

# **The Inquisitive Christians**

*H. H. Meyers*

Copyright © H. H. Meyers 1992 ISBN 0 646 087762  
New Millennium Publications Post Box 290  
Morisset N. S.W. 2264. Australia

## **CONTENTS**

**Preface**

**Chapter 1** India a land of diverse religions – Were the Indian churches of St Thomas Sabbathkeepers?

**Chapter 2** Sabbath observance, a memorial of God's creation - Responsible for our weekly cycle - Christ claims to be Lord of the Sabbath - Apostles continue in Sabbathkeeping - Early Christians continue with Sabbath-keeping - Constantine passes first law for Sunday observance -Roman Catholics claim honour of instituting Sunday worship.

**Chapter 3** Early Syrian Christians reach Persia and India - Indian Christians assist with translating Pauline Epistles - They were Sabbath-keepers - Fourth century Abyssinian Christians kept Sabbath.

**Chapter 4** Vasco da Gama's expedition to Malabar - Purpose of his voyage both commercial and religious - Indian Christians find Portuguese idolatory offensive -Examples of Portuguese brutality - Francis Xavier and Jesuits arrive in India -Goa Inquisition established.

**Chapter 5** Information on Goa Inquisition restricted -Historians "libeled" by-Jesuits - False information likened to misinformation on St Patrick - Jesuits promote caste system and claim Brahmin connection - Portuguese hatred of Jews -Council of Laodicea forbids Judaizing - Prejudices follow Jewish immigrants to India.

**Chapter 6** Goa Inquisition used to enforce Roman Catholic Christianity -Jesuits busy subverting Thomas Christians - Evidence of Sabbath-keeping among Indian Jacobites in Seventeenth century and Indian Armenians in Nineteenth century.

**Chapter 7** Roman Catholics claim power to change commandments and appoint holy days - Protestants acknowledge Rome's authority - Beginnings of Seventh-day Adventist denomination.

**Chapter 8** Alexis de Menezes arrives in Goa -Persecution of Syrian Bishops and bribery of Indian Princes - Menezes visits Cochin and threatens Mar George - George submits to Menezes - Synod of Diamper convened with help of Cochin garrison.

**Chapter 9** Description of Diamper - Leaders of St Thomas Christians accept authority of Pope and agree to abide by Council of Trent -Syrian Bible and Liturgy abolished - Judaizing legally punishable by Inquisition.

**Chapter 10** Goa in the Sixteenth century – Church sanctions slave trading - Three grand cathedrals and sixty convents burdens Goans -Description of Inquisition building - Dr Dellon describes conditions in Inquisition prison - Incentives offered natives to turn Christian - Inquisition encourages spying and false witnessing - Jesuits join with Dominicans to use Inquisition to enrich themselves - Women molested and burnt as heretics - Even deceased persons accused and their estates plundered - Accused expected to confess to unspecified charges by nameless accusers - Dellon confirms torture.

**Chapter 11** Erasmus produces Greek New Testament - It differs from Catholic Vulgate - Luther and Tyndale Bibles follow Erasmus - Protestantism flourishes - Jesuits counter with Rheims Bible-Spanish Armada-Portuguese domination of sea-lanes around India begins to wane -Syrian and Persian prelates attempt to regain control of Indian churches - The Coonen Cross - Split develops as many Christians revert to orthodox worship - Portuguese tighten control by Inquisition.

**Chapter 12** British occupation of India encourages Syrian Christians and forces closure of Inquisition - Dr Claudius Buchanan carries out Christian research in India - Dr Buchanan discovers a Syriac Bible and Sabbath-keepers among Armenian Christians - Armenia, first Christian nation - They had preserved their Bible in apostolic purity -Account of Seventeenth century persecution among British Sabbathkeepers - Christian Sabbath-keeping in India finally lost - In early Twentieth century, Sabbath-keeping re-introduced to India.

**Chapter 13** Is the history of Roman Catholic persecution in India now relevant to our time? - Vatican promotes Roman Catholic dictators, Mussolini and Hitler - During World War II, Roman Catholic hierarchy of Croatia engage in genocide of Serbians - and Jews in Yugoslavia - Persecution aimed at destruction of Orthodoxy in Balkans and Russia -murders in Yugoslavia exceed those of Spanish Inquisition -Historians conclude that Rome cannot be trusted with political control -Present events in Yugoslavia indicate a repeat of history.

**Appendix A**

**Appendix B**

**Appendix C**

**Appendix D**

**Appendix E**

## ***AUTHOR'S PREFACE***

In writing a book that, because of its very subject matter, will fail to please all readers, the charge of bias must inevitably surface. I do not expect this book to be an exception and I freely admit that I am biased.

Professing the Christian faith, I am biased towards Jesus Christ, the Creator; towards God's holy word which foretold of His coming to this earth as the Saviour of mankind; towards the Scriptures which tell of His sojourn in this world and which teach us Christianity; and towards His revelation of things to come, as given to His disciple John.

Everyone has a bias and writers are no exception. Recently I spent some time perusing Malachai Martin's recent work, "The Keys of This Blood". As he is a Roman Catholic and an ex Jesuit priest, we should not be surprised to find him biased towards the Roman Catholic Church and its dogmas. This does not mean that Mr. Martin's work is of no value. On the contrary, his skilful pen gives us a valuable insight into an experienced observer's view of the workings of the papal system - its ambitions, goals and methods of operation. Bias in promoting a worthy cause can be a decided advantage if that bias is based on real evidence. It should then lead to sound conclusions.

Mr. Martin's approach to Rome's present role in global strategy is based on illusory premises which wisely he doesn't attempt to prove. Two of them, to use his own terminology, are the Primacy of Peter as "Christ's vicar", and the apostolic succession of "Petrine keys" (See Appendix B). On page 19 of his introductory chapter he postulates three geopolitical contenders for global supremacy in a new world order - Roman Catholicism, led by Pope John Paul II; the Soviet Union, led by Mikhail Gorbachev and the Western Democratic Alliance, led presently by American president, George Bush.

In discussing Rome's attitude to the two latter powers ("models" he calls them), Martin shows just where bias, based on false premises, can lead: "The primary difficulty for Pope John Paul II in both of these models for the new world order is that neither of them is rooted in the moral laws of human behaviour revealed by God through the teaching of Christ, as proposed by Christ's Church." He is adamant on one capital point: "No system will ensure and guarantee the rights and freedoms of the individual if it is not based on those laws. This is the backbone principle of the new world order envisaged by the Pontiff".

In view of the Vatican's continuing attempts to dominate politics and control a new order through global supremacy, it is well that we should question the quality of Christian morality which Martin imputes to the papacy by denying it to the other two "globalist" powers.

In this book, we shall look at aspects of Roman Catholicism's views on "rights and freedoms" as inflicted upon the hapless people of India.

Why India? Because it was in India that the papacy allied itself with the Portuguese state to establish a tribunal for the "Holy Office of the Inquisition". It is in India that the cruelties which in the name of "peace and love" "were carried to even greater excesses" than in European Inquisitions (Goan Historian, Miranda). It is in India, where the Vatican has been most successful in obscuring the history of hideous crimes against its peoples, its culture, and its Christian minority.

There, "Christ's Church" not only prostituted "the moral laws of human behaviour revealed by God" but ruthlessly stamped out the sacred observance of the very day which Christ claimed specifically as His very own - the Sabbath day! (Luke 6:5)

History is a hard schoolmaster. Those who do not learn its lessons are doomed to experience the consequences of its repetition. Rome's face might change, but her

spirit does not. History teaches us that Rome's notion of rights and freedoms is, to put it mildly - extremely subjective.

In presenting this sad encounter of India's introduction to the inquisitive practices of Imperial Christendom, I have had to make a choice common to all who delve into history - to risk boring the reader through diligent documentation, or to hold the reader's attention with little interruption to the narrative. Should readers consider that I have leaned toward the former, I trust they will accept it as a token of my respect for their time and intellect.

H. H. MEYERS

## **CHAPTER 1**

Perhaps no other country conjures up in the mind of the Occidental a more vivid image of Oriental mystique than does India. This is the country which cradled the religious philosophy of Buddhism. Together with its progeny of multi-deism known as Hinduism, about half the world's population is offered the hope of a joyful reincarnation. Today thousands of disillusioned Westerners are forsaking the platform of Christian ethics, on which their society was founded, for the mystical mirage of transcendentalism and the expectation of obtaining a state of bliss which is limited only by the imagination.

But whether it be the incantations of a guru, the skirl of a snake charmer, or the mysteries of the legendary Indian rope trickster that conjure up pictures of mysterious India, there is another profound mystery buried deep in its not-too-distant history. It has little to do with Indian religion or philosophy, but plenty to do with Christianity!

India is a land comprised mainly of Hindus, Moslems and some Buddhists. Found mainly in southern India are more than 20 million people professing some form of Christianity, who can be broadly categorized as Roman Catholics or Protestants. In both these groups are to be found Christians who proudly trace their origins to one of the several churches which claim to have been established by the Apostle Thomas. They are the Syrian Christians of the Latin, Orthodox and Western rites. Indeed, so ingrained is the legend of Thomas that many refer to themselves as St Thomas Christians.

Now if it be true that the Apostle Thomas introduced Christianity to India we are faced with an intriguing mystery, for the Apostles and all Christians prior to the fourth century A.D. observed the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment, namely the seventh day of the week, known to us as Saturday (Exodus 20:8-11). Yet today not one of these St Thomas Christian churches reverences the day which God commanded should be kept holy. So the question arises: when and how did the St Thomas or Syrian Christians give up keeping the Sabbath in favour of Sunday?

When the writer recently put this question to prelates of both the Chaldean and Orthodox Syrian churches in Southern India, it was met with profound incredulity and parried with disclaimers: "St Thomas was not a Sabbath-keeper! The Sabbath was done away with at the cross! The Syrian Christians of India have never kept the seventh-day Sabbath!"

It is therefore evident that seventh-day Sabbath-keeping among the Apostles and the early Christians must first be established if there is to be any suggestion, let alone a discussion, of the means by which Indian Christians were persuaded to relinquish the keeping of the seventh-day Sabbath. This fact we shall establish in the following chapter.

## CHAPTER 2

Some Christians who wish to defend the practice of Sunday-keeping claim that the observance of the Sabbath (Saturday) was part of the Jewish ceremonial law and so was abolished at the cross. If this be so, then we are faced with a major dilemma: When writing with His finger the Ten Commandments on tables of stone, God became disorientated and failed to differentiate between His moral and ceremonial laws. If and when He discovered His oversight, He didn't bother to correct it, but left it to theologians to sort out His problem. Strangely, it is only the inclusion of the commandment which deals with Sabbath observance which some have discovered to be misplaced! But do we as Christians really believe that God is the author and perpetrator of confusion?

We are told by the Creator and Lord of the Sabbath that "The Sabbath was made for man." (Mark 2:27,28). Therefore it has been in place for man's benefit since creation. When we read the record of creation in the first two chapters of Genesis we are reminded of certain facts fundamental to Christian believers: God created man in His own image; the evening and the morning were the sixth day; God rested from this work of Creation on the seventh day, and He blessed the seventh day and sanctified it. This all took place about 2,000 years before Abraham, the father of the Jews, was born. So it is evident that the Sabbath was not just made for Jews, but made for "man", a generic expression denoting all mankind.

That all mankind recognizes this Sabbatical division of time is evidenced by our world-wide weekly cycle <sup>1</sup>. It is significant that it is mentioned in the work contract between Jacob and Laban. (Gen. 29:27,28). According to Usher's chronology of the Bible, this was in 1760 B.C., about 270 years prior to the giving of the Decalogue. Canon F.C. Cook had no doubts about the Sabbath being instituted at Creation:

"'And God blessed the seventh day'. The natural interpretation of these words is that the blessing of the Sabbath was immediately consequent on the first creation of man, for whom the Sabbath was made, Mark 2:27." ("The Holy Bible, with an explanatory and Critical Commentary by Bishops and Clergy of the Anglican Church" Vol. 1, p.37).

<sup>1</sup> see Appendix E

In recognizing Jesus Christ as Lord of the Sabbath, how futile it would be had He come to this earth with the intention of abolishing His very own special day! He said, "I am not come to destroy [the law] ... but to fulfil" (Matt. 5:17).

Far from anticipating its extinction along with the ceremonial law, Christ forecast continued Sabbath observance after His resurrection and ascension. Speaking to his followers of the coming destruction of Jerusalem, He instructed them, "Pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day." (Matt. 24:20).

So carefully had Christ instructed His followers in Sabbath-keeping they dare not anoint His broken body on the Sabbath. Instead, on the preparation day, which was Friday, they "prepared spices and ointments ... and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment" - not according to the old commandment - according to the commandment - "On the first day of the week," which is Sunday, they then came to the grave to work - to carry out the anointing. (Luke 23:52-56). It is understood that Luke's account of the Gospel was written thirty-five years after the resurrection, yet he is here reminding his readers that the Sabbath commandment is binding. Obviously he is referring to the day between Friday and Sunday.

Nowhere do we find the Apostles advising Christians or Jews of a transfer of the sanctity of the Sabbath to the first day of the week. On the other hand we read in Acts 13 of Paul preaching in Antioch on the Sabbath and, in response to a request from the Gentiles, he waited until the following Sabbath day to preach to them again.

In another situation where there was apparently no synagogue we read, "And on the Sabbath he went out of the city by a river side where prayer was wont to be made." (Acts 16:12,13).

Some proponents of Sunday observance claim that the disciples commenced keeping the new Sabbath day by meeting on the first day of the week in honour of the resurrection. John 20:19 and Mark 16:9-14 are quoted as proof. But an examination of these texts reveals that they could not have gathered together to celebrate Christ's resurrection, for they did not know that He had risen. No! They were despondent at losing their Master and discouraged to the point that they had "assembled for fear of the Jews". That was the reason for their meeting together - sheer cold fear!

Others point to Acts 20:7 citing a meeting at Troas as proof that the early Christian believers were accustomed to meeting on the "first day of the week".

But we are also told in Acts 2:46 that the believers gathered "daily.. breaking bread". Does that mean that every day was made holy? Not at all! The fact is that the meeting in Troas was held on a Saturday night.

Therefore Paul departed on his journey on the Sunday morning, something which he would not have done had Sunday been regarded as a sacred day of rest. So really it is futile to quote this text in support of Sunday observance because it proves the opposite! McGarvey in his commentary says:

"I conclude that the brethren met on the night after the Jewish Sabbath which was still observed as a day of rest by all who were Jews or Jewish proselytes; and considering this the beginning of the first day of the week spent it in the manner above described. On Sunday morning Paul and his companions resumed their journey" ("Commentary on Acts." Acts 20:7).

Had the Apostles changed their day of worship from Saturday to Sunday, we would also expect the early Christian churches to be worshipping on that day. But history testifies to the contrary. Says Lyman Coleman (1852):

"Down even to the fifth century the observance of the Jewish Sabbath was continued in the Christian Church, but with a rigor and solemnity gradually diminishing until it was wholly discounted." ("Ancient Christianity Exemplified" Chap.26, Sec.2, p.527).

Socrates, that famous Greek traveler and historian was able to write in 391 A.D.:

"For although almost all churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries [The Lord's Supper] on the Sabbath of every week, yet the Christians of Alexandria and at Rome, on account of some ancient tradition, refuse to do this. The Egyptians in the neighbourhood of Alexandria, and the inhabitants of Thebais hold their religious meetings on the Sabbath ..." ("Ecclesiastical History" Book 5, 1892 p.289).

After affecting conversion to Christianity, the Roman emperor Constantine sought to unite Christendom with his pagan state. To accommodate the pagan sun worshippers he declared Sunday to be a day of celebration and feasting:

"Unquestionably the first law, either ecclesiastical or civil, by which the Sabbath observance of Sunday is known to have been ordained, is the Sabbatical edict of Constantine, A.D. 321" (Chamber's Encyclopedia, art. "Sunday").

and from the Encyclopedia Britannica we read:

"It was Constantine the Great who first made a law for the proper observance of Sunday; who appointed it should be regularly celebrated through out the Roman empire." (Art. "Sunday")

Constantine's Sunday Law was issued on the seventh day of March, 321 A.D. From "Codex Justinianus" Philip Schaff translates thus:

"On the venerable Day of the Sun let the magistrates and people residing in the cities rest, and let all workshops be closed. In the country, however, persons engaged in agriculture may freely and lawfully continue their pursuits; ..." ("History of the Christian Church", Vol. III, p. 380).

However, it must not be thought that Constantine had any purpose other than enforcing a popular pagan festival. Nor did he intend it to replace Sabbath-keeping as a religious day of rest. (This was to come later from the emerging Roman Catholic Church).

Christian Edwardson in his book, "Facts of Faith" (p. 112) quotes Hugo Grotius to reveal Constantine's attitude to the Sabbath and Sunday:

"He refers to Eusebius for proof that Constantine besides issuing his well-known edict that labour should be suspended on Sunday, enacted law courts on the seventh day of the week, which also, he adds, was long observed by the primitive Christians as a day for religious meetings ... And this says he 'refutes those who think that the Lord's day was substituted for Sabbath - a thing nowhere mentioned either by Christ or his apostles'" ("Opera Omnia Theologica" 1679).

Edwardson points out that at this time the church consisted of two widely different classes of members. There was the old class who had accepted Christianity in a primitive way with genuine conversion and separation from the world. Mostly they were country dwellers. Then there were the new converts who lived mostly in the large cities who had come to Christianity on a tide of popular mass movement with its opportunities for temporal gain and honour. Being in the majority, they elected bishops of their own kind. ("Facts of Faith" P. 115).

Thus the spirit of popery and politics came to be manifested as popular prelates of the church sought to impose religious laws to support their plans for future Christianity.

By the fourth century the dominant bishops felt sufficiently confident in the acceptance of Sunday to promulgate a decree, which they did at the Council of Laodicea (Circa 336 A.D.). John Fulton, DD, LLD, translates it thus:

"Christians shall not Judaize by resting on the Sabbath, but must work on that day, rather honouring the Lord's Day; and, if they can, resting then as Christians" (Canon XXIX, "Index Canonum" p. 259).

It is not only interesting but important to note that the Sabbath day is here being stigmatized as "Judaizing", the keeping of which is promoted as being unchristian!

Although the keeping of the "Jewish Sabbath" was placed under an anathema (Wm. Prynne, "Dissertation on the Lord's Day" p. 34) yet true Christians continued to keep the seventh-day Sabbath. This we know because Pope Gregory I (A.D. 590-640) was constrained to remonstrate with "Roman citizens [who] forbid any work being done on the Sabbath day" ("Post-Nicene Fathers" Second Series, Vol. XIII, p. 13).

The Roman Catholic Church makes no attempt to hide its interference with the Biblical day of rest. One Catechist, Peter Geiermann, openly boasts of his Church's authority in this respect:

"We observe Sunday instead of Saturday because the Catholic Church, in the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 336), transferred the solemnity from Saturday to Sunday" ("The Convert's Catechism of Christian Doctrine" p. 50, 1934) Sanctioned by the Vatican, Jan. 25, 1910.

So, without delving further into the plethora of evidence available to the student of Scripture and history, we have established that:

1. The Sabbath was instituted by God at creation for all mankind.
2. Christ expected His followers to continue Sabbath-keeping after His death and resurrection.
3. Neither the disciples, apostles, nor any of the early Christians advocated, let alone kept, Sunday as sacred.
4. When Sunday-keeping did creep into the Christian church, it was at the instigation and commands of Constantine and the newly emerging Roman Catholic Church during the fourth century A.D.

The obvious and inescapable conclusion then is that, if the apostle Thomas took Christianity to India, and there established churches, then his converts, the so-called St Thomas Christians, were seventh-day Sabbath-keepers.

But for those who discount the St Thomas legend, believing that Christianity was brought to India at a later date from Persia, it is still incumbent on them to accept the evidence of history, that the early Christians were Sabbath-keepers. If the Syrian Christians in India were subject to the Eastern Syrian Church it follows that they would be in agreement as to their day of worship; for Mingana writes:

"Any attempt to speak of early Christianity as different from the East Syrian Church, is, in our judgment, bound to fail". ("Early Spread of Christianity", Bulletin of John Rylands Library, Vol. 10, p. 440)

In order to unlock the door to the mystery of the disappearance of the Sabbath from Indian Christianity it is obvious that we need a key. It so happens that the key, like Malachai Martin's, has very much to do with blood; not Christ's blood, not the blood of saints, but the blood of Indians!

When we unlock that door, we shall not only gain insight into the extent of Christian Sabbath observance but we shall also discover a sinister plan to shield modern-day Christendom from the light of truth.



## **CHAPTER 3**

Little is known of early Christianity in India. The church records and literature of the St Thomas Church have mysteriously disappeared. But thanks to historians and travellers who recorded their experiences, we can piece together an interesting picture of the early Indian Christians which links them to the early Antioch church. However there is nothing recorded that would throw any light on the welfare or otherwise of the original church communities thought to have been established by St Thomas.

It is this absence of information that causes many to doubt that St Thomas ever reached Southern India.

It will be recalled that it was in the Syrian region around Antioch that the followers of Jesus Christ first became known as Christians. The bulk of these Christians were Jews. With the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. there was a tremendous exodus northward into Syria, especially around Antioch.

With their renowned business acumen and missionary zeal, Christians not only settled along the trade routes of Asia but soon colonised large areas in Asia Minor (now part of Turkey), as well as spreading eastward into Assyria (parts of Persia and Iraq).

During renewed, but selective forms of persecution of the Christians who refused to fall in with Constantine's politicised form of Christianity, a group of Assyrian Christians migrated to India in the year 345 A.D. They were received cordially by the King of Malabar, and this influenced successive waves of migrants to settle in that area. There is no record of these immigrants meeting up with descendants of the original St Thomas Christians, but it is tempting for some to conclude that it was their established presence that attracted the immigrants to India.

The historian Mingana leaves no doubt that these Christians brought with them the beliefs and scriptures of the Syrian Church and that this characterised them as separate in jurisdiction and belief from papal and Jewish beliefs:

"The fifth century opens with an Indian Christianity which was in such a state of development that she is able to send her priests to be educated in the best schools of the East Syrian Church and to assist the doctors of that Church in their revision of the ancient Syriac translations of the Pauline Epistles." ("Early Spread of Christianity" Bulletin of John Rylands Library, Vol. 10, p. 459).

Mingana's statement is important. Notice that these Indian St Thomas Christians were actually assisting in the revision of "ancient Syriac translations of the Pauline Epistles". This links this church and its Bibles to the purity of the apostolic age. The line of New Testament Scripture is now identified as the Byzantine or Received Text line from which the King James Version derives. As the doctrines of a church can be no purer than the Bible which it uses, we may here pause to acknowledge the impoverished nature of the corrupted Bibles used in Rome and Alexandria which eventually formed the basis of the Roman Catholic Vulgate, and we may reflect on the effects of such a travesty as shown in the doctrines of a church that interprets scripture in accordance with tradition and dogma.

Owing to subsequent persecution by the Romans, no doubt brought about by their refusal to obey the Sunday law of the Council of Laodicea, there were periodic migrations of Syrian Christians to India. One such company of some three thousand Christians departed Persia in 822 A.D. to settle in the Southern Indian State of Travancore. Here the King of Malabar is reported to have welcomed them, and

recognizing the advantages of having people with business enterprise and acumen, bestowed on them social and commercial privileges usually available only to nobility.

With further clashes between the Roman Empire and the Persians following the death of Constantine, many Assyrian and Persian Christians came to look to India as a haven of peace (See Wilkinson, "Truth Triumphant" pp. 307,308).

As shown in the previous chapter, the Christians kept holy the seventh-day Sabbath. In this regard, the Syrian and Persian churches which parented the Eastern branches of Christianity were no exception. Dr Peter Heylyn confirms that in spite of papal pressure the Eastern Churches still remained loyal to Sabbath-keeping:

"Innocentius did ordain the Saturday or Sabbath to be always fasted .... It was by him intended for a binding law. [Most of the churches refused, however, to obey him]. And in this difference it stood a long time together, till in the end the Roman Church obtained the cause, and Saturday became a fast, almost through all parts of the Western world. I say the Western world, and of that alone: The Eastern Churches being so far from altering their ancient custom, that in the sixth Council of Constantinople, Anno 692, they did admonish those of Rome to forebear fasting on that day, upon pain of censures" ("History of the Sabbath" part 2, pp. 44,45, (1636)). (Cited by Christian Edwardson in "Facts of Faith" 1943, p. 84).

Dr B.G. Wilkinson, in his comprehensive coverage of the history of the Christian Churches, summarizes Mingana's conclusive evidence of Sabbathkeeping in the Eastern Churches. He says:

"Mingana proves that as early as 225 A.D. there existed large bishoprics or conferences of the Church of the East stretching from Palestine to, and surrounding, India. In 370 A.D. Abyssinian Christianity (a Sabbath-keeping church) was so popular that its famous director, Musaeus, travelled extensively in the East promoting the church in Arabia, Persia, India and China ... These churches were sanctifying the seventh day, as can be seen by the famous testimonies of Socrates and Sozomen, Roman Catholic historian (c.A.D. 450), that all the churches throughout the world sanctified Saturday except Rome and Alexandria, which two alone exalted Sunday." ("Truth Triumphant" note, p. 308).

In more recent times, we have evidence that the Jacobites of India, a branch of the early Syrian Christians, also refused to make Saturday a fast day. Samuel Purchas tells us that they regarded Saturday in a similar way as did the Jews:

"They keep Saturday holy, nor esteem the Saturday fast lawful, but on Easter even. They have solemn service on Saturday, eat flesh, and feast it bravely like the Jews." ("Pilgrims" Part 2, Book 8, p.1269, (1625)).

## **CHAPTER 4**

Toward the end of the fifteenth century the Malabar coast of India was gaining the attention of the sea-faring Portuguese. In 1502, Vasco da Gama led an expedition to India, his first port of call being Calicut, a journey of a few hours north of Cochin.

This voyage was not one of discovery, for already the Portuguese had made their presence felt on the Malabar Coast. His previous visit to Calicut had left very unpleasant memories. They had fallen victim to the wiles of wealthy Arabian merchantmen who had influenced some of the Moslem community to attack the aspiring Portuguese traders.

This, Da Gama, who ever sought to further the religious domain of the pope, saw as an insult and affront to Catholicism. Hence, his second expedition was partly a punitive one.

His fleet consisted of 20 vessels, most of which were armed. As well as carrying numerous soldiers, Da Gama had brought with him his spiritual and tactical advisers - priests of the Roman Catholic Church.

As the armada approached the shores of India it encountered a ship heavily laden with Moslem pilgrims returning from Mecca. Realising their helplessness in the face of such formidable odds, the pilgrims handed over to the Portuguese a sizeable ransom. But Da Gama's response was to set their ship ablaze!

With a valiant effort, born of desperation, the pilgrims succeeded in quelling the fire, only to have the heartless Da Gama return and order the re-torching of their vessel. The historian D'Orsey records how the terrified mothers held up their screaming children, pleading with Da Gama for mercy. But their cries only encouraged the priests who stood by and assured Da Gama that the horrendous scene being enacted was but a foretaste of further successes to come ("Portuguese Discoveries, Dependencies and Missions in Asia and Africa" p.5).

Their sadistic anticipations were soon fulfilled. Da Gama proceeded to Calicut and after heavily bombarding the town, sent in a raiding party who administered to the terrified inhabitants a dose of "savagery too horrible to describe." ("Encyclopedia Britannica" 1953 ed. art, Da Gama).

On this same voyage, Da Gama established a trading post and a factory in Cochin and in the following year, the Portuguese conferred upon this town the dubious honour of making it into the first European fortress in India.

Apparently the Portuguese continued to regard the Moslems as a pestilential obstacle to trade, for in 1510 they massacred the entire male population of Goa. (Ibid., Article, Goa). "By marrying his men to the widows of his victims he would give to Goa its own population." (Ibid. 1990 ed. art, Albuquerque Alfonso de).

This, no doubt, reflected their innate hatred of the Moors and the Moslem religion, as they recalled how the Moors had overrun Portugal and Spain.

We must not assume that the sole purpose of, the Portuguese conquerors was the acquisition of wealth. "We have come in search of Christians and spies" - this was the answer given by one of the companions of Vasco da Gama to a couple of Moors who questioned them about the purpose of their journey to the East. ("The St Thomas Christian Encyclopedia of India, (1982) p.22).

There seems no doubt that the Portuguese saw themselves as a nation chosen by destiny to be emissaries of the pope and exponents of the teachings of Jesus Christ. King Emanuel is reported to have written in one of his dispatches to India:

"We are sending [in this expedition] religious persons and men well versed in the Christian faith and religion that they may celebrate the divine worship and administer the sacraments, so that you may be able to see for yourselves what is our religion and faith which was established by Jesus Christ." (Ibid., translated from Castanheda, Historia BU, Chap. 35, p.78).

One might suppose that the St Thomas Christians of the Malabar Coast would have welcomed the Portuguese as Christian brothers. Indeed, this is the impression given by the Encyclopedia Britannica for we are told, "Hard pressed by the Moslems, they welcomed the Portuguese." (Ibid., article, St Thomas).

Perhaps this was so with their initial contacts with some Portuguese. But if we are to believe that this continued to be so after they had become acquainted with the way in which the Portuguese dealt with the Moslems, then a serious question must arise in the minds of thinking Christians. Here was a professedly Christian nation who took their religion seriously enough to take their priests with them on their voyages of conquest, yet they acted with a savagery completely foreign to the very principles enunciated and practised by Jesus Christ. If we are to believe that the St Thomas Christians of India condoned and consented to profit from such barbarity, then we must believe that the St Thomas Christians also had lapsed into a similar state of depravity. A brief look at the behaviour of the Portuguese should dissuade charitable minds from arriving at such a conclusion.

It is well to realise that at this time Portugal was a nation whose rulers were completely subservient to ecclesiastical authority and power, and that power was absolute under the authority of a church which claims to speak, command and act on the authority of Jesus Christ.

But whatever the state of the Indian church, there are some things of which we may be sure - their religion was not compatible with that of the Portuguese. They looked to the Syrian Bible as their guide and refused to accept the traditions of Rome.

The celebrated historian Edward Gibbon mentions a fundamental difference between these religions. Of the St Thomas Christians he says:

"The title of Mother of God was offensive to their ear, and they measured with scrupulous avarice the honours of the Virgin Mary, whom the superstition of the Latins had almost exalted to the rank of a goddess. When her image was first presented to the disciples of St Thomas they indignantly exclaimed, "We are Christians not idolaters!" ("Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" ch. 47, p.31).

It was inevitable then that the Church of Rome would find the simplicity of their faith and their independence of Rome offensive. Claudius Buchanan, D.D. tells of their early contacts and designs:

"These Churches', said the Portuguese, 'belong to the Pope.' 'Who is the Pope?' said the natives, 'We never heard of him.... ' 'We', said they, ' are of the true faith, whatever you of the West may be; for we came from the place where the followers of Christ were first called Christians.'" (Antioch] ("Christian Researches in Asia" p.60 (1813)).

It is said that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. No better examples of the truth of this statement can be found than in the conduct of the colonial Portuguese. Under the ecclesiastical banners of the cross and the images of the Virgin Mary, they availed themselves of the secular governments' instruments of war to force their will on a less sophisticated people whose lands they proceeded to plunder.

In such an environment it is not surprising that some who were placed in command of these unfortunate people should become intoxicated with power, and revelled in their own sadistic outrages. An example of such conduct has been recorded by the traveller Sir James Tennant, and it is mentioned here in order to give the reader an insight into the attitude of those who regarded themselves as part of a race destined by God to lord it over those whom at times they regarded less than human:

"Jerome Azavido, a soldier less distinguished by his prowess than infamous for his cruelties, was dispatched to Ceylon in 1594 to avenge the iniquities endured by his

fellow countrymen ... In the height of his success there, he beheaded mothers after forcing them to cast their babes between millstones ... He caused soldiers to take up children on the points of spears ... He caused many men to be cast off the bridge at Malwane for the troops to see the crocodiles devour them, and these creatures grew so used to the food, that at a whistle they would lift their heads above the water!" (Furia Y Souza, Steven's Translation, Vol. 111, pt.III, Ch. XV, p.279. Cited by James Tennant - "Ceylon" Vol. 2, p.33).

In recognition of what vestige of decency and justice may have lingered in this papal-led government of Portugal, it should here be recorded that as a result of the publicity accorded the conduct of Commander Azavido and his accomplices, the Portuguese government was shamed into punishing him. Incarcerated in a Lisbon dungeon, he was able to ponder his reverses and speculate upon the fickleness of a system that condoned similar behaviour by a patriot such as Da Gama, yet used him as a scapegoat to appease public conscience!

Such were the people who intruded their attentions on the peoples of the Indies.

And what of the state of the Indian Christian church at the time of the Portuguese arrival? It is probably expecting too much to assume that it had preserved the faith in all its apostolic purity over a period of fifteen centuries. When we look back over the comparatively short history of Protestantism and compare the way in which its churches have changed their perceptions of truth, and compromised their protest against Romanism, we can then allow that many of the Christian communities in India must have become careless and indifferent.

The Reverend James Hough, M.A., F.C.D.S, believed this to be the case. Speaking of the Indian Christian church in the tenth century he observes:

"It partook indeed of that alloy which soon corrupted the profession of Christianity in all parts of the world; yet we need not hesitate to confirm that it would not suffer by comparison with any church in Christendom." ("History of Christianity" p.115).

Yet Hough was able to affirm that these Christians still regarded their apostolic Bibles as their sole authority on faith and godliness. He says:

"Tried by this test [SOLA SCRIPTURA] the impartial reader will be satisfied that the Syrian Church of India was a daughter of the primitive church of Christ." (Ibid.)

In the year 1534, two Roman Catholic priests named Ignatius Loyola and Francis Xavier<sup>1</sup> gained permission from the Pope to establish an exclusive Order for the purpose of combating the inroads of the Protestant Reformation and for enforcing the Pope's assumed "divine" authority. With typical effrontery they called themselves the "Society of Jesus". Its members are commonly known as "Jesuits".

<sup>1</sup>Note: Rarely does Xavier share with Loyola the dubious honour of founding the Society of Jesus. The Collins Dictionary of Proper Names gives him this credit. Perhaps there has been an attempt to bolster his missionary image by disassociating him from one of the seamy sides of Roman Catholicism.

The Government of Portugal soon came to be dominated by the Jesuits and it was not long before some of them appeared in Portuguese India. The historian Kaye tells us of their intentions:

"They accompanied the conquerors principally for the purpose of converting the St Thomas Christians." ("Christianity in India" reviewed in Dublin University Magazine. Vol.54, p.340).

The most famous of the early Portuguese missionaries to arrive, in Southern India was Francis Xavier. His indefatigable missionary zeal is legendary in Christendom and he is revered as a saint by Roman Catholics. His body now rests in an ornate jewel-encrusted coffin with glass panels in the Cathedral of Bom Jesus in Goa.

Being a co-founder of the Jesuit Society, Xavier was naturally an automatic believer in the Society's dictum that "the end sanctifies the means". He could not tolerate what was known as "Jewish wickedness", such as Sabbath-keeping and refraining from eating pork, nor did he like the Moslems who regarded swine flesh with abhorrence and the Roman Catholics as idolaters. So, in the true spirit of Romanism, he opted for tried and tested methods of fear and force to coerce such people into conforming to the "true faith." On May 16, 1545 he wrote to D. Joao III, King of Portugal as follows:

"The second necessity for Christians is that your majesty establish the Holy Inquisition, because there are many who live according to the Jewish Law and according to the Mahomedan sect, without fear of God or shame of the world." (Siva Redo). (Cited by A.K. Priolkar - "The Goa Inquisition" pp.23,24, 1961).

(For those who are not aware of Roman Christianity's ingenious device for maintaining the "Purity" of their faith, Collins Dictionary defines the Inquisition thus: "A tribunal for the examination and punishment of heretics in the Roman Catholic church." The Dominican Friars were exclusively entrusted with this "Holy Office" under the Pontificate of Pope Gregory IX in the year 1233).

King Joao was not disposed to grant Xavier's request. However, following his death, his infant grandson, Don Sebastian, assumed the crown and under the regency of a Catholic prelate, Cardinal Hesperique, the "spiritual" needs of the Indies were readily recognized. In 1560 Aleixo Diaz Falcao was appointed Inquisitor of the Indies and he set up a Tribunal for the Inquisition at Goa.

The Christian churches of India had over the centuries coexisted and eventually thrived in what was essentially a Hindu and Moslem community. It is estimated that on the Malabar coast alone were upwards of a hundred Christian churches. Their followers had, along with the Jews, established themselves among the business leaders of their communities. Marignolle speaks of them being masters of the steelyards and becoming the chief merchandisers of the spice trade in South India (Mingana, "Early Spread of Christianity" John Rylands Library Bulletin, Vol.10, p.487).

But with the setting up of the Goa Inquisition, the Bible-believing Christians of the Indian Syrian Churches were to enter into a fatal struggle with the zealots of the papacy. Says Wilkinson:

"It was a dark night for the St Thomas Christians when the Jesuits, supported by the guns of Portugal, arrived in India." ("Truth Triumphant" p.314).

## **CHAPTER 5**

There would be few people, if any, who interest themselves in history who have not heard of the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions. Most would be aware that Inquisitorial Tribunals were also set up by Roman Catholics in several other countries in which the Church enjoyed state support. But it is little known that Portugal extended her

Inquisitorial arm to the Indies by establishing the Holy Office of the Inquisition in the Indian port of Goa.

During his recent visit of research in Southern India the author was amazed to discover how little is known of the Indian Inquisition. It is true that one can visit the remains of the now deserted city of Old Goa, where enterprising guides gladly dispense limited or misguided information about the Inquisition. Some will even oblige the more enquiring visitor by taking him to the ruins of the old "Aljube", the prison and torture house used in the Inquisition. But, in fact, all vestiges of that infamous house of terror were finally removed in the year 1859 when the remaining rubble was cleared away "on the occasion of the exposition of the body of St Francis Xavier." (Fonseca, "An Historical and Archaeological Sketch of the City of Goa", 1878 p.216).

Most of today's visitors to Old Goa are pilgrims of the Roman Catholic faith who reverently worship at the remains of their hero and saint, Francis Xavier; yet how many of these devotees realise that they are revering the memory of a Jesuit who implored the King of Portugal to bring the infamous Inquisition to India, which in turn brought untold misery, torture and death to their very own forebears.

But the farther one travels away from this scene of former papal triumphs, such knowledge of the Inquisition fades. The writer was quite shocked when enquiring of a senior library assistant in Madras recently for information on the Goa Inquisition, to be confronted with a blank stare. "You mean the Spanish Inquisition?" came the perplexed reply.

One would expect that libraries operated by the Syrian Christian Churches of India would be an obvious source for records of popish excesses in India. On the contrary, most books dealing with the history of Indian Christianity portray the Roman Catholic Portuguese as benefactors, and the Inquisition rates barely a passing thought. Many of the books in these so-called Protestant libraries are written by Roman Catholics.

Under such circumstances one is entitled to suspect that there exists a well-organized and concerted effort to conceal the records of the unsavoury practices which have characterised the actions of Colonial Portuguese Catholicism.

If so, such suspicions are confirmed by the Rev. James Hough. In his voluminous work "The History of Christianity in India (1893) he calls many legendary beliefs of Indian Christianity into question and deplores the lack of truthfulness in recording its history:

"If asked what constitutes this constraint I could answer - The pertinacity of the Romanists in continuing to misrepresent the state of their own and the Protestants' foreign missions." (Vol.1, Preface).

Then he documents a very serious and personal example:

"Like M.P. Norbed, a Romish missionary in India, who tells us that he was compelled by Jesuits' libels to publish many things in justification of himself and his brethren, so have I been urged, on former occasions as well as present, from a similar cause, to expose the fallacy of their statements." (Ibid.).

Serious as these charges undoubtedly are, it should not be surprising. He is speaking of a church that indulged itself in deception from its very inception. For instance, how can the Roman Catholic church claim Apostolic succession from Peter, when it never existed prior to Constantine's union of church and state in the fourth century?; for the very term, Roman Catholic, indicates a coupling of church and state.

How can they claim Patrick of Ireland as a saint when he lived, worked, and died (372 - 463 A.D.) before Pope Gregory sent Augustine as the first Roman Catholic missionary to the British Isles in 597 A.D.? Furthermore, Patrick kept the seventh-day Sabbath! This latter fact alone makes it impossible for him to have had any connection with the Papacy, let alone being a Roman Catholic saint!

Says Edwardson:

"There is no more historic evidence for Patrick's being a Roman Catholic saint, than for Peter's being the first Pope. Catholics claim that Pope Celestine commissioned Patrick as a Roman Catholic missionary to Ireland; but William Cathcart D.D. says: 'There is strong evidence that Patrick had no Roman commission in Ireland. As Patrick's churches in Ireland, like their brethren in Britain, repudiated the supremacy of the popes, all knowledge of the conversion of Ireland through his ministry must be suppressed [by Rome at all costs].' ("Facts of Faith" p.135 and "The Ancient British and Irish Churches" p.85).

"Patrick must have been a Sabbath keeper, because the churches he established in Ireland, as well as the Mother Church in Scotland and England, followed the apostolic practice of keeping the seventh-day Sabbath, and of working on Sunday...." (Facts of Faith", p.137).

Wilkinson observes:

"One is struck by the absence of any reference to Patrick in the 'Ecclesiastical History of England' written by that fervent follower of the Vatican, the Englishman Bede, who lived about two hundred years after the death of the apostle to Ireland... The reason apparently is that, when this historian wrote, the papacy had not yet made up its mind to claim Patrick." ("Truth Triumphant" p.88).

Presumably one could become wearied through reading of the myriad deceptions of Catholicism, but the reader is asked to consider the following deception which played on the credulity of the Indian Brahmins during the time with which this book is concerned. The historian Kaye says:

"To break down the barrier of caste was a great achievement; for caste is the great stumbling block of the Gospel. The Jesuits did not attempt it. They went among the people with great parade of caste, and declared that they were sprung from the head of Brahma himself. To have made an assault upon caste would have been to portray their own secret and utterly to ruin their schemes." (J.S. Kaye "Christianity in India" p.33).

The above examples indicate the serious lack of veracity that characterizes much of Roman Catholicism. Conceding that the Jesuits sincerely believe that "the end 'sanctifies' the means," we would naturally expect the "end" in the case of Christian goals to be the establishment of the Gospel in the lives of Brahmins. In this instance, the Jesuits reveal that this could not have been their goal, for the caste system is the very antithesis of Christianity'. Did not Christ say, "All ye are brethren?" (Matt. 23:8). Thus, these members of the misnamed "Society of Jesus" demonstrated that they were in fact doing the work of the antichrist in the manner of antichrist. (For further evidence of the unreliability of Roman Catholic statements, (see Appendix A,B).

In Portugal, as in Spain, were to be found large numbers of Jews. In keeping with God's promise to Israel (Deut. 28:13) this race seems to have merited God's special favour in that they are renowned for their general astuteness and undoubted business acumen. But their very success has often brought down the envy and ire of others in the



communities in which they lived and prospered. Thus it is considered by many that God has allowed His "chosen people" to suffer the curse which they called down upon their own heads when urging Pontius Pilate to hand over Jesus Christ to be Punished according to their law. "His blood be on us, and on our children." they cried. (Matt. 27:25).

The Jews of the Iberian Peninsular during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were no exception. In both Spain and Portugal they had taken advantage of the exceptional business and professional opportunities brought about by expanding empires. This provoked a jealous anger amongst the "Gentile" Roman Catholics who found it expedient to add to their religious intolerance of those whom the Papacy had already branded as heretics. Outrageous inventions against the Jews were circulated as if they were fact. They were accused of desecrating the holy symbols of Catholic worship, and of crucifying or otherwise sacrificing Christian children at their celebration of the Passover. Prescott comments on such fabrications in Spain:

"With these foolish calumnies, the more probable charge of usury and extortion was industriously preferred against them, till at length, towards the close of the fourteenth century, the fanatical populace, stimulated in many instances by no less fanatical clergy, and perhaps encouraged by the numerous class of debtors to the Jews, who found this a convenient mode of settling their accounts, made a fierce assault on these unfortunate people..." (as cited by A.K. Priolkar, "The Goa Inquisition p.5).

Prescott goes on to tell how:

"The only remedy left to the Jews was a real or feigned conversion to Christianity". St Vincent Ferrer, a Dominican of Valencia, is credited with what must surely be one of the greatest miracles of all time. He "changed the hearts of no less than 35,000 of the race of Israel!"

With such suspect motivation it was well nigh impossible for these "New Christians" to maintain a continuous outward show of Christianity while, at heart, remaining true to their ancient convictions and secretly practising the traditional rites and usages of their faith. This of course included Sabbath-keeping and abstinence from unclean meats like pork.

It was primarily to correct this situation that the Inquisition was introduced in both Spain and Portugal in the years 1481 and 1541 respectively. But there was also another group of Christians to whom the Inquisition was directed. They were the Waldenses who had moved from Southern France to Spain. As they also kept the Sabbath, they came under the category of Judaizers.

As we shall shortly be noticing the attention given to Indian "Judaizers" by the Goan Inquisition, it is important that we understand how this term, which was meant to be derogatory, came into Christian usage, and to whom it applied. One of the serious differences between the early Christians and the Roman Catholic church was Rome's substitution of Sunday as the Christian's Sabbath or day of rest. At the Council of Laodicea (365 A.D.) convened by the Roman Catholics, a decree was passed forbidding Christians to sanctify the Saturday-Sabbath and cursing those whom they branded as Judaizers. Canon 29 said:

"Christians must not Judaize by resting on the Sabbath, but must work on that day.... If any shall be found to be Judaizers, let them be anathema for Christ." (Scribners' Nicene and Post Nicene Father's, Vol.14, p.148).

It is interesting to note that this decree also commanded these Christians to break the Sabbath by working on Saturday.

Two and a half centuries later, the practice of Sabbath-keeping among Christians was really worrying the papacy. Pope Gregory I, who in 597 A.D. was responsible for sending Augustine with a band of monks to Britain in order to bring the Celtic Church under Rome's control, was incensed by the widespread practice of Sabbath-keeping. There were even Sabbath-keepers in Rome! In the year 602 A.D. just two years before his death "he issued a bull declaring that when the antichrist was come, he would keep Saturday for the Sabbath!" (Wilkinson, "Truth Triumphant" p.195. cit. Epistles of Pope Gregory I).

But the "antichrists" persisted. By the time his namesake Pope Gregory III came to throne the Sabbath-keeping Christians were still being charged with Judaizing. Apparently Augustine had been so unsuccessful in his mission to Britain that "Gregory III wrote to the bishops of German Bavaria 'exhorting them to cling to Rome's doctrines and beware of Britons coming among them with false and heretical priests.'" (Neander, "General History of the Christian Religion and Church" Vol.3, p.49 note 1). Obviously Patrick had laid a firm foundation for Sabbath-keeping.

Notice that the term "Judaizing" has at no time applied to Jews, but to Christians who kept holy Saturday as the Sabbath, and that the term Sabbath always is applied to Saturday.

With the establishment of Portuguese colonies t, in India it was only to be expected that Jews from Portugal would be attracted by business opportunities created there. But with the establishing of the Inquisition in Portugal, they and the "New Christians" would look to India as a place where they could hopefully enjoy relative security and tolerance. Here they would naturally come into business and social contact with the Indian Jews and the St Thomas Christians. One could well imagine that they would be greatly encouraged to revert to open Sabbath-keeping.

But the arrival of Francis Xavier and the eventual granting in 1560 of his request for an Indian Inquisition, soon placed the Sabbath-keepers of India in a precarious position. Once more they would be vulnerable to the Inquisition's charges of Judaizing.

Only a brief look at the offences of which the Inquisition would take cognisance will here be attempted, with particular attention to those offences which would bring a charge of Judaizing.

Although it is believed that subsequent to the abandonment of the Inquisition in 1812 the records were either entirely removed to Portugal or completely destroyed, we have the evidences of certain travellers and historians as- well as a rather detailed account of one of its victims who lived to tell his tale. He was a French doctor of medicine by the name of Charles Dellon.

Thanks to the considerable efforts of an Indian historian Anant K. Priolkar who wrote and Published a book "The Goa Inquisition" (1961, Bombay) we now have information skilfully drawn from these sources and preserved as a salutary lesson for posterity. The author of the book which you are now reading, considers himself most fortunate to have obtained a copy of Priolkar's work through the kindly offices of a helpful librarian in India.

Like Priolkar, he has refrained from acknowledging by name those who have been of valuable assistance in his own humble research, for "It must be remembered that the Inquisition has been abolished but the spirit which guided its activities is not entirely extinct." (Priolkar - Introduction). History has shown that the aims of the Papacy never change. Her methods may, but the spirit which devised the "Holy Inquisition" shows no sign of becoming extinct.

Priolkar points out that "The Inquisition of Goa was modelled on the pattern of the Inquisition of Portugal," a manual of which he was able to obtain. ("The Goa Inquisition" p.87).

To these Portuguese regulations were added special edicts applicable to the Indian scene. These are quite lengthy and tedious, many of them being directed against the customs of the native Hindus, thereby hoping to coerce them into becoming Christians. Insolent laws were passed in Goa which succeeded in driving a large portion of the natives into other parts of the country beyond the practical jurisdiction of the Portuguese. Those who remained sought relief by consenting to baptism, whereupon many of them found themselves accused of retaining former habits and so found themselves arrested by the Inquisition on charges of heresy.

As the concern of this book is with Indian Christianity and its involvement with Sabbath-keeping, we are not able to dwell on the terrible insults inflicted on the religious culture of India and its devotees whose great misfortune was to come under the control of popish zealots and Portuguese tyrants. Their compatriot A.K. Priolkar has already done this job superbly. Should his book be no longer available, it would surely be in the interest of future liberty in India to have it republished.

We have previously noted that any Christian who kept holy the Sabbath day of the fourth commandment would automatically be categorized by the Roman Catholic Church as a "Judaizer". As with the Inquisition in Portugal and Spain, the Goa Inquisition considered Judaizing as heretical behaviour to be punishable by public burning at the stake.

## **CHAPTER 6**

When the Portuguese King, D Joao III had agreed to the establishment of the Inquisition at Goa, it was on the understanding that it would concern itself with the Christian population only, i.e. those who had been baptized as Roman Catholics. But Priolkar shows that this ruling "was ignored soon after his death; the cult of others was no longer tolerated." ("The Goa Inquisition p.187).

Perhaps this departure from the original charter was occasioned by the fact that Portuguese Christians in Goa were adopting many of the native customs connected with Hinduism. Obviously the Hindus in Goa were considered to be a bad influence on the Christians. Therefore they must be Christianized at all costs or be removed. In December 1567 a law was promulgated, "that the Hindu residents of the city of Goa and certain other cities should compulsorily attend preaching of the Christian doctrine by a priest deputed for the purpose." ("Cunha Rivera, op.cit.Fasc.IV,pp.68,69).

Interestingly, no such order for proselytizing was made concerning Moslems in Goa for the simple reason, as we have already noted, that the heartless Portuguese had virtually eradicated them as though they were a pestilent plague.

Neither do we read of any laws specifically made against the St Thomas Christians for not being baptized Roman Catholics; they were legally outside the jurisdiction of the Inquisition. Although, as it will be subsequently shown, many of their religious practices known as Judaizing would have drawn the attention of the Holy Office, yet it was not easy for the Inquisitors to enforce their will on people so widely dispersed in territories far from Goa.

But one other important factor must be taken into consideration. It seems that in certain areas of India the St Thomas Christians were surprisingly political. For many centuries they had survived in an alien environment, and not always were they able to rely on the whims of the Zamorins or Rajas to look after their well-being. Accordingly, over the centuries they had built up sizeable armies. Historians Mathew and Thomas cite the Portuguese historian Gouvea who says that the "Christians had supplied the Raja of Cochin with an army of 50,000 gunsmen." ("The Indian Churches of St Thomas p.26).

So it is evident that the St Thomas Christians, in this part of the country at least, were not likely to be pushed around, and that the Raja of Cochin was obviously in their debt. Therefore it would not always be easy for the Portuguese to bring suspected heretics to Goa to face the Inquisition.

As an example, D' Orsey B.D., Knight Commander of the Portuguese Order of Christ, tells us how some of the mountain-dwelling Christians forcibly ejected some troublesome Jesuit priests from their Presence; and this action took place some forty Years after the infamous Inquisition had commenced operations! ("Portuguese Discoveries, Dependencies, and Missions in Asia and Africa, P.190).

Obviously such an outburst against the Jesuits must have indicated an awakening on the part of the Christians. They had foolishly allowed the Portuguese in Cochin to gain a virtual monopoly on the export of pepper. Thus the Moors [Moslems] who had previously handled the trade were disadvantaged. No doubt it was this jealousy of the Moslems which encouraged some Hindu Rajas to cooperate in trading with the Portuguese, which in turn caused the Christian pepper merchants to prosper.

Now the Portuguese commenced pressuring the Christians to sever ecclesiastical links with Persia and Syria and accept the Pope as their Patriarch. This placed them in an invidious position as they did not wish to alienate the goodwill of the Portuguese and so place their pepper trade at risk. Soon the Catholic friars began easing themselves into the Syrian Churches where some were able to conduct mass according to the Roman rite.

Mathew and Thomas reveal how one of the Syrian bishops, Mar Jacob, allowed himself to be "bought up" by the Portuguese king "who was giving him a regular salary." ("The Indian Churches of Thomas" p.27).

Because of the powerful Roman Catholic interference with the Syrian Christians in Persia about this time, the dependant churches in India became quite confused. One of their Patriarchs, John Suid Sulaga of Baghdad had submitted to the pope who then appointed him Patriarch of the Chaldean Church. So now the Indian Syrian Christians were considered by Rome to come under the jurisdiction of Portuguese Catholicism. But this Patriarch was shortly to pay for his disloyalty. In 1555 he was murdered and replaced by Mar Abdiso who then claimed to be the head Patriarch of the whole Syrian Church in India.

Now came a period of greater confusion as bishops were appointed to India from both Persia and Rome. One such appointee from Persia to the Malabar coast, Mar

Joseph, was detained on his arrival in Goa, but eventually he was allowed to proceed, and the reason later became obvious. He must have agreed to turn traitor, for he wasted no time in introducing into his churches the Roman practices of auricular confession, confirmation and extreme unction. (Ibid.).

But it appears that the scorn of his fellow church members was too much for him. He added to the confusion by later reverting to his previous faith; whereupon the Jesuits bundled him off to Goa from whence he was despatched to Lisbon and oblivion.

In the midst of all this turmoil, the Jesuits were busily engaged in their own subtle programme of subversion. This entailed educating the young St Thomas Christians in the language and ways of the Syrians, yet turning them out as young papal ministers. Wilkinson says:

"The Jesuit College founded at Vaipicotta, near Cochin, introduced the Syrian language. It allowed the youth of the St Thomas Christians to use Syrian dress. These youth were indoctrinated in the traditional beliefs and practices of the papacy. But when the teachers had finished the training of a number of Syrian Christian young people the Assyrian Church would not recognize them as clergymen." ("Truth Triumphant" p.321).

Having failed in their deceptive programme the Jesuits now turned on the leaders, cajoling and then threatening them. Wilkinson tells us that:

"The Jesuits surrounded the leaders in India with spies. They threatened them with the terrors of the Inquisition at Goa." (Ibid. p.321).

Revealing as these accounts of political intrigue are, they do not reveal any contention over the Sabbath day. Had the church by this time abandoned its practice of Sabbath-keeping? We have just been reading of the bishops who were willing to auction their political allegiance, and of Roman Catholic doctrines being introduced into some St Thomas churches; yet there is no hint of problems over divergent views as to the correct day of worship. Apparently Roman priests who entered the Syrian churches did so on the day to which they were accustomed - Sunday. The inevitable conclusion is that these people should no longer be known as St Thomas Christians, but rather by the more appropriate term of Syrian Christians. It will be recalled, as already mentioned, that Rome had exerted her influence over the headquarters of the Syrian church in Persia.

But it must be realized that the conduct of Indian Christians in one locality does not necessarily reflect the conduct of Christians elsewhere. In those days travel was restricted by environment and isolation was very real, Christians being scattered widely throughout India. Nicolo de Conti, who travelled India, reveals that the Nestorians [a term often, though improperly, used to include Syrian, Jacobite and Armenian Christian churches] "were scattered all over India in like manner as are the Jews among us." (Major - "India in the Fifteenth Century", Travels of Nicolo Conti, p.7).

Apparently Christians living in places remote from centres of commerce had not accepted Sunday observance:

"In the remote parts of the dioceses, as well as towards the South as towards the North, the Christians that dwell in the heaths are guilty of working and merchandising on Sundays and holy days, especially in the evenings." (Rae - "The Syrian Church in India" pp.238).

It is true that the above quotation alone is not proof that these Christians were worshipping on the biblical Sabbath day. But in view of evidence presented previously, and the following quotation relating to a later period, we should give them the benefit of

remaining true to their churches' ancient Sabbath belief. We cite a noted geographer of the seventeenth century, Samuel Purchas, who speaks of the Jacobite branch of the Eastern Church in India:

"They keep Saturday holy, nor esteem the Saturday fast lawful, but on Easter even. They have solemn service on Saturdays, eat flesh, and feast it bravely like the Jews." ("Pilgrimages" Part 2, Book 8; Chap.6, p.1269 (1625)) as quoted by Edwardson in "Facts of Faith" p.154.

Notice that Purchas used the present tense, thus indicating that at the time when the Goa Inquisition was at its height, these Jacobites bravely defied the Roman Catholic demand that Saturday should be a miserable day of fasting. Furthermore, it was their day of "solemn service."

At a time well after the arrival of the British in India, Cladius Buchanan, who carried out Christian research early in the nineteenth century, reveals some surprising information regarding another branch of the Eastern Church, the Armenians of Hindustan:

"They have preserved the Bible in its purity, and their doctrines are, as far as the author knows, the doctrines of the Bible. Besides, they maintain the solemn observance of Christian worship, throughout our Empire, on the seventh day." ("Christian Researches in Asia" p.266, 1812).

The import of this startling information and its implications will be discussed later, but at this point it is profitable to spend some time pondering the now obvious great cover-up resulting in the mystery of the disappearing Sabbath in India. We shall see how it relates to a much broader aspect of a strange phenomenon through-out Christendom to prostitute the very day which their professed master claims as His own: "Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." (Mark 2:28).

## **CHAPTER 7**

When one reads modern books on Christianity in India or speaks with Indian clergy, the appalling ignorance of its long and eventful history of Sabbath-keeping is at once evident. How and why has this dereliction come about?

As will be shown shortly, the main reason for this omission is the deliberate and wanton destruction of Syriac literature by the Roman Catholic church. This is understandable, as in doing so Rome is instinctively following her well-established habit of covering her tracks. For instance, Mathew and Thomas in their book, "The Indian Churches of St Thomas", have a note on page 121 regarding the behaviour of the Romans in ancient Persia (now Iraq):

"The extensive library of Mosul, 'consisting of many thousands of volumes' was carried in baskets to the Tigris and thrown into the river." (Badger Vol.11, p.1).

For Rome to allow the history of Christian Sabbath-keeping to be known is to admit that the Syrian Christians and the apostle Thomas were not part of the Roman Catholic tradition. Another reason is less understandable, yet just as effective. The Protestant world in general will not recognise that the Sabbath, as part of the Decalogue, is binding upon Christians, nor do they wish to acknowledge Rome's boast to have changed the sanctity of the Sabbath to Sunday lest they be seen to admit that they are

not fully protesting against the power which "think[s] to change times and laws" (Daniel 7:25). The Syrian Churches which are presently independent of Rome are no exception.

The Roman Catholics recognize such an inconsistency and throw it back in the face of Protestantism:

"It was the Catholic Church which by the authority of Jesus Christ ' has transferred this rest day to Sunday in remembrance of the resurrection of our Lord. Thus the observance of Sunday by the Protestants is an homage they pay, in spite of themselves, to the authority of the [Catholic] church." ("Plain Talk About the Protestantism of Today" Mgr. Segur, p.213, (1868). Imprimatur, Johannes Josephus).

It is this great weakness in the armour of, Protestantism which exposes these would-be Reformers to such cutting thrusts by Rome. They had claimed to have gone forth to do battle with the antichrist in the armour of "the Bible and the Bible only" with "Sword of the Spirit", but nowhere in the Bible could they find authority for Sunday observance. In refusing to abandon the pagan day of the sun in favour of God's memorial day of creation they had acknowledged that Roman Catholic tradition had more authority than scripture. The Council of Trent had triumphed over Protestantism.

Wilkinson drives the point home in his classic, "Truth Triumphant" p.318. He quotes Pallavicini:

"According to Pallavicini, papal champion of the Council, [of Trent] the archbishop said, 'It is then evident that the church [papacy] has power to change the commandments,' because by its power alone and not by the preaching of Jesus it had transferred the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday." (Pallavicini, "Historic du Concile de Trente" Vol.2, pp.1031,1032).

It is not surprising then that many Protestant clergy have spoken in perplexity about the acceptance of a pagan holiday as the Sabbath day; yet most, like the concerned Dr Hiscox, seem to suppress their conscience in the interest of conformity and unity:

"Of course, I quite well know that Sunday did come into use in early Christian history as a religious day, as we learn from the Christian Fathers [Roman Catholic clergy?] and other sources. But what a pity that it comes branded with the mark of paganism, and christened with the name of the sun god, when adopted and sanctioned by the papal apostasy, and bequeathed as a sacred legacy to Protestantism." (Dr Edward L. Hiscox, author of "The Baptist Manual" in a paper read before a New York Minister's Conference, held Nov. 13, 1893 - as quoted in "Source Book for Bible Students" pp.473,474, 1919 Edition).

It is encouraging to note that not all Baptists denied their conscience by taking the easy road to conformity. In the early nineteenth century, a small group pressed forward along the path of reformation and formed a Sabbath-keeping church known as Seventh-day Baptists.

One of their early members, Rachel D. Preston of the state of New York, came into contact with a group of people in Washington, N.H. USA, whose study of Bible prophecies had convinced them of the impending second advent of Christ. She accepted their interpretation of the signs of Christ's return and she in turn "instructed them in the commandments of God, and as early as 1844 nearly the entire church in that place, consisting of about forty persons, became observers of the Sabbath of the Lord." (J.N. Andrews, "History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week" pp. 505, 506, 1887).

From such a beginning eventually came the Seventh-day Adventist denomination, the name being expressive of the two aforementioned tenets of their belief. It was formerly adopted at a conference in Battle Creek, Mich. USA in 1860.

## **CHAPTER 8**

We shall now concern ourselves with further events which led up to the Romanizing of the Syrian Christian churches in India and eventually placed them "legally" under the jurisdiction of the "Holy Inquisition".

As mentioned earlier, the original charter of this ingenious device for the salvation of souls was to be applied only to those who had been baptized into the Roman Catholic faith. Although in practice this did not preclude the Portuguese priests from interfering in the lives of Hindus around Goa and Moslems in general, yet it was still illegal according to Portuguese law. With so much "Judaizing" (Sabbath-keeping) and opposition to the non-scriptural practices of Romanism, it became apparent that the only way to control these "heretical Nestorians" would be to bring them under the jurisdiction of Portuguese Romanism. They would then be automatically subject to the rules and regulations of the Holy Office in the Inquisition.

As has often been the case throughout history where direct opposition to a cause has been unsuccessful, Rome decided to revert to Trojan Horse tactics by attacking the Syrian Church from within. Accordingly, the Vatican selected a wily papal prelate as archbishop of Goa. His name, Alexes de Menezes is remembered in India as the man who changed the course of Christianity in that country.

He is described by historians as "a man of indomitable courage and strength of will and great zeal for his church," (Mathew and Thomas) and "A man of invincible tenacity and consummate craft." (Wilkinson).

Shortly after the arrival of Menezes in Goa, (1595) the Syrian Archbishop Abraham passed away. His archdeacon Mar George, had been appointed to act in his place until a replacement should be sent from Baghdad. History has shown this to be a most unfortunate choice for the Syrian church, in that he lacked the "indomitable courage", "tenacity" and "craft" of Menezes.

But no replacement was forthcoming for the simple reason that the Portuguese controlled the shipping in and out of Malabar. This left Menezes free to work on the beleaguered archdeacon and his clergy who were now virtually isolated from Persia and Syria. According to the Rev. E Philipos, this was a very difficult time for it appears that Syrian bishops endeavouring to run the gauntlet were mysteriously eliminated:

"The Portuguese not only persecuted and killed all the bishops as they came from Antioch but their metran (Alexis de Menezes) residing at Goa came to Malayalum country [Malabar] in 1598 and ... bribed the petty princes ruling the country, and some Syrians, in order to gain them over to his interest. And those Syrians who opposed his designs were persecuted and put to death." ("The Syrian Christians of Malabar" p.23).

We are not given details of the way in which these unfortunate Christians were tortured and murdered, but we do know that at that time the frightful papal engine of persuasion, the Inquisition at Goa, had been operating for 39 years. During this time



public ceremonies known as "Acts of Faith" had been taking place at which punishments, including burning at the stake, had been administered.

Kaye sheds further light on the fate of clergymen who failed to co-operate.

"But like a wolf on the fold, down came the delegates of the Pontifical tyrants upon those doomed Indian churches. Their own shepherds, unworthy of such a charge, deserted their flock in the hour of need, scrambled for power, and played a game of dissimulation, that was not even justified by temporary success." ("Christianity in India" p.24).

"The first Syrian prelate who was brought into antagonism with Rome, expiated his want of courage in the dungeons of the Inquisition. The second shared the same fate. A third whose sufferings are more worthy of consideration, died after much trial and tribulation in his diocese, denying the Pope's supremacy till the last." (Ibid, p.24).

Apparently, one of the "petty princes" bribed by Menezes was none other than the Raja of Cochin. It will be recalled that only a few decades previously, a Raja of Cochin had enjoyed the services of 50,000 Syrian Christian "gunsmen". But by this time, the Hindu Raja had fallen into the debt of the Portuguese by allowing their fleet to wipe out a nest of troublesome pirates.

In January 1599, Menezes decided to pay a visit to Cochin where he was accorded a lavish state reception. D'Orsey describes the grandeur of the scene:

"The grandest preparation had been made for his reception, [and] richly carpeted stairs had been expressly constructed; the governor and a brilliant staff were at the landing place, and the prince of the church, disembarked amid the waving of flags, the clang of martial music, the shouts of the people and the thunder of artillery." (Portuguese Discoveries Dependencies, and Missions in Asia and Africa" p.193).

Amidst the excitement of this splendid display;: of civic support, Archbishop Menezes singled out one man for special attention - Archdeacon George who was summoned to appear before him. There in the harbour lay the Portuguese war galleys from Goa. Being confronted with the united power of ecclesiastical and civil authority, he could expect' no help from the Raja. No doubt the fate of his compatriots who had experienced the terrors of the Inquisition weighed heavily on his mind, yet he, dare not refuse. Accordingly he took the precaution of assembling three thousand armed men who escorted him to the interview. ("The Indian Churches of St Thomas" p.29).

Under these circumstances it is not too surprising that George's courage failed. "He kisses, his [Menezes] hand and gave him permission to preach and sing mass in the Syrian churches.'." ("Truth Triumphant" p.322).

Having thus got his foot in the door, so to speak, Menezes wasted no time in letting it be known that he considered the Syrian churches now under his jurisdiction. Upon hearing that these churches were still praying for the Patriarch of Babylon as the universal church pastor, he became enraged. With consummate insolence "He summoned their professors, students, archdeacons, and clergy to appear before him, asserting with rage that the pope alone was supreme .... He produced a written document, excommunicating any person who should in the future pray for the Patriarch of Babylon or Baghdad .... Quailing before the Jesuit archbishop, Archdeacon George signed." (Ibid. p.322,323).

Having thus cowed the heads of this ancient church who were custodians of a faith "vouchsafed to them when Rome owned a heathen Emperor and knew not the

sterner, more capacious tyranny of a sovereign Pontiff." (Kaye), the elated Menezes now went about openly preaching against the practices and beliefs of the Malabar Christians. The haughty Menezes now sought to effect a legalisation of his actions by planning a Synod whereby the Syrian Church would be seen to be responsible for renouncing their allegiance to the Eastern Patriarch and adopting the rites of the Roman Catholic church. Wilkinson reveals his snide tactics:

"He even ordained young men to the ministry who promised to renounce the Patriarch of Babylon and to recognize the pope. These youth gave up the distinctive teachings of the Church of the East for papal doctrines and rites. This he continued to do until he was assured of enough votes in the approaching Synod." ("Truth Triumphant" p.323).

Mathew and Thomas tell us that he ordained about ninety priests, and they quote the Roman Catholic historian Gouvea:

"It was thus that Menezes began to secure in this country a number of persons who remained faithful to him and never abandoned his interests." (Hough - "History of Christianity" p.392).

All that remained now to complete this gigantic farce was to obtain Archdeacon George's submission to the pope by ratifying the papal decrees authorizing the proposed Synod. Imagine the anguish of this poor man whose vacillation had led to his present dilemma! The Synod would now be stacked with Menezes' lackeys while preserving the appearance of a deliberative delegation. Wilkinson describes the parlous position of a hesitant George:

"Then Menezes brought out the most terrible weapon of all which he had kept in reserve. He threatened the tormented leader of the helpless people with excommunication and the Inquisition at Goa. Visions of the gibbet, the rack, and the faggot rose up before the lonely official. Overcome with terror, he signed the ten articles laid before him, which paved the way for the Synod of Diamper." ("Truth Triumphant" p.323).

Archbishop Menezes now prepared a circular to be read in all Syrian churches commanding the Archdeacon and all the clergy and four lay representatives from each of the parish churches to attend the coming Synod on the 20th - 26th June, 1599. The meeting-place was to be in the Church of All Saints in the village of Udayamperur situated about fourteen miles east of Cochin. For obvious reasons this Synod has since come to be known in the English speaking world as the Synod of Diamper.

In the following chapter we shall highlight the events of those momentous seven days, when with the assistance of the armed garrison of Cochin, Missionary Menezes superintended what must surely come to be seen as the greatest mass "conversion" in the history of Christendom.

## **CHAPTER 9**

The 20th June, 1599 was the day which signalled the commencement of the Synod of Diamper. C.B. Firth describes it as "those momentous seven days" while the Roman Catholic, Cardinal Tisserant, is constrained to call it "a fateful date and one of the darkest in the history of the relations between Latins and Orientals...." ("Christianity in India" p.166).

Archbishop Menezes was certainly aware of the import of this occasion. He made sure that it would be so regarded and long remembered by the Christians of Cochin. The Synod consisted of 133 priests (most of whom had been ordained by Menezes), 20 deacons and 660 lay representatives. Mathew and Thomas tell us that many of these were "far from feeling happy, and in fact there were many who murmured even openly, but none dare oppose outright". Their apprehension was quite understandable, for Menezes had seen fit to impress all concerned with the seriousness of his intent by bringing along the Portuguese garrison from Cochin.

To witness the success of this, Menezes' crowning achievement, there were invited influential government administration officers "richly costumed in silk, velvet and lace, blending in dazzling colours with polished mail and plumed helmets." (D'Orsey, Portuguese Discoveries, Dependencies, and Missions in Asia and Africa, PP.215,216).

Wilkinson tells us that they were accompanied by merchants and captains of ships and that the local dean and pastor had provided dignity to the occasion with the presence of a church choir.

As for the beleaguered Archdeacon George, he` could at least try to minimize the extent of his, coming humiliation. He arrived robed in splendid vestments of dark red silk, a large golden cross hanging from his neck, and his beard reaching below his girdle." ("Truth Triumphant" p.324).

Archbishop Menezes opened the proceedings with a pious address, followed by the celebration of a solemn Roman Catholic mass for the removal of the "schism". The Archdeacon's wish to participate in the proceedings was completely ignored.

Then followed a sermon upholding the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff to whom, as Vicar of Christ, complete obedience was due. Now came the recitation of the elaborate decrees of the Synod and a demand that the delegates pass by and accept them Wilkinson gives us an interesting insight to this, humiliating scene as he quotes the historian, Geddes:

"The most reverend metropolitan after having made this protestation and confession of faith, rose up, and seating himself in his chair, with a mitre on his head, and the holy Gospels, with a cross upon them in his hands; the Reverend George, archdeacon of the said bishopric of the Serra, kneeling down before him, made the same profession of faith, with a loud and intelligible voice, in the Malabar tongue, taking an oath in the hands of the lord metropolitan, and after him all the priests, deacons, subdeacons, and other ecclesiastics that were present, being upon their knees, Jacob, curate of Pallarty, and interpreter to the synod, read the said profession in Malabar, all of them saying it along with him; which being ended, they all took the oath in the hands of the lord metropolitan, who asked them one by one in particular, whether they did firmly believe all that was contained in the profession." (Geddes, "The Church History of Malabar" pp.116,117).

Thanks to the Portuguese historian Gouvea, who was in India at this time, we have recorded for us the decrees agreed to by the Synod albeit, of course, from the Roman Catholic viewpoint. They have been translated into English by Geddes whose work has been drawn upon freely by modern historians.

One of the first decrees involved the acceptance of the wide-ranging provisions of the Council of Trent. This Council was convened during the years 1545 - 1563 as a

defence against Protestantism, and one of its first concerns was to establish the authority of the Roman Catholic Vulgate Bible. It was no coincidence then that at Diamper, priority was given to ensuring that the Syrian Bible, which we have seen to be of the Byzantine, or Received Text line, be replaced by the Latin Vulgate.

Other decrees set forth for the Syrian churches to submit to or accept were the supremacy of the bishop of Rome (the Pope), the doctrines and dogmas relating to transubstantiation of the mass, auricular confessions, adoration of images and saints and reverence for relics, extreme unction, penance, Purgatory, indulgences and very importantly, the worship of the Virgin Mary.

Another of the decrees, which receives little or no mention by modern historians, is remarked on at length by Wilkinson. His following quotation is based on Rae, *The Syrian Church in India*, p.201:

"Another of the cruel regulations was to single out for burning at the stake those Christians whom the Roman Catholic Church chose to designate as apostate." (*"Truth Triumphant"* p.326).

He then observes:

"The Christians whom they designated as apostate were generally called Judaizers, or those who observed the seventh day as the Sabbath." (*Ibid.*).

Wilkinson then quotes Decree 159 of Action VIII as recorded by Geddes:

"The Synod doth command all the members thereof upon pain of mortal sin, not to eat flesh upon Saturdays." (*"The Church History of Malabar"*, p.357).

These quotations are very important to our discussion. They reveal that in accepting the decrees of the Synod, the Syrian Church in India was really voting itself out of existence! All were now members of the Portuguese/Roman Catholic Church. As such, according to Portuguese law, they were now legally under the jurisdiction of the Inquisition. All those who Judaized, even to the extent of treating Saturday as a feast day, let alone treating it as a day of worship, were guilty of mortal sin, and therefore as apostates from Catholicism would automatically incur punishment at the stake.

Although we have previously reached the conclusion that many of the Syrian Christians had long since grown careless about the Sabbath, yet it is quite obvious that the Synod was aware that there were still significant numbers who came under the category of Judaizers. Why else would they have found it expedient to pass a decree concerning Saturday?:

"Archbishop Menezes, therefore, in harmony with the usual practice of imperial Christianity forced the decree which turned Saturday in to a fast day through the Synod of Diamper. This put those Syrian Christians who in the future would observe the Sabbath as a festival, into the category of apostate Christians, and destined them for the stake at Goa." (*"Truth Triumphant"* p.326,327).

So this decree of Diamper confirms the truth of the statement by Thomas Yeates regarding St Thomas and other Eastern Christians, that Saturday "amongst them is a festival day agreeable to the ancient practice of the Church." (*"East Indian Church History"* p.72).

At last the long cherished papal desire to stamp out Sabbath observance in India now seemed capable of "legal" fulfilment. The Indian Christians, through their leaders, had themselves accepted the jurisdiction of the Inquisition! They had not only promised

to obey the "holy, upright, just, and necessary court of the holy office", (Decree XXII) but had agreed to act as informers against any of their brethren who disregarded the laws of the Inquisition." (Decree XXIII) (See Hough, "History of Christianity" Vol. 11, pp.556,557). How many Sabbath-keeping Christians today would be prepared to face the terrors of the Inquisition, let alone go through with that terrible "Act of Faith" known in Portuguese as the Auto De Fe!

Owing to one of the criminally-inspired demands of Diampur, not only was the Syrian Bible to be eliminated ("corrected" was the term used), but all Syrian literature was to be delivered up for destruction. Buchanan reveals the Portuguese motive behind the destruction of ecclesiastical literature. It was to destroy evidence of the Syrian Church's Apostolic heritage - a claim which Rome wishes to preserve for itself and itself alone. Yet not a scintilla of historical evidence can be produced in support of Rome's claim. Buchanan confirms that the reason given by the Inquisitors for the burning of literature was "in order that no pretended Apostolic monument may remain." ("Christian Researches in Asia" p.60).

Undoubtedly it was the Syrian Bible to which they referred when speaking of "pretended Apostolic monuments" but in truth it was an Apostolic monument. To the pretenders of the Apostolic succession of the imaginary Petrine keys their Bible was anathema.

A measure of the gratification gained from this wanton act of vandalism can be gauged from Menezes' immediate response:

"The Syrians report that while the flames ascended, he went around the Church in procession chanting a song of triumph." (Ibid., p.133).

How much of the record of the struggles of God's commandment-keeping churches throughout the ages has been lost to posterity through Rome's wanton behaviour, God alone knows!

## **CHAPTER 10**

We shall now endeavour to piece the few remaining pieces of India's jigsaw puzzle together. To help identify the pieces we shall digress briefly to acquaint ourselves with the setting and times of that monstrous invention of the papacy for the enforcement of its decrees - the Goa Inquisition.

The Portuguese City of Goa during the sixteenth century became one of the largest and richest cities in the world. As the capital of the Portuguese eastern empire, with a population by the end of the sixteenth century of 225,000, it ranked in size with the contemporary cities of London and Antwerp (Penrose, "Goa, Queen of the East" p.55).

Situated on one of the lush islands at the wide mouth of the Mandavi River, its protected harbour had become one of the world's busiest ports. Its great warehouses were bursting with the natural riches of the Orient which filled the holds of an endless stream of European ships. They, in turn, unloaded their extravagant cargoes of European luxuries and those items necessary to a congenial way of living in a European outpost in Asia.

Goa gained a reputation as an important distribution point for Arab horses. Fine Arab steeds were very much in demand in India, and the Portuguese importers found

this trade very lucrative. But another profitable trade had developed in another form of livestock - human beings! S.C. Pothan tells us that:

"The Portuguese also inaugurated slave trade by seizing able-bodied men and women in the neighbouring Indian territory and selling them. They opened a slave market in Goa." ("The Syrian Christians of Kerala", 1963, p.31).

Apparently this market not only served the export trade but was in much demand by the local Portuguese whose lifestyle was extravagant and profligate. But we are also told that there was a lively trade in Kaffirs, a derogatory term for the natives of the Portuguese colony of Mozambique. The girls who, we are told, were very much in demand, were paraded for sale in the nude. (B. Penrose - "Goa, Queen of the East" p.67).

There is indisputable evidence of the fact that the church joined with the secular government in sanctioning this inhuman practice for they made it known that they had the power to set slaves free. In 1592 the viceroy of Goa "proclaimed that slaves of infidels who converted themselves to Christianity would be freed." (Cunha Rivara - cited by Priolkar, "The Goa Inquisition" p.141).

In keeping with the true aims of the Portuguese in these times, religion dominated the political and social life of Goans. Towering above the numerous warehouses, shops, bazaars, gambling dens and private dwellings were magnificent churches and convents. One of these churches was the Cathedral of St Catherina, the building of which; commenced in 1562 and took some sixty years to complete. It was described by an Anglican, Dr Fryer, towards the end of the seventeenth century, as a cathedral hardly surpassed in grandeur by any church in England. By the end of the sixteenth century, although still incomplete, it boasted no fewer than eighty thousand parishioners!

Standing today, presiding over a desolate scene of departed glory, it remains as a magnificent memorial to the religious fervour of a misguided nation and its religious zealots. It was this religious fervour that eventually burdened the citizens of Goa with the upkeep of sixty convents and the support of twenty thousand friars! (Priolkar, "The Goa Inquisition" p.188).

But there was one building in this thriving metropolis that more than any other reflected the autocratic bigotry of a Government devoted to the propagation of papal supremacy. Prominently situated near the busy waterway of the Ribiera Grande and close to the civic centre, it would seldom escape the attention or the thoughts of the citizens. It was held in such awe and apprehension that few would dare to be heard uttering its official name - the Holy Office of the Inquisition. Rather, if mentioned at all, it was referred to by "the mysterious appellation 'Orlemgor' - the Big House." (Ibid. p.31).

This building was originally a sultan's palace but after confiscation by the Portuguese it became the residence for their viceroys and governors. In 1560 it was taken over by the Inquisition and over the years considerably rebuilt to suit its new role in religious affairs. Boies Penrose says:

"It was by 1600 a stately and handsome edifice, three stories in height and with a beautiful facade of black stone: (its black outside appears a fit emblem of the cruel and bloody transactions that passed within its walls)... Its outside casing was five feet thick and within were two hundred cells for the unfortunate heretics, apostates, bigamists, sodomites, and sorcerers, who were about to undergo the auto de fe." ("Goa, Queen of the East" p.69).

In the confines of the Orlemgor was the sinister-looking "Aljube" (Archbishop's prison). It was a great mystery to all except anyone having had the misfortune to become one of its "guests"; not that there were never any who lived or were released after serving a sentence in the Portuguese galleys. No! the poor wretches were just too frightened to talk, because one of the conditions of their release was to observe strict secrecy regarding their ill-treatment. One who did save his life by a confession of guilt and was released after a term at the Lisbon galleys had the good sense to remove himself beyond the Portuguese jurisdiction. After some few years in France he plucked up the courage to reveal his experiences. He was the Frenchman Dr Dellon and he tells us that:

"Those who have escaped death by their extorted confessions, are strictly enjoined, when they leave the prisons of the Holy Office, to declare that they have been treated with great tenderness and clemency, in as much as their lives, which they justly merited to lose, should be spared. Should anyone, who has acknowledged that he is guilty, attempt to vindicate himself on his release, he would be immediately denounced and arrested, and burnt at the next Act of Faith, without hope of pardon." (Dellon, quoted by Priolkar "The Goa Inquisition", Sec.2, p.34).

This would explain why those who had thus been released were ever regarded as affected by their ordeal. Buchanan reports on a conversation he had with an elderly Franciscan Father who had been connected with the Inquisition saying of those he knew who had been liberated:

"They never speak afterwards of what passed within that place. He added that ... he never knew one who did not carry about with him what might be called, 'the mark of the Inquisition', that is to say, who did not shew in the solemnity of his countenance, or in his peculiar demeanour, or his terror of the priests, that he had been in that dreadful place." (Ibid. p.95).

Dr Dellon described the Archbishop's prison as:

"The most filthy, dismal, and hideous of all I ever witnessed, and I doubt if there can be any other in the world more repulsive."

As mentioned. previously, the original charter given by Portugal for the establishment of the Indian Inquisition was for the preservation of the Roman Catholic faith through the threat of punishment of those who might be tempted to become lax or apostate.

Although the terms of this charter were never really seen as a stumbling block to increasing Portuguese interference in the religions and private lives of the indigenous peoples, it was deemed desirable to bring them within the legal pale of the Inquisition. Hence all kinds of incentives were proffered to those Hindus who would embrace Roman Christianity. Among such positive incentives offered them was a monopoly of public positions, favourable laws of inheritance, and generally improved civic rights and privileges. Those Hindus who failed to avail themselves of such opportunities usually came to be seen as undesirable residents of Goa. Their religion was discouraged by repressive regulations affecting certain of their religious rights and customs. Many were exiled. Those who remained were subjected to deprivation of their means of subsistence and even their ancestral rights in the village communities. Their temples and shrines were ruthlessly destroyed and they were forbidden to rebuild them.

Another particularly odious Edict of Faith was the obligation of Goa's citizens to spy on behalf of the Inquisition. Those who failed to apprise the Tribunal of Offences of

which the Inquisition took cognizance were themselves committing an offence against the Inquisition. As the witnesses were never required to substantiate their charges and their identity was never revealed to the accused, it can be readily perceived that the system would lend itself to abuse. Priolkar quotes H.C. Lea on this particular form of corruption in Spain and claims that "the same infamous trade flourished in Goa":

"The trade of false witness was a thriving one, both for gain and gratification of enmity. These were regular associations of perjurers, who made a living by levying blackmail on rich new Christians, accusing those who refused their demands, so that the unfortunate class lived in perpetual terror and purchased temporary safety by compliance." ("The Goa Inquisition" p.108).

The Hindus themselves were not immune to the lure of reward from such evil practices which some of them perpetrated even on their fellow men. "For instance", says Priolkar who cites Cunha Revara as authority:

"In a letter addressed by the King of Portugal to the viceroy of India on March 24, 1702, we find a reference to the arrest of six recent Indian converts who moved from door to door demanding money from the Hindu residents under the threat that if the latter refused they would be falsely denounced to the Inquisitor, Frei Manoel de Assumpeao, as having hidden away Hindu orphans to prevent their being baptized." (Ibid. pp.108,109).

One can only imagine the air of distrust, suspicion and general malaise imposed upon the business and social life of this European outpost in India. It was to lead to the eventual downfall of the Portuguese Empire in India. But the main culprits in this travesty of European "civilisation" were the religious leaders of whom the wily Jesuits were chief.

As the Indian natives demonstrated their lack of confidence in the Goa government by removing themselves to areas outside Portuguese jurisdiction, so the Jesuits increasingly moved into secular affairs. The Encyclopedia Britannica (1953 Art. Goa) tells us that Goa's trade was gradually monopolised by the Jesuits. But worse still was their abuse of the Inquisition. They joined with the Dominican friars to enrich their pockets and gratify their ambitions, and in the process gained for it the reputation as "the most pitiless" Inquisition in Christendom.

[Its] "infamy never reached greater depths, nor was more vile, more black, and more completely determined by mundane interests than at the Tribunal of Goa, by irony called the Holy Office. Here the Inquisitors went to the length of imprisoning in its jails women who resisted their advances, and after having satisfied their bestial instincts there, ordering that they be burnt as heretics." ("A India Portuguesa, Vol.11, Nova Goa", 1923, p.263 - cited in "The Goa Inquisition" p.175).

These self-styled apostles of Christ were able to turn one of the Inquisitorial functions to their own particular financial advantage. It was the practice of the Inquisition, upon seizing a suspect, to impound his personal possessions and property. We are told by Tavenier that such liquid assets as gold and silver jewellery were never recorded and never seen again, "being taken by the Inquisitor for the expense of the trial." (Tavernias' Travels in India" p.184 - cited in "The Goa Inquisition" p.174).

Tavernier goes on to tell how the Inquisitors obtained valuable or rare articles by sending a servant to auction to bid for the prisoner's effects. As few would dare to offer a greater price, these priests would purchase at bargain prices! Such was the incentive to imprison wealthy persons, that arrests of poor people were considered scarcely worth the trouble. (See Dellon "Goa Inquisition" Sec.2, pp.36,37)



Although the confiscation of assets proved to be very lucrative, yet the practice merely served to whet the rapacious appetites of these wolves in sheep's clothing. Erelong deceased person who had left substantial estates were being posthumously charged with crimes against the Inquisition. States Dellon:

"The jurisdiction of the Inquisition is not limited to the living or to those who have died in prison, but processes are often instituted against persons who have been dead many years before their accusation. When any important charge is preferred against a person deceased, his body is taken out of his tomb, and, on conviction, consumed at the Act of Faith; his estates are seized, and those who have taken possession compelled to refund." (Ibid. Sec. 2 p56).

Let us now look in on a scene where the above claim is being enacted. The account is given by Dellon and the translation is the one used by Rae:

"The cases of such as were doomed to be burnt had yet to be disposed of, and they were accordingly ordered to be brought forward separately. They were a man and a woman, and the images of four men deceased, with the chests in which their bones were deposited ....Two of the four men statues also represented persons convicted of magic, who were said to have Judaized. One of these had died in the prison of the Holy Office; the other expired in his own house, and his body had been long since interred in his own family burying ground, but, having been accused of Judaism after his decease, as he had left considerable wealth, his tomb was opened, and his remains disinterred to be burnt at the autoda-fe.... We may well throw a veil over the smoky spectacle on the banks of the river which seems to have attracted the viceroy of Goa and his heartless retinue." ("The Syrian Church in India" pp.217,218), (cited in "Truth Triumphant" p.320).

One of the terrible uncertainties with which the accused were expected to come to terms was the fact that they were not told the nature of the accusation brought against them. Yet they were expected to confess their crime. As can be imagined, this would pose a serious problem for both the guilty and the innocent. The guilty ones would have a problem determining which one of his misdemeanors the Inquisitor had in mind, while the innocent would naturally deny knowledge of any infringement of the Inquisitorial regulations. As the accused were always considered guilty, the only way to avoid serious punishment was to confess to some misdemeanor, whether real or imaginary.

The ever present threat of torture was used to persuade the accused to confess his crime. It was also used by the Inquisition as an expedient to obtain a confession where the evidence against the accused was incomplete, defective or conflicting. As mentioned earlier, survivors of the Inquisition were extremely reluctant to speak of their experiences. Dellon, who escaped torture by confessing, confirms that torture did take place at Goa:

"During the months of November and December, I every morning heard the cries of those to whom the torture was administered, and which was inflicted so severely, that I have seen many persons of both sexes who have been crippled by it....

"No distinctions of rank, age, or sex are attended to in this Tribunal. Every individual is treated with equal severity; and when the interest of the Inquisition requires it, all are alike tortured in almost perfect nudity." (Dellon Chapter XXIX), (cited in "The Goa Inquisition" Section 2, pp.48,49).

This then, gives us an insight into the times: and conduct of the Portuguese affairs in Goa during the traumatic years of confrontation with the Syrian Christian

Church. Now that it had capitulated to Roman Catholicism and placed itself under the jurisdiction of the Inquisition, how did it fare?

But before proceeding to give the answer, is it not pertinent to reflect on the papacy's practical application of the "moral laws of human behaviour" as exercised by "Christ's Church" while in total command of a selected portion of India? What then may we expect if the Pope John Paul II's vision of "globalist supremacy" as outlined by Malachi Martin were to be translated into reality?

## **CHAPTER 11**

By any account, the sixteenth century was a remarkable one for Europe. It was during this century that Western civilization burst out of the fog of the Dark Ages into the sunshine of the Reformation. Already Holland's intellectual giant, Erasmus, was making his presence felt in the new Age of Learning. Between the years 1516 and 1522 he had brought out three editions of his Greek New Testament. This translation of the New Testament was taken from manuscripts and versions that had been handed down from apostolic times. It had been jealously guarded by the Syrian, Greek and Gallic churches, all of whom had a history and tradition of seventh-day Sabbath keeping. His New Testament of the Byzantine tradition differed markedly from the Alexandrian line of manuscripts from which the Roman Vulgate derived.

Two great scholars and linguists, Martin Luther and William Tyndale, quickly realized the value of Erasmus' New Testament as a source of spiritual and moral enlightenment. By 1534 both the Germans and the English were able to read what Rome called "Waldensian Bibles" in their own language. In 1537 the French received their own Waldensian Bible, known as the Olivetan. Thanks to the recent development of printing and the consequent upsurge in literacy, the domain of these Bibles soon became strongholds of the Protestant Reformation.

By mid-century Pope Paul III had responded to the plans of the newly-formed Society of Jesus and called a prolonged council of war against Protestantism - the Council of Trent. But even as the Council deliberated, an updated version of the New Testament, followed by the Old Testament known as the Geneva Bible, had arrived in Britain to fuel the Reformation.

In accordance with plans formulated at Trent, the Jesuits endeavoured to counter these English Bibles by thrusting their Rheims Bible upon the English-speaking world. The declared purpose of this Bible was "to shake out of the deceived people's hand the false heretical translations of a sect called Waldenses." (Preface to Geneva Bible). But this Bible was not generally welcomed, especially by Protestants.

Thus we have an acknowledgment by Rome of two important points - that the Waldensian Bible was responsible for the Received Text of Erasmus on which Luther and Tyndale relied heavily, and that it was sufficiently different in doctrine from their Latin Vulgate to support the Protestant Reformation.

One result of the failure of the Romish Bible to replace the Bible of the Waldenses was the Pope's decision to reclaim Britain by force. As has always been the case, the Vatican used the armed might of another political power to carry out its nefarious intentions. In 1588, King Philip II of Spain set out to invade England with a mighty armada of some 130 ships which included ships from the recently vanquished Portuguese navy. The destruction of the Spanish Armada led to British naval supremacy and the spreading of Protestantism.

However, for the Christians of India, the sixteenth century was even more traumatic. Little did they realise at the time of the Portuguese arrival early in the century that their ancient Syrian form of worship would virtually cease to exist before the century ended. Neither could they have foreseen that their churches would be forcibly inducted into Roman Catholicism, their Syrian Bibles and literature totally destroyed, and that their leaders would commit their church to the jurisdiction of a terrible form of European persecution - the Goa Inquisition.

It seems that the Portuguese in India were determined to atone for Rome's losses to the Protestants in Europe by expunging all traces of non-conformist Christianity in India.

As a result, practically nothing is known of the travail and anguish of these former St Thomas Christians over the next century. But what we do know is that Portugal and Spain no longer ruled the waves, let alone the Arabian Sea.

With successive victories of the Dutch, French and British over the Portuguese armies in India, the Portuguese gradually lost control over their vast Eastern empire. Their territories on the Malabar Coast contracted increasingly around their stronghold of Goa.

By the mid-seventeenth century it seemed feasible for the Patriarch of Babylon to consider resuming control over the long-lost church in India. He ordained and dispatched to India a new leader by the name of Ahatalla, but on his arrival at Marlapore, just a little south of Madras, he was kidnapped by Portuguese agents and shipped to Goa, where in 1653 he was burned at the stake. (see "Truth Triumphant". p.329)

The indignation of the Malabar Christians awakened their desire to be free of their oppressors. No doubt, during the intervening half century of unrecorded history, many a Christian had been betrayed by apostate leaders and delivered up to the Holy Office of the Inquisition.

Outraged by the burning of their newly-designated leader, a spontaneous gathering of protest converged on the small town of Mattancherry near Cochin. Before a huge cross, they assembled to protest against the papal-led priests of Portugal. Regarding it as a sacred symbol, they tied long ropes to the cross, so that all could grasp them while taking an oath to sever their allegiance to Rome. This event has become known as the Coonen Cross - meaning the bent cross, and is today regarded by Indian Syrian Christians as a landmark in their history.

But decisions taken in the heat of emotional crises are not necessarily well-considered ones. When the papal leaders learned of the defection of some four hundred thousand Christians from their church they immediately dispatched Carmelite emissaries to visit among the dissenters in order that the disaster might be averted. Their efforts were not without success, for we must realise that the majority of these people had been brought up in the pomp and ritual and fear of Catholicism. Their knowledge of Syrian Christianity was solely hearsay from a by-gone era. No Syrian Christian literature, including the Bible, was available to them. Their leaders were virtually all Roman Catholics.

When faced with the cajoling, the anathemas and threats of the papal clergy, a split developed among those who had embraced the Coonen Cross. Approximately two-thirds of the protesters had second thoughts, electing to remain loyal to the Pope and continue in his "blessing". Thus they became known as Romo-Syrians, while the more daring spirits elected to remain true to their oath and return to the Syrian ways of

worship of their forebears. But by this time they had completely forgotten that the observance of Sunday as a day of rest and worship was purely an invention of Rome. From henceforth it would be left to a few brave souls, mainly among the orthodox Jewish communities of the Malabar Coast and, as we shall shortly see, to Armenians, to keep alive even the notion that the Sabbath commandment was still binding. With the progressive loss of Portuguese control, a small colony of orthodox Jewry survives today not far from the shrine of the Coonen Cross, and Sabbath (Saturday) services are held regularly in their synagogue.

But in areas that were still under Portuguese control, any would-be Sabbath keeper would be aware of the high price that would be exacted for any outward semblance of Judaizing. Historian Rae gives us an insight into the type of offenders caught within the dragnet of the Inquisition:

"Besides hunting down heretics, Jews, New Christians and all who were accused of Judaizing (that is conforming to the ceremonies of the Mosaic law, such as not eating pork, attending the solemnization of the Sabbath', partaking of the paschal lamb, and so forth), the Goanese Inquisitors also replenished their dungeons with persons accused of magic and sorcery." (Rae, "The Syrian Church in India" p.200).

As the Portuguese government has seen fit either to conceal or destroy official records of the Goa Inquisition, we can only speculate as to how long it took to stamp out any vestige of Sabbath-keeping in territories under their control. But Dellon, who was held by the Inquisition from 1674-1678 - nearly eighty years after the Synod of Diamper - makes this observation regarding those who were accused by the Inquisition of Judaizing:

"... that of a hundred persons condemned to be burnt as Jews, there are scarcely four who profess that faith at their death; the rest exclaiming and protesting to their last gasp, that they are Christians, and have been so during their whole lives; ...." (cited by Priolkar, "The Goa Inquisition" Sec.2, p.35).

Obviously Rae had fallen into the common trap that God had mistakenly included the Sabbath commandment with the moral law of the Decalogue.

## **CHAPTER 12**

During the eighteenth century the British inexorably tightened their grip on India and the Dutch and French influence, progressively waned. This was the great age of British expansionism. With them they brought the religion of the state Church of England and the all-conquering Protestant Bible of King James, known as the Authorised Bible.

Yet the Portuguese continued to exert strict religious control over their greatly diminished Empire. To do so, they persisted in maintaining the Holy Office of the Inquisition.

It seems that the British were negligently tolerant of continuing Portuguese intrusion in the lives of those Indians living in British India and who remained under the spell and domination of the Romish religion which they had left behind. But increasingly, there was criticism of Britain's failure to protect her subjects from the remaining tentacles of the Inquisition. Dr Claudius Buchanan of the Anglican Church conducted Christian researches in Asia very early in the nineteenth century. He was concerned that a papal Inquisition should still exist with the implied tolerance of the British Government, and that

some British territories should be amenable to its power and jurisdiction. This led him to visit Goa. It is certain that his published findings in "Christian Researches in Asia" provided the catalyst for British intervention in bringing this particularly obnoxious facet of Roman Catholicism to its end in India. But that was not until the year 1812.

Yet leaders of the Church of England were very much aware of the plight of the Syrian Churches, who had long been deprived of their Syriac Bibles and literature. The Rev. Buchanan D.D. throws some light on these fragmented churches. His comments on the Christians living in the mountainous interior of South India are based on his visits with widely-scattered Christians. This is what he was told:

"About 300 years ago [early sixteenth century], an enemy came from the west bearing the name of Christ, but armed with the Inquisition and compelled us to seek protection of the native Princes. And the native Princes have kept us in a state of depression ever since." ("Christian Researches in Asia" (1811) p.117).

"The glory of our church has passed away; but we hope your nation will revive it again. I observed that 'the glory of a Church could never die, if it preserved the Bible'. 'We have preserved the Bible' said he, 'the Hindu Princes never touched our liberty of conscience.'" (Ibid.).

Apparently this was a reference to the only known surviving Syriac Bible. It was graciously offered to Dr Buchanan who placed it in the Cambridge University Library for safe-keeping.

In November 1990 the author of this book had the privilege of meeting with the Chaldean Metropolitan, Dr Aprem, at his home in Trichur in South India. Mar Aprem has seen this Bible, and being familiar with the Syriac, claims that it agrees very substantially with the King James Authorized Version. This places it in the same family as the Bible of the Waldenses - the Bible so hated by Rome. No wonder the Indian Syrian Bible was hated and hunted for destruction by the Portuguese Catholic Church in India.

It is not surprising then, that when the Anglican Church Missionary Society offered to translate the Authorized Bible of King James into the main Indian languages, the surviving Syrian Christians accepted with gratitude. Because the New Testament portion of the King James Bible was based on Erasmus' Byzantine Greek text they now virtually had their Syriac Bible back again, but this time it was in their own language.

Understandably, considering their isolation and lack of association with other communities of like faith, their worship practices had suffered and their faith wavered. Buchanan reported of the churches in one area:

"Instruction by preaching is little in use among them now. Many of the old men lamented the decay of piety and religious knowledge." (Ibid. p.121).

While in another area he was able to report:

"I attended divine service on Sunday. Their liturgy is that which was formerly used in Churches of the Patriarch of Antioch." (Ibid.).

It is interesting to note that nowhere does Dr Buchanan make any mention or give any hint of Saturday Sabbath-keeping among those inland Syrian churches of the South. Yet we must assume that those who had taken to the mountains, following the subjugation of the Syrian churches at Diamper, would have consisted mainly of those who had been unwilling to submit to Portuguese religious control. Even so, many of these people found it difficult to escape the long tentacles of Roman Catholicism and the Inquisition. Buchanan remarks:

"In its [Inquisition] influence therefore may be fairly attributed no small portion of the rapid success attending on the Crusades of Menezes amongst the churches of Serra [mountainous area in South India] for the Syrian Christians well knew that had they offered any resistance, the arm of the Inquisition was long enough to reach them even in the fastnesses of their mountain homes." (Ibid. p.249).

However, India is a large country and there were amongst those Christians who had migrated to India numerous communities of the Eastern Church of Armenia. Of them Buchanan makes an important claim:

"Of all the Christians in central Asia, they have preserved themselves most free from Mahomedan [Moslem] and Papal corruption." (Ibid. p.257).

Buchanan had good reason to observe the relative freedom from papal corruption, especially among those Armenians who had settled in that region of central and northern India which he refers to as Hindustani. There they had successfully established themselves among the Hindus and built numerous Christian churches. And the day on which they worshipped was the Biblical Sabbath day - Saturday!

1 "Hindustan" is an ancient name for the peninsular of Southern Asia now known as India. In British times it came to designate that area between the Himalayas and the Ghats of South India.

Not only is this fact of particular interest in tracing the history of Christian Sabbath-keeping in India, but Buchanan brings to light another very interesting observation. Upon discovery of these Sabbath-keepers, Buchanan became concerned that the thinking of Christian Protestant England ran parallel to Roman Catholicism in branding these Sabbathkeeping Christians as Judaizers. He was constrained to plead their case:

"The Armenians in Hindustan are our own subjects. They acknowledge our government in India, and they are entitled to our regard. They have preserved the Bible in its purity, and their doctrines of the Bible are, as far as the Author knows, the doctrines of the Bible. Besides, they maintain the solemn observance of Christian worship throughout our empire on the seventh day; and they have as many spires pointing to heaven among the Hindoos, as we ourselves. Are such people then entitled to no acknowledgment on our part as fellow Christians? Are they forever to be ranked by us with Jews, Mahomedans and Hindoos?" ("Christian Researches in Asia" (1811) p.259).

The author is sure that the import of this dramatic evidence of relatively recent biblical Sabbath-keeping will not be lost on the reader. M C Gabrielian, M.D., a graduate of Princeton Theological Seminary, confirms the Armenian claim that:

"Soon after the ascension of Christ three of His apostles, Thaddeus, Bartholomew and Jude, successively preached the gospel in Armenia." ("Armenia, a Martyr Nation" (1918) p.67).

The fact that in the nineteenth century the Indian branch of this early church was still observing the seventh-day Sabbath, underscores once more the continuance of a practice obviously established by the Apostles.

In this connection it is well for us to realise that Armenia has the honour of being the world's first Christian nation. Gabrielian continues:

"We know that when Gregory the Illuminator, who was born about AD 257, proclaimed the message throughout Armenia, he found Christians everywhere, and a church which though society persecuted and oppressed [by the Sun-worshippers of

Mithraism] had existed from Apostolic times. He was, in fact, rather the restorer than the founder of the Armenian Church, which became the church of the whole nation half a century before the cross was emblazoned on the standard of Rome. The Armenians may justly claim to be the oldest Christian nation in the world." (Ibid. p.67).

Therefore, as was the practice of the early Christian churches, these Christians observed the sanctity of the seventh day of the week as a memorial of creation. After Constantine's efforts to unite Christianity and paganism we find a period when both Saturday and Sunday observance became acceptable in Christendom. With the later Roman occupation of Armenian territory, we find these two days competing for allegiance:

"As one glances over the Armenian Church calendar he is struck not only by the array of sacred feasts, but also by their frequent and severe fasts. It is further noteworthy that they not only keep Sabbath in the commemoration of Christ, but Saturday also in memory of the finished work of creation. 11("Armenia, A Martyr Nation" pp.26,27).

1 Note the almost hopeless confusion in sections of Christendom over the true meaning and purpose of the Sabbath day. Here it has been transferred to Sunday in commemoration of Christ, yet the Sabbath was given to man to commemorate creation (Exodus 20:11).

There appears to be no record of the time and circumstances surrounding the first migrations of Armenians to India. But Firth, in his "Introduction to Indian Church History" (p.34) reminds us that in the seventh century Mesopotamia and Persia came under Moslem rule. These changed circumstances may have caused Armenian Christians to migrate to India where Christianity was tolerated. Both J.W. Kaye in his book, Christianity in India (1859) and Rev. Richard Collins in Missionary Enterprises in the East, refer to an Armenian merchant by the name of Thomas Cona as settling on Malabar Coast towards the close of the eighth century. The early Portuguese writers also give his nationality as Armenian, calling him Thomas Conares.

So it appears that the Armenian Church in Hindustan, having been so isolated in Persia from the parent church which had suffered from the influence of Romanism, and which later had migrated to those parts of India outside the effective jurisdiction of the Goa Inquisition, had retained the observance of Sabbath-keeping throughout the centuries. By early nineteenth century, in Hindustan at least, their churches were as numerous as were those of the now flourishing Churches of England.

Very interestingly, the Armenian Bibles which they had brought with them to India were according to Dr Buchanan, unadulterated. Obviously, Buchanan found them in basic agreement with the Protestant Authorised Bible of King James. In writing of his visit to the Indian town of Angamalee in the year 1807, Buchanan makes similar claims for the Bible of the Syrian Christians:

"How wonderful it is, that during the dark ages of Europe, whilst ignorance and superstition, in a manner, denied the Scripture to the rest of the world, the Bible should have found an asylum in the mountains of Malayala; where it was freely received by upwards of an hundred churches." ("Christian Researches in Asia" p.140).

So here is further evidence of the apostolic pedigree of the New Testament portion of these Bibles. The inescapable conclusion then is that the Roman Catholic Church hated these Bibles because their own Bibles had been deliberately perverted in an attempt to support their man made dogmas and traditions. Hence the prodigious efforts by Rome to destroy Byzantine Bibles. Following the invention of printing and the

multiplicity of copies, Rome is presently foisting upon Protestants its corruptions of scripture through the numerous modern versions of the Bible. Most Bible Societies are only too willing to help them. They have allowed themselves to come under the umbrella of the United Bible Society which includes Roman Catholics on its board. One notable exception is the Trinitarian Bible Society of England which promotes only New Testaments that are based on the Byzantine texts, such as the Protestant King James Bible.

In more recent times, Armenian traders are known to have migrated to India. Bishop Baliozian, Armenian primate of the Far East, claims that during the early seventeenth century Armenian artisans had been taken in large numbers to Persia and by the end of the century many had left Persia for India, finding the climate of British rule congenial to the practice of their faith. Thus sizeable numbers of Armenians who, being surrounded by

Persian Moslems had not experienced any other form of Christianity than their own, would have settled in India and established their customs of worship among Hindus, Moslems, and Syrian Christians. This could very well explain why Buchanan would find them worshipping on Saturday, while the long-established Christians who had been exposed to Portuguese Catholicism and threats of the Inquisition apparently held their services on Sunday.

Such historical evidence as we have examined cannot be ignored. Roman Catholics may not like it, Protestants may not wish to admit it, but the fact remains, that seventh-day Sabbath observance in India had survived the consistent and systematic onslaughts of Romanism and paganism until as late as the early years of the nineteenth century. And, as acknowledged by Buchanan, far from being Jews, these commandment-keepers were indeed Christians.

So if Protestant England had difficulty in recognizing true Sabbath-keepers as Christians, how likely is it then that many who were seized by the Inquisition as Judaizers were in fact genuine Christians of the Eastern Churches?

Perhaps Dr Buchanan's concern for these Armenian Sabbath-keepers was prompted by his knowledge of fairly recent unsavoury practices in British religious history. Only some 150 years earlier, several ministers in England had been persecuted by the state church for defending the biblical seventh-day Sabbath. John Trask was thrown into prison and his wife, a school teacher of "devout Christian character", spent fifteen years in prison. John James persisted in preaching biblical Sabbath-keeping, so on 26 November, 1661, he was hanged "and his head was set upon a pole opposite the meeting house in which he preached the gospel." (Dr. J.M. Cramp, "History of the Baptists" (1868) p.351) (cited in "Facts of Faith" p.144).

Shortly after a former speaker in one of Cromwell's parliaments, Dr Thomas Bampfield, wrote two books (1692 and 1693) defending the seventh-day Sabbath. As reward for this apostolic zeal, he attracted the wrath of the state-supported church and was imprisoned." ("Facts of Faith" p.144).

How then did the British church react to Buchanan's appeal for brotherly love and understanding? The author would welcome information, for this is one of the mysteries surrounding the disappearance of the Armenian Sabbath keepers of India. Perhaps, what could not be accomplished by papal persecution and pagan pressure, was indeed accomplished by brotherly "love". Undoubtedly, they were told of the undesirability of taking the Bible too literally and of the advantages, both social and financial, of falling



into line with those whose protests against Roman Catholicism were at best selective and at worst politically inspired.

Certainly, after observing the Sabbath for centuries according to the commandment made known by God to them through their Armenian Bible, they would be aware that the Church of England had acknowledged the authority of Rome which claims to have the power to promote the pagan day of the sun ahead of Christ's day of Sabbath rest. Logically then, many came to look up to Rome as authority in matters of faith, liturgy and politics.

By the year 1830 the Sultan of Turkey appointed a Patriarch over Roman Catholic Armenians in India. Such action recognized the defection of some one hundred thousand Armenians from the mother church to Rome (M.C. Gabrielian, "Armenia, A Martyr Nation" 1918 pp.153, 154.). Where the compulsion of the Inquisition had failed, freedom of choice had triumphed!

Christianity in India had finally succumbed to the authority of that pseudo-Christian religion of the papacy. Tradition and dogma were elevated above God's Holy Word.

Until the advent of the twentieth century, Sunday-worship remained virtually unchallenged in India. In 1895 the fledgling Seventh-day Adventist Church commenced mission work in Calcutta. Today, they and a Reform Movement bearing the same name, are valiantly reintroducing the Sabbath truth to the vast millions of India. Seventh-day Baptists also have a small presence there.

A significant number who are now accepting the Sabbath of Christ are converts from fragmented Eastern Christian churches. While recently carrying out research in India the author received this interesting comment from Pastor Paulose Varghise, himself a convert from Syrian Christianity to Seventh-day Adventism:

"In Kerala we have a group of people called Chaldean Syrian Christians. They claim that they are the descendants of Thoma of Cana .... These people also agree that their forefathers kept the Sabbath on the seventh day of the week.

"It was my privilege to take the Adventist message to these people and they never disagreed. But the question why they observe Sunday is due to the pressure and practice of the present age."

## **CHAPTER 13**

Now that we have examined the conduct of what Mr. Malachi Martin so confidently refers to as "Christ's Church" during the era of its political and religious supremacy in India, how nice it would be were we able to consign such conduct to a bygone era, knowing that the Vatican had reformed its concept of morality to coincide with the teachings of Christ! Surely in this day and age of moral enlightenment such papist outrages could be forever consigned to the historical trash heap!

If the history of Portuguese Imperial Christianity in India were an isolated case, one could be excused for accepting at face value Mr. Martin's glowing account of Pope Paul's globalist strategy. Unfortunately the well-documented history of papal supremacy shows that Rome's outrageous conduct in India was no isolated case. The very term Inquisition is synonymous with the terrors of the Dark Ages. Yet are these memories not

also something to be forgotten or looked upon as milestones in man's struggle towards a global new age of enlightenment?

If this were the case then this author would not be wasting his time writing this book. The sad reality is that one of the most despicable and cowardly religiously-inspired acts of genocidal butchery has been perpetrated against a small ethnic group of people during times within easy memory of many alive today. We speak of the Vatican's planned destruction of a sovereign state by encouraging and abetting Croatia to declare its independence from Yugoslavia during World War II.

It is not the purpose of this book to launch into the history of the conflict between the predominantly Roman Catholic Croatians and the Orthodox Christians and Jews of Yugoslavia and in particular, Serbia. Such eminent authors as Avro Manhattan of England and Edmond Paris of France have superbly documented Catholic leadership in this tragic struggle. But we will refer briefly to information contained therein to demonstrate that Papal Rome has not had a conversion to true Christianity, nor can we expect a future globalist papal-led system to allow, let alone "guarantee, the rights and freedoms of the individual".

In short, we shall demonstrate that any promise of a Vatican-led utopia is just another stratagem designed to blind the world to the Vatican's lust for the absolute power which she enjoyed during the Dark Ages.

During the few years leading up to World War II, three infamous dictators who strutted the world stage were staunch defenders of Roman Catholicism.' They were Mussolini of Italy, Franco of Spain and Hitler of Germany. All three were Fascist-like dictators, all three were loyal Catholics, and all three dutifully negotiated a concordat with the Vatican.

Any country which signs a concordat with the Vatican is committed to the aims of the papacy and will commit its total resources to furthering those aims. The reward for placing their resources at the disposal of the "government of God" is a guaranteed form of political stability underwritten by the "Vicar of Christ".

It is extremely doubtful if any of these dictators would have achieved their position of power had they not been supported and trained by their Roman Catholic constituents at the instigation of the Catholic hierarchy. Let us take an example: Avro Manhattan in his book "Catholic Terror Today" gives a detailed account of Cardinal Pacelli's machinations in promoting Benito Mussolini and Adolf Hitler to power. From the years 1917 to 1929 Pacelli was papal nuncio in Munich and later in Berlin, "the cradle of Nazism". While in that role he helped pave the way for a papal alliance with Fascist Italy known as the Lateran Treaty and a Concordat signed in 1929. Article 20 of the Concordat compelled all Italian Bishops to swear allegiance to Mussolini (Ibid. p.129).

In 1930, Pacelli's efforts were acknowledged and he was promoted to the position of Secretary of State where he was able to influence the German Catholic Party to negotiate with Hitler. By 1932 Hitler's rising popularity caused the Vatican to see him as a winner. Manhattan reveals the result of Pacelli's secret negotiations with Hitler:

"A quid pro quo was agreed upon. The Vatican - or rather, Pacelli - would:

- (a) Help Hitler to power;
- (b) Order the Hierarchy of the church to support Nazism; and
- (c) Remove the Catholic Party.

In return Hitler would:

- (a) Share his Government with Catholics;
- (b) Grant a privileged status to the church; and
- (c) Sign a Concordat with the Vatican.

("Catholic Terror Today" p.129)

Manhattan goes on to tell how over the next couple of years Pacelli was responsible for influencing the Catholic President Hindenburg to promote Hitler as Premier. This was achieved in early 1933 with the Catholic Von Papen as his Vice-Premier. Before the year was out, members of the Catholic Party followed Pacelli's orders and gave Hitler more than the two-thirds majority needed to make him the Fuhrer and dictator of Germany.

Soon after this, Hitler repaid his debt by signing the Concordat with the Vatican, thus ensuring the religious and political support of the papal hierarchy. Article 16 of the Concordat ensured that there would be no misunderstanding in the minds of the Catholic prelates:

"I swear and promise to honour the legally constituted [Nazi] Government. I will endeavour to avoid all detrimental acts which might endanger it."

"Clause 30 stipulates: "On Sundays and on Holy Days special prayer will be offered... for the welfare of the German Reich..." (Source "Catholic Terror Today" p.130).

Said Catholic Von Papen, Hitler's second in command: "The Third Reich is the first power which not only recognizes but puts into practice the high principles of the Papacy." (Ibid.).

As the leader of the Axis Powers of World War II, Hitler's early successes were seen by him as milestones toward the setting up of the "Thousand Years Reich". The Roman Hierarchy preferred to see it as the commencement of a papal millennium.

Among the great hates endemic to the papacy, we could mention three that pertain to religious organizations - they hate the Jews, they hate the Orthodox Christian Church, and they hate Great Britain's state Church. England is the country which more than any other nourished and spread the Protestant Reformation which, although begun in Germany, quickly succumbed to Jesuit intrigue. All three religions represent rites and worship over which Rome has no control. The latter two are described by Rome as schisms, or renegade from "Christ's Church". They do not submit to the authority of the Bishop of Rome, nor do they have any regard for his imaginary "Petrine keys" of an invented Apostolic Succession. Both have another practice obnoxious to Rome - they base their faith and practice on what Rome calls "Waldensian Bibles". These Bibles, common to the Byzantine tradition and handed down by the Eastern Orthodox and Western Celtic churches to Protestantism, are in disagreement with the Roman Catholic Vulgate Bible of Jerome, the interpretation of which is the sole preserve of the Church and its traditions.

History recalls Hitler's "valiant" attempt at Jewish genocide. There is no point in spending time proving it for, to our readers or their parents, it was contemporary history. The Nuremberg and subsequent trials of Nazi war criminals provide indisputable documentation.

Hitler's efforts to crush Britain accorded with the Vatican's plans to redress Spain's failure to Catholicize England at the time of the defeat of the Spanish (and

Portuguese) Armada. Although now a greatly diminished bastion of Protestantism, there were sufficient of the intelligentsia in Britain to realise that Hitler was mounting a frontal attack on a perceived enemy of the papacy. While Britain was sorely pressed with her back to the wall, Prime Minister Churchill rallied His Majesty's subjects with his battle cry "Nothing matters now but victory". In the hour of extremity, he blurted out the fear that few Protestant politicians dared to make public - that a victory for Hitler would herald the return of the Dark Ages on the "gleaming wings of science". After all, had not the celebrated historian J.A. Wylie described "the noon of the papacy" as "the midnight of the world"?

Thus we see that it was the Vatican which put in place the dictators who were to ravage Europe during the Second World War. For the unspeakable terrors perpetrated under their regimes, Cardinal Pacelli who in 1939 became Pope Pius XII, must not be denied credit. His willing assistants, already strategically-placed in key positions of power in Europe, soon showed that their allegiance to the Pope transcended their duty to their homeland. Manhattan identifies the "Trojan Horses" that delivered Belgium and France into Hitler's bloody hands:

"In Belgium, we find a Leon Degrelle, the Catholic Fascist Leader; we see a Cardinal counsel the Belgian King and thus decide the fate of a country. In France we meet a Papal Knight, Laval, a Jesuit general, Wegand, and another Catholic, Marshal Petain.

When, finally Hitler attacked Russia, Catholic volunteers from all Catholic countries rushed to the Russian fronts, with the blessings of the Church." ("Catholic Terror Today" p.132).

Soon, stories detailing terrible atrocities in German-occupied territories were being received by British intelligence. In 1941 the victorious armies of Germany overran Yugoslavia. There they were welcomed by the Roman Catholic Church whose members dominated the area known as Croatia. Practically ever since the setting up of the state of Yugoslavia following the First World War, the Croats had been agitating for independence. A rabid Roman Catholic by the name of Ante Pavelic had emerged as the leader of a subversive separatist group known as the Ustashi.

At that time, Fascist Benito Mussolini, whose expansionist aims caused him to support any unstabilising force in the Balkans, stepped up moral, political and financial help to Pavelic. Part of this help included a plan to eliminate King Alexander of Yugoslavia. After a failed assassination attempt in Zagreb in 1933, Mussolini took over, charging his son-in-law, Count Ciano, with the organization of a second attempt.

On October 6, 1934 his plans reached fruition when Alexander was killed by a bullet within minutes of his arrival in Marseilles.

But Hitler also had plans for the Balkans. On July 25, 1934 he had succeeded in murdering the Austrian dictator Dollfuss. Who would succeed in deciding the destiny of Yugoslavia?

In the meantime, Pavelic had taken advantage of the situation and had set Ustashi recruiting and training organizations in both Germany and Italy. When in April 1941 the Ustashi leaders in both countries finally moved in a two-pronged attack against Yugoslavia, the Germans moved quickly and went in with them.

Only then did the extent of the Roman Catholic plot to wreck the kingdom of Yugoslavia become known. Their aim was to set up a Catholic Fascist State of Croatia. The new state was proclaimed on April 10, 1941. Manhattan comments:

"The promotion of such a large treacherous body within the country would have been impossible without the active co-operation of the Catholic Church. Pavelic's terrorist bands, the Ustashi, had been morally and financially encouraged and supported by her. Indeed, their backbone had been formed by priests, monks and even bishops. Monasteries had been used as the clandestine headquarters of the Ustashi long before the Nazi attack. Secret separatist and military activities had been disguised for years under the cloak of religion. The Catholic priesthood in Croatia, Herzegovina, and Dalmatia had repeatedly convoked so-called Eucharistic Congresses which in reality were for extremist political purposes." ("Catholic Terror Today" p.18).

Manhattan continues:

"On that very day the newspapers of Zagreb carried announcements to the effect that all Serbian Orthodox (Church) residents of the new Catholic capital must vacate the city within twelve hours and that anyone found harbouring an Orthodox would immediately be executed." (Ibid. p.19).

This was the signal for the convicted murderer Ante Pavelic to leave his place of refuge in Italy and return to Yugoslavia with a bodyguard of Italian tanks. When he arrived in Zagreb, he was sporting a fascist black shirt. Historian Edmond Paris tells how the Catholic hierarchy of Croatia immediately threw their support behind Pavelic's black shirts. On the day after his arrival, "during the banquet of the Archbishopric, black shirts and ecclesiastical robes fraternally mingled. They, each in turn, gave toasts brimming with cordiality, and during the dessert flash bulbs photographed the edifying picture of his Grace reigning among the terrorists, which should be of interest to the historians of the future." ("Convert or Die" p.55).

Indeed, just fifty years on "into the future", the author of this book is very interested in present-day outcomes. The story of the horrific atrocities committed by the Ustashi over the remainder of World War II is both the sequel to, and partial achievement of, Pope Pius XII's plan to forcibly convert the Orthodox church throughout the Balkans and Russia to Catholicism. His support of Mussolini and Hitler was now paying off!

Edmond Paris continues:

"On Easter Day, 1941, Archbishop Stepinac announced from the pulpit in the Cathedral of Zagreb, the establishment of the Independent State of Croatia. Thus in the church itself, he celebrated high treason against Yugoslavia. The Archbishop ended his sermon with these words: 'Jesus our resurrected Saviour!... I will pray thee tell the Croatian people who are now facing a new era of life, what you told the Apostles after the Resurrection! Peace be with you!'" (Ibid. p.56, cit. "Katolecke List" No.16, 1941).

But the Archbishop failed to enlighten his audience as to the kind of "peace" he had in mind, for did not Christ draw a distinction between the peace given by God and the "peace" of the world? "My peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth, give I unto you." (John 14:27).

Yugoslavia was soon to find out (the outside world much later) that the "peace" that the Catholic hierarchy had in mind for Yugoslavia was not just a worldly one. It

would be flavoured by the subjective view of the Vatican and coloured by the blood of Serbians, both Orthodox and Jewish!

Not surprisingly, in the process the Roman Catholic church and the Ustashi would act as one, for had not the Fascists gained virtual control of Europe through the helpful offices of the Vatican?

Now the newly-proclaimed religious state of Croatia, protected by Nazi Germany to the north and Fascist Italy to the south, could wreak its vengeance against Orthodox Serbians in a full dress rehearsal for the expected extermination of the Orthodox church of Russia.

In his introductory chapter, "Christ and the Ustashi March Together", Avro Manhattan succinctly explains how the church achieved absolute control in Yugoslavia:

"If the first ingredient of Ustashi supernationalism was race, the second was religion. The two could hardly exist independently, having been so closely intertwined as to have become almost synonymous. The word "Croat", in fact signified Catholic, as much as, in Croatia, Catholic came to signify Croat. If this was useful to Ustashi racialism, it was no less beneficial to Catholicism, in so far as, once the theory had been established that Catholic meant Croat, the idea that Croatia had to be totally Catholic not only became firmly rooted: it was turned into one of the basic tenets of the new State.

"The results of such an identification were portentous. For, while nationalism had embarked upon a policy of 100 per cent racialism, the Catholic Church had embarked upon an inevitable parallel policy of 100 per cent Catholicism. The two policies were in effect one single policy, the political authorities automatically furthering the religious interests of Catholicism, while the religious authorities furthered the political interests of Ustashi racialism." ("Catholic Terror Today" p.41).

In the same chapter Manhattan details Catholic control of the press in a campaign to condition fair-minded Croats to the idea of a Christ-led Ustashi and a religious hatred towards Serbian Orthodoxy and the Jews, and even to the very concept of a Yugoslavian state. The press openly hailed the participation of Catholic priests as organizers and soldiers of the Ustashi while various Catholic leaders, both of the laity and the priesthood, quickly moved into administrative positions of state.

Prominent among those who advocated and joined in the Ustashi blood-bath were the Franciscan priests. One of their order, Mate Mogus, became first commandant of the Udbina district. After organizing Ustashi militia and disarming Yugoslav troops he gave a homily on June 13, 1941: "Look, people, at these sixteen brave Ustashi, who have 16,000 bullets and who will kill 16,000 Serbs, after which we will divide among us in a brotherly manner the Mutilic and Krbava fields." (Ibid.p.48).

"A group of Franciscan priests, who tortured and finally killed twenty-five Serbs in the village of Kasle, took photographs of their victims." (Ibid.).

The Franciscan, Anti Klaric, who became the first Ustashi commissar and the organizer of Ustashi militia, castigated his parishioners during a sermon in 1941:

"You are old women and you should put on skirts, for you have not yet killed a single Serb. We have no weapons and no knives and we should forge them out of old scythes and sickles, so that you can cut the throats of Serbs whenever you see them." ("Convert or Die" p.114).

The Franciscan, Marko Zovko, also managed to earn himself a reputation among modern day necrologists. Manhattan gives him credit for "the murder of 200 persons,

whose bodies were thrown into a ditch in a field in Vidovo ("Catholic Terror Today" p.49); but Paris throws more light on the activities of this papal zealot in the Herzegovina province:

"559 Serbs, all of them old men, women and children, were led to a deep crevice called "Gobibinka", massacred and then thrown into space. And to do the job thoroughly, hand grenades were hurled down upon the dying bodies." Then follows a list of names of the 16 assassins, one of whom is the Franciscan priest, Harko Zovko." ("Convert or Die" p.103).

No fewer than 51 names of Franciscan priests "and many others" are listed by Viktor Novak in "Magnum Crimen" and cited by Paris as organisers and attack leaders of the Ustashi militia (Ibid. p.53).

So we see how these Franciscan clergymen whose order was founded on three vows of chastity, poverty and obedience, interpreted their vows once they no longer came under civil or divine restraint. Not satisfied with their own depravity, they encouraged their flock to join with them in Rome's unique interpretation of the "moral laws of human behaviour, revealed by God through the teaching of Christ". No wonder Malachi Martin added the qualifier: "as proposed by Christ's church!"

As we have noted in the story of the Goa Inquisition, Rome has rather novel ways of bringing about mass conversions to her church. Her great missionary to the East, Francis Xavier, was not adverse to a little coercion such as the threat of the Inquisition stake, the installation for which he was mainly responsible.

Therefore it is not surprising that this form of evangelism was tried in Yugoslavia, but with one important difference. With the passage of a couple of centuries, "salvation" on popish terms had become considerably more complicated. The following memorandum of protest sent by a Serbian Orthodox priest to the General Commanding officer of German troops in Serbia will illustrate:

"From the very beginning, the Ustashi authorities have inaugurated a system of terror, where by they have forced many Orthodox Serbs to be converted to the Catholic faith. The close co-operation between the Catholic Church and the Ustashi authorities is known, which is also evidenced by the fact that among the Ustashi officials there are a great number of Catholic priests. The -first intimidation for conversion to Catholicism was directed against the State's employees, who were advised that in the Croatian State's employ only those Orthodox people might remain who would embrace the Catholic faith, but in effect this was only a ruse. Thus depriving the Serbian people of having their clergy, the Roman Church forced the Orthodox people to the Catholic rites. According to the testimony of Reverend Janko Veljakovic, pastor of Grbovic, the Catholic priests there led the armed Ustashi in the closing of Orthodox churches and the confiscation of church records, also in the plundering of all church valuables. At Banja Luka, an official order was issued directing that all the Orthodox Church records (of marriages, baptisms, burials, etc.) be delivered forthwith to Catholic parishes, which order was later extended throughout the territory of the former Croatian province. Catholic priests took possession of the Serbian Bishops' residence at Pakrac and locked and sealed the Cathedral all of which occurred April 12, 1941. ("Convert or Die" p.97).

Lest there should-be any lingering doubts in the mind of the reader as to the extent of the religious component in this rampant genocide let us hear from the head of the Religious Department, the priest Dionis Juricev in his speech to the citizens of Staza:

"Thenceforward only Croats will be allowed to live in this country because the country belongs to the Croats, and we shall have to take action against those who refuse to be converted. I have succeeded in cleansing other regions and have rid them of everyone, from infants to old men, and if it is necessary I shall do the same thing here. It is no longer considered a sin to kill a child of seven if he interferes with the Ustashi law and order. Although I wear the robes of a priest, I am often obliged to resort to the machine gun, and the minute anyone is against the state or the Ustashi who are in power, I make good use of it right down to the cradle." (Convert or Die" p.98).

And what of the Serbian Jews?

"The imprisonments and internments started en masse at the end of June 1941, and continued during the following months all through the year 1942, at the end of which practically no Jews were left in satellite Croatia except those who had not yet succumbed to the diabolical regime of the extermination camps." ("Convert or Die" p.117). (Paris claims that in pre-war Zagreb there lived about nine thousand Jews).

In August 1941 Archbishop Stepinac made known the official attitude of the Roman Catholic church towards Jews in a government circular over his signature:

"The following circular is forwarded to the soulsaving clergy in order that they may be informed regarding all those who are to be converted. Beside being in possession of the document of release from the Greek-Eastern Church, [ORTHODOX], each person must have a document from the District or Police Authorities as to the honesty of his character." (Ibid. p.117,118).

This automatically disqualified all Jews who might have been tempted to save their lives by "conversion" to Catholicism for a previous government circular of July 30, 1941 stated:

"The Government is acquainted with the fact that numerous Jewish people are presenting themselves for conversion to Catholicism, but the conversion to Catholicism has no connection with these people because of their status in relation to the existing law on non-Arians." (Ibid. p.117).

It was patently obvious that, in the sight of the Catholic hierarchy, the Jewish race were merely a human form of trash!

And as such they were treated:

"At Vlasenica... they were imprisoned all Jews, and at Ploce, led their wives and their daughters away to be raped and then slaughtered." (Ibid. p.116).

"At Bugojno, on August 2, 1941, the Jews, accompanied by the Serbs, were hauled away in trucks and taken to Cracanica. Once there, on the edge of a deep crevice where 1,900 Serbians lay dying in agony, they were massacred and hurled into space. A similar act occurred on the banks of the Sava where 340 Jews whom the Chief of Police from Brcko, Veceslov Montani, wished to 'liquidate', were taken one snowy night to the bridge. Their clothes were torn off, and their throats cut, and their brains bashed in with hammers." (Ibid. p.116).

The author considers that enough has been said to convince the reader of the type of Christian morality practised by Rome when she has established a "Christian" nation. Both Manhattan and Paris give seemingly unending documentation of Catholic-Ustashi brutality. Many of their stories concern the same atrocities as told by living witnesses - and both accounts are in agreement.



Both tell of the forced "conversions" of the fortunate few Serbians who survived the war by accepting this odious option. To many not even this option existed.

To conclude this unhappy reminder of Catholicism's outbursts of barbarism during one of its recent forays into "Christian" government let us summarize the feelings of these two brave historians to whom we are indebted for an account of mid-twentieth century Vatican-inspired conduct. First, from the martyr Edmond Paris:

"The Spanish Inquisition is noted for its atrocities. The head inquisitor, named by the Pope, was the Dominican Monk Thomas de Torquemada, who is remembered with such sinister bitterness. During the eighteen year period of his mandate, 10,220 persons were burned at the stake while 114,401 (according to the historian

Motley) perished from hunger and torture in their prisons, which meant 125,000 people within a period of eighteen years.

"This record is frightful enough, but the inquisition of the Serbian Orthodox was much more terrible, for 750,000 Serbs were killed in just four years." ("Convert or Die" p.5).

And now from Arvo Manhattan:

"Organised religion can be as powerful as guns. Indeed, more so. Since it can outmatch the destructiveness of armies, outsmart the fanaticism of political zealots, and mobilise human emotions to an extent denied to any lay unit. It will stop at nothing.

"The ordinary individual cannot accept as yet the startling facts that only a few years back, for instance, the Catholic Church advocated forcible conversions, helped to erect concentration camps, and was responsible for the sufferings, torturing and execution of hundreds of thousand of non-Catholics. Deeds coolly perpetrated by her lay and ecclesiastic members. Furthermore, that many of such atrocities were carried out personally by some of her Catholic priests and even monks.

"Many will reject as sectarian falsification, if not pure invention, what have been justly reckoned the greatest religious massacres of our century. They will not be the first to have done so. It took the author almost half a decade of painstaking investigation before he accepted what seemed unbelievable.

"The result is this account, documented from as authoritative and as varied sources as possible. Among them, people with whom the present writer became personally acquainted. Some of these played no mean role in the religious, political and military events herein narrated. Others were eyewitnesses. Indeed, not a few were victims at the incredible atrocities sanctioned and promoted by the Catholic Church.

"The names of most of the participants, Catholic laymen, military, priests, friars, bishops, archbishops and cardinals, as well as those of their non-Catholic victims, men, women and children, including clergymen, are as genuine as the names of the localities, villages and cities where the atrocities took place. Their authenticity can be verified by anyone willing to do so. Documents and photographs of Catholic concentration camps, Catholic mass executions and Catholic forced conversions, some of which are in this book, are kept in the archives of the Yugoslav Government, of the Orthodox Church, of the United Nations and of other official institutions." ("Catholic Terror Today", Foreword).

During the writing of this book events i Eastern Europe have moved rapidly.

With the disintegration of the Soviet Empire Malachi Martin's contenders for geopolitical sur remacy have been reduced to two. Or are they i reality collaborators?

With the fast diminishing Communist influent we are now witnessing in the Balkans a repeat of history as the postwar reconstituted state of Yugoslavia is being again destroyed. Once again, Croatia is the catalyst for furthering the aims of inquisitive Christianity.

Beware all ye of Orthodox and other faiths that do not conform to Romanism, whether ye be in Serbia or the fragmenting remains of the USSR. The guardians of "Christ's Church" aspire to be custodian of your "rights and freedoms".

"Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots?" (Jeremiah 13:23).

## **VATICAN DECEPTION**

To those who revere Patrick of Ireland as a saint, it must come as a shock to discover that he never embraced the Roman Catholic faith. On the contrary, his adherence to the apostolic faith would have, in later times, branded him as an heretical Protestant.

But in appropriating Patrick to herself, some two centuries after his death the Roman Church was simply behaving "true to form," for it was also by fraud that she arrogated to the popes, the supposed successors of Peter, the dogma of the infallibility and divine right of monarchy.

In order to produce some semblance of authority for a system of papal primacy, Pope Nicholas I seized upon ancient fabricated documents known as the Isidorian Decretals. The fraud was later exposed by Roman and non-Roman sources alike. But during the interval, the fraudulent documents had served their purpose and established in the minds of Christendom a false premise.

We here cite evidence as published in "Source Book for Bible Students", 1919, pp.256,257.

"Isidorian Decretals, CONTENTS OF.--The compilation contains in Part I, besides a few other pieces, the fifty so-called Apostolic Canons received by the church (vid. I. 234, II. 11) and fifty-nine alleged, but all spurious, letters of the Roman bishops, from Clemens down to Meichiades (d. 314), in chronological order; in Part II there follow, after a few other pieces (of which the Donatio Constantini ad Sylvestrum is the most important) the canons of many councils, beginning with that of Nicaea, essentially following the Hispana (Falsification is only perceptible in one passage); Part III gives the decretal letters of the Roman bishops from Sylvester to Gregory II (d. 731), of which thirty-five are spurious. The author has therefore admitted a number of already existing anonymous pieces, and the Epistle of Clement to James (from the Clementine Homilies), the Donatio Constantini and the Constitutio Sylvestri, but has invented the most of the spurious papal letters, for doing which Rufinus, Cassiodorus, and the Liber Pontificalis must have supplied him with the historical substratum, and older ecclesiastical authors, acts of councils, etc., with the material. --"History of the Christian Church in the Middle Ages," Dr Wilhelm Moeller, translated by Andrew Rutherford, B. D., p.161 2d edition. London: George Allen & Co.,1910.

Isidorian Decretals, PURPOSE OF--To bring men to listen to, and receive, this new system of ecclesiastical law, which was so very different from the ancient system, there was need of ancient documents and records, with which it might be enforced and defended against the assaults of opposers. Hence the Roman pontiffs procured the

forgery, by their trusty friends, of conventions, acts of councils, epistles, and other documents; by which they might make it appear that from the earliest ages of the Church, the Roman pontiffs possessed the same authority and power which they now claimed. Among these fraudulent supports of the Romish power, the so-called Decretal Epistles of the pontiffs of the first centuries, hold perhaps the first rank. They were produced by the ingenuity of an obscure man, who falsely assumed the name of Isidore, a Spanish bishop. Some vestiges of these fabricated epistles appeared in the preceding century; but they were first published and appealed to in support of the claims of the Roman pontiffs, in this [ninth] century.--"Institutes of Ecclesiastical History," Mosheim, book 3, cent. 9, part 2, chap. 2, sec. 8 (Vol. II, pp. 199,200). London: Longman & Co., 1841.

Isidorian Decretals, IMPORTANCE OF.--The theory of the papal monarchy over the church was not the result merely of grasping ambition and intrigue on the part of individual popes; it corresponded rather to the deep-seated belief of Western Christendom. This desire to unite Christendom under the Pope gave meaning and significance to the forged decretals bearing the name of Isidore, which formed the legal basis of papal monarchy. This forgery did not come from Rome, but from the land of the Western Franks. It set forth a collection of pretended decrees of early councils and letters of early popes, which exalted the power of the bishops, and at the same time subjected them to the supervision of the Pope. The Pope was set forth as universal bishop of the church, whose confirmation was needed for the decrees of any council. The importance of the forgery lay in the fact that it represented the ideal of the future as a fact of the past, and displayed the papal primacy as an original institution of the church of Christ.

"The Papacy did not originate this forgery; but it made haste to use it. Pope Nicholas I claimed and exercised the powers of supreme ecclesiastical authority, and was happy in being able to exercise them in the cause of moral right.--"A History of the Papacy," M. Creighton, D.D., Vol. I, pp.13,14. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1899.

Isidorian Decretals, INFLUENCE OF.-No document has ever had a more remarkable history, or a more lasting influence on the relations of society, than that in which this feeling found expression, and which is known in modern times by the name of the False or Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals. A collection of decretal letters made by Isidore of Seville had long been in great repute in the West, based on the earlier collection made by Dionysius Exiguus in the sixth century, containing the apostolic canons, the canons of the most important councils of the fourth and fifth centuries, and the decretal letters of the popes from the time of Siricius to that of Anastasius II.

Suddenly there appeared at Mainz, in the time of Archbishop Autcar, a collection purporting to be that of Isidore, brought, it was said, from Spain by Archbishop Riculf, but containing a series of documents hitherto unknown--fifty-nine letters and decrees of the twenty oldest bishops of Rome from Clement to Melchiades, the Donation of Constantine, thirty-nine new decrees of popes and councils between the time of Sylvester and Gregory II, and the acts of several unauthentic councils. The chief points to which the spurious decrees were directed were, the exaltation of the episcopal dignity, the security of the clergy against the attacks of laymen, the limitation of the power of metropolitans, reducing them to mere instruments of the Pope, and a consequent enlargement of the privileges of the See of Rome.--"The See of Rome in the Middle Ages," Rev. Oswald J. Reichel, B.C.L., M.A., pp.89,90. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1870.

## **VATICAN DILEMMA**

We here reprint an article by C.S. Longacre from the "Signs of the Times", Nov. 1, 1948, which illustrates Rome's problems in attempting to establish the dogma of Apostolic Succession.

### **VATICAN REVISES ITS LIST OF POPES**

The new official directory recently issued by the Vatican after investigating the nineteen-hundred-year line of succession of the popes of the Roman Catholic Church, dropped six popes from its old list in the former directory, and placed two more popes in the doubtful column, and listed two new popes who had not been listed until now. Also the dates of the pontificates of seventy-four popes were changed from what they were before, and Pope Dono II, who had been listed as a Roman pontiff back in the tenth century of the Christian era, "was actually a person who never existed," says the new directory. And, the third and fifth popes, listed from the beginning of popes, namely Cleto, a Roman, and Anacleto, an Athenian, are combined in the new list "as one and the same person." Pope Pius XII, the present pope, who was listed in the old directory as the 261st successor of St. Peter, is now lower in the list, and if the doubtful popes are dropped, he will descend two more notches in the list of alleged popes.

One wonders how much reliance as to accuracy can be placed in the present list. One thing is absolutely certain, the Apostle Peter never claimed to be a pope of the early Christian church. In his first epistle, Peter writes about the position he occupied in the church, saying: "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ.... Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock. And when the Chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." 1 Peter 5:1-4.

He said, I "am also an elder." He placed himself on the same level as all the other elders in the churches, and not as a pope or "lord over God's heritage." None of the early church leaders listed by the Catholic Church hierarchy as popes of the Roman Catholic Church for the first three centuries ever claimed the title of pope or set forth any claim that they were the chief bishop of all the churches throughout Christendom. In fact, all the bishops for the first three centuries of the Christian era claimed equal rank.

A rivalry sprang up during the fourth century among the bishops of the Christian churches in Jerusalem in Palestine, Alexandria in Egypt, Constantinople in Greece, Carthage in Africa, Antioch in Asia, and Rome in Italy. The bishop of the church in Jerusalem claimed priority rights because it was the first and oldest Christian church established in Christendom. Doctor Kock, of the Catholic Divinity School at Braunsberg, says that Saint Cyprian, who was bishop of Carthage and who died in A.D. 258, was absolutely ignorant of any difference between the official rank and standing of the bishop of Rome and that of any other bishop; that at the close of the third century of the Christian era there was no idea entertained among churchmen either of a pope, a papacy, or the doctrine of infallibility; and that up to the time of Saint Cyprian's death there was only a hint made of a general subjection to the Roman See, and when it was first raised it was absolutely repellent to the powerful bishop of Carthage, Saint Cyprian. Some of the bishops that are now listed in the Catholic Register as popes of the Roman Catholic Church, were not only opposed to the church's having a pope, but never knew they would be listed in the future as Roman pontiffs. The popes listed for the first three centuries of the Christian era are mere inventions of the hierarchy of later centuries. The

facts of history, as well as the New Testament record, contradict the doctrine of the Primacy of Peter as being the first Roman pontiff.

It is libel on Christ to claim that Christ founded such an institution as the Papacy. There is no evidence in the New Testament that Christ appointed a visible head on earth to exercise authority over the church. Yet we read in all Catholic literature that the pope is the vicar of Christ, the head of the Papacy, and appointed as such by Christ. Such a claim is a travesty upon the teachings of Christ.

Christ knew that many of His professed followers would misuse His name and claim authority for their iniquitous doings in His name. In closing His remarkable sermon on the mount He said: "Not every one that saith unto Me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of My Father which is in heaven. Many will say to Me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in Thy name? and in Thy name have cast out devils; and in Thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from Me, ye that work iniquity." Matt. 7:21-23. To invoke the name of Christ as authority for the establishment of the Papacy is nothing less than sacrilege.

The Roman hierarchy needs to give further study to the revision of the humanly invented list of popes. Instead of dropping six popes that they had formerly listed and placing two more on the doubtful list, the Catholic Church needs to drop all the bishops that are listed as popes prior to the Church Council which finally determined that the bishop of Rome, because of his strategic position at the capital of the Roman Empire, should take priority over all the metropolitan bishops. That did not happen until we come to the fourth century of the Christian era. Constantine the Great, emperor of the Roman Empire, soon after his nominal conversion to Christianity in A.D. 312, elevated himself to the head of the Christian churches and convened councils and presided over them, and regulated the external affairs of the church of Christianity. He united the church and the state, and remodelled the government of the church after the government of the state. In the church he appointed patriarchs, exarchs, archbishops, canons, prebendaries, prelates and priests, to correspond with the various secular offices and dignitaries in the state. He appointed five patriarchs who formerly were bishops of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople. At first great stress was laid upon the fact that all these bishops who had been appointed as patriarchs over their own dioceses, stood on the same equality in rank. At this time no preference was given to the bishop and patriarch of the diocese of Rome. When the bishop and patriarch of Rome at first began to exercise arbitrary authority over the other patriarchal bishops in Africa and Asia, these latter bishops with great force and resolution resisted the arrogance of the bishop of Rome. The blasphemous dogma that the bishop of Rome is the supreme head of the church, the vicar of Christ, and the vicegerent of God upon earth, had never yet been heard of and would have been rejected by all the bishops of every diocese in the Christian churches during the first three centuries of the Christian era.

None of the bishops of the metropolitan areas were appointed at this time by the bishop of Rome, but all bishops claimed that they derived their ambassadorship directly from Jesus Christ as the head of the church. It was during the fourth century that the bishop and patriarch of Rome was invested by the emperors of Rome with a superior degree of power and authority over all other bishops, because of his political connections with the Roman Empire. The bishop of Rome possessed the richest and most influential diocese, the most intimate political connections with the Roman emperors and lawmakers. He appeared in great splendour of dress, rode in the most costly coaches, enjoyed sumptuous feasts, and outdid the sovereign princes in the expenses

of their tables in entertaining politicians in order to gain political favours. The spirit of worldly pride and domination, together with political influence, finally elevated through intrigue the bishop of Rome not only to a superior position over all other bishops of the church, but to a supremacy over earthly kings and rulers, and required them to bow their necks under his autocratic heel of supreme authority.

To claim that Christ appointed all these popes to lord it over God's heritage is an insult to Saint Peter, who said he was only an "elder," and it is sacrilegious and blasphemous to attribute such a system of human exaltation and arrogance to Jesus Christ, the meek and lowly Nazarene who said, "My kingdom is not of this world."

## ***APPENDIX C ANTICHRIST IDENTIFIED***

The following article by J.B. Conley taken from the "Signs of the Times" May 24, 1948, biblically identifies the antichrist.

### ***HE IS ANTICHRIST THAT DENIETH THE FATHER AND THE SON***

The word "antichrist" comes from two Greek words--"Anti" and "Christos." Dr. Strong defines the word "anti" to mean "opposite, i.e., instead or because of, in the room of." "Christos" being the Greek rendering of "Christ," the word "antichrist" then means "opposite to," "instead of," or "in the room of" Christ.

Four times only is the word "antichrist" used in the Scriptures. In each instance the Apostle John is the writer of the epistle in which the word is used. He wrote his epistles toward the end of the first century. Each time the word is used it has reference to one who was operating already in the world in which John was living, nineteen centuries ago.

Ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now there are many antichrists." "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son." 1 John 2:18,22.

"This is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world." 1 John 4:3.

"For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist." 2 John 7.

Each of these scriptures indicates clearly that the antichrist whom the infant church had been expecting to appear was then operating. One of the reasons for the writing of John's epistles was to expose the activities of this deceiver.

#### **The Marks of Antichrist**

Many years before John wrote his epistles the Apostle Paul made his last journey among the churches. Gathering the elders and bishops together, he gave them a last warning. Solemnly and earnestly the aged apostle foretold a time when from within the church itself apostasy would arise: "For I know this that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock.

Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." Acts 20:29,30.

A little later, in a letter which he was writing to the church at Thessalonica, in which he spoke of the second coming of Jesus, he added this warning: "For that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? ... For the mystery of iniquity doth already work." 2 Thess. 2:3-7.

From these scriptures we glean the following identification marks of antichrist:

1. He denieth the Father and the Son. 1 John 2:18,22.
2. He had appeared in John's day. 1 John 4:3.
3. He denied that Jesus had come "in the flesh." 2 John 7.
4. He would arise from within the early church as a result of apostasy or "a falling away." Acts 20:29,30.
5. He would presume to sit in "the temple of God," claiming the prerogatives of God. 2 Thess. 2:3-7

Fundamental Protestant opinion has ever claimed that the marks of "antichrist" find their complement in the Roman Catholic hierarchy and its unbiblical system of religion. This interpretation was strongly held by such men as John Wycliffe and the later English Reformers Tyndale, Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley; and by John Huss of Bohemia and Martin Luther of Germany, together with John Knox of Scotland. In fact, such was the universal teaching of all Protestantism in the days of the Reformation. Dr. Charles H. Wright expresses the Protestant position clearly when he says:

"In all ages of the church from the days of Gregory the Great down to the present, men have pointed to the Papacy as the fulfilment of the prophecy. That interpretation is set forth in the homilies of the Church of England and by all the Reformed churches. The interpretation, however, has been ignored or rejected by critics, for reasons which need not be specified. It can, however, stand all the tests of criticism."

As a result of the widespread preaching of this identity of antichrist, the Catholic Church became alarmed and set afoot other interpretations with which to counteract the identification of the Papacy as the antichrist. Accordingly, the Jesuit Alcasar wrote emphasizing the "preterist" system of interpretation which claimed that antichrist had appeared and had been overthrown before the days of the popes. Another Jesuit, Ribera by name, about the year 1580 endeavoured to confuse the issue by introducing the "futurist" view, in which he propelled the appearance of antichrist so far into the future as to relieve the pressure of public opinion from the popes of Rome. These two attempts to confuse the issue and to screen the Papacy from detection have met with a degree of success. Some Protestants have been so far influenced by this teaching that they have surrendered the fundamental teaching of the Reformation and have embraced the confused and uncertain teachings of Alcasar and Ribera.

But the Scriptures have placed the identity of antichrist beyond either guesswork or confusion. The Bible has clearly named the guilty one. John says that he denies that "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." 2 John 7. Let this be the first mark of antichrist by which his identity will be placed beyond dispute. The verse does not say that antichrist denies that Jesus is come, but that he denies "He is come in the flesh." Far from denying the existence of Christ, the text suggests that antichrist teaches the Christ has come but teaches a doctrine about his coming which denies that "He is come in the flesh."

If the Catholic Church is guilty, as the Protestant Reformers claimed her to be, then her teaching concerning the nature of Jesus in His incarnation into this world as a babe will reveal it. Let us examine that teaching in the light of the text before us.

The Bible teaches that Jesus was born into the world through Mary, who was a direct descendant of Adam. By inheritance she partook of Adam's nature. Adam's nature was mortal and subject to death as a result of the transgression of God's will in Eden. His flesh was by nature that of the "children of wrath." Mary partook of this nature in all its aspects. She was a representative of the whole human race, and in no way different from others descended from Adam's line. She was "favoured among women" only because she was the one chosen of God through whom the "mystery of godliness was to be made manifest," and through whom Jesus was to be incarnated into the fleshly state of Adam's race. It was God's purpose that through a divine miracle Jesus should be brought from heaven, where He had been one with the Father in the Godhead, to be born into the human family, there to partake of all the temptations to which Adam's race is subject. This was possible only as He would partake of the nature of Adam's race. Of this Paul says, "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same. ...Wherefore in all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren." Heb 2:14-17.

If further evidence were needed the same writer supplied it. In 1 Tim. 3:16 he records: "Great is the mystery of godliness. God was manifest in the flesh." Here, he says, is the mystery of godliness, the ability of Jesus to come from heaven, suffer Himself to be manifest in human flesh, and yet to live sinlessly.

This latter fact antichrist was to deny. He was to deny that Jesus came in a divine manifestation which brought Him in all phases of His nature to partake of the weakness of Adam's race. He would deny that Jesus came "in the flesh," the same flesh as that of mortal men.

On this first count, the denial that Jesus "is come in the flesh," the Catholic Church stands convicted of guilt and thus is identified by the marks of antichrist. Through the teaching of the "Immaculate Conception of Mary," that she was preserved from all original sin, they in theory provide "different flesh" from that of the rest of Adam's race to be the avenue through which Jesus was incarnated into the plan of salvation. To state their teaching with authority it will be the best to quote our evidence from Catholic authors.

Our first proof will be from the pen of Cardinal Gibbons in his book, "Faith of our Fathers," pages 203,204. He says: "We define that the blessed Virgin Mary in the first moment of her conception ... was preserved free from the taint of original sin. Unlike the rest of the children of Adam, the soul of Mary was never subject to sin."

Cardinal Gibbons has here clearly stated the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church concerning the sinlessness of the Virgin Mary. It is a teaching not taught in the Bible, but which has been introduced by Catholic teachers who claim to have authority even above that of the Scriptures, in matters of doctrine.

Here I would ask my readers both Protestant and Catholic, to ponder carefully what this teaching does to the gospel plan. It means that if Mary was born without sin and was preserved from sin for the express purpose of bringing Jesus into the world, then Jesus was born of holy flesh, which was different from that of the rest of Adam's race. This means that He did not take upon Himself our kind of flesh and blood, and in His incarnation did not identify Himself with humanity. It means, too, that He was not



tempted "in all points" as we were. It means that Paul was all wrong when he wrote the Book of Hebrews in which he declares that Jesus "also Himself likewise took part of the same" flesh as the rest of Adam's race that "in all things" he was made "like unto His brethren." Heb. 2:14-17. But above all this, if the Catholic teaching is true, then Jesus, not having come within reach of humanity by partaking of man's nature, cannot be the "one mediator between God and men." Nor can we "come boldly unto the throne of grace that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." Heb 4:16. All this plays conveniently into the hands of the Catholic plan of salvation, it opens wide the door for the intercession of the Virgin Mary and the respective "saints," who form part of the papal mediatorial system. And moreover, it places in the hands of the priesthood the power to usurp authority which God in the Scriptures has never delegated to them--that of being controllers of the approaches to the throne of mercy.

At this stage of our review of the subject of antichrist, I believe all fairminded people will acknowledge that if the Papacy is not the antichrist it has been singularly unfortunate in being so like the scriptural description of him. In the papal claim that Jesus was born of one who had been "preserved from every taint of original sin" and who, "unlike the rest of the children of Adam ... was never subject to sin," we find the first mark of antichrist indelibly implanted.

The Papacy certainly teaches that Jesus Christ did "not come in the flesh."

### **Antichrist Invades God's Temple**

The next mark of antichrist which we shall consider is spoken of in the writings of both John and Paul. John says that under the title of "anti, christ" this one will deny the "Father and the Son." 1 John 2:22. Paul explains how this will be done. He indicates that this deceiver will not deny the existence of the Father and the Son, but rather that he will usurp the position of both by sitting "in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." 2 Thess. 2:4.

The temple of God is the church. It is thus defined by Paul in his first letter to the Corinthian believers. "According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise master builder, I have laid the foundation.... But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon... Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" 1 Cor. 3:10-16. The church upon earth is God's spiritual temple and it was in this spiritual temple that antichrist was to endeavour to usurp the place of God. Paul says "For that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God," 2 Thess. 2:3-7.

It is in the matter of receiving the worship of the worshippers that this one assumes God's place in the church. He presumes to exalt himself above God in receiving the worship due to God, God's existence will-not be denied, but He will be given only an obscure position in the system of worship which is headed by antichrist, while antichrist himself assumes the authority of God and receives the worship which God should receive. True Protestants of every age have ever believed that this scripture exposes the activities of the papal hierarchy, as from the popes to the priesthood, men have usurped God's place in claiming authority equal to God's, and with it the right to take God's place above Him in the affairs of the church on earth. Claiming the power to forgive sins in the confessional, this priesthood "sits in the temple of God," showing itself "that it is God." For its pope and priesthood the Roman Catholic Church even presumes to claim titles which belong to God and God alone.

### **The Pope Attempts to Assume God's Place**

In the "Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII," page 193, the following statement appears: "But the supreme teacher in the Church is the Roman Pontiff. Union of minds, therefore requires, together with a perfect accord in one faith, complete submission and obedience of will to the church and to the Roman Pontiff as to God Himself."

Again, on page 304, this astonishing statement is found: "We hold upon this earth the place of God Almighty."

No greater proof could be found than the testimony of the accused himself. Here, from the lips of one of the greatest popes, is the evidence of guilt--the identification of the hierarchy of the Roman church with the marks of the antichrist of Scripture.

### **The Priesthood Claim God's Power**

While recognising the pope to be the supreme head of the church on earth, the Papacy also recognises that the priest within his sphere also has the mantle of divine power resting upon him to such an extent that he becomes the local vicegerent of Heaven. From one of the highest Catholic sources we glean the following statements which put the identity of the Papacy with the antichrist of Scripture beyond all question:

"The priest has the power of the keys or the power of delivering sinners from hell, of making them worthy of paradise and of changing them from the slaves of Satan into the children of God. And God Himself is obliged to abide by the judgement of His priests ... The Sovereign Master of the universe only follows the servant by confirming in heaven all that the latter decides upon earth." - "Dignity and Duties of the Priest," St. Alphonsus de Ligouri, pages 27,28. New York, Benziger Bros., 1888.

Here we have before us the position claimed by the Catholic priesthood. All power is in their hands. God simply does their bidding. Believing this, the Catholic people fear the priesthood, who they believe have absolute control of the destiny of their souls.

But there is more to follow. Having separated the sinner from direct access to God, from the direct mediatorial approach to God through Christ, they now exalt the priest to the position of being the sole dispenser of grace and favour for the sinner. Even Christ is said to be subject to this earthly man to whom, the Catholic Church says, have been given the keys of heaven and hell. Having robbed the sinner of the simple gospel approach to God through the sacrifice of Jesus on Calvary, this earthly priesthood now proceeds to substitute a continual earthly sacrifice of the Mass to take the place of the all-sufficient sacrifice of the One who "was once offered to bear the sins of many." Heb. 9:28. Having done this, it is now necessary to exalt an earthly priesthood to a place of power from which they can claim divine attributes which rightly belong to Jesus, who the Scriptures declare is our "high priest who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens" (Heb. 8:1); and who "hath an unchangeable priesthood," and who is also able "to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him." Heb. 7:24,25.

Of the "sacrifice of the Mass," Ligouri says: "If the person of the Redeemer had not yet been in the world, the priest, by pronouncing the words of consecration, would produce this great person of a Man-God. 'O wonderful dignity of the priests!' cries St. Augustine; 'in their hands, as in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, the Son of God becomes incarnate.' Hence priests are called the parents of Jesus Christ...."

"Thus the priest may, in a certain manner, be called the creator of his Creator.... 'He that created me without me is Himself created by me.'"-"Dignity and Duties of the Priest," pages 32,33.

What is supposed to take place during this ceremony is explained by the same writer in the following statement: "In obedience to the words of the priests--Hoc Est Corpus Meum--God Himself descends on the altar .... He comes wherever they call Him, and as often as they call Him, and places Himself in their hands... .They may if they wish, shut Him up in the tabernacle..they may, if they choose, eat His flesh, and give Him for the food of others." -Id., pages 26,27.

Thus, according to Catholic teaching, through the creative power vested in an earthly priesthood, a wafer suddenly becomes the actual body of Jesus Christ. The following quotation expresses this belief from a Catholic authority:

"But suddenly, amid the silence of the breathless multitude, the priest utters the divine lifegiving giving words of consecration; and that which was bread and wine, is bread and wine no longer, but the true body and blood of our Lord Himself. It is the same body that was born of the blessed Virgin Mary, that died for us upon the cross, that was raised again to life, and that even now sits at the right hand of God the Father."--"The Holy Mass, the Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead," M. Muller, pages 174,175, New York, 1876.

On count number two, on the testimony of its own writers, the Catholic hierarchy stands convicted of having the identification mark of antichrist "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." 2 Thess. 2:4.

Here we should pause long enough to consider what all this means. By denying that Jesus "is come in the flesh," the exponents of this doctrine separate the worshippers from direct access to the throne of grace. No sinner, therefore, can come to God to ask forgiveness for his sins because he has no "kinsman" to plead his cause or to claim the mercy of heaven on his behalf. Moreover, there is still a gulf between the sinner and Christ which must be bridged by other intercessors such as Mary and the "saints." How far away from the needy sinner this unscriptural rigmarole places the throne of mercy! But this is not all. If the pope holds the position on earth "of God Almighty" and the priest in the celebration of the Mass becomes "the creator of his Creator," as the wafer upon the altar becomes "the actual body of our Lord," it follows then that the means of salvation in the Roman Catholic Church is associated with supposedly transformed bread and wine miraculously changed in the hands of the priest. This gives the priest all power over his congregation, for in his hands alone is held the deliverance of the people from their sins. Thus, sitting "in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God," he places stumbling-block after stumbling-block in the way of the troubled sinner. First, a wafer Christ has to be created, then the saints invoked, and the Virgin Mary petitioned; and finally, through her intercessions, Christ is approached to do that for the sinner which the Bible says from His great heart of love He has already done. By thus separating the sinner from direct access to the Father's-throne of mercy, through Jesus the "one mediator between God and men," the Catholic hierarchy obscures the simplicity of the plan of salvation, exalts an earthly priesthood above high priesthood of Jesus, and submits the rank and file of the people to spiritual slavery, the severity of which is determined by the moods and judgments of earthly men.

But God never ordained it so. The Roman Catholic teaching is a travesty of truth: it is a counterfeit gospel which finds no support in the Sacred Scriptures. As an

overshadowing cloud arising from beyond the horizons of our western world, in the unwatered lands of Egypt and Babylon it would spread itself over our fair land to shut out the blessed sunshine of the gospel of our Lord. It bears the marks of antichrist, indelibly imprinted.....There can be only one effective answer—a reconsecration of heart and life to the gospel standards of the Word of God and a revival of the heaven-born evangel of Reformation times; that men everywhere should have placed before them the simplicity of the gospel story that Jesus, God's only begotten Son, incarnate from heaven, became the Son of man and "elder brother" of the human race; that He lived as men ought to live, being "tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin"; that He died the death that man deserved to die, thus tasting death for every man; that He is risen, ascended to the Father's presence; that He is the "one mediator between God and men"; that He can save to the uttermost all who "come unto God by Him"; and that He invites all, however vile and sinful, to come "boldly unto the throne of grace ... and find grace to help in time of need." This is the heaven-ordained answer of the Scriptures to the man-made, soul-enslaving "other gospel" of antichrist.

## **APPENDIX D**

### **THE SOCIETY OF JESUS (JESUITS)**

Jesuits, the name generally given to the members of the Society of Jesus, a religious order in the Roman Catholic Church, founded in 1539. This society may be defined, in its original conception and well-avowed object, as a body of highly trained religious men of various degrees, bound by the three personal vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, together with, in some cases, a special vow to the Pope's service, with the object of laboring for the spiritual good of themselves and their neighbours. They are declared to be mendicants and enjoy all the privileges of the other mendicant orders. They are governed and live by constitutions and rules, mostly drawn up by their founder, St Ignatius of Loyola, and approved by the popes. Their proper title is "Clerks Regulars of the Society of Jesus," the word Societas being taken as synonymous with the original Spanish term, Compania; perhaps the military term Cohors might more fully have expressed the original idea of a band of spiritual soldiers living under martial law and discipline. The ordinary term "Jesuit" was given to the society by its avowed opponents; it is first found in the writings of Calvin and in the registers of the Parlement of Paris as early as 1552.

Constitution and Character.--The formation of the society was a masterpiece of genius on the part of a man [Loyola] who was quick to realise the necessity of the moment. Just before Ignatius was experiencing the call to conversion, Luther had begun his revolt against the Roman Church by burning the papal bull of excommunication on the 10th of December 1520. But while Luther's most formidable opponent was thus being prepared in Spain, the actual formation of the society was not to take place for eighteen years. Its conception seems to have developed very slowly in the mind of Ignatius. It introduced a new idea into the church. Hitherto all regulars made a point of the choral office in choir. But as Ignatius conceived the church to be in a state of war, what was desirable in days of peace ceased when life of the cloister had to be exchanged for the discipline of the camp; so in the sketch of the new society which he laid before Paul III, Ignatius laid down the principle that the obligation of the breviary should be fulfilled privately and separately and not in choir. The other orders, too, were bound by the idea of a constitutional monarchy based on the democratic spirit. Not so with the society. The founder placed the general for life in an almost uncontrolled

position of authority, giving him the faculty of dispensing individuals from the decrees of the highest legislative body, the general congregations. Thus the principle of military obedience was exalted to a degree higher than that existing in the older orders, which preserved to their members certain constitutional rights.--The Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol. XV, art. "Jesuits," p.337, 11th edition.

#### THE JESUIT OATH OF SECRECY

"I, (name), now in the presence of Almighty God, the blessed Virgin Mary, the blessed Michael the archangel, the blessed St. John Baptist, the holy apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and the saints and sacred host of heaven, and to you my ghostly father, do declare from my heart, without mental reservation, that His Holiness Pope Urban is Christ's vicar-general, and is the true and only head of the Catholic or Universal Church throughout the earth; and that by the virtue of the keys of binding and loosing given to his Holiness by my Saviour Jesus Christ, he hath power to depose heretical kings, princes, states, commonwealths, and governments, all being illegal, without his sacred confirmation, and that they may safely be destroyed: therefore to the utmost of my power I shall and will defend this doctrine, and His Holiness' rights and customs against all usurpers of the heretical or Protestant authority whatsoever: especially against the now pretended authority and Church of England, and all adherents, in regard that they and she be usurpal and heretical, opposing the sacred mother church of Rome. I do renounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical king, prince, or state, named Protestants, or obedience to any of their inferior magistrates or officers. I do further declare that the doctrine of the Church of England, of the Calvinist, Huguenots, and of others of the name of Protestants, to be damnable, and they themselves are damned, and to be damned, that will not forsake the same. I do further declare, that I will help, assist and advise all, or any of His Holiness' agents in any place, wherever I shall be, in England, Scotland, and Ireland, or in any other territory or kingdom I shall come to, and do my utmost to extirpate the heretical Protestants' doctrine, and to destroy all their pretended powers, regal or otherwise. I do further promise and declare, that notwithstanding I am dispensed with to assume any religion heretical for the propagation of the mother church's interest, to keep secret and private all her agent's counsels from time to time, as they intrust me, and not to divulge directly or indirectly, by word, writing, or circumstance, whatsoever; but to execute all what shall be proposed, given in charge, or discovered unto me by you my ghostly father, or by any of this sacred convent. All which I, (name), do swear by the blessed Trinity, and blessed sacrament, which I now am to receive, to perform, and on my part to keep inviolably. And do call all the heavenly and glorious host of heaven to witness these my real intentions, and to keep this my oath. In testimony hereof, I take this most holy and blessed sacrament of the eucharist; and witness the same further with my hand and seal in the face of this holy convent." ("Foxes and Firebrands," Usher.)

The Sabbath Day as a basis of the week in the Hebrew, Syriac and Armenian languages (Compiled from a Chart of the Week by W.M. Jones, D.D.)

Day of Week	L A N G U A G E			
	Hebrew. (Ancient and Modern use.) * Proceeding on to the Sabbath.	Ancient Syriac.	Chaldee Syriac. Kurdistan, and Urama. Persia.	Armenian. Armenia.
1. (Sun) (Sun)	אחד בשבת akhad bé-shab-bath. One into* the Sabbath.	ܐܚܕ ܒܫܒܬܐ ahad bé-shab-bo. One into* Sabbath.	ܐܚܕ ܒܫܒܬܐ ahad bé-shab-ba. One into Sabbath.	մի օր օրօթ mia shapti. One to the Sabbath.
2. (Mon) (Mon)	שני בשבת shai bé-shab-bath. Second into the Sabbath.	ܐܢܗ ܒܫܒܬܐ anah bé-shab-bo. Two into Sabbath.	ܐܢܗ ܒܫܒܬܐ anah bé-shab-ba. Two into Sabbath.	երկու օրօթ yerkh-shapti Second to the Sabbath.
3. (Tue) (Tue)	שליש בשבת shai-shai bé-shab-bath. Third into the Sabbath.	ܐܢܗ ܠܗ ܒܫܒܬܐ anah-lo bé-shab-bo. Three into Sabbath.	ܐܢܗ ܠܗ ܒܫܒܬܐ anah-lo bé-shab-ba. Three into Sabbath.	երես օրօթ yerkh-shapti. Third to the Sabbath.
4. (Wed) (Wed)	רביעי בשבת ré-vei bé-shab-bath. Fourth into the Sabbath.	ܐܪܒܥܐ ܒܫܒܬܐ ar-be-ah bé-shab-bo. Four into Sabbath.	ܐܪܒܥܐ ܒܫܒܬܐ ar-be-ah bé-shab-ba. Four into Sabbath.	չորեք օրօթ chorék shapti. Fourth to the Sabbath.
5. (Thu) (Thu)	חמישי בשבת khami-shai bé-shab-bath. Fifth into the Sabbath.	ܚܡܝܫܐ ܒܫܒܬܐ kham-shai bé-shab-bo. Five into Sabbath.	ܚܡܝܫܐ ܒܫܒܬܐ kham-shai bé-shab-ba. Five into Sabbath.	հինգ օրօթ hian shapti. Fifth of the Sabbath.
6. (Fri) (Fri)	ערב שבת é-rah shab-bath bé-dash. Eve of Holy Sabbath.	ܕܝܘܢܐ di-rah-ah. Eve (of Sabbath).	ܕܝܘܢܐ di-rah-ah, and ré-ia. Eve (of Sabbath).	Միջօր mij-oh-rah. Fast Day.
7. (Sat) (Sat)	שבת shab-bath Sabbath	ܫܒܬܐ shab-ba-ah. Sabbath.	ܫܒܬܐ shab-ba. Sabbath.	Սօթ shapti. Sabbath

It is obvious, that at the time Armenians received a written language in the fifth century, they were still observing the seventh-day Sabbath as taught them by the Apostles.