

"YISU DAS – WITNESS OF A CONVERT": A REVIEW ARTICLE

Jan Henningsson, Henry Martyn Institute, Hyderabad

(Dr. Henningsson was former Ambassador of European Union to Arab world. A scholar in Islam and comparative philology, he taught at Gurukul too. He was the Senior Advisor Foreign Affairs, the MENA, Government of Sweden and also the Former Director, Sweden Institute, Alexandria, Egypt. He is now retired and is living in Sweden)

In mission studies, as well as in the psychology and sociology of religion, "conversion" is as central a concept as it is ambiguous. In the case of India, studies of individual conversions tend to highlight academic personalities, gratifying for the researcher because of their written legacy. Robin Boyd (1975) parades a number of outstanding Indian intellectuals – converts as well as Christ-oriented Hindus: e.g. Sadhu Sundar Singh and Keshab Chandra Sen, whereas Antony Copley (1997) targets European missionaries to India and only in the last chapter some high-profile converts from Bengal and the North. However, questions remain about their long-term impact on Indian Christian theology. We may also ask: to what extent have the conceptual or terminological innovations suggested by famous Brahmin converts (Brahmabandhab Upadhyaya, Nehemiah Goreh, Pandita Bramabai, N V Tilak) affected Western theologies.

In recent times, however, other trends have emerged in both Western and Indian scholarship. In his detailed, longitudinal study of post-independence conversions in Tamil Nadu, Andrew Wingate (1997) has followed the religious developments in rural communities who had changed their affiliation from Hinduism to Islam or Christianity. What is the meaning of "conversion" in the context of a Tamil village, where a majority of the once baptized families gradually revert to Hinduism in their external behaviour (names given, worship traditions) in the absence of a Christian pastor or Bible woman?

Likewise, Julian Saldanha's essay "Patterns of conversion in Indian mission history" targets "conversion movements" among different groups rather than individual cases. However, neither Saldanha, nor any of the other contributors in the Roman Catholic anthology "Mission and conversion" (Mattam/Kim 1996), seems able to bring out personalities – names and characters – from the anonymous mass of group converts among Dalits, *adivasis* or other communities. This failure to give a face to the conversion movements enhances the risk of perpetuating a hierarchical, caste- or merit-based approach to Christians in India. Furthermore, writers of *hindutva* persuasion, like Arun Shourie and Sita Ram Goel approach these questions polemically – from political rather than sociological perspectives – questioning the sincerity both of the missionaries and of their converts.

It is within this charged context that Ravi Tiwari (henceforth: Tiwari Jr) has launched his "Yisu Das – witness of a convert" (ISPCK, New Delhi 2000). Tiwari Jr, religions professor at Gurukul Lutheran Theological College in Chennai, is well-known for his work in comparative philosophy, especially his cross-cultural study of Shankara and Tillich (1985). His academic focus is on the Hindu-Christian dynamics of "Indian theology", an elusive concept which we may tentatively define as a highly complex socio-cultural organism nourishing simultaneously several competing intellectual structures, constantly in the making. In its scope "Yisu Das – witness of a convert" is, on one hand, a traditional study

of an intellectual Brahmin convert, but through its methodology, on the other hand, it promises to be a major contribution to the (interreligious) process of talking about God in India.

Drawing upon a variety of sources, Tiwari Jr explores the life, work and theological heritage of his father, Yisu Das Tiwari (1911-1997; henceforth: YDT). The book includes five main sections: the first two reproduce some of YDT's own writings – autobiographical and academic, especially his meditations upon the Farewell Discourse of Jesus Christ, as recorded in the Gospel according to St John; the third, "My Father" is a biographical sketch by Ravi Tiwari, the youngest son of YDT; the fourth section is a collection of tributes paid to YDT by his friends, students and colleagues. The fifth section, "Theology of a convert", represents an attempt by Tiwari Jr to (re-)construct a systematic theology based on – but not restricted to – his father's writings.

Yisu Das – devotee and scholar

Before the book under review here, precious little about YDT was known to the academic world in India outside the circle of Bible translators and theological educators. The bulk of the manuscripts now published by his youngest son were found tucked away in desk drawers. Apparently the author was not keen on publicizing his "theological diary" too widely, but at the same time, the style of these texts is that of a lecture, a discourse intended for readers and listeners of various persuasions. A quick glance through the biographical chapters is enough to reveal a curious doubleness in YDT's character: at times he comes across as highly self-disciplined, verging on the ascetic, with a towering spiritual authority; at other times he seems shy – wounded, perhaps – reluctant to appear in public, refusing to publish the fruits of his scholarly labour. This latter aspect of his personality is labelled by Tiwari Jr as "utter humility" and may very well be interpreted as the mirror image of a very high sense of self, as illustrated below in the passages on spiritual authority.

This ambiguity (with its concomitant ambivalent attitudes to the world) of a person who feels both elected and rejected, is reflected in YDT's writings in some interesting ways. Thus, it appears that he identified himself with John, the Evangelist, who had seen and understood so much but was not able to communicate it to others. In this commentary to John 14:9 ("Have I been with you so long..."), YDT opens a window on his own soul:

"It often happens that a friend or relative fails to understand us; husband and wife, father and son sometimes misunderstand each other for a long time. It is natural that the innocent partner will be astonished and deeply hurt. [---] One can also perceive, behind these words, the heart of the writer of the Gospel. He had left his land and was now residing in Ephesus, a city in Asia Minor. He had some disciples, but most of them were just listeners. He could only partially succeed in making others understand the good news of Jesus", (:58-59).

The Bible translator

During an intensive sojourn in Oxford (1954-55) YDT equipped himself for the daunting task of revising the extant Hindi version¹ of the New Testament (:132ff). He learnt Greek and modern exegesis from G D Kilpatrick, a leading authority in the field. Thus, when YDT came back to Jabalpur he was better updated on the latest advances in European Biblical scholarship than most of his contemporaries in India, including the foreign missionaries.

In 1961 the WCC held its general assembly in New Delhi. The Bible Society of India and Ceylon (BSIC) asked YDT to speed up his translation of the Gospels and Acts so that those portions could be presented (along with an English version) to the solemn ecumenical meeting, the first of its kind in Asia (:145). The complete "New Testament, Hindi – revised version" (*Naya Niyama*) was finalized in 1962 but did not appear in print until 1965 and then only in a very limited edition. By that time, professional links between YDT and the BSIC had already been severed and continued work on the full Bible in Hindi was handed over to J H Anand.

Soon a new version (*Hindi Baibil*) appeared, in which the Hindi style of Anand's Old Testament translation was carried over into the New Testament, in an effort to harmonize vocabulary and usage. Thus YDT's sanskritized Hindi was replaced, to a large extent, by more colloquial language, a source of professional dissent and even resentment. In an obituary ("An Epithet for my Guru-Friend") Anand himself comments:

"Tiwariji was so much discouraged by the non-theologian Bible Society Auxiliary Secretaries [--] who had thrown away his Hindi New Testament in the dust bin that he [--] never wrote anything or translated into Hindi again. But the truth is still alive. Hindi speaking Hindu Enquirers believe that his translation has communicated the Good News in a best way. His language and style is more acceptable to them", (:214-15).²

A few examples may suffice to demonstrate the differences – theological as well as stylistic – between the three Hindi (Protestant) versions mentioned. An interesting illustration of a seemingly technical, syntactic problem with deep theological consequences is John 14:1, "Let not your hearts be troubled. Believe in God, believe also in me":

<i>Dharmashastra</i>	<i>Naya Niyama</i>	<i>Hindi Baibil</i>
Tumhara man vyakul na ho. Tum Parameshvar par <i>vishvas rakthe ho</i> , mujh par bhi vishvas rakho.	Tumhara man vyakul na ho. Parameshvar par <i>vishvas rakho</i> aur mujh par bhi vishvas rakho.	Tumhara man vyakul na ho. Parameshvar par <i>vishvas karo</i> aur mujh par bhi vishvas karo.

As can be seen here, the first sentence is kept intact throughout the three versions; *man* for "heart, mind" and *vyakul* for "troubled, shaken"; *Parameshvar* ("Supreme Lord") is the standard name for "God". But YDT rectifies the interpretation of the second sentence. Where *Dharmashastra* has "you have put your faith in God, put your faith also in me", YDT translates with parallel imperatives: "Believe in God, and believe also in me". The *Hindi Baibil* has retained the two imperatives, but replaced *rakhna* with (the ubiquitous, pseudo-auxiliary verb) *karna*. The result is partly a flatter style, but also a shift in meaning: from the relational, psychological *vishvas rakhna* "to place one's faith in someone" to the more theological, intellectual *vishvas karna* "to believe (in) someone". The former may also signify a "once-and-for-all" surrender, whereas the latter may imply an ongoing activity, (:38).

What is at stake here is not so much nuances of Hindi usage as the question whether faith (*vishvas*) in God precedes faith in Christ. YDT's rendering – which reflects a broad consensus among modern exegetes – may be regarded as a testimony both to his Greek scholarship as well as to his "high" Christology.

One characteristic of YDT's Bible style is that he, as Anand puts it, "introduced 'honorific' Hindi uses for Jesus in place of barbaric, uncultured 'thou'" (:215). The background is the

following: Hindi offers three ways of addressing an interlocutor – *ap*, *tum* and *tu* – representing three degrees of increasing intimacy or decreasing respect, as the case may be. (*Ap* is by far the most common address in neutral conversations between adults; young lovers would mutually address one another as *tum*, whereas *tu* can be used either derogatively or as a literary device when invoking abstract entities like “life”, “love” or “fate”, e.g.) For obscure reasons, the translators of *Dharmashastra* use *tu* rather indiscriminately – in dialogues between adults as well as an address to both Jesus and God.³

By contrast, YDT introduced stylistic nuances according to certain principles, rooted in his theology. *Tu* (second person singular) is used when Jesus is talking directly with His heavenly Father, e.g. when praying in Gethsemane (Mt 26:39: “not my will but thine”) or when crying out on the cross (Mt 27:46: “why hast thou forsaken me?”; cf also Luke 23:34: “Father forgive them...”). This deliberate usage underscores the exceptional intimacy between the holy persons of the Godhead, and gives an inculturated Indian expression, as it were, to patristic concepts such as *homo-ousis* and *perichoresis*.

When addressing His disciples – individually or as a group – Jesus would use *tum* (second person plural), whereas they would address him as *ap* (plural, honorific); in modern Hindi, this distinction reflects the hierarchy that normally exists between teacher and students. YDT’s rendering is consistent on this point, even in situations when the disciples are not aware of Christ’s identity, as on the road to Emmaus (Luke 24:18); He addresses them as *tum* and they reply using *ap*. An interesting pericope is the dialogue between Jesus, the risen Christ, and Peter in John 21:15-22. Jesus asks, three times: “Simon, son of Jona, do you love me more than the others do?” and Peter replies, three times: “Yes, Lord, you know that I love you”.

<i>Dharmashastra</i>	<i>Naya Niyama</i>	<i>Hindi Baibil</i>
v 15 ... “He Shamaun, Yuhanna ke putr, kya <i>tu</i> in se badhkar mujhse prem rakhta hai?” ... “Han, Prabhu, <i>tu</i> to janta hai ki main <i>tujhse</i> priti rakhta hun”.	...”Shamaun, Yuhanna ke putr, kya <i>tum</i> mujhe inse adhik prem karte ho?”... “Han Prabhu, <i>ap</i> jante hain ki main <i>apse</i> priti karta hun”.	...”Shamaun, Yuhanna ke putr, kya <i>tum</i> mujhe inse adhik prem karte ho?”... “Han Prabhu, <i>ap</i> jante hain ki main <i>apse</i> prem karta hun”.

Taken at face value, *Dharmashastra* records an intimate exchange, as between sons of the same mother, whereas the other two translations reflect an unequal relationship as between master and servant. It may seem somewhat surprising that YDT would portray the Risen Christ as persisting in this hierarchical usage even after the Farewell Discourse, where He declares His disciples to be “friends” from now on (John 15:15).⁴ After all, YDT was strongly influenced by Thomas a Kempis’ mystical experience of intimacy with the Divine, and he was likewise very fond of the (Muslim) Sufi imagery of God and the devotee as a pair of lovers (:70). However, Tiwari Jr offers a biographical note in explanation:

“His tradition and training did not allow him, even to think, to address seniors and religious persons, irrespective of their caste, religion, age and gender, without honorific. He himself never addressed anyone, even children, without honorific. ... Eastern tradition, he pointed out, would not allow anyone to address Jesus in derogative and diminutive pronoun. Later in life, he conceded that a closer relationship between the devotee and God, I and Thou, ‘*Tu aur main*’ ... may prompt the use of such language, as a special case...“ (:140).

What about those instances, when God Himself is the addressee? A test case is the translation of the Lord’s prayer – who is the speaker? Jesus, addressing His “heavenly Father” (*svargika pita*, cf Mt 5:48), or the disciples, for whose benefit and future use this prayer is formulated? YDT seems to have opted for the second reading; (lest there be confusion between the special intimacy of Jesus with the Father and the devotion of believers towards God?) Thus his rendering is the only one where God is addressed with the respectful *ap* (the ensuing verb takes plural form), whereas the other two Hindi versions – like the common Urdu translation – keep the intimate *tu* address (with the possessive form *tera* and the verb in singular).⁵

Here we look at the longer version, according to Matthew 6:9-13; grammatical key words are given in italics:

<i>Dharmashastra</i>	<i>Naya Niyama</i>	<i>Hindi Baibil</i>
v. 9 He hamare pita, <i>tu</i> jo svarg men <i>hai</i> ; <i>tera</i> nam pavitra mana jaiye...	He hamare pita, <i>ap</i> jo svarg men <i>hain</i> ; <i>apka</i> nam pavitra mana jaiye...	He, hamare svargika pita; <i>tera</i> nam pavitra mana jaiye...
v. 13 Aur hamen pariksha men na <i>la</i> , parentu burai se <i>bacha</i> ...	Hamen pariksha men na <i>daliye</i> , varan burai se <i>bachaiye</i> ...	Hamare vishvas ko mat <i>parakh</i> , varan Shaytan se hamen <i>bacha</i> ...

The same pattern of differences persists in the translations of the shorter version in Luke 11:2-4. As we can see from these brief examples, Anand’s denunciation of the “uncultured” *tu* address (cited above) is borne out by his own adaption of Tiwari’s usage of *ap* in many instances, as Luke 24 and John 21. Apparent inconsistencies could be the result of a different exegesis. Thus, Anand may have preferred to emphasise Jesus as the speaker in the Lord’s prayer, which would explain his (reversion to) the use of *tu*.

The teacher

Many a contemporary Bible scholar in contemporary India owe the foundations of their exegetical expertise to YDT, who taught at theological seminaries in Serampore, Calcutta and Bareilly for more than thirty years. In his exegetical writings, YDT displays a number of tools for explicating the text; his commentary to John 14 is a case in point (:28-78). For the purpose of Biblical theology his primary method was to explore a given pericope by referring to other passages within the Bible itself. This was by no means merely an academic exercise. As YDT was a true Verbi Divini Minister – an ordained pastor in the Baptist Church (1947), an elder in the Methodist Church (1959) and a Presbyterian of the CNI (1980) – his concern was often homiletic, i.e. to glean from the Biblical text a *kerygma*, a relevant message, for today’s world, peoples, hearts (:37).

YDT also used other, modern methods, which he had learnt in Oxford and which were hardly known in India at the time: historical-critical (locating the text in space and time) and semantic analysis of the Greek text; (cf his discussion of John 14:2 “many rooms”, :41f). Furthermore, YDT tried to communicate the spiritual treasures of the Gospel by what we may call a connective theology, i.e. relating concepts in the Greek text to words and concepts in the Indian culture. This he did through Sanskrit scholarship (references to the Vedas, Upanishads and Brahmasutras) and through references to Indian culture (Tulsidas, Ravindra Nath Tagore, e.g. :41). One example of this methodology is YDT’s description of the Gospel of John as an Upanishad and the Farewell Discourse as the *Yisu-Gita* (:32, 231f).

Against the background of his experiences in England and his wide reading, it is fair to characterise YDT as an intellectual with some multicultural competence. Thus, when the audience is attuned or when the text itself seems to demand it, YDT makes excursions into Western culture, as when he quotes Thomas a Kempis in order to give a mystic's perspective on John 14:3 "...where I am you may be also", (:5, 48).

To YDT (as to so many philosophers through the ages) the beginning of independent thought is "doubt", and he never discards it as irrelevant or irreverent. However, unlike the creative *skepsis* of secular philosophers, the religious doubts that YDT endeavours to tackle can be paralysing, existentially threatening. As an experienced teacher, YDT addresses the skepsis of intellectuals through either of two methods.

The first concerns philosophical arguments, as in his discussion of (the possibility of) knowing the Spirit, of the relationship between the revealed and the Revealer, of Jesus' authority as the (source of) truth and so on. In some instances YDT takes recourse to the *pramanas* ("valid sources of knowledge") of Indian philosophy, and claims that Jesus' words can be validated in and through Himself, as He can be regarded as a *Shabda Pramana* (:43). YDT even coins a new set of terms, most important of which is the name *Shabdeshvara* (literally "Word-Lord") for Christ the Logos (:53, 249 et passim)⁶.

However, beyond – or rather: above – the rationality of philosophical epistemology and logical reasoning there remains the fact of the spiritual experience of the believer, the personal encounter with Jesus Christ Himself, who impersonates self-authentication, *Apta-Purusha* (:44, 253f). Thus, the second method is the personal testimony, the "witness of a convert". Indeed – as in the case of St John – we may again discern a kind of identification by YDT with those saintly persons whose credibility/authority comes through their life in faith and devotion and whose experiences cannot be questioned:

"Some readers may not find these thoughts right and appropriate. I can only say to them that they should take them as the words of a realized saint (*pahunche hue sant*), behind which lays his spiritual experience. *Anubhava* of a saint cannot be straight away and contemptuously set aside", (:39-40).⁷

The same type of argument is carried out at the end of the philosophical defense of Jesus' authority: "Even if you are not convinced, believe in Him because of His righteous life and great deeds", (:45).

Despite all his erudition and intellectual acumen, YDT was at heart a self-professed *bhakta*, a "devotee" (:19). He once gave this brief definition of Christian faith: "It is transcendental truth founded on devotion, not a fantasy or an opiate of the people", (:72). This is, perhaps, the most moving aspect of YDT's spiritual heritage – the unflinching commitment to his Guru: "I became a Christian because of the faith in the person of Christ. Him I regarded as my Saviour. He had the devotion of my heart and the obedience of my will", (:7).

A booklet within the book

The sequence of stages in the spiritual journey and their consequences are explored by Tiwari Jr in the chapter labelled "Theology of a convert". In many ways, this is a libellus in libro (:223-274), compact and innovative. Here Tiwari Jr is extrapolating theological ideas from his father's heritage as well as from those sources of Sanskrit Hindu tradition that he has grappled with himself. The conceptual framework for this attempt at a systematic

theology derives from Badrayana's Brahmasutra. Tiwari Jr applies four aphorisms to the pilgrim's progress:

- a) *Athato Brahma-Jijnasa* (:233ff) signifies the desire and conscious effort to know the essential nature (*svarupa lakshana*) of Brahman;
- b) *Janmadyasya yatah* (:242ff) is the next step, in which the knowledge acquired is formulated, the Ultimate Reality "identified, denoted and defined";
- c) *Shastra-yonitvat* (:249ff) denotes the stage where the believer realises that he/she has not invented something new, but only discovered a truth which was always there and to which the Holy Scriptures bear witness. These Scriptures, like Jesus Christ, shed light on everything but do not themselves need enlightenment – they are *svatah-prakasha*;
- d) *Tattu samanvayat* (:252ff) is the inner harmony which results from the insight that the personal encounter of the devotee (*anubhava*) with the Ultimate Reality does not conflict with the testimony of the Scriptures. In the case of the Christian convert, this means to understand with heart and mind that Christ is God, *Shabda-Parameshvar*, and that His words, therefore, are nothing less than *shruti*, i.e. authoritative Scripture.

One may question Tiwari Jr's high-profile use of the word "convert", since that term, like "conversion", is laden with controversial (or even denigrating) connotations – not least in modern India. However, this choice of words seems to be quite deliberate, for Tiwari Jr takes the psychological and theological dimensions of his father's life journey – from Advaita Vedantism⁸ to *Imitatio Christi* – very seriously. On the basis of this close-up case study of seeking, suffering, commitment and fulfilment, he formulates some fundamental assumptions: "One needs to recognise the fact that for a convert, *Anubhava*, the perceptual and ontological experience, precedes all theological formulations", (:236). Furthermore: "It is in the dialectical tensions that are created through interaction between existential questions and ontological answers that "God-talk' takes place", (:240).

It is beyond the scope of this review to evaluate the outcome of Ravi Tiwari's theological efforts. Suffice it to make one tentative observation. It seems to me that Tiwari Jr, as a Christian of the second generation, takes a slightly more liberal view of his Hindu/Sanskrit heritage than did his father. First, he is less hesitant to use concepts and terminologies from Brahminic philosophy, as evidenced in his references to Shankara. YDT warned against "borrowing" or trying to transplant Hindu idiom into Christian theology, lest the latter appear as a bad copy of the former, (:7). Secondly, YDT's striking Christocentrism – verging on Christomonism – is not to be found in the work by Tiwari Jr, who strives to maintain a Trinitarian equilibrium in his theology.

Missiological aspects

Despite their different theological emphases, father and son Tiwari share the concern that Christ be made known in India without the artificial – and potentially ruinous – ruptures that Western Protestant theologians have advocated. YDT confesses that, upon reading Kraemer's "Christian Message to the Non-Christian World", he exclaimed to himself: "Good God! What narrow-minded religious community I have joined", and, likewise: "Barthianism is simply out of place for a student who reads Indian philosophy and religion in depth", (:15).

Tiwari Jr expounds: “A convert, more often, genuinely desires to live and witness in his own context of family and social life, but the propounders of the theory of ‘radical discontinuity’ would not allow him to do so”, (:236). But he also problematizes the opposite tendency, nostalgia: “For most of them, time stops at the time of their conversion-experience... Even though their original community, after their excommunication/disinheritance/ casting off, goes on changing and adjusting itself ... the converts are, more often, the people of the past in their psyche and attitude”, (:96).

To be sure, young Badri Prasad’s conversion and baptism (after which he took the Christian name Yisu Das, “servant of Jesus”) led to a dramatic break with his family, who did everything short of murder to punish him. But the rift was not desired by YDT; in fact his life-long ambition was to be a witness to Christ in his own native milieu, within the Hindu culture, into which he was born and which he knew so utterly well. Initially, he seems to have believed, in all earnest, that he would be able to “live, with his faith in his new-found *ishhta-deva*⁹, within his family” (:102). However, he had underestimated the effects of his personal choice. Even M K Gandhi, in whose ashram YDT was soon to seek refuge, resented the young brahmin’s decisive step into the visible communion of Christ, although the Mahatama was wise enough not to try and force YDT back into the Hindu fold; he had, after all, a similar problem with his own son...

For YDT there was never a question of condemning his family or his native community. Rather than to dwell upon the awful hardships of his first post-conversion year (January 1934 to January 1935) he instead describes the process of his radical spiritual transformation in terms of *meta-noia*, a new mind-set. Tiwari Jr gives an account of these important events under the heading *Christanubhava* i.e. “direct experience of the living presence of Christ”, (:101f). It is, however, outside my competence to analyse the epistemological, psychological and theological implications of the Sanskrit terms used by Tiwari senior and junior in relation to “seeing” (*darshana*) or “encountering” (*sakshatkara*) the Ultimate Reality.

Despite his obvious – albeit involuntary – homelessness, the young convert was never to find external harmony and sense of belonging in any of the local parishes or congregations of the Protestant churches in India. Indeed, he met with so many disappointments in this respect, that he might very well have ended up disillusioned and bitter. But resisting the temptation of self-pity YDT, in a characteristic moral gesture, turned the critical eye back on himself:

“... converts have to realise that largely the fault lies with [their own] attitudes. We need social education which the religion of our ancestors has not given us. Hinduism has taught meditation, individual perfection ... but it never emphasized ... the art of having fellowship with our friends and neighbours. Little wonder a convert alienates his fellow-Christians”, (:8).

Towards the end of his life, YDT did admit that the kind of fellowship offered by the organised churches was not his heart’s inmost desire: “Christ is my *ishhta*, he has never left me ... but I would not have joined the Christian community. I would have lived with my people and my community and been a witness to them”, (:24).

Jan Henningsson

References:

- Boyd, R "An introduction to Indian Christian theology", ISPCK, Delhi 1975/1998
Copley, A "Religions in conflict – ideology, cultural contact and conversion in late colonial India", OUP, N Delhi 1997/1999
Mattam/ Kim, eds "Mission and conversion – a reappraisal", FOIM no IV, St Paul's, Mumbai 1996
Wingate, A "The Church and Conversion", ISPCK, Delhi 1997

¹ Nowadays published as "The Holy Bible, Hindi – Old Version" (*Dharmashastra*).

² Sic. The English style is shaky throughout the book, especially in the section "Theology of a convert". However, in this review I have retained the original text in all quotes, regardless of errors of grammar and syntax. The by far most frequent mistake by native Hindi speakers is to omit the article – definite or indefinite.

³ It can of course be argued that the disciples usually address Jesus with the title *Prabhu*, "Lord", mitigating the impression of undue intimacy or lacking respect that the *tu*-form might otherwise give.

⁴ Note that both the Dharmashastra and YDT faithfully differentiate between the two Greek words for "love" in this pericope: *prem* for *agape* and *priti* for *filia*.

⁵ There are several major differences between these three translations of Mt 6:9-13, e.g. in the prayer for daily bread (v 11). Syntactically most noteworthy perhaps, is that the past perfect tense of the Greek "as we have forgiven those..." (v 12) is retained in the two earlier Hindi versions, whereas Anand's *Hindi Baibil* has present tense (as in Luke 11:4) "as we forgive those...". Lexically we may note the spiritualising trend of the most recent version, e.g. in v 13, where it says "do not test our faith (*vishvas*)", whereas the previous versions say "bring us not into test". Likewise the *Hindi Baibil* talks about "Satan" (not warranted by the Greek) while the others have the abstract concept *burai*, "evil".

⁶ Other new terms introduced by YDT are *Putreshvara* ("Son-Lord"), *Shabda-Brahman* ("Word-God") and *Shabda-Parameshvar* ("Word - Supreme Lord"). *Shabd* is the term YDT uses to render the Greek *logos*.

⁷ The expression *pahunche hue sant* literally means "a saint who has arrived" and derives from the Sufi idea of the devotee's progress, a popular metaphor being "to climb a ladder" to reach God. *Anubhava* (and *sakshatkara*) are terms used to describe the devotees direct personal encounter with God, "face to face".

⁸ *Advaita* means "non-duality" and *Vedanta* means "the end of the Veda", a name which refers to the Upanishads; (cf the etymology of the term *meta-physics*!) *Advaita Vedantism* is a systematized, intellectual form of Hinduism, elaborated by the famous sage Shankara in response to the religio-philosophical challenges posed by Buddhism.

⁹ For purposes of personal worship and devotion – especially at home – Hindus often select one divinity out of the pantheon to be their "private god", *ishta-deva*.