



# The Translation of Ὑποκριτής in the Gospels as *Osatotse* in Dangme Bible Translations

Ebenezer Quaye<sup>1</sup>  & Jonathan Edward Tetteh Kuwornu-Adjaottor<sup>2</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> Department of Theological Studies (DTS), Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences (FASS). Valley View University, Oyibi, Ghana.

<sup>2</sup> Department of Religious Studies, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi Ghana.

## ABSTRACT

Translating from one language to another is a difficult task. Words, phrases and other expressions are socio-culturally or contextually defined and more so, they assume new meanings through both diachronic and synchronic time effects. The nuances in meaning when ideas are carried from one linguistic setting to another is another challenge in translation work. This becomes more challenging when one attempts to find equivalences in translations. This work looks at the word, *osatotse*, being the Dangme word for the Greek, Ὑποκριτής of the biblical text, especially, in the gospels. *Osatotse* (*O sa [kɛ]to tse*) in Dangme, literally or basically means “rotten (spoilt) but hidden owner (person).” Although this translation for all intents and purposes largely fits the contexts in which it is used, especially in the gospels, it does not fully translate the word, Ὑποκριτής. This basically affects the interpretation of the texts in which *osatotse* finds itself in terms of meaning and usage. This paper discusses Ὑποκριτής and *osatotse* by using lexical analysis and the mother-tongue to underscore the challenge of equivalence of translating words from one language into another. It emphasizes the need for a corresponding footnote (commentary) in subsequent publications of the Dangme Bible, *Ngmami Klɔuklɔ* to the word, *osatotse* to make its usage in preaching and teaching more efficient and effective. This work seeks to redefine the meaning of Ὑποκριτής in Dangme translations although *osatotse*, to a large extent but not absolutely, fits the contexts in which it is used in biblical texts, especially, in the gospels. This paper, therefore, puts forward that Ὑποκριτής is a broader terminology as compared to *osatotse* as an equivalence in Dangme translations.

Correspondence  
Ebenezer Quaye  
Email: [equaye@vuu.edu.gh](mailto:equaye@vuu.edu.gh)

Publication History  
Received 22<sup>nd</sup> October, 2024  
Accepted 12<sup>th</sup> December, 2024  
Published Online  
30<sup>th</sup> December, 2024

*Keywords: Osatotse, Ὑποκριτής, Equivalence, Dangme language, Linguistic analysis*

## INTRODUCTION

The work of translation has existed for many years and this has been done over the centuries. The translation of biblical texts has been one of the oldest works throughout human history. For instance, the translation of the Hebrew text into Greek during the Greco-Roman era for diasporan Jews especially is outstanding. This work is referred to as the Septuagint or the LXX. These works of the translation of biblical texts continued over the centuries with the Latin Vulgate and several other

translations. Although much work has been done in this area of translation, it is a recognized fact that translation is an arduous venture as it is characterized by diverse challenges in its attempts. Confirming the above understanding, Panou observed that translation, thus the facilitation of both linguistic and cultural transfer is a difficult task.<sup>1</sup> Although translations have existed over a long period of time, however, as a discipline, it began to develop in the second half of the twentieth century under the name of Translation Studies.

Nida and Taber in their work, *Theory and Practice of Translation*, indicated that translation consists of reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalence of the source language message. According to them, it should first be in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, translation is basically, giving the meaning of a text from one language into another language or rendering the meaning in the same language in the way that the author intended in the text. With this view in mind, it is understood that the Dangme Bible, *Ngmami Klɔuklɔ* ɔ came through the translation of one language into another. In doing this, the processes of translation involved looking at: i) the medium of translation, whether human or machine translation; ii) the area of translation, that is specific linguistic or cultural groups; iii) rank which is looking at particular linguistic levels, for instance, that of the word, phrase or the sentence; iv) the type of text dealing with particular genres or literary type; v) the time in terms of dealing with specific periods of time; vi) as well as the problem whereby one looks at the particular translation problem, such as metaphor translation and other idiomatic expressions.<sup>3</sup> One cannot avoid the above in an attempt to affect both the art and science of translation. It is observed by this paper that the Dangme Bible, *Ngmami Klɔuklɔ* ɔ with its good translation standard, had gone through the thorough phases or considerations as observed above.

Appreciating the difficulties that attend the work of translating a text from one language into another, the *Ngmami Klɔuklɔ* ɔ is of no exemption. In spite of its profound and enormous help to its readers, the *Ngmami Klɔuklɔ* ɔ is also fraught with its own challenges like other translated works. Several critical works have been done in the past to unravel some of the challenges by some scholars. Under consideration in this work is the Dangme word, *osatotse* which translates the Greek word *ὕποκριτης* (in its various forms). Although, looking at the biblical contexts in which *osatotse* is variedly used, it seems, to a large extent, to have fully translated the Greek word *ὕποκριτης*. However, a careful study of both words will reveal a deficiency in the use of *osatotse* in Dangme as an equivalence of the Greek word *ὕποκριτης*.

It is, therefore, in the interest of this paper to study and discuss the two words in context, thus, the Dangme word, *osatotse* as an equivalence of the Greek word, *ὕποκριτης*. This would be done by looking at their formation, that is giving the etymological meaning of both words, meaning, and contexts in which they are used in the biblical texts, especially, the gospels. It will first and foremost look at the equivalence in translation theories in relation to the translation of the Dangme Bible, *Ngmami Klɔuklɔ* ɔ. This work seeks to further provide a footnote (commentary) in the Dangme Bible, *Ngmami Klɔuklɔ* ɔ for subsequent publications. This will enhance the effective and efficient usage of the word *osatotse* in teaching and preaching the word of God in churches, schools and other religious, socio-cultural and economic settings of society.

### Survey of Equivalence in Translation Theories

Following the work of Panou, it emphasized Jean-Paul Vinay et al work, *Stylistique Comparée du Français et de l'Anglais* produced in 1958. In this work, they made a comparison by analysing the different styles of translation strategies and procedures used in French and English.<sup>4</sup> In their work (the English version published in 1995), they distinguished between direct and oblique translations referring to as literal and free translations respectively. Furthermore, they put forward seven

<sup>1</sup> Despoina Panou, "Equivalence in Translation Theories: A Critical Evaluation.," *Theory & Practice in Language Studies (TPLS)* 3, no. 1 (2013).

<sup>2</sup> Eugene Albert Nida and Charles Russell Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, vol. 8 (Brill Archive, 1974). 16.

<sup>3</sup> Panou, "Equivalence in Translation Theories: A Critical Evaluation," 1.

<sup>4</sup> Panou, "Equivalence in Translation Theories: A Critical Evaluation," 3

procedures in translation work: borrowing, calque, literal translation, transposition, modulation, equivalence and adaptation.<sup>5</sup> To them, the first three are categorized under direct translation and the other four are grouped under the oblique translation. In specificity is the argument that equivalence is seen as a process whereby the same situation is replicated as in the original but different wording is used. Through this understanding, it is believed that the stylistic impact of the source-language text can be maintained in the target-language text.<sup>6</sup> However, this does not assure a successful translation since contexts (both text and linguistic-cultural nuances) play important roles in determining the translation strategy to use in order to communicate an effective meaning. They concluded by stating that the situation is what determines the need for creating equivalences. They encouraged translators to first look at the situation of the source-language text in order to come up with a solution.<sup>7</sup>

In the work of Jakobson, the Roman Structuralist, he maintained that there are three kinds of translation. According to him, these are: i) intralingual translation which involves rewording or paraphrasing within one or the same language; ii) interlingual which involves rewording or paraphrasing between two languages; and iii) intersemiotic which deals with rewording or paraphrasing between sign systems.<sup>8</sup> Deducing from this view, it is the interlingual translation that has been used in translating the Dangme Bible, *Ngmami Klɔuklɔu* ♂. It is either from the original languages of the biblical texts or an existing translated version like an English version. In dealing with the difficulty of equivalence in meaning between words in different languages, he emphasized that it is not possible to have full equivalence between two words.<sup>9</sup> This point stresses the appreciation of this paper that though the word *osatotse* in the *Ngmami Klɔuklɔu* ♂ does not fully translate the Greek word *ὑποκριτης*, it does provide a meaning that suits the context. The observation is that instead of assuming absolute translation for the word, one would see that full meaning did not prevail in the *Ngmami Klɔuklɔu* ♂ as *osatotse* did not fully translate the Greek word *ὑποκριτης*,

In the works of Nida, he showed that there are two basic types of equivalence. These are: i) formal equivalence in which the translated text to a large extent, resembles very much the source-language text in both form and content; and ii) dynamic equivalence in which a determined effort is made to carry the source-language text message into the translated text as naturally as possible.<sup>10</sup> Although he proposed the two, he seemed to have a better liken to dynamic equivalence. This, he considered it to be a more effective and efficient translation procedure. As a Bible translator himself at the time, he was trying to produce the same effect on various different audiences he was simultaneously addressing. His preference is more clearly stated in that he argued that dynamic equivalence in translation goes beyond correct communication of information.<sup>11</sup> Nida is said to be known to have introduced a receptor-based direction to the task of translating.<sup>12</sup> In spite of the critical relevance of Nida's theory, he has been seriously criticized by Lefevere who opined that equivalence is still focused on the word.<sup>13</sup> Broeck also struggled to appreciate how it is possible to measure the equivalent effect. He argued that no text could have the same effect or bring about the same response in two different cultures in different time periods.<sup>14</sup> Gentzler also criticizing the work of Nida showed his scepticism about the scientific virtue of translation methods. In his thoughts, Nida's concept of dynamic equivalence was meant to proselytize readers, in spite of their culture. He went on to say that

<sup>5</sup> Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet, "Stylistique Comparée Du Français et de l'anglais: Méthode de Traduction," (*No Title*), 1958. 84.

<sup>6</sup> Vinay and Darbelnet, *Stylistique Comparée du Français et de l'anglais*, 32.

<sup>7</sup> Vinay and Darbelnet, *Stylistique Comparée du Français et de l'anglais*, 255.

<sup>8</sup> Roman Jakobson, "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation," in *On Translation* (New York: Harvard University Press, 1975), 232–39.

<sup>9</sup> Jakobson, "On Linguistics Aspects of Translation", 11.

<sup>10</sup> Nida and Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, 24.

<sup>11</sup> Nida and Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, 25.

<sup>12</sup> J. Munday, *Introducing Translation Studies* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000).42.

<sup>13</sup> A. Lefevere, *Translating Literature: Practice and Theory in a Comparative Literature Context* (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1993).7.

<sup>14</sup> R. van den Broeck, "The Concept of Equivalence in Translation Theory: Some Critical Reflections," in *Literature and Translation*, ed. J. S. Holmes, J. Lambert, and R. van den Broeck (Leuven: Academic, 1978), 29–47.

the dynamic equivalence has the purpose of endorsing the ideas of Protestant Christianity.<sup>15</sup> In spite of these critical views, Nida's work produced a systematic and analytical procedure for translators working with all kinds of texts. He emphasized the importance of the receptors and their communities and their cultural expectations. One finds this relevant arguing that though this paper has a genuine concern, it is not oblivious to the difficulty of translating a word from one language and culture into another.

In the work of Catford, he introduced the idea of: i) three broad types of translations according to criteria being first, full translation is contrasted with partial translation which differs according to the extent of translation; secondly, a total translation which differs from restricted translation according to the levels of language involved in translation; and thirdly, he distinguished between rank-bound translation and unbounded translation. According to him, this is dependent on the grammatical or phonological rank at which equivalence is established; ii) is the shifts of translation which refer to the changes that take place during the translation process.<sup>16</sup> Accordingly, shifts are deviations from formal correspondence while translating from the source language to the translated language.<sup>17</sup> These shifts include,

“(a) structure-shifts involving change in grammatical structure, (b) unit-shifts involving changes in rank, (c) class-shifts involving changes in class, and (d) intra-system shifts which occur internally when source and target language systems share the same constitution but a non-corresponding term in the TL is selected when translating.”<sup>18</sup>

Catford's view was criticized by Snell-Hornby for significantly holding a linguistic theory of translation that should have also considered cultural, situational and historical factors.<sup>19</sup> However, Catford's equivalence of translation should not be thought of as the replacement of source-language textual material by translated language equivalent textual material.<sup>20</sup>

House, in his work, has also developed a translation model based on pragmatic theories of language use.<sup>21</sup> In this model, the fundamental need for equivalence of source-language text and translated-language text is that the original and the translated should match one another in function. The translated text is considered to be of quality if it matches the textual profile and function of the original.<sup>22</sup>

In his work *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft*, Koller did a detailed assessment of the concept of equivalence in translation work. He looked at two language systems where differences and similarities are described contrastively. According to him, equivalence has to do with equivalent items in specific source-language text to translated-language text pairs and contexts. He posited five different types of equivalence. These are i) denotative equivalence which deals with the extralinguistic content of a text; ii) connotative equivalence relating to lexical choices; iii) text-normative equivalence relating to text types; iv) pragmatic equivalence involving the receiver of the text or message; and v) formal equivalence involving form and aesthetics of the text.<sup>23</sup>

Newmark, eventually through his works replaced Nida's terms of formal equivalence with semantic translation and dynamic equivalence with communicative translation. He tried to differentiate between his two types of translations by showing that semantic translation deals more with meaning whilst communicative translation focuses on effect. Whereas the semantic translation tries to retain characteristics of the source-language text as much as feasible, the communicative approach focuses

<sup>15</sup> E. Gentzler, *Contemporary Translation Theories* (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001).

<sup>16</sup> J.C. Catford, *A Linguistic Theory of Translation* (London: Oxford University Press, 1965).72.

<sup>17</sup> Catford, *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, 73.

<sup>18</sup> Catford, *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, 80.

<sup>19</sup> M. Snell-Hornby, *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1988).19-20.

<sup>20</sup> K. Malmkjær, *Linguistics and the Language of Translation* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005).20.

<sup>21</sup> J. House, *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited* (Tübingen: Narr, 1987). 85.

<sup>22</sup> Catford, *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, 82.

<sup>23</sup> W. Koller, *Einführung in Die Übersetzungswissenschaft* (Heidelberg: Quelle and Meyer, 1979). 186-191.

as much as possible to satisfy the needs of the recipients.<sup>24</sup> The semantic approach being used in the translation of the *Ngmami Klɔuklɔ* ♂ is also seen. However, as the difficulty would be as shown so far, *osatotse* did not fully translate the Greek word *ὑποκριτής* although, to a large extent, it makes sense in the context in which it is used.

In her work, *In Other Words*, Baker through her neutral approach argued that equivalence is a relative concept.<sup>25</sup> According to her, the concept of equivalence is “influenced by a variety of linguistic and cultural factors.”<sup>26</sup> She came up with terms like i) grammatical - diversity of grammatical categories and rules across languages and the difficulty to find an equivalent term in the translated text; ii) textual - equivalence that may be achieved between a source-language text and translated-language text in terms of cohesion and information; and iii) pragmatic equivalence - deals mainly with implicature (what is implied and not literal meaning). She emphasized that in translations, words are looked at firstly as single units so that the translator can find their equivalent in the translated language.<sup>27</sup>

At this point, conclusively agreeing with Pym, there is nothing such as perfect equivalence between languages. The term equivalence should be seen as a relational concept of “equal value” between the source-language text and translated-language segment made possible by a linguistic level from form to function.<sup>28</sup> This work is not attempting a re-translation of the text or providing a better rendering of the word. It is only appropriate to review possible translation strategies that allow the word, *osatotse* in the *Ngmami Klɔuklɔ* ♂ to translate the Greek word *ὑποκριτής*. However, the critical point is that *osatotse* does not fully translate *ὑποκριτής* and it is even a challenge to look at contextual meaning in the biblical passages in which it is used to translate *ὑποκριτής*.

### Lexical Meaning of *ὑποκριτής* and *Osatotse*

As mentioned earlier, there is no such thing as perfect equivalence between two different languages and such cannot exist between two words even in the same language – they can only be nearest in meaning. This part of the paper explores the lexical makeup, etymology and meanings (be it denotative or connotative) of the two words *ὑποκριτής* and *osatotse*. This would help establish a proper understanding of the thesis of the paper that although *osatotse* in the *Ngmami Klɔuklɔ* ♂ has not fully translated the Greek word, *ὑποκριτής*, *osatotse* to a large extent gives full meaning in the contexts in which it has been used.

The Greek word *ὑποκριτής* is a compound word made up of *ὑπο* which in its usage could mean under and *κριτής* which means a judge or critic. It, therefore, explains that *ὑποκριτής* by word formation could mean someone who is under a judge or a critic. This word, *ὑποκριτής* is a derivative of the Greek verb, *ὑποκρίνομαι* which means “to pretend”. Here, *ὑποκριτής* is one who pretends to be something other than what he/she really is – a pretender who acts hypocritically or pretentiously. For instance, Matthew 6:16 states that *ὅταν δὲ νηστεύητε, μὴ γίνεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταὶ σκυθρωποὶ* which means ‘when you fast, do not put on a sad face like the hypocrites’. This in essence means that a hypocrite gives the impression of having a purpose or motivation, while in reality having quite different ones. In a number of languages, both the noun and verb forms of the word are expressed in idiomatic ways because of the difficulty of translation. For example, ‘to have two faces,’ ‘to have two tongues,’ ‘to be two people,’ or ‘to have two hearts.’<sup>29</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Peter Newmark, “Approaches to Translation (Language Teaching Methodology Series),” *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7 (1) 114 (1981): 115.

<sup>25</sup> Mona Baker, *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation* (Routledge, 2018). 222.

<sup>26</sup> Panou, “Equivalence in Translation Theories: A Critical Evaluation,” 4.

<sup>27</sup> Baker, *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*, 224.

<sup>28</sup> A. Pym, *Exploring Translation Theories* (London and New York: Routledge, 2010). 37.

<sup>29</sup> Johannes, P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*, 2nd ed. (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989).

In Thayer's Greek Lexicon, *ὑποκριτής* means one who answers or an interpreter (in the works of Plato, and Lucian).<sup>30</sup> It can also refer to an actor, or stage-player (in Aristophanes, Xenophon, Plato, Aelian, Herodian). However, in Biblical Greek, it means a dissembler, pretender, or hypocrite as in English translations. In the New Testament, especially in the gospels, it is used figuratively as a moral or religious counterfeit, pretender, or dissembler.<sup>31</sup>

*Osatotse* on the other hand, which translates *ὑποκριτής* in the *Ngmami Klɔuklɔɔ* follows the structure of many other Dangme nouns showing possession or ownership. For instance, *πλουσιος* which means rich, wealthy, or well-to-do person in Matthew 19:23, 24 is translated as *niatse (ni[hi]-a-tse)*. This literally means 'owner of many things'. It, therefore, follows that *osatotse (o-sa-to-tse)* which translates *ὑποκριτής* literally means 'rotten (spoilt) but a hidden person (owner)'. It then means that the equivalence of *ὑποκριτής* in Dangme being *osatotse* means someone who is bad, spoilt, or rotten but pretends to be good. This, to a large extent, reflects the meaning of *ὑποκριτής* meaning a dissembler, pretender, stage player, counterfeit and several other nuanced meanings applied to *ὑποκριτής*. The difficulty is that whereas *ὑποκριτής* could mean someone who has a good virtue within but out of pretence shows ill outwardly, *osatotse* is limited in this sense since it etymologically, connotatively and denotatively shows someone who is bad, spoilt or rotten but pretends to be good outwardly. Looking at the two words in contexts, as they are used, will expose the limitation of *osatotse* here expressed.

### Contexts, Usage and Meaning of *ὑποκριτής* in the gospels especially

Though there are several scenarios and scenes in scripture that depict the meaning of *ὑποκριτής*, its usage is especially found in the gospels. At this point, it is relevant to look at the word *ὑποκριτής* in context in relation to its translated 'equivalence' *osatotse* in the *Ngmami Klɔuklɔɔ*. Among the gospel writers, the Matthean gospel used the word *ὑποκριτής* quite a number of times compared to the other gospels, especially the synoptics. The author of Matthew used it most of the time in reference to Jesus' description of the Scribes and Pharisees especially. In a more general sense, Wallace pointed out that "Matthew's Gospel attacks the Pharisees and other Jewish leaders more than Mark or Luke do (cf. 3:7 16:6, 11, 12; ch. 23). Perhaps, the reason for this, was in part due to how hard these religious leaders were on the tax-collectors (they associated them with sinners and Gentiles). Not much can be made of this, however."<sup>32</sup> In this, one sees an authorial motive in the writing of the biblical texts as pertained here. One of such veritable attacks on the Jewish leaders, especially, is the use of the word *ὑποκριτής* in describing their persons and deeds in various contexts.

The word appears in the "Sermon on the Mount" four times in the Matthean narrative. In Matthew 6:1ff, Jesus cautioned His disciples and other audience not to behave as the *ὑποκριται* who do their charitable giving (verse 2); pray in public, that is in the synagogues and street corners (verse 5); fasting with sad, disguised and disfigured faces (verse 16). These, they do as blinders and pretentiously, to cover their real identities. By these, they also trumpet and project their 'righteous' deeds to be seen by the public. They succeed in showing to the public how good they are by the various acts which are not bad in themselves. However, they have wrong motives in doing them. Therefore, the attribute or meaning of *ὑποκριτής* in this context is the one who wants his deeds to be known to the public which may serve as a blinder so he or she could be perceived as a good person. Although the texts did not mention their rotten hidden nature in these contexts as *osatotse* reveals, one may see a deliberate attempt to make a public showing of good deeds.

In Matthew 7:1-6, another caution is seen not to quickly pass judgment on others whilst one might be in the same condition or even worse. It is quite a wonder to see the ills in others and not see one's own defects. The only way according to this context that this can be possible is unless one is a

<sup>30</sup> Joseph Henry Thayer, "ὑποκριτής," *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, (International Bible Translators: Bible Works, 1998-2000).

<sup>31</sup> Barbara Friberg and Timothy Friberg, "Kai." *Analytical Greek New Testament: Greek Text Analysis* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1981); F. Wilbur Gingrich, *Lexicon of the Greek New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979).

<sup>32</sup> B. Daniel Wallace, *New Testament: Introductions and Outlines* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999). 8.

hypocrite. Therefore, the meaning here is that being oblivious of one's own life defects and focusing on that of others. In these circumstances, *osatotse* can verily translate *ὑποκριτής* since there is the gesture of covering up ill to project oneself as good by judging the deeds of others.

In Matthew 15:1-9, *ὑποκριτής* is used to describe especially the Pharisees who use the traditions of the elders to negate God's commandments unto disobedience. They use the outward performance of hand washing, a tradition of the elders to prove their pious and sanctimonious lives whilst their real identities are hidden. They pay lip service to God ignoring the weightier matters being worship from the heart. There seemed to be a deliberate cover-up of what is inside of them known to themselves and God.

In Matthew 16:1-4, the Sadducees and Pharisees have switched from their religious roles of discerning and knowing the times to weather forecasting. These were religious groups who should concern themselves with religious matters but have decided to become something else which is not their core mandate. Here, they pretend to be what they are not and that is hypocritical. They desired a sign from Christ which when performed, might put Him in the same bracket with them. Christ's main purpose in coming to earth was not for the purpose of performing miracles but to save humanity from sin. They were calling Jesus' attention to peripheral issues setting aside His core mandate. This is one of the difficulties in using *osatotse* to translate *ὑποκριτής*. Though the idea of pretence is found in this context, the idea of rotten but hidden being the literal meaning of *osatotse* is absent. One can only see people who should know what to do but have refused their main duties to do what is not their role. One can relate this to the church today, especially its leadership who have left the main role as found in Matthew 28:18-20 to becoming all manner of consultants, business executives, and other responsibilities unbeknown to the early church.

Another scenario where *osatotse* etymologically does not necessarily translate *ὑποκριτής* is found in Matthew 22:15-22. Here, being a hypocrite is applied to those who know what to do but are pretending not to know. In this scenario, the good virtue of having knowledge and being pretentiously covered with ignorance which may be termed as bad is portrayed. Speaking strictly to the meaning of *osatotse*, this word does not translate *ὑποκριτής* in this case since a good virtue is being covered by ill. Following the coinage of the word *osatotse*, which etymologically means "rotten but hidden owner", then, *ohitotse*, meaning "good but hidden owner" should be used though not existent in Dangme terminologies. To maintain *osatotse* in the contexts in which it does not etymologically translate *ὑποκριτής*, it is then relevant to introduce a footnote to make up and give the full meaning of *ὑποκριτής* in order to make the texts relevant to its audiences. However, speaking of context and meaning, the question they asked Christ had a different agenda or motive. They conceived wickedness but wanted to be perceived as seekers of truth or righteousness. The purpose of their question is to entrap Christ. It is not to seek knowledge because they already know exactly what to do. In this scenario, the meaning of *ὑποκριτής* is fully represented since the good virtue of having knowledge is covered with the deed of ignorance which is ill as well as having an ill motive and coming to ask a question as seekers of truth or righteousness.

In Matthew 23:1ff, *ὑποκριτής* in context variedly received several meanings. For instance, we have a) those who say but do not do; b) those who assign roles but they themselves do not participate; c) those who cherish public showings and performances; d) those who love to be seen, hailed and honoured calling attention to themselves; e) make long prayers at the expense of doing what is right; f) those who by their deeds hinder others from entering into the divine kingdom because they themselves would not enter; g) those who do all that they can to proselytize or win others to the faith but make them their kind and not after godliness (even worse than themselves); h) those who make the lighter matters weightier and weightier matter lighter (misrepresentation of issues); i) those who portray outward cleanliness but rotten within. This seems to be the clearest representation of *osatotse* as translating *ὑποκριτής* in context; j) they judge past generations as unworthy but they do the same things they criticize and even worse; and k) their nature and deeds point them to destruction. In Matthew 24, talking about the signs, manner, and required virtues of His people as well as the days of

Christ's coming, in verse 51 specifically, hypocrites have no place in the kingdom but are already condemned.

Not oblivious of the inconspicuous and subtle differences in the various narrations in the gospels, the Markan usage of the word *ὑποκριτής* parallels what is discussed in Matthew as the people drawing near to God with their lips and their hearts are far away from Him. Mark used the word once as found in chapter 7:6. Luke on the other hand used the word *ὑποκριτής* four times. Three of his scenarios certainly parallel the usage in the Matthean account although, here also, one may observe subtle differences in the narrations. One of the usages of *ὑποκριτής* as in Luke 13:15 is peculiar to the Lukan research and narration. In chapter 13:10-17, the word is used in one of the Sabbath healing episodes of Christ. He healed a woman with a withered hand on the Sabbath. This act was criticized by the ruler of the synagogue as something that was not supposed to be done on the Sabbath. Jesus addressed them (not only the ruler of the synagogue who spoke) as *ὑποκριται* translated in the *Ngmami Klɔuklɔ* ♂ as *osatotseme*. They are hypocrites because they freed their horses from the stalls and fed them on the Sabbath day but how much more the daughter of Abraham? It seems here also, they make lighter issues weightier and the weightier issues lighter.

The word *ὑποκριτής*, outside the gospels, is used in the context of Psalms 26. David would not go in with the *ὑποκριται* translated, *osatotseme* because of his integrity as in verse 1. This gives another contextual meaning being those who have no integrity are hypocrites. It is so because their outward actions do not align with their inner life or thoughts. Their outer life contradicts their inner life, the reality of their lives. This makes sense because the lacking virtue of hypocrites is integrity –their actions do not conform to their words or inner world. This understanding is not far from the contextual meanings discussed above in the synoptic gospels. Verse 5 proves difficult. However, that David hated the assembly of evildoers and did not sit with the wicked does not prove him righteous. The idea of assembly and sitting make the acts of those people perpetual not David who would confess his sins and wash his hands in innocence; go about the altar of Yahweh; love Yahweh's house and where his glory dwells. He further reiterated his abhorrence of sin by his plea to Yahweh for deliverance in order not to perish with sinners and bloodthirsty men whose right hands are full of bribes.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, although *osatotse*, in the *Ngmami Klɔuklɔ* ♂ to a large extent, translates the Greek, *ὑποκριτής*, showing a person being a counterfeit, dissembler, or pretender et al, it only focuses on a person being rotten, spoilt or bad but hiding it with good outward appearances and performances. *Osatotse*, therefore, as used in some of the contexts shown above, does not fully translate or give the contextual meaning of *ὑποκριτής*. For example, where the one or the persons referred to as *ὑποκριτής* (*ὑποκριται*) in context possess good virtue(s) and yet pretend or portray themselves to have an ill-behaviour on the outside. In this case, following the etymological or literal meaning of the word *osatotse*, the appropriate word to use is *o-hi-to-tse* (this does not exist in Dangme vocabulary) which would then mean good but hidden person. It is in the interest of this paper to finally suggest that a footnote be introduced into the *Ngmami Klɔuklɔ* ♂ where appropriate to help readers appreciate the full meaning of *ὑποκριτής* as compared to the limitations of *osatotse* which does not fully translate *ὑποκριτής* as its 'equivalence'. As discussed above, this paper is not oblivious to the fact that equivalence in exactly translating a word from one language to another is not possible.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baker, Mona. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. Routledge, 2018.
- Broeck, R. van den. "The Concept of Equivalence in Translation Theory: Some Critical Reflections." In *Literature and Translation*, edited by J. S. Holmes, J. Lambert, and R. van den Broeck, 29–47. Leuven: Academic, 1978.
- Catford, J.C. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Friberg, Barbara, and Timothy Friberg. "Καί." *Analytical Greek New Testament: Greek Text Analysis*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1981.

- Gentzler, E. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001.
- Gingrich, F. Wilbur. *Lexicon of the Greek New Testament*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- House, J. *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited*. Tübingen: Narr, 1987.
- Jakobson, Roman. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." In *On Translation*, 232–39. New York: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Koller, W. *Einführung in Die Übersetzungswissenschaft*. Heidelberg: Quelle and Meyer, 1979.
- Lefevere, A. *Translating Literature: Practice and Theory in a Comparative Literature Context*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1993.
- Louw, Johannes, P., and Eugene A. Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*. 2nd ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
- Malmkjaer, K. *Linguistics and the Language of Translation*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005.
- Munday, J. *Introducing Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Newmark, Peter. "Approaches to Translation (Language Teaching Methodology Series)." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7 (1) 114 (1981): 115.
- Nida, Eugene Albert, and Charles Russell Taber. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Vol. 8. Brill Archive, 1974.
- Panou, Despoina. "Equivalence in Translation Theories: A Critical Evaluation." *Theory & Practice in Language Studies (TPLS)* 3, no. 1 (2013).
- Pym, A. *Exploring Translation Theories*. London and New York: Routledge, 2010.
- Snell-Hornby, M. *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1988.
- Thayer, Joseph Henry. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, 1889.
- Vinay, Jean-Paul, and Jean Darbelnet. "Stylistique Comparée Du Français et de l'anglais: Méthode de Traduction." (*No Title*), 1958.
- Wallace, B. Daniel. *New Testament: Introductions and Outlines*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999.

## ABOUT AUTHORS

Ebenezer Quaye, PhD in Theology (New Testament Studies) is a Senior Lecturer at the Department of Theological Studies, Valley View University. He is a known transformational author, speaker and influencer through his seminar, workshop, conference and other personal engagements as well as a discussant of diverse issues of global significance. He combines both academic and public speaking in a seamless manner to reach thousands across the world. As a biblicist, he researches in pistology, mother-tongue and translation issues, lexicography, leadership and other areas of global scope that transform societies.

Jonathan Edward Tetteh Kuwornu-Adjaottor, PhD, Associate Professor of New Testament and Mother-Tongue Biblical Hermeneutics, Department of Religious Studies, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi Ghana.