

# On Bodding's 'Madness for Power'

## A Critical Phase in the History of the Santal Mission

---

**Harald Tambs-Lyche**

*Harald Tambs-Lyche is Dr. Phil. in Social Anthropology and Professor Emeritus at Université de Picardie-Jules Verne, Amiens (France). He has done research on immigration and ethnicity, especially in the context of India. His most recent book is *Transaction and Hierarchy: Elements for a Theory of Caste* (London: Routledge, 2017). Together with Marine Carrin, he has published *An Encounter of Peripheries: Santals, Missionaries, and their Changing Worlds* (Delhi: Manohar, 2008).*

### Abstract

This paper deals with a critical phase in the life of missionary and scholar Olaf Bodding: his efforts to transform the Scandinavian Santal Mission from 1910 to 1923. In this period, he was torn between the heritage of the founders, notably the juridical foundation of the Mission as a Trust in Anglo-Indian law, and the demands for a more democratic organisation, from the younger missionaries and the supporters in Scandinavia and America. However, the Trust Deed (a type of founding constitution of the Mission) did not allow for any delegation of responsibility, and the newcomers did not understand the implications of the juridical situation. Thus Bodding, as sole trustee and responsible for the mission, was constantly accused of being autocratic, while he in his turn wrangled with the juridical framework to democratise the organization as far as legally possible. Perhaps it was just as well for him that his divorce made him unacceptable for mission work, for by 1920 he must have been thoroughly exasperated by his administrative work. In this paper, I wish to restore to Bodding the honour of reforms for which he was never thanked, as well as to locate this critical period of the Mission's history within the contemporary development of Christian Missions in general.

**Search Terms:** Bodding – Santal Mission – Leadership – Indian Trust Law

# Norsk sammendrag

Artikkelen behandler en kritisk fase i Boddings liv, fra 1910 til 1923, da han arbeidet med å omorganisere Santalmisjonen. I denne tiden måtte han megle mellom arven etter grunnleggerne, som hadde gjort misjonen til en stiftelse (trust) etter anglo-indisk lov, og kravene om en mer demokratisk organisasjonsform, som kom fra de yngre misjonærene og fra støttekomitéene i Skandinavia og Amerika. Stiftelsesdokumentet (the Trust Deed) åpnet ingen mulighet for ham til å dele eller delegeres ansvaret for misjonen, men de nye misjonærene forstod ikke denne situasjonen. Derfor ble Bodding, som eneansvarlig for stiftelsen og misjonen, stadig anklaget for å være enerådig, mens han på sin side strevde med å tilpasse det juridiske rammeverket i demokratisk retning så langt det var mulig. Kanskje var det like bra for ham at hans skilsmisse gjorde ham uakseptabel til misjonsarbeid, for i 1920 må han ha vært grundig trett og lei av sine administrative plikter. I denne artikkelen prøver jeg å gi Bodding den æren han fortjener for reformer som han aldri fikk noen takk for, samtidig som jeg plasserer denne kritiske perioden i Santalmisjonens historie innen den almenne utviklingen i kristent misjonsarbeid på denne tiden.

## Introduction

The missionary and scholar Olaf Bodding (1865-1938) is best known today as the first ethnographer of the Santals, an Austro-asiatic speaking people in Middle India now numbering some ten to twelve million. His work as a linguist and anthropologist is dealt with elsewhere in this issue. Here I concentrate on his role as a missionary, which is less known. Bodding was active at a time (1890-1922) when Christian Missions were changing all over the world, and the period stands at a watershed in the history of the Scandinavian Santal Mission. This Mission, which began as a Baptist enterprise in 1867, had become, ten years later, a rather unusual organization – as the Indian Home Mission to the Santals, it was based in India, not in Europe and America, and was constituted as a Trust. It was, by then, independent of any theologically defined congregation as well as particularly concerned with accommodating the Christian message to Santal culture.<sup>1</sup> This policy was forcefully stated by Lars O. Skrefsrud (1840-1910), one of the Mission's founders. In the 1870s, it had created a sensation in missionary circles by converting some three thousand Santals in a single year, clearly a record then.<sup>2</sup> By 1890, when Bodding came to the field, the pioneer phase of the Mission was largely in the past, and it was he who, later, had to transform the idiosyncratic early set-up into a modern organizational structure.

Bodding succeeded the pioneers, Skrefsrud and the Børresens - Hans Peter (1825-1901) and his wife Caroline, b. Hempel (1832-1914). Skrefsrud effectively did name Bodding as his successor, and as sole trustee of the Mission in his testament. But this happened only after a long struggle with Caroline Børresen, the last survivor of the founders. Skrefsrud clearly wanted Bodding to lead the mission as he himself would have done, as sole but paternalist leader of the enterprise. But Bodding's situation was quite different from what Skrefsrud's had been. Bodding was among the first of the Santal missionaries to have formal theological training, and the younger missionaries he had to deal with were theologians like himself. Unlike Bodding, who was quite familiar with the early history of the Mission through his close amity with its founders, the new missionaries had a vision of the missionary enterprise formed by their acquaintance with more bureaucratic and formal organisations such as the Norwegian Missionary Society (NMS)<sup>3</sup>. Bodding had to devise a form of management to satisfy their demands while remaining true to the legal framework within which the Santal mission operated.

The crucial point here was the Trust Deed. Nothing like this existed in Norwegian or Scandinavian law, and neither the younger missionaries nor the Mission's supporters in Scandinavia seem to have grasped its implications fully. This problem

runs through my story, and to deal with it, I shall have to briefly resume the beginnings of the Mission.

Skrefsrud and Børresen had come to the Santal Parganas with Johnson, a Baptist missionary. Together, they built their first mission station at Ebenezer,<sup>4</sup> not far from Dumka. It seems clear that it was Johnson who took the initiative, and invited the Scandinavians to work with him, though Børresen was to deny this later.<sup>5</sup> From the point of view of the Baptist Missionary Society, who supported the mission, the two Scandinavians were simply Johnson's assistants. They seem to have seen themselves as collaborators, but it is quite clear that only Johnson received a missionary's pay, and the others depended on him. With two Lutherans active, the Baptists would not recognize the Mission as part of the BMS, but it was treated by them as an "auxiliary Mission." Skrefsrud, in fact, became a Baptist for a while.<sup>6</sup> But the funds for the Mission were collected from Christian communities in India, and so the Indian Home Mission (IHM), as it was called, was independent – though Baptists were important among the Mission's supporters, and they dominated the Managing Committee<sup>7</sup>.

This continued for some ten years, though Johnson was long absent from illness – his arm was taken by a tiger – and finally had to leave for health reasons. Skrefsrud and the Børresens were left with a problem. The mission had considerable success by then, and the Scandinavians felt they were responsible for this. They were determined to continue their work. But the Baptists were reluctant to let them take charge. Conflicts arose, and Børresen, who was always a Lutheran, had some part in them.<sup>8</sup> In 1877, there was a final break.<sup>9</sup>

## The Trust Deed

This is where the Trust Deed comes in. The original purchase of land at the Ebenezer Mission Station had been made in the name of the BMS. When more land was needed in 1872, Skrefsrud bought it in the name of the IHM. But in 1875 he was told that the original land deed was invalid, since it had not been signed by the proper persons. He, therefore, set out to get a new and valid deed established, including all the land, in the name of Børresen and himself on behalf of the IHM. The BMS would no longer figure. But the lawyers were unwilling to enter IHM as owners. We are not told why, but probably they were reluctant to replace BMS in the original deed with IHM without a clarification of the relationship between the two Missions. Skrefsrud certainly did not want to subscribe to the legal supposition that IHM was a branch of the BMS, now that conflicts were rife between the two. What he wanted, was independence for the IHM – and freedom of action for Børresen and himself.

The lawyers then proposed that the Mission land and buildings were given over to a Trust. This means, for those not familiar with British Law, that the property becomes virtually unalienable, since it is legally bound to the purpose of the Trust and to the entity for which it is held. The trustees are responsible for the trust property, and may even sell part of it, but the money from the sale must be used for the purpose stated in the Trust Deed. Trust property cannot be appropriated in settlement of the debts of the trustees: at worst, they may be removed due to mismanagement of trust funds – but this seldom happens in practice. In the world controlled by British or British-derived law, trusts may function not only as ways of removing property from ordinary taxation but also, in a financial crisis, to secure it from appropriation by the creditors. In formulating the Trust Deed, they were helped by the brothers Allen, one of whom was a judge and the other a barrister. The brothers became trustees, along with Skrefsrud and the Børresens.<sup>10</sup>

The Baptists were furious at the way their Mission – as they saw it - had been taken away from them, and considered legal action. If Skrefsrud or Børresen, or even the

IHM, had registered the property in their name, it would have been tempting for the Baptists to pursue the matter. But the Trust Deed declared that the property belonged to the Santal Evangelical Church, an entity which only existed on paper, and in this legal document only: no Church would be founded for several generations yet. What it meant was that the Mission property belonged to the community of Christian Santals, and legally, it could only be handed over to them, once they had founded their Church – provided that this Church was recognized by the authorities as representing the Santal Evangelical Church in whose name the Deed was made.

Skrefsrud and Børresen were nervous about their legal situation and about possible Baptist action until the Trust Deed was signed. This was done, finally, on June 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1880. For now, they were safe. They and Mrs. Børresen were the trustees, along with the brothers Allen, who were businessmen in Calcutta. They could do what they wanted, as long as it was consistent with the effort to build a Santal Church. The legal arguments of the Baptists were not invalidated by the Deed: they could have contested Skrefsrud's right to sign away their property, as they saw it, to a Trust.<sup>11</sup> But it was one thing to attack dissident missionaries legally, quite another to attack the Santal Evangelical Church, since all the Protestant Missionary Societies saw themselves as involved in a common struggle for Christianity and against Heathendom, in spite of their theological differences.

All this meant, however, that the IHM, however it should be organised in the future, could not become the owner of the Mission property or take any decisions relating to it. Only the named trustees could take such decisions. In fact, they were empowered to take all decisions relating to the Mission: they could recruit or dismiss new missionaries, they could receive and spend money. But there was no legal way in which the support committees – which were forming all over Scandinavia at this period - could be granted any influence as to how the funds they collected should be spent. Nor could the missionaries in the field take part in decision-making, except those who were trustees. This was what the Scandinavian mission activists could not understand. By the Trust Deed, the founders had gained the power – and the responsibility – of running the Mission as they choose.

## Olaf Boddling

When Boddling arrived at Ebenezer in 1890, the district of Santal Parganas was no longer the colonial frontier it had been twenty years earlier. Colonial power and administration had expanded, and the pioneer phase of the Santal Mission was over. There were some six to eight thousand Christians in their congregation, and on the face of it, the Mission was well established<sup>12</sup>. But Boddling soon found that “The conditions are not magnificent, rather they are pretty dark, and one has to work hoping for hope”<sup>13</sup>. He found the Church practices slack and the devotees' knowledge of Christianity lacking. Organisation was still largely as Skrefsrud's Norwegian friend Paus had described it much earlier: “the best possible, that is, none”<sup>14</sup>. Boddling also realised that preaching and practice did not always conform to the Lutheran principles of the Norwegian church, in which he had been ordained as a priest. From the start, then, Boddling was sandwiched between his respect for Skrefsrud – of which there is no doubt – and his own critical gaze. But while the Swedish missionary Heuman, the first trained theologian of the Mission, was fired after several conflicts with the founders,<sup>15</sup> Boddling never confronted Skrefsrud or the Børresens with his criticism. Rather, he worked silently and loyally to ameliorate matters wherever he could.

Boddling showed his qualities as a linguist from the start, and learned Santali quickly. From the start, he was given responsibility for the Santali Christian magazine *Hor Pera*, and, with Heuman at first, assisted Skrefsrud in his work on Bible translation<sup>16</sup>. According to Boddling, it was his search for a colloquial but clear language for the Bible which led him to collect folk tales,<sup>17</sup> while the dictionary

was a direct continuation of work Skrefsrud had begun. Writing took up much of Boddings' time from the start, and his charge of the relatively modest Mohulpahari mission station was chosen to enable him to write<sup>18</sup>. But he soon had to deal with administrative matters. He was given the main responsibility for the new field, in the West, which the Mission took over when the German missionary Haegert died in 1904. In 1908, it was he who approached the authorities when the Assam government wanted to take away half their settlement area there.<sup>19</sup>

Boddings' character comes through clearly in our sources from the twenty years he worked under Skrefsrud's supervision. He was extremely serious and conscientious, but he seems to have preferred compromise to confrontation. While his respect and admiration for Skrefsrud as a person is evident, it is also clear that he had quite a different view of Church and Mission organisation from his mentor. Still, he became Skrefsrud's closest collaborator, particularly after Børresen's death in 1901.<sup>20</sup>

### Proposals for reorganization in Skrefsrud's lifetime

Compared to other Missions, the way the IHM was run was becoming an anachronism. In spite of Skrefsrud's satisfaction with the lack of formal organisation, he did introduce reforms in 1905, dividing the Mission area into 10 congregations, a decentralization urgently needed since many villages were unable to send anybody to attend the monthly meetings at Ebenezer. But these reforms had little effect in practice, since Skrefsrud did not, at this time, trust the Santals to run their own congregations.<sup>21</sup> In fact, he still took all important decisions himself, and even less important ones. In the 1880s, when "the Santals must be converted by the Santals", they and Børresen, especially, had shown a lot of confidence in their Santal collaborators.<sup>22</sup> The turning point had come in the nineties: in 1898-99 Skrefsrud conducted a veritable "purge" of the catechists and other Santal workers in whom he had lost confidence.<sup>23</sup> Boddings noted at the time that though some of Skrefsrud's accusations were justified, others were not.<sup>24</sup>

It seems clear that this purge was not really caused by the misdemeanors of some Santal workers, but was symptomatic of a real change in policy, perhaps unconscious at the time. Børresen was getting old, and Skrefsrud, who had much less to do with the practical affairs of the congregations, had to step in. The change partly reflected their contrasting personalities. Børresen was a hard-line, low-church Pietist, but surprisingly liberal and open in his dealings with Santal collaborators. As long as they were earnest, he trusted them and gave them a good deal of autonomy – perhaps he was too confident that those led by true Christian goodwill could do no wrong. Skrefsrud was the theorist of cultural autonomy, eager to respect Santal customs, who stated repeatedly that he wanted to change Santal religion only, and not their culture<sup>25</sup>. But he tended to mistrust his collaborators – with the exception of the Børresens – and often seems to have felt that if things were to be done rightly, they must be done by himself. When he had to take over Børresen's work with the congregations from the late nineties, he soon perceived flaws in faith and practice that Børresen had tolerated or ignored. In those years, the number of new conversions diminished considerably, and Skrefsrud, especially, but also Børresen, turned their attention to the need for revival within the established Christian community. They felt that the enthusiasm of the Santals, so marked in the 1870s and 1880s, had waned: the converts needed to reach a new level of faith.

The deception with the quality of faith among the converts was not particular to the Santal Mission. It was part of a larger trend. The missionaries among the Oraon in Chota Nagpur clearly felt a similar deception, though they argued that the weakening faith of their converts was due to Hindu influence – the Arya Samaj was very active in Ranchi.<sup>26</sup> The "holiness movement" among British Evangelicals from the 1870s had led to a new stress on the inward feelings of Christians, with

less emphasis on good works and charity, as well as on mission work.<sup>27</sup> Similar developments followed elsewhere, and now, at the apex of the imperial age with its emphasis on empire building, the “Christian missions were losing their space both in the metropolis and the colony.”<sup>28</sup> The Scandinavian countries no longer had colonies, but in Norway, at any rate, there was an important schism of the political left in 1884, between the low Church and the liberals, which isolated the mission from the intellectual mainstream.<sup>29</sup> The pessimism in mission circles may have been more psychological than real, however. Thus, in India the number of Christians rose by 34,2 per cent between the 1901 and the 1911 censuses.<sup>30</sup> The number of European and American missionaries there rose by more than fifty per cent from 1901 to 1914.<sup>31</sup>

Skrefsrud’s ideas about Protestant theology and church practice had developed considerably since his Baptist period in the seventies. He had been obliged to convince his new Scandinavian supporters that he, and the mission he represented, were truly Lutheran. His long correspondence with Hertel, the first supporter and the chief activist of the Santal Mission in Denmark, is crucial here<sup>32</sup>. These letters also show - I may reasonably add - Skrefsrud’s struggle to convince himself. And then, during his visit to America, he had finally found, in the “Conference” of Georg Sverdrup (1848-1907) and Sven Oftedal (1844-1911), a Lutheran view of church and congregation that could satisfy him.<sup>33</sup> From a theological point of view, it was a new Skrefsrud - something like a convert to a new faith - that emerged in the nineties, and this influenced his stand towards his supporters in Scandinavia and America, as well as his attitudes towards the Santal Christians. Finally he had, in Bodding, a trained Lutheran priest who respected his views on the Santals and their conversion and agreed with them, while, at the same time, subtly influencing him towards a position closer to the Norwegian Church.

But the main pressure for reorganisation, in these years, came from the Norwegian supporters of the Mission. In fact, the first proposals for a thorough national organization of the Norwegian support committees were made as early as 1895. The plan was to discuss these plans with Skrefsrud when he would visit Norway on his return from America, but Skrefsrud did not visit Scandinavia then, and the discussion was put off for the time being.<sup>34</sup> Various ideas on reorganisation continued to appear in the correspondence however, and in 1896 Skrefsrud even broached the idea of founding a new Missionary Society, on the lines of other such societies, though it should be ‘more liberal’ - in the sense of offering more independence to the missionaries in the field<sup>35</sup>.

In 1892, Skrefsrud and Børresen made a will, where they named one trustee in each of the Scandinavian countries to take over after their death, while the Mission in the field should be managed by three active missionaries, one from each Scandinavian country. If the support from Scandinavia ceased, the Mission should be given over to the Anglican Church. Skrefsrud hoped these provisions would be compatible with the clauses of the Trust Deed, but it soon became clear that they were not. The name of the Mission could not be changed either, to “the Scandinavian Evangelical Lutheran Mission to the Santals”, as Skrefsrud had hoped. Things remained as they were. The brothers Allen had left India by then and rescinded their charge, and new trustees should have been named. This was never done, so only Skrefsrud and the Børresens remained. When Børresen died in 1901, Skrefsrud wrote a new testament: upon his death the Mission should remain with Caroline Børresen as sole trustee. Caroline herself may well have insisted on this last clause, for, from then on till Skrefsrud’s death in 1910, she effectively seems to have controlled the Mission. Caroline’s will was Law, said Bodding.<sup>36</sup>

In 1905, however, Skrefsrud wrote to Lars Dahle, the secretary of the NMS, to get a copy of their rules - to see how they were organizing their Mission work. That year, too, he wrote in ‘Santalen’<sup>37</sup> that Bodding would succeed him as manager, under an equal number of trustees to be named from Denmark and Norway.<sup>38</sup> But the



Americans, who now had a large share in the financial burden, wanted their part in running the mission, an idea Bodding supported. Things were beginning to move, and when Bodding went to Scandinavia in 1906, he brought Skrefsrud's proposals for discussion with the support committees. But no decisions were taken, and by 1908, when the Norwegians wrote urging Skrefsrud to take up the matter of future organization, he was becoming very weak, and no longer fit to answer. Bodding then asked them to wait, and to concentrate on asking Skrefsrud to name his successor, and to name new trustees. The Scandinavians wanted Bodding as co-manager since Skrefsrud was ill, but there was no provision in the Trust Deed for such a move. The best that could be done was to ask Skrefsrud to authorise Bodding to act in his name.<sup>39</sup>

Then, in 1909, Bodding found out about Skrefsrud's testament of 1901. He wrote to Norway, asking them to demand that Skrefsrud made his testament known, and to request him to appoint new trustees and a successor. They did so, supported by the Americans. Caroline Børresen was furious, but Bodding was supported by Lewis, the Mission's accountant, and after some struggle, Caroline agreed to have three documents issued in Skrefsrud's name:

- An authorization for Bodding to act in Skrefsrud's stead.
- A document appointing the following trustees: Caroline Børresen, Bodding, Gustav Jensen (Norway), Viggo Moltke (Denmark) and J.H. Blegen (America).
- A document naming Bodding as manager of the Mission on Skrefsrud's death.

But there was some delay, as Skrefsrud refused to sign the last of these documents, and only agreed when Bodding threatened to leave the Mission. Skrefsrud now had a new testament made, where Bodding was named as his successor. The three other missionaries then active had also written to Skrefsrud: they would leave if Caroline was to take charge. As they put it, female leadership of such an undertaking was proscribed by the Bible as well as by the Lutheran Church Order. This statement was conventional enough at the time, but their fear of Caroline's leadership was certainly due to her authoritarian personality as well as to the gender issue. It is clear, however, that the committees at home - in Norway, especially - saw the idea of female leadership of the Mission as scandalous. Caroline continued to interfere with Bodding's managerial function, however.<sup>40</sup> This was the situation when Skrefsrud died, on the 11<sup>th</sup> of December, 1910.

In September, 1909, Bodding had his proposal for future organization ready, and sent it to the Norwegian and Danish Committees. He met Blegen, from the Norwegian support committees, at the World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh and discussed it with him there. The proposal was voted and accepted by the Norwegian, Danish and American Committees in 1910-11.<sup>41</sup>

### 1910-1920: New Rules conflicting with the Trust Deed

Bodding's new rules implied a radical reorganization of much of the Mission work. There was to be an annual conference of all missionaries in the field, where each missionary had a vote. The decisions taken were to guide the work in the field, though Bodding, as manager, had the final authority, as stated in the Trust Deed. It seems clear that Bodding, however, saw this as rather like the king's place in a constitutional monarchy: though the legal decision would be his, its content should be the result of democratic debate. The committees in Norway, Denmark and America would sanction the budget and appoint new missionaries - though they must be formally "called" by the manager. Bodding clearly saw this as a formality.<sup>42</sup> But it would soon be clear that he had underestimated both the exigencies of the Trust Deed, and the capacity of his Scandinavian collaborators to understand it. For Bodding it was obvious that any provision of the new rules must be limited by the Trust Deed. Most of the Scandinavians - and especially the Norwegians - seem

rather to have thought that the Trust Deed's provisions were set aside or limited by the new, democratic rules. Both views proved too optimistic, however: the lawyers found that the new rules infringed on the provisions of the Trust. Addressing this tension meant that either the rules or the deed would have to be modified.

In a further move to dispose with the absolute power of the manager, Bodding proposed, in 1912, to delegate his power to the trustees. But this proved legally impossible. Bodding now realised that no real reorganisation was possible unless the Trust Deed was modified. But this could only be done if legal proceedings were instituted against the Mission for mismanagement of the Trust. Bodding as the manager thus had to take the Mission to court for mismanagement – a logic which could only make sense in the context of the Law. To save time, the case was taken to the District Court at Dumka: at the Calcutta High Court it would have taken ages to get a decision. The District Judge ruled in the case on 21<sup>st</sup> October, 1921, and the Trust was henceforth to be administered by new and modified rules. They allowed for an advisory missionary conference, and explicitly allowed trustees from outside India to be appointed. But the Manager still had sole responsibility for running the Mission, and only the named trustees could appoint new ones – they could not be elected by any outside body, such as the Scandinavian committees. Still, the new document did allow for the new rules the Mission had voted, with some modifications, notably to make clear that any decision taken by the Missionary Conference, or by the committees, would be advisory only. The trustees could not delegate any of their responsibility to the committees, but they could 'decommission,' and Bodding proposed that they should engage themselves formally to do so, if they opposed the advice of the committees. The remaining trustees could then appoint new ones, and were of course free to follow the advice of the committees in this matter. The new order, then, was legally defensible at last, but the line between elective democratic practices and responsibility under the trust deed was fuzzy, and smooth functioning would demand understanding, good-will and diplomacy on all sides. This was not always forthcoming, as we shall see.

### Reorganization in Scandinavia

At the turn of the century, the support for the Santal Mission in Norway was still organized in local, independent committees. The Central Committee in Oslo (then Christiania) had no formal power over them, nor vice versa. At that time, the older generation – those who knew Skrefsrud and Børresen personally – were dying or getting very old, and enthusiasm for the Mission was on the wane. It was the emissaries taken on by the Mission – notably Nils Chr. Olsen – who was able to get things moving again. He took initiative to move towards a more formal organization, and started from below. Olsen organized the western Norwegian committees into regional circles, with committees formed by representatives from the local units, in a democratic structure. His colleague Olafsen then did the same in eastern Norway. In 1906, this led to a proposal to replace the Central Committee with a national body constituted by representatives from the various circles. This was not to happen for several years yet. But when Pauss, Skrefsrud's trusted friend, died in 1907, Whittington took over as chairman. His leadership revived the Central committee, but it was still quite independent of the local and circle organizations. Olsen wanted to change this, and wrote to Skrefsrud, who was against such reforms. In 1908, the Central Committee reprimanded Olsen and Olafsen. They had been hired to work within the existing order, not to work towards the founding of a new Mission Society.<sup>43</sup>

This was a time of theological strife in the Norwegian Church, among other things about the order for Holy Communion, and whether it was to be led by a pastor in a church, or whether it could be celebrated by the lay believers themselves, in 'congregation houses' or chapels.<sup>44</sup> The Central Committee took a stand against the practice of a more open communion and wanted to exclude the emissaries that



practiced it. In Stavanger, the emissaries retorted by walking out of the local meeting to celebrate communion then and there.<sup>45</sup>

The 'church strife' in Norway, which had begun in the 1880s and ebbed out in the 1930s, saw broad church and low church parties,<sup>46</sup> as well as liberal versus conservative theological positions at odds with each other. A struggle about the professorship in theology at the University of Christiania – lasting from 1902 to 1906 - ended with the establishment of a separate low-church teaching institution, the Congregational Faculty or College (Menighetsfakultetet) in 1907.<sup>47</sup> The Mission to the Interior, a domestic missionary society, where many supporters of the Santal Mission were active, was the strongest organization in the low-church party. They insisted on democracy at all levels, a demand resonating with the Norwegian struggle for full independence, which was gained in 1905. The period was characterized by a populist reaction against elite dominance at all levels – a persistent theme in modern Norwegian history - and this partly explains why the conflict in the Santal Mission was so bitter.

The Central Committee of the Santal Mission had an eclectic history in theological terms: at one time, it was led by the Socialist Oscar Nissen (1843-1911). In the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, its leaders were closer to the official Church, but estranged from the populist ideology of the Mission of the Interior. Still, the Central Committee finally agreed to a national meeting in 1908. Here they proposed new "basic rules" for the organization of the Mission work in Norway. The proposed rules were to be revised after three years, in 1911, and implied some reorganisation. The Central Committee was to remain self-recruiting and independent, but the rules for the local committees, and the organisation in circles, showed the mark of Olsen's and Olafsen's work.

The question of joining the Norwegian Mission Society (NMS) was not taken up formally, but the idea was in the minds of many. Others, like Olsen, would have preferred to merge with the low-church China Mission. Here again, the conflict in the Mission reflected the larger strife in the Church. But either merger would most certainly be opposed by the Danes, who had no wish to be absorbed by any of the Norwegian Mission Societies. The Americans, too, resisted a merger.<sup>48</sup> Various ideas were broached concerning a 'loose affiliation' with the NMS. Overtures were made, but the NMS was not interested. They were affiliated with the official Church and skeptical of the non-conformist elements within the Santal Mission. They wanted no more students at their Mission school in Stavanger, already overwhelmed by the number of students wanting to attend. Perhaps they hesitated, too, to extend their retirement pensions to a whole lot of new people, who certainly would have liked to profit from them<sup>49</sup>.

The Danes were even more hesitant than the Norwegians to take steps towards a more formal organization. Yet they did introduce more democratic rules too, and held their first National meeting in 1913. In Sweden, the support for the mission had all but petered out by this time. The same was true of the support from Britain. In America, however, the work for the Mission was well and active.

The episode clearly shows the difference between the two Missions. The Santal Mission was composed of variously-minded people, mostly outsiders to formal Church organization with very few academically trained theologians, and had a loose and – it must have seemed to the NMS – unreliable organizational form. The NMS, with its conventional theological position, was well organised, with a proper education system and pension fund. In this, the NMS was in tune with international trends, as we shall see.

### Trends in World Mission: the Edinburgh Conference of 1910

In 1910, the very year Skrefsrud died, the first World Missionary Conference was held

in Edinburgh,<sup>50</sup> and Boddling was one of the participants. The conference has often been seen as a turning point in the world's Missions: its impressive organization, the ecumenical attitude and efforts behind it, and the presence of spokesmen from non-Western churches<sup>51</sup> meant that the Conference was representative of the trends that would influence Mission work until World War II<sup>52</sup>. Various committees had been set up to interrogate the state of Mission work, and Boddling seems to have participated in the commission debating the relationship between Missions and governments<sup>53</sup>. As he was answering questions during the Congress, he must have felt how badly his Mission fared in terms of organisation when compared to most of the 176 mission societies present. When he answered, for example, that actual conversion work in the Mission he represented was mainly done by Santal workers, he must have been acutely aware that this was due to lack of trained missionaries and funds, and not to any conscious policy. Indigenisation was one theme that came up at the Conference, voiced particularly by the Chinese pastor, Cheng Jingyi. Skrefsrud and Børresen had indeed held that 'the Santals should be converted by the Santals,<sup>54</sup> but as Børresen got older, Skrefsrud - and Caroline - had been running the Mission with an iron hand. True, the Santal Mission was held in Trust for the "Santal Evangelical Church", but any steps to found an indigenous Church were still very much in the future.

The education of Missionaries was one of the themes of the Conference. It was stated that "[t]he Missionary should have the highest possible professional qualifications in the relevant field. He must be able to think independently and maintain a broad, academic outlook on life and culture."<sup>55</sup> Apart from their short training with the Gossner Mission, Skrefsrud and Børresen had no theological qualifications: they were mechanics. Boddling had his university degree in theology, but when he was ordained before joining the field in 1890, the founders of the Mission had seen this as a waste of time. Now the exigencies were quite different, and Boddling's education was probably representative of Missionaries of his generation: they had theological training, but very few had been to a Mission school of any kind. There were still very few such schools on a world scale. England and America had a few strong institutions, such as the Hartford Seminary in Connecticut, whose rector headed the commission. In Norway, the NMS had its own mission school, dating way back to 1843, and by 1910 it provided five years of Missionary education<sup>56</sup>. The Santal Mission had nothing. Neither did they have any seminar to train Santal pastors and evangelists. Next year, in 1911, Boddling wrote about the need for a divinity school to the Norwegian national assembly of the Mission. It is typical of him that, when the school was started in 1916, he chose Steinthal, his most ardent opponent in the matter of the reorganisation of the Mission, to lead it.<sup>57</sup>

There was also a strong trend, during the conference, for co-operation between the various Mission Societies in evangelising the non-Christian world. Many societies did, in fact, co-operate in the field: The Santal Mission had much contact with the British Church Mission Society (CMS) in the Santal Parganas, though they did not always agree. But again, such future co-operation seemed to demand an amount of stable organization, rather than the impressionable autocracy that the Santal Mission had known under Skrefsrud and the Børresens.

### **Conflict and confusion: 1910-1918**

From Skrefsrud's death, then, two parallel efforts were made to reorganize the Santal Mission. On the one hand, under the pressure of the Norwegian low-church demand for democracy, new rules for the Mission appeared, in which the Missionary Conference was established as the main decision-making body in the field. The supporters in Norway, followed by Denmark, also organized themselves as if they were, indeed, a Mission Society, with an authority over the Mission work they funded. In parallel to these developments, Boddling was struggling - by means of his juridical process against the Mission - to modify the Trust Deed so as to allow for democracy

in practice, though legal authority could be held only by the trustees and by himself as manager. From Boddings's point of view, they were working towards the same goal.

Before the Trust Deed could be changed by the court ruling, however, the World War broke out. The Deed proved to have an unexpected advantage: since the Mission was legally established as a Trust in India, it was not taken over as enemy or neutral property, as other foreign Missions were. The Basel Mission in Mangalore, established in Switzerland but run mainly by German missionaries, was taken over and became, for the time being, a foundation. The Indian workers effectively had to run the Mission for more than five years, which helped to speed up indigenisation and the formation of an independent Church later. Similarly, the German Gossner Mission, which worked among the Mundas of Chota Nagpur, was seized, and here, too, the temporary absence of foreign missionaries was a boost to indigenisation later.<sup>58</sup> Nothing like this happened in the Santal Mission.

Boddings would not sign the proposal for the new Trust Deed before he had discussed it with the committees in Scandinavia and America. The war certainly did not help the consultation process, but this was never the main problem. The Norwegian committee and activists seem, as noted, never really to have understood what a Trust Deed was, far less its implications. Neither did the new missionaries that kept coming out from Scandinavia, now that the missionary force in the field was increasing rapidly. By 1911, there were twelve missionaries in the field. There were 18,996 Christians under the Mission in 1910, yet there were only five ordained Santal Pastors, though there were 236 indigenous workers – elders, catechists, bible women and so on. Indigenisation was yet to come.

The first Missionary Conference in the field, in 1911, was called a “farce” by one of its participants,<sup>59</sup> since they knew that any decision they made had to be accepted by Boddings. The text of the modified Trust Deed, which was ready in October, 1914, recognised the advisory role of the Missionary Conference, and indeed of the support committees. But the Deed did not allow for democratic elections to decision-making bodies. More power was given to the trustees in relation to the manager, who would now serve for a renewable five-year period. New trustees must still be appointed by the trustees, however. Boddings wrote about all this to the support committees, explaining the situation as fully as he could. Yet the Norwegians do not seem to have understood his explanations.<sup>60</sup>

Before the new Deed could be enacted, however, it must be signed by the trustees, and Boddings did not want them to do so before the Support Committees had approved it. This only happened in 1920. The delay was not due to impaired communications in wartime. Boddings was asked by the Norwegian committee to come home for discussions, which he did in 1916. In the field, the opposition against the Trust Deed, and against Boddings, was led by a Danish newcomer among the missionaries, Fredrik Wilhelm Steinthal (1862-1951).<sup>61</sup> He argued strongly against an administration that did not conform to the “laws” of the Mission: according to his view, they established the Missionary Conference as an autonomous and decision-making body. This was also how the Norwegian Central Committee saw it. “Apparently”, they wrote in 1915, reacting to the modified Trust Deed, ‘the future direction of the Mission will have to be done in a way which does not conform to the rules voted in 1911’. The Danes, on the other hand, professing their ignorance of English Law, trusted Boddings and approved his decisions. They did, in fact, write to Steinthal, criticising his behaviour.<sup>62</sup>

After Boddings's visit, the Norwegians finally revised the rules of the Mission in 1917, so they would conform to the new Trust Deed. The Danes and the Americans also approved the revised rules that year.<sup>63</sup> Everything seemed finally to be in order. Boddings expected approval from the missionaries in the field when he came back, and called a Missionary Conference, in July 1917.

The missionaries accepted the revised rules without apparent opposition,<sup>64</sup> but events were to prove that they were far from content. The revised laws had been promulgated rather than debated and voted, and the rules of 1911 clearly stated that changes in the laws must be voted by the Conference. An extensive correspondence now developed between individual missionaries and members of the home committees, especially the Norwegian one. Joh. Baklund, then treasurer of the Norwegian committee, felt that the revised laws must be modified, to restore real power to the Missionary Conference. He saw the Trust Deed as the main problem, but he seems to have thought that the necessary changes to the laws could be made in spite of the Trust Deed's provisions. He also broached the idea that Bodding should retire, to concentrate on his literary work. Rasmus Rosenlund (1884-1955), who was to succeed Bodding as manager later, was already an experienced missionary, and would be fully capable of taking over. Bodding himself noted the restive atmosphere among the missionaries, and wrote home about this in 1918.<sup>65</sup>

### **Bodding under fire: 1910-1923**

The Norwegian committee, and especially its secretary, M.A. Waaler, concluded from Bodding's letter and the correspondence from the missionaries that there was general discontent among the missionaries in the field, and that the revised rules were the main cause of the problem. Even so, they wanted to have the new Trust Deed registered. They appealed to the Danes for confirmation of their view, but the latter now felt that the restrictions of the Deed for the Mission's organisation were too severe. The Danes therefore returned to the old alternative of founding a new Mission Society, which would be quite independent of the Trust except for renting its buildings and properties. The Trust would in fact delegate the evangelisation of the Santals to the new Society. They proposed, however, not to act on this while Bodding remained the manager, so as not to hurt his feelings.<sup>66</sup> With all this, the registration of the new Trust deed had once again to be put off.

The proposition of founding a new society was discussed at the Missionary Conference in February, 1920, but the move was rejected. As to the procedure for changing the laws, they proposed that the Conference should vote them, but that the trustees should authorise them formally, and that they should be sanctioned by the Committees at home.<sup>67</sup>

From 1918, however, the secretary of the Norwegian committee had begun what Hodne calls "an active campaign to undermine Bodding's influence and authority", blaming Bodding for the tense situation in the field. Waaler, says Hodne – implying that he had not necessarily the support of the Committee – consciously worked to remove Bodding from his position as manager. He did this by exchanging letters with individual missionaries – behind Bodding's back, as it were, since Bodding was sole responsible for any correspondence from the field about the mission's affairs – and by maintaining that the revised rules were imposed by Bodding in his "quest and madness for power." He even wrote to Bodding's sister, and made the Board send her a letter asking her not to discuss the Mission with outsiders. Bodding was furious about this treatment of his sister. In his letters, Waaler is quite clear that he is acting in his own capacity, not as a representative of the Committee.<sup>68</sup>

Hodne may have cast Waaler as the villain of the narrative: it is clear that he himself had a great respect for Bodding. But the correspondence he cites seems to bear him out. Bodding was getting the point: in a letter to Waaler he hints that the troubles in the Mission surely have other sources than his sister or himself.

Now the Norwegian Committee wanted to revise the revised rules of 1917, to give the Missionary Conference and the Home Committees real power. This, they said, was why the registration of the new Trust Deed must wait. There is a misunderstanding

here: they seem to have thought that the Mission rules were to be registered along with the Deed.<sup>69</sup> This goes to show how little they understood of English law: the laws of an association are an internal matter and need not be legally registered. Laws in conflict with the registered Deed, however, would be legally null and void. This was what Bodding had tried to explain.

The Committee also wanted the Trustees to sign an undertaking that they would administer the Mission in accordance with the directions of the Missionary Conference and the Home Committees. Bodding had to explain that the trustees, having the juridical responsibility for the Mission, could not legally delegate their authority in this way.

A committee of four of the missionaries was set up to propose new, revised rules. They did so, but both Bodding and Rosenlund quickly realised that their proposition did, in fact, install the Missionary Conference as the main decision-making authority. This could not be allowed under the Trust Deed, and revisions were necessary. Eventually, the missionaries in the field accepted these revisions, and voted the modified rules without significant opposition. Rosenlund, who had just returned from a visit home, feared a new conflict. Despite this, things went quite smoothly, and Rosenlund praised Bodding later for his role in the affair. So did the American Committee when they approved the new laws. The Norwegian and Danish Trustees approved them in April 1921, and the American trustee did so shortly after. The new rules were printed in 1923. Finally, the ambiguous situation that had existed since Skrefsrud's death in 1910 had been sorted out – or so it would seem.<sup>70</sup> Yet sixteen years later, in 1939, the Scandinavian office-holders declared in a meeting, that some rules printed in 1923 were 'unknown to us,' despite them being used in the field. Rather they claimed that they had always used the rules voted for in 1911 and revised in 1917. As Hodne remarks, this ignorance of the formally accepted and voted rules of the Mission is inexplicable.<sup>71</sup> It does seem to show, however, how little the Scandinavians at home understood the entire process.

### **An ignominious ending**

Before the new laws were made public, Bodding had been sidelined. According to the contract of December 1922, signed by the chairmen of the Norwegian and Danish boards, Bodding would retire as chairman of the Mission, but continue to receive his wages. He would be given the use of the Mohulpahari mission station, where he would dedicate himself to literary work. His wife, the medical doctor Christine Larsen, would be put in charge of a medical clinic on behalf of the Mission.

I shall be brief here about the matter of Bodding's third marriage. It was, however, an important argument in the question of removing him from the chairmanship. Bodding's first wife died a few months after she joined him in India, in 1892. In 1897 Bodding married Børresen's daughter Ingeborg, who had become a widow. She, however, left Bodding in 1899, with a Muslim coachman whom she later married according to Muslim Law. Nothing was heard of her – at least by Bodding. Before he married Christine Larsen in May, 1922, he had sent a man to inquire about her: the envoy was told that Ingeborg was dead. But after Bodding's marriage, Børresen's second daughter Katharina Heuman<sup>72</sup> made it known that she had recently received a letter from her sister. Ingeborg was still alive and well.

In the meantime, Bodding had got his divorce, by the High Court, in 1921. Thus, there was no question of bigamy. The real problem was divorce. The Norwegian Church accepted the validity of legal divorce, but would not allow a divorcee to hold any responsible position in the Church. The Norwegian committee for the Santal Mission held the same view. If Bodding had remarried as a widower, there would have been no argument here for his demission. But the idea of a divorced man as head of the

Mission was absolutely unacceptable. The Danes agreed, but their argument was rather that Bodding must have deceived them when he said that Ingeborg was dead: he had betrayed their confidence. The Americans, perhaps significantly, do not seem to refer to the question of divorce at all: moreover, they doubted the conclusion of the Danes, preferring to believe that Bodding had acted in good faith.

Since the early twentieth century, Norwegian and Danish law had been rather liberal in relation to divorce. In general, this was also true of American Law. But the conservatives of the Norwegian Church still saw marriage as a sacrament that could not be broken. In Norway, this question had become a part of the church strife between conservatives and liberals. The Danish and American activists of the Mission were not involved in this debate to anything like the same extent. This is certainly why the Norwegian committee, eager to get rid of Bodding, insisted that a divorcee could not head the Mission, against the Danes and the Americans who do not seem to have given this argument much weight. The Norwegians won out, however, and Bodding had to go.<sup>73</sup>

But there is every reason to believe that Bodding himself, in spite of an amount of bitterness, was quite relieved to be rid of his responsibility. He had taken over the Mission in a situation of crisis, and kept it going through the stormy conflicts that followed. In the end he produced a compromise between the missionaries' and the home committees' demand for democracy and the exigencies of the Trust Deed, a compromise which worked quite satisfactorily until the indigenous Church – for which the Trust was held – could take over. The organisation kept the Santal Mission different from other mission societies, since its formal leadership was in the field, not among its supporters at home.

In 1910, the Santal Mission sadly lacked the organizational texture of the established Mission Societies. After 1923, it found its own organizational form which, on the whole, probably served it just as well as the constitutions of other missionary societies did.

## Noter

1 Marine Carrin and Harald Tambs-Lyche, 'Une église nationale pour les Santals: du romantisme scandinave à l'orthodoxie luthérienne', *Archives de Sciences Sociales des Religions*, no. 103, (1998), 99-127; Marine Carrin and Harald Tambs-Lyche, 'The Santals, Though Unable to Plan for Tomorrow, Should be Converted by the Santals', in R. Frykenberg (ed.): *Christians and Missionaries in India: Cross-Cultural Communication since 1700*. (Ann Arbor and London: Lawrence Erlbaum and Routledge, 2002).

2 Marine Carrin and Harald Tambs-Lyche, *An Encounter of Peripheries: Santals and their Missionaries, 1867-1900*. Delhi: Manohar, 2008, 119-139 and 146-175. The mass conversion

took place during the famine of 1874, and was the subject of an article in the *Times*, 31 August, 1874. Johan Nyhagen, *Santalmisjonens Historie*, vol. 1. (Den Norske Santalmisjon: Oslo 1990), 204. It was alleged at the time that the missionaries had taken advantage of the crisis to convert the Santals assembled for relief work. The success as well as the criticism, however, made the Mission well known outside India. Carrin and Tambs-Lyche, *An Encounter of Peripheries*, 130-131.

3 On the NMS, see Torstein Jørgensen (ed.), *I Tro og Tjeneste, Det Norske Misjonsselskap 1842 – 1992*. (Stavanger: Misjonshøgskolen, 1992.)



- 4 *The station was called Ebenezer, and was situated in the village of Benagaria. Both names are used in the literature of the Mission.*
- 5 Nyhagen, *Santalmisjonens Historie*, vol. I, 334, also 140, n. 14.
- 6 Hodne discusses Skrefsrud's conversion to Baptism as well as his subsequent reconversion to Lutheranism. Olaf Hodne, *L.O. Skrefsrud: Missionary and Social Reformer Among the Santals of Santal Parganas.* (Oslo: Land og Kirke, 1966, p. 143-146). See also Johan Nyhagen, *Santalmisjonens Historie*, vol. I, 345-353.
- 7 Olaf Hodne, *L.O. Skrefsrud*, 96-97, 101; Marine Carrin and Harald Tambs-Lyche, *An Encounter of Peripheries: Santals and their Missionaries, 1867-1900.* (Delhi; Manohar, 2008), 124.
- 8 Olaf Hodne, *L.O. Skrefsrud*, 104-109 and Marine Carrin and Harald Tambs-Lyche, *An Encounter of Peripheries*, 139, 160-161.
- 9 Marine Carrin and Harald Tambs-Lyche, *An Encounter of Peripheries*, 172.
- 10 Olaf Hodne, *Oppreisning. Misjonæren og Vitenskapsmannen Paul Olaf Bodding 1865-1938.* (Oslo: Luther Forlag, 2006), 52.
- 11 The best account of the conflict is found in Johan Nyhagen, *Santalmisjonens Historie*, I, 330-339. In spite of his affiliation with the Santal Mission, Nyhagen tries hard to be impartial here, crediting the BMS with their 'honorable' decision not to pursue the matter legally.
- 12 Johan Nyhagen, *Santalmisjonens Historie*, II. (Oslo: Santalmisjonens Forlag, 1990), 181.
- 13 "Forholdene er ikke storartede, men heller temmelig mørke, og man maa arbeide med haab mot haab." Letter, Bodding to Pauss, 19.06.1894.
- 14 Letter from Pauss to Hertel, 07.05. 1893.
- 15 Johan Nyhagen, *Santalmisjonens Historie*, II, 255-266. Heuman was sacked mainly because his efforts to improve the schools clashed with the views of Caroline Børresen, responsible for the girls' school. But the last straw came when, during this conflict, he returned to Sweden and had himself ordained as a priest of the Swedish Church. Not only did the pioneers see ordination as useless, they also distrusted the Swedish Church for its high church leanings, as manifest in its apostolic succession for the bishops.
- 16 *Ibid.*, 185-186.
- 17 Paul Olaf Bodding, *Om Santalbibelens Tilblivelse.* (Copenhagen: Den Nordiske Santalmisjon, 1915).
- 18 Marine Carrin, and Harald Tambs-Lyche, *An Encounter of Peripheries*, 320.
- 19 Hodne, *Oppreisning*, 45-52.
- 20 Hodne, *Oppreisning*, 42-44, see also O. Eie, *En kirke bliver til. Santalkirkens vækst og udvikling.* (Copenhagen: Den Danske Santalmisjon, 1967).
- 21 Nyhagen, *Santalmisjonens Historie II*, 291-92.
- 22 Marine Carrin and Harald Tambs-Lyche "The Santals, though unable to think of tomorrow, should be converted by the Santals," esp. 284-285.
- 23 Marine Carrin and Harald Tambs-Lyche, *An Encounter of Peripheries*, 300.
- 24 Paul Olaf Bodding, *Sona: En Kristen Santalvindes liv og gjerning.* (Copenhagen: Den Nordiske Santalmisjon, 1919), 22.
- 25 Marine Carrin and Harald Tambs-Lyche, "The Santals, though unable to think of tomorrow, should be converted by the Santals", *op. cit.*, pp. 281-284; Marine Carrin and Harald Tambs-Lyche, 'Une église nationale pour les Santals', *op. cit.*, III-III2. Skrefsrud's respect for Santal culture was important in gaining support from Denmark, where Ludvig Hertel, a follower of N.F.W. Grundtvig (1783-1872), became the kingpin of support for the Santal Mission. Grundtvig's views became a major influence on Danish and Norwegian culture. He believed, among other things, that there was ethical and moral continuity between the old Norse religion and Christianity. Christianity could only thrive in Scandinavia if it remained close to the 'national genius' and to folk culture. See Marine Carrin and Harald Tambs-Lyche, *A Peripheral Encounter*, 151-154, 167-172.
- 26 S. Dasgupta, "Heathen aboriginals', 'Christian tribes', and 'animistic races': Missionary narratives on the Oraons of Chotanagpur in colonial India". *Modern Asian Studies*, 50, 2, (2016): 458-59.
- 27 D. W. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain. A History from the 1730s to the 1980s.* (London: Routledge, 1989), 151ff.
- 28 A. Porter, *Religion versus Empire? British Protestant Missionaries and Overseas Expansion, 1700-1914.* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 314, cited by Dasgupta, "Heathen aboriginals', 'Christian tribes', and 'animistic races,'" 466.
- 29 Marine Carrin and Harald Tambs-Lyche, *An Encounter of Peripheries*, 273-74.
- 30 The number of Lutherans increased by 41 per cent: but apart from the Anglicans (56,2 %) the most successful missions were the Baptist ones, with a 53,2 per cent increase. This was a sign of times to come, when Baptists, Adventists and finally Pentecostals would be far more successful in the mission field than the more established churches. These statistics are given by C.H. Robinson, *History of Christian Missions.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915), 118-19.

- 31 The actual numbers were 16,218 and 24,871. But indigenization, which was as yet little felt in the Santal Mission, was even more marked: There were 62,366 indigenous mission workers in 1901 and 123,567 in 1914, according to Robinson, 493.
- 32 *Marine Carrin and Harald Tambs-Lyche, An Encounter of Peripheries, 167-171.*
- 33 The "Conference" differed from the majority among Norwegian Lutherans in America in two ways. Sverdrup and Oftedal opposed the idea of individual human agency, since they believed God alone is the acting power, rather than working through the congregation, which they juxtaposed to the church hierarchy. Right or wrong are seen as questions of faith, not of theological expertise, and priests were considered *primus inter pares* in their flock, since ordination was seen as a human invention and not by divine order. See J.S. Hamre, *Georg Sverdrup: Educator, Theologian, Churchman*, (Northfield, MI, The Norwegian-American Historical Association, 1986). Some of the main points are resumed in Carrin and Tambs-Lyche, *An Encounter of Peripheries, 295-97.*
- 34 *Nyhagen, Santalmisjonens Historie, II, 313.*
- 35 *Ibid., 314-318.*
- 36 *Ibid., 321-22.*
- 37 *The Norwegian journal of the Santal Mission.*
- 38 *Nyhagen, Santalmisjonens Historie, II, 322.*
- 39 *Ibid., 324.*
- 40 *Ibid., 325-28.*
- 41 *Ibid., 328.*
- 42 *Ibid., 328-29.*
- 43 *Johan Nyhagen, Santalmisjonens Historie, II, op. cit., 338-52.*
- 44 "Menighetshus" or "Bedehus" (Prayer house). The opposition here may be likened to that between Church and Chapel in Britain.
- 45 *Nyhagen, Santalmisjonens Historie, II, 355-58.*
- 46 "Kirkestriden" in Norwegian. I avoid the term "high church" here. Though a party reminiscent of an Anglican high church position existed in Sweden, it was quite insignificant in the Norwegian Church.
- 47 *Menighetsfakultetet. This institution remains important in Norway today.*
- 48 *Nyhagen, Santalmisjonens Historie, II, 363-365.*
- 49 *It was Bodding, in fact, who proposed a pension fund for the Santal Mission in 1916. See Hodne, Oppreisning, 70.*
- 50 *See D. E. Kerr, and K.R. Ross, 'Introduction', in D. E. Kerr and K.R. Ross (eds.): Edinburgh 2010. Mission Then and Now. (Oxford: Regnum Books, 2009), 3.*
- 51 *They were not there as spokesmen of their churches, since only Missions were represented, and they were few, but they spoke and were heard.*
- 52 *Escobar distinguishes two main periods in the history of missions after 1910. Up to 1945, Protestant missionary activity was dominated by societies affiliated to the "main-line" churches. After WW II there was a marked growth in "conservative" Protestantism, mainly outside of the established churches, and of "faith mission" sustained mainly by organizations of laypersons. See S. Escobar, "Mission from Everywhere to Everyone: The Home Base in a New Century" in D.E. Kerr and K. R. Ross (eds), Edinburgh 2010. Mission Then and Now, 185-186.*
- 53 *I am not certain of this. There was a Norwegian member, and as the Norwegians were few, it may well have been Bodding.*
- 54 *See M. Carrin and H. Tambs-Lyche, "The Santals, though unable to think of tomorrow...", 284-285.*
- 55 *See A.M. Kool, "Changing Images of the Formation for Missionaries. Commission Five in the Light of Current Challenges: A World Perspective", in Kerr and Ross (eds), 159.*
- 56 *See T. Jørgensen, "Misjonshøgskolen – I går, I dag og framover". Misjon og Teologi, vol. I, nr. 1, 1994, 1-6.*
- 57 *Hodne, Oppreisning, 64-65.*
- 58 *Dasgupta, "Heathen aboriginals', 'Christian tribes', and 'animistic races,'" 439, note 4.*
- 59 *Hodne, Santalmisjonens Historie, III. (Oslo: Santalmisjonens Forlag, 1992), 29.*
- 60 *Ibid., 48-49.*
- 61 *Ibid., 52.*
- 62 *It seems that Steinthal was rather difficult to get on with: letters from the missionaries Ofstad and Gausdal allude to this problem. The three shared lodgings for some time, says Hodne (Oppreisning, 65-66).*
- 63 *Olaf Hodne, Santalmisjonens Historie, III, 71-77.*
- 64 *Hodne, Oppreisning, 59-60.*
- 65 *Ibid., 61-62.*

---

66 Hodne, *Santalmisjonens Historie*, III, 63-64.

---

67 *Ibid.*, 65.

---

68 *Ibid.*, 68-71.

---

69 Hodne, *Oppreisning*, 77.

---

70 Hodne, *Santalmisjonens Historie*, III, 76-83.

---

71 Hodne, *Oppreisning*, 77.

---

72 Katharina had married Heuman, the Swedish missionary who had been sacked by Skrefsrud and Børresen, and who had since become the bishop of Tranquebar. He was now heading the oldest Protestant congregation in India, descended from the Mission founded by Bartholomeus Ziegenbalg in 1706. Indira Viswanathan Peterson, "Tanjore, Tranquebar and Halle: European Science and German Missionary Education in the Lives of Two Indian Intellectuals in the Early Nineteenth Century," in Robert E. Frykenberg (ed.), *Christians and Missionaries in India: Cross-Cultural Communication since 1700*. (Ann Arbor and London: Lawrence Erlbaum and Routledge, 2002), 94; Anders Nørggaard, *Mission und Obrigkeit: Die Dänisch-Hallesche Mission in Tranquebar 1706-1845*. (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Mohn, 1988), Gunnar Brundin: *Ernst Heuman, Biskop av Tranquebar*. (Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokforlag, 1926).

---

73 Hodne, *Santalmisjonens Historie*, III, 86-103, see also Hodne, *Oppreisning*, 81-85.

