be found in Psalm 98 : 2 where the word is parallel to *jeshu'a*, and in Psalm 103 : 17, where it is parallel to *chesed*.

It is manifest that the Bible translator, in particular the translator of the Old Testament, is not faced with an easy task. The fulfilment of this task requires the most careful scrutiny and cautious prudence. But it is a privilege, never to be sufficiently appraised, to be entrusted with this responsible task.

On the Use of the Name 'Isa

A third and final contribution by Wilfred J. Bradnock

The arguments for and against the use of *'Isa* have now been set forth with compelling advocacy by D. A. Chowdhury and L. Bevan Jones and one is led to the conclusion that those who must make a decision on the basis of theory alone deserve all our sympathy! It remains to ask whether there is any additional factor which has not so far been adduced. This article is written in the belief that there is, but it is a factor which will demand the most careful analysis and evaluation. In the last resort the decision for the use of *'Isa* in preference to some form of transliteration of *Iesous* must remain to some degree subjective and call for the courage of the translator's conviction.

The factor so far not discussed is that of actual usage. In the many scores of versions of the Christian Scriptures produced in areas where Muslim influence is either predominant or very strong, how have translators in the past actually dealt with the problem and has time any verdict to pass upon their decisions? The study which follows is based upon some 70 different versions in use in Muslim areas and though it is to some degree representative, it is far from exhaustive.

The most interesting results derive from a study of the history of Arabic versions. These show a remarkable consistency. Beginning with the *editio princeps* of the Arabic New Testament edited by T. Erpenius and published at Leyden in 1616, and continuing through the outstanding versions of the 17th century including the great London and Paris polyglots, right up to modern times, the usage has been *Yesu Almasih* or some approximate transliteration. *'Isa* is nowhere found. This goes also for the great standard version of Van Dyck which is in current use.

The history of the Persian version is rather different. Beginning with the early 19th century, we find that Henry Martyn decided on the use of *'Isa* in his edition of 1815. Possibly because Henry Martyn's version was of such outstanding quality, it remained for many years the standard Bible and though subsequent editions underwent correction, the use of *'Isa* has never been challenged. A different story, however, is to be told about Henry Martyn's even greater translation of the New Testament into Urdu. As might have been expected, he used *'Isa* also in this version, but by the year 1829 for reasons which can now be the subject of conjecture only, *'Isa* gave way to the transliteration *Yesu Masih*. Is it legitimate to suppose that whereas in an entirely Islamic

context the use of *'Isa* would be quite natural, in the context of mixed cultures and a variety of religious traditions existing in India, the young church became more speedily aware of the dangers inherent in the use of the Koranic name, or was it that in such a context the church found it easier to challenge the historic ideas associated with *'Isa* by the use of transliteration from the Greek *Iesous?*

Of more recent translations, and these are mostly of gospels many of a tentative nature only, 9 in my list of 70 use *'Isa.* In each instance the version is for an area where Muslim influence is very strong. By far the greatest number (42) make use of some form of transliteration of *Iesous Christos.* The rest, 17 in all, use the hybrid form *Yesu Almasih* which is a combination of transliteration of *Iesous* with the Hebrew-Arabic triliteral *MSH,* however it be derived.

One or two safe conclusions can now be drawn. Firstly, it is in Persia only that a claim can be made for the consistent use of *'Isa* in a full Christian context over more than a century. It would be of very great interest to know how far modern historians of the church in Persia would claim that the use of *'Isa* is devoid of its Koranic content. Has the time now come when in Bevan Jones' words the church can sing with all the fullness of its Christian meaning, "How sweet the name of *'Isa* sounds in a believer's ear"? Secondly, as the title *Almasih* was Hebraic before it was Koranic, there could be no conceivable objection to its use in transliteration. This ought to reassure those translators who are anxious to establish the historic connection between the *'Isa* of the Koran and the *Iesous* of the Greek New Testament. It would seem to be in every way preferable to a transliteration of the English *Christ* or the Greek *Christos* which in most Islamic contexts is meaningless. Thirdly, the instinct of most translators for the transliteration of *Iesous* would seem to be as sound as it is widely shared. The ideal combination would seem to be *Yesu Almasih* or some appropriately derived form thereof. In this form *Yesu* both identifies and differentiates, thus meeting the pleas of both parties, those who fear confusion of thought on account of the Koranic content of *'Isa* and those who stress the necessity of establishing the historic identity of *'Isa* and *Iesous.*

A study of the usage in the following lists reveals that there has, so far, been only a partial effort to achieve uniformity between versions in contiguous geographical areas. This surely is a matter which deserves fuller consideration, especially on the part of those responsible for the revision of a major version in an important key language or lingua franca. The evidence suggests that so far insufficient attention has been paid to what one's predecessors or fellow translators in some neighbouring language may have done. This is notably the case in certain parts of Nigeria where of three dialects of Jukun, two have the transliteration *Yesu Christi* and the third has *'Isa Almasihu.* It is fairly evident, however, that in Nigeria most of the smaller tribal versions are consistent in the transliteration of *Iesous Christos.* It would be interesting to know whether this is due to chance or whether the translators in most instances looked to the Hausa or Nupe versions. If it is the former, it may well be that second thoughts may have to prevail in the event of any revisions

as in the forthcoming revision of the Hausa New Testament the Committee have now decided to adopt the form *Yesu Almasihu* instead of *Yesu Christi*. This is a logical compromise and a very fair attempt to meet the needs of a radically changed situation. Thirty years ago in Northern Nigeria the response to the Gospel was made by pagans only and it mattered little whether the translators used *Yesu Christi* or some other form derived from the Koranic usage. Now, however, there is extensive work and a growing church among Mohammadan converts and the whole issue has to be faced afresh. What is of real importance is that as barriers break down and the church in areas such as this draws closer together, that form of the name should prevail and enjoy the widest possible usage which has the most substantial authority and is capable of conveying the fullest Christian content.

Some final observations of a general interest may be of interest. My experience of converts from Islam in India is that after conversion they seem to have an instinctive preference for the use of the name *Yesu* and this is probably a natural reaction against what they have come to recognise as only a very partial representation of the fullness of Christ in the name *'Isa*. On the other hand, in communities where Christians are in daily contact with Muslims, I have subsequently heard Indian Christians of non-Islamic origin use the name *'Isa* freely, especially in prayer. I think this is to be accounted for by the fact that *'Isa* may appeal to them simply as a native word, though not in relation to its Koranic context. The list on which these conclusions are based is appended.

LANGUAGE	USAGE	DATE
Persian	'Isa Masih	1815 onwards
Arabic	Yisu Almasih	1616 onwards
Indian Versions		
Kashmiri	Yisu Masih	1913
Balochi	Yisu Masih	1900
Panjabi	Yisu Masih	1927
Pashto	Yisu Masih	1894
Shina	Yisu Masih	1929
Sindhi	Jisu Krist	1927
Urdu	'Isa Masih	1814 (Henry Martyn)
	Yisu Masih	1829 onwards
Malayalam	Yisu Masih	1903
Tamil (Arabic)	'Isa Almasih	1912
African Versions: Nigeria		
Nupe	Yisu Christi	1860
Hausa	Yesu Kristi	1932
	Yesu Almasihu	1953 (St. John's Gospel, tentative edition)

LANGUAGE	USAGE	DATE
Ibo	Jisus Kraist	1913
Yoruba	Jesu Christi	1932
Idoma	Jisus Kraist	1930
Fula	Yesu Masiya	1929
Igala	Jesus Christ	1933
Ora	Jesu Kristi	1909
Ijo	Jesus Christ	1921
Bura	Yesu Christi	1950
Gbari	Jesu Masihu	1925
Tangale	Yesu Kristi	1920
Chawi	Jesu Kristi	1923
Eggon	Yesu Kristi	1935
Munchi	Yesu Kristu	1920
Jukun: Donga	Jesu Kristu	1918
Wukari	Jesu Kristu	1914
Kona	'Isa Almasihu	1927
Tsamba	Yesu Kristi	1933
Yergum	Yesu Kristi	1917
Wurkum	Yesu Kristu	1932
Ganawuri	Yisu Kristi	1940
Jarawa	Yesu Kristi	1940
Sura	Jesu Kristi	1940
Kanuri	Yisu Kristibelan	1949
Addo	Yesu Kristi	1914
Igabo	Jesu Kristi	1920
Ogoni	Jesus Kraist	1935
African Versions: Egypt		
Nubian	Yesu Mesih	1885
Dinka (Bor)	Yecu Kritho	1940
Egyptian Arabic Colloquial	Yisu Al Masih	1927
Dinka (Padang)	Yecu Kritho	1933
Shilluk	Jisus Kraist	1911
Nuer	Jiidheth Kraitht	1938
Moru	Yesu Kristo	1928
Bari	Yesu Kristo	1942
Other African Versions		
Swahili: Zanzibar	'Isa Masiya	1883
Mombasa	Jesu Masihi	1909
Tanganyika	Yesu Kristo	1937
Standard	Yesu Kristo	1953
Algerian Colloquial	Yisu Almasih	1940
Algerian Tunisian Colloquial	Yisu Almasih	1911
Arabic: Palestinian	Yesu Almasih	1946
Djerma	'Isa Almasih	1934
Mandingo	Issa Ulmasih	1837
Meninka	Yesou Masiya	1931

LANGUAGE	USAGE	DATE
Jolof (Gambia)	Yesu Krista	1882
Tula	'Isa Almasihu	1929
Habbe	Yesou Kristo	1933
Kabyle	Aisa el-Masih	1833
Bambara	Yesou Krista	1937
Dagbani	Yisa Masih	1953
Asia		
Turkish Osmanli	'Isa Almasih	1819
Malay	'Isa Almaseh	1731 onwards
Malay (Bode)	Jesus Keristus	1938
Batak	Jesus Kristus	1911
Bare'e (Adriani)	'Isa i Masehi	1913
Javanese	Jesus Kristus	1829
Sundanese	Jesus Kristus	1854
Balinese	Jesus Kristus	1910
Toba-Batta (v. d. Tuuk)	Si 'Isa si Miniakan	1867
(revision)	Jesus Kristus	
Sangirese	Jesus Christus	1875
Tae	Jesu Karistu	1933
E. Sumbanese	Jehu Karitu	
W. Sumbanese	Jezu Karetu	
Timorese	Jesus Neno Anan	1941

A Programme for Missionary Language Learning

Wiliam A. Smalley

(Reproduced by permission from the International Review of Missions, January 1953)

The modern science of descriptive linguistics has provided at least two important by-products of value to missions. The one, which has been exploited increasingly over the last fifteen years, is the technique of scientific language analysis applied to the unwritten languages in use in regions to which many a missionary still goes. This contribution, thoroughly on its feet and expanding as a missionary tool, we will not discuss further.[1]

The second by-product of descriptive linguistics is not being exploited except on a sporadic and individual scale. It has to do with language learning and language pedagogy in all the major languages of the world.

[1] For some relatively non-technical discussion of this phase of linguistics see Eugene A. Nida, *Bible Translating* (American Bible Society, New York, 1947), pp. 62-64, 100-27, 241-76.