayalam text, 82, 102, 108-109; English at the end, 37, 46, 49. The first prayer-request found in this Missal was absent in the 1982 and 1968 texts. See respectively pages 90 and 41.

²² *The Syro-Malabar Qurbana: The Order of Raza* (Syro-Malabar Bishops' Conference), Trivandrum 1989, 30, 39, 43-44; Malayalam *Taksa* 1989, 66, 85, 92-93.

²³ A. De Gouvea, *Synodo diocesano da Igreja e bispado de Angamale*, appendix, fol. 1; P. Pallath, *The Eucharistic Liturgy of the St Thomas Christians*, 14-15.

²⁴ See Introductory Article One, no.1. 6.

²⁵ Cf. A. Kalapura (trans.), *An English Version of Raza or the Syriac Pontifical High-Mass*, 3.

modified by the Synod of Diamper in 1599, in conformity with the then Latin tradition.²⁶ In the years 1955-1959 the Oriental Congregation made a double restoration: the initial sign of the cross was dropped and the traditional Eastern manner of making the sign of cross from right to left was reinstated.

With regard to the manner of making the sign of the cross it was stated: "When the celebrant makes the sign of the cross on himself, he does so by placing his right palm first on the forehead or the head, where it is prescribed, and then on the chest, and lastly on the right and left shoulders respectively".²⁷ Obviously in the 1962 *Taksa* also, the initial sign of the cross was dropped and the *Qurbana* again began with the Angels' hymn.²⁸ Moreover the sign of the cross from right to left was prescribed:

While making the sign of the cross on himself, the celebrant first places his right hand on the forehead, then moves it down to his chest, and then moves it to the right shoulder and finally to the left shoulder.²⁹

Since this change was effected after three and a half centuries, without sufficient catechism and formation, this also caused dismay among some bishops, priests and Christian faithful. Archbishop Parecattil, who strongly objected to making the sign of the cross from right to left, asserted:

Whether the sign of the cross should be made from right to left or left to right is another problem. The Keralite Syrians were making the sign of the cross from right to left till the sixteenth century, following the Chaldean practice. It is the Portuguese missionaries who changed it. So, for the last three centuries we were making the sign from left to right.

²⁶ See, Introductory Article One, no. 1. 6.

²⁷ Sacra Congregatio pro Ecclesia Orientali, *Ordo Celebrationis*, no. 7, p. 6; cf. also *Liturgia Siro-Malabaresi*, 90-91.

²⁸ *The Order of Qurbana of the Syro-Malabar Church* (1962), 1.

²⁹ *The Order of Qurbana of the Syro-Malabar Church* (1962), General Instructions, no. 7; document 31.

But the Chaldean advocates argued that while restoring the Syro-Malabar rite, the old Chaldean practice should be revived and imposed on us. In the outlines and rituals sent from Rome, this practice was ordered. But in the letter I wrote to Rome in 1965 (sic, but it should be 1955) I have explained that it is not desirable to introduce the old custom of making the sign of the cross from right to left. But all my pleadings fell on deaf ears and the rituals of the 1962 Mass prescribed compulsorily making the sign of the cross from right to left.³⁰

In the petition submitted by the Syro-Malabar bishops to the prefect of the Oriental Congregation on 27 October 1963 permission was sought to begin the Mass with a sign of the cross.³¹ With regard to the sign of the cross from right to left the bishops stated:

Permission is also requested to make the sign of the Cross from left to right as we were accustomed to do for the last three and a half centuries and more. The Catholics of the Latin Rite and of the Syro-Malankara Rite and the Jacobites make the sign of the Cross from left to right. The same is the case with the Catholics of several other Oriental Rites, including the Chaldean Rite. Moreover, if in liturgical services the practice of the signing from right to left is introduced, eventually it will have to be adopted also in the ordinary prayers and the faithful will hardly appreciate it. Apart from that, in our secular and Sunday schools, catechism classes are attended by the children of the three different Rites. To teach the sign of the Cross in two different fashions according to their Rite will be a difficult and delicate task. The same difficulty and delicacy will be experienced also by the teachers in the schools conducted by the Latin and Syro-Malankara Catholics with regard to the Syro-Malabar students. Hence for the sake of uniformity and for avoiding undue emphasis on the difference between the Rites even in such matters as the sign of the Cross, we are of opinion that the practice

³⁰ J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, 102; on the same argument, see also pages 21 and 71. When Parecattil was consulted in 1955 he mentioned this point (see document 10). However, on the occasion of the second consultation he did not indicate any particular point, but he gave a general positive response (cf. document 18).

³¹ Cf. Document 34.

of signing from left to right be kept up. It may also be noted that this way of signing is more constant with the Indian mentality.³²

The requests of the bishops were not accepted at that time. Evidently according to the 1968 *Taksa*, the *Qurbana* begins with the sign of the cross.³³ It was also ordered that the sign of the cross should be made from left to right.

While making the sign of the cross on himself, the celebrant first places his right hand on the forehead, then moves it down to his chest, and then moves it to the left shoulder, and finally to the right shoulder.³⁴

With regard to the beginning of *Qurbana* with the sign of the cross and the practice of making the sign of the cross from left to right, in the course of further liturgical reform the Oriental Congregation reiterated:

The sign of the cross, preferably made from right to left, or from left to right where this is long-standing custom, may be tolerated *ad libitum* at the beginning of the liturgy, where it is already in general use. But it is not to be included in the approved text of the *Qurbana*, and in areas where it is not in general use, it is not to be introduced.

It must be noted once again: the Christian 'sign of the Cross' was for over a millennium made in the same way in all the Churches of the East and of the West: from right to left. In 1962 there was simply a timely return to the *normal* usage of the non-Latinized East: the measure is in full conformity with the cogent, general directive in *OE* 2, 6 and 12. For this reason, the relevant rubric of 1962 is to be upheld.³⁵

In accordance with this directive, according to the Missal now in use the initial sign of the cross is not printed, although in some dioceses the celebrant begins the *Qurbana* with the sign of the cross. Moreover

³² Document 34.

³³ *The Order of Qurbana of the Syro-Malabar Church* (1968), 1.

³⁴ *The Order of Qurbana of the Syro-Malabar Church* (1968), General Norms, no. 4; document 55.

³⁵ *Congregatio pro Ecclesiis Orientalibus, Final Judgement*, no. 19; in *Roman Documents on the Syro-Malabar Liturgy*, 106.

the sign of the cross from right to left is prescribed: “While making the sign of the cross on himself, the celebrant raises his right hand just above the head and makes the sign of the cross over himself by moving his hand first down to his breast saying ‘now’, then moving it to the right shoulder saying ‘always’ and finally to the left shoulder saying ‘for ever’”.³⁶

2.3. Correction of Anticipatory Expressions

In the pre-Diamper *Qurbana*, once in the preparatory prayer of the chalice and twice in the anthem of the mysteries, the bread and wine were called body and blood of Christ in anticipation. While pouring wine into the chalice the priest said, “The *precious blood* of Christ is being poured into the chalice of Christ, our Lord, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit”.³⁷ The expression “precious blood” was changed into wine, “that no occasion may be given to the error of calling the wine before it is consecrated, the precious blood of Christ”.³⁸ In the Diamper text there was no preparatory prayer for the bread. During the transfer and deposition of bread and wine, in the Anthem of the mysteries it was sung twice: “*The body of Christ and his precious blood* are on the holy altar”. Here also the expressions the body of Christ and his precious blood were substituted with sacred bread and the precious chalice, in order to avoid the error already mentioned.³⁹

³⁶ *The Syro-Malabar Qurbana: The Order of Raza* (1989), General Instructions, no. 14.

³⁷ J. F. Raulin, *Historia Ecclesiae Malabaricae cum Diamperitana Synodo*, 301; P. Pallath, *The Eucharistic Liturgy of the St Thomas Christians*, 28-29.

³⁸ Synod of Diamper, session V, part 2, decree 1.

³⁹ Synod of Diamper, session V, part 2, decree 1; J. F. Raulin, *Historia Ecclesiae Malabaricae cum Diamperitana Synodo*, 301; P. Pallath, *The Eucharistic Liturgy of the St Thomas Christians*, 28-29.

Raulin himself, who re-published the Diamper *Qurbana*, indicated that the aforementioned prayers were modified not because they contained heretical expressions, but because of the scrupulosity of Menezes only as a precautionary measure. According to Raulin, the designation of bread and wine as body and blood of Christ before their consecration is an acceptable manner of speaking, widespread both in the West and the East in ancient times, in so far as the gifts offered by the Church will necessarily be converted to what they are called, within a very short time. In other words, the Eucharistic bread and wine are body and blood of Christ *in fieri*. In the West not only in the Mozarabic, Gallican and Celtic rites but even in the Roman rite such anticipatory expressions can be found.⁴⁰

As in some other cases, also the aforementioned unnecessary corrections of the Synod of Diamper did not survive and the anticipatory expressions always continued to exist in the Syro-Malabar Missal.⁴¹ Naturally the proposed Missal of 1955, sent to all the Syro-Malabar bishops for consultation, contained these expressions in the preparatory prayers: “the precious blood is poured into the chalice”, “the paten is signed with the sacred body of our Lord Jesus Christ”, and in the anthem of the Mysteries: “the body of Christ and the precious blood are on the holy altar”.⁴² However, the Syro-Malabar bishops did not make a single comment on such expressions, when they were consulted, perhaps because they already existed in the *Qurbana*, which the bishops celebrated every day and hence did not

⁴⁰ Cf. J. F. Raulin, *Historia Ecclesiae Malabaricae cum Diamperitana Synodo*, 301-302, footnote; for details about anticipatory expressions in the Roman Missal at that time and today, see P. Pallath, *The Eucharistic Liturgy of the St Thomas Christians*, 135-137.

⁴¹ A. Kalapura (trans.), *An English Version of Rasa or the Syriac Pontifical High-Mass*, 55-56 & 66-67; Fabian TOCD, *The Qurbana of the East Syrian Catholics of Kerala*; 121 & 136.

⁴² Cf. Sacra Congregazione per la Chiesa Orientale, *Liturgia Siro-Malabaresi*, 16-17 & 19.

seem strange to them. Also Archbishop Parecattil, twice consulted, did not make any objection on this point.⁴³ As we have already seen, the entire Missal prepared by the Roman Commission, was approved by the plenary assembly of the Congregation for the Oriental Church and then by Pope Pius XII. Hence the doctrinal authenticity of calling bread and wine, body and blood in anticipation is evident.

Surprisingly the problems began to arise for the first time, when the Syriac-Malayalam text began to be used in 1962. While speaking about the shortcomings of 1962 *Qurbana* Archbishop Joseph Parecattil affirmed:

The main difficulty one encounters in the text is that wine and bread are called 'blood' and 'body' of Christ right from the time they are brought to the altar and there is no indication of any real change taking place in them according to the anaphora now actually in use. This lends itself to the idea of transfiguration, rather than to the accepted doctrine of transubstantiation.⁴⁴

Naturally in the 1968 *Qurbana ad experimentum*, prepared under the direction of Parecattil, in order to avoid calling the bread and wine, body and blood in anticipation, the preparatory prayers were practically omitted and a new prayer, avoiding such expressions, was composed for recitation during the transfer of gifts.⁴⁵ The said prayer reads:

Come, glorify the Lord. With tears of repentance let us rinse out the stains of our sins. God will not reject a repentant heart and a humble soul. Therefore let us approach him with reverence and love, and offer ourselves as a sacrifice.⁴⁶

⁴³ See documents 10 and 18.

⁴⁴ J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, Appendix III, 53-54.

⁴⁵ *The Order of Qurbana of the Syro-Malabar Church* (1968), 19-20.

⁴⁶ *The Order of Qurbana of the Syro-Malabar Church* (1968), 20.

Parecattil explained the reason for the elimination of anticipatory expressions as follows:

In the Mass of 1962, when the celebrant pours wine into the Chalice he says ‘the precious blood of our Lord Jesus Christ is being poured into the Chalice’. Also he says, ‘The paten is sealed by the sacred body of our Lord Jesus Christ’ when he places bread in the paten. These are dropped in the Mass of 1968. The expression ‘precious blood’ and ‘sacred body’ used at that time will confuse ordinary persons. They are irrelevant and improper.⁴⁷

In the course of the intricate and painful process of liturgical reform, after studying the *Order of the Holy Mass (Qurbana) of the Syro-Malabar Church*, prepared by the Central Liturgical Committee and finalized by the Episcopal Conference at its session on 1-2 June 1981, the Congregation for the Oriental Churches rejected the text and gave its observations on 1 March 1983. With regard to the alternative translations avoiding anticipatory expressions the Congregation asserted:

[...] They (the translations) not only depart from the original text, but manifest a total incomprehension of the nature of Christian liturgical language, which is symbolic and often proleptic, and not ontological, pedantic literalism. Liturgical texts that use ‘Body and Blood’ to refer to the gifts before the consecration, are not thereby advancing a theological thesis. This sort of language is common in the pre-anaphora and throughout the Christian East. The preservation of such expressions in the reformed rite approved by the Holy See in 1955 should have been sufficient proof of their suitability.⁴⁸

Anyway, according to the indications of the Apostolic See all the aforementioned anticipatory expressions remain in the present text in

⁴⁷ J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, 72.

⁴⁸ Sacra Congregatio pro Ecclesiis Orientalibus, *Observations on: “The Order of the Holy Mass of the Syro-Malabar Church 1981”*, C. 32/42-35/44; in *Roman Documents on the Syro-Malabar Liturgy*, 76.

use. However, with the publication of the variable prayers (Propria), the anthem of the mysteries varies according to the seasons or Sundays and feast days. Hence anticipatory expressions appear only in the anthem given in the common order of *Qurbana* and in the private prayers for the preparation of gifts.

2.4. Liturgy Facing the People

From apostolic times until the practice of the liturgy facing the people became prevalent in the Latin Church, the St Thomas Christians in India always celebrated liturgy facing the East or towards the Lord. According to the common tradition of the Western and Eastern Churches and the practice of the St Thomas Christians from the apostolic period, the 1962 restored Missal prescribed the celebration of the entire Eucharistic liturgy facing the East (or *versus Deum*). The celebrant turned to the people only for the greetings, blessings, prayer requests and the proclamation of the Gospel.

After the Second Vatican Council, without any authorization or permission from the competent authority, Archbishop Joseph Parecattil began to celebrate the *Qurbana* facing the people. Gradually the practice was introduced in the entire archdiocese of Ernakulam. Then this new manner of celebration spread to neighbouring dioceses as well. However, Mar Sebastian Valloppilly by order No. 5/65 dated 15 July 1965 prohibited offering the Mass facing the people.⁴⁹ Mar George Alapatt, bishop of Trichur, also did the same; on 10 May 1967 he ordered: “There is no permission for the celebrant to face the people while offering the Mass”.⁵⁰

However, in the course of time gradually the practice was introduced in both of those dioceses, perhaps because of the great influence of Archbishop Parecattil, who at that time acted as the head

⁴⁹ J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, 99.

⁵⁰ As cited in J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, 99.

of the Syro-Malabar Church and permanent president of the Bishops' Conference and liturgical committee. According to Parecattil, "two dioceses alone are 'backward looking' even now, both in the literal and ceremonial sense".⁵¹ One may note that this very fundamental change concerning the orientation of the celebrant during the *Qurbana* was introduced without any authorization or approval of the Apostolic See, the only competent authority for this at that time.

In the letter of Archbishop Parecattil requesting approval for the 1968 Missal and in the attached notes on "Some Changes in the Rubrics of the Mass" attached to it,⁵² he did not even indicate this fundamental change regarding the orientation of the celebrant during the *Qurbana*, which would torment the Syro-Malabar Church for more than half a century. The text submitted to the Oriental Congregation only in Malayalam language contained the norm permitting only the liturgy of the Word facing the people: "The first part of the *Qurbana* (liturgy of the Word) may be said facing the people".⁵³

However, the Congregation was unaware of this change, since the translation of the text was not submitted, according to the regulations of that time for the approval of liturgical books. It seems that for reasons unknown the Cardinal Prefect was determined to grant the approval without examining the text and without consulting any expert as the praxis and norms of the Congregation required; hence the Syro-Malabar bishops were not even asked to submit a translation of the Malayalam text. It is noteworthy that even in the 1968 Missal permission was not given at all for celebrating the entire *Qurbana* facing the people. Many modifications were made on the pretext of satisfying the laypeople, but surprisingly enough in none of the

⁵¹ J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, 99. The two dioceses mentioned by Parecattil may be Changanacherry and Palai.

⁵² Document 53.

⁵³ General Norms, no. 5; document 55.

petitions or memorandums at that time they asked for liturgy facing the people.

During the course of the second restoration of Syro-Malabar *Qurbana* (1980-1989) the Congregation for the Oriental Churches prescribed that the “traditional posture facing East is not be abandoned for another Westernization, the *versus populum* position”.⁵⁴ However, some bishops who were already accustomed to celebrate the whole *Qurbana versus populum* continuously insisted that they should be permitted to do the same. Hence the Oriental Congregation later stated:

On the difficult question of celebrating the entire Eucharist *versus populum*, rather than preserving the traditional distinction between the position of the priest during the Liturgy of the Word and during the anaphora, when he stood at the head of the people, facing in the same direction as the congregation he was leading in prayer, the S. Congregation has the following to say:

- a) The introduction of the mass *versus populum* was done without any approval from the Holy See.
- b) The tradition in this matter remains the ideal and clearly represents the will of the Holy See in this matter.

The Eucharist celebrated *versus populum* certainly runs counter to the basic approach to worship in any Eastern tradition worth the name.

- c) The celebration, therefore, is not to be *versus populum* but in conformity with the normal way of standing at the altar in the Oriental tradition.

Care must be taken:

- to celebrate the Liturgy of the Word among the people, as was done in the more ancient tradition.
- to see to it that every cathedral and parish church is eventually provided with *bema*, constructed in the middle of the central nave and regularly put to use.

⁵⁴ Sacra Congregatio pro Ecclesiis Orientalibus, *Observations*, 53a; in *Roman Documents on the Syro-Malabar Liturgy*, 78.

d) The *versus populum* position may be tolerated, in parishes where it has already been introduced, provisionally and for as brief a time as is reasonably possible, while keeping the fact in mind that all permissions and dispensations of whatever kind given during the experimental period are revoked.⁵⁵

The Congregation officially stated what we have already seen above: “The introduction of the mass *versus populum* was done without any approval from the Holy See”. It again confirmed the authentic tradition of the Church, namely the Eucharistic liturgy facing the East, but provisionally tolerated the *versus populum* position only in parishes where it was already introduced. It is beyond the scope of this work to deal with further developments in this regard.

2.5. Restructuring of the Pre-Anaphora

According to the Eastern tradition the pre-anaphora has two parts: the material preparation and the spiritual preparation for the sanctification or anaphora. The first one, less important, mainly comprises the preparation, transfer and deposition of gifts on the altar. The essential elements of the spiritual preparation are the proclamation of the symbol of faith (creed) and the official entry of the celebrant to the altar.⁵⁶

According to the Missal approved by the plenary assembly of the Oriental Congregation and by Pope Pius XII as well as promulgated by the same Congregation, the traditional Eastern order of spiritual and

⁵⁵ Congregatio pro Ecclesiis Orientalibus, *Final Judgement*, no. 40; in *Roman Documents on the Syro-Malabar Liturgy*, 111-112.

⁵⁶ Cf. Sacra Congregatio pro Ecclesiis Orientalibus, *Observations*, 26b; in *Roman Documents on the Syro-Malabar Liturgy*, 72-73; V. Pathikulangara, *Qurbana: The Eucharistic Celebration of the Chaldeo-Indian Church*, Kottayam 1998, 190-214.

material preparations are maintained.⁵⁷ Now the established structure of the pre-anaphoral rites is presented in a schematic manner.

1. Preparation of the gifts (bread and wine) during the *karozutha*, preferably at *bethgazzas*;

2. Concluding prayer of *karozutha* by the celebrant, “Lord, Almighty God [...]”;

3. Imposition of hands and dismissal of catechumens;

4. Anthem of the Mysteries I (variable), washing of hands, transfer of gifts from *bethgazzas* to the altar, presentation of gifts with the prescribed prayers, deposition on the altar and veiling, anthem of the mysteries II (invariable part);

5. Symbol of faith, Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed;

6. Official entrance of the celebrant to the altar reciting the prescribed prayers, kissing of the altar, prayer-request of the celebrant to the faithful.

In accordance with the approved Latin text, the Missal of 1962 (obviously also Syriac text 1960) substantially maintained the traditional Eastern order of the material and spiritual preparations.⁵⁸ However, the entire pre-anaphoral rite was re-arranged in the Missal of 1968, as is evident from the following scheme.⁵⁹

1. *Karozutha* and its concluding priestly prayer;

2. Imposition of hands and dismissal of catechumens;

3. Proclamation of faith with the so-called Apostles’ Creed or with Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed as an option;

4. Official entrance to the altar;

⁵⁷ Sacra Congregazione per la Chiesa Orientale, *Liturgia Siro-Malabaresi*, 15-23; *Ordo Celebrationis*, 12-15.

⁵⁸ *The Order of Qurbana of the Syro-Malabar Church* (1962), 11-27.

⁵⁹ *The Order of Qurbana of the Syro-Malabar Church* (1968), 11-22.

5. Preparation of gifts at the altar, washing of the hands at the altar;

6. Anthem of the mysteries I by the faithful, offer of gifts with the prescribed prayers, deposition and veiling, anthem of the mysteries II, anaphora.

As we have already seen, the order of pre-anaphoral rites established by the Apostolic See obviously respected the Eastern liturgical heritage in general and the East Syrian tradition in particular; on the other hand the 1968 Missal closely followed the order of Roman Missal. The two fundamental modifications were the official entrance (*accessus*) to the altar before the preparation of gifts and the position of the Creed. During the period of the second restoration of Syro-Malabar Missal (1980-1989) some bishops wished to maintain the pre-anaphoral structure of the 1968 Missal. Hence the Oriental Congregation confirmed the universally valid norm of the Eastern pre-anaphoral rites:

the *accessus* rites follow the preparation of gifts, and come just before the anaphora, for which they are the immediate preparation. To shift them up to before the preparation of gifts destroys the whole order and movement of the Eastern preanaphora, and cannot be tolerated [...].⁶⁰

With regard to the Creed the Congregation stated: “The traditional text and location of the Creed are obligatory at all liturgies. The Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed is a fixed element before the anaphora in all Eastern traditions except the Ethiopian. Parallels with Roman usage, based on a totally different history, have no relevance here”.⁶¹

⁶⁰ Sacra Congregatio pro Ecclesiis Orientalibus, *Observations*, 26b; in *Roman Documents on the Syro-Malabar Liturgy*, 73.

⁶¹ Sacra Congregatio pro Ecclesiis Orientalibus, *Observations*, 49/50; in *Roman Documents on the Syro-Malabar Liturgy*, 77.

2.6. Modifications in the Anaphora of Addai and Mari

As we have seen the second and the third anaphoras were not included in the Missals of 1960, 1962 and 1968. Hence we need to consider only the anaphora of Addai and Mari. In the 1968 text no change was made with regard to the position of the institution narrative and the structure of the anaphora. However, the triple blessing over the bread and wine during the institution narrative and the one after the epiclesis were suppressed. Similarly, as in other places the sign of the cross during the anaphora had to be made from left to right in tune with the custom after the Synod of Diamper. Some Christological prayers including the prayer-request of the priest inside the anaphora which explicitly or implicitly requested Christ to accept the oblation were so modified as to signify that it is the Father who receives the sacrifice.⁶² In the opinion of Cardinal Parecattil this change was necessary, because according to the Catholic theology Eucharist is the sacrifice of Christ offered through the hands of the priest to the eternal Father.⁶³

Moreover, Archbishop Parecattil detected that there is confusion between the Father and the Son of the Holy Trinity in the anaphora of 1962 Missal. The institution narrative begins with the phrase: “O’ my Lord, we make this memorial of the passion of your Son as he taught us”, where as in the last *g’hanta* prayer it is said: “My Lord [...] in the commemoration of the Body and Blood of your Christ which we offer you upon the pure and holy altar as you have taught us”.⁶⁴ According to the first prayer it is Christ who taught us, whereas according to the second the Father taught us.⁶⁵ In order to avoid this confusion in the

⁶² *The Order of Qurbana of the Syro-Malabar Church* (1968), 21, 29, 34.

⁶³ Cf. J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, 72; Appendix I, pages 28-29 and Appendix III, 54.

⁶⁴ *The Order of Qurbana of the Syro-Malabar Church* (1962), 30-31 & 33.

⁶⁵ Cf. J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, 72-73 and Appendix III, page 57.

1968 Missal the prayers were modified so as to explicitly indicate in both places that it is Christ who taught us, inserting the same phrase in both place: “as your beloved Son taught us”.⁶⁶

According to Parecattil in the 1962 Missal, “Such confusion and mixing up are seen in the prayers coming after the consecration words are said (page 32). In that prayer, at the opening ‘Your example’ refers to Christ. In the next sentence, the use of ‘of our Lord Jesus Christ’ would make the salutation as addressed to the Father. Then the first ‘Your example’ has no meaning”.⁶⁷ This prayer was also modified and the “confusion” engendered by alternatively addressing the Father and Christ was rectified in the 1968 Missal.⁶⁸

3. Consequences of Counter-Reform: Liturgical Indiscipline and Anarchy

The liturgical indiscipline and chaos started with the publication of 1968 Missal affected also other sectors of liturgy: the Pontifical, the Ritual and the Liturgy of the Hours. However, limiting to the theme of the present book some indications are given only with regard to the Eucharistic liturgy. The period after the implementation of 1968 Missal was marked by the proliferation of unauthentic and unapproved Orders of *Qurbana*. In some regions each priest began to celebrate *Qurbana* according to his own whims and fancies, without depending on any particular text. Here the main texts in circulation at that period are indicated.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ *The Order of Qurbana of the Syro-Malabar Church* (1968), 30 & 34.

⁶⁷ J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, 73; cf. Appendix III, p. 57.

⁶⁸ *The Order of Qurbana of the Syro-Malabar Church* (1968), 32.

⁶⁹ For information about these texts: J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, 65-73, 82-83, 91-98 and Appendix III, pages 65-74; T. Mannoorampampil, *The Historical Background of Syro-Malabar Qurbana*, 152-154; G. Thadikkatt, *Liturgical Identity of the Mār Tōma Nazrāni Church*, 123-133; for a critical evaluation of Indian Masses, see *Roman Documents on the Syro-Malabar Liturgy*, 19-28.

1. *An Order of the Mass for the Indian Church* was prepared by Dharmaram College Bangalore (CMI) in 1969. The anaphora of Addai and Mari was substituted with an unapproved Indian anaphora. The Congregation for the Oriental Churches prohibited this new order of the Mass on 23 June 1978.

2. *Indian Mass, Indianized Mass* or *Bharathiya Pooja*, inspired by the *Order of the Mass for India*, prepared by the National Biblical, Catechetical and Liturgical Centre (NBCLC) for the Latin Church, was first celebrated on the occasion of the consecration of the cathedral church of Ernakulam on 31 March 1974. Here also, instead of approved anaphoras, an “Indian anaphora”, compiled by the protagonists of Indianization was used. The Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments prohibited this Indian Mass on 14 June 1975 and the Oriental Congregation on 23 June 1978.

3. *Mini Mass* of Ernakulam, an abbreviated form of 1968 Missal with more omissions and modifications was published on 3 July 1974. With respect to the Missals of 1962 and 1968 the anaphora of Addai and Mari was also shortened. Even the *g'hanta* prayers (essential part of the anaphora) after the institution narrative could be substituted with a devotional song, during which some priests silently recited those prayers. The Congregation for the Oriental Churches prohibited it on 23 June 1978.

4. Four Masses of Fr. Abel CMI: he affirmed, “Since 1965, I have been working on liturgy texts under the instructions from His Eminence (Parecattil). With his approval the following books have been published by me so far”.⁷⁰ Then he enumerated 19 liturgical books, among which there are four orders of *Qurbana*: Festival *Raza*, Requiem *Raza*, Festival High Mass and Requiem High Mass,⁷¹ all these obviously based on 1968 *Taksa* and *Mini Mass* of Ernakulam.

⁷⁰ Abel CMI, “Foreword”, J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, IX.

⁷¹ Abel CMI, “Foreword”, J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, IX-X.

Since at that time the only competent authority for the approval of Syro-Malabar liturgical books was the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, all these texts were published and used for Eucharistic celebration without any canonical approval. They were not even regularly approved by Syro-Malabar Bishops' Conference. With regard to the Festival *Raza* and Requiem *Raza*, Archbishop Parecattil himself explicitly affirmed: "Though the *Raza* for the living and the dead have not been formally approved, they are probably celebrated not only in the Archdiocese of Ernakulam, but in some of the other dioceses also. As president of the Central Liturgical Committee I authorized the use of these texts as an experimental measure [...]"⁷² Whether approved or not, prohibited or not, at that period all the aforementioned orders of *Qurbana* continued to be used for Eucharistic celebration in the dioceses mentioned by Archbishop Parecattil.

Conclusion

After the publication of 1960-1962 *Taksa*, in the course of about six years generally the clergy and people were gradually accustomed to the restored Pontifical and *Qurbana* in Malayalam language and by actively participating in the celebrations, began to appreciate their richness and beauty. However, the publication of the 1968 Missal precipitated the Eucharistic Liturgy of the Syro-Malabar Church into the abyss of uncertainty and liturgical anarchy. Although modifications were made in the name of the laypeople, they cannot be held responsible for the liturgical chaos that tormented the Syro-Malabar Church for several years. The sudden introduction of the new Missal also marked the reversal of the entire restoration process so that the Oriental Congregation had to start again in 1980 its strenuous efforts for restoration and reform, and that too with enormous difficulties, misunderstandings and controversies.

⁷² J. Parecattil, *Syro-Malabar Liturgy as I See It*, 98.

I have stated in the General Introduction that the scope of this book is to publish the documents concerning the restoration and reform of Syro-Malabar *Qurbana* from 1954 to 1969. In spite of this I have simply indicated the liturgical anarchy that broke out after the publication of the 1968 Missal only as regards the Eucharistic liturgy. The aim of all the subsequent efforts of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches especially during the period of 1980-1986 was simply to lead the Syro-Malabar bishops back to the restored Missal of 1960-1962, officially promulgated by the same Congregation after the approval of the plenary assembly and that of Pope Pius XII.

APPENDIX I

Sacra Congregatio pro Ecclesia Orientali, Prot. 947/48,

INSTRUCTIO “DE RITU SACRIFICII EUCHARISTICI
INSTAURATO” AD HIERARCHAS MALABARENSES.

Assidua, qua ardebat, sollicitudine, ut digne undique ac devote persolveretur cultus, quem Ecclesia Sancta Deo ómnium Creatori tribuit, permotus, Pius XI, f. r. Pontifex Maximus, statuit ut Malabarensibus Pontificale ad genuinas ipsorum ritus rationes redactum appareretur. Nec praetereunda sunt verba quae Ipse in Litteris Apostolicis “Sancta Dei Ecclesia” die, XXV mensis martii anno millesimo nongentesimo duodequadragesimo e dixerat, scilicet: “Si nonnulli nimiae utilitatis concordiaeque amore compulsi cum non satis Orientalium res atque indolem agnoscerent, vel sacros eorum ritus corrumpere vel eos ad latinos ritus redigere enisi sunt, at Romani Pontifices, Decessores Nostri, hisce nisibus pro facultate nullisque parcendo laboribus, obstiterunt” (AAS, 1938, p. 154).

Huius Pontificalis editio prínceps, post diuturnam ac belli causa non semel interruptam studii operam, tandem cura Sacrae huius Congregationis, anno millesimo nongentesimo quingentesimo séptimo in lucem prodiit, addito, explicationis directionisque causa, libello cui index “Ordo persolvendi ritus Pontificales iuxta usum Ecclesiae syro-malabarensis”.

Ut autem litúrgica instauratione ex integro perficeretur, eadem Sacra Congregatio proprio rerum liturgicarum Consilio Missale quoque ad usum Malabarensium reformandum iam pridem commiserat. Re in plenariis comitiis ab Eminentissimis Patribus librata, ac probante PIO XII, v. m., Pontifice Maximo, in Audientia diei XXVI mensis iunii eo ipse anno concessa, tres editi sunt libri: primus qui inscribitur “Taksa d’quddaša”, chaldaica lingua exaratus, Ordinarium Missae cum anaphora SS. Apostolorum Addai et Maris praebet; alter, cui index “Ordo celebrationis Quddaša iuxta usum Ecclesiae syro-malabarensis”,

lingua latina digestus, tres celebrandi formas recenset; tertius, item latino sermone confectus, habet titulum “Supplementum Mysteriorum sive Proprium de Tempore et de Sanctis iuxta ritum Ecclesiae syro-malabarensis”. Hoc postremo libro opus est ad instaurandum in celebranda Missa tum calendarium ritus tum cantus variabiles qui ex usu deciderant, nec non lectiones ritui proprias e sacris scripturis depromptas.

Attentis animadversionibus ab episcopis Malabarensium in re factis, Eminentissimi Patres, omnibus rite perpensis, normas quoque ad reformationem rite inducendum statuerunt quas Idem Summus Pontifex acceptas ac ratas habuit.

Normae sunt hae:

1. = Permittitur usus linguae Malayalam, quae dicitur, in universa Divina Liturgia; anaphoræ autem edentur sermone chaldaico et malayalam, facta facultate celebranti alterutro utendi;

2. = Firmo praescripto ritus Syro-chaldaici adhibendi panem fermentatum, facultas fit azymo utendi, remota tamen fidelium admiratione.

3. = Sicubi vestes liturgicae proprii ritus desint, aliorum ritum catholicorum vestibus uti licet, remota tamen fidelium admiratione. In ecclesiis in quibus usus propriarum vestium liturgicarum qualibet ex causa obsolevit, sedulo curent locorum Hierarchae ut ille restituatur;

4. = Ex genuina ritus ratione, Divina Eucharistia ipsis fidelibus sub utraque specie praebenda est. Haec norma tenenda erit in Divina liturgia Sollemni et Sollemnissima, quae Raza dicitur, prout describitur in “Ordine celebrationis” ad nn. 50-52. Valde commendatur ut, occurrentibus aptis adiunctis, veluti in collatione ordinum aut in matrimoniorum celebratione, Divina Eucharistia sub utraque specie praebetur, prout describitur in eodem libro ad nn. 50-51.

5. = Resumatur usus veli sanctuarii in Divina Liturgia Sollemnissima, Raza quae dicitur, etiamque, ubi consuetudo vigeat, in Divina Liturgia Sollemni.

Sacri Antistites consilia hac de re conferant in ipsorum episcopalibus collationibus et omnia sedulo definiant ut ad Divinam Liturgiam uniformiter celebrandam in omnibus et singulis ecclesiis feliciter deveniatur.

Perutile opus fiet, si sine mora Lectionarium edetur cum pericopis e Vetere Testamento desumptis, nec non Epistolarium et Evangeliarium, attentis normis in “Supplemento Mysteriorum seu Proprio Missae” traditis. Sed antea videant ipsi sacri Antistites utrum ad pericopas Veteris Testamenti quod attinet, conversio in linguam malayalam e textu pšitta an potius e textu hebraico facienda sit. Donec Epistolarium et Evangeliarium edantur, lectiones biblicae sumantur e libris qui nunc in usu sunt et secundum calendarium in ipsis contentum.

Ad usum Missalis nunc instaurati inducendum, Sacra Congregatio haec proponenda censuit:

1. = Illis, qui ante Novi Missalis instaurationem sacerdotio initiati sunt, indulgetur ut Divinam Liturgiam celebrent secundum veterem consuetudinem, donec episcopis aliter videatur.

2.= In Seminariis sive maioribus sive minoribus, itemque in Collegiis scholasticorum atque in domibus novitiorum Divina Liturgia ex Missali instaurato quamprimum celebretur.

In fidelibus instituendis de novis Divinae Liturgiae celebrandae praescriptis, opportune illustretur Apostolicae Sedis sollicitudo ritus orientales omnes in sua cuiusque primigenia ac genuina maiestate servandi, ac minime Ipsam cunctari quin ritum quoque romanum reformet, sicut novissime peractum est, caeremoniis Tridui Sacri instauratis novoque dato rubricarum codice.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus Sacrae Congregationis pro Ecclesia Orientali, die 20a ianuarii anno Domini 1962.

Gabriel A. Coussa, Pro Secr.,

I. Baptista Scapinelli, Adessor.

APPENDIX II

Sacra Congregatio pro Ecclesia Orientali, Prot. 947/48,
DECRETUM de celebrando “Quddasa ex ritu Syro-Malabarensi”.

Attendis postulationibus a venerabilibus Episcopis malabarensibus die 22 mensis octobris vertente anno porrectis, Sacra Congregatio pro Ecclesia Orientali, omnibus rite et cogitate perpensis, sequentes ex normis in Ordine celebrationis “Quddasa” iuxta usum Ecclesiae syro-malabarensis datae (Romae anno 1959) hac ratione mutari decrevit.

Ad numerum 15 addatur: “De hac autem “marmitha” licitum est cantare tantum primum psalmum”.

Ad numerum 25 sic mutetur initium: “Minister, quando videt sacerdotem praeparationem oblatores perfecisse, dicit, si tempus urget, ultimam petitionem: “Animas nostras...”; deinde velum sanctuarii aperitur”.

Ad numerum 38 post verba “preces a fratribus moderata voce postulat” addatur: “vel dicto a Diacono: Orate mentibus vestris; pax vobiscum, sine adiecto, Sacerdos alta voce pronuntiat orationem: Domine Deus fortis, accipe hanc oblationem...; orationem autem sequentem: Domine Deus noster, secundum tuam misericordiam... submissa voce recitat; preces deinde a fratribus moderata voce postulat, respondentibus ministris tantum haec verba: Christus exaudiat tuas preces, Christus accipiat tuum sacrificium”.

Ad numerum 39 addatur: “vel tantum primum versum psalmi Miserere mei...”.

Ad numerum 45 addatur quod iam habetur ad numerum 70, 6): “Ad “Kazozutha” Minister cantat: Omnes nos cum timore... usque: et respondent fideles. Interea Sacerdos orationem dicit: Benedictus es...usque: et dedisti nobis vitam immortalem, et concludit doxologiam finalem huius orationis”.

Praeterea haec duo notanda sunt:

1) Ubi in textu syriaco rubricae praescribunt in principio et in fine alicuius orationis quaedam verba a sacerdote esse repetenda, in versione malayalam hae verborum repetitiones omittendae sunt.

2) Cum praescriptae lectiones Sacrae Scripturae vere longae sint, licet eas rationabiliter, id est secundum sententiarum aut narrationum sensum breviare, ita ut per quinque saltem versus lectio protrahatur, decem autem versus non multum excedat.

Contrariis quibuslibet minime obfuturis.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus Sacrae Congregationis pro Ecclesia Orientali, die 3 mensis decembris anno 1963.

(G. Card. Testa),

(J. B. Scapinelli, adessor).

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- Aggiornamento*, 282
Agnus Dei, 53, 171, 173, 244, 260
Allatae sunt, 37, 271
Altar Boy's Association, 106
Amantissimus, 274
Anaphora/s (of Apostles, Addai and Mari or East Syrian), 26, 28-30, 34, 38, 39, 53, 87, 89, 92-96, 99, 130, 156, 168, 172, 190, 196, 197, 202, 205, 207, 268, 283, 284, 286, 287, 309, 352, 356, 358, 360, 363, 366, 367, 374, 378-384, 387, 388
Angelus, 242, 259
Annunciation (Sunday of), 38, 96, 303
Anointing of the sick, 86
Anthem of the mysteries, 16, 52, 53, 196, 204, 358, 359, 362, 372, 373, 375, 380
Apostles' creed, 335, 359, 380
Apostolic (Holy) See, 60, 63-66, 68, 69, 72, 73, 81, 82, 84, 130-133, 140, 142, 143, 163, 166, 169, 170, 175, 188, 198, 209, 215, 216, 218-221, 228, 242, 247, 254, 256, 259, 265, 266, 268, 270-274, 277-281, 285, 289, 292, 294, 298-300, 323, 325, 344-349, 362, 375, 377-380
Aqqaptha, 203
Ash Wednesday, 54, 55
Baptism, 39, 86, 106, 254, 289
Bema, 15, 203, 204, 378
Bethgazzas, 15, 16, 210, 342, 358, 362, 379, 380
Blessed Sacrament, 102, 128, 152-154, 185, 186, 242, 244, 246, 248, 259-262, 269, 296, 301
Body and Blood (consecration of), 27, 29, 31-33, 40, 212, 283, 358, 372-375, 382
Body of Christ, 27, 31, 35, 53, 372-374
Breviary, 107, 111, 146, 156, 209, 314, 315
British Museum, 85, 181
Byzantine Liturgy, 87, 91
Byzantine/s, (rite), 88, 89, 90, 137, 146, 147, 179, 184, 187, 191, 203, 216, 258, 367
Cappa (cape), 90, 134, 135
Catholic Action, 106

- Catholic Church, 26, 27, 29, 34, 57, 58, 88, 115, 117, 121, 137, 152, 242, 247, 269, 271, 274, 277, 279-282, 366
- Central Liturgical Committee, 305, 308, 312, 319, 325, 332, 362, 375, 385
- Ceremonial*, 88, 99, 128, 129, 137, 139, 141, 148, 173, 187, 247, 248
- Chaldean (Syro-Chaldean) rite, 93, 108, 129-131, 135, 139, 140, 147, 148, 156, 173, 178, 191-193, 202, 207, 217, 228, 229, 234, 240, 247, 257, 268-270, 286, 295-297, 370
- Chaldean Catholics, 138, 203-205
- Chaldean Mass, 239, 240, 294, 336
- Chaldean Pontifical, 68-70, 85, 140, 169, 170, 198-200, 229, 286
- Christological prayers, 362, 363, 365, 366, 368, 382
- Christology, 26
- Christus Dominus*, 64
- Code of Canon Law*, 63, 64, 180
- Communion (under both kinds/species), 39-42, 102, 103, 111, 112, 114, 117, 118, 120, 123, 125, 137, 147, 149, 151, 153-155, 169, 174, 186, 187, 211, 214, 361
- Communion (under the form of bread alone), 39, 40, 42, 100, 102, 153-155, 159, 164, 186, 187, 212, 214, 339
- Communion ecclesiology, 72
- Communion hymn, 196
- Communion rite (Holy Communion), 16, 54, 66, 88, 93, 96, 119-121, 137, 147, 149, 150, 154, 155, 171, 172, 177, 186, 187, 190, 191, 196, 204, 205, 213, 233, 244, 245, 260, 304, 339, 361
- Congregation for Divine Worship, 384
- Congregation for the Oriental Church(es), 20, 23, 42, 59, 69-73, 77-84, 92, 95, 97, 99, 100, 103, 112, 116, 118, 122, 125, 126, 128, 132, 138, 140-142, 144, 151, 156, 157, 160-167, 169, 171, 174, 176, 188, 190-200, 206, 207, 209, 215, 222, 223, 230, 232, 236, 238, 241, 253, 255, 266, 271, 272, 275, 290, 293, 299, 305-312, 314, 316, 318-322, 324, 326, 328, 330-332, 337, 343, 346-349, 351-353, 355, 362, 365, 367, 375, 377, 383-385

- Constitution on Sacred Liturgy, 282, 289, 334
 Coptic rite, 179, 183
 Council of Constance, 40
 Council of Florence, 35, 272
 Council of Trent, 40, 41, 241, 287
Credo, 180, 334
Daqdam wa'd batar, 86
Dei providentis, 69, 72
Demandatum Coelitus, 217, 271
 Diamper *Qurbana*, 25, 26, 29, 30, 52, 54, 364, 372
 Diaconate, 115
 Divine office, 67, 77, 78, 87, 94, 143, 171, 172, 180, 268, 270, 288, 300, 303
 Divine worship, 81, 105, 108, 110, 152, 384
 Doxology, 91, 237
Dukrana, 212, 215, 218, 221
 East Syrian liturgy, 46, 47, 228
 East Syrian tradition, 15, 16, 26, 38, 39, 45, 67, 196, 356, 361, 367, 381
 Eastern (oriental) tradition(s), 41, 42, 48, 63, 64, 89, 90, 103, 116, 144, 148, 303, 358, 378, 379, 381
 Eastern Churches, 35, 36, 41, 42, 88, 274, 275, 278-280, 289, 306, 307, 338, 376, Eastern rites, 81, 131, 153, 155, 178, 180, 187, 191, 242, 258, 269, 273, 275, 279, 281
 Elevation of Body and Blood (Sacred/consecrated Host), 33, 53, 141, 172, 173, 190, 191, 244, 245, 260, 282, 326, 366
Engarta, 211
 Epiphany (*Denha*), 38, 96, 150
 Eschatology, 26
 Eucharistic (Sacred) Liturgy, 15, 17, 19, 23, 24, 26, 27, 30, 33, 41, 49-52, 55, 66, 78, 149, 168, 218, 219, 253, 254, 258, 269, 277, 278, 291, 292, 294, 302, 303, 334, 364, 368, 372, 373, 376, 379, 383, 385
 Eucharistic adoration, 261, 301
 Eucharistic benediction, 128, 135
 Eucharistic celebration (sacrifice), 16, 17, 34, 36-38, 44, 95, 183, 185, 202, 283, 284, 303, 379, 384, 385
 Eucharistic processions, 242, 248, 259, 262, 301
 Excommunication, 39, 44, 228, 229
 Form of the Eucharist, 31, 32, 34

- Franciscan Third Order, 242, 259
- French (language), 39, 75, 144, 366
- G'hanta*, 15, 197, 211, 356, 359, 360, 382, 384
- Gazza*, 95, 96
- Gloria Patri*, 117, 233
- Gloria, 52, 91
- Gradual*, 173, 177, 203
- Greek(s), 17, 36, 38, 42, 47, 88, 90, 91, 96, 136, 147, 183, 184, 217, 271-273, 287, 335
- Heretic(s), 109, 117, 172
- Hierarchy, 59, 63, 80, 108, 109, 113, 115, 119, 151, 161, 175, 183, 188, 300
- Holy Eucharist (Mass), 31, 34, 37, 52, 87, 97, 127-129, 138, 139, 142, 172, 173, 177, 180, 187, 205, 208, 212, 214, 219, 220, 244, 246, 249, 259-262, 264, 269, 270, 282-284, 286, 294, 300, 301, 309, 375
- Holy Week, 54, 143, 174, 177, 209, 242, 259, 270, 315, 346
- Hosanna (Sunday of), 38, 96
- Hudra*, 95, 96
- Hutama*, 340-342
- Imprimatur*, 196, 197, 308, 324, 331, 345, 362
- In Suprema Patri Apostolici*, 217, 273
- In Universi*, 58
- Indian anaphora, 383, 384
- Indian Mass, 383, 384
- Institution narrative, 26-34, 53, 92, 93, 197, 356, 360, 381, 382, 384
- Italian (language), 75, 79, 83, 98, 126, 151, 167, 190, 192, 193, 198, 266, 337, 348, 366
- Jacobites, 109, 111, 137, 145, 234, 261, 370
- Jura particularia*, 201
- Karozutha, Korozutha or Karosousa*, 15, 52, 53, 88, 123, 128, 129, 196, 231, 233, 237, 326, 341, 342, 357-360, 379, 380, 391
- Karozwatha*, 205
- Kottina (kotina)*, 88, 90
- Kusapa (Kushapa)*, 15, 211
- Laku Mara (Te Dominum)*, 16, 180
- Last Supper, 34, 41, 283, 284, 286
- Latin (language), 27, 67, 68, 75, 89, 91, 108, 169, 175, 270, 286, 300, 347
- Latin (Roman) rite, 33, 37, 58, 68, 87, 101, 102, 110, 129, 132, 140, 144, 148, 162, 166, 176, 177, 182, 189, 193, 203, 206, 209,

- 220, 226, 227, 234, 239,
240, 242, 248, 254, 257,
258, 269, 272, 277, 279,
295, 296, 301, 302, 307,
329, 335, 345, 370, 373
- Latin Church, 23, 35, 39, 41,
42, 45, 52, 55, 57, 63, 65,
66, 89, 106, 109, 114, 117,
120, 131, 134, 136, 137,
166, 181, 248, 273, 274,
376, 383
- Latin Liturgy, 110, 133, 287,
289, 294
- Latin Missal, 27, 92, 288
- Latin Pontifical, 68, 229
- Latin Ritual, 67, 300
- Latin vestments, 45, 85, 90,
100, 134, 148, 159, 174,
183, 300
- Latinism(s), 132, 280, 348,
350
- Latinization, 24, 69, 84, 85,
130, 131, 133, 169, 175,
225, 226, 281, 295, 297,
348-350
- Leavened (fermented) bread,
34-38, 103, 112, 114, 117,
118, 120, 123, 136, 137,
141, 147, 149, 152, 160,
169, 174, 180-182, 190,
207, 214
- Lebanese Synod, 90
- Lectionary, 15, 92, 94, 178,
203, 208, 213
- Legion of Mary, 100, 106,
242, 259
- Lent, 95, 117, 303, 314
- Liturgical books, 23, 49, 66,
67, 70, 71, 79, 81-83, 99,
111, 130-132, 140, 141,
143, 152, 195, 229, 276,
278, 280, 289, 309, 313,
347, 348, 377, 384
- Liturgical calendar, 79, 96,
139, 196, 202, 203, 263,
269, 288, 291, 315
- Liturgical commission
(Kerala/Malabar), 140, 218,
305, 313, 315
- Liturgical commission
(Roman 1954), 69-71, 77-
84, 92, 95, 99, 125-127,
133-137, 140, 141, 143,
159, 165-167, 170, 171,
173, 176-190, 193, 196,
198, 199, 202, 205, 207,
218, 231, 253, 266, 289,
304, 309, 311, 347, 348,
353, 362, 373
- Liturgical reform, 19, 68-70,
72-74, 80, 84, 111, 133,
134, 144, 156, 157, 161-
164, 167, 169-171, 177,
188, 206, 222, 228, 266,
268, 282, 284, 286, 310-
312, 315, 321, 330, 347,
348, 366, 371, 375
- Liturgical vestments, 43-45,
54, 66, 87, 88, 93, 96, 125,
133, 141, 147, 160, 163,
171, 182, 184, 185, 191,
196, 208, 270, 287

- Liturgical year, 54, 66, 172, 173, 196, 205
- Liturgy (divine), 15, 17, 23, 32, 36, 49, 54, 65, 67, 77, 83, 86-89, 95, 97-100, 103-113, 115, 116, 119, 121, 122, 125, 131-134, 138, 143, 144, 146, 150-152, 155-157, 160, 161, 168, 177, 179-181, 190-192, 198, 207-209, 215-220, 223, 226, 229, 232, 235, 239-242, 247, 249, 253-259, 262, 264, 269, 273, 276-278, 280, 283, 285, 286, 289-299, 301-306, 310, 315, 318, 322, 324, 325, 327-329, 332-334, 338, 345-347, 349, 351, 352, 367, 371, 376-378, 383, 384
- Liturgy of the hours, 54, 91, 303, 383
- Ma'pra*, 90
- Malayalam (language), 25, 70, 71, 75, 87, 98, 99, 103-108, 111-113, 116, 119, 122, 123, 125-128, 134, 140-142, 146, 157, 177-180, 190, 191, 195, 197-201, 207-210, 213, 215, 218-220, 223, 224, 230, 232-234, 237-242, 249, 286, 289, 294, 297, 299, 304, 308, 309, 313-315, 330, 331, 333, 337, 338, 340, 343-345, 347, 350-352, 356, 365, 368, 374, 377, 385, 388, 389, 392
- Mariology, 26
- Marmitha (Marmyatha)*, 16, 94, 128, 150, 202, 203, 231, 237, 357, 391
- Maronite Missal, 53, 54
- Maronite rite, 179, 183, 270, 295
- Maronite Synod of Mount Lebanon, 279
- Matrimony (Marriage), 86, 106, 191, 208, 214, 254
- Maundy (Passover/Holy) Thursday, 38, 54, 96, 172
- Melkite(s), 126, 179, 180, 258, 295
- Minor Orders, 115, 140, 191
- Missal 1962 (1962 Missal), 307, 309, 310, 316, 321, 322, 352, 363, 365, 374, 376, 380, 382
- Missal 1968 (1968 Missal), 303, 309, 311, 324, 331, 337, 338, 343, 347, 352, 355, 364, 367, 374, 377, 380-385
- Mitre, 175, 183, 184, 248
- Mother's Association, 106
- Mysterium fidei*, 30, 32
- National (Library) of Paris, 85
- Nestorian heresy or Nestorianism, 26, 363-366
- Nestorians, 89, 145, 243, 248, 259, 261, 296, 364, 372

- Nicene-Constantinopolitan
Creed, 171, 380, 381
- Offertory, 35, 52, 53, 172,
177, 287, 325, 335, 359,
362-364, 367
- Old Testament, 16, 172, 173,
203, 208, 268
- Onitha d'bema*, 196, 205, 343
- Onitha d'Evangelion*, 204
- Onitha d'qanke*, 16, 94, 203
- Onitha d'raze*, 16, 94, 204,
340, 343
- Onyatha*, 205
- Orarion*, 88
- Order of *Qurbana* (Mass), 19,
78, 92, 97, 100, 125, 159,
197, 210, 213, 215, 219,
220, 232, 303, 308, 338,
356, 362-364, 369, 371,
374, 375, 380-383
- Ordinarium Missae*, 99, 171,
187, 199, 200, 207, 266,
286, 387
- Ordo Celebrationis*, 195, 207,
208, 223, 235, 236, 369,
379, 387
- Oriental Canon Law, 166,
180, 182
- Oriental Institute of Religious
Studies, 19
- Oriental rites, 95, 162, 193,
209, 234, 258, 270, 281,
287, 297, 370
- Orientalis omnes Ecclesias*,
277
- Orientalis Ecclesiae*, 217, 277
- Orientalis Ecclesiam Dei*,
217, 276
- Orientalium Dignitas*, 217,
274
- Paina, 90, 101, 110, 134, 135
- Palm Sunday, 54
- Passion (Good) Friday, 54,
55, 172
- Pater Noster* (Our Father), 91,
124, 180, 196, 233, 234,
- Phelonion (phaina)*, 182-184
- Plenary assembly, 20, 69, 84,
97, 165-167, 190, 192, 193,
195, 206, 207, 309, 310,
365, 374, 379, 386
- Pneumatology, 26
- Pontifical (Liturgy/Qurbana),
87, 150, 263, 385, 387
- Pontifical (Roman/Latin), 19,
67-70, 84, 109, 133, 139,
169, 170, 175, 177, 228,
229, 286, 300, 347, 348
- Pontifical Commission, 166
- Pontifical Oriental Institute,
83
- Praeclara Gratulationis*, 217
- Presbyterate, 115
- Priestly/sacerdotal ordination,
67, 68, 71, 84, 115, 140,
156, 169, 208, 214, 218,
245, 246, 263, 270, 286
- Prokeimenon*, 203
- Propaganda Fide, 37, 68, 69,
72, 92, 131, 132, 279, 365

- Propria*, 196, 202, 205, 213, 253, 315, 326, 338, 342, 361, 375
- Proprium Missae*, 199, 201
- Provincial council of Goa, 49, 67
- Psalms, 16, 35, 47, 123, 128, 129, 196, 202, 204, 357, 360
- Pšitta*, 208, 213, 389
- Puqdankon*, 521
- Qanke*, 211, 212
- Quae rei sacrae*, 58
- Quam sollecita*, 275
- Questroma*, 210, 211
- Quo Ecclesiarum*, 59
- Quod iampridem*, 57, 58
- Qurbana* (Malabar, Holy), 16, 19, 20, 24-27, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35, 39, 42, 46, 47, 49-55, 62, 66, 73, 77-79, 87, 92, 96, 97, 100, 125, 159, 165, 195-197, 202, 207, 210, 213-215, 218-220, 222, 230, 232, 290, 295, 303, 304, 307-309, 324, 334, 338, 339, 342, 356, 357, 359, 362-369, 371-380, 382-385
- Raza*, 16, 17, 87, 94, 96, 99, 121, 138, 139, 150, 172, 173, 185, 186, 196, 202-205, 208, 219, 220, 288, 368, 372, 384, 388
- Real Presence, 153, 262, 263, 269, 282-284
- Reformation or Reform (of *Qurbana*/Syro-Malabar Missal), 19, 20, 60, 66, 68-75, 77, 78, 80-84, 88, 103, 104, 110-112, 115, 122, 126, 128, 130-135, 138, 140-148, 151, 156, 157, 159-164, 167, 169-174, 176, 177, 188, 189, 206, 207, 222, 228, 229, 231, 238, 241, 245, 253-255, 264, 266-268, 282, 284-290, 292, 298, 303, 305, 309-313, 315, 321, 322, 330, 345, 347, 348, 366, 371, 375, 385-389
- Reformed liturgy, 322,
- Reformed Missal, 62, 222, 238, 241, 255, 266, 290, 305
- Reforms, 115, 157, 220, 241, 242, 244, 247-249, 262, 264, 288, 294, 297
- Regimini Ecclesiae Universae*, 72
- Regnum Caelorum*, 60, 61
- Rerum Orientalium*, 276
- Restoration (of *Qurbana* or Syro-Malabar Missal or Liturgy), 19, 20, 34, 39, 57, 63, 66, 68, 70-73, 75, 77, 78, 80, 83, 92, 97, 98, 103, 121, 122, 135, 137, 159, 169, 175, 184-186, 191,

- 206, 207, 209, 215, 218,
229, 240, 253, 261, 279,
281, 295, 299-302, 306,
315, 316, 324, 328, 332,
349, 362, 368, 377, 381,
385
- Restored Missal, 198, 209,
215, 222, 225, 230, 231,
257, 293, 295, 305, 324,
376, 385
- Restored *Qurbana*, Mass or
liturgy, 62, 214, 215, 218,
220, 232, 295, 301, 304,
325, 332, 333, 336
- Ritual (Rituale), 67, 77, 78,
86, 87, 107, 109, 131, 132,
143, 146, 156, 168, 171,
191, 253, 254, 268-270,
300, 383
- Ritus Servandus*, 41, 55
- Roman Canon, 32, 33, 171
- Roman Missal, 27, 29, 32-34,
41, 50, 52-55, 89, 93, 94,
172, 173, 202, 203, 241,
270, 287, 303, 358, 368,
373, 381
- Roman Pontiffs, 36, 72, 80,
97, 103, 109, 132, 206,
266, 270-272, 279, 281
- Roman tradition, 23, 49, 52,
53, 67, 177, 358, 360
- Romani Pontifices*, 59, 72,
132, 239, 387
- Romanians, 126, 180
- Rosary, 77, 259, 269, 291,
296, 301, 350
- Ruthenian Synod of Zamost,
277-279
- Ruthenian/s (rite), 88, 130,
138, 140, 143, 193, 277,
278
- Sacramental theology, 26
- Sacred Scripture, 15, 95, 99,
142, 173, 178, 207, 213,
237, 282-284
- Sacrifice of the Mass
(doctrine of), 24, 30, 43,
180, 282
- Sancta Dei Ecclesia*, 132,
206, 387
- Sanctuary veil (veil of the
Sanctuary), 46, 47, 100,
102, 103, 111, 117, 118,
121, 123, 125, 138, 141,
149, 151-153, 174, 185,
186, 190, 191, 208, 210,
237
- Sanctuary, 15, 16, 129, 152,
172-174, 185, 186, 196,
203-205, 210, 212, 339,
340, 342, 358
- Sanctus*, 34, 52, 91-93, 124,
171, 180
- Santoral* (cycle), 173, 270,
288
- Schism, 26, 175, 228, 229,
243, 272, 296
- Scholastic theology, 31, 32,
34
- Second Vatican Council
(Vatican II), 64, 72, 230,
231, 241, 254, 257, 264,

- 266, 269, 278, 279, 283,
289, 295, 302, 314, 346,
351, 356, 376
- Sign of the cross (left to right
or right to left), 28, 42, 43,
52, 118, 122, 211, 214,
234, 236, 244, 260, 305,
318, 325, 335, 339, 340,
356, 360, 368, 370, 371
- Slama*, 340
- Slav(s), 91, 126, 136, 184
- Sodalities, 85, 106, 242, 258
- St Joseph's Pontifical
Seminary, 312, 316
- St Thomas Christians, 23-27,
30, 32, 33, 35-37, 39, 41-
43, 45, 46, 48-51, 55, 57,
58, 66, 67, 70, 107, 108,
125, 133, 218, 225, 226-
228, 243, 258, 280, 294,
296, 303, 364, 368, 372,
373
- Stikhar*, 88, 90,
- Subdiaconate, 115
- Supplementum Mysteriorum*,
196, 202, 205, 207, 208,
223, 388
- Surraya*, 16, 94, 173, 196, 203
- Synod of Angamaly, 30, 49,
50
- Synod of bishops, 63
- Synod of Diamper, 20, 23-26,
29-34, 36, 39, 41-45, 48-
53, 66, 67, 77, 84, 92, 131,
132, 169, 175, 202, 218,
228, 241, 243, 247, 279,
294, 303, 368, 372, 373,
382
- Syriac (language), 15, 19, 23,
25-29, 49, 51, 55, 67-71,
77, 82-84, 89, 94, 108, 113,
119, 126, 127, 133, 142,
144, 146, 151, 169, 170,
176-179, 191, 196-198,
205, 207, 211, 213, 217,
226-233, 237-239, 254,
270, 286, 303, 304, 310,
340, 345, 347-352, 356,
357, 365, 366, 374, 380,
392
- Syriac Pontifical, 34, 51, 70,
71, 98, 365, 368, 373
- Syro-Malabar or Malabar
hierarchy, 59, 60, 170, 197,
201, 206, 218, 239, 247,
256, 280, 290, 300
- Syro-Malabar or Malabar
bishops, 58, 65, 68-70, 73,
75, 78, 80, 84, 92, 97, 98,
125, 126, 134, 140, 143,
159, 165-167, 174, 175,
183, 188, 189, 195, 197,
206, 210, 215, 222, 228-
232, 236, 257, 266, 282,
304, 305, 308-312, 319-
321, 324, 332, 335, 348,
349, 362, 368, 370, 373,
377, 385
- Syro-Malabar or Malabar
Church, 15, 16, 17, 19, 27,
36, 48-50, 52, 55, 57-60,
62-67, 69-72, 78-80, 83,
89, 92, 103, 109, 113, 116,

- 118, 130, 131, 133, 138,
140, 153, 156, 166, 167,
170, 171, 176, 180, 185,
186, 192, 193, 195-197,
200, 201, 204, 206, 210,
215, 218, 224, 228-230,
238, 241, 255, 264, 266,
286, 296-298, 301, 304-
311, 318, 324, 333, 347,
355, 362-366, 368, 369,
371, 374-377, 380, 382,
383, 385
- Syro-Malabar or Malabar
Missal, 19, 20, 55, 72, 75,
77, 78, 89, 95, 99, 132,
143, 159, 165, 166, 167,
171, 190, 192-195, 197,
206, 225, 347, 365, 373,
381
- Syro-Malabar (Syro-Oriental)
Pontifical, 19, 98, 112, 286,
307
- Syro-Malabar Bishops'
Conference, 64, 65, 66,
195, 201, 305, 308, 310,
319, 320, 324, 362, 368
- Syro-Malabar Liturgy, 19, 30,
42, 49-51, 71, 77, 78, 80,
103, 159, 176, 230, 231,
241, 244, 248, 249, 257,
261, 294, 295, 298-301,
305, 307-311, 338, 343,
362-364, 367, 370, 371,
374-376, 378-385
- Syro-Malabar rite, 68, 81, 97,
99, 101, 103, 108, 109,
113, 114, 119, 120, 130,
131, 140, 146, 168, 188,
189, 198, 202, 213, 215,
218, 222, 232, 236, 238,
241-243, 247, 248, 255-
260, 264-266, 269, 270,
279, 281, 294, 295, 299,
302, 328, 369
- Syro-Malankara Church, rite,
liturgy or hierarchy, 77, 81,
105, 145-149, 178, 183,
201, 234, 307, 370
- Syro-Oriental or Oriental
vestments, 103, 112, 118,
182
- Syro-Oriental *Qurbana* or
liturgy, 97, 125, 294, 362
- Syro-Oriental tradition, 70,
196
- Taksa (Taksa d'Quddasa)*, 17,
50, 51, 87, 196, 197, 207,
210-213, 308, 309, 337,
338, 340, 342, 343, 355,
356, 361, 362, 366, 368,
369, 371, 384, 385, 387
- Temporal (cycle)*, 87, 96, 172,
270, 288, 292
- Tesbohta*, 205
- Theology of non-Christian
religions, 26
- Thúkása*, 55
- Tridentine Roman Missal, 41,
55
- Trisagion*, 17, 52, 53, 123,
180
- Turgama*, 17, 94, 172, 173,
203, 204

- Universal Church, 32, 72,
 161, 244, 281
 University of Saint Joseph in
 Beirut, 84
 Unleavened bread, 34, 37, 93,
 100, 101, 110, 114, 136,
 137, 141, 152, 159, 164,
 171, 174, 181, 182, 191,
 207, 214
Unnaya, 203
Urara, 88, 90
 Vatican Library, 28, 85
 Vatican Syriac Codex, 28-30,
 93, 205
 Vernacular (language), 70, 82,
 94, 98, 101, 102, 104, 105,
 116, 119, 155, 156, 177,
 179, 180, 189, 223, 232,
 239, 263, 304, 345
 Vernacularization, 97, 100,
 101, 112, 116, 119, 125,
 161
 Vincent de Paul Society, 100,
 106, 259
 Way of the Cross, 242, 259,
 269, 285, 296, 301
 Western missionaries, 23, 24,
 35, 37, 38, 48, 167, 364,
 365
 Westernization, 50, 81, 378
 Words of consecration, 27,
 30-34, 53, 54, 93, 171, 173,
 180, 284, 286, 360
Zande, 90
Zummara, 17, 94, 196, 204
Zunara, 90

