

W. R. PHILIPPS

"THE CONNECTION OF ST. THOMAS  
THE APOSTLE WITH INDIA"

INDIAN ANTIQUARY

5

As regards the Greek and Latin versions of these Acts, it may be convenient here first to quote what Mr. Alexander Walker said about them in the introduction to his English translation of *Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, and Revelations*, published at Edinburgh in 1870. Writing first of the Greek Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles in general, he said:—

"These stories came at length to form a sort of apostolic cycle . . . They exist also in a Latin form in the ten books of the Acts of the Apostles, compiled probably in the sixth century, and falsely attributed to Abdias, the first bishop of Babylon, by whom it was, of course, written in Hebrew."

Afterwards coming to the Acts of St. Thomas, he wrote:—

"The substance of this book is of great antiquity, and in its original form it was held in great estimation by the heretics of the first and second centuries. The main heresy which it contained was that the Apostle Thomas baptiz'd, not with water, but with oil only. It is mentioned by Epiphanius, Turribius, and Nicephorus, condemned in the decree of Gelasius, and in the Synopsis of Scripture ascribed to Athanasius, in which it is placed, along with the Acts of Peter, Acts of John, and other books, among the *Antilegomena*. St. Augustine in three passages refers to the book in such a way as to show that he had it in something very like its present form. Two centuries later, Pseudo-Abdias made a recension of the book, rejecting the more heretical portions, and adapting it generally to orthodox use. Photius attributes the authorship of this document, as of many other apocryphal Acts, to Lucius Charinus.

"The Greek text was first edited, with copious notes and prolegomena, by Thilo in 1823. The text from which the present translation is made is a recension of five MSS., the oldest of the tenth century."

Then as regards The Consummation of Thomas, he wrote:—

"This is properly a portion of the preceding book. Pseudo-Abdias follows it very closely, but the Greek of some chapters of his translation or compilation has not yet been discovered.

"The text, edited by Tischendorf for the first time, is from a MS. of the eleventh century."

These extracts, though now rather out of date, even as regards the Greek text, will give an idea of the age and authority of the Acts. Mr. Walker wrote before the publication of the Syriac version, and does not seem to have been aware of its existence.

The Syriac text was first published for the first time by Dr. W. Wright in 1871, in *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*, 2 Vols., London, 1871. Till then, only the Greek and Latin had been available, and Dr. Wright wrote in his preface (Vol. I, p. XLII), "we have here for the first time the Acts [of St. Thomas] in a nearly complete form."

The Syriac text edited by Dr. Wright was from a MS. in the British Museum (Add. 14645), written 1875. From internal evidence he dated the composition not later than the 4th century. Mr. E. C. Bickart, on additional evidence, says— "I do not think we shall be far wrong if we put the date of our Acts before the middle of the 3rd century." (*Early Christianity outside the Roman Empire*, Cambridge, 1899, p. 76.)

Since Dr. Wright published his text, two additional Syriac texts have come to light. These are the MS. in the Sachau collection at Berlin, and the MS. in the Cambridge University Library.

Mr. Tischendorf says of the Sachau MS. that it is later than the British Museum one, and has an interpolated text, though he expresses no opinion as to the date. The Cambridge MS. is a transcript of the Sachau one. (*Studia Sacra*, No. 15, London, 1869, Appendix VII.)

With the Syriac text recently discovered fragments which have been edited and translated by Mr. Tischendorf. (*Studia Sacra*, Nos. IX., X., XI., XII., XIII., XIV., and XVI., London, 1870. As far as they go,

they generally confirm the British Museum text; the differences in no way affect the story. The interest of these fragments for us consists in the fact that they are at least 400 years older than any other known text. Mr. Burkitt thinks they cannot be later than the beginning of the 6th century, and may be fifty years earlier.

Since the discovery and publication of the Syriac version, it has, I think, been satisfactorily established that the Acts were originally composed in that language, — that the Greek versions, though less complete, are substantially translations from the Syriac, — and that the Latin are taken from the Greek. (See paper by Mr. F. C. Burkitt, *The Original Language of the Acts of Judas Thomas*,<sup>1</sup> in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. I. No. 2, Jan. 1900.)

The Syriac may therefore be regarded as the original, and it is also the fullest version. We had better, therefore, take the story of St. Thomas from it, using the Greek and Latin only where they differ in the details with which we are concerned.

I have not yet been able to refer to the Ethiopic version; but that probably does not matter. Mr. Burkitt says, it "is mixed up with the alternative Acts of St. Thomas at Kentera," and "This alternative book of Acts, lately discovered and edited by Dr. M. R. James, is a late work, but certainly of Greek origin." (*Journal of Theological Studies*, Jan. 1900.) Reference may, however, be made to two works, which contain Ethiopic versions: they are — S. C. Malan, *The Conflicts of the Apostles*, London, 1871; and E. A. W. Budge, *The Contendings of the Apostles*, 2 Vols., London, 1901.

For the Syriac, we will follow Dr. Wright's translation which fills 153 octavo pages. For the Greek and Latin, we may go to Max Bonnet's *Acta Thomae*, published at Leipzig in 1883. This is an elaborate work with collations of all known Greek and Latin MSS. and other printed editions. Mr. Burkitt says it is the best edition. (*Journal of Theological Studies*, Jan. 1900.)

As Dr. Wright's translation of the Syriac occupies 153 pages, it will be seen that these Acts in their complete form are of a considerable length. Nevertheless, all the particulars we want to take from them can be put down in a small space.

We are not here concerned with the ethical and doctrinal matter with which these Acts, especially the Syriac, as they have come down to us, are filled. What we want for our purposes, is mainly the record of St. Thomas' movements. We must pay attention to the geographical and proper names mentioned, and to such local details and colouring as may serve as indications of place and time. Keeping these ideas in view, I set down only such particulars of the story told in the Acts as are likely to be of use to us. The passages in inverted commas are actual quotations from Dr. Wright's translation.

1. — The Acts are divided into nine parts, of which eight are called "Acts," and the last "*The Consummation of Judas Thomas*."

2. — The first Act is headed: — "*The (first) Act of Judas Thomas the Apostle, when He (i. e., apparently our Lord) sold him to the Merchant Habban, that he might go down and convert India.*"

3. — This Act begins by telling us that the twelve apostles divided the countries of the world among themselves by lot, and that India fell to St. Thomas, who did not wish to go there.

<sup>1</sup> In the Syriac the book is called *The Acts of Judas Thomas*, i. e., "Judas the Twin." *Thomas* means "a twin" (Compare John xi. 16, xxi. 2.) The real name of the apostle St. Thomas was Judas, and the appellation *Thomas* or "the Twin" was added to distinguish him from others bearing the name Judas. (See W. Cureton's *Ancient Syriac Documents*, London, 1861, p. 111.)

In the story itself, the Apostle is commonly called Judas, not Thomas, both in the Syriac and in the best Greek MSS., as in the old Syriac Gospels and other very ancient Syriac documents. This use of the name Judas is one of the several minor proofs of the Syriac origin and antiquity of the Acts.

4. — At that time “a certain merchant, an Indian, happened to come into the South country “from . . . .” (The Syriac MS. in the British Museum is injured here, and the name is unfortunately illegible. It is of course of the first importance. I do not know if it is found in the Sachau MS. at Berlin or in the Cambridge MS. The Greek says only ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰνδίας. The Latin gives no name.)

The name of the merchant is given as Ḥabbān, and he had been sent by King Gūdnaphar to bring him a skilful carpenter.

5. — Our Lord appears to this merchant, and sells St. Thomas to him for “twenty (pieces) of silver.” In the bill of sale, which is quoted, Ḥabbān is described as “Ḥabbān the merchant of King “Gūdnaphar.”

6. — St. Thomas and Ḥabbān start by ship next day. On the ship, in answer to Ḥabbān's questions, St. Thomas told him he was skilled in “carpentering and architecture — the business of the “carpenter;” also : — “In wood I have learned to make ploughs and yokes and ox-goads, and oars “for ferry boats (*pontones*) and masts for ships; and in stone, tombstones and monuments, and “palaces for Kings.” Ḥabbān replies : — “And I was seeking just such an artificer.”

7. — “And they began to sail, because the breeze was steady, and they were sailing along gently, “until they put in at the town of Sandarūk.”

8. — They disembarked, and were going into the city, when they were told of the marriage feast of the King's only daughter, and that everyone was obliged to be present. So they thought they had better go.

9. — In the long account of what happened at Sandarūk, there is little to help us. But the following points may be noted : — (a) A Hebrew woman or girl (a flute-player) is mentioned as performing at the feast. (b) The bride and bridegroom were converted and ultimately followed St. Thomas to India. (c) St. Thomas and Ḥabbān left for India immediately after the feast. (d) The King was converted after the apostle's departure.

10. — The **second Act** is headed : — “*The second Act, when Thomas the Apostle entered into India, and built a Palace for the King in Heaven.*”

11. — It begins with the words : — “And when Judas had entered into the realm of India “with the merchant Ḥabbān, Ḥabbān went to salute Gūdnaphar, the King of India.”

12. — There is not much to be said about this Act. St. Thomas agrees to build a palace for the King, beginning in the month Teshrī (Oct.-Nov.) and finishing in Nisān (April). But he spends the money given to him for the purpose on the poor; and the meaning of building a palace in heaven is that, by using the royal funds in almsgiving, he was preparing for the King a heavenly habitation. The only additional proper name given is Gad, the name of the King's brother. St. Thomas preaches in the villages and cities. The King and his brother and many others are converted.

13. — The headings of **the next four Acts, Nos. 3 to 6**, are : — “*The third Act of Judas, regarding the Black Snake.*” — “*The fourth Act, of the Ass that spake.*” — “*The fifth Act, of the Demon that dwelt in the Woman.*” — “*The sixth Act, of the Young Man who killed the Girl.*” These Acts can be passed over. They relate certain miraculous events and conversions in and about the city of King Gūdnaphar. They do not contain any proper names or any particulars, geographical or otherwise, to help us.

14. — The **seventh Act** is more important. It is headed : — “*The seventh Act, how Judas Thomas was called by the General of King Mazdai to heal his Wife and Daughter.*” It begins with the words — “And while Judas was preaching throughout all India;” but it does not say where he was at the time, though the words quoted might imply an interval of years between the sixth and seventh Acts. However the general Šifūr, who speaks of himself as “a great man throughout all “India,” came for him. St. Thomas left his converts under the care of his deacon Xanthippus (or

Xenophon) and set out with Šifūr. They went with a "driver" in a "chariot" drawn by "cattle." There is nothing to indicate a long journey. So they reach the city of King Mazdai; and the Apostle heals the general's wife and daughter.

15. — The eighth Act. Then follows "*The Eighth Act, of Mygdonia and Karish.*" The events in this Act take place soon after what has been described in the seventh Act. The additional persons mentioned by name in this Act are:—

- |  |   |                                  |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| (a) Mygdonia, a noble lady.                          | } | (d) Tertia, wife of King Mazdai. |
| (b) Karish, her husband, and kinsman of King Mazdai. |   | (e) Vizān, son of King Mazdai.   |
| (c) Narkia, "nurse" of Mygdonia.                     |   | (f) Manashar, wife of Vizān.     |

It is the conversion of Mygdonia and Tertia that brings about the martyrdom of St. Thomas, as detailed in the final section of the book. Beyond these six names, there is little in the eighth Act to help us.

16. — While in prison, St. Thomas sings, and the first song put in his mouth is headed: — "The hymn of Judas Thomas the Apostle in the country of the Indians." But the "hymn" which follows this title is the famous Hymn of the Soul which went down to Egypt for the One Pearl, which modern scholars have ascribed to the Gnostic Bardaisan.

17. — There follows "The song of praise of Thomas the Apostle." And of this Mr. F. C. Burkitt says it is undoubtedly a genuine portion of the Acts. (*Early Christianity outside the Roman Empire*, p. 68.)

18. — The final section of the work is headed "*The Consummation of Judas Thomas.*" The apostle is condemned to death by King Mazdai, and his martyrdom is described. It takes place "outside the city" and "on the mountain." St. Thomas is speared to death by four soldiers.

19. — The story continues: — "And the brethren were weeping all together. And they brought goodly garments and many linen cloths, and buried Judas in the sepulchre in which the ancient kings were buried."

20. — Finally we are told that the bones of the apostle were taken away secretly by one of the brethren to the "West," and that this happened during the lifetime of King Mazdai and Šifūr.

Such is, briefly, the story of St. Thomas' connection with India as told in these Acts, which are generally supposed to be a work written for the purpose of spreading Gnostic teaching. Certain it is that their interest is chiefly doctrinal, and very little historical. It is possible, however, that, in the form of a religious romance, they embody some genuine details of the history of St. Thomas. It seems certain that they originated in a region (the Euphrates valley) which, as we shall see further on, was by early tradition associated with St. Thomas. The Acts would, therefore, seem more likely to contain some fragments of genuine history than would the case be if their origin had been Greek or Latin.

It is usual, I believe, to regard the Greek and Latin versions as, roughly speaking, abridgments and expurgated editions of the Syriac. There is, however, the possibility that the Syriac, as we now have it, has been very largely interpolated, and that the Greek and Latin, as a whole, give us a better idea of the Syriac work as it originally stood, than the more bulky Syriac version now extant.

But the doctrinal aspects of the Acts do not affect the use we have to make of them, and if we treat them as a historical record, the following appear to be the only suggestive points we are able to extract:—

#### 1. — Movements of St. Thomas.

(a) Note first the heading of the first Act: — "That he might go down and convert India."

(b) St. Thomas went by sea to the city of Sandarūk. The Syriac implies that he started from "the South Country." The Greek and one of the two Latin versions printed by Max Bonnet imply

started from Jerusalem. That would involve a preliminary journey by land. The other version says Habbān came to Caesarea by ship, and met the apostle there, and together they went by sea all the way.

Instead of Sandarūk, the Greek has Andrapolis. The first Latin version does not name the city, but says the journey was done within three months (instead of the usual three years), and that they arrived "in Indiam citeriorem" and "ingressi sunt primam Indiae civitatem." The other version names "Andranopolis," and says the apostle got there from Caesarea in seven days "plenis velis et prosperis ventis." The heading of the second Act seems to imply that Sandarūk was not in what was considered India proper at the time of the writer.

(c) St. Thomas next "entered into the realm of India and went to the court of Gūdnaphar the King of India." The Greek says "when he came into the cities of India" he went to the King in question. The first Latin version has "ad ulteriores Indiae partes processerat," and that the apostle "in ulteriorem Indiam commorari." The other names King Gūdnaphar's city as Elioforum, Hienoforum, or Hyroforum, and speaks of a mountain Gazus.

(d) St. Thomas preached "throughout all India." This might imply a number of years. The Greek has the same; the first Latin version has nothing to the point; the other says "profectus est . . . ad Indiam superiorem."

(e) St. Thomas goes to the city of King Mazdai, where he is put to death, outside the city, on a mountain. The name of the city is not given in the Syriac, Greek or Latin Acts. Calamina is the name in some ecclesiastical writings; we shall come to them afterwards.

(f) To the above indications of place we may add that the body of St. Thomas was afterwards carried away to the "West." The Greek says to Mesopotamia; the Latin, to Edissa or Edessa.

These particulars do not help us to any definite ideas of place.

I do not know if any one has attempted to locate the seaport city Sandarūk or Andrapolis. If we take the Latin to guide us, we should, I suppose, locate it on the coast west of the Indus; and that would be the meaning of "India citerior."

It is unfortunate that the name of the place from which Habbān came, cannot be deciphered in the Syriac text. It would help us to locate King Gūdnaphar, a most important point.

The statement in the Syriac, that the relics of the apostles were carried away to the "West," is worth remark. As we shall see further on, the fact that the relics were taken from India to Edessa rests on sources of information better than these Acts.

## 2. — Proper Names.

A table of all the proper names that occur in the Acts is given on the opposite page. Mr. Burkitt points out that most of the names in the Syriac text are not Syriac, but old Persian. Kōrēsh (Cyrus); as in the Sachau MS. (misspelt Karīsh in the British Museum MS.), Mazdai, Vizān, Manashar, are all, he says, good old Persian names. Mazdai was the name of the well-known satrap of Babylonia known to the Greeks as Maçāios, who died 328 B. C. Sandarūk reminds him of a similar word at the beginning of "the essentially Syriac Romance of Julian," a work assigned by Wright to the 6th century. (See *Short History of Syriac Literature*, London, 1894, p. 101.)

Mygdonia (or Magdonia) is another name for Nisibis. Habbān has a Semitic look. (*Early Christianity outside the Roman Empire*, pp. 68 and 72; *Journal of Theological Studies*, Jan. 1900.) The fact that Kōrēsh (Cyrus) has become in the Greek *Xapīσιος*, instead of *Kēπος*, is suggestive of a blundering translator, and seems to be one of the many minor indications that the original was Syriac.

The Persian names, so far as they prove anything, seem to exclude the idea that the scene of St. Thomas' death was in South India.

Proper names contained in the Syriac Acts of St. Thomas, and the corresponding names in Greek and Latin versions.

	Syriac.	Greek.	Latin.	
1	Habbān.	Ἀββάνης.	Abban. Albanes.	Arabic, Habbān. See Dr. Wright's translation, p. 146, footnote. The merchant sent from India by King Gudnaphar to bring him an artificer.
2	Gūdnap̄har. Gundaphar.	Γουνδαφόρος. Γουνδιαφόρος. Γουντάφορος.	Gundaforus. Gundoforus.	The King of India" (Syriac): ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰνδῶν (Greek): "Rex Indiae," "Rex Indorum" (Latin).
3	Sandarūk. Sanadrūk.	Ἀνδράπολις.	Andranopolis. Andranobolys. Andronopolis. Adrianopolis.	City of an unnamed king: a seaport.
4	Gad.	Γὰδ.	Gad.	Brother of Gūdnap̄har. "Gad" seems to have been the name of a Babylonian deity in the time of Isaiah (say 8th century B. C.). See Is. lxx, 11, A. V., margin.
5	Mazdai.	Μισδαῖος. Μισδέος.	Misdeus. Mesdens. Migdeus.	A king in India ("India superior," according to some Latin versions).
6	Šifūr.	Σίφαρ. Σιφάρ. Σίφορος. Σιφώρας. Σήμφορος.	Saphor. Saphyr. Sapot. Siforus. Sephor. Siforatus. Sinforns. Sinfurus. Symphoras.	The General of King Mazdai.
7	Xanthippus.	Ξανοφῶν.	.....	Deacon of St. Thomas. Not named in the Latin.
8	Karīsh (Brit. Mus.) Kōrēsh (Sachau).	Χαρίσιος.	Charisius. Caritius. Kritius. Carisius. Carissius.	Kinsman of King Mazdai. Kōrēsh is the Syriac for Cyrus.
9	Mygdonia.	Μυγδονία.	Mygdonia. Migdonia.	Wife of Karīsh.
10	Narkia.	Μαρκία. Ναρκία.	Narchia. Marehia.	Nurse of Mygdonia.
11	Tertia.	Τερτία. Τερεντιανή. Τερτιανή.	Treptia. Tertia. Trepicia. Triplicia.	Wife of King Mazdai.
12	Vizān.	Ουαζάνης. Ἰουζάνης. Ἰουαζάνης. Ἀζάνης.	Zuzanes. Zuzani. Zuzanius. Luzanis. Oazanes.	Son of King Mazdai.
13	Manashar.	Μνησάρα. Λνισάρα. Σεμνησάρα. Σισάρα.	Manasara. Manazara.	Wife of Vizān.

## 3. — Other particulars.

Of other particulars that may serve as indications of place and time, there are few, if any, in the Acts. In fact, if we leave out the proper names, these Acts might refer to any ancient countries where there were kings and cities. However, in the short outline of the story given above, a few particulars have been noted that may be of service. We might expect some references to the religions of the countries, and to their priests or ministers; but there are none. The references to plants and animals, ships, buildings, furniture, carriages, money, musical instruments, implements, clothes, etc., yield no information. We can hardly infer anything of the social condition or customs of the people from these references.

*Plants.* — The only plant named is the myrtle. A "cane" is mentioned as used for taking the measurements of the palace to be built for King Gūdnaphar.

*Animals.* — The animals named are a lion and dogs at Sandarūk, a black deadly poisonous snake and an ass's colt near the city of King Gūdnaphar, the "cattle" (Greek *ἵππους*) which drew the "chariot" when St. Thomas journeyed with Šifūr to the city of King Mazdai, and a troop of wild asses encountered on the way. Wild asses are found in the Indus Valley; but they are also found in Beluchistan, Persia, Syria, Mesopotamia, Arabia, etc. Marco Polo reported them on the road from Yezd to Kerman.

*Buildings.* — As to buildings, there is just the bare mention of palace, house or prison, and we learn also that King Gūdnaphar and his brother were baptized in a bath or bath-house, and that for seven days beforehand no one was allowed to bathe therein.

*Carriages and Furniture.* — There are the "chariot" (Greek *ἄρμα*) above mentioned, a palanquin (so Dr. Wright thinks he had better translate the Syriac word) in which Mygdonia was carried, and a seat with two legs, with which King Mazdai beat St. Thomas about the head. Also, Šifūr says, "for three years no table has been laid in my house, and my wife and daughter have not sat at it."

Some sort of a *street fountain* is mentioned, for the wife of Šifūr says, "I was going along the street, and had come to the pipe that throweth up water."

*Clothing.* — We are told how Karīsh took the *turban* off one of the servants, and put it round St. Thomas' neck in order to drag him along.

*Linen* cloths were used to prepare the body of the apostle for the tomb. Was linen ever known in India?

*Money* is mentioned; St. Thomas was sold to Ḥabbān for twenty pieces of silver; 20 zūzē and 360 zūzē are named as bribes to King Mazdai's jailors.

There is a *Hebrew flute-girl*, and there are *cup-bearers* at the marriage feast at Sandarūk.

Mygdonia has a *nurse*, with whom she slept to avoid the importunities of her husband. He is stated to have been afraid of Mygdonia, his wife, "for she was far superior to him in her wealth, and also in her understanding."

The wife of Šifūr describes the devils who torment her as *black men*.

St. Thomas was buried "in *the sepulchre* in which the ancient kings were buried."

None of the above allusions seem to specially suggest India, ancient or modern. Some of them would seem to exclude Southern India as the scene of the apostle's martyrdom. But we cannot lay any particular stress upon them, in any direction.

II. — Writers of the first six centuries of the Christian era who make mention of the apostleship of St. Thomas.

The following writers of the first six centuries of the Christian era make mention of the apostleship of St. Thomas :—

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>1.—The author of the Syriac work, entitled "The Doctrine of the Apostles;" perhaps 2nd century.</p> <p>2.—Heracleon; probably 170 to 180.</p> <p>3.—The writer of "The Clementine Recognitions;" perhaps as early as 200 to 220.</p> <p>4.—Clement of Alexandria; died about 220.</p> <p>5.—Origen; died about 251 to 254.</p> <p>6.—Eusebius; died about 340.</p> <p>7.—St. Ephraem the Syrian; died about 378.</p> | <p>8.—St. Gregory Nazianzen; died 389 or 390.</p> <p>9.—St. Gregory of Nyssa; died about 394.</p> <p>10.—St. Ambrose; died about 397.</p> <p>11.—St. Asterius; died about 400.</p> <p>12.—St. John Chrysostom; died 407.</p> <p>13.—Rufinus; died 410.</p> <p>14.—St. Gaudensius; died probably between 410 and 427.</p> <p>15.—St. Jerome; died 420.</p> <p>16.—St. Paulinus of Nola; died 431.</p> <p>17.—Sozomen; about 443.</p> <p>18.—Soerates; about 445.</p> <p>19.—St. Gregory of Tours; died 594.</p> |
|---|--|

There are probably other writers who might be quoted, especially among those who wrote in Syriac; but I have not been able to trace them. For the purpose of this paper, it is not necessary to go beyond the sixth century.

The necessary quotations from the writers and writings above-named will now be given.

1. — The ancient Syriac work, entitled "The Doctrine of the Apostles." (Written perhaps in the 2nd century.) Extracts:—

"And after the death of the Apostles there were Guides and Rulers in the churches, and whatsoever the Apostles had communicated to them, and they had received from them, they taught to the multitudes all the time of their lives. They again at their deaths also committed and delivered to their disciples after them everything which they had received from the Apostles, also what James had written from Jerusalem, and Simon from the city of Rome, and John from Ephesus, and Mark from the great Alexandria, and Andrew from Phrygia, and Luke from Macedonia, and Judas Thomas from India; that the epistles of an Apostle might be received and read in the churches, in every place, like those Triumphs of their Acts, which Luke wrote, are read, that by this the Apostles might be known . . . . ."

"India, and all its countries, and those bordering on it, even to the farthest sea, received the Apostles' Hand of Priesthood from Judas Thomas, who was Guide and Ruler in the church which he built there, and ministered there."

These translations are taken from W. Cureton: *Ancient Syriac Documents*: London, 1864. pp. 32, 33.

2. — Heracleon, a gnostic, who wrote in the 2nd century, probably about 170 to 180. Clement of Alexandria in his "Stromata" (Miscellanies), book 4, chapter 9, headed "Christ's sayings regarding martyrdom," after quoting Luke xii. 11, 12, writes as follows:—

"In explanation of this passage, Heracleon, the most distinguished of the school of Valentius, says expressly, 'that there is a confession by faith and conduct, and one with the voice. The confession that is made by the voice, and before the authorities, is what the most reckon the holy confession. Not soundly: and hypocrites also can confess with this confession. But neither will this utterance be found to be spoken universally; for all the saved have confessed with the confession made with the voice, and departed. Of whom are Matthew, Philip, Thomas, Levi and many others. And confession by the lips is not universal, but partial' . . . ."

This is not particularly intelligible. It is taken from *The writings of Clement of Alexandria translated by the Rev. William Wilson*, Edinburgh, 1869, Vol. 2, pp. 170 to 171. It seems, however, to agree with the Greek in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 8, Paris, 1857, cols. 1281-2.

R. A. Lipsius refers to it as meaning that St. Thomas, with the other apostles named, died a natural death; and he attaches importance to it as the early testimony of one of the gnostics, among whom originated, according to his view, the Acts of St. Thomas, which contain the details of the apostle's martyrdom. See his article "Acts of the Apostles (Apocryphal)" in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography, etc.*, Vol. 1, London, 1877. Lipsius calls Heracleon a "perfectly trustworthy witness," and adds:—"This witness deserves all the more attention, inasmuch as it comes from a Gnostic source, i.e., from one of those circles in which afterwards sprang up the legends of the martyrdom of St. Matthew by fire, the crucifixion of St. Philip, and the impaling of St. Thomas." It is not necessary to adopt Lipsius' ideas. His theories were sometimes impossible.

The sense of the passage from Clement of Alexandria is perhaps better given, than by Wilson, in an article on Heracleon by G. Salmon, in the dictionary above quoted, Vol. 2, 1880, as follows:—

"Men mistake in thinking that the only confession is that made by the voice before the magistrates; there is another confession made in the life and conversation, by faith and works corresponding to the faith. The first confession may be made by a hypocrite, and it is one not required of all; there are many who have never been called on to make it, as, for instance, Matthew, Philip, Thomas, Levi [Lehbaeus]; the other confession must be made by all."

3. — **The Clementine Recognitions.** In book 9, chapter 29, we read:—

"Denique apud Parthos, sicut nobis Thomas, qui apud illos Evangelium prædicat, scripsit, non multi jam erga plurima matrimonia diffunduntur, nec multi apud Medos eanibus objiciunt mortuos suos, neque Persæ matrum conjugii aut filiarum incestis matrimoniis delectantur, nec mulieres Susides licita ducunt adulteria; nec potuit ad crimina genesis compellere, quos religionis doctrina prohibebat."

See Migne: *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 1, Paris, 1857, col. 1415.

We only possess the Clementine Recognitions in the Latin translation made probably not long after 400 by Rufinus, who is supposed to have subjected them to some mild expurgation. We do not know the date of the original writing. F. J. A. Hort (*Notes Introductory to the Study of the Clementine Recognitions*: London, 1901) considered that it and the Clementine Homilies were both derived from a common original, which may probably be dated in the first or second decade of the 3rd century, and was probably written in Palestine, east of the Jordan, or in the region running northward thence between the mountains and the desert.

4. — **Clement of Alexandria**; died about 220. His testimony must, I think, be taken to be the same as that of Heracleon (above-mentioned No. 2), whom he quotes apparently with approval. In other words, he seems to allege that St. Thomas died a natural death.

5. — **Origen**; born 185 or 186, died about 251 to 254. He was a native of Alexandria, and most of his life was spent in Egypt and Palestine. We have his testimony, as will be seen in the next place, only through the medium of Eusebius, who quotes his Commentary on Genesis, an elaborate work, of which we only possess some fragments. According to Origen, Parthia was the region allotted to St. Thomas.

6. — **Eusebius, surnamed Pamphilus**; born in Palestine about 264, Bishop of Caesarea 315, died about 340. Extract from his *Ecclesiastical History*, book 3:—

"Chapter I. — The parts of the world where Christ was preached by the apostles. — Such, then, was the state of the Jews at this time. But the holy apostles and disciples of our Saviour, being scattered over the whole world, Thomas, according to tradition, received Parthia as his allotted region; Andrew received Scythia, and John, Asia; where, after continuing for

"some time, he died at Ephesus . . . This account is given by Origen, in the third book of his expositior of Genesis."

This translation from the Greek is by C. F. Crusé: *Ecclesiastical History by Eusebius*: London, 1847, p. 101.

7. — **St. Ephraem the Syrian**; born about 300, died about 378. He spent most of his life at Edessa. The following Latin translation of a portion of one of St. Ephraem's Syriae hymns is taken from Dr. G. Bickell: *St. Ephraemi Syri Carmina Nisibena*: Leipzig, 1866, pp. 163-4.

"XLI. Octavum carmen ejusdem modi [*i. e.*, Ad modum: cornu et tuba, as shewn by heading of Carm. XXXV.: 'De Domino nostro et de morte et diabolo. Ad modum cornu et tuba.']

"Argumentum. Lamentatur diabolus de damnis, quibus per reliquias S. Thomae Edessae asservatas afficitur.

"1. Ululavit diabolus: — Quem in locum nunc fugere possum justos? Mortem incitari ad apostolos interficiendos, ut per mortem eorum evadam verberibus eorum. Sed nunc multo durius verberor. Apostolus quem interfeci in India, praevenit mihi Edessam. Hic et illic totus est; illuc profectus sum, et erat illic; hic et illic inveni eum et contristatus sum. (Responsorium: — Laudetur potentia, quae habitat in ossibus sanctis!)

"2. Ossa portaverat mercator ille, vel potius illa portaverunt eum. Ecce enim ab invicem lucreti sunt. Mihi autem quid profuerunt, cum sibi invicem profuerint? Ambo mihi damnum intulerunt. Quis monstrabit capsam Iscaiotis ex qua fortitudinem accepi? Capsa autem Thomae interfecit me, quia virtus occulta, habitans in ea, excruciat me.

"3. Moyses electus portaverat ossa in fide tamquam lucrum. Si ergo magnus hic propheta credidit, auxilium inesse in ossibus, recte etiam credidit mercator et recte se nominavit mercatorem. Hic mercator lucretus est et magnus factus est et regnavit. Aerarium ejus valde me depauperavit; Edessae enim apertum est, et ditavit magnam urbem auxilio suo.

"4. Obstupui de hoc aerario thesaurorum; antea enim exiguus erat thesaurus ejus, et, quamquam nemo aliquid abstulerat ab eo, tamen pareus erat fons divitiarum ejus. Postquam autem multi circumdederunt et diripuerunt illud et rapuerunt utilitates ejus, quo magis diripitur, eo abundantius multiplicantur divitiae ejus. Quando enim quaeritur fons oclusus, valde scinditur, et tunc demum late fluere et effundi potest."

Then follow six more strophes. Dr. Bickell's notes on the four strophes quoted are useful: they are:—

"Confirmatus hoc carmine (1) S. Thomam apostolum Indis evangelium praedicasse, quod testatus etiam Ambrosius (in ps. 45), Paulinus Nolanus (carm. 26), Hieronymus (ep. 148 ad Marcellam), Gregorius Nazianzenus (orat. 21); (2) cum ibidem martyrio coronatum esse, qua de re apud scriptores vetustiores nullum invenitur testimonium, immo negatur ab Heraclione haeretico, apud Clementem Alexandrinum (strom. lib. 4, p. 502); testes autem sunt Gregorius Turonensis, Gaudentius Brixiensis, S. Nilus, S. Asterius, fortasse etiam Theodoretus (qui gr. aff. eur. lib. 8, p. 607, Thomam aliquem inter celeberrimos martyres numerat); (3) reliquias ejus Edessae asservatas esse, quod asserunt etiam Rufinus (hist. eccl. 2, 5), Soerates (4, 18), Sozomenus (6, 18), auctor vitae syriacae S. Ephraemi (B. O. I. p. 49) et chronici Edesseni ad ann. 705 et 753 aerae graecae. Apparet tamen ex hac et quarta strophâ, non totum S. Thomae corpus Edessam translatum esse, sed partem tantum, alia parte Indis relicta, quae adhuc Goae asservatur. Confirmatur ergo hoc carmine opinio Baronii, qui recte jam observavit, et Edessae et in India partem harum reliquiarum asservatam esse, refelluntur autem Pagius, Tillemont, Assemanus, qui Indicas S. Thomae reliquias pro commento Nestorianorum habent.

"2. Docet nos S. Ephraem, haec ossa per mercatorem ex India Edessam asportata esse. De hac translatione cf. etiam Gregorium Turonensem (de gloria martyrum c. 32) et Martyrologia ad

"3 Julii aut ad 21 Decembris. De tempore, quo Edessa tantum thesaurum acceperit, nihil apud antiquos legitur; Baronius autem ad a. 236 ait, incertam esse famam, hoc anno translationem accidisse. Fontem suum non indicat, nec eum lucusque invenire potui."

8.—**St. Gregory Nazianzen**; born in Cappadocia about 329, bishop 372, died 389 or 390. Homily 33 against the Arians: extract from chap. 11:—

"What! Were not the apostles strangers to the many nations and countries among which they were divided that the gospel might be spread everywhere? . . . . Granting that Judaea was the country of Peter, what had Paul in common with the gentiles, Luke with Achaia, Andrew with Epirus, John with Ephesus, Thomas with India, Mark with Italy?"

The Greek text is in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 36, Paris, 1853, col. 227.

9.—**St. Gregory of Nyssa**; born about 331, bishop of Nyssa in Cappadocia about 372; died soon after 394. In Epist. 13 he writes:—

"Mesopotamiae incolae, tametsi inter ipsos ditissimi Satrapiarum rectores essent, nihilominus Thomam civitatis digniorem esse censuerunt, quem sibi ipsis praeficerent. Ita et Titum Cretenses, et Hierosolymitanae civis Jacobum in episcopum elegerunt, nosque Cappadoces, centurionem illum, qui passiones tempore divinitatem Domini fassus est."

This Latin translation of the Greek text is from R. Ceillier: *Histoire Générale des Auteurs Sacrés et Ecclésiastiques*, Vol. 6, Paris, 1860, p. 254.

10.—**St. Ambrose**; born 340, bishop of Milan 374, died 397. "In Psalmum XLV. enarratio:" extract from chap. 21 (vers. 10):—

"Aufere bella usque ad fines terrae: arcum conteret et confringet arma: et scuta comburet igni. Et antequam Romanum diffunderetur imperium, non solum singularum urbium reges adversum se paeliabantur; sed etiam ipsi Romani bellis frequenter civilibus atterebantur. . . . Unde factum est ut taedio bellorum civilium Julio Augusto Romanum deferretur imperium: et ita praelia intestina sedata sunt. Hoc autem eo profecit, ut recte per totum orbem apostoli mittentur, dicente Domino Jesu: Euntes docete omnes gentes. (Matth. xxviii. 19.) Illis quidem etiam inter cetera barbaricis montibus regna patuerunt, ut Thomae India, Mattheo Persia. . . ."

Migne's *Patrologia*, Vol. 14, Paris, 1845, cols. 1142-3.

11.—**St. Asterius**, archbishop of Amasea in Pontus; died about 499. This Greek writer bears testimony to the fact of the martyrdom of St. Thomas, but does not specify any locality. In Homily 10, Eulogy of the holy martyrs, he says:—

"And see how many you dishonour in the one insult; John the Baptist, James who was called the brother of the Lord, Peter, Paul, Thomas; I name these as chiefs of the martyrs."

The original is in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 40, Paris, 1863, cols. 325-6.

12.—**St. John Chrysostom**; born 317, archbishop of Constantinople 397, died 407. Translation of a passage from Homily 26 on the Epistle to the Hebrews:—

"But tell me: do not the bones of Moses himself lie in a foreign land? And as to those of Aaron, of David, of Jeremiah, and of many apostles, we do not even know where they are. The graves of Peter and Paul and John and Thomas are indeed known (*ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ τάφοι*); but of the others, though they are so many, nothing is known."

The original text is in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 63, Paris, 1862, col. 179.

13. — Rufinus Tyrannus; born about 345, died 410. He wrote in Italy. Extracts from his "Historia ecclesiastica:"—

Lib. I. Cap. IX., "De captivitate Frumentii et Edesii, et de conversione Inderum per ipsos gesta.

"In ea divisione orbis terrae, quae ad praedicandum verbum Dei sorte per Apostolos celebrata est, cum aliae aliis provinciae obvenissent, Thomae Parthia, et Matthaeo Aethiopia, adhaerens citerior India Bartholomaeo dicitur sorte decreta . . . . ."

Lib. II., Cap. V., "De persecutione quae fuit apud Edessam.

"Edessa namque Mesopotamiae urbs fidelium populorum est, Thomae Apostoli Reliquiis decorata . . . . ."

From Migne's *Patrologia*, Vol. 21, Paris, 1849, cols. 478 and 513.

14. — St. Gaudentius, bishop of Brescia in 402; date of death uncertain, probably between 410 and 427. Extract from Sermo XVII. [After speaking of St. John the Baptist, St. Andrew, St. Thomas, and St. Luke, he says]:—

"Horum quatuor beatas habemus in praesenti reliquias, qui regnum Dei, et justitiam praedicantes, ab incredulis, et iniquis occisi, Deo semper vivere operationum suarum virtutibus demonstrantur. Joannes in Sebastena urbe provinciae Palaestinae, Thomas apud Indos, Andreas et Lucas apud Patras Aethiopiae civitatem, consummati referuntur."

Migne: *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 20, Paris, 1845, cols. 962-3. This Sermon was delivered on the occasion of the dedication of the church "basilica Concilii Sanctorum" at Brescia, for which church, as St. Gaudentius states in his discourse, he had obtained relics of St. Thomas, and other martyrs, whom he names. The church no longer exists, at least not under its original name.

15. — St. Jerome; born about 340, priest 379, died 420. Extract from "Epistola LIX. ad Mareellam." This letter is sometimes quoted as CXLVIII. It was written in 395 or 396.

"Erat igitur uno eodemque tempore et cum apostolis quadraginta diebus, et cum angelis, et in Patre, et in extremis maris finibus erat; in omnibus locis versabatur; cum Thoma in India, cum Petro Romae, cum Paulo in Illyrico, cum Tito in Creta, cum Andrea in Aethiopia, cum singulis apostolis et apostolicis viris, in singulis cunctisque regionibus."

Migne: *Patrologia*, Vol. 22, Paris, 1845, col. 589.

16. — St. Paulinus of Nola: born at or near Bordeaux about 353, bishop of Nola 409, died 431. Extract from Poema XIX., carmen XI. in S. Felicem:—

"Sic Deus et reliquis tribuens pia munera terris  
"Sparsit ubique loci magnas sua membra per urbes  
"Sic dedit Andream Patris, Ephesosque, Joannem  
"Ut simul Europam, atque Asiam curaret in illis,  
"Discenteretque graves per lumina tanta tenebras.  
"Parthia Matthaeum complectitur, India Thomam,  
"Lebbaeum Libyes, Phruges acceperere Philippum."

Migne: *Patrologia*, Vol. 61, Paris, 1847, cols. 513-4.

17. — Sozomen, ecclesiastical historian; he wrote his history in Greek at Constantinople about 443. In book 6, ch. 18, speaking of the emperor Valens, who reigned from 364 to 378, he writes:—

"Having heard that there was a magnificent church at Edessa named after the apostle Thomas, he went to see it."

This is from a translation published by Samuel Bagster & Sons, London, 1846: the name of the translator is not given. I have not seen the original Greek. But, if the word *μαρτύριον* is used for *ehneh*, it would probably imply that the relics of St. Thomas or some part of them were enshrined there.

18. — Socrates, surnamed Scholasticus, of Constantinople; born (306) the date of his death is not stated, but it must have been after 445, as his history of the church, written in Greek, extends to that year.

In book 1, ch. 19, he writes:—"When the apostles went forth by lot among the nations, Thomas received the apostleship of the Parthians."

In book 4, ch. 18, he writes:—"But I must here mention a circumstance that occurred at Edessa in Mesopotamia. There is in that city a magnificent church (*μαρτύριον*) dedicated to St. Thomas the apostle, wherein on account of the sanctity of the place, religious assemblies are incessantly held."

Socrates here uses the word *μαρτύριον*, which was generally applied to a church or basilica where the relics of some martyr were deposited. He must, I think, be taken to mean that the relics of St. Thomas, or some part of them, were enshrined in this church. The incident which he relates took place while the emperor Valens, who reigned 364 to 378, was at Edessa. The above passages are taken from a translation published by Samuel Bagster & Sons, London, 1844. The name of the translator is not given.

19. — St. Gregory of Tours; born probably in 538, bishop in 573, died 594. Extract from "Libri miraculorum: liber primus: de gloria beatorum martyrum: caput XXXII.: de Thoma apostolo:"—

"Thomas apostolus (Post an 66, 21 Dec.) secundum passionis ejus historiam, in India passus esse declaratur. Cujus beatum corpus post multum tempus assumptum in civitate quam Syri Edissam vocant, translatum est, ibique sepultum. Ergo in loco regionis Indiae, que prius quievit, monasterium habetur, et templum mirac magnitudinis, diligenterque exornatur: atque compositum. In hac igitur acie magnum miraculum Deus ostendit. Lychnus etenim ibi positus, atque illuminatus, ante locum sepulture ipsius perpetualiter die noctuque divina luce resplendet, a nullo fomentum olei scirpique accipiens: neque vento extinguitur, neque casu dilabatur, neque ardendo minuitur; habetque incrementum, per apostoli virtutem, quod nescitur ab homine, cognitum tamen habetur divine potentie. Hoc Theodorus qui ad ipsum locum accessit nobis exposuit. In supradicta igitur urbe, in qua beatos artus diximus tumulatos, adveniente festivitate, magnus aggregatur populorum coetus, ac de diversis regionibus cum votis negotiisque venientibus, vendendi comparandique per triginta dies sine ulla telonei exactione licentia datur. In his vero diebus qui in mensi habentur quinto, magna et inasitata populis prebentur beneficia. Non scandalum surgit in plebe, non musca insidet mortificate carni, non latex deest sitiendi. Nam cum ibi reliquis diebus plusquam centenum pedum altitudine aqua hauriatur a puteis, tunc paululum si fodias, affatim lymphas exuberantes invenies, quod non ambigitur haec virtute beati apostoli impertiri. Decursis igitur festivitatis diebus, teloneum publicum redditur, musca quae defuit adest, propinquitas aquae dehiscit. Dehinc emissa divinitus pluvia ita omne atrium templi a sordibus et diversis squaloribus qui per ipsa solennia facti sunt mundat, ut putei locum nec fuisse calcatum."

Migne: *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 71, Paris, 1849, cols. 733-4.

The information contained in the above passages may be summed up as follows, with the remark that the years given in the list are generally the years of the death of the writers named:—

1	2nd cent.?	Syriac "Doctrine of the Apostles."	St. Thomas wrote letters from "India." He evangelised "India" and countries bordering on it.
2	c. 170	Heracleon ... ..	St. Thomas died a natural death.
3	c. 210?	Clementine Recognitions.	St. Thomas evangelised the Parthians.
4	220	Clement of Alexandria ..	St. Thomas died a natural death.
5	251	Origen ... ..	St. Thomas evangelised the Parthians.
6	340	Eusebius ... ..	Do. do. do.
7	378	St. Ephraem .. ..	St. Thomas was martyred in "India." His relics were part at Edessa, part in India.
8	389	St. Gregory Nazianzen ...	St. Thomas evangelised India.
9	394	St. Gregory of Nyssa ...	St. Thomas evangelised Mesopotamia.
10	397	St. Ambrose .. ..	St. Thomas was martyred.
11	400	St. Asterius ... ..	St. Thomas was martyred.
12	407	St. John Chrysostom ...	The locality of the grave of St. Thomas was known to him.
13	410	Rufinus ... ..	St. Thomas evangelised Parthia. His relics were at Edessa.
14	410	St. Gaudentius ... ..	St. Thomas was martyred in India. Some of his relics were at Brescia.
15	420	St. Jerome ... ..	St. Thomas was in India.
16	431	St. Paulinus of Nola ...	St. Thomas was allotted India.
17	443	Sozomen ... ..	He mentions the famous church of St. Thomas at Edessa, and perhaps implies that his relics were there.
18	c. 445	Socrates ... ..	Do. do. do.
19	594	St. Gregory of Tours ...	St. Thomas was martyred in India; his relics were translated to Edessa, and there was then existing a famous church in India, at the place where the body of the apostle was first buried.

The early evidence is, then, that **St. Thomas evangelised Parthia**; and, apart from the Syriac "Doctrine of the Apostles," there does not seem to be any mention of "India" in connection with St. Thomas till we get to St. Ephraem (378) and St. Gregory Nazianzen (389), the two living in adjacent countries. The "Doctrine of the Apostles" would be more important if we could fix its date; from expressions used in it, it is thought to be of the 2nd century; but Lipsius says "towards the end of the 4th cent.," which would bring it to the time of St. Ephraem. See article in Smith and Waec's *Dictionary of Christian Biography, etc.*, Vol. 1, London, 1877.

It will be noticed that in none of these ancient writings is there any mention whatever of the name of the place at which St. Thomas was martyred, — Calamina, as it appears in later and perhaps undateable writings. Of some of these, it is necessary now to give some account.

(To be continued.)

## THE CONNECTION OF ST. THOMAS THE APOSTLE WITH INDIA.

BY W. R. PHILIPPS.

*(Concluded from page 15)*

## III. — Some writings of doubtful date or antiquity which make mention of the connection of St. Thomas with India.

WE come now to some writings which have been frequently quoted as the genuine productions of the ancient authors whose names have been put upon them. They have been even quoted as genuine from the very volumes in which they are distinctly printed as "spurious," where, indeed, they have been inserted by way of warning to prevent persons being deceived by extracts and references they may find elsewhere. It is therefore necessary to say something about them. They are not entirely to be rejected because they have a wrong name attached to them; but, until we know their real dates, we cannot make much practical use of them.

1. — Pseudo-Hippolytus. The genuine Hippolytus is St. Hippolytus, bishop, who died about 239; he lived and wrote in Rome. There is a Greek work ascribed to him entitled "Hippolytus on the Twelve Apostles: where each of them died, and where he met his end."

It contains the following passage:—

"And Thomas preached to the Parthians, Medes, Persians, Hyrcanians, Bactrians, and Margians,<sup>1</sup> and was thrust through in the four members of his body with a pine spear<sup>2</sup> at Calamene,<sup>3</sup> the city of India (ἐν πόλει Καλαμῆνῃ, τῆς Ἰνδικῆς) and was buried there.

<sup>1</sup> Μάργους. Combefisius proposes Μάρδοις. Jerome [should be Pseudo-Jerome] has 'Magis.'

<sup>2</sup> The text is ἐλακὴν ἐλογχιάσβη, ἐλακὴν being probably for ἐλάτη.

<sup>3</sup> Καλαμῆνῃ. Steph. le Moine reads Καραμῆνῃ."

The above translation and notes are from S. D. F. Salmond: *The Writings of Hippolytus, Bishop of Portus*, Vol. 2. Edinburgh, 1869, p. 131. The translation has been verified by reference to the Greek text in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 10, Paris, 1857. Salmond apparently took his notes from Migne.

On reference to several authors who treat of St. Hippolytus and his works, — Cardinal Wiseman (1853), Combefis (1648), Wetzer and Welte (1861), Bunsen (1854), Ceillier (1858), etc., — I find no opinion as to the real date of the doubtful work "On the Twelve Apostles." The point seemed important in view of the mention of Calamene or Caramene. As regards the "Margians," Combefis proposed Μάρδοις, as the Mardi were a Hyrcanian people.

This Pseudo-Hippolytus affords an example of the misuse of such writings. In 1892, the Rev. George Milne Rac, Fellow of the University of Madras, published at Edinburgh a book entitled "The Syrian Church in India," — a subject which has lent itself to much foolish writing in England, India, and Germany during the last two hundred years or more. Mr. Rac referred to this passage from Pseudo-Hippolytus as if the work containing it were genuine, and he actually made use of Salmond's translation, overlooking the translator's warning.

2. — Pseudo-Dorotheus. A Greek writing exists under the title of "Ecclesiastical History (σύγγραμμα ἐκκλησιαστικόν) concerning the 70 Disciples of the Lord, by Dorotheus, bishop of Tyre." It does not purport to be his actual writing; but it gives particulars of his life, and then records what he wrote about the Seventy Disciples and the Twelve Apostles "and the places where each of them preached Christ." The passage about St. Thomas is as follows:—

"And Thomas the apostle, having preached the gospel to the Parthians and Medes, and Persians, and Germani, and Bactrians, and Magi, suffered martyrdom (τελειούται) in a city of India called Calamita (Καλαμίτη)."

Dorotheus is stated to have been bishop of Tyre at the close of the 3rd century. If so, and if he wrote about the twelve apostles as above, the passage quoted would be valuable, as containing an early mention of the place of St. Thomas' martyrdom. But there seems to be no reason for ascribing it to him. "Germani" really means, I surmise, "Carmanians."

The passage is signalled here by way of warning, for it figures in books as an early testimony of St. Thomas' martyrdom in India. It was so used by the Abbé Huc, famous for his travels in Tibet, and in particular for his success in reaching Lhassa, where he and his colleague Gabet resided for some months in 1846. Manning (1811-12), Huc, and Gabet seem to have been the only Europeans who succeeded in reaching Lhassa in the nineteenth century. In 1857-8, Huc published at Paris four volumes entitled *Le Christianisme en Chine, en Tartarie et au Thibet*, — a work of which there are one or two English editions. In Vol. 1, p. 20, he brings forward the testimony of Dorotheus as to the martyrdom of St. Thomas at Calamina, and actually says it is contained in a fragment preserved in the Paschal Chronicle, "tom. ii, 198." The Paschal Chronicle is a Greek work written soon after 630, probably at Constantinople, and its chief value is said to consist in the fact that it contains the remains of older writings incorporated in it. Nevertheless, it contains no trace of the "fragment" in question. Dindorf, in 1832, published at Bonn an edition of the Paschal Chronicle in two volumes. In an appendix in the second volume, he printed the Syngramma, above mentioned, among "Selecta ad illustrationem Chronici Paschalis." He did so by way of illustrating a passage in the chronicle regarding the Seventy Disciples; the document has no connection with the Chronicle, and Dindorf pointed out it was not by Dorotheus, even if such a person existed in the 3rd century. Huc evidently had this edition in view, for he quotes volume and page correctly; but there his accuracy ends.

In 1877, the Rev. C. E. Kennet, a missionary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, published a small pamphlet at Madras, entitled *S. Thomas the Apostle of India; an Enquiry into the Evidence for his Mission to this Country*, — a pamphlet that is often quoted. Kennet makes no mention of Huc's book. But he evidently had it before him, as he repeats its error about Dorotheus and the Paschal Chronicle, and in other instances reproduces its mistakes, besides taking much of his matter from it. He, however, dates Dorotheus as being born 254, and gives a reference to "Cave's *Historia literaria*, pp. 107, 108. Colon, 1720."

The date to be ascribed to this writing of Pseudo-Dorotheus does not appear to be settled. Presumably it must be considered earlier than the Paschal Chronicle, earlier than 630.

It is interesting to note the form of the name of the place of martyrdom, — Calamita, not Calamina.

3. — **Pseudo-Jerome or Pseudo-Sophronius.** The following statement from the Greek has often been quoted, sometimes under the name of St. Jerome, who died 420, and sometimes under the name of his Greek friend Sophronius who translated some of his works: —

"Thomas the apostle, as has been handed down to us, preached the gospel of the Lord to the Parthians and Medes and Persians and Carmanians and Hyrcanians and Bactrians and the Magi. He slept in the city of Calamina which is in India."

Scholars are agreed that the document in which this statement appears was written neither by St. Jerome nor by Sophronius. St. Jerome wrote a work in 135 chapters entitled "De viris illustribus liber." This is in fact a misleading title, for the book is an account only of Christian writers up to his own time, and it is otherwise known as his book "de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis," "Catalogue of Church Writers," "Liber de auctoribus," etc. Sophronius translated this work into Greek, and we have his translation as well as St. Jerome's Latin original.

Erasmus published this translation at Bâle in 1539, and the Greek MS. which he used appears to have contained, in addition, the document from which the above passage is taken,—part inserted after chapter 1, and the rest after chapter 4. In Migne's *Patrologia*, Vol. 23, it is printed separately under the title "Appendix de Vitis Apostolorum," as it forms no part of the work either of St. Jerome or of Sophronius. It is, in fact, a short account of the apostles who left no writings, and who were therefore quite outside the scope of St. Jerome's work.

It is unnecessary to give here the reasons for regarding it as an altogether spurious addition. They may be found at length in R. Ceillier's *Histoire Générale des Auteurs Sacrés*, Paris, 1860, Vol. 6, p. 278; also in Migne's volume above mentioned, cols. 599 ff. These particulars may prevent people being misled, as many have been, by finding the above citation put forward in various books as a genuine statement by St. Jerome or by Sophronius.

The Abbé Huc, in the volume already mentioned, quotes the passage as written, if not by St. Jerome, then certainly by Sophronius; and he gives the apparently unmeaning reference "Sanctus Hier. Catal. script. eccl. I., 120." In fact such part of his book as refers to the introduction of Christianity in India is full of mistakes. The Rev. C. E. Kennet of Madras, who followed him blindly, though he never mentions his name, gave the same reference. He also said (really translating from Huc) that St. Jerome "speaks of the mission of St. Thomas to India as "a fact universally known and believed in his time." I cannot find that any such statement was made by St. Jerome in any of his writings.

General Sir Alexander Cunningham, writing of St. Thomas, has the following:—"The scene of his death is said to have been the city of Calamina in India, Sophronius, c. viii., 'Dormivit in civitate Calamina quæ est Indiae.'"

Now, in early Christian history, we have to reckon with a considerable number of persons bearing the name of Sophronius. But there is only one really notable writer among them; and, when we speak of Sophronius simply, we mean him and no other, and the person we mean is St. Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, 633 to 637, a most voluminous Greek writer, many of whose works are very well known. And with a writer whose works, or rather only some of them, occupy several large volumes of Migne's *Patrologia Græca*, what are we to do with so vague a reference as "c. viii."? It has no meaning for any Sophronius; not even for the comparatively insignificant friend of St. Jerome whose few little original works have all perished. It is also somewhat misleading to quote Greek writers as if they wrote in Latin.

The writing to which I am referring is General Cunningham's *Archæological Survey of India*, Vol. 5, Report for 1872-3, Calcutta, 1875, p. 60. There are other curious statements on the same page. For instance, in referring to the legends about St. Thomas, he speaks of "the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles written by Leucius and his copyist Abdias." This is a strange inversion: the Acts in question purport to have been written by Abdias, first bishop of Babylon in the first century; and they, or some of them, are supposed to have been really composed in later times by one Leucius, a Manichean. Certainly Abdias could not have been the copyist of Leucius.

On the same page, the Latin form of the name Mazdai,—a good old Persian name, as Mr. Burkitt calls it,—the name of the king who put St. Thomas to death,—is transformed from Mesdeus into Meodens. A reference is given to Col. H. Yule's *Cathay and the Way Thither*, London, 1866, Vol. 2, p. 376. There the same mistake may be found, with several others. Col. Yule, not satisfied with writing "Meodens," actually put "(Mahadeva?)" after it!

Another case of misquotation may be mentioned here. A passage has been given above from St. Gaudentius, Sermon 17, in which he states simply that St. Thomas is said to have been martyred "apud Indos." Huc (Vol. 1, p. 22) actually gives a reference to this Sermon, and says "Gaudencee "comme Sophrone" states "qu'il mourut dans l'Inde, à Calamine." Kennet (p. 10) translated this, while affecting to be original:—"Gaudentius says, like Sophronius, that he died in India at the

"town of Calamina (Serm. 17)." As a matter of fact, St. Gaudentius makes no mention of Calamina, or of any city or town.

The form in which the three similar statements appear in the above three pseudographs, appears worthy of remark. St. Thomas is described as having preached to certain people mentioned by name, all of whom might, I think, be fairly regarded as elements of the Parthian empire of the time, with the doubtful exception of the Bactrians, who, however, might themselves have then been under a separate Parthian dynasty (that of Gondophares). The apostle is not mentioned as having preached to the "Indians," though all the passages end by saying he died in a city of India. We might take it, therefore, that the India of the writers must have been, or must have included, the country of one or more of the peoples named, *e. g.*, the country of the Bactrians, or perhaps any country beyond the limits of Parthia or Parthian rule, as a late writer might understand those limits.

There remains one more writing to be mentioned, not as a spurious work, but for other reasons. I refer to:—

**The Apostolical Constitutions.**—Scholars are, I believe, still divided as to the date of this work. Bunsen thought that, apart from a few interpolations, it belonged to the 2nd or 3rd century. F. J. A. Hort, however, says it apparently dates from the fourth century, though containing earlier elements. (*Notes introductory to the Study of the Clementine Recognitions*, London, 1901, p. 9.) Among the various Greek versions there are two Vienna MSS., which were first published in 1724. These Bunsen considered to be nearer the original than others, both in what they give and in what they omit.

In book 8, chapter 21 is headed "Constitution of Thomas regarding sub-deacons." In one of the Vienna MSS. alluded to, this heading is omitted, and in its place is the following:—

"Thomas preached to the Parthians, Medes, Persians, Germanians (*Γερμανοῖς* probably should be *Καρμάνοις*), Hyrcanians, Bactrianians, Bavsians (*Βαρσοῖς*), who also, having been a martyr, lies in Edessa of Osdrone (τῆς Ὀσδρονῆς)."

*Βαρσοῖς* should, I suppose, be *Μαρδοῖς* (the Mardi or Amardi, a tribe who dwelt on the south shore of the Caspian), or possibly *Μαγοῖς*, the Magi, as in Pseudo-Sophronius. Osdrone must be Osroëne.

The original may be seen in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 1, Paris, 1857, col. 1117. It is not, I think, to be supposed that the heading quoted is more than a copyist's addition. But in view of the importance of the manuscript containing it, we ought not to entirely reject it. Unfortunately, I have not been able to ascertain the date assigned to the manuscript itself.

#### IV. — Calamina.

We have now got together all, or nearly all, the early information at present available regarding the connection of St. Thomas with India. It remains to make a few remarks about Calamina. As has been shewn above, the statements made in modern works that St. Hippolytus (c. 230), Dorotheus (3rd cent.), St. Jerome and Sophronius his friend (c. 400), and St. Gaudentius (c. 410), assert that Calamina, a town or city in India, was the place of the apostle's martyrdom, all prove on examination to be untrue. No writer that we can name or date before the 7th century, if so early, makes mention of Calamina. We have only apparently later writings, of unknown authorship and apparently small value. We have yet to learn when the name first appeared in ecclesiastical history. This is a point that might be usefully taken up by some competent person. Some information might perhaps be obtained from the ancient martyrologies in Greek, Latin, Syriac, etc., upon the study of which several eminent scholars are engaged.

In these circumstances, it seems almost a waste of time to try to identify the place, or to discuss the various attempts at identification made by modern writers under the impression that Calamina had been mentioned in works of the first four centuries. Kalyân, near Bombay, the Calliana of

Cosmas (c. 535), has been suggested, but for no particular reason. Here it may be noted that Cunningham was inclined to identify the place with the *Mina-nagar* of the *Periplus*, which he thought might have been called *Kara-Mina* or "Black Mina" to distinguish it from the older *Mina* in Sakastene. He added that Calamina might also be *Kalah-Mina*, or the "Fort of Mina," for, according to Rawlinson, the original Semitic word for 'fort' was *Kar*, corrupted early to *Kal* or *Khal*, as in Kalasar, Kalwâdeh, etc. (See *Archæological Survey of India*, Vol. 2; Report for 1863-4, p. 60). There does not seem to be much in these suggestions. Gutschmid seems to have suggested Kalama, a village on the west of Gedrosia, opposite the island of Karbinê or Karmina.

We may, however, note the various forms under which the name appears in the Greek writings quoted above. In Pseudo-Jerome or Pseudo-Sophronius, it is *Καλαμίνα* or Calamina, the name that appears in the Roman Martyrology; in Pseudo-Dorotheus, it is *Καλαμίρα*; in Pseudo-Hippolytus it is *Καλαμήνα* or *Καραμήνα*.

The opinion has been expressed to me that the second form *Karamēna*, obtained from Pseudo-Hippolytus, is of considerable importance, because it at once suggests *Carmana* (*Karmāna*), the capital of the well-known ancient country *Carmania* (*Karmāna*) *Propeia*.

*Carmana* either is the modern *Karmān*,— the 'Kerman' and 'Kirmān' of maps, etc.,— the chief town of the *Karmān* province of Persia, on the west of *Seistān* which is on the south-west frontier of *Afghānistān*, or else was some other city in the neighbourhood of *Karmān*, from which, on its becoming deserted, the ancient name was transferred to the modern *Karmān*. From a geographical, an ethnical, and indeed, as it seems to me, from every point of view, *Carmana* would, better than any part of India, fit the story of St. Thomas as told in the Acts; it would also harmonise with the good early evidence we have, which mentions the connection of St. Thomas with *Parthia* only, a geographical name which would include *Carmania* and possibly that part of "India exterior" which at the time seems to have been subject to a Parthian dynasty. As has already been pointed out, most of the names of the persons mentioned in the Acts in connection with the death of St. Thomas seem to be of Persian origin. They may, therefore, have been those of *Carmanians*, a people akin to the Persians. According to the Acts, St. Thomas came by sea to *Sanlarūk*, went thence to the realm of King *Gūdmar* or *Gondophares*, and afterwards to the realm of King *Mazdai*, where he was put to death. The numismatic evidence seems to shew that the dynasty of *Gondophares* was of Parthian origin, and that it ruled over *Afghānistān* and the Western *Pāñjāb*; and there seems to be some reason for thinking that about that time, or not long after, the country at the mouth of the *Indus* was in the hands of Parthian rulers. (*Periplus*, c. 38.) We might take it that St. Thomas travelled up the valley of the *Indus* and afterwards went to *Carmana*. There is said to have been a well-known trade route through the *Bolan Pass* to *Carmana*.

All this is, of course, speculation. But it seems less fanciful than the theories which locate *Calamina* in Southern India. Such theories have been run on the supposition that St. Thomas was martyred near *Madras*, and that there is a tradition to that effect. There is nothing inherently improbable in such a supposition; still, it ought to be very plainly pointed out here that, not only is there no ancient written evidence to connect St. Thomas with Southern India, but there is no available evidence that there ever was even a tradition to that effect till we come to *Marco Polo*, who died in 1324. We cannot jump over thirteen centuries, and then say, as often has been said, that there has been a constant tradition that St. Thomas was martyred in Southern India. Even as regards *Marco Polo*, there is nothing to shew that he was ever near *Mylapore*; and the local tradition he records is that St. Thomas was not martyred at all, but met his death through an accident.

If we are to treat the Acts of St. Thomas as possessing some historical basis, and if we are to regard as serious writers the Fathers of the Church, whose works have been quoted above, then, I think, we must say that, though there may be nothing to absolutely exclude Southern India, yet all the indications point in another direction. I am not aware that the ecclesiastical

authorities at Rome have ever given any real support to the modern belief that St. Thomas was martyred near Madras, and buried at San Thomé or Mylapore: there may be documents in which the idea is mentioned, but never, I think, as a fact established; always with some qualifying phrase, so as to leave the question open. To judge from quotations, the Syriac liturgical books, which contain some details of the apostle's career, give no support to this modern supposition. The supposition may be correct; but it is still only a supposition. Marco Polo must have had something to go upon, and so must others who followed him, — Odoric, for instance, about 1322; but had they anything better than the current talk of the Nestorians then in India and China? The Indian Nestorians would naturally have easily come to the belief in the apostolic origin of their church, just as now some of their Catholic descendants pretend they never had any Nestorian ancestors, but were always Catholics, in communion with Rome. (See G. T. Mackenzie: *Christianity in Travancore: Trivandrum*, 1901.) Nevertheless, we know from history that they were Nestorians until the Catholic missionaries took them in hand in the 16th century and converted them.

Anyhow, when the Portuguese arrived in Southern India, they found among the Nestorians the story already known from mediæval travellers, that the tomb of St. Thomas was at Mylapore, or San Thomé, as the Portuguese afterwards called it, near Madras. The tomb was opened in 1521; some remains were found and were removed to Goa. These are the relics alluded to by Bickell, quoted above. They or part of them have, I understand, been since returned to Mylapore, and are enshrined in the cathedral built over the tomb.

Of the discovery, and of the translation to Goa, there must be or ought to be authentic acts in the archives of Goa or Portugal; for, no carelessness was likely to occur in matters of such religious interest and importance. I do not know at present if the documents have ever been published; and, unfortunately, the accounts of the discovery, repeated from book to book, are disfigured by an absurd story, which, if true, only shows the credulity of the Portuguese. A stone, with a cross and inscription in unknown characters cut upon it, was discovered about 1547 at St. Thomas' Mount near Madras; and a learned Brâhman was sent for, who interpreted the inscription into a long account confirmatory of St. Thomas' martyrdom in the locality. Another learned Brâhman was brought from a distant country; and, independently of the former one, he gave the same interpretation. It never occurs to the writers who repeat this story, that the stone is still at the Mount church, and that they may go and look at it, or look at the pictures that have been published of it, and see for themselves that the inscription, which these learned Brâhman are alleged to have read in such an extremely copious and satisfying way, consists only of a few words in the Pahlavi character. Dr. E. W. West, who has last dealt with the record, has interpreted these few words as most probably meaning: — "(He) whom 'the suffering of the selfsame Messiah, the forgiving and upraising, (has) saved, (is) offering 'the plea whose origin (was) the agony of this'" (see his article on Inscriptions around Crosses in Southern India, in *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. 4, 1896-97, p. 174 ff.). Dr. Burnell was inclined to refer the record to the 7th or 8th century (see his article on some Pahlavi Inscriptions in Southern India, in *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. 3, 1874, p. 308 ff.; see, also, Mr. Sewell's *List of Antiquarian Remains in the Madras Presidency*, Vol. 1, 1882, p. 176).

These discoveries near Madras do not, — it seems to me, — help us towards the identification of Calamina, though they have served to convince many persons, to their satisfaction, that Calamina and Mylapore are one and the same place. Hue (Vol. 1, p. 24), following the Abbé Rémoudot (1718), says that Mylapore in the middle ages was known to Arabic writers as "Bétama ou Beit Thoma, la maison, l'église de Thomas." Kennet copies Hue. But the place indicated, Batuma or Tanumah, was evidently not in India, but much further east; the name is perhaps an error for Natuma, the Natuma Islands, in the China Sea (see Yule: *Cathay, etc.*, Vol. 1, p. civ.). In any case, it is a wholly gratuitous assumption that the word has anything to do with any Thomas.

We have no evidence whatever of Christianity in Southern India or Ceylon till we come to Cosmas (about 535).— And it seems to me that, by locating St. Thomas' tomb at Mylapore, we go out of our way to create difficulties. We have more or less to explain away or improve upon early Christian evidence, or to assume miracles of which there is no record.

Even what we learn from early sources about the relics of St. Thomas, seems out of harmony with the notion that the tomb of St. Thomas was in Southern India. The Acts, or some versions of them, tell us that the relics were carried away to the "West," an expression which would have been inappropriate if the starting-point had been Mylapore. The constant tradition of the Church seems to have been that the body was taken to Edessa. St. Ephraem (end of the 4th century), as quoted above, seems to imply that part of the body had been left in India; but that in no way implies Southern India. It is interesting, here, to note that the territory of which Edessa was the capital was in some sort of dependence on the Parthian empire till 216 A. D.; and so the Parthian connection of St. Thomas seems to run through everything. In the long account from an eyewitness, which St. Gregory of Tours (end of the 6th century) gives of a famous church in India at the unnamed place where St. Thomas was first buried, there is no suggestion of Southern India, and his description of the depth of the wells could hardly apply to Mylapore. We may note, also, that he says nothing about a part of the body being still there. The omission of so important a fact would be impossible in such a narrative, if we are to take it seriously. So, even if we assume him to mean Mylapore, we must conclude that the tomb was empty and that no relics were there.

The opinion of Asseman, mentioned by Bickell, as quoted above, is of great weight in such a matter as this. Asseman, who wrote at Rome early in the 18th century, was perfectly well informed; and no one could be more competent to pass judgment on the facts. He deemed these Indian relics of St. Thomas a Nestorian fabrication.

#### V. — General Conclusions.

The Right Rev. A. E. Medleycott, Bishop of Tricomia, formerly Vicar Apostolic of Trichur, has, I understand, a monograph on St. Thomas in preparation. It will, we may hope, afford us some fresh information, especially from recently explored Syriac sources. Meanwhile, the results at which we have here arrived regarding St. Thomas, may be summed up as follows:—

(1) — There is good early evidence that St. Thomas was the apostle of the Parthian empire; and also evidence that he was the apostle of "India" in some limited sense,—probably of an "India" which included the Indus valley, but nothing to the east or south of it.

(2) — According to the Acts, the scene of the martyrdom of St. Thomas was in the territory of a king named, according to the Syriac version, Mazdai, to which he had proceeded after a visit to the city of a king named, according to the same version, Gūduaphar or Gūndaphar.

(3) — There is no evidence at all that the place where St. Thomas was martyred was in Southern India; and all the indications point in another direction.

(4) — We have no indication whatever, earlier than that given by Marco Polo, who died 1324, that there ever was even a tradition that St. Thomas was buried in Southern India.

#### VI. — Some remarks about Gondophares, and about the proposed identification of certain persons mentioned in connection with him.

It does not come within the scope of this paper to discuss what is known from other sources than the Acts of St. Thomas, about the Gondophares whose name has been mentioned in some of the preceding pages. The following statements, however, may be made:—

At Kābul and Kandahār in Afghanistan, and at various places in the Panjāb, in Sindh, and in Seistān, there are obtained certain coins which have an Indian legend on one side and a Greek legend on the other. The Indian legend gives the name of a king in two forms, Gudaphara and

Gudapharna. Of the Greek legends, some present the name of the same king, in the genitive case, as Gondopharon and Gondapharou, and others present the genitive Undopherron. The two Greek names are understood to denote one and the same person. And his name is habitually accepted as Gondophares. He is held to have been of Parthian extraction. And the *provenance* of the coins indicates that his rule extended at least over Afghanistan and the Western parts of the Panjāb. In connection with the above-mentioned genitive Undopherron, it is convenient to say here that Mr. Budge has a note in *The Contendings of the Apostles*, Vol. 2, p. 21, that the old Persian form of the name is Viñdafra.

Other coins, also having both Greek and Indian legends, present the names of Abdagases, who appears to be distinctly described on them as a son of a brother of Gudaphara, — of Orthagnes, who is supposed to be described on them as a brother of Gudaphara, — and of Sasa and some other persons.

Also, at Takht-i-Bahi in the Yusufzai country, near Peshāwar, there has been obtained an inscription, in Indian characters, which is dated in the 26th year of the reign of Gudaphara, and in the year 103 of an era not specified by name. And no hesitation has ever been felt, I believe, about identifying the king who is therein mentioned with the king whose name we have in various forms on the coins and in the tradition about St. Thomas.

It is held that the coins preclude us from referring the date of the inscription to the Saka era commencing A. D. 78, and from placing that record in A. D. 180; because the general style of them forbids us to place them as late as that, and one of them, which connects with the name of Gondophares a certain particular epithet, seems to have been struck not later than the middle of the first century A. D. It is also held that that period would suit the other coins. And it has been admitted, in some quarters at least, that a very appropriate synchronism between the coins and the inscription and the period of St. Thomas may be established, by referring the date of the inscription to an initial point quite close to that of the Vikrama era commencing B. C. 58, and so placing the record in about A. D. 45 and the commencement of the reign of Gudaphara-Gudapharna-Gondophares in about A. D. 20.

(Authorities: — A. Cunningham: *Archæological Survey of India*, Vol. 2, Report for 1862-65, Calcutta, 1871, pp. 59, 60, and Vol. 5, Report for 1872-73, Calcutta, 1875, pp. 23, 58. A. von Sallet: in *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. 9, 1880, pp. 255-263. P. Gardner: *The Coins of the Greek and Scythic Kings of Bactria and India in the British Museum*, London, 1886. M. A. Stein: in *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. 17, 1888, pp. 89-98. A. Cunningham: *Coins of the Indo-Scythians*, London, 1890. G. Bühler: in *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. 25, 1896, p. 141.)

It has been suggested that Orthagnes is identical with the Gad of the Acts,— the brother of King Gūdnaphar. It is, however, doubtful whether Orthagnes was a brother of Gondophares. The supposition rests only on the supposed meaning of a word on the coins, the reading of which, proposed by Gen. Cunningham, is doubtful. Gardner (p. xlv.) can only say “the supposition has nothing improbable in it.”

As to Abdagases: — In the Greek writing concerning “the Falling Asleep of the Holy Mother of God,” which Tischendorf dated not later than the 4th century, there is the following passage, which I take from A. Walker’s translation (*Apocryphal Gospels, etc.*, 1890, pp. 507-8): — “And Thomas also answered and said: — And I, traversing the country of the Indians, when the preaching was prevailing by the grace of Christ, and the King’s sister’s son, Lablanus by name, was about to be seized by me in the palace, on a sudden the Holy Spirit says to me, Do thou also, Thomas, go to Bethlehem to salute the mother of thy Lord, because she is taking her departure to the heavens.” “Lablanus” should be “Lablames.” The original Greek may be seen in C. Tischendorf: *Apocryphes Mosis, Esdræ, Pauli, Johannis item Mariæ dormitio, etc.*, Leipzig, 1866, p. 101. Regarding Syria: versions see supplementary note at the end of this paper.

We have no King's sister's son in the Acts; but we have the son of King Mazdai, Vizān in the Syriac, who was baptised in his own house. In the Greek versions of the Acts, Vizān, as shewn above, is Ουαζάνης, Ίουζάνης, Ίουαζάνης, and Ἀζάνης, and in the Latin Zuzanes, Zuzani, Zuzanius, Luzanis, and Ozanes. The allusion may be to the same person.

In the *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. 9, 1880, pp. 255-263, there is a review of A. von Sallet's *Die Nachfolger Alexanders des Grossen in Baktrien und Indien*, Berlin, 1879, with translations of long extracts from the same. One of the extracts is as follows (p. 262 f.):—

"Abdagases, Nephew of Yndopheres. The passage communicated by Gutschmid from *Apocryph. Evangelium Joannis de obitu Marie* is important. There the apostle Thomas says of his mission "to the king of India:— τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀδελφῆς τοῦ βασιλέως ὀνόματι Λαβδανοῦς ὑπ' ἐμοῦ μέλλοντος σφραγίζεσθαι ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ. Moreover, besides Gondophoros, his brother Gad, who was converted with him, is mentioned; now Gutschmid justly compares ΒΑCILEΥ ΑΒΑΔΑ ΓΥΝΔΙΦΕΡΟ ΑΔΕΛΦΙΔΕΩΣ "with υἱός τῆς ἀδελφῆς τοῦ βασιλέως. This is certainly the same person, and the notice again "demonstrates how well the first legend writers were informed about Gondophares and his family. "But from the former erroneous lection ΑΟΑΔΑ instead of ΑΒΑΔΑ fixed by the Berlin specimen which "I copied, the erroneous suppositions of Gutschmid follow, who considers βασιλευα<sup>2</sup> to be a barbarous "genitive of the name Ὀάδας = Γράδ, Gad,—the supposed brother of the king and perhaps = Labdanes "(Abdanes) and compares this supposed Oadas with ΟΛΔΟ, the wind-god of Kanerku.

"Now the more correct lections of these nephew-coins (Prinsep, *Essays*, Vol. II., p. 216), with the "distinct name Abdagasa in Aryan, which Gutschmid has not used in this instance, demonstrate the "erroneousness of these conjectures.

"The nephew of Gondophares, as we learn from his coins, was called Abdagases, in Aryan "always Abdagasa, or Avdagasa, in Greek sometimes corrupted to Ἀβαδά . . . , Ἀβαλάσου, etc. "The reading adduced by Gutschmid of υἱοῦ τῆς ἀδελφῆς τοῦ βασιλέως Λαβδανοῦς is certain and of "great value; this nephew and his name are certainly identical with the Abdagases, Abada . . . "Abalgases of the coins."

We seem hardly in a position to make such positive statements. If we make use of these "legends," we must interpret them one with another. There seems no sufficient reason to think that the king to whom St. Thomas is made to allude, in the passage given just above, is Gondophares: the allusion would seem to be a totally different king, namely, the Mazdai of the Syriac Acts, the Μασδαῖος of the Greek and Misdeus of the Latin, — the king who put St. Thomas to death. It may be that the "legend-writers" have confused them; but, then, how are we to say they were "well informed about Gondophares and his family"? This Labdanes may perhaps be the Vizān or Ουαζάνης of the Acts, the son of King Mazdai; but there seems no good reason to identify him with Abdagases, the nephew of Gondophares. It should be remarked also that, though the reading Λαβδανοῦς is probably certain, still one of Tischendorf's texts has Κλαυδανοῦς. Also the texts do not say that the apostle is speaking "of his mission to the king of India:" that is only Von Sallet's inference.

We know nothing about Gondophares and his family except what can be learnt, as detailed above, from coins, from one inscription, and from the Acts of St. Thomas. His date is not yet definitely fixed; his territories are still more or less undefined; and his race is still not certain.

But, according to Gutschmid, all had been settled. Gondophares reigned A. D. 7 to 29; he ruled over "Aria, Drangiana and Arachosia;" and he derived "his descent from a Parthian "dynasty." His investigations had also shewn "that the Acts of Thomas are really based on "a Buddhist work, containing the history of a conversion, the scene of which must have been

<sup>2</sup> There seems to be something wrong about this sentence, from the word "But" to "βασιλευα." I can only quote exactly what is before me in print.

"Arachosia, and its date the times of Gondophorns." (R. A. Lipsius: article "Acts of the Apostles, Apocryphal," in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography, etc.*, Vol. 1, London, 1877.) Further, "Gutschmid shows that Gaspard, one of the three Kings of the Christian legend, is identical with Gondophares" (quotation from Gardner, p. xliii.).

All this seems fanciful. And Lipsius' easy acceptance, in 1877 or before, of the positive statements made by Gutschmid in matters which were then and still are uncertain, must continue to diminish the value of the former's criticism of the Acts of St. Thomas. Lipsius appeared to ignore the existence of the Syriac Version, which must be our starting-point. These Acts of St. Thomas should also be treated as an independent work, complete in itself, as Mr. Burkitt has treated it; not merely as a chapter in a work dealing with all the apostles, as scholars were inclined to treat it when only the Latin version of Pseudo-Abdias was available. The publication of the Syriac has made some criticism obsolete. And if we are to use these "legends," we must go to the Acts of St. Thomas, in the Syriac version, first of all, and not, as Cunningham, Yule, and others have done, to Pseudo-Abdias and to so very late a compilation as the "Legenda Aurea" of Jacobus de Voragine (c. 1230-1298), Archbishop of Genoa.

#### VII. — Note on the Legenda Aurea.

As mentioned just above, the *Legenda Aurea* has been quoted by some writers in dealing with Gondophares. It therefore seems desirable to say something about it, although it is too modern a work to be of much use for our purposes. It is one of the numerous works of the Dominican friar Jacobus a Voragine, or as we should say in English, Friar James of Varazze. Varazze or Voragine is a small seaport town in the Italian Riviera, and was the birthplace of the author, who ultimately became archbishop of Genoa, and died in 1298.

The work in question is an explanation of the offices celebrated by the Church during the ecclesiastical year, beginning with Advent. The *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 9th edition, 1888, describes it, not correctly, as a collection of legendary lives of the greater saints of the mediæval church. It is a work which obtained a large circulation, and it was translated from the Latin into several languages. Caxton published three English versions, 1483, 1487, and 1493.

The Latin text may be seen in the edition published by Dr. Th. Graesse at Dresden and Leipzig in 1846 under the title "Jacobi a Voragine Legenda Aurea vulgo Historia Lombardica dicta." A new French translation has been published recently by the Abbé J. B. M. Roze: *La légende dorée de Jacques de Voragine nouvellement traduite*: Paris, 1902: 3 volumes.

The festival of St. Thomas, 21st December, falling as it does in Advent, is dealt with in an early part of the work; and an account is there given of the life of the apostle, from which the following points of interest are extracted.

When St. Thomas was at Caesarea "rex Indiae Gundofernus misit praepositum Abbanem quaerere hominem architectoria arte eruditum . . . ut romano opere sibi palatium construeretur." The apostle consented to go; and our Lord, Who had appeared to him and to Abbanes, "tradidit ei Thomam . . . Navigantes autem ad quandam civitatem venerunt, in qua rex filiae suae nuptias celebrabat." The name of the city is not given, but what took place there is described.

"Post haec autem apostolus et Abbanes ad regem Indiae pervenerunt," *i. e.*, to Gundofernus, though the name is only mentioned once, namely as above at the beginning of the narrative.

The king gave St. Thomas much treasure with which to build a palace, and went away to another province for two years. Meanwhile the apostle gave the money away, preached to the people, and made innumerable conversions. On his return, learning what had been done, the king imprisoned St. Thomas and Abbanes, intending to put them to death.

Then Gad, the king's brother, died, and came to life again on the fourth day, and told of the palace he had seen in heaven. Gad released St. Thomas from prison; and the king begged his pardon. Many conversions followed.

"Post hoc autem in superiorem Indiam abiit." There he converted:—

1. Sintice or Syntice (the name is spelt both ways), friend of Migdomia.
  2. Migdomia or Migdouia (this name also is spelt in two ways), wife of Carisius, kinsman ("cognatus") of the king.
  3. The wife of the king, sister of Migdomia.
- The names of the king and queen are not given. The king would be the Mazdai of the Syriac Acts.

Finally, St. Thomas was put to death in the presence of the king and Carisius by the high priest of a temple, (" . . . pontifex autem templi elevans gladium transverberavit"). His body was buried by the Christians.

"Post longum tempus scilicet circa annos domini CC. et XXX. corpus apostoli in Edessam civitatem, quae olim dicebatur Rages Medorum, translatum est, Alexandro imperatore ad Syrorum preces hoc faciente." The confusion of Edessa in Mesopotamia with Rhagae the great city of Media is curious.

Thus the *Legenda Aurea*, as far as it goes, agrees substantially with the Syriac and other Acts. But the version it follows most closely is the second of the two Latin ones given by Max Bonnet, namely, the version headed "*Passio Sancti Thomae Apostoli*." This version mentions "Sinthice," "Sintice," or "Sentice," friend of Migdonia, who is not mentioned in the other Latin version or in the Greek or Syriac. It likewise makes the statement, but without a date, that the remains of the apostle were removed to Edessa at the request of the Syrians through the instrumentality of the emperor Alexander, who sent "ad regulos Indorum" for them. It is also there stated that the Syrians made their petition "ab Alexandro imperatore romano veniente victore de Persidis proelio, Xerse rege devicto." The allusion appears to be to the emperor Alexander Severus, who in 232 A. D. undertook an expedition against Artaxerxes (Ardashir), king of Persia, and founder of the Sassanidan dynasty.

Some explanation may be suggested, of a statement made by General Cunningham that it is recorded in the "*Saxon Legenda Aurea*" that "king *Gundoferus*" put St. Thomas to death (*Archaeol. Surrey of India*, Report for 1872-73, Calcutta, 1875, p. 60). Probably, the General intended to refer, not to the *Legenda Aurea* just described, but to the Anglo-Saxon Life of St. Thomas written by Elfric or Aelfric in the tenth century, which life, according to Sharon Turner (*History of the Anglo-Saxons*, 6th edition, London, 1836, Vol. 2, p. 159), is an abridgment of the Latin one which passes under the name of Abdias. Cunningham, in fact, gives a reference to Turner's book. Anyhow, there is no such work as a "*Saxon Legenda Aurea*." It is possible that the life written by Elfric is so abridged as to make it appear that "*Gundoferus*" was the king who put the apostle to death, which is not the case in the *Legenda Aurea*. Indeed, the quotation from it by Turner on p. 147, the page to which Cunningham refers, certainly implies that "*Gundoferus*" was the guilty person.

Again, in *Coins of the Indo-Scythians*, subdivision *Coins of the Sakas*, p. 16, London, 1890, Cunningham stated that "the *Legenda Aurea*" made "*Gundofores*" [*sic*] "King of Upper India, (Indiam superiorem)." In this case, he can only refer to the work of Jacobus a Voragine, who, however, speaks of "*Gundoferus*" as "rex Indiae" simply, and says that St. Thomas after leaving him "in superiorem Indiam abiit," and there converted Migdonia and others, and was put to death under an unnamed king. So, the only king mentioned in connection with "India superior" is not "*Gundofores*." The various texts of the *Legenda Aurea* are said to vary. But the three editions consulted agree in all that has been stated above.

## VIII. — Postscript.

1. — **Ethiopic versions of the Acts of St. Thomas.** Since the above paper was written, there has been an opportunity of seeing the two works referred to on page 3 above. Malan's *Conflicts of the Apostles* is out of date. The translation was made from a faulty modern MS. as shewn by Mr. Budge. The other work, entitled *The Contendings of the Apostles, Galla Hawaryât*, contains the Ethiopic texts in Vol. 1 edited by Mr. E. A. Wallis Budge from two MSS. formerly belonging to King Theodore of Abyssinia, and brought from Magdala in 1868. Vol. 2 contains a translation. The MSS. were probably written in the 15th and 17th century. The oldest MS. known is in Paris, and is dated 1379 A. D.

Lipsius writing in 1883, as appears from Mr. Budge's preface, was of opinion that these Ethiopic works were translated from the Coptic between 400 and 540. But Mr. Budge gives good reasons for concluding them to have been made from Arabic versions, probably during the early part of the 14th century. These Arabic versions would have taken the place of earlier ones in Sahidic Coptic, the dialect of Upper Egypt, when the one language had been superseded by the other. Some fragments of the Sahidic versions still exist. The Ethiopic versions of the Acts of St. Thomas would, therefore, appear to be of only small importance for our purposes. But we may note the proper names which appear in them, and a few other points.

The Ethiopic work contains two separate accounts about St. Thomas. The first, pp. 319-356 of the translation, has not much resemblance to the Syriac as a whole, and seems to be in a confused state. The second, pp. 404-465, entitled "The Acts of St. Thomas in India," is very like the Syriac as far as it goes; but it belongs to a part of the book, which Mr. Budge considers to consist of selections from less ancient works than the proper "Galla-Hawaryât," which seems to end at p. 368.

To take the second account first; here are some passages: —

When St. Thomas was at Jerusalem "a certain merchant who was from the county [sic] of India . . . and his name was Abnês, and he was sent from the king of Gônâ."

After the apostle and the merchant leave, "they sailed on happily until they arrived in the country of India, and came to the city of the king." Then the marriage feast is described, as usual.

In the 2nd Act: — "Now when the Apostle had entered into the country of India with 'Abnês, the merchant, 'Abnês departed to salute Gondapôr the king." In the same Act "Gádôn the brother of the king" is mentioned.

There are no other proper names, and there is nothing else worth noting. This account does not go farther than the 6th Act of the Syriac; so we do not reach the court of Mæzdai.

As regards the other account, which is moreover the only one in Malan's book: it is in two sections. The first is "The Preaching of Saint Thomas in India." There we have, for the Habbân and Gûdnaphar of the Syriac, "a certain officer of king Kaufûkôrôs," also "Arbâsôs, an officer of Kôntôrôs, king of India." When the apostle reaches India, this king requires him to build a palace, and directs "Lûkiyânôs (Vecins) the governor," elsewhere "Lûkiyôs," to supply him with materials, after which we hear no more of the king. What follows about the governor's wife "Arsônwâ (Arsenia)," has some resemblance to the story of Mygdonia in the Syriac; but that was in another king's country. Afterwards, St. Thomas is directed by our Lord to go to "a city in the East, which is called Kantôryâ (Quantaria);" and he does so.

The next section is "The Martyrdom of Saint Thomas in India." It does not seem to join on naturally to the previous section. After establishing a church and clergy in India, "he departed unto the city of Hâkît, which is by Macedonia;" but the story is evidently corrupt, as what follows

implies that the apostle was still in India, or had returned there. For the Syriac *Mazdai*, we have in different passages "Mastyôs the king," "Maytewanyânôs," "Mastÿôs" and "Mâtsÿôs." We have "Têrtêrbânî [elsewhere Têrtêrbányâ] the wife of the king, and Marhanâ his daughter," who seem to be the Tertîa and Manashar (daughter-in-law) of the Syriac. After the burial of St. Thomas "in the sepulchre of the kings," it is stated: — "Now Sekûrâ and Awÿsyâs did not come into the "city." Who they are, is not said; they have not been mentioned before. Mr. Budge identifies Sekûrâ with the Šifûr of the Syriac, and Awÿsyâs doubtfully with Vizân. Further on we have: — "Now Mastayôs, the king, and Zirâyâsôs took their wives "Têrtêrhányâ and 'Aḫbânâ and chastised them sorely," etc. This is the first mention of Zirâyâsôs (lower down, Zerayâs) and of 'Aḫbânâ, presumably the Karîsh and Mygdonia of the Syriac; and they are not brought naturally into the story, which seems to be mangled in the Ethiopic. Lastly, there is "'Astayôs the king's son" who became possessed of a devil, and on whose account the king went to the tomb to obtain a relic. Mr. Budge's translation appears to imply that the body of the apostle was still there. The story ends in the conversion of the king; and "Awÿtyôs Kôrôs, the priest" of the Christians, is mentioned.

[With reference to the name Têrtêrbânî in the preceding paragraph, it may be noted that among the "Festa immobilia ecclesiae Antiochenae Syrorum" under 6th October is "Coronatio Thomae Apostoli, et regis Indiae et Misadi ejusque filii Joannis et matris ejus Tartariae." See N. Nilles, S. J., *Kalenarium manuale utriusque Ecclesiae Orientalis et Occidentalis*, Vol. 1. Innsbruck, 1896, p. 460.]

2. — "The Falling asleep of the Holy Mother of God." Syriac versions of this work were discovered or published about the same time that Tischendorf discovered the Greek. Wright published one in the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, Jan. and April, 1865, and two others, incomplete, in *Contributions to the Apocryphal Literature of the New Testament*, London, 1865.

As scholars seem to be of opinion that the Syriac of this work is based on the Greek, the Syriac versions are not important; but the passage corresponding to what has been given on page 152 above is still of some interest. It is as follows: — "And Thomas said: I was informed in India, when "I had gone in to visit the nephew of Lūdân, the king of India, and as I was talking to him, the "Holy Spirit said to me: The time draws nigh for the mother of thy Lord to leave the world." This passage is only in the MS. published in the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, a manuscript which Wright thought belonged to the second half of the 6th century. The passage is not in the other two MSS., which are incomplete.

There is, however, yet another passage connecting St. Thomas with India in the Greek and in all the Syriac versions. It precedes the one already quoted which is in chapter 20 of the Greek. This other passage is chapter 12. There we have the words: — *Θωμᾶς ἐκ τῶν Ἰνδῶν ἐρωτήρων* [variant *ἐρωτέρων*]. The corresponding passages in the Syriac are: — (MS. in *Journ. Sac. Lit.*) "Thomas in India, who had gone in to visit the nephew of Lūdân [or Laudân] the king of "India;" and (MSS. in *Contributions*, etc.) "Thomas in India." Walker translates the Greek "Hither India."

There has been no opportunity of referring to the Syriac text published this year [1902] by Mrs. A. S. Lewis in *Studia Sinaitica*, No. 11, *Apocrypha Syriaca*, Cambridge University Press. A review in the *Tablet*, 4th Oct., says it is edited from the underwriting of a palimpsest which Mrs. Lewis dates at latest the beginning of the 6th century. It is the complete text of one of the two versions of which Wright published fragments in *Contributions*, etc. The reviewer states that it is the most corrupt form of the story, and the most removed from the Greek, so freely rewritten, in fact, as to be in effect an original Syriac composition.

With reference to the opinion that these Syriac versions are based on Greek originals, it may not be out of place here to recall that, when Wright published the Syriac text of the Acts of

St. Thomas, he was almost certain that that work also was a Syriac version of a Greek text. But scholars seem subsequently to have come to the opinion that the Syriac is the original. It may be that further examination may shew that the work we are now considering was also Syriac in origin, in which case the reading "the nephew of Lūdān, [or Laudān] king of India" might be of importance. It seems to be held that apocryphal literature of this sort was generally of Semitic origin.

3. — M. Sylvain Lévi on St. Thomas, Gondophares, and Mazdai. My paper was unfortunately written without knowledge of M. Lévi's suggestive article entitled *Notes sur les Indo-Scythes, III., Saint Thomas, Gondopharès et Mazdeo*, in the *Journal Asiatique*, Jan.-Feb. 1897.

Allusion has been made on page 154 above to the unsatisfactory manner in which the subject of this paper was treated by Gutschmid, whose views were adopted by Lipsius. It was not very willingly that a mere compiler like myself would presume to criticise scholars of such eminence; but when, under the authority of these great names, uncertainties had been given as positive facts in such a standard work as Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography, etc.*, it seemed necessary to say something. It is, therefore, satisfactory to observe that M. Lévi also found the time had come for shewing that Gutschmid's theories about St. Thomas were obsolete or rested on false data. It is unnecessary to detail them here. But something may be said about the route followed by the apostle.

Gutschmid considered that *Andrapolis*, the *Sandarūk* or *Sanadrūk* of the Syriac, the port at which St. Thomas disembarked, indicated a town of the *Andhras* in the *Koṅkaṇ* coast where the *Andhra-Sātakarṇi* dynasty ruled in the first century of our era; and on this he assumed that the account of the apostle's subsequent mission to Gondophares and Mazdai was only the stolen story of a Buddhist missionary, perhaps *Nāgārjuna*, who went from the *Dekkan* to propagate his religion among the *Yavanas* and *Pahlavas*. M. Lévi shews that Gutschmid had to do violence to the texts of the *Acts* in order to develop his theory. But in doing so, he himself seems to fall into an error of some importance. He states that the various versions of the *Acts* are unanimous in making St. Thomas travel to the East after leaving *Gondophares*. That is not the case, as has been shewn on page 6 above. The Greek and the Syriac say simply he preached throughout all India. The first Latin version says nothing; and the second, the "*Passio*," — from which M. Lévi says "*il prend le chemin de l'Inde l'Étréneure*," — states "*profectus est ad Indiam superiorem*," which is not the same thing. It is necessary to point this out, as the error affects the force of M. Lévi's suggested identification of *Mazdai* with *Vāsudēva*. It is, however, true that the *Ethiopic* account (see above) says the apostle went to "a city in the East which is called *Ḳantōryā*;" and in this name, *Quantaria* in Malan's now obsolete translation, the only one available in 1897, M. Lévi thinks *Gandhāra* may be recognised, which place, he states, was occupied by the *Sakas*, *Kushans*, and *Parthians* at different times.

As regards *Andrapolis*, M. Lévi shews it may really be the same word as *Sandarūk*, the initial sibilant being dropped in the Greek, as in *Andracottus*, a form employed as well as *Sandracottus*.

M. Lévi considers that the *Acts* clearly indicate that St. Thomas and *Habbān* followed the ordinary trade route between the Syrian coast and the *Pañjāb*, as detailed by *Pliny* (*Hist. natur.* vi, 26, 103) and in the *Periplus* (38, 39), that is to say, down the Red Sea, and on past *Cape Syagros* in Arabia to *Patala* or *Barbarikon* at the mouth of the *Indus*. There the ships used to anchor; and the merchandise went up the river to *Minnagar*, described in the *Periplus* as the metropolis of *Scythia*, governed by *Parthians*, always fighting among themselves. If the country was not safe, the ships would go on to *Barygaza* (*Broach*), whence there was a trade route *viâ Ozōnē* (*Ujjāin*) to *Proklais* (*Puṣkalivāin*) on the borders of *Bactriana*.

M. Lévi says a tradition, constant among the Greek Fathers from the 5th century, designates the town at which St. Thomas was martyred as "*Kalaminē*." This appears to be an erroneous statement, though often made, as has been shewn above.

An unpublished Armenian version of the Acts of St. Thomas in the Berlin Library is mentioned, the text of which appears to be identical with the Syriac. M. Lévi has made some use of the Armenian forms of proper names contained therein.

The most important and suggestive part of the article is that which relates to the proposed identification of **Mazdai** with **Vāsudēva**. But it is impossible to deal with that properly here; and the reader must go to the article itself. A few points may, however, be taken up, mostly in further elucidation of the proper names occurring in the Acts and in "The Falling asleep of the Holy Mother of God."

M. Lévi appears to hold, with Von Sallet, that **Labdanes** and **Abdagases** are the same person. He suggests that the initial lambda results from dittography, [Λ]ΑΒΔΑΝΗC. Hypocoristic forms are found among Parthian names, and *gas* means 'beautiful.'

On coins, the names of **Vāsudēva** appears in Greek as ΒΑΖΟΔΗΟ and ΒΑΖΔΗΟ. Coming into Iranian territory, the name would fall under **Mazdian influences**, and become **Mazdeo**; moreover, he remarks, the two labials are constantly confused, as for instance in Mumba turned by the Portuguese into Bombay, and Minnagar in the Periplus made into Binnagar by Ptolemy. (Compare what has been said above by Mr. Burkitt that **Mazdai** is a good old Persian name.) M. Lévi gives the further information that the name is **M-stēh** in the Armenian Acts, **Smidaios** in the *Menaea* [liturgical books of the Greek Church, containing short histories of the saints], and **Smindaios** in *Nicephorns* (presumably N. Callistus Xanthopulus, 14th century). These forms may be added to those already given.

As regards **Vizān** (*Vizan* in the Armenian according to M. Lévi) son of **Mazdai**, Gutschmid and Marquart considered the name to be the same as the Pahlavi **Wijēn**, Persian **Bijēn**. This does not harmonise with the Greek and Latin forms, and further, though admissible if we locate **Mazdai** in Iranian territory, it is not at all so, if we make St. Thomas go into India, to **Vāsudēva**, as suggested. M. Lévi thinks the compiler of the Acts was too well informed about India to give to an Indian prince the name of a secondary hero of the Iranian epic, the name in fact of **Bezhan**, son of **Gēv**, son of **Gudarz**. Be that as it may, M. Lévi thinks that, though the remembrance of this personage may very well have influenced the Syriac and Armenian transcriptions, the Greek and Latin forms exclude the identity of the two names. The Greek **Ouzanes**, etc., and Latin **Zuzanis**, etc., all lead back to an original *ouzan* or rather *gouzan*. The change of *vi* into *gu*, which had been definitely accomplished by the time of the Sassanians, was in progress soon after the Christian era, and facilitated the substitution of one syllable for the other; and, at the same epoch, on the confines of India and Iran, the pronunciation oscillated between initial *u* and *gu*. This is confirmed by the forms "Gondopharon," "Induphrra," and "Undopherron," in Greek, on coins, being all equivalent to the "Gudaphara," "Gudupharna," and "Gondopharna" of the Indian legends on the same. (I quote the names as printed in the article, but they do not all seem correct.)

Thus, — M. Lévi concludes, — **Ouzanos** would seem to be equivalent to **Gushana**. The forms **Iouzanes** in Greek, and **Zuzanes** and **Luzanes** in Latin perhaps preserve the trace of a initial lost in **Ouzanes**, and **Γουζανης** in writing might easily become **ιουζανης**. Hence and for other reasons given, M. Lévi suggests that the *Mahārāja* **Gushana**, who closely followed the **Kushan Vāsudēva**, was perhaps identical with **Ouzanes** or **Vizān**, the son of the king **Mazdai**, who put St. Thomas to death.

4. — **Syriac versions of the Acts of St. Thomas.** As mentioned on page 3 above, Wright's translation from British Museum Add. MS. 11645, dated A. D. 936, has been followed. Allusion was made to two other MSS. of these Acts, one at Berlin in the Sachau collection, and the other at Cambridge. In answer to enquiries, Mr. F. C. Burkitt has kindly supplied some further information regarding these MSS.

The Berlin MS. (Sachau 222) was written in Alkôsh in 1831, and contains 33 Acts, beginning, like the British Museum MS., with the Acts of St. Thomas. The readings of this MS. are to be found in P. Bedjan's *Acta Sanctorum et Martyrum*, Vol. 3, Paris, 1892. Bedjan made use of Sachau's MS., and, whenever he gives a reading in text or notes which differs from Wright's text, it agrees with the Cambridge MS.

The Cambridge University Library MS. Add. 2222 was written in A. D. 1883, at Tel-Kêphê in the district of Mosul, and was acquired through Wright. Mr. Burkitt understands that it was copied for Wright after the Berlin MS. had been acquired by Sachau, but before it left the East. This Cambridge MS., though no doubt a faithful copy of its immediate archetype, is very inferior to Wright's MS. It omits many words, sentences and paragraphs, which undoubtedly belong to the old Acts. But it agrees with the Greek in having "Gundaphar" instead of "Gûdnaphar," the latter being, so Mr. Burkitt supposes, a mere perversion, and due to the scribe of the British Museum MS. Possibly the Cambridge MS. may be a cousin, and not a son of the Sachau MS.

As has been shewn on page 4 above, an important word is illegible in the British Museum MS. There we find "a certain merchant happened to come into the South country from . . . ." The Berlin and Cambridge MSS. give "a certain merchant came from the south country." Thus, the illegible word is omitted, and "from" is read instead of "into." Mr. Burkitt suspects that the lost word was only the Syriac for "Hindustan." He adds that Gundaphar is called "king of Hindu;" and that what Wright calls "the realm of India" (see page 4 above) is literally "Hindu City."



# “Thank You for



Photos by Harold Kurtz

**A little-known  
state in  
northeast India  
seems like  
a “Christian  
Shangri La”**

**B**anners stretched across the road; a forest of faces on each side smiled their greetings; 30 young, muscular men with traditional headdress and waistcloth, their chests and feet bare, stood beside shining motor-scooters, waiting to serve as our motorcade.

We were four busloads of people, predominantly Presbyterians, arriving from other parts of India, from nearby Asian countries, and from

the United States and Europe, the biggest group representing Wales. We had come to the border of a remote, little-known state of northeast India, Mizoram, until 1987 a part of Assam, to participate in a week-long celebration of the centenary of the arrival of the first Welch Presbyterian missionaries in that area.

The Mizo people trace their ethnic heritage to Mongolia and have sought, and now received, more au-

# the Gospel”

BY HAROLD KURTZ

tonomy. A period of political unrest with its attendant security problems had kept most of the outside world at bay in recent history. But the Indian government had lifted the veil to allow the Mizoram Presbyterian Church to invite delegates from partner churches and organizations to join them for this special celebration. What a gift it was for Dr. Beverly Booth, a Presbyterian mission co-worker in Delhi, and me to be there. What an unbelievable experience!

It seems like a Christian Shangri La, this remote state of India where more than 90 percent of an ethnic group, the Mizos, have embraced Jesus as Lord. The Mizos comprise the majority of the Mizoram State, which has a population of more than 6 million. Mizos are also found in neighboring states and spill over into Burma and Bangladesh. The church has had a dynamic outreach to many other tribal groups still without the gospel. These ethnic groups made a unique contribution of music, dance, language and witness to the centenary celebration.

With a membership of more than 3 million, the Mizoram Presbyterian Church is now one of four synods making up the 6 million-member Presbyterian Church of India. The missionary force of the Mizoram Synod, numbering more than 800, serve in other parts of India, Nepal and Taiwan. The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) has helped some Mizo students sent to the States for advanced study in theology. For a number of years the Presbyterian Frontier Mission Fund assisted the Mizos in their outreach to tribal groups without the gospel.



A phrase we saw over and over again on banners hung over the streets, on publications, and written on the beautiful shoulder sashes of the ushers was “Thank You for the Gospel.” This was most personally directed to the Welch Presbyterian missionaries and the church that sent them. But it was also directed generally to the Christian world that had taken seriously the Great Com-

**More than 90 percent  
of the Mizos  
have embraced  
Jesus as Lord**



Music, metered by drums, was prominent in the celebrations (one drum—not pictured—may be the world's largest)



## Over and over again the Mizos related how the gospel had changed their society and given them a future and a hope

mission and carried the Good News to places where people lived in isolation, burdened by their superstitions and haunted by the fear of the spirit world.

Over and over again the Mizos related how the gospel had come as welcome good news that changed their society and gave them a future and a hope. "Thank You for the Gospel" was the centerpiece of the centenary.

The new life that has come to these people was evident everywhere we went, but most graphically as some 30,000 people gathered for the celebration in the largest open field in the center of Aizwal, the mountainous state capital. All around that mass of humanity was an array of colorful dress, for which they are known. Music rose up in a traditional form metered by drum and shaped by occasional dancers swaying in the aisles.

The Mizos had scoured the mountains to find the biggest of their drum trees out of which to fashion a drum for the celebration. There it stood, perhaps the largest drum in the world, over 12 feet in diameter,

beating out the joy of the gospel. Choir after choir sang, including a special 2,000-voice Centenary Choir. Many styles of songs moved us deeply but none as much as the Mizo rendering of Handel's "Hallelujah Chorus."

Huge crowds gathered morning, afternoon and evening. A morning was given over to the women and an afternoon to the young people. Each group celebrated what it meant to them that Jesus had come into their society and lives. Original dramas were acted out with natural ability and humor. The theme of the women's presentation was the change in a woman's life that resulted from Jesus' message. The young people depicted the change of society from "head hunting to soul winning."

We had wondered if there would be too much glorification and idealization of the missionaries. The plays put our minds at ease. Though we did not understand the language, the acting and the uproarious laughter that greeted the Mizos dressed up as the first missionaries with their stumbling efforts to communicate the

gospel told us they readily understood the foibles and mistakes of that mission community. It was the gospel they were revering, not the frail vessels in which it had come. But they also honored the fact that without missionary dedication and sacrifice they would never have known the new life in Christ. That new life changed their society and enabled them to fulfill the best in their traditional way of life.

I never saw a beggar during our time in Mizoram, and stealing is rare. They have retained the traditional tribal structures and family loyalty in an amazing commitment to care for one another and to remain closely tied into extended family units with mutual responsibility. And the traditional taboo against stealing has been reinforced by the message of Jesus, producing a society casual with locks and possessions. We returned to the hotel near midnight to find the desk clerk gone but the keys neatly laid out on the desk for each of us to take!

"Thank You for the Gospel"—and there was a counterpoint on the banners as well, "The Gospel for All." We left that hauntingly beautiful country with those two phrases ringing in our minds and hearts and challenged by the way the gospel had been witnessed back to us. ■



Harold Kurtz, a Presbyterian missionary in Ethiopia for 22 years, now retired and living in Portland, Ore., is director of the Presbyterian Frontier Fellowship, a validated mission support group of the PCUSA.

*Vacation Clinic in Kashmir.* Dr. Lois H. Visscher, Superintendent of Memorial Hospital, Fatehgarh, India, spent most of her hot weather vacation conducting a clinic at a lake in the hills near Kashmir. The Kashmir area was suggested to her by India's Minister of Health, Raj Kumari Amrit Kaur, a Christian woman, who is concerned about the many hill people of India to whom no medical aid is available.

In a resort bungalow lent by a Church of England group, Dr. Visscher spent her week days seeing as many as 122 new patients and 30 "repeats" a day, though her average was considerably less. People arrived from many villages within an eight-mile radius to tell her about their aches and pains. In addition to the excitement seekers, there were patients with abscesses to be opened; patients half blind with sore eyes;

*Handwritten notes:*  
The first case was a child with a large abscess on the face.  
IS mt of eye + sites.

*Published by*  
The Division of Research  
and Post-Graduate Studies  
of  
THE UNITED  
THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE  
Bangalore

*Editor*  
THE REVD DR ERIC J. LOTT

*Business Manager*  
THE REVD DR IMMANUEL DAVID

*Annual Subscription Rates. Sea-mail* (for a 3-year  
advance subscription 10% discount is offered).

India, Bangla Desh, Pakistan & Sri Lanka Rs. 40 00

UTC Alumni (From 1987 onwards) Rs. 25.00

Other Asian Countries, Africa  
and South America Rs. 40.00

United Kingdom £ 5.50

Germany and European Countries DM 24.00

U.S.A. and Canada \$ 10.00

Australia and New Zealand A \$ 8.00

Published Quarterly

Printed at :

Printers India

1, Dickenson Road,

Bangalore-560 042.

Address all correspondence to:

*Bangalore Theological Forum*

United Theological College,

17, Miller's Road,

Bangalore-560 046, S. India.

**BANGALORE  
THEOLOGICAL  
FORUM**

Vol. XIX, No. 1, Jan - April 1987

---

A Journal of the United Theological College, Bangalore,  
S. India, with Papers primarily by staff, students and alumni.

---

	Page
M. V. ABRAHAM	
Good News to the Poor in Luke's Gospel	1
↘ S. MARK HEIM	
The Nature of Doctrine and the Development of Asian Theology	14
EILEEN MURRAY	
Religious Education : Theolo- gical or Social Science?	33
JAMES SRINIVASAN	
Criteria for A Curriculum for Lay Preachers in the Church of S. India	49
BOOK REVIEW (ARUN GOPAL)	66

## The Nature of Doctrine and the Development of Asian Theology

S. Merk Heim \*

It comes as no surprise for Christian theologians to be told that their whole field is today in a state of disarray. The discipline of theology is fragmented. By this I do not simply mean that there is a proliferation of various emphases in theology: Black theology, feminist theology, liberation theology, Minjung theology, and so on. The history of theology is a history of different schools of thought, of frequent and vigorous arguments. It is thus not simply the existence of various points of view that makes the present moment different.

What is striking about the current situation is precisely the lack of argument in the traditional sense. Strong disagreement necessarily involves a certain amount of agreement. Two opposing views are opposite answers to the same question. The common understanding of the question is the basis upon which argument proceeds. The fragmentation of theology today is precisely the lack of common questions. Different theologians pursue their work in isolated camps. It is very hard even to apply the shopworn labels of 'liberal' or 'conservative', since these make sense only on a shared axis. For instance, if theologians were to agree that the historicity of the gospel narratives is an absolutely crucial point, it might make sense to classify those who argued most strongly for that historicity as conservatives and those who most questioned it as liberals. But this is not the most helpful way of distinguishing those who think the question is important from those who may think it entirely irrelevant.

Perhaps the most striking point at which this fragmentation shows up is in the understandings of the nature of theology itself.

\* Dr. Merk Heim, Assistant Professor of Theology at Andover-Newton Theological College, was Visiting Professor at U.T.C., Bangalore, in June term 1986.

Bangalore Theological Forum, Vol. XIX, No. 1, April—1987.

It has often been remarked that contemporary Western theology has a kind of methodological fixation. The questions which are discussed at the greatest length have to do with *whether* theology can be done, *how* it ought to be done, and what sort of thing it is *when* it is done. So 'doctrinal' disagreement today goes deeper than that between those who would accept or reject a Chalcedonian Christology, or between those who reject or defend the doctrine of the incarnation. It is more profoundly a disagreement over what 'doctrine' is. It is not an accident that one of the most prominent recent works in Western theology is Bernard Lonergan's *Method in Theology* and one of the most-discussed books in the last year has been George Lindbeck's *The Nature of Doctrine*.<sup>1</sup>

In the Asian context, some of the same fundamental concerns are prominent, though for slightly different reasons. The attempt to develop an authentic Indian theology, for instance, involves the conviction that such theology must be authentic in two ways: authentically Indian and authentically Christian. But this raises with special urgency the question as to what constitutes the 'authenticity' of Christian doctrine. Surely it is not its Westernness or its alliance with Hellenistic philosophy. How then is it to be understood?

The question has been forced in the West by historical change (causing theologians to ask how it is that doctrine can develop from one period to another) and ecumenism (causing theologians to ask how it was that controversial questions could be resolved without either side changing their fundamental convictions.)<sup>2</sup> In Asia the question is forced by the need for doctrine to undergo a cultural conversion, to come to terms with the rich and ancient context within which the church is located. But the question is similar, and is of crucial importance for all of us.

It is crucial if Christian theology is to avoid geographical fragmentation. It would be a pyrrhic victory if Asian theology were to throw off the domination of Western categories and models at the same time that a kind of anarchy in theology became the rule. Whereas in the past Western theology dominated the Asian

Christian scene, the future would be for Asian theology to be left to go its own way, as Western theology did, on the grounds that everybody is entitled to their own theology. This would be unfortunate, I believe, in that it would prevent any significant 'return flow' of influence from East to West, a flow which holds much promise.

The question is a difficult one however. If a vital interaction is to continue between Asian Christian theology and other Christian theology, we must be able to articulate this process in some way that indicates Asian Christian theology is normative Christian theology, every bit as much as that in the established tradition. That is, it is necessary to avoid two extremes. One extreme would be to say that all theology is strictly 'local', in the sense of being for a single group and place, and for those only. Asian Christian theology would not interact with others (or even Asian theologies with each other) because they would be basically isolated. The other extreme would be to say that there is a 'universal' theology which is the property of some particular groups or traditions, and all others—though they may have some validity—are 'second hand' adaptations of the real thing for some special situation. Thus Asian theologies, even though their 'special situation' is the environment for half of humanity, would be in some intrinsic sense 'junior' theologies. If these extremes are to be avoided, and a healthy interaction maintained, we must have some common way of understanding the theological task which preserves the integrity of all the participants. Only, too, on some such understanding can the precious insights of one tradition be shared with another.<sup>3</sup>

There seem to be three main ways of understanding the nature of doctrine itself: the cognitive, the expressivist and the cultural-linguistic.<sup>4</sup> In many ways, modern history of theology in the West can be written in terms of the development of these approaches, and the modern fragmentation of theology can be partly traced to the fact that all three (and variations on them) coexist vigorously today. We might even attach historical labels to these approaches identifying the cognitive approach with a traditionalist stream in theology, the expressivist with the explosive development of 'liberal' theology from the time of the 18th century, and

the cultural-linguistic with the 'post-liberal' theological stirrings in most recent times. This would be a little too neat, but it offers a suggestive indication of the historical centre of gravity of each approach.

By a cognitivist understanding of doctrine, I mean one which understands the content of doctrines to be propositional in character, directly representing objective reality. Ideally, on this view, a doctrine is a statement of a one-to-one correspondence between a verbal formula and an ontological state of affairs. Though in practice it may not be possible, because of the inherent ambiguity of language, for a doctrinal proposition to designate one and only one possible state of affairs, doctrine seeks the closest approximation to this that is possible.

The role of doctrine is descriptive. Thus, when one considers a doctrine like that of the two natures of Christ, human and divine, the cognitivist approach would view this doctrine as stating as exactly as possible the objective character of Christ's being.

To say the same thing slightly differently, the doctrine is regarded as intending to designate the one and only state of affairs that is true in relation to Christ's nature and being. There may be numberless possible statements of Christ's character: the doctrine gives as nearly as possible the one of all these which is to be preferred over the rest. Doctrine is the correct answer to an eternal question.

The expressivist approach, however, would see the nature of doctrine quite differently. In this view, doctrine is propositional in form but not in essential character. Doctrine is the expression of a fundamental religious experience. The relation between the experience itself and the doctrinal expression of it is not a one-to-one relation, but a symbolic one. It is not appropriate to expect a doctrine to have a univocal meaning. Its meaning is the experience it expresses. The doctrine of the two natures of Christ, then, tells us something not about the nature of Christ, but about the religious experience of those professing the doctrine. Further, it is not to be assumed that different doctrines necessarily represent

different experiences: this is something that can be determined only by examining the experience behind them. We might instance, one of the paradigmatic shifts from a cognitivist to an expressivist outlook the shift occasioned by historical-critical study of the Bible, from regarding the New Testament as primarily propositional statements about the activities and character of Jesus to regarding it as primarily expressing the religious experience of early Christian communities and writers.

The cultural-linguistic approach views doctrine from yet a third perspective. If the first approach sees doctrine as propositional, and the second sees it as expressive, this approach sees it as regulative. 'Linguistic' refers to a similarity perceived between religious faith and participation in a language community. Reality does not come to us transparently through language. There are many different ways, in many different languages, to express what we see and feel before the horizon at sunset. No one of these can be said to be identical with that which it describes. On the other hand, it is also not the case that statements in different languages about a sunset are simply interchangeable expressions of the same experience. The experience itself is significantly shaped and determined by the language through which, so to speak, it is experienced. It is then, perfectly meaningful to speak of an objective difference between statements in two different languages.

On this view, then, doctrine is part of a religious language or culture, a way of life. The meaning of doctrine lies primarily in its representation and constitution of relationships that exist within a particular religious form of life. That is, doctrines *express* relationships between modes of speech and behaviour within a faith community and they also *form* a faith community by guiding people to share its modes of speech and behaviour. In particular, doctrine is seen to be analogous to the grammar of a language. The rules of grammar regulate the usage of a language, with the language and the usage together constituting a certain 'life form' within which people describe and encounter reality. So too doctrine is understood to be a 'second level' proposition, a principle to regulate the language (actions as well as words) of a religious tradition, and so to define a particular life of faith.

The regulative function of doctrine is seen to be primarily not to symbolically express an experience or to provide one and only one positive description of reality, but to regulate what *kind* of things can meaningfully be said (and done) within a form of faith. To take the example again of the two natures doctrine, the cultural-linguistic approach would see this not as an attempt to provide the one and only objective description of the nature of Jesus Christ (ontologically or physiologically) but rather as a rule for making such descriptions. Thus the principle rules *out* certain ways of speaking about Jesus as unacceptable: to speak of Jesus purely as a human like all others or to speak of Jesus as purely divine, with only the appearance of humanity. But it rules *in* no single description absolutely, leaving the field open to an unknown number which could all comply with the rule, while perhaps differing from each other in some way.

To treat doctrine in such a way may seem to some to trivialize it, or at least to cast doubt upon whether it has a truth value beyond simply giving the 'rules of the game' for a particular community. We should remember, however, that many of the church fathers at the time of the trinitarian and christological controversies very readily spoke of the doctrinal decisions as rules of speech: rules of liturgical speech. But as liturgy was understood as a very real kind of action, these rules were also understood to regulate life, not only talk. We should also remember that the regulating function of doctrine depends upon convictions about truth. We follow a particular form of life because we believe it to be in rapport with reality, to be in touch with the truth. The cultural-linguistic approach stresses the fact that doctrines are not the sort of thing that can be true or false on an isolated, case by case basis. Their truth, or falsehood, inheres in a larger system or form of life, of which they are an integral part.

We may pause for a moment here to consider the similarity between this cultural-linguistic approach to doctrine and the understanding of scientific theories which has developed in a significant portion of the philosophy of science. Here too, we find that there has been a conflict between an understanding of scientific theories

which understood them as simple descriptions of the objective mechanisms of nature and one which took them to be symbolic forms in which humans construed the phenomena of nature for their own purposes, arbitrarily choosing one out of an unlimited number of possible forms.

Between the radically 'realistic' and the radically 'nominalistic' approach to the doctrines of science, another view has grown up which tends instead to treat scientific theories as maps for certain areas of nature.<sup>5</sup> No map is a simple one-to-one transcription of the reality it represents. Maps describe reality in a number of different ways and in the service of many different purposes. Geological maps are different from road maps, though both may cover the same geographical area. It makes sense to ask whether a map is 'true' or 'false' because maps can misrepresent reality, they can lead one to look for a road that is not there, for instance. But there is a further and vast area within which true/false are not completely binary opposites.

If we ask whether Newton's laws of motion are true or not, the answer depends somewhat on the range of application we intend or imply for them. At the time of their formulation, scientists tended to look upon them as direct pictures of the inner workings of the universe. With the realization that these laws did not hold in many circumstances, as for instance in those where velocities approach the speed of light, such a view of their character had to be changed. But they remained true and accurate accounts and predictions of the motions and interactions we encounter ordinarily in daily life: the motion of cars, trains, balls, bullets and so on.

Thus many philosophers of science would say that scientific theory has both a realistic and creative element. It is not simple description, though it is in a real way constrained and tested by objective data. It is not simply the subjective expression of a human vision of nature, though it is decisively shaped by human purposes and aesthetic tastes. This is why the analogy to a map is so apt. Maps are made as they are in careful relation to observed reality, but also with ruling considerations for the particular

kinds of purpose we want met by them and the kinds of aesthetics and images which communicate most effectively to us.

We could say that a road map, for instance, not only describes reality in a valid way—there are real avenues of pavement laid across the countryside—but also describes or partly defines a form of life, namely one related to travel on highways in vehicles with the purpose of reaching certain kinds of destination. It is a particular form of life which determines how the objective reality shall be represented to some extent: the map makes it clear how to get from Bangalore to Mysore, not how to get from a particular forest glen to a mountainside cave, because we are more interested in cities than glens. On the other hand, the form of life also *creates* certain of the realities which are to be represented: the roads are there as they are precisely because of most peoples' interest in connecting Bangalore and Mysore. The map reflects a form of life. And it is by reference to the map that people participate in that form of life. A similar thing could be said of scientific theories. They can be viewed as maps of reality, about which the crucial question to ask is, 'Where can you get by using them?' Two theories may treat the same sphere of reality quite differently and for quite different purposes, and yet not contradict each other, if the range of their applications is different. This may be suggestive for us in our approach to theological doctrines:

Before we turn to the large question of how such an approach might affect our view of the development of Asian theology, let us consider how the cultural-linguistic model of doctrine views theological conflict and agreement. As George Lindbeck points out, certain kinds of theological agreement can be as perplexing as controversy for those who contend that doctrine has an objective value.<sup>6</sup> The instance that Lindbeck cites is that of ecumenical doctrinal agreements like that reached in the Roman Catholic-Lutheran dialogue. How is it Lindbeck asks, that two theological positions, long held on both sides to be opposed and incompatible (in this case the Roman Catholic and the Lutheran views of justification by faith) can then be agreed by each side to be reconciled, even though neither side believes it has changed its view?<sup>7</sup> What kind of thing is Christian doctrine, if that is the sort of thing that can be done with it?

On the cognitivist understanding of doctrine, such a situation is a conundrum. Propositions expressing different descriptions of the same reality are in conflict: one is right and the other wrong or one is better and the other worse. The meaningfulness of doctrinal statements is maintained, but the kind of ecumenical agreement mentioned can only be seen either as a self-deception or as a retreat from the significance of doctrinal content. On the expressivist view, the agreement seems more plausible: both sides can come to recognize that different doctrines are expressing the same experience. But such agreement is almost too easy. The expressivist seems to doubt the reality of doctrinal conflict altogether, seeing it almost necessarily as a mistake, a confusion engendered by the use of different verbal formulas to represent immediate experiences.

The cultural-linguistic approach is somewhat different. In viewing doctrine as regulative, it sees a possibility of reconciling apparently conflicting doctrines by delineating the scope of their applications. On the other hand, it is also capable of recognizing conflicts as direct as those envisioned in the cognitivist approach. When conflicting rules claim to apply in the same way to the same sets of circumstances, one must give way to another. To give a very simple example, 'Drive on the right' and 'Drive on the left' are conflicting rules. They may both be valid, however, and both be accepted by the same person, the one applying when in the U.S. and the other when in India. Both are true at the same time, but with different ranges of application. On the other hand, if someone were to maintain that they both could apply at the same time to the same location, there would be real objective conflict, leading to real objective collisions.

The form of a doctrine and its range of application are seen to be integrally related. Yet at the same time the permanency or even the 'infallibility' of certain doctrines is not ruled out. Indeed, on such an understanding such contentions may seem more plausible or at least more intelligible. In thus briefly sketching the cultural-linguistic approach to the nature of doctrine, I have laid the groundwork for some reflection on how these insights might relate to the development of Asian theology.

## III

To take a concrete example, I will focus on Kosuke Koyama's recent stimulating book, *Mount Fuji and Mount Sinai*.<sup>8</sup> In this book, Koyama explores the contacts and conflicts between the cultural life forms of his native Japan and the principles of his Christian faith. In this internal dialogue or pilgrimage, Koyama elucidates in a fresh and vital way some of the tensions between these two life-forms. He can sometimes express these tellingly through reflection on a particular biblical passage. He quotes Psalm 121:2 for instance: 'My help comes from the Lord who made heaven and earth'. He contrasts this with the Japanese view, which he thinks would more readily say 'My help comes from heaven and earth'. Thus he draws out in a concrete and delightful way the tensions between an eschatological and a cosmological outlook on the world.

But he is not content to stop with the contrast. The real dynamism of the book lies in his constant probing to see how far the regulative principles of these two outlooks may not in some way be recognized or present in their opposites. He devotes a chapter, for instance, to the question of whether Buddhism is truly unconcerned with history or not. He makes clear the very real contrast in the orientations to history in Buddhism and Christianity. This is not something that simply evaporates at some deeper level of insight. At the same time, however, Koyama sees something in Buddhism which touches inevitably on history: its focus on human greed. If for Buddhism the overcoming of human craving and greed is the central religious enterprise, then Koyama argues, this religion will be very history-involved. To struggle against greed, a motive force of history, is to be history-transforming, intentionally or not. Koyama draws parallels between aspects of Buddhism and aspects of Christian discipleship, while at the same time noting that the context of the two approaches to history remain different: the Buddhist being more oriented to the individual and the Christian to the social, for instance.

The thing that I find most noteworthy about Koyama's work here is the way in which he avoids the extreme of simply placing the

two forms of faith in conflict on one hand or the extreme of supposing a common experience or content behind the different forms. Neither of these extremes are adequate he says, for both of the forms of faith are part of his personal reality, and he knows they cannot be collapsed into each other or completely isolated from each other.

The whole book is an integrative search for the way in which regulative principles of one life-form can be lodged also in the other. Once suggesting such places, he goes on to reflect how the same principles, though in some sense present in both forms, are different because of the scope and type of application given to them. Thus the Buddhist analysis of greed and attack upon it is very much like one of the regulative principles of Christianity, but the scope of application is different. 'Do not be greedy' is a rule which the Buddhist extends to areas where the Christian will not extend it, for instance to the possession of a self.

In fact, Koyama's book is an extended reflection on the subject of idolatry. He begins with the imperial state religion of pre-war Japan, which brought about finally the destruction of Tokyo and created the 'wilderness' in which the young Koyama first raised these issues for himself: Was the American victory over Japan God's rebuke to Japan's idolatry? If so, why did the American instruments of this rebuke seem so liable to idolatry themselves? What is it exactly which constitutes idolatry? Is there something crucial given in the tradition which begins at Mount Sinai that unmask and liberates from idolatry? If so, is it totally foreign to the spirit and tradition of Japanese culture?

Koyama notes the profound religious unity of the Japanese with nature. Yet he suggests that there is within this tradition also a certain uneasiness, a sense that nature is not enough. He treats the coming of Buddhism to Japan in this light. Buddhism brought a kind of negation to bear on the 'nature religion' of Japan. Here was a kind anti-idolatry principle at work. Buddhism taught people not to expect salvation from 'heaven and earth' for these were unreal and immaterial. But Buddhism did this without any felt need to appeal to a 'Lord' who created heaven and earth. The Christian

approach to idolatry thus finds both continuity and discontinuity, contact and tension, in the Japanese culture.

Koyama does not come to an end of his pilgrimage in the book. But he does end the book with a Christological reflection in the final chapter, a 'theology of the scars of Jesus'. The heading of the chapter is 'The broken Christ heals the world broken by idolatry'.<sup>9</sup> In these few pages, Koyama draws together a statement of faith in Christ which echoes the carefully nuanced discussion that has come before concerning Christian distinctives and the special genius of Japanese culture.

Traditional 'dogmatic' language about Christ is absent from this chapter. Yet the careful groundwork that Koyama has laid makes it clear that the formulations in which he describes Christ are not simply images picked at random, but rather statements which express Christ's significance in a very clear and definite way in the context of Japanese thought, and perhaps even of Asian culture more broadly.

I have hardly done justice to Koyama's book, but I take it as one example of the kind of theological work which is being done on many fronts in Asian theology. As this work grows in volume and importance, the questions which are steadily raised in conversation with its authors have to do with the relation of this theology to 'classical' Christian theology. The arguments which recur from one generation to the next over 'syncretism' are one way in which the question comes out. People propose to 'test' whether some new formulation of Christian faith has properly 'translated' the truth expressed in the established doctrines. Or it is asked whether Christian faith has been properly 'transposed' into a new cultural context, recognizing that the process cannot be a simple translation but must involve a new constitution of theology in another soil.

But I am not sure that these ways of raising the question are adequate or helpful. Theologians who are working on this new frontier often find themselves having to parry two misconceptions

of their work. On the one hand, charges of 'syncretism' suggest that essential elements of Christian faith are being lost, ignoring the profound commitment to Christ which is operative in these theologians. On the other hand, approving words about these theologians 'restating' Christian truth for their people undervalues or even rejects the contribution, the recreation even which these theologians believe their own cultural contexts have to offer to Christian theology. So much energy is expended in dealing with variations on these two misconceptions, that it would seem a common understanding of the theological process itself would go a long way toward freeing Asian (and other) theology to do its main work.

Here it seems that the emphases of the cultural-linguistic approach to doctrine offer us some useful clues. It is possible to affirm the enduring validity and applicability of the church's doctrine (as for instance the Christological dogmas) while at the same time believing that there is room for, indeed the necessity for, 'new' doctrine of equal regulative value. As we have seen, this assertion that there can be development of and even proliferation of 'true doctrine' is very hard to accept on cognitivist grounds, while on expressivist grounds it is perhaps entirely too easy to accept, reducing the significance of doctrine itself to a vanishing point.

But there is at least the possibility of a middle way which recognizes both an objective dimension to doctrine and a context-dependent dimension. Doctrine can be understood to provide a regulative principle which is normative in the terms in which it is expressed within a certain context. And even more, such a regulative principle is expressive of the inner logic, the 'deep structure' of a form of faith. This 'deep structure' is not simply the experiential content of the faith, but the objective 'wiring' as it were that makes the experience possible. To continue the linguistic analogy, a grammatical rule in Sanskrit (say relating to verb forms) derives its truth from its fidelity to the whole system of interrelation which is the Sanskrit language. It is this whole underlying pattern or structure which the rule specifies in part. The rules guide us into the pattern of the whole language. If we

want to know a truth which comes to us through this language, we must enter into the form in which it is received. So too for a form of faith.

So, for instance, we have referred to the doctrine of Christ's two natures as a regulative principle, indicating a rule for how Christ is to be spoken of and understood by believers. The rule is specifically normative within a context where the terms of speech and understanding have to do with the relation of the divine and the human in Christ. There are other contexts where the question may not be one of the relation of the divine and the human but rather of some other dimensions. This does not necessarily mean that the concepts 'divine' and 'human' would be entirely absent or irrelevant in this context, and to the extent that they were present, the Chalcedonian principle applies. But other dimensions may have a more crucial place. Thus Koyama suggests that in his own context, it is a more urgent matter to ask how the cosmological and the eschatological relate in Christ. What is the regulative principle for speaking of Christ 'between Mount Fuji and Mount Sinai?'

'The broken Christ heals a world broken by idolatry.' At first this sounds a far distance from Chalcedonian doctrine, as though it were a slogan or a pietistic exclamation, not 'doctrinal' at all. We first should remember that statements of Chalcedonian doctrine may often be little more than slogans or exclamations themselves. But what Koyama makes clear is that in fact we have here an analogous kind of statement, each word containing a richness of meaning, indicating at the same time identity with and distinction from the context.

'Idolatry' itself, as Koyama argues throughout the book, has a specifically Christian understanding, but also has a meaning within Buddhist thought. 'The broken Christ heals...' expresses a similar tension. Idolatry as a wound to be healed has a Buddhist understanding, related to its idea of the Buddha as the healer, the physician who prescribes the cure. But 'the broken Christ...' expresses a difference in the Christian view of the healer and so also of the illness. Koyama indicates this in pointing to the

mockery of Jesus on the cross: 'He saved others; he cannot save himself'.<sup>10</sup> In a situation where to affirm the rule 'fully human and fully divine' might be perfectly valid but quite beside the point, Koyama produces another regulative doctrine, which I might rather clumsily put this way: 'Fully broken by and attached to the world, yet fully healing the world of greed and idolatry.'

In other words, while 'divine' and 'human' were two things which the Hellenistic world of the early church had difficulty relating (and hence a doctrinal rule was produced for understanding Christ in these terms) Koyama knows that in his own cultural context 'divine' and 'human' do not necessarily constitute a tension: there is a kind of cosmological unity between them. There is however a sharp tension between the kind of 'brokenness' that is present in Jesus (attachment, suffering, passion) and the 'healing' of transcending or escaping idolatry and greed. These two things do not go together. And precisely for this reason, a doctrinal rule is evolved indicating  $\pm$  the principle that should guide Christians when in this context.

A similar point was made in one of Koyama's early works, *Waterbuffalo Theology* when he spoke of communicating the gospel to people in Buddhist Thailand.<sup>11</sup> To certain aspects of Jesus' teaching and life, he said, the people readily responded out of their cultural heritage. That heritage had taught them to value 'coolness.' It is passion, attachment, craving, desire — all 'hot' — that lead to suffering. It is detachment, cessation of desire, that lead to release. So Koyama said when Jesus counselled his hearers to take no thought for the morrow, this was very 'cool' and highly appreciated. But when Jesus referred to an agitated and passionate God, spoke of loving enemies, or wept and groaned before the cross, this was too 'hot' and not attractive. The crucial rule for speaking of Christ then was not 'divine and human' but 'cool and hot'.

'Divine and human' and 'cool yet hot' are not opposing or conflicting doctrinal statements. Nor is one a simple translation of the other; they stand on equal ground. This equality is based on the faithfulness with which each, as a 'grammatical' rule, reflects the deep structure of a shared form of life, the form of life

which we see in Christ through scripture. Neither one is dependent on the other, yet both belong together because they give a fuller grasp of the Christian life. Both are normative, and apply beyond the context in which they may have been developed. But each one comes more to the fore in certain circumstances.

Some such understanding I believe is crucial for our theological work today. It allows us to avoid the notion on the one hand that received doctrine simply needs to be 'translated' into other cultural situations or the notion on the other hand that the various 'contextual' theologies are in fact ghetto theologies, of interest and significance only for the group within which they are developed.

To put the matter somewhat differently, we sometimes assume (to continue the linguistic analogy) that we have learned to speak 'Christian' or to live 'Christian'. Being 'Christian speakers' we simply need to translate what we are saying into other tongues. It would be more accurate, I think, to say instead that we are all only partially 'Christian speaking'. The whole language as yet escapes us all. Someone learning a language, whether a child in their own culture or an adult in a new one, learns how words are used in one situation, then in another, and so finally gains a tacit grasp of the rules by which words relate to situations (as for instance in the manner in which plurals are formed). So we learn the form of life that is Christianity, and which ultimately is being 'in Christ' by learning the principle for one situation, and then for another. Each cultural context is such a situation, and the doctrine developed in each is important to all for this reason. The more we have, the clearer becomes our grasp on the tacit but quite objective reality which doctrine treats.

#### IV

In these brief comments I have tried to suggest some considerations that bear on the development of 'new' theologies, and particularly on the development of Asian theology. My argument is that doctrine can be developed in distinct but quite complementary ways, while yet retaining a clear relation to objective reality. Doctrine need not be literalistic in a narrow cognitivist sense, nor

subjectivistic in an extreme expressivist sense. My suspicion is that the rich ferment of theological thinking, in Asia, and also in Africa and Latin America, need not lead as some fear to a radical balkanization and fragmentation in theology. In fact this ferment holds the key to an appreciation of the nature of doctrine itself, which can give a new collegiality and *koinonia* to the theological task. Asian theologians themselves must test whether the approach to doctrine that I outline here in fact seems more responsive to their needs and concerns. I can only say that I have found it an avenue through which to appreciate and to be challenged by the work of Asian theology.

## NOTES

1. Bernard Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 2nd edition. (London: Darton Longman and Todd, 1973) and George A. Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1984).
2. The classical treatment of the first case is John Henry Newman's *The Development of Doctrine*. The case of ecumenism is only beginning to receive consideration in this connection. See Chapter 2 in Lindbeck.
3. A good example of this may be found in the work of the Black American theologian James Cone. In Cone's early work he was quite insistent that Black theology was done only by and for Blacks. However, in his later work he recognized that a black theology so understood could not save Blacks from white racism. A certain universality was essential to theology. See James H. Cone, *Black Theology and Black Power* (New York: Seabury Press, 1969), p. 32, and *God of the Oppressed* (New York: Seabury Press, 1975) pp. 33 f.
4. The terminology is that used by Lindbeck, in *The Nature of Doctrine*.

5. See for instance Stephen Toulmin, *The Philosophy of Science* (New York: Harper and Row, 1960).
6. See Lindbeck, pp. 15-19.
7. See the agreed statement "Justification by Faith" in *Origins* 13, pp. 277-304, October 6, 1983. Published by the Bishop's Committee on Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs, Washington DC.
8. Kosuke Koyama, *Mount Fuji and Mount Sinai* (London: SCM, 1984).
9. Koyama, p. 240.
10. Koyama, p. 260.
11. Kosuke Koyama, *Waterbuffalo Theology* (London: SCM, 1974).