

EVANGELICAL REVIEW OF THEOLOGY

VOLUME 17

Volume 17 • Number 3 • July 1933

Evangelical Review of Theology

*Articles and book reviews original and selected from
publications worldwide for an international
readership for the purpose of discerning the
obedience of faith*

EDITOR: BRUCE J. NICHOLLS



Published by
PATERNOSTER PERIODICALS

Mrs. E. L. Wenger, 'The Serampore Mission and Its Founders', *The Story of Serampore and its College*. Edited by Wilma S. Stewart. Serampore, West Bengal: The Council of Serampore College, rev. ed. 1961 (pp. 1–11).

Research at Serampore College or in other missionary files in India or at Regent's College in Oxford, England would undoubtedly turn up much more documentation for this subject.

Dr. Watts taught for several years in the Theological Faculty of Serampore College. p. 342

Aspects of William Carey's Missionary Policy

Waiter B. Davis

Reprinted with permission from Foundations, January 1962

In this carefully researched article the author analyzes the strengths and weaknesses of Carey's missionary policy in his relationships with the officials of the British government and the East India Company and with younger missionaries and the home board of the Baptist Missionary Society. Conflicts over the control of work, money and property, and confusion over accountability, have been endemic to the missionary movement since Carey. The cause may be other than theology and spirituality.

Editor

August 17, 1961 was the 200th anniversary of the birth of the famous English missionary, William Carey; and commemorative services were held in many places in Great Britain, India and East Pakistan. The facts of Carey's life are generally well known to British Baptists, but not so well known to American Baptists. The best biographies of Carey are by John Clark Marshman,¹ Pearce Carey² and Deaville Walker.³ A small, popular edition of Carey's life by J. B. Middlebrook, the home secretary of the Baptist Missionary Society, was published in 1961.⁴

Carey's greatness as a missionary statesman is unquestioned. Some missionary historians and biographers such as George Smith,⁵ Robert p. 343 Glover,⁶ Miller,⁷

¹ John Clark Marshman, *The Life and Times of Carey, Marshman and Ward* (London, 1859).

² Pearce Carey, *William Carey* (George H. Doran, New York).

³ Deaville Walker, *William Carey, Missionary Pioneer and Statesman* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1960).

⁴ J. B. Middlebrook, *William Carey* (London: John Murray, 1885), p. 437.

⁵ George Smith, *William Carey* (London: John Murray, 1885), p. 437.

⁶ Robert Glover, *The Progress of World Wide Missions* (revised by Kane), (New York: Harper, 1960), p. 59.

⁷ Basil W. Miller, *William Carey* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1952), p. 5.

Oussoren⁸ and Meyers⁹ accord him the title of 'Father of Modern Missions'. Other writers who are not prepared to acknowledge Carey as the father of modern missions still hold him in the highest honour. Deaville Walker writes about Carey: 'He was not the "Father of Modern Missions." ... When mistaken ideas are swept away, Carey still stands before us a unique figure, and the present writer firmly believes him to have been beyond question the greatest, and certainly the most versatile, missionary ever sent out'.¹⁰ J. B. Middlebrook states, 'He was neither the "Father of Modern Missions" nor their "Pioneer." ... His title to fame, and it is notable, is that he founded the Baptist Missionary Society'.¹¹ Kenneth Scott Latourette writes:

The organization of the Baptist Missionary Society is usually called the inception of the modern Protestant foreign missionary enterprise. In one sense this is not in accord with the facts. As we saw in the preceding volume, more than two centuries before Carey Protestants had had missions among non-Christians, and the eighteenth century had been marked by a rising tide of Protestant efforts in many parts of the world to win pagans to the Christian faith. Yet in another sense Carey marks the beginning of a new era. He seems to have been the first Anglo-Saxon Protestant either in America or in Great Britain to propose that Christians take concrete steps to bring their Gospel to all the human race.... William Carey and the Society which arose in response to his faith were in fact the beginning of an astounding series of Protestant efforts to reach the entire world with the Christian message.¹²

In the light of Carey's acknowledged place in missionary life and work, it is unfortunate that his views on missionary policy are not more widely known. It is not possible within the limits of one article to review systematically Carey's policy on such important subjects as the foreign missionary, converts, and non-Christians and their religions. This article will deal with Carey's policy in two areas: the relationship of the missionary to government, and the relationship of the missionary p. 344 to his colleagues and the missionary society; for it is in these two areas perhaps more than in any other that one sees illustrated both the strength and the weakness of Carey's policy.

1. RELATIONSHIP OF THE MISSIONARY TO GOVERNMENT

Carey's views on the relationship of the missionary to government were two-fold: the missionary must be loyal to government; and in cases where serious trouble arose between the missionary and government, the attitude of the missionary must be one of conciliation, not of defiance. Carey's attitude is best summed up in his own words: 'Whatever be my ideas of the best or worst modes of civil Government, the Bible teaches me to be an obedient and peaceable subject'.¹³

However, it has been said of Carey that, with respect to these views, he was inconsistent. In 1793 when Carey and his colleague Thomas determined to go to India as

⁸ A. H. Oussoren, *William Carey* (Leiden: A. W. Siethoff, 1945), p. 36.

⁹ John B. Myers, *William Carey* (London: S. W. Partridge & Co., 1887), p. 25.

¹⁰ Walker, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

¹¹ Middlebrook, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

¹² Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, vol. iv (New York: Harpers, 1941), pp. 58f.

¹³ Marshman, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 76.

missionaries, they tried to obtain the East India Company's license required by all persons proceeding to the Company's territories, but failed. They resolved to go without licenses and found an East India Company ship whose captain, knowing their predicament, agreed to take them to India. Just before sailing, the captain ordered them off the ship, as he had received an anonymous letter informing him that he would be reported for having unlicensed passengers on his ship. Nothing daunted, the two missionaries found the captain of a Danish vessel who expressed his willingness to convey them to India.

Here we raise the question, as did some of Carey and Thomas's supporters at the time, of the legality of the action of the missionaries in going to India without licenses. We note the following facts:

1.) Carey knew that a license was necessary. The East India Company Court of Directors was at the time invested with absolute power to exclude or to banish from their territories anyone who contravened their wishes. Knowing this, Carey tried to obtain a license.

2.) In deciding to go without a license, Carey had precedents for this action as there were already hundreds of unlicensed Europeans in India.¹⁴ It seems clear that the letter of the licensing law had never p. 345 been strictly enforced, and the practice was to allow unlicensed persons to settle in India.

3.) As an unlicensed person in India, Carey was not guilty of a high crime as J. C. Marshman supposes him to have been. Marshman states that a law was passed in 1783 enacting that any person, not lawfully licensed, who was found in the East Indies, was guilty of a high crime.¹⁵ An examination of the Statutes at Large for 1783, however, reveals that no such statute was enacted. Furthermore, the words of the statute which Marshman quotes are similar to a statute in the Charter Act of June 11, 1793, namely 33 Geo. III C52, S131, S132:

Be it further enacted, that if any subject or subjects of His Majesty, etc., not being lawfully licensed or authorized, shall at any time or times, etc., directly or indirectly go, sail, or repair to, or be found in the East Indies, or any of the parts foresaid, all and every such person and persons are hereby declared to be guilty of a high crime and misdemeanour: and being convicted thereof, shall be liable to such fine and imprisonment, as the Court in which such person or persons shall be convicted, shall think fit.¹⁶

This statute did not come into force in India until February 1, 1794, that is, after Carey's arrival there. In that same year the East India Company of Directors sent a dispatch dated May 28 in which they stated that unlicensed residents, instead of being summarily deported, could remain, provided some responsible person stood surety for them and that they entered into a covenant to date from February 1, 1794 when the Charter Act came into force.¹⁷ In 1795 Carey entered into a covenant with the Company. This gave him a recognized position and protected him from expulsion.

Carey's first twenty years in India from 1793 to 1813 have been called 'The Dark Period in the history of Christianity in India', because during these years, according to Stock, the historian of the Church Missionary Society, 'All possible discouragement was

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. i, p. 74.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, vol. i, p. 57.

¹⁶ *Statutes at Large*, xxxix, p. 185.

¹⁷ Charles Hole, *Early History of the Church Missionary Society*, (London, 1896), p. 154.

given by the East India Company to every effort to spread the Gospel'.¹⁸ This statement may be true of the Company's official attitude, but it should be kept in mind that many of the Company's representatives in Bengal were sympathetic towards missionary work, and several of them openly p. 346 encouraged it. The credit for accomplishing this must go to William Carey.

There were only four occasions when the government definitely interfered with the work of Carey's mission, and on each of these occasions it felt it had good grounds for action. In 1799 there was fear that the four new missionaries were political revolutionaries. In 1806 the Vellore Mutiny was at first thought to be the result of missionary work, when some sepoys mutinied and massacred fourteen British officers and 99 soldiers.¹⁹ In 1807 the Baptist Mission Press inadvertently published a tract which was offensive in its references to the Prophet Muhammad.²⁰ In 1812 the government was apprehensive that, unless action was taken against missionaries, princes like the Dowlat Scindia, who had registered a formal protest against missionary work, would cause political trouble.²¹ The restrictions placed upon missionary work in these several instances were severe, and pressure was brought upon Carey to defy government; but he firmly maintained an attitude of conciliation.

The wisdom of this policy bore fruit in Great Britain in 1813 when Parliament reviewed the East Indian Company's policy in India, and considered a resolution, the effect of which would be to give missionaries the right to pursue their calling in Company territories without government interference. There was much bitter opposition by many members of Parliament to this resolution and to other clauses on Christianity in the East India Charter Bill of 1813. When Wilberforce was urging Parliament to pass the resolution, he spoke in glowing terms about Carey and his colleagues at Serampore, and referred to their loyal and conciliatory attitude. There can be no question that this was a major factor in bringing about the passage of the Charter Bill on July 13, 1813, thus making possible a new era for missions in India.

2. RELATIONSHIP OF THE MISSIONARY TO HIS COLLEAGUES AND THE MISSIONARY SOCIETY

The far-sightedness of Carey, so evident and so rewarding in all of his dealings with government, seems lacking in some of his dealings with his colleagues and the Baptist Missionary Society. When Carey sailed to India in 1793 under the auspices of the Baptist Mission, it was with p. 347 the clear intention of becoming financially independent of the Home Board after a year. In his pamphlet, *An Enquiry into the Obligation of Christians to use Means for the Conversion of the Heathen*, published in 1792, Carey advocated the setting up of a missionary community on the mission field to make the mission self-supporting.

It might be necessary, however, for two, at least, to go together, and in general I should think it best that they should be married men, and to prevent their time from being employed in procuring necessities, two, or more, other persons, with their wives and families, might also accompany them, who should be wholly employed in providing for

¹⁸ Eugene Stock, *History of the Church Missionary Society* (London, 1899), vol. i, p. 55.

¹⁹ John W. Kaye, *Christianity in India* (London, 1859), p. 252.

²⁰ Marshman, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 307.

²¹ *Life of Wilberforce* by his sons, vol. iv, p. 15.

them. In most countries it would be necessary for them to cultivate a small spot of ground just for their support, which would be a resource to them, whenever their supplies failed. Not to mention the advantages they would reap from each others company, it would take off the enormous expense which has always attended undertakings of this kind, the first expense being the whole.²²

Soon after his arrival in Bengal, Carey began to implement this policy of self-support. He accepted the offer of some jungle land in the Sunderbunds rent free for three years, and spent three months clearing and planting it. In March 1794 Carey accepted the lucrative position of superintendent of an indigo factory in North Bengal, and wrote to the Missionary Society in England that he would no longer require their support for his personal needs, but that he wished to remain in the same relation to the Society as if he needed support.

In 1799 four Baptist missionaries and their families arrived in India, but as the East India Company refused them permission to join Carey in North Bengal, he came to Danish Serampore, where they had taken refuge and established a missionary settlement there. Rules for the missionary community were prepared by Carey and adopted by his colleagues. It was agreed that each missionary would take his turn in acting as superintendent of the Mission for a month; the missionaries and their families would dine together at a common table; the missionary community would be supported by the earnings of its members, all income being credited to a common treasury, and each family receiving a small allowance for personal expenses: and on Saturday all would gather at a special session to settle, in the spirit of Christian love, any differences which might have arisen during the week.

In uniting secular occupation with missionary work Carey was not p. 348 inaugurating a new policy. Missionaries connected with the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, such as Schwarz, Gericke and Kiernander, had never depended upon their missionary society for their entire financial support, but supplemented the Society's allowance by their own earnings in India. Carey however, did adopt a new principle by which missionaries divested themselves of the right of property in their own earnings and devoted their income exclusively to missionary work through a common fund.

Carey's colleagues, the Marshmans and William Ward, loyally endorsed his policy of making the mission self-supporting. In May 1800 the Marshmans opened boarding schools at Serampore to help mission funds. By the end of two years, profits from these schools had risen to \$200 per month. Ward had set up a printing press with the primary object of printing the Bible and gospel tracts; but he also undertook printing for the government and the general public, and income from work of this nature steadily grew. The finances of the Mission were further strengthened when in May 1801 Carey became teacher of Bengali in the government's College of Fort William, Calcutta at a monthly salary of \$100. Some years later Carey was promoted to a professorship in the college, and his salary was increased to \$200 per month. All of this money was put into the common fund.

Although the Baptist Mission at Serampore had gained financial independence, Carey encouraged the Home Committee of the Baptist Mission to send grants-in-aid. This policy gave the missionaries freedom of action and they were able, without reference to the Society at home, to enlarge the sphere of their work, purchase buildings, erect churches and appoint missionaries raised up in India. From a financial aspect, the communal system of living adopted by the Baptist missionaries at Carey's suggestion was successful; but in the realm of personal relationships the scheme did not have similar success. By July

²² William Carey, *Enquiry* (New facsimile edition, London: Carey Kingsgate Press Ltd., 1961), p. 73.

1801, of the six missionaries who had agreed upon the rules for communal living, there were only three survivors, Carey, Marshman and Ward. These three seem to have been well adapted to each other and lived in close harmony.

The situation changed with the arrival in Serampore of several new missionaries, one in 1803 and four in 1805. Dissatisfaction arose among the new missionaries because they were not permitted an equal share in the management of the mission on the ground of inexperience. Feelings were aroused, and there was much correspondence on the subject between Serampore and the Home Committee. The Committee in England had from the first disagreed with Carey's feeling [p. 349](#) that every missionary was entitled to an equal share in the management of the Mission. In 1807 the missionaries decided that they and their families should live communally only by their own consent, and that the distinct families should constitute a general mission with a committee and a secretary to transact business. This new arrangement did not succeed as the junior missionaries still objected to the control of affairs exercised by their senior colleagues. The dispute was ended, at least openly, when the Home Committee notified all concerned that the management of the Baptist Mission in Bengal was to be vested in Carey, Marshman and Ward for their lifetime.

By insisting in 1805 that experience be the determining factor in deciding who should manage the mission, Carey revealed a change in opinion; in 1800 he had admitted Marshman, Ward and the others to equal partnership in the affairs of the mission, even though they had newly arrived in the country and were totally inexperienced in missionary matters. Carey's later viewpoint failed sufficiently to appreciate that it was unreasonable to expect missionaries and their families to conform to a system of communal living, yet deny them the privilege of an equal share in the management of the community life and work. One of the junior missionaries, Johns, in a series of letters entitled *The Spirit of the Serampore System* points out in Letter Two that the senior missionaries, who had arranged for him to be appointed government surgeon in Serampore, received all his salary and private fees into the common fund, and expected him to take his meals at the common table, but did not admit him to equal partnership in the system.

After the death in 1815 of Andrew Fuller, home secretary of the Baptist Missionary Society from its commencement, a dispute arose between the Serampore missionaries and the Home Committee about the same matter, the management of the Baptist Mission in India. The dispute was carried on for several years and became known as the Serampore controversy. The controversy involved a vital question of missionary policy: whether or not missionaries, in managing the affairs of the mission in India, were to be subordinate to the wishes of the Committee in England.

Carey never regarded himself and his colleagues as being in a position of subordination to the officers and members of the Baptist Missionary Society in England, but considered they were equal partners with them in a great enterprise. It was quite out of the question, so far as Carey was concerned, that the Home Committee should issue orders to him. Though Carey received grants from the Society in England, he depended mainly upon the secular occupations [p. 350](#) in which he and the other missionaries engaged to supply money to finance the work of the mission. He therefore felt free to use the funds of the mission to purchase property, erect buildings, appoint Indian evangelists and train missionaries without consulting the Home Committee. A full account of all decisions reached at Serampore was sent to the Home Committee of the Baptist Missionary Society for information, not for approval.

In 1816 the Home Committee wrote to Carey of their desire that the Serampore property be vested in eleven trustees, eight in England and three in Serampore. The

Serampore missionaries were astounded, and Marshman states that the letter containing the resolution ‘filled us all with astonishment and grief’.²³ The missionaries felt that ‘to place the premises in the hands of a majority of trustees in England chosen by the Committee would deprive them of all control over them, endanger their continued residence in them, and expose all their Missionary operations to the risk of interruptions’.²⁴ The Home Committee resolution concerning the control of property and another resolution concerning the control of Indian workers associated with the Mission do not seem to justify the feeling of alarm aroused among the Serampore missionaries upon receiving them. The expression used about property and the direction of workers appear to be straightforward, and the suggestion about the appointment of trustees seems perfectly reasonable. To understand fully the reaction of Carey and his fellow-missionaries, two facts must be kept in mind: one of Carey’s great friends in England, Ryland, had written that the Home Committee was suspicious of the senior missionaries at Serampore and was anxious to seize power; and the junior missionaries at Serampore, some of them with close personal friends on the Home Committee, had become increasingly hostile to Carey, Marshman and Ward. When the three senior missionaries indicated their unwillingness to comply with the Committee’s wishes, the junior missionaries, who advocated submission to the Home Committee in every matter, withdrew altogether from Serampore in 1817 and formed a separate Missionary Union in Calcutta.

In September 1817 the Serampore missionaries sent a lengthy reply to the Committee resolutions of December 1816. Two matters raised by the Home Committee are especially dealt with in this letter. The first concerns what exactly is involved in the committee’s resolution that [p. 351](#) the supervision of the native preachers be carried out by the Serampore missionaries ‘on behalf of the Society’.

Your requesting in your 7th resolution ‘that we will undertake on behalf of the Society, the direction of the native ministering brethren already under our care’, that is, of the brethren whom we support ourselves, has created much uneasiness in our minds, lest you should thereby have intended to hint, that you have some kind of right over the labour of our hands. If undertaking it ‘in behalf of the Society’ be intended to convey no other idea than that of cooperation with the Society at home;—if it be addressed to us as brethren and fellow helpers in the cause, possessing the same right over the funds we originate, as you possess over those intrusted to you, we feel no objection to the expression of the thing; ... But if it be intended to convey any further idea, regard for the welfare of the cause, and for our usefulness in the work of God forbids our admitting it even for a moment.²⁵

The second matter dealt with is property.

What shall we say to the request made us to put into the hands of a majority of trustees in England the premises on which we reside? The spirit of this request is impossible not to perceive ... To waive the injustice of it, where could be the delicacy of a new Committee’s saying to those who have for so many years furnished the greater part of the funds expended in the mission: ‘It is no longer safe to intrust with four thousand pounds’ of property: give it up to US?’²⁶

²³ J. C. Marshman, *Statement Relative to Serampore* (London, 1828), p. 44.

²⁴ Marshman, *Life and Times*, vol. ii, p. 140.

²⁵ Marshman, *Statement Relative to Serampore*, p. 63.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

The reply of the missionaries clearly attributes to the Committee in England a desire to dominate and control the Baptist mission at Serampore. So convinced were they of this, that at the time of making the reply they drew up an Explanatory Declaration which recorded their decision that the Serampore premises, though held in trust for the Baptist Missionary Society, were to be forever attached to the Baptist Mission at Serampore, and to be held in trust by Carey, Marshman and Ward and by such persons as they might appoint.

And they further hereby declare, that it is their will, design, meaning and intention that no other person or persons, either in England or in India belonging to the said Baptist Missionary Society ... shall have the least title or right to the property or the administration of the said premises, unless lawfully appointed thereto by them as Trustees for that purpose.²⁷

In order to protect themselves from what they considered an [p. 352](#) unfriendly Home Committee, the Serampore missionaries thus adopted the anomalous position that, though the Serampore premises belonged to the Baptist Missionary Society, the Society was not to be allowed to occupy the premises or to have the right of appointing trustees. The argument between the Serampore missionaries and the Committee over the question of the control of the mission in India continued for ten years, and on occasions the exchanges were angry and bitter. The climax of the controversy was reached in March 1827, when it was decided that the Baptist Missionary Society and the Serampore Mission were henceforth to operate as separate and distinct mission organizations.

An examination of the views of missionary historians and Carey's biographers concerning the Serampore controversy reveals that in almost every case their sympathies are with the Serampore missionaries rather than the Home Committee. Writing nearly forty years after the controversy, John Marshman states:

The missionaries offered the society cordial and affectionate cooperation on the basis of independence, a kind of federal union with individual freedom ... Had it been possible to create a dozen establishments like that of Serampore, each raising and managing its own funds and connected with the Society as the centre of unity in a common cause, it ought to have been a subject of congratulation, and not of regret.²⁸

Deaville Walker comments:

Secretary Dyer and a group of London men were determined to run the mission on the same lines as a business concern, and to put its mission staff on the same footing as the employees of a commercial house—with regard to receiving instructions be it noted, not with regard to remuneration.... The Committee in England had a perfect right and even a duty to look into the management of affairs and also to ask for full information. That information Carey, Marshman and Ward were perfectly willing to give and did give; what they were grieved about was the tone and spirit of the demands and the way the correspondence was conducted.²⁹

Richter, the gifted missionary historian, writes about the controversy:

It was a tragic circumstance that these lives which had been 'in labours more abundant' should be embittered during a decade and a half by a quarrel of the most petty character

²⁷ Appendix to the Annual Report of the Baptist Missionary Society, 1827, p. 32.

²⁸ Marshman, *Life and Times*, vol. ii, p. 213.

²⁹ Walker, *op. cit.*, p. 298.

with the Society which Carey had himself founded, and which really existed on the strength of his p. 353 success—the Baptist Missionary Society.... Today we can only read the annals of this unworthy strife with the deepest regret.³⁰

It is impossible, however, to escape the feeling that Carey and his colleagues were themselves responsible for bringing about the controversy. It is not enough, as nearly every historian and biographer of Carey has done, to consider the controversy in the light of events from the death of Fuller, the first home secretary, until the 1827 Agreement. The seeds of controversy were sown in 1805 when the Serampore trio refused to admit new missionaries to full and equal partnership in the Baptist Mission at Serampore. The dissatisfaction created among the new missionaries because of this policy spread to their friends in England, some of whom were members of the Home Committee. It is argued that the older group did not consider several of the new missionaries fit to share with them in the management of the Mission. However, if Carey, Marshman and Ward had shown to their junior colleagues that perfect trust which they expected the Home Committee to have in them, it is doubtful that there would ever have been a controversy.

On the other hand, the Home Committee in England failed to appreciate fully the self-sacrifice which had characterized the lives of Carey, Marshman and Ward from the very beginning. If they had so chosen, the Serampore trio could have used the large sum of money they earned in secular employment for their own personal benefit, rather than devoting all of it to the Baptist Mission. Furthermore, it was too little realized that the contributions which steadily and increasingly flowed into the funds of the Baptist Missionary Society were largely given because of interest in the splendid accomplishments of the Serampore missionaries. If the Serampore missionaries sowed the seeds of controversy, the Committee in England, by its lack of sympathetic understanding of all the factors involved, and in some instances by its lack of tact, helped the controversy to flourish.

There can be little doubt that a vital question was involved in the Serampore controversy, although at times it was obscured by arguments about property rights: To what extent did the Baptist Missionary Society in England have the right of control over the work of its missionaries in India? The principle laid down by Carey was that 'control originates in contribution'. Since he and his colleagues contributed the major share of the money required for the Baptist p. 354 Mission in Bengal, they reserved the right to control the work of the Mission. The Home Committee, in accordance with the same principle, felt that they should have a share in the control of the work in the measure that they have contributed financially to it.

It is important to realize that we have here a decided change in missionary policy as it had been originally conceived by Carey. The policy under which he went to India was to make himself self-supporting as soon as possible and thus relieve the home Society of any further financial responsibility for him. After Carey went to India, the financial resources of missionary societies grew to such an extent that it was no longer deemed necessary to send missionaries who would be expected to support themselves by secular employment. It was then possible for missionaries to devote their whole time to missionary work, under the arrangement that a regular and sufficient allowance would be paid them by the Home Committee. The missionary whose salary was paid in full from the homeland came to be regarded as an agent or a servant of the missionary society rather than a co-partner in a great enterprise. Moreover, the missionary became dependent upon the society at home not only for his own salary, but also for the salaries of the nationals whom he

³⁰ Julius Richter, *History of Missions in India* (Edinburgh, 1908), pp. 142f.

employed and for all the money necessary to finance local missionary work. The missionary no longer found himself able to appoint workers or commence new work without first ascertaining from the Home Committee if money was available. All of this meant that ultimately the control of work overseas rested with a committee in the homeland.

The agreement of 1827 between Carey and the Baptist Missionary Society brought to an end a bitter controversy. However, it also marked the abandonment of Carey's policy concerning the financial support and control of missionary work, a policy which, had it received the encouragement it deserved, might have resulted in something not yet achieved in Bengal 127 years after the death of Carey—a self-supporting, self-propagating Bengali church.

Walter B. Davis, professor of missions at Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, has recently returned from the scene of Carey's labours, where he turned over a manuscript of Carey's life for publication by the East Pakistan Christian Council in Bengali. [p. 355](#)

William Carey: Climbing the Rainbow

Iain H. Murray

Published with Permission from the Banner of Truth October 1992

Exactly two hundred years ago the modern missionary movement was born in England and at the centre of that movement was a man who lived here in Leicester. So this is an appropriate place and certainly an appropriate time to speak of William Carey. Such a bicentenary is far too important to be ignored and we need to stir up our churches to remember it.

I am also convinced that this bicentenary can be a special inspiration to us at the present time. We live in a confusing and, in some ways, discouraging period of church history. At times the confusion enters into our own thinking as we begin to wonder what our priorities ought to be in the present spiritual conditions. There is an emphasis in Carey which is very relevant to our need. We want a key to break through the circumstances of our day which often seem so restricting to the advance of the gospel. We know what that key is, it is *faith in the Word of God*, but Carey put a far stronger emphasis upon that key than we commonly do—for him it was the sole means of going forward. He took literally the words of the apostle John, 'this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith', and, supremely, the words of the Lord Jesus Christ: 'Have faith in God. For verily I say unto you, that whosoever shall say unto this mountain, be thou removed and cast into the sea; and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe those things which he saith shall come to pass; he shall have whatsoever he saith.' For Carey the Word and promises of God were so sure that he laid everything upon them.

Let us begin by paying a visit to Carey, just a few miles from here, on the first Tuesday in April, 1792. His house would not be hard to find for it was almost opposite the Baptist chapel which he served in Harvey Lane and it stood out from the other simple homes in that lane because of the flowers that were so often in the windows. Carey had a life-long