

# WORDS RELATING TO THE LORD JESUS CHRIST

R. M. CLARK

*The following article is in note form and it is unfortunately impossible to give the meanings of all the various Indian words discussed without it being completely rewritten. Nevertheless it is hoped that even readers who have no knowledge of the Indian languages will find the more exegetical comments of value.*

In the N.T. there are some 10 verbs, as many adjectives, and more than 50 nouns that are of christological significance. In the following notes matters of etymology and history of usage are touched on only in so far as they are directly relevant for translation.

The following books have been found particularly helpful:

Arndt & Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*  
Kittel & Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament (TWNT)*  
Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*  
Taylor, *The Names of Jesus*

The following abbreviations are used, this list indicating also the Indian versions of the N.T. that have been consulted:

B	—	Bengali	HR	—	Hindi Revision
G	—	Gujarati	M	—	Marathi
H	—	Hindi	S	—	Sanskrit

Some, or all these together are referred to as "the versions".

In general the words considered have been arranged alphabetically under the three heads: verbs, adjectives, nouns. As exceptions to this, cognate words are considered together and in some cases words of similar meaning have been grouped together.

The method of transliteration employed is a very rough one, without the use of diacritical marks—nor is it always consistent. It is hoped, however, that the words will be recognized.

## I. Verbs:

*Anistêmi* (Acts 2:24, etc.), *anastasis* (Acts 2:31, etc.), *egeirô* (Acts 3:15, etc.), *egergis* (Mt. 27:53). Any difference in meaning between these pairs meaning 'rise, resurrection' respectively may be overlooked in translation. The translation *ji uthna, ji uthana* (H) is not satisfactory, as the verbs *uthna, uthana* do not have the meaning of rising (raising) from the dead. The construction is clumsy and artificial. A nominal compound formed with *jivita*, perhaps preceded by *punah*, is to be recommended.

*Erchomai*, 'come'. In translation the simple verb meaning to come, e.g. *ana* (H), is perhaps satisfactory in all cases, but it might be considered that in certain occurrences, e.g. Jn. 9:39; 16:28, which speak of Jesus' coming from the Father the verb has a heightened significance which might appropriately be recognized. If this were considered desirable, a compound formed with *agamana* would be suitable.

*Eudokeō* (Mk. 1:11, etc.). This means 'be pleased with' or 'take delight in' (a person or thing). In the LXX it can carry the idea of Divine election, as in the quotation Mt. 12:18.

The versions translate by a compound formed with *prasanna* (G, H, HR), *pṛita* (B, S), or *santushta* (M). The first of these is to be preferred. But would it be still better to use *atiprasanna*? Note how the meaning of the Greek verb is heightened by the prefix.

*Katabainō*, 'come down, descend'. Here too, in some occurrences, e.g. Jn. 3:13, there is a heightened significance. For this the only satisfactory translation is a compound formed with *avatarita*.

*Kenoō* (Phil. 2:7), 'to make empty, to make void or of no effect, to destroy'. The first is the meaning in Phil. 2:7. Of what Jesus made himself empty is shown by the context.

B and H translate by a compound formed with *shunya*, M and HR by a compound with *rikta*. The latter is preferable. *Shunya* suggests a complete absence of everything, a vacuum; *rikta* connotes deprivation in some particular respect or respects.

*Stauroō*, *stauros*, 'crucify', 'cross'. Sanskrit uses the nouns *vadhastambha* and *shula* for the stake on which a condemned person is impaled. If *stauros* is to be translated, either *vadhastambha* (G, M) or *shula* (*suli*) might be used. Some versions (B, H, HR) use the transliteration *krusa*. (This form came into Indian languages via Portuguese.) This is perhaps preferable. The word *krusa* is widely known in India and has found its way into some dictionaries.

For *stauroō* it is possible to use a circumlocution, such as 'lift up on a cross'. Is it not legitimate, however, to coin an adjective *krusita* and use that, as HR has done? It is certainly much neater.

*Sunistēmi* (Col. 1:17). The Greek verb, when used intransitively, as here, means 'to stand with or by, to stand together, to form a league, to be joined together (as in marriage)'. It means also to continue or endure, to consist of parts, to hold together, to be compact, to have a firm consistency. Might one say that the meaning in Col. 1:17 is to be united in a cosmos?

The versions translate variously by compounds formed with *stīti* (B, H, S), *samavishta* (M), *vyavasthita* (G). Would it not be better than any of these to use *sangathita* or *sangathana*?

## II. Adjectives:

*Agapētos*, 'beloved'. (Mt. 3:17, etc.). In the O.T. God's love for Israel is a love of election. This idea of election seems to appear also in the N.T. where *agapētos* is used of Jesus, and with it is combined the suggestion of the intimate unity of the Father and the Son in love. The word also contains the sense of 'unique', 'only'. It is used in the LXX to translate 'only' in Gen. 22:12.

Most versions have *priya*, but M has *paramapriya*. *Paramapriya*, *atipriya*, or *priyatama* is to be recommended.

*Hagios*, 'holy'. (Mk. 1:24, etc.). When used of Jesus this suggests that he must be classed with God, the Holy One of the O.T.

The versions have *pavitra*. This is not very satisfactory, as its meaning extends little beyond that of purity; but there seems to be no better word available. We are probably compelled to use this, trusting to Biblical, especially O.T., associations to help out.

*Hosios*, 'holy'. (Acts 2:27; 13:35). In the LXX this is used for *chasis*. When used of men, it means devout or pious; when used of God, it means holy, with the accompanying suggestion of faithfulness (i.e., steadfast in *chesed*).

Most versions translate the same as *hagios*, but would *punya*, or possibly even *punita*, be better?

*Dikaïos*, 'righteous'. (Acts 3:14, etc.). (Cf. the discussion under 'Salvation'.) *Dikaïos* was used as a messianic designation in Judaism in N.T. times (Cf. Schrenk, *TWNT*). If such an association is present in the N.T., it is very weak. Where *dikaïos* is used of Jesus it appears to refer not so much to his being Messiah as to his being wholly faithful to God's righteous will.

This is best translated by an adjective formed from *dharma*. Adjectives formed from *nyaya* or *niti* have in general a more restricted and therefore less satisfactory meaning.

*Dunatos*, 'powerful' (Lk. 24:19), *dunamis*, 'power' (Lk. 4:14, 36; 1 Cor. 1:24). In Lk. 4:14, 36 Jesus is endowed with *dunamis*; in 1 Cor. 1:24 he is the *dunamis* of God.

In the versions *dunamis* is rendered variously as *samarthya* (H, M), *parakrama* (B, G), *prabhava* (S). The first is to be preferred. *Parakrama* tends towards the meaning of valour or prowess, and *prabhava* towards that of power exerted on another. As connoting power in itself, might *bala*, *samarthya*, and *shakti* be considered as being in ascending order of forcefulness? If this is true, should *shakti* be considered here? Or would its use in Hinduism for the female, dynamic principle in the Godhead be considered as precluding this?

*Dunatos* may be translated by the adjective cognate with the noun that is used for *dunamis*.

*Eklektos* (Lk. 23:35), *eklelegmenos* (Lk. 9:35, best text), 'chosen'. Messiah as the Elect One and head of the Elect Community is prominent in Jewish Apocalyptic. In Luke there is a close association between election and the passion.

The versions translate variously. To be recommended are *varita* (S) and *nirvachita*.

*Monogenês*, 'only begotten' (Jn. 3:16, 18, etc.). Such adjectives, formed with *genês* and a prefix, usually refer to origin in general, not only to physical birth, e.g. *allogenês*, 'one of another race.'

The versions have *ekajata* (B, S), *ekaki janita* (G), *ekalauta* (H, HR, M). The first of these is to be preferred. The last is not

satisfactory. It is a clumsy and little-used word. If *ekajata* cannot be used, *ekamatra* would be much preferable to *ekalauta*. It carries every bit of the meaning of the latter and is a much better word. If it is felt absolutely necessary to bring out literally the idea of *genês* here, then *ekamatra janita* might be a possibility.

*Prôtotoskos*, 'first-born' (Lk. 2:7; Rom. 8:29; Col. 1:15, 18; Heb. 1:6, etc.). The original meaning of the word is giving birth for the first time. Later it came to mean first-born or first in rank. This is the N.T. meaning. In the N.T. the *tokos* element is clearly implied only in Lk. 2:7; in other places it tends to recede into the background.

In most N.T. occurrences, including Lk. 2:7, *prathama* (*sarva-prathama*) or *prathamaja* is a satisfactory rendering. In Rom. 8:29 *jyeshtha* (G, HR, M, S) is to be preferred. In Col. 1:18 the rendering *sarvaprathama jivita* is suggested.

*Prôtos*, *eschatos*, 'first', 'last'. Where these are used in Rev. 1:17; 2:8; 22:13, is not the idea that of eternity reaching beyond both past and future? The versions have *adi*, *anta* or *prathama*, *antima* (or variants of these). Would it not be better to use *anadi*, *ananta*? Cp. Is. 44:6.

In 1 Cor. 15:45, does not *eschatos* suggest finality or perfection? The versions have *antima* (or synonymous variants).

*Christos*. This is the equivalent of the Hebrew *mashiach*. The meaning is 'anointed', and thereby designated for high office.

If it is to be translated (e.g. in Acts 4:26), the obvious rendering is *abhishikta*; but in other contexts this hardly does justice to *christos*, with all its wealth of associations in both O.T. and N.T. In the New Testament, at least, it would appear that the better course is to transliterate, as the versions have done. Should this be a transliteration of the Hebrew or the Greek? The Greek would seem preferable, especially as many people in India are familiar with the English words Christ and Christian.

### III. Nouns:

*Adam* (1 Cor. 15:45). Here *adam* is not so much an individual person as a representative of the human race. The translation *mulapurusha* is suggested, with perhaps a footnote indicating that the original is *adam*.

*Arkrogôniaios*, 'cornerstone' (Eph. 2:20; 1 Pet. 2:6. Cf. *kephalê gônias*, Mk. 12:10, etc.). Is this a cornerstone in the foundation or a stone that crowns and completes the building? Jeremias (*TWNT*) adduces considerable evidence in support of the latter.

Is a free translation permissible here, e.g. Hindi, *kamana* (*meharava*) *ki* *kendrashila*, 'centre stone of the arch' (cf. HR, Mk. 12:10)? (In the discussion it was agreed that a free translation is a possibility, provided the sense of "the supreme strengthening stone in the structure" is conveyed by the translation.)

*Alêtheia*, 'truth' (Jn. 14:6, etc.). This is used in the LXX for *emeth* or *emunah*, that which is firm and can be relied on. It is used of the trustworthiness of God in his dealings with men. This becomes the truth, the abiding reality, for man's life. For Plato *alêtheia* is true being. In later Hellenistic religion it is used for that divine being which becomes accessible to man through revelation, initiation, ecstasy, and gnosis.

In the N.T., where the word is used in relation to Jesus, the meaning is Ultimate Being or Reality. The 'faithful' God of the O.T., the Source and Ground of all that is, is revealed in Jesus, with infinite love and grace.

Where *alêtheia* is used of Jesus, the only possible translation is *satya*. *Satya* means Truth or Reality, including true personality and Ultimate Being. The translation *sachchai* (H, some occurrences) is entirely unsatisfactory, as in general usage this tends to mean merely truthfulness.

*Amen* (Rev. 3:14; cp. 2 Cor. 1:20). If translated, this would be *tathastu*. But, as the Hebrew word has been adopted in our worship, it would seem better to transliterate.

*Amnos* (Jn. 1:29, etc.), *arnion* (Rev. 5:6, etc.) 'lamb'. These may be translated the same. B and S have *meshashava* or *meshashavaka*. These are satisfactory. Where these are not well known a more colloquial word may be used, e.g. *memana* (H).

*Ampelos*, 'vine' (Jn. 15:1, etc.). The Sanskrit word *drakshalata*, or a derived form, is satisfactory in all cases.

*Anêr* (Acts 2:22), *anthrôpos* (Jn. 19:5), 'man'. *Anthrôpos* is the general word for a member of the human race. *Anêr* carries the implication of virility.

In translation, *manushya* and *purusha* respectively are suitable. *Purusha* is especially appropriate for Jesus as it carries associations with the Primal Man, the Divine Person.

*Aparchê* (1 Cor. 15:20, 23). The basic meaning is the first-fruits of the harvest. In Greek usage it is sometimes a technical term for sacrifice. Sometimes the word appears in a weakened sense as meaning the first of anything.

The versions have *prathama phala*. This is the obvious literal translation, but, since the word is used metaphorically of Jesus, would it not be better to say *prathama phala svarupa*?

*Apaugasma* (Heb. 1:3). Is this effulgence or reflection? The use of the word in the Wisdom of Solomon and by Philo would suggest the former. Patristic exegesis also favours this.

The versions have *teja* (G, M), *prakasha* (H), *prabha* (B), *pratibimba* (S). The first three are satisfactory, the last doubtful. It might possibly be desired to reserve *teja* for *doxa* (see below).

*Artos*, 'bread' (Jn. 6:35, etc.). Translate by the common colloquial word for bread. (N.B. This is satisfactory for N. India, where

bread is well-known. It does not meet the translator's difficulty in S. India and other places, where there is no indigenous word for bread; in these areas a general word for food or a corresponding local article of diet may be used. Ed.).

*Archê*, 'beginning' (Col. 1:18). This connotes primacy in time, being, authority, or power. The most common meanings are beginning, origin; elementary principle, first cause; rule, authority. Aristotle speaks of matter, form and negation as *archai*. Similarly the Stoics sometimes speak of matter and god; but they also use *archê* for the *koinos nomos*, the all-pervading world-principle that gives order to the cosmos. St. Paul often uses the word for spiritual powers inimical to man.

In Col. 1:18 the versions have *adi* (B, H, M) or *arambha* (G). Would not *muladhara* be much better than either of these?

*Archêgos* (Acts 3:15; 5:31). The meaning is 'originator, founder leader, ruler'. The versions have *adhishthata* (HR), *kartta* (H), *adikartta* (B, S), *athipathi* (M), *adhikari* and *raja* (G). The first of these is much preferable to the others. Would *adhinayaka* also be possible?

*Despotês*, 'master, lord' (2 Pet. 2:1; Jude 4). This is used for the owner of property, including slaves; the head of a household; also of the absolute rulers of the Persian and Roman empires. In the LXX it is used rarely of God.

The versions have *svami* (H, M), *adhipati* (B), *prabhu* (G, S). The first two are satisfactory. *Prabhu* should be reserved for *kurios*, 'lord'.

*Didaskalos*, *epistatês*, *rabbi*, 'teacher'. These are practically equivalent in the N.T. All may be translated *guru*.

*Doxa*, 'glory' (Jn. 1:14, etc.). This has been considered more generally under the topic "God", p. 80. Where this is used of Jesus the versions have *mahima* (B, G, H, HR, S), *gaurava* (G), *pratapa* (S). Perhaps *teja* might also be considered suitable. *Gaurava* is primarily the quality of being weighty (cf. Heb. *kabod*). From this it is extended to mean the quality of being important, respectable, or honourable. The basic idea of *pratapa* is heat and the radiance of heat. The meaning extends to splendour and majesty. *Mahima* is primarily greatness. It extends to majesty, might, exalted rank. *Teja* is primarily brilliance. It extends to splendour, beauty, valour, spiritual or moral strength, majesty. In Sanskrit literature *mahima* and *teja* are found most often having divine associations. The choice should perhaps be confined to these two.

*Doulos* (Phil. 2:7). The Greek word means primarily a slave, especially one born in slavery. It may also mean one who is subject to another, e.g., politically. In relation to God (as *Kurios*) it means one who is dependent and whose responsibility it is to render obedient service.

Most versions have *dasa*, which means either slave or servant. Satisfactory.

*Eikôn* (2 Cor. 4:4; Col. 1:15), *morphê* (Phil. 2:6), *schêma* (Phil. 2:7), *charaktêr* (Heb. 1:3). *Eikôn* is an image or likeness, as found in a statue, picture, or image on a coin. *Morphê* is a more general term, meaning form, shape, or appearance. *Schêma* means bearing, manner, outward appearance, form. *Charaktêr* is the impress of a die, stamp, or seal. The meaning extends to distinctive mark or characteristic.

For *eikôn* the versions have *pratirupa*, *pratima*, and *pratimurti*. The first is satisfactory. For *morphê* they have *rupa* or *svarupa*. Both are satisfactory, the second perhaps being preferable. For *schêma* they have *akriti*, *sadrishya*, *samanata*, *upama*, and *prakriti*. The first three are satisfactory. For *charaktêr* they have *mudra*, *chhapa*, *pratirupa*, *pratima*, and *murti*. The first is satisfactory, the second a bare possibility.

*Exousia* (Mk. 1:22, 27, etc.). The meaning is 'right, ability, authority'.

Most versions have *adhikara*. This covers all the meanings of the Greek and is entirely satisfactory.

*Zôê*, 'life' (Jn. 14:6, etc.). The versions have *jivana*. Satisfactory.

*Hiereus*, 'priest' (Heb. 5:6; 10:21), *archiereus*, 'high priest' (Heb., *passim*). Most versions have *yajaka* and *mahayajaka*. These are now obsolete. *Purohita* and *mahapurohita* are to be preferred.

*Hilasmos*, 'expiation, propitiation' (1 Jn. 2:2). (Cf. the discussion under 'Salvation', p. 108.)

Most versions have *prayashchita*. This is not really satisfactory, but what else is possible. Could *papamochana ka sadhana* be used?

*Kephalê*, 'head' (Eph. 1:22, etc.). The versions have *mastaka* or *sira*. Satisfactory.

*Kritês*, 'judge' (Acts 10:42; 2 Tim. 4:8). The versions have a noun of agency formed from either *nyaya* or *vichara*. The former is preferable, as it defines the function more clearly. The latter is rather diffuse.

*Kurios*, 'Lord'. This means one possessing power or authority, an owner of property, of slaves, master of a household, husband. The vocative is common as a form of respectful address. *Kurios* is used of gods, rulers, and high officials, especially in Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt. In the LXX it is most frequently used as a substitute for the Divine Name. In the N.T., when used of Jesus, it carries a very exalted significance (cf. 1 Cor. 8:6; Phil. 2:11). In the early Church it was the title used preeminently in confession of faith and in worship.

The versions generally have *prabhu*. This means basically one who is powerful or dominant. Occasionally it may mean one who is eternal or who is supreme in being. In Indian literature it is common as a form of respectful address. It is used frequently of the gods, its usual correlative being *dasa* (cf. *kurios* - *doulos*). The term is satisfactory. Although there is perhaps no adequate reason for attempting to displace *prabhu* from its present position,

*bhagavan* might be considered on its own merits as being at least as good a term. Its pedigree is good, both in etymology and usage. It is used far more frequently than *prabhu* in worship and prayer.

**Logos.** This means a word, a meaningful utterance; the power of reason in man which is the basis of meaningful utterance; the divine, formative, vivifying, and ordering power in the universe; the integrating and ordering principle in society. In Hellenistic popular religion it is used of many cult deities who are considered to be mediators of divine revelation and salvation, especially of Dionysos, Orpheus, Isis, and Hermes.

In the LXX it is used to render *dabar*, which, in relation to God, is his word of power in creation, in nature, in history; and his word of revelation or command to men. Occasionally the LXX uses it for *torah*. In later Judaism the Law was spoken of as preexistent and present in creation.

In the N.T., *logos* is used in the Gospels for the words and sayings of Jesus, the message which he brought. Outside the Gospels it is used especially for the message preached by the Church concerning Jesus. In Jn. 1:1-18 it is used of Jesus himself. The writer probably has both Judaic and Hellenistic usage in view, and in contrast with both of these he boldly declares that the *logos* is Jesus, whose glory his disciples have seen and in whom they have found grace and truth.

The versions translate either by a derivative of *vach* (*vachana*, *vakya*) or by *shabda*. In early Vedic literature *vach* is the creative power in the universe. Sometimes she appears alone, sometimes with Prajapati, the creator god. She is called 'Mother of the Vedas'. All of this suggests an interesting parallel with *logos*. From the Upanishads on, however, she retreats from her creative role and becomes identified with Saraswati, the goddess of speech. Only in Kashmiri Shaivism does she maintain her creative function. There she appears with Shiva as his Shakti.

*Shabda* is of importance from the Upanishads on. As *shabda-brahman* it is eternal and is the ground of the phenomenal world. In some late Upanishads, the Gita, and some of the Puranas *shabdabrahman* is spoken of in terms similar to *saguna brahman*. In some Upanishads it is identified with the syllable OM, and as such is further identified with the Supreme Brahman, both *param* and *aparam*. In the writings of Kabira *shabda* is divine, dynamic power active in revelation and salvation.

*Vach* long ago lost its associations with the creative working of God (except for Kashmiri Shaivism, an association of doubtful value for Christian use). *Shabda* has an important and good usage down to the present. It would appear to be the more appropriate term for our purpose.

**Martus.** This means a witness. In the N.T. it sometimes has the heightened meaning of one who witnesses in the face of persecution, even at the cost of his life. It is used of Jesus in Rev. 1:5; 3:14. The meaning here is probably similar to that in Jn. 18:37.



As a translation G has *shahida*, other versions have *sakshi*. *Sakshi* is satisfactory, *shahida* doubtful here.

*Mesitês*. This in general is a legal term, meaning mediator or arbitrator. Occasionally it is used of a cult deity, especially Mithras, as the one who exercises judicial functions. In Gal. 3:19f. it is used of Moses as intermediary in the giving of the Law. In Heb., e.g. 8:6, it is used of Jesus as the one through whom the New Covenant is established.

Most versions have *madhyastha*. Satisfactory.

*Hodos*, 'way' (Jn. 14:6). The versions have *marga* or *patha*. Both are satisfactory. Both are used in India of ways of salvation.

*Pais* (Acts 3:13, 26; 4:27, 30). Is this servant, child, or son? Jeremias (TWNT) gives good evidence for believing that it is servant, and that there is a conscious reference to the Servant in Isaiah, where the word *pais* is used in the LXX.

Most of the versions have *sevaka* here; B has *dasa*. *Dasa* is in general used for *doulos* and *sevaka* for *diakonos*. Is there a third possibility? It might be noted that the Hindi O.T. uses *dasa* generally for *ebed*. What of other versions of the O.T.?

*Paraklêtos*, 'advocate' (1 Jn. 2:1). The versions have *sahayaka* or *madhyastha*. Possibly the former is preferable. Should *madhyastha* be reserved for *mesitês*? Is *abhibhashaka* a possibility?

*Parousia* (Mt. 24:3, etc.). The meaning is 'coming', or the presence of one who has come. Where this refers to Jesus the versions have *agamana*. This is satisfactory.

*Pascha*, 'passover' (1 Cor. 5:7). H has *phasaha*, G has *pascha yajna*, M has *yajna pashu*. The first two are satisfactory.

*Poimên*, 'shepherd' (Jn. 10:11, etc.). HR has *meshapala*, B has *meshapalaka*. These are satisfactory. Where these are not well known a more common word for shepherd may be used, e.g. *ghetapalaka* (G).

*Prophêtês*, 'prophet' (Jn. 6:14, etc.). HR transliterates the Hebrew *nabi*. This is perhaps best. If translation is considered necessary, then *sandeshta* (M) or *prabodhaka* (G) is much preferable to either *bhavavadi* (B, S) or *bhavishadvakta* (H).

*Sophia*, 'wisdom' (1 Cor. 1:24). The versions have *jnana*. Satisfactory.

*Huios*, 'son'. The versions usually have *putra* or a derived form. This is satisfactory. In the phrase 'Son of David' all the versions have a genitive construction. For 'Son of Man' B and S have *manushya-putra*, HR has *manavaputra*, others use the genitive. The compound is preferable, as the relation of the component parts in *bar nasha* is closer than the genitive would indicate, whether in Greek or in a modern vernacular. Is this true also of Son of God? Most versions use the genitive, but S has *ishvaraputra*. Is this preferable? In languages where *deva* is used for God, should Son of God be *devaputra*?

*Hupostasis*, 'substance, essence' (Heb. 1:3). Is *hupostasis* here, as in the Nicene Symbol, to be considered synonymous with *ousia*? I think so. If so, then it should be translated *satya*, or perhaps *sattva* (G), rather than *tattva* (other versions). It is not to be objected that *satya* has been recommended for *alêtheia* (truth); *satya* comprehends both being and truth.

*Phôs*, 'light' (Jn. 8:12, etc.). The versions have  *jyoti*, *prakasha*, *ujyala*. *Jyoti* is light that shines, is brilliant, illumines, as the light of the sun. Since Vedic times  *jyoti* has been used of the light of the Supreme Spirit or the light of divine favour. *Prakasha* is light that reveals or illumines. *Ujyala* is primarily the light of burning. It has the secondary meanings of brilliance, beauty. *Jyoti* would seem to be the first choice here. *Prakasha* might be used, if not used for *apaugasma* 'radiance'.

*Charis*, 'grace' (Jn. 1:14). The versions have *anugraha*. *Graha* = 'grasp, a reaching-out after, with gracious intent'. This is satisfactory. The word *prasada* has a very good history in older Indian usage, but it has been rendered unserviceable in modern Hindi at least by its popular use for what is more properly called *prasadanna* or *prasadadravya*, food distributed in the name of a god.

---

## THE MEANING AND TRANSLATION OF COVENANT

J. C. HINDLEY

*This article has also appeared in the 'Indian Journal of Theology', Vol. X, No. 1.*

Perhaps for few New Testament words is the Old Testament background more essential to a true interpretation than for the word *diathêkê*. But we immediately run into difficulties because of the very different emphases given to the Hebrew *berith* and the LXX *diathêkê* by our major Old Testament authorities. This paper cannot claim to be a full study of the evidence. It offers a few notes on the way to such a study, which may guide us in the immediate problem of producing our various Indian translations.

The problem is challengingly put by the recent American edition of Bauer's Lexicon by Arndt and Gingrich. They will permit the translation 'covenant' only under the most stringent conditions, and in the body of their article suggest as preferable such variants as 'declaration of God's will, ordinance, decree'. This interpretation seems to go back to the work of J. Behm, first published in 1912<sup>1</sup> and repeated in the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Here, in regard to LXX usage, we have the emphatic conclusion: "Through the retention of the noun *Bund* ("covenant") which does not exactly cover *berith*, through compromise formulae such as *Bundesverfugung* ("covenant-

---

<sup>1</sup> Der Begriff, *Diathêkê* im Neuen Testament.