CHAPTER III

FATHER EMMANUEL NIDHIRY
AND HIS EFFORTS FOR REUNION

Suriani¹ Catholics or Nazrani² Catholics³, dwelling mainly on
the Malabar⁴ coast of southwest India⁵, who are known as Mar Thoma
Christians and recently as Syro-Malabarians, were in a unique and
anomalous situation in the second half of the nineteenth century.
Divided among themselves into factions, the Syrian Catholics remained
unorganized, confused and manipulated. Yet they were proud of
their faith which their traditions traced back to the evangelizing mission
of Apostle Thomas, whence their name of “Mar Thoma Christians”,
and they struggled to keep up their Christian faith and traditions
against the different politico-religious forces met with in the course
of their history. The history of the St. Thomas Christians during the
19th and 20th centuries was animated by the enterprises for union
and reunion. The Nazrani Jathyaykya Samgham⁶ or Syrian National
Union Association intended for united action between the Syrian
Catholics and the Syrian Jacobites in common affairs, and the reunion
attempts of Mar Dionysius and of Mar Abdiso Thondanatt. Besides,
a notable leader in the St. Thomas Christian community became
prominent as Fr. Emmanuel Nidhiry. He played a leading role in bringing
the Syrians under the reunion movement.
3.1 Fr. Emmanuel Nidhiry and the Reunion Movement

Fr. Emmanuel Nidhiry had the wider vision of Christian unity. Half a century before Mar Ivanios, he was dreaming of achieving Jacobite reunion. He spread the idea of Christian unity in word and in deed. He heralded the dawn of the spirit of Christian unity. He was a fighter throughout his life - a fighter against division and an apostle of reunion. He was thinking of various schemes to bring together the St. Thomas Christians of all denominations who had been divided due to the opposition to the Portuguese missionaries. He was sad to see the once-united community fighting for the ownership of Church properties. He was troubled by the conflicts in the Church and was seriously thinking of a permanent solution to this problem. His two great ambitions were to obtain Bishops for the Catholic St. Thomas Christians from among their own priests and to bring back all the dissidents. He worked hard for the realization of those ambitions. His education, family connections and his talents helped him to have many contacts with other Syrian Christian leaders.

3.2 Manikathanar: A Polyglot and Versatile Genius

On account of Manikathanar’s outstanding personality, the King, the Resident, the Pescar, and the Diwan used to come to the presbytery of Kuravilangad. He went up to Bombay to receive the Apostolic Delegate Msgr Antonio Aliardi. He had the full confidence of the Apostolic Visitor Meurin. He was elevated as a pontifically privileged Vicar General. He was appointed Vicar General of Kottayam in 1889. He was the first Vicar General from Kerala. As a freedom fighter, he
worked tirelessly for the individuality of the Syrian community. He was a man of farsightedness and extra-ordinary intelligence. According to K.C Chacko, Nidhiry was a versatile prodigy who had left his mark in practically every field of the socio-religious life in Kerala—literary, educational, historical, political and above all religious realms. He made the history of Kerala and was always anxious that others maintained true historical perspective. In his preface to the biography of Fr.Nidhiry, Mr.V.C George says,

“It is left to the readers to judge in which field he shines best as a leader of the people, devotee of religion, one proud of his community, fighter for freedom, man of letters, historian, promoter of culture, physician, political thinker, administrator of justice, saviour of the oppressed and philanthropist”.

The poet Vallathol bestows the following encomium on Nidhiry: “The great Fr. Nidhiry is a beautiful picture that will shine without fading or ever getting dim, on the walls of the Malayalam language as long as it lasts”. He was able to handle 18 languages; it is clear that he was an exceptional Indian in this regard. He was the founder Editor of Deepika, the oldest Malayalam newspaper now extant and also a co-founder of the newspaper, Malayala Manorama. Together with Keralavarma Valiyakoithampuran and Kandathil Varghese Mapplai, he worked hard in giving shape to the journal, Bhasha Poshini. He identified himself with the oppressed and downtrodden and fought for their amelioration.
He was a famous physician and a silvertongued orator as well. P.R Sankara Pillai, a contemporary of Manikathanar, eulogises:

“I do not know anyone else who has equal proficiency in fields as diverse as medicine, astrology, poetry, politics, social service and so on. Kathanar had the extraordinary gift of simultaneously attending to several activities: playing chess, creating poetry, prescribing medical treatment, listening to arguments of rival parties, and making horoscopic calculations.”

He had exceptional talents in civil and Church laws. He was practically a law court for the people of his time.

“The enthusiasm he aroused, the energies he released, the ideals he spread, the high standards he set, the ideals he upheld, the destination he fixed, the example he showed, all gave his countrymen a new momentum, which all have successfully driven them along the road to freedom, enterprise, and prosperity.”

His noble ancestry and extraordinary intelligence won for him wide reputation all over Kerala. He was an ecclesiastical luminary who left an indelible mark on the Thomas Christians. The extraordinarily bold development of the 19th century in the Malabar Church is to a certain extent the saga of Nidhirikal Manikathanar. ‘Nidhiry’ was the most vocal and influential among the Syrian Christian natives of his time.
3.3 Manikathanar, the Mahatma and the Fore-runner of Vatican II

Mahatma is an epithet that has been carved in the hearts of all Indians because of its association with Gandhiji. He was qualified as Mahatma all over the world. The term Mahatma meant, a great soul, a great person. When we reflect on our history and the role played by Fr. Nidhiry in the national and religious scenario of our country, we can name him also Mahatma. It was not any single aspect of the personality of Gandhiji that enabled him to be known like this. It was due to his vision, especially as the freedom fighter, and the patriotic spirit he inculcated in the hearts of the Indians that secured him this title. He was the greatest acharya of the whole nation. Gandhiji had a profound vision of education, too, which was rooted in the indianness in all its varied aspects. The strong conviction of Nidhiry was that the growth of a community or nation was possible only through proper education of the people. Thus Nidhiry was the forerunner of Vatican II. One could without any suspicion speak of a ‘School of Gandhiji’ and a ‘School of Nidhiry’ in this regard.

3.4 Theologian, Ecumenist and Defender of Catholic Faith

Manikathanar’s vision of the church, both theologically and ecumenically, seems to be profound and prospective. Nidhiry was a master of theology, Church dogmas and source languages. Nidhiry had a dream of his community and he was dreaming of the building stones of the future Church. ‘From the rites to the churches’ was his theological motto. A rite has to be established as a proper church by promoting its own liturgy, theology, spirituality, canonical tradition
and administrative systems. Speaking about the theologians and ecumenists, one could speak about a St. Thomas Christian 'quarternity', Alexander de Campo, Dr. Joseph Carattil, Thomas Paremmakkal and Nidhirikkal Mani Kathanar. They were the shining stars of the Syrian Church community of India. The 19th century St. Thomas Christian history presents before us a galaxy of local leaders like Louis Pazheparampil, Kuriakose Chavara, Palakunnel Valiachan, the seven priests in connection with the seven ‘dolours’ who advocated the autonomy and freedom of the Syrian Christian community. They were the freedom fighters of the church.

3.5 Promoter of Syrian, Indian and Christian Cultures

Nidhiry was sentimentally attached to everything Syrian, the language and the tradition. Even the missionaries wondered at Nidhiry’s scholarship in Syriac language. His competence in the Syriac language was the main reason for his profound vision of the St. Thomas Christian community. The St. Thomas Christians considered him the source of authenticity. Paremmakkal says:

“We are the Syrians from the time Apostle St. Thomas was in our country and gave us the treasure of the holy faith; we have been until today, without any break, performing our ecclesiastical ceremonies and practices in the Syrian rite”

Nidhiry was proud of everything Indian - Sanskrit literature, Malayalam language and ancient Indian culture. Culture is the life style of a society or people, which finds expression in their social, intellectual, and religious activities and artistic works.
3.6 The Reformation Leader of Kerela and the Promoter of Syrian Autonomy and Christian unity

When we speak about Nidhiry, we can immediately think of a binomial expression- Syrian autonomy and Christian unity. They were his twin aspirations. Both of these goals are inter-twined. They are not mutually exclusive principles. He was convinced of the fact that the unity of the church meant a communion of the churches and not mere communion of individuals. He wanted to highlight the fact that the St. Thomas tradition occupied a distinctive place in the whole Christian tradition. He had great theological insights regarding the diversity of traditions in the Church. One could speak about a school of Nidhiry when we consider his extraordinary ecclesiological vision, because he was a man of originality and multifarious vision. It was on the basis of the strength of his personal conviction and the strength of the strong Malabar tradition that he stood for this. Likewise, the theological insights of Manikathanar are called upon to establish their significance in the Syro-Malabar Church. Nidhiry could not tolerate the idea of the ancient Malabar Church being ruled by the bishops of the Latin rite. The tensions between the Latin bishops and the archdeacons in India are not rifts between two sets of persons but between two ways of administration. After Alexander de Campo, it was Nidhiry who got the privilege to use pontifical dress among the natives of the St. Thomas Christians. Since he stood for the native Syrian bishops, the missionaries began to say that Nidhiry was ambitious to become a bishop. They could, even in the 19th century, never imagine an Indian as capable of becoming an ecclesiastical dignitary. Zaleski says: “In some way I
should forewarn Your Eminence that it is the most dangerous thing in India to raise the question of native bishops ..” According to him, the native bishops would destroy the character of the Catholic church in India. But, for Nidhiry, only the native bishops could preserve the proper Catholicity.

3.7 Advocate of the unity of the Syrian Christian Community

The deep-rooted thinking of Nidhiry was that the Syrian Christian community of Kerala was a single community. Unity of the Church was his life goal. But he was never seen as a fundamentalist. It was his love for the Church that makes his memory for us ever-endearing. He was a creative thinker and a man of originality. To lead the community from discord to concord, from sectarianism to solidarity, was his life goal. Nidhiry’s problem with his foreign superiors has nothing to do with personal animosity. That was the conflict between two apostolic traditions. Nidhiry spoke about freedom and autonomy at a time when even the Indian National Congress was afraid of speaking about freedom and self-rule. His was a kind of ‘revolution’. Prof. Joseph Mundassery says that Nidhirikkal Manikathanar was the sum and substance of a conflicting period in the history of the Syrian Christians of Kerala. For the self-government and autonomy of the church, he fought against the Europeans. For the Unity of the Church he had to work untiringly with the Jacobites, Marthomites, Rokossians, Mellusians, etc. Vatican II has later defined the nature of the Church as a community which enjoys its own discipline, liturgical usage, theological and spiritual heritage. Pope John XXIII was a small child when Nidhiry spelt out
an ecclesiology of communication and unity. Nehru and Gandhiji were in their teens when Nidhiry spoke about the emancipation from the foreign rule of the church. According to Nidhiry, autonomy of the church was a primary level of reality. He considered communion as the matrix of the constant form of ecclesial unity. That was also the reason why he worked hard for unity between all the fractions of the Syrian Christians. While fighting against schism inside the church, he had the wider vision of Christian unity. Half a century before Mar Ivanios, he was about to achieve Jacobite re-union, and three quarters of century before Pope John XX III, he was spreading the idea of Christian unity through words and deeds. He was the prophet of ecumenism, the morning star that heralded the dawn of the spirit of Christian unity. He was a visionary far ahead of his time. His contemporaries could not rise to his levels. “Even in his failure there was success; when he failed to reach his ends, he succeeded in establishing them as goals for later generations to strive after.”

3.8 Undisputed Leader in a Divided Community

Fr. Emmannel Nidhiry was the undisputed leader of the divided St. Thomas Christian Church. It was because his ecclesiological consciousness was shaped by the Apostolic and Syriac characters. For the preservation and maintenance of this patrimony, he was absolutely convinced that there should be native bishops. The inspiring force behind the formation of Suriani Vicariates was none other than Nidhiry. His was not merely a kind of one-sided nationalism. He stood for this because of his ecclesiological convictions. Without seriously questioning
the authority, he succeeded to inculcate this spirit among the believers. At that time, many criticized him on the basis of this. But in the course of time, we are constrained to esteem and appreciate him. As Vicar General, he was given enthusiastic receptions and in many gatherings not only Catholics but Jacobites too gathered in large numbers to greet him. The whole Syrian community respected Nidhiry. Nidhiry was a man much ahead of his time. He was an ecclesiologist in the primary sense of the word because he knew the Church and truly loved it.

The split in the Syrian community occurred in 1653. Those who left the authority of Rome had a large number of bishops of their own, while those who remained loyal to Rome were in perpetual bondage under the Europeans. The Puthenkoor Syrians who renounced communion with Rome by the Koonan Cross Oath choose as their leader one Thomas of Pakalomattom family and entitled him Mar Thoma. Pakalomattom family was held in high repute and veneration as one of the Brahmin families, that was believed to have been converted and ordained by St. Thomas himself. This family had the credit of providing bishops till 1815. The St. Thomas Chirstains say that St. Thomas ordained priests from among two families. One of these families, named Sankarapuri, has died out, but the other family, named Pakalomattom, existed down to the last century and gave this church hereditary Archdeacons in the Portuguese period and Bishops in the Dutch period. The fact that most of these Jacobite bishops hailed from the Pakalomattom family of Kuravilangad might have had a strong
appeal for Nidhiry. His stepmother was also a Jacobite. These situations prompted Nidhiry to consider the Jacobite brothers as essential elements of the same community and the subsequent unity as an existential necessity. The autocracy of the European missionaries and their ethnocentricism had provoked a strong opposition to them. Just as Nehru’s internationism did not decrease his nationalism, Fr. Nidhiry’s identification with wider groups did not undermine his loyalty to the smaller group. He was a Nordist Syrian Catholic Christian. He opposed the domination of one group by another but stood for friendship and co-operation among the different groups. His opposition to European rule over Indians, Latin over Syrians and the Southists over the Nordists, reflects the former attitude while his invitation to the archbishop of Verapoly to start missionary work near Kuravilangad, his scheme for the merger of Suddists and Nordists, and the re-union of the Jacobites and his friendship with Protestant missionaries reveal the latter.

Nidhiry was the undivided leader of the divided Christians.

3.9 Reunion at the Social Level

When the reunion at the church level failed to realize its goal, Fr. Emmanuel Nidhiry devised various schemes to enable both Jacobites and Catholics to work together in social, educational, political and economic fields. Such collaboration, it was hoped, would actually lead to the reunion of all the St. Thomas Christians.

3.10 The Syrian National Union Association

To bring all the St. Thomas Christians under one community and faith was a Herculean task. It required a great deal of courage
and determination in the nineteenth century. Collaboration among the various denominations of the St. Thomas Christians, especially under a common association, could not be effected because of the conflicts between the Jacobites and the Mar Thomites\(^{27}\). Finally, a plan for a united organisation of both Catholics and Jacobite St. Thomas Christians was worked out. A conference of Syrian leaders prepared the objectives of the organisation. The Jacobite leader, Mr. K.C Mammen Mappillai, gives a detailed account of the formation of the *Jathyikya Samgham* in his memoirs. He observes.

“ The association brought nineteenth century St. Thomas Christians, both Catholic and Jacobite, across the threshold of reunion ....Associations were not new in India. Were not all the St. Thomas Christians from one community, an apostolic community with a hoary tradition? The new association of *Jathaikya Samgham* is unique in many senses, since it visualises the unification and uplift of the Syrians in the social, economic, and educational fields...”\(^{28}\)

Ever since the division of the St. Thomas Christians, corporate actions were absent among them. But the social life in Malabar was compelling many Syrian leaders to redefine their relationship with each other. The initiative to form an association came from Fr. Nidhiry and Mar Dionysius v.\(^{29}\) Fr. Nidhiry’s idea was to liberate all the Syrians from the yoke of Europeans, bring all of them into one community and
also bring all back to one Church. The United Syrian Church would be a great force in the Malabar society. Mar Dionysius was longing for reunion with the Catholic Church and concerned about the prosperity and future of all Syrians as one community. Mar Dionysius became interested in the move, says I.C. Chacko, mainly because of his fear of the outcome of the litigation with the Mar Thomites. If the decision went against the Jacobites, they would be deprived of the churches and properties and would be incapable of keeping up an independent existence.30

The Syrian National Union Association was launched in December 1882 with the support of the Madras Governor, Mountstuart Elphinstone Grant Duff. Formed with great enthusiasm, the association’s immediate objective was to work for the uplift of the Syrians especially in the social, economic and educational fields. In those days, when the concept of the welfare state was unheard of, the starting of such an association adds to the credit of Fr.Nidhiry.

V.C. George has given a detailed description of the objectives and declaration of this association in his biography of Nidhirikal Manikathanar. The declaration of the objectives stated:

“The Syrians of Malabar or the St.Thomas Christians, being separated into two groups called Pazhayakuttukar and Puthenkuttukar, are weakened like an amputated body. Moreover, they are lacking in social progress, and in the field of education.
To make amends for this deterioration, it was thought that an association should be formed called the Syrian National Union Association and that all the St. Thomas Christians should be brought into it. Some people, responsible for the formation of this association, were deliberating this for years and after consulting many great men, who were friends and well-wishers of their community, and knowing their opinions, the following decisions were taken ..... An association should be formed among the Syrians, called the National Union Association of Malabar, representing the St. Thomas Christian community belonging to the group called Antiochian Syrians and Romo-Syrians and aiming at their national and social well being”.

The constitution of the Samgham was carefully drafted to provide facilities to start various institutions. Sub-committees were formed to supervise the various activities of the Samgham. The main scheme was to start a central college at Kottayam. The bishops of both sections were made the patrons of the Samgham. All the doubts regarding the working of the constitution were to be referred to them. The Viceroy, the Governor of Madras, the British Resident and the Maharajahs of Travancore and Cochin were also made the patrons of the Association. The immediate task before this association was raising the huge fund required for the various schemes of the Samgham. Sub-committees
were formed to collect funds. The generous financial assistance of Mr. Darrah, an American Catholic industrialist at Alleppey, came to the rescue of the Syrians through the influence of Fr. Nidhiry. He agreed to donate Rs. 20,000 to carry out various schemes of the Samgham and to sell Woodland Estate\textsuperscript{34} measuring 22 acres, at a reduced price of Rs.3500.00\textsuperscript{35}. This was an ideal place to locate the institutions of the Samgham. The sale deed was registered in the joint ownership of Fr. Nidhiry and Mar Dionysius on 24 March, 1886, with the permission of Bishop Marcelline\textsuperscript{36}.

Soon, the ownership of Woodland Estate became a bone of contention between Mgr. Lavigne, Vicar-Apostolic of Kottayam, and Mar Dionysius V. Arguments and counter-arguments were advanced by these two leaders, who had conflicting interests to safeguard. This led to the failure of the negotiation for re-union. It was very painful to Fr. Nidhiry, who was chiefly responsible for buying the Woodland Estate and founding the \textit{Jathyaikya Samgham}. In a letter dated 24 May, 1889, to Dr. Bernard, Archbishop of Verapoly, Fr. Nidhiry wrote:

\begin{quote}
“I tried my best to acquire the friendship of all the Jacobite prelates and many of the chief members of their community, both clergy and laity, and after long discussions and consultations for many years I got their consent to make an association which, as Your Grace many have known, was called the Syrian National Union Association, and bought the property, which is at present called ‘Manorama’
\end{quote}
in the name of Mar Dionysius and myself as founders of such an association in order to establish there a college which should be conducted by European Roman Catholic teachers and likewise got the secret consent of Mar Dionysius to abjure Jacobitism and become Catholic after the establishment of such a college. Moreover, I took Mar Dionysius secretly to the residence of H.E Mgr. Ajuti, the then Delegate, at Ootacamund to consult about the establishment of that college and further steps to be taken for the conversion of the whole community of Jacobites. But, alas, the whole plan was upset by the opposition of his Lordship Mgr. Lavigne, who thought the conversion of the Jacobites was a very easy matter, as their head, Mar Dionysius, was in our favour and that to establish a Jesuit College on the proposed spot would be better than a joint college of Syrians and, therefore, pressed me and Mar Dionysius to make over the property in his Lordship’s name and, when we did not consent to that, His Lordship compelled me to quit the Association, bungalow and property which were in my sole possession and consequently the Jacobites became masters of the same”.

To Fr. Nidhiry, the Jacobite reunion was an issue of paramount importance. His approach to the problem was basically different from that of his superior. He had, more than any of his contemporaries, a strong sense of Syrian unity. The Jacobites and Catholics belonged
to the same community, tradition and culture. The Syrian National Union Association was formed with the hope of achieving reunion later on\textsuperscript{38}. The background had been prepared and he hoped that the goal could be reached without delay. The hasty decision of Mgr. Lavigne spoiled the reunion proposals. Fr.Mathai Palakunnel considered that the hope of reunion was lost forever \textsuperscript{39}.

3.11 Mellano’s Agliardi’s and Aiuti’s attitudes towards the association

Mellano sent the statutes to Propaganda Fide\textsuperscript{40} with the following observations approved by Marcelline and other missionaries of the Varapuzha Mission, who were elderly and capable of making a judgement\textsuperscript{41}.

The idea of such an association seemed to be based on the false supposition that the Malabarians of the Suriani rite belonged to a different caste from the other Malabarians, and from that point of view it would be ridiculous.

The union of Catholics and Jacobites in the same common association governed by general vote or, better to say, by few supporters of revolutionaries was contrary to the spirit of the Catholic Church.

The financial part of the project would be an incessant source of quarrel. Instead of the conversion of the Jacobites, there was the danger of the perversion of the Catholics. Aiuti appreciated Nidhiry very much, had his distrust for the Association under Nidhirys leadership, the collaboration between Nidhiry’s and Mar Dionysius. One being Catholic and the other Jacobite, are Suriani (Christians) and therefore they do not have any other aim or other fundamental desire than
seeing their nation independent from foreigners and glorious in the way they deem, ie, bishops of their rite. The Catholicism for the one and the Jacobitism for the other are nothing but means toward that aim, and whatever pressure they might bring.\textsuperscript{42} Later, in April 1888, when Nidhiry, as Mar Dionysius’ interpreter, and Lavigne reached Aiuti’s residence at Ooty, Ajuti managed to convince Nidhiry that the realisation of the project was impossible. Ajuti was aware that if the Catholics stepped back from the association to obey the Holy See’s order, they would not be able to claim the property bought jointly in Kottayam, since the civil law would not be in favour of the party which abandoned the common project. Ajuti tried to convince Nidhiry of both the imposibility of actualizing the association and the question of finance that would originate from his stepping back. Thus, the attempt for the Nazarani Jathyaiykyam Samgham was aborted through Aiuti’s diplomatic approach. Still, the reunion attempts of Mar Dionysius continued with Nidhiry himself as the intermediary.

3.12 Mar Dionysius’ Reunion Attempts

Mar Dionysius was the head of the Jacobite Syrian Christians of Malabar, having his residence in Kottayam. The history of the Jacobites in Malabar went back to the Koonan Cross Oath taken on January 3, 1653, in the Mattancherry church when a large number of the Syrian Catholics took an Oath against Archbishop Francis Garcia. Eventually, on Pentecost Sunday, May 22, 1663, twelve priests imposed hands on the Archdeacon calling him Archbishop Mar Thoma I. In 1665, Mar Thoma I invited Mar Gregorios, a Jacobite bishop, who propagated
Jacobitism among his followers. In 1772, Mar Thoma VI received episcopal consecration from the Jacobite bishop, Mar Gregory, and took the name Mar Dionysius. His attempts for reunion through Mar Cariattil were not accomplished. One late night in February 1874, Mar Dionysius, along with a Catholic priest, his friend, visited Mellano at his residence expressing his desire to reunite with the church along with his people and clergy. From 1868 onwards, Mellano worked for the eventual conversion of the Jacobites, intending mainly the conversion of individuals rather than the whole community.

The main points under discussion were:

1) Whether the Jacobite priests would be recognized as they were;
2) Whether they would be allowed to practise ministry;
3) Whether and what dispositions would be adopted in regard to the married clergy (possible past and future considerations);
4) What would be prescribed about the materia of the Eucharist;
5) Which rite would the Jacobites follow.

On 26th April, 1888, Mar Dionysius, along with Lavinge and Nidhiry, reached the residence of the Apostolic Delegate Aiuti at Ooty, where they remained until April 28, 1888. Mar Dionysius, who was waiting for the court decision of the civil court cases, asked Lavigne for a loan of 20 to 25 thousand rupees, which he intended to offer to the Thiruvithamcore Rajah to effect a favourable decision. Lavigne stated that such a large loan was impossible simply because he did not have that amount. Following the counsel Marcelline gave him, when he approached him in the past with the same question, Mar
Dionysius decided to write to the Holy Father. The questions regarding the reunion included the following;

1. Whether the Jacobite hierarchy would be conserved;

2. Whether Mar Dionysius and the other bishops who converted along with him would be left in their respective sees, and whether they would be provided with an annual financial allowance unless there were another stable provision for their subsistence;

3. Whether married priests at the time of the reunion would continue to live with their wives, by requiring celibacy of the unmarried priests and also those who would become priests afterwards;

4. Whether the clergy and people would be permitted to keep the Maronite Catholic rite of the missal and the breviary;

5. Whether some college or seminary would be established for them through one or more religious institutes so that they might save the clergy and people from tremendous ignorance.

Mar Dionysius also asked for a considerable number of missals and breviaries as well as some copies of the works of St. Ephrem.

3.13 Propaganda's General Meeting on June 25, 1888

Fr. Jerome of Immaculate Conception, O.C.D, General of the Carmelites and Consultor of Propaganda Fide, was entrusted by the Cardinal Prefect to study the question of Mar Dionysius' conversion.
On June 25, 1888, the general meeting of Propaganda Fide took the matter under discussion and made the following decisions.

1. That the General meeting suggested an examination of the Baptism, form and the mode in use by the Jacobites in order to stabilize norms for the future.

2. That the Apostolic Delegate, through the Apostolic Vicars of Kottayam and Trichur, should explore whether or not the actual bishops were validly consecrated; they could be received accordingly, but if found null or dubious, they were to be consecrated absolutely or conditionally according to each case.

3&4 That their hierarchy be conserved with the converting bishops having jurisdiction in their respective sees and the converted priests allowed to exercise their occupations in their respective offices.48

5. That they be allowed to maintain their rite after examining the books and use of the rituals of the Jacobites;

6. That regarding the use of leavened bread the Apostolic Delegate should try to eliminate it but, in case of difficulty, he should collect information on the quantity of salt and oil used and the motive for such a mixing:

7. That there was no problem regarding priests married before their ordination, but the case of each priest married after ordination would be treated individually. For the future, the Apostolic Delegate should investigate whether there was and is any basis for Mar Dionysius’ declaration in favour of celibacy;
8. That Mar Dionysius’ requests, for subsistence and books were to be answered positively;

9. That Aiuti should continue encouraging the good dispositions of Mar Dionysius. The Holy Father approved the decision of the Cardinals on the same day.

3.14 Mar Dionysius’ Letter to the Holy Father

Mar Dionysius gave his reasons for the delay in writing to the Holy Father that there was no one at his disposal in whom he had full confidence to translate the letter into English and he was reluctant to think that, in his first approach, he had to ask money from the Holy Father, and Aiuti thought both reasons could be true. Aiuti wanted Nidhiry to know the causes for the delay and to encourage him to allay the fears of the Jacobite prelate, to which Nidhiry replied.

“I do not believe that Mar Dionysius is afraid to write to His Holiness. He only fears the people and the Patriarch for the reason that if they might become aware of his intentions before the propitious time, his plan of action would be received. But I assured him that in this matter the Holy See and Your Excellency would observe the strictest confidence, which they (Holy See and Aiuti) will not violate as the Carmelites did previously.”

Finally, on August 11, 1888, Mar Dionysius wrote to the Holy Father, and sent his letter to Aiuti with a covering letter in English, written by
In his letter to Aiuti he clarified, “the Royal appeal which I mention of in that letter is to come on within two or three months. Therefore if I am to get any help I desire that it should be as early as possible”. As soon as Nidhiry received Aiuti’s letter, he sent to Mar Dionysius and gave him the word-for-word translation. Mar Dionysius was not pleased with the reply from Rome and informed Nidhiry that he already had received 10,000/- rupees from one friend and another had promised to give him an additional 10,000/- Nidhiry reported that Mar Dionysius’ reaction to Rome’s reply (the letter) did not create a good impression on him. His Grace declared to me that his hope in the magnanimity of the Holy See was deluded and that he found a private individual friend more truthful, and that if he had placed his whole confidence in the Holy See only, he would now be a victim of the wickedness of the Protestants. Mar Dionysius expressed his displeasure at Rome’s refusal of the idea of a lower school by the National Union of Catholics and Jacobites, and told Nidhiry,

“that to him no other alternative remains than that of opening a school in the place that was previously bought with the purpose of establishing a school under the title ‘School of National Union’...

Mr. Dharrah was said to have advised him to start a school for the Jacobites in case the Catholics refused to join and promised to pay for the building and its maintenance. Nidhiry continued. Finally, Mar Dionysius with a profound sigh and with tears in his eyes told me:
“Dear Father Nidhiry, let us not be discouraged, but let us hope that our works of these preceding 12 years will be crowned with good success through the grace of the Almighty God; but let us pray also that he may illuminate the mind of those dignitaries of the Catholic Church so that they may perceive that these are the better means to unite the Suriani Jacobites to their Catholic brothers.”

Though the reply from Rome for financial assistance and for the joined project of education was not encouraging, Mar Dionysius carried on his aspiration to reunite.

3.15 Mar Dionysius’ continued Attempts

Mar Dionysius persisted in his attempts for reunion. He asked Aiuti for an extract of the decisions of the congregation which Aiuti sent through Nidhiry asking him to translate it into Malayalam and to help him as far as possible. Without delay, Nidhiry wrote to Aiuti with a reply from Mar Dionysius.

The Catholics were given strict regulations regarding their relationships with the Jacobites. Seeing that the two Apostolic Vicars for the Suriani Catholics delayed considerably in renewing the regulations for their subjects Aiuti exhorted them to fulfil the promise they made to him. The union of Jacobites and Catholics for the educational institutions was prohibited by the Holy See. “However, there were
also other circumstances in which the Jacobites and the less stable Catholics sought to fraternize always with the intention of arriving at the formation of the National Union". The Suriani Catholics were under all conditions prohibited from the following acts.

1. To co-operate with the Jacobites in the religious ceremonies that they made in their houses on the occasion of the death of some heretics and to give on various occasions to the priests or to others the sign of peace called to Casthuri;

2. To kindle lamps and to hang out the clothes on the streets when a Jacobites procession passed in front of the Catholics’ houses; and

3. To take part in the nuptial feasts of Jacobites or to go to their churches when they celebrated their services.

From Aiutis’ own personal observation and from what he heard from zealous persons worthy to be believed, these prohibitions were seldom observed and could produce very harmful effects. Aiuti also feared that, in the event of agitation, any Catholic Church might unite with the Jacobites and the loss would be irreparable. Therefore, Aiuti wanted Lavigne and Medlycott to renew the prohibitions in an efficacious way, reinforcing them by a sanction that might be suitable for the observance.

Lavigne and Medlycott published Aiuti’s letter with a pastoral letter. Mar Dionysius’ reaction to the circular letter was made clear in Aiuti’s letter to Rome.
“I learned a little that Mar Dionysius found it very much annoying that such a publication had definitively and irreparably shattered his perception. This prelate has a fixed idea, as is well known, to make a union of Jacobites and Catholics of Malabar in one and single nation, and to become the spiritual head of the same under the possible name of the Jacobite Patriarch of Malabar, reuniting under him all united together in schism, Catholics and Jacobites.”

In the High Court of Thiruvanathapuram, Mar Dionysius won the case against Mar Athanasius, the protestantising Jacobite Bishop and after the victory, his people went on making a feast for him wherever he was present. After recalling the oath of the forefathers at Mattancherry, ie, the Koonan Cross Oath, stating how some Suriani Christians approached Antioch to have bishops, which fulfilled their wish to have native bishops.

3.16 Nazrani Deepika

It was thought most desirable to start a journal to further the cause of reunion. It was argued that such a journal would not only disseminate Christian ideas but also bring the dissident and Catholic St. Thomas Christians closer. When the scheme was finalised, Mgr. Marcelline gave the necessary permission. Since there was a press at Mannanam, it was easy to get the new journal printed there. Fr. Nidhiry, realizing the importance of the journal for the larger cause
of Syrian Christian unity, took the responsibility of the paper. The new venture was begun in April 1887. Fr. Nidhiry signed the declaration before the government. He became the founder and first editor of the *Nazrani Deepika*. The name suggested implied the very aim of the journal as a Light of Syrian Christians. The first editorial was a call for Christian unity a theme uppermost in the minds of many Syrian Christians of the time, both Catholics and non-Catholics. The content and tone of the journal reflected the religious beliefs of the Christians. In starting a journal, the St. Thomas Christians had recognized the need for an organ that would truthfully depict the dangers facing the St. Thomas Christian community.

### 3.17 The Malayali Memorial

The political issues of the time helped the St. Thomas Christians of various denominations to come closer. Although the St. Thomas Christians were an important segment of Malabar society, they were not treated fairly in the matter of government services and jobs. It was an interesting feature that Travancore and Cochin had a larger Christian population than any other native State in India. The numerical strength of the Christians increased during the course of the nineteenth century. Still they were not considered favourably for the public services of Travancore and Cochin. Most of the vacancies of the Travancore and Cochin civil services were occupied by the non-Malayali Brahmins who came from outside. The bureaucratic dominance of non-Malayali Brahmins infuriated both Nayars and Christians. Dissatisfied with their non-appointment to the highest offices of the State, the Nayars
sought the co-operation of the Christians for a better deal. The St. Thomas Christians, too, could not keep aloof from the burning issue of the day. The Christians of all denominations supported the move and their representatives signed the memorial known as Malayali Memorial, which was submitted to His Highness the Maharaja of Travancore on January 1891.

The Malayali Memorial was an occasion for many Christian groups to come together as one Christian community, forgetting their denominational differences. This prepared the ground for closer ties among them. For the Catholic St. Thomas Christians, it was actually an extension of the principle for which they were fighting inside the Church. The Catholic Syrian leader, Fr. Nidhiry, came out in open support of the movement. He addressed a public meeting at Kottayam. The Malayala Manorama reported:

“A huge crowd gathered in the local public library to consider His Highness the Maharaja’s reply to the Memorial submitted by the people of Travancore regarding their rights for government service. People belonging to the Nayar, Ezhava, Syrian Catholic, non-Catholic and Protestant Christian communities were present at the meeting. Besides the crowd inside the library, such a large number stood outside that the traffic was virtually blocked until the gathering dispersed.”

Archbishop Mar Athanasius presided. After the presidential address, Fr. Nidhiry spoke the following words: “I do not see any reason why
Christians should not be appointed in the Revenue Department. During the reign of Her Highness Lakshmi Bhai there were no fewer than two hundred Christians in government service". He gave statistics of the officials in each department and the number of Christians was found to be so small as to give a painful shock to any one. In great detail, he elaborated the services of the Christians in the educational field and highlighted their ability to hold any kind of job.

A deputation was arranged to meet the king. Mr. Cyriac Nidhiry (brother of Fr. Nidhiry) represented the Christians on the six-men deputation that met the Dewan. The Christian participation in this anti-Brahmin movement benefited only the Nair community. They gained some political benefits and favours. The Christians who were more numerous and more educated than the Nairs got only 749 jobs. This was far too small a number, taking into consideration their education and economic strength. This disappointed the Christians. They felt the necessity of reuniting as a community and fighting for their political rights. The community which was divided into various denominations showed the willingness to come together for getting their grievances redressed.

The fact that reunion could be worked out at the social and political level was a novel idea, and the credit goes to Fr. Emmanuel Nidhiry. So also, in the 1880’s, the idea that the Catholic clergy could work in union with the clergy of any other Christian church was novel to all and reprehensible to many. Even the fact that it was permitted, adds to the credit of Fr. Nidhiry. The historical importance of the reunion at the social, cultural and political levels is not what it
achieved; that was pretty little, but what it should achieve. It set an example for Christian unity and provided a common platform for two hitherto antagonistic churches to work together in social, educational and political fields. The problems it created, the antagonism it aroused and the bitterness it left behind, all show that the time was not ripe for the move; but still the move definitely initiated the spirit of Christian ecumenism.

3.18 Reasons for the failure of Reunion

The non-realization of reunion must be attributed to a complex of causes rather than to a single cause. The main obstacle to the realization of reunion seems to have come primarily from the dissidents themselves. Secondly, the missionaries, both Padroado and Propaganda, who ruled the St. Thomas Christians, put many hurdles in the way of reunion. They failed to understand the emotional ties that bound the Catholic and dissident St. Thomas Christians together.

3.18.1 Attitude of the Dissident St. Thomas Christians

The history of the Puthenkuttukar till the twentieth century was characterized by continuous attempts for reunion with Rome. Throughout their attempts for reunion their minimum demand was that their Metropolitan must be received as a bishop. For them, it was only a just demand. They were not to understand why this demand could not be granted. There were many difficulties regarding the episcopal ordination of Archdeacon Thomas Parambil. His episcopal ordination was not a valid one. He was consecrated by twelve priests imposing their hands on him and proclaiming him Metropolitan Mar Thoma. This was not a
vailed procedure. Only a bishop could consecrate a new bishop; but the Archdeacon and his friends gave an excuse that the Pope had given authorization for this step through Athallah. The rebel Archdeacon also put conditions for reunion. He was prepared to rejoin the Catholic Church on condition that his episcopacy should be accepted. The missionaries were not willing to concede his request. It was clear that if he returned to the Catholic Church, he would have to be an ordinary priest. After going about as bishop for six years, he could not think of descending to be an ordinary priest. He decided that it was better to reign outside the Catholic Church than to serve inside it as an ordinary priest. Disappointed in his efforts to come to a settlement with the Catholic Church and also to save his face, he turned to the Patriarch of Antioch for help. At Mar Thoma’s request, Mar Gregorios, the Metropolitan of Jerusalem, came to Malabar in 1665. His arrival made the move towards reunion still more difficult.

3.18.2 The Attitude of the Missionaries

The reunion of all the St.Thomas Christians was delayed considerably by the attitude adopted by the Carmelite missionaries. When Mar Alexander Parambil requested for a coadjutor, the Carmelites, though they had been asked by Rome to elect a native, elected a Latin rite priest, Raphel Figueredo Salgado. This was a severe blow to the reunion movement. Raphael Figuere do had no interest in the unity of all the St.Thomas Christians. He viewed Mar Alexander Parampil and the St.Thomas Christians with hostility. His election closed the hope of a return of the rebel archdeacon and his supporters who were unwilling to be under the Latin Bishops.
The Carmelite Missionaries adopted an indifferent attitude towards the reunion proposal of Mar Dionysius I. Mgr. Florence, Vicar Apostolic of Malabar, showed no eagerness for the reunion of the Jacobites, for the Carmelites feared that they would lose their flock, the St. Thomas Christians. This fear was not unfounded, because they knew that the St. Thomas Christians disliked them. Consequently, if they got a bishop of their own rite and race, all would join him. The Vicar Apostolic took great precaution “not to encourage the nation’s desire to have its own bishop or head of its rite, because if this were conceded to the people..there would be evident danger of the same nation separating itself abruptly or at least gradually from its dependence on the Vicar Apostolic”. Bishop Sales made it clear that if Mar Thoma was allowed to be received into the Catholic Church, he would be given only a title other than that of bishop. Paulinus of St. Bartholomew, a Carmelite, wrote from Malabar to the Papal Nuncio in Lisbon: “Indians are incapable of governing. If the Syrians are removed from under the Latin jurisdiction, we Latins will become weak ...” The Latin bishops entertained the fear that they would lose their authority if Mar Dionysius I was appointed the legitimate bishop of the St. Thomas Christians, as it would enable the Syrians to get united under their own leader.

3.18.3 New Laws and Statutes Perpetuated the Division

The Latin prelates who were ruling over them enacted many laws with sanctions, prohibiting co-operation with the dissidents in religious matters. The Statutes of the Vicariate of Verapoly promulgated
in 1879 by Bishop Leonard Louis prohibited the Catholics from taking part in the funeral service of the Puthenkuttukar and in their celebrations of ‘Pulikuli’, “Sraddha” and the like, and putting “dakshina” and receiving the “pax” from their minister and exchanging it with others. It also prohibited them from showing veneration during their procession by lighting lamps or covering the route of the procession with mats, or by other similar deeds. These customs were prohibited with sanction of one month’s public penance. These prohibitions divided the community perpetually. A similar prohibition also was imposed with regard to mixed marriages with the Puthenkattukar. If any Catholic gave his daughter to be married to a Jacobite, the father of the girl or her guardian who acted in place of the father was to be excommunicated and all those who in any way helped arranging the marriage also were to be excommunicated. Further, absolution from these sins was reserved to the bishop. These and similar laws helped to make the division among the St.Thomas Christians permanent. But it is interesting to note that these legislations are based on the Latin influence and customs without understanding the spirit of the oriental customs.

3.18.4 The Attitude of Rome Towards Reunion

The Roman Congregation of the Propaganda had difficulties regarding the episcopacy of Mar Thoma and his successors, as they had been intruders without any episcopal character. The Sacred Congregation feared that some of them, being old, would be weak and be a seduced to leave their office and appoint their successors from their own family. It would be dangerous precedent and a bad
example for the future. Some of them, while remaining interiorly schismatics, could pretend externally to be Catholics and consecrate heretical bishops.

In spite of all these difficulties, the Congregation showed willingness to confer Holy Orders on Mar Thoma V, at some opportune time, provided he showed true repentance. To prove his genuine repentance, he was asked to abjure all episcopal rights and powers. He was also told that he would not be given any episcopal jurisdiction, but had to be content with the episcopal character and title. The Roman Congregation thought that episcopal jurisdiction granted to the Archdeacon would be a threat to the authority of the Vicar Apostolic, who had jurisdiction over the Catholic Syrians.

Regarding the use of leavened bread in Holy Mass, the Congregation had both theological and practical objections. It observed that Jesus Christ had used unleavened bread in the institution of the Holy Eucharist and that the permission to use leavened bread would help the Archdeacon retain his heresy and make his conversion doubtful. The preservation of the Syrian rite or a claim for it was suspected of heresy. It was too early for Rome to think of a local hierarchy. On the question of the reunion of Mar Thoma VI, Rome was very cautious in the matter. It seems that Rome was unwilling to grant any jurisdictional power to the reuniting bishop. Besides, the Holy See was reluctant to allow any further relations with the Chaldean Syrians. The fear of Rome was that it would help the Syrians to fall into heresy.

The idea of receiving the Malankara bishop into the Catholic Church with jurisdiction over his people was unacceptable to Rome at
this stage. This attitude of Rome was clearly reflected in Bishop Francis’ refusal to grant jurisdiction to Mar Thoma even over a minimum number of three or four churches that would be reunited with him. Bishop Sales considered this ‘neither advisable nor feasible’.  

The Sacred Congregation had many difficulties to receive Mar Dionysius I into Catholic Church. Mgr. Emmanuel, bishop of Cochin, was delegated to receive Mar Thoma VI into the Catholic church after absolving him from all ecclesiastical censures and irregularities. But the final judgement on the validity of his episcopal consecration was reserved to the Holy See. It seems that at this stage Rome was willing to grant episcopal jurisdiction to Mar Thoma VI, if the validity of his consecration could uncontestably be proved, and to confer episcopal consecration in case he would not be validly consecrated, provided the local authorities were not against it. Reports were sent to the Congregation both by the Propagandist and Padroadist missionaries and Rome favoured the idea of granting independent jurisdiction to Mar Thoma VI over his people. When Dr. Cariattil was nominated Archbishop of Cranganore, the Congregation thought it expedient not to entrust the whole affair to him. In the instruction given to him on 10th July 1784, he was reminded that the granting of episcopal jurisdiction to Mar Thoma VI was reserved to the Holy See. But the sudden death of Dr. Cariattil put an end to the hope of reunion.

After his death, the Sacred Congregation on 18th February 1788, took another step to satisfy the demands of the reuniting people of the Malankara Church. All that Rome insisted was that the reuniting
party make their profession of faith according to the formula of Pope Urban VIII. “The Congregation seems to have been concerned now only with the integrity of faith”. The granting of episcopal jurisdiction to Mar Thoma VI over his own people was no longer a problem. Rome was even ready to reconsecrate Mar Thoma VI if necessary.

At this stage, the Holy See was ready to meet all the demands of Mar Thoma and his followers, including the privilege of electing their own bishop. Even to the repeated attempts of Fr. Paulinus to change the attitude of the Congregation, it had replied, “instructions given earlier are to be followed”. But the negotiations with the Bishop of Cochin were suspended on account of the intervention of Vicar Apostolic Aloysius of Malabar, who hastened to inform that neither Bishop Soledade nor Archbishop Emmanuel of Goa had the special faculties needed to settle such an important case. So both Bishop Soledade and Archbishop Emmanuel of Goa lost courage and waited for fresh orders from Rome. It is to be noted that on 7 February, 1792, the Propaganda Congregation had, in its instruction to the Vicar Apostolic, made it clear that there was no need of waiting for any further permission to receive Mar Dionysius and his people, provided they made the profession of faith according to the formula prescribed by Urban VIII, though the conferring of episcopal jurisdiction to Mar Dionysius over the reuniting churches was reserved to the Holy See.

On July 28, 1794, the Sacred Congregation once again commissioned Mgr. Emmanuel, Archbishop of Goa, to handle the case
and granted him faculties which had earlier been given to Archbishop Cariattil. The faculty granted to the Archbishop of Goa by the Pope, says Podipara, did not go beyond accepting Mar Dionysius I as a priest.\textsuperscript{95}

But more than twenty years of tiresome efforts for such a noble cause were deplorably frustrated by the self-interest of a few church dignitaries and everything ended in confusion. In all this one can discern the Padroado interests clashing against the Propaganda interests\textsuperscript{96}. The St. Thomas Christians lamented the indifferent attitude of the Catholic dignitaries who refused to hand over the jurisdiction to the indigenous leadership. On the other hand, the Catholic dignitaries accused Mar Dionysius of ambition and insincerity in proposing that all the syrians should be brought under his jurisdiction.

The Holy See adopted a sympathetic attitude towards Dionysius V’s reunion attempt. The Propaganda Congregation decided that the reuniting clergy could be received in their dignity and office, provided the validity of their baptism and holy orders was ascertained.\textsuperscript{97} With regard to the retention of their rite, the Holy See gave an affirmative answer with the understanding that deviations would be corrected and books and rituals would be examined, following the principles already stated by Benedict XIV. The question of the use of leavened bread in the Holy Mass did not cause any difficulty. For, by that time the use of leavened or unleavened bread was viewed as a matter of mere ecclesiastical tradition and custom. Thus, the Holy See unhesitatingly allowed the continuation of the practice of celebrating the Holy Mass
with leavened bread. Since by this time among the Jacobites marriage of clerics was considered to be the normal rule and clerical celibacy its exception, special provision was made to allow the married clergy to continue in their married state, while making clerical celibacy obligatory for those who wanted to enter the priesthood. The Holy See had given all the faculties to Mgr. Ajuti to receive Mar Dionysius V into the Catholic Church. The Delegate Apostolic writing to Fr. Nidhiry on 14th January 1888 informed:

“....it is better if you could remind him (Mar Dionysius) that I have been granted by the Holy See all the necessary faculties for handling the case .....”

Accepting the invitation, Mar Dionysius held discussions with the Delegate Apostolic. But as the negotiations proceeded, the chances of reunion receded.

It is quite clear, therefore, that the Holy See was lenient to the demands of the reuniting group, provided those were helpful and conducive to the final goal of unity. However, as in the previous cases, this time too the long-cherished hope of reunion was not realised.
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