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ABSTRACT During the second half of the sixteenth and the first half of the seventeenth centuries, the Syriac literary heritage of the Malabar Christians shifted from a standard East Syriac (“Nestorian”) canon of texts to a Catholic post-Tridentine literary output in Syriac, a fusion of Western (Latin) and Middle Eastern (Syriac) sources and elements. The present article analyzes the literary networks of the community of the Malabar Christians, as expressed in the production of Syriac texts undertaken by the Catholic missionaries and arguably their Indian Syriacist pupils. The period under investigation is around the time of the Synod of Diamper (1599), a turning point in the ecclesiastical history of Malabar. The synod marked the Portuguese’s attempt to impose Tridentine Catholicism on the Malabar Christians and ordered to correct their Syriac books according to Catholic Orthodoxy or burn them as heretical. My paper focuses on the relationship between (1) collections of sermons and (2) liturgical poetry, since these two are entangled literary genres. Occasionally Syriac sermons (translated from Latin or composed on the spot by Catholic missionaries) were replicated in liturgical poetry and show the chains of transmission of Syriac knowledge from Catholic teachers (especially Jesuits) to their Indian students. Such relationship between literary genres comes clearly to the fore in the case of prose compositions coming arguably from the Syriacising circles of Francisco Ros, the first European Bishop of the Malabar Christians (1601–1624), and newly discovered pieces of Syriac poetry which might have been written by his Indian disciple Alexander the Indian/Kadavil Chandy Kattanar (1588–1673). The groups of texts under discussion show the transfer of knowledge from both the Latin West and the Syriac-speaking Middle East that created a new theological literary culture for the Malabar Christians as an expression of the Jesuit missionary principle of accommodatio. Source analysis of such texts allows one to dive into various aspects of the ecclesiastical and confessional life of the Malabar Christians, and into the cross-cultural encounters between them and the Catholic missionaries.
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Introduction

The second half of the sixteenth century witnessed manifold transformations in the religious life of the Malabar Christians from South India. Up to that time, the functioning of the ecclesiastical structures of the local Christian community—known as ‘Saint Thomas Christians’ and claiming Syriac identity—depended highly on bishops consecrated and sent to the Malabar Coast by the Catholicos Patriarch of the Church of the East, from Iraq. As Heleen Murre-van den Berg emphasizes, since the end of the fifteenth century “after almost two centuries of near isolation, the Church of the East in Mesopotamia was reconnected to the wider world; its clergy started to travel and influences from outside began to impact upon its internal development” (Murre-van den Berg 2015, 23). In this context, the contacts between the Church of the East and the Indian Church from the Malabar Coast “were resumed in the late fifteenth century, testifying to the important fact that, in this period, the Church of the East was being reintegrated into a global network of political and ecclesiastical contacts” (ibid.).

Since 1553, when the ‘Uniate’ counterpart of the Church of the East, the Chaldean Catholic Church, was created, both the East Syriac and the Chaldean Patriarchs sent metropolitan bishops to Malabar and contended for their own jurisdiction over the South Indian Christian community. According to the same scholar, in the context of renewed contacts and communication between the Indian Church and the East Syriac Christians from Iraq, the creation of the Chaldean Catholic Church in the Middle East “seems to have been stimulated as much by the ‘pull-factor’ of a Roman Catholic presence in India as by the ‘push-factor’ of the incumbent [East Syriac] patriarch’s misconduct” (Murre-van den Berg 2015, 47). In 1552, the abbot of the Rabban Hormizd Monastery (near Alqosh, in Iraq), John Sulaqa, revolted against the existing Patriarch, Simeon bar Mama, and went to Rome, where he made a Catholic profession of faith and was re-ordained and appointed Catholicos Patriarch by the pope in the spring of 1553 (on this matter, see Murre-van den Berg 2015, 44–54; Beltrami 1933).

In competition with the East-Syriac and Chaldean bishops coming from Iraq to India, the Portuguese, present in Malabar since the end of the fifteenth century, attempted to control the religious life of the Malabar Christians by cutting off their connection with the Syriac Iraqi prelates and by imposing on them Tridentine Catholicism. A process of ‘Latinization,’ carried through by the Catholic missionaries active in the area during the second half of the sixteenth and the first half of the seventeenth centuries, had two main objectives. The first one was to achieve Catholic Orthodoxy in terms of doctrine, rites, and jurisdiction by uprooting the Syriac identity of the Malabar Christians and purging their Syriac books from what the Catholic missionaries considered “Nestorian” heresy (in this sense, the Syriac language was often regarded by the European missionaries as a vehicle for heresy). The second objective was to suppress many of the social and cultural customs and practices which the Malabar Christians adopted as a result of their interaction with and integration into the local society of Malabar. Examples include the observance of the rules on purity and untouchability, the practice of charms, magic, and divination, the participation in the festivals of their non-Christian neighbors, and the adoption of the dress, appearance and habits of the Nayars by the Malabar Christians (an overview of these customs are listed in the Ninth Action of Acts of the Synod of Diamper entitled “On the Reformation of Manners;” see Da Cunha Rivara 1862, 488-519).

These two tendencies are mirrored in the decrees of the Synod of Diamper (1599), a turning point in the history of the Malabar Christians, which also placed this Christian community under the direct authority of the Latin archbishop of Goa. Yet, the Syriac rites and language
in the liturgy as well as many of the local social customs were part of the identity of Malabar Christians, and the missionary strategies used by the Catholic clergy among them needed to be refined. In order to make their missionary enterprise efficient, the missionaries (especially the Jesuits) felt the need to negotiate the borders between social and religious customs and practice, and to redefine them in the light of the local multicultural and multireligious society of Malabar (see Županov 1996). They also adjusted the Catholic dogma, theological discourse and European erudition to the East Syriac tradition of liturgy and theology. This East Syriac tradition formed a rich corpus of literature that reached the Malabar Coast through the repeated contacts of the Malabar Christians with the Middle East (see Perczel 2018, 2015). As shown by Ines Županov, it is through their interaction with the Malabar Christians that the Jesuits elaborated for the first time their missionary strategy of “separating the social from the religious” and of developing “a permissive and flexible attitude towards the diversity of the pre-Christian social customs” (Županov 2005, 287–88), a strategy conventionally known in secondary literature as the principle of accommodatio (see Županov 2005). The importance of the Jesuit mission and of the practice of accommodatio among Malabar Christians has been substantiated and analyzed by Antony Mecherry in his work Testing Ground for Jesuit Accommodation in Early Modern India: Francisco Ros SJ in Malabar (16th–17th Centuries) (see Mecherry 2019). Mecherry analyzes the practice of accommodatio promoted by Francisco Ros, the first European Archbishop of the Malabar Christians, among the South Indian Christians, and stresses that the Jesuit prelate was as important for the practice of accommodatio in the Early Modern Catholic missions in Asia as other prominent missionaries, such as Alessandro Valignano in Japan, Matteo Ricci in China, or Roberto de Nobili in Tamil Nadu (Mecherry 2019, 431). In Mecherry’s words:

Given the dilemma faced by the missionaries, namely an underlying conflict between the faith that they wanted to import to India and the local culture that resisted such imports, Malabar turned out to be the primary testing ground of the Jesuit accommodation. […] The Jesuit praxis of accommodation was a “way-out” approach promoted by Francisco Ros and Roberto de Nobili in their attempt to respond to the local resistance of the people of Malabar. In this process, Ros appeared as a Chaldean in terms of his imitation and appropriation of the traditions of the Malabar Church and Nobili appeared as a high-caste sage in terms of his imitation and appropriation of the customs and symbols of the Brahmans of Madurai. While Ros […] tried to perpetuate the Syriac language and the Indo-Oriental format of the Malabar Church, Nobili presented the Catholic religion before his potential converts as a universal faith that was compatible with their cultural symbolism. (2019, XXXI)

As an expression of this complex missionary context, during the second half of the sixteenth and the first half of the seventeenth centuries, the Syriac literary heritage of the Malabar Christians shifted from a standard East Syriac (“Nestorian”) canon of texts to a Catholic post-Tridentine literary production in Syriac, a fusion of Western (Latin) and Middle Eastern (Syriac) sources and elements (see Perczel 2009). While, with one exception,1 Syriac manuscript evidence from Malabar does not date earlier than the sixteenth century, in the sixteenth century, when substantial Syriac manuscript evidence from Malabar is available, Syriac emerges

---

1 The exception is MS Vaticanus Syriacus 22 copied in Šēnglē, in 1301; see on it Van der Ploeg (1983, 187–89).
as the liturgical language of this Christian community, being endowed with prestige as the sacred language of the learned priestly elite (see Perczel 2018, 193–95). The Syriac literary output conducted in Malabar under the agency of the Catholic missionaries during the second half of the sixteenth and first decades of the seventeenth centuries is an important witness to the literary networks of the community of the Malabar Christians at that time. It encompasses various literary genres, such as sermons and homilies, liturgical poetry, theological treatises, commentaries, translations, and original creations (Perczel 2009, 295–317). Source analysis of such texts allows one to explore various aspects of the ecclesiastical and confessional identity of the Malabar Christians as well as the cross-cultural encounters between them and the Catholic missionaries.

Besides announcing the discovery and emphasizing the importance of several such Syriac Indian compositions from sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Malabar, pioneering studies by István Perczel have shown how the cosmopolitanism of the Arabian Sea facilitated the circulation of Syriac texts from the Middle East to the Malabar Coast. In Malabar, through the agency of the Jesuit missionaries, the Syriac Middle Eastern culture met the theological erudition of the Latin West, leading to the creation of this new original Catholic culture in Syriac based on European, Middle Eastern and local sources from Malabar (Perczel 2015, 2009). Perczel also showed how this newly created literature in Syriac, stimulated mainly by the Jesuit missionaries and their Indian disciples, was intended as a means of *accommodatio* in the context of a controversy about the Chaldean rite analogous to controversies about other rites in Asia, and is thus of crucial importance for understanding early modern Catholicism and the history of Catholic missions in a global perspective (Perczel 2018, 2014).

Within the same theoretical framework, in the following paragraphs I would like to focus on a special case of textual *accommodatio* that reveals this missionary strategy among the Malabar Christians as an enterprise shared by Catholic missionaries (most likely the Jesuits) and arguably their Indian Syriacist disciples. The central point of my analysis is the entanglement between two literary genres in Syriac from the second half of the sixteenth and the first half of the seventeenth centuries—namely (1) prose sermons and (2) newly discovered liturgical poetry—since occasionally Syriac sermons (translated from Latin or composed on the spot by Catholic missionaries) were reused or replicated in liturgical poetry. As I will try to show, the study of these two groups of texts together is an important witness to the amalgamation of the East Syriac heritage of Malabar Christians and Indian Catholicism as promoted by Western Catholic missionaries. Such texts also illustrate the chains of transmission of knowledge from the Jesuit teachers to their Indian pupils.

**Syriac Catholic *Paideia* and the Collections of Syriac Catholic Sermons from Malabar**

Most of the Syriac texts that I will discuss henceforth belong to the Syriacist circles of Francisco

---

2 Whenever I am using the term ‘textual *accommodatio*’ in this paper, I refer to a degree of flexibility that favoured the adaptation and the hybridization between the European Catholic tradition and the Syriac literary culture of the Church of the East, as this tendency is reflected in the production of new Syro-Catholic theological texts from Malabar. I am not implying that at an early stage of the Catholic mission in Malabar the missionaries had a preconceived plan of *accommodatio*, nor am I trying to project way back into the sixteenth century a more elaborated system of *accommodatio* as it was later developed in the Madurai mission by Roberto de Nobili. I would like to thank Paolo Aranha for his advice on this methodological matter.
Ros, a polyglot Jesuit missionary to India who, in 1587, became Professor of Syriac language at the Jesuit Seminary of Vaipicotta in Chennamangalam. Ros was entrusted with the ‘correction’ of the Syriac books from Malabar following the synod of Diamper. Later on, he became the first European Bishop of the Malabar Christians (1601–1624) and was the patron and defender of Roberto de Nobili, the most controversial accommodationist missionary in the Indian rites controversy, from Tamil Nadu (on Francisco Ros, see Mecherry 2019; Ferolli 1939, 1:291–360; Thekkedath 1988, 2:75–79). Under the supervision of Ros, a considerable number of Syriac compositions (both translations/adaptations from Latin and original creations) were created in Malabar in the late sixteenth and the first decades of the seventeenth centuries (see Perczel 2018, 214–25). Before assessing the importance and value of several Syriac compositions coming from him and his Syriacist circles (which are the object of the present study), it is necessary to make some preliminary remarks on what the Syriac heritage of the Malabar Christians looked like before the Jesuits started to teach Syriac in their seminary at Vaipicotta in the 1580s. This provides a general context on the emergence of these Syro-Catholic texts from Malabar and allows one to link them to the previous Syriac textual tradition of the South Indian Christian community.

As far as one can rely on the preserved and clearly dated evidence, the Syriac manuscript material from Malabar up to the 1560s generally consists of standard East Syriac literature, mostly liturgical material. Indicative in this sense are, for instance, the Syriac manuscripts from Malabar (either locally copied or brought from the Middle East to South India) preserved in the Vatican Library and discussed by Van der Ploeg in his book (1983, 184–203). Most of them are standard East Syriac liturgical and biblical books belonging to the various Syriac prelates from Iraq, consecrated and sent by their Patriarchs to the Malabar Coast for the local Christian community (ibid.). Such works continued to be copied and eventually adapted by diligent local scribes fond of their Syriac Church and culture. It is possible that many of the East Syriac books condemned by the Synod of Diamper had belonged only to a very learned ecclesiastical elite directly related to the circle of Mar Abraham (?–1597), the last Chaldean Metropolitan of the Malabar Christians before the Synod of Diamper (Perczel 2013, for the list of condemned books, see Da Cunha Rivara 1862, 328-337). Yet, the continuous copying of several such condemned works by the Malayalee Syriacist scribes, throughout the centuries, is an indicator that at least some of these titles had been circulating and continued to circulate among the Malabar Christians before and after Diamper (Perczel 2013).

In competition and complementary to this, in the second half of the sixteenth century a new Syriac Catholic culture started to develop in Malabar comprising both translations/adaptations from Latin and original creations meant to contend with East Syriac sources of authority. The earliest dated Syro-Catholic compositions to be used in the Catholic mission among the Malabar Christians are from the year 1567.\(^3\) It is possible that these Catholic texts were produced in response to the fact that by the early 1560s Mar Joseph, the Chaldean Metropolitan of Malabar and the brother of the first Chaldean Patriarch, John Sulaqa, refused to ordain to priesthood Malayalee pupils trained by the Franciscans in their seminary at Cochin on account of their ignorance of the Syriac rites and language (Thekkedath 1988, 2:44). To the year 1567 one can link such works as a collection of testimonia from the Greek and Latin Church Fathers on the primacy of Saint Peter over the whole Church and an un-

\(^3\) I have not included here the text “on the administration of the Holy Orders” translated from Latin into Syriac by Mar Joseph, the Metropolitan of Malabar, comprised between fol. 1–10 of MS Vatican Syriac 66, as it is not clearly dated; on this matter, see Van der Ploeg (1983, 193–95). Apparently, the text is related to Mar Joseph’s detention in Bassein (v. 1983, 194).
titled sermon on the Elevation of the Cross which belongs to a larger corpus of sermons for various feast-days and commemorations of saints.\footnote{The texts are comprised between fol. 33r–37v and 113r–118r of the manuscript. On this, see I. Perczel’s description of the manuscript in Mustață (2019, 97–103); the MS is also mentioned in Thelly (2004, 268).} I have referred elsewhere to this collection as “the Malabar Sermonary” (Mustață 2020). The core of the collection of sermons (including the sermon on the Elevation of the Cross) seems to be based on a Latin/Western model, and there is need for further philological work in order to identify its source(s). The Indian Syriacist scribes either copied the sermons in independent collections with a life of their own, or inserted some of the sermons in miscellanies.

After the Synod of Diamper, other sermons were added to the collection and the Malayali scribes continued to copy and adapt these texts until the nineteenth century.\footnote{Two such examples are MSS Mannanam Syriac 46 (described by I. Perczel in Mustață 2019, 97–103) and Thrissur Syriac 17 (on this MS, see Mustață 2019, 103–12; Van der Ploeg 1983, 145, Mar Aprem 2011, 16).} Many of the later additions to the collection are examples of Syriac textual *accommodatio* and must have been composed within the Syriacist circles of Francisco Ros. Such is, for instance, a sermon on Saint Thomas the Apostle, an original composition based on both Latin and Spanish sources from Europe and Syriac Middle Eastern sources (see Mustață 2019) that I will further refer to and which must have been composed sometime in the first decades of the seventeenth century, after 1601. The augmented collection of sermons comprising initial adaptations from European source(s) (done around the year 1567) and enriched further with original creations addressing the audience of the Malabar Christians might have been used for teaching purposes, perhaps for the instruction of future priests in the seminary. This is suggested by the fact that after 1653 (when the Malabar Christians revolted against the Portuguese and the Jesuit Archbishops) the West Syriac branch of Syriac Christians from Malabar reedited and reused this sermonary and even composed sermons according to the prescriptions of the European medieval *artes praedicandi* (manuals for writing model sermons) in order to polemicize with their Syro-Catholic rivals. This practice of writing sermons in Syriac while observing the rules of European medieval *artes praedicandi* was already embedded in the compositions belonging to the Malabar Sermonary (see Mustață 2020).

Together with a variety of other literary and theological texts, the sermonary seems to have constituted the basis of Syriac institution in Malabar at the turn of seventeenth century. Most of this literary output arguably reflects the activity of Francisco Ros and can be understood as an expression of textual *accommodatio* (Perczel 2018, 214–25). Among other items, this corpus of Syriac literature comprises original theological treatises on various topics, compilations on canon-law, Syriac-Garshuni Malayalam explanations on the books of the Bible, translations from Latin of biblical or Patristic works (such as a translation of the Revelation of John on the basis of the Vulgate and a translation of Pseudo-Dionysius’ “Mystical Theology” from the Latin version by Ambrogio Traversari), and commentaries on various biblical works by Western authors such as Denis the Carthusian (see Perczel 2009, 2008); all these works need further study. While there is need for substantial research in order to establish the precise date and authorship of these texts, they still provide the general picture of a Syriac *paideia* in Malabar against which the texts referred to further on can be better understood.

Almost a century later, a similar Catholic literary movement in Syriac took place in the Middle East after the establishment of the Capuchin mission in Aleppo in 1667. In this context of Catholic consolidation, many Catholic literary and theological works were compiled, composed, and translated into Syriac through the literary activity of learned men such as
Joseph II Śliiba, the Patriarch of the Chaldeans (1696–1714) (see Murre-vanden Berg 2015, 60–68). The Syriac Catholic material from the Middle East was usually compiled or translated from Latin into Syriac through the intermediary of already existing Arabic translations (2015, 245–52). Compared to this, the distinctive textual peculiarity of the Syriac Catholic texts from Malabar seems to be precisely the fact that they lack such an Arabic intermediary; thus, from a glocal perspective, they enrich our understanding of the variety of Catholic missions among different groups of Syriac Christians in different parts of the world, in the early modern times.

**The Canticles of Glorification for the Night Service and the Malabar Catholic Revision of the Ḥudrā**

In order to unravel the entanglement between Syro-Catholic sermons from the Malabar Sermonary and pieces of Syriac liturgical poetry from Malabar on the basis of compared manuscript analysis, I will mainly show how a newly discovered group of hymns belonging to the genre of “canticle of glorification” (ܟꗪꗨꗨꗨꗨ) [Syr. tešboḥta] was composed in Malabar and how they circulated both in anthologies and liturgical manuscripts. I will also explain the relationship of these new compositions to the already existing Syriac liturgical poetry belonging to the literary heritage of the Church of the East. I will define the place of this type of poetry within the ritual: the stanzas of these new hymns from Malabar were inserted as propers in the Malabar Catholic revision of the Ḥudrā and Gazzā under the title “anthems” (ܟꗬꗨꗨ) [Syr. hpākātā] according to a pattern which already existed in the Middle East but has been little documented so far in secondary literature; the Ḥudrā and the Gazzā are two complementary collections and can be seen together as a breviary, a collection of hymns and services, for the main festivals of the liturgical year. Another question that I will try to answer is: What is the relationship of these produced locally hymns to the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Syriac Catholic collections of sermons from Malabar and to the Latin hymnography of the Roman Breviary approved by the Council of Trent? I will also discuss as a working hypothesis the evidence for ascribing these poetical compositions to the authorship of the Indian Syriacist poet Alexander of the Port/Kadavil Chandy Kattanar (1588–1673), author of religious and humanistic erudite poetry and a disciple of Francisco Ros. I will bring forward three textual examples in order to reconstruct the history of these texts from ritual books back to the workshop of their skillful author(s) and show the sources and chains of Syriac knowledge in Malabar after the Synod of Diamper (1599).

In a pioneering study from 2014, István Perczel reported about the discovery of seven memrē by Alexander of the Port (Kadavil Chandy Kattanar) comprised in a South Indian manuscript: MS Mannanam Syriac 63 (Perczel 2014). The name of the poet does not appear in the manuscript, but the manuscript comprises, among other things, a memrē on the Eucharist, which the Indian poet sent to Pope Alexander VII in 1657. The poem on the Eucharist is also preserved under Kadavil Chandy’s name in another manuscript (MS Mannanam Syriac 99: fol. 149r–160v) (Perczel 2014, 32–34). Perczel established that out of the eight poems of similar structure and style comprised in MS Mannanam Syriac 63, seven are by Kadavil Chandy while the eighth poem is written by a medieval East Syriac poet from the thirteenth century, Gabriel Qamṣa of Mosul (2014, 42–43); the poem by Gabriel of Mosul served as

---

6 Whenever I transliterated Syriac words in this paper, I did not mark the initial and final ālap, the spirantisation of the consonants and the doubling of the consonants within the words (except for words which are well known in this form, such as Gazzā).
the model for the poetry of Kadavil Chandy (2014, 36–40). While analyzing the content of a memrā on the Syriac language by Kadavil Chandi, Perczel showed its reliance on an untitled Catholic treatise against heresies in Syriac, which is comprised in MS Mannanam Syriac 46: fol. 123v–135r (2014, 42–43). This miscellaneous manuscript is the oldest copy of the Malabar Sermonary. In order to show the intertextuality between liturgical hymns from the Malabar Catholic revision of the Ḥudrā and Gazzā and sermons from the Malabar Sermonary, I follow Perczel’s analysis.

I will begin with the case study of an eighteenth/early nineteenth century manuscript preserved in the library of the Metropolitan Palace of the Church of the East in Thrissur. MS Thrissur Syriac 62 is an interesting anthology (a pocket-book) and contains Syriac and Garshuni Malayalam material. The manuscript, which does not contain any colophon or date, can be dated to the eighteenth/early nineteenth century on paleographical grounds. It is written in a special type of Indian East Syriac script that does not seem fully developed as a local Indian variant of the East Syriac script when compared to other Syriac Indian manuscripts from the nineteenth century (on this type of script, see Briquel-Chatonnet and Desreumaux (2010)). For the sake of the present discussion, I have conventionally divided its contents into five main sections/parts:

1) fol. 1r–11r: A fragment from the Eucharistic celebration (according to the revised rite of Francisco Ros) and other liturgical fragments;
2) fol. 11v–33r: A short catechetical work in Garshuni Malayalam, in the form of questions and answers;
3) fol. 33v–99v: Poetical works by Kadavil Chandy Kattanar/Alexander the Indian, a Syriacist Indian poet, disciple of the Jesuits, and other pieces of poetry which resemble in style the compositions of the same poet;
4) fol. 99v–110r: A couple of anthem-like canticles which seem to be part of the ritual for various feast days.
5) fol. 110v–120v: The Litany of the Saints, the Marian Litany (translated from Latin) and other hymns and liturgical fragments.

The third part of the manuscript (fol. 33v–99v) that is important for the present discussion consists of poems belonging to Kadavil Chandy Kattanar (1588–1673), an Indian priest and Syriacist poet (a disciple of Francisco Ros), and other religious pieces of poetry similar in style which have been taken out of their liturgical context in an anthological manner. An important figure in the general revolt of the Malabar Christians against their Jesuit bishops and the Portuguese from 1653 (see Thekkedath 1988, 2:91–109; Pallath 2006), Kadavil Chandy Kattanar became one of the four advisors of the newly consecrated Archdeacon Thomas Pakalomattam (Thekkedath 1988, 2:92), who later joined the Syriac Orthodox Church of Antioch and became Mor Toma I, the metropolitan of the so-called “New Faction/New Allegiance” (in Malayalam, Puthankūru) among the Malabar Christians (1988, 2:100–102). Further on, in 1663, a part of the Malabar Christians who had previously revolted against the Portuguese and the Jesuit Archbishops returned to the fold of the Catholic Church. This happened as an outcome of the fact that Parambil Chandy, the cousin of Archdeacon Thomas, was consecrated as the

---

7 See Mar Aprem 2011, 28; the manuscript contains 236 pages (size: 15.3x9.8 cm; written surface: 12.5x6 cm); as I worked with a digital copy of the manuscript, I took the size of the manuscript from Mar Aprem’s description.

8 As I worked with digital copy, I have not seen the paper watermark of the manuscript.
first indigenous Catholic bishop of this Christian community. In this context, Kadavil Chandy Kattanar became Parambil Chandy’s Vicar General (2014, 32; Toepel 2011, 389). I. Perczel, who discovered five hymns composed by the same Kadavil Chandy, has described his poetry of as “a synthesis of Indian, East Syriac, and post-Tridentine Latin Christian elements along with humanistic erudition which the poet acquired from his Jesuit teacher” (Perczel 2014, 40). In this manuscript (MS Thirissur Syriac 62), the name of the poet is absent but I was able to identify three of his hymns on the basis of Perczel’s work; the mēmrā on the Eucharist is the only poem explicitly preserved under the poet’s name in another manuscript (MS Mannanam Syriac 99: fol. 149r–160v) (see Perczel 2014, 32–34). This section of the manuscript comprises the following items:

- fol. 33v-58r: Kadavil Chandy’s mēmrā on the Eucharist. The title and the tune anthem is missing; it begins with the first verse under the heading alap (i) of the acrostic. Incipit: (on fol. 57v-58r).
- fol. 58r-69v: Kadavil Chandy’s mēmrā on the Syriac language. Title and incipit: (on fol. 74r-76v: Untitled hymn on the wood of the Cross. Incipit: (on fol. 76v-82r: Another untitled hymn on the wood of the Cross. Incipit: (on fol. 82v-89v: Kadavil Chandy’s mēmrā on the Arabic language. The title is missing. The poem is only fragmentarily preserved (it ends after the section yūd of the acrostic).

---

9 Sic!
10 In rubrics: (on fol. 69v-71r: Canticle of glorification in praise of St. Mary. Title and incipit: (on fol. 72v-74r: Untitled hymn about the Crucifixion of Christ. In the first part of the hymn the Greek Trīs hāgion hymn is meant to be repeated after some of the stanzas, while after other stanzas the words of Christ “My people, what have I done to thee?” are to be repeated. Incipit: (on fol. 74r-76v: Untitled hymn on the Cross. Incipit: (on fol. 76v-82r: Another untitled hymn on the wood of the Cross. Incipit: (on fol. 82v-89v: Kadavil Chandy’s mēmrā on the Arabic language. The title is missing. The poem is only fragmentarily preserved (it ends after the section yūd of the acrostic).
In the second half of the nineteenth century two editions of the Malabar Catholic revision of the Hudrā and Gazzā are known to have been published. First, Elias Kuriakose Chavara (1805–1871) prepared a...
morning (سапр) in the Chaldean tradition from Iraq, the difference between the manuscripts of the *Hudrā* and those of the *Gazzā* is that “*Gazzā* contains only compositions belonging to the night vigil; such pieces are not to be found in the *Hudrā*; the two books are therefore complementary to each other” (Mateos 1956, 11). The same scholar asserts that

*Hudrā* is the book which contains the oldest services for all days of the ecclesiastical year. Later compositions have been reunited in another volume, namely the *Gazzā*. The content of the *Gazzā* is exclusively dedicated to the night vigil. Actually, this vigil is the last one to have been organized among the liturgical hours. Being an anthology, *Gazzā* shows notable variations with respect to contents from one volume to another. Basically, in each monastery, the poet monks could add new pieces of poetry according to their own will. (1956, 12)

Be this as it may, the liturgical manuscripts containing the Malabar Catholic revision of these two collections usually form a single corpus combining both parts in a single codex, and the manuscripts do not display a clear division between *Hudrā* and *Gazzā*. Occasionally, the scribes would group the temporal section (services for Sundays) in a volume and the sanctoral section (commemorations of saints and feast days with fixed date) in another one, but even this is inconsistent, since feast days such as the Ascension of Christ and the Pentecost (which belong to the temporal section of the liturgical year) usually end up in the sanctoral part. Therefore, whenever I refer to the “Malabar Catholic revision of the *Hudrā*” in what follows, it is only a convention in order designate manuscripts combining both the *Hudrā* and *Gazzā*; I prefer to use the term *Hudrā* over *Gazzā*, as I have not encountered the term *Gazzā* in any manuscript containing this Catholic revision of the ritual from Malabar. Also, for comparison I have used three other manuscripts for the analogous East Syriac ritual from the Middle East, namely MS Thrissur Syriac 27 (on this manuscript, see Othottil 2011, 71–84) and MSS Vatican Syriac 86 and 87. MSS Thrissur Syriac 27 and Vatican Syriac 86 bear the title *Hudrā*, while MS Vatican Syriac 87 begins directly with the services without a generic title (on the two *Hudrā* MSS from the Vatican Library, see Assemani and Assemani 1758, 476–82; Van der Ploeg 1983, 196–97).

In order to determine the liturgical place of the canticles of glorification, I looked into the services of various feast days and commemorations of saints from several South Indian revised edition of it, which he tried to simplify and uniformize on the basis of the existing manuscripts; he is also said to have added some other prayers translated from the Roman Breviary. This edition, usually known as ‘Chavara’s Breviary’, was sent to the head of the Congregation *De propaganda fide* in Rome for approval since 1862, but apparently the authorities in Rome did not answer this petition during the lifetime of Chavara. However, Chavara published an edition of his breviary in India (without approval from the authorities in Rome) in Koonammavu (nowadays a Northern suburb of Cochin), perhaps in three volumes, according to A. Vallavanthara (out of which only the first volume is still known to have survived in the library of the Mannanam library, but it is not even clear whether the other two volumes have ever been published). The content of this printed volume has been discussed by Fr. Vallavanthara (see Vallavanthara, *Liturgical Contributions of Blessed Chavara*, available online: http://christianmusicologicalsocietyofindia.com/chavara-vallavanthara, last accessed December 16, 2019). Another “breviary” version of the Malabar Catholic revision of the *Hudrā* “greatly different from the one [Chavara] organized” and is said to “have been introduced in the Malabar Church on the 4th February 1876” (ibid.). I have consulted a handwritten copy of Chavara’s Breviary for the present study, MS Mannanam Syriac 33.

In scholarly literature, the existence of the series of (سپکات) [Syr. *hpākātā*] for the night service has been already mentioned in two articles by Sr. Jincy Othottil. When referring to the differences between the services for the commemoration of the Virgin Mary in two East Syriac MSS of the *Hudrā* from the Library of the Metropolitan Palace of the Church of the East in Thrissur, i.e., MSS Thrissur Syriac 27 and 29, Sr. Othottil mentions that from the MS Thrissur Syriac 29 “in the night prayer are missing the long (سپکات) hymns and
liturgical manuscripts (ranging from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries) and from a few sixteenth-century manuscripts of the Ḥudrā from the Middle East. I noticed that the beginning of the service of the night (لَا مَيَا) [Syr. lēlyā] was a (liturgical) place of relative freedom in the ritual, where unsystematically various pieces of liturgical poetry could be inserted as proper (= distinctive elements for every feast day); most of the hymns inserted in this place of the ritual are abridged versions of the mēmrē (metrical homilies) composed in dodecasyllabic meter (4+4+4) by Narsai of Nisibis (fifth to sixth centuries), but the name of the poet is always omitted from the manuscripts. In the East Syriac tradition, Narsai is considered to be the most important East Syriac poet from Late Antiquity after Ephrem the Syrian and a champion of Nestorian theology. As the founder of the School of Nisibis and due to his dependence on the theology of the ‘Three Greek Doctors’—Diodore of Tarsus (d. 390), Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428) and Nestorius (d. 450)—Narsai “ultimately became the most foundational theologian articulating a dyophysite Christology in Syriac” (Butts 2020, 4) (on the most recent scholarly contribution to Narsai, see Butts 2020).

These abridged poems of Narsai have been inserted in manuscripts of the Ḥudrā under the title “anthems” (مَهْمَر [Syr. hpākātā]22 however, this type of poetry is missing from the printed editions of the Ḥudrā and Gazzā (i.e., Bedjan 1886–1887; Darmo 1960–1962). It is also missing from the Chaldean revision of the Gazzā done in the Middle East at the end of the seventeenth century by the Chaldean Patriarch Joseph II of Amid.23 While in some East Syriac manuscripts of the Ḥudrā and Gazzā this type of poetry is missing,24 it is to be found three manuscripts of the Ḥudrā from the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Middle East. It is present in MS Thrissur Syriac 27, a Ḥudrā manuscript copied in Alkaye in Urmī (Iran) in 1598 A.D. (the manuscript is described in Othottil 2011, 71–84) and in MSS Vatican Syriac 86 and

22 This type of poetry inserted in the service of the night under the title “anthems” (مَهْمَر [Syr. hpākātā]) before the session (مَوْتَبَّا [Syr. mawtbā] should not be confused with another series of “anthems” (مَهْمَر [Syr. hpākātā]) belonging to the vigil (حَدَم [Syr. šahrā]). In his work, Mateos describes the “anthems” (مَهْمَر [Syr. hpākātā]) for the vigil as follows: “Hepakta, h’paktā (مَهْمَر) retour, peut-être alternance: 1. – Distiques, empruntés aux mémra de Narsay, qu’on intercale aux qale d-šahra festifs entre le psaume avec refrain (šubbaḥ ou qanona) et le tešboḥta qui le suit. Leur nombre varie selon les mss. 2. – Distiques de même origine qu’on intercale entre les trois psaumes qui forment les qale d-šahra, à la fête des apôtres Pierre et Paul, au Dimanche de Nusardel et à d’autres jours de la même période. Les distiques des apôtres sont les mêmes, à peu près, pour tous ces jours” (Mateos 1956, 483). However, it is noticeable that in the East Syriac tradition, the practice of introducing couplets excerpted from Narsai’s poetry into the ritual received the generic title of “anthems” (مَهْمَر [Syr. hpākātā]; this phenomenon is mentioned by Sr. Othottil (Othottil 2014, 296). The same practice is also mentioned by Macomber, who, in his study on the manuscripts of Narsai’s mēmrē, mentions the fact that manuscripts containing collections of (مَهْمَر [Syr. hpākātā]) excerpted from the poetry of Narsai circulated in the Middle East. Macomber mentions the existence of five such manuscripts ranging from the thirteenth to the sixteenth centuries (Macomber 1973, 278).

23 On this revision, see Murre-van den Berg (2015, 149–52, 341); I have also consulted, for comparison, two manuscripts of the Chaldean revision of the Gazzā: MSS Thrissur Syriac 13 and 14 (on these manuscripts, see Mar Aprem 2011, 14-15).

24 For instance, MS Thrissur Syriac 29, a manuscript of the Ḥudrā copied in Alqosh in 1681 A.D. (see Othottil 2015, 438).
The two Ḥudrā manuscripts from the Vatican Library are particularly important for the Indian context as they might have belonged to Mar Joseph Sulaqa (see Van der Ploeg 1983, 196–97). As mentioned above, Mar Joseph was the brother of the first Chaldean Patriarch in the Middle East, Yohannan Sulaqa. In the 1550s and 1560s Mar Joseph was active in Malabar, where he was sent as Metropolitan Bishop of India by his Patriarch, 'Abdišo' of Gazarta (on Mar Joseph, see Beltrami 1933, 35–59; Thekkedath 1988, 2:40–47).

Alongside with the poetry of Narsai, in the same liturgical context, new “canticles of glorification” were composed and introduced as *proper* s in the services belonging to the Malabar Catholic revision of the Ḥudrā, under the same title “anthems” (ܡܟܟܡܠܐ) [Syr. ḫpākāṭa]. Like the poetry of Narsai, such poems usually precede the session (ܡܡܒܬܐ) [Syr. mawtbā] of the service of the night and are meant to be read or chanted as insertions at Psalm 82:1 (“God stood in the assembly of angels”) in the beginning of the twelfth (ܢܠܒܚܐ) hulālā, during the reading of the Psalter within the night service (for their place in the ritual, see, for instance, Bedjan 1886–1887, 1-3:3:278). All newly added poems use the dodecasyllabic metre of Narsai, but like late medieval Syriac poetry they also use rhyme (on the peculiarities of late medieval Syriac poetry, see Brock 2018, also Pritula 2015, 72–116, with an emphasis on the Wardā collection; on the continuity and changes between medieval and early modern Syriac poetry in the Middle East, see Murre-vanden Berg 2015, 156–83). The rhyme pattern suggests that some of the newly created poems are divided into couplets, while others might be divided into quatrains; the division of some of the canticles into quatrains is suggested by the fact that in the ritual, a canticle is occasionally divided into shorter “anthems” resembling stanzas of four verses each. The scribes introduced each such stanza/anthem with the word (ܠܒܚܐ) (鄣ˤhrêtā) “another-one.” The rhyme pattern is either *aaaα* or *aabβ*, but there are also instances when isolated verses do not present any rhyme. However, some of the newly composed canticles do not appear divided into quatrains even in liturgical context; this is, for instance, the case for the canticle for the feast day of the Transfiguration of Christ discussed below. Also, unlike their Middle Eastern peers, the Indian scribes do not always mark verses or hemistichs in Syriac poetry with two oblique dots (⏜) and little crosses (⏝). Since the use of punctuation in manuscripts seems to rather reflect the choice of the scribe, punctuation does not always help to understand the structure of these canticles.

Upon a systematic search through Syriac liturgical manuscripts from several South Indian libraries, to which I have added the evidence of an Indian manuscript preserved in Paris, I have collected twenty one canticles of glorifications for the service of the night from the Malabar Catholic revision of the Ḥudrā. Around half of the canticles are abridged versions of Narsai’s poetry showing continuity with the East Syriac liturgical tradition from the Middle East. Other canticles present in both the Iraqi and South Indian manuscripts might be pieces of poetry composed by medieval East Syriac poets, and the identification of their author(s) requires further study. A third group of canticles are newly created Syro-Catholic poems composed in the meter used by Narsai in India. Occasionally, such newly created pieces of Syro-Catholic poetry were meant to replace the existing pieces belonging to Narsai. The majority of the manuscripts testifying to this tradition are nineteenth-century copies (which is not exceptional

25 These two manuscripts do not contain a colophon, but Assemani dates MS Vatican Syriac 86 to the sixteenth century and MS Vatican Syriac 87 to the fifteenth (see Assemani and Assemani 1758, 476–82; Van der Ploeg 1983, 196–97).

26 I did not find any indication in the manuscripts concerning any tune (qālā) to which this type of poetry should be sung/chanted.

27 A hulālā is a division of the East Syriac Psalter in liturgical context.
if one considers the general situation of the Syriac manuscripts preserved in Malabar). Since most of these manuscripts do not contain a colophon, it is difficult to determine their precise date. Among the manuscripts that can be safely dated and help one trace the origin of these Syro-Catholic poems to the decades following the Synod of Diamper, one should mention MS Paris Syriac BnF 25, the prayer book of Parambil Chandy, the first indigenous Catholic bishop of the Malabar Christians after the general revolt in 1653. The manuscript, which is a Kaškūl (i.e., to be used for the ferial section of the liturgical year), also contains some services for feast days and commemorations of saints (i.e., belonging to the temporal and sanctoral sections of the liturgical year) copied as an appendix to the ferial section (this manuscript has been discussed in detail by Van der Ploeg 1983, 231–44; more recently, it was revisited by Perczel 2016, 50–52, 264–65). Among the manuscripts preserved in India, one of the most comprehensive collections of the Malabar Catholic revision of the Ḥudrā is MS Mannanam Syriac 99 dated to the year 1734 AD (on this manuscript, see Perczel 2014, 32; Thelly 2004, 261–62, 267). The canticles of glorification survive in collections of varying length depending on the aim of the scribe. In most cases, they are copied in manuscripts of the Malabar Catholic revision of the Ḥudrā (combining both the temporal and the sanctoral sections of the liturgical year), but services for a few feast days might have been added as a small appendix to other liturgical books such as the Kaškūl or to the “Book of the Week Before and After” (Ktābā da-qdam wa-d-bātar) containing the standard services of the days of the week, corresponding to the šḥimō in the West-Syriac tradition. 

In South Indian manuscripts, these poems sometimes appear in non-liturgical context, in anthologies, bearing the title “canticle of glorification” (مَهْمَسَهَا) [Syr. tešboḥtā]; in such cases, the text of the poems runs continuously and there is no stanzaic division (such is the case of MS Thrissur Syriac 62 discussed above). In most of the manuscripts (which are liturgical manuscripts), the canticles are inserted under the title “anthems” (حَكَاتَهَا) [Syr. hpākātā], as propers, in the beginning of the service of the night (َحَلْكِ) for various feast-days; such series of anthems are usually organized in units of four verses. Occasionally, even the canticles based on Narsai’s mēmrē (i.e., those inherited from the East Syriac liturgical tradition) do not appear in their liturgical context but are rather isolated, usually in the end of a liturgical manuscript, preceding the colophon. When in the second half of the nineteenth century, Blessed Elias Kuriakose Chavara reorganized the liturgical material from the Malabar Catholic revision of the Ḥudrā for his breviary, he sometimes suppressed some of the verses of the canticles or reorganized their verses into units (anthems) of uneven length.28

The following list comprises an inventory of the canticles of glorifications for the night service from the Malabar Catholic revision of the Ḥudrā, ordered according to their incipit. Since the Malabar Catholic revision of the Ḥudrā displays a hybridization between the Roman Catholic and the East Syriac liturgical calendars, I have chosen to list the feast days in the order in which they appear in MS Mannanam Syriac 99. The manuscript is one of the most complete collections of this type and was copied in 1734 A.D.:

1. The Nativity of Christ (مَهْمَسَةَ مَقَسَمَةُ يُحْيَى حَؤْدُودُ بِنْسُ كَحْلُكُ): inc.: (حَلْكِ يُحْيَى حَؤْدُودُ بِنْسُ كَحْلُكُ)

2. Commemoration of St. Steven (مَهْمَسَةَ بِنْسُ حَؤْدُودُ حَبَّا حَبْثُ كَحْلُكُ): inc.: (حَلْكِ بِنْسُ حَؤْدُودُ حَبَّا حَبْثُ كَحْلُكُ).

28 This is the case of MS Mannanam Syriac 30 identified by Fr. Emanuel Thelly as Blessed Chavara’s Breviary; in Thelly’s checklist, the manuscript is registered under the shelf-mark 090-248-BRE-S (Thelly 2004, 266). I owe to Prof. István Perczel the correspondence between the old shelf-mark and the new call number of the manuscript in the collection.
This canticle has been identified as being based on Narsai’s 1970 1973 1970 1970 1970 1970 1970 1973 1973 canticle for the Nativity of Christ (see Macomber 1973, no. 4; Eshai Shimon 1970, 1-2:1:77–98), the one for the commemoration of St. Steven (see Mingana 1905, 1-2:1:90–100), the one for the Epiphany (see Macomber 1973, no. 6; Eshai Shimon 1970, 1-2:1:134–157), the one for the Ascension of Christ (see Macomber 1973, no. 45; Eshai Shimon 1970, 1-2:1:546–563), the one for Pentecost (see Mingana 1905, 1-2:2:72–84), the one for the commemoration of the departed (see Macomber 1973, no. 18; Eshai Shimon 1970, 1-2:1:743–766), and the one for the commemoration of the Evangelists; they are attested by both manuscripts from the Middle East and the Malabar Catholic revision of the Ḥudrā. The canticles for the feast of the Birth of St. John the Baptist and for the commemoration of St. Peter and Paul also

The list does not strictly follow the liturgical calendar, because the canticles for the Marian festivals, one of the Apostles, one of the Evangelists, one of the Martyrs, the Bishops Confessors (of the faith), the Virgin Holy Women, and Holy Women (not Virgins) rather belong to the category of commune sanctorum, that is to say, they are used whenever a commemoration of a saint from such a category is celebrated.

From the items listed above, the following canticles are abridged versions of Narsai’s mēmrē: the canticle for the Nativity of Christ (see Macomber 1973, no. 4; Eshai Shimon 1970, 1-2:1:77–98), the one for the commemoration of St. Steven (see Mingana 1905, 1-2:1:90–100), the one for the Epiphany (see Macomber 1973, no. 6; Eshai Shimon 1970, 1-2:1:134–157), the one for the Ascension of Christ (see Macomber 1973, no. 45; Eshai Shimon 1970, 1-2:1:546–563), the one for Pentecost (see Mingana 1905, 1-2:2:72–84), the one for the commemoration of the departed (see Macomber 1973, no. 18; Eshai Shimon 1970, 1-2:1:743–766), and the one for the commemoration of the Evangelists; they are attested by both manuscripts from the Middle East and the Malabar Catholic revision of the Ḥudrā. The canticles for the feast of the Birth of St. John the Baptist and for the commemoration of St. Peter and Paul also

This canticle has been identified as being based on Narsai’s mēmrē on Saints Peter and Paul (see Eshai Shimon 1970, 1-2:1:191–220) by Sr. Othottil (Othottil 2014, 337n59 and 60).
belong to the hymnography of the Church of the East, but I could not identify their author. Sr. Othottil, who edited and translated the service of the commemoration of the Saints Peter and Paul, attributes it to Narsai (Othottil 2014, 296). However, if Narsai is truly the author of a sogitā “On Nero and the Workers and Peter” (see Mingana 1905, 1-2:2:391–396), then the author of the canticle of glorification for the night service for the commemoration of St. Peter and Paul must be a different one. This is suggested, for instance, by the fact that the canticle of glorification spells Nero’s name as (ܕܝܲܪܘϨ) [Nē’roṣ], while the sogitā provides the spelling (ܕܝܲܪܘܬ) [Nē’ron]. There is need for further study in order to establish with accuracy which of the remaining hymns from the list are original creations from Malabar; such a study should also take into account the hybrid structure of the Malabar Catholic revision of the Ḥudrā at the crossroads between the liturgical tradition of the Church of the East and the Roman Catholic tradition of the Roman Breviary. Some feast days mentioned in the list, such as Corpus Christi, are of distinct Roman Catholic origin, without any parallel in the East Syriac tradition. The Catholic liturgical revision from Malabar also predates and is distinct from the Chaldean revision of the Ḥudrā and Gazzā, which was done in the Middle East by the Chaldean Catholicos Patriarch Joseph II of Amid (see Murre-vanden Berg 2015, 148–52, 341) at the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century; this Chaldean revision was the main source for Paul Bedjan’s Breviarium Chaldaicum.

While the preservation of the canticles based on Narsai’s mēmrē in the beginning of the service of the night witnesses to the continuity between the Malabar liturgical tradition and that of the Church of the East, sometimes it seems that the Malabar Catholic revision of the Ḥudrā contains newly created hymns meant to replace East Syriac compositions. One such example seems to be the canticle for the Marian feasts fashioned according to the pattern of Ave Maria (no. 8 in the list above). This canticle is preserved in both liturgical manuscripts and in MS Thrissur Syriac 62: fol. 89v–91v (the anthology containing poetry by Kadavil Chandy Kattanar, which I described above). The canticle seems to have been composed in order to replace a canticle for the commemoration of the Holy Virgin, which in the Church of the East was celebrated on the Friday preceding the feast of the Epiphany of Christ. The East Syriac canticle begins with the words: (ܒܝܬܓܲܕܐܕܡܕܬܪ u-law d-‘)itutā “Mary is the Mother of the Second Adam and not of the Essence”; I was not able to identify the author of this canticle, but the canticle might be an excerpt from another mēmrā by Narsai. Although generally the printed version of the Ḥudrā published by Mar Thoma Darmo does not contain the canticles of glorification for the service of the night, in this peculiar case the edition preserves the first four verses of this canticle in the service (Darmo 1960–1962, 1:1:603). This phenomenon deserves further study and I will not focus on it here. Yet, a comparable tendency is to be noted in the evolution of ritual books throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in the Middle East. As Heleen Murre-van den Berg notices: “The relatively minor changes in the liturgy [in the Middle East] were much less important than the many new additions that were made, in both traditional and Catholic circles, by way of the hymns. It is in this field that the most important innovations took place, developing new or re-using older genres and in a continuous stream of new poetry that kept the liturgy of the time up to date” (Murre-van den Berg 2015, 182).

In order to highlight the religious entanglements of the Syriac Christians from Malabar and their Syriac culture as a synthesis of various Eastern and Western Christian elements, in the following paragraphs I will present three textual examples which illustrate the textual
traditions involved in the composition of new canticles of glorification from Malabar. The chosen hymns show the relationship between such pieces of religious poetry, the Roman Breviary, and the Malabar Sermonary. On the basis of the collected evidence, I will also attempt to formulate a hypothesis on their authorship. The focus of the analysis, however, will be on the intertextuality between the sermons from the Malabar Sermonary and newly created hymns. I have chosen for discussion the canticles of glorification for three feast days: the Transfiguration of Christ, the commemoration of Saint Thomas the Apostle, and the feast of Corpus Christi, which is a distinctly Roman Catholic feast day. The first two examples show how undated Syriac Catholic sermons from Malabar have been used by the hymnographer as sources for the composition of liturgical poems. The last example discusses the evidence available for claiming the authorship of Kadavil Chandy Kattanar over this type of poetry as an open question. For this purpose, I am providing semi-diplomatic editions of texts on the basis of one manuscript.\footnote{All the interventions in the text have been recorded in the critical notes; I did not correct the misuse of *rukākhā* and *quššāyā*. The abbreviations used in the critical notes are those recommended in *Règles et recommandations pour les éditions critiques* 2003: em. = emendaui; a.c. = antecorrectionem; p.c. = post correctionem; coni. = conieci; mg. = in margine; om. = omissit; s.l. = supra lineam. I used square brackets [ ] to mark interpolations and angle brackets < > to mark editorial additions.}

The Roman Breviary, the Malabar Sermonary, and the Canticles of Glorification: The hymns for the Transfiguration of Christ and for the Commemoration of St. Thomas the Apostle

The canticle of glorification for the Transfiguration of Christ

MS Mannanam Syriac 33\footnote{I have abbreviated it in the critical notes as M.} fol. 137r–v—Text and Translation:

\footnote{I have conventionally divided the text into stanzas to more easily follow its analysis. However, in the manuscript the text is not divided and the rhyme pattern is generally *aabb*.}

1. 

\footnote{\[48\]}

\footnote{\[49\]}

\footnote{\[50\]}

\footnote{\[51\]}

2. 

\footnote{\[48\]}

\footnote{\[49\]}

\footnote{\[50\]}

\footnote{\[51\]}

3. 

\footnote{\[48\]}

\footnote{\[49\]}

\footnote{\[50\]}

\footnote{\[51\]}

31 All the interventions in the text have been recorded in the critical notes; I did not correct the misuse of *rukākhā* and *quššāyā*. The abbreviations used in the critical notes are those recommended in *Règles et recommandations pour les éditions critiques* 2003: em. = emendaui; a.c. = antecorrectionem; p.c. = post correctionem; coni. = conieci; mg. = in margine; om. = omissit; s.l. = supra lineam. I used square brackets [ ] to mark interpolations and angle brackets < > to mark editorial additions.

32 I have abbreviated it in the critical notes as M.

33 I have conventionally divided the text into stanzas to more easily follow its analysis. However, in the manuscript the text is not divided and the rhyme pattern is generally *aabb*.
1. All of you, who desire Jesus—your Blessing—lift up your minds, and you will see the sign of the splendor of the eternal glory: the Everlasting Word, Which is hidden from all, the Immeasurable, the King of kings, the Consolation of Nations, the Ineffable.

2. To appease the people, the Commander of the armies Who is Yah Sabaoth sent men to the Land of Promise, and they explored it entirely, and they brought very pleasant fruits, and [so] they raised those who had fallen and all of them waged war with very mighty enemies.

3. Our Lord Jesus has shown His glory to three of His friends so that He may attract men to His divinity, the source of His blessings, because it was about Him that had declared and said beforehand through His saints [i.e., the prophets] the adored Father, Who also commanded with His [own] voice: “Listen to Him, all My people!”

4. If the service of death, the tyrant, was in glory, so that the sons of Israel were not able to gaze at the face of Moses, as it was glowing, and he was hiding his rays, then, how much more so will the place of salvation be in glory?

5. How beloved are the tents [of] Your glory, [oh,] mighty Lord! My wretched soul desired the comprehension of our Lord, Day and night my tears became my daily bread, When they were telling the whole day long: “Where is your Lord, [your] salvation?”

6. As the blind man awaits for [the sight] of his eyes and the thirsty one for the [springs

37 Em. M; Em. M 38 Sic, quamquam est femininis generis. 39 Em. M 40 Numbers 13–14 altered and conflated with Joshua 2. 41 See Matthew 17: 1–8; Mark 9: 2–8; Luke 9: 28–36. 42 See 2 Corinthians 3: 7–8. 43 See Numbers 24: 5. 44 In the original is used the singular number, “my tear.” 45 See Psalms 42: 1–3 and Matthew 6: 11.
of] waters,
so is the soul awaiting to see Your splendid Person⁴⁷,
and since this vision of Yours is hindered by corporality,
You sent the Spirit so that it may see You spiritually.

One of the main sources of the hymn edited and translated above was a sermon on the feast of the Transfiguration of Christ from the Malabar Sermonary. Because of its fragmented structure, one understands the content of this canticle of glorification better after reading the sermon which the poet seems to have taken as his model. The sermon on the Transfiguration of Christ (ṣurādā d-ʾal gelyāne(h) d-māran) is preserved in two nineteenth-century manuscripts: MS Mannanam Syriac 47: fol. 257r–274r (Thelly 2004, 268, the manuscript is registered under the number 090-252-SCA-S); and MS Thrissur Syriac 17: fol. 1r–10v (see the description of the manuscript in Mustaţă 2019, 103–12). The sermon is focused on a long and detailed description of the Heavenly Jerusalem based on the Revelation of John and the works of Augustine (of approximately ten folios). The main purpose of the author is to emphasize the greatness of the everlasting blessings (rabut tubē) of the heavenly kingdom which he discusses in relation to the everlasting beatitude (ṭubtānutā) of the saints. The sermon mentions such Western authorities as Boethius and Bernard of Clairvaux and often relies on allegorical interpretations. For instance, the Apostles participating in the event are depicted as the embodiment of the theological virtues. Yet, in the exordium of the sermon, the author makes a digression on the people of Israel in the desert, which is in fact the source for the second stanza of the corresponding canticle of glorification:

MS Mannanam Syriac 47, ⁴⁸ fol. 257v:

We read in the Law concerning Moses that when he was halting together with the sons of Israel in the desert and wanted to encourage them to enter the promised land, he sent twelve men, one from each tribe of the sons of Israel, to go and explore the land. They went and explored it and brought to [their] leader from the fruits [of the land] and he showed the sons of Israel [the fruits], that is to say pomegranates and grapes, and especially a cluster of grapes [that was carried] on poles between two [men]. And it happened that when the sons of Israel saw

---

⁴⁶ See Luke 18: 35–43.
⁴⁷ See Psalms 63: 1–3.
⁴⁸ I have abbreviated it in the critical notes as M. See Thelly (2004, 268); the MS is registered under the number: 090-252-SCA-S.
⁴⁹ Em. (M ṭubtānutā);
⁵⁰ Em. (M ṭubtānutā);
⁵¹ Em. (M ṭubtānutā).
[the fruits], many of them regained their strength and fought with the Canaanites and slaughtered them.\(^{52}\) Likewise, our Lord Jesus has chosen three apostles out of twelve and has revealed them the glory of His kingdom, so that they would recount it to the inhabitants of the earth and in this way [the latter] would get courage to spiritually strive against the dark powers which are in the world, and thus to inherit the Kingdom of Heaven, which is the promised land that has been vowed to us from before.\(^{53}\)

After the quoted passage the author establishes a typological relation between the fruits of Canaan and the pleasantness of the Kingdom of heaven, a relation which is described as \((\text{Syr. } \text{ṭelānitā ṭupsā ḏ-šubḥā})\) “a shadow and a týpos of glory”, and this is the prelude for the long description of the blessings \((\text{Syr. } \text{ṭubē})\) of the Heavenly Kingdom mentioned above. According to the author of the sermon, the fruits of Canaan brought by the spies were meant to determine the Israelites fight for the promised land, and they are a týpos for the experience of glory by the Apostles on Mount Tabor during the moment of Transfiguration. I would emphasize the fact the poet rather alludes to the context of the sermon from which he took the initial imagery, and what he writes down afterwards is a sort of personal reflection on the basis of the Psalms and biblical readings connected to the feast day. The reference to Christ as \((\text{Syr. } \text{ṭubkun})\) “your blessing” in the first verse of the canticle again alludes to the blessings \((\text{Syr. } \text{ṭubē})\) of the Heavenly Kingdom on which the sermon is centered.

Yet, the first stanza of the poem is an adaptation of the first part of a hymn from the vespers of the feast day of the Transfiguration of Christ in the Roman Breviary. The text of the Latin hymn runs as follows:

\[
\text{Quicumque Christum quaeritis/ Oculos in altum tollite:/ Illic licebit visere/ Signum perennis gloriae./ Illustre quiddam cernimus,/ Quod nesciat finem pati/ Sublime, celsum, interminum/ Antiquius coelo, et chao./ Hic Ille Rex est Gentium/ Populique Iudaici/ Promissus Abrahae patri,/ Eiusque in aevum semini./ Hunc et prophetis testibus,/ Iisdemque signatoribus,/ Testator et Pater iubet,/ Audire nos et credere./ Iesu, tibi sit gloria,/ Qui te revelas parvulis,/ Cum Patre et almo Spiritu,/ In sempiterna saecula. Amen. (Breviarium Romanum 1854, 511)
\]

[“All of you who are seeking Christ/ Lift up your eyes in the height!/ There you will be able to see/ The sign of the enduring glory./ We can discern something bright,/ Which knows no end,/ Sublime, elevated, limitless,/ Older than the heaven and the chaos./ He is the King of the nations/ And the King of the Jewish people,/ [He] Who was promised to father Abraham,/ and to his seed for eternity./ Through His prophets as witnesses/ and attestants,/ The Witness-Bearer and Father commands us/ To listen to Him and believe [in Him]./ Glory be to You, Jesus,/ Who reveal Yourself to the infants,/ [Glory to You] together with the Father and the Nurturing Spirit,/ To the everlasting ages! Amen.”]

It is noticeable that verses from the Latin hymn have been adapted and inserted especially

---

\(^{52}\) See Numbers 13–14 altered and conflated with Joshua 2, as in the second stanza of the canticle of glorification.

in the first and, to a certain extent, third stanzas of the Syriac canticle of glorification. The reference to Christ as (ဖղpheres) [Syr. ṭubkun] “your blessing” in the first verse of the canticle (but absent from the Latin hymn) is the lexical element meant to connect Christ as antitypos to the blessings from the Land of Promise; these motifs were incorporated into the canticle through the mediation of the sermon quoted above. However, the contribution of the Roman Breviary to the composition of Syriac canticles of glorification is quite limited; after a systematic search through it, the only example analogous to this one that I found is the Syriac canticle for the feast day of Archangel Michael (no. 20 in the list above). It was composed by adapting a Latin vespers hymn for the feast day of the “Apparition of Saint Michael the Archangel” (Apparitio Sancti Michaelis Archangeli); the Latin hymn begins with the words: Te splendor, et virtus Patris/ Te via, Iesu, cordium,/ Ab ore qui pendent tuo,/ Laudamus inter Angelos (Breviarium Romanum 1854, 324).

Here I have presented a structural connection detected between the canticle of glorification for the feast of the Transfiguration of Christ and a sermon for the same feast day from the Malabar Sermonary. The same structural connection can be observed between the canticle of glorification written for the commemoration of Saint Thomas the Apostle, and a sermon for the same feast day from the Malabar Sermonary.

The canticle of glorification for the Commemoration of St. Thomas the Apostle

MS Paris Syriac BnF 2554 fol. 218v–219v—Text and Translation:

1. [69]

[70]

2. [71]

3. [72]

[73]

54 I have abbreviated the MS in the critical notes as P. For a detailed description of this manuscript, see Van der Ploeg (1983, 231–44); the manuscript was revisited by I. Perczel, see id. (2016, 50–52, 264–65). I would like to thank my supervisor Prof. István Perczel for first pointing out to me the connection between the anthems from the service for the feast of Saint Thomas from this manuscript and the Sermon on Saint Thomas from the Malabar Sermonary.

55 in rubrics: ܡܟܟܐܕ ܕܡܢܓܒܠܒܐ
56 Em. Pܐܓܒܠܒ Pܓܒܠܒ
57 Em. ܕܓܒܠܒ Pܓܒܠܵܒ Pܓܒܠܒ
4. Come, sons of India, pupils of the apostle Thomas:
the light of the world, the shepherd of the Church, its great treasure,
whose history is sublime and cannot be comprised in the speech of men,
and comely is the beauty of his story, which is wonderful.

2. Through a sign of the Spirit, Thomas came to the country of India,
And he built up a palace according to a craft which cannot be comprehended.
The king rejoiced, got baptized by his hand and venerated the Apostle,
And many peoples in all India bowed their heads [to him].

3. Through his humility and ineffable renunciation,
Thomas the Apostle preached the word in the whole earth;
he diligently subjected kings under the yoke of the Cross,
and they dismissed [their] crowns, renounced [their] scepters, and venerated the Cross.

4. A leopard killed the assailant miraculously
and a dog brought his right hand in front of [all] at the wedding feast.
All the guests were astounded and chanted praises, while the king believed,
according to the typikón of the resplendent Church of India.
5. The hand of the one who took the sacraments unworthily got dried; Thomas healed it in the waters of mercy and rendered his heart to contrition. He fell before the blessed-one and his word [i.e., of Thomas] vivified him. [And] with abundant love he offered gifts to the one who brought him the tidings [of the Gospel].

6. Powerfully, the Apostle, the mighty one, pulled down the likeness [i.e., idol] of the Sun and casted out from it the accursed Satan and sent him to roam around. They threw the holy man in the furnace, but suffered no injury, they pierced him with a spear, killed his flesh and delivered him to the blessings.

7. In order to save the servants, Thomas assumed the likeness of a servant; in the likeness of his Lord he sold himself and freed the servants, a faithful servant who bestowed a way to his fellows, and his Lord waited for him, he entered His gladness, and gave life to the dead.

The main source of the canticle of glorification for the feast day of Saint Thomas the Apostle edited and translated above is the corresponding sermon from the Malabar Sermonary. Preserved into two Syriac manuscripts from Malabar, the text of the sermon was written for an Indian audience sometimes after 1601 (for the edition and study of this text, see Mustaţă 2019). The sermon presents an interesting fusion of scriptural, Patristic, and early modern literary sources in Latin, Spanish, and Syriac, pointing to the literary networks of the Malabar Christians with both the Syriac literary heritage of the Middle East and the Latin culture from Europe. The text focuses on the quasi-messianic role of Saint Thomas (called “the Saviour of the Indians”, [Syr. pāroqā d-hendwāyē]). Moreover, Saint Thomas is depicted as a missionary—the itinerary of his preaching combines the metropolitan sees of the Church of the East with the itinerary of the Portuguese expansion in Asia (see the introduction to this text in Mustaţă 2019, 11–46). In the older manuscript, the list of peoples among whom Saint Thomas is said to have proclaimed the Gospel runs as follows: “For Mar Thoma preached to and taught the Persians, and among the people of Herat, and of Merw, and of Rayy, and of Parthia, to the Bactrians, to the Babylonians, to the Soqotri, to the Indians, to the Chinese, to the Ethiopians, and also to the Magi, who were worshipers of our Lord. He baptized and confirmed them” (Mustaţă 2019, 78). In the later manuscript the list of peoples and places has been augmented:

For Mar Thoma did not only preach to Israel, but in person or through his disciples, [he also preached] to the Persians and among the people of Herat, and of Merw, and of Rayy, and of Parthia, and of Media, to the Bactrians and to the Hyrcanians, to the Babylonians and the people of Smarkand, to the Socotrans, to the Indians, to the Chinese, and to the inhabitants of Mahācīna, to the Ethiopians, and also to the Magi who were worshipers of our Lord in His infancy. He baptized and confirmed them. And through his disciple, whose name is Thaddaeus [Tadai], he also converted to our Lord, Abgar, the king of Edessa, and the subjects of his kingdom, after Thaddaeus had healed the king of his illness through the sign of the Cross. (2019, 78)

[76] The Syriac ( Penisā) [pursā] from the Greek πόρος, “way”—eventually a linguistic calque on the basis of the Malayalam mārgam (മാർഗം), “way,” “path,” but also with the sense of “religion”—suits this context better than the manuscript-reading ( Penisā) [prāsā] “cover,” “veil,” as there is no account in the Acts of Thomas or anywhere else about St. Thomas bestowing a veil to the Indians.
By comparing the canticle with the text of the sermon, it appears that:

1. the first stanza of the poem is meant to repeat a passage from the exordium of the sermon:

Although this commemoration of Saint Mar Thoma, the beloved Apostle, is extolled in all the churches, most of all it is fit for us to celebrate, to sanctify, to praise and to chant this feast-day, since this apostle belongs to us, he taught our fathers, he founded, established and completed our Church. And if others are also celebrating him today, it is above all right for us to praise him. But what are we going to say about the one whose history surpasses all discourse? And with what shall we compare the one to whom there is no likeness, whose stories are amazing, whose miracles are admirable, whose deeds strike fear, whose actions are grand, whose conduct is sublime, and whose life vivifies and makes us divine, who is a seraph in the body and a cherub in the flesh, an altar of wisdom and a throne of the Divinity? (Mustaţă 2019, 75)

Although this commemoration of Saint Mar Thoma, the beloved Apostle, is extolled in all the churches, most of all it is fit for us to celebrate, to sanctify, to praise and to chant this feast-day, since this apostle belongs to us, he taught our fathers, he founded, established and completed our Church. And if others are also celebrating him today, it is above all right for us to praise him. But what are we going to say about the one whose history surpasses all discourse? And with what shall we compare the one to whom there is no likeness, whose stories are amazing, whose miracles are admirable, whose deeds strike fear, whose actions are grand, whose conduct is sublime, and whose life vivifies and makes us divine, who is a seraph in the body and a cherub in the flesh, an altar of wisdom and a throne of the Divinity? (Mustaţă 2019, 75)

2. the typological link between the emptying of Christ and the humility of St. Thomas in the last stanza of the poem constitutes in fact the theological backbone of the sermon:

And although the holy apostle is great, he did not resist becoming the slave of Ḥabban, the steward of the King of India, who had been sent [by the king] to Jerusalem, so as to bring for him from there a learned and experienced craftsman to build in India a palace for the king and his heirs. And so, Thoma obeyed our Lord, committed himself to Ḥabban, and came together with him to India. [...] Behold, my brothers, the eagerness of the Apostle’s love! In the likeness of Christ, “he emptied himself, assumed the likeness of a slave”, and came to India, in the guise of a craftsman, in order to found the Indian Church, so as to save us in it, through baptism; just as Noah saved the human race from the devastation of the flood. Consider, my beloved, this mystery which I am telling you – that is to say, that of the Wisdom of God, who is the Word, the Son of God! She is the craft of everything, and as Salomon says in the Proverbs, “She built a house and hewed seven pillars,” that is to say, the Catholic Church, and secured it on the seven sacraments. And since She revealed and showed Herself to the world in the guise of a woodworker – as it is written in the divine Gospels: “is this not the carpenter?” – he sent afterwards the blessed one in the same appearance towards us. Take into account that also, Noah, the carpenter, made the ark according to the word of God,

I have already mentioned the connection between the poem and the sermon in the introduction to Sermon on Saint Thomas..., but I did not realize that the series of anthems is in fact a poem by itself (see Mustaţă 2019, 31–32).
and he redeemed the world. God inspired Moses as well, with all craftsmanship, so as to build according to it, the tabernacle, and the stupefying vessels which he put in it. And so, he saved Israel from the Egyptian slavery. Also, Salomon the King was a craftsman, who learned from God how to found, to build and to embellish the temple of God; and with his wisdom he illuminated the world. So, those who were well known and renowned saviors in the world, were craftsmen as well, in the likeness of the true Savior, Christ our Lord. For this reason, Thomas, the savior of the Indians, revealed himself in India, in the guise of a carpenter. (Mustaţă 2019, 85–86)

3. it is the use of little lexical details that suggest that the poet took the sermon as a model in composing his poetry, not the other way round. For instance, the reference to the leopard (حيد) [Syr. nemrā] who killed the cupbearer who slapped St. Thomas (in the fourth stanza of the canticle of glorification) is missing from all the traditions and versions (Eastern and Western) of the Acts of Thomas (who speak instead of a lion), but the mentioning of the leopard has an internal function in the text of this sermon: The author delves into a long comparison between St. Thomas and the lion (on the basis of the tradition of the Physiologus) and for this reason feels uncomfortable with the fact that a lion (i.e., St. Thomas) killed the cupbearer and so, he invents a leopard (Mustaţă 2019, 21). It is noteworthy that both the sermon and the canticle of glorification are centered on the extraordinary role of Saint Thomas in India, whereas the liturgical tradition of the East Syriac Hadrā, as reflected in the service of the feast day, ascribes to the Indian mission of the Apostle only a marginal role. The promotion of the cult of Saint Thomas as founder of the Indian Church and the insistence on the ancient prestige of the Malabar Church seems to have been part of the agenda of Francisco Ros in order to restore the metropolitan status of Angamaly after the Synod of Diamper. This was due to the fact that the synod decided on the reduction of the Malabar Church to a simple suffragan diocese subjected to the Archbishop of Goa (on this matter, see Mecherry 2019, 183–278).
The connection between the collections of sermons and this type of poetry is important because it helps trace the composition of undated sermons (usually preserved in nineteenth-century manuscript copies) to the decades immediately following the synod of Diamper. For instance, the sermon for the commemoration of Saint Thomas must have been written after 1601, as it made use of Pedro Ribadeneira’s *Flos Sanctorum*, which was first published by that time (ibid, 24–31). Since the sermon is the main source for the analogous canticle of glorification and since the Malabar Catholic revision of the Ḥudrā was done in the first decades of the seventeenth century (being prescribed by the Synod of Diamper), it is very likely that the sermon was composed during the times of Francisco Ros. The correspondence between sermons and the canticles is also an expression of the attempt to create a unitary ideology, encompassing both the cult and the preaching. The intertextuality between the sermons and the liturgical poetry illustrates the fact that a new stream of Syro-Catholic literature was added to the East Syriac literary tradition from Malabar and it was read and used as source of inspiration for the Catholic revision of the liturgy.

Moreover, the author(s) of the canticles of glorification relies/rely on the information provided by the corpus of Catholic sermons in the same way as some pieces of poetry by Kadavil Chandy Kattanar rely on Syriac Catholic compositions arguably composed by European Catholic missionaries (on the sources of Kadavil Chandy, see Perczel 2014, 40–43). In his study on the poetry of Kadavil Chandy Kattanar, Perczel emphasizes the fact that in Kadavil Chandy’s *mēmrā On the Syriac Language*, the poet made use of an untitled treatise on the refutation of heresies preserved in MS Mannanam Syriac 46: fol. 123v–135r (ibid.); the same codex contains sermons belonging to the Malabar Sermonary.

### The Canticles of Glorification and the Poetry of Kadavil Chandy Kattanar

As shown so far in this paper, the composition of the canticles of glorifications for the Malabar Catholic revision of the Ḥudrā is quite complicated; the author(s) used both the Roman Breviary and Syriac Catholic sermons belonging to the Malabar Sermonary as sources for newly created hymns. Yet, MS Thrissur Syriac 62, with which I began this inquiry, contains a part consisting of religious poetry taken out from its liturgical context in an anthological manner and mixed with poems written by the Indian priest and Syriacist poet Kadavil Chandy Kattanar, a disciple of Francisco Ros. In the following paragraphs I will discuss on which grounds one can ascribe to Kadavil Chandy the authorship of the newly composed canticles of glorification. First, I will compare the canticle for the feast day of *Corpus Christi* (which is a distinctly Roman Catholic feast day) with other works on the Eucharist from the same literary context: a sermon on *Qurbana* from the Malabar Sermonary and Kadavil Chandy’s *mēmrā* on the Eucharist. It is important to note that this canticle of glorification does not have any parallel/model in the hymnography for the same feast day in the Roman Breviary.

Another reason why I have chosen to discuss this canticle is that the service for the feast day of *Corpus Christi* from the Malabar Catholic revision of the Ḥudrā seems to be older and is different from the service for the same feast day as it appears in the Chaldean recension of the Ḥudrā and *Gazzā*. The Chaldean recension was done in the Middle East later (in the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century), by the Chaldean Patriarchs Joseph I and Joseph II (see Murre-van den Berg 2015, 149–50). For comparison, I have used the service for the feast day of *Corpus Christi* from the Chaldean recension, as it is contained
in a late eighteenth-century (?) manuscript, MS Thrissur Syriac 13: fol. 61v–69r (on this manuscript, see Mar Aprem 2011, 14, the Chaldean service is basically the same as the one provided by Bedjan 1886–1887, 1-3:3:102–111 (§93)). The services for the same feast day in Malabar and the Middle East are different; even the title of the feast day is different in the two traditions: the Chaldean manuscript reads “Order for the Holy Feast of the Adoration of the Body of Our Lord” ([raksā b-ʾē’dā qadišā d-ʾiqar pagrē(h) d-mārān] (fol. 61v), while in the Malabar ritual books this service always bears the title “Service Which [is] for the Feast of the Holy Sacraments/Mysteries” (ܡܲܨܥܲܐ ܕܒ-ʾ⡢ܐ ܕ-ܪעים ܩܕܝܫܐ). For the present reference, MS Mannanam Syriac 59: fol. 85v). I regard the canticle of glorification discussed here as another piece of poetry belonging to the local development of Syriac Catholic literature in Malabar.

The canticle of glorification for the feast day of Corpus Christi

MS Mannanam Syriac 59, fol. 86r–87r—Text and Translation

[99]

[100]

[101]

[102]

[103]

[78] The manuscript does not contain a colophon and therefore the date is uncertain.

[79] I have abbreviated it in the critical notes as M. This MS contains the Malabar Catholic revision of the Hadrā; the original shelf mark of the manuscript is 090-264-X2-S (see Thelly 2004, 266, [Breviaries III.11]) and it is datable to the first half of the eighteenth century; I owe this information to István Perczel.
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[99] MS Thrissur Syriac 13: fol. 61v–69r (on this manuscript, see Mar Aprem 2011, 14, the Chaldean service is basically the same as the one provided by Bedjan 1886–1887, 1-3:3:102–111 (§93)). The services for the same feast day in Malabar and the Middle East are different; even the title of the feast day is different in the two traditions: the Chaldean manuscript reads “Order for the Holy Feast of the Adoration of the Body of Our Lord” ([raksā b-ʾē’dā qadišā d-ʾiqar pagrē(h) d-mārān] (fol. 61v), while in the Malabar ritual books this service always bears the title “Service Which [is] for the Feast of the Holy Sacraments/Mysteries” (ܡܲܨܥܲܐ ܕܒ-ʾ懋ܐ ܕ-ܪעים ܩܕܝܫܐ). For the present reference, MS Mannanam Syriac 59: fol. 85v). I regard the canticle of glorification discussed here as another piece of poetry belonging to the local development of Syriac Catholic literature in Malabar.

The canticle of glorification for the feast day of Corpus Christi

MS Mannanam Syriac 59, fol. 86r–87r—Text and Translation
1. Come, mortals, and gather the manna, the bread of wonder!
What is this, what kind of food? Oh, the greatness,
Oh, the beauty and the pleasantness of Divinity,
The great depth, the deep abyss of all [things] made.

2. Everyone who wants to be joined to God, let him take
The divinizing and the outstandingly life-giving Sacraments that are full of riches.
The wisdom of God invites all of us to the supper.
Come, my beloved ones, with innocent heart and get replete from it!103

3. Taste [from it] and see that the Word is pleasant and sweeter than all104,
Why are you erring in a pathless desert more troublesome than all?
Why are you digging broken cisterns in which there is no water,
And have abandoned the spring of life from which the chosen [ones] are drinking?105

4. Oh, sweetness is coming out now from the mighty one,
And nourishment rose from the Eater as a burning fire,\textsuperscript{106} The God of gods offered Himself as nourishment to mankind, To raise the poor, strengthen the sick, and lift up the fallen ones.

5. The Lord fed twelve tribes with the stupendous manna, And led them through the frightening desert for forty years.\textsuperscript{107} Those who ate it and drank [water] from the rock died in their sins,\textsuperscript{108} Although they received endlessly exquisite spolia, a týpos of the blessings [to come].

6. Through the bread from the gridiron Elijah was travelling for forty days, And he mounted on Horeb, the mountain of God, and saw visions. Likewise the Artos, Jesus our Lord, Who vivifies the minds And appeases the sufferings, gets the spiritual hunger replete.

7. The [people] of old observed the sacrifice of the lamb in the evening of the Passover And ate its meat mixed with bitter herbs and with azymes.\textsuperscript{109} Behold, today, the Lamb of God Who removes our iniquity\textsuperscript{110} Is sanctifying us all through the sacrifice of His body and blood!

While the canticle of glorification for the feast day of the Transfiguration of Christ and the one for the commemoration of Saint Thomas the Apostle have been composed by making use of analogous sermons from the Malabar Sermonary, such a clear intertextual connection does not appear between the canticle of glorification for the feast day of Corpus Christi (edited and translated above) and analogous sermons on the Eucharist from the Malabar Sermonary. However, one of the Eucharistic sermons comprised in MS Mannanam Syriac 46\textsuperscript{111} fol. 196ra–199ra and entitled “Sermon on the [Eucharistic] offering” (sawādā d-qurbānā) [Syr. suvatā d-qurbānā] contains the following digression on the manna as Eucharistic týpos:

\textsuperscript{106} See Judges 14: 14.
\textsuperscript{107} See Exodus 16.
\textsuperscript{108} See 1 Corinthians 10: 3–5.
\textsuperscript{109} See Exodus 12: 3–8.
\textsuperscript{110} See John 1: 29.
\textsuperscript{111} I have abbreviated it in the critical notes as M.
\textsuperscript{112} Em. Ṣic!
\textsuperscript{113} Em. Ṣic!
\textsuperscript{114} Em. Ṣic!
\textsuperscript{115} Em. Ṣic!
\textsuperscript{116} Em. Ṣic!
\textsuperscript{117} Em. Ṣic!
\textsuperscript{118} Em. Ṣic!
\textsuperscript{119} Em. Ṣic!
\textsuperscript{120} Em. Ṣic!
\textsuperscript{121} Em. Ṣic!
\textsuperscript{122} Em. Ṣic!
Similarly the soul of the Christian who does not take this divine bread gets quickly ill and dies into various sins. And the Holy Spirit has prefigured this for us in the Holy Scriptures, through the τύπος of the manna, with which God has nourished the sons of Israel all the days they were lingering in the desert. As that heavenly bread was nourishing them [i.e., the Israelites] and was making them strong, valiant and joyful, likewise whilst we are in the desert of this world full of thorns, thistles and snakes, we should manducate this divine bread. We should be mindful of the fact that, as in the case of this angelic manna all the pleasantness of delightful and dainty viands was present according to the desire of the eater, likewise in this divine and divinizing bread is comprised all pleasure. And it comprises all the sweetness of the spiritual virtues, when are tasting from it those who approach [it] in the purity of their heart and in [a state of] repentance of the soul, in order to receive it with love.

Again, as when the Hebrews were collecting the manna, [each of] them had had one measure [of it] and it did not lessen for those who collected less [than that], and it did not multiply for those who collected more [than that]—likewise it happens with these sacraments, since all their receivers are eating the body of Christ...
according to one measure, perfectly and fully. And in a crumb and in one small morsel of these accidents of the bread, Christ is entirely united and received; but all this divine bread is better than the manna, as the Creator is greater than His creation, and He is not limited by a bit of dust, nor is the infinite God [limited] by a grain of mustard. For, this nourishment was satiating the body of the one eating [it only] for a little while, and in the heat of the sun it was spoiled by creeping worms; but this food and divine bread satiates our souls incorruptibly and provides the one receiving [it] with strength and roboring vigor, and it fills one with all the blessings. It never gets spoiled, it is consumed completely and if we wish, it lasts inside us forever. On this [matter] our Lord says: *This is the bread of life. Your fathers ate the manna in the desert and died. If anyone eats from this bread, he will never die.* For, Christ calls this bread “the bread of life,” not only because those who receive it become worthy of grace and heavenly blessings through it, but also because those approaching and manducating it must by all means live a new life thenceforth and show a good conduct and hold fast to the good deeds.”

The topic of the manna developed in the Eucharistic sermon quoted above is also present in the first and fifth stanzas of the canticle of glorification for the feast of *Corpus Christi*. Yet, as the interpretation of the manna as a *týpos* of the Eucharist is a common place in the Patristic and medieval exegesis, the literary connection between the two texts remains an open question. Another instance where some of the Eucharistic motifs from the canticle of glorification for the feast day of Corpus Christi appear is Kadavil Chandy’s *memrā* on the Eucharist, an acrostic poem which the poet sent to Pope Alexander VII in 1657 (see Perczel 2014, 32–34; Thelly 2004, 261). Under the letter *he* of the acrostic, the poem runs as follows:

This is the bread that descended from the exalted heaven, and the manna that fed the sons of Israel in a *týpos*, and the shewbread (*drτos*) placed before on the table of consecration, and the faultless Passover lamb foreshadowing [the truth]. And the sacrifices and the beautifully arrayed mysteries of the corporeal, and the rational living offerings of the fleshy [things], and the oblations which were commanded by the Most High,
All these which are [prescribed] in the old Law
Are a τύπος of the wonderful offering of our Lord.

In addition to the reference to the manna, Kadavil Chandy’s 
[121]mēmrā on the Eucharist mentions the paschal lamb, which also appears in the seventh stanza of the canticle of glorification. Again, the use of unusual, small lexical details, such as the reference to the Eucharistic bread as (ܐܪ) [Syr. ἄρτος] from the Greek ἄρτος—present in the Greek version of the New Testament, but not that often attested in Syriac texts[142], though repeatedly used in Kadavil Chandy’s hymn on the Eucharist—might suggest a possible connection between the two poems. As the similarities between the language of the canticles of glorification and the poetry of Kadavil Chandy Kattanar generally consist of small lexical choices scattered throughout his poems—without repetition of entire verses—it is difficult to take such fragmented evidence as proof of his authorship of the canticles of glorification. Yet, the same observation is valid for other compositions of the same Kadavil Chandy: there is a predilection for certain words, but not for premade formulas. To make things even more complicated, the poetry of Kadavil Chandy uses sometimes Syriac words which seem to be tributary to the language of Malabar Sermonary quoted several times in this article. It is not possible to provide here an inventory of words and expressions shared by the canticles and other poems by Kadavil Chandy, as this would require systematic philological work on the whole corpus: the edited work of the poet will shed more light on this complicated matter.

The fact that pieces of poetry by Kadavil Chandy might have been used for the Malabar Catholic revision of the Hudrá might not be as surprising if one takes into account that he was apparently appointed “to complete the Syriac translation of the Roman Pontifical, which was begun by Francisco Ros” (Kaniaparambil 1989, 90–91). This information comes from the account of Giuseppe Maria Sebastiani O.C.D., Apostolic Commissary in Malabar, which is the most important source of information on Kadavil Chandy’s life (an account on the poet’s life based on various sources is included in Toepel 2011; an English translation of Sebastiani’s account has been provided in Pallath 2006). After recounting the appointment of Parambil Chandy as the first indigenous bishop of the local Catholic Christian community in 1663, Sebastiani mentions the fact that the poet was appointed as a vicar of the newly elected bishop and that he was charged with the completion of the Syriac translation of the Pontifical:

Donai anco 400. Fanos del mio al Padre Alessandro de Carò per translatare molte cose del Pontificale Romano in Siriano, haundone già le forme tradotte da D. Francesco Ros, primo Arcivescouo della Compagnia in quella Christianità; il chè detto Padre fece con aiuto de’ Sacerdoto Portoghesi, e di altri, che sapeuano benissimo Malauare, essendo egli perfettissimo in detta Lingua Sirtana, e l’unico Cassanare, che sapeua ben comporre nella medesima. (Sebastiani 1672, 147 [Book II, ch. 25])

[“I [i.e. Sebastiani] donated my own four hundred fanams to Alexander Kadavil for translating many parts of the Roman Pontifical into Syriac, the (sacramental)

142 I did not find the word in Aaron Butts’ book on Greek loanwords in Syriac (2016); however, the term is recorded in Thesaurus Syriacus, and seems to be first attested in the Syriac translation of the Festal Letters of Athanasius of Alexandria (see Payne-Smith 1879, s.v. ἄρτος). The word is also listed in the Lexicon of Bar-Bahlul, which means that it was used in Syriac texts at least since medieval times (see Bar Bahlul s.v. ἄρτος; for the present reference: [from sedra.bethmardutho.org, accessed on June 3, 2021]).

143 The three mēmrē on Syriac, Hebrew and Arabic are an exception from this point of view, as the poet uses similar arguments to praise any of these languages.
forms of which were already translated by Francis Ros, the first Jesuit Archbishop of that Christianity. The said father did this with the help of some Portuguese priests and others who knew Malayalam well, he being most perfect in the said Syriac language and the unique cassanar, who knew how to compose well in that language. (translation by Paul Pallath in Pallath 2006, 214–15)

While on the basis of the available evidence the authorship of the canticles of glorification is uncertain, pieces of information like the one quoted above suggest that the collaboration between European missionaries and the local clergy (Kadavil Chandy Kattanar) for the Malabar Catholic revision of the Ḥudrā and Gazzā prescribed by the Synod of Diamper is certainly possible. The part played by the European missionaries is strongly supported by the occasional translation into Syriac of fragments from Latin hymns belonging to the Roman Breviary. On the other hand, the use of the Malabar Sermonary in the hymnography of the canticles of glorification points to the mediation of European theological knowledge through Syriac intermediary from Malabar. The amalgamation of newly composed canticles of glorification with the poetry of Kadavil Chandy in MS Thrissur Syriac 62 suggests that the Indian poet might have played a role in the composition of new Catholic poetry to be inserted in the ritual. While the extent of this collaboration remains an open question, Giuseppe Maria Sebastiani’s account testifies to such a “collaboration” between Francisco Ros and Kadavil Chandy Kattanar for the translation of the Pontifical.

Conclusions

This study of entangled literary genres is an important witness to the amalgamation of the East Syriac heritage of the Malabar Christians in contact with the Catholic missionaries, especially the Jesuits, in the second half of the sixteenth and first decades of the seventeenth centuries. Due to their literary interconnectedness, the texts under scrutiny allow one to carefully examine the complicated textual layers and transmission networks of the Syriac heritage of the Malabar Christians in the times of the Synod of Diamper; they also illustrate the attempt of the missionaries to create an unitary ideology encompassing both the cult and the preaching, as part of a new Syriac Catholic paideia in Malabar. The case studies presented here display an interesting instance of religious entanglement: the Malabar Catholic revision of the Ḥudrā presents both continuity and innovation compared to the tradition of the Church of the East in Iraq. At the textual micro-level of the poetry presented here, this entanglement is expressed through a synthesis which incorporates the poetry of Narsai, the Roman Breviary and Syriac Catholic sermons produced locally in Malabar by the Catholic missionaries.

The study of the canticles of glorification is in itself important, as it helps to recover a corpus of Syriac poetry from early modern Malabar which otherwise would be lost. It raises new research questions regarding the so far unexplored but fascinating Malabar Catholic revision of the Ḥudrā, such as the need to reconsider the ratio between translations from Latin into Syriac and original compositions which were at interplay in this liturgical enterprise. The intertwined relationship between sermons and pieces of liturgical poetry provides important dating criteria: many of the sermons used as the main source for the canticles of glorification survive in nineteenth-century manuscript copies, and this type of poetry can be used as a terminus ante quem for dating back the sermons to the times surrounding the Synod of Diamper (when the Malabar Catholic revision of the Ḥudrā was made). Source analysis of this
material studied together also offers an interesting incursion into the intellectual history of Syriac writing in Malabar in the seventeenth century, leading one from the workshop of one (or more) skillful poet(s) and the sources of his (or their) Syriac education to the liturgy. The entanglement between sermons and the hymns testify to the mediation of European knowledge from the Catholic missionaries to their Indian pupils. While the sermons are based on European theological and humanistic erudition of the sixteenth century, the canticles of glorification often seem to rely on similar information only through the mediation of the corpus of sermons.

From a cross-cultural perspective, the Malabar Sermonary represents the adaptation of a European literary genre into Syriac; the canticles of glorification in their turn are an example of adapting and conveying Catholic doctrine by making use of a literary genre specific to the Syriac culture of the Middle East, and as such it is in itself an example of textual accommodatio. If the author of at least some of these poems is Kadavil Chandy Kattanar, this example shows that the Jesuits involved the local people in this process of Syriac literary production and translation as a means of accommodatio.
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