

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Baptist Review of Theology* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_brt.php

ARTICLES

	Page
BRITISH RECRUITS FOR SERAMPORE, 1800-1825 A. Christopher Smith	4
L'HYMNOLOGIE DE RUBEN SAILLENS (1855-1942) PREDICATEUR, POETE ET CHANTRE DE LA CROIX André Constant	36
A HERMENEUTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE ROLE OF WOMEN Daniel G. Lundy	55

INTERCHANGE

John S. H. Bonham and John W. Seaman	77
--------------------------------------	----

BOOK REVIEWS / BOOK NOTICES	82
------------------------------------	-----------

BOOKS RECEIVED	100
-----------------------	------------

IN THE NEXT ISSUE

JOEL ET LE CULTE
Sylvain Romerowski

THE CHANGING ROLE OF WOMEN IN FELLOWSHIP BAPTIST
CHURCHES
Daniel G. Lundy

PRAISE AND PRAXIS: DOXOLOGY AS THE CONTEXT FOR KING-
DOM MINISTRY
David G. Barker

BENJAMIN KEACH'S *THE GOSPEL MINISTER'S MAINTENANCE VIN-*
***DICATED* AND THE STATUS OF MINISTERS AMONG SEVEN-**
TEENTH-CENTURY BAPTISTS
J. Barry Vaughn

EDITORS

Editor-in-Chief:	Michael A. G. Haykin
Managing Editor:	Daniel G. Lundy
French Editor:	Pierre Constant
Editorial Assistants:	Heinz Dschankilic / Jane Lundy

EDITORIAL BOARD

James Cianca (*London Baptist Seminary*)
Pierre Constant (*L'Eglise Baptiste Montclair de Hull*)
Stephen Dempster (*Atlantic Baptist College*)
Stanley Fowler (*Central Baptist Seminary*)
Donald Garlington (*Toronto Baptist Seminary*)
Terry Giles (*Central Baptist Seminary*)
Grant Gordon (*Ontario Theological Seminary*)
Michael Haykin (*Central Baptist Seminary*)
Daniel Lundy (*Central Baptist Seminary*)
Richard Mitchell (*Central Baptist Seminary*)
Tom Nettles (*Trinity Evangelical Divinity School*)
Robert Oliver (*Old Baptist Chapel, Bradford-on-Avon*)
Leigh Powell (*Covenant Baptist Church, Toronto*)
John Seaman (*McMaster University*)
Douglas Shantz (*Trinity Western University*)

PURPOSE

The Baptist Review of Theology/La Revue Baptiste de Théologie is published semi-annually by Central Baptist Seminary. It seeks to provide a forum for theological reflection and discussion from an evangelical Baptist perspective. Views expressed in *The Baptist Review of Theology/La Revue Baptiste de Théologie* should be considered as the personal opinions of the individual authors and are not to be taken as the official perspectives or policies of Central Baptist Seminary.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Canada:	\$20.00 per annum (2 issues)
	\$36.00 for 2 years (4 issues)
	\$52.00 for 3 years (6 issues)
	\$70.00 for 4 years (8 issues)
US/ international:	Add \$2.00 per year.

Gift subscriptions are available on request.

SUBMISSIONS

Manuscripts in either English or French, editorial correspondence, and books for review, should be sent to:

Editor,
The Baptist Review of Theology / La Revue Baptiste de Théologie,
Central Baptist Seminary,
6 Gormley Industrial Avenue,
P.O. Box 28,
Gormley, Ontario, Canada
L0H 1G0

ABSTRACTS

The Baptist Review of Theology / La Revue Baptiste de Théologie is abstracted in *Religious and Theological Abstracts*, *New Testament Abstracts*, and *Old Testament Abstracts*.

BACK ISSUES

A limited number of back issues of the two previous issues are available. Please specify either Fall 1991 or Spring 1992. The cost per issue is \$10.00.

COPYRIGHT

The Baptist Review of Theology/La Revue Baptiste de Théologie©1992, Central Baptist Seminary. Unauthorized reproduction by any means, except for brief quotations for the purpose of review or scholarship, is prohibited. Address reproduction requests to the editor.

INTERCHANGE

Correspondence received in response to articles may be selected by the editor, with the permission of the correspondent, to appear in a printed exchange with the author of the article.

BRITISH RECRUITS FOR SERAMPORE, 1800-1825

A. Christopher Smith

1. Introduction

Missiology may be considered as the scientific and spiritual discipline of servant-leadership under the lordship of Christ who leads his church to cross frontiers, for the eternal welfare of others.¹ Thus one may gain light on the missiological significance and thought of William Carey (1761-1834), Joshua Marshman (1768-1837) and William Ward (1769-1823), the Serampore Trio, by considering how they functioned as *mission leaders*.

This paper argues that it *cannot* be taken for granted that the Serampore Trio *were* able to deploy the young men sent out to Bengal by the Baptist Missionary Society (BMS). In view of that, the authority and right that Carey and his colleagues had to act as mission leaders must be identified first. The focus here is on their evolution as managers of a mission enterprise which had to contend with a host of personnel problems.² We will review the increasingly awkward relationship between the Trio and the BMS committee at home — which I will call "the home Committee" for the sake of convenience. From this, one can perceive how the triumvirate's problems as personnel-managers were to a large extent the product of forces beyond their own control. Thus although the Trio *were in a position* to deploy the young missionaries entrusted to their supervision, it will be seen that they reached a point of being quite unable to do so in many cases.

This leads to another set of questions. "Of what use were the junior mission-personnel who were sent out to Bengal between 1800 and 1820?" Were they worth the cost involved? Not just the cost of shipping them overseas, but the cost to which the Trio were put as they sought to deploy them responsibly and sympathetically in the Master's mission. What effect did the junior missionaries' uprising have on mission-extension? What impact did their actions have on all involved in the mission enterprise founded by Carey and his colleagues at Serampore? From such reflection, one may be able to say something about the influence that Baptist missionaries might have had in Pre-Victorian India, if only the newcomers had been willing to let their apostolic elders direct their paths for the common good.

There is no space here to consider the benefits derived from the Trio's successful deployment of Indian and Indo-British Christians as BMS personnel. Similarly, attention will have to be given in another essay to the viewpoint of those at the receiving end of the mission. That is why little will be said *directly* about the influence of the modern British missionary movement in India.³ Rather, Serampore's experience in the early nineteenth

century is treated as an example of how junior missionaries can enhance or diminish a mission's effective influence in a given country, by taking the Serampore experience in the early nineteenth century as an example. This may be of some interest to those authorized to direct mission enterprises. Perhaps it will be of value to those who do not have the advantage of twenty or more years' experience in the *missio Dei*.

2. "By What Authority?" *The Trio as Mission Leaders*

The Trio's evolution — or devolution, depending on one's perspective — as mission leaders calls for attention first. Only then can one grasp the significance of the Juniors' *unwillingness* to be deployed without causing a considerable commotion. For reasons of space, the presentation of this first section will be reduced to skeletal form. All that will be offered is the gist of an answer to the following question: What right, authority, and responsibility did the Trio have to act as executive "personnel managers", of the Serampore Mission in Bengal on behalf of the BMS and British Baptists? First for consideration is the changing managerial framework for leader-follower relationships between 1800 and 1811. This will be followed by the different set of circumstances which affected personnel interaction between 1812 and 1827.⁴

i. Serampore Mission's Rules and Regulations, 1800-1811

The Serampore mission-community was established in 1800 with the clear understanding that all its members were to function as equal partners in managing its affairs.⁵ Such a democratic arrangement did not meet with the home Committee's approval and eventually was found by the Trio to be rather impractical.⁶ After several new missionaries arrived between 1803 and 1805, the Trio overhauled their existing rules and produced various regulations, including the 1805 "Form of Agreement."⁷ This laid down, henceforth, that experience would be the determining factor in management decision-making at the Bengali end of the BMS' operations.⁸ Newcomers consequently would be expected to serve a time of something equivalent to probationership.⁹

From early on, however, junior missionaries with different sets of priorities cavilled at living in such a close community-of-commitment, and the Trio were soon put under pressure to adopt a different arrangement.¹⁰ This came to pass in 1807 when it was agreed, first, that missionaries would live communally only by their own consent; second, that the Trio would "act for the General Mission" in Bengal, "subject to the revision of the [full missionary] body" at their annual meeting; and third, that no one could become a member of "the Associated Body" of Serampore missionaries except by his being elected by the other Serampore missionaries and this "signified to him in a written document signed by us."¹¹ That, however, was

not enough to secure the peace, for in the latter half of 1808 the Trio had to appeal to the home Committee for help in controlling considerable unrest on the part of their junior brethren.¹² This, Andrew Fuller (1754-1815), as Secretary of the Society, provided very firmly by decreeing that the management of the Baptist Mission in Bengal was to be vested in Carey, Marshman, and Ward for their lifetime, and by warning that any juniors failing to cooperate with them would meet with severe sanctions.¹³ Nonetheless, the Trio could not prevent themselves from fearing that the Mission would become "a speedy wreck after we are laid in the dust," if suitable successors did not come forward and get trained in time.¹⁴

ii. The Trio's Relationship to the Home Committee, 1812-1827

Until 1815, the Trio had enjoyed a fairly informal relationship of delegated responsibility with the BMS leaders in Britain, thanks to the faithfully forceful leadership of Fuller.¹⁵ Yet signs of change began to appear on the horizon in 1812 after nineteen men, who belonged to another generation, were added to the home Committee.¹⁶ Thus Fuller wrote to Carey and his colleagues with a heavy heart, warning them to "beware of a speechifying committee" not very disposed to prayer and brotherly consultation, but marked by bureaucratic "fondness for multiplying rules and regulations."¹⁷

After Fuller's death in 1815, the Serampore mission-leaders found that they could no longer count on staunch support from the BMS Committee as a whole, and junior mission-personnel knew it.¹⁸ So although the Trio were appointed as "the Corresponding Committee" of the BMS in Bengal on the last day of 1816, nothing could hide the fact that their managerial independence was under threat.¹⁹ The process of institutionalization was inexorably under way, much to the Serampore leaders' discomfort.²⁰ With that in mind, a statement was drawn up in 1822 which stated precisely how the Trio and the home leadership would interact in future. However, it was not enough to defuse the explosive mixture of irreconcilable differences in management procedures, and a complete rupture occurred between the Serampore pioneers and the second-generation leadership of the Society in 1827.²¹

In all this, grievous harm was done to the Trio, for new arrivals — up to thirty years younger than them — were able, in their short-sightedness, to take advantage of the estrangement between their seniors in Britain and Bengal, to the great loss of the whole Baptist mission-cause in South and South-East Asia. Nevertheless, Carey and his colleagues did not diminish in personal stature as they passed through such "woes." Instead, they matured through the long, drawn-out conflict and emerged as bigger men, able to exercise an unusual variety of leadership roles within the kingdom of God.

iii. The Trio's Leadership Roles in the Church-on-Mission

Carey, Marshman, and Ward excelled in the way they functioned as interdependent members of a close-knit team, yet Carey was ever acknowledged as *primus inter pares*.²² That was quite proper because he was the BMS' trail-blazer, a pioneer in *many* respects, who made it possible for others to reap where he had sown so painstakingly.²³ He was a provider of mission resources who enabled others to build on a good foundation. Driven by a dynamic, Anabaptist sense of first-generation "sent-ness" (*Sendungsbewusstsein*), he was the Serampore Mission's chief seer, prophet, reconciler, and apostle.²⁴ As such, he stood out "head and shoulders" above the younger missionaries, even though he was only 5 ft. 4 in. tall.²⁵

In him, more than in any other Baptist of the time, apostolicity somewhat akin to the Apostle Paul's developed side-by-side with patriarchal qualities.²⁶ So much so that none less than John Newton declared in the 1790's: "I look up to such a man with reverence. He is more to me than Bishop or Archbishop; he is an apostle."²⁷ With that, Ward concurred, for Carey was one who had passed through tough apprenticeships and deep waters to become an effective ambassador of Christ in pre-Victorian India, and a much-sought-after consultant in many spheres of life.²⁸ One who, among other things, could appeal justly as professor, senior pastor, field-director, and employer-trustee, if need be, to his younger brethren, though without ever "lording it" over them.²⁹

No doubt, Carey's achievements were due in part to his good fortune in having such first-rate colleagues as Marshman and Ward, who were seven and eight years younger than himself respectively, and complemented him admirably. These two functioned pre-eminently as administrators, strategists, and project-managers of the Serampore Mission and carried out some significant missiological tasks.³⁰ Because of their back-up, Carey was ever the gracious patriarch, with whom very few even of the Juniors quarreled directly; *their* animus was rather against the administrators — Marshman in particular, and Ward to a lesser extent. Through it all, and in spite of all temperamental differences, there existed a bond within the Trio which only death could change.³¹ No one was allowed to deprive them of that unity, which grew with time and enabled them to function as the spearhead of a mission which sought to overcome the forces of darkness with the light of Christ.

3. "Of What Use?" The Trio's Personnel Problems

Before turning to the question of what happened when the Trio sought to deploy the junior missionaries, one must consider what they thought about securing further young reinforcements — a question which proved to be a very thorny one for over twenty years.

i. Ambivalence about the Desirability of New Missionary Recruits

John Fountain (d. 1800) was Carey's first British missionary-assistant. For his companionship "the consecrated cobbler" was most grateful, with the result that he wrote shortly after his arrival to his bosom-friend, the pastor Samuel Pearce (1766-1799):

The sending out [of] more missionaries ... appears to me of so much importance, that I dread the thoughts of its being neglected much longer. We are too few, and though I have written already to brother F[uller] on that head; yet I must again intreat [*sic*] that this very important thing may not be put off ... Pray send more; one, or two, or three in a year, as you can; but let them be men of a missionary spirit.³²

Fountain was a zealous soul, but his frequently indiscrete remarks about the East India Company alarmed Fuller to such an extent that he trembled over a possible backlash from the authorities.³³ This simply highlighted the importance of scrutinizing a mission-candidate's character. Try as the BMS might to send Carey new colleagues, they had to record in 1797 that there was "either a want of suitable persons who are willing to go,"³⁴ or insurmountable difficulties in the way of sending them. Fortunately, respite came two years later, when Marshman and Ward were accepted and sent out with Daniel Brunson and William Grant to collaborate with Carey.

After a high mortality-rate had made its mark among the new arrivals, the Trio requested the Society to step up its efforts in providing replacements at least.³⁵ These, the new Trio felt, should be "thoroughly tried" in the Serampore mission-community before being deployed further afield in such a way that "the older hands" would be freed to get on with itinerant evangelism.³⁶ Thankfully, help arrived by 1804 when five new recruits and Carey's eldest son, Felix, augmented the missionary band.³⁷ But it was not long before one of them, John Chamberlain (1777-1821), stirred up great trouble by stubbornly refusing to cooperate, with the result that the Trio requested the BMS *not* to send out any more missionaries until further notice.³⁸ This request was honoured until the Serampore missionaries revoked it with a letter in 1805, stipulating the sort of personnel they were now willing to receive.³⁹

Then new factors came into play. In 1806, Carey and his colleagues began to think that a door might be opening up for the Gospel in Burma, western China, and various Himalayan kingdoms; so they put out an open appeal for reinforcements.⁴⁰ Also in their minds was concern about the permanence of the work, particularly in terms of "the translation and other leading objects."⁴¹ Two or three understudies therefore were sought from home, so long as they were already competent in Hebrew, Greek and Latin, and had been "thoroughly tried as to personal religion, and amiableness of character."⁴²

This was how the Trio began to oscillate when they thought of managing

new missionaries raised up by the BMS. Of course, the work demanded more labourers, but only the most cooperative, and not just gifted, candidates were desirable.⁴³ Otherwise, it would be better, in the long run, if only a few were sent out. Besides, there was only a limited number of out-stations for junior brethren of the non-pioneering type to take over.⁴⁴

Because of opposition from British authorities in Bengal between 1806 and 1813, the Trio set their sights on harvest-fields elsewhere in Asia.⁴⁵ Their awareness of the magnitude and potential of this task grew through time until a clarion call rang out from them in 1809: "let us lengthen our cords and strengthen our stakes, for we shall break forth on the right and on the left, and shall not be put to shame."⁴⁶ This was a call which echoed the faithful optimism of Carey's May 1792 mission-summons. However, the trumpet ere long put out another sound which confused the home Committee, as Fuller complained in a letter of January 1811, which reflected the slowness of trans-oceanic mail then.

We have been much at a loss what to do from the different and opposite nature of your requests. For two or three years past the purport of your letters has been. Send us no more missionaries unless it be one or two linguists for Serampore. Now bro. Carey writes that whoever is sent over must immediately go to some new station, and not stop at Calcutta or Serampore.... Several who might have been medium characters, and useful in some stations in consequence of your first intimations were advised to accept...invitations in England, and have done so. Lawson and Johns were the only two whom we considered as suited to the neighbourhood of Serampore or Calcutta, and these are not linguists.⁴⁷

This meant that the candidate-selection-process had become very problematic, as events proved, particularly in the case of William Johns (1771-1845).

Worse was to follow. After much frustration in attempting to service Serampore with additional manpower, the BMS had been relieved to accept the applications of some promising young men: first, Carey's nephew, Eustace Carey (1761-1855), and William Yates (1792-1845), who were sent out as missionaries in 1814 and 1815 respectively, and then W. H. Pearce (1794-1840), son of Carey's late friend, Samuel Pearce, and James Penney (d. 1839), two years later.⁴⁸ These arrived and appeared to settle in satisfactorily, but great disappointment was not far away, for by the end of 1817 the arrivals of the last four years separated from the Trio and set up their own rival establishment in Calcutta.⁴⁹ This secession was felt all the more because the Juniors chose to settle down in colonial Calcutta, thereby ignoring the calls on their energies from open, unworked fields of opportunity elsewhere. Evidently they were not interested in the Trio's challenging plans for mission advance; all of which greatly discouraged Carey and his colleagues, making them wonder when and how trustworthy men would ever step into the breach.⁵⁰

As it happened, Ward was able, while on furlough in Britain in 1821, to secure the services of John Mack (1797-1845) who proved to be all that the Trio could have desired as a talented and utterly faithful co-worker.⁵¹ He was the only really satisfactory recruit that the Trio managed to enlist in a period of more than twenty years. Of all those sent out under the BMS' initiative in that time, Joshua Rowe (d.1823) was the only one who did not cause his seniors considerable heartache, though even he took some time to settle down and become a missionary of whom they could be proud.⁵² All of which must have perplexed the Serampore mission-leaders, for Providence granted them little substantial joy in their search for personnel who were needed so much.

Yet the Trio still found ways to establish a series of mission-stations throughout North India. This was possible due to their obtaining evangelistic workers from the church they established in Calcutta, and through the witness of some of the missionaries who had arrived in the 1800's. Between 1800 and 1820, they thus secured the services of fourteen Europeans converted in India, (some from military background), and as many Indian believers, which may have more than compensated for the immediate losses and disappointments caused by the most refractory personnel sent out in the 1810's.⁵³

ii. Altercations over the Settlement of Junior Missionaries

Lest it be thought that the Trio were prejudiced against the suitability of new personnel valedicted from England, even before the latter had had a chance to prove their worth, it should be noted that Carey and his colleagues went to great lengths to accommodate to their wishes. The point is that the Serampore seniors had every reason to seek the welfare and happiness of their young associates, because the Mission's future appeared to depend on their successful integration into its operations. However, for a variety of reasons, once the Juniors had been in Serampore enough months to become familiar with their elders, disaffection and misunderstanding developed, and the senior brethren were put on the defensive. This in turn resulted in the junior mission personnel resorting to some very regrettable, high-handed actions, the most significant of which will be referred to in the ensuing series of case-studies.

The junior missionaries sent out at different times by the BMS arrived in Bengal with their outlook influenced by the home Committee members of their day. They can be classified consequently into two broad groups: namely, those who left England *before* the BMS Committee was enlarged in 1811, and those who were appointed to missionary service *after* the event, after which Fuller found it more difficult to "go to bat" successfully for the Serampore Trio. For the sake of convenience, these will now be referred to as "the 1800s group" and "the 1810s group."⁵⁴

Members of "the 1800s group" were accepted by the BMS between

1803 and 1806. These were John Biss (d. 1807), John Chamberlain (d. 1821), Richard Mardon (d. 1812), William Moore (d. 1859), Joshua Rowe, James Chater, and William Robinson (1784-1853), all of whom were at least sixteen years younger than Carey. "The 1810's group" was accepted by the BMS between 1812 and 1818, and included William Johns, John Lawson (d. 1825), Eustace Carey, William Yates, William H. Pearce, James Penney, and William Adam, all of whom were between twenty and thirty years younger than Carey.

The Trio found it well-nigh impossible to manage the members of "the 1810s group," in contrast with those who came out in the previous decade and who agreed to toe the line after Fuller asserted his full authority. Carey later explained the basic difference in attitude between the two groups in late years as follows, and it should be remembered that he was highly respected by nearly all BMS personnel for his unswerving role as reconciler and peace-maker:

Before brother Fuller's death the junior brethren who separated from us came out. I do not say they were commissioned by the Society, as a body, to act the part of spies on our conduct, because this has been disavowed by the Society. Yet there is a strong impression on my mind whether true or not, I will not take upon me to say, that there was an understanding between them and some members of the society considered individually; and that they did, in that sense, come as spies upon our conduct.⁵⁵

In order to identify the root causes of the altercations and separation which occurred between the Trio and their younger brethren, a representative selection of case-studies follows, in chronological order.

(a) John Chamberlain: a highly-independent, aggressive type of pioneer missionary.

John Chamberlain (1777-1821), more than any of his contemporaries, revolted against the Trio and set the ball of opposition rolling against them. He began as a Northamptonshire plough-boy, noted from adolescence more for his "force of character" than anything else.⁵⁶ Of him, one of the early members of the BMS home Committee is reported as writing this:

Dr. Ryland acknowledged that he had not had under his care any one who had displayed so much ardour, or [who had] acquired learning with so much facility... But Chamberlain being already deeply imbued with a missionary spirit, and a total stranger to discipline, was with difficulty restrained within the sober limits of college rules.⁵⁷

Shortly after arriving in Bengal in 1803, he made it very obvious that he was

not going to fall into line with the Trio's ways of prioritizing and strategizing, notwithstanding his great lack of missionary experience. In due course he became known as a most contentious person, with whom "scarce a European, or even a native brother can live..."⁵⁸ True, he was a man of deep devotion and no little linguistic ability, but he did not have the sense to refrain from his tendency to dictate to his elders.⁵⁹ Indeed, he so exasperated Carey and his colleagues by the way he thwarted them at every step, that in the end they had to make him "immediately dependent" on the home Committee, under Fuller's express supervision.⁶⁰ They had done everything responsibly within their power to settle him in a situation in which he could exercise his considerable energies creatively, but all to no avail.⁶¹

Chamberlain thus turned out to be a very independent sort of missionary who fitted best in pioneer mission situations at a distance from Serampore. He was in charge of the mission station at Katwa until 1810, when he was transferred far up the Ganges river-system to Agra, not far from Delhi, in Hindustan. That was after his first two wives died and he married his third.⁶² In Agra he ran a school, translated the New Testament into several languages, and pursued a form of ministry in which he was particularly interested: that of evangelizing British soldiers in nearby military cantonments.⁶³ But the way he went about it so incensed the authorities that he was ordered to leave Agra post-haste.⁶⁴ Further labours followed in the Delhi area, but Britishers who had no time for anyone associated with the Baptist mission saw to it that he was expelled from there also.⁶⁵ So 1815 found him back at the Serampore base. From there, he moved on to do a notable work at Monghyr, the third Gangetic town in which he sojourned for a number of years. By then, however, the conflicts of the past had begun to take their toll on his health, and he died at sea, on his way home in 1821, while attempting to rebuild his worn-out constitution. He died as one who had stood up to everyone in his path, no matter what the price.

(b) William Robinson: a "John Mark" who struggled and suffered much before proving his worth.

By way of contrast, William Robinson (1784-1853) was not at all cut out to be a rugged pioneer-missionary. Born in Olney, near Carey's childhood home, he too was a shoemaker by trade. With John Sutcliff as his pastor, he was able to struggle through many difficulties until the BMS accepted him in 1806.⁶⁶ Like other Baptist missionaries, he sailed from England without the permission of the East India Company, but he had the misfortune of arriving in Bengal just after the Vellore Mutiny. The result was that the authorities immediately set about deporting him, and it was only with the greatest of difficulty that the Trio and their friends managed to prevent it.⁶⁷

After a year or more in the refuge of Danish territory at Serampore, he and his wife went to assist Chamberlain at Katwa. But the two hot-tempered juniors clashed and within three months had to part company.⁶⁸ Thus, in

1808, the Trio were faced with the unexpected question of how to re-deploy him. Their answer was to persuade him to try to start a work in Bootan, a mountainous kingdom in the North, beyond the rule of the East India Company. It had long been in Carey's sights, yet it turned out to be one of the biggest failures of the Serampore Mission, for during a three-year period, six abortive attempts were made to establish a station there. Robinson felt that the country was far too difficult, while the Trio wondered how much of an effort he really made. In the end they had to abandon the idea.⁶⁹ Patience ran thin and Robinson rebelled, warning the Trio that a split would occur if they were not more careful in the way they handled their junior brethren. However, he was led to repent of his conduct, and the conflict was allowed to evaporate without disciplinary action being taken against him.⁷⁰

Robinson consequently "returned to square one" after going through all sorts of fruitless tribulation during his first five years as a missionary. Quite a discussion followed over what his next move should be, and in the end he consented to sailing over to Java, to try pioneering once again. Perhaps it was just as well that he did so, for soon after leaving Bengal in 1813 with his second wife, an order was issued by the Governor-General's Cabinet for his deportation to England.⁷¹ This he providentially escaped.

In far-off Java, he laboured with hope and some acceptance for twelve years, once again evading anti-mission authorities who wanted him to be sent home. In addition, his wife died, and Batavian fever eventually reduced him to the point of suffering "a mental breakdown."⁷² In order to convalesce, he returned to Calcutta, where Carey and Marshman graciously resigned from being co-pastors of Lal Bazar Baptist Church, in favour of his being appointed pastor.⁷³ There he ministered well for thirteen years and so worked at his relationship with his seniors that he became "one of Carey's most prized coadjutors" (or colleagues).⁷⁴ However, further deaths struck his family, and it was with his fifth wife that he responded to a great call for help at Dacca in 1838. There he gave himself unstintingly to grass-roots evangelism until he died in 1853, the last survivor of the Serampore missionaries.⁷⁵ Thus he "finished the race" honourably, as one of "the 1800's group" who typically created something of a rumpus in the beginning, but eventually came to terms with reality, mellowed, and ended up being appreciated by the apostolic leadership.

(c) William Johns: the instigator of a new order of opposition against the Trio.

To William Johns goes the invidious distinction of initiating an uprising by "the 1810's group," the likes of which shocked Carey and his cohorts. A medical doctor, he was accepted by the BMS and sent out to Bengal in 1812, in spite of the Trio's personnel policies, and in spite of Fuller's personal view that he would probably not fit in well at Serampore.⁷⁶ According to Carey, he should have been told quite categorically before sailing, not to expect to

settle at Serampore. Failure by the BMS at that point produced "the original cause of all the difficulty" that the Trio had with him.⁷⁷

Johns travelled with Lawson to Bengal via America, because he did not have a licence from the East India Company's Board of Directors to reside in India. Now, such a state of affairs was nothing new in the BMS, but on this occasion the Baptists got themselves into a no-win situation.⁷⁸ Since Marshman was the Trio's public-relations officer, the task fell on him to try to secure permission for the two new arrivals to remain in Bengal; but the task was anything other than straightforward. In the event, he miscalculated. Certain contrivances were exposed, and Lawson could only be retained at the expense of Johns' being shipped back to Britain.⁷⁹ Here, however, studies of the Serampore missionaries have failed to point out that Johns himself played a considerable part in assuring Marshman of how to handle his case; so full blame for Johns' deportation should not be laid at Marshman's feet.⁸⁰

Johns proved to be the only BMS missionary in Serampore's experience to go through such an unfortunate experience. To the dismay of the Trio he utterly refused to "make this providence the means of his more eminently serving the cause at home, than he could have done in India."⁸¹ Instead, it became "a root of bitterness" in him, for on returning to England "he sowed the dragon's teeth of suspicion of Marshman" which resulted in a harvest of ill-will towards the senior brethren in subsequent years.⁸² Highly injudicious talk consequently prejudiced missionary candidates against Marshman thereafter, and the devil was given an unprecedented opportunity to create discord which sapped so much of the Serampore leaders' energies, and caused endless distress.⁸³ For the junior personnel sent out by the BMS after 1813 were well aware that Carey and his colleagues did not find it easy to keep everyone happy in the fluctuating circumstances of the day.⁸⁴ They also knew that men like Marshman had shown themselves to be quite fallible in certain tricky administrative matters; added to which, questioning was mounting up in the home Committee which did not put the Trio in good light. These were ominous signs that a new period of mission relations was beginning among the Baptists, in which the Trio would find themselves openly resisted, attacked, and vilified in a quite unprecedented manner by those who were meant to be their brethren.

(d) Eustace Carey: the "bête noire" who brought the Trio to the brink of despair.

In the last three case-studies, different "roots of contention" have been identified. It has been seen how personality clashes were common among the strong-willed characters of "the 1800's group" and those who followed. Evidence has also been brought forward of junior personnel who lacked the strength necessary for launching out into brave new pioneer ministries. Many would have preferred to stay in the European security of Serampore, as Marshman and Ward had been able to do. And then, when one of the Trio

erred in judgment, those who had far less experience of the complications involved in keeping the mission going were quite merciless, venting their pent-up frustrations with daring abandon.⁸⁵

Unfortunately, all this came to a head under the captaincy of Carey's nephew, Eustace (1791-1855). He was accepted by the BMS in 1814, and was followed by William Yates a year later, but of both, Carey had to write sadly ere long: they "brought out a superabundance" of "such sentiments of personal importance and independence as tend to promote a system of Segregation."⁸⁶ For starters, they found it impossible to cope with the Trio's form of community life. Then they began to speak very disparagingly, and at times maliciously, about some of the Indian and Indo-British evangelistic workers appointed by the BMS several years earlier than themselves.⁸⁷ In an endeavour to restrain the rising swell of opposition caused by the Juniors' "high notions of independence," the Trio accordingly conceded "everything they required without material injury to the general cause" of the Mission; but this brought little relief.⁸⁸ For Eustace had no intention of going to the Indonesian isle of Amboyna, in deference to his famous uncle's wishes.⁸⁹ So Carey and Ward stepped aside, in September 1815, in order to allow Eustace and Lawson to become resident co-pastors of the Lal Bazar church.⁹⁰

That in turn gave the Juniors the advantage of a greater degree of independence, and before long they seduced Yates, W. H. Pearce, Adam, and Penney from Serampore. To consolidate their gains, they then proceeded to form a separate "Auxiliary Mission Society" (to the BMS) under their leaders' noses by 1817, in the very church of which Carey and Ward were senior pastors!⁹¹ This, Carey wrote, was "the first throwing down of the gauntlet of opposition to us," for it was carried out quite brazenly with "interminable hostility" against Marshman in particular.⁹² Yet even there they did not stop, for they sought to turn the church against the Trio. They tampered with its finances, and when challenged they and their families seceded. Eustace "renounced the pastoral office," and a separate place of worship was set up in Calcutta.⁹³ Such schism was rendered even more deplorable by the Juniors' subsequent step, which was to set about duplicating in Calcutta all that Serampore was already providing a few miles away, to the neglect of vast areas of human habitation elsewhere in the subcontinent.⁹⁴ But even that was not the end of their insurrection, for a few years later they started litigation against their seniors over the will of a recently deceased friend of Serampore, even though the Trio had acted transparently and circumspectly, as honourable Christian gentlemen do.⁹⁵ All this was furthered by a series of imprecations, censures, and attempts to impugn the Trio before the BMS, with such a vehemence that stunned Carey and his colleagues.⁹⁶ One would have thought that the Juniors had forgotten that their own expenditure of mission funds — for which the Serampore Seniors were still legally accountable — so far exceeded that of the Trio by 1820 as to put the Mission in imminent danger of financial collapse!⁹⁷

In the face of such calumny and virtual anarchy, the Trio were quite

thunderstruck, but what made it all so much worse was the way in which the Juniors were throwing the whole Baptist enterprise into public disrepute. Yet there was no home Committee that the mission leaders might turn to now for assistance, and they had to weather the storm as best as they could until death and ill-health removed the ringleaders from Bengal.⁹⁸ Consequently, it is not too difficult to posit that the Baptist Mission would have been much more successful in North India and South-East Asia if the likes of Eustace and Lawson had restrained their burning antipathy against Marshman and replaced it with the sort of self-denying grace that so characterized Carey. At the very least, they could have done it for the sake of the advance of God's kingdom! But short-sighted self-interest was not uprooted, and the work established at such cost by the Trio came perilously close to being wrecked, even betrayed, from within. The ultimate injustice! Perhaps this was the price that has to be paid for attempting great things in God's will.

With that, it would be good to leave the whole fiasco. But one last case calls for attention, a case which has the merit of illustrating the big-souled manner in which Carey and his colleagues sought to act and react, even when under the most blatant and crass forms of pressure.

(e) James Penney: "a law unto himself" in financial matters.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, BMS personnel leaving England had to almost take it for granted that a tough life of pioneering awaited them. This was confirmed soon after they arrived in Bengal, where only the simplest sort of living could free the basic funds necessary for mission advance.⁹⁹ It happened, however, that most of the so-called reinforcements sent out after Robinson had very different ideas about stewardship and disciplined prioritizing.

Perhaps much could have been said on both sides of the question, but it is a fact that financial issues constituted one of the strongest and deepest roots in the Juniors' rebellion. Their contestation of Mrs. Bryant's will was scandal enough, but the ultimate case centred on James Penney (d. 1839), who was accepted by the BMS in 1817.¹⁰⁰

Soon after arriving at Serampore, he proved extremely difficult to please, and the Trio had to go to unusual lengths to settle him down comfortably.¹⁰¹ They had to ask Peacock, one of their Indo-British converts, to relinquish his post as headmaster of the school supported by their Benevolent Institution in Calcutta, to make way for Penney, even though he himself was doing a first-class job. Penney was, in addition, allowed to draw a higher allowance than any other missionary. Yet far from responding to the Trio with due appreciation, he simply became all the more refractory. This meant protesting against the Trio and insisting on setting up his own income-yielding educational institution on the side, even though the school he was already responsible for demanded *all* his time. Apart from other considerations, this put the Mission in a publicly embarrassing position,

since the school's funding came from people in all ranks of society who respected the Trio; thus Penney's seniors sought to direct him towards a more reasonable course of action — though to no avail.¹⁰² They then sought to pour oil on the troubled waters, for the sake of their good name in Bengal, by giving him a most generous choice; but that too was treated with disdain. Their overtures fell on deaf ears and resulted in Penney inducing his junior colleagues to turn on Carey and his cohorts with all sorts of slander.¹⁰³

Deployment of junior mission-personnel by the Trio was consequently an impossibility when the latter could not even suggest what Christian propriety required in relationships or mission extension without receiving much abuse. Then too, there was the reproach of a divided Baptist witness to bear, as well as the crippling effects on the overall mission caused by the duplication of costly establishments. One can therefore understand why the Trio came to the conclusion that "the 1810's group" was draining the Mission in North India of its life-blood.¹⁰⁴ These junior personnel achieved precious little by huddling together in Calcutta instead of bearing the Gospel far and wide.¹⁰⁵ Besides, the Trio already had their hands full in trying to produce the funds so urgently needed for the continuation of their many mission-stations and other enterprises. They simply did not have the time or desire to be full-time fire-fighters or trouble-shooters, just because their brethren had much more than missions on their agenda. On more than one occasion the mission leaders simply had to place their hands over their mouths, determining that if many of their associates insisted on counter-productive behaviour, then they themselves would not be counted in their number. In this endeavour, the Trio may be judged to have been remarkably successful in the short-term considering the number of obstructions that their young friends put in their way.

4. "With What Result?" The Outcome of the Juniors' Uprising

The repudiation of the Serampore Trio as mission personnel-managers by "the 1810s group" in particular had two major consequences so far as the Baptist mission in Bengal and beyond was concerned. On the one hand, it led the Seniors to seek an alternative to the junior personnel (from England) for securing the Mission's prosperity, so far as it was in their power to do so. On the other hand, it resulted in the dissenting missionaries in North India losing a golden opportunity to make a telling, evangelical impact far and wide, at the very time when many Hindus were susceptible to the advances of a faith with vitality and realistic assurances of salvation.¹⁰⁶

i. An Alternative to the Juniors for Securing the Mission's Future

A comparison of the Apostle Paul's life-ministry with that of the Serampore Trio in the pre-Victorian third of the nineteenth century provides ample justification for saluting Carey and his cohorts as men of apostolic character

and consequence. Not least was this evident in their commitment to "suffer any injustice" personally rather than allow the Redeemer's cause in India to come into disrepute.¹⁰⁷ This accounts for the numerous occasions when they granted considerable concessions to the Juniors, for the sake of prudence rather than cherished strategy, in order to preserve their enterprise from being speedily ruined.¹⁰⁸ They chose to bend over backwards — at least in their own eyes — sacrificed their own comforts, and readily granted to the inexperienced what they themselves would never enjoy, even though it was they, and not the young ones, who had had to "bear the heat and burden of the day" with scarce any let-up. From most accounts, it would appear that this was done with Christian grace and in the hope that fraternal relationships would be re-established, expecting no more than the estimation of mission-advance as the *summum bonum*.

Perhaps the Trio felt it necessary to act with a measure of magnanimity because they realized that times were changing, particularly after Fuller passed on to his heavenly reward in 1815. The personnel sent out by the BMS now were rarely endowed with the physique or the perspective of the courageous pioneer. Thus all sorts of allowances *had* to be made, and that ungrudgingly, for in many senses most of the newcomers were "weaker brethren."¹⁰⁹ Furthermore, the Serampore Mission was going through a process of institutional evolution which made new demands and rendered former arrangements obsolete or outmoded. This called for managerial readjustments which did not permit the Trio to turn the clock back to "the good old days" of the early 1800s, or whenever they genuinely could be found.

"The 1810s group" can be said, therefore, to have featured in the history of the BMS as second-generation missionaries — of rather disappointing quality, in the judgment of the Trio. They were younger than Carey's oldest sons, Felix and William Jr., and built, at best, on others' foundations. They were not ready for the hardships of trail-blazing and did not expect to have to earn their own living, let alone financially undergird others, as the Trio did.¹¹⁰ So it is hardly surprising that they should have been regarded eventually as something of a liability, or worse.¹¹¹

Because of that, it can be argued that the Trio reached the point, within several years of Fuller's death, where they no longer expected that the BMS would send out any stalwart personnel to help them on with their great work. Instead, the elder missionaries had become accustomed to the development that new arrivals came with little intention of knuckling under or getting down to formidable spells of back-breaking spade-work. This was exacerbated by the fact that the "1810ers" were hand-in-glove with the post-Fuller régime back home, to whom the Trio would not surrender management of their own Bengali operations, on almost any account.¹¹² Consequently, Carey and his colleagues had to look elsewhere for men willing to undertake basic evangelism in the villages and interior of India. They found small numbers of these in the young churches already established in Bengal.

Such an avenue was altogether consistent with their mission principles,

anyway, regardless of the expediency of the measure.¹¹³ When the Trio estimated the cost of getting a British missionary out to India, and of training him to do a worthwhile job, it was patently clear that it was much more cost-effective to raise up "native witnesses" and to enlist the services of Europeans converted to Christ in India.¹¹⁴ Yet how much more obvious was the wisdom of such a course of action when one considered the amount of trouble caused by the British "elect"! There was also the fact that the Seniors had no hope of BMS candidates ever carrying Serampore's good work forward. Thus they decided to establish a minister-training college at Serampore in order to provide their Mission with a certain permanence which would be unaffected by their deaths.¹¹⁵ This seemed to be the only step to take if they were to compensate for the ways in which many British Baptists had been failing them. Also in their minds was the prospective advantage that an "Indian Church" might come into being sooner, without being overly dependent on the presence and guidance of numerous overseas personnel.¹¹⁶ Beyond that, Carey and his faithful colleagues could do no more than leave the outcome of their mission enterprise in the hands of Providence.

ii. A Golden Opportunity Missed for Making a Significant Impact in India

One might well ask whether there had been much point in the BMS sending new personnel out to Bengal between 1800 and 1820. The answer is one that only eternity will disclose. However, some things in general are clear. For instance, it is a fact that the members of "the 1800s group" forsook most of the securities of a relatively comfortable life in Calcutta, and largely gave themselves to establishing centres of Gospel witness in what was, to evangelicals, virgin territory. That was very much in contrast to "the 1810s group," who did not have to reckon with the prohibitive sanctions which prevailed before the altering of the East India Company's Charter in 1813.¹¹⁷ "The 1810ers" consequently felt freer to throw their weight around and to play the Trio off against the home Committee, with the disastrous results outlined above. So far as deployment was concerned, they simply took the law into their own hands and ended up at the close of their short terms in Bengal with little to show for it. Regrettably, one of their chief pastimes was thwarting their seniors at almost every turn. Thus they had an ominously destabilizing influence, much to the distress of Carey and his colleagues, who, under different circumstances, might well have acted firmly as bishops, with the whole authority of the Church behind them. Accordingly, it is very much more difficult to exonerate "the 1810-ers" than "the 1800s group," when their forward behaviour and mission achievements come under view.

The effect of all this on the Trio's mission-station strategy was considerable. It really curtailed the spread of the Baptists' influence in India and the Asiatic countries to which, it had been hoped, Serampore would have

acted as Halle did to lands in and beyond Europe in previous decades.¹¹⁸ A fair enough beginning had been made by some of the members of "the 1800s group" in establishing new mission-stations, but at the very time when the process of mission extension could have been accelerated, the Juniors threw several wrenches into the works.¹¹⁹ Now, mission extension had never been a straightforward exercise in the experience of Chamberlain or Robinson; nor was it all "plain sailing" in deploying young missionaries like Mardon, Chater, and Burton, or in trying to establish out-posts in Dacca, Bootan, Burma, and elsewhere.¹²⁰ But nothing ever equalled the way in which "the 1810-ers" threatened to bring the whole Serampore Mission to a standstill.¹²¹

Such an antithesis, and such a discrepancy between what the Serampore Mission achieved and might have accomplished — had the Juniors grasped the potential of the *kairos* at the end of the 1810s — was doubly painful to the apostolic pioneers. Having suffered so much from non-Christian hands before 1813, they could see thereafter what an impact could be made by evangelicals who were ready to be "thrust forth" into the harvest (Matt 9:37-38). All that was required for this vision to be fulfilled was a unity of purpose, a team-spirit in the bonds of Christly *agape*, and a readiness, on the part of "the 1810ers," to match their leaders in "presenting their bodies as a living sacrifice." The period of such heroic missionary service, however, seemed to be on the wane as the second generation of BMS missionaries came onto the Indian scene. A certain amount of confusion appeared as to who was really in control, and who were allies worthy of whole-hearted commitment.

In conclusion, it must be left to others to judge whether the Trio were forced by their fellow-Baptists to pay too high a price for what they did achieve. That may well be so. But more than that was at stake. The BMS personnel in Britain and Bengal who thought they had the advantage over Carey and his colleagues miscalculated. Their high-handed actions, which subsequent Baptist historians have deplored so correctly, were carried out at a dangerously significant moment in the BMS' development. They prevented Baptist missions in Asia from ever reaching their early potential, and may even have done something to the virility and foresight of the whole cause.

Had it not been for the faithful workers raised up from the Christian community in Bengal, together with the two stalwart Johns (Marshman and Mack), then the work and witness of the Serampore Trio in mission extension (not including Bible translation for the moment) might have come to a fairly swift end.¹²² What an ironic outcome that would have been for the pioneers who had endured so much secular opposition and had finally prevailed! What a thought, that the Serampore Mission should be brought down to the ground by youngsters who would scarcely tolerate their apostolic elders advising them, let alone actually deploying them in the *missio Dei*! Yet providence did not allow that to happen. The spectre of ruin was narrowly averted, even if British Baptists *did* fall far short of the mark

in India and the East.¹²³

What effect all this had back home, others will determine. But surely history's repeated lesson must be taken seriously, if missions are to make a permanent, Christ-like mark in the world: "United we stand, but divided we fall."

Bibliographical Note

[Correspondence between Carey, Marshman, Ward, Fuller, John Ryland, and John Sutcliff has been cited as follows for the sake of brevity: for example, C to R, 16 Aug. 1809 means Carey's letter to Ryland, dated 16 August 1809. Letters written to the Committee of the Baptist Missionary Society are cited in the following standardized form, for example: Ser. miss.s to BMS, 10 Apr. 1817 (written by the Serampore missionaries, that is, the Trio and those with them at Serampore at that time). For the sake of brevity, the precise archival location of each letter has been omitted; however, most of the correspondence is to be found in BMS Microfilm reels nos. 1, 20, 21, 22, 35, 36 (such references have only been provided when the letter is to be found in an unexpected location; this I have noted as follows: for instance, BMS Micro. rl. no. 1).]

¹David J. Bosch, in his *Witness to the World* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1980), p.248, defines mission as "the Church-crossing-frontiers-in-the-form-of-a-servant." Hence, I understand missiology in its applied mode as being the comprehensively practical, historico-theological discipline which endeavours to help the Church reflect on its servant nature so that it will fulfil its divine vocation. Missiology's focus is properly on Christ-centred world-discipleship.

²In the annual BMS sermon which Edward Steane preached at Kettering, 1 Jun. 1842 ["The First Fifty Years", in *Missionary Sermons, 1812-1924* (London: Carey Press, 1924), p.60], the term "enterprise," as applied to Christian missions, denoted an undertaking which involved risk and adventure. On the Trio's significance as mission leaders, see A. C. Smith, "The Legacy of William Carey," *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, 16:1 (1992), 2-8, and "A Tale of Many Models: The Missiological Significance of the Serampore Trio," *Missiology*, 20:4 (1992) [forthcoming October 1992].

³For a useful introduction to this, one might turn to S. Neill, *History of Christianity in India, 1707-1858* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p.307-431.

⁴This periodization has the merit of demonstrating that changes were already under way in personnel-relationships within the BMS *several years before* Fuller died in 1815.

⁵Journal of William Ward, 18 Jan. 1800 (typed transcript, in the Archives of the BMS, London). C. E. Abraham, "William Carey and the Indian Church,"

the Carey Lecture for 1964 under the auspices of the Council of Serampore College (Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press, 1964), p.5.

⁶G. Smith, *The Life of William Carey, D.D., Shoemaker and Missionary* (London: John Murray, 1885), p.127-128; S. Pearce Carey, *William Carey* (London: Carey Press, 1934), p.194-195 [this was the eighth edition revised and enlarged, henceforth cited as: 1934 ed.]; E. Daniel Potts, *British Baptist Missionaries in India 1793-1837. The History of Serampore and Its Missions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), p.22-23. Potts argues that "egalitarianism among those who were not of equal calibre or devotion" inevitably resulted in conflict. Carey wrote to John Sutcliff on 8 April 1801, asking the BMS to send reinforcements who would not "account it a hardship to be subject to Rules in all their conduct." M to F, 20-27 Apr. 1804 (in *Periodical Accounts relative to the Baptist Missionary Society*, II, 542) [henceforth cited as P.A]; John C. Marshman, *The Life and Times of Carey, Marshman, and Ward, embracing the History of the Serampore Mission* (London: 1859), I, 401-402 [henceforth cited as *Life & Times of CMW*]; Walter B. Davis, *William Carey. Father of Modern Missions* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1963), p.52. The Trio admitted that thus far all the rules for governing the Mission had "arisen out of our necessities, rather than anticipated by any foresight": Ser. miss.s to BMS, 6 Aug. 1805, 2.

⁷Ser. miss.s to BMS, 6 Aug. 1805; Ward's Journal, 5 Oct. 1805; C & Jn.M. (John C. Marshman) to BMS, 15 Nov. 1827 [in *Letters from the Rev. Dr. Carey* (1828) p.56]. According to C & Jn.M, Ward's ideas of missionary economy, in the "Form of Agreement," were found to be impracticable in less than a year, and so were "consigned to oblivion!" "A plan of union for the [Serampore] family" accompanied the family rules drawn up by Marshman; a set of "Station Rules" was also drawn up by Ward.

⁸Smith, *Life of Carey*, p.130; Davis, *Carey*, p.53; Ser. miss.s to Cran and Desgranges, 1805, p.2 (BMS Micro. rl. no. 35).

⁹Before assigning particular tasks and responsibilities to junior personnel, the Trio wished to take measure of their suitability for missionary work. The initial spell for every man at the Serampore base would thus disclose whether he was proud, passionate, headstrong, submissive, or truly committed to a life of godly service. Trio & Brunsdon to BMS, 18 Apr. 1801, p.2: they asked strongly that future personnel should be "thoroughly tried respecting temper as well as zeal" before leaving Britain.

¹⁰Davis, *Carey*, p.53, 90; Jn. Marshman, *Life & Times of CMW*, I, 402-403; Ser. miss.s to BMS, 25 Mar. 1807, in P.A., III, 346.

¹¹Ser. miss.s to BMS, 25 Dec. 1897. 2f.; Robinson to Trio, 11 Jul. 1808, p.5. The Trio thus initiated what evolved as "the Corresponding Committee" of the BMS in Bengal. Cf. Ward's "Original Communication of Plan for Settling the Premises &c. at Serampore," sent by him as a letter to Ryland, Burls, and Ivey (BMS leaders), dated 11 Mar. 1816 [in Joseph Ivey, *Letters on the Serampore Controversy* (London: 1831), p.105-107; cf. p.144-146]. C & M to BMS, 12 May 1820, p.2-3. This was so as "to remove

even the possibility of mistake and dispute" (C & M to D. Templeton, 15 Apr. 1820).

¹²Rowe (on behalf of the Ser. miss.s) to Robinson, 23 Jul. 1808; Jn. M., *Life & Times of CMW*, I, 403-404; Trio to BMS, 1 Nov. 1808. See n.70 below.

¹³Davis, *Carey*, p.53; Potts, *Baptist Missionaries*, p.23-24; F to Chamberlain, 18 May 1809; F. to Ser. miss.s, 15 May 1809; Trio & Rowe to BMS, 25 Jun. 1809, p.1-2; Jn.M, *Life & Times of CMW*, I, 400-402.

¹⁴Trio to BMS, 1 Nov. 1808, p.2; J. B. Middlebrook, *William Carey* (London: Carey Kingsgate Press, 1961), p.94. As early as 1796, Carey was aware of the damage that a young, inexperienced missionary could do to the whole missionary enterprise — from the salutary experience of the BMS mission to Sierra Leone: C to R, 23 Jun. 1803; F to C, 11 Oct. 1796, and 25 Apr. 1799; cf. *P.A.*, I, 257-261, 305-306, and BMS Minutes, 7 Apr. 1795 to 18 Apr. 1797.

¹⁵Cf. Benjamin Wickes to F. (from Philadelphia), 22 Jan. 1811; Gilbert Laws, *Andrew Fuller. Pastor, Theologian, Ropeholder* (London: Carey Press, 1942), p.14, 53-54, 57-58, 69.

¹⁶The new committee-members represented "the respectable class who had held aloof at first, but were ... [now] eager that the head-quarters of so renowned an enterprise should be removed to London": Smith, *Life of Carey*, p.356-357. They prevented Fuller from securing the services of Christopher Anderson, of Edinburgh, as his assistant and successor; he was the one man who could have prevented the Trio from suffering so much from the Dyer (post-Fuller) BMS administration. F to W, 12 Sep. 1805, 10 Dec. 1807, 16 May 1812, 9 Aug. 1812; F to C, 17 Nov. 1812; J.G.F. (F's son) to Maria Hope, ca. May 1815; Smith, *Life of Carey*, p.358.

¹⁷F to W, 15 Jul.-9 Aug. 1812; cf. C to R, 7 May 1823, and S. Pearce Carey, *William Carey, D.D. Fellow of Linnaean Society* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1923) p.316-317 [henceforth cited as: SPC, *William Carey*, 1st ed.]. The post-Fuller BMS administration demonstrated its keenness to bring the Trio "into a state of subordination to their control": Jn.M., *Life & Times of CMW*, II, 134-140, 522.

¹⁸F to W, 5 Mar. 1813, pp.5f.; Potts, *Baptist Missionaries*, p.25.

¹⁹The Trio then requested that all the junior, British missionaries at their out-stations should depend immediately on the BMS from now on, in order to forestall further conflict: C to R, 4 Oct. 1815, and 30 May 1816; cf. Rowe and Trio to Robinson, 23 Jul. 1808, and F to Robinson, 15 May 1809. Even during Fuller's life-time, the Trio had found the office of directing the Juniors so invidious that they only consented to exercise it further when under great pressure from Fuller; however, soon after they heard of his death, the Trio relinquished that burden. Fuller was disturbed at the idea of mission-stations being left in the hands of obstreperous, inexperienced junior personnel. Jn.M., *Life & Times of CMW*, I, 462; II, 105-106, 135.

²⁰Cf. SPC, *William Carey*, 1st ed., p.317-318, 325-326, 332-333, 340; Davis, *Carey*, p. 88-92. While they granted the BMS ownership of the Serampore

property, the Trio resolved never to grant it management rights, and never to allow it to elect members to the "Serampore Union": Ser. miss.s to R, 11 Mar. 1821; C & M to BMS, 12 May 1820. Jn.M. judged that "it was this question of independence which underlaid the whole controversy between the society and the missionaries. It was the head and front of their offending" (*Life & Times of CMW*, II, 141-144, 208, 521-522; thus, Trio to BMS, 4 Sep. 1817 (in Ivimey, *Letters on the Serampore Controversy*, p. 107-133, especially p. 125).

²¹The 1822 statement was drawn up by John Marshman and the BMS in London, 10 Oct. 1822 (BMS Micro. rl. no.1, vol.5A, p.267). This followed the BMS letter to the Ser. miss.s of Apr. 1821, which only widened the breach between them: Jn.M., *Life & Times of CMW*, II, 241-242. Cf. Potts, *Baptist Missionaries*, p.25-26; SPC, *William Carey*, 1st ed., 347-351; Ivimey, *Letters on the Serampore Controversy*, p.58-59. The statement of the terms of separation was drawn up by Joshua Marshman and the BMS in London, 23 Mar. 1827. Carey and Co. had no alternative to this. Cf. Davis, *Carey*, 93; Jn.M., *Life & Times of CMW*, II 309-310, 343-344, 373-374, 393, 431-434. So nauseated was Carey by the whole controversy that he resolved, in 1826, to quit Serampore, for the sake of getting some peace; he would have done so had friends not persuaded him to do otherwise.

²²Cf. Jn.M., *Life & Times of CMW*, II, 521; F. Deaville Walker, *William Carey. Missionary Pioneer and Statesman* (London: S.C.M., 1926), p.228-230.

²³Many a time such thoughts went through his mind, and were expressed in his letters, between 1797 and 1801. He was the first ordained Englishman sent to Bengal as a missionary, from any country: Smith, *Life of Carey* p.78, 168-169, 209-210; Middlebrook, *Carey* p.103; SPC *William Carey*, 1st ed., p.135, 175, 193. Clearly, Carey did not pioneer missions in every part of India—for example, Ziegenbalg and Schwartz achieved much in the South—nor was he a pioneer of every missionary method, but he was instrumental in enabling many others to forge ahead in the same sort of work that he and his team-mates had exemplified already. Cf. Jn.M., *Life & Times of CMW*, II, 523.

²⁴Cf. Robert L. Ramseyer, "The Anabaptist Vision and our World Mission (I)," in Wilbert R. Shenk, ed. *Anabaptism and Mission* (Scottsdale PA: Herald Press, 1984) p.178-187; David A. Shank, "Anabaptists and Mission," in *ibid.*, p.204, 202-228. Cf. Middlebrook, *Carey* p.7-8; J.N. Ogilvie, *The Apostles of India* (London: 1915) p.333, 336-337.

²⁵SPC, *William Carey* (1934 ed.) p.26.

²⁶"Apostle" (from Greek) is etymologically equivalent to "missionary" (from Latin), particularly when referring to "someone who is sent, with a view to initiating a work or planting a church" at some distance from the sending church: (cf. Michael C. Griffiths, "Today's Missionary, Yesterday's Apostle," *Evangelical Missions Quarterly*, 21, No.2 (Apr. 1985), 156, 164, 154-165.

²⁷F to Foutain, 27 Sep. 1797, p.3; William Ward, *Farewell Letters to a Few Friends in Britain and America on Returning to Bengal in 1821*, 2nd ed. (London: 1821) p.287-288. Carey frequently turned to apostolic precedents for wisdom: cf. the Trio's December 1817 "Review of the Mission," in *P.A.*, VI, 295-297, 307, 337; and William Carey, *Enquiry* (1792), *passim*.

²⁸Ward, *Farewell Letters* p.287-288. Ward called Carey "a christian bishop" without the name, in India. Cf. Walker, *Carey*, p.168-169, 204; Neill, *Christianity in India, 1707-1858*, p.191; Smith, *Life of Carey*, p.23. G. Smith identified Carey as "the apostle of North India as Schwartz was of the South. Carey, however, was too aware of his own imperfections to claim such prestige for himself; cf. Middlebrook, *Carey*, p.103.

²⁹In 1800, the Ser. miss.s constituted themselves a Baptist Church with Carey as pastor, and Marshman as one of the deacons. In 1805, M and W became co-pastors with C, and the younger missionaries became deacons of the Baptists' church in Serampore: Ward's Journal, 6 Oct. 1805; Ser. miss.s to BMS, 25 Dec. 1805, p.1. It was as managers of the Benevolent Institution in Calcutta that the Trio would relate to Penney early in 1818.

³⁰Ward exercised special influence as the leading figure in the internal development of the Serampore Mission during its first twenty years; Marshman became responsible for public-relations and correspondence, and was financial manager for the out-stations. George Howells and A.C. Underwood, *The Story of Serampore and Its College* (Serampore: 1918), p.12-13. Here I only refer to their administrative roles and not to the mission methods in which they excelled. Marshman's responsibilities doubtless aggravated his relationship with the junior missionaries. Marshman and Ward both produced substantial writings, formulated plans for various aspects of the Mission, and elaborated mission procedures — these constitute their missiological contributions.

³¹See Henry Martyn's high tribute for them as a team, in Middlebrook, *Carey*, p.94. On their unity with "the home triumvirate" (Fuller, Ryland, Sutcliffe), see Edward Steane, "The First Fifty Years," in *Missionary Sermons*, p.56-57.

³²C to Pearce, 19-21 Nov. 1796, in *P.A.*, I, 328-329; SPC, *William Carey*, 1st ed., p. 168-169.

³³F to C, 11 Oct. 1796; 22 Aug. 1798, p.2; 25 Feb. 1799; 25 Apr. 1799, p.7; 12 Apr. 1800, p.1. BMS Minutes, 2 Feb. 1796; 4 Apr. 1796; 17 Apr. 1800. F to W, 14 Jul. 1800, p.2. Jn.M., *Life & Times of CMW*, I, 75-77. Carey thus learned that passion and zeal were not enough for a young man to be fit to play an effective part as a missionary. Cf. C to Pearce, 2 Oct. 1795, p.6-7.

³⁴BMS Minutes, Kettering, Aug. 29, 1797 (p.86). Smith, *Life of Carey* (p.116-117), notes that "men ... were a greater want than money at that early stage of the modern crusade" of missions to India.

³⁵Trio to BMS, 18 Mar. 1801, in *P.A.*, II, 171. Grant died soon after landing in Bengal, and Brunson died two years later. The next batch of missionaries were sent out to Bengal in 1803.

³⁶Trio and Brunson to BMS, 18 Apr. 1801; Trio to BMS, 16 Jul. 1802, in P.A., II, 295.

³⁷Biss, Chamberlain, Mardon, Moore, and Rowe were at the very least sixteen years younger than Carey, nine years younger than Marshman, and eight years younger than Ward; the young men were no more than twenty-six years old.

³⁸C to R, 23 Jun. 1803. This was in spite of Chamberlain promising the BMS, before leaving England, that he would cooperate carefully with the Serampore leadership: BMS Minutes, 20 Apr. 1802. Ser. miss.s to BMS, 25 Mar. 1805, p.4.

³⁹Ser. miss.s to BMS, 25 Mar. 1805, p.4. Cf. Neill, *Christianity in India, 1707-1885* p.387-389. Neill observes that "Carey and his colleagues at Serampore came from the ranks of those whom the Victorians somewhat patronisingly called the respectable poor."

⁴⁰C to R, 17 Jul. 1806, p.6; Ser. miss.s to BMS, 31 Aug. 1806, p.3.

⁴¹Ser. miss.s to BMS, 25 Mar. 1807, in P.A., III, 346-347.

⁴²*Ibid.* In a postscript to the correspondence with Robinson (of July-August 1808) which the Trio sent to the BMS, Carey and Co. wrote that new missionaries should be "men of the mildest tempers, or all is ruined."

⁴³Trio to BMS, 1 Nov. 1808, p.1. At this point, A.K. Oussoren [*William Carey, Especially His Missionary Principles* (Leiden: 1945), p.257-259] argues that Carey did not lay enough stress upon the training of the missionaries at home. That may be so, but Oussoren fails to recognize that there was no-one with enough missionary experience in Britain available to provide such training. The BMS had no full-time staff in Britain then at all. Admittedly, Sutcliff's preparing of missionary candidates left quite a lot to be desired (e.g., F to C, 25 Oct. 1804, p.3), but little more could be done at that time, so early in the history of modern missionary societies. Oussoren is thus passing an anachronistic judgment on the basis of experience one hundred years later — facile retrospect! Oussoren's entire work is vitiated by his utter lack of consulting the vast majority of sources in the BMS Archives and elsewhere; he relied almost entirely on secondary works. Careful reading of the Trio's correspondence with the BMS shows that the candidate-screening process then deserved much more attention even than formal missionary training.

⁴⁴An important "safety-valve" for containing junior rebellion was sending men like Chamberlain to form subordinate mission-stations and manage the day-to-day affairs of the same: C to R, 23, Jun. 1803, p.3-4; 14 Dec. 1803, p.4; 30 May 1816.

⁴⁵In the summer of 1807, the Ser. Miss.s even considered transferring the whole Mission to Rangoon, in order to get *Lebensraum*: cf. SPC, William Carey, 1st ed., p.258-261.

⁴⁶C to R, 16 Aug. 1809, p.2. The Ser. miss.s' letter to the BMS of 31 Aug. 1806 contained their plan "for taking all Asia." Trio & Rowe to BMS, 21 Dec. 1809, p.3. They put out "a loud call for twenty-four missionaries

immediately" (*ibid.*, p.2).

⁴⁷F to W, 14 Jan. 1811, p.1; cf. F. to Sutcliff, 27 Mar. 1810, and SPC, *William Carey*, 1st ed., p.156, 162-163. See n. 105 below.

⁴⁸Cf. F to W, 15 Jun. 1810, p.2; C to R, 15 Mar. 1810. Carey wrote to Ryland on 17 Nov. 1813: "the loud calls of providence are now very numerous, and are continually increasing, but the want of labourers such as we could wish is severely felt, so that I sometimes almost sink into discouragement." At the end of 1815, after Fuller had passed away, the BMS thought it might be necessary, because of the low level of their finances, to "act (as indeed Dr. Ryland suggests) with considerable caution as to the admission of additional Missionaries, admitting, for the present, such only as shall appear to be eminently qualified for the work" (BMS Minutes, 5 Dec. 1815). This contrasted with Carey's outlook, and the earlier situation (see n. 34 above).

⁴⁹Jn. M., *Life & Times of CMW*, II, 165-167; SPC, *William Carey*, 1st ed., p. 339-343; Mrs. E. Carey, *Eustace Carey: A Missionary in India* (London: 1857) p.202-203, 205, 208.

⁵⁰The Trio's 10 Feb. 1818 letter to the BMS (p.8-16) is full of their distress over these developments. Cf. C & M to R, 17 Dec. 1818; Trio to Penney, 14 Jan. 1818, p.3.

⁵¹E. A. Payne, *The First Generation: Early Leaders of the Baptist Missionary Society in England and India* (London: Carey Press, 1936), p.128-132; Jn.M., *Life & Times of CMW*, II, 243-244. In my judgment, Payne's "first generation" actually covered two generations, if one's perspective derives from *the beginning* of the BMS rather than using the term "first generation" loosely from the vantage-point of the twentieth century.

⁵²Ser. miss.s to BMS, 25 Dec. 1807, p.3, and 1 Nov. 1808, p.1; C to R, 17 Nov. 1813, and 30 Dec. 1816, p.2; Ser. miss.s to BMS, 17 Dec. 1821, p.2, and 12 May 1820. See n. 84 below.

⁵³By 1817, sixteen mission-stations had been established in India by the Trio and those working in harmony with them (P.A., VII, 39-40). Providence extended the Trio's own lives much longer than anyone expected, rather than granting them the successors that they so much desired from Britain. The personnel statistics are from the *Centenary Volume of the BMS*, p.313-314. The Indian Christian workers included Petumber Singh, C. C. Aratoon, Petruse, Krishna Pal, Krishna Prasad, Ram Boshoo, and others; the BMS list does not include those Indian workers who were not accepted as mission-workers by the BMS. According to the Trio and Rowe, in their letter of 21 Dec. 1809 to the BMS (p.1-2), European missionaries were needed for "beginning new Missions, and ... occupying some stations of more than ordinary importance." Otherwise, people from India's churches could do the job; however, cf. Trio to BMS, 10 Feb. 1818, p.4-5.

⁵⁴John Fountain has been omitted from this group since he arrived in India three years before Marshman and Ward, and died not long after their arrival. Carey's three sons who became missionaries have also been omitted since they were raised for the work in India and did not have the outlook of those

recruited by the BMS. Mack did not belong to either group since he was personally selected by Ward and not appointed by the BMS until 1821.

⁵⁵C to Rev. Dr. Steadman, 21 Jan. 1818, in Letters from the Rev. Dr. Carey (1828), p.60-61.

⁵⁶Payne, *The First Generation*, p.91-92. Although Fountain was earlier marked by gross indiscretion, he never rebelled against the Trio.

⁵⁷*Ibid.* Webster Morris was pastor of Clipston, not far from Carey's boyhood home: SPC, *William Carey* (1934 ed.) p.69-70, 185. After spending several months in Olney under Sutcliff, Chamberlain was required to spend two years at the Baptists' "Bristol Academy," where he was instructed by Ryland. Thus the home triumvirate were well acquainted with his character. He was judged unready to accompany Marshman and Ward to Bengal in 1799. This greatly disappointed him and may have been a contributory factor in his early resistance against the Trio's *modus operandi et vivendi*. Cf. BMS Minutes, 20 Apr. 1802.

⁵⁸C to R, 23 Jun. 1803, p.1-3; F to Moore, 15 May 1809.

⁵⁹F to C, 25 Oct. 1804; Neill, *Christianity in India*, 1707-1858, p.194. Fuller had to write "a Letter full of strong but brotherly expostulation" to Chamberlain.

⁶⁰Ser. miss.s to BMS, 25 Mar. 1808, p.3; cf. F to W, 6 Feb. 1809, p.1.

⁶¹See n. 44 above; C to R, 17 Jul. 1806. He was indefatigable in his labours, though often discouraged at his lack of "success": Ser. miss.s to BMS, 26 Mar. 1809, p.2.

⁶²Serampore's "Letters and Review of 1810," p.3-4. (BMS Micro. rl. no.35). For Chamberlain's deployment within the Trio's mission-strategy, see Smith, *Life of Carey*, p.168. C to R, 12 Dec. 1805; Trio & Rowe to BMS, 25 Sep. 1809, p.3. Three little children of his also died by 1812.

⁶³Payne, *The First Generation*, p.94-95; Trio & Rowe to BMS, 25 Sep. 1809, p.2.

⁶⁴The Trio persuaded him as strongly as they could to refrain from evangelizing the military any more since it would only jeopardize the whole Mission: Trio to Chamberlain, 25 Jul. 1812. Cf. Neill, *Christianity in India, 1707-1858*, p.194; Potts, *Baptist Missionaries* p.194-196.

⁶⁵Jn.M., *Life & Times of CMW*, II, 90-93.

⁶⁶Payne, *The First Generation*, p.105-106; Jn.M., *The Life & Times of CMW*, I, 259.

⁶⁷Jn.M., *Life & Times of CMW*, I, 269-273; SPC, *William Carey* (1934 ed.), p.271, 274.

⁶⁸Ser. miss.s to BMS, 25 Mar. 1808, p.3; prefatory note by the Trio in their correspondence to Robinson, and sent to the BMS, July 1808 (BMS Micro. rl. no.35). On 19 Apr. 1808, he and Wm. Carey Jr. set off from Serampore on an exploratory journey to Bootan. Whereas the Trio never seemed to have fallen out with one another in any significant way, the junior mission-personnel frequently fell out with one another and others. For example, Yates' "hostility to brother Chamberlain was unmeasured," according to

Carey, in his *Thoughts upon the Discussions which Have Arisen from the Separation between the Baptist Missionary Society and the Serampore Missionaries* (Liverpool: 1830), p.4. "The 1810's group" brought all this to a climax.

⁶⁹According to Walker (*Carey*, p.295), Carey felt that Robinson "never entered with spirit" into that undertaking. It should be remembered, however, that Robinson had much to contend with between 1808 and 1811: violent attacks by robbers, serious spells of fever, the death of his wife, and civil war in Bootan. See Lewis' series of reports on this, published in the *Oriental Baptist* and reproduced in M. Wylie, *Bengal as a Field of Missions* (London: 1854), p.95-99; also "Bootan Mission," *P.A.*, IV, 266-271.

⁷⁰After his first attempt on Bootan, he charged the Trio with breaking their own rules and making new ones, and warned that he and some of his peers would not take much more of it. See n. 12 above. The July 1808 correspondence is to be found in BMS microfilm rl. no.35 (Archives box IN 21).

⁷¹Payne (*The First Generation*, p.106-108) thinks that the Trio may have expected too much of Robinson. When Fuller heard of all that had happened, he likened Robinson to John Mark, an associate of Paul. This, wrote Payne, was "a prophetic remark, for, like the young companion of Paul, the Olney shoemaker lived to win the confidence and affection of those who had been compelled formerly to criticise him." On 15 Apr. 1815, however, Fuller wrote to Burls (one of the BMS home Committee leaders) that he was most displeased about Robinson's "evil-minded," independent spirit towards the Trio.

⁷²Robinson to Trio, 4 Dec. 1824; C, M & Jn.M. to BMS, 7 Jul. 1825; C to Saffery, 20 Jan. 1812; also #23 of Ward's 1815 "Review of the Mission" in *P.A.*, V, 650-651; C to F, 25 Jan. 1814; Trio to BMS, 29 Mar. 1813, p.1-2,4,15.

⁷³Ser. miss.s to BMS, 7 Jul. 1825.

⁷⁴E. S. Wenger, *The Story of the Lall Bazar Baptist Church, Calcutta* (Calcutta: 1908), p.189-213; C to M, 15 Nov. 1827; SPC, *William Carey*, 1st ed., p. 379; H. Bridges, *The Kingdom of Christ in East Bengal* (Bangladesh Baptist Sangha, Dhaka, 1984), p.30. He proved to be a great source of strength and comfort to Carey & Co. during the period of hard controversy between the BMS and Serampore. Payne, *The First Generation*, p.110-111.

⁷⁵Bridges, *East Bengal*, p.30-31, 37-38. He often lamented the paucity of converts under his ministry and died disappointed after forty-seven years of missionary labour.

⁷⁶F to W, 14 Jan. 1811, p.1.

⁷⁷C to R, 30 May 1816, in *Letters from the Rev. Dr. Carey*, p.4; C & M to D. Templeton, 15 Apr. 1820 (printed p. 4 in the correspondence between the Juniors, Seniors, and Templeton of March -April 1820; College Street Baptist Church MSS, Northampton, book 9).

⁷⁸Cf. Potts, *Baptist Missionaries*, p.197, 66-67.

⁷⁹The most important documentation on this event is the long letter from the Trio to the BMS, 29 Mar. 1813. For Fuller's judgment that Marshman had mishandled communications with Government in Bengal, leading to Bro. & Sister Johns' deportation, see F to Trio, 14 Feb. 1814.

⁸⁰According to Fuller, Johns "expected too much, and it seems received too little. I think whatever partiality might be felt for Bro. Lawson, none should have been shown in this case ..." (F to Trio, 14 Feb. 1814, p.10). In spite of what the Trio did for Lawson, he joined Eustace and other peers in seceding from the Serampore Mission and defiantly setting up a rival establishment.

⁸¹Cf. Trio to BMS, 29 Mar. 1813.

⁸²SPC, *William Carey*, 1st ed., p.293, 313, 317-318, 342, 348-349; cf. C to F, 25 Jan. 1814; C to Sutcliff, 5 Aug. 1813.

⁸³SPC, *William Carey*, 1st ed., p.340. In 1828, Johns published an invective against the Trio entitled *The Spirit of the Serampore System*.

⁸⁴Carey wrote thus to Ryland at the end of 1816: "When my nephew and brother Yates came out, they saw some letters from brethren Moore and Rowe, to brother Lawson, and believed all the evil, without giving us credit for knowing as much as they. They imbibed a strong prejudice against brethren Marshman and Ward; and this was not a little strengthened by brother Lawson, who had always been full of the same from the time brother Johns left us, or a little before" (30 Dec. 1816, p.2).

⁸⁵Cf. Jn.M., *Life & Times of CMW*, II, 166-167; C & M to BMS, 12 May 1820, p.3; Robinson to Trio, 21 Jul. 1808, p.7.

⁸⁶This was so, even though his early relationship with his uncle at Serampore was pretty good: SPC, *William Carey*, p.339-340; Ward's "Review of the Mission" (1815), in *P.A.*, V, 636; C & M to BMS, 12 May 1820; F to C, 15 May 1814; C to R, 30 May 1816, in *Letters from the Rev. Dr. Carey*, p.5. Carey continued: "That, and a spirit of condemning in the most unqualified manner everything done by the elder brethren, was very distressing. Poor brother Marshman, who is naturally a little tortuous [rather than getting straight to the point], but than whom a more excellent and holy man does not exist in the Mission, had a most abundant part of this unqualified and unmerited condemnation." Cf. Oussoren, *Carey*, p.120; Walker, *Carey*, p.296-297.

⁸⁷Cf. Middlebrook, *Carey*, p.41; C to R, 30 Dec. 1816, p.2. Those who came under attack included Thompson, De Bruyn, and Kerr. The Juniors felt slighted that such persons received more coverage than they did in the mission reports that the Trio sent to England. The Trio replied by pointing out that it was "our native or country-born Brethren" who were doing most of the work among the "natives." The Trio felt that some of the Juniors, like Moore and Rowe, would never be able to do anything comparable in advancing the Gospel. Cf. C to R, 30 May 1816. See n. 105 below.

⁸⁸Carey claimed this in his letter to Ryland, 30 Dec. 1816, p.2.

⁸⁹Cf. C to R, 8 Sep. 1814.

- ⁹⁰C to Dyer (BMS), 15 Jul. 1819, in *Letters from the Rev. Dr. Carey*, p.11-12. Carey and Ward were then appointed as non-resident Senior Pastors.
- ⁹¹C to Dyer, 15 Jul. 1819, p.12f.; (Mrs. E.) Carey, *Eustace Carey*, p.202-204; Jn.M., *Life & Times of CMW*, II, 165-167. It was a heavy blow for Carey to lose his understudy, Yates, in such a way. Not until Lawson died and Eustace Carey returned to Britain, due to failing health in 1824, did Yates admit to the Trio all the wrong they had done, and seek reconciliation: C to M, 12 Sep.1826. However, Yates' repentance was not a thorough one, for in 1827 he gave himself to collaborating with Eustace in writing the *Vindication of the Calcutta Baptist Missionaries* against the Serampore leaders.
- ⁹²C to M, 12 Sep. 1826, in *Letters from the Rev. Dr. Carey*, p.42.
- ⁹³C to Dyer, 15 Jul. 1819, p.12-13.
- ⁹⁴*Ibid.*, p.15,7. Carey thought that what they had done was "a monstrous waste of money and strength" and quite "anti-missionary," for if they had cooperated with Serampore's mission-strategy they would have been able to establish and occupy mission-stations covering an area "400 miles in length by 100 in breadth," and, in fellowship with those already at work in Bengal, could have "completely occupied the province." Cf. Oussoren, *Carey*, p.113, 120.
- ⁹⁵C & M to BMS, 12 May 1820.
- ⁹⁶Jn.M., *Life & Times of CMW*, II, 167; C to R, 4 Jul. 1822, p.5, and 28 Sep. 1819; Cf. Carey's 1830 "Thoughts upon the Discussions ..," p.3-4; Jn.M., *Life & Times of CMW*, I, 463.
- ⁹⁷Ser. miss.s to BMS, 14 Aug. 1820, p.7, and 24 Feb. 1821. Cf. C & M's "Statement relative to the administration of the funds entrusted to the Serampore missionaries" of 20 Jan. 1820, p.5; Ser. Miss.s to BMS, 17 Dec. 1821; p.3.
- ⁹⁸Cf. Trio to BMS, 10 Feb. 1818; C & M to BMS, 12 May 1820; Juniors to C & M, 15 May 1820.
- ⁹⁹Cf. Jn.M., *Life & Times of CMW*, I, 462-463; II, 104. This biographical work has been hailed by no less than Stephen Neill as "that best of all missionary biographies" because of the way "he maintained an astonishing objectivity and impartiality in his handling of a crucial period in Christian history" [S. C. Neill, "The History of Missions: An Academic Discipline" in G. J. Cuming, ed., *The Mission of the Church and the Propagation of the Faith* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970) p.158]. This is high praise indeed from the recent dean of mission historians, who certainly had no special affection for Baptists. Jn.M., son of Joshua Marshman, went so far as to write thus: "There can be no doubt, that the economy which was then considered essential to the prosecution of the mission was erroneous in principle and objectionable in practice, and that it generated hostility more than it promoted efficiency... The principle of rigorous economy which they [the Trio] adopted themselves and enforced on others, was felt to be insupportably irksome, and they often exposed themselves to the imputation of great unkindness" (II,104).

¹⁰⁰Penney was not an isolated case, for Eustace Carey and Yates fully supported him in his "black action" (C to Dyer, 15 Jul 1819, p.11). In 1821, William Moore unilaterally resigned from the BMS in order to engage wholly in secular concerns in North India (BMS Minutes, 13 Sep. 1821).

¹⁰¹The main account of this episode is in: Trio to Penney, 2 Jan. 1818.

¹⁰²The Trio were trustees of the Benevolent Institution and in various ways could act as Penney's employer: they were the money-raisers who paid his allowance.

¹⁰³Trio to Penney, 14 Jan. 1818.

¹⁰⁴Cf. C & Jn.M. to BMS, 15 Nov. 1827, in *Letters from the Rev. Dr. Carey* p.50-53; Ser. miss.s to BMS, 14 Aug. 1820, p.7, and 24 Feb. 1821. Only one of five or six young missionaries now settled in Calcutta was able to preach in the native language, according to the Trio, probably at the end of 1818 (Trio to Yates, 16 Dec. —year not given— (BMS Micro. rl. no. 35).

¹⁰⁵For example, Lawson was supported by the BMS as an English pastor in Calcutta because "his diffidence...almost wholly prevented his preaching in Bengalee" (Ser. miss.s to BMS, 7 Jul. 1825, p.5). See above, nn. 47, 87. Yates refused to go to Cuttack, in the centre of Orissa. In the Trio's view, this was scandalous since all the necessary Bible translations were already at hand for the Juniors to pursue mission-extension in certain designated areas.

¹⁰⁶Here I refer to the Baptists as "dissenters," vis-à-vis the Anglican establishment. On the Indian situation then, see Charles Grant's *Observations on the State of Society among the Asiatic Subjects of Great Britain, particularly with Respect to Morals and on the Means of Improving it* (1797). Cf. Neill's evaluation of this work in his *Christianity in India, 1707-1858*, p.443-444: compare this with Neill's estimate of the poor state that India was in then (*ibid.*, p.135). Rammohun Roy fully understood how much Hinduism needed wide-spread reform at that time.

¹⁰⁷Trio to Penney, 14 Jan. 1818, p.2.

¹⁰⁸Cf. Jn.M., *Life & Times of CMW I*, 400; II, 104-105.

¹⁰⁹In contrast to the Trio, who soldiered on for decades in India, less than half of the missionaries sent out by the BMS in the ten-year period up to 1827 were still at their post when Carey and Jn.M. wrote to the BMS (on 15 Nov. 1827, in *Letters from the Rev. Dr. Carey*, p.53). Cf. Neill, *Christianity in India, 1707-1858*, p.392-393.

¹¹⁰Cf. C to Ryland, 30 May 1816.

¹¹¹"The last straw" for the Trio may have been when William Adam (accepted by the BMS in 1818) joined the Junior league at Calcutta and then left the Baptists to consort with Unitarians, who had no time at all for evangelical missionaries; cf. Neill, *Christianity in India, 1707-1858*, p.500, n.36. With that happening, in addition to events noted above, it would be no wonder if the Trio felt that they had seen almost everything that could go wrong, among the Juniors, actually go wrong! Adam entered the lists of published attacks on the Trio: C to his son Jabez, 17 Apr. 1828, in Smith, *Life of Carey*, p.376. Ser. miss.s to BMS, 19. Jan. 1825, in *Letters from the*

Rev. Dr. Carey, p.31.

¹¹²It was all too easy for the Juniors to crow about their own submission to the BMS, because it was the BMS, and not they themselves, who provided their stipend: very much in contrast to the Trio who bore many times the Juniors' work-load. The Trio realized that the home Committee could not grasp the missiological reality of their mission in Bengal—for example it never understood the significance of Serampore College, and adamantly refused to cooperate with the Trio in fund-raising for it as a whole—so it is not surprising that the Trio refused to surrender management of their Mission to the BMS.

¹¹³Cf. Ser. miss.s to BMS, 21 Dec. 1809, pp.1f.; Ward, "Letters and Review of 1810," pp.3f., 5; Neill, *Christianity in India, 1707-1858*, p.409; Smith, *Life of Carey*, p.167-168.

¹¹⁴Ser. miss.s to BMS, 15 Nov. 1827, in *Letters from the Rev. Dr. Carey*, p.52-53. By the end of the 1810's, it was becoming clearer that such nationals could bear more responsibility in evangelistic and church-planting undertakings—with no little success—than had been imagined at first. Cf. the December 1817 "Review of the Mission," in *P.A.*, VI, 296-297, 304; M to R, 9 Dec. 1811, in *P.A.*, IV, 367-368.

¹¹⁵C & Jn.M. to BMS, 15 Nov. 1827 (p.52-54). It was for this reason that the Serampore chiefs associated the College professors in their missionary exertions, gradually devolving on them the responsibility and management of the out stations. Thus they hoped to "secure...the perpetuity and enlargement of the missionary plan, which has formed the chief business of our lives." Cf. Davis, *Carey*, p.82-83, 107. Although Mack and Jn.M. played a valiant role, worthy of their deceased leaders, they were never considered to be the primary means for achieving the mission's long-term objectives—for who knew how long they would live? They were but the distinguished instruments for running the forward-looking institution set in place by the Trio to stimulate and enhance the rise of a "native ministry." Mack suddenly died from cholera in 1845, eleven years after Carey passed away, while John Marshman left India for good in 1855.

¹¹⁶It was to the great loss of India that the BMS stymied this process by the pressure they brought to bear on Carey; cf. Davis, *Carey*, p.93; Neill, *Christianity in India, 1707-1858*, p.386-412.

¹¹⁷For the 13th Resolution of 1813, which superseded the clause in the East India Co.'s Charter that had occasioned much controversy and persecution, see Smith, *Life of Carey*, p.350-351. Cf. Jn.M., *Life & Times of CMW*, II, 1-48; SPC, *William Carey*, 1st ed., p.306-309; Neill, *Christianity in India, 1707-1858*, p.151-155.

¹¹⁸Cf. SPC, *William Carey*, 1st ed., p.330. Between 1806 and 1810, the Trio had thought much of Serampore becoming a strategic centre for mission-extension throughout the South, East, and South-East Asia, with missionaries fanning out from it in every direction: C to R, 17 Jul. 1806; 11 Nov. 1806; 7 Oct. 1807; 16 Aug. 1809; 15 Mar. 1810. Consider the document that Fuller

dubbed: "Marshman's Plan for Taking All Asia by a Coup-de-Main — to be reserved as a Memorial to be printed at some future time" (in BMS Micro. rl. 22; BMS Archives box H6). This was 13 pages long, drawn up by M, signed by the Trio, Mardon, Rowe, and Felix Carey on 31 Aug. 1806, but perhaps not sent until 18 Nov. 1816. Trio & Brunson to BMS, 18 Apr. 1801; Trio & Rowe to BMS, 21 Dec. 1809; C to Dyer, 15 Jul. 1819, p.16. Cf. M. Drewery, *William Carey. Shoemaker and Missionary* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1978), p.127-128, 218; Middlebrook, *Carey*, p.43; SPC, *William Carey*, 1st ed., p.242, 254, 260; Smith, *Life of Carey*, p.168.

¹¹⁹Ser. miss.s to BMS, 6 Aug. 1805; C to Dyer, 15 Jul. 1819. Cf. C to R, 17 Jul. 1806; C to M, 31 May 1826, and 12 Sep. 1826; SPC, *William Carey*, 1st ed., p.341-342. Cf. Potts, *Baptist Missionaries*, p.28-34.

¹²⁰Because of the difficult socio-political situation in North India before 1813, Serampore's mission-advances were rather *ad hoc* in nature: thus Ward's 1815 "Review of the Mission," in *P.A.*, V, 643. It took ten years, and a number of different approaches, before the Gospel could be proclaimed openly and effectively in Dacca: Bridges, *East Bengal*, p.10-14. Mardon refused to go to Burma, while Chater took himself off to Ceylon; Yates refused to go to Cuttack, Orissa, while Burton transferred himself, without permission, from Sumatra to Digah, Bengal: C to R, 7 Oct. 1807; Trio to BMS, 1 Nov. 1808; Ser miss.s to BMS, 21 Nov. 1825. Payne, *The First Generation*, p.98-103. Biss and Rowe had to be prevailed upon not to settle at Madras, before they even arrived at Serampore! (Trio to Grant of Madras, 14 Feb. 1805; Ser. miss.s to BMS, 6 Aug. 1805. Cf. Walker, *Carey*, p.251-259). Furthermore, the Trio ever had to make allowances for Providence overruling their deployment plans.

¹²¹In fairness to the Juniors, it should be pointed out that such a crisis was exacerbated (though not early in the process) by the Trio over-extending themselves financially in the construction of the Serampore College on a grandiose scale: cf. C & Jn.M. to BMS, 1 Nov. 1826; 15 Nov. 1827; 15 Apr. 1826. However, it might be argued in the Trio's defence that no such problems would have occurred if the Dyer regime (BMS) had recognized the importance of the Serampore Mission being free to make decisions from the field H.Q., accordingly supporting — instead of strongly opposing — the Trio — and thereby "aiding and abetting" the Junior uprising: cf. Smith, *Life of Carey*, p.359-361.

¹²²Thus the Trio wrote to Yates, probably at the end of 1818: "Were it not...for the few brethren raised up in the country [of India], the Society would have scarcely the shadow of a mission among the heathen in India" (see n. 104). This is borne out vividly by the mid-1830 listing of the personnel responsible for running Serampore's mission-stations, and of evangelizing from there: see Serampore's 17 Jun. 1830 "Appeal on behalf of the Serampore Mission," *Periodical Accounts of the Serampore Mission*, I, 6, p.430-431. Compared with the 1819 list of mission-stations' personnel (*P.A.*, VII, p.39-40) one can see that a marked decline had occurred in British

Baptist missionaries' presence there. Serampore was simply unable to depend on British Personnel any more for manning its kingdom outposts—not a bad thing! The proportion of non-British missionaries in the BMS by 1820 was about 50%—vastly more than what obtains in many North Atlantic mission societies today!

¹²³After 1837, "the Baptists, in relative terms, ceased to be the important influence they had been" (Potts, *British Baptist Missionaries*, p.245).

A. Christopher Smith is Religion Program Officer, for Cross-Cultural Christian Partnership, at the Pew Charitable Trusts, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Until 1991, he was Research Fellow at the Centre for the Study of Christianity in the Non-Western World, New College, University of Edinburgh, Scotland.