

An Indigenous Theologian's Perspective on the Bodding Era

Timotheas Hembrom

*Timotheas Hembrom is an ordained Priest in the Church of North India, has a PhD in theological studies, and has over 40-years of theological teaching experience. Hembrom has taught at several theological colleges across India. Retired from full time teaching, he occasionally continues his pastoral ministry. A writer, editor, translator, singer-musician and songwriter; literary and cultural work occupy much of his post-retirement time. His most recent publication is *The Santal and the Biblical Creation Traditions: Anthropological and Theological Reflections* (Adivaani: Kolkata: 2013).*

Abstract

Paul Olaf Bodding (1865–1938), Norwegian Missionary to Santal Parganas, India, had very large shoes to fill—those of his mentor and predecessor at the The Indian Home Mission to the Santals, Lars Skrefsrud (1840–1910), who was regarded as its founder. Bodding arrived in India in 1890 and was stationed at Mohulpahari Mission. Along with his Santali guide Sido, he worked on the completion of the translation of the New Testament into Santali using the Roman script in 1908, which Skrefsrud had begun. In his 44 years in India, his literary works—*Materials for a Santali Grammar*, *Collection of Santal Folk Tales*, *Santal Riddles and Witchcraft among the Santals* and *Studies in Santal Medicine and Connected Folklore* showcased his mastery as a linguist and ethnographer. His publication of a catechism—*Kukli Puthi* (The Book of Questions and Answers) in 1895 gives us the first glimpse of the rise of a dogmatic theology of the Santal Mission of Northern Churches of those years. His other religious literature contributions were two Santali hymnbooks, published in 1887 and 1907 that included many traditional Santali tunes. Theologically, unlike Skrefsrud, Bodding appeared to be attracted to and influenced by the Bengalis, a dominant non-tribal culture from this region of the country. This influence found its way into his translations. As I will highlight, one prominent example is that while Skrefrud's translations retained traditional names for the deity as *Thakur Jiv*, Bodding replaced it with *Isor* from the Bengali Ishwar. Also, he translated Psalm 150 using the word *tabla*, a traditional South Asian musical instrument instead of a term for a Santali drum. This paper thus discusses how Bodding as a theologian, linguist and translator spearheaded a Lutheran orthodox trend that was an impediment to

the enculturation of Christianity to the religious practices and native beliefs of the Santals. Most importantly, I'd like to highlight what I call Bodding's greatest theological error: his equation of the Santal principal spiritual being—Maran Buru Bonga—with the Biblical Satan, which was instrumental in creating both confusion and discomfort among Santals being wooed by the Christianity of the Lutheran Mission.

Search terms: Bodding – Paul Olav – Santals – Santal Mission – Kukli Puthi – catechism – demonology

Norsk sammendrag

Artikkelen diskuterer misjonæren Paul Olav Bodding som teolog, lingvist og oversetter. Sammen med santalen Sido oversatte han Det nye testamentet til santali. Begrepsbruk viser at han til forskjell fra forgjengeren, pionermisjonæren Lars O. Skrefsrud, var mer påvirket av tidens hegemoniske bengalske allmennkultur enn santalenes egen. Videre påvises det hvordan Bodding særlig i sin katekisme, formidlet en luthersk ortodoksi, som hindret kristendommens akkulturasjon ved ikke å ta santalenes religiøse praksis og tro på alvor. Dette vises ved et eksempel. Bodding identifiserte santalenes øverste åndelige vesen, Maran Buru Bonga, med Bibelens Satan. Dette var i følge artikkelforfatteren et alvorlig feilgrep, noe han redegjør for.

The end of the pioneer era and the rise of orthodoxy

Paul Olaf Bodding (1865–1938) joined The Indian Home Mission to the Santals in 1890. By that time, it had evolved under the collaboration of three Western missionaries: The Baptist Missionary Edward C. Johnson (nd–1900), the Danish Missionary Hans P. Børresen (1825–1901) and Norwegian Missionary Lars O. Skrefsrud (1840–1910) into the present Ebenezer Evangelical Lutheran Church. In 1867, these three Missionaries chose the Santal village Benagaria, Dumka District, Santal Parganas (in today's Indian state of Jharkhand) as the base of the new Santal Mission. They started preaching the Gospel of Christ to the originally monotheistic, non-idol worshiping, autonomous, egalitarian Santals who had a fully developed, sophisticated language to communicate in. These belief system included *bongas* (a generic term indicating invisible, inexplicable, supernatural spiritual forces/powers behind things subordinated to Thakur Jiv, the Supreme Being) Bodding arrived in India a generation later, in 1890. He was stationed at Mohulpahari Mission, and, being theologically educated, his main task was assisting Skrefsrud with his literary works. Together with his Santal guide, he undertook the completion of the Santali edition of the New Testament using the Roman Script in 1908.¹ Soon after that he undertook publishing autonomously and completed the Old Testament Santali translation independently. He was a gifted linguist and ethnographer, and the impressive body of his literary works is witness to it.

Bodding's *Kukli Puthi* (The Book of Questions and Answers)—a catechism, published in 1899—and the two Santali hymnbooks with Santali traditional tunes published in 1897 and 1907—give us the first glimpse of the increasingly dogmatic theology of the Santal Mission of the Santal Churches of those years. This belief was built by Bodding and other missionaries' work on the ground, with sponsorship from Scandinavian Churches and support committees, including an American one. Bodding alone is not responsible for it but he endorsed and contributed to it, as I will highlight below, based on his publications and other printed material of that time.

In their zeal to preach 'good news' to the people of Santal primal religion, the Scandinavian Missionaries - Christian preachers of their time - communicated the opposite, vilifying the indigenous worldview and spirituality. Rather than giving a true witness of the primal religion, they more 'false witness' against it. Bodding and his contemporaries, influenced by their interpretation of Christian theology, identified the Santals' most revered spiritual being, *Maran Buru Bonga*, with the Christian understanding of Satan.² This greatest theological error first finds concrete documentation and visibility in Bodding's *Kukli Puthi* and the hymnbooks, and in many Santali Christian songs of that period. This misinterpretation likely shut down all paths of dialogue between the primal religion of the Santals and this strand of Protestant Christianity.

This trend continues among the present day's native Christians of the Northern Evangelical Lutheran Church (NELC). Local Santal Christians today still hold the missionaries' early writings in high regard, those of Bodding's included. Those influential texts built up a Christian demonology, saying that the *Maran Buru Bonga* of the Santal creation tradition is the dogmatic counterpart of the Christian's Satan/Devil/Diabolos.³

The Santali term *Bonga* is a generic term and connotes invisible, inexplicable, supernatural spiritual forces/powers. The term *Bonga* in itself does not connote anything good or bad unless preceded by a qualifying adjective. The term may be considered equivalent to the English word 'spirit' which sometimes is specified by an adjective preceding it either to connote good or evil. From the existing literature of the early missionaries, among the Santals, it becomes evident that the term *Bonga* confused them.

The majoritarian Hindu religion⁴ presents India as a land of idols (Shiva, Durga, Kali), temples and shrines (Badrinath, Varanasi), holy mountains (Kailash, Haridwar, Hrishikesh), holy rivers (Ganga, Jamuna) and holy animals (cow, snake—Lord Shiva wears a serpent around his neck and the festival Nag Panchami honours snakes⁵).

The Scandinavian missionaries in the late nineteenth century suddenly came across a people—the Santals, who had no idols, no temples, no shrines, no holy places, no holy mountains, no holy rivers and no holy animals. To them these people seemed to revere *Bongas* and at the same time they were mortally afraid of them. This religious phenomenon was unparalleled in the experiences of the missionaries. Their own worldview and theology had no analogy by which they could understand this phenomenon. So it was obvious that they would seek assistance in Hinduism, polytheist and idol-worshipping, which was more relatable, in order to understand the religious belief of the Santals. References to spiritual supernatural beings, which were dreaded by people such as *bhut*, *churin*, *rakshasa*, etc., were found in some Hindu mythological writings. It is possible that the early missionaries took the attributes of these Hindu mythological evil spiritual forces hostile to mankind and attributed them as a whole to the *Bongas* of the Santals.

Failing to find the exact analogy for the Santals' belief in *Bongas* there also, they proceeded to treat the religion of the Santals as a distinct religion and their concept of *Bonga* as a distinct concept to be rejected and denigrated. We find evidence of this in Bodding's *Studies in Santal Medicine and Connected Folklore*.

They believe in the existence of a large number of bongas, all more or less malevolent, often immoral and downright bad. Besides in a Supreme Being, the Santals also believe in a number of spirits, without exception evil and enemies of man. These bongas, as they are called, are supposed to harass humanity, to 'eat' people (as the Santals express it), because they are hungry, displeased, hurt or envious, and this 'eating' is the devouring of the health and substance of the person exposed to the displeasure of the spirits.⁶

Maran Buru Bonga's Identity

Maran Buru Bonga is one of the most revered Bongas of the Santals. On festival days, he is revered along with *Jaher Era Bonga*, *Gosae Era Bonga* and *Moreko-Turuiko Bonga* at the sacred grove, the *Jaher Than* of every Santal village, by the village priest, the *Naeke*. Studies on the *Bongas* of the primal religion of the Santals have shown that not all *Bongas* are spiteful. *Maran Buru Bonga*, *Jaher Era Bonga*, *Gosae Era Bonga*, *Moreko Turuiko Bonga*, *Abge Bonga*, *Manjhi haram Bonga*, *Pargana Bonga* are intimately related with the integrity and welfare of human beings.⁷ Santals believe that there are also evil *Bongas*. But good *Bongas* and evil *Bongas* are not in different categories.

Traditionally, *Maran Buru Bonga*, *Jaher era Bonga* and *Gosae Era Bonga* are the *Bongas* of the Santal people. Their creation tradition (according to the version of the Scottish Free Church missionary Andrew Campbell, one of Skefsrud's contemporaries⁸) shows that they are supernatural eternal spiritual beings, who co-exist with the supreme God *Thakur Jiv* and that they work under his instructions, and that all these national *Bongas* under *Thakur Jiv's* supervision have contributed to the creation of the world and humankind.

The Santals do not have a theogony, just as the Bible does not have one. Both the Santals' creation traditions and the biblical creation traditions take the existence of supernatural eternal beings for granted. And just as the Santals do not believe in a lonely God, the Bible does not believe in a lonely God living in isolation. On the contrary, as in the Santals' tradition, he is also believed to be surrounded by other supernatural spiritual eternal beings¹⁰.

Maran Buru Bonga is considered to be the greatest *Bonga*, because of his contributions to early humankind. In the creation narrative of the Santals¹¹ *Maran Buru Bonga* is the emissary of the creator god *Thakur Jiv* to the early human beings, whom *Thakur Jiv* had allowed to be born of two eggs of a single pair of parent birds, *Has* and *Hasil*. *Thakur Jiv* appointed *Maran Buru Bonga* as the first Santal's guardian and was entrusted with the task of bringing them up as human beings should be. *Maran Buru Bonga* helped the parent birds in feeding the children and when they grew up he taught them the art of carpentry, animal husbandry, the art of agriculture, home science, hygiene and the offering of the first fruits to the creator God, *Thakur Jiv*. When they reached adulthood, he led the early man and woman into the union of marriage to ensure the continuity of humanity in this world. In this respect, *Maran Buru Bonga* did exactly the same as the creator God of the Bible *Elohim* did through a blessing to the early man and woman "...be fruitful and multiply...".¹²

Maran Buru Bonga is not the Biblical Satan

The activities of *Maran Buru Bonga* to instruct early humanity have no analogy with Satan/devil/diabolos of the Bible, as is clear from the above. Therefore, this author sees no justification for identifying *Maran Buru Bonga* of the Santals' faith with Satan of the Christian faith.

Some Christian missionaries dealing with the Santals' creation tradition have considered that *Maran Buru Bonga* lead the first man and woman into consummation of the marriage union as an evil act, *baric' kami*.¹³ This is ludicrous! For nowhere in the world is sexual relationship between husband and wife considered *baric' kami* (a sinful deed). Christians themselves do not consider a sexual relationship between husband and wife as something sinful. The Santals consider the sexual union between wife and husband as a gift of God for procreation and a joyful family life.

Of course, the Santals do not contract marriage between brothers and sisters, between the same sex and between close relatives. The early man and woman were

brother and sister having been born of one single parent bird's eggs. But since there were no other human beings in the world *Maran Buru Bonga* had to unite them in a marriage bond. It was a challenge for *Maran Buru Bonga*, a compulsion of necessity, a noble task to induce the process of procreation through them, the process of actualizing the blessing "be fruitful and multiply"¹⁴. To consecrate this marriage *Maran Buru Bonga* had to make use of the intoxicating beverage *handi*, or rice beer. But this case is unlike that of what was done to the biblical Lot to obtain procreation¹⁵.

To engage in this consecration, we assume that *Maran Buru Bonga* had the approval of *Thakur Jiv*. The Santal creation tradition tells us that the associates of *Thakur Jiv*, the lower supernatural beings do nothing without his blessing or *bhor*.⁹ Then, for the noble act of instituting marriage union of the early man and woman, should *Maran Buru Bonga* be equated with Satan of the Christian faith? The analogy between the *Maran Buru Bonga* of the Santal tradition and the biblical Satan, two supernatural beings of these two distant traditions, can be shown only through mutation and manipulation of the Santal creation tradition as it has been done in *Horkoren Mare Hapramko Reak'Katha*.¹⁶ This version was told by the legendary Santal sage Kolean to Skrefsrud, is laden with dualism, which Santals never believed in. In this version, *Maran Buru Bonga* enters the scene out of the blue, and teaches the early man and woman how to brew rice beer, *handi*, and asks them to pour a libation to him before he makes them drink it, signifying that he deceived them to worship him.¹⁷

But in Campbell's version¹⁸ it was the *Maran Buru Bonga* himself who poured out the libation of the rice beer to *Thakur Jiv* and then made them drink it. I have serious doubts about the authenticity of the creation tradition presented in the *Horkoren Mare Hapramko Reak'Katha*.¹⁹ Granted that the version is correct, then where do we get a parallel to this act in the Bible to prove that Satan deceived early man and woman to worship him?

One may draw the analogy of the deception theory for the alienation of humankind from the story of the Garden of Eden in Genesis chapter 3. But here also the Serpent-Satan equation is exegetically impossible. It is clearly stated that the Serpent was one of the creatures that the Lord God had made.²⁰ The Serpent of this episode is nowhere identified with Satan in the Bible. The Serpent of the Garden of Eden received its due punishment for its deed immediately.²¹ That the Satan entered the serpent of the garden episode is nowhere stated in the Bible. Therefore, the *Maran Buru Bonga* and Satan equation via the serpent of the Garden of Eden to uphold the deception theory of alienation from God is an inadequate analogy to associate *Maran Buru Bonga* with the deceiver of early humankind.

The Missionaries' Unbiblical Understanding of Satan

The popular Christian understanding of Satan prevailing among Santal Christians, presumably taught by their missionaries, is mostly unbiblical, and a later development in Christian history. I cite one instance, which is taught in response to a question "Have the Santals been alienated from God?" And the response follows: He, Hor hoponko do goc'hor nutumte ar nur akan serma godetko, metak'me Maran Buru Soetantekoko sewa agu akawat'koa, ar Isorre botor banuk'takote emanteak'baric' kai losot' reko jobe akana²².

Yes, since the Santals have been worshipping in the name of the dead (persons) and since they worship the fallen angels, namely Maran Buru Satan and others, and since they have no fear of God, they wallow in the mud of various unpleasant sins. Every statement made in the above quotation is false. Santals do not worship in the name of the dead nor do they worship fallen angels. The identification of *Maran Buru Bonga* with fallen angels is malicious and frustrating. The fallen angel theory of the Christians for the origin of Satan is not found in the Bible either. Isaiah 14:12 is a taunt song by the prophet for the overthrow of Babylonian imperial power.²³ In fact, the

Old Testament did not know of any power working independently as God's adversary, 'the source of evil is religion opposed to Israel.'²⁴

In the New Testament, there is no theory of a fallen angel for the origin of Satan. In Luke 10:18 Jesus seeing Satan fall like lightning from heaven is an expression of an ecstatic vision, expressing that his power over evil dethrones the forces of evil and brings in a new age.²⁵ This passage does not, however, speak of the origin of Satan as a fallen angel. In Jude 6 and 2 Peter 2:11 there are references to rebellious angels, but they are vanquished and kept imprisoned. In Revelations 12:7-9 the defeat of the Devil and Satan with their associates, and then to be thrown down from heaven also, does not speak of the origin of Satan as a fallen angel, it merely confirms his existence in heaven. The fallen angel theory of the origin of Satan taught to the Santal Christians is extra-biblical. In this case, how damaging it would be for Christians to equate *Maran Buru Bonga* with the fallen angel Satan?

In the creation narrative of the Koran we have clear indication of a rebellious angel, who became an adversary of God found in Sura 7:11-18. Christian Preachers may easily draw some kind of analogy between *Iblis* and Satan of their faith. But why drag *Maran Buru Bonga* of the Santals' creation tradition into this analogy?

In the creation tradition of the Santals the *Maran Buru Bonga* has been shown as completely obedient to the creator God *Thakur Jiv*. As an emissary of *Thakur Jiv* to early human beings, he has performed his task with success in educating the early human beings in the basic arts of survival and how to live in communion with *Thakur Jiv*. We can assume that in subsequent human history, the creator God has continued to use him amid different situations of humankind in various ways for the welfare and survival of humankind.

If one were to draw an analogy of the *Maran Buru Bonga* with any supernatural spiritual being in the New Testament, then he can more appropriately be compared to the angel who brought the message to Joseph and to Mary²⁶ concerning the birth of Jesus, the angel who brought the message to Zachariah²⁷ of the birth of John the Baptist, or with the angel Michael who fights evil spiritual beings in heaven and drives them out of heaven²⁸. In fact, *Maran Buru Bonga* can be seen in analogy with any of the angels in the Bible intimately associated with the integrity and welfare of human beings, but in no way with the Satan of the Christian faith.

Knowledge Of Alienation From God

The alienation of humankind from God is known in the Santal tradition. For them humankind itself is responsible for this alienation. Their simple thought on alienation from God is comparable with one school of thought in the Old Testament, which says "... every imagination of the thought of his (human's) heart was only evil continually"²⁹. That humankind became alienated from God is expressed in the Santals' tradition of the devastation of the first human generation at *Khoj Kaman* in which only one pair of humans who had found favour with *Thakur Jiv* survived the devastation."³⁰

With formal literacy spreading in the Santal's land after India's independence, many more Santals could read Santali Christian literature by the 1950's. When they found that their greatest *Bonga*, *Maran Buru Bonga*, had been identified with Satan/devil/diabolos of the Christian faith in the Santali Christian hymnbooks and other literature, they protested. Subsequently the Santal Christians deleted identification of the *Maran Buru Bonga* with Satan/devil/diabolos from their subsequent editions of hymnbooks and from other writings. But this has not been able to blot out the negative impact of the *Maran Buru Bonga*-Satan equation that was preached³¹.

Bodding's Personal Theology and Impact

When Bodding equated the Santal main *bonga* to Satan, he was evidently influenced by the neighboring dominant polytheist Bengali culture. He changed the name of God in Santali from *Thakur Jiv*— meaning the spirit worthy of worship—to *Isor/Ishwar*, the polytheist Hindu name for God. Skrefsrud though, had retained *Thakur Jiv* for God even in his Bible Translation.

Santal oral tradition says that Bodding under the influence of Bengali culture, advocated banning community dancing and singing and playing of Santali musical instruments among the Santal Christians either for worship or civil ceremonies. There was no logical explanation for this cultural gatekeeping. In later years, this ban on Santali dance and Santali musical instruments, created resentment and confusion among Santal Christians, because other denominations accepted these festive dances and their musical accompaniments, as their inherited culture.

The rationale for the Lutheran Church's opposition to the Santal's natural expression and ways of worship and celebration, during Bodding's time as missionary and later, is not known and not well taken. But it had several consequences for worship and disciplinary regulations.

Worship in Santal Churches then started being accompanied by non-traditional Bengali instruments and breach the ban against use of Santal traditional drums and dance forms was severely punished.

The translation of Psalm, 150 "Praise the Lord" by playing the *Tabla*, a leather thatched drum (*Uni sarhaoepe tabla ar enec'ate*) used by Hindu idol worshippers is completely out of place in the context of the Santals. Why could the translation not have the *tumdak*, *tamak*, the Santal traditional drums instead?

This ban on ancient instruments and dance forms constituted part of a larger orthodox trend in the late Bodding's era of alienating and vilifying Santal philosophy, faith and belief. It represented a clear departure from his mentor Skrefsrud's policy of indigenizing Christianity. Skrefsrud—influenced by German romantic ideas and Norwegian ethno-nationalism—said: "I have come to Santals to preach Christianity, not to destroy their nationality". The lexical meaning of nationality includes culture also.

Conclusion

I have in this paper sought to highlight that the Satan-*Maran Buru Bonga* equation is a problematically contextualized Christian theology. It is a flawed attempt at a contextual Christian demonology based on imaginary data. Inflicting insults to others' revered deities—without finding out the interpretative facts—has been and remains unchristian and has been injurious to Christian mission among the Santals. It is arrogance and not service. This kind of contextualized Christian demonology only fans the flames of hatred and distrust already existing between tribal Christians and those of the primal faith.

To build up a harmonious human community with love and justice is the goal of the gospel. The need of the hour is to build up a contextual indigenized theology for attaining a harmonious community life in order to obliterate Christian tribal and primal tribal hostility by re-reading and re- interpreting texts and material from the influential Bodding Era.

Noter

1. A draft version of this paper was circulated at the *The Bodding Symposium 2015: Belief, Scholarship and Cultural heritage: Paul Olav Bodding and the Making of a Scandinavian-Santal Legacy*, held in Oslo, Norway on the 3–5 November, 2015. Unlike Bodding, none of the first generation Santal missionaries were educated theologians. Both Børresen and Skrefsrud were in 1877 and 1882 respectively, ordained in respectively the Danish and Norwegian state churches. Olav Hodne, *The Seed Bore Fruit*, (Kolkata, Arabinda Dey 1967): 68.
2. Paul Olav Bodding, Kuk'li Puthi, (Lucknow, Santal Mission of the Northern Churches, (1955), 41. (ed.) Santal Folk Tales, Vol I, (Oslo, Instituttet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning, 1925), 227. Goha Puthi I His, Benagaria, the Northern Evangelical Lutheran Church, (1967), 27. Timotheas Hembrom, 'Maran Buru Bonga-Satan Equation: A Theological Crime' in *Indian Journal of Theology*, Vol., 38 Issue 2, (1996) 43–54.
3. Stephen Murmu, 'Understanding the Concept of God in Santal Tradition Myth' in *Indian Journal of Theology*, Vol. 38, Issue 1, (1996) 81, 86.
4. India's first official census in 1951 placed Hindus as the majority religion with 84.1% (the number in 2017 stands at 78.355), which would have been true of the Mission era as well. See <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1951_Census_of_India> and Krishna Murthy Ponnappalli and Faujdar Ram, 'Religious Taxonomy of States and Districts in India: An Analysis Using a Standardized Index of Diversity (SID) of Religion' in IIPS Working Paper No. 2, 2010, which can be accessed here: <<http://iipsindia.org/pdf/IIPS%20Working%20Paper%20No.2.pdf>>.
5. See <<https://iskconeducationalservices.org/HoH/index.htm>>
6. Paul Olav Bodding, *Studies in Santal Medicine and Connected Folklore*, (Calcutta, The Asiatic Society, 1986, Reprint), iii, 1–2.
7. J. Troisi, *Tribal Religion: Religious Beliefs and Practices Among the Santals*, (Delhi, Manohar publication, 1978), 78. Timotheas Hembrom, *The Santals: Anthropological Theological Reflections on Santali and Biblical Creation Traditions*, (Calcutta, Punthi Pustak, 1996), 36–40.
8. Rev. A. Campbell, 'Santal Traditions' in *Indian Evangelical Review*, Vol. IX, No. 73, (1892) 1–13. The tradition can be seen in T. Hembrom, *op.cit.*, 88–94. Campbell was one of the leaders of the Scottish Free Church's Santal Mission and a friend of Skrefsrud.
9. Rev. A. Campbell, *op.cit.*, 1–13, T. Hembrom, *op.cit.*: 90ff.
10. Cf. Gen. 1: 26–27; 3:22; 11:7; 2 Kings. 22:19ff.; Is. 6:1f.; Job 1:6ff.
11. W. J. Culshaw, *Tribal Heritage: A Study of the Santal*, (London, Butterworth Press, 1956), 65–66; Stephen Murmu, *op.cit.* 86.
12. Gen. 1: 28.
13. Hembrom, *op.cit.*, 88, 107.
14. Gen. 1: 28.
15. Gen. 19:30ff.
16. Hembrom, *op.cit.*, 100.
17. Hembrom, *op.cit.* 100
18. Hembrom *op.cit.* 91.
19. Hembrom, *op.cit.* 99–101.
20. Gen. 3: 1.
21. Gen. 3: 14–15.
22. Bodding, Kukli Puthi, 21, 38.
23. Frederick L. Morialrly in Raymond E. Brown (ed.), *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*, (Bangalore, Theological Publications in India, 1968), 274.
24. Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, (London, SPCK., 1984), 238–239.
25. S. Maclean Gilmour, 'St. Luke' in George Arthur Buttrick (ed.), *Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. VIII, (New York, Abingdon Press, 1952), 189.
26. Mathew 1:20; Luke 1: 26ff.
27. Luke 1: 11.
28. Revelations 12:7ff.
29. Gen. 6:5b, J.
30. Umashankar, *Santal Sanskar Ki Ruprekha*, (Patna, Nirman Prakashan, 1944), 38 ff. Cf. Gen. 6:11ff. the flood narrative.
31. Stephen Murmu, *op.cit.*, 72–86.

