

DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE AND MOTHER-TONGUE TRANSLATIONS OF THE BIBLE
JONATHAN EDWARD TETTEH KUWORNU-ADJAOTTOR, PATRICK YANKYERA AND
SOLACE AGO YANKSON¹

ABSTRACT

African theologian discourses have tended to remain perpetually foreign and neo-colonist in thought and language, which is quite often irrelevant to the contemporary Ghanaian and African context. This has resulted from the fact that African theological education has been integrated into typical European and North American academic traditions neglecting the norms, values and principles inherent to Ghana and African culture. This includes the introduction of Western methodologies of Bible translation into the translation curriculum of African seminaries and universities. This paper discusses two major philosophies of Bible translation – formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence – and their relevance to mother-tongue translations of the Bible. Using evidence from literature and observations made by the authors, it argues that if Ghanaians and African translators and theologians want their readers to identify with God’s word then dynamic equivalence translation philosophy should be used to translate mother-tongue Bibles.

INTRODUCTION

For much too long, Ghanaian theological education has been integrated into the typical European and North American academic tradition, neglecting the norms, values, principles and insights inherent to Ghanaian culture. Many African biblical scholars have introduced Western methodologies of bible translation into the Translation curriculum of African Seminaries and Universities. As a result, African theological discourse on issues such as eschatology, salvation and ecclesiology have tended to remain perpetually foreign and neo-colonist in thought, language and expression, which are quite often, irrelevant to the contemporary Ghanaian context. Such alien conversation does not address the material, moral and spiritual problems that preoccupy Africans in their cultural settings. Ghanaians and Africans in general must not keep on living in the European mind-set represented by researchers like Fredrich von Hegel who stated that Africans were incapable of self-perception and self-description and had to be “civilized” by Europeans who had supposedly attained a “higher” level of cultural consciousness.² Therefore, the time has come to re-focus the curriculum on African cultural and religious heritage because it is no longer necessary for Africans to continue to study the Bible from alien perspectives.

The insights expressed above provide the background leading us to appreciate the relevance of a dynamic equivalence translation technique to revise the mother–tongue version of the Bible. For many Ghanaian Christians, the Bible must be read as the ‘Word of God’ addressed to them personally and therefore they must be able to receive its message and encounter it in their own idioms. It is very important, therefore, for God’s message of salvation and liberation to be re-interpreted within the Ghanaian cultural contexts. Thus there is an urgent need for African theologians to begin to take a fresh scrutiny of themselves and their social contexts. There is the need for our Bibles to be written from Ghanaian perspective so that

¹ Jonathan. Edward. Tetteh. Kuwornu-Adjaottor, PhD is an Associate Professor of New Testament and Mother-tongue Biblical Hermeneutics in the Department of Religious Studies, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi. Patrick Yankyera is a PhD Candidate in the Department of Religious Studies, KNUST. Solace Ago Yankson, PhD is a Lecturer in the Department of Modern Languages-Akan section, KNUST.

² J.N.K Mugambi, ‘Missiological Research of Globalization,’ in *Swedish Missiological Themes, Vol 86 No. 4, 1988, Uppsala, Swedish Institute of Missionary Research.*

Ghanaian theologians can make the interpretation and understanding of the Bible accessible to the majority of Ghanaians.

It may not come as a surprise to most people that the Bible was written by people. What we don't often think about is that these people lived in a specific time in history. The time, society, and culture that they lived in are very different from the time, society and culture that we live in now. We are influenced by the world around us therefore translators often have to consider the impact of the world around them on their writing. Culture is dynamic and diverse and so is language. Therefore, we need to devise methods of translation that are culturally informed and yet faithful to biblical translation.³

TRANSLATION PHILOSOPHIES

Biblical Hebrew and Koine Greek are the original languages of the Old and New Testaments respectively. Any version of the Bible has been translated from these languages. One of the problems that translators encounter is that both of these languages are significantly different from English. What should a translator do when there are three words in an ancient language for which we only have one equivalence in English? This is where we get into the sticky mess of biblical translation. The common question of which Bible translation to use is very important because it concerns the most important words ever spoken, the words of God the Creator. It is very crucial to understand at the outset that behind each version of the Bible is a fundamental philosophy of Bible translation. We can separate the philosophies behind modern Bible translations into two basic groups - formal equivalency and dynamic equivalency. The purpose of this post is to expand a little bit more on the differences between these Bible translation philosophies.

Formal Equivalence

Formal equivalence takes the words that are written in the ancient texts and translates them into a modern language and format and leaves the onus on the reader to interpret and apply the text. Some examples of translated versions of the Bible that used formal equivalence philosophy are:

- King James Version
- Revised Version
- American Standard Version
- Revised Standard Version
- New American Standard Bible
- New King James Version
- New Revised Standard Version
- English Standard Version

The arguments against formal equivalence are that the text often becomes wooden and difficult to read. Another problem is that the difference between the ancient languages and modern languages makes word-for-word translation difficult. Therefore, some modifications have to be made for the sake of readability and ease of use.

Dynamic Equivalence

Proponents of dynamic equivalence would argue that its main objective is to translate based on what the author's intended message was. The benefit of this is that it takes into consideration the difference in setting and cultural influences. It is worth noting that dynamic equivalence is a lot messier and can be carried out to different degrees. Some examples of dynamic equivalence translations are:

- New International Version
- Today's New International Version
- New English Translation

³ Chris Manus Ukachukwu, *Intercultural Hermeneutics in African*, (Nairobi, Action Publishers, 2003), page 1-2

- New Living Translation
- Contemporary English Version⁴

The biggest problem with dynamic equivalence is that it does some interpretation in the translation process since it takes the thought or intent of the original author into consideration. When you do interpretation and present it as biblical text you will ruffle some feathers.⁵ You will also open yourself up to the argument that you are translating with an agenda or ulterior motive. There is also the always-fun possibility of wild conspiracy theories.

FORMAL EQUIVALENCE OF MODERN TRANSLATIONS

Word-for-word (literal) translation are mostly based on (a) dogmatic presuppositions,⁶ specifically the mechanical theory of inspiration of Scripture. These dogmatic presuppositions have dominance over the linguistic, literary, and socio-cultural considerations in the process of translation. Word-for-word translations are further based on (b) the assumption that translation involves the conveying of the vocabulary terms and grammatical forms, which implies that no ‘interpretation’ is necessary. These are two of the most important reasons why the formal equivalence (word-for-word) translation philosophy is employed in biblical translation, although others claim that they are the only reasons for employing philosophy in biblical translation.

One of the main reasons for the support of a word-for-word translation is the dogmatic claim that only the (original) Greek and Hebrew/Aramaic texts are divinely inspired. Inspiration is mostly seen as mechanical event.⁷ This implies that the text as a whole, i.e. words, structure, grammar, etc. is inspired.⁸ The implication is clear: if only the ‘original’ was inspired,⁹ no translation can consequently be inspired.¹⁰

According to the supporters of this view, the only means by which the inspired word can be kept whole is by staying as closely as possible to the grammar, structure and words of the original because the farther one moves from the ‘original’ the farther one moves away from the inspired word of God. A good and trustworthy translation is therefore a translation that stays as ‘close as possible’ to the inspired text, although the translation might not be regarded as being inspired itself. Any measure by the translator of what may be regarded as ‘interpretation’ is evaluated in a negative light (even regarded as ‘evil’).¹¹ This obviously means that anything less than a literal translation should be rejected, since it moves away from the words and form of the inspired text.¹² The farther it moves away, the less accurate it is, since accuracy and trustworthiness are measured in terms of inspiration.

⁴ <http://theexpositors.com/tag/dynamic-equivalence> (Accessed May 12, 2018).

⁵ <http://theexpositors.com/tag/dynamic-equivalence> (Accessed May 12, 2018).

⁶ P. Newmark. *Paragraphs on Translation*, (Clevedon, Multilingual Matters Ltd. 1993)

⁷ Inspiration was viewed differently during the process of translating the original Hebrew text into Greek (LXX). Greenspoon (2000:ad loc), for instance, maintains: ‘It cannot be proven to be so, but it is reasonable to maintain that the Greek text, whatever its precise origins, would be viewed by many first century Jews as equal in authority to the Hebrew. Such a view goes back at least as far as the second century B.C. *Epistle of Aristeeas*, which describes the reception of the Greek Pentateuch at Alexandria in language unmistakably reminiscent of Moses’ giving of the Ten Commandments at Sinai. The first – century A.D. Jewish philosopher Philo was surely not alone in maintaining that those responsible for the Septuagint were more than mere translators-they had functioned as authentic and true prophets.’ Obviously, questions about the way in which the Holy Spirit works, or the inspiration of the translator and how it differs from the inspiration of the original author, are relevant in this regard.

⁸ See, as example of this position, Forrest who quotes several scholars to substantiate his position.

⁹ D. C. Arichea *Theology and translation: the implication of certain theological issues to the translation task in Stine* (1990) pg 55-62

¹⁰ C. D. Alert *Assessment of inspiration and translation? The problem of verbal inspiration for translation and proposed solution in Porter et al.* (1999) pg 111-113

¹¹ S. Noorda et al (1998:2th09)

¹² J. P. Sterk. *Translation as re-creation.* (The Bible Translator 1994) pg130

It must be noted that the above argument is not based on sound linguistic and literary arguments, but on specific dogmatic presupposition. It should also be realized that the above is not the only theory of inspiration of Scripture. To allow such a theory to dominate the method by which the Bible is translated, ignoring obvious literary and linguistic elements, is unacceptable. Literary and linguistic voices should not be vetoed by dogmatic presupposition.

Excursus: The ‘tension’ between literal and free translations is not a modern issue. Support for both approaches is present in ancient as well as medieval times. Ancient translation, did not hesitate to make adjustments for the sake of better understanding.¹³ Paraphrase was also characteristic of the targumim, since the aim of targumic production was to give the sense of the Hebrew Scriptures.¹⁴ Although the Aramaic translation 11QtgJob can be classified as literal translation, it often changes the poetic structure in an effort to make the Hebrew text more understandable.¹⁵ Often homilies were added in the targumim. Noorda et al cites Maimonides a twelfth century Jewish philosopher who already remarked that word-for-word translations result in unclear and unsure translations.¹⁶ Maimonides maintains that a translator should rather communicate the idea(s) clearly. To ‘add’ or ‘leave out’ words in the receptor language is therefore acceptable if the idea is communicated effectively according to the characteristics of that particular language. Noorda et al mentions that Luther did not insist on translating words, but also valued meaning in the translation process, although one should not deviate from the acceptable use of language.¹⁷

The assumption that the translator should remain as faithful as possible to the original text implies for some that only the vocabulary terms and grammatical forms of the original writing should be conveyed and reflected within the document in the target language. These are regarded as the ‘codes’ of language that can be ‘translated’ into the respective ‘codes’ in the receptor language.¹⁸ This is the translator’s sole task since translators should only focus on the text in front of them. According to the proponent of this view, translation should not involve interpretation, since interpretation is done by exegetes and not translators.¹⁹ A translator should present what is said and not what is meant – s/he is simply a conveyor of words and phrases from one language to another, and this should be done by staying as close as possible to the original.²⁰ The translator should work with the ‘codes’ in the text and reflect it in the translation. They do not really have to interpret the text within its broader context. That is the task of the exegete. The modern reader must now follow the path of exegete to determine the meaning of the words or phrases.

¹³ L. J., Greenspoon. (*OLD TESTAMENT VERSIONS, ANCIENT Dictionary of New Testament Background*, (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Vasity Press-CD, ad loc 2000)

¹⁴ B. D, Chilton. (*RABBINIC LITERATURE: TARGUMIM Dictionary of New Background*, (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Vasity Press-CD, and loc 2000)

¹⁵ R. Buth. *ARAMAIC TARGUMIMM: QUMRAN Dictionary of New Testament Background*, Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Vasity Press-CD, ad loc.

¹⁶ S. J. Noorda, Beentjes, P.C. (reds) *Werk in uitvoering*(NGB: Haarlem, 1998) page 208.

¹⁷ S. J. Noorda, Beentjes, P.C. (reds) *Werk in uitvoering*(NGB: Haarlem, 1998) page 209

¹⁸ Iersel B. Van, *Vertaler en exegete als handlangers* (Welzen et al. 1998) pg 171-179

¹⁹ Forrest (www.jayforrest.org) (Accessed May 12, 2018) rightly points out ‘.....a dynamic translation must first discover the meaning of a passage before it translates it, therefore it is partly based upon the translator’s understanding and interpretation.....By giving the meaning of the text rather than a translation of what it literally says, the translator goes beyond his role and becomes interpreter’.

²⁰ See www.auburn.edu/~allenkc/.

This approach is, of course, based on a particular view of what a translation should be. It restricts the process to minimum involvement of the translator. The translator must mechanically ‘exchange codes’ and exclude interpretation.²¹

Although this might seem like a valid approach, it is not an ideal option since linguistic and literary codes cannot be separated from the formation of meaning. The approach results in Greek English (i.e. Greek by means of English words). Hermeneutically, it de-ecologizes the text by not taking into account all the elements active in creating meaning. It is indeed like trying to separate the milk and sugar from a cup of white, sweet coffee. The idea that this assumption is untenable is nowadays widely accepted because the moment a person starts to read; the process of interpretation has already begun. Apart from that it has been realized since the 1980’s, as Naude points out, that a translation does not take place in a vacuum but within the socio-cultural ecology of the translator and his target group.²² This initiated the movement away from a normative and prescriptive approach to a more functional approach.

DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE OF MODERN TRANSLATIONS

In contrast to the formal-equivalence translations is the dynamic equivalence translation. The focus of the dynamic equivalence translation is directed toward the receptor response but not the form of the source message. A dynamic-equivalence (D-E) translation may be described as one which a bilingual and bicultural person can justifiably say, "That is just the way we would say it." It is important to realize, however, that a D-E translation is not merely another message which is more or less similar to that of the source language message. It is a translation and therefore must clearly reflect the meaning and intent of the source language message.

One way of defining a D-E translation is to describe it as "the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message." This type of definition contains three essential terms: (1) *equivalent*, which points toward the source-language message, (2) *natural*, which points toward the receptor language, and (3) *closest*, which binds the two orientations together on the basis of the highest degree of approximation.

Since a D-E translation is, however, directed primarily toward equivalence of response rather than equivalence of form, it is important to define more fully the implications of the word *natural* as applied to such translations. Basically, the word *natural* is applicable to three areas of the communication process: a *natural* rendering must fit (1) the receptor language and culture as a whole, (2) the context of the particular message, and (3) the receptor-language audience.²³

The aim of dynamic equivalence translations is to have the same impact on a modern audience as the original text had on its audience. Instead of translating every word of the biblical text into an exact equivalence in the receptor language, translators, who basically adhere to the principles of dynamic equivalence aim to produce the closest equivalents - in terms of style and understanding - of the meanings enclosed in the original language structures. On a lower level of abstraction, however, this ideal is applied and expressed differently in modern translations. For instance, the translators of *God’s Word*, who opted for a “closest natural equivalents” translation aimed, first of all, to find suitable English equivalents that give expression to the meanings embedded in the original text. Secondly, “readability” was a prerequisite, therefore, English punctuation and gender-neutral language was used wherever possible so that the intended readers will be able to apply relevant biblical passages to their own modern contexts. Furthermore, the translators of *God’s Word* chose the natural equivalents terms, expressions, and phrases which mostly reflected the style of the Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek texts. Against the awkwardness and inaccuracy often associated with formal equivalents translations, which closely follow the word arrangement and structure

²¹ E.A. Nida *Creativity in translating in Omanson* (2000) pg 165

²² J. A. Naude, *Tydskrif vir Geesteswetenskappe*, (Vertaalkunde vandag, ‘n Oorsig 2001) page 181

²³ <http://www.bible-researcher.com/nida1.html> (Accessed May 12, 2018).

of the original language, in recent times, the translators of *God's Word* try to address the loss of meaning by, amongst others, avoiding long complicated sentence. They vary the word arrangement and substitute theological concepts with terms that can be understood easily by readers with no theological training.²⁴

It is clear from the above that dynamic equivalents concentrate on the exegetical meaning of the original text as well as on the best way to express this meaning in the target language. Recent developments within the field of linguistic and, specifically, in semantics obviously encouraged Bible translators to hold a much broader understanding of the concept "meaning". In contrast to traditional views, which hold that meaning is embedded in specific words and may be transported to and expressed in similar words in other languages, most modern translators determine meaning in terms of the total expression of utterances, including the syntax of how words, phrases, and paragraphs are interconnected.²⁵ According to Wayne Lehman, aspects such as the denotation of words, the implicit meanings attached to concepts in specific cultures, the rhetorical impact of verbal utterances and stylistic features must be taken into consideration when meaning is at stake.

At the same time, clarity of expression and naturalness of language is of great importance. Most translators of modern versions of the Bible share the presupposition that a translation should not sound like one; the Bible must be translated into the intended reader's normal vocabulary.

The modern era of the reader-friendly Bible, which communicates effectively and smoothly in the idiom of modern readers, is somewhat different from the heyday of the literal translation. The complex grammatical structures and unintelligible phrases of literal translation as well as the sensitivity of translators to "contemporary" ideological issues such as political correctness, the use of gender neutral language, the rearrangement of Biblical discourses along the lines of modern patterns of argumentation have turned many of today's editions of the Bible into completely new Western texts, where modern cultural artifacts, ideologies and meanings are too easily imposed on these ancient religious documents.

WHY DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE PHILOSOPHY SHOULD BE USED IN REVISING MY MOTHER-TONGUE BIBLE.

For over three hundred years the King James Version, published in 1611, was the prominent translation used in most Protestant churches. As the English language continued to change, however, it became increasingly more difficult for people to understand the Old English vernacular. Faced with the obvious need for our society to understand God's Word, scholars sought to update the scriptures into more contemporary language. Dr. Lewis Foster, one of those who helped to translate the NIV and the NKJV states that it is necessary to continue to make new translations and revise old ones if people are to read the Word of God in their contemporary languages. With the passage of time, the meaning of words change. For instance, during the time when the King James Version of the Bible was being translated the word 'prevent' could mean 'come before' but not necessarily 'to hinder'. So the translators in those days rendered 1 Thes. 4:15 as 'For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep.' But today the word 'prevent' has lost the meaning 'come before', therefore, the translation of this verse has been revised to convey the current meaning as indicated in NIV: 'According to the Lord's own word, we tell you that we who are still alive, who are left till the coming of the Lord, will certainly not 'precede' those who have fallen asleep'. To keep the translation of God's Word living it must be kept in the living language the people who are using it."²⁶ The foregoing discussion points to the fact that dynamic equivalence translation will be needed for mother-tongue versions of the Bible in Ghana and in Africa as whole because it will give Ghanaians and Africans

²⁴ S.J. Joubert, No Culture Shock? Addressing the Achilles Hells of modern Bible Translations, *Verbum et Ecclesia* 22(2) 2001, pp.314-325.

²⁵ Lehman Wanye, *Internet: http://www.geocites.com/bible_translation/maxims.htm*. (Accessed May 12, 2018)

²⁶ *bid.*

the opportunity to interpret Scripture from their own worldview. Dynamic equivalence of Mother-tongue versions of the Bible will also prepare the grounds for the Gospel to meet with Ghanaian cultures. This results from the fact that when Scripture is translated with the dynamic equivalence philosophy it no longer remains alien to the receptor culture but rather becomes part of the culture because it uses categories from that very culture. Unlike some other religions, Christianity has no *lingua franca* or sacred language but translate itself into every language and culture wherever it goes. Sanneh has said that without translation there will be no Christianity or Christians because “Translation is the church’s birthmark as well as its missionary benchmark: the church would be unrecognizable or unsustainable without it.”²⁷

Dynamic equivalence translation offers Ghanaians the opportunity to interpret the Bible in languages that they can best understand. It uses indigenous categories and idioms that make biblical interpretation in the native languages of Africa as a whole and of Ghana in particular relevant. The indigenous categories and idioms easily connect to the hearts of indigenous people and enhance biblical interpretation and Christian discipleship. Clement Akrofi, a Ghanaian linguist and translator, states that languages are an indispensable factor of national life. It provides the most adequate means of expressing what a people feels, thinks, and wills.²⁸ Therefore if the dynamic equivalence philosophy is employed in the translation of mother-tongue versions of the Bible for Ghanaians it will enable them to hear God’s word in languages and expressions they can identify with. Whenever people claim to have heard God spoke to them, it has always been through a language. This presupposes that God speaks to them in known and comprehensible tongues. The Mother-tongue, therefore, plays a cardinal role in Christian missions. Languages have intrinsic merit for communicating the divine message and they make translation feasible and primarily serve as vehicles for the consolidation of the *missio Dei* in Africa.²⁹

Language has been paramount in God’s mission to Africa and this was clearly demonstrated during Pentecost. Africans from Egypt and Libya for the first time heard the wonders of God declared in their own languages. In amazement they asked one another, “What does this mean?” (Acts 2:1-12). Commenting on this, Bediako argues that the significance of Pentecost does more than answering to the chaos of Babel and restoring harmony between God and humanity, and between human beings. Its deeper significance is that God speaks to men and women always in the vernacular.³⁰ God’s desire to reach people through heart languages makes dynamic equivalence philosophy an indispensable tool in the Christian missionary enterprise.

Dynamic equivalence gives indigenous people the hope and belief that God also speaks their languages and this enables biblical interpretation that really touches their cultural needs to be done. Again, creativity is not stifled and indigenous theologies and songs come into existence. Christianity therefore touches their primal world view and does not remain alien to them.

CONCLUSION

Two main philosophies are used in Bible translation - formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence. Formal equivalence is word-for-word translation that are mostly based on dogmatic presupposition, specifically the mechanical theory of inspiration of scripture. This has dominance over linguistic, literary and socio-cultural considerations in the process of translation. It is also based on the assumption that translation involves the conveying of the vocabulary terms and grammatical forms. As a result, formal equivalence translation takes words written in the ancient text and translate them into modern language and

²⁷ Sanneh, Lamin, *Whose Religion is Christianity?* (2003) pg 97

²⁸ C.A. Akrofi, *Twi Kasa Mmara*, (Scottish Mission Book Depot, Accra, Gold Coast, 1973) pg. vii.

²⁹ Lamin Sanneh. *Whose Religion is Christianity? The Gospel beyond the West* (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2003) 100

³⁰ Kwame Bediako. *Christianity in Africa: The Renewal of a Non-Western Religion*, (Grand Rapids; Orbis Books Edinburgh University Press, 1995), 60.

format and leaves the onus on the reader to interpret and apply the text. In contrast, the main object of dynamic equivalence is to translate based on the author's intended message but not so much on the words and phrases used. It takes the differences in setting and cultural influences into consideration when translating a text. As a result, the focus of dynamic equivalence translation is directed toward the receptor response and not the form of the ancient text. Therefore, dynamic equivalence translation is sometimes defined as the closest natural equivalence of the source language.

The lack of ability to speak the languages in which the Bible was originally written has made the translation of the Bible to other languages necessary. In recent times, however, the dynamic equivalence translation of the Bible is preferred to the formal equivalence since readers can identify with it than what the formal equivalence offers. Indigenous people of Ghana and Africa are able to apply Scriptures to their cultural context when the Bible is translated with the dynamic equivalence philosophy. This is because it re-tell as exactly as possible, the meaning of the original message in a way that is natural in the language which the translation is being made. Culture is dynamic and diverse and so is language. Hence if Ghanaians and African translators and theologians want their readers to identify with the Word of God, then Dynamic equivalence philosophy should be used to revise mother-tongue Bibles.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akrofi, C.A, *Twi Kasa Mmara*, Scottish Mission Book Depot, Accra, Gold Coast, 1973.
- Alert, C.D. Assessment of inspiration and translation? *The problem of verbal inspiration for translation and proposed solution in Porter et al.* 1999
- Arichea, D. C. *Theology and translation: the implication of certain theological issues to the translation task in Stine* 1990.
- Bediako, K. *Christianity in Africa: The Renewal of a Non-Western Religion*, Grand Rapids; Orbis Books Edinburgh University Press, 1995.
- Buth, R., *Aramatic Targumim: QUMRAN Dictionary of New Testament Background*, Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press-CD, ad loc.
- Chilton, B. D., *Rabbinic Literature: TARGUMIM Dictionary of New Background*, Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press-CD, and loc 2000.
- Greenspoon, L. J. *OLD TESTAMENT VERSIONS, ANCIENT Dictionary of New Testament Background*, Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press-CD, ad loc 2000.
- Joubert, S.J. No Culture Shock? Addressing the Achilles Hells of modern Bible Translations, *Verbum et Ecclesia* 22(2) 2001.
- Lamin, S. *Whose Religion is Christianity? The Gospel beyond the West* Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2003.
- Mugambi, J.N. K. 'Missiological Research of Globalization,' in *Swedish Missiological Themes, Vol 86 No. 4, 1988, Uppasala*, Swedish Institute of Missionary Research.
- Newmark, P. *Paragraphs on Translation*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters Ltd. 1993
- Nida, E. A. *Creativity in translating in Omanson*, 2000
- Noorda, S. J., Beentjes, P.C. *redsWerk in uitvoering* NGB: Haarlem, 1998
- Sterk, J. P. *Translation as re-creation*. The Bible Translator 1994
- Ukachukwu. C. M. *Intercultural Hermeneutics in African, Nairobi, Action Publishers, 2003*
- Wanye, L. *Online: http://www.geocities.com/bible_translation/maxims.htm*
- Van, I. *Vertaler en exegete als handlangers*, Welzen et al. 1998
- Marlowe, M. *Dynamic Equivalence Defined*, accessed May 12, 2018, url: <http://www.bible-researcher.com/nida>