

Analysing the Frames of a Bible: The Case of the Setswana Translations of the Book of Ruth

by

Sidney K. Berman



*Dissertation presented for the degree of
PhD in Biblical Interpretation in the
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at
Stellenbosch University*

Supervisor: Prof. Christo H. J. van der Merwe
Co-supervisor: Dr. Ernst R. Wendland

April 2014

Declaration

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this dissertation is my own original work and has not previously in its entirety or in part been submitted to any university for a degree.

S. K. Berman

Date: 13th February 2014

Abstract

This study investigates how the contextual frames of reference (CFRs) of the three extant Setswana Bibles – Moffat, Wookey and BSSA (Bible Society of South Africa) – could have impacted on their renderings of the book of Ruth. The fact that the Bibles were translated within contexts that differed from those of the Hebrew text of Ruth gives rise to the assumption that some of such contexts or frames could have had problematic influences on decision making during translation. Differing frames were assumed to have led to differences (i.e., translation shifts) between the translations and the Hebrew text. Such frames were hypothesised to have emanated from socio-cultural, textual, communication-situational and organisational circumstances pertaining to the making of the Hebrew text and the translations.

Since contextual frames of various kinds presumably converged on the Setswana target texts (TTs), this study proposes an integrated multidisciplinary approach to frame analysis, namely, the cognitive CFR model. The framework, which is embedded in biblical interpretation, merges insights from other disciplines including translation studies, cognitive semantics and cultural studies. The translators' decisions are evaluated using the heuristic perspective of “an exegetically justifiable rendering.”

The study identified indeed countless shifts in the three Setswana translations which resulted from hypothetical socio-cultural, organisational, communicational and textual factors. Moffat's shifts revealed a predomination of organisational CFRs throughout the book of Ruth. The organisational CFR also stood out occasionally for Wookey as well. BSSA did not show a predomination of any class of CFRs but manifested the least problematic CFRs. As far as the negative influences of CFRs were concerned, BSSA was the least affected, followed by Wookey and lastly Moffat. The study reveals that it could sometimes be simple, but other times also be difficult or impossible, depending on the pertinent CFR, to provide an exegetically justifiable rendering of an ST unit. Yet, it can be concluded from this study that an awareness of CFRs during translation or analysis of translations can contribute towards the improvement of existing translations or the reduction of problematic shifts in new Bible translation projects.

Opsomming

Hierdie studie ondersoek hoe die kontekstuele verwysingsraamwerke (KVRs) van die drie bestaande Setswana Bybels - Moffat, Wookey en BSA (Bybelgenootskap van Suid-Afrika) – hulle weergawes van die boek Rut kon beïnvloed het. Die feit dat die Bybels vertaal is binne kontekste wat verskil van dié van die Hebreeuse teks van Rut, dra by tot die aanname dat van die kontekste of raamwerke moontlik 'n problematiserende invloed op besluitneming tydens die vertalingsprosesse kon hê. Daar is aangeneem dat verskillende raamwerke lei tot verskille (byvoorbeeld: vertaalskuiwe) tussen die vertalings en die Hebreeuse teks. Daar is veronderstel dat sulke raamwerke spruit uit sosio-kulturele, tekstueel-kommunikatiewe en organisatoriese omstandighede van die vertaalproses asook die van die Hebreeuse teks.

Aangesien verskillende soorte kontekstuele raamwerke vermoedelik ingespeel het op die Setswana teikentekste (TTs), fokus hierdie studie op 'n geïntegreerde multi-dissiplinêre benadering tot die raamwerk-analise, naamlik die kognitiewe KVR model. Die raamwerk, wat ingebed is in die veld van Bybelse interpretasie, kombineer insigte uit ander dissiplines, insluitend: vertaalkunde, kognitiewe semantiek en kulturele studies. Die vertaler se besluite word geëvalueer met behulp van die heuristiese perspektief van "'n eksegeties begrondbare vertaling." Die studie het inderdaad talle vertaalskuiwe in die drie Setswana vertalings geïdentifiseer wat teruggevoer kon word na hipotetiese sosio-kulturele, organisatoriese-, kommunikatiewe- en tekstuele faktore. Moffat se vertaalskuiwe vertoon 'n dominansie van organisatoriese KVRs regdeur die boek Rut. Die invloed van organisatoriese KVR's is dikwels ook in Wookey geïdentifiseer. BSA vertoon egter nie 'n oorheersing van enige klas van KVRs nie. Tewens, dit vertoon die minste problematiese KVRs. Sover die negatiewe invloede van KVRs betref, is BSA die minste geraak, gevolg deur Wookey en laastens Moffat. Die studie toon dat dit soms eenvoudig, maar ander kere ook moeilik of onmoontlik is, afhangend van die pertinente KVR, om 'n eksegeties-regverdigbare vertaling van 'n GT eenheid te bied. Tog, kan dit afgelei word uit hierdie studie dat 'n bewustheid van KVRs tydens vertaling of ontleding van vertalings kan bydra tot die verbetering van reeds bestaande vertalings of die vermindering van problematiese vertaalskuiwe in nuwe Bybelvertalingsprojekte.

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my wife, Keneilwe Cannie Berman, whose love and support I could not succeed without.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere thanks to the following:

God, to whose sovereignty I attribute all circumstances that enabled me to succeed in this study.

My promoters, Prof. C. H. J. van der Merwe and Prof. E R. Wendland for their guidance throughout this study. You devoted quality time and effort to this thesis and gave me express service.

The Graduate School of the faculty of Arts and Social Sciences for the funding that was awarded to me to pursue my doctoral studies full-time at Stellenbosch University.

Mrs. Hanlie Rossouw at the library of the Bible Society of South Africa in Tyger Valley, Belville for opening the door to the Setswana Bibles archives. Your assistance was always timely and precise.

Maggie and Yurie Goosen for being my new parents in Stellenbosch. You gave me full life outside of academics.

My children, Tumisang, Sydney Jr. and Justin for their love, prayers and patience during my years of absence. Bless your hearts!

My praying partners: All the Berman families; the Malope family; Africa Evangelical Church Botswana and Shekinah Student Fellowship in Stellenbosch. Without your constant prayers and best wishes, I wouldn't have made it.

Others who provided some important documents and professional opinions: Prof. Andy Chebanne of the University of Botswana and Mr. Gasebalwe Seretse.

My language editor, Dr. Susan Nyaga, a Motswana indeed.

Thank you! Dankie! Ke a leboga! Enkosi!

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|------------|
| Declaration | i |
| Abstract | ii |
| Opsomming | iii |
| Dedication | iv |
| Acknowledgements | v |
| List of Abbreviations | x |
| List of Tables | x |
| Chapter 1: Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.2 Statement of the Problem | 1 |
| 1.3 Focus..... | 3 |
| 1.4 Hypotheses..... | 4 |
| 1.5 Theoretical Points of Departure..... | 4 |
| 1.5.1 Cognitive Linguistics | 4 |
| 1.5.2 Translation Studies..... | 5 |
| 1.5.3 Biblical Studies | 5 |
| 1.6 Research Goals | 5 |
| Chapter 2: The Theoretical Framework for Analysing the Frames of Reference of Setswana Bible Translations | 7 |
| 2.1 Introduction | 7 |
| 2.2 An Integrated Approach | 7 |
| 2.3 Developments in Translation Studies | 9 |
| 2.3.1 Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS)..... | 9 |
| 2.3.2 Translation Shifts | 10 |
| 2.3.3 Functionalism..... | 13 |
| 2.4 Developments in Cognitive Linguistics and Semantics | 17 |
| 2.4.1 Cognitive Linguistics | 17 |
| 2.4.2 Cognitive Lexical Semantics | 20 |
| 2.5 Contextual Frames of Reference | 30 |
| 2.5.1 Socio-cultural Frames | 31 |
| 2.5.2 Organisational Frames | 33 |
| 2.5.3 Situational (communicational, conversational or communication-situation) frames | 35 |
| 2.5.4 Textual frames | 39 |
| 2.6 Towards Hypothesising on Cognitive Contextual Constraints..... | 42 |
| 2.7 Summary and Conclusion..... | 42 |
| Chapter 3: A History and Ethnographic Description of the Batswana | 44 |
| 3.1 Introduction | 44 |
| 3.2 Method of Analysis | 45 |
| 3.3 The Origin of the Batswana..... | 45 |
| 3.4 Location and Groupings | 48 |
| 3.5 Language and Dialect | 49 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 3.6 Social Structure and Kingship | 51 |
| 3.7 Kinship..... | 55 |
| 3.8 Marriage, Family and Inheritance | 56 |
| 3.9 Division of Labour..... | 61 |
| 3.10 Spirituality and Ancestral Spirits..... | 62 |
| 3.11 The Supreme Being | 64 |
| 3.12 Divination, Sorcery and Death | 66 |
| 3.13 Reproduction and the Value of Children | 67 |
| 3.14 Means of Economic Production | 69 |
| 3.15 Summary and Conclusion..... | 73 |
| Chapter 4: The History of Bible Translation in Setswana | 75 |
| 4.1 Introduction | 75 |
| 4.2 The Four Eras of Bible Translation History | 75 |
| 4.3 The History of Bible Translation in African Languages | 79 |
| 4.3.1 The Missionary Period..... | 79 |
| 4.3.2 The Missionary Revisions and Corrections Period..... | 81 |
| 4.3.3 The Bible Societies Period..... | 83 |
| 4.4 Background of Bible Translation in Setswana | 86 |
| 4.4.1 The Moffat Bible..... | 86 |
| 4.4.1.1 The Life of Robert Moffat until Settlement at Dithakong | 87 |
| 4.4.1.2 Challenges to Evangelisation and Translation | 89 |
| 4.4.1.3 The Beginnings of Translation Work..... | 90 |
| 4.4.1.4 Translating and Printing at Kuruman | 91 |
| 4.4.1.5 Revisions of Moffat..... | 93 |
| 4.4.2 The Wookey Bible | 94 |
| 4.4.2.1 The Translation of the Wookey Bible | 94 |
| 4.4.2.2 The Revision of the Wookey Bible | 99 |
| 4.4.3 The BSSA Bible..... | 103 |
| 4.4.3.1 The Translation of the BSSA Bible..... | 103 |
| 4.4.3.2 The Revision of the BSSA Bible..... | 107 |
| 4.4 Summary and Conclusion..... | 108 |
| Chapter 5: The Background of the Source Text of Ruth | 110 |
| 5.1 Introduction | 110 |
| 5.2 Background of the Book of Ruth..... | 111 |
| 5.2.1 Date and Authorship | 111 |
| 5.2.2 Language..... | 111 |
| 5.2.3 Purpose and Theme..... | 113 |
| 5.2.4 Genre..... | 115 |
| 5.2.5 Literary Style | 115 |
| 5.3 Background of the Book's Original Audience | 117 |
| 5.3.1 Marriage and Family | 118 |
| 5.3.2 The Levirate | 119 |
| 5.3.3 Inheritance and the Importance of Children | 120 |
| 5.3.5 Social Structure..... | 122 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 5.3.6 Agriculture | 123 |
| 5.3.7 God..... | 124 |
| 5.4 Conclusion..... | 125 |
| Chapter 6: The Shifts of the Setswana Translations of Ruth..... | 127 |
| 6.1 Introduction | 127 |
| 6.2 Procedure: How the Tables of Shifts were Produced..... | 127 |
| 6.2 Excluded Shifts..... | 129 |
| 6.3 Key Concepts..... | 130 |
| 6.4 Tables of Shifts in Ruth..... | 133 |
| 6.4.1 Ruth 1:1..... | 133 |
| 6.4.2 Ruth 1:5..... | 139 |
| 6.4.3 Ruth 1:6..... | 140 |
| 6.4.4 Ruth 1:8..... | 143 |
| 6.4.5 Ruth 1:9..... | 146 |
| 6.4.6 Ruth 1:10..... | 151 |
| 6.4.7 Ruth 1:11..... | 152 |
| 6.4.8 Ruth 1:12..... | 154 |
| 6.4.9 Ruth 1:16..... | 156 |
| 6.4.10 Ruth 1:17..... | 158 |
| 6.4.11 Ruth 1:20..... | 160 |
| 6.4.12 Ruth 1:22..... | 162 |
| 6.4.13 Ruth 2:1..... | 162 |
| 6.4.14 Ruth 2:8..... | 164 |
| 6.4.15 Ruth 2:11..... | 165 |
| 6.4.16 Ruth 2:16..... | 166 |
| 6.4.17 Ruth 2:17..... | 167 |
| 6.4.18 Ruth 2:18..... | 169 |
| 6.4.19 Ruth 2:20..... | 172 |
| 6.4.20 Ruth 2:21..... | 175 |
| 6.4.21 Ruth 3:1..... | 176 |
| 6.4.22 Ruth 3:7..... | 177 |
| 6.4.23 Ruth 3:9..... | 179 |
| 6.4.24 Ruth 3:10..... | 181 |
| 6.4.25 Ruth 3:11..... | 184 |
| 6.4.26 Ruth 3:13..... | 185 |
| 6.4.27 Ruth 3:14..... | 187 |
| 6.4.28 Ruth 3:16..... | 189 |
| 6.4.29 Ruth 3:17..... | 191 |
| 6.4.30 Ruth 3:18..... | 191 |
| 6.4.31 Ruth 4:1..... | 193 |
| 6.4.32 Ruth 4:2..... | 195 |
| 6.4.33 Ruth 4:3..... | 197 |
| 6.4.34 Ruth 4:4..... | 198 |
| 6.4.35 Ruth 4:6..... | 200 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 6.4.36 Ruth 4:7..... | 201 |
| 6.4.37 Ruth 4:10..... | 203 |
| 6.4.38 Ruth 4:12..... | 206 |
| 6.4.39 Ruth 4:13..... | 208 |
| 6.4.40 Ruth 4:17..... | 210 |
| 6.5 Summary and Conclusion..... | 212 |
| Chapter 7: Summary, Findings and Recommendations..... | 214 |
| 7.1 Introduction | 214 |
| 7.2 Summary..... | 214 |
| 7.3 Findings | 214 |
| 7.4 Recommendations | 216 |
| Appendix A: The Book of Ruth from Moffat 1857 | 218 |
| Appendix B: The Book of Ruth from Wookey 1908 | 223 |
| Appendix C: The Book of Ruth from Wookey 1992 | 228 |
| Appendix D: The Book of Ruth from BSSA 1970 | 233 |
| Appendix E: The Book of Ruth from BSSA 1987 | 238 |
| Appendix F: Copyrights Letter from the Bible Society of South Africa..... | 243 |
| Appendix G: More Shifts from the Translation of the Book of Ruth | 244 |
| Bibliography | 254 |

List of Abbreviations

| | |
|-------|---|
| BDB | Brown, Driver and Briggs lexicon |
| BFBS | British and Foreign Bible Society |
| BHRG | Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar |
| BHS | Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia |
| BSSA | Bible Society of South Africa |
| CASAS | The Standard Unified Orthography for Sotho/Tswana Languages (published by The Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society – CASAS) |
| CEDE | Collins English Dictionary |
| CFR | Cognitive Frames of Reference |
| DTS | Descriptive Translation Studies |
| GNB | Good News Bible (i.e., Today's English Version) |
| GNV | Geneva Bible |
| HALOT | Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament |
| ICM | Idealised Cognitive Model |
| KJV | King James Bible |
| NET | New English Translation |
| NAB | New American Bible |
| NAS | New American Standard Version |
| NRSV | New Revised Standard Bible |
| ST | Source Text |
| TT | Target Text |

List of Tables

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1: Cognitive categories and cognitive frames of reference..... | 23 |
|--|----|

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This chapter serves as an introduction to my study. It presents the study's statement of the problem, focus, hypotheses, theoretical points of departure and research goals.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

When mapped against the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (BHS), each of the three extant Setswana Bibles manifests similarities and/or differences in accordance with the hypothesised circumstances under which it was translated. The three Bibles are as follows: The Moffat Bible, published in 1857 and known to have been translated by Robert Moffat; the Wookey Bible, published in 1908 and known to have been translated by Alfred Wookey; and BSSA, published in 1970 and known to have been translated under the supervision of the Bible Society of South Africa.¹

Although these Bibles did not use BHS as their source text (ST), I use BHS as a standard for comparison because it is regarded by the United Bible Societies (UBS) as the best available Hebrew ST for Bible translations.² The validity of BHS for purposes of this thesis is demonstrated by the fact that I was able to match with ease and precision the boundaries of each unit of the three Setswana Bibles with the boundaries of a particular BHS unit during analysis (cf. chapter six). The semantic relationship between each translation and BHS is explained in terms of influential contextual factors. Such factors are referred to in this study as Contextual Frames of Reference (CFR – cf. Wilt and Wendland 2008, for example).

It can be assumed that some of these “frames” left traces within the target texts (TTs) which can be identified upon investigation. For example, the organisational frame of a translation

¹ Moffat and Wookey were published by the British and Foreign Bible Society (BFBS) while BSSA was published by the BFBS and the Bible Society of South Africa (BSSA). A fuller history of the Bibles and the identity of their translators are dealt with in chapter four of this thesis.

² As will be seen in chapter four, historical literature for each Setswana Bible purports that its translators consulted the Hebrew original text, but it does not name the Hebrew text that they used. Moreover, the only European language Bible identifiable as a primary source was the KJV for the Moffat Bible. Yet whether the units were translated from an unknown Hebrew or secondary source, their boundaries match those of BHS remarkably.

project which pertains to the choice of a ST, whether it is in the original Hebrew and Greek languages or from another translation, is likely to be discovered during analysis. CFRs can be identified particularly because they probably constrained the translators from providing a rendering that matches a more widely accepted scholarly and exegetical interpretation of the original Hebrew text.³ In other words, some CFRs were problematic for the translation process and led to differences between the Hebrew text and the TT, known technically as “translation shifts” (Catford 1965: 73; Toury 1995: 85; Pym 2010: 67).⁴ The main focus of this study is to systematically analyse the texts of Ruth in the three extant Setswana translations for evidence of the problematic influences of the CFRs, and to determine how they might indeed have interfered with an exegetically justifiable interpretation of the text of Ruth.

The book of Ruth was chosen as a test case because it is rich in socio-cultural material that relates to Tswana traditional culture, and is also relevant to a wide spectrum of audiences. Firstly, the story manifests many rich points of intersection between the culture of ancient Israel and that of many Sub-Saharan African peoples, including that of Setswana mother tongue speakers (cf. De Waard and Nida 1973: 1 and Alfredo 2010: 3).⁵ The postulation that there are problematic mismatches, despite widely acknowledged similarities between the two sets of contexts, can highlight the complex nature of socio-cultural CFRs and other frames and consequently serve as an illustration of the difficulties that the translators faced. Secondly, a wide spectrum of audiences appreciate and identify with the Ruth narrative, probably because its surface structure is relatively simple (de Waard and Nida 1973; Hubbard 1988). An extensive range of themes can also be gleaned from the book of Ruth, which may explain why it appeals to a wide range of audiences and why it has traditionally been interpreted from varying perspectives (cf. Tribble 1992: 846). Consequently, an analysis of the contextual factors that are relevant for an accurate interpretation of the book has potential to benefit diverse audiences.

³ An “exegetical understanding” here means the localised understanding of the biblical text; that is, an interpretation of the translated Setswana text in view of the Hebrew text’s meaning.

⁴ Cf. page 10 for a detailed description of the notion “shifts.”

⁵ De Waard and Nida refer to societies in general while Alfredo refers to his Lomwe tribe of Mozambique. If translated adequately in Setswana, the book of Ruth could avail pleasurable cultural discoveries for a Setswana audience.

The above discussion points to the need for a consideration of several contextual factors during the translation or analysis of a translation of the book of Ruth, both from the perspectives of the Hebrew text's original audience, target text (TT) audience and the translators. My study proposes that influential factors from such perspectives converge on the translated text to produce renderings that can be deemed as exegetically unjustifiable. When Nord (2011: 45) talks of "rich points," she has in mind the problematic intersections of such types of factors that tend to lead to translation errors.⁶ My study will seek to analyse the intersections of various cognitive factors upon the translated text of Ruth in Setswana. It will employ an investigative approach that can be used to expose and hopefully circumvent the influences of contextual frames of reference on a translation.

In view of the above-mentioned insights about cognitive CFRs that converge on the translation process to cause shifts, my study will endeavour to answer the following question: what approach can enable the analyst to take cognisance of all the pertinent frames of a translation project, particularly the translation of Ruth into Setswana? I propose an integrated form of frame analysis that utilises insights from translation studies, cognitive linguistics, biblical interpretation and cultural studies. This integrated approach is the subject of the next chapter.⁷

1.3 Focus

The main focus of this study is to investigate how and to what extent specific conceptual frames of reference have impeded a scholarly justifiable interpretation of the Hebrew text of Ruth in the Setswana translations of the Bible.

⁶ In that instance, Nord was referring to socio-linguistic points of intersection that were problematic for cross-cultural communication. Such types of problematic intersections can be identified in frames other than socio-linguistic, however, as this study will seek to demonstrate.

⁷ It is an approach advocated for and illustrated in publications like Van Steenberg 2002, Van Wolde 2009 and Wilt and Wendland 2008, just to name a few examples.

1.4 Hypotheses

This study hypothesises as follows:

1. There are differences between each Setswana Bible version and the Hebrew text of Ruth which can be attributed to the negative influences of clearly identifiable CFRs.
2. The problematic CFRs that were influential during the translation of the Setswana texts of Ruth were socio-cultural, textual, communicational and organisational.
3. Insights from recent developments in translation studies, cognitive semantics, cultural studies and biblical studies can be consolidated to make a comprehensive analysis of the factors that influenced decision making during the translation of Ruth into Setswana.
4. Cognisance of all the CFRs that were at play during the translation of the Setswana versions of Ruth can contribute significantly towards the improvement or correction of the translations.

1.5 Theoretical Points of Departure

The third hypothesis above points to the multi-disciplinary nature of my theoretical framework, whose starting point is Wendland's and Wilt's concept of Contextual Frames of Reference. The concept incorporates insights from cross-cultural cognitive linguistics, translation studies and biblical studies (cf. Wilt and Wendland 2008; Wendland 2008; Wendland 2010).⁸ This model is dealt with extensively in chapter two, but this section only presents its summary.

1.5.1 Cognitive Linguistics

In the framework of CFR, my study merges insights from recent developments in Cognitive Linguistics which focus on the cognitive and socio-cultural nature of linguistics. Such developments have provided new tools that can contribute to a holistic linguistic and contextual analysis of the Setswana translations of the book of Ruth.

⁸ The theoretical points of departure below are based primarily on concepts from Wendland and Wilt, but several more authors that advocate for this approach are also discussed in chapter two.

1.5.2 Translation Studies

The field of translation studies has also recently undergone significant developments which my theoretical framework of CFR has incorporated. They include the following: Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS), from which my study takes its descriptive perspective; the concept of translation shifts, which provides a practical procedural tool for comparing the Hebrew text with the Setswana TTs; and the functionalist approach to translation, which I utilise for its communicative approach to translation (and analysis of translations), and from which I obtained the tools to investigate particularly organisational aspects – and certain socio-cultural elements – of the Setswana translation projects.

1.5.3 Biblical Studies

In my CFR framework, the notion of “an exegetically justifiable interpretation of the Hebrew text” derives from the field of biblical exegesis, while taking a new perspective that integrates biblical exegesis with insights from other disciplines (cf. Van Wolde’s 2009: 14-19).

1.6 Research Goals

In order to expose the cognitive CFRs that could have impeded translators from giving exegetically justifiable renderings of the Hebrew ST in the Setswana TTs, the study will do the following:

1. Develop an integrated CFR model based on insights from cognitive linguistics, translation studies and biblical studies, for the analysis of the Setswana translations of Ruth;
2. Describe, using the CFR model, some pertinent socio-linguistic contextual factors from the Setswana speaking target audiences and the ancient Israelite audience as well as the organisational contexts of the translators;
3. Reconstruct, from hindsight, the hypothetical skopoi of the three Setswana Bibles so as to identify primarily the organisational CFRs of the translators;
4. Comparatively evaluate, using the methodological tool of “translation shifts,” selected units from the BHS text of Ruth against their correspondents in the Setswana translations to extract and describe semantic differences between the pairs;
5. Link a specific hypothetical CFR, be it socio-cultural, textual, communicational or organisational, to problematic decisions in each Setswana Bible which manifest semantic differences or shifts, and;

6. Explain how a translation choice in a Setswana Bible falls short of an exegetically justified and contextually adequate interpretation of a ST unit in the book of Ruth.

Chapter 2: The Theoretical Framework for Analysing the Frames of Reference of Setswana Bible Translations

2.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to present a theoretical framework for the study of the contextual frames of reference of Setswana Bible translations of the book of Ruth, viz., Moffat, Wookey, and BSSA. This study assumes that in order to assess these Bibles (and other translations in general), cognisance must be taken of as much of their contextual and linguistic background as possible. The chapter will start by introducing the concept of a multi-disciplinary, integrated approach to analysing the translations. Then it will discuss recent developments in Translation Studies and Cognitive Linguistics, which provide the theoretical foundation for the approach, namely the various frames of reference to be used in analysing the three Bibles. Concerning Translation Studies, the chapter will discuss the concepts of Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS), translation shifts, and of functionalism in translation. On the one hand, DTS provides the basis for a descriptive perspective towards the study of the various contextual frames of reference (CFRs) involved in these different translations. On the other hand, the concept of translation shifts offers the procedure for pairing and comparing the BHS text with the target text (TT). As for the functionalist paradigm, it is important for its emphasis on elucidating the communicative context under which translations are produced. In the area of linguistics, the chapter will address developments in Cognitive Linguistics and cognitive lexical semantics which highlight the contextual dimension of language. These developments will provide the basis for the study's CFR approach to analysing the Setswana Bible translations. The latter include four generic types, namely, socio-cultural, organisational, situational, and textual frames of reference.

2.2 An Integrated Approach

As evident in the introduction above, my study will attempt a multi-disciplinary integrated approach in which translation studies (represented by DTS, the concept of translation shifts, and functionalism), linguistics (represented by CL and, in particular, cognitive semantics), cultural studies (represented by the socio-cultural elements of CFRs, functionalism, CL, and the study of the book of Ruth) and biblical studies (represented by the exegetical study of the Hebrew ST and the Setswana TTs of the book of Ruth in the Bible) converge under the

umbrella of cognition.⁹ An integrated approach towards biblical studies has recently received unequivocal advocacy in studies such as Van Steenbergen (2002), Van Wolde (2009), Wendland (2008, 2010), Wilt (2002, 2003), Wilt and Wendland (2008) and others.¹⁰ Van Wolde (2009) articulates a compelling argument for the integration of biblical studies with insights from other fields such as archaeology, cultural studies, linguistics, biblical exegesis and the cognitive sciences (Van Wolde 2009: 14-19). She briefly describes her approach as follows (*ibid.*):

[...] an integrated approach in which one can examine the dynamic interactions of conceptual, textual, linguistic, material and historical complexes. And I suggest considering *cognition* as the basis of this study, in which brain activities, individual sensations, and experiences as well as social and cultural routines are intimately intertwined. Because language is the connective tissue between the world and the people living in it, I will propose that language lies at the heart of this mental processing.

This approach is analogous to Wilt's and Wendland's cognitive model for the field of Bible translation, namely, the notion of contextual frames of reference (CFR). It overcomes the disadvantages of using only the insights from one's own discipline. In particular, the inadequacies of the literary-historical method of biblical studies (exegesis) have widely been pointed out, and it is now acknowledged that exegesis is undergoing a crisis (cf. Van der Merwe 2006; Van Wolde 2009: 3, 18).¹¹ A major contributing factor to this crisis has been that academic disciplines tended to function in isolation from one another (Cotterell 1997: 136). As a result, for example, in biblical studies and studies of Ancient Near Eastern texts, concepts and language have been lacking "for examining the interaction of textual and historical complexes" (Van Wolde 2009: 18). A multi-disciplinary, integrated approach can

⁹ The project's umbrella is the cognitive theoretical framework of CFR, which will be the regulatory perspective from which all features that will contribute to the analysis of the Setswana translations of Ruth will be examined.

¹⁰ Several other recent publications integrate insights from biblical studies and Cognitive Linguistics. They include Alfredo (2010), De Blois (2004), and Van der Merwe (2006).

¹¹ Van der Merwe (2006) outlines the nature of this crisis and some attempts to respond to it.

contribute towards solving that problem. An integrated approach is different from historical studies and from linguistic/literary studies because whilst such disciplines study phenomena separately, an integrated approach exploits the point where they meet (Van Wolde 2009: 18). My study proposes that different disciplines meet during the analysis of constraints and deficiencies that may have led to the differences between the Hebrew text and the Setswana TTs. Such a meeting place is the study of cognitive CFRs.

2.3 Developments in Translation Studies

This section discusses some of the developments in translation studies that could contribute to an analysis of the three Setswana translations of the book of Ruth, namely, Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS), the notion of translation shifts, and the functionalist approach to translation. DTS, on the one hand, represents the wider descriptive perspective to translation studies that my study will take. The notion of translation shifts, on the other hand, serves as a practical methodological tool for analysis of the Hebrew text and TTs. The functionalist approach will be utilised for its communicative approach to translation (and translation analysis) as reflected in the concept of “skopos.” It also embodies the organisational and socio-cultural elements of translation, particularly with reference to the concept of the translation brief.

2.3.1 Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS)

Toury (1995: 2-3) advocated for assessing translations in such a way as to extract trends and generalisations for how these translations could have occurred. Such a procedure would establish “probabilistic laws of translation” by which other studies of translations can be compared and tested (Munday 2008: 180-181; Pym 2010: 54-55). Toury argued that Translation Studies must be “elevated to a truly scientific status, as the empirical science it deserves to become,” able to describe, explain and predict translation behaviour, or to account for regularities and standards of translation behaviour (Toury 1995: 1-3). The assessment of a given translation would entail pairing units from the ST with corresponding units of their translation to identify significant structural, semantic and pragmatic deviations between them, often termed translation shifts (Pym 2010: 67). These shifts may then be accounted for and described according to an exegetically justifiable interpretation of the original text and the TT audience’s probable response to the translation.

2.3.2 Translation Shifts

The analysis of translation shifts attempts to identify the similarities and differences between the ST and TT and to explain the means and reasons for their existence. Catford, the pioneer of the term “translation shifts” for such differences, regarded the differences as “departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from the SL [source language] to the TL [target language]” (Catford 1965: 73). However, my study takes Toury’s perspective, which views shifts from both a formal and functional perspective (Toury 1995: 85). A formal shift occurs where the TT does not correspond to the ST in form. A functional shift occurs when a form fails to capture the functional meaning of the ST unit, regardless of whether or not it is a correct formal correspondent of the ST.¹² An example of a correct formal correspondent which is functionally wrong may be found in the Wookey Bible’s literal rendering of יַעֲשֶׂה וְיַבְיִיחַ in Ruth 1:17 as “May Yahweh do for me, and so may he do again if death separates me and you.” Instead, the Hebrew text functionally refers to “May Yahweh strike me dead” (Conklin 2011: 23).¹³ Toury advocates that all the formal and functional (including the intermediate) relationships of a pair should be displayed so as to identify the overall semantic network of the pair.¹⁴ My study anticipates that some shifts will be formal, others both formal and functional, while others will be only functional. In this way, more than one type of a relationship in the pair could be identified, described and evaluated in terms of exegetical accuracy and the target audience’s likely interpretation of the TT.

The concept of translation shifts enables the translation analyst to specify, evaluate and attempt to explain the differences between the ST and TT. These shifts occur because of the differing frames of reference of the two texts’ communication contexts (both linguistic and extra-linguistic). Some shifts can be considered as justifiable and/or unavoidable while others may be considered unjustifiable and/or avoidable. Furthermore, some shifts may be neither right nor wrong, but may need some clarification by means of a footnote.

The notion of “translation problems” (as developed by Nord) can be used to explain why shifts occur (Nord 2005: 166). A translation problem is an objective task that all the translators who are involved in a given project have to overcome during the translation

¹² Shifts could, of course, also be both formally and functionally wrong or correct.

¹³ Cf. the detailed discussion of this shift on page 158.

¹⁴ Toury 1995: 85.

process.¹⁵ Nord classifies translation problems into four categories, namely: i. Pragmatic translation problems, which pertain to the contrasts between situations under which the ST was produced or used and for which the TT is produced; ii. Convention-related translation problems, resulting from socio-cultural differences in behaviour conventions between the source and target cultures; iii. Linguistic translation problems, which arise from structural differences between the source and target languages; and iv. Text-specific translation problems, which are unique to a particular text (Nord 2005: 167).

The above-listed “problems” can be identified within the framework of CFR – discussed in section 2.5 of this chapter – in which they would correspond respectively to the following frames: i. Organisational frames; ii. Socio-cultural and situational frames; iii. Language related textual frames; and iv. Text specific textual frames.¹⁶ The model of CFR will be used to categorise and explain the specific translation problems that could have led to the shifts in the three Setswana translations of Ruth.

The process of finding translation shifts in this study started by treating the BHS text and TT as sets of linguistic structures and examining where the structures are different (Pym 2010: 66).¹⁷ I read and interpreted each verse sequentially in BHS and then its Setswana correspondent, starting with Moffat and ending with BSSA. I paused reading and demarcated the beginning or end of a unit at points where the Setswana text manifested a form that I deemed to differ with the Hebrew lexical form, where it chose a different syntactical construction from the Hebrew text’s, where the TT manifested clumsy communication, and where it represented a different meaning from the Hebrew text’s meaning (cf. the section “How the Tables of Shifts Were Produced” in chapter six). I identified numerous shifts in the course of this study, so I could only discuss the most significant and most representative of the four generic CFRs.¹⁸ The units were segmented at the level of words, phrases, clauses, sentences and paragraphs. The unit sizes varied because of the flexibility of the domains of

¹⁵ Nord 2005: 166.

¹⁶ Items iii and iv represent different sub-frames of textual frames, of which there are several, as is the case with all the other generic frames of reference.

¹⁷ The exposition of translation shifts in this paragraph is adapted from Pym’s (2010: 66) comprehensive summary of the concept, except where another source is indicated.

¹⁸ The rest of the shifts were compiled and put into Appendix F of this thesis.

different shifts, which could cover a lexical item, phrase, clause, sentence or paragraph. The study chose units that were relevant to a reconstruction of “translation decisions and the constraints [and contexts] under which they were made” (Toury 1995: 88-89). The shifts were labelled either as formal or functional. Such labels or categories were in turn used further to explore postulations and propositions of how the rendering could have arisen (this is the point of hypothesising on constraints that occur during translation). In this case, the identification of translation shifts is not an end in itself but is a means towards hypothesising with regard to the contextual and cognitive influences on the translator(s) that resulted in differences between the Hebrew text and the TT. This study calls such an examination “frame analysis.”¹⁹ Frame analysis in this study entails categorising the various shifts under organisational, socio-cultural, situational and textual frames.

The study will use a bottom-up analysis of shifts (analysis of translation shifts can be made bottom-up or top-down).²⁰ A bottom-up analysis starts with smaller units, namely, words, phrases, clauses, sentences or more, and progresses to larger ones such as text, context, genre or culture. For example, let us consider “Pull the handle in case of danger. Penalties for improper use,” as a translation of the Italian warning: “Tirare la maniglia solo in caso de pericolo. Ogni abuso verra punito.”²¹ The Italian warning is meant to communicate that the user should pull the handle to stop the train only in case of emergency; furthermore, there would be penalties for improper use. The analyst could break down the texts into smaller segments so as to create the following pairs, for example:

“solo in caso” and “in case of” and

“di pericolo” and “danger”

¹⁹ This term was originally coined by Goffman (1974), but since then, its meaning has been expanded radically, especially since it has now been adapted in diverse disciplines, as in this study.

²⁰ Pym judges scholars that use bottom-up analysis to be oriented towards the equivalence paradigm, and those interested in top-down analysis to be oriented towards the descriptive paradigm (Pym 2010: 68-69). This study’s interest in an exegetical interpretation of the original Hebrew source text, and its use of bottom-up analysis, is likely to affirm Pym’s opinion.

²¹ This example is adapted from Toury 1995: 95.

The analyst would find that “solo,” has not been accounted for (or translated), so a shift has resulted. In addition, the analyst would observe that “di pericolo” should have been interpreted as “emergency” rather than “danger.” The analyst would then go further and hypothesise concerning the difference in overall interpretation between the two texts and investigate the different contexts that may have given rise to the identified shifts.²²

2.3.3 Functionalism

DTS coincided with other developments in Translation Studies outside of Bible translation in the 1980s (which Snell-Hornby calls “the cultural turn of translation studies”) which began to take cognisance of the target audience’s culture (Snell-Hornby 2006: 47). In the field of Bible translation, this cultural turn occurred much earlier, notably in the 1950s at the start of Eugene Nida’s publications and conferences (Pattermore 2007; Wendland 2011: 21). Outside of Bible translation, between 1976 and 1984, the introductions of the concepts of “skopos theory” coined by Vermeer and “translational action” coined by Holz-Manttari marked the onset of the functionalist paradigm (cf. Pym 2010: 43-51). Such developments contributed in the displacement of the concept of “linguistic transcoding” from its place of prominence in translation theory (Snell-Hornby 2006: 58). In linguistic transcoding, translation was perceived as the transmission of information codes, which was deemed sufficient for communicating meaning (Mason 2001: 29). However, in a target culture oriented paradigm, translation is viewed as a communication oriented process (Munday 2008: 78).

Although it preceded the concept of translational action and was conceived independently of it, “skopos is part of a theory of translational action” (Vermeer 2004: 221). That is because it emphasises purposeful action in a TL setting based on a ST.²³ Nevertheless, both skopos theory and translational action propose that prospective activities of the participants and their purpose(s) in a translation project be stipulated and explained.²⁴ In addition, both take cognisance of the socio-cultural contexts of the translator, the initiator or client, and the TT

²² A top-down analysis, however, begins with “larger systemic factors (especially constructs such as the position of translations within a socio-cultural system) and works down to the smaller ones” (Pym 2010: 66). For example, the analyst may start by considering the use of Psalm 137 (which is a hymn/song) in the ST culture and compare the poetic effects of the Hebrew original with those of the TT (e.g., genre type, layout, etc). After that, the analyst would examine smaller units of the psalm.

²³ Vermeer 2004: 221; Munday 2008: 79; Pym 2010: 50-51.

²⁴ Pym 2010: 43-52.

audience.²⁵ These perspectives of skopos theory and translatorial action can be invaluable in the analysis of a translation because they raise an analyst's sensitivity to socio-cultural and communicative constraints under which translation decisions are usually made. My study integrates such contextual sensitivities within its framework. A very important difference between the two lines of thought, however, is that the translatorial action approach can severely subordinate the ST to the extent that a translator could produce a completely new text and still be considered to be translating (Schaffner 2009a: 3; Pym 2010: 47). In this regard, my study will lean more towards the skopos theory, which insists on a relationship of closer correspondence between the ST and TT than does translatorial action. Vermeer (2004: 222) explains the important relationship between the skopos, ST and TT as follows: "Insofar as the duly specified skopos is defined from the translator's point of view, the source text is a constituent of the commission, and as such the basis for all the hierarchically ordered relevant factors which ultimately determine the [translation]."

The introduction of the functionalist paradigm in Translation Studies can be dated to 1984 when Vermeer and Reiss (1984) and Holz-Manttari (1984), respectively introduced the terms *skopos theory* and *translatorial action* respectively.²⁶ The authors sought to challenge and dispense the concept of equivalence and introduce the notion of function, although they worked quite independently of each other (cf. Pym 2010: 43-44). Skopos theory is often credited with playing an important role in the institutionalisation of the current functionalist trend in Translation Studies, although in the field of Bible translation, functionalism had already been institutionalised. The trend came to be referred to as "functionalist theory," "functionalist approaches," or "functionalism," which is a broad label that focuses on the purpose of translation (Munday 2008: 39; Nord 1997: 1-3). Functionalist approaches to translation advocate that "a translator's decisions in the translation process should be governed by the function or communicative purpose the TT is intended to achieve in the target-culture situation" (Nord 2011: 41). That emanates primarily from action theory, which views action as determined by its intention, and whose results must be judged based on that intention (Nord 2011: 43). Other theories that functionalism draws from include

²⁵ Munday 2008: 79.

²⁶ The books' full impact was delayed for many years, especially since they were not translated from German into other languages. Even now, these books are not commonly used (Pym 2010: 44).

communication theory and cultural theory (Schaffner 2009b: 115).²⁷ The quality of a translation is thus judged in accordance with whether it achieves the intended communicative function or not. The above-mentioned elements of functionalism, which include an interest in communicative function, cultural theory, as well as the respective contexts of the translator, the initiator or client, and the TT audience, are indicative of the elements of the different CFRs of a translation project. My study of the CFRs that are likely to have influenced the Setswana renderings of Ruth will thus analyse the translations from a functionalist perspective. It will draw on and integrate, where possible, insights from the already discussed notions of functionalism, DTS, translation shifts, and others that will be discussed in the sections that follow (i.e., the concepts of Cognitive Linguistics and CFR).

Functionalism led to the idea that different translations could be made that serve various functions within the TL community, some of which may differ from the functions of the ST. Furthermore, different translations can be produced from one ST in accordance with different intended uses of the translated texts.²⁸ However, although Bible translation subscribes to functionalism, it does not subscribe to the freedom to ignore the conventional functions of the ST textual frame when translating.²⁹ The tradition of Bible translation to follow as closely as possible the form and functions of the ST textual frame stems from the fact that the Bible is a religious (sacred) text. Its translation is often influenced by expectations from users, clients and others to preserve the sacredness of the original – stakeholders tend to believe that nothing can preserve the sacredness more than to make the translation function like the original in terms of its textual frame and its socio-cultural use.

The *skopos* of a translation project informs its translation brief, which is a commission prescribing and/or describing all the components and participants of a given translation project.³⁰ It stipulates as much as possible the primary purpose or intended function of the

²⁷ Translation is therefore, an intentional and intercultural communicative interaction involving a ST and a TT (Nord 2011: 43).

²⁸ Pym 2010: 44-45.

²⁹ For example, Bible translation is interested in following accurately the religious truths that are espoused by the ST, even when the translations are made for varying settings of use such as academic, liturgical, devotional, and other situations.

³⁰ Cf. Pym 2010: 46.

translation,³¹ its principal target audience, organisations involved, translators, financing, approaches, and all other conditions under which the translation will be produced (Vermeer 2004: 229; Nord 2011). According to the skopos rule, a translation would be viewed as adequate if the TT satisfies the communicative purpose defined in the translation brief.³² Skopos theory takes into account “the culture of the intended readers and of the client who commissioned it and... the function which the text is to perform in that culture for those readers” (Schaffner 2009c: 235). The skopos is the yardstick for the choices and decisions to be made in the translation process as well as for assessing a finished translation (Palumbo 2009: 107).³³

The skopos of a Bible translation project may be stated explicitly and articulately in written form, or left implicit in letters, minutes, reports, diaries and other written documents from stakeholders.³⁴ In the cases of the three Setswana Bibles, my search of different sources only led me to implicit skopoi, so my conclusion is that the skopoi of the Bibles were not articulated explicitly. I reconstructed the skopos of each Bible from hindsight using the translators’ and their sending institutions’ plenary and logistical documentation (of such types as listed above).³⁵ Such reconstructed skopoi led me to identify the TT communities, dialects used, purposes of the translations, levels of expertise of translators and reviewers, approaches to translation, primary texts used and other related information.³⁶ From the skopoi, I identified primarily the organisational CFRs of the three Bibles and to a lesser extent, some textual-

³¹ *Skopos* is Greek for “purpose” (Munday 2008: 79).

³² Naude 2005: 52. Adherence to source culture norms determines a translation’s “adequacy” while adherence to the target culture norms determines a translation’s “acceptability” (Toury 2000: 201). Still, although the two concepts of adequacy and acceptability in DTS have supposedly displaced that of equivalence, they still share the same basic claim that a translation is somehow related to the ST. Pym summarises equivalence as “the relationship of ‘equal value’ between a ST segment and a TT segment” (Pym 2010: 7). He also argues that the skopos theory and the concept of equivalence are compatible (Pym 2010: 44-45). It should be noted that equivalence is not necessarily antagonistic to the notion of “purpose” (or function), for “purpose” can be found in Nida 1964: 43 and Nida and Taber 1969: 1-2.

³³ The dynamics of the translation process, such as the participants, the addressees, financing and others incorporated in the skopos theory and translatorial action would be included within the concept of an organisational “frame of reference,” which is one of the cognitive principal CFRs (Wendland 2010).

³⁴ Or it may never have been written or implied, having been only assumed or agreed verbally.

³⁵ These materials are discussed throughout chapter four.

³⁶ However, some details were either missing or unavailable to me, especially in the case of Wookey.

linguistic and socio-cultural CFRs. I was, therefore, able to hypothesise (in chapter six) the reasons that led to erroneous translation choices that the translators made. The implied (presumed) skopos of a project can, in turn, be specified with greater precision in terms of the pertinent CFRs that influenced the production of the translated text (cf. section 2.5 below). The cognitive contextual nature of the notion of CFR corresponds to the cognitive contextual aspect of Cognitive Linguistics (CL) which will be discussed further in the next section.

2.4 Developments in Cognitive Linguistics and Semantics

This section surveys some recent developments in Cognitive Linguistics and cognitive lexical semantics that form the theoretical basis of my study. The survey will not cover the entire spectrum of Cognitive Linguistics and its recent developments because not all of them fall within the scope of this study. These developments focus on the cognitive and socio-cultural nature of linguistics. They have provided new tools that can contribute to a holistic linguistic and contextual analysis of translation. Contemporary translation studies have become more interdisciplinary, advocating for the investigation of both the sociological and the linguistic aspects of translation. The study of the CFRs that hypothetically influenced the Setswana renderings of Ruth will utilise relevant insights from CL and semantics.

2.4.1 Cognitive Linguistics

My study adopts Cuyckens and Geeraerts' (2007: 4) differentiation between Cognitive Linguistics (with capital letters) and cognitive linguistics (in small case letters). In simple terms, the latter designates broadly all approaches to the study of natural language. The former specifically bases its approach to language study on people's experience of the world and how they observe and comprehend it (Ungerer and Schmid 1996: x). Cuyckens and Geeraerts define CL concisely as "the study of language in its cognitive function, where cognitive refers to the crucial role of intermediate informational structures in our encounters with the world" (2007: 5). This definition opens a window into the rich world of CL. Because of my study's strong emphasis on contextual and cognitive frames of reference, its focus is on Cognitive Linguistics (with capital letters). The following description sheds light on the cognitive and contextual dimensions of CL:

Cognitive Linguistics is cognitive in the same way that cognitive psychology is: by assuming that our interaction with the world is mediated through informational structures in the mind. It is more specific than cognitive psychology, however, by focusing on natural language as a means for organizing, processing, and conveying that information. Language, then, is seen as a repository of world knowledge, a structured collection of meaningful categories that help us deal with new experiences and store information about old ones (Cuyckens and Geeraerts 2007: 5).

The main argument of CL is that when describing a lexical item, for example, we should not only think in abstract terms, but “we should take into account the [concrete] things that the definition is about, if we are to attain an adequate level of knowledge...” (Geeraerts 2006: 1).

In CL, *cognitive* means not only that language is a mental phenomenon, but also that actual information is processed and stored by means of language. In the words of Geeraerts (2006: 3), CL does not just mean knowledge of a language, but also that “language itself is a form of knowledge.” Langacker presents the following fundamental assumptions about linguistic meaning which contributed to the study of language from a CL point of view:

Meaning comprises

- i. Both established and novel conceptions;
- ii. Not only abstract or intellectual concepts but also immediate sensory, motor, kinaesthetic, and emotive experience;
- iii. Conceptions that are not instantaneous but change or unfold through processing time; and
- iv. Full apprehension of the physical, linguistic, social and cultural context (Langacker 2007: 431).

An appropriate summary of the preceding quote is that meaning is conceptual, emotive, flexible, socio-cultural and functional.³⁷

³⁷ Cf. Geeraerts 2006: 1-3 and Croft & Cruse 2004: 2-3.

Language encodes (symbolises) real-world experiences recorded and stored as concepts in the mind. These concepts are organised rather than random, and are inter-related rather than isolated.³⁸ Certain concepts “belong together because they are associated in experience” and not just by structural semantic relations (Croft and Cruse 2004: 7). For example, the conceptual frame of a restaurant is to be described not only as a service institution but in association with other related concepts such as customer, waiter, ordering, eating, bill, and others.³⁹ Consequently, CL posits that knowledge is organised, processed and accessed by means of conceptual framing. Thus, a frame can be described as “a system of [mental] categories structured in accordance with some motivating context,” and the context would be a body of understanding in the language community which enables the categorisation of a certain experience based on the real-world setting in which it occurs (Fillmore 2006: 381). Let us consider, as another example, the concept *week-end*. It communicates what it does to an English speaking Christian community firstly because of the cycle of a seven-day calendar, and secondly because of a particular practice within that community of allocating a large continuous block of days to public work and two continuous days to one’s private life. If there was only one day of rest, or four days of rest, the term *week-end* would probably not have been given for that period.⁴⁰ There needs to be a body of understanding and a specific cultural context that creates the category *week-end*.

Meaning in language is mental, but also represents continuously inter-related (yet organised) concepts that cannot be described exhaustively or absolutely, and has the purpose of communicating and sharing social experiences. Social experiences, in this context, are all realities that are part and parcel of human existence, most of which have been stored as concepts of the mind, and only some of which can be expressed in linguistic form. The next subsection presents a major sub-topic of CL, namely, cognitive lexical semantics, so it will deal in greater detail with notions of lexical meaning, cognition, categorisation, framing and other topics related to them. This approach, which incorporates the cognitive world behind language, implies that language (along with a set of specific semantic content) triggers a recollection or reactivation of concepts which have been stored in human cognition. Cognitive linguists argue that knowledge of language should go hand in hand with representation of

³⁸ Croft & Cruse 2004: 7; De Blois 2004: 98.

³⁹ This example comes from Croft & Cruse 2004: 7.

⁴⁰ The example that follows comes from Fillmore 2006: 381.

real-life experience. The focus on context is extended in the broad field of CL such that even in dealing with the different linguistic theories,

You have to know about the scientific content of the theory, that is to say, the abstract definition of the approach: the topics it deals with, the specific perspective it takes, and the observations it makes. But you also have to know about the sociology of the theory: the people it involves, the conferences where they meet [and] the channels in which they publish (Geeraerts 2006: 1).

The theoretical notion of CFR which guides this study argues that such cognitive factors as mentioned above, which include organisational, socio-cultural, language-related, and textual (semantic and syntactic) constructs converge to influence how a translation is rendered. The study seeks to identify which frames could have led to differences between the Hebrew text and those parts of the Setswana Bible that yield translation shifts. Therefore, when probing lexical units towards the identification of these shifts, this study strives for a holistic understanding of the lexical units. It endeavours to explain the cognitive world of the translations in terms of socio-cultural, organisational, situational and textual CFRs. The theoretical foundations for this study are, therefore, based on insights from Translation Studies (discussed in sections 2.3), from CL (discussed in the present section), and from the integrative theoretical framework of CFR (which will be discussed in the next section, 2.5).

2.4.2 Cognitive Lexical Semantics

Cognitive lexical semantics is one of the sub-disciplines of CL. However, the academic landscape of approaches to finding linguistic meaning is vast. Geeraerts 2010 offers an insightful way of mapping this landscape which positions the focus of this sub-section. Geeraerts (2010: xiii-xiv) chronologically outlines the major traditions of lexical semantic research from the mid-nineteenth century to the contemporary period as follows:

i. Historical philological semantics (1850-1930). The primary interest of historical philological semantics was the study of change of meaning, the results of which included the classification of mechanisms of semantic change such as metaphor, metonymy, generalisation and specialisation, among others.

ii. Structuralist semantics (1930 onwards). Structuralist semantics favours the systemic approach of treating mutual relations of meanings as the basis of semantic analysis. Approaches within structuralist semantics include lexical field theory, relational semantics and componential analysis.

iii. Generativist semantics (1960 onwards). In this period, aspects of structuralist semantics, particularly componential analysis, were incorporated into generative grammar. Attempts to formalise semantics as part of a formal grammar, as well as a focus on the psychological side of semantics were introduced. Consequently, questions arose concerning formal and cognitive dimensions of componential analysis, which led to further research in structuralist semantics (of a more formalisable strand) and cognitive semantics after the generativist period.

iv. Neo-structuralist semantics (post-generativist, contemporary period). These are miscellaneous approaches that advance the major types of structuralist semantics (such as decompositional or relational descriptions) in a post-generativist fashion. They pay attention to issues raised by generativist semantics like the possibility of formalisation and the delineation of linguistic and cognitive meaning.

v. Cognitive semantics (1980 onwards). Cognitive semantics is an approach to semantics that is based on insights from psychology and cognitive studies. It has contributed innovations like prototype theory, conceptual metaphor theory and frame semantics.

In the above time-line, the field of Bible translation began to feature from the third era through the contribution of Nida.⁴¹ According to Geeraerts (2010: 72), Nida reflects American linguistics' "strong interest in the relation between the investigated languages and the culture of the communities concerned." Nida's approach had a strong encyclopedic orientation, striving for the application of both socio-cultural and linguistic elements in language study. Nida also classified meaning into linguistic, referential (denotative) and emotive (connotative) meaning (Nida 1964: 57-58).⁴² His argument was that a word assumes varying meanings in

⁴¹ Nida authored some books and co-authored others, published in 1960, 1964 and 1969 (cf. the bibliographical section of this thesis).

⁴² See also Munday 2008: 39.

accordance with given contexts. From that era onwards, greater attention has been paid towards the cognitive world behind language.⁴³

Towards presenting a clearer understanding of cognitive semantics, I find Taylor's (2003: xii) simple observation to be a good starting point: The study of cognitive lexical semantics is, to a large extent, the study of categorisation within a specific setting of use. Cognitive lexical semantics considers meaning to be construed by means of categorisation whereby lexical items are conceptual categories. For example, "tree" is a concept that categorises certain forms of vegetation, just as other forms of vegetation could be referred to as grass, bush and so on. Furthermore, categorisation abstractly demarcates boundaries for an object of experience that also has other potential objects of experience. It does that by employing specific linguistic and extralinguistic contexts of use. For example, different animals, including tigers and cats (pets), could all be referred to as CAT. Cat is a concept that demarcates the object of experience DOMESTIC CAT, but TIGER, LEOPARD and certain other wild animals are also potential objects that can be activated by the lexical item CAT. The sentence "We saw a big cat yesterday on our game drive [while hunting lions]," illustrates an example of such categorisation using a specific linguistic and extra-linguistic context. Although the animals are different, they are regarded as examples of the same category CAT.⁴⁴ Lexical items represent webs of meaning potential which are activated selectively by categorisation in accordance with the immediate context of use.⁴⁵

A lexical item represents a category of different but related meanings organised in relation to a prototype, that is, a central meaning component (Evans and Green 2006). A prototype, in turn, can be regarded as the best example out of many under a category represented by the lexical item, with some examples being more prototypical (central) or less prototypical (peripheral). For example, a weaver bird and other birds that fly are more prototypical examples of the category BIRD, while ostrich and chicken are less prototypical. The *prototype* notion emanates from the fact that human beings innately know that certain

⁴³ De Blois 2004: 98.

⁴⁴ This example is adapted from Taylor 2003: xii.

⁴⁵ Also, categorisation can be unique to socio-cultural and individual perspectives. For example, CAT as conceptualised by someone in Africa is likely to be different from CAT according to people from Eskimo territory, where there are no "wild" cats.

category members are better examples of that category than others (Croft and Cruse 2004: 77).⁴⁶

The tendency towards categorisation underlines the inter-relatedness of cognitive concepts. An even more specific manifestation of inter-connection between concepts is the relationship of profile and base (also referred to as domain). Croft and Cruse (2004: 14-16) define domain as “a semantic structure that functions as the base for at least one concept profile.”⁴⁷ For a simple explanation of the notions “profile” and “domain,” I adopt Croft’s and Cruse’s use of “base” and “domain” as interchangeable terms (Croft and Cruse 2004: 14-16).⁴⁸ For example, CIRCLE is a domain that incorporates several concepts connected to it, such as circumference, arc, diameter, radius, chord and so on. It thus serves as a base for such entities, which cannot exist outside of the context of CIRCLE. CIRCLE, in turn, is a concept within the domain GEOMETRIC FIGURE. The notion of domains belongs in frame semantics, which assumes that concepts are intimately related in such a way that they form a system. In order to understand any one of the concepts, one has to understand the whole structure in which they fit (Taylor 2003: 88). In the above example, CIRCLE is presupposed by the concept RADIUS (or arc and so on). In turn, the profile is the concept symbolised by the word in question, namely, RADIUS. Profiling is highlighting “a particular region or configuration in the relevant domain,” just as radius is highlighted instead of the other concepts inside the CIRCLE domain in the preceding example (*ibid.*).

Lexical semantic domains, especially when the domain is cognitively intricate,⁴⁹ can also be referred to as cognitive frames (Taylor 2003: 90; Wilt and Wendland 2008: 255).⁵⁰ In the case

⁴⁶ This is the notion of Goodness-Of-Exemplar (GOE). Prototype theory is not unproblematic, however. See Geeraerts 2006: 146-161; Croft & Cruse 2004: 80-81.

⁴⁷ This paragraph is indebted to Croft & Cruse 2004: 15-16.

⁴⁸ They treat “base,” “domain,” and “frame” as the same concept. Interchanging them is helpful in laying the foundation for the concepts of frame and domain, but can prove to be inhibiting if it is done constantly.

⁴⁹ “Or when a linguistic form needs to be characterised against several domains simultaneously” (Taylor 2004: 90). The notion of domains overlaps with what has also been labelled as scripts, frames, schemata, scenes, scenarios and idealised cognitive models. Because of this overlap, the terminology can sometimes be confusing.

⁵⁰ A frame could be described in general terms as “coherent sets of beliefs and expectations that shape our way of thinking and talking about specific domains of the world,” or as knowledge structures that embody our

of the concept CLASSROOM, for example, the profiles are more complex than in the case of CIRCLE. The concept “people being instructed,” under the domain CLASSROOM, opens up more possibilities than the concept “diameter” under CIRCLE. The people being instructed could be pupils, students, or apprentices, for example, which would open up different sub-contexts. It would be best to regard CLASSROOM as a generic frame and “people being instructed” as a framed category or subframe. The table below (Wilt and Wendland 2008: 256) gives a broader picture of the relationship between a cognitive frame and a category. The sub-frames 1-5 evoked by the term “classroom” will differ according to the cotext and context of usage. Frame 5, for example, is more of a workshop type of “classroom” with computers instead of books being accessed for technical information.

CLASSROOM FRAME:



| Seats | People being instructed | Instructors | Teaching material |
|--------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Chair | Student | Professor | Book |
| 2. Couch | Learner | Instructor | Texts on the chalkboard |
| 3. Stool | Pupil | Teacher | Hand-outs |
| 4. Cushion | Apprentice | Assistant | Journal article |
| 5. Bench | Trainee | Trainer | Computer |

Table 1: Cognitive categories and cognitive frames

The above description of cognitive semantics can be described in terms of four assumptions about linguistic meaning as follows (adapted from Geeraerts 2006: 3-6):

i. Linguistic meaning is encyclopedic and non-autonomous. Cognitive semanticists hold that there is no distinction between separate, independent linguistic meaning and pragmatic meaning based on context (cf. also Evans and Green 2006: 157).⁵¹ Even dictionary meaning

thinking about the world (Geeraerts 2010: 223). In strict lexicographic terms, however, it refers to a specific type of knowledge organisation in a lexicon.

⁵¹ Context in general pertains to both the cotext and extralinguistic factors. More specifically, “cotext” is the relationship between the lexical item and other words occurring in the same sentence (or larger unit) which

has to be understood as a feature of encyclopedic meaning. Words do not exist as fully-specified and pre-assembled, but are specified semantically and practically by encyclopedic knowledge in a particular context and cotext of use. The following examples illustrate that each distinct meaning of the word “safe” is dependent on practical knowledge of the objects child, beach or shovel (extra-linguistic context).⁵² The mind is a rich depository of the different contexts of the word “safe.” The meanings of the word will be activated by relevant experience or by the use of the word.

- a. The child is safe.
- b. The beach is safe.
- c. The shovel is safe.

According to the first sentence, the child will not come to harm, but the second sentence does not mean that the beach will not come to harm. Rather, the beach is an environment in which the child will not come to harm. Likewise, the third sentence does not mean that the shovel will not be harmed, but that it will not cause harm to the child.

ii. Linguistic meaning is conceptual. Words refer to concepts in the mind rather than to objects in the world. In turn, concepts in the mind are formed from objects and experiences in the world. For example, we must have a concept for the place below our nose and above our mouth in order to understand that the hair that grows there is called a moustache. Language and mental concepts are ways of labelling and organising an extensive and otherwise random world. In contrast to concepts and experiences, however, language is limited. This means that no amount of lexical data can match the vast amounts of reality in the world or the amount of conceptual experience stored in the mind (cf. Evans and Green 2006: 159).

iii. Linguistic meaning is structured. It consists of inter-related frames which can produce different strands of meaning which, in turn, have to be conceptually processed to retrieve the expected meaning. The different uses of “safe” in the sentences under i. above also illustrate this fact well.

determine the meaning of such a lexical item; “context” is the socio-cultural or experiential information associated with the item.

⁵² This example comes from Evans & Green 2006: 159

The notion of knowledge structures also means that aspects of certain knowledge accessed by the same word do not have equal standing, at least from the perspective of native speakers. For example, an unmarried young man who has a girlfriend (or girlfriends) will be a more prototypical example of a bachelor than the pope or an unmarried homosexual man. In response to examples such as these, scholars have developed the Prototype theory and the notion of Idealised Cognitive Models⁵³ (ICMs) to account for the different hierarchies of meanings and associated objects that can be labelled by the same lexical item (cf. the discussion on prototype theory and the example BIRD a few paragraphs above).

iv. Meaning is constructed by the process of conceptualisation. Meaning cannot be packaged by language but always has to be processed. Because of the encyclopedic nature of knowledge, meaning has to be inferred from different aspects of conceptual structures, organisation and packaging (Evans and Green 2006: 162). Here again, the example of “safe” may be used to illustrate this fact. The hearer has several possible assumptions that s/he can use in the process of identifying the meaning of the sentence intended by the speaker (Gutt 2000: 27). This is according to the principle of relevance in context; otherwise, s/he will use the wrong assumptions and misunderstand the communicator.⁵⁴ Context, in this case, is “the set of premises used in interpreting [an utterance]” (Sperber and Wilson 1995: 15). This context consists of verbal (cotext) and psychological (cognitive/conceptual) features. In other words, a profiled word’s meaning is specified by its relation to other words in the sentence as well as by stored cognitive information surrounding the word.⁵⁵ The problem for the translator stems from the nature of translation as secondary communication. The participants (speaker and audience) in the ongoing communication situation are not the original (or primary) participants of the communication that was intended. In translation, the translator attempts to

⁵³ Idealised Cognitive Models is best regarded as “a cover-term for the various models of (encyclopedic) knowledge” which tend to have prototypical and peripheral meanings (Geeraerts 2010: 224-225).

⁵⁴ Gutt (2000: 76) calls the author-intended contextual assumptions “primary communication situations;” but the interpreter sometimes fails to use the assumptions that the author intended and instead uses others. Gutt calls these others “secondary communication situations.” Secondary communication situations sometimes lead to mistranslations or shifts.

⁵⁵ The context in mention here is not external as in socio-cultural circumstances, but pertains to syntactical relationships of words and cognitive processing of their meanings (Gutt 2000: 27). However, external context (often called extra-linguistic context) is also crucial to the interpretive process.

take the place of someone else (the original speaker) – to accurately interpret and communicate thoughts that were made by the original speaker (cf. Smith 2002: 108). It is not surprising that often, “not all the [author-intended] assumptions available from the potential context are readily accessible at any given point in time” (Gutt 2000: 27-28). Even in primary communication, the speaker sometimes picks the wrong expressions unknowingly, intentionally or because of other difficulties of the communication process, and can end up muddying his/her own intentions.⁵⁶ Consequently, it can demand hard work to find the right assumptions, and, at other times, the right assumptions may never be found.

In the translation process, one of the crucial reasons why the right assumptions can be hard to find is that many concepts in the source cultures and languages are non-existent in the mind of the translator or are not fully equivalent to the concepts that they are supposed to communicate. The translator operates from the target culture and language, so s/he may fail to find precise or even partly corresponding expressions for certain concepts. The STs and languages of Bible translation projects are ancient, and their means of conceptualisation often differ from those of the translators’ (modern) language. Yet another problem can be that a translator may be biased towards certain interpretations because of his/her cognitive orientation which may differ from the intentions of the ST – an example would be religious beliefs that interfere when translating some portions of Scripture (such as in the example of the Episcopal Church of America’s attempt to ordain homosexuals and women, as discussed in section 2.5.2 below). The right assumptions may also be missed due to hermeneutical constraints, namely difficulties which pertain to the use of exegesis as an interpretive tool. My study postulates that shifts could result either from failure to use exegesis efficiently, or from the weaknesses of exegesis as a hermeneutical tool. Since exegesis is a linguistic and socio-cultural activity, my theoretical framework considers exegetical constraints to be sub-frames of the linguistic and cultural CFRs (cf. for example, the discussion of the shift at Ruth 1:5 in chapter six).

⁵⁶ Gutt (2004: 72-73) refers to the fact that the communicator sometimes deliberately, for ironic effect, chooses the wrong expressions for his/her intentions. A biblical example that may come to mind is Job’s word to his three friends, “No doubt you are the people, and wisdom will die with you” (Job12:2). Job was being sarcastic concerning their claim to wisdom. Such kind of irony can sometimes be difficult to discover for immediate audiences, translators or target audiences (it is likely to be much harder in the case of translating ancient texts).

From the preceding discussion, it is apparent that a full definition or description of the notion of “meaning” would be multifaceted and bulky. I find Evans and Green’s (2006: 6) concise definition of “meaning” to be generally representative of conceptualisations of “meaning” and of the four assumptions about meaning elaborated above, and yet it is straightforward – “meaning is the conventional ideational or semantic content associated with a symbol.” Meaning is conceptual (cognitive or mental) and is bound to a conception of real-life entities as represented by forms (signs or symbols). My framing of “meaning” in this regard incorporates the notion of cognitive CFRs to be investigated in the study of the Setswana TTs of Ruth which are both linguistic and extra-linguistic in nature and scope.

In the discussion of shifts in chapter six, the reader will find the application of the notions discussed in the preceding paragraphs regarding encyclopedic semantics, prototypicality, categorisation, profiles, domains, frames and assumptions about meaning. That discussion does not always refer to this terminology, but the relevance of these concepts and the shifts in chapter six will be easily recognised by the reader. In turn, the link between these CL concepts and the shifts discussed in chapter six points to Bible translation as a difficult form of secondary communication.

In order for more credible biblical interpretation to occur, exegesis should take cognisance of new insights in Cognitive Linguistics (cf. Cotterell 1997: 137). Thus, as crucially as they need historical and theological expository tools, biblical exegetes also need the tools of linguistics, especially socio-cultural linguistics, to more effectively extract and communicate meaning (cf. Cotterell 1997: 136). The biblical scholar could, for example, contextually “frame” a distinctive theological usage or terminology with reference to the historical period in which it was being used.

Wilt (2003) is a demonstration of the benefits of inter-disciplinary interaction. Wilt edited a collaborative work, *Bible Translation: Frames of Reference* (2003), which draws on insights from recent developments in Cognitive Linguistics.⁵⁷ The book is one of the recent publications that seek to demonstrate the vitality of the cognitive notion of frames to Bible Translation (the others are *Scripture Frames and Framing*, *Contextual Frames of Reference*

⁵⁷ Wilt & Wendland, two of the contributors, have followed up on the cognitive approach to semantics in subsequent publications.

in Translation, and Framing the Frames).⁵⁸ These works present Wilt's and Wendland's application of the cognitive notion of frames and framing to Bible translation, which they have labelled *Contextual Frames of Reference*. They expound and apply this notion in Bible translation as a tool for teaching/learning and for composing and analysing vernacular translations (cf. Wendland 2010: 1). Wendland 2010 illustrates how the notion of conceptual frames and framing, in which Bible translation studies has recently taken a keen interest, already has a well-established place in contemporary Cognitive Linguistics.

The starting point for the notion of CFR in Bible translation is the recognition that translation is a complex and multifaceted form of communication. From the foregoing discussions on cognitive semantics, we should acknowledge that communication comprises inter-lingual, inter-cultural and inter-cognitive complexities. The perception that Bible translation is communication has been a theme of Nida's and other Bible translation scholars "since a half century ago" (Wilt 2002: 145). The call for a more adequate communication model than the code model that Nida used was made by Gutt. Gutt pointed out defects in Nida's earlier approaches and advocated for the inference model of communication (Gutt 1991).⁵⁹ Viewing Bible translation as communication yields an awareness of the varied contexts within which and for which a particular translation is made, such as the following:

- The translator's relationship with others involved in the production and use of Scriptures;
 - The communicative goals involved in producing a translation, including those of ritual;
 - The relationship between text, community and meaning;
 - The notion of frames and framing,⁶⁰ and:
 - The relationships between the ST and TT regarding language and context
- (These contexts are adapted from Wilt 2003: 27).

⁵⁸ These works are, respectively, Wilt & Wendland 2008, Wendland 2008 and Wendland 2010.

⁵⁹ Gutt developed for use in Bible translation the inference communicative model that was pioneered by Sperber and Wilson (1986).

⁶⁰ In the subsequent paragraph, Wilt explains briefly the notion of frames and framing as "the frames of reference for formulating and interpreting the text" (Wilt 2003: 27).

For any real translational communication to occur, translators should extract and translate meaning through exploiting the inter-dependence of text, cotext and context (Cotterell 1997: 136; Wilt 2002: 145). In this study, text, cotext and context are collectively perceived as different cognitive “frames” that interact to influence the interpretation and translation of the source text. The preceding bullet points share some of the features of the different CFRs that play an influential role in the process of translation. The list is reminiscent of ideas propagated in Vermeer’s skopos theory, Holz-Manttari’s theory of translatorial action, and contemporary functionalist approaches to translation, which actively promoted the idea that translation is a purposeful communication-oriented process (discussed in section 2.3). The framework of Wilt’s and Wendland’s CFR merges such assumptions of Translation Studies with the Cognitive Linguistic notion of cognitive frames. The following section is a summary of Wilt and Wendland’s CFR approach that this study will use to analyse and evaluate the three extant Setswana translations of Ruth.

2.5 Contextual Frames of Reference

Contextual Frames of Reference are cognitive factors that influence translators to produce certain renderings for the TT during translation. These influences are summarily captured by Wilt’s introduction as follows:

The ability to effectively and efficiently translate is influenced to a large degree by the translators’ understanding of the source text, their understanding of the target audience, their resources and conditions for working independently and as a team (especially training, salaries, reference materials, manuscript tools, and clear understanding of and ongoing support from the organisations sponsoring the publication of their work.⁶¹

(Wilt 2003: 43)

These factors and many more establish a hermeneutical grid for translators, which influences their translational action and the decisions they make every day. Such conceptual frames often constrain translators during decision making, which would give rise to differences between

⁶¹ Incidentally, the idea behind the “translation brief” of the functionalist approach converges with the sense of this quote. The “brief,” too, is envisaged to have an influence on the translation project as a whole.

the ST and the TT. These cognitive-based influences can be classified as socio-cultural, organisational, situational, and textual frames of reference (Wilt 2003: 43). They often overlap due to the fluid and fuzzy nature of their boundaries. For example, in analysing a translation, sometimes it may be unclear whether a word choice was influenced by a lexical frame or a communication situation frame. Similarly, a socio-cultural influence could be found to be also organisational and textual, and so on. Yet it is important to categorise them because the CFR model presents a methodological framework that enables the analyst to discern more precisely errors, potential problem points and their causes as well as the means of preventing or solving them. The CFRs are cognitive because they are contexts of the mind that make up an individual's or society's worldview (Wendland 2008: 19). Thus, CFRs are also described as psychological, conceptual or mental. The four enumerated frames act as a heuristic summary of, and a tool for investigating, the many diverse factors that can determine choices made by a translator (or team of translators) given different possibilities of rendering.

These factors specify different dimensions of the “cognitive environment” concept of relevance theory. My study seeks to identify and explain how different frames might have influenced each of the three Setswana translations of the book of Ruth. It takes the perspective of relevance theory that assumptions of what a speaker means can be inferred from an utterance. This can be achieved by investigating the manifold linguistic and extra-linguistic cognitive communicative environments of the utterance; in the same way, linguistic and extra-linguistic contexts can be inferred or hypothesised from an utterance. The study will hypothesise concerning such linguistic and extra-linguistic contexts (that is, factors or constraints) from the Setswana translations. It will do that by investigating the nature (addressed in four categories, namely, the CFRs) of the differences that resulted when the translation of the original text was made in the three Bibles.⁶²

2.5.1 Socio-cultural Frames

Socio-cultural frames pertain to primary socio-cultural practices and our internalisation of them (Wilt 2003: 44); they are influential factors “passed down formally or informally as ‘tradition’ from one generation to the next” (Alfredo 2010: 24). From a CL point of view, socio-cultural frames should be perceived as inter-connected bodies of knowledge organised

⁶² The Hebrew text is really the ideal standard against which all the three Bibles are examined. It was not the primary text for Moffat and Wookey (Muller 1958: 2), however, which were apparently translated from English.

and stored as concepts in the mind after real life experience (Fillmore 2006: 381). Thus, socio-cultural frames represent encyclopedic knowledge. Socio-cultural factors make up an individual's or society's worldview. In turn, worldview can be defined as "the fundamental cognitive orientation of a society, a subgroup, or even an individual" (Palmer 1996: 113-114), or as "an individual or corporate conception of knowledge, being, and existence" (Wendland 2008: 19). It includes the following: i. Natural philosophy, norms, values, emotions and ethics; ii. Cognitive models of persons, spirits and things, and of events and actions; iii. Social scenarios and their values, contingencies and feeling states; iv. Metaphorical and metonymical structuring of thought; and v. Subconscious assumptions or unstated premises of a culture.⁶³

These elements of worldview are often categorised under "classification" (evidenced in naming, for example), "self and other" (how to relate to humanity in general), "relationship" (with the other and the environment, both physical and spiritual), "causality" (forces at work, evidenced by existence of ritual, for example), "time" (concepts of past, present and future) and "space" (location, distance and direction) (Van Steenbergen 2002: 51-53). Examples of societal realities that embody and shape worldview are endless. They include ideas and behaviour regarding family relations, marriage, natural and supernatural things, economic means of production, governance, legal issues, morality, death and other life-cycles, and so on.⁶⁴ A society's or individual's worldview is intricate, consisting of integrated networks of perception of reality. Differing socio-cultural CFRs represent the differing cognitive worlds behind the source language and target language being studied. The differences tend to produce translation shifts.⁶⁵ That is because, in cognitive terms, words and experiences encountered in a translation setting are likely to trigger a reactivation or recollection of certain bodies of knowledge that affect decision making in translation. A translator, like all human beings, has to "call on [his/her] encyclopedic knowledge in order to properly understand a concept" (Croft and Cruse 2004: 30).

⁶³ This sentence is a summary of Palmer's paragraph which elucidates his definition of worldview (1996: 114). The numbering is not in the original.

⁶⁴ For the sake of brevity, the present discussion avoids categorising these examples and is therefore random. An extensive discussion such as Van Steenbergen's (2002: 48, 53) would normally categorise them.

⁶⁵ Therefore, the translator needs to bring these subconscious perceptions to the surface. That is, s/he needs to be aware of the ways in which his/her worldview could influence the translation. Some exercises in Wilt & Wendland 2008 attempt to alert translators to the reality of their own cognitive frames (for example, 23-24).

My study hypothesises that differing socio-cultural factors between the Hebrew culture and the Setswana target cultures can be specified to explain some shifts between the Hebrew text and the three Setswana versions of Ruth. On the one hand, the book of Ruth presents the story of people in a certain socio-cultural setting during the times of the Judges in ancient Israel (Judges 1:1). The original text was written to communicate with that context as a frame of reference that was largely presupposed for its intended audience. On the other hand, the TT audience, translators and other influential stakeholders were brought up in, and influenced by their own contemporary socio-cultural settings and a worldview that differ from those of the ST culture. The differences pose “convention-related translation problems” (Nord 2005: 167). “Rich points between cultures” as explained by Nord (2011: 45) are points of intersection between two cultures in verbal and non-verbal behaviour, which can cause conflict or miscommunication between the cultures.

In this thesis, the two cultures that are being compared and contrasted with each other are the traditional Tswana culture and the culture of ancient Israel. In chapters three and six, I point out specific similarities and differences between the two cultures. The differences could cause misinterpretation of the Hebrew text by the TT translators and audiences, whilst the similarities may not always have been easy to exploit for more accurate renderings. The general similarities also could have distracted the translators from discovering semantic differences. Socio-cultural problems (convention-related translation problems) contribute to the difficulty of finding the right assumptions during the interpretation of the source text, considering that translation is secondary communication. My study will investigate occurrences where Setswana renderings of Ruth represent a translation shift when compared with the original Hebrew text, and hypothesise concerning how socio-cultural factors (among others that will be explained below) could have influenced the translators’ choices.

2.5.2 Organisational Frames

Organisational frames are influences from stakeholder institutions (also referred to as clients in functionalist formulations) and the translator’s perception of the organisational aspects of his/her work (Wilt 2003: 46). That would include his/her sense of responsibility and job satisfaction in relation to her/his work environment. All these can be summarised as the rights and responsibilities of “allegiance” (Wendland 2008: 68). Organisational frames are cognitive in the same sense that socio-cultural frames are. That is, they result from individuals’ unified psychological conceptualisations concerning the Bible, translation, methodology, uses of the

Bible, the job of translators, remuneration of translators and countless other factors. Such concepts also come from important communal life experiences. Institutions have their own *cultures* (and languages) that embody their preferences, goals, prejudices, rules, traditions, ways of relating with the translator(s), conditions of service of translators, among others (cf. Wilt and Wendland 2008: 107ff).⁶⁶ The above description of organisational frames indicates some of the specific socio-cultural and linguistic sub-frames within them. This is primarily because all such organisations are smaller institutions of the community, which is the human setting of all socio-cultural and linguistic frames. Churches, an example of such organisations, are made up of individuals from the same (but only larger) community which is likely to have its own conceptualisation of what a Bible translation should sound like, look like or do. The translator's interpretation of these organisational factors can constrain him/her in decision making during translation. The following example illustrates the interplay of different constraints that often influence decision making in translation:

The Episcopal Church of America's leaders currently promote the ordination of women and homosexuals as priests.⁶⁷ Such ordination is currently prohibited by traditional church teaching and practice, based on an interpretation of biblical passages concerning ordaining homosexuals and women as leaders (for example, Romans 1:27 and 1 Corinthians 6:9). The church's official statement on the ordination of women and homosexuals has to be officially altered to correspond with this practice. In turn, that will mean that the church should re-word or re-translate the said Scriptural passages because the church's official position is apparently based on the Scriptures. The attempts at alteration are opposed by the laity, on the one hand, who also seem to represent the opinion of the majority in the church as a whole. On the other hand, the clergy may want a new translation of the texts, motivated by the conviction that the current English translations that the church is using have mistranslated the original Greek text. Conversely, they may simply need a new translation that takes cognisance of contemporary issues of equality and human rights. Controversy has ensued that threatens to split the Anglican Church worldwide. Given the scenario that the Episcopal Church of America funds

⁶⁶ The institutions that conceived of, oversaw, sponsored or benefited from the three Bible translation projects were the British and Foreign Bible Society (BFBS), London Missionary Society (LMS), Dutch Reformed Church, Dutch Reformed Mission Church, Berlin Mission, Hermannsburg Mission and various churches in Tswana settlements (cf. chapter 4).

⁶⁷ This example is adapted from Wendland 2008: 69.

a new African language translation project of the Greek New Testament, the same debate would probably rage not only between the translation team and the donors, but also across denominations, in government institutions and even in secular communities.⁶⁸ It would be interesting to speculate how great the pressure would be on the translators and how it would affect their translation and overall life. Influences on translation choices are known to come from organisations like churches, sponsors and governments (Wilt 2003: 47). How a translator would translate such passages of Scripture is likely to be influenced less by his/her independent interpretation of the texts than by the traditions and desires of his/her employers, the churches who will use the Bible, and his/her perception of his/her relationship with such stakeholders.

This study hypothesises that some translation shifts in TTs could be explained with reference to the varied organisational frames of the different Setswana Bibles. Of particular prominence in chapter six is the assumption that the translators of the Setswana Bibles consulted other earlier Bibles either because it was stipulated by their sending institutions, or it was conventional. The postulated Bibles include earlier versions of the Setswana Bible, European language versions and versions in other Bantu languages. My study investigates which Bible versions may have influenced translation decisions in the composition of the Setswana Bibles, and in what manner (cf. chapters four and six).⁶⁹

2.5.3 Situational (communicational, conversational or communication-situation) frames

Situational (communicational or communication-situation) frames pertain to the immediate physical and temporal setting of the act of communication that includes the medium, codes, roles and goals of the participants and recipients (Wilt 2003: 55-58). They are influences that emanate from the immediate communication contexts of the ST communicator and of the TT translators. In CL terms, focus on these factors issues from the discovery that linguistic meaning is structured, non-autonomous, encyclopedic, and is constructed through conceptualisation. Therefore meaning can only be interpreted by cognitive processing in a

⁶⁸ Bible translation projects in Bantu Africa have traditionally had many direct and indirect beneficiaries, some of whom could be so remote yet so vocal as to be regarded as interfering.

⁶⁹ From the perspective of chapter four, such a collection includes the King James Version, the Afrikaans Bible, the Good News Bible and the Pedi Bible (but a reliable link could not be established with the Afrikaans and Pedi Bibles, at least for the book of Ruth).

specific context of use (Evans and Green 2006: 157; Geeraerts 2006: 3-6). Communicative situational context can be broken down into lexical, syntactic and extralinguistic contexts (or text, cotext and context respectively). Lexical context pertains to the summarised meaning of the word observed by itself.⁷⁰ Syntactic context considers the meaning of the word in relation to other words in the same sentence, paragraph, chapter, book, or corpus by the same author – a sentence specifies the most appropriate meaning, among several, for a word.⁷¹ Extralinguistic context pertains to socio-cultural or life-application information associated with the word.

In this regard, my study will investigate situational frames with respect to the Hebrew text and TT so as to more fully analyse the meaning of the Hebrew unit and investigate how the meaning of the TT compares with it. Wendland uses the socio-linguistic model **S-P-E-A-K-I-N-G** to summarise the different aspects of situational frames of texts (Wendland 2008: 92-93). He briefly describes the situational components of **S-P-E-A-K-I-N-G** as follows:

Setting: the physical setting including time, place, environment, weather and other factors that could disturb or distort communication.

Participants: speaker(s) and hearer(s) and their cognitive environments, especially any contrastive or antithetical features in their worldview, including their social and psychological background in relation to each other.

Ends: the primary communication goals of the participants, whether expressly stated or implied, including those of a listening audience.

Activity: the selection, arrangement and prioritizing of portions of speech (speech acts), along with any accompanying non-verbal types of communication.

Key: the overall psychological tone, manner, attitude, or emotions of the participants which characterises the prevailing social atmosphere in which an act of communication occurs.

Instrumentality: the sensory channel (medium) of message transmission that is activated during the speech event, especially the cases of oral or written communication, along with any accompanying media like musical or visual background, print formatting devices, and more.

⁷⁰ Recent developments indicate that this concept is flawed because it is impossible to describe a word by itself without accounting for contexts of usage and the encyclopedic knowledge that it activates (Cf., for example, Geeraerts 2006: 1).

⁷¹ As in the example of “safe” on page 25.

Norms: customs of interpersonal interaction and interpretation as determined by the preceding factors as well as conventional speech styles, communicative codes, social formality, linguistic subtypes (that is, dialect or sociolect), and other aspects.

Genre: recognised patterns of natural, informal or formal spoken and written discourse along with their associated stylistic qualities (examples include the distinctive features of a poem, folktale, ballad, proverb, riddle, sermon or political speech).

The above model has a socio-linguistic focus and seeks to discover the initial cognitive context setting “that presumably governed [a text’s] original conception, intention, representation and transmission” (Wendland 2008: 93). The example below from the notion of speech acts is helpful for an understanding of communication-situation frames. The notion of speech acts emanates from the recognition that when a person speaks, s/he usually intends his/her speech to perform one of several different pragmatic actions such as asserting, evaluating, opining, stipulating, requesting, suggesting, authorising, committing and others. For example, if a lecturer says to a student who is sleeping at the back row of his English class, “Mr Banda, are you ready to comment on the next paragraph of the essay before us?” he does not intend for Mr Banda to say “yes” or “no.”⁷² Instead, he is doing one of the following possibilities: i. Attempting to rouse the student from sleep, ii. Requesting an adjacent student to wake Mr Banda, iii. Warning other students not to follow Mr Banda’s bad example; and/or iv. Seeking to inject humour into what may have been a dull session. A clue to what the teacher intended comes from the immediate context such as tone of voice, the relationship between him and Mr Banda and their understanding of it (perhaps they are close friends), mood, socio-cultural protocol and others. In turn, a clue to what a biblical text intended to communicate or do lies in an understanding of its original context.⁷³ A translator’s failure to determine the original context of that communication can result in misinterpretation of the text. The various translation shifts described in chapter six of this thesis illustrate this problem well.

⁷² This example comes from Wendland 2008: 96.

⁷³ In so far as communicational frames of reference pertain to lexical concepts embedded in a specific socio-cultural context, they overlap and interact with socio-cultural and textual frames.

Relevance theory makes explicit the problems implied by the above paragraph for the translator (Gutt 2000). As already observed in subsection 2.4.2, the translator may fail to recognise the author's intended assumptions (from the primary communication situation) and instead use other assumptions (secondary communication situation), which would lead to mistranslations.⁷⁴ The original author's intended assumptions derive from the primary communication situation, namely, the context of the source text's communication, whilst assumptions not intended by the original author may be ascribed to the translator's present translational cognitive context, referred to as a secondary communication situation (Gutt 2000: 76). Another difficulty stems from the fact that there are often implicit meanings in the text, that is, meanings intended but not explicitly stated by the author (Gutt 2000: 83). For example, the meaning of a sentence like "The LORD is my shepherd" could be difficult for the translator to express if s/he deems that the audience will be clueless about shepherds and the implications of the sentence. Yet another difficulty stems from the fact that natural language allows the twisting (or skewing) of linguistic forms in conveying meaning (Gutt 2000: 85). For example, the rhetorical question, "what is Sam doing?" may seem to the reader to be normal inquiry, whereas the speaker may have meant that Sam's neighbour should advise Sam to stop what he was doing, or the speaker just wanted to convey his/her disapproval of Sam's actions. The problem for translators is that linguistic forms do not usually indicate what the speech act is or how the form is to be interpreted. This fact often leads to misinterpretation.

Various exegetical and encyclopedic tools were consulted for an investigation of the communication situations in the Hebrew text of Ruth in the form of commentaries such as De Waard and Nida (1991) and Bush (1996), Bible background sources like De Vaux (1974) and lexica such as Botterweck and Ringgren (1977) (cf. chapters five and six). However, since the Setswana Bibles were also made in their own distinctive socio-cultural settings, it is important to subject each translation to the above-described type of analysis in order to interpret it correctly. In that regard, the study depended on archival searches at Bible Society of South Africa,⁷⁵ materials on Tswana history and culture, the history of Bible translation in Setswana,

⁷⁴ In the case of ancient texts, it is often not easy to extract the intended assumptions of the communication situation. Hence, it should be expected that the book of Ruth (being an ancient text) will not be easy to interpret.

⁷⁵ The archives of the Bible Society of South Africa (BSSA), in Cape Town, historically a branch of the British and Foreign Bible Society from 1820-1965, contain information on all of the Setswana Bible Translations and

Setswana grammars and Setswana-English dictionaries. Only after comparatively investigating the communication situation that pertains to each translation would one be able to critically examine the various equivalence relationships between BHS text and TT.⁷⁶ This procedure would also enable one to make informed hypotheses about the translation shifts occurring between the Hebrew text and TT of each of the Setswana translations. However, room must be left for the fact that it may at times be impossible to reconstruct the original setting of the Hebrew text and/or the TT.

2.5.4 Textual frames

Textual frames are formal, semiotic and cognitive frames of the ST and TT. Texts can consist of verbal and nonverbal signs such as “illustrations, tables, text format, etc. in written texts – intonation and pitch, gestures face and body movements in face-to-face communication” (Nord 2005: 43-45). In the words of Evans and Green, “language encodes and externalises our thoughts through means of symbols” (2006: 6). The symbols may be spoken, written or signed (Evans and Green 2006: 6). The most common signs of biblical texts are written linguistic signs, that is, verbal, but they can also be non-linguistic, visual and aural (Wilt 2003: 34-35). Examples of non-linguistic texts are audio (e.g., audio Bibles), video (e.g., The Jesus Film), sign language, drama, photographs, art sculptures, paintings and others.⁷⁷

the extent to which these organisations were involved in the translation and publication of the Setswana Bibles. South Africa and Botswana used to be one large country administered primarily from Cape Town before being divided by border lines. The three translation projects were carried out within the large area surrounding the border shared by the two countries that is occupied by the Batswana tribes, the majority of whom currently fall within the South African border. The population of Setswana speakers in South Africa is roughly double that of Setswana speakers in Botswana (cf. “The Origin of the Batswana” in the next chapter). Several facts from this reality contribute to the organisational frames of the three Setswana Bible projects as follows: Firstly, when Robert Moffat served as a missionary among the Setswana-speaking tribes, his centre of administration was in Cape Town; secondly, Botswana Bible Society could not have much influence on Setswana Bible translations because it came into existence as an extension of BSSA long after the publication of the three Bible translations.

⁷⁶ Each translation was separated from its successor or predecessor by more than 50 years (see Smit 1970). Thus, the times, spaces, cultural outlooks, print devices, participants, goals and many other components were unique to each translation.

⁷⁷ Some examples in this paragraph are from Wilt 2003: 34-35.

Moreover, the linguistic visual⁷⁸ aspects of a Bible (or any other printed text) include both its lexical and visual components. The formatting of the book of Psalms, for example, if different from that of Genesis, could communicate how it is to be interpreted or used. The first two translations (Moffat and Wookey) presented the Psalter in prose whilst the third translation presented it in verse. Encountering the Psalms in verse is likely to evoke a regard for them as songs or poems, which is more appropriate for psalms than encountering them in prose and approaching them the same way as approaching Genesis narratives. As another example of visual semiotics, the black cover and red edges of the Setswana Bible customarily communicate its identity, value, contents and use, among others. Apparently all Setswana Bibles have traditionally been published with a black hard cover and red edges. Such consistent packaging has made the Setswana Bible a promptly identifiable religious object. On the one hand, Batswana non-users of the Bible (in secular circles) derisively call it *thamaga* – an indigenous label for the red and black colour combination – a name which personifies such a Bible and which reflects their dislike and fear of it. On the other hand, users of the Bible seem to find this familiar colour combination an affirmation of the sanctity of the Bible. It would be interesting to observe the changes in attitude towards the Setswana Bible, were it to be suddenly presented in different colours. The focus of this study is on the three Setswana Bibles which are printed texts and, therefore, instances of linguistic visual communication.

From the cognitive viewpoint that language externalises our thoughts, my study holds that certain linguistic difficulties constrained the translators from re-capturing accurately or adequately the thoughts of the Hebrew text's speakers, authors or redactors. Chapter six will describe such constraints as inter-textual, intra-textual, lexical or syntactic frames, in addition to the four generic descriptions from the model of CFR (Wendland 2008). It will examine some of the most illustrative and problematic aspects of the Hebrew text's and TT's textual frames of reference that could have caused a particular translation shift.⁷⁹ It will map BHS segments against their corresponding segments in the TT (Toury 1995: 88). These segments may range in size and scope from a lexical item, a phrase, sentence, paragraph, or more, depending on the Hebrew unit that is deemed to be causing a shift in the TT (Cf. section

⁷⁸ "Linguistic visual" pertains to written language.

⁷⁹ The textual aspects to be examined will also include paratextual features such as footnotes, section headings and quotation marks, for example.

2.3.2).⁸⁰ My study starts by investigating the relationships between the above mentioned units of the BHS text and of the Setswana translations to identify shifts.⁸¹ Smaller units will be treated as building blocks of the larger text's meaning. Then, I will hypothesise concerning what textual (and other) frames of reference may have influenced the translators towards the rendering that produced the shift. As already mentioned in the section "Translation shifts" above, I hypothesise that the shifts will be inaccurate or erroneous regarding BHS meaning, clumsy or unidiomatic regarding TL form, and ambiguous or confusing regarding TL communication (cf. also the section "Procedure: How the Tables of Shifts were Produced" in chapter six).

The study of textual frames stems from several observations, the most important of which is that languages are structurally different from each other. According to Nord (2005: 166), this difference is the cause of "linguistic translation problems." ST and TT segments are likely to yield shifts when paired together. In the case of Bible translation, the ST and TT languages (in my study, Hebrew and Setswana respectively) are quite different and far removed from each other in time and culture. In addition, languages cannot be separated from their cultures, and ancient cultures differ from the TT cultures (Katan 2004: 100). Whereas there are many similarities between ancient Hebrew culture and Bantu African cultures, my study postulates that the Hebrew texts still embody many significant mismatches between the culture of their origin and African cultures; that is one of the fundamental reasons why translating the Hebrew text into a Setswana TT is likely to yield important translation shifts. My study also hypothesises that many shifts occurred because of the lack of explanations of certain "loaded" concepts, viewing words and other linguistic units as being "tips of encyclopedic icebergs," or as significant signs of culture, context and cognition (Van Wolde 2009: 51-56).⁸² An understanding of the world behind a given word, phrase, sentence and other units in the Hebrew text will contribute towards a more accurate interpretation of the text. Similarly, when analysing translations, an understanding of the world behind the target text segment

⁸⁰ The lexical item represents the concept while larger units represent concepts in a semantic relationship.

⁸¹ This scenario is theoretical for the sake of a simple explanation, but in actual analysis (cf. chapter six), a Setswana lexeme was sometimes found to correspond to more than one Hebrew lexeme, and vice versa.

⁸² This statement accounts for the fact that culture and worldview are not conveyed or understood through language alone (Palmer 1996: 113). For example, drama, art, events and other non-linguistic behaviour could be investigated for an understanding of socio-cultural frames, worldview and so on.

should enable the analyst to identify and hypothetically explain a translation shift from the corresponding source text. The use of explanatory footnotes in a translation can contribute towards eliminating many shifts.

2.6 Towards Hypothesising on Cognitive Contextual Constraints

The ultimate step in the analysis of the Setswana Bible translations is worth elaborating, which will be “to reconstruct the translation decisions and the constraints under which [the] translation decisions were made” (Toury 1995: 88). My study will ultimately present hypotheses on how and why certain significant shifts resulted during the making of the three translations. The hypothetical reasons will be investigated from the socio-cultural, organisational, situational and textual cognitive contexts that could have had a significant influence on the translation process. While this study will probably discover many shifts between BHS and each TT, it will focus only on a collection of the most significant and most diverse shifts as far as the representation of the four CFRs is concerned. I anticipate to isolate and hypothesise on the most significant and representative constraints faced by the translators. In addition, I also expect to postulate how the CFRs constitute exegetical constraints.⁸³

2.7 Summary and Conclusion

This chapter has presented a survey of some of the recent developments in Translation Studies and CL that contributed to the study of CFRs in the Setswana Bible translations of the book of Ruth. From Translation Studies, the chapter surveyed the developments of DTS, the functionalist approach and translation shifts. DTS, which advocates an approach that describes and explains translation behaviour, lends a broad descriptive perspective to the study. Functionalism, the view that translation is purposeful communication, enables my study to examine the different contextual factors that pertain to such communication in the particular case of the Setswana Bibles. Regarding the notion of translation shifts, the chapter presented the theoretical concept of pairing corresponding BHS and TT units to identify the

⁸³ I acknowledge that I have an interpretive edge over the translators of the three Setswana Bibles because the exegetical tools at my disposal are much greater and more helpful than those that were available to them. Moreover, their exegetical constraints also include the different translation approaches that the translators of each Bible used (cf. chapter four).¹ For example, it hypothesises on changes in the levirate system, tribal administration, and the concepts of sojourn and *kgoro* as understood by the Batswana (cf. the shifts in 1:1; 2:11; 2:20; 4:1 and 4:2).

differences between BHS and TTs. The concept of translation shifts can be invaluable to translation analysts, especially in the Bible translation field, where translators often have to investigate the differences between them. Next, the chapter discussed the recent developments in CL. Using a CL perspective, my study demonstrates in chapter six how cognitive lexical semantics, which has recently experienced a proliferation of publications, can contribute towards the analysis of the communication of the ST and TT (through examining both linguistic and extralinguistic cognitive contexts) in the area of Bible translation. The chapter finally presented the concept of CFRs in translation, developed from perspectives in CL and Translation Studies, which enables this study to describe and evaluate more precisely the diverse contexts in which the Setswana translations were made that led to identifiable translation shifts. Thus, the chapter attempted to present a multi-disciplinary approach that serves as the basis for my study, which merges insights from the notions of DTS, functionalism, translation shifts, cognitive semantics and CFR in its analysis of the frames of reference that influenced the translations of the three Setswana Bibles. The next chapter presents primarily the socio-cultural frames of reference of the Setswana Bibles through a description of the socio-cultural context of the Setswana speaking target audiences. The linguistic frame is also discussed briefly in that chapter, which I entitle “A History and Ethnographic Description of the Batswana.”

Chapter 3: A History and Ethnographic Description of the Batswana

3.1 Introduction

This chapter aims at presenting the history, culture and worldview of the Batswana, the target audience of the three Setswana translations of the book of Ruth. This is done in order to determine the possible contextual frames under which the book has been translated. In turn, this endeavour will enable me to postulate why the Setswana Bibles render the text of Ruth the way they do, especially in instances where the Bibles faced translation difficulties or deviated from what may be considered an exegetically justifiable interpretation of the original Hebrew text. This is because the full meaning of a translation can be investigated adequately only if the linguistic and socio-cultural contexts of both the original text (as will be carried out in chapter five) and the target text (TT) are explored.

The chapter will start by explaining the methodology of this study and then proceed to present the history, culture and worldview of the Batswana. It will present and analyse the existent literature on the history and ethnography of the Batswana. However, it is beyond the scope of this study to conduct an exhaustive analysis of the history and ethnography of the Batswana. Also the thesis did not address specifically temporal and geographical factors that differentiate the target audiences of the Setswana Bibles from each other in terms of culture, religion and other related factors. Yet several examples of these issues were dealt with as they arose from the shifts in chapter six, which were picked carefully for purposes of this thesis.¹ Further study on this subject, where the description is not as limited as presently, could be quite informative.

The present chapter will focus in general on the primary aspects of the target audience of the Setswana Bibles that could have influenced decision making during the translation of Ruth. The primary aspects can be summarised as follows: different Setswana dialects used in the three Bibles; political administration revolving around the *kgotla*; marriage, family, kinship and inheritance; economic production and division of labour; and spirituality. These categories mainly describe the socio-cultural frame of reference (CFR) of the target audiences

¹ For example, it hypothesises on changes in the levirate system, tribal administration, and the concepts of sojourn and *kgoro* as understood by the Batswana (cf. the shifts in 1:1; 2:11; 2:20; 4:1 and 4:2).

of the Setswana versions of Ruth.² Many other sub-frames of these features of Batswana's history and ethnography that relate to the Setswana translations of Ruth are discussed alongside the primary CFRs. This chapter will give examples of parallels and differences between the cultural features of Batswana and of the Israelites, which are postulated as being the rich points of intersection between the two cultures.³ That is because the knowledge gap created by the differences may lead to misinterpretation, on the one hand while on the other hand, the similarities may not always have been exploited by the translators to provide an accurate interpretation of the Hebrew text and unambiguous communication by the TT translation.

3.2 Method of Analysis

The presentation and analysis of the history and ethnography of the Batswana in this chapter will be done from the perspective of contextual frames of reference (CFR). The present chapter will examine, through the conceptual lens of CFR, the social structure of Batswana, their worldview, and the impact of Christian and European interaction on their cognitive environment. The translators, reviewers, their sending institutions and sponsors also had their own frames of reference, but these will be explored in chapter four which will present the history of Bible translation in Setswana.⁴ Likewise, the original audience had its own linguistic and socio-cultural CFRs, which will be postulated in chapter five.

3.3 The Origin of the Batswana

The Batswana originate from the Sotho-Tswana branch of the Bantu family of people (Setiloane 1976: 12-13; Brown 1925: 19). This branch consists of the Batswana, the Southern Sotho of Basotholand (presently Lesotho), and the Northern, Eastern or Transvaal Sotho (Schapera 1984: 9).⁵ The origin of the Sotho group which the Batswana descended from is not known definitely, but they are thought to have separated from the main body of Bantu peoples

² The issue of dialect discussed briefly in this chapter contributes mostly towards presenting the linguistic-textual CFRs of the target audiences of the Setswana translations of Ruth. As a general rule, I have striven to discuss only the socio-cultural and linguistic features that were hypothetically influential towards the occurrence of translation shifts in the three Bibles. Where the reader may deem some minor features as irrelevant, such as, for example, the origin of the name "Tswana," the reader must regard such a discussion as introductory.

³ Cf. the discussion of Nord's concept of "rich points" in the section "Socio-cultural Frames," page 33.

⁴ The sending institutions and sponsors form an important organisational CFR for the translators and reviewers.

⁵ The Transvaal has now been split into several provinces of South Africa.

“in the vicinity of the Great Lakes of East Africa, and... entered South Africa... through the western portions of Southern Rhodesia (presently Zimbabwe), in three series of migrations” (Schapera 1984: 14). The first migration was by the present day Bakgalagadi, who settled in eastern parts of Botswana and intermingled with the pre-existing Basarwa Bushmen (Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 8).⁶ The second migration consisted of the ancestors of the present day Barolong and Batlhaping, who settled along the Molopo River and progressively spread south and west. This group absorbed some of the Basarwa and Bakgalagadi who had preceded them (*ibid.*). The third and largest group to migrate consisted of the ancestors of all the other Sotho-Tswana tribes. Its Tswana section settled “in the south-western portions of the modern Transvaal, and then broke up rapidly into separate clusters, the most important of which were the Hurutshe, Kwena and Kgatla (Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 9).

Presently, all Batswana clusters have non-Tswana groups living among them (Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 3-5).⁷ Some groups adopted the Setswana language and culture after they were conquered and absorbed by some Batswana groups. Others, like the Balete, broke off from their Ndebele parent-tribe during migration, settled in Tswana regions and eventually adapted Setswana language and culture.⁸ Moreover, almost all Batswana groups have minor offshoots existing as subject communities. For example, there are groups of the Bakwena in all the clusters of Botswana.

There are two plausible explanations for the origin of the name “Batswana,” but none can be confirmed with certainty (Schapera 1984: 9). The first possibility is based on the verb *tswa*, meaning to secede. Its diminutive or reciprocal form is *tswana*, which gives the name *Batswana* the meaning “little offshoots,” or “those who sprout out from each other.” The second possibility is that the name comes from the verb *tshwana*, meaning to resemble or to have many similarities. Thus *Batswana* would be people who resemble or are similar to each

⁶ The information on Sotho Tswana migrations in the next few sentences is taken from Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 8ff, except where indicated otherwise. Schapera (1984: 14) reports that the Bakgalagadi are distinct enough to be classified as yet another (fourth) Sotho-Tswana group, according to research.

⁷ The discussion in this entire paragraph is based on Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 3-5.

⁸ Incidentally, I am a Molete. The Balete are Ndebele by origin, but can only speak Setswana. They have completely lost their original Ndebele culture, too.

other (Brown 1925: 25-26).⁹ By implication, this means that they all sprouted out from each other. The fact that they share the same language and generally many other socio-cultural, economic and political traits attests to their common roots.

The historical trend of secessionism is related to the traditional democratic leadership system of the Batswana. Duggan-Cronin reports that the political leadership system had strong democratic elements and “an innate sense of compromise surpassing that of other tribes” (Duggan-Cronin 1929: 13). The chief normally allowed “discontented sections of the tribe to break away from the parent tribe, [hence] their name [...] ‘the separatists’” (*ibid.*). Presently, there are many Tswana clusters which are quite independent from each other geographically and politically (Brown 1925: 20-21). Most Tswana groups descended from another Tswana group, whether from the main group or an offshoot. Furthermore, the numerical strength of each group does not indicate its seniority.¹⁰ In other studies, such types of groups would probably be called clans, but anthropologists and historians of Batswana groupings refer to them as tribes.¹¹

The name Botswana was initially written by Europeans in different forms such as Beetjuana, Bichwana, Booshuana, Bootchuana, Buchuana, Becwana, Becuana, and Becoana, but the European writers soon standardised it as Bechuana. *Botswana* means *home of Batswana*, but, on the one hand, it is also home to many non-Batswana tribes. On the other hand, the country of *Botswana* has had, for some decades, roughly half the number of Batswana and Setswana

⁹ Cole presents more inconclusive scenarios and concludes that there is no evidence for where the name originates (Cole 1955: xx-xxii).

¹⁰ For example, the Bahurutshe are numerically insignificant, but are acknowledged as being the most senior tribe (cf. the section “Language and Dialect,” page 51).

¹¹ According to Mojola (1989) who elaborately challenges the designation “tribes” for such groups, the more accurate designation is “clans.” In that case, all the Batswana groupings would be part of one Tswana “tribe,” but individually they would not be tribes. For this thesis, a change in designation in that regard is likely to be a radical departure from convention, so it would call for an elaborate explanation. However, space limitations in this thesis do not allow for an elaboration of such a debate. For purposes of this thesis, I use the generic terms “groups,” “groupings,” “clusters” and “communities” (cf. also Isaac Schapera 1991).¹² They were 3.4 million in South Africa and about 1.7 million in Botswana in 2006 (Lewis 2009; Index Mundi 2012). Thus, they all consider themselves to be “Batswana,” at least for the purpose of census-taking.

speakers as in South Africa (cf. Lewis 2009).¹² In addition, there are some non-Batswana tribes living within Botswana who use Setswana as a second language such as Bakalanga, Baherero, Bayeyi, BaGova, Bakgalagadi and Basarwa. Some even reside in another country such as the Bakalanga of Zimbabwe (Cole 1955: xv; Lewis 2009).

3.4 Location and Groupings

The Batswana are distributed in more than 50 separate clusters, or Tswana villages (Schapera 1984: 34). Schapera and Comaroff list 17 primary group that became independent. These are the Bakwena, Bahurutshe, Bakgatla, Barolong, Banogeng, Batlhaping, Batlharo, Batlokwa, Babididi, Balete, Batlhalerwa, Baphiring, Bataung, Batlhako, Barolong Boora-seleka, Bapo and Bahwaduba (1991: 4-5). Some of these groups acquired new names after some time, although their origin usually continues to be well-known (cf. Brown 1925: 23). The Batswana clusters are generally found between the Orange River and the Zambezi (Brown 1925: 23). Most of the 17 groups have split several times and are distributed haphazardly in Southern Africa, while some of the smaller sections attached themselves to different groups (cf. the section “Social Structure and Kinship” below). Primarily, they reside in South Africa and Botswana, but there are a few (an insignificant number) in the Plumtree district of Zimbabwe and Namibia’s Gobabis district.¹³ In South Africa, they are located mostly in the western and central districts of the former Transvaal (especially Marico, Rustenburg, Pretoria, Ventersdorp and Lichtenburg), and in the northern districts of the Cape Province, formerly called British Bechuanaland (especially Mafikeng, Vryburg, Kuruman and Taungs). In Botswana, they reside primarily in the eastern and north-western areas (Schapera 1984: 9).

In colonial times, the central administration of the Batswana clusters was based in Cape Town and run on behalf of the British government (Mgadla 2003: 2).¹⁴ The high commissioner appointed officials and established administrative headquarters in Mafikeng for the Batswana groups, but administered the office from Cape Town. Even then, his rule was only indirect, for he administered the office through the resident commissioner, also based in Cape Town. Incidentally, the British and Foreign Bible Society (BFBS) offices were in Cape Town, too,

¹² They were 3.4 million in South Africa and about 1.7 million in Botswana in 2006 (Lewis 2009; Index Mundi 2012). Thus, they all consider themselves to be “Batswana,” at least for the purpose of census-taking.

¹³ Schapera 1984: 9; Shillington 1985: xvii-xviii.

¹⁴ The information in the few sentences that follow is from Mgadla 2003: 2.

and Moffat had to travel to Cape Town to print Bibles until he was gifted with a hand press (Jones, Reyneke and Sandilands 1989: 2). Even at the present time, the parent body of the Bible Society of Botswana is the Bible Society of South Africa, whose headquarters are in Cape Town. This setting provided some of the organisational CFRs of the translators of the three Bibles which would influence decision making during translation.

3.5 Language and Dialect

The language of the Batswana is Setswana, which belongs to the Sotho-Tswana language group. The Sotho-Tswana language group itself belongs in the “South Eastern Zone of African Languages” and is categorised among the five language groups below:

- a. Nguni, which includes Zulu, Xhosa, Swati and Ndebele;
- b. Sotho-Tswana;
- c. Venda;
- d. Tsonga, which includes Ronga, Shangana-Tsonga and Tswa; and
- e. Inhambane, which includes Chopi and Tonga (Cole 1955: xv; Kruger 2006: 3).

The Sotho-Tswana group of languages comprises Setswana, Southern Sotho, Northern Sotho and Lozi (cf. CASAS 2003: 3; Cole 1955: xv; Kruger 2006: 3). Setswana can be divided into four dialects, viz.: central division, spoken by the Barolong, Bahurutshe and Bangwaketse; southern division, spoken by Batlhaping and Batlhwane; northern division, spoken by the Bangwato, Batawana and Bakwena (i.e., western Bakwena); and eastern division, spoken by the Bakgatla, Bakwena and minor groups like Batlokwa, Balete, Batlhako, Baphiring, Bakubung and Batlounng (Cole 1955: xvi-xviii; cf. also Kruger 2006: 3). The dialects used in the three Bibles being analysed in this study are Setlhaping by Moffat, a merger of Setlhaping and other dialects by Wookey, and Sehurutshe by BSSA. These dialects belong to the central and southern divisions of Setswana.

The dialectical differences, as far as my analysis of Ruth is concerned, are very few and mostly phonological (cf. the sections “The Revisions of Moffat,” “The Translation of the BSSA Bible” and “The Translation of the Wookey Bible” in the next chapter for examples of these differences as found in the three Bibles). From the insignificance of the differences, at

least in their written form,¹⁵ it can be argued that dialect has played almost no role in the emergence of translation shifts in the three Bibles.¹⁶

English and to a greater extent Afrikaans have had an influence on the Setswana language, especially regarding vocabulary. English loanwords appear in the Moffat and Wookey translations such as *tu* (two) in Moffat (1:1) and *barele* (barley) in Wookey (1:22). BSSA appears inclined towards Afrikaans loanwords rather than English ones so that in instances where the other two Bibles use English-derived terms, BSSA uses Afrikaans based ones. For example, where the other two use *barele* (barley) in 1:22, it uses *garase* (gars), and where Wookey uses *Baebele* on the cover, it uses *Beibele*. This could be due to three factors: firstly, the Afrikaans loanword may be more common than the English one; secondly, in the process of coining loanwords using newer rules, Afrikaans phonology is often closer to Setswana than English is (cf. Tswana Terminology and Orthography 1972: 37), and thirdly; the translators may have been influenced by the Dutch or Afrikaans Bible during translation.¹⁷ These loanwords represent some textual, socio-cultural and organisational CFRs. Firstly, the frames are primarily textual because of the lexical and linguistic influences of Afrikaans and English. Secondly, they are also socio-cultural because the items they refer to were introduced to the Batswana from Afrikaner farmers. Thirdly, they are organisational because of the use of the Afrikaans Bible by the translators (in the case of BSSA, which was published later than the Afrikaans Bible).¹⁸

Concerning the Moffat and Wookey Bibles, the Setlhaping dialect was spoken by the Batlhaping of the district of Kuruman where Moffat and Wookey were based during the process of their translation. Kuruman is in the neighbourhood of Mafikeng, Postmasburg, Taungs and Vryburg, which are inhabited primarily by Batswana clusters. These groups are all on the South African side of the border. The chief translator of the Wookey Bible, Alfred

¹⁵ Orally, the text may sound radically different when read by the speaker of a different dialect.

¹⁶ Orthographical differences exist between the three Bibles too, but it is not correct to compare the Bibles on the level of orthography and then refer to the differences in terms of translation shifts. Therefore, I eliminated orthographical differences when transcribing the biblical verses of the three Bibles in chapter six.

¹⁷ Setswana appears to be just one of the examples of how Afrikaans permeated some Bantu languages that it came into contact with. For example, Makutoane and Naude (2009: 79-94) examine the use of Afrikaans in the Sesotho Bible.

¹⁸ This example, therefore, illustrates the occasional overlapping of frames.

Wookey, was based in Kuruman and Vryburg over the ten years that he rendered the Bible, but it is reported that he consulted Batswana clusters extensively so as to prepare a translation that would be acceptable to all of them. His list of collaborators, which includes a Mongwato, Mokwena, Mohurutshe, Motlhwaro and a Morolong, has representatives from all the four main dialects. Still, he had to choose a dialect, and he used Setlhaping. Concerning the BSSA Bible, the Sehurutshe dialect is spoken primarily by the Bahurutshe of the Zeerust area (Schapera 1952: 10). There are more Bahurutshe groups in other areas of Botswana and South Africa. Yet, the Bahurutshe are smaller in total population than many Batswana groups (Jones et al. 1987: 7). Despite this fact, there is a common acknowledgement of their seniority among other Batswana groups (Schapera 1952: 8). The latest Setswana Bible (BSSA) was made in the Sehurutshe dialect for that reason, with the hope that it will be acceptable to most Batswana (cf. Jones et al. 1989: 5; section 4.4.3.1).

3.6 Social Structure and Kingship

Unlike many Southern African Bantu tribes that tended to unite under one monarch, the Batswana traditionally did not have a central government. Instead, each of the numerous groups lived independently from the other, politically and geographically speaking, although they consisted of many minority groups. Virtually every group had a representative minority within the other (cf. Schapera 1952). For example, in his analysis of 10 clusters, Schapera reports that a small population of the Bakwena was found in all ten, Bangwato, Balete and Barotse in eight, Bahurutshe, Bakhurutshe and Bakubung in seven, Bangwaketse and Bakgatla in three, Batlokwa in two, while Barolong Boora-tshidi, Barolong Boora-seleka and Batawana were found in one (Schapera 1952: 127).

By tradition, the greatest authority in a Tswana grouping is the *kgosi* (chief) who is the ultimate administrator and adjudicator over all tribal and individual affairs. This chief seems to the judges that governed Israel in the book of Ruth. The chief's personal counsellors consisted of his uncles and elderly relatives as well as some rich and respected members of the community whom he chose arbitrarily (Lichtenstein 1973: 78). These counsellors generally do not hold governing positions. Instead, the one next in governing hierarchy after the chief is the ward headman – the *kgosana* (diminutive of *kgosi*). A person becomes a *kgosi* or *kgosana* through inheritance. However, there have been instances when a *kgosana* was appointed by the government (Breutz 1968: 83). It may be noted here that the Setswana chief is not a tyrant, and he has little control over his juniors and subjects (Lichtenstein 1973: 78;

Setiloane 1976: 25; Duggan-Cronin 1929: 22). “There is none of the personal tyranny on the part of the chief such as is found among some other Bantu tribes in South Africa. It is on the whole perhaps the most democratic political organisation found among the South African Bantu” (Duggan-Cronin 1929: 21-22).¹⁹ Tribal matters are discussed at public gatherings where the whole community is expected to attend, and anyone is allowed to stand up and speak. Such a meeting is called a *phuthego* (assembly) or *pitso* (a calling) (cf. Moffat 1842: 248; 347-353).

The *kgosana* is in charge of the largest division in the community, namely, the *kgotla* (ward). The *kgotla* was a cluster of many family groups whose core was related, although there could be a large number of aliens and minority groups within a *kgotla* (Duggan-Cronin 1929: 11). The *kgosana* was traditionally a close relative of the *kgosi*, handpicked by him, and he ruled the *kgotla* by the authority delegated to him by the chief. The *kgosana* had authority to allocate residential and agricultural land and to settle minor disputes which the smaller family group could not solve. All such matters would be brought to the chief to adjudicate if the *kgosana* failed to resolve them. Likewise, all matters that are under the jurisdiction of the family group and household would be brought to the *kgosana* if they could not be resolved, and then to the *kgosi* if the *kgosana* had also failed to resolve them (Setiloane 1976: 27-28). Such a hierarchical system seems to be non-existent at the time of Ruth. Therefore, a Setswana audience could wonder why Boaz did not start the matter with So-and-so and one or two members of the family group before taking it to a “*kgotla*.” Furthermore, the audience may wonder what authorities and channels of appeal were available to Boaz, in case he lost the case.

The family group itself consisted of several households built side by side in a circular manner, whose male heads are descended from the same grandfather or great grandfather. They also have their own smaller *kgotla* at the centre of the households (Setiloane 1976: 22). The household often comprises the head, his wife or wives, unmarried and married children, sometimes his married brothers and sisters, one or more orphans and dependent relatives, and servants (cf. Schapera 1984: 39-40). The family group is headed by an elder – *mogolwane* –

¹⁹ Moffat reports that the *dikgosana* (plural of *kgosana*) use uncompromising language in exposing the chief’s guilt or laxity. On a certain occasion, a *kgosana* concluded his accusations by asking the audience to observe the chief’s body to confirm that he was becoming obese (Moffat 1842: 248-249).

who is the most senior patriarch of all the heads in the households by line of descent.²⁰ The *mogolwane* adjudicates his family group independently of the *kgosana*, but refers major conflicts to him. The smallest unit in the group is the family, called *lolwapa*. Its immediate authority is the father. Upon old age, the father usually delegates his authority to his eldest son, but first priority is given to the eldest son of his senior wife,²¹ even if he is younger than the other sons; if there is no son in the family, the father may appoint his wife's brother, that is, the maternal uncle (Brown 1925: 47).²²

Whilst the *kgotla* in the preceding paragraphs refers to people, there is another equally important sense of *kgotla* that refers to a communal meeting place. The family group tended to build its homes in a crescent around an empty piece of land, which they called a *kgotla*. The doors of the nuclear families traditionally faced towards this empty space, which explains its synonym, *kgoro* (door). This synonym is contemporarily out of use, and only *kgotla* remains.²³ *Kgoro* was also the exit route from the family group to the village, river, or bush. The Hebrew concept of נֶעְרַר (Ruth 4) has some parallels and contrasts with the Setswana concepts of *kgotla* and *kgoro* which sometimes lead to errors during translation (cf. the shifts in Ruth 4:1 and 4:10 in chapter six).

The family group's *kgotla* was used for communal gatherings, entertainment, ceremonies and the adjudication of various affairs where the patriarch is the ultimate authority.²⁴ There is a larger *kgotla* which serves the same purpose for the whole ward (or clan). Yet an even larger *kgotla*, reserved in front of the *kgosi*'s residence was used for village-wide gatherings. This largest *kgotla* appears to be a crude equivalent of נֶעְרַר in as far as village-wide meetings are concerned.²⁵ Meetings that occur there include when the chief declares a ploughing season,²⁶ prays for rain, declares war, or addresses criminal and civil legal matters of the village. Moffat (1842: 347-353) effectively demonstrates the protocol of a *kgotla* meeting. The *kgosi* is in charge of the meeting, although all he normally does is to introduce the subject, allow the public to speak, and then summarise the decisions. There are sometimes cheers, applauses and exclamations of *pula* (rain)!²⁷ Some speakers may rebuke others for foolish ideas, but,

²⁰ Schapera 1984: 40.

²¹ Polygamy was less common than monogamy because it depended on a man's wealth. Many men were unable to provide for more than one wife (Lichtenstein 1973: 76).

²² The maternal uncle was senior to other uncles, even if he was younger (ibid.).

generally, each speaker is allowed to speak to his satisfaction. Hjort argues that the *kgotla* system conserved proto-democratic traditions of pre-colonial Batswana groups, which eventually led to the political and economic success of Botswana (2010: 695-696).

The above mentioned democratic parliament system in community meetings is analogous to the one referred to in Ruth 4 in which Boaz called a meeting to negotiate the acquisition of Ruth the Moabite. The fact that all people whom he called came, sat to listen, and gave their opinion at the end reflects a democratic frame of reference. The important similarities include the atmosphere where opinions from different speakers are invited, as well as a common meeting place. The difference seen in Boaz's context is the absence of a presiding chief or judge in a village-wide venue in Ruth. Boaz's meeting seems to crudely reflect a primitive stage of the Israelite justice system whereby "disputes and trials were settled by the Elders, that is, heads of families in the clan, the leading citizens of the place" (De Vaux 1974:152).²⁸ Historical records of the Tswana system do not show such a stage, but family and clan elders indeed served as judges in a frame where there was an ultimate authority (*kgosi*). They, the *kgosana*, the *kgosi* or anyone else were not called "judges," however. This fact partly explains why it was almost impossible for the three Bibles to translate "the judging of the judges" in Ruth 1:1 without causing conceptual shifts.

²³ The Sotho, however, use the noun, *kgoro*, rather than *kgotla* for this entity (Setiloane 1976: 28).

²⁴ The smallest meeting place, which catered for the nuclear family, was called *lolwapana*.

²⁵ There appears to be no hierarchy of meeting places in the Hebrew context of Ruth 4, however. This indicates an absence of a leadership hierarchy since each Tswana *kgotla* had an individual accountable for it. Such a difference in the Tswana and Hebrew systems could prove confusing or distracting to the TT audience, as far as understanding the setting of the narrative is concerned. An explanatory footnote could be employed to fill the knowledge gap of a TT audience in this case.

²⁶ People were not supposed to start ploughing until the chief had made the announcement, or until his fields were ploughed by certain sections of the tribe (Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 16). The same procedure was followed for weeding, reaping and threshing.

²⁷ *Pula!* is an ideophone used in public address which can mean "blessing!" "Greetings!" or "I conclude!" The noun, *pula*, can also be used for welcome and farewell, such as in *goroga ka pula* (arrive with rain), or *tsamaya ka pula* (go with rain). Incidentally, the currency of Botswana is named *pula*, as are many other entities belonging to Batswana (such as schools, societies, businesses, etc). These usages of the lexeme reflect the high esteem for rain among Batswana tribes, borne from the constant threat of drought.

²⁸ Cf. the section "Social Structure" in chapter five, page 122.

3.7 Kinship

The Batswana traditionally cherished kinship. Everybody with whom a Motswana “can establish a genealogical connection, no matter how remote, is brought within his circle of kin” (Schapera 1984: 40). Thus, older family members habitually sought opportunities to acquaint younger ones with all their relatives. Such opportunities presented themselves during a relative’s visit and family reunions like weddings, feasts and funerals. That was important especially for identification of distant relatives and those who lived far away. During introductions to unacquainted relatives, even the most distant relative must be traced to a specific individual whom the ignorant party can recognise. Thus, to a Motswana, to call such an important character as the מֹדֵעַ of Ruth 2:1 a relative is quite vague. One has to be more specific, with terms like Elimelech’s cousin, maternal/paternal uncle’s son, and even Elimelech’s father’s older brother’s son.²⁹ To call him a friend, as the three Bibles do, is tantamount to denying one’s relative. If the parents were legally married, matters of identity began with the father, (Brown 1925: 53; Schapera 1984: 40).³⁰

The purposes for identifying kinship included the following:³¹ 1. Maintaining the family’s awareness of belonging and identity – determining membership of a community, ward, or family was based on descent traced through the father; 2. Determining candidates for inheritance and rank – inheritance is passed from father to son, otherwise it has to be given to the next closest male kin, who may not always be easy to identify; 3. Marking marriage boundaries and preferences – Batswana traditionally married their relatives, but there were certain prohibitions; 4. Hospitality and general assistance – the kinship tradition created an environment where relatives would recognise each other in times of need, especially in distant places, so that they could help each other. The concept of kinship in Israel, observable in the story of Ruth, carried approximately the same kinds of benefits as its Setswana counterpart. It is likely that, upon hearing from his servants that Ruth came from Moab with Naomi, Boaz began to think of himself as Ruth’s relative – he was related to Elimelech, albeit distantly (Ruth 2:1 and 3:12). He appears to have felt compassion and probably a sense of obligation

²⁹ The more distant the relative, the more intricate and challenging the explanation to the listener. However, the explainer never appears confused about this way of tracking.

³⁰ Cf. the section below on marriage.

³¹ Cf. Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 38.

because of this relatedness, so he made provision for Ruth's safety and abundant gain when gleaning.

3.8 Marriage, Family and Inheritance

Marriage in Setswana culture is patriarchal in orientation. The patriarchal CFRs of marriage, family and inheritance among the Batswana discussed in this section are strikingly similar to those of the ancient Israelites. The latter will be discussed in chapter five in the sections "Marriage and Family," "The Levirate" and "Inheritance and the Importance of Children." In the first place, the terminology of Tswana marriage says that the man "takes" the woman, and the woman "is taken" by the man (Brown 1925: 61), that is, *o a tsaya* and *o tserwe*. The woman can be deemed as belonging to the man, but not the other way round. This is reminiscent of the Hebrew word for marry, **בָּעַל** (master), which suggests that the husband becomes the master of the wife. Setswana marriage grants great authority and responsibility to the husband, and the family's identity and genealogy is established through the husband/father's lineage. Traditionally, women were perpetual social minors (Schapera 1984: 37). Before marriage, she and her children, if she had any, belonged to her father. Any man who wanted the woman and/or her illegitimate children, be it the biological father of her children or a new prospective spouse, negotiated to pay *bogadi* (*lobola* or bride price) to her father (cf. Breutz 1956: 63). The father of the children, whether a former lover or an ex-husband, who previously did not pay *bogadi*, had the right to pay *bogadi* so as to acquire the children. If he did not want their mother, she would either marry another man or stay single. If he could not pay *bogadi*, the children would belong to their grandfather when their mother gets married. However, her new husband may choose to acquire them, so he would have to pay *bogadi*.

Concerning inheritance, the Setswana woman/daughter traditionally did not receive an inheritance.³² Rather, the family's inheritance went to her first brother, viz., the eldest son of her father, even if she were the eldest in her family (Breutz 1956: 69). Once she was married, "[she] was at the disposal of the new family into which she had gone" (Brown 1925: 61, 63). From then onwards, she will live by the possessions of her husband and, if she becomes a

³² Nowadays, however, fathers give daughters cattle of their own for inheritance (Breutz 1956: 70). Also, women's status as minors has declined. Emancipation started occurring when they began to work for wages (Breutz 1968: 82).

widow, by the inheritance and possessions of her sons. If a widow who has no son remarries, or if her son is still a minor, family elders will meet to decide what to do with her husband's inheritance (cf. Breutz 1956: 53). Inheritance was usually in the form of cattle, tribal fields, money, agricultural tools, or small livestock.³³ These laws of inheritance are similar to those that affected Naomi, the widow who had a piece of land that had belonged to Elimelech (Ruth 4). The piece of land is not really hers because, according to ancient Israelite culture, she, being a woman, could not own or inherit land (cf. page 120). She probably only had the right to lease it out (Bush 1998: 95). Naomi should have been supported by the possessions of her sons, but they both died. Her situation is depicted conspicuously with the summary "So the woman was left alone, without her two boys and her husband" (Ruth 1:5). Likewise, traditionally, a Motswana woman left to live without a boy or a man by her side was in dire economic circumstances.

In Setswana marriage, a person cannot be considered married unless the bride price – *bogadi/lobola* is paid (Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 35). *Bogadi* was invariably paid by the husband and/or his family in the form of cattle, though some smaller livestock and gifts sometimes accompanied the cattle. The price of *bogadi* has fluctuated throughout history, with some saying that, initially, it was determined by the economic ability of the husband, others setting the standard at four to six cattle and sometimes eight to ten, whilst still others set it at between ten and twelve cattle (cf. Breutz 1956: 64). Nowadays, the market equivalent of the cattle in cash is normally given, but the cattle prices have risen exceedingly in monetary value. The average *bogadi* is now eight cattle.

Traditionally, the choice of the marriage partner and the time to marry did not depend on the partners concerned but was entirely the prerogative of the parents and close relatives. Years later, however, if the man could afford another wife, he could find her without their help or interference (Brown 1925: 61-63). Betrothals could occur even during childhood, without the couple's knowledge (Breutz 1956: 59-60). Whilst in very rare cases parents could agree to a child's choice of spouse, no marriage could be recognised if it was not negotiated by the parents and their relatives. Normally, when a man's parents decided it was time to find a wife for him, they chose the partner regardless of his consent or refusal, and the bride's parents

³³ The eldest son is responsible for dividing the inheritance among her younger brothers, under the supervision of his maternal uncle.

consented (or declined) regardless of her opinion. The parents' criteria for a daughter-in-law were good behaviour, industry, reliable character and social rank (Breutz 1956: 59-60).

After being prohibited by churches for a long time, the traditional rights of parents were abolished in 1878 by some chiefs who had become Christians. They included the right to: 1. Choose spouses for their children; 2. Decide when their children should marry; and 3. Carry out marriages on behalf of children without their knowledge or consent (Breutz 1956: 57, 58; Schapera 1970).³⁴ The practice of finding partners for children without their consent is really a manifestation of the tradition that a man did not marry a wife because of love or mere desire for sex, but to produce children for the growth of his extended family and clan. These children were valuable to all relatives and the whole village for the same reasons that can be postulated for Israelite children, given the socio-economic frames of reference of the two cultures – military strength, manpower for economic production, survival of the family name, and maintenance of the family's property (cf. "Inheritance and the Importance of Children," page 120).

The Tswana marriage brought the additional benefit of a daughter-in-law who had to contribute labour towards economic production. She would live under the authority of her husband's parents, grandparents, uncles, aunties and other relatives for many years until she was eventually counted among the elderly members of the family. The custom of *bogadi* functioned partly to compensate the donor family for the loss of a daughter to a family that might not even treat her well. Particularly, the new wife lived under the apprenticeship and near servitude of her mother-in-law (*matsale*) almost indefinitely. A *matsale* was notoriously oppressive to a *ngwetsi*.³⁵ That custom was probably perpetuated by the fact that, despite the patrilineal society, women practically owned the home and were in close contact with each other most of the time, which created friction. In contrast, men went their different ways during the day – consequently, contact among men was not constant enough to cause similar

³⁴ Another noteworthy change was the prohibition of initiation ceremonies, or compulsory initiation of anyone who objected or whose parents objected (Breutz 1956: 57-58; Schapera 1970: 161-162).

³⁵ That was not the case between a son-in-law and his mother-in-law or father-in-law, or with any other in-law relationship. I surmise here that the rivalry emanates from the condition of both women being viewed as a "daughter-in-law" in the household. The senior one would attempt to show the younger one that she was a better daughter-in-law in her time, while the younger one would want to be independent in her own home.

levels of tension. Traditionally, a good daughter-in-law (*ngwetsi*) respected her *matsale* greatly, but did not love her. In the book of Ruth, Ruth's extreme love for her mother-in-law is incomprehensible to a Tswana traditional mind. It is so severe that it even appears to break the boundaries of respect for a mother-in-law, such as when she saved some left-over food for Naomi.

Primarily, the custom of *bogadi* functioned as license to acquire the woman's children (Brown 1925: 62).³⁶ This practice is parallel to that of the מִקָּהָר in early Israelite society.³⁷ Traditionally, the Motswana husband did not need to pay *bogadi* until the first child was born, except if the woman had pre-existing children whom he also wanted to own (Breutz 1956: 62). If he did not want these children, they would belong to the woman's father until or unless their biological father paid *bogadi* and claimed them (*ibid.*).

Batswana groups traditionally practised the levirate marriage. The arrangements described below show several parallels with the ancient Israelite version of the levirate, namely, the *goel*. The concept of the *goel* and his redemptive activity have proven quite problematic to the translators of the Setswana Bibles, and led to significant translation shifts (cf. the shifts in 2:20, 4:6 and 4:7 in chapter six). There was a time when a Motswana husband's family would be entitled to an additional wife from their in-laws (the wife's sister or cousin) if she was deemed to be barren after the payment of *bogadi*, or if she died childless (cf. Breutz 1956: 66; Breutz 1968: 82). The custom of replacing a barren wife was not common or consistent, but substituting for a deceased wife was very frequent. Her younger sister or another close relative would take her place as a new wife. This new wife would be called *seantlo*, literally meaning *one who goes to the house*. In some cases, the *bogadi* could be returned if no substitute was available, but that was practiced by only a few of the Tswana groups (Schapera 1984: 42).

Divorce, or returning the wife, was very rarely done, even in cases of her adultery, although married women were reported to have been often guilty of adultery (Lichtenstein 1973: 77; Schapera 1984: 42). The husband normally sued her lover for cattle (Schapera and Comaroff

³⁶ However, the fact that *bogadi* is paid to her father, not herself, means that the children are not really hers, but his. Apparently, she could not legally own children, even when married to their father.

³⁷ Cf. the section "Family and Inheritance" in chapter five.

1991: 36). Thus, Naomi's suggestion in 1:13 that her daughters-in-law return to their mothers could come as a shock to a traditional Setswana audience. According to Setswana tradition, as will be explained in the next paragraph, they should have been given new husbands (among whom So-and-so and Boaz were candidates – Ruth 3:12 and 4:4). Naomi's decision could easily be misunderstood to blame the daughters-in-law for her situation (for sorcery or failure as daughters-in-law), or for finding them unworthy to marry her relatives – the *goels* (cf. Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 36 and Wendland 1987: 168).³⁸ A translation would have to explain adequately Naomi's later explanation that she ascribed her misery to the hand of Yahweh and not to the daughters-in-law (Ruth 1:13).

In the case that the husband himself died before he produced children with his wife, his younger brother took his place to become the new husband (Brown 1925: 63). It seems to have been the standard for this candidate to be the younger brother, probably because his fertility was viewed as being higher than that of older brothers and that he may be not yet married. The children produced would, theoretically, not be recognised as his, but as his brother's. This principle parallels the one expressed in the Ruth narrative, namely, that the new husband will “raise the name of the dead man” (Ruth 4:10). However, whilst it may communicate fully to a translator or exegete, this formal rendering of the Hebrew text is likely to be vague to an average Setswana audience. Care would have to be taken in rendering, or an explanatory footnote would have to be employed. A man could even “marry the widow of his father, as long as she is not his own mother” (Breutz 1956: 60). Unlike his female counterpart, this new husband seems to have no formal title – he was not called *seantlo*, but for convenience he could be referred to as *yo o tsenang mo ntlong* (he who enters the house). The two expressions are lexically neuter, and the man serves primarily the same role as his female counterpart – both are substitutes. However, for unknown reasons, the norm appears to be that only the female actually “enters the house,” and therefore the man's title was not important.

The Batswana seem not to have had laws prohibiting marriage between close relatives (Brown 1925: 58-59; Schapera 1984: 41). Instead, tradition seems to stipulate that the wife should be found among first cousins, especially cross-cousins, and the snubbing of a cousin could cause family strife (Brown 1925: 58-59). The wife belonged to the family and could be the child-bearer of more than one of its members (Brown 1925: 58). Marrying outside of the

³⁸ Cf. the sections in chapter five, “Family and Inheritance” and “The Levirate.”

cluster was quite uncommon, and the person who did it or married a non-Motswana risked stigmatisation (*ibid.*). A widow was legally bound to her husband's family. Even if he died, she should continue to produce children for his extended family. According to Ruth 1:11, Ruth was bound to Elimelech's family in the same way. Ruth was not supposed to marry outside of the family, but was supposed to be taken by the next closest male relative of Elimelech after Naomi could not provide any more sons for her. Boaz and So-and-so (2:20; 4:10) were two of the most likely candidates to marry Ruth.

3.9 Division of Labour

The Batswana gave individuals and groups specific roles in order to accomplish their daily household chores as well as family and community projects. A family produced and prepared its food and built its huts and grain storages. Wives, daughters and mothers worked mostly in and around the house. They tilled the fields, planted, weeded, fetched water from the river, gathered firewood, pounded the corn, prepared food, made beer, collected wild edible plants and built and repaired huts, grain storages and courtyards (Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 21). Even roofing the huts was done by the women (*ibid.*). While observing them at work, Moffat reports that he suggested that at least the roofing must be done by the husband, but the women burst into incredulous laughter (Moffat 1842: 252).³⁹ The man was out most of the day hunting, herding cattle, cutting timber and thorn bushes for building and fencing, clearing fields, and attending council meetings. The home was mostly left to the wife and children, especially girls. Boys, too, spent much of the day absent from the homestead, feeding, irrigating and tracking cattle and small stock.⁴⁰ For all practical purposes, the house belonged to the woman. In Ruth 1:8, Naomi beseeches Ruth and Orpah to return to their "mothers' house," a plea which was meant to evoke memories of security, food and shelter which they were currently lacking. Indeed, it is apparent that in both Setswana and Israelite cultures, the pleasant memories of home are activated strongly by the mention of a loving mother.

³⁹ The timber for roofing was cut by the men but collected and used by the women. However, I note that according to my experience in my Balete tribe, the men roofed the huts while the women and children built the walls. It is likely that my observation, being about 150 years later than Moffat's represents a change in socio-cultural practice.

⁴⁰ For ritualistic reasons, females were forbidden from herding or handling cattle and small stock, but rather managed fowl (Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 21).

When a family had a big project that it could not accomplish by itself, it usually invited a group of relatives, or otherwise organised a public work-party called *letsema* and gave them meat, beer or some kind of food to consume during the work (Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 22). The majority of the public are likely to be relatives of the family, but the few outsiders present would already be closely incorporated in the neighbourhood so that they are generally treated as relatives. Such a project could be building a hut, threshing corn or clearing a ploughing field (*ibid.*). *Letsema* is one of the examples of Batswana's strong sense of family and community (cf. Breutz 1956: 57). This practice is reminiscent of the spirit of *hesed* that is observable in the community of Ruth 3 and 4, viz., “joint obligation [...] solidarity, loyalty” and mutual assistance in the time of need (HALOT 2000: 133). The people of the book of Ruth are representative of כָּל־שַׁעַר עַמִּי – the whole gate of my people – who exemplify *hesed* by soon acknowledging Ruth as a woman of valour (Ruth 3:11).

The division of labour in the contemporary period shows changes in roles that men and women traditionally played. For example, now the men, instead of the women, do the ploughing and sometimes fetch firewood (Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 21; cf. Morapedi 1999: 201). This is primarily because of new heavy implements such as ox-drawn ploughs and wagons, which the men must operate. Moreover, as another new practice, men occasionally weed and reap in the fields. Women, who were once forbidden from entering a kraal or handling cattle can now handle them by assisting in ploughing and driving (Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 21).

3.10 Spirituality and Ancestral Spirits

Although the Batswana had their traditional religion, they observed very few religious ceremonies. They had neither idols, shrines or temples, nor seemed to worship any named being or object (Brown 1925: 141; Moffat 1842: 265-266). It appears that the Batswana's rituals or external activities did not fit the anthropologists' perceptions of worship. Of course, worship is not always observable externally, and may be missed by observers who have stereotypes of what constitutes worship. At tribal level, magic rituals were performed by rain makers, doctors or undertakers, usually in response to disasters such as drought, strange occurrences and disease (cf. Moffat 1842: 306; cf. Comaroff 1980: 646). Since these occurrences are not frequent, the traditional religion of the Batswana must have appeared non-existent to the first European anthropologists. Moreover, at the individual level, consultation

of a traditional doctor and the subsequent magical rituals were private. The rituals were prescribed or carried out by the doctor who diagnosed the patient. The consultation itself arose from personal ills and the fear of sorcery rather than from a desire or tendency to worship.

The traditional religion of the Batswana revolves around belief in the spirits of their dead ancestors, whom they call *badimo*. This belief was not readily observable because the *badimo* “never received much attention until at marriages, during hardships, misfortune and disobedience of children” (Breutz 1956: 76). The *badimo* are collective, and it appears that none of them is singled out. Even dead people who recently joined the *badimo* or well-known heroes of oral traditions who are known by name are not specifically named in prayer or ritual. Dead men were buried with their weapons in their hands whilst the women were buried with hoes and seeds to enable them to continue their jobs of herding cattle and cultivating the soil (Schapera 1984: 59).⁴¹ It was believed that these dead people lived somewhere underground where they lived a life similar to that of living people on earth (*ibid.*). The *badimo* could be blamed and chastised for being unjust (Breutz 1956: 76). They could also eat; for example, a sauce of meat and potatoes was left on a table the day before a wedding for them to enjoy, and many people left behind ears of sorghum for the *badimo* on their fields after harvesting (Breutz 1956: 76).

The Batswana believed that their ancestral spirits had mystical power over the lives of the living, and an active interest in the affairs of the living (Schapera 1984: 59). Almost all misfortunes of the community are ascribed to the displeasure and punishment or curse of the *badimo*. The *badimo* were consulted and appeased in times of lack of rain, sickness, death, spirit-possession, unpleasant events, mysterious occurrences and other evils (Breutz 1956: 76). They rewarded individuals who gave them due respect and attention with good health and prosperity. They “punished with sickness, economic loss, or some other misfortune those who neglected them or offended against the social code, of which they were guardians” (Schapera 1984: 59; cf. Setiloane 1976: 66).

⁴¹ Moffat (1842: 308) records a burial ceremony in which an old woman brings to the grave the deceased’s bows, arrows, war-axe, grain, garden seeds and the bone of an ox and says, “There are all your articles.”

3.11 The Supreme Being

The absence of objects made or activities done in the name of the Supreme Being prevented some anthropologists from recognising the existence of the Supreme Being among the Batswana (Ntloedibe-Kuswani 2001: 83-84). Robert Moffat actually held that the Batswana had no concept of spirituality or divinity (Moffat 1842: 265-266). Livingstone, in contrast, felt that the Batswana were clearly religious (Sundkler and Steed 2000: 432). Historians attest that the Batswana acknowledged a Supreme Being who was greater in power than all the *badimo* and smaller gods, and whom they recognised as the God of gods (*Modimo wa medimo*), the God of the heavens (*Modimo wa magodimo*), or the invisible and far distant God (*Modimo wa go dimelela*) (Brown 1925: 113; Lichtenstein 1973: 72). *Modimo* is the creator of all things, which gives *Modimo* the title *motlhodi* or *mmopi* (Setiloane 1976: 78). Brown, whom I noted in the previous section saying that the Batswana had no idol, shrine or temple, observes that the Batswana always believed in the ultimate Supreme Being whose creative works were evident, “who is the great unknown and invisible yet real” (1925: 113). Amanze observes that this God is too remote to be approached in prayer and does not participate actively in human affairs (Amanze 1998: 4-5). *Modimo* is generally ignored in the ritual practice of appeasing the *badimo* (Brown 1925: 114; cf. Schapera 1984: 59). This perceived distance of *Modimo*, and the immediate proximity of lesser spirits, tended to blind historians and anthropologists to the existence of the Supreme Being in the Batswana worldview (Lichtenstein 1973: 71-72). Although *Modimo* was not prominent in the life of the Tswana society, *Modimo* was the most powerful of spirit beings. Thus, Setswana traditional belief sets *Modimo* at the top of the socio-religious hierarchy, followed by demi-gods and ancestral spirits. It appears that only *Modimo* is considered to be purely god whilst the others are part-human and part-god (Brown 1925: 95).

Modimo is a class 2 noun and takes the impersonal plural prefix *me-*. Therefore, *Modimo* is neuter and impersonal, and fits the pronoun “it” rather than “she” or “he” (cf. Cole 1955: 75). The noun *Modimo* is not a class 1 noun, although it has the same prefix for personal nouns in Setswana. It does not take the plural prefix *ba-*. Thus, *Modimo* is traditionally and grammatically “it” and not “him,” although this frame of reference has changed because of Christian usage of the name. Moreover, *bomodimo* (godness) was not reserved only for the Supreme Being, but the abstract term could be applied loosely in deference to people, ancestral spirits, animals and other objects (cf. Brown 1925: 113).

The above-discussed aspects as well as the one of remoteness mark a significant difference between the traditional *Modimo* of the Batswana and the contemporary one adapted from the Bible. The contemporary *Modimo* is Judeo-Christian, male in gender, more personal, much closer to human affairs, and no longer belongs in the world of mythological storytelling (cf. Ntloedibe-Kuswani 2006: 78-97). Recently, African analysts have challenged the glaring mismatches between the Bantu and Biblical concepts of the Supreme Being. They include Masubelele on the Zulus' Supreme Being (2009: 63-78), Mbuwayesango on the Shonas' *Mwari* (2001: 63-77) and Togarasei on the Shonas' *Mwari* (2009: 52-64). Unfortunately, it appears that the translation of the Hebrew Supreme Being is one of the areas where translation shifts are inevitable because of socio-religious frames.⁴² However, like the biblical God, *Modimo* had supreme power over the lives of people. It appears that, traditionally, this power was primarily associated with the weather, and he could send or withdraw rain (cf. Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 53). Therefore, the statements, “there was famine in the land” (Ruth 1:1) and “Yahweh had taken care of his people by giving them bread” (Ruth 1:6), can easily evoke both the traditional and contemporary Setswana views that *Modimo* is responsible for drought and abundance.⁴³ Actually, the Batswana are apt to identify many more instances of “the hidden hand of God” than the translator could anticipate in the translation – the new *Modimo* has been received with the same zeal formally accorded the *badimo*. Sometimes, however, some Batswana ascribe supernatural activity to both *Modimo* and *badimo*.

Modimo is more mythological than *badimo*, its role being slightly more pronounced in the world of folk tales and creation narratives. Yet, most Setswana myths about the origin of life, including animals and people, only mention the demi-gods,⁴⁴ viz., *Loowe*, *Tintibane*, *Matsieng*, *Thobega*, *Nape* and *Tshosa*, and exclude *Modimo* (Breutz 1956: 76; Brown 1925:

⁴² Ntloedibe-Kuswani suggests that the Setswana term for the Supreme Being should be “Ant-bear” (*Thakadu*) instead of *Modimo* (2001: 94). This sounds like a mismatch with the judeo-Christian concept, just as *Modimo* also causes a mismatch. The other three analysts' discussions demonstrate difficult socio-religious and linguistic frames of references for the missionary translators. In consideration of these three analysts, one must reiterate the fact that shifts between the Hebrew and Bantu terms were sometimes inevitable, as can be argued with the case of *Modimo*.

⁴³ These actions of *Modimo*, however, are triggered primarily by neglecting traditional customs and breaking taboos.

⁴⁴ These were the super human beings that were created first.

113; Schapera 1984: 59). Still, in actual daily living, these demi-gods were completely ignored and even less noticeable than *Modimo*. Currently, *Modimo* and the *badimo* are the only active deities in the Batswana worldview, the rest belonging only in folk-tales and myths. In the contemporary worldview, *Modimo* has replaced the *badimo* as the main object of worship. Thus, biblical narratives, which Batswana now regard as records of the activities of *Modimo*, are understood as belonging to the world of reality rather than of myth.

3.12 Divination, Sorcery and Death

While community disasters are ascribed to the activities of the *badimo*, almost all personal ills were traditionally blamed on sorcery, and no calamity or illness is considered to arise from natural causes or from personal irresponsibility (Breutz 1956: 71; Brown 1925: 137). There was a supernatural explanation for all forms of evil. A diviner-medicine man, called *ngaka* (traditional doctor), often had to be consulted to discover: 1. The nature and causes of sickness; 2. The reasons for a person's death; 3. The whereabouts of missing stock; 4. The prospects for a journey; 5. The meaning of unexpected objects and occurrences; or 6. What the future has in store (Schapera 1984: 64). There was one or more such doctors in each village (Breutz 1956: 74). They were specialists in medicine and magic ritual. Alongside diagnosis, their job was to restore and maintain the health and fortunes of the individual and of the community (Brown 1925: 139). Good fortune, like bad fortune, was not attained or sustained by chance or personal initiative (Brown 1925: 137). Thus, the Batswana have a saying, *Lesego le le senang more le a tloga* (fortune without a charm is only fleeting) (Brown 1925: 139).

The story of Ruth is similar in the sense that it portrays an Israelite culture that ascribes personal and communal success or failure to the supernatural activities of Yahweh. In the Setswana context, however, it could be puzzling that there is no explanation for why there was drought, or even all the tragedies of Naomi's family. The people would have sought the diagnosis of a diviner-rainmaker to explain the occurrence of the drought.⁴⁵ Naomi would have been expected to consult a diviner-healer, and great were the chances that she would be found to be bewitched by a jealous friend or relative, or to be under the curse of an aggrieved

⁴⁵ The diagnosis that Moffat was a bad omen that brought drought made the Bathaping try to expel Moffat by force, but he refused and insisted that they would rather have to kill him before he leaves (Moffat 1842: 327-328).

elderly person or ancestral spirits. Only belief in the new mysterious Christian Supreme Being partly helps Batswana explain why unpleasant things may happen without cause. In the new so-called syncretistic context when the diviner cannot explain the cause of a problem, s/he attributes it to “the will of God” (Ullin 1975: 98).

Immediately after a person’s death, his/her closest relations like spouse, children and siblings have to undergo purification rites. That is because “death is perceived to be highly polluting” (Comaroff 1980: 655). Particularly, the widowed spouse (*moswagadi*) is believed to have hot and dangerous blood. S/he has to remain in seclusion for a certain number of months, abstain from sexual contact, and not come into proximity with infants (cf. Haram 1991: 169). It was believed that after sexual intercourse, the two partners’ blood is mixed with each other’s, and when one of them dies, his/her share of the blood clots in the other partner. So, a *moswagadi* has in his/her veins the clotted blood of the deceased and is therefore dangerous to people’s health (Haram 1991: 170). For that reason, a traditional Motswana may regard Ruth as carrying in her veins the clotted blood of her deceased husband, which would make her a cause of sickness to livestock and crops and death to her new sexual partner. These aspects of the Setswana worldview indicate that even after death, a person continues to have a certain amount of control over the lives of the living. That explains why the Batswana regard all dead people with awe, be they a corpse, an ancestral spirit or a ghost. Euphemisms are employed for reference to the dead. Normally, the Batswana do not say that a person is “dead” – rather, “the person has left us” (Brown 1925: 76). Another example is using the noun “death,” as in “the death of so and so,” which is more euphemistic than using the verb for death, viz., *swa* or *sule*, as in *mokete o sule* – so and so is dead. Thus, in Ruth 2:1, the Hebrew coincides with Tswana mind-set when it uses the expression “after the death of your husband.” Wookey and BSSA depart from this expression and say “after your husband died.”

3.13 Reproduction and the Value of Children

Children were valued greatly, and the traditional Setswana couple prided itself in having as many children as possible (Brown 1925: 64). Marriage itself, as evidenced in the practice of *bogadi*, existed primarily for the production of children (Brown 1925: 60). The boy-child seems to have been more valued than the girl-child for various reasons:⁴⁶ first, males were fewer in number than females (cf. Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 7-8); second, a male child

⁴⁶ The five reasons that follow are from Lichtenstein 1973: 75 and 77, except where indicated by another source.

would add numbers (through marriage) and leadership to the family, whilst a girl would benefit a different family upon marriage (Brown 1925: 60); third, a boy child became a soldier, a defender of the community in war; fourth, he was a provider and bringer of wealth in the form of hunting and cattle-rearing; and fifth, the boy child kept his family name upon marriage, perpetuated it and, therefore, prevented its extinction. The factors of bringing wealth and perpetuating the family name stand out in the book of Ruth. When the widows, Naomi, Ruth and Orpah were stranded, a son would have provided some hope for the future by maintaining the family's inheritance, acting as a surrogate husband, or at least being the caretaker of the three women. The fact that Naomi was left without even a single male child sealed her demise.

Children were highly cherished in Setswana traditional society, but conception, pregnancy and childbirth were regarded as matters of privacy. Pregnancy and childbirth were celebrated for the child that they entailed, but they were and are still socially awkward, and euphemistic terms for them are used most of the time. In public, the society completely avoids explicit reference to these concepts and instead uses the words *itsholofela* ('expect oneself' – for pregnancy) and *tshola* (hold or bear – for giving birth).⁴⁷ This usage could cause difficulties for translators in some instances since these are not the prototypical references for the terms "pregnant" and "give birth."⁴⁸ In some instances, the implicit terms may cause difficulties for TT audiences to interpret biblical verses correctly. The scenario of pregnancy is demonstrated by Ruth 1:11 where two of the Bibles, in avoidance of social impoliteness, end up with ambiguous renderings (cf. the shift at Ruth 1:11 in chapter six). The same is true of sexual intercourse, for which the Setswana euphemism is *tlhakanela dikobo* (share blankets).

Besides socially restricted terminology, there are social restrictions related to pregnancy and the newborn. For example, the expectant mother was not supposed to eat offals (*serobe*) and eggs (*mae*) or drink alcohol (*bojalwa*) (Mogapi 1991: 141). The new mother and her infant went into seclusion called *botsetsi* where elderly midwives cared for the mother, and they did nothing but eat and sleep (Mogapi 1991: 140). Sexually active people, menstruating teenagers, people who had had an abortion, widows, widowers and the husband were not

⁴⁷ Cf. Dent 1992: 11 and Hartshorne et al. 1984: 534.

⁴⁸ The prototypical expressions for conception and pregnancy are *go ima* and *go ithwala*. For childbirth, the prototypical expression is *go tsala*.

supposed to enter the hut of the new mother (Mogapi 1991: 141-146).⁴⁹ These people were ceremonially unclean, and it was believed that new-born babies easily picked up their uncleanness.⁵⁰ This uncleanness posed a risk of ill-health and death, especially since babies were believed to live “on the margin of two worlds, that of the living and of ‘badimo’” (Setiloane 1976: 35). A medicine man/woman was called immediately after birth to perform rituals and apply charms on the baby’s body to protect it against ceremonially unclean individuals and sorcerers and to attend to any physical sickness. It was also believed that the baby and/or its parents had many enemies that would try to kill it by magic or by feeding it poisonous food. Such seclusion takes about six months, after which the baby is introduced to the outside world with celebration (Mogapi 1991: 147-148). Ruth 4:16 seems to document a breach of many of these Tswana taboos, and can be distracting to a Setswana audience: Obed is introduced immediately to the public when he is born.

3.14 Means of Economic Production

The *Batswana* clusters that were targeted by the three Setswana Bibles traditionally depended on cattle rearing and crop production for economic means. Later on, they depended more on salaries from European farmers in their districts and on mines (Breutz 1963: 80). The European farms were much more profitable than their own subsistence farming. In fact, the native farmer’s own farm did not produce enough even for his own consumption, let alone to cover the costs of ploughing (Breutz 1956: 53; Breutz 1963: 77).⁵¹ At the European farms, they were paid with enough maize or other crops to feed the family for almost a whole year (Breutz 1963: 63). Therefore, by the period between the publications of Moffat and BSSA, many men and women were seeking income from employment in European farms during harvest time (Breutz 1963: 78). Most families began to have members working on European farms each harvesting season. Currently, schooling has removed children, formerly an

⁴⁹ The people in this list, respectively, *makgarebe kgotsa makau...ba ba senyegetsweng, kgarebe e e mo setswalong le batlholagadi*, are said to have hot feet – *ba dinao di bolelo* (Mogapi 1991: 141-146). Thus, the uncleanness is depicted as bringing fire with their feet, which would burn the infant.

⁵⁰ Mogapi 1991: 145.

⁵¹ The situation improved due to the adoption of European farming methods and modern tools (cf. Morapedi 1999, which discusses the advantages of working in European owned farms and mines. The experience and the wages led to the acquisition of modern farming methods and tools). In Botswana, an insignificant number of Batswana have currently gone into commercial farming whilst very few subsistence farmers remain or plough consistently.

important source of labour, from subsistence farms. Unreliable rains often discourage subsistence farmers, also, at least as observable from the context of Botswana. Moreover, the economic miracle of Botswana, brought about by the discovery of diamonds in the late 1970s, rapidly created urban contexts in and around many settlements in Botswana that destabilised subsistence farming.

Ruth the foreigner's gleaning for grain in Boaz's farm (Ruth 2) does not have a parallel in Setswana culture. In a Setswana context, a poor person or beggar would be expected to help in harvesting and threshing, after which s/he would be paid with corn. Otherwise, everyone generally worked hard for their survival, and able bodied poor people were no exception. Without a footnote to explain the background of gleaning in ancient Israel, it could be hard for the reader to make sense of that part of the narrative. Rather, gleaning in the story of Ruth probably triggers in the minds of TT readers scenes of a Motswana on a European owned farm, with locals helping to harvest some cash crop, after which they would be paid with corn. Employment on these farms probably brought much needed economic relief to the Batswana.

The experience of employment on European farms must also have introduced the Batswana to European farming methods and crops (cf. Morapedi 1999: 198-199). After contact with Europeans, the Batswana began to produce new crops such as tomatoes, potatoes, oranges and peaches (Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 15). The foreign crops mentioned in Ruth, namely, barley and wheat, may have been seen by Batswana first on European farms. They did not have vocabulary for them, so it would have been natural for translators to give them European loan words. Otherwise, there has been no fundamental change in the crops that the Batswana grew traditionally. They still primarily plant sorghum (*mabele*) in large quantities as food for the main meals. Other crops planted, but in smaller quantities, were maize, millet, sweet reed, ground-nuts, beans, water melons and pumpkins (Breutz 1963: 65; Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 15). These crops were grown in fields (*masimo*) located outside the village in clusters. The fields used to be small in the days when they were cultivated by women using hoes, viz., between two and three acres. However, since the introduction of ox-drawn ploughs, they are usually more than five acres, and sometimes extend to 20 acres (Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 15).

The average family had these three means of economic production: livestock, a ploughing field, and occasional employment in a farm, town or mine (Breutz 1963: 78). Of these three, working in the mines was the most radical change, for it was the beginning of an era for the Batswana where one would migrate to live far away from his community for economic purposes. The mining companies recruited miners in Batswana communities annually, giving contracts of 9-18 months (Breutz 1963: 79). Otherwise, a Motswana traditionally engaged in economic production within the immediate vicinity of his/her own village. Employment in another village, town or country was uncommon and stigmatised, and it was called *go jaka* (to sojourn).⁵²

In Ruth 1, the act of sojourning, which Batswana would traditionally consider a pitiful move in the first place, yielded no positive results for Elimelech and his family. However, Ruth the Moabite then left her own community to live in Bethlehem where she would, predictably, carry the tag of “foreigner/Moabitess.” Worse still, Ruth indicates the awareness that she may have no shelter in a foreign land, with her statement, “Where you lodge, I will lodge” (Ruth 1:16). “Lodge,” expressed well by *lala* in Setswana, profiles the temporary and uncertain nature of the type of accommodation she foresaw. To the mind of a Motswana, few things beside famine and excommunication are worth that risk. She still found love and a home though, a sign that a sojourner does not always end up in poverty. In later years, with the general collapse of subsistence farming and the rise of European-style urbanised economies, the Batswana came to accept that sojourning is often mandatory for economic survival and prosperity (cf. Morapedi 1999). Nowadays, most Batswana children go to school solely to prepare for an urban kind of employment that could, over the years, make them migrant labourers in different communities. Some students are already compelled to go to school in a different district, a neighbouring country or even a European country. They may find employment and live there for many years.

Customarily, most Batswana families have not been able to survive on agriculture alone primarily because of arid lands, unreliable rainfall and regular droughts (cf. Moffat 1842: 309; Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 72). Their primary lands covered the following areas, most of

⁵² Sojourning must have been undesirable because of the Batswana’s sense of community. To be an outsider in a community would be a last resort among difficult options. Thus, sojourners were traditionally thought to be desperate individuals or gamblers, willing to risk everything, including their families.

which were notorious for unreliable rainfall: Botswana (formerly Bechuanaland Protectorate); the former British Bechuanaland (north eastern part of the Cape Province, formerly the Cape Colony); central and western Orange Free State (now called Free State); and western Transvaal (now split into Gauteng, Limpopo, Mpumalanga and Northwestern provinces) (cf. Cole 1955: xv; Mgadla 2003: 1, 2). Rainfall could sometimes be substantial in these areas, but it would normally come too late for the ploughing season – it would come at once and disappear for long spells, and/or it would come as violent thunderstorms. Moffat (1842: 336) reports that the rain, after being anticipated for months, “comes in torrents,” violent thunder and fatal lightning, “but its water runs off quickly,” whereupon the chronic drought continues unabated. The Taung districts (presently in the Northwestern Province) received, over a period of 36 years, an annual average of 42.5 cm² of rain, 85% of which came from thunderstorms, whilst the Mafikeng district (the capital of the Northwestern Province) received an annual average of 40cm² (Breutz 1956: 43, 50; Breutz 1968: 12). In many areas, the rains are quickly followed by hot dry weather and winds from the Kgalagadi desert (in Botswana), which evaporate the water quickly (cf. Moffat 1842: 333-334). November is traditionally the best month to begin ploughing, for two reasons: an earlier month like October would have very little prospects for rain, and a later month would allow little time for ripening before the first winter nights in June (cf. Breutz 1956: 50). Yet, stable and adequate rains often delayed until December or January (Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 16; cf. Breutz 1956: 50). The famine that fell over the land of Judah during the days of the Judges in Ruth 1:1 is likely to evoke strong memories of drought in the mind of a Motswana. This is because many devastating famines have come from droughts throughout the history of the Batswana.

By the 1950s, the department of Bantu administration and development had outlawed ploughing in the Kuruman and Postmasburg districts, except for government-aided irrigation projects (Breutz 1963: 63). It decided that the rainfall was so low that cultivation was unproductive, loosening the soil only to cause desertification (*ibid.*). As for stock farming, the traditional Tswana economy was, in fact, based on cattle and small stock rearing as opposed to crop production (Breutz 1963: 63). Tswana cattle seem adapted to dry conditions so that with small, consistent amounts of rain in their arid climate, they multiply quickly. Unfortunately, gains were often wiped out by consecutive years of drought, but only a small

number of cattle were, historically, killed by disease or predators (Breutz 1956: 47).⁵³ Crop production was plagued not only by arid land and unreliable rainfall, but the traditional methods of ploughing were also crude, and farmers did not adopt the practice of weeding (Breutz 1963: 65).

3.15 Summary and Conclusion

This chapter examined the possible origins of the Batswana and the name *Batswana*. Also considered was the language grouping and dialect of Setswana, with the view to highlight the dialects that were used to translate the Moffat, Wookey and BSSA Bibles. Next I discussed the social structure of a Setswana grouping and its governance, followed by kinship bonds among individuals, families and community. I described the marriage systems of Batswana, the division of labour and Setswana worldview, which incorporated concepts of spirituality and ancestral spirits, the Supreme Being, and sorcery and divination. Then I presented the Batswana's perception of reproduction and the value of children. Finally, I examined the Batswana's means of economic production.

The chapter thus presented the historical, ethnographical and socio-cultural frames of reference of the Batswana that may have influenced decision making during the translation of the Setswana versions of Ruth. Some of these traditional frames have changed over the years so that they now differ from contemporary perceptions and practices. Yet, they were possible CFRs of the target text in the eras when the translations were made, so they provide the most relevant contexts for postulating factors that could have led to translation problems and shifts. I also compared certain crucial aspects of the socio-cultural frame with those that were presumably active for the original audience of the story of Ruth, which are dealt with in detail in chapter five. A number of rich points were noted, which, if not attended to during translation, may lead to a misinterpretation of the Hebrew text by the TT audience. Explanatory footnotes could contribute towards solving this problem. Some striking similarities were noted which could have been advantageous to decision making during translation. As will be observed in chapter six, such an advantage was not always utilised. To avoid repetitiveness, the similarities and differences between the two sets of cultures will not be noted in chapter five in the discussion of the socio-cultural frames of ancient Israel.

⁵³ For example, in 2011 in the northwest of Botswana, farmers lost between 10 000 and 15 000 cattle to drought (Endi 2012).

This brief description of the history and ethnography of the Batswana presented various socio-cultural contexts, which are likely to have provided a major composite frame of reference for the translations of the three Setswana Bibles, and which are likely to have determined the target audience's interpretation of the TT. Looking broadly at the idea of the four generic types of CFRs, this chapter presented three, namely, the socio-cultural, textual and communication situation CFRs. Most of the chapter discussed socio-cultural CFRs. The section "Language and Dialect" briefly presented two generic CFRs, namely the primary textual-linguistic and communication situation frames of the Setswana translations. The fourth CFR is the organisational one, which will be the primary subject of the next chapter (four). Other secondary CFRs of chapter four will be textual-linguistic and communication situation CFRs. Chapter four will hopefully contribute towards a fuller understanding of the overall cognitive context of these Setswana Bible versions.

Chapter 4: The History of Bible Translation in Setswana

4.1 Introduction

This chapter aims at presenting the history of the translation of the Bible into Setswana. In turn, this history will hopefully shed light on the context, especially the organisational frame, which influenced the outcome of the three Setswana translations. To achieve that, the chapter begins by placing the three translations in their wider context. This is accomplished by presenting the four main eras of Bible translation throughout history, followed by a discussion of the history of Bible translation in African languages south of the Sahara (sub-Saharan Africa). The latter is a sub-frame of the former. The discussion of the general history of Bible translation, as well as the more specific history of Bible translation in African languages, will be limited to factors that relate to the frames of reference for the three extant Setswana Bibles, namely, Moffat, Wookey and BSSA. Finally, the chapter will present the specific historical context of each Setswana Bible.

The previous chapter of the thesis provided the context for explaining the possible reasons for the translation choices of the Setswana versions of Ruth as influenced primarily by the socio-cultural frame of reference (CFR) of the Batswana people. The next chapter will attempt to present the CFR of the Hebrew source text (ST) of Ruth as a basis for explaining the reasons for the choices of the Setswana translations. The frames in chapters three, five, and the present one (four) are used in chapter six to postulate the reasons for the decisions that were made during the translation of Ruth into Setswana, especially in instances where the translations appeared to face translation problems, or deviated from exegetically justifiable renderings.

4.2 The Four Eras of Bible Translation History

This section places the three Setswana Bible versions in a global context of Bible translation history, demarcated as follows: the first era, which extends from around 400 BC to 400 AD (Targums and the LXX); the second era, which ranges from around AD 400 to 1500 (Latin Vulgate and several secondary and tertiary translations); the third era, extending from around 1500 to around 1960/70; and the fourth era, ranging from around 1960/70 to the present (Makutoane and Naude 2009: 82-83; Wendland and Noss 2013: 1-2; cf. also Metzger's 2001:

9 and Jinbachian 2007: 29).¹ The first period was Jewish, and the primary translations that it produced were the Septuagint (LXX) and the targums.² The targums were produced from around the fifth century BC while the LXX was translated between BC 250 and 100. It was the only era among the four, when Bible translation was non-Christian. The second era features old Latin translations, Jerome's Latin Vulgate went onto the Latin Vulgate around 400 AD and continued with miscellaneous secondary and tertiary versions until around 1500 (Wendland and Noss 2013: 1-2).³

The third era was inaugurated by the efforts of mainly Protestant translators in Europe at the time when Catholic Church-affiliated governments resisted new translations, burning and banning new Bibles as well as imprisoning and killing translators (cf. Metzger 2001: 53-69; Nida 1992: 513). Still, many Bibles were produced despite this hostile setting. The persecution abated after the arrival of the King James Version (KJV), but that did not quicken the pace of translation. Instead, it was much later in this period, when mission societies sent missionaries to evangelise foreign countries, that there was an explosion of translations in many languages across all continents (Metzger 2001: 8; cf. Hermanson 2002: 7).⁴ Much of the history of Bible translation in Setswana occurred during this later phase of the third period, viz., from the 1830s onwards.

The frames of the third period were characterised by the tradition of trying to produce, as much as possible, the forms and structure of the ST (Makutoane and Naude 2009: 82). This goal was followed even when the translators were making a translation or revision from another translation like the LXX, Latin Vulgate, or an English version, for example.⁵

¹ However, each of the four sources' orderings differs slightly with the rest. The ordering in the paragraph that follows is based on a general interpretation of the four named sources.

² According to Wendland and Noss (2013: 2), translations are "primary" when they are made from the original biblical languages, Hebrew and Greek. They are secondary and tertiary when they are made from primary and secondary translations respectively.

³ They included versions in Coptic (from Egypt), Nubian (from present day Northern Sudan), Ge'ez (Ethiopian), Armenian, Syriac, Gothic, Chinese and Slavic (Wendland and Noss 2013: 2).

⁴ The third era has two phases, namely, the Protestant phase, and the Missionary phase. The KJV marks the Protestant phase while various missionary vernacular translations mark the missionary phase.

⁵ The Rheims-Douay Bible (1582-1610), for example, "was made not from the original languages but from the Latin Vulgate" (Metzger 2001: 68).

Translators could either consult a commentary which deals with the original STs (cf. Wendland 1987: 17),⁶ or strictly follow a version which they deemed to resemble the original Hebrew and Greek texts. Moffat literally followed the KJV, according to my analysis in chapter six. Ironically, the KJV translators were mandated to make their project a close revision of the Bishops' Bible, even as they would consult the Hebrew and Greek STs (Metzger 2001: 76). The main adverse results of strictly following the forms of an ST, at least as observable from the Setswana Moffat version, include ambiguity in communication and clumsiness in TL style. Translations of the third era, including Moffat, sometimes even went further than the KJV and avoided marginal notes altogether, supposing that notes "would bring into question the authority of the Scriptures" (cf. Metzger 2001: 73-74). Thus, Moffat avoids notes and headings throughout the book of Ruth. Yet, the original KJV actually had about 9000 marginal references throughout the Bible (Metzger 2001: 75). There were a few other notable translations at the dawn of the KJV era that include the Dutch Statenvertaling, which probably influenced Moffat and/or Wookey (cf. Makutoane and Naude 2009: 82).

The fourth, contemporary era of Bible translation (from around 1960/70 onwards), introduced some important developments in quick succession of each other, such as the following: movement from word for word correspondence to equivalence in the meaning of words, sentences and texts; the dawn of Nida's dynamic equivalence; a descriptive approach to translation; and a surge of scholarship's interest in Bible translation, which progressively took a multidisciplinary outlook. The transition to this period of Bible translation can be said to have come with the translation of the Revised Standard Version (RSV, published in 1952). The RSV primarily departed from the trend of imposing Christian theological traditional interpretations on the Bible (Orlinsky and Bratcher 1991: 155). For example, the RSV translated the word **עַלְמָה** as "young woman" rather than "virgin" (Isaiah 7: 14).⁷ The RSV also departed from the use of archaic words that tended to distort the meaning of the text and/or fail to communicate to contemporary English audiences (cf. Orlinsky and Bratcher 1991: 155-177). Its revision, the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV, 1990), took "giant steps forward in the never-ending task of finding new words to speak to readers of the old story" (Bratcher and Orlinsky 1991: 177).

⁶ Even as late as the Bible Societies period, a "committee [made] a translation based on existing translations such as RSV, GNB, NIV, NAV and Gute Nachricht" (Hermanson 2002: 9-10).

⁷ The examples on the RSV come from Orlinsky and Bratcher (1991: 155-177).

In the 1950s, around the time of the publication of the RSV, Eugene Nida began giving conference presentations and publishing articles (Pattermore 2007: 234; cf. Gentzler 2001: 44-45). The pragmatic and theoretical ideas from such early activity would later culminate in the publication of his influential books, *Message and Mission* (1960), *Toward a Science of Translating (TASOT)*, 1964), *Theory and Practice of Translation (TAPOT)*, co-written with Taber, 1969) and *From One Language to Another: Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating (FOLTA)*, co-written with De Waard, 1986) (Pattermore 2007). Nida developed the translational approach called “dynamic equivalence.” Working for the United Bible Society, he disseminated his ideas among Bible translators around the world in seminars and conferences (Carson 1993: 38-39; Hermanson 2002: 9). The concept of dynamic equivalence was introduced also to on-going revision and translation projects (*ibid.*). Thus, the fourth era of Bible translation, in part, strongly carries the marks of Nida.

The later stage of the fourth era, from the 1990s onwards, is predominated by much scholarly interest in the description of how Bible translation occurs. In this era, Bible translation is heavily influenced by developments in the wider field of Translation Studies which, in turn, was beginning to focus on the target audience’s culture (cf. Snell-Hornby 2006: 47; Nord 2011: 41). This new interest in Translation Studies was influenced by insights from, among others, action theory, communication theory and cultural theory (cf. page 15). Whilst focus on the target audience’s culture was not new to Bible Translation (Wendland 2012: 21), secular Translation Studies contributed new concepts to Bible translation, the most important of which is, arguably, Skopos theory (cf. Nord 1997; cf. Nord 2011). One of the major effects of Skopos theory on Bible translation is that “a translator’s decisions in the translation process [would] be governed by the function or communicative purpose the TT is intended to achieve in the target-culture situation” (Nord 2011: 41). Different approaches within the continuum of formal and functional equivalence could be used for different types of STs in accordance with the intended purpose for translating the text, without prescribing any approach as being superior to the other (cf. Van der Merwe 2012: 1).⁸ Moreover, a variety of translations in the

⁸ Even the categorisation of extant versions as literal or functional has been cast in doubt by the realisation that “literal translation and free translation exist on the same spectrum, distinguishable in the extreme but nevertheless unavoidably connected” (Carson 1993: 38-39; cf. Kroeze’s, Van den Heever’s and Van Rooy’s 2011 examination of the literalness of the KJV).

same language could be made from a document in accordance with different purposes and approaches.

The ultimate result of this new scholarly interest was a movement away from the prescriptive aspects of Nida's approach to translation. Scholars like Gutt asserted that Nida's code model of communication was defective; communication works by inference from relevant contexts rather than by exchange of words as codes of communication (cf. Gutt 2000). During translation, the cognitive contexts of words matter more than the words themselves. Departure from Nida's prescriptive approach in the current era of Bible translation history has led to a greater appreciation of the fact that Bible translations may fulfill different functions for different audiences (typically churches).⁹ The following section will discuss the contextual frames of the three Setswana Bibles from the regional context of Bible translation in African languages.

4.3 The History of Bible Translation in African Languages

The history of Bible translations in African languages can be divided into three time periods. The first two, viz., the missionary period and the missionary revisions and corrections period fall under the third great era of Bible translation discussed above (cf. section 4.2), which covers Protestant and missionary translations (cf. Noss 1998: 66; cf. Mojola 2002: 205-206). The third period of Bible translation in African language is the Bible Societies period. It falls under the fourth (contemporary) era of Bible translation, which is from around 1960/70 onwards (Hermanson 2002: 9ff; Makutoane and Naude 2009: 84).¹⁰

4.3.1 The Missionary Period

The first period, viz., the missionary era, can be dated from around 1800 when European Protestant missionary societies sent missionaries around the world to evangelise (Bandia 2001: 296; Metzger 2001: 8; Mojola 2007: 146). About half a century later, many missionary

⁹ Cf., for example, Van Der Merwe 2012: 1, 2.

¹¹ For purposes of this study, my categorisation acknowledges the transition period between the missionary period and the Bible Societies period, and calls it the missionary revisions period. It is sandwiched generally between the time of the first Bantu language translations (1860s) and the establishment of the Bible Society of South Africa in 1965 (cf. Makutoane and Naude 2009: 83-84).

translated Bibles were published in African languages. Missionaries,¹¹ sometimes without much formal training in exegesis and source languages, learnt the native language and proceeded to translate the Bible, mostly producing a literal or word for word translation (Makutoane and Naude 2009: 83).¹² Sterk (2004: 180-181) points out that “a formal approach, the one practiced in practically all old ‘missionary’ Bible translations, is the easy one to carry out,” while a good meaning-based project requires the translator to know “first of all what the ST means, before s/he can search for the appropriate way of re-expressing this meaning in his/her language.” The frames of the missionary period tended to lead translators to depend almost completely on the KJV and other formal correspondence European language Bibles of the time rather than follow independent interpretation and communication frames.¹³

Generally, the initial or primary mandate of the missionaries was to evangelise and plant churches rather than translate Scripture, but they soon discovered that evangelisation was more efficient when mother tongue speakers read the Bible for themselves (cf. Noss 1998: 67). That was the case with Moffat who, together with his sending body, did not know that he would end up translating the Bible (cf. Moffat 1842: 571; Moffat 1889: 17). He was academically unprepared to interpret the Scriptures from their original STs. It would appear that John Evans, the London Missionary Society’s (LMS) missionary who preceded Moffat, was academically well equipped to translate the Scriptures from the original languages. John Evans “had a good grounding in French, Latin and Greek and a sound knowledge of Hebrew and Aramaic” (Lubbe 2009: 18-19). He, however, abandoned his work within 9 months, citing failure to reduce Setswana to written form.¹⁴ The contextual frames of the time were such that even a well trained translator like John Evans was not adequately prepared to face

¹¹ There were a few exceptions, the most prominent being Bishop Samuel Crowther, a Yoruba mother tongue speaker who translated the Yoruba Bible (Noss 1998: 67). His Yoruba version of the book of Romans was published in 1850 (Noss 1998: 69).

¹² It was the age of literal translations borne out of a strong respect for the written Word of God, and an age during which there was a strong prejudice against idiomatic and functional approaches to translation (Nida 1992: 513; Noss 1998: 66). It would only later be realised that non-formal approaches to translation do not necessarily violate the Scriptures.

¹³ It appears that many translators and stakeholder institutions felt that the KJV was more inspired than other Bibles.

¹⁴ From Moffat’s learning of the Setswana and Dutch languages and persistence in adverse circumstances, it appears that what Moffat lacked in academic training, he made up for in rigour and intelligence.

the challenges of translation. Moreover, the frames also contributed to the insufficient training of Robert Moffat. Therefore, whether it was Robert Moffat or John Evans, one would expect that such imposing, project-related organisational frames would adversely affect the outcome of a translation (cf. Wilt 2003: 46; Wilt and Wendland 2008: 107ff).

The organisational frame included the following difficulties: linguistic – there was not a written word in Setswana, let alone an alphabet or grammar book to aid a translator in language learning, or a mother tongue speaker literate enough to help revise; economic – hunger, thirst, low salary, shortage of supplies from the Cape Town headquarters of the LMS and tiring travel by ox-wagon regardless of distance; environmental – constant fear of predators, and malaria which gave missionaries fever, some of which was fatal; political – inter tribal wars and intimidation as well as attempts at expulsion by Batswana chiefs; and exegetical – lack of exegetical and translation aids, not to mention Paratext or Translator’s Workplace. As it turned out, the exegetical quality of Moffat’s translation was generally lower than that of Bibles made in subsequent eras owing to such difficulties.¹⁵ That is one of the reasons why the immediate era after the missionary period is referred to in this study as the missionary revisions and corrections era.

4.3.2 The Missionary Revisions and Corrections Period

The second era is the missionary revisions and corrections period. It stretches from the publication of the first missionary translations to about 1960/70 and beyond. Rather than mark the end of the missionary revisions period, the point 1960/70 generally marks the onset of the new era of Bible Societies in Bible translation. The revision of Bible translations has overlapped with the other later Bible translation trends and is likely to continue indefinitely. That aside, the mission organisations that had published the first Bibles soon appointed reviewers who were more theologically and linguistically competent together with the help of well educated mother tongue assistants (cf. Mojola 2002: 205). Translation was still undertaken by missionary societies before Bible Societies assumed the oversight of translations.¹⁶ Corrections were made with respect to orthographies, grammar, exegetical errors and format, and new translation projects in the same language were started (*ibid.*). The missionary revisions usually communicated better than the original translations, but they

¹⁵ A comparison of the three versions in chapter six gives credence to this judgement.

¹⁶ The information in this sentence and the next two sentences comes from Mojola 2002: 205.

generally adhered to the literal method of translating (Mojola 2002: 205). Moffat and Wookey exemplify the pattern of revision and correction that marks this era, with Wookey moving further than Moffat towards making the translation communicate better. Moffat was revised several times until 1890, maintaining strictly the word for word approach.¹⁷ The Wookey project was pioneered in 1897 to make “a complete revision of the [Moffat] Bible,” although it developed into an independent translation (Smit 1970: 199-200). It [Wookey] too, underwent revisions immediately after publication.

One of the marks of the missionary revisions and corrections period of Bible translation in African languages, at least as observable in Wookey’s translation of Ruth, appears to be inconsistency in methodology. It is literal and verbose at the same time in such a way that it breaks the rules of both formal correspondence and functional equivalence. An example where Wookey’s methodology is unhelpfully literal is its word for word rendering of Naomi’s question in Ruth 1:11, viz., “Are there still sons for me in my bowels?” For a largely amplified version, in this instance, this Bible surprisingly omits to explain the meaning of the text in full for Setswana audiences. Yet, at other times, Wookey is explanatory to the point of ignoring the ST’s apparent meaning. One such example is its rendering of the *goel*. Throughout the book of Ruth, it avoids using a single term for the *goel*, probably because of the assumption that just one Setswana word is not explanatory enough. Wookey provides various long phrases like *monna yo o gaufi le rona ka go tsalwa* (the man who is close to us by birth), *monna yo o gaufi le rona* (the man who is close to us) and *wa losika gaufi le rona ka go tsalwa* (a relative close to us by birth),¹⁸ while the other Bibles translate consistently *mogolodi* and *morekolodi* (deliverer/redeemer) (Ruth 2:20, 3:9, 3:12, 4:3 and 4:8). In view of such deficiencies in methodology, it is no surprise that revising these Bibles would start immediately and continue until a Bible fell out of use. It may be predicted that revision work on versions from the first era will be revived throughout the next eras, unless the Bible is no longer in use. Wookey, for example, underwent immediate and constant revision since it was published until well into the third era, the Bible Societies period. For that reason, the second era tends to overlap with the third era, discussed in the next section.

¹⁷ For the story of who revised the Moffat, Wookey and BSSA Bibles, cf. below the sections “Revisions of Moffat,” “Revisions of Wookey” and “Revisions of BSSA.”

¹⁸ That meaning is appropriate only for 2:1, but not for the other five occurrences.

4.3.3 The Bible Societies Period

The third period, viz., the Bible Societies period, can be traced from around 1960/70 up to the present. It is called the Bible Societies era because of the work of United Bible Societies (UBS) and the establishment of national Bible Societies or their auxiliaries in Africa. The UBS generally took on the tasks of oversight, coordination, sponsorship and publication of translations (Hermanson 2002: 7-12). The Bible Society of South Africa, for example, was formed in 1965 to provide such an organisational framework for translation projects in the southmost countries of Africa, most of which were carried out by churches and mission organisations (*ibid.*). The UBS thus provided an overarching organisational frame for the BSSA and translation projects.¹⁹ The period of the BSSA and UBS introduced the trends of large translation committees, translator training seminars/workshops and inter-denominational translation consultants (Hermanson 2002: 7-12; Makutoane and Naude 2009: 83-84). Translation was normally done by a mixture of mother tongue speakers, mission-appointed European translators and coordinators, and consultants appointed by Bible societies, although the non-mother tongue speakers still formed the bulk of the committees (cf. Mojola 2002: 205). Mother tongue speakers usually lacked the right level of education and training to carry out the projects independently. The Setswana Bible that was published in the early phase of the Bible Societies period is the one referred to in this study as the BSSA Bible (1970). It is referred to as BSSA because, unlike Moffat and Wookey which were published by the British and Foreign Bible Society (BFBS) in London, it was published by the Bible Society of South Africa in Cape Town (Coldham 1975: 135).

In the beginning of the Bible Societies era, translation approaches were still prescriptive, but were progressing from literal to more interpretive translation. Nida's meaning-based dynamic equivalence was introduced to translation projects around the world (Hermanson 2002: 9, 11; Munday 2008: 38-44). The heyday of Nida's approach began around the date of the publication of *TAPOT* (1969) which "provided the framework within which all of Bible translation has taken place, both within and outside of the UBS," leading to some "normative developments" in the field of Bible translation (Pattermore 2007: 219). Nida's influence went

¹⁹ Wycliffe Bible Translators (or SIL), however, was not involved in this region of Africa during this period.

beyond Bible translation – it affected “translation theory in general” (Gentzler 2001: 45).²⁰ Nida travelled the world, speaking at conferences and training translators. In South Africa, he spoke at a conference in 1967 and trained translators at seminars in 1979, 1982 and 1985 (Hermanson 2002: 9).

By the time Nida began to hold seminars in South Africa (1967), the Setswana manuscript of BSSA had already been handed over to the Bible Society (in 1964) for publication (Smit 1970: 203). The start of the BSSA project can be dated decades earlier than that because the translators “finished the New Testament and the Psalms in [...] 1938” (Brummerhoff 1959: 1). Therefore, although BSSA is not a word for word translation of the Hebrew and Greek STs, it was not translated according to Nida’s meaning-oriented notion of dynamic equivalence. Its approach could be likened to that described by Hermanson, namely that even as early as the missionary period, “some translators made an attempt towards what would have been regarded at the time to be a more idiomatic rather than literal translation, involving mother tongue speakers and using something of the genius of the language into which they were translating” (Hermanson 2002: 7-8).²¹ Judging from a comparison of the three Bibles’ versions of Ruth, organisational frames have been improving, resulting in progressively better communication in Bibles.

The Bible Societies era can be currently thought to be at a post-Nida stage. This phase could be said to be marked by two prominent trends. The first trend starts with the realisation that “Bible translation needs have changed over the years,” and there is now a range of needs and interests among both the target audiences (TAs) that speak the same language, and audiences that do not yet have a Bible (cf. Sterk 2004: 177). Such a range includes formal correspondence Bibles, idiomatic Bibles, study Bibles, children’s Bibles, pew Bibles,

²⁰ Nida kept on refining his model, which culminated in the publication of *FOLTA* (1986). Pattermore notes that “If *TAPOT* was the ‘Bible’ of UBS translation activity, then [...] *FOLTA* was the authorised commentary” (2007: 224).

²¹ Hermanson (2002: 12) observes that the Setswana language does not have a dynamic/functional equivalence Bible. Indeed, one is restrained from calling BSSA a dynamic, idiomatic or communication oriented Bible because modern scholarship hesitates to categorise Bibles. For example, some would say that the NRSV is dynamic while others, including its translators, would label it as “literal” (Carson 1993: 41). Bratcher’s and Orlinsky’s (1991: 155-177) fairly descriptive story of the RSV avoids labels like free, literal, formal, dynamic, functional and others that could categorise the RSV, for example.

common language Bibles, audio Bibles and Bibles for the deaf (cf. Hermanson 2002: 12,13; cf. Van der Merwe 2012). The English speaking European context has produced a number of translations to meet different needs and interests, many of which are currently being used in English speaking sub-Saharan Africa. The translation project of the new Bible in Afrikaans is a good illustration of an attempt to meet a special need in a Southern African language (Van der Merwe 2012: 1). This project is working on a direct translation which endeavours to provide Afrikaans churches with a Bible that is oriented towards the ST's language and culture.²² Direct translations and study Bibles are needed in the rest of African national languages including Setswana.

The second trend in the contemporary phase of the Bible Societies period is scholarship's active interest in inter-disciplinary interaction and the interplay of contextual factors during translation. Such an interest was demonstrated in the exploration of the ST audience's culture and worldview, the ST's linguistic and textual contexts, institutions overseeing the project, the target audience's culture, target audience's linguistic context and other communication factors (cf. Snell-Hornby 2006: 58-59; Wilt and Wendland 2008). The above-listed insights from the Bible Societies era have contributed to the inter-disciplinary framework of CFR that I use to analyse the Setswana Bibles.²³

As noted concerning different fields in section 1.5, scholarship's new multi-disciplinary focus is likely to translate into effective tools for the analysis of translations and for good road maps for future projects. It will be interesting to observe, for example, the notion of CFR being applied not only in the analysis of translations, but also in the actual rendering of translations.²⁴ The sections that follow will discuss different circumstances in the history of Bible translation in Setswana that will ultimately yield a more specific organisational CFR

²² A direct translation is best perceived as a rendering that strives to produce all the linguistic features and conceptual world of the source text as intended for the original audience (Van der Merwe 2012: 5). This approach avoids making semantic compromises that accommodate the target audience.

²³ Wilt and Wendland (2008) can be credited with refining the concept of frame analysis for Bible translation, which they have coined Cognitive or Contextual Frames of Reference (cf. also Wendland 2008 and 2010). The concept of "frame analysis" was originally conceived in the field of linguistics by Goffman (1974), but it has since been refined and diversified by scholars in various disciplines.

²⁴ Cf., for example, Wendland's (2010) illustrative exposition of John 1:29 for Bible translation using the notion of CFR and Alfredo's (2010) analysis of the translation of *hesed* in the Lomwe version of the book of Ruth.

than the ones described in previous sections. They will present an organisational CFR for Moffat, followed by Wookey and, finally, BSSA.

4.4 Background of Bible Translation in Setswana

In May 1813, Rev. John Campbell, an LMS missionary based in Cape Town, who had sent missionaries to different parts of Southern Africa, visited the various mission stations until he reached Klaar Water, a missionary settlement north of the Orange River. There, the missionaries described to him “a large and populous city [called Latakkoo/Dithakong], which contains 1500 houses and 8000 people” (LMS 1814: 7). He agreed with the chief of the city/village to send missionaries there. Further information given to him was that there were more than twenty clusters north of the village speaking the same language as the people of Dithakong (LMS 1814: 8). Evangelistic work in the large area would later result in the three Bible versions in the Setswana language. Thus, Dithakong was a strategic place for Bible translation in Setswana. The sections below present the story of the three Bibles.

4.4.1 The Moffat Bible

The name “Moffat” has a significant place in the history of Bible translation, being associated with the first complete Bible in a Bantu language. That history can be traced precisely from 1825, when he translated a catechism along with John 3 and other passages of Scripture into Setlhaping, the Setswana dialect of the Batlhaping people of the Dithakong area (Moffat 1842: 444). This first ever set of translations in Setswana was sent to Cape Town in 1825 to be printed, but after printing, it was accidentally sent to London instead of Moffat’s base in Kuruman (*ibid.*). It was published by the LMS in 1826 (Coldham 1966: 694). Judging by the radical change that these texts later had on the Kuruman mission,²⁵ this accident significantly disrupted Moffat’s work. The next publication was the book of Luke in 1830. In 1840, the complete New Testament (NT) in Setswana was published by the BFBS. A year later, the NT with Psalms followed. Finally, in 1857, the whole Bible was completed and published (Hermanson 2002: 13). The events described in the section that follow will provide more of the contextual frame of reference of the Moffat Bible.

²⁵ Upon hearing the Scriptures read in their mother tongue and singing songs written in their own language, the Batlhaping immediately seemed to like the Gospel message. That invigorated Moffat’s translation work. Cf. “The Beginning of Translation Work” several pages below.

4.4.1.1 The Life of Robert Moffat until Settlement at Dithakong

Robert Moffat was born in Scotland in 1795.²⁶ His first experience with schooling was when he was taught the alphabet and “the short catechism” (Moffat 1889: 2).²⁷ When he finished the catechism, he ran off to work as a sailor, but eventually left that trade. At the age of about 11, he and his elder brother went to school to learn writing and book keeping. He left that school after six months, the last time he would ever set foot in a classroom (Moffat 1889: 2). His religious education came primarily from sermons at church services. About 1809, when he was 14, Moffat became an apprentice gardener, and afterwards found employment as a gardener in London, England (Moffat 1889: 3-7). His new environment abounded with the preaching of Methodists who, together with the concept of evangelism, were a new development in the country. He became a devout Christian. He confesses that he “read the Bible and the Bible only, for [his] stock consisted chiefly of works on gardening and botany” (Moffat 1889: 12).

One day when he was in town, Moffat saw a placard that announced that a missionary meeting was to be held, but the meeting was past. The desire to be a missionary gripped him from then onwards. He realised the difficulty of his prospects because he had “never been at a college or an academy” (Moffat 1889: 13). He searched for the chairman of the meeting, whose name was recorded in the placard. The chairman turned out to be a sender of missionaries to different continents. He made arrangements for Moffat to become a gardener for one of the other reverends, seemingly for observation’s sake (Moffat 1889: 15). A summary of his time in preparation for the mission field says that, “whatever gifts may have been bestowed upon Robert to fit him for his work as a missionary, it certainly could not be said that they were in the form of collegiate opportunities” (Moffat 1889: 17). He had no knowledge of biblical languages, biblical interpretation or translation.

Moreover, no one foresaw that he would go into Bible translation in the mission field. The scenario where “In preparation for their work, many missionaries studied Hebrew, Greek and

²⁶ The information in this paragraph and the next come from Moffat 1889: 2-20, unless a different source is indicated.

²⁷ Moffat underwent this course “to learn to read” from “a parish schoolmaster” by the name of William Mitchell (Moffat 1889: 2). Thus, the catechism was primarily for practising how to read and write rather than religious purposes.

Latin” (Hermanson 2002: 7), did not apply to Moffat. Moffat might have been posted to Polynesia with a young friend of his, but someone on the sending committee decided that the two were too young to be paired together (Moffat 1889: 20). On October 18, 1816, twenty one year old Robert Moffat sailed to South Africa to be a missionary, sent by the LMS to meet a general need for missionaries (Jones, Reyneke and Sandilands 1989: 1). Events following his arrival threatened to prevent him from becoming a missionary to Southern Africa or from working among the Batswana.

Upon his arrival, Governor Charles Somerset in Cape Town refused to allow him into the interior of South Africa to work in the mission field, as part of his (Somerset’s) government’s new plan to prohibit any missionaries from going anywhere further than the Cape Colony (Moffat 1889: 21-22). Thus, Moffat was stalled in Cape Town for eight months until an influential individual, Mr. George Thom (whom Moffat had befriended by chance during the delay) convinced the governor to waive his new policy (Moffat 1834: 178; Moffat 1889: 23). This delay would prove advantageous for translation work later, for Moffat used the eight months to learn the Dutch language (cf. also Sundkler and Steed 2000: 429). In the mission field, he was able to consult the Dutch Bible alongside the English ones during translation into Setswana (Smit 1970: 196). It is possible that if his translation were to be examined in greater detail, some traces of the Dutch Bible would occasionally show. Such influence did not show in the shifts that I investigated. Because of a limited scope, my analysis focuses on the book of Ruth only, and I could only pick a small sample from it.²⁸

Moffat had not been trained in Greek or Hebrew, so his Bible “had not been translated from the original languages, but from the English version” (Muller 1958: 2). An analysis of Moffat’s translation in chapter six of this thesis betrays a significant dependence on the KJV so that he seems to have used it as his ST. Thus, the KJV was an important textual and organisational frame of reference in the translation of the Moffat Bible.

As already discussed above, Moffat was initially posted to Namaqualand, but after some months, he observed that this base was unsuited for a mission station and so he searched the Damara and Griqua regions for a better area (Moffat 1842: 116). He gave up after many

²⁸ The same reasons may be postulated for why my analysis of Wookey and BSSA may not show traces of some Bibles that they could be hypothesised to have used such as Pedi and Afrikaans Bibles.

months of futile travel and settled back at Namaqualand after all. Nonetheless, during his visit to Cape Town to obtain supplies, his superiors decided to send him to Dithakong to work among the Batswana (Moffat 1842: 180). He objected at length, but was immediately transferred to Dithakong of the Batlhaping in fulfillment of the longstanding agreement between Mr. Campbell and the chief. Yet again, the application for him to go there was refused, so he withdrew from Dithakong to live with another missionary in Griquatown. After several months, the objection of the authorities was lifted, and he set off for Dithakong in May 1821 to establish his mission base there (Schapera 1951: xiii; Sundkler and Steed 2000: 429). He followed the Batlhaping and established another mission station among them when they went to resettle in the New Dithakong, later renamed Kuruman (Jones et al. 1989: 1).

4.4.1.2 Challenges to Evangelisation and Translation

Moffat's mandate and initial goal were to evangelise the indigenous people. He faced long lasting challenges in his initial endeavor of evangelism and his later goal of translation. According to his interpretation, the Batlhaping's worldview concerning God, spirituality and virtually all areas of life, was antagonistic to evangelisation (Moffat 1842: 256-297). The Batlhaping believed that the Bible was alive because it could speak and be spoken to, and that it had great magical powers to scare off diseases and sorcerers as well as perform many other mysterious acts (Cryer 1979: 77-78; cf. West 2009). Evangelisation was so futile that even after many years, the natives still ridiculed the Gospel and tried to expel Moffat, regarding him as a bad omen that brought prolonged droughts (cf. Moffat 1842: 295, 472, 478). There was no apparent spiritual change in any individual. Political instability, primarily caused by tribal wars, presented yet another difficulty. It forced the Moffats, the Batlhaping and surrounding Batswana clusters to flee their bases several times, which caused Moffat irreversible setbacks (cf. Moffat 1889: 74-92; Sundkler and Steed 2000: 427).²⁹ Linguistic challenges were also daunting (cf. Moffat 1842: 291-294). He found no single Setswana word on paper, so he had to learn the language aurally and orally. However, there were no Batlhaping with an adequate grasp of English to help him, so it took him years to acquire the language. The situation also led to great linguistic blunders in his sermons and daily speech (*ibid.*). In his translation, certain renderings like the transliteration *tu* for two (Ruth 1:1) and the word *Semoaba* for *Bamoaba/ba Moaba* (of Moab) (Ruth 1:4) illustrate the difficulties of

²⁹ In particular, the Ndebeles and the Mmanthasi, who were fleeing from the armies of Shaka the Zulu king, wiped out many settlements in their path of flight, including some Batswana villages.

his linguistic frame of reference. The construction *Semoaba* (Moabite-ish) is too impersonal for the Hebrew ST's personal adjective,³⁰ which leads to clumsy communication. The problem with *tu* is that it is an English loan word for a very common Setswana word *babedi*. Moffat might have been compelled by the illiterate state of his target audience to make a decision that might have been helpful at the moment, but which was linguistically inappropriate.³¹

4.4.1.3 The Beginnings of Translation Work

Radical changes began after a missionary visitor suggested that Moffat must replace the Dutch hymns with Setswana ones so that Gospel truths in the Setswana language could be fully implanted in the hearts and minds of the Batswana (Moffat 1842: 478). Moffat then translated the Dutch hymns into Setswana, and he also translated Dr. William Brown's catechism (Scripture Lessons) of 136 questions and answers, viz., *Buka ea Pocho ea Tuto le Poluko tsa Yesu Kereste*³² (Lubbe 2009: 21), the Lord's Prayer and other related material (cf. Coldham 1966: 698).³³ After the introduction of Setswana singing and oral interviews based on the catechism, he realised that there was now greater concentration and participation during church services (Moffat 1842: 495-497).³⁴ Moreover, people sang the hymns even in their homes (from memory, initially, since they were still illiterate), and thereby could be

³⁰ It was constructed from the class 4 prefix *se-* and the noun *Moaba* (Cole 1955: 364). Wookey and BSSA prefer the class 1 prefixes *mo-* and *ba-* which are strictly personal (Cole 1955: 70).

³¹ It is unlikely that Moffat did not know the common Setswana numerals *bedi* (two), *tharo* (three), *supa* (seven), and *some* (ten), for which he uses transliterations from English, such as *tu* (1:1; 3:1) *sekes* (3:15,17) *seven* (4:15) and *ten* (1:4; 4:2). It seems that Moffat introduced transliterated English numerals into Setswana in order to teach the Batswana arithmetic, among other literacy skills needed to read the Bible. Although reading and writing were not part of the sociolinguistic frame of reference of the Batswana, numeracy was. Yet, arithmetic was more abstract and often dealt with much larger numbers than the Batswana had previously needed. Along the same lines, Sandilands (also an LMS Bible translator) says: "The old Bantu system of numeration was logical and adequate for the limited demands of a pastoral and unlettered people, but it is too clumsy to be an effective instrument for modern trading or money matters. Especially is this so in the case of numbers upwards of twenty; the English numerals are increasingly being used, often with modifications of pronunciation. (E.g. *dikgomo di le naene; di le sekestini; di le toenteterii*, 9, 16, 23 oxen)" (Sandilands 1953: 110).

³² Literally, it means "The Book of Questions of the Teaching and Salvation of Jesus Christ."

³³ This is the first collection that was sent to London by accident in 1825. It arrived at Kuruman in 1826.

³⁴ Apparently, the Batswana had not understood or agreed that a church service was time for paying attention, but instead preferred to chat and carry out small household chores during the service.

reminded of Gospel concepts at any place and time. That spurred him on with the work of literacy schools, which eventually enabled the people to read the hymns and write answers on the Scripture lesson worksheets which he had translated into Setswana (Moffat 1842: 570). He hastened to finish translating the Gospel of Luke and in 1830, went to print it in Cape Town. There, he failed to find printing services, so someone assisted him, over several days, to use the printing press in the government office (Jones et al. 1989: 1). Previously, Setswana orthography was virtually non-existent. He “set out to provide [...] a systematic orthography [...] for Setswana” (Jones 1975: 1).³⁵ It is commendable that Moffat’s orthography sufficed for the readers of his Bible. His linguistic CFR, however, led to imperfections in this orthography which are observable in his renderings.³⁶

4.4.1.4 Translating and Printing at Kuruman

The experience of printing the book of Luke for himself gave Moffat – and Dr. John Philip – the realisation that he could actually produce the Scriptures in Setswana entirely on his own (cf. Jones et al. 1989: 2). Dr. Philip gave him a large printing press and he returned to Kuruman with both the printed copies of the Gospel of Luke and that priceless possession for production (Jones et al. 1989: 2). By simply being in the personal use of the Batswana, the book of Luke contributed radically to the genuine conversion of the first Batswana Christians (cf. Moffat 1842: 571). Thus, Moffat commenced to translate the first Setswana Bible, spurred on by the realisation that their reading Scriptures for themselves could evangelise the Batswana much more effectively than listening to sermons only. Labouring day and night at the printing press at his mission station in Kuruman, Moffat was able to complete printing the Setswana NT in 1838, eight years after he first went to Cape Town to print the Gospel of

³⁵ Jones (1975: 1) reports that “by the time the complete Setswana Bible was published in 1857 Moffat had devised a serviceable and consistent orthography for the language.”

³⁶ For example, in Ruth 1:1, Moffat writes “spend the day” as *tlola* (without *h*), which means “jump,” instead of *tlhola*. Another example in Ruth 1:1 is Moffat’s *na* (which would mean “to rain” in Setswana), but which should have been *naa* (be). English apparently influenced this orthography because English pronounces the *h* sound in *tlola* even though it is not written. As for *na*, English pronunciation seems to ignore a doubled *n* sound (for example, giving the *n* sound in “announce” and “another” the same length) whilst Setswana prolongs the *n* sound in *naa* (a syllabic nasal). That could lead to distraction and/or misinterpretation. Later, when Setswana literature rose in secular circles, dissatisfaction with Moffat’s orthography led to the development of different orthographies.

Luke.³⁷ Again, when he arrived in Cape Town to duplicate the copies,³⁸ he found the printing services deficient. This time, Dr. Philip decided to ship him and his family to London to have the Setswana NT duplicated and bound (Jones et al. 1989: 3). The work was financed and published by the BFBS. Its first consignment of 500 copies was brought by the famous David Livingstone in 1841 on his first journey to Africa (Hermanson 2002: 13). David Livingstone later became Moffat's son-in-law.

At the time when he translated the NT, Moffat had two colleagues at the Kuruman station, Roger Edwards and Robert Hamilton (Moffat 1889: 146). It is not clear why these missionaries did not assist him in the work of translation. Edwards helped with the printing work and the literacy schools, then went to live among a different Tswana group (Moffat 1889: 146; 168). Hamilton did the maintenance work of the mission and some occasional preaching (*ibid.*).³⁹ It was the young missionary who lived with them later, William Ashton, of whom it is said that he assisted with translation work, but that was at the time when Moffat translated his last batch of the OT and after the book of Ruth was already published (Coldham 1964: 697; Lubbe 2009: 28).⁴⁰ Moffat finished translating the whole Bible in 1857. Again it went to England to be duplicated, bound and published.

The impact of the gift of the printing press cannot be overlooked. Before this, Moffat would have had to travel several times about a thousand miles on an ox-drawn wagon to Cape Town to print, which would cost him time, energy and resources. Moreover, there were dangers

³⁷ The sources available to me during research were vague concerning how Moffat involved mother tongue speakers in testing, proofreading and revision. They mention that he received unreliable assistance from them when learning the language (cf. Moffat 1842: 291-294). It is specific, however, about Rev. William Ashton helping him revise the last batch of his OT translation (Coldham 1964: 697; Moffat 1889: 182). Ample reference to specific review work on the Moffat Bible by different reviewers focuses on the time after he retired to England.

³⁸ Sources do not explain, so I postulate that the reason Moffat still had to go to Cape Town and London was that he expected them to have facilities and manpower for mass duplication and book binding. It would probably strain Moffat's press to produce enough copies of the NT to sell to all the interested Batswana tribes. England proved to be the best place for such publishing and binding services.

³⁹ Hamilton preached in Dutch through an interpreter. Even until his old age, he was "never able to acquire the Setswana language" (Moffat 1889: 146).

⁴⁰ Other missionaries who stayed shortly at Kuruman and then, like Edwards, left to evangelise other Batswana tribes were William Ross and David Livingstone (Moffat 1889: 168).

from wild animals such as lions, buffaloes and snakes. Besides, if he kept posting the scripts to be printed in his absence, they could get lost as they once did. Without the printing press, these adverse circumstantial frames of reference might have possibly sapped his zeal and made him compromise on quality, or quit altogether, as his predecessor John Evans had done.

4.4.1.5 Revisions of Moffat

From 1863 and even after he returned to England, Moffat continued revising his translation, making the orthography more uniform and correcting linguistic and typographical mistakes.⁴¹ The Moffat Bible was constantly being reissued because of its high demand, even as he was still trying to complete its revision. In 1867, an edition with orthographic changes was made of the 1840 NT. In 1872, Moffat supervised, in England, the printing of the first single volume of the Bible in Setswana, which continued to be in use decades after another Setswana version (Wookey) was made. In 1877, a corrected edition by Roger Price (one of Moffat's two sons-in-law) and, later, John Brown, was published. In 1890, John Mackenzie made yet another edition of the Moffat Bible with corrections. Rev. A. J. Wookey made a revision for a pocket edition of the NT in a new orthography in 1891. In 1894, the NT was published afresh, edited by Roger Price to incorporate a new spelling and orthography.

Smit asserts that despite the above mentioned revisions, “the old Moffat translation, with certain adaptations as to spelling and orthography, had to be followed [or reproduced]” (1970: 200). As far as my comparison of the 1857 (original) and 1890 (latest) versions of the book of Ruth is concerned, indeed the revisions avoided correcting exegetical errors or changing the vocabulary and syntax of the original Moffat Bible. The following are examples of the kind of revisions observable in the 1890 version. The differences represent, generally, corrections of orthography and pronunciation, slight changes towards a more typically Setswana dialect and grammar, changes on font size and type, and corrections of vocabulary that were made to improve Moffat 1857 as follows: 1. The title of the book was changed from *Buka Ea Rute* to *Lokwalo Loa Ga Ruthe*; 2. Spelling of the common conjunction *vav* ‘and’ was changed from *Mi* to *Me* (e.g., 1:1); 3. *Lehatsing* was given an *h* to become *lehatshing* (e.g., 1:1); 4. *Mothatietle* was changed to *Mothata-eotlhe* (1:21); 5. *R* was changed to *d* in words that take the *d* sound in standard Setswana (e.g., *dihala* for *rihala* and *mosadi* for *mosari* in 1:1); 6. *L* was changed to *n* for the particles “was” and “had” to fit standard Setswana (e.g., *e ne e le* for *e le*

⁴¹ The information in this paragraph is taken from Smit 1970: 199, unless a different source is indicated.

e le in 1:2, and *a na a* for *a la a* in 1:6); 7. *Gone* was changed to *gonne* as fits standard Setswana pronunciation (e.g., 1:6); 8. The label *KHAOLO* (CHAPTER) for each chapter was replaced by a bold number on the first verse; and 9. The font was shrunk and sharpened so that a full page covered about 22 verses instead of 19. Each revision was received by Setswana speakers with enthusiasm and was sold out within a few years, thus prompting another slight revision and publication.⁴² The popular momentum of the Moffat Bible continued long into the era of the Wookey Bible. Although Wookey was published in 1908, its rise to popularity was very slow due to the widespread use of the Moffat Bible. Wookey's rise to popularity can be claimed with certainty only as late as 1956, when a large reprint was requested from London (Van Arkel 1956: 1). The story of the Wookey Bible follows in the next section.

4.4.2 The Wookey Bible

4.4.2.1 The Translation of the Wookey Bible

In 1897, the Reverends from the LMS, J. Brown, R. Price and A. J. Wookey were appointed by the Bechuanaland District Committee of the LMS to make a thorough revision of the whole Moffat Bible. Price died, so the task remained with Wookey and Brown (Smit 1970: 200). It is not documented why Brown left the work, but it soon fell in the hands of Wookey. Errors in his work may have resulted from the organisational frame in which he worked, that is, without either a co-translator or consultant at or above his level of training. Apart from target language assistants, he seems to have been accountable to nobody as far as ST interpretation and method of communication were concerned. These errors, the most prominent of which pertain to verbosity (discussed in the paragraphs that follow) led to an

⁴² For example, these orthographic revisions were published as follows (“undisclosed number” in some of the cases means that Smit 1970 did not specify the number of copies): 1867 revision – 1 000 copies of the NT; 1872 revision – 3 000 copies of the whole Bible and 4 000 copies of the NT; 1877 revision – an undisclosed number of copies of the whole Bible; 1890 revision – 10 000 copies of the whole Bible, being primarily a re-issue of the 1877 edition; 1891 revision – an undisclosed number of copies of the NT; 1894 revision – an undisclosed number of copies of the NT, being primarily a re-issue of the 1891 edition; 1898 reprint – an undisclosed number of copies of the whole Bible and the NT, being primarily a reprint of the 1890 Bible and the 1891 NT respectively.

initial prolonged general rejection of his translation by target audiences and stakeholder institutions (cf. the next paragraph).⁴³

Wookey worked full time on the translation for ten years at Kuruman and Vryburg, extensively visiting the Batswana clusters of British Bechuanaland, the Protectorate and the Colony in order to make the translation acceptable to them all (cf. Jones et al. 1989: 5). It is reported that he had a wide-ranging consultation team, as far as tribal and dialectal representations were concerned. The team included Seakgano Ncaga (a Mongwato), Ramochane Monchojang (a Mokwena), Khukhu Mogodi (a Mohurutshe), Gaositwe Gaobepe (a Motlhwaro), and Stuurman Morolong (a Morolong) respectively (*ibid.*). It appears that the Wookey translation project endeavoured to cater for the dialects and cultures of Batswana in general. That can be deduced from the variety of groups represented in the list above, especially the presence of a Mongwato, whose group is more than 200 kilometres further than the circle of clusters where Wookey was based.⁴⁴ Consequently, although the dialect is known officially to be Setlhaping, it can be assumed that the Setswana of the Wookey Bible is wide-ranging.⁴⁵

By 1906, Wookey had finished translating, so he headed to England to print the second version of the Bible in Setswana. The supposed revision was so thorough that Wookey's Bible became an independent translation from Moffat's. In 1908, the Wookey Bible was published in London by the BFBS (Smit 1970: 200). Smit's (1970: 200) review is that "Wookey's translation used a far better orthography than that of Moffat. On the other hand, Moffat's translation was far easier to understand generally, while Wookey's, as far as the language was concerned, was mainly limited to the Setlhaping dialect, and was much too verbose." He surmises that these are the reasons why Wookey "was never generally accepted" (*ibid.*). For reasons that are explained below, this review is generally inaccurate.

⁴³ Moffat, who also translated his Bible virtually alone, would probably have faced the same rejection if the Setswana audiences had already had a Bible.

⁴⁴ The absence of a border between South Africa and Botswana must have made the thought of reaching all Batswana tribes more natural than presently.

⁴⁵ Cf. "Language and Dialect" in the previous chapter.

Smit's summary of Wookey's weaknesses rather echoes that of Professor D. T. Cole who observed that Wookey had the weaknesses of a restricted dialect, an obsolete orthography and clumsy communication (cf. the discussion below).⁴⁶ My analysis of Moffat in chapter six reveals that Moffat had even more serious weaknesses of restricted dialect, obsolete orthography and clumsy communication than Wookey. Moffat's word for word renderings were often awkward, broke grammar rules and left concepts unexplained. Wookey is much more idiomatic than Moffat. Jones et al.'s (1989: 6) opinion of the Wookey Bible is that "[it] is a very fine piece of work, and has remained the Bible of the Batswana for the last eighty years."⁴⁷ Generally, Wookey improved on the areas of interpretation where Moffat fell short.⁴⁸ Unlike Smit, however, Cole was not comparing Wookey against Moffat, but was comparing Wookey against two newly translated NTs (cf. Hawthorn 1960: 1).⁴⁹ One is tempted to postulate that, coming at the launch of the BSSA Bible (1970), Smit's unfavourable assessment of Wookey attempts to justify why Wookey should be discontinued in favour of BSSA.

The continued preference of Moffat over Wookey was probably because of the latter's wordiness. Wookey has frequent features of a paraphrastic Bible, although these sometimes make no apparent contribution to a more accurate interpretation of the text. At times, it causes

⁴⁶ Smit's review, however, represents an accurate comparison between Wookey and BSSA. As the discussion of BSSA aims to prove, BSSA (1970) had overwhelming advantages over Moffat (1857) and Wookey (1908).

⁴⁷ This review came a year before the new major revision of Wookey was expected to be published (instead, it was published in 1992). Some readers may, therefore, regard it as a marketing gimmick. Instead, it is a fact that works well for marketing purposes. The fact remains that Wookey replaced Moffat in popular use. Even presently, BSSA has not managed to supplant Wookey – both BSSA and Wookey are currently popular among Setswana audiences.

⁴⁸ For example, where the Hebrew ST refers to "our relative" in 3:1, Moffat's word for word rendering *tsala ya rona ya madi* (our blood friend) is confusing while Wookey's *wa lesika la rona* (our relative) is referentially accurate.

⁴⁹ These were BSSA's and Sandilands' NTs (Hawthorn 1960: 1). In 1956, Rev. Sandilands of the LMS in Bechuanaland was appointed by the LMS to make a light revision of the NT of Wookey to celebrate the centenary of the Moffat Bible (Jones et al. 1989: 7). Instead, he made a radical revision, as far as sentence construction, dialect and orthography were concerned. At that time, the BSSA NT had been completed, and the translators were still working on the OT (Brummerhoff 1959:1; 1961). For certain organisational reasons, the BFBS wanted to know which version among BSSA, Sandilands and Wookey communicated best, as far as Setswana language was concerned, so they sought Professor Cole's advice.

a distraction. In most verses in Ruth, Wookey has a higher word count than the other translations. A comparison of the three Bibles' rendering of Ruth 1:1, "Now it happened that during the days of the judging of the judges," can illustrate this verbosity. The three Bibles translate the clause as follows (the English equivalent is given under each Setswana *seme*):

Wookey – *Me ga dihala e rile mo metlheng ya ha baatlhodi ba athola*
Now it happened it happened in times of when judges were judging

BSSA – *E rile ka malatsi a puso ya baatlhodi*
It happened in days of reign of judges

Moffat – *Me ga dihala ka basiamisi ba siamisa*
Now it happened when correctors were correcting

Counting the *semes* in the preceding sentences, Wookey is found to be four *semes* longer than BSSA and five longer than Moffat. Having observed that Moffat's main weakness was that it was not clear enough interpretively and communicatively, it appears that the Wookey project set out to correct that weakness – to be as clear and communicative as possible.⁵⁰ In the end, it seems that Wookey tried too hard.

In accordance with Smit's review, my analysis of the two Bibles found Wookey to be much easier to read than the original Moffat because of a more advanced orthography. The orthographic and phonological differences discussed between Moffat 1857 and 1890 above in the section "Revisions of Moffat" exemplify the same differences between Moffat 1857 and Wookey 1908. My analysis indicates that Wookey 1908 and Moffat 1890 used the same orthography. Concerning dialect, however, the differences between the two versions of Ruth are so microscopic that an audience could not really prefer one over the other on the basis of

⁵⁰ I could only postulate this *skopos* for Wookey from an examination of his renderings rather than from bibliographical sources. In this research, I often failed to find the details of Wookey's *skopos* in bibliographical sources. For Moffat, I had access to several sources based on his diaries from which I reconstructed his *skopoi* whilst for BSSA I had access to sources on microfiche at the BSSA library in Belville, South Africa. Of course, it was not possible to find all the details of the *skopos* of each Bible.

dialect. Both Moffat and Wookey used Setlhaping, so the problem of dialect applied to both Bibles, namely, that Setlhaping was spoken in “a very restricted area south of Kuruman” (Coldham 1966: 697, 700; Hawthorn 1960: 1). The few differences I observed actually indicate the opposite of Smit’s evaluation. Wookey can be placed closer to a more widely spoken Setswana dialect than Moffat. Moffat uses a less representative dialect. An example is its use of *monona* (man/husband), which belongs to the Sepedi and Sekgalagadi dialects (Van der Merwe and Schapera 1943: 17), while Wookey uses *monna*, which is more widely used in Setswana (Ruth 1:1). Other examples from Ruth 1:1 are the use of *rihala* (happened) and *mosari* (woman/wife) by Moffat, while Wookey uses *dihala* and *mosadi*. The use of *r* instead of *d* is commonly found in Sekgalagadi, a distinct language that is related to Setswana (cf. Van der Merwe and Schapera 1943: 11 and 15). As mentioned above, Wookey selected a team widely representing the four main divisions of Setswana dialects, particularly to avoid rejection on the basis of a restricted dialect (cf. Hermanson 2002: 13; Jones et al. 1989: 5).

The above mentioned dialectal frame of reference as well as aspects of the 1992 revision (see the section “Revision of Wookey”), may hold the key to the staying power of Wookey for many years to come. Thus, as far as dependence on Setlhaping is concerned, Moffat was more rigid than Wookey. In summary, Wookey had more strengths than Moffat. The belated acceptance of Wookey, therefore, was probably motivated by different reasons than the ones offered in Smit’s review. This possibility is highlighted by the fact that the sales of BSSA’s NT and Psalms were so low that the Society doubted that they should publish the complete Bible (Van Arkel 1960b: 2). The low initial sales did not mean that BSSA was a poorer translation than its predecessor. Rather, at that time, BSSA’s sales were low simply because audiences were used to and preferred Wookey. Professor Cole’s explanation for that phenomenon was that “[it was] an indication of the conservatism of the Native in religious matters. An unintelligible book with sacred associations would be preferable to something [...] new” (Hawthorn 1960: 2).⁵¹ In validation of the idea that poor initial sales do not necessarily mean that a Bible was worse translated than its predecessor, the complete BSSA was received with enthusiasm by audiences a decade later (1970), and “during the next 15 years, 16 reprints had to be made, and more than half a million of these Bibles were reprinted” (Reyneke 1987: 2).

⁵¹ Cole’s opinion is important because it implies real bonds that audiences often have with Bibles, probably concretised by accustomed usage in the churches and even liturgical or catechetical memorization.

At the time when Smit made his review of Wookey, viz., at the launch of BSSA, he was symbolically writing Wookey's obituary, for the plan had been "to let the 'Wookey' version lapse over a period of time with the minimum of offense to anyone and do more to promote the Central Tswana" (Hawthorn 1960: 2). Nonetheless, Wookey's popularity had not abated, its supply was depleted in the market, and 20 000 copies from a new reprint were ordered (Hawthorne 1960: 2; Van Arkel 1956: 1). Smit's evaluation that Wookey "was never really accepted," ignores this rise in popularity (Smit 1970: 200). It appears that the BFBS neither foresaw nor desired the success of Wookey. The BFBS decided before the arrival of BSSA that "if the Tswana Bible must in any way be reprinted, viz., in the new orthography, not the Moffat nor the Wookey version should be printed therein, but a translation from the original should be handed to the printer" (Muller 1958: 2). The overlapping of Moffat's reign with Wookey's, and the pioneering of BSSA before Wookey grew in popularity, had led the BFBS to believe that Wookey had no future. The LMS in Bechuanaland and some in the BFBS advised strongly against the plan to stop publishing Wookey, with Rev Van Arkel (1960b: 2) warning that "It would be unwise to the extreme to even think of discontinuing this version during the next decade." It was decided that the BFBS's interest in Wookey should be restricted to a light revision of the NT only, particularly because Rev. Sandilands had already embarked on it (Van Arkel 1960a). It appears that the Setswana speakers of Bechuanaland did not embrace the new translations because two years after the publication of the new Setswana Bible (BSSA 1970) and Sandilands' revised NT and Psalms, the LMS in Bechuanaland launched the initiative to resurrect Wookey.

4.4.2.2 The Revision of the Wookey Bible

The idea of revising Wookey can be traced to 1912 when the LMS in Bechuanaland collaborated with the Berlin Mission, Dutch Reformed Church (DRC), Dutch Reformed Missions Church and Hermannsburg missions to retranslate Wookey, using the so-called Central Tswana dialect (Brummerhoff 1959: 1; Muller 1958: 2).⁵² That was only four years

⁵² The Dutch Reformed Church was established by Dutch migrants who settled in South Africa. Three congregations split with the main church to form the Dutch Reformed Missions Church for people of racially mixed parentage (coloureds) (Encyclopaedia Britannica Online 2014; cf. Smit 1970: 201). The Hermannsburg Mission (from Germany) started operating in South Africa from 1854 onwards while the Berlin Mission started sending its missionaries to South Africa in 1834 (Lehman 1974: 62-87).

after the publication of Wookey, which all the stakeholder missions had rejected as unsatisfactory (*ibid.*). The Gospels and Acts were published in 1916, but after World War I, cooperation between the missions ceased, with the LMS in Bechuanaland withdrawing from the project (Brummerhoff 1959: 1; cf. Smit 1970: 200). It appears that the LMS in Bechuanaland had changed their opinion about Wookey and decided to keep it in circulation rather than make a replacement for it. The other three missions continued with a replacement project and eventually produced what became known as the Central Tswana Bible or the BSSA Bible (discussed in the next section).

In 1956, more than four decades after their first attempt, the LMS in Bechuanaland revived their old quest for a review of Wookey, with the view to use a more common dialect and a new orthography (Jones et al. 1989: 7). The LMS appointed a committee headed by Rev. A. Sandilands to make a light revision of Wookey, which it would call the Centenary Edition (initially to be published in 1957 to mark the 100th anniversary of Moffat). However, Rev. Sandilands instead made a completely new translation, which was published in 1970 (*ibid.*). Beside Sandilands, native collaborators who contributed their services in this revision included Rev. K. Petso, followed by Rev. J. Leshona, and finally Mr. M. S. Kitchin (Jones et al. 1989: 7). Sandilands retired back to Canada, but continued translating and consulting with his colleagues by post. According to Jones et al.'s review (1989: 8), Sandilands' NT was dynamic and common language oriented, and could be regarded as pointing the way to a future idiomatic Setswana Bible. Sandilands did not use the officially recognised orthography when revising Wookey – he used his own personal orthography, which Hawthorn says was “acceptable to nobody but himself” (1960: 2). Moreover, his NT was similar to BSSA in many ways, and the Bible Society would be unlikely to publish two similar Bibles in the same language. The translators who contributed in the translation of Sandilands' NT were Revs. G. Lowe, J. T. Brown and J. Baumbach (Smit 1970: 200-201).

In 1972, two years after the publication of Sandilands' NT and BSSA, LMS Botswana helped start a Wookey revision which would legitimately remain a Wookey Bible.⁵³ Despite the initial poor reception of the Wookey Bible, its appreciation had grown over the years so that even after a new Setswana Bible version was made (BSSA 1970), “the Wookey Bible [was]

⁵³ Where a source is not indicated in this paragraph and the next, the information is ascribed to Jones et al. 1989: 8-10.

still *the Bible*” for many people (Jones et al. 1989: 8). By then, publication of Moffat had already been stopped due to the realisation that Wookey would be an adequate replacement (Van Arkel 1956: 2). The orthography of Setswana had changed radically over the years, and there was need to reset Wookey in the new orthography.

In that regard, Wookey would be able to keep up with BSSA’s orthography and the orthography approved by modern Setswana audiences.⁵⁴ Towards that goal, revision work on Wookey was begun by a team of mostly mother tongue speakers of Setswana in Botswana, headed by a prolific Motswana linguist and writer, Mr M. Kitchin. Rev. J. Reyneke was the BSSA translation consultant, and Rev. D. Jones joined the project several years later. These two were the only members of European origin, but it seems that their input in the area of exegesis was minor, considering that the revision made virtually no exegetical corrections, at least in as far as the book of Ruth is concerned. My comparison of Ruth 1992 with Ruth 1908 revealed no corrections on exegetical errors, although many such errors are conspicuous (cf. Chapter six and Appendix G). That being said, it can be argued that the context whereby all the revisers resided in Botswana, and whereby the Rev. Dr. J. L. Reyneke had grown up in Botswana, contributed to Wookey 1992 being ideologically a Botswana Bible (cf. Muller 1958: 3).

Ms. M. Tshephe typed out the whole Wookey Bible, adjusting the spelling in the process. The manuscript was marked by Mr. M. Kitchin and typed afresh by Mrs. B. Gaboutloeloe. When Mr. Kitchin died in 1976, the project stopped, and several attempts to revive the project failed. Sources do not disclose it, so I can only hypothesise that Mr. Kitchin was the chief editor of the Wookey orthography, which was almost entirely the only aspect to be revised. It is possible that the other team members could only work part-time on the project, or that they lacked the skills to take his position. An arrangement was finally made with the Botswana Book Centre (BBC) in Gaborone in which a small team was appointed to finish the project. Rev. M. Morolong was appointed as full time reviewer while Mr. Z. Matumo and Mrs. M. Johnson, who were already members of staff of the BBC, were freed to help part time. Rev.

⁵⁴ That orthography is set out in “Tswana: Terminology and Orthography No. 3 (1972)” published by the Tswana Language Committee, Pretoria (Jones 1975: 1-2). It was approved by government education authorities in South Africa and the government of Botswana. These authorities resolved that “only one orthography should prevail throughout the Setswana speaking world” (ibid.).

D. Jones worked as coordinator. Mr. H. Ramolefhe, the secretary of the Bible Society of Botswana, actively participated in meetings of the group where policy matters and major issues were discussed.

The Bible Society of South Africa supervised the work on behalf of the United Bible Societies. This new orthographic edition was published in 1992. It was funded substantially by the Bible Society, and to a smaller degree, the BBC. The Baptist Mission in Botswana made a donation, too. The revisers' primary aim remained that of correcting the orthography, but a few translation errors were corrected and paragraph breaks, speech quotation marks, section headings and cross references (footnoted) were added to keep up with current changes in Bible formatting. However, the reviewers avoided substantial changes. For instance:

“At one stage, the book of Genesis began to change considerably, but the group reminded itself that it has not been charged with a fresh translation, so it reverted to a light, orthographic revision. Readers will see clearly that behind the orthographic and cosmetic changes, this is still the Bible they knew before” (Jones et al. 1989: 10).

Indeed, my analysis of the whole book of Ruth in Wookey 1908 and 1992 reveals similarities *per verbatim* except for orthography, paragraph breaks, chapter titles, and all the above-listed minor changes. My analysis did not discover any corrections of translation errors in Ruth, although chapter six points out several. Thus, the translators seem to have stayed true to their mandate of essentially preserving Wookey.

The context whereby this important work was undertaken by a team of Batswana in Botswana would mark Wookey as a Botswana Bible and later cause an ideological separation between it and BSSA. The revision did not only update orthography, but also drastically revised the dialect to match (and sometimes surpass) the central one used by BSSA. For it went further than BSSA in removing traces of other Bantu languages (especially Sotho) and standardising certain phonological aspects of the language. A comparison of the two versions (based on dialects) that will follow in the next section (on BSSA), will illustrate these changes. The result is that now BSSA has many more traces of Sotho and of a restricted phonology than Wookey does, and Wookey's dialect is now purer than that of BSSA. The current difference between the two Bibles has led to two rival groups, but it appears to meet the needs of the

rival groups, with South African Tswana groups generally preferring BSSA and Botswana ones preferring Wookey.⁵⁵

In conclusion, my observation is that the 1992 revision of Ruth in Wookey takes the middle road between Moffat and BSSA. In formatting, it tends to give titles only to chapters and not to smaller sections. However, the titles often fit only a small fraction of a big chapter, such as the title for Ruth chapter one, viz., “Elimelech and his family migrate to Moab.” That heading applies only to the first five verses of the 22-page long chapter. In the use of notes, Wookey 1992 provides cross references only – and they have been footnoted, as opposed to being placed in the central margin. That presented an opportunity to footnote some fuller explanations, such as the rendering of the *goel* (discussed several pages above). It would be more effective and less tedious to provide a term like *mogolodi* or *morekolodi* (as the other two versions do) and explain its interpretation sufficiently in a footnote. The organisational frames of reference of the revisers were overly restrictive, and sometimes hindered good decision making during translation. Some aspects of this hybridity will be explored further in chapter six. The overall effect of the organisational frame of the missionary revisions period is that it led to the hybrid identity of Wookey.

4.4.3 The BSSA Bible

4.4.3.1 The Translation of the BSSA Bible

When they lost the cooperation of the LMS in Bechuanaland, the Dutch Reformed Church, Dutch Reformed Mission Church, Berlin Mission and Hermannsburg Mission co-wrote a memorandum in 1932 reminding the BFBS that there were important clusters of Batswana which needed a Bible in their dialect (Smit 1970: 201). It was the central cluster of communities from Western Transvaal, the Orange Free State and Bechuanaland (Smit 1970: 201). The rest of the Batswana had the Moffat, Wookey, or Sepedi (Northern Sotho) Bible in accordance with their dialects and geographical locations (*ibid.*).⁵⁶ The translator of the

⁵⁵ Along the joint border of the two countries, however, it may be postulated that the tribes will break this pattern.

⁵⁶ The southern clusters had their Moffat and Wookey Bibles. Since the northern Batswana groups share the same area with the Bapedi, their dialects accommodated Sepedi so that they could use the Sepedi Bible (Jones et al. 1989: 4). The Sekgatla dialect and the context where the Rev. Muller (one of the chief translators) worked among the Batswana of the OFS whose neighbours included the Southern Sotho probably influenced the introduction of certain Sotho forms.

Sepedi Bible, Rev. P. E. Schwellnus, was consulted in the process of making this decision (Smit 1970: 202). The memorandum requested the Bible Society to print and publish the new translation once it was completed (Smit 1970: 201-202). It appears that the Bible Society did not provide a translation consultant for the project, but left it in the hands of its three pioneer missions. Evidently, however, the Bible Society was involved in additional oversight and funding, and eventually in printing and distribution of the Bibles (Smit 1970: 201-203). The Rev. J. L. Reyneke gained a doctorate for his dissertation on Tswana traditional healers and joined the Bible Society of South Africa in 1969, and served as the translation consultant until he retired after the publication of Wookey 1992.

The Central Tswana dialects include Sehurutshe, Sekwena and Sekgatla (Smit 1970: 201). They are called “central” because “they are [spoken] in the Centre of the Batswana population [...] [and] show the least evidence of influence by other Bantu languages such as Sepedi and Sesotho sa ga Mosweswe” (Brummerhoff 1964: 1; Cole 1955: xix; Muller 1958: 1). The primary dialect used was that of the Bahurutshe, who, as already mentioned, are commonly regarded as the most senior group among the Batswana, although they have a small population in comparison with the other groups (Jones et al. 1989: 7). The dialect had the additional advantage over Moffat’s and Wookey’s Setlhaping in that it was the most characteristic dialect of Setswana language since it was spoken by a considerable section of the Setswana speaking population (Brummerhoff 1964: 1). Its orthography was the newly introduced official one used in schools in South Africa (Brummerhoff 1959: 1; Jones et al. 1989: 7). It was the 1937 orthography agreed upon by the four stakeholder education departments, namely, “Cape, OFS, Transvaal and the Bechuanaland Protectorate” (Jones 1975: 1).

My comparison of the three versions of Ruth shows that BSSA 1970 indeed uses a much better orthography and a more characteristically Setswana dialect than Moffat’s 1857 version and the Wookey version of 1908. The advantage of BSSA’s dialect over the other two Bibles can be illustrated with the following examples: 1. For the first person pronoun singular, BSSA uses *ene* (him) instead of Moffat’s and Wookey’s *ena* (e.g., 1:1); 2. BSSA uses *нна* instead of Moffat’s and Wookey’s *dula* for “sit” (e.g. 4:1, 2); and 3. BSSA uses the *f* sound instead of the *h* used by Moffat and Wookey 1908 (e.g., *fa baatlhodi* – when judges, and *lefatsheng* – land, in 1:1 instead of *ha* and *lehatsheng* – for “when” and “land” respectively). BSSA’s choices in the above examples represent pure and characteristic Setswana whilst Moffat’s and

Wookey's represent a restricted dialect (cf. Cole 1955: xix; CASAS 2003: 6; Tswana 1972: 208).⁵⁷

However, Wookey 1992 reversed BSSA's advantage as far as vocabulary is concerned. That is because, as already observed, the revisers of Wookey seem to have made it a major goal to purge the translation of Sotho linguistic influences. Thus, the vocabulary of BSSA Ruth has more traces of Sotho than Wookey 1992 does. Examples include the use of *kajeno* by BSSA while Wookey 1992 uses *gompieno* (3:18), and *o phele* while Wookey 1992 uses *o tshele* (3:1). For Wookey 1992, my examination of lexical usage in Ruth yielded just one instance of Sotho influence, viz., the choice *dula* for *nna* (sit, 2:14).

Another difference between BSSA and Wookey 1992 pertains to BSSA's use of a casual phonology whilst Wookey uses a more formal linguistic register. That difference could contribute to nationalistic preferences whereby the audiences of Botswana prefer Wookey while South African audiences prefer BSSA. For example, BSSA uses *tlile* instead of *tsile* (2:12) and *mantsiboeng* for *maitseboeng* (2:17), which represent a kind of informal language that seems popular in South Africa but is regarded as too informal to be used in writing in Botswana.⁵⁸ As can be observed from the minuteness of the differences described in the two preceding paragraphs, the ideological division does not emanate from a lack of understanding of the different dialects. The Setswana language is generally uniform in such a way that its speakers have no problem understanding each dialect (Cole 1955: xix).

The four institutions – Hermannsburg Mission, Berlin Mission, Dutch Reformed Church and Dutch Reformed Mission Church – started the BSSA project in 1932 under a committee led by the Rev. K. O. E. Muller, which finished the NT and Psalms around the time World War II broke out (1939) (Muller 1958: 2). Therefore, the project was interrupted until 1948 (*ibid.*; Smit 1970: 201).⁵⁹ They had translated the NT with the same intentions that the LMS in

⁵⁷ Cf. Cole 1955: xix for a classification of some of these differences.

⁵⁸ BSSA 1970 also had *lla* for *lela* (cried, 1:9) and *duella* for *duelela* (reward, 2:12), which it corrected in BSSA 1989. Cf. Cole 1955: 49 for a grammatical explanation of this type of elision.

⁵⁹ Muller later joined the new committee that resumed the work in 1948, but by then all the other members of the 1932 committee had died. Muller himself died of a stroke in 1961 during a translation meeting (Brummerhoff 1961; Muller 1958: 3).

Bechuanaland started with, namely: 1. To choose the most central dialect of Setswana, unlike Moffat's and Wookey's Setlhaping; 2. To use a new orthography, since Moffat's and Wookey's were outdated; 3. To translate from the original Hebrew and Greek STs as opposed to Moffat and Wookey, who translated from an English version; and 4. To consult several commentaries and other Bible versions (Muller 1958: 2). Such guidelines provided a critical organisational CFR for the translators. Together with the secondary organisational frames discussed below, this CFR served to produce a widely acclaimed Bible version.

In 1948, a new committee was appointed after the institutions agreed to continue with the Old Testament (OT). The committee was led by the Rev. O. Brummerhoff (Brummerhoff 1959: 1). The translators consisted of the Revs. F. Jenson, W. Wenhold, R. Tonsing, E. Penzhorn, C. Meyer and O. Brummerhoff of the Hermannsburg Mission; Revs. G. Stegmann and J. Reyneke from the Dutch Reformed Church Mission; J. Baumbach and E Muller from the Berlin Mission; and Rev. H. H. Firkins and Pastor H. Pfitzinger (Reyneke 1987: 1). Many were equipped enough to cross check with the Greek and Hebrew STs during proofreading (Brummerhoff 1959: 1). The work was done by means of committees which included Batswana Christians (Smit 1970: 203). Brummerhoff undertook the task of translating the OT from 1952 to 1958, and then the committee corrected and improved the translation (Brummerhoff 1959:1; 1961). Afterwards, the committee revised the NT and Psalms, which were published by the BFBS in 1957. In 1964, the completed manuscript of the Bible in central Setswana was handed over by the chairman of the revision committee, Rev. Brummerhoff, to the Bible Society (Smit 1970: 203). It was published in 1970 (Reyneke 1987: 2).

Although, as often happened, the names of the translation team mentioned by Smit are all European (1970: 201-203), Muller (1958:2-3) says: "The following Natives listened to the translation or had their own copies of the proposed translation in front of them to agree or disagree with what was translated and gave sound advice and often surprisingly well the correct word or the Tswana idiom, They were Pastors I Segale, Phuthego Makgotlho, Jakob Kooa, Andries Moseki and Goitlamo." This list of Setswana mother tongue speakers is also provided by Brummerhoff (1964: 1). In my opinion, the virtually flawless use of the Setswana language in the Bible testifies to a strong presence of Setswana mother tongue speakers throughout the translation. As the preceding sections on the history of the three Bibles reflect, BSSA also boasts a more efficient organisational frame of reference than that of Moffat and

Wookey.⁶⁰ The communication in BSSA 1970, as will be observed in chapter six, is much clearer than that of the other two versions. It is not as wordy as Wookey's or as form oriented as Moffat's.

Muller (1958: 2) lists the following versions as having been consulted during the translation of BSSA: Moffat, Wookey, Sepedi Bible, the Bible in Afrikaans and in revised Afrikaans and Luther, Menge and Zurich Bibles (all three in German), and Dutch, French, and English Bibles. He also lists the commentaries of Kautsch and "Das Alte Testament Deutsch" (*ibid.*). My study of the Setswana translations of Ruth did not find particular evidence of the use of any of these versions, however. The reasons seem to be that, as the reports claim, indeed the project was translated from the Hebrew ST, and that it consulted not one but multiple versions, with the result that no extant Bible version at the time was used prominently as a base text. Moreover, more than one version usually coincided on a choice of a rendering, so it would not be clear which version was preferred. An illustration of this uncertainty is that BSSA coincides with the renderings of the Pedi Bible, GNV, KJV and Webster Bible remarkably in 1:1 with choices like "rule" (*busa/puso*) instead of Moffat's and Wookey's "judge," and "hunger" (*tlala*), departing from Moffat's and Wookey's "drought."

4.4.3.2 The Revision of the BSSA Bible

BSSA 1987 Ruth manifests entirely cosmetic and phonological improvements on BSSA 1970. Some of the cosmetic changes listed below show some influence of Today's English Version (TEV, popularly known as the Good News Bible). My search yielded the following changes: 1. Elision was reversed – the ending *-ela* replaced *-lla* (e.g., *lela* for *lla* and *duelela* for *duella* in 1:9 and 2:12 respectively); 2. Assimilation was reversed (e.g., *ka ntlha ya eng* replaced *ka ntlha-ang* in 2:10); 3. Speech quotation marks, paragraph divisions and section headings, exactly matching those of TEV, were introduced; 4. In 2012, when the Bible was reset, section headings and chapter numbers were boldened, their font changed and their italicisation reversed; and 5. Labels were tagged to cross references instead of pairing the corresponding verses together in a footnote. Overall, BSSA Ruth 1987 looks more presentable and attractive than BSSA Ruth 1970, and its linguistic register is more formal. Perhaps that

⁶⁰ For example, it was translated mainly through concerted effort of committees in a hierarchical procedure rather than by an individual. Moreover, it can be assumed that more exegetical resources and more qualified exegetes and linguists were available for BSSA 1970 than Wookey 1908 and Moffat 1857.

was the whole purpose of the revision, which may also explain why Reyneke, the Translation Consultant of the Bible Society reports the day after the publication of the new revision that, “On 14th May 1987 the first copies of the Tswana (Central) Bible (Second edition, Revised) came off the press in a beautiful, clearly legible and well laid out format” (1987: 2). The analysis of BSSA 1970 in chapter six confirms that BSSA 1970 was a good translation from the perspective of exegesis, semantics and target language communication; therefore, subsequent revisions would probably be minor. The same may not be said about Moffat and Wookey. Yet, it should be borne in mind that, as noted above, BSSA had a far more advanced and favourable organisational CFR supporting it than its two predecessors.

4.4 Summary and Conclusion

In this chapter, I described the pertinent contextual frames of reference, based on the history of Bible translation, under which the three Setswana Bibles – Moffat, Wookey and BSSA – were prepared. I have restricted my discussion to the circumstances within the history of each project, which could have influenced the version’s translation, especially when faced with translation problems within the book of Ruth. The chapter identified some organisational factors that provided a major frame of reference during the translation and revision of each of the three Bibles. Some of these circumstances were favourable, but many factors could be judged to be problematic for a Bible translation project. That judgment is made possible by the benefit of hindsight when viewing each hypothetical situation from the perspective of modern translation studies and principles of Bible translation. Consequently, my study postulates that such factors presented certain translation problems and led to erroneous interpretation and/or communication. The general frames under which the three Bibles were translated, which possibly led to erroneous translation shifts, included the following: the inability to study the Scriptures from their original Hebrew texts, translation by non-mother tongue speakers, difficulties in learning Setswana, unformulated orthographies, restricted dialects, unavailability of literate mother tongue translators or assistants, deficient translation methods and tools, inadequate organisational support, unfavourable organisational mandates and others.

This chapter also demonstrated that the three Bibles manifest some peculiarities unique to their eras. Moffat belongs in the time of the missionary era – the first period in the chronology of Bible translation in African languages. Wookey is placed in the missionary revisions and corrections period – the second era in African language translation. BSSA was translated in

the Bible Societies era – the third period in Bible translation in African languages. The chapter noted that these periods sometimes overlapped, however, and particularly Wookey and BSSA sometimes manifest the shared traits of different eras.

The various organisational factors from the history of Bible translation, as discussed in this chapter, provide a major frame of reference for helping us to analyse and evaluate the Moffat, Wookey and BSSA versions. In the next chapter (five), I will discuss selected contextual frames of the Hebrew ST of Ruth. The discussion will focus on the textual, organisational and socio-cultural background of the Hebrew text of Ruth, which should have provided the corresponding frames of reference for the three translations of Ruth in Setswana. The socio-linguistic frames of the TT discussed in chapter three (from the history of the Batswana people), the organisational frames discussed in the present chapter (from Bible translation history), and the socio-linguistic frames of the Hebrew text to be discussed in chapter five will hopefully provide a balanced understanding of the factors that converged to influence the outcome of the book of Ruth in Setswana. In turn, such factors will be used in chapter six to hypothesise the reasons for a selection of some of the most important choices made during the rendering of the book of Ruth.

Chapter 5: The Background of the Source Text of Ruth

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will briefly discuss some selected aspects of the background of the original Hebrew text of the book of Ruth which pertain to the frames that probably presented translation problems during the rendering of the three extant Setswana Bibles, viz., Moffat, Wookey and BSSA. The discussion does not attempt to explain in depth or in their entirety the important issues relevant to the interpretation of the narrative *per se*. The number and depth of the contextual frames of ancient Israelites that were discussed have been limited to the degree of their relevance and relationship to the Batswana's – regarding parallels and contrasts.¹ Such rich points between the contexts of the presumed audience of the Hebrew text and the TT audiences were raised throughout chapter three, and are a major focus of the next chapter. To avoid repetition, such connections will not be pointed out in the present discussion.

The cognitive frames (CFRs) in which the Hebrew text of Ruth is embedded are mainly textual, socio-cultural and communication-situational. These CFRs converge on the text of Ruth because, although the text is linguistic, it has to be understood from a socio-cultural point of view. The argument of my thesis is that translation problems sometimes resulted in one or more of the following effects on a rendering: 1. Errors of interpretation or exegetical shortcomings; 2. Unnatural or clumsy style; and 3. Ambiguous communication. In this chapter, I will present the following sections that deal with the writing of the book: Date and Authorship, Language, Purpose and Theme, Genre, Literary Style, and Canonicity. Then I will present a brief history and culture of the book's presumed audience which is discernible in the story and which can be hypothesised to have had a problematic influence on the rendering of the Setswana Bibles. These sections will be as follows: Marriage and Family, The Levirate, Inheritance and the Importance of Children, Social Structure, Agriculture, and God.

¹ Because of the limitations of this study, less space was devoted to an exposition of the Ruth narrative and the socio-linguistic context of ancient Israel (and the socio-linguistic context of the Batswana) – but more space was devoted to an exposition and illustration of the concept of CFR. The strength of the thesis is mainly in demonstrating the notion of CFR in action.

5.2 Background of the Book of Ruth

5.2.1 Date and Authorship

The historical setting of the events of the story of Ruth is the time when judges were ruling in Israel (Ruth 1:1). That would be “between the death of Joshua after the initial conquest of Canaan (Joshua 11:23; Judges 1:1) and the establishment of the monarchy during the time of Samuel the prophet (1 Samuel 10:1-2)” (Moore 2008: 687). The book itself was written later than the time of the judges. That fact is supported by the narrator’s reference to former customs (Ruth 4:1-12). The date of the writing of the book has been postulated from its internal elements like language, style, historical allusions and themes (Block 2008: 673). However, such evidence is inconsistent and inconclusive (*ibid.*; Bush 1996: 18).² For Bible translation in Setswana, the issues surrounding the dating of Ruth ultimately lead to one relevant problem – Ruth is an ancient text, so it has ancient features that will make it difficult to translate. Its antiquity presents mismatches in language, frames of communication/conceptualisation and culture which are likely to lead to translation shifts. As for the identity of its author, the book of Ruth does not give a hint. The rabbinic Talmud proposed Samuel,³ and some scholars even proposed an unidentified female author (Block 2008: 673, 673; Hubbard 1988: 23). Many postulations have been made for the book’s author, but they have not contributed to identifying him/her.

5.2.2 Language

The language of the book of Ruth is Biblical Hebrew. The language is ancient, having been in use since around 1400-1200 BCE (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 4). Unlike other languages that normally change over the years such as English, for example, the Hebrew language has remained uniform so that “A well-educated Hebrew speaker can read and understand Hebrew literature from all ages, from the oldest portions of the Hebrew Scriptures to Modern Hebrew” (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 4). Certain minor features developed over time, however, and have led to a classification of Hebrew according to four different time periods. The categories

² Earlier scholarship proposed an exilic or postexilic date, “based on alleged Aramaisms, the remoteness of customs (cf. Ruth 4:7), discrepancies with the Deuteronomic law, and the theme of universalism over against nationalism” (Trible 1992: 843).

³ The book of Ruth was accepted in Judaism as part of the Jews’ inspired canon at an early stage (Hubbard 1988: 4). For a concise discussion of important Jewish manuscripts’ arrangements of Ruth, cf. Irwin 2008: 693-694.

are Biblical Hebrew (BH), Rabbinic Hebrew, Medieval Hebrew, and Modern Hebrew, Ivrit or Israeli Hebrew (BHRG 2002: 17-18).⁴

The language of Ruth falls under the first category, viz., BH. BH is the language of the Old Testament (OT) and the Masoretic text (MT) (Waltke and O'Connor 1990: 4). Because OT Hebrew had died as a language of communication, contemporary speakers and scholars of Hebrew are not on a cultural continuum with ancient OT speakers of the language – they are unlikely to bridge an exegete's knowledge gap because many cultural aspects of the language are obsolete. Examples may include vows, metaphors, euphemisms, cultural idioms, communication formulas and other technical OT expressions. This can explain why for a long time Setswana and English Bibles misinterpreted the oath formula of Ruth 1:17, for example (literally, "May Yahweh do for me like that and like that if anything other than death separates you and me" – cf. the shift on page 158). The first comprehensive study of OT oath formulas emerged only as late as 2011 (cf. Conklin 2011).

The fact that BH died as a language of popular communication also means that it is now primarily an academic language, and thus requires academic rigour to learn. In many settings it is not easy to find enough people who are well acquainted with it when forming a translation team (Wendland 1987: 17). BH is even less likely to be studied than Greek (the New Testament ST's original language), because its alphabet is written quite differently from most contemporary alphabets. This fact can cause a first acquaintance with Hebrew to be more intimidating (cf. Alfredo 2010: 119). The discussion in the paragraphs above explains why the linguistic CFRs of OT translators, including Setswana translators of Ruth, would be complex.

In its broader context, BH is an ancient Semitic language from the Near East or Middle East that belongs in the Afro-asiatic language family and has certain similarities with some North African languages (Waltke and O'Connor 1990: 6; cf. BHRG 2002: 15). However, Hebrew belongs to a linguistic family different from sub-Saharan African languages, and Bible translation in sub-Saharan African languages, such as the large Bantu family to which Setswana belongs, is not easier than in other languages. The history of Bible translation in

⁴ BHRG stands for Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar.

sub-Saharan Africa points to the Hebrew text's linguistic and socio-cultural problems for translation projects in Africa just as in other continents.⁵

5.2.3 Purpose and Theme

Generally, the opinions of scholars about Ruth's purpose and theme are diverse (Bush 1996: 48). This is because the narrative conveys several significant themes at once, thus making it difficult to argue for just one. Social, political, religious and artistic functions are adequately represented in the story (Trible 1992: 846). Due to the structure of the plot, the dominant purpose of the narrative seems to be to legitimise the family tree of King David (cf. Block 2008: 679; Wendland 1988).⁶ Bernstein (1982: 1041) lists this purpose as one of those popularised by scholars. Yet, he disagrees with the idea of picking a purpose or theme for the story, hypothesising that Ruth could have been just a story worth telling, and could have had no ulterior motives (*ibid.*). For that reason, some scholars like Bush (1996: 52-53) give all-encompassing purposes or themes that cover *hesed*, divine providence and apologia for the Davidic dynasty.

Bush's (1996: 52) and Wendland's (1988: 53) arguments for the prominence of the concept of *hesed* throughout the narrative are compelling. They demonstrate how Ruth, Boaz, Naomi and Yahweh embody *hesed* (*ibid.*).⁷ In her *hesed*, Naomi is concerned about Ruth's security and sets out to find her "a home for [her] rest" (3:1). Boaz goes to great lengths to ensure that Ruth's request for marriage is fulfilled (Ruth 4). Ruth's *hesed* involves the greatest risks, and starts long before the other characters' *hesed*. It starts when she leaves her people and her

⁵ In fact, corresponding elements of the organisational frames of reference for most translation projects in Africa appear to have been more problematic than in Europe, for instance, whose languages and cultures do not bear as close a resemblance to Biblical Hebrew. The frames in Africa involve either translators who are non-mother tongue speakers or mother tongue translators who depend on a foreigner's opinions, thereby producing "a translation based upon a translation" (Wendland 1987: 17). Yet, while such organisational frames have a significant influence on the outcome of translation, they are only a part of the complex network of CFRs in translation.

⁶ Wendland uses the narrative's symmetrical structure to illustrate this purpose.

⁷ For general purposes, *hesed* can be understood here as interpersonal, relational and reciprocal acts of loving kindness, loyalty or faithfulness (HALOT 2000: 133; Stoebe 1997: 453; cf. also the section "Division of Labour" in chapter three). A detailed explanation that does greater justice to the concept is given in the analysis of the translations of this concept in the next chapter.

god(s) to take care of Naomi (1:16, 17). It culminates in her decision to marry a man advanced in age (3:10). God's *hesed*, which runs throughout the narrative, is discussed several pages below in the section "God." Throughout the three Setswana translations of the narrative, numerous shifts arose because of the difficulties of interpreting these characters' acts of *hesed*, as will be evidenced by the next chapter (six). Even the corresponding unit for the term *hesed* manifests a shift each time it appears in the three Setswana translations. Thus, one can conclude that the theme of *hesed* is not as clear in the translations as it probably was to the original audience. Notwithstanding the parallels shown in chapter three between acts of *hesed* in Setswana culture and those in ancient Israelite culture, the difficulty of fully portraying the narrative's theme of *hesed* attests to the fact that there are significant socio-cultural (and linguistic) differences between the respective frames of reference of the Setswana TTs and the Hebrew text.

Merrill (1985: 131-138) also presents a multifaceted purpose for the book of Ruth.⁸ He looks outwards to the intertextual context of Ruth and argues that firstly, Ruth was written to complete the trilogy on Bethlehem.⁹ Secondly, Merrill's intertextual outlook finds the book of Ruth to be linking the royal promise given to Judah with the dynasty of David, namely, that "The scepter will not depart from Judah [...]" (Genesis 49:10).¹⁰ Merrill's third purpose coincides with that of Bush as described above. Merrill investigates the narrative internally and concludes that it propounds the concept of God's *hesed*. The remarkable pattern of this *hesed* has been to enable Ruth to surmount almost impossible obstacles like foreignness, femaleness, widowhood, childlessness, and socio-economic fragility to become the ancestress of David and ultimately Jesus (Matthew 1). The relevance of Merrill's insights for Setswana translation is similar to that discussed in the last sentences of the preceding paragraph. Shifts occur that illustrate how some aspects of the theme and purpose of Ruth are not as fully or as adequately exposed in the Setswana TT as what was implied by the Hebrew text.

⁸ The discussion in this paragraph is based on Merrill 1985: 131-138.

⁹ That is Judges 17-18, Judges 19-21 and Ruth 1-4.

¹⁰ Ruth has important parallels with Tamar that include foreignness, widowhood in a levirate setting, and giving birth to a son in the Davidic line (Genesis 38 and Ruth 4).

5.2.4 Genre

The book of Ruth presents the above mentioned themes and purposes by means of two types of genre, namely, narrative (1:1-4:17) and a genealogical record (4:18-22). The genealogy serves to interpret from a broader historical perspective the events of the narrative.¹¹ The birth of Obed is much more significant than the end result of a search for survival or satisfaction of a woman's need for children (cf. Block 2008: 676). The events of the narrative have their ultimate significance in the production of the ancestors of King David. The narrative "expose[s] the characters of Naomi, Ruth and Boaz" within a setting of *hesed* (Block 2008: 677). The story does this mostly by dialogue (rather than a detailed description of events), as is usually the case with OT narratives (Bush 1996: 38). The neglect of formatting for direct speech in a translation, therefore, can affect not only a small portion of the text but the whole narrative. Incidentally, all the Setswana Bibles initially had no quotation marks or distinct paragraphs for direct speech in Ruth. The two Bibles that remained in circulation (Wookey and BSSA) later included them. Upon comparison, the re-formatted editions seem to be easier to read than their predecessors because they demand less effort when identifying the divisions of the narrative.

5.2.5 Literary Style

It is widely acknowledged that the story of Ruth is a lively artistic literary composition (Wendland 1988: 30). Wendland (1988) examines the intricate structural patterns of the story, with a focus on the larger discourse structure in order to expose the artistic appeal of Ruth. Because of its scope, however, this thesis can only make brief observations of the literary style of Ruth. The book has a closely knit but simple plot which employs "the techniques of suspense, dialogue, characterisation, repetition, reticence, ambiguity, word play and inclusion" (Block 2008: 678). The plot follows the normal linear arrangement of a narrative, that is, setting – conflict – augmentation – climax – resolution – coda that can be outlined as follows:¹²

¹¹ Genealogical lists in other narratives in the Bible (such as Genesis, for example) also demonstrate that this is the primary purpose of the genre of genealogy in the Bible.

¹² I made this outline from Block's (2008: 678-679), Bush's (1998) and Wendland's (1988: 2) versions of the plot's linear structure as well as a general observation of the events of the story.

- I. Setting (1:1-2)
- II. Conflict: Naomi and Ruth face bleak lives (1:3-22)
 - A. Naomi loses her husband and sons; Ruth loses her husband (1-5)
 - B. Ruth shows *hesed* to Naomi (6-19a)
 - C. Naomi and Ruth return to Bethlehem facing a bleak future (19b-22)
- III. Augmentation (2:1-3:18)
 - A. Preliminary solution: Ruth provides for the family (2:1-23)
 - i. Ruth Plans to Provide for the Family
 - ii. Boaz Shows *Hesed* to Ruth (2:1-16)
 - iii. Ruth Describes her Experience to Naomi (17-23)
 - B. Fresh conflict: Ruth searches for a husband in Boaz (3:1-18)
 - i. Naomi Plans for Ruth's Marriage to Boaz (1-6)
 - ii. Ruth's Efforts with Boaz Succeed (7-15)
 - iii. Ruth Describes Her Experience to Naomi (16-18)
- IV. Climax: Boaz acquires the right to redeem Ruth (4:1-12)
- V. Resolution: Boaz redeems Ruth, and Obed is born (4:13-17)
- VI. Coda: Genealogical Epilogue (4:18-22)

A carefully delineated plot can aid in demarcating sections and choosing chapter and section headings (Wendland 1988). In particular, among the revised versions of Wookey and BSSA that incorporated section headings in Ruth, BSSA's headings were the most precise while Wookey's were sometimes erroneous (cf. the first shift at Ruth 1 discussed in chapter six regarding Wookey's heading).

The generic translation problems discussed in the section "Translation Shifts" in chapter two of this thesis probably arose during the translation of Ruth into Setswana (cf. Nord 2005: 166-167). The first type of problem (viz., pragmatic) relates to the differing conditions under which the Hebrew text and the Setswana Bibles were produced and used. Chapter four of this thesis – A History of Bible Translation in Setswana – illustrates this problem with a discussion of the organisational environment (CFR) of the Setswana Bibles, which differ significantly from the conditions under which the Hebrew text of Ruth was written. The second type of translation problem (viz., convention related) pertains to differing socio-cultural elements between the respective audiences of the original text and the Setswana Bibles. Chapter three, entitled "A History and Ethnographic Description of the Batswana,"

discusses such convention-related problems, or, in other words, the socio-cultural CFRs of the Setswana TT. The TT socio-cultural CFRs sometimes coincide with, but really differ in many ways from those of the ancient Israelites presented in the sections below (and discussed in chapter six). The third kind of translation problem, viz., linguistic, relates to structural differences between BH and Setswana. A section in chapter three discusses the language and dialects of the three Bibles (Setswana, Setlhaping and Central Setswana), several examples in chapter four illustrate the differences in the dialects of the three Bibles, while another section in the current chapter (above) discusses BH. Even though BH is classified as Afro-asiatic, there appears to be no relevant relationship between it and Setswana (an African Bantu language) that may contribute towards interpreting the book of Ruth. The fourth category of translation problems, namely, text-specific, relates to ST problems which are unique to the book of Ruth. An illustration of a text-specific problem in Ruth is the ambiguity of the “six measures of barley” that Ruth carried in her shawl (cf. NET on Ruth 3:15). It is not indicated whether the “six measures” are of an ephah, omer or seah, but the ST audience probably knew.¹³ The three Setswana Bibles give no clue as to the amount of barley that this entails.

5.3 Background of the Book’s Original Audience

The discussion in this major section focuses on the socio-cultural context of the Israelites, the original audience of the book of Ruth. For the sake of scope, only the material that is relevant for the analysis of the selected shifts discussed in chapter six of this thesis is included in the background discussion below. While presenting the history and ethnography of the Batswana, chapter three investigated the background of the Setswana target audiences for hypothetical socio-cultural scenarios that could cause translators problems during translation and which could possibly lead to translation shifts. Chapter six uses some of the most important aspects of such background material to propose how certain selected shifts may have occurred. On the one hand, the shifts arose where the translators did not take advantage of points of intersection between the two backgrounds to make the meaning of the Hebrew text clear. On the other

¹³ The seah is more likely because six measures of it would be generous but carriable (about 27 kgs). Six ephahs would be too heavy (80-135kgs), while six omers would be too small (less than what Ruth had gleaned in a day) (NET).

hand, translators could have erroneously assumed points of intersection even where some knowledge gaps needed to be filled for the TT audience.¹⁴

The discussion below will cover marriage and family, the levirate, inheritance and the importance of children, social structure, agriculture, and God. In several of the sections, I used De Vaux 1976 as a point of departure, but for relevance to the book of Ruth, I also utilised several more recent commentaries on Ruth and scriptural references from Ruth that pointed to Israel's socio-cultural background.¹⁵ De Vaux has the advantage of being comprehensive, for he points to many socio-cultural features that commentaries and other studies do not refer to. Other referenced sources were different OT examples in books like Genesis, Exodus and Leviticus, among others. Such books refer to socio-cultural features that are also identified in Ruth.

5.3.1 Marriage and Family

The basic social unit of ancient Israel was the extended family, the *בֵּית*, headed by a patriarch. The patriarch normally had many people living under his care and authority. Such people included his wife (or wives), children, adult sons, daughters-in-law, servants, aliens, widows and orphans (De Vaux 1974: 20).¹⁶ The Decalogue counts a wife as part of a man's possessions (Exodus 20:17). To marry a woman was to *בָּעַל* her (become her master) (Deuteronomy 21:13). Generally, upon marriage, she became a member of her husband's family (parents and relatives) and clan (if she was from a different clan). Just as women belonged to their fathers before they married, they belonged to their husbands when they married. Scripture shows some instances where a man paid a certain kind of bride price called *מֶהָר* (Genesis 34:12). Jacob paid his *מֶהָר* in the form of labour to his uncle, Laban. Apparently, *מֶהָר* was considered as a token of appreciation to her parents, or acknowledgement of their loss, rather than a purchase. De Vaux (1974: 28) argues that this practice did not become institutionalised in Israel, however. It appears to have made no contribution to Israelite

¹⁴ Other shifts occurred for reasons not directly related to the socio-cultural background but which are organisational, linguistic, communication-situational and exegetical in nature (cf. the section "Literary Style" above for all of Nord's four generic translation problems).

¹⁵ Other shorter works on Israel's socio-cultural and religious background were consulted too.

¹⁶ The members of Jacob's family who migrated to Egypt were said to be seventy in total, and they included his daughters-in-law and grandchildren (Genesis 46:6-27).

society's subordination of women. The socio-cultural setting already did not cater for an independent woman (a widow, for instance), and she found it hard to survive because she was not expected to own anything economically viable.

A married woman did most of the domestic work around the home, such as looking after small livestock, cooking, grinding grain and other chores (De Vaux 1974: 39). She probably apprenticed her daughters, preparing them to manage their own homes in the future. In Ruth 1:8, Naomi exhorts her daughters-in-law to go back home, which was a breach of custom because they had become permanent members of their husbands' family. Traditionally, they should be given new husbands from among relatives (whose candidates included So-and-so and Boaz).¹⁷ Instead, Naomi seems afraid that disaster will continue to follow her and affect her daughters-in-law. She wants them to return, where they will experience again the warmth of a mother's home (cf. Alfredo 2010: 136) just like the days of their apprenticeship, as they awaited prospective husbands. Motivated by her *hesed*, Ruth declines Naomi's offer "without knowing what she will get back in return" (Van Wolde 1997: 21).

The family members had common interests and duties (De Vaux 1974: 6). They were family members on the basis of a common bloodline and a common home (De Vaux 1974: 20). Members of the family were expected to care for and protect each other (De Vaux 1974: 21). The *goel*, or kinsman redeemer, was the institution that prescribed how such protection was to be carried out (Leviticus 25). The most eligible candidate to be the *goel* was the closest male relative (Ruth 3:12; 4:4). He could redeem by buying back the property that his relative had to sell to pay a debt, buying back a relative who sold himself as a slave, and, carrying out any other responsibilities of redemption towards his relative (Ringgren 1975: 352; cf. also the shift at 2:20, page 172).

5.3.2 The Levirate

One of the important redemptive rights and responsibilities of the *goel* was to marry a widow who stood to lose property and buy back the property (Deuteronomy 25:5-10). That marriage was called a levirate marriage, from the Latin word *levir* that translates the Hebrew word for "brother-in-law" (De Vaux 1976: 37). There are only two examples of the levirate in the OT,

¹⁷ Cf. the discussion below on the levirate. They would have qualified to marry the deceased men's brothers if there had been some.

namely, the ones involving Tamar and Ruth (Genesis 38 and Ruth 4). According to Deuteronomy 25 and Ruth 4, the purpose of the levirate arrangement was to raise a child for the dead relative so as to preserve his ancestral line and to protect his property from being lost (cf. De Waard and Nida 1991: 51). The redeemed property would not belong to the redeemer, but to the son of the widow (*ibid.*). Also, the new son would be regarded as belonging to the deceased relative rather than to the redeemer (De Waard and Nida 1991: 51). From Onan's refusal to produce an heir for his deceased brother (Genesis 38:9), So-and-so's refusal to redeem (Ruth 4:6), and the prescribed shaming of the candidate who declines to redeem (Deuteronomy 25:9), it appears that this custom was inconvenient to the redeemers, and their refusal to comply could be anticipated. Later developments were that the obligation of the levirate was no longer binding, "and the prophets had to plead the case of the widow and orphan" (De Vaux 1974: 23).

5.3.3 Inheritance and the Importance of Children

Concerning inheritance, the father shared his wealth among his sons. If he had no sons, Numbers 27: 8-11 stipulates alternative recipients in the following order of priority: closest male relative – paternal uncles – brothers – daughters (cf. also Hubbard 1988: 54). Scholars can only hypothesise how Naomi, a widow, could have the right to be "selling the portion of land that belonged to [her deceased husband]" (Ruth 4:3). Beattie's (1974: 256) assumption is a good starting point for speculation: the narrator would not tell a story that is absurd to its audience – Naomi must have inherited the property under some conditions not specified in the law of Moses (cf. also Hubbard 1988: 54-55). Moore (2008: 692) quotes an ancient Near Eastern law whereby a husband could "grant, by a sealed and witnessed document, property to his wife." The condition was that the property should remain forever in the name of one of the man's children (Moore 2008: 682, 692). That inheritance probably lasted only until the widow remarried, upon which the property would pass on to her children (*ibid.*). Ruth, rather than Naomi, remarried and had the child, so this scenario specifically applies to Ruth. Naomi only benefits indirectly from it, but the narrator tells the story from her perspective as the principal survivor of Elimelech's family so he makes Naomi appear as the principal beneficiary. The property and name of "Elimelech," the original patriarch of the story, were at stake.

As proof of the importance of children, the motif of childlessness (and hunger) frequents ancestral narratives, that is, family narratives, of the OT (Westermann 1999: 286).¹⁸ When Elimelech's family left Bethlehem for Moab, the cause was hunger (Ruth 1:1). When the survivors of his family returned to Bethlehem (namely, Naomi and Ruth), the apparent leading cause was not hunger but childlessness (and lack of a husband) which had diminished her chances of survival. Although she went to Moab to fill the emptiness of hunger, she experienced the emptiness of having no child or husband (Ruth 1:21). In the story, hunger and childlessness are interrelated, for Naomi is a widow without a child to provide for her.

Marriage among ancient Israelites seems to have served primarily to produce children, and the more the children, the greater the sense of security (De Vaux 1974: 41).¹⁹ The main reasons that could be postulated for the passion for great numbers of children included the need for a strong military in that hostile environment, the need for manpower for economic production, survival of the family name, and maintenance of the family's property. The community's wish for Ruth when she remarried was that she might be like Leah and Rachel who gave Jacob many children and thus built Israel (Ruth 4:11-12). The preference for great numbers of children seems skewed, however. The strength of a family was measured not by the number of its daughters but sons (De Vaux 1974: 41). The need for females was ambivalent. In ancient Israel, the family stood to lose all its daughters permanently to other families when they got married (*ibid.*). Yet, to perpetuate itself, it needed the daughters of other families.

A woman was stigmatised for childlessness in ancient Israelite society (e.g., 1 Samuel 1:6). As already indicated, she would particularly prefer a son because a son would inherit and maintain her husband's property and name as well as care for her and vulnerable family members (cf. Moore 2008: 693). Naming was done immediately after birth (De Vaux 1974: 43). A name normally had meaning, denoting the essence of the object and/or "reveal[ed] the

¹⁸ Examples include Abraham, Sarah, Rachel and Hannah (Genesis 15:2; 29:31; 1 Samuel 1:2).

¹⁹ The motives of love and sex appear to have been secondary. Whilst Naomi postulates an unlikely sexual encounter with a man (1:12), and Boaz and Ruth do have sexual contact (4:13), both scenarios are directly related to the need for conception. Likewise, sexual terminology was not as explicit as the desire for reproduction and can prove difficult for a Setswana audience to identify in a translation. Naomi's literal expression, for example, "Even if I should be to a man tonight" is an implicit reference to sex, but it could be mistaken for reference to marriage (cf. the shift at 1:12 in the next chapter).

character and destiny of the bearer” (De Vaux 1974: 43).²⁰ The name of Ruth’s child was “Obed,” which means “he who serves,” probably anticipating that he will help Naomi in future (NET, Ruth 4:17). The significance of this name was probably conspicuous to the Hebrew audience, but, as with other biblical names in general, this significance is not communicated in the Setswana Bibles. The three Bibles all transliterated the name “Obed” to *Obete*, without explaining what it means.²¹

5.3.5 Social Structure

Kinship in Israel was connected to bloodline, whether real or supposed, even at the level of clan membership (De Vaux 1974: 5). The clan members called each other “brothers” (1 Samuel 20: 21). Although the family also functioned as a distinct unit of the society, such as when the Passover festival was celebrated in every home, the family was intricately bound to the society (De Vaux 1974: 21). With institutions like the *goel*, the clan and tribe were institutional security bases for the family. The strong bonding of individuals probably extended from the family to the whole village, and it was quite insecure for Elimelech to break that bond to migrate to another country.

At the time of Judges, the nation of Israel did not have a central government united under a single administrator (Judges 17:6). None of the fifteen judges who ruled Israel were central administrators or ruled over the whole nation at once (Wendland 1987: 167). Some of them served simultaneously. According to Judges 2:18, Yahweh occasionally raised judges for military intervention when the judge would unite the people for battle. Otherwise, the people were settled in Palestine in relatively independent, sometimes competing groups, according to the twelve groups descended from Reuben, Simeon, Judah, Issachar, Zebulun, Benjamin, Dan, Naphtali, Gad, Asher, Ephraim and Manasseh. The groups united for war and religious purposes around the symbolic Ark of the Covenant (De Vaux 1974: 7). Generally, the noun “judges” (שֹׁפְטִים) could refer to administrators who held an official position such as rulers, governors, kings and their officials, elders and forensic judges (Niehr 2006: 422-426). Deborah, who “used to sit under Deborah’s palm tree” to judge Israel, exemplifies the occasional forensic judging of the judges of this period (Judges 4:5). This forensic judging is

²⁰ This was the case with names in general. For example, Naomi means “pleasant,” Mara means “bitter,” and Bethlehem means “house of bread” (NET, Ruth 1:20 and 1:1).

²¹ The same is true of the names of Elimelech, Bethlehem and others in the book of Ruth (cf. the shift at 1:1).

parallel to that of Moses and the assistants he chose in Exodus 18:13-26. Boaz's judging at the gate (Ruth 4) is reminiscent of this aspect of judging. The elders heads of families of the clan, sat at the city gate to resolve disputes (De Vaux 1974: 152).²² Several shifts resulting from the rendering of the concepts of judges and the city gate are discussed in the next chapter (e.g., in 2:18; 3:11; 4:1 and 4:10).

5.3.6 Agriculture

The setting of the story of Ruth starts with an uncertain agrarian environment – an environment prone to drought. It is similar to the setting of the migration of the sons of Jacob to sojourn in Egypt (cf. Genesis 41-47). Apart from the problem of childlessness, several family narratives carry the motif of hunger (Westermann 1999: 286). As in Ruth, hunger caused some of the ancestors to “sojourn” in a foreign land.²³ Much of the story (chapters 2-4) occurs when famine has passed in Bethlehem, but Naomi and Ruth are still running the risk of hunger by virtue of having no man or son to provide for them. Land was allocated to families (male heads of families, to be precise) for growing crops and keeping livestock (*ibid.*; cf. De Vaux 1974: 166). The Ruth narrative makes no reference to rearing livestock, but focuses on crop harvest throughout. The Gezer calendar below, from around the time of the judges, shows what was done in crop farming in ancient Israel throughout the year (Gower 2004: 87):

| | |
|--------------|-------------------------|
| (Sept./Oct.) | – Olive harvest |
| (Nov./Dec.) | – Planting grain |
| (Jan./Feb.) | – Late planting |
| (March) | – Hoeing up of flax |
| (April) | – Barley harvest |
| (May) | – Harvest and festivity |
| (June/July) | – Vine tending |
| (August) | – Summer fruit |

²² The gate was the entrance to a ward, village or city (Otto 2006: 368-369) where affairs of the community were carried out. It was the place of the city market and public meetings.

²³ For instance, in Genesis 12:10, Abraham goes to sojourn in Egypt. In Genesis 26:1, there is yet another famine different from the one that had unsettled Abraham, which now forces Isaac to relocate. At the beginning of the book of Exodus, a nation is born out of sojourners in a foreign land.

The planting in January and February was for millet, peas, lentils, melons and cucumbers.

The staple crops were wheat and barley (Gower 2004: 88). Rainfall was quite unreliable, so it is not surprising that there was famine in the land (cf. Ruth 1:1; Gower 2004: 87).

Naomi and Ruth return to Bethlehem at the beginning of barley harvest (Ruth 1:22). It appears that, for well-to-do farmers, the custom was to have male and female servants help with the harvesting, threshing, winnowing and other related activities (cf. Ruth 2:8-9). The law allowed poor people to glean behind the reapers for anything that the reapers missed (Deuteronomy 24:19-22). Reapers were commanded not to track back for the missed pieces of crop.²⁴ Harvested grain would then be separated from the straw through pounding. This process is called “threshing” (Gower 2004: 89). The final separation of grain from the last bits of straw is called winnowing. It was done by tossing the grain up into a breeze (Gower 2004: 90). Chapter six examines some terminology surrounding the crops, weight measures and the agrarian setting of the Ruth narrative that proved problematic to translators.

5.3.7 God

The narrative of Ruth refers explicitly to a Supreme Being (God) who controls nature and the fate of the nation and of individuals. The narrative is also replete with the implied activities of this God. The national religion of the Israelites was monotheistic, being the worship of Yahweh as the only Supreme Being (De Vaux 1974: 271). The Hebrew name *Elimelech*, which means “God is my king,” refers to this God. The book of Ruth uses the personal name “Yahweh” for God sixteen times. This is the God of Elimelech’s family and the Israelite nation, and the God of Ruth’s new religion after she left her Moabite religion and community (Ruth 1:16). Granted, there were different gods that the Israelites sometimes worshipped in apostasy or syncretism, but that was in subversion of their monotheistic national religion (De Vaux 1974: 271).

The Supreme Being of Israel was worshipped as the sovereign God over all other gods and over the affairs of human beings. Westermann (1999: 300) argues that “God is present in everything of which the book [of Ruth] speaks.” God provides or refrains from providing, and

²⁴ Ruth gleaned about 13 kgs on her first day at Boaz’s field (NET, Ruth 2:17).

“makes the grain grow or brings drought” (Westermann 1999: 301). The two references where God explicitly and directly did something are 1:6 and 4:13, which say that Yahweh had provided for his people by giving them bread, and that he had also given Ruth conception. Apart from such references, the work of God in the book of Ruth is rarely explained, and scholars express God’s involvement throughout the story as “the hidden hand of God” (Block 2008: 681). It is clearly manifested in the *hesed* of the main characters of the story and other occurrences that could otherwise be thought to happen by chance. The ultimate confirmation of the hidden hand of God is the conclusion of the narrative, namely, that Ruth’s and Boaz’s son, Obed, became the father of Jesse, the father of King David (1:22). The hidden hand of God that reveals itself at this conclusion can be understood as God’s *hesed*. Naomi’s neighbours ascribe to God’s providence the fact that she had a *goel* (4:14). The acts of *hesed* of the main characters of the story, namely Ruth, Naomi and Boaz, can be interpreted as being directed by God to achieve his intended purposes, the ultimate of which was to raise a monarch from the family line.

5.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have presented some selected features of the background of the original text of Ruth that relate to the book’s composition as well as the hypothetical cognitive context of its intended audience, the people of Israel. The topics that were selected for the discussion of the book’s composition were as follows: Date and authorship, language, purpose and theme, genre, and literary style. Some selected topics surrounding the history and culture of the original audience were as follows: marriage and family, the levirate, inheritance and the importance of children, social structure, agriculture, and God.

The discussion under the above-mentioned topics was restricted to features that hypothetically had a direct bearing on the outcome of the three translations into Setswana. These were the features whose parallels and contrasts were discussed throughout chapter three. In that chapter, the cognitive contexts of the Batswana audiences were compared and contrasted with those of the Israelites to identify rich points of cognitive significance that could lead to translation problems and shifts during translation. The material in the present chapter was selected to provide a general understanding of the socio-cultural, textual-linguistic and communicational CFRs of the Hebrew text that would be relevant to the analysis of shifts in the Setswana Bibles. These three CFRs can only be hypothesised because the text of Ruth is ancient. Since such factors converge within an ancient text to make it generally difficult to

translate, they will be seen to overlap occasionally. As will be observed in the next chapter, instances of shifts resulting from such CFRs in the book of Ruth are quite numerous. Due to space restrictions, my next chapter will discuss only a representative sample of the most illustrative and problematic shifts (the bulk of the shifts will be appended to the thesis). In that chapter, I will endeavour to identify those shifts that are adequately representative of all the four generic types of CFRs of the Hebrew text and TT. I will use the concept of CFRs to postulate how the translation shifts of the three renderings of Ruth in Setswana could have occurred and/or might have been avoided.

Chapter 6: The Shifts of the Setswana Translations of Ruth

6.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the data of the study in tabular form, namely, the shifts that occur when each of the three existent Setswana versions of the book of Ruth is paired against BHS. In the chapter, I give the interpretation of the Hebrew textual units and their corresponding translations. Next, I postulate on the contextual factors that could have prevented the translators from matching an exegetically justifiable interpretation of the Hebrew text. The sections of the chapter are as follows: Procedure: How the tables of shifts were produced; Excluded shifts; Key concepts; Tables of Shifts in Ruth; and Summary and Conclusion.

6.2 Procedure: How the Tables of Shifts were Produced

In order to produce the tables of shifts in this chapter, I paired the Setswana texts with the Hebrew text to investigate if they differed with the Hebrew in form or interpretation. To accomplish this pairing, I read and interpreted each verse sequentially in the Hebrew text. Next, I read its intended correspondent, starting with Moffat and ending with BSSA. I would pause reading at points where the Setswana text manifested a form that I deemed not to correspond to the Hebrew form, where it chose a different grammatical construction from the Hebrew construction, where the TT failed to represent idiomatic Setswana, and where its meaning does not match that of the Hebrew text as an exegetically justifiable interpretation of the Hebrew text is concerned. In so doing, I was able to describe the discrepancies manifested by the TT as follows:¹

- a) significant difference in lexical form between the Hebrew text and TT;
- b) significant difference in grammatical form;
- c) unidiomatic or unnatural TL form and;
- d) inexact or erroneous TL meaning.

I determined the precise boundaries of the particular unit that fell under the above categories and placed it in tabular form under the Bible's name. That is how I identified the Hebrew text's unit of focus. The corresponding units in Setswana and Hebrew could range from a

¹ At times there was overlapping.

single word to a full sentence.² After that, I examined how the other two Setswana Bibles translated the unit, in comparison and contrast with the one that first showed a discrepancy (a formal or functional shift). This was a procedure of trial and error, starting with Moffat, moving on to Wookey and ending with BSSA.³ When I did not find a mismatch in one of the Bibles, I investigated the next Bible. As a result, I discovered that either none of the others manifested the same shift, or one or both of them had one or more shifts. At other times, of course, all three Setswana Bibles manifested different shifts of some kind.

Immediately below the tabular divisions of the four texts, which are the BHS, Moffat, Wookey and BSSA, I presented the unit's literal formal equivalent in English as accurately and concisely as I could. I did that to avoid possible uncertainties as to the parameters of the unit in its English version. That needs not be construed as a premature jump to a decision because after the formal equivalent, I discussed the functional correspondent, the different nuances and debates surrounding the interpretation of the Hebrew unit as well as a justification of the interpretation (where a standard exegetical interpretation is not well-established). However, some of my decisions needed a very brief explanation. That normally occurred when a misinterpretation of the Hebrew unit was apparently not the cause of the shift, when the interpretation was not contested by scholars in general and/or when discussing the interpretation was not useful towards correcting the shift.

I classified the mismatches as formal shifts, formal and functional shifts, and functional shifts. I further rationalised why I deemed them as such and elaborated how they departed from the Hebrew unit's meaning. Then I postulated the circumstances in terms of cognitive Contextual Frames of Reference (CFRs) that could have influenced the translators towards their decision. Lastly, as a conclusion to the discussion of the shift(s) of a given Hebrew unit, I suggested and explained the best Setswana rendering for the unit using the standard of "an exegetically justifiable interpretation" of the Hebrew text (cf. the key term "exegetical," page 132). Admittedly, such a standard is ultimately skewed towards functional correspondence – as the

² Sometimes the Setswana unit would cover two sentences in my endeavour to represent the Hebrew unit adequately.

³ The shifts cover the four chapters of the book of Ruth.

reader will discover in this chapter – but it is not incompatible with formal correspondence (cf. the key terms “formal shift” and “functional shift” below).⁴

I wrote all the verses in the latest orthography as used by Wookey (1992 edition), which was also the Botswana/South Africa government approved orthography of the time (cf. Tswana Terminology and Orthography 1972). I took this decision to avoid confusion and false appearances of shifts. Such differences between the three Bibles may accidentally seem to the reader of this thesis to pertain to different meanings or forms whereas there is essentially no difference in that regard, especially as far as the rendering of the Hebrew text is concerned. The latest government approved document stipulating a new orthography, which I refer to in this thesis as CASAS 2003, essentially retains the 1972 orthography.⁵

6.2 Excluded Shifts

Some shifts are excluded from the discussion and are listed in Appendix F of this thesis. This is done because, firstly, it was not possible to be exhaustive, given the scope and time frame of this project. Secondly, some shifts were too trivial, causing no mismatch in meaning with the interpretation of the Hebrew text. Thirdly, some shifts were important but were repetitive. That occurred because the Bibles often translated certain expressions consistently. Fourthly, the study sought to allot a roughly balanced number of shifts to the four categories of CFRs, which are hypothetical influences on translators that probably led to erroneous decisions.⁶ Consequently, some important shifts were excluded because their CFR category was already well represented.

⁴ As noted in chapter four, a formal correspondence approach is a viable translation method just like functional correspondence. However, the present CFR framework of my study is more functional than formal.

⁵ It introduces conjunctive writing where particles and pronouns are attached to verbs, nouns and other grammatical items.

⁶ The undiscussed shifts were compiled and are listed in the appendix section of this study.

6.3 Key Concepts

Formal shift: A formal shift is best regarded as a “departure from formal correspondence in the process of going from the SL to the TL” (Catford 1965: 73).⁷ In my research, a departure from formal correspondence is identified in one of the following ways: Firstly, it could occur when the Setswana text uses a lexical item that does not correspond to the Hebrew form. For example, if the Setswana text were to use the word *monna* (male adult or man) for the Hebrew ST’s אִישׁ, that would be identified as a formal shift.⁸ A formal shift also occurs when the Setswana text uses one or more extra lexical items which do not have a formal correspondent in the Hebrew text. For example, the Setswana text could have opted to render אִשָּׁה as *mosadi yole* (that woman) instead of just *mosadi* (woman). Conversely, a formal shift can occur when the Setswana TT does not render all forms that the Hebrew unit contains, such as, for example, if the Hebrew unit had רוּת הַמֹּאֲבִיטָה (Ruth the Moabitess), but the Setswana TT just renders it as “Ruth.” A formal shift also occurs when the sentence construction in the Setswana TT does not follow that of the Hebrew unit. For example, a Setswana TT may render the phrase, מִשִּׂבְעָהּ (from her satisfaction), as *a sena go kgora* (after she was satisfied), which turns the noun phrase into a clause. Lastly, a formal shift can occur where the Setswana TT form represents an ungrammatical construction. For example, a Setswana Bible could render וַיִּטֵּב לְבוֹ (and his heart was merry) as *pelo ya gagwe e natehala* (his heart was enjoyable). In Setswana, this expression is ungrammatical, and would lead to a formal shift.

Functional shift:⁹ A functional shift is a departure from functional correspondence. Functional equivalence, in turn, can be more comprehensively understood as “an acceptable, appropriate, appreciable degree of ‘similarity’ in terms of the meaning variables of pragmatic intent, semantic content, and textual-stylistic form” (Wendland 2002: 177). An example of a

⁷ Catford’s definition fits that of “formal shift,” although he applied this definition to the whole concept of “shift.” He considered all shifts to be departures from formal correspondence to the Hebrew text (Catford 1965: 73).

⁸ Formal shifts sometimes lead to functional shifts (as is the case with this shift from *monna* (man) to *mosadi* (woman), especially if the form could be said to emanate from erroneous interpretation. However, at other times, a formal shift is chosen in order to avoid a functional shift. For example, in Ruth 4:17, BSSA leaves out the forms “they called him a name saying” in order to avoid the semantic confusion (functional shift) that the expression creates in Setswana. Instead, BSSA opts for a formal shift with “they said” (cf. the shift in 4:17).

⁹ The heuristic concepts of “formal” and “functional” are differentiated and specified in this way purely as a working model for this thesis.

functional shift could be if the Setswana TT rendered וַתִּדְבַק בְּנַעֲרֹת בְּעֹז (she clung to the maidservants of Boaz) as *a tlamparela barweetsana ba ga Boase* (she hugged the maidservants of Boaz). That would probably affect the interpretation of a large portion of the narrative's discourse in the Setswana TT. The reason is that the TT audience would want to understand why Ruth is hugging the servants. Since that is not part of the narrative, they could be confused by subsequent narrative events that do not fit their understanding. The semantic intent in the context of functional correspondence can include pragmatic and textual stylistic effects of the ST (Wendland 2002: 177). Hence, if the intended information and its intended effects and response on the original audience are not captured by the TT, then the translation represents a functional shift. Such effects can be socio-cultural or stylistic, or may simply entail a different exegetical interpretation of the text. Thus, functional shifts can be socio-cultural, stylistic or simply exegetical. However, "exegetical" is quite generic, and will sometimes overlap conceptually with "socio-cultural" and "stylistic/literary."¹⁰

Meaning: The idea of meaning is applied prominently in this study, such as when a shift represents an inexact/erroneous meaning, or when describing the referential, representational or connotational meaning of a unit or rendering. The following is a concise description of the general concept of "meaning" from a CL perspective (cf. section 2.4.2, page 24ff) that is applied in this chapter: meaning is information about realities that are part and parcel of human existence, most of which have been stored as concepts of the mind and some of which are expressed through linguistic symbols (Croft and Cruse 2004: 7; Geeraerts 2006: 1-3).¹¹ Occasionally, referential, representational and connotational meanings overlap. Referential meaning is best understood as the "objects, events, abstracts [and] relations" that symbols or linguistic units refer to or denote (Nida and Taber 1974: 56). Its synonym is denotational meaning. Functional shifts in this study primarily emanate from failure by the Setswana Bibles to convey the referential meaning of the BHS unit. As for representational meaning, it can be explained best as the objects, events, abstracts and relations that are represented by

¹⁰ These labels pertain to effects as observable in the TL forms, so they are really a further description of a shift's behaviour. The labels which pertain to circumstances that led to shifts, or, in other words, influences on translators which resulted in an erroneous decision, are postulated as Contextual Frames of Reference (CFRs).

¹¹ A symbol is a sign that encodes experience. Examples of symbols include written words, audio, video, sign language, drama and art sculptures (Evans and Green 2006: 6; Wilt 2003: 34-35). The present chapter deals primarily with linguistic meaning since BHS and the Setswana Bibles consist of almost entirely linguistic symbols. None of these Bibles include illustrations.

symbols (Evans 2006: 498-499). Representational meaning focuses more on a contextual understanding of the TT symbol and less on its referential meaning, although the two are not necessarily incompatible. For example, the rendering *Obete* for “Obed” (the Hebrew name meaning “he who serves”) in the Setswana Bibles gives a representational meaning – the referential meaning for “Obed” is better captured by a name like *Modiri* or *Modiredi* (worker or server).¹² A representational TT rendering can be either referentially accurate or inaccurate in relation to the ST. Connotative meaning is best understood as the associations evoked by symbols (Evans and Green 2006: 210). In this chapter, connotative meaning is most conspicuous when there is a shift in which the Setswana TT evokes the wrong associations for the corresponding lexical unit in BHS. Apart from the specific terminology discussed in this paragraph, reference to these types of meanings will also be recognised by the reader in the chapter in verbs like “refer to,” “connote,” “denote” and “represent.”

Contextual Frames of Reference: After describing each shift, I will postulate what governing cognitive factors – CFRs – could have influenced the translators towards the rendering that led to the shift (cf. section 2.5, page 30ff). As indicated in chapter two, I classify the CFRs into organisational, socio-cultural, textual and communication situational frames.

Exegetical: The term “exegetical” as used in this chapter refers to the interpretation of the Hebrew/BHS text. It will be found in various forms such as “exegetical difficulties/problems/frames” and “exegetical shortcomings/failures/errors.” I will postulate causes of exegetical errors as unavoidable difficulties, accidental renderings and fatigue, or indeterminable origins. The exegetical errors in this chapter will be described in CFR terms, namely, as emanating from problematic textual, socio-cultural and communication situational contexts.¹³

¹² Representational meaning features most prominently in the aesthetic analysis of art objects.

¹³ In this study, exegetical subframes are not hypothesised under organisational CFRs because the study cannot determine whether the translator actually faced an exegetical difficulty or simply followed the form of the Hebrew text (or KJV, or another ancient English Bible).

6.4 Tables of Shifts in Ruth

6.4.1 Ruth 1:1

| BHS | Moffat | Wookey | BSSA |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| Title [not available] | Title not available | Title not available | Elimeleke le ba lapa la gagwe ba hudugela kwa Moabe (Elimelech and his family relocate to Moab) |

Title. The BHS text does not have titles.¹⁴

Moffat 1857 and Wookey 1908 do not give titles to chapters or sections. Because the Hebrew text does not have titles and headings, their absence in a translation is not a formal shift. It can be deemed as a slight functional shift, nonetheless, as regards naturalness or style in TL communication. That is because, without titles or headings, the TT can appear disorderly and psychologically daunting.¹⁵ This slight functional shift can be ascribed to organisational CFRs because it was apparently the convention of translations of the time to provide no titles in TTs. Wookey added a chapter title in its 1992 revision, viz., *Elimeleke le ba ntlo ya gagwe ba hudugela kwa Moabe* (Elimelech and his family relocate to Moab). The title is essentially similar to that of BSSA 1970. The addition of a title represents a formal shift because it is an additional form that the Hebrew text does not have. The shift can be attributed to an exegetical frame of reference in particular and a textual CFR in general. The translators probably deemed that without chapter titles, the text would be difficult for the TT audience to organise and interpret.

¹⁴ Because of space limitations, I also discuss collectively other shifts here that pertain to formatting and paratextual aids like chapter titles, section headings, paragraph divisions, speech quotation marks and footnotes.

¹⁵ A few verses into the chapter, the audience can get lost visually and conceptually. As a result, it will require more work from the audience to mentally organise the narrative, which can be distracting and lead to a loss of “relevance.”

For the revisions, Wookey 1992 gives the title to the whole chapter while BSSA 1987 adds a heading for a smaller division of the chapter at 1:6, namely, *Naomi le Ruthe ba boela kwa Betleheme* (Naomi and Ruth return to Bethlehem).¹⁶ It can be argued that the chapter title of the Wookey translation represents a functional shift because it applies to just a small part of the chapter rather than to the whole chapter. For example, Elimelech's family relocates to Moab, but within the first quarter of the chapter, they return to Bethlehem. However, the chapter title "Elimelech and his family relocate to Moab" implies that the whole chapter is about their relocation to Moab. In addition, it also wrongly suggests that the focal participant throughout the chapter is Elimelech, while in fact he is removed from the narrative stage as early as verse 3. Therefore, the functional shift represents an erroneous TT meaning.

An organisational CFR that pertains to Wookey's methodology can be hypothesised for this particular decision. That is because when Wookey provides a functional rendering or paratextual aid, it tends to fall short of being fully functional. As will be seen in the shifts below, Wookey's method often appears as intermediate between those of Moffat and BSSA. For instance, Wookey is often more idiomatic than Moffat, but less so than BSSA. It is also less form-oriented than the Moffat version, but still less functional than BSSA.

The title and subtitle of BSSA present an accurate interpretation of the Hebrew text's order, and therefore, do not manifest a functional shift.

Apparently, contemporary organisational CFRs are such that paratextual aids are now popular in Bible translation in Setswana. For example, BSSA 1987 and Wookey 1992 added speech quotation marks, paragraph divisions and section headings. A specific organisational CFR in this regard pertains to the use of the Good News Bible (i.e., Today's English Version – TEV) because the paratextual aids of the two Bibles often match those of the GNB.¹⁷ The original Wookey also did not have footnotes. Wookey 1992 included them, although they are quite

¹⁶ The publication of Moffat was discontinued before it made any such revisions.

¹⁷ Apart from their revisions following the GNB's above-mentioned paratextual aids and formatting, the Setswana Bibles, which were translated earlier than the GNB (published in 1970), did not revise their translations according to the GNB. Actually, the only other aspects of their revisions were dialectal and orthographic (cf. chapter four). This fact explains why this chapter observes almost no organisational influence from the GNB, even though the GNB was very influential to Bible translation in general after its publication.

conservative – they are only cross references and are very few (seven in total throughout the book of Ruth). Among the above mentioned paratextual aids, the original BSSA had only chapter titles and footnotes but incorporated the others in its 1987 revision (cf. “The Revision of the BSSA Bible,” page 107). The latest reprints of BSSA (i.e., 2008) and Wookey (i.e., 2013) match generally in such paratextual aids, but differ at Ruth 1:6 where Wookey does not provide a heading, and where Wookey seems restrained in the provision of footnotes.

The three Setswana Bibles’ practice of either providing or not providing titles appears to be determined primarily by organisational (or institutional) frames of reference. For certain reasons, the initiating agencies and client institutions may or may not have preferred to have titles in their translations. Such preferences can be said to fall under different ages of Bible translation. Moffat (1857) was made in the missionary period when translation agencies tended to avoid titles, headings and footnotes, but attempted to make the TT follow the original text’s forms literally and word for word (cf. Makutoane and Naude 2009: 83). It is likely that, at the time, stakeholder institutions deemed titles to add human ideas to Scripture (cf. Metzger 2001: 73-74). Wookey (1908) was made in the missionary revisions period. Although its revision (1992) was made long after that period, it still follows a conservative methodology with regard to formatting and paratextual aids. As for BSSA (1970), it was made at a time when stakeholder institutions were liberal about providing additional material in the translation to aid interpretation – this explains why even the original BSSA version had titles and footnotes.

Paratextual aids and formatting are commendable for Bible translation because they can contribute towards the target audience’s interpretation of the text. Cross references, footnotes, titles and headings can evoke a conceptual frame of reference to aid and guide the interpretation process. On the one hand, considering that Wookey’s avoidance of a section heading resulted in a skewed title, as discussed above, one would find BSSA’s practice of providing section headings to be preferable. On the other hand, Moffat’s lack of titles could only serve audiences well in certain contexts in the contemporary period when there are other TT oriented translations.¹⁸ Some stakeholder institutions may mutually decide on an ST oriented version to accompany the functional one.

¹⁸ The missionary era of Moffat did not have the advantage of different Bible versions in existence, in contrast with the current situation in which there are two other versions of the Setswana Bible instead of none.

| | | | |
|-------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| בֵּית לֶחֶם | Beta-lehema (Bethlehem) | Bethelehema (Bethlehem) | Betleheme (Bethlehem) |
|-------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|

The Hebrew name formally corresponds to “Bethlehem.” It literally means “house of bread.” בֵּית לֶחֶם primarily designates bread, food, grain or staple food (Fabry 1995: 521-529).

The important shift that occurs in all the three translations is found in the disappearance of the element of “bread” or “food” in the Setswana renderings of the name Bethlehem. The irony of the story is lost, namely, that there is hunger in the “house of bread,” in contrast with the foreign fields of Moab (LaCocque 2004: 20). This shift is unavoidable because, being a proper name, Bethlehem could not be replaced with *Ntlo-ya-dijo* (house of bread) in Setswana. The shift is functional because the TT’s “Bethlehem” does not profile the concept “house of bread” which is profiled by the Hebrew text. The reader’s awareness of the root meaning of Bethlehem is important for the interpretation of the story, but the meaning is not discernible in the translation.

In terms of CFRs, it appears that the major English translations have set a methodological precedent for these Bibles’ translation of proper names – they transliterate them. This can be described as organisational CFRs. In turn, these transliterated Setswana forms of Bethlehem sound more natural than *ntlo ya dijo*, and have grown to be recognised by Setswana audiences as the name of the town referred to. Literary frames, viz., frames from a stylistic point of view, can be said to overlap with organisational CFRs. In other words, the decision for this shift was also made to avoid poor style in the TL. Such literary frames are a subframe of the generic textual CFR. A footnote, however, could assist to restore the cognitive relationship between the name “Bethlehem” and “food.” It could explain that “Bethlehem means ‘house of food.’” The story presents the irony of hunger in the house of food.

| | | | |
|--------|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| לָגוּר | Tlolatlola (jump about repeatedly) | Jaka (Sojourn) | Jaka (Sojourn) |
|--------|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|

The Hebrew expression literally means to sojourn, or dwell for a time (whether definite or indefinite), or dwell as a newcomer (BDB 1907: 157). The word’s meanings include “to tarry

as a foreigner, to attack, strive and to be afraid” (Kellermann 1975: 439-440). Kellermann ponders whether these differences are a result of independent homonymous roots or whether there is a connection between them “so that the various meanings represent special meanings of the same root” (*ibid.*). He hypothesizes that to be foreign and hostile could have been “two different observations about the same person.” Nonetheless, the narrative discourse points to the simple choice “dwell for a time as a foreigner or newcomer.” The verb גור indicates that Elimelech would probably return after some time or after the famine (Block 1999: 30).

Moffat represents a formal and functional shift because the lexical form, *tlolatlola* (jump repeatedly), does not refer to the Hebrew text’s concept for sojourn. The word *tlola* means “jump,” and *tlolatlola* means “hop about aimlessly” (Cole 1955: 217). However, one would have expected it to be as easy then to identify the Setswana expression *jaka* for “sojourn” as it is today. That is because the practice of “sojourn” was well known to Batswana, especially since they had many sojourners living among them (Schapera 1994: 20). Moreover, they sometimes travelled and attached themselves to other tribes to escape their own famines and political enemies (Schapera 1952: 23).¹⁹

Nonetheless, all indications are that Moffat produced the word *tlolatlola* by accident – he rather misspelt *tlholatlhola*, a word that connotes “spend day after day.” According to Cole (1955: 217), the frequentative form that Moffat created here would signify “that the action is carried out frequently or repetitively, often with the added idea of indiscriminate, careless, aimless or inopportune action.” The frequentative is formed by reduplicating the verb stem (*ibid.*). Possibly, by reduplicating this verb stem, Moffat may have thought that he was conveying to his readers the idea that Elimelech’s family aimlessly spent day after day in Moab. Moffat’s European accent apparently caused him to pronounce the phoneme *tl-* as an aspirated explosive (i.e., as *tlh-*) rather than as an ejective explosive (cf. Cole 1955: 21). As a result, Moffat’s readers could interpret that Elimelech’s family hopped all over the country of Moab. Yet even if we were to correct Moffat’s misspelling, we would still encounter an erroneous verb – *tlholatlhola*. The verb for “spend a day,” whether doubled or not, does not profile “sojourn,” which would have evoked the category *mojaki* (cf. the discussion of *jaka*

¹⁹ For example, the ancestors of Moseki, Marokhu and Dinokwane wards among the Bamangwato came from the Bakwena, in search of food either as single families or as individuals (*ibid.*).

below) and its troubling connotations of foreignness, stigma, economic disadvantage and dependency that would be triggered in the mind of a Setswana MT speaker.²⁰

In the communication of Moffat, the communicator would have been expected to choose the established word, *jaka*. Therefore, the shift represents a significant difference in lexical form between the TT and the Hebrew text. The shift seems to be caused by a limited knowledge of Setswana vocabulary. In terms of CFRs, the influence of such insufficient knowledge can be classified as a type of deficient lexical frame, which is a subframe of the heuristic textual CFR. Errors with respect to this kind of lexical/textual CFR have caused many shifts in the Moffat translation, most of which have not been discussed due to their repetitiveness and insufficient space. One of the translator's challenges was that all the mother tongue speakers at the time were illiterate and could not proofread the translator's manuscript.²¹ This inadequacy of mother tongue influence is stark when Moffat is compared with the other two Bibles.

The Wookey and BSSA translations are more in line with the meaning of the Hebrew word גַּר. The word *jaka* means to reside as a stranger in a foreign land (in short "sojourn," which is one of the options of Brown (1980: 544). To sojourn occurs in Setswana worldview primarily because of economic difficulties or political insecurity. A *mojaki* (sojourner) is always regarded as a stranger by the locals, even if s/he resides permanently. S/he, like the Hebrew גַּר (cf. BDB 1907: 157), has no or much fewer privileges and rights in contrast with the locals. Kellermann (1975) mentions similar kinds of causes and conditions for a Hebrew sojourner as the Tswana one. Ruth the Moabitess' conditions and labours in Bethlehem, because they are elaborated more, reflect better the travails of a sojourner than those of Elimelech. That is despite the fact that Elimelech, and not Ruth, is said to have sojourned.

²⁰ Brown's (1980: 544) dictionary translates the word "sojourn" erroneously as *tlholatlhola*. In its preface, it says that the dictionary maker "learned much from those of the preceding generation, men such as Moffat, Ashton, Livingstone and Hughes, who had pioneered the study of the language" (Brown 1980: iii). Thus, Moffat's writings, in which he attached erroneous meanings to some Setswana words, probably influenced decisions made in the Brown dictionary. Moreover, the word *tlholatlhola* is not recorded in the other Setswana dictionaries (for example, Dent 1992: 182; Snyman, Shole and Le Roux 1990: 184).

²¹ Whilst he probably got assistance in countless instances, it must have been impractical to read out loud every word with an illiterate proofreader.

The word *jaka* is still in use, but might be declining among younger audiences. That would be because of less frequent usage of the word. The practice of *jaka* is quickly being replaced by that of searching for employment. In ancient times, leaving one’s community and joining a foreign one only happened in dire economic or political circumstances. That started to change when the Batswana were introduced to the concept of monetary employment, especially men who found jobs in South African mines and farms where they could spend many months away from home each year (Kooijman 1978: 79-80). Nowadays, many Batswana need to live away from their original communities because of school and formal employment in more urbanised areas or even other countries. There is a threat that this new socio-cultural CFR can diminish the afore-mentioned traditional subframes of the term *jaka* (sojourn) for Setswana TT audiences in the future, so a footnote explaining the word’s background may be necessary in a future Bible translation.

6.4.2 Ruth 1:5

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|---|---|
| מִשְׁנֵי יְלָדֶיהָ | [...]bomorwawe ba tu (her two sons) | [...]bana ba gagwe ba babedi (her two children) | [...]bana ba babedi ba gagwe (her two children) |
|--------------------|--|---|---|

The Hebrew phrase literally means “without her two male children.” The expression יְלָדֶיהָ “her male children/boys” derives from the verb for “bring forth children” (Botterweck 1990: 76). A difference can be identified between this expression and the noun בָּן, which has connotations of familial belonging, membership and hereditary relationships (cf. HALOT 2000: 139, 413; Haag 1975: 145-159). Yet, the author rather appears to focus on Naomi’s infertility and empty-handedness. In ancient Israel the production of offspring was a significant socio-cultural frame.

In that case, the three Bibles all choose an imprecise correspondence of the Hebrew lexical item יְלָדֶיהָ. Moffat manifests a shift because its translation “sons” makes no attempt to differentiate between בָּנִים (“sons,” occurring in verse 1, for example) and יְלָדֶיהָ (“male children,” occurring in the present verse). It is a formal and functional shift because it profiles a different conceptual category from that of the Hebrew text. Moffat seems to follow the

decision of the KJV. Consequently, an organisational CFR can be hypothesised to have influenced this decision.²²

The other two Bibles manifest a formal and functional shift by rendering the unit with the general expression, *bana* (children). *Bana* leaves out the element of maleness. Setswana does not assign gender to the lexical item (Cole 1955: 415), so it cannot be thought to profile “male children” by any chance.²³ The shift represents an inexact or erroneous TL meaning. As for the cause of this shift, it appears that the translators have mistakenly thought that לְבָנִים is a generic term for “children,” so they picked a Setswana generic term for “children.” From a lexical semantic point of view, that is an exegetical mistake. Thus, a textual CFR of the lexical semantic type has led to the two latest Bibles’ decisions.

Bana ba basimane would be the best suggestion for translating this unit, for it is closer to the Hebrew text than the three Bibles’ existing renderings. Unlike the Wookey and BSSA translations, it does not widen the conceptual gap between לְבָנִים and its translation – also, unlike Moffat, it captures the difference, though not absolutely, between the Hebrew text’s intended concept of male children (*bana ba basimane*) and sons (*barwa*). It is not an absolute differentiation because, to a contemporary Setswana conceptual world, it is not possible to separate completely between the ideas of “sons” and “male children.” This type of imprecision is problematic for translation because it is an example of insurmountable linguistic differences between the two languages, which can inhibit the interpretation of an ST concept. That linguistic difference is a subtype of the textual CFR.

6.4.3 Ruth 1:6

| | | | |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| לָקַטְנִי | A lekotse (He visited) | A lekotse (He visited) | A babaletse (He protected) |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|

²² Project guidelines, personal "gatekeepers" (such as translation consultants) or convention may determine which versions to follow in times of difficulty in the translation process.

²³ It appears unlikely that the decision was due to ignorance of the lexical item because the lexeme is simple, and there was scholarly expertise and resources available during the making of these two translations (Smit 1970: 200-203).

The basic meaning of לָקַח can be summarized as “examine closely” and includes the consequences of such an examination (Andre 2003: 51; Williams 1997: 659). Other translation options for the verb include “attend to, take care of, provide for, protect, visit, give heed to and to muster, among others” (BDB 1907: 823). In general, the verb has the positive function of “bless” and the negative one of “punish” (De Waard and Nida 1991: 10; Williams 1997: 659). Hence, in the context of this verse, the verb is taken to denote “attend to” in order to bless or provide for.

The three Bibles use the verbs *lekotse* (Moffat and Wookey) and *babaletse* (BSSA) for לָקַח. The difficulty with the choice, *lekotse*, is that whilst it connotes “attend to or visit,” it lacks the additional sense of “provide for.” That results in a formal and functional shift due to an inexact TL meaning as well as a difference between the Hebrew and TT lexical forms. The socio-cultural context of *lekotse* interferes with an accurate understanding of לָקַח. In a Setswana traditional cultural context, a visitor or guest could be notoriously burdensome. S/he is normally in need of provisions, and the host is expected to provide for such needs (cf. Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 20).²⁴ Even in contemporary times when the hosting family is likely to be in need, such as during sickness or bereavement, it is an exception when the guest helps cover the expenses of his/her stay.²⁵ The tradition could have emanated from the fact that visitors often walked long distances to reach their destinations, had to travel light, did not carry food, water, and other necessities, and were hungry, thirsty and tired by the time they arrived. Long distance communication was almost non-existent, which meant that the visitor could not forewarn his host about the impending visit. Yet, food and water were traditionally scarce commodities to an average Motswana family, and were often rationed strictly (cf. Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 19).²⁶ Probably, one of the reasons why the Setswana worldview does not say that God visits people is because, rather than to be provided for, God

²⁴ Failure to provide food for visitors, traditionally, could create a stigma or shame for the host (Alverson 1978: 14).

²⁵ Particularly in times of bereavement, several well-wishers and relatives often visit for several days to comfort and give a helping hand, and the hosting family is expected to provide for them.

²⁶ The authors note that malnutrition was common (Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 19). A traditional Setswana meal consisted of sorghum (“kaffir corn”) porridge with little or no relish. As a Motswana of the Balete group, I can add that even the porridge itself was not necessarily abundant – apart from the usually insubstantial amount of the harvest, the grain itself had to be pounded and sifted in a long and laborious process everyday to feed the extended family. Thus, the arrival of a visitor could cause much rationing.

is expected to provide food, water and other necessities for people.²⁷ For that reason, *lekotse* invokes different referential and connotational meanings from those invoked by לָקַח . It is possible that this decision was influenced by the KJV rendering, which uses the term “visit.” The organisational CFR of consulting the KJV could be hypothesised for Moffat’s decision.

BSSA’s *babaletse* corresponds to “protected or conserved” (Le Roux 1991: 327; Snyman et al. 1990: 5). It is difficult to postulate whether BSSA intended to convey “protected/conserved,” or the unlikely sense of “provided for.” “Provided for” is an implausible rendering of *babaletse*, even though Brown and Dent present it as one of the possibilities (Brown 1980: 13; Dent 1992: 81).²⁸ One can postulate that Brown carried over errors from pioneer grammarians (cf. Brown 1980: iii). Nevertheless, it is difficult to postulate why the more contemporary Dent or BSSA would assume that *babaletse* could refer to “provided for.” If that possibility is discarded altogether, the denotation remaining for the BSSA is “protected” or “conserved.” That would mean Naomi learned that Yahweh had protected or preserved his people. If this is what BSSA’s translation intends to convey, then it causes a functional shift because the rendering gives an inexact TT meaning when compared with the Hebrew unit. The shift would be formal, too, because the lexical form of the TT would be different from the one suggested by the Hebrew text. A more plausible understanding of the Hebrew unit’s discourse appears to be that Yahweh simply responded to the people’s need for food. The need for protection or preservation would be a more specific interpretation than what the Hebrew text seems to convey. As regards CFR influences on BSSA, it is also difficult to hypothesise how it chose an erroneous lexical item for לָקַח whilst a more obvious and accurate TL term (*tlamela*) existed. The best proposal one can make is that a lexical semantic, or more generically, textual CFR is responsible for this shift, but it is not possible for me to explain the reason for its occurrence.

When God provides like that, He is said to be blessing the people, taking care of them, remembering them or having mercy on them, rather than visiting or protecting them. The lexical form *tlamela* (provide for) would be the best option for rendering לָקַח .

²⁷ Ancestral spirits, however, could visit expecting to be provided with food, blood, alcohol and other goods (Setiloane 1976: 66, 67 and 71).

²⁸ More dictionaries leave out the possibility that *babalela* could correspond to “provide for” such as Hartshorne, Swart and Rantao (1984: 608), and Le Roux (1991: 327).

6.4.4 Ruth 1:8

| | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|---|
| לְבַיִת אִמָּהָ | Tlung ya mmaagwe (To the house of her mother) | Kwa ga mmaagwe (To her mother's home) | Kwa lapeng la ga mmaagwe (To the home of her mother). |
|-----------------|---|---|---|

The Hebrew phrase corresponds to “to the house of her mother.” It primarily refers to “house,” “dwelling place,” “home,” “family,” “dynasty” and other related nuances (HALOT 2000: 129; Wilson 1997: 655). Because they are likely to refuse to return, Naomi apparently entices her daughters-in-law to think of a dwelling place with connotations of family, security, pleasant memories and emotional stability. Her mention of their mothers reinforces her enticement.²⁹

In Setswana tradition, house (and/or hut) is understood as one of the permanent shelters in a home. The “home” corresponds to the Setswana concept of *lelapa/lolwapa* (Dent 1992: 133). Naomi’s invocation of “mother’s house” harmonises with the Setswana traditional worldview regarding the owner of the home. The mother, not the father, practically owns the houses/huts in the home (“home” usually has more than one hut). That scenario must be understood in pragmatic rather than legal terms. It is the woman’s prerogative to prepare shelter for cooking, for the children’s bedroom, storage and other uses, as well as to see to daily activities in the home (cf. Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 21). In Setswana traditional culture, the women (with the help of the children and female neighbours) built the houses without the help of their husbands (Lichtenstein 1973: 69). At the stage of roofing, the husband cuts the timber, but the women still roofed the huts (Moffat 1842: 252; Schapera and Comaroff 1991:21). The husband, especially if he had more than one wife, was often treated as a guest in the home (Lichtenstein 1973: 76). He spent much of the day absent: hunting, herding cattle, visiting or at council meetings. The home was mostly the domain of the mother and the children (especially girls, since boys often fed and watered cattle away from home). Similarly, to a Motswana “home” for Ruth and Orpah is a dwelling place with connotations of family

²⁹ Moreover, such memories probably include apprenticeship for raising her own family with a husband, which is the ultimate blessing. Naomi utters the blessing of finding marriage in the same breath as the advice to return to their mother’s homes, thereby making an association between the two – at least mentally – to entice the two daughters-in-law (cf. Block 1999: 34).

security, memories of a mother’s love and other benefits. Ruth and Orpah have lost their husbands, so they need to start life afresh from the secure homes of their mothers.

Moffat’s *tlung* denotes the physical structure “house,” but does not evoke the nuance of “home.”³⁰ Therefore, it represents a functional shift. It avoids a formal shift, however. The functional shift denotes and evokes a different concept from that of the Hebrew text. An organisational CFR probably led to this decision since it is as literal as possible, and it resembles the KJV’s. Wookey’s *kwa ga mmaagwe* is idiomatic – even more so than BSSA’s. The expression refers conceptually to “her mother’s home,” though it leaves out the actual form “home.” It leads to a formal shift because it lacks the Hebrew text’s form for “home – *lelapa*,” which has become redundant. The formal shift can be ascribed to a lexical frame, which is a subframe of the textual CFR. That is, the translators avoided elements of the Hebrew form which could lead to clumsy communication. In the process, Wookey avoids a functional shift. It is the most preferable rendering because it is precise and not as longwinded as BSSA’s. This is one of the instances in Wookey where evidence of mother tongue influence is remarkable (cf. section 4.4.2.1 “The translation of the Wookey Bible”).

| | | | |
|-------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| ᠲᠦᠯᠠᠭ | Pelonomi (kindness) | Pelonomi (kindness) | Lorato (love) |
|-------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------|

The word ᠲᠦᠯᠠᠭ (*hesed*) generally corresponds lexically to “loving kindness,” yet it is essentially relational and reciprocal, and often arises in times of need (Baer and Gordon 1997: 218; Stoebe 1997: 454). It has many specific possible interpretations related to “loving kindness.” Here, Naomi is wishing that Yahweh would show her daughters-in-law *hesed* just as they had shown in their relationship with her and their deceased husbands. The starting point towards interpreting the term is to consider it in general as a noun for acts of goodness or kindness (Stoebe 1997: 453; Zobel 1986: 47). *Hesed* is best understood as describing an act rather than a virtue in a similar way that the English sense of “kindness” does (Stoebe 1997: 453). Such a description includes the potential of graciousness, devotion, love, favour, mercy, loyalty, faithfulness and other qualities (Baer and Gordon 1997: 218; HALOT 2000: 337-

³⁰ Dictionary entries such as “*lapa*,” “*ntlo*,” “family” and “home” (Snyman et al. 1990: 82 and 111; Hartshorne et al. 1984: 185/572; Hartshorne et al. 1984: 136/559) separate the concepts of “home” and “house.” They confirm Setswana traditional usage which confines the meaning of *ntlo* to the physical structure of “house” or “hut.”

338). Translating *hesed* in terms of only one of such virtues does not convey the full meaning of the term, however, because *hesed* tends to be more descriptive and specific to the Hebrew text's contexts. Moreover, there seems to be no clear criteria for picking one nuance over another in a given context. A good example of this problem is the different contextual applications of *hesed* in the book of Ruth (1:8, 2:20 and 3:10).

The Moffat and Wookey Bibles translate the term as *pelonomi* while BSSA uses *lorato*. BSSA's *lorato* corresponds to "love" (Snyman et al. 1990: 138; 287). The word *lorato* tends to evoke attitudes and feelings of affection, and can be used to refer exclusively to them.³¹ *Hesed*, however, has a strong element of loyalty and faithfulness which is based on an interpersonal relationship (HALOT 2000: 337). It neither denotes nor is it based on feelings of affection, but rather labels actions (Zobel 1986: 47). In this case, *lorato* departs in some ways from *hesed*'s general concept of "to do good." Consequently, it can be said that BSSA represents a functional shift. That is because there is a difference in connotational meaning between the Hebrew text's *hesed* and that of the TT (viz. *lorato*). It can be argued, though, that it does not represent a formal shift since *lorato* is one of the valid representational meanings of *hesed*. It can be hypothesised that BSSA's inclination towards natural language has led to this decision. *Lorato* is natural and simple whilst *pelonomi* is more technical and less common. Therefore, the choice can be ascribed to methodology, in which case an organisational CFR could be postulated for it.

The word *pelonomi* used by the Moffat and Wookey Bibles can be deemed as a closer equivalent of *hesed* than *lorato* (used by BSSA). It refers to kindness and goodness, which label actions more than they label feelings. *Bopelonomi* refers to a character of kindheartedness, goodness and generosity which can be deemed to primarily profile the person's habitual actions (Snyman et al. 1990: 121). Nonetheless, *pelonomi* represents a significant functional shift because it does not typically apply to an isolated act of kindness, nor does it label the action separately from the doer. Rather, the act must come from a person who is known to be habitually kind or kindhearted in order for it to qualify as *bopelonomi*. Setswana audiences, for example, may conclude that Orpah was not *pelonomi* because her kindness did not last long enough in the narrative, despite her mother-in-law labeling her acts

³¹ Brown adds the concept "passion" to "love" while Dent adds "affectionate" (Brown 1980: 169; Dent 1992: 137).

to Naomi and the deceased men as *hesed*. Yet, *pelonomi* can be deemed to represent no formal shift since it is also one of the possible glosses of *hesed*. Therefore, the Moffat and Wookey Bibles can be said to avoid a formal shift but to manifest a slight functional shift.

Textual CFRs of the subtype of lexical and linguistic frames can be hypothesised for this shift. That is, the linguistic differences between the two languages, as regards this lexical item, are so problematic that the Hebrew term's precise equivalent in the TL does not exist. *Pelonomi* appears to be the closest that a Setswana TT can come to a rendering of *hesed*. Kindness, goodness, love and generosity, which are profiled in the three Bibles, are merely general attempts at representing *hesed*. Moreover, Naomi appears to have in memory more specific scenarios of the daughter's *hesed*, which they once showed, as well as corresponding scenarios of Yahweh's *hesed*, which she wishes him to show to them.³² Such specific scenarios, if explored further, would probably uncover more inadequacies of the TL vocabulary pertaining to rendering *hesed*.

6.4.5 Ruth 1:9

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| יִתֵּן יְהוָה לָכֶם וּמְצָאֲנָה מִנוּחָה אִשָּׁה בֵּית אִישָׁהּ | A Yehova a lo nee, gore lo bone ikhutso, mongwe le mongwe ntlong ya monna wa gagwe (May Jehovah grant you that you find rest, each one in the house of her husband) | A Jehova a lo neye gore lo bone boikhutso, mongwe le mongwe wa lona mo ntlong ya monna wa gagwe (May Jehovah grant you that you find rest, each one of you in the house of her husband) | A MORENA a lo thuse go bona boikhutso, mongwe le mongwe mo lapeng la monna wa gagwe (May The LORD help you to find rest, each one of you in the home of her husband). |
|--|--|---|---|

³² Alfredo's (2010: 135-139) postulation is an example of a more specific interpretation of *hesed* in this verse. The *hesed* of the daughters was specific to their roles of caring for the family in a marital and agrarian setting. Yahweh's *hesed* is expected to be a response to their widowhood, namely to restore them to their former positions, but in the meantime, to protect and provide for them.

The clause formally denotes “May Yahweh grant to you that you find a resting place, each woman in the house of her husband.” The primary meaning of מְנוּחָה is rest, yet “it often refers to ‘security,’ such as provided in marriage” (NET).³³ For that reason, English Bibles render it in three but related ways, namely, 1. Rest, 2. Security, and 3. Home (NET). In this unit, Naomi ties the blessing of מְנוּחָה to the premise of finding a husband so that whether מְנוּחָה is rest, security or home, it must result from finding a husband. Therefore, the present discussion primarily examines problems that may hinder the projection of the need to find a husband. If Yahweh finds each woman a husband, then she will have social and personal rest.

Two major problems faced by the Setswana Bibles are due to formally following the grammatical construction of the sentence as well as the socio-culturally incompatible elements of the Hebrew text and the Setswana TT. Firstly, in Setswana, the order of the clauses, when followed strictly, contradicts the message that the women are currently unmarried. Secondly, the concept of rest (מְנוּחָה – *menuhah*) is not compatible with the benefits of marriage in the Setswana worldview. The Setswana worldview neither considers life outside of marriage to be tiring, nor marriage to be the solution to fatigue.³⁴ The above mentioned problems pertain to elements of communication, namely, grammar/syntax, lexical semantics and extralinguistic context. Some minor, separate potential problems are literary and lexical, involving the rendering of the forms נָתַן (*nathan*) and אִשָּׁה (*ishshah*). In a Setswana sentence, a different lexical form is needed in order to render נָתַן (give/grant) naturally. As for אִשָּׁה in this sentence, it refers formally to “a woman,” but requires a shift in order to be rendered functionally.

The three Bibles follow the construction of the Hebrew unit formally, notably in the order of its clauses. By appearing first in the order of the Setswana sentence, the clause, *A Jehofa/MORENA a lo neye/thuse gore lo bone boikhutso* (May Yahweh grant to/help you that you find rest), skews the meaning of the sentence. It gives the impression that the two daughters in law are exhausted, and that their primary need is physical rest. Instead, the socio-cultural frames of the Hebrew text are such that their primary need is marriage. An accurate

³³ In contrast to the bitter life that Naomi had led, such a rest connotes “peace, permanence, and the satisfaction of having their daily needs met” (Block 1999: 34).

³⁴ Incidentally, the Batswana are aware of the potential difficulties of married life (cf. some examples in Schapera 1994: 149-151).

exegesis of the rest of the events and speeches of the Hebrew narrative, moreover, points towards the need for marriage rather than rest. That socio-cultural context is quite similar to that of Setswana in which every adult is expected to marry. Particularly, Setswana culture considers it more essential for a woman than a man to marry. Thus, the TT reader is likely to anticipate that the text will focus on the need for the two unmarried women to find husbands. In following the order of the Hebrew clauses, the three Bibles fall short exegetically because they put focus on a different topic from the one intended by the Hebrew text. As a result, the three Setswana Bibles can be said to represent a functional shift. The functional shift represents an inexact TT meaning.

By following the Hebrew unit formally, the next Setswana clause of the three Bibles, viz. *mongwe le mongwe wa lona mo ntlong ya monna wa gagwe* (each one of you in the house of her husband), communicates that the two women already have husbands and marital homes, and such homes are, by implication, full of strife. In the context of the Setswana sentence, Naomi's blessing primarily aims at replacing the strife in their marital homes with peace.³⁵ In that case, the three Bibles do not match the Hebrew unit's meaning. Therefore, they can be said to manifest a functional shift which is due to an inexact TT meaning. As regards the CFR model, an organisational frame may be postulated for Moffat, but for BSSA and Wookey, organisational frames may be ruled out because the translator does not normally follow strictly the order and lexical forms of the Hebrew unit. Rather, communication situational CFRs can be postulated for the two Bibles. The error probably occurred accidentally. That is, the translators reproduced literally the communication settings of the Hebrew text – viz., its text, cotext and context (or lexical, syntactic and extralinguistic frames) – unaware that they will communicate unintended information.

In order to capture the intended meaning of the Hebrew unit, the Setswana sentence would have to start with the need for marriage first, then get to the benefits of marriage. That is, firstly, the order of the clauses would have to be reversed so as to switch focus. That would eliminate the first problem of the three Bibles, which was the notion that the two women primarily lacked rest. In the first clause, Naomi would say, *A Jehofa/MORENA a lo neye/thuse gore lo bone lenyalo* (May Yahweh grant you that you find marriage). This clause

³⁵ Such a conclusion can be reached easily by some TT readers (and preachers) who have the habit of reading random pieces of Scripture without accounting for the contexts of their paragraphs.

breaks up the two concepts of marriage and home so that the one of marriage occurs in the clause that starts the sentence, and the one about home can be placed in the clause that ends the sentence. That also solves the second problem, namely, the impression given by its earlier version, that the women already had husbands and marital homes. The third problem can be solved in the following way: since according to a Setswana worldview, the benefits of marriage are not described in terms of finding rest (מְנוּחָה) but include the important concept of finding a home, the term *boikhutso* (rest) can be replaced with *bonno jo bo siameng* (a good dwelling place). The overall sentence would read approximately as, *A Jehofa/MORENA a lo neye/thuse gore lo bone lenyalo, mongwe le mongwe wa lona, gore le tle le bone bonno jo bo siameng* (May Yahweh grant you that you find marriage, each one of you, so that you may find a good dwelling place).

Such a sentence would represent formal and functional shifts grammatically or syntactically – represented by the re-ordering of the clauses and the introduction of the element of cause effect in the last clause, and lexically – represented by the use of different forms in the TT from those in the Hebrew text like *bonno jo bo siameng* (a good dwelling place) and *lenyalo* (marriage), and removing the form “husband.”

As for the minor problems in this unit, the first one occurs in the translation of the lexical form נָתַן (grant or give). Moffat and Wookey follow the form literally to produce *neye*. Consequently, they avoid a formal shift. The resultant Setswana sentences in the two Bibles, just like the Hebrew one which they follow word for word, are constructed in such a way that the form נָתַן can be understood to imply “cause” or “help.” Still, the Setswana sentences represent an unnatural or unidiomatic expression in contrast with the Hebrew unit’s sense. Therefore, Moffat and Wookey translations represent a slight functional shift from a literary or stylistic point of view. Organisational CFRs can be postulated for this error. For Moffat, it is because of its consistent literal formal correspondence, whilst for Wookey, it is because it often fluctuates between formal and functional correspondence. BSSA avoids such a shift with the translation, *thuse* (help), instead of *neye* (grant). It is more idiomatic than the other two translations although it leads to a formal shift. The shift was necessary to avoid an unnatural or unidiomatic TT form. The shift involves lexical frames, which are a subgroup of textual CFRs.

The second minor problem involves the rendering of the form הַשֵּׁנִי . The translations all represent a formal shift because they replace the form הַשֵּׁנִי with “each one.” This formal shift does not represent a functional shift since the expression is BH’s way to express the distributive sense “each one.” The cause of this shift can be ascribed to linguistic differences between the source language (SL) and the target language (TL) in which formal difference between the two is essential for correct rendering. Hence, diverse textual CFRs of the linguistic subframe can be postulated for this shift. Wookey produces another formal shift where it adds *wa lona* (of you) to the expression to read as “each one of you.” The expression becomes formally complete, but this causes no functional shift because *lona* adds nothing to the communicative context of the Setswana texts. It appears that *lona* was added in a quest to sound more natural, a quest which pertains to methodology and which, therefore, was influenced by its organisational CFR. It is a general organisational frame that led to verbosity for Wookey in general.

| | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| וַתִּשָּׂק לָהֶן | Me a ba atla (And she kissed them) | Foo a ba atla (Then she kissed them) | A ba a ba atla (Then she kissed them) |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|

The Hebrew expression formally corresponds to “And she kissed them.” The verb קָשַׁק has the concrete meaning of “kiss,” with various semantic contexts (Beyse 1986: 73), for example, “kissing at the acquisition of honour, at the occasion of a reunion after a long absence, and at the occasion of departure” (Beyse 1986: 74). Kissing one’s kin was practiced, but the Old Testament rarely refers to kissing between lovers or spouses. Where this occurs in Proverbs 7:13, it is reckoned as seduction by the adulterous woman (Beyse 1986: 74). The kissing being profiled in Ruth 1:8 is in farewell on the occasion of departure (Block 1999: 34; Bush 1998: 24).

The three Bibles’ renderings manifest a functional shift. That is because the TT does not indicate that Orpah bade farewell to Naomi. The Hebrew text seems to assume that to mention the kiss is to indicate farewell. In the Setswana texts, however, only the disagreement that follows between Naomi and the daughters-in-law indicates that the kiss was meant to mark the point of separation. That is because Setswana culture does not have a farewell kiss. After the kiss, the TT reader will probably still be waiting for an indication of the farewell. In

contemporary Setswana, a familial kiss, accompanied by a hug, occurs sometimes during excited reunification, but not during farewell. Moreover, in verse 14, it is not reported that Orpah actually departed, but merely that she kissed her mother-in-law. This manifests a functional shift because of the gap in information for the target reader. The functional shift represents an inexact or ambiguous TL meaning.

Regarding the cause of the error, the preceding discussion hints that the translators may have been unaware of the communication gap represented by the TT. They were tied to a surface reading of the text and did not consider possible clashes between the underlying socio-cultural frames of the two cultures (ancient Israelite and Tswana cultures). The communication situation frames of the TT do not sufficiently match those of the Hebrew unit. Taking cognisance of such socio-cultural (extralinguistic) frames could have contributed to their better understanding of the overall communication frames of the unit. Incongruous communication situation CFRs can be thought to have led to this shift. The extralinguistic element that is missing in the TT's communication context is the farewell, which was represented by a kiss in the Hebrew text but not by the kiss in the TT.

A formal shift in which words are added for clarification is needed to fill the information gap. The TT could be made to read as *Foo a ba laela ka go ba atla* (Then she bade them farewell with a kiss). Alternatively, a footnote could be provided for the formally correspondent sentence *Foo a ba atla* (then she kissed them) that reads *Go atla go ne go kaya go ba laela* (The kiss was a sign of farewell).

6.4.6 Ruth 1:10

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| אֶתְּךָ נָשׁוּב | Re tla ya nao (We will go with you) | Re tlaa boa nao (We will return with you) | Re tlaa boela nao (We will return with you) |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|

The expression formally corresponds to “we will return with you,” or “we want to return with you.” The Hebrew verb נָשׁוּב is an imperfect form that can be understood as having a modal or modal future sense (BHRG 2002: 149; NET). In this instance, the imperfect form should have a modal sense and should be understood to refer to a wish or desire.

The three translations represent a functional shift because they translate the clause as *re tla* [...] (we will [...]). The resultant expression is a simple future tense asserting the intention to return with their mother-in-law. The Hebrew unit’s discourse, rather, appears to convey a request, wish or intention. It appears that the two women were pleading with Naomi. Only one of them ended up going with Naomi, albeit after an apparent argument. Formally, the TTs do not manifest a shift because “we will return” is one of the possibilities of translating the phrase. Most major English Bibles also follow this interpretation.³⁶ The functional shift represents an inexact TL meaning.

For Moffat, its organisational CFR can be hypothesised because the KJV, which Moffat closely follows, also renders the unit as “we will go.” For Wookey and BSSA, exegetical shortcomings or more specifically, textual CFRs, can be postulated.³⁷ If they followed an older English Bible for this unit, that is probably because they faced an exegetical difficulty when interpreting נָשׁוּבָה. Such exegetical factors belong to lexical frames, which are a subtype of the generic textual CFR.

Re batla go boa le wena (we want to return with you) is the best choice for translating the unit.

6.4.7 Ruth 1:11

| | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|---|
| הַעוֹדֵי־לִי בָנִים בְּמִעֵי | A go sa le tshimane mmeleng wame? (Are there still boys in my body?) | A ke sa na le bana ba basimane mo sebopelong sa me? (Do I still have sons in my womb?) | Ke santse ke ka belega bomorwa? (Can I still give birth to sons?) |
|------------------------------|---|--|---|

The Hebrew unit reads literally “Are there still sons for me in my bowels?” Naomi is asking rhetorically if she is still able to conceive so as to give birth to sons who could become husbands for the two young women. The translation of the question has the potential problem of causing social awkwardness or ambiguity. That is because, for the sake of social etiquette (the need for a euphemism – De Waard and Nida 1991: 14), it is likely to require a

³⁶ KJV, NAS, NET, NIV and NRSV.

³⁷ They are paired together because they pick the verb “return” while Moffat uses “go.”

reconstruction that may alter the meaning in the TL – but, if followed formally, it could be distracting to the TT audience because of social impoliteness or meaninglessness since the cultural expressions between the Hebrew text and TT may not correspond adequately.

Moffat and Wookey adhere to formal correspondence. Therefore they present Naomi as implying that children were supposed to live in her body or womb. Not only is that ambiguous communication, but it is also awkward and socially offensive in the TL. That is because in Setswana worldview, children do not live inside a woman's womb or body. In public – and the Bible is a public book – pregnancy and reproduction are topics too embarrassing to describe explicitly. For these reasons, Moffat and Wookey represent a functional shift because of unnatural TL form and inexact TL meaning. It can be assumed that organisational CFRs related to methodology led to this decision. For Moffat, it conventionally follows formal correspondence. As for Wookey, this decision can be regarded as one of the manifestations of its inconsistent method, and this time, it follows a formal correspondence approach.

BSSA reconstructs the sentence in order to present a more specific and euphemistic rendering, *Ke santse ke ka belega [...]* (literally, “can I still bear [...]?” and functionally, “can I still conceive [...]?”). It represents a formal shift. The formal shift was necessary for an accurate interpretation of the Hebrew unit. The decision was necessitated by a mismatch of socio-cultural CFRs between the Hebrew and Setswana worldview pertaining to the social phenomenon of pregnancy. In the Setswana worldview, it is socially awkward to regard children as coming from the woman's body/womb. Rather, she bears them from a seed planted by a male. The decision was made to avoid the kind of distraction that results from the Moffat and Wookey renderings. In CFR terms, the decision was influenced by differing socio-cultural frames of reference. A literary CFR can be postulated for that formal shift, too, considering that the formal shift avoids an unnatural style of communication in the TL. Thus, textual CFRs can be said to have overlapped with socio-cultural CFRs, since literary CFRs are part of textual frames.

Beside the preceding problem, the expression for בניִם (sons), namely, *bomorwa*, renders the sentence unnatural (unidiomatic and clumsy). The expression was created by adding a class 1a prefix to a class 1 noun. The result is that the sons are presented as if they are already known personally. That is because the plural prefix *bo-* is normally affixed to personal proper

nouns, kinship nouns without their own singular prefixes, or to collective personal proper nouns (Cole 1955: 72). This represents a functional shift because of unnatural communication resulting from the grammatical inexactness of *bomorwa*. The decision can be said to have been influenced by a wrong lexical frame, which is a subtype of the heuristic textual CFR. That is, the translators attempted to interpret כְּנָיִם as specifically as possible, unlike the other two Bibles. Unfortunately, it was too specific for naturalness. The expression itself does not represent a formal shift since *bomorwa* can still correspond to sons. The overall sentence, however, represents a formal shift, for it was reconstructed in order to be euphemistic and socio-culturally more comprehensible. Therefore, that shift was influenced by literary-textual and socio-cultural CFRs.

The overall unit can best be rendered by following BSSA’s reconstruction and using Wookey’s *bana ba basimane*. The new sentence would read as *Ke santse ke ka belega bana ba basimane?* (literally, “can I still bear male children?” but functionally, “can I still bear sons?”).

6.4.8 Ruth 1:12

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| גַּם הִיָּיתִי הַלַּיְלָה לְאִישׁ | Le fa nka nna le monna sigong jono (Even if I had a man/got married tonight) | Fa nkabo ke ne ke ka bona monna fela bosigong jono (Even if I were only to find a man/husband tonight) | Ka tsewa ke monna bosigo jo (and were taken/married by a man tonight) |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|

This Hebrew clause corresponds formally to “even if I should be to a man/husband tonight.” Its referential meaning is “even if I could have sex with a man tonight” (De Waard and Nida 1973: 15; Bush 1998: 25). The interpretation of this clause has the potential to be awkward socio-culturally and grammatically because it involves the subject of sex.

The three translations’ renderings follow formal correspondence and, as a result, are void of the concept “have sex with a man tonight.” That represents a functional shift. In the Setswana worldview, “find or be taken by a man” evokes “find a husband or get married.” Granted, the Setswana expressions, if perceived literally, can profile to be in the company of a man

(Moffat Bible), to acquire a man (Wookey Bible), and to be taken by a man (BSSA Bible) – they could be interpreted to mean “to find contact with a male tonight.” Yet, in these translations, the idiomatic connotations of finding a husband are prototypical while those for sexual contact with a man are quite peripheral. The three Bibles’ renderings, which hinge on the form “husband,” resemble those of the KJV and virtually all the other major English Bibles. An organisational CFR can be postulated for Moffat.

For BSSA and Wookey, the renderings do not sufficiently match the communication situation frames of the Hebrew unit. Although the KJV and other English versions manifest the same error, the organisational CFR is, in this instance, considered to have played only a subordinate role.³⁸ Primarily, the translators can be deemed to have failed to capture the communication CFR of the unit – in specific terms, they did not account for the explicitly sexual elements of the Hebrew clause. Moreover, this may be accidental whereby they were misled by the Hebrew forms whose communication appeared straightforward. Thus, a communication situation CFR can be considered to have caused this shift.

Another type of formal shift occurs for BSSA and Wookey (Moffat follows the ST word for word and avoids a formal shift and an additional functional shift). BSSA does not include “even if,” but assumes the sense of the אֲפִלּוּ from the larger context of the unit. The formal shift makes BSSA concise without causing another functional shift. However, instead of the Hebrew text’s “even if I found,” Wookey opts for the longwinded “even if I were only to find.” This construction adds *semes* (notably “only” – *fela*) that are unnecessary for a better understanding of the unit, but which could either cause slight changes in the meaning of the Hebrew unit, or distract the audience. Consequently, Wookey manifests not only a formal shift but also another slight functional shift, apart from the one about sex. This time, the shift pertains to unnatural communication due to verbosity. The decision of Wookey towards this wordiness can be ascribed to an organisational CFR that pertains to methodology. As postulated in the section “The Translation of the Wookey Bible” in chapter four, one of Wookey’s main goals seems to have been to be as explanatory or expansive as possible, in order to avoid the mistake of being unclear interpretively and communication-wise (which

³⁸ It can be postulated that the translators turned to an older version in the face of a difficult exegetical context.

was for Moffat a prominent problem). Throughout the book of Ruth, such an attempt at explicitness was overdone.³⁹

The best suggestion for rendering the unit could read like, *Le fa ke ne ke ka robala le monna* (literally, Even if I were to sleep with a man tonight).⁴⁰ This suggestion is euphemistic, idiomatic, clear and accurate.

6.4.9 Ruth 1:16

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| תָּלַיְנִי | Kwa o ttholang sigogona (Where you spend the night) | Kwa o lalang gone (Where you sleep for the night) | Kwa o nnang teng (Where you live) |
|------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|

The Hebrew clause corresponds to “where you spend the night.” Its lexeme תָּלַיְנִי literally denotes lodging, beginning in the evening and ending in the morning (Oikonomou 1995: 545; Hubbard 1997: 796). The activity expressed by the verb is temporary, denoting lodging for only one night or at most a few nights (HALOT 2000: 530; Oikonomou 1995: 545). תָּלַיְנִי presupposes an interruption of a traveller’s journey, either because of resting or reaching his/her destination (Oikonomou 1995: 545). In HALOT, “live” does not feature among the meanings of תָּלַיְנִי. The peripheral meaning is rather “stay, dwell,” and that is found only in non-narrative texts (HALOT 2000: 530).

Moffat represents a formal and functional shift because its expression in Setswana is ungrammatical and awkward. Whilst *tthola* connotes “spend or stay,” it is only used for “spend the day” and never for “spend the night” (Sandilands 1953: 135). The shift can be specified further as lexical, representing a difference in form between the Hebrew text and TT. It also represents an inexact or erroneous TL meaning. This can be ascribed to the translator’s insufficient knowledge of the Setswana language. That factor can be classified as a type of lexical frame error, which is part of the textual CFR. It is difficult to gauge the severity of the resultant shift. On the one hand, one may argue that the mistake is glaring

³⁹ The section “The Translation of the Wookey Bible” in chapter four also illustrates this weakness, using the shifts at 1:1 and 3:1.

⁴⁰ The expression of sleeping with a person of the opposite sex at night is the Setswana euphemism for sexual intercourse (Cf. Dent 1992: 382).

because the expression does not exist in the TL and will unnecessarily distract the TT reader. On the other hand, another may argue that the shift is insignificant because the sense of “sleep for the night” can be inferred from the context.

Wookey does not represent any kind of shift. *Lala* connotes sleeping for the duration of the night. It seems to have the primary concept of לָלַךְ, but whereas לָלַךְ can refer to the general nuance of staying (cf. HALOT 2000: 530), *lala* can never reference any other aspect of staying than sleeping overnight (Sandilands 1953: 134). Most of the earlier Bibles in English and other languages follow the Hebrew unit’s sense of “lodge,” and I found only the GNB and NET, which were published later than BSSA⁴¹ to use “live.” BSSA could not have obtained the word choice from these two Bibles, so an organisational CFR can be ruled out. The decision “live” manifests a functional and formal shift which results in an erroneous TL meaning.

I hypothesise here that BSSA’s decision was exegetical for the following reason: Naomi was relocating permanently, so the magnitude of Ruth’s decision was that it entailed her moving permanently to “live” in a foreign land. Yet, as noted above, this sense of לָלַךְ, viz., “live,” is quite peripheral, and the likelihood of “lodge” for this unit is greater than that for “live.” On the one hand, the Hebrew text’s idea of “spend the night” is important because it leaves room for homelessness and insecurity. On the other hand, *kwa o nnang teng* primarily evokes secure residence because of its sense of permanence. Ruth was told by her mother-in-law that her future will be less secure and less certain, but in her devotion and protectiveness towards Naomi, she chooses that uncertainty. The vow about spending the night can project the uncertainty of future accommodation and, consequently, the extent of Ruth’s devotion to Naomi. Therefore, Wookey’s rendering, *kwa o lalang gone*, is a precise rendering of the unit both functionally and formally and is the best suggestion for a Setswana translation.

⁴¹ This word choice, as in all other shifts apart from those pertaining to formatting, was made in the original 1970 version of BSSA and maintained in the rest of the revisions.

6.4.10 Ruth 1:17

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| יַעֲשֶׂה יְהוָה לִּי וְכֹה יִסְיַף כִּי הַמָּוֶת יִפְרִיד בֵּינִי וּבֵינָךְ | A Jehova a ntirele jalo le jalo ha re ka kgaogana ha e se ka loso (May Jehovah do for me like that and like that if we are separated by anything other than death) | A Jehofa a ntirele jalo, a ba a fetise fa sengwe se ka nkgaganya nao fa e se loso fela (May Jehovah do like that and even more if anything can separate us apart from death) | Le fa MORENA a ka ntirela jang le jang, ke loso fela lo lo ka nkgaganyang nao (Even if Jehovah does to me however, it is only death that can separate us) |
|---|--|---|--|

The Hebrew vow corresponds formally to “may Yahweh do for me, and so may he do again if death separates me and you.” According to Conklin (2011: 23), its interpretation is “May Yahweh strike me dead if I allow anything but death to separate you and me,” and is not as vague as its form seems. This sentence is a Hebrew oath formula and, because of the culture specific and figurative nature of oath formulas, can be expected to be difficult to translate. Communication situation frames of such units are notoriously difficult to extricate and express. For example, most major English Bibles have struggled to interpret specifically Ruth’s vow and ended up giving an indefinite curse. They match the Hebrew text’s form generally with “May the LORD do so to me and more also if even death parts me from you,” such as the GNV, KJV, NAB and NAS. Some are a little more interpretive, rendering the unit generally as “May the LORD deal with me [punish me], severely, if anything but death separates you and me [if I do not keep my promise]” like the NIV and NET Bibles.

Conklin’s interpretation is a product of arguably the most recent and exhaustive work on oath formulas in the Old Testament so far. According to him, oath formulas have two parts, the first one being the authenticating element (or indicator of the oath formula) and the second being the oath content (Conklin 2011: 6, 7). The authenticating element “Thus will Yahweh do to me and thus will he add [May Yahweh strike me dead]” occurs 12 times in the Old Testament (Conklin 2011: 23). The oath content is that Ruth will not let anything separate her and Naomi. Thus, she vows that Yahweh should strike her dead if she allows anything to separate them.

Translating this oath formula proved to be a challenge for the three Setswana Bibles. They all manifest both formal and functional shifts. The formal shift in Moffat and Wookey resulted from adding *jalo* (like that) to the sentence, even though they strove to stick to a literal rendering. That shift is insignificant – *jalo* functions in this instance to complete a sentence that would otherwise be left hanging in a Setswana construction that strives for a word for word rendering of the Hebrew text's forms. The word for word rendering itself avoids specifying what Yahweh should do, although the Hebrew oath specifically means that Yahweh should strike her dead. In Bantu TLs, including Setswana “May Yahweh do so to me and more also” is too indefinite and, therefore sounds strange for a curse (de Waard and Nida 1991: 8).

As for BSSA, it reconstructs the sentence and replaces the appeal “may Yahweh [...]” with the conditional “even if Yahweh [...]” The result is the vow “even if Yahweh does to me however (however he pleases), it is only death that can separate us.” The connotational meaning of that sentence is that Ruth perceives Yahweh to be intent on separating them, and she vows to resist him to the point of death. Whilst the other two Bibles' meaning was vague, BSSA's interpretation of the oath formula is explicitly erroneous: there is no indication in the oath formula or narrative that Ruth perceives Yahweh to be antagonistic to her relationship with Naomi. Rather, Ruth is merely declaring her refusal in the strongest terms possible. Therefore, BSSA represents further significant functional and formal shifts. The formal shifts, on the one hand, are due to different grammatical constructions and forms between the Hebrew unit and the TT. The particular functional shift, on the other hand, is due to an erroneous TL meaning, which represents an exegetical error.

From a broader perspective, whilst the Hebrew text's context indicates categorically that this is an oath formula, the Setswana literal renderings do not hint at an oath formula. The first two appear to present a polite request, while BSSA seems to give a mild statement. Consequently, the meanings of the three translations cause functional shifts.⁴² The functional shifts represent an inexact TL meaning and exegetical failure. In CFR terms, organisational CFRs can be postulated for Moffat. However, an organisational CFR may not be postulated as a primary influence on BSSA and Wookey. Rather, the exegetical frames discussed in the

⁴² Still, in its formal correspondence, Wookey was surprisingly more word for word than Moffat because it translated literally the form “may he do again” (*a ba a fetise*).

preceding paragraph, which involve a communication situational CFR, can be assumed to have influenced the two Bibles. It seems the translators were unaware that the Hebrew unit had a specific idiomatic meaning. That is because the communication setting, namely the text, cotext and context of the oath formula appear straightforward. As a result, the translators reproduced literally the communication setting of the Hebrew ST. Unfortunately, the resultant communication frame of the TT does not match that of the Hebrew unit.

For a curse in the Setswana worldview, to say “May Yahweh strike me dead/May God kill me” (*A Jehofa a nkitee gore ke swe/A Jehofa a mploae*) is too explicit and unnatural. De Waard and Nida correctly observe that curses involving the notion of death but normally avoiding the lexical form “death” already exist in many Bantu languages (1991: 8). It seems that the forms “death,” “die” and “kill” are avoided for euphemistic purposes – God does not kill or cause people to die – he is said to take a person or take his/her life. Unfortunately, technical oath formulas in Setswana seem to avoid reference to God, too, although God is an important part of Ruth’s vow – in the preceding and present verses, she pledges allegiance to Naomi, God and Naomi’s people. Therefore, already-existing vows that I found in Setswana do not adequately capture Ruth’s vow. It appears that an idiomatic expression that mentions God and evokes death without explicitly providing the afore-mentioned lexical forms has to be coined to serve as Ruth’s curse in Setswana. An expression such as *A Jehofa a tsee botshelo jwa me* (May God take my life) would adequately render the authenticating element euphemistically, idiomatically and functionally. The whole oath formula would be, *Nna le wena re tlaa kgaogangwa fela ke loso – e seng jalo, a Jehofa a tsee botshelo jwa me* (You and I will only be separated by death – if not, let God take my life).

6.4.11 Ruth 1:20

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>אֶל־תִּקְרָאנִי לִי נָעֳמִי קָרָאנִי לִי מָרָא</p> | <p>Se mpitseng Naomi, mpitseng Mara (Do not call me Naomi. Call me Mara)</p> | <p>Lo seka lwa mpitsa Naomi, mme lo mpitse Mara (Do not call me Naomi, but call me Mara)</p> | <p>Se mpitseng Naomi. Mpitseng Mara (Do not call me Naomi. Call me Mara.)</p> |
|---|--|--|---|

This statement corresponds to “you should not call me Naomi. Call me Mara” (LaCocque 2004: 55). The name change from Naomi to Mara is significant. Naomi intends the name change to reflect the worsening of her fortunes, for the names mean “pleasant” and “bitterness” respectively (Bush 1998: 43; De Waard and Nida 1991: 20).

In the presentation of the name Naomi, Moffat and Wookey manifest a functional shift. In the ST, Naomi’s hearers, being mother tongue speakers of Hebrew, understand that she is changing her name from “pleasant (Naomi)” to “bitter (Mara).” BSSA gives footnotes to explain the names “Naomi” and “Mara.” Nevertheless, the footnote on the name “Naomi” can be said to represent a functional and formal shift because, instead of “pleasant” it denotes “beauty.” It translates Naomi as *Bontle* (Beauty) and “Mara” as *Bogalaka* (bitterness). The note “bitterness” for “Mara” is accurate, and obviously so because it is already given in Naomi’s speech. Yet, the footnote that the Bible gives for “Naomi,” namely, *Bontle*, does not correspond to “Naomi” because “Naomi” means “Pleasant” and not “Beauty” (De Waard and Nida 1991: 9; LaCocque 2004: 51). It gives *Bontle* (Dent 1992: 10) a capital letter to indicate that it is a proper name, supposedly a translation of the proper name Naomi (*Bontle* is a common Setswana proper name for females).

The provision of footnotes often aids the audience to make a more informed interpretation of the ST by creating a wider contextual frame of reference pertaining to the socio-cultural, situational, and/or textual setting of the original text. Without such footnotes, the Setswana audience, who are not mother tongue speakers of Hebrew, will certainly miss the significance of this name change from “Pleasant” to “Bitterness” represented in the change from Naomi to Mara. BSSA’s footnote can be deemed to represent an erroneous TL meaning and, therefore, a functional shift. That shift is due to a different lexical form from that of the Hebrew text. An exegetical shortcoming can be postulated for this erroneous meaning. In terms of CFRs, the exegetical failure is a subframe of a lexical semantic frame, which is in turn a subframe of the textual CFR. Such an exegetical failure is difficult to explain, however, because the text seems quite simple to interpret, especially since Naomi’s explanation is meant as an aid for interpreting the name switch. Moffat and Wookey can be regarded as representing a functional shift because they do not express the significance of the name change that was explicitly intended by the Hebrew unit. The shift is due to an inexact TL meaning. The organisational CFR, which tended to avoid the use of footnotes, appears to have had an influence on the translations.

The BSSA rendering would be a good choice if its footnote were corrected to read *Boitumelo* (joy) rather than *Bontle* (Beauty). *Boitumelo* is a common Tswana proper name that literally means “Joy,” but also represents “Pleasant.”

6.4.12 Ruth 1:22

| | | | |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| שַׁעֲרִים | Barele (Borrowed term for barley) | Barele (Borrowed term for barley) | Garase (Borrowed term for barley) |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|

שַׁעֲרִים denotes “barley” (De Waard and Nida 1991: 22).

The grain crop “barley” does not exist in the Setswana agrarian culture. The Batswana encounter the item normally in its final production stages of flour and bread. The hybrid terms, *barele* and *garase* (both of which denote “barley”), derive from English and Afrikaans respectively (Tswana Terminology and Orthography 1972: 63). They appear to be the best alternative for translating the crop, so they do not represent a functional shift. Difficulty in interpretation would probably stem from the audience’s unfamiliarity with the cultural object rather than from its translation. Each rendering can be said to represent a formal shift because it does not offer a native Setswana term for “barley.” The decision for this rendering can be ascribed to a socio-cultural CFR because Setswana agrarian culture neither has barley as one of its crops nor a Setswana term for it. The translators faced an otherwise insurmountable mismatch between the Hebrew culture and Setswana one.

Since the word *garase* is not purely Tswana, a footnote could bridge the knowledge gap by indicating that it is a loanword from the Afrikaans language and that this grain is used primarily to make a “poor man’s” bread flour.

6.4.13 Ruth 2:1

| | | | |
|--------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| מִדָּע | Tsala (Friend/acquaintance) | Tsala (Friend/acquaintance) | Tsala (Friend/acquaintance) |
|--------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|

מוֹדֵעַ can refer to an acquaintance, kinsman, relative or close friend (BDB 1907: 396; O’Connell 1997: 855).⁴³ In the narrative of Ruth, the term refers to a relative or kinsman. Ruth 3:2 uses the feminine form of the noun מוֹדֵעָתְנוּ where Naomi asked, “Isn’t Boaz our kinsman?” There, the context does not allow for the translation “acquaintance.” That is because Naomi obviously wanted to take advantage of her social and legal relationship with her kinsman (cf. LaCoque 2004: 62) – the kinsman potentially had some obligations towards widows and underprivileged relatives. There were no legal obligations for a mere acquaintance. Besides, one can easily postulate a scenario whereby Elimelech (and many others) had several acquaintances who were closer to him than Boaz was but were unrelated to him.

Here in 2:1, the three Setswana translations translate the term מוֹדֵעַ as “acquaintance.” That represents a functional and formal shift at the lexical level. Yet, at the sentence level, because another phrase that follows soon, namely, מִמִּשְׁפַּחַת אֶלְיָמֶלֶךְ (from the clan of Elimelech), restores the element of “relative” or “kinsman” to the sentence, the functional shift is cancelled out. The three Bibles translate this latter phrase generally to read as “a relative of Elimelech.” It would have been interesting to observe their choices if the verse had lacked this latter phrase. Therefore, ultimately, the rendering *tsala* (friend) manifests a trivial functional shift. The shift represents a different lexical form from that of the Hebrew text, which outside of this context might have led to an erroneous TL meaning.

The term “relative,” rather than “friend,” is a more obvious choice, according to the narrative’s perspective. Therefore, apart from the fact that the functional shift does not affect the surrounding text, it is difficult to explain why the translations opt for the shift. Even the CFRs that could have influenced the three choices are difficult to hypothesise. The KJV and other earlier translations employ the term “relative [kinsman],” so organisational CFRs can be ruled out. The only other causes for the erroneous renderings that could be postulated are exegetical difficulties, whether lexical, communicational or socio-cultural, but such a postulation is doubtful because the Setswana translators tended to follow earlier English versions when faced with exegetical difficulties. Moreover, it is noteworthy that all the Setswana translations follow the same lexical choice whilst major English translations

⁴³ The term may have its origins in the semantic field of יָדַע (to know) (LaCocque 2004: 62; O’Connell 1997: 855).

correctly opt for the sense of relative or kinsman (for example, GNV, KJV and RSV). *Lesika* is an accurate correspondent of “relative” or “kinsman” and can be deemed as the best translation choice for מוֹדֵעַ.

6.4.14 Ruth 2:8

| | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|---|
| הֲלֹא שָׁמַעַתְּ בְּתִי | Morwadiaka a ga o utlwe? (My daughter, don't you hear?) | A ga o a utlwa, morwadiaka? (Have you not heard, my daughter?) | Reetsa fa, morwadiaka! (Listen to this, my daughter!) |
|-------------------------|---|--|---|

The question in the Hebrew ST is literally “Do you not listen?” It is a way in Hebrew to say “let me advise you,” or “listen carefully” (cf. Block 1999: 50; De Waard and Nida 1991: 18).

To follow literally the Hebrew form “do you not hear, my daughter?” is to cause a functional shift, which is what happens in Moffat and Wookey. In Setswana, the form of the question has the sense of either “My daughter, are you unable to hear?” or “My daughter, are you stubborn?” It does not have the Hebrew unit’s intended sense, and therefore can be deemed to represent a functional shift that leads to an erroneous TT meaning. The factors that influenced the translation choice can be explained as emanating from the projects’ organisational CFRs. That is because other hypothetical hindrances such as lexical, communicational or socio-cultural frames can be easily ruled out for the following reasons: The translators must have inferred from the narrative’s discourse that Ruth was not deaf, or that Boaz did not ask that question because he finds her to be stubborn. The only remaining explanation for the Hebrew question would be that Boaz was calling for Ruth’s attention. If a translation does not pick that choice, then it can be assumed that it followed the lead of other versions (such as the KJV and the GNV, for example, which translated the question literally).

BSSA interprets it correctly and translates it as “listen to this, my daughter.” It represents a formal shift, however, because it departs from the form of the Hebrew unit. That formal shift is necessary so that the communication situation frames of the TT would match those of the Hebrew text. The translation, *Reetsa fa, morwadiaka!* can be recommended as an accurate correspondent of the Hebrew unit. Nonetheless, BSSA’s exclamation mark should be removed to eliminate the tone of alarm in the Setswana question. That call to attention in the

Setswana language is an appeal already, so an additional exclamatory component could make it sound like a reprimand. That choice can be made in light of the fact that the question introduces a kind offer from Boaz to Ruth.⁴⁴

6.4.15 Ruth 2:11

| | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|---|
| אָתְּרִי מוֹת אִישׁךָ; | Morago ga loso lwa monna wa gago (After the death of your husband) | Monna wa gago a sena go swa (After your husband died) | Monna wa gago a sena go swa (After your husband died) |
|------------------------|---|---|---|

This clause formally and functionally corresponds to “after the death of your husband (Block 1999: 52).”

Moffat’s rendering is word for word and represents no shift. Wookey and BSSA restructure the clause to express the husband’s death with a verb rather than with a noun as the Hebrew presented it. That manifests a formal shift. It is due to a difference in form between the Hebrew and the TT. This shift can be distracting to a sensitive Setswana audience, so it must also be deemed as a slight functional shift. It is harsh, impolite communication in Setswana to use the verb “die,” as in the latter two Bibles’ *a sena go swa* (after [he] died) rather than the noun “death,” as in Moffat’s *morago ga loso* (after [his] death). The noun “death” is more euphemistic than the act of dying. Nevertheless, if the Bibles preferred a verb, they should have chosen a common idiomatic and euphemistic one, namely, *tlhokafala*. Incidentally, the Sepedi Bible also departs from the Hebrew concept “death” but uses the euphemistic verb *tlhokafala* (died). The Sepedi Bible was translated later than Wookey, however, so it did not influence Wookey towards picking a verb. BSSA, which was translated later than the Sepedi Bible, uses a different verb from the Sepedi rendering, so it also does not seem to have been influenced by Sepedi.

⁴⁴ Since BSSA does have the exclamation mark, it can be deemed to represent a slight functional shift in the sense that its question can have a slight tone of a reprimand. It would sometimes sound as though Ruth was failing to pay attention to Boaz.

It is difficult to hypothesise which earlier Bible, if any, Wookey and BSSA got the rendering “after your husband died” from. Earlier Bibles in English, Afrikaans, Dutch and German follow the Hebrew text and use the noun “death” rather than the verb “died.” The organisational CFR of consulting other Bibles is therefore ruled out for both Wookey and BSSA. Despite the shift, it does not appear that the translators faced a difficult exegetical choice. From the Bibles’ otherwise perfect use of Setswana idioms in general, it is difficult to say that the translators were unaware of the existence of a more euphemistic verb. Thus, I am unable to postulate a frame of reference that could explain the shift in Wookey and BSSA.

Moffat’s translation, *morago ga loso lwa monna wa gago* (after your husband’s death), would be the best suggestion for this unit because it avoids the problems discussed above whilst it corresponds functionally to the Hebrew unit. An alternative rendering with several syntagmatic and lexical shifts that would correspond euphemistically to the Hebrew unit is *monna wa gago a sena go tlhokafala* (“after your husband passed away”).

6.4.16 Ruth 2:16

| | | | |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| שֶׁלֹּהֶלֶל לָהּ | Mo latlheleng ka bomu (Throw down deliberately for her) | Lo mo somolele (Pull out for her) | Lo nne lo mo somolele (Keep pulling out for her) |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|

The Hebrew verb construction can be read literally as “pull to pull for her.” The discussion below focuses on the Bibles’ interpretation of the infinitive absolute construction. The infinitive absolute construct can function to emphasise the modality of the action such as in “Make sure you pull out” (cf. NET), or to indicate the continuous nature of the action such as in “Keep pulling out” (BHRG 2002: 158). Emphasis of the modality of the action is the most typical interpretation of the construction in this instance. Whereas the ears of grain normally fell by accident and could then be gleaned, Boaz suggests that the servants should drop them intentionally and liberally.

Moffat’s *ka bomo* (purposefully) reproduces the effects of the infinitive construct. In this instance, it chooses the conventional function of the infinitive absolute construct, which is placing an emphasis on the modal action. Thus, as far as the construct is concerned, Moffat does not represent a functional or formal shift. However, the sense of “purposefully” together

with that of *latlhelele* (throw down) is also found in the KJV, which uses “let fall.” Apparently, Moffat simply followed the KJV. The idea of “throw down” manifests a functional shift, but a trivial one. The decision can be ascribed to an organisational CFR due to the influence of the KJV.

Wookey makes no attempt to capture either the emphatic or continuous element of the infinitive absolute construct. Consequently, it manifests a functional shift. The shift produces an inexact TT meaning. As for the cause of the erroneous decision, it can be assumed that the Wookey translators faced an exegetical difficulty. In CFR terms, the complex lexical semantic frame of the construct led to this erroneous decision, so the textual CFR can be hypothesised for this unit.

BSSA’s attempt renders the phrase with the aspectual sense of continuously pulling out the ears of grain. Thus, BSSA interprets the construct to indicate continuous action. This does not lead to a functional or formal shift either because this interpretation is applicable. Possible suggestions for rendering the unit are *Lo nne lo mo somolele* (Keep pulling out for her – by BSSA) and *Lo mo somolele ka bomo* (Pull out for her deliberately – by Moffat).

6.4.17 Ruth 2:17

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| אֵיפָה שְׂעָרִים | Efa ya barele (Ephah of barley) | Emere ya barele (Bucket of barley) | Makapa a le mabedi a garase (Two buckets of 20 litres of barley each) |
|------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|

The expression corresponds formally to “An ephah of barley.” Traditionally, it has been difficult to give the exact equivalent of an ephah at the time of Ruth, although those that approximate it arrive at the figures of about 40 litres, 30 pounds or 13 kg during the Hellenistic period (De Waard and Nida 1991: 26; cf. HALOT 2000: 44; La Cocque 2004: 76; NET).

Even if one assumes that there is uncertainty regarding the referential meaning of an “ephah of barley,” one can still say with certainty that Moffat represents a functional shift. That is because it virtually leaves the phrase אֵיפָה שְׂעָרִים untranslated by giving its transliteration word

for word. It renders it as *efa ya barele*. The shift leads to meaninglessness in the TT unit. Setswana target audiences are unfamiliar with the form “ephah,” or its referent, namely, its lexical equivalent in units of volume measurement. *Barele* (like *garase*), even though it is uncommon, is easier to get to know because, being a crop, it is less abstract. Apart from the modern *emere* and *lekapa*⁴⁵ (cf. BSSA), there are no apparent established standards of volume measurement in Setswana tradition. Moffat’s decision probably resulted from an organisational CFR relating to the use of the KJV – it resembles the KJV rendering.⁴⁶

As with Moffat, one can also say with certainty that Wookey represents a formal and functional shift because the rendering, *emere ya barele* (bucket of barley), leaves the ST virtually untranslated. It is still a meaningless rendering for the reason that, in the Setswana cultural life-setting, *emere* comes in different sizes including 5 litres, 10 litres and 20 litres. In that regard, the designation, *emere*, is indefinite and ambiguous. In contrast, it can be assumed that the Hebrew text’s “ephah” has a definite measurement in mind. For that reason, the formal and functional shifts in Wookey represent an inexact TT meaning. The fact that some major modern English Bibles follow the KJV for this unit testifies to the longstanding uncertainties of interpreting it. Therefore, one can postulate that exegetical difficulties and socio-cultural mismatches have led to this erroneous rendering. Setswana traditional culture does not have barley or technical units of measurement. The translators thus faced an insurmountable mismatch between the Hebrew ST culture and Tswana culture. Socio-cultural and textual CFRs can be postulated for this decision (the textual CFR is represented by lexical subframes).

It is possible, on the one hand, that Wookey offers *emere ya barele* to serve as an idiomatic representational meaning for the Hebrew unit. That is one of De Waard and Nida’s (1991: 26) suggestions after considering the exegetical difficulties of the phrase. Granted, the translation is more idiomatic than Moffat’s *efa ya barele*, yet *emere* is not an exact correspondent of “ephah,” so it would still manifest a shift.

⁴⁵ As evidenced by their hybrid names, the Batswana apparently encountered these objects from contact with European settlers. Thus, familiarity with the objects may be dated from the time of the arrival of the first Europeans in the Cape.

⁴⁶ Incidentally, many major English translations follow the KJV, so they, too, can be said to be influenced by organisational factors. These include the NAB, NAS and NRSV.

On the other hand, it is also possible that Wookey intended *emere* to act as a functional equivalent of “ephah,” but an *emere* that is equivalent to 40 litres (size of an ephah) is a strange phenomenon in the Setswana culture. This rendering would represent a functional shift because a traditional *emere* is not as big as that. That shift would be due to incomplete exegesis. That is because the translators seem to have been aware that *efa* (in earlier Bibles) was an unfamiliar lexical form, and they replaced it. Equally, they would probably have considered that its socio-cultural object was unfamiliar and therefore would not correspond precisely to the familiar object, *emere*. In that case, the translator probably decided for an easier option of not interrogating further the potential equivalence dynamics of the Hebrew text and TT.

The BSSA translator has in mind the common 20 litre bucket, known as *lekapa*, two of which make up the equivalent of an ephah (40 litres). The status quo of scholarship opinion does not refute the notion that an ephah is equivalent to 40 litres. As a result, this rendering is more defensible than its predecessors. It represents a formal shift, though, because the Hebrew text does not mention two buckets but just invokes “ephah.” That formal shift was made in order to avoid a functional shift. BSSA’s *makapa a mabedi* is the best functional option to translate the concept of “an ephah.” With the information that an ephah is 40 litres, it has matched the TT’s socio-cultural and lexical frames. As for “barley,” the suggestion made in 1:22 of a footnote – to the effect that barley is a crop that is milled to make bread flour – could be followed.

6.4.18 Ruth 2:18

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---|---|
| אֲשֶׁר־הוּתְרָה מִשֶּׂבֶעָה | Se se setseng sa kgoro ya gagwe (What was left of her satisfaction) | Mo o ne a go beile a sena go kgora (What she had kept after she was satisfied) | Dijo tse a di sadisitseng a sena go ja (The food that she had kept after she ate) |
|-----------------------------|--|---|---|

This clause can be rendered word for word as “what she had left over from her satisfaction.” It refers to the leftovers from Ruth’s meal after she was satisfied (Block 1999: 56).

Moffat follows the ST form and uses the noun for “satisfaction” – *kgoro* – thereby avoiding a formal shift. Wookey and BSSA employ the verbs “was satisfied” and “ate” respectively instead of following the Hebrew text’s nominal form. Therefore, they manifest a formal shift while Moffat avoids a formal shift. Yet, Moffat manifests a slight functional shift because attaching a possessive sense to the noun “satisfaction” leads to unnatural or unidiomatic communication in Setswana. Also, the word *kgoro* also refers to a “gate,” and the difference between the two concepts is distinguishable only in pronunciation (Snyman et al. 1990: 87). Consequently, it can lead to a distraction or ambiguity for a TT audience.⁴⁷ Incidentally, the entry *kgoro* in Le Roux (1991: 339) and other Setswana-English dictionaries is rendered only as “gate,” which indicates the peripherality of the noun “satisfaction.” Moffat’s functional shift represents ambiguity as regards meaning, and awkwardness as regards style. The organisational CFRs that pertain to methodology can be postulated as the primary cause of this shift. In accordance with its tradition, Moffat follows the forms of the Hebrew text as closely as possible.

Wookey’s and BSSA’s syntagmatic and formal shifts create a more natural rendering. Wookey replaces the noun for “satisfaction” (i.e., *kgoro*) with the verb for “she was satisfied” (i.e., *go kgora*). BSSA uses the words *dijo* (food) and *go ja* (she ate). It is likely that the translators were aware of the unnaturalness or ambiguity of following the Hebrew forms.⁴⁸ Thus, the formal shifts were dictated by the goal of producing natural communication from a stylistic point of view. Consequently, a literary textual CFR can be deemed to have influenced the translation choices.

BSSA’s choice of *ja* (ate) in this construction can be regarded as more euphemistic than *kgora* (satisfied) or *kgoro* (satisfaction). Ruth’s act is unacceptable in Setswana culture: she gave her mother-in-law left over food after she had first eaten. In the Setswana worldview,

⁴⁷ This distraction can be tested by oral readings of the TT clause by different individuals, which is likely to lead to two different interpretations of the word *kgoro*.

⁴⁸ The potential confusion here that involves the word *kgoro* is analogous to the one that occurs in 4:1, viz., “he went to defecate,” instead of “he went to the gate” (also by the Moffat Bible).

left over food is only saved for unimportant people, minors and pets. BSSA probably attempts to taper down the incongruity between Ruth's act of kindness and Setswana audiences' customs. Interpretively, it lessens the likelihood that she saved some food only because she was too satisfied to continue eating – rather, she was primarily thinking of Naomi's need for food.

Nevertheless, it is impossible for the BSSA translation to remove completely the Hebrew text's negative connotations of giving left over food to one's mother-in-law. That is because BSSA is obliged to be faithful to the Hebrew text – and in the story, Ruth did actually give her mother-in-law left over food. That information gives a distracting connotational meaning to the unit. The distraction occurs in all three Bibles' renderings – although in BSSA, it is slightly less glaring. This distraction, in turn, gives an erroneous TL meaning unintended by the original Hebrew text. In that sense, all three Bibles represent a functional shift.

Communication situation difficulties have influenced the decision towards Wookey's and BSSA's renderings. For Moffat, such influences may be ruled out, since the translator most likely followed the KJV. For Wookey and BSSA, there were unavoidable communication settings in the Hebrew text, namely lexical, syntagmatic and extralinguistic/socio-cultural factors (text, cotext and context) that had to be presented in the TL. In other words, the Bibles could not avoid communicating that Ruth indeed gave her mother-in-law left over food. This manifests a mismatch of communication settings between the two sets of texts whereby that of the TT presents different socio-cultural information from that of the Hebrew text. The intentions, expectations and outcomes between the two sets of texts do not correspond.

Of the three Bibles, BSSA is the most idiomatic. Its sentence reconstruction goes further than Wookey's, for it provides the more concrete lexical form, *dijo* (food), and the verb *sadisitse* is more idiomatic than *beile*. This rendering, namely, “the food that she had kept after she ate” can be derived from the Hebrew text. A footnote could then be inserted to explain that unlike what Setswana culture anticipates, according to the Hebrew text and its culture, Ruth displayed great kindness and generosity towards her mother-in-law.

6.4.19 Ruth 2:20

| | | | |
|-------------|--|---|---|
| מְגַאֲלָנוּ | Mongwe wa barekolodi ba rona (One of our redeemers) | Mongwe wa ba ba gaufi le rona ka go tsalwa (One of those close to us by birth) | Mongwe wa bagolodi ba rona (One of our deliverers) |
|-------------|--|---|---|

The phrase corresponds literally to “one of our kinsman redeemers.” מְגַאֲלָנוּ is a participle of the verbal root גאל (Block 1999: 59). This verbal root has the following senses: “redeem, deliver, rescue, save, ransom, repurchase, bring back and restore.” The participle is used here as a noun. As a noun it refers to a man's nearest relative such as brother, uncle, cousin, or other kinsman who is legally “responsible for standing up for him and maintaining his rights” (Ringgren, 1975: 351-352). The nearest relative at the particular time was obliged to do the following:

1. buy back a house or piece of property that his relative sells to pay a debt;
2. marry the widow of his relative who is about to lose property, and buy the property;
3. buy back a relative who sells himself as a slave; and
4. perform any other defensive and redemptive acts on behalf of his relative.⁴⁹

The translation of this term here is critical to the interpretation of the story of Ruth. That is especially because the decision made here is likely to be replicated in the other four occurrences of the root גאל in the narrative. Unfortunately, the term is quite technical and covers a large socio-cultural frame of reference in Hebrew; therefore, to find an equivalent in any TL is difficult (De Waard and Nida 1991: 29). Moffat’s and BSSA’s *barekolodi* and *bagolodi* refer to the indefinite sense of “redeemer” or “deliverer,” which generally refers to assistance in very difficult circumstances but does not suggest any of the acts listed above that are fundamental for the concept of גאל. Therefore, the two Bibles’ functional shifts represent significant differences between the lexical forms of the Hebrew text and the Setswana TTs as well as inexact or erroneous TL meanings. Moffat’s shift can be deemed to result from formal correspondence and an organisational CFR that pertains to methodology. BSSA’s shift can best be regarded as exegetical lethargy, that is, the translators were probably aware that the

⁴⁹ Cf. Block 1999: 59-60; Ringgren 1975: 351-352)

renderings were exegetically inaccurate, but decided to do nothing about it. This hypothesis is even more pertinent for BSSA because BSSA uses footnotes, but seemingly chose not to insert an explanatory footnote for this term. In the paragraphs after the next, I postulate a socio-cultural CFR that may have contributed to this lethargy and which may also have caused Wookey's shifts.

Wookey opts for "those close to us by birth," which is even more indefinite and fails to hint at the redemptive role of the *לֵאָל* (*go'el*). Throughout the book of Ruth, Wookey is particularly longwinded in its renderings of this Hebrew concept – it gives various long phrases for the term, which are really appropriate only for the *מִוֹדֵעַ* of 2:1 but which are incorrect for all five occurrences of the concept of *לֵאָל*. As postulated in chapter four,⁵⁰ Wookey's formal and functional shifts may represent an attempt to be as interpretive and explanatory as possible, a trait which can be hypothesised for the missionary revisions period of Bible translation in sub-Saharan Africa. For that reason, an organisational CFR that pertains to methodology can be postulated for Wookey's shifts.

Whilst *barekolodi* (by Moffat), *ba ba gaufi le rona ka go tsalwa* (by Wookey) and *bagolodi* (by BSSA) fail to evoke the socio-cultural settings of the *לֵאָל*, there is a traditional term that can, namely, *go tsena mo ntlong* (literally "to enter into the house"). *Go tsena mo ntlong* is the Setswana traditional version of the levirate marriage, and has parallels with the Hebrew custom such as the perpetuation of the bloodline, protection/provision for widows, and the general redemption of the relatives over whom the man has responsibility (Schapera 1994: 165). The female version of this practice was that a younger sister (or closest younger relative) to the deceased wife would take her place as a substitute wife (Schapera 1994: 167-168). She was called *seantlo* (literally, "she who enters the house").⁵¹ This practice was observed because traditionally, marriage was more considered as a union between two extended families, and these families had permanent obligations towards each other mainly centred on the payment of *bogadi*. In that socio-cultural setting, it was considered wrong for a widow to remain without a partner or children, for a family to lose a daughter-in-law without replacement, for a family to lack children, or for a widower to pay bride price for a new wife.

⁵⁰ This shift and hypothesis are also discussed in the section "The Revisions of the Wookey Bible" in chapter four.

⁵¹ Cf. the section "Marriage, Family and Inheritance" in chapter three.

Socio-cultural CFRs can be postulated for Wookey's and BSSA's decision not to invoke *seantlo* and *go tsena mo ntlong*, which legitimately correspond to the Hebrew concept, and which could, consequently, serve as an interpretive aid. It is probable that the decision was influenced by the stigma that the practice has developed. The abandonment of both the levirate and the sororate partly indicates that they kept declining in popularity. There were elements that could make it unpopular, especially with the advent of Christian missionary teachings, Eurocentric laws, and HIV/AIDS.⁵² For example, the male candidate had "the acknowledged right and duty to cohabit with the widow, even if he himself was already married" (Schapera 1994: 165-166). Yet they are not regarded as husband and wife, even though the widow in reference was not free to leave her husband's family or to remarry.⁵³ It could be hypothesised that the three Bibles avoided to appear to be endorsing such problematic traditional customs, so they opted for *barekolodi* (redeemers), *ba ba gaufi le rona ka go tsalwa* (those close to us by birth), and *bagolodi* (deliverers).

The first step towards eliminating the formal and functional shifts could be to note that the levirate and sororate were meant to be beneficial to both males and females, but were bound to be abused later on. A Bible can legitimately invoke the Setswana levirate in the translation and add a footnote to that effect. For example, a translation of the sentence could be *monna yoo ke mongwe wa bagolodi ba rona, mongwe wa ba ba ka tsenang mo ntlong* (that man is our redeemer, one of those who can enter into the house). The footnote could be, *Bajuta ba ne ba na le tsamaiso e e tshwanang le ya Setswana ya go tsena mo ntlong. Go tsena mo ntlong, le mo Setswaneng, e ne e le mogopolo o molemo, mme o ne o le motlhofo go senngwa* (The Israelites had a practice resembling the Setswana one of entering into the house. Entering into the house was meant to be a good arrangement, but it was susceptible to abuse).

⁵² Presently, the fight against HIV/AIDS occasionally campaigns against some remnant elements of the levirate and sororate in Setswana tradition. Ntseane (2004), for example, is dedicated towards examining the relationship between sexual cultural practices and the HIV/AIDS pandemic across ethnic groups within Botswana. Most of the sexual practices she examines are within the marital context of, or are inherited from, the levirate and sororate.

⁵³ However, in actual practice (but seemingly not in theory), it appears that the difference between cohabiting and marriage (or polygamy for an already married man), in such instances, was significantly blurred (see Brown 1925: 58).

6.4.20 Ruth 2:21

| | | | |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| הַנְּעָרִים | Barweetsana ba me (My young women) | Makau a gaetsho (Our young men) | Malata a me (My servants) |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|

הַנְּעָרִים denotes “servants.” Although it is masculine, it serves as a generic term in which the sex of the servants does not matter (BDB 1907: 655; Block 1999: 61; De Waard and Nida 1991: 30).

Moffat’s “my young women” represents a formal shift because the term refers to all servants. The shift represents a different lexical form from that of the Hebrew text. It is difficult to postulate why the translator would opt for the wrong lexical item. Nonetheless, it is interesting that he does not follow the KJV’s expression “young men,” although the KJV follows the Hebrew form more strictly, as expected. It is unclear, however, whether or not the translation also represents a functional shift. The translator possibly understood the term as generic, and then profiled only the young women out of the mixed group. Verse 22 supports this argument with Naomi’s affirmation of Ruth’s report – if Ruth takes Boaz’s advice, she will not be molested in other fields. In verse 22, Naomi interprets the הַנְּעָרִים of verse 21 as including female servants.

Wookey does not represent a formal shift since the term הַנְּעָרִים is masculine and fits the label “young men.” It manifests a functional shift, though, because it excludes female servants and, as a result, causes Naomi’s answer in verse 22 to be at odds with Ruth’s report in verse 21. It can be hypothesised that the translator was misled by the Hebrew masculine form and rendered the concept as masculine. In that case, he was probably unaware that he made an exegetical error. The error stems from lexical differences between the two texts as well as an erroneous TL meaning. Consequently, textual and communication situation CFRs can be thought to have overlapped to influence this decision. On the one hand, they are textual because of a deceptive lexical form הַנְּעָרִים. On the other hand, the CFR is communication situational because the clue to the unit’s interpretation lies not only in the unit but primarily in the next verse (i.e., it relates to cotext). BSSA avoids the above discussed mistakes and, consequently, manifests neither a formal nor functional shift. Its rendering is the best suggestion for this unit.

6.4.21 Ruth 3:1

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|
| וַתֹּאמֶר לָהּ נְעָמִי הַמֹּתֶה | Mme Naomi matsalaagwe a mo raya a re (Then Naomi her mother- in-law said to her) | Naomi matsalaagwe a mo raya a re (Naomi her mother-in-law said to her) | Mme Naomi a raya ngwetsi ya gagwe a re (Then Naomi said to her daughter in law) |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|

The Hebrew text corresponds formally to “and Naomi her mother-in-law said to her.” The *vav* conjunction in this instance is best understood as indicating “the next significant element in the sequence of events” (De Waard and Nida 1991: 32). The narrative discourse indicates that there is a time lapse between the last events of 2:23 when Ruth gleaned and the present event when Naomi spoke to her about finding her a husband. Block (1999: 62) translates it as “one day.” Some English versions, accordingly, account for this lapse with renderings like “afterward (GNV),” “when she was back (NAB),” “at that time” (NET), and “one day” (NIV). Without accounting for this time lapse in the TT, the sequence of events could become unnatural and confusing.

The three Bibles manifest a functional shift as far as the translation of the *vav* is concerned. Moffat’s and BSSA’s particle, *mme*, marks continuation or sequence in narration with the general sense of “and,” “then” or “next.”⁵⁴ In other words, it primarily denotes immediate succession of narrative events. Consequently, *mme* neither accounts for the time lapse between the events nor accurately translates the *vav* conjunction of the Hebrew text. Wookey chooses to leave the *vav* untranslated and, as a result, the time lapse is unaccounted for. Therefore, all three Bibles manifest a functional shift because it will cause difficulty for the TT audience to understand at what point in time Naomi communicated the present message. The shift represents an inexact TT meaning. It also exemplifies an exegetical failure. It is

⁵⁴ Outside of a narrative context, it has the general sense of contrast, namely, “but.”

likely to lead to distraction, confusion or erroneous interpretation in the TT. The communication situation CFR may be hypothesised for this decision. That is because the cues for interpreting the function of the *vav* here lie in various elements in the present unit and in some of the preceding ones. Such cues can be understood as the *vav*'s typical communication settings. The *vav*'s lexical semantic frames alone are insufficient for understanding its function here.

BSSA manifests two more shifts – they are formal. The first one occurs when it removes Naomi's tag "her mother-in-law." It appears that the shift was made in order to avoid a monotonous use of the term *matsalaagwe*, which was the last word in the preceding sentence (2:23), and would be the third word in the present sentence (3:1). This shift and the next represent an insignificant difference in lexical form between the Hebrew and TT forms. They make no difference to the overall meaning of the Hebrew sentence. The second one is the addition of *ngwetsi ya gagwe* (daughter-in-law) to the tag "her" [Ruth]. It was probably made to compensate for the removal of the tag, *matsalaagwe*, and to uphold the profiled relationship between Naomi and Ruth. The restructured forms give an adequate representational meaning of the Hebrew unit. A literary CFR can be said to have influenced the translators towards this decision. That is, the changes are made for stylistic purposes – to avoid clumsy, unnatural or unidiomatic communication. BSSA's translation is a good suggestion for translating this unit.

6.4.22 Ruth 3:7

| | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|---|
| וַיִּטֵּב לְבוֹ | Pelo ya gagwe e natehala (His heart was becoming enjoyable) | Pelo ya gagwe e le mokete (His heart was a celebration) | Pelo ya gagwe e itumetse (His heart [was] pleased/content). |
|-----------------|---|---|---|

This clause corresponds formally to "His heart was pleased or content." Its referential meaning is that Boaz was happy, in a good spirit or in a relaxed mood (cf. Block 1999: 65).

This clause appears to be quite easy to interpret, but the three Bibles struggle to translate it. They communicate it in an ungrammatical and unnatural manner and leave the audience to make inferences for its logical interpretation. It is easy to deduce, when the term "heart" is

combined with the term “enjoyable, celebration or merry” in a Setswana clause, that someone is pleased, so the audience is unlikely to struggle to interpret the Bibles’ renderings. Nevertheless, the TL renderings represent a functional shift because in Setswana context, it is not the heart that becomes jovial but the person. Thus, the ungrammatical and unnatural renderings are bound to be distracting to a TT audience. The Bibles’ common challenge centred on the form, לִבּוֹ (his heart), which they followed literally.

For Moffat, one can assume that the translator was simply deficient in Setswana, and consequently created an ungrammatical clause – viz., “his heart was becoming enjoyable.” The translator had little editorial assistance from MT speakers. Therefore, lexical frames, which are a subframe of textual CFRs, can be hypothesised for this erroneous decision. For the Wookey shift, a conceptual textual CFR can be postulated in which the translator(s) failed to understand the concept of the combined lexical items. However, it is difficult to explain why the Wookey translators would struggle with such a simple expression. *Mokete* refers to celebration or mirth (Brown 1980: 206; Dent 1992: 135). The clause essentially says that Boaz’s heart was a celebration. The BSSA’s term *itumetse* (was merry) is idiomatic, but the presence of *pelo* (heart) in the construction yields the unnatural expression *Pelo ya gagwe e itumetse* (His heart was merry). As for the factors that led to this erroneous decision, it can be posited that this Bible was misled by the textual frames of the Hebrew unit. They mistakenly deemed it relevant to account for the lexical item *pelo*, although the lexeme is redundant in the Setswana expression. Therefore, the textual CFR can be hypothesised for the erroneous decision.

The best approach to translating this clause would be to replace the form לִבּוֹ with the form “he,” and render וַיִּיטֵב as “was merry.” That would render the clause as *A itumetse* (He was merry). It would then correspond to the Hebrew unit’s concept without any functional shift or distraction.

6.4.23 Ruth 3:9

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| וּפְרִשְׁתְּ כַנְפֶךָ עַל־אֲמָתְךָ | Phuthololela lelata la gago lohuka lwa gago (Spread your wing on behalf of your servant) | Phuthololela lelata la gago kobo ya gago (Spread your garment on behalf of your servant) | Phuthololela lelata la gago diphuka tsa gago (Spread your wings on behalf of your servant) |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|

The Hebrew phrase corresponds formally to “Spread out your wing over your maidservant.” פְּרִשְׁתְּ has the semantic potential of “wing, skirt, or corner of a garment.” Ruth was referring to the corner of Boaz’s garment. The garment’s corners were metaphorically called “wings” (Dommershausen 1995: 231). It was used and worn in different ways. Dommershausen explains that “to spread the corner of one’s garment over a woman [...] means to cover her nakedness, to marry her” (cf. Bush 1998: 70; LaCocque 2004: 96).⁵⁵ Hence, Ruth’s request to Boaz invoked a culturally specific metaphor for marriage which can cause translation problems in other socio-cultural settings. Another aspect of the phrase that could be difficult to capture is the term which Ruth uses for maidservant אֲמָתְךָ. It is different from אֲפָדָה which she used in 2:13. The NET Bible notes that אֲמָתְךָ represents a more elevated social status than אֲפָדָה. In 2:13 she had just arrived from Moab, and her position as a foreigner was more pronounced. Now, she is more aware that she is Boaz’s relative, a position that grants her certain potential privileges.

The three Bibles use “wing” (Moffat), “garment” (Wookey) and “wings” (BSSA). Generally, these prevent a formal shift. BSSA opts for the plural “wings” and can therefore be said to represent a slight formal shift. Concerning the possibility of functional shifts, one can start by considering the socio-cultural interpretation of Ruth’s request. That is, the metaphor she uses would be understood unequivocally as a marriage proposal by the original audience. However, the three Bibles can be said to represent a functional shift because for all three translations, Ruth’s request does not even hint at a marriage proposal. The Bibles also represent another, less significant shift. For example, the translations all present Ruth as asking Boaz to merely spread his wing (whatever that might mean) or blanket “on behalf of” or “for” her. Yet the surface interpretation of the Hebrew forms is that Ruth is asking Boaz to

⁵⁵ See also Ezekiel 16:8 where God spread the corner of His garment over Israel and covered her nakedness. In that context, God figuratively entered into a marriage covenant with her.

cover her with his garment –referring to *apesa lelata la gago kobo/lefuka la gago* (cover your servant with your wing/garment). It is understandable why the Bibles would be vague. At face value, Ruth’s request in Setswana can easily lead the TT audience to deduce that she is asking for sex. That is because she is asking to sleep under the same garment with Boaz. The Bibles are probably avoiding the socio-culturally awkward notion of Ruth asking for sex. Consequently, the divergent socio-cultural CFR can be cited as the cause of such a functional shift. For Moffat, this functional shift, and the one that follows in the paragraphs below, can be ascribed to its traditional adherence to formal correspondence, in which technical expressions and metaphors are left uninterpreted. The major factors of influence, in that case, can be regarded as pertaining to an organisational CFR.

For the two latest Bibles, the absence of connotations of a marriage proposal in the TT can also be ascribed to differing socio-cultural CFRs. That is because they are more inclined towards functional equivalence and could be expected to be more interpretive and conscious of the marriage proposal than Moffat. Actually, BSSA suggests this awareness with a footnote reference to Ezekiel 16:8. Ruth, being a woman – and the heroine of the story – is not expected to propose marriage (or sex), but can be expected to ask for material assistance from a well-off male relative such as Boaz. The Bibles, presumably, do not want to spoil the sparkle of the story. They avoid what may be deemed socio-culturally awkward or embarrassing in the TT, especially if committed by Ruth. BSSA’s footnote cross reference to Ezekiel 16:8, if it were elaborated, would indicate that indeed the unexpected happened – she proposed to Boaz, but rightfully so, and the footnote offers no explanation that this is a metaphor for marriage. It merely presents the cross-reference.

Concerning *לַעֲבֹדָה*, the Bibles all translate it as *lelata* – servant – and thereby fail to capture the enhancement represented in the term. Another inaccuracy is the absence of the gender element in the TL. These errors represent slight formal and functional shifts as a result of differences in lexical forms and inexact correspondence between the Hebrew text and the TTs. The shifts can be deemed to be caused by lexical difficulties in which it is not easy to find satisfactory equivalents between the Hebrew text and the TT. The lexical difficulties pertain to incompatibilities between the two languages and their cultural frameworks. For example, it is difficult to differentiate in Setswana between the lowly servant of 2:13 and the more honoured servant of 3:9. The same difficulty applies to capturing the gender element of the concept “servant.” Attempts to differentiate accordingly are bound to be expansive and

more elaborate than intended by the Hebrew text. In generic CFR terms, these lexical frames that affected decision making in the TL are textual CFRs.

“Marry me,” suggested by De Waard and Nida (1991: 38; cf. GNB) is arguably the best interpretive rendering of the Hebrew ST. The most euphemistic Setswana equivalent of “marry me” is formally “take me,” which, unfortunately, could be vague or meaningless. The expansion “to be your wife,” would eliminate all ambiguity without affecting the idiom or eupheme. The sentence would be *Tswewe-tswewe, ntsee gore ke nne mosadi wa gago* (Please take me to be your wife). On the one hand, the absence of the expression “your servant” does not make a significant difference to the sense since it is already in the preceding sentence of the same verse. Its inclusion, on the other hand, can be distracting. That is because Ruth refers to herself in the second person, and to reconstruct the phrase in first person terms would produce a longwinded sentence.

6.4.24 Ruth 3:10

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| הַיִּטְבֵּתָ תְּסִדֵּדָה הָאֲחֵרֶיךָ מִן־הָרִאשׁוֹן | O dirile <i>pelonomi</i> e ya bofelo ya gago go sita ya ntlha ⁵⁶ (You have made this last <i>kindness</i> to be greater than the first) | O itshupile <i>pelonomi</i> mo bokhutlong bogolo go mo tshimologong (You have shown greater <i>kindness</i> in the end than in the beginning) | <i>Lorato</i> lo lwa gago lo gaisa lwa pele (This <i>love</i> of yours is greater than the first) |
|--|---|---|---|

This sentence literally corresponds to “you have made this latter *hesed* of yours better than the first” (Bush 1998: 75). This sentence is examined for the translation of the term הָרִאשׁוֹן . The various senses and difficulties of translating this term were discussed in 1:8. The present context seems to communicate that Ruth is, by character, a person of kind deeds. She could be described as a loyal and loving person, regardless of whether the recipient of her kindness is Boaz or anyone else.

⁵⁶ The italics in the Setswana translations are mine.

However, the translation *lorato* (love) could accidentally profile the concept of feelings rather than deeds and give the impression that she is in love with Boaz (although that is a possibility). The terms *pelonomi* and *lorato* were discussed in detail when dealing with 1:8. In that discussion, it was noted that *hesed* refers primarily to faithful deeds. Therefore, the translation, *bopelonomi*, which focuses more on her acts than on her feelings, is a better translation than *lorato*. The Moffat and Wookey translations use *pelonomi*. They can be regarded as adequate, exemplifying no formal or functional shift. BSSA yields a functional shift in this case by using the term *lorato*. Considering that *hesed* can also mean “love.” BSSA does not manifest a formal shift. As for the functional shift, it represents differences in referential meaning between the Hebrew text and the Setswana TT. The primary influence on the erroneous decision is probably BSSA’s tradition of seeking the most common or idiomatic Setswana term possible during translation. Therefore, the organisational CFR that pertains to BSSA’s methodology can be postulated to have led to this decision. Still, while *lorato* is more common, *pelonomi* is more technical and suitable for such a technical term as *hesed*. Thus, *pelonomi* is the best option for rendering the term in this context.

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| לְבַלְתִּי לָלֶכֶת אַחֲרָי הַבְּחוּרִים | Wa seka wa latela makau (You did not go to young men) | Wa seka wa latela a e leng makau (You did not go to those who are young men) | Wa seka wa latela makau (You did not go to young men) |
|--|---|---|---|

The Hebrew expression corresponds formally to “You did not go after the young men.”⁵⁷ Boaz is commending Ruth’s *hesed* in not preferring a younger husband after discovering that her potential husband was old. However, there are three exegetical problems in the Hebrew forms. Firstly, they do not indicate that she would be seeking marriage but leave open the interpretation that she would be promiscuous. Secondly, they do not refer to one young man but to a plurality of them. Thirdly, the Hebrew idiom “to go or walk after” often has the

⁵⁷ Apparently, the expression “walk after” originated from the context of war where the army or people follow after commander-in-chief (Helfmeyer 1974: 205). Its common contexts are religious and sexual, but other contexts of “walk after” include servant-master, husband-wife and disciple-master relationships as well as political affiliation (Block 1999: 71; Helfmeyer 1974: 204-205).

derogative meaning of “to whore after” (Bush 1996: 77).⁵⁸ The three problems are accidental because according to the larger discourse, Boaz is too kind and wise to tell Ruth that he had expected her to follow after different young men promiscuously. A translation of the text could accidentally give the impression that Boaz expected Ruth to be promiscuous. This interpretation could arise, firstly, if the audience were to attach the stigma of promiscuity to foreign women, or Moabite women in particular. Genesis 19:30-38 and Numbers 25:1 seem to indicate that Moabite women were thought to be promiscuous by nature. Secondly, the interpretation could arise if the audience were to think that Ruth would fail to find a husband and end up desperate. The NET Bible’s rendering “You have not sought to marry one of the young men” restores Ruth’s need for marriage and reduces the number of the young men to one (cf. De Waard and Nida 1991: 40).

The three Bibles’ renderings are virtually identical. The only difference is in Wookey’s redundant expansion of young men with “those who are.” This version was expansive here, as per its tradition, but may also be attempting to account for the definite article in the Hebrew ST. Nevertheless, the three Bibles follow the Hebrew expression word for word, thereby leaving the clause open to the interpretation that Boaz expected Ruth to be promiscuous. That represents a serious functional shift because the Hebrew unit does not mean “whore after young men.” Whilst the translator may not know if the Hebrew audience could make a mistake in interpreting the clause, he would do well to be alert to how the TT audience might understand its formal correspondent. It is difficult to hypothesise whether the translators were unaware of the two possibilities, in which case the exegetical error would be accidental, or they opted to ignore them. The decisions can be said to have been caused by textual CFRs. Specifically, such frames have problematic connotations inherent in the corresponding lexical items of the Hebrew text and TT, even when formal or functional correspondence is accurate.

The NET Bible is arguably the best example for capturing the whole sense of this clause, viz. “You have not sought to marry one of the young men.” In Setswana, it would be, *Wa seka wa senka go nyalwa ke mongwe wa makau.*

⁵⁸ Bush refutes that Boaz may have had this sense in mind, nevertheless. Boaz’s use of the noun, *hesed*, implies that Ruth could either select one of the younger men for a husband, or to marry the older Boaz. She picked the more sacrificial choice. The idea of her foregoing another option of promiscuity would not justify the use of the noun, *hesed*.

6.4.25 Ruth 3:11

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|
| יִדְעַ כָּל־שַׁעַר עָמִי | Motse otlhe wa batho ba me o a itse (The whole town/village of my people knows) | Motse otlhe wa batho ba ga etsho o a itse (The whole town/village of my people knows) | Mongwe le mongwe mo lekgotleng la morafe wa gaetsho (Everyone in the council of my people knows) |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|

The Hebrew text corresponds formally to “The whole gate of my people knows.” The “gate” can denote either all the people of Bethlehem or the council that is legally responsible for the town (Bush 1998: 79; cf. HALOT 2000: 1617).⁵⁹ While “council” is a possible interpretation of the Hebrew concept, it appears restricting in view of Boaz’s generous discourse (cf. De Waard and Nida 1991: 40). Boaz’s rhetoric appears to be that everyone knows about Ruth’s heroism (cf. Otto 2006: 373). From that perspective, the best interpretation of the Hebrew unit is the sense of “All the people of my town” (cf. GNV, KJV, NAB, NAS, NET, NIV and NRSV).

Moffat and Wookey render the phrase as “the whole town of my people knows,” whilst BSSA translates it as “everyone in the council of my people knows.” Moffat and Wookey do not manifest any shift whilst the latter manifests a formal and a functional shift. Of the two, Wookey is slightly more idiomatic and therefore the best translation choice. The BSSA rendering manifests a formal shift because “council” profiles a different lexical form from that of the Hebrew text’s “town.” It can be said to result in a functional shift, too, if the TT concept, *lekgotleng*, were to be deemed to limit the Hebrew concept of “town.” The shift would lead to an erroneous TL meaning. This kind of decision follows the general endeavour of BSSA to be as specific as possible in its interpretation. That endeavour pertains to methodology, so the factors that led to the rendering *lekgotleng* can be deemed to arise from the project’s organisational CFR. In this instance, the specificity of BSSA is too limiting.

⁵⁹ “Gate” was part of the structures that fortified major settlements, but is used metaphorically here to refer to the inhabitants of that settlement (Otto 2006: 373).

Intertextual frames, which are a subtype of the generic textual CFR, seem to have overlapped with the organisational ones in BSSA’s shift. Intertextual frames are influences from another text which, in this case, is a different unit in another chapter. That is, the lexical item שָׁעַר occurs also in 4:1 where it legitimately profiles the place for legal deliberations. This occurrence apparently influenced BSSA to perceive the city gate as a council meeting place. Consequently, it translates וּמִשְׁעַר מְקוֹמוֹ in 4:10 as “and from the council of his place.” That understanding could have led to the present interpretation, viz. “everyone in the council of my people knows.” Wookey is the best suggestion for translating this unit. It is almost identical to Moffat’s rendering, but is more idiomatic.

6.4.26 Ruth 3:13

| | | | |
|------------|--|--|---|
| חַי־יְהוָה | Jaaka Jehova a tshedile (As Jehovah lives) | Jaaka Jehofa a tshedile (As Jehovah lives) | Ka bophelo jwa MORENA (By the life of the LORD) |
|------------|--|--|---|

The clause חַי־יְהוָה is an oath indicator (or authenticator) formally corresponding to “the life of Yahweh.” For fuller understanding, it is best understood as “by the life of Yahweh, I swear it” (Conklin 2011: 63; De Waard and Nida 1991: 42). According to Conklin, the oath pattern “the life of [...]” is the most common oath authenticator, coming in different forms or varieties (Conklin 2011: 27).

Moffat and Wookey render the formula as “as Yahweh lives.” That represents several formal shifts because firstly, there is no particle for “as” in the Hebrew text. Secondly, they replace the noun “life” with the verb “lives.” These formal shifts are trivial as far as an attempt to find a functional equivalent in the TT is concerned – the two Bibles still correspond closely with the Hebrew expression. However, they also manifest a functional shift because they do not resemble a Setswana oath formula. The shift produces an inexact TT meaning. The primary factors that influenced Moffat’s and perhaps Wookey’s decisions can be deemed as organisational since the renderings essentially retain the form of the Hebrew unit.⁶⁰ Hence, the Bibles were influenced by their respective organisational CFRs. It may be postulated that

⁶⁰ Wookey’s methodology is inconsistent, being alternately formal and functional.

the formal reconstructions in the two renderings represent an attempt to make them function as oath formulas in the TL. That would be unconventional. Besides, in view of their formal correspondence tradition, it is not surprising that the translators did not go far enough in that attempt.

BSSA's rendering is surprising because it is more word for word than the other two. Formally, it sounds virtually like the Hebrew text's "the life of Yahweh." Yet it does not serve as a Setswana oath formula. In Setswana, one does not conventionally swear by an honourable person's life or death such as a parent, God or ancestral spirit. One could indeed say "By Yahweh" or "By my father," but it only means "I honour this oath as I honour my father or God." When it relates to life or death, one normally swears by the fontanel of an infant (i.e., *Ka phogwana ya ga nnake/ngwanake*), or by one's own life (e.g. *tladi nthathele maaka* – may lightning strike me if I'm lying). Still, it does not directly refer to life and death (cf. De Waard and Nida 1991: 42). Consequently, whilst BSSA does not manifest a formal shift, it manifests a functional shift because its meaning does not correspond to that of the Hebrew text.

This erroneous decision can be attributed specifically to disparate communication situation frames.⁶¹ As argued at 1:17, the main problem is that oath formulas are difficult to interpret because they are technical (idiomatic) and culture specific. Complex textual formulations and foreign socio-cultural frames tend to merge and cause exegetical difficulties. An additional problem with the present oath formula is that its form is deceptively natural and straightforward in the Setswana TL. The translators probably mistakenly presumed that the rendering would function as a correct interpretation of the Hebrew oath formula. In short, the foreign communication situation CFR of the Hebrew unit probably led to this decision.

The Setswana idiomatic oath indicator mentioned above, namely, *Ka Jehofa* (By Jehovah), would be an accurate correspondent of the Hebrew expression. It comes after the oath content. It can be expanded to read as "I swear by Jehovah" *Ke ikana ka Jehofa*.

⁶¹ This may be postulated for the Wookey error, too. It can be assumed that they may have preferred functional correspondence, if they could have succeeded at correctly exegeting the unit.

6.4.27 Ruth 3:14

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| אֶל־יְיָדַע כִּי־בָאָה הָאִשָּׁה הַגֵּרָר | A go sa itsege fa mosadi a na a tla seboping (Let it not be known that a woman came to the threshing floor) | A go se itsiwe fa mosadi yo a ne a tsile mo seboping (Let it not be known that this woman came to the threshing floor) | A go seka ga itsiwe gore mosadi yoo o letse kwa seboaneng (Let it not be known that the woman spent the night at the threshing floor) |
|--|--|--|---|

The clause corresponds formally to “let it not be known that the woman came to the threshing floor.” This is also the literal sense that the forms denote (cf. Bush 1998: 61). Boaz’s problem is that Ruth slept over for the night rather than that she visited him. Explaining it as “the woman came” does not fully capture this problem. That is, if she merely “came,” the TT audience could assume that she came in the daytime or only for a short time, and Boaz would not need to hide the fact that she visited. The Hebrew expression does not make explicit Boaz’s fear that someone may discover that she had spent the night with him. Consequently, there is a problem of an information gap between this sentence and the larger narrative discourse setting. Another important point of interpretation concerns the definite article on the item for “woman.” Boaz is forward looking, for he plans to negotiate the levirate. For him to negotiate successfully, it must neither be known that a woman spent a night with him nor that this very woman is his levirate candidate.

The first point of interpretation concerns the information gap between the present clause and the narrative discourse. BSSA opts for a formal and functional shift by replacing “came” (*tsile*) with “spent the night” (*letse*). It is a functional shift because it has moved further than the Hebrew expression and introduced a different concept, namely “spending the night.” Thus, as a formal shift, it represents a difference in lexical form between the Hebrew and the TT expressions. As a functional shift, it leads to a more explicit TL meaning than the Hebrew text gives. Therefore, the shift can be regarded as exegetical. The CFR that influenced this decision is textual. Specifically, the subframes are intertextual since the translators follow the

same verse's earlier revelation that Ruth slept at Boaz's feet until morning.⁶² BSSA chose this shift probably to fill the information gap that the clause creates as well as to capture the full essence of the risk that Boaz is hoping to avoid. Moffat and Wookey avoid this shift. They present the Hebrew unit's correspondent without attempting to fill the Hebrew text's apparent information gap. BSSA's shift is helpful for aiding the TT audience towards a logical interpretation of the narrative's discourse. However, it could be adapted to present the interpretive *letse* (spent the night) in a footnote and leave the closest correspondent *tsile* (came) in the text. In view of the following point of interpretation, more explanation is needed, which would justify the use of a footnote.

The second point of interpretation concerns the definiteness of $\eta\psi\lambda$ (cf. NET Bible). Moffat makes no attempt to account for it. As a result, it manifests a formal and functional shift. It reads as "a woman came." That is a shift because it removes from the context the fact that the identity of this woman can be problematic for the prospective levirate negotiations. The council is yet to hear about this woman as a candidate for marriage to Boaz. If they hear about her premature contact with him, it may jeopardise the negotiations. Thus, whilst the news of a woman spending the night with Boaz may be controversial, it appears that according to the narrative, it can be much more problematic to the bid for the levirate if that woman is already known to be the candidate Ruth. The shift of neglecting the sense of the definite article represents an inexact TL meaning. It can, consequently, be deemed as exegetical. The organisational CFR of dependence on the KJV can be presumed to have influenced the decision since the rendering resembles that of the KJV per verbatim. Otherwise, one would have expected this Bible to reproduce the definite article as per its conventional method of following the Hebrew ST word for word.

Wookey's and BSSA's *yo* (this) and *yoo* (that) attempt to capture the sense of the definite article. However, BSSA is closer to the sense of the definite article in this instance. Wookey profiles too strongly the woman's proximity, while in BSSA her distance serves to profile more her exploits. BSSA is closer to the concept of "the woman in mention" whilst Wookey

⁶² They may also be deemed as communicational, with the co-text playing an important part since the translators have taken the communicative clue from an earlier unit of the same verse. This is an example of a possible overlap of CFRs.

is closer to that of “the woman who is here with us”.⁶³ These differences arise from the fact that it is difficult to find a TL lexical equivalent for the definite article. Linguistic differences between Hebrew and the TL can lead to difficulty in finding equivalents for certain lexical and grammatical particles. Such linguistic factors are some of the subframes of the textual CFR. Thus, a divergent textual CFR has influenced this shift.

To capture the Hebrew unit’s function in the two points of interpretation above, BSSA’s conceptualisation would be a good starting point. However, it will need a footnote in order to make the Hebrew text unambiguously clear. The unit can be translated as *A go seka ga itsiwe gore mosadi yoo o tsile kwa seboaneng* (let it not be known that the woman came to the threshing floor). Then a footnote would read generally as *Boase o ne a tshaba gore fa Ruthe a ka bonwa, kgang eo e ne e ka dirisiwa ke bangwe go lwantsha maiteko a bone a go nyalana* (Boaz feared that if Ruth was discovered, that information may be used to oppose their intentions to marry).

6.4.28 Ruth 3:16

| | | | |
|---------------------|--|---|--|
| מַה־אַתְּ בְּתוּרַי | O mang, morwadiaka? (Who are you, my daughter?) | Go rileng, morwadiaka? (What is wrong, my daughter?) | Go ntse jang, morwadiaka? (What is it like, my daughter?) |
|---------------------|--|---|--|

This phrase literally corresponds to “Who are you, my daughter?” Here, Naomi is not asking Ruth to identify herself, but is essentially asking, “How did it go?” (De Waard and Nida 1991: 44; NET). Naomi wants to find out how the negotiation went between Ruth and Boaz. Ruth’s extensive answer indicates that this is indeed the meaning of the question. If left at “who are you” in the TL, the question would be nonsensical and would result in a major functional shift.⁶⁴

⁶³ “Closeness” here refers to degree, and avoids the notion of precise correspondence.

⁶⁴ Sasson adds the word “now” to the question to indicate that Naomi was inquiring about new developments from Ruth’s mission (1979: 101).

Moffat opts for the literal “Who are you, my daughter?” That avoids a formal shift but represents a functional shift because the question can be confusing to TT audiences.⁶⁵ The functional shift arises from an erroneous interpretation in the TL which in turn is due to the organisational CFR of following a word for word rendering of the Hebrew text.

Wookey’s translation *Go rileng?* is typically asked in Setswana contexts to find out what went wrong. This Bible attempts to render a TL interpretation of the Hebrew text’s original question. However, this rendering can be said to represent a formal and functional shift because it gives a different interpretation of the Hebrew unit. Likewise, BSSA’s translation, *Go ntse jang?* (What is it like?), neither presents the Hebrew expression’s original question nor gives its idiomatic sense “How did it go?” BSSA also represents a formal and functional shift because “What is it like, my daughter?” is so ambiguous that its meaning can only be inferred from the subsequent answer that Ruth gives (which is a report of her dealings with Boaz). In the final analysis, both BSSA’s and Wookey’s attempts at interpreting the Hebrew text result in functional shifts which are due to erroneous TL meanings. It appears from their attempts that the two Bibles were aware that the question means “How did it go?” Consequently, exegetical difficulties may not have influenced the translations. Rather, it can be argued that the translators did not foresee that their TL forms would manifest ambiguity. That could be perceived as a textual accident. In that case, the influences could be explained as arising from an incompatible textual CFR.

Considering the interpretation suggested in the first paragraph of this discussion, the question could be rendered as, *Kgang e tsamaile jang, morwadiaka?* (How did the matter go, my daughter?).

⁶⁵ Some audiences, especially the less literate, may struggle to make sense of it. To the fully literate, it could be at least distracting. Either way, it would represent a functional shift.

6.4.29 Ruth 3:17

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| שֵׁשֶׁ־הַשְּׁעָרִים הָאֵלֶּה נָתַן לִי | Dilekanyo di le sekese tse tsa barele o di nneile (these six measures of barley he gave to me) | A nnya dielo tse thataro tse, tsa barele (he gave me these six measures of barley) | O mphile dielo di le thataro tseo tsa garase (he gave me those six measures of barley) |
|---|--|---|--|

The Hebrew expression formally corresponds to “these six measures of barley, he gave to me.”⁶⁶

Moffat follows this order, so it avoids a formal shift. This Bible does communicate that Boaz gave Ruth the six measures of barley. Nevertheless, it yields a difficult, longwinded grammatical construction in Setswana and can thus be deemed to cause a slight functional shift –it takes a while to understand what is being said about the six measures of barley. Therefore, the functional shift is literary, for it represents unnatural or unidiomatic communication from a TT stylistic point of view. This shift was influenced by the organisational CFR relating to the project’s method of word for word correspondence.

BSSA renders הָאֵלֶּה as “those” rather than its apparent equivalent “these.” In BSSA, however, “those” alters the distance between her and the barley. One would have thought that the distance between the barley and the two women makes no difference to the interpretation of the sentence. Thus, one could say that this Bible represents a trivial formal and functional shift. It is not clear why BSSA opts for “those” instead of “these,” so the CFR that influenced that decision is difficult to hypothesise. Perhaps it was only a typographical mistake, and sufficient checking and testing of the drafts was not done. If that was the case, then the project’s organisational CFR can be assumed to have caused the rendering.

6.4.30 Ruth 3:18

| | | | |
|---------|----------------|------------------|----------------|
| הַיּוֹם | Kajeno (Today) | Gompieno (Today) | Kajeno (Today) |
|---------|----------------|------------------|----------------|

⁶⁶ The primary interest in this unit is the word order and the demonstrative particle. The units of measurement and their TT equivalent are dealt with elsewhere and will, hence not be addressed. Incidentally, the focus here is not on the exact measure but on the large quantity (De Waard and Nida 1991: 45).

The Hebrew unit corresponds formally to “today.”

All three Bibles do not manifest a formal shift. However, Moffat’s and BSSA’s *kajeno* is not a pure Setswana word. In Botswana, it is commonly known to belong to Sekgatla (Cole 1955: 260), which in turn is known to be influenced by other languages on the South African side of the Botswana-South Africa border, especially Sotho and Afrikaans. On the one hand, Moffat’s Setlhaping itself is known to be a “restricted dialect” (cf. Hawthorn 1960: 1). On the other hand, BSSA’s “central dialect” includes Sehurutshe, Sekwena and Sekgatla (Smit 1970: 201). From my examination of the dialects of the original versions of Moffat (1857), Wookey (1908) and BSSA (1970), BSSA’s dialect has the most characteristics of standard Setswana, including only a few traces of Sotho (another example is the expression *o phele* – “live” – in Ruth 3:1. The standard Setswana expression is *o tshela*).⁶⁷ However, my examination of the revised versions of the book of Ruth (BSSA 1987 and Wookey 1992) revealed that Wookey revised its dialect to the extent that it surpassed that of BSSA in keeping to standard Setswana. In the book of Ruth, BSSA 1987 shows more influence from Sotho than Wookey 1992 does (other comparisons were given in the section “The Translation of the BSSA Bible” in chapter four). Wookey’s choice, *gompieno*, is the standard Setswana term for “today,” and is the best suggestion for the rendering. Wookey, therefore, avoids a formal and functional shift.

Moffat’s and Wookey’s rendering *kajeno* can cause a distraction emanating primarily from a possible public disapproval of the choice of the word because it is not a typical Setswana word. Therefore, from the perspective of pure Setswana, it can be deemed to cause a functional shift. Currently, because Setswana speakers in Botswana consider Wookey to be linguistically purer than BSSA, they generally prefer Wookey – they regard Wookey as a Botswana Bible and BSSA as a South African Bible (cf. pages 110-111). In general reference, Botswana audiences commonly differentiate between the two Bibles by the labels on their cover pages. Wookey is labelled as *Baebele*, which is pronounced generally like the English word “Bible” – BSSA is labelled as *Beibele*, which is pronounced generally like the Afrikaans

⁶⁷ BSSA may have taken *kajeno* from Sekgatla and/or other Southern Sotho groups among whom Batswana groups settled and where the Rev. Muller worked (cf. section 4.4.3.1, footnote 58).

word “Bybel.”⁶⁸ This difference on the cover page symbolises the ideological divide between the respective audiences of the two Bibles.

A textual-linguistic CFR that pertains to dialect can be postulated for the decision *kajeno*.

6.4.31 Ruth 4:1

| | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|---|
| עָלָה הַשַּׁעַר | A ya kgorong (He went to the gate/court/he went to defecate) | A ya kgotleng (He went to the court/gate) | A ya kwa kgotleng (He went to the court/gate) |
|-----------------|---|---|---|

The Hebrew phrase formally means “He went up to the gate.” The Hebrew “gate” was the entrance of wards, towns and cities (Otto 2006: 368-369; cf. the shift at 3:11, pages 192-193). It was also the space inside the gate for public meetings, “where elders, judges [...] sat officially” (BDB 1907: 1045). The gate in Ruth 4 seems to be the entrance to the town or village. The Hebrew gate corresponds approximately to the ancient Setswana one. Traditionally, the Setswana household, consisting of a few families and several huts, was enclosed in a large fence with a gate. This gate has the synonyms, *kgoro*, corresponding formally to “gate,” and *kgotla*, corresponding formally to “ward” (Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 19; Setiloane 1976: 28). The larger ward and the whole village had their own gates, too, although these often lacked a full protective fence. Therefore, *kgotla* and *kgoro* designate “gate,” “court” and “ward.” Trivial civil and criminal matters were addressed at the household gate. The larger ward and village *kgotla* addressed progressively more serious civil and criminal matters, attended to by elders and ultimately judged by the chief of the village. Concerning this terminology, the Setswana traditional designation, *kgoro*, for ward or court is now virtually extinct so that only *kgotla* prototypically evokes such a conceptual scenario. *Kgoro*, contemporarily, primarily evokes “entrance” or “gate” without any suggestion of a meeting place. Yet, formally, the Hebrew ST prototypically profiles *kgoro* (gate). However, עָלָה הַשַּׁעַר evokes the sense of *kgotla* (ward).

⁶⁸ Botswana audiences generally consider *Baebete*, an English loanword, to be a Setswana word and *Beibete* to be an Afrikaans loanword. The choice *Beibete* for BSSA may indicate the influence of the Afrikaans Bible. However, I have not found such a linguistic influence in any of the Setswana versions of the book of Ruth.

Moffat's *a ya kgorong* represents a functional shift because it literally means "he went to the gate." It avoids a formal shift, however. Contemporarily, it would almost never refer to "he went to the ward/court." That is because it can refer to "ward or court" only quite remotely. More serious, however, is the fact that *a ya kgorong* is a euphemism for "he went to defecate," or "he went to the toilet" (Sandilands 1953: 359). Traditionally, Batswana did not build toilets. They used the fence behind huts for urination, but they exited through the *kgoro* and went into the surrounding vegetation and thick bushes to defecate. So, euphemistically they were just "going to the gate" because they would return shortly, unlike if they were going to visit another home or going to work. Nowadays *kgoro* has lost its sense of *kgotla*, so *ya kgorong* (go to the gate), now prototypically profiles the concept of going outside to defecate. A stronger influence from mother tongue speakers would probably have raised the concern regarding this problematic implication of the choice *kgorong*. The organisational problem evidenced by Moffat's choice is double – he was inclined towards the original unit's forms, yet he did not receive adequate mother tongue input in certain case where the two languages mismatched glaringly.

Wookey's and BSSA's *kgotleng* for the translation of הַשַּׁעַר matches well the Hebrew text's idea of "town gate," for it primarily profiles the community's meeting place. It is correct formally and functionally. The Bibles did well to avoid a form that would be more exact, but which would evoke the wrong socio-cultural contexts or, at the least, be meaningless. Leading to the Wookey and BSSA decisions, therefore, the socio-cultural CFR of the TL regarding "to go to the gate" probably played an important role. Organisationally, this strengthens the assumption that the translators of these two Bibles had commendable mother tongue assistance. As observable in the preceding and next shifts, the difference between these two Bibles and Moffat – as regards mother tongue input – stands out most conspicuously each time the forms of the original unit lead to a socially awkward formal rendering.

Still, all three Bibles represent a minor functional shift as far as the translation of עָלָה (he went up) is concerned. They do not capture the sense of "up," which contrasts with Ruth's going "down" to the threshing floor (LaCocque 2004: 124). Unfortunately, to try and capture the sense of "went up" in Setswana would rather produce the sense of "climb up," which would manifest a glaring functional shift. For that reason, the translators probably omitted it to avoid such an erroneous shift. Therefore, the cause of this omission can be attributed to unmatching

lexical frames in which translating the lexical item could lead to a greater error than omitting it. Such mismatching lexical frames belong within the heuristic textual CFR.

6.4.32 Ruth 4:2

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| עֲשָׂרָה אַנְשֵׁים מִזְקְנֵי הָעִיר | Banna ba bagolo ba ten ba motse (Ten big men of the town) | Banna ba le some ba bagolwane ba motse (Ten big men of the town) | Banna ba bagolo ba motse ba le some (Ten big men of the town) |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|

The עֲשָׂרָה אַנְשֵׁים מִזְקְנֵי הָעִיר are “men from the elders of the town.” זְקֵנִים refers to old men (although it refers to an old woman once) or elders as officials (Bush 1998: 98; Conrad 1980: 122). The elders in reference here are not necessarily old, but are men of prominence in the community or who hold an elder’s office. The Setswana socio-cultural context has the equivalent of elders too. Such elders are normally senior members of the family lineage. They are recognised as counsellors, intercessors and leaders in the community (Schapera and Comaroff 1991: 34, 48). Elders are usually appointed from among elderly senior men, although their ages may vary greatly.

Because in Setswana culture, the elders are always men, the addition of the term “men” to their designation in the Hebrew text has caused a significant translation problem for the translators. As a result, all the Bibles manifest a functional shift because the Hebrew text’s meaning is “men from among the elders” whilst the TL meaning is “big men.” In Setswana, putting the noun *bagolwane* after *banna ba* turns the noun *bagolwane* or *bagolo* into the adjective “big” (cf. Snyman et al. 1990: 37-38).⁶⁹ Leaving out the equivalent of אַנְשֵׁים, i.e., *banna* would have solved the problem. It is evident that “ten men from the elders” merely refers to “ten elders.” It is also ironic that all three translations try to provide an equivalent for a lexeme which would be better left untranslated. In the process, they avoid a formal shift, but they cause a functional one which pertains to an erroneous TL meaning.

⁶⁹ In this discussion, *bagolo* differs from *bagolwane* on the basis that *bagolwane* includes the nuance of “seniority” which *bagolo* does not have, and *bagolo* includes the sense of old age which *bagolwane* does not have (Snyman et al. 1990: 37-38). *Bagolwane* can refer to size and serve as an adjective just like *bagolo* (Snyman et al. 1990: 38), but only in a construction that is fashioned to create such a nuance.

For BSSA and, to a lesser extent, Wookey, this is a good example of an instance where an uncharacteristic attempt towards formal equivalence results in an unforeseen functional shift. I assume that if the translators had been aware of this error, they would have discarded the formal correspondent in favour of a more functional equivalent. For Moffat, it can be presumed that this lack of functional correspondence would not bother the translator. This postulation arises from an awareness of the three Bibles' methodological traditions whereby Moffat prefers strict word for word correspondence, Wookey generally fluctuates between the formal and functional traditions, and BSSA is largely functional. In that case, the primary influences on Moffat which led to this error relate to an organisational CFR. For BSSA and Wookey, it can be assumed that the error is accidental. It could be argued that they were unaware that their renderings would lead to a wrong meaning. The translators were misled by the apparently simple communication setting of the Hebrew unit and reproduced the unit literally – viz., the words, grammatical construction and socio-cultural hints (or lexical, syntactic and extralinguistic frames) – unaware that they would communicate unintended information. In that sense, differing communication situation CFRs contributed to this decision.

Another functional shift could be postulated in Moffat's and BSSA's use of *bagolo*, which designates elderly people, rather than *bagolwane*, which refers to elders (cf. De Waard and Nida 1991: 65). The term, *bagolo*, loses the official aspect of the people being referred to. Therefore, the translation, *bagolo*, represents a functional shift. That said, the office of *bagolwane* is currently disappearing quickly, and positions in the hierarchy after the chief are gradually taking the general designation of *dikgosana* (diminutive of *dikgosi* – chiefs). It could be expected that Moffat would make the error of picking the most basic form of this stem in the TL because it does not seek functional correspondence. Thus, the organisational CFR that pertains to methodology probably influenced this Bible. However, for BSSA, a local divergent socio-cultural CFR can be posited. The translators possibly considered that the designation, *bagolwane*, was becoming socio-culturally extinct and might be meaningless to the TL audience.

In view of the foregoing discussion, it appears simple to find an accurate functional correspondent of “ten men from the elders of the city.” It can be rendered as *Bagolwane ba motse ba le some*. This translation leaves out the form “men.” A footnote may be given to explain who an elder in ancient Israelite culture was.

6.4.33 Ruth 4:3

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| מְכַרָּה נְעָמִי הַלְקֵת הַשָּׂדֶה | Naome o na le leota go le bapatsa (Naomi has a piece of land to advertise) | Naomi o rekisa sebata sa lefatshe (Naomi is selling a piece of land) | Naomi o rata go rekisa kabelo ya tshimo (Naomi wants to sell the piece of land) |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|

The Hebrew text corresponds formally to “Naomi is selling the piece of land.” According to ancient Israelite property law, Naomi, being a woman, could not own land, but would have the right to use it until her remarriage or death. It appears that it was sometimes possible for a widow to inherit the land temporarily on the condition that it would remain in the name of the deceased man’s children (Moore 2008: 682, 692). Thus, instead of “selling,” Bush translates that Naomi is “surrendering her right to” the piece of land (Bush 1998: 95).⁷⁰ Yet, these attempts at clarification do not seem to fit in a rendering or its footnote because they are likely to be longwinded and confusing to a TT audience. The Hebrew unit has the inherent textual problem of incongruity between what is known of the ancient Israelite custom and what arises in the Ruth narrative.

Amazingly, Moffat neither follows the form nor grammatical construction of the Hebrew unit. It avoids the word “sell.” Instead, it uses “advertise” (*bapatsa*), which is erroneous for the reason that it points to the ultimate purpose of selling the piece of land. That represents a functional shift. Because Moffat departs from his conventional formal correspondence approach, it is difficult to hypothesise what led its translator to this decision. Wookey and BSSA give the denotational and referential meaning of “selling” as it appears in the Hebrew unit. That can be said to cause a formal and functional shift because of the possibility that the land was not really Naomi’s and she may not have had the right to sell it. There appear to be other unknown subframes concerning Naomi’s ownership and possible sale of the piece of land. This dilemma stems from a textual CFR that pertains to the Hebrew unit’s inherently problematic nature due to our lack of an adequate socio-cultural frame of reference.⁷¹ Such a textual CFR presents exegetical discrepancies during translation. Alongside textual CFRs,

⁷⁰ She might exchange it for some substantial commodities, or some form of accommodation (cf. NET).

⁷¹ Cf. also the similar problematic textual frame of “six measures of barley” (Ruth 3:15) as illustrated in the section “Literary Style” in chapter five.

other incompatible CFRs that overlap in this unit are communication situation CFRs and socio-cultural CFRs where the text, cotext and context of the Hebrew unit are incomplete and, therefore, misleading to the translator.

While the background information given by scholars for this unit is helpful to the researcher, its inclusion in a rendering or footnote seems more likely to complicate rather than clarify the unit for the TT audience. This is a shift that I am prepared to regard as unpreventable and irremovable. I would simply follow Wookey’s and BSSA’s translation “Naomi is selling her piece of land.”

6.4.34 Ruth 4:4

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| וַאֲנִי אֶמְרָתִי אֲגַלֶּה אָזְנְךָ | Mme ke ne ka re, ke tlaa kabolola tsebe ya gago (And I said, I will unblock/open your ear) | Ke gopotse go go loma tsebe (I thought to tell you a secret) | Ke ne ka re, ke tlaa go begela (I said, I will report to you). |
|--|--|--|--|

The Hebrew metaphor corresponds formally to “And I said/thought I will/should open your ear.” Its interpretation is “I thought that I should inform you,” or the shorter version “I thought to inform you” (cf. Bush 1998: 95; NAB; NKJ).⁷²

Moffat avoids a formal shift but manifests a functional one. It is a functional shift because its translation, while it formally corresponds to the Hebrew text, happens to be a metaphor for “give you a good beating” (Sandilands 1953: 358). Thus, Boaz would be understood to threaten So-and-so with a beating. The TT profiles a Setswana idiom which represents a misinterpretation of the Hebrew unit. The functional shift produces an erroneous TL meaning. The shift is caused by Moffat’s organisational CFR, particularly its tradition of seeking formal equivalence in translation.

Wookey uses the metaphor, *go go loma tsebe*, which literally reads as “to bite your ear” or “to whisper to you.” This metaphor means “to tell you a secret” (Brown 1980: 450; Sandilands

⁷² “Get someone’s attention” is another possibility for interpreting “open[ing] the ears” of someone (Block 1999: 82).

1953: 358). It represents a functional shift because the scenario of exposing a secret does not match the circumstances, even though the information might have been kept secret because Naomi and Ruth indeed bypassed So-and-so to reach Boaz.⁷³ Still, it would be strange for Boaz to declare that he is exposing Ruth's and Naomi's secret to So-and-so. Therefore, Wookey can be said to represent a formal and functional shift from "inform you" to "tell you a secret." This functional shift is also due to an erroneous TL meaning. That incorrect reading is caused by an attempt by Wookey to find a Setswana idiom that could be as close as possible to the form of the Hebrew text. Therefore, the decision can be ascribed to an organisational CFR whose specific subframes pertain to methodology. The respective textual CFR can be said to overlap with the organisational CFR because the Hebrew unit resembles closely the Setswana one for "tell a secret," both in form and function. Thus, the translators were probably misled into thinking that they correspond.

BSSA's translation avoids one functional shift and manifests another. Its rendering *go begela* captures accurately the Hebrew text's idea of "inform you." Yet, the clause, *Ke ne ka re* (I said), profiles more the idea of "I said" than of "I thought." That represents a functional shift because it can give the inaccurate impression that Boaz is reminding "So-and-so" of what he had told him previously. The functional shift results in an erroneous TL meaning. Since the phrase *אָמַרְתִּי* is relatively easy to interpret, it can be assumed that the translators either were unaware that the TL form profiled an unintended concept, or presumed that the error would be insignificant. Moreover, the Hebrew form normally means "I said," but in this context it should be construed as "I thought." The translators may have been misled by this nuance. Consequently, lexical CFRs could be hypothesised as the primary influences on this decision. Such frames would be a subgroup of the generic textual CFR.

For a translation suggestion, there are many idiomatic functional equivalents of the Hebrew expression such as *Ke ne ka ipolelela gore* (I told myself that I should), *Ke akantse gore* (I have thought to) and *Ke bone gore* (I have seen that I should). The complete clause would sound like *Ke akantse gore ke go begele* (I have thought to inform you).

⁷³ She may not have known him, but she could have investigated about him since she knew that there was a very high likelihood he would become her husband.

6.4.35 Ruth 4:6

| | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|---|
| פֶּן־אֶשְׁחִית אֶת־נַחְלָתִי | E sere kgotsa ka senya boswa jwa me (Lest I destroy my inheritance) | Nka tla ka senya jo e leng boswa jwa me (Otherwise I would destroy my inheritance) | E sere gongwe ka senya boswa jwa me (Lest I destroy my inheritance) |
|------------------------------|---|--|---|

This phrase literally states “Lest I destroy my inheritance.” It reflects So-and-so’s fear of the consequences of redeeming Ruth. An understanding of what he meant is important for appreciating the extent of Boaz’s *hesed* since it means that Boaz faced the same loss as him. The buyer of the field was supposed also to acquire the widow and raise an heir for the deceased. Such an heir would inherit the same land that the buyer was acquiring (NET). In that regard, buying the land would be “more economically burdensome than beneficial” (NET; cf. also Bush 1996: 229-233). Therefore, So-and-so’s explanation could be interpreted as “because I would impoverish myself” (De Waard and Nida 1973: 69).

The three Bibles translate the clause almost identically, except in minor formal differences such as synonyms (between Moffat and BSSA) and a redundant expansion (by Wookey). They avoid formal shifts. However, they manifest a functional shift because the phrase at the centre of the interpretation of the sentences, *senya boswa* (“destroy [my] inheritance”), in the Setswana translations is meaningless. The discourse of the unit is likely to be ambiguous to a target audience due to the cognitive gap between the two cultures. One must assume that a more specific interpretation of the clause was clear enough to the original audience. That is because the context of kinsman’s redemption was part of their culture. Therefore, one may conclude that the three Bibles produce a functional shift due to an inexact TT meaning which, in turn, is caused by socio-cultural differences between the Hebrew text and the TT. The TT does not capture the cultural elements evoked by the Hebrew text. It can be postulated that exegetical lethargy prevented BSSA from bridging the knowledge gap between the two cultures. The translators (of Moffat and BSSA) were probably aware that “destroy inheritance” is vague, but chose not to address the problem. A secondary hindrance to an adequate interpretation of this unit can be postulated as an organisational CFR since the Bibles follow the lead of most English versions.

In order to give an adequate interpretation, a more precise formulation is needed to replace *senya boswa* as well as a brief annotation to explain what motivated So-and-so's answer. Consequently, one could translate the clause as *Nka tla ka ikhumanegisa* (otherwise I would impoverish myself). The footnote that could clarify the Hebrew unit's context would read, generally, as "According to that culture, nothing that belonged to the deceased could not be inherited by the *goel* or his children. They would permanently remain in the name of the deceased, his widow and children. Therefore, the time, labour and resources that the *goel* would contribute towards advancing such wealth would not benefit him, as far as heritage is concerned."

6.4.36 Ruth 4:7

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| וְזֹאת לְפָנִים בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל עַל-הַגָּאוּלָּה וְעַל- הַתְּמוּרָה לְקַיִם כָּל- דְּבַר שְׁלֵף אִישׁ נָעֻז וְנָתַן לְרֵעֵהוּ וְזֹאת הַתְּעוּדָה בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל | Mme o e ne e le mokgwa mo Baiseraeleng metlheng e e fetileng ka ga thekololo le ka ga kananyo, go tlhomamisa tsotlhe; monna a rola tlhako sa gagwe a se neela mongwe ka ene: mme se e ne e le sesupo mo Baiseraeleng (Now this was a custom among Israelites in former times about sales and exchanges, to certify everything; a man took off his shoe and gave it to his | Gale mo Iseraele, mokgwa wa go rekolola le wa go ananya, go tlhomamisa dilo tsotlhe, e ne e le o: Motho o ne a tle a role setlhako, mme a se neye wa ga gabo; e ne e le one mokgwa wa go tlhomamisa mo Iseraele (Formerly in Israel, this was the custom for sale and exchange all things: a person took off his sandal and gave it to the other; it was a custom of certifying in Israel). | Jaanong mo metlheng ya pele go ne go le mokgwa mo Iseraele wa gore: Fa go rekollwa gongwe go anannngwa, motho a role setlhako sa gagwe, a se neele mongwe-ka-ene, e le go tlhomamisa mafoko aotlhe (Now, in former times there was a custom in Israel that: during sale or exchange, a person removed his sandal and gave it to the other as a way to certify the transaction). |
|---|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | neighbour: this was authentication in Israel) | | |
|--|---|--|--|

The Hebrew form explains the ancient tradition whereby the one who declines to redeem an item takes off his sandal and hands it over to the one who agrees to redeem. The unit is parenthetical, so the discussion that follows focuses on formatting (cf. Ruth 4:7 in the appendices).

Moffat's formatting does not cater for the fact that this verse is parenthetical. For this Bible, the verse is formatted like all the other verses throughout the book. They all comprise a paragraph each, although they are rather condensed together because there is no line spacing between them. The formatting does not indicate that this verse is a parenthesis, which creates a functional shift as far as the style of the TT is concerned. This parenthesis should be considered as an intervention by the text to make a certain aspect of the story clearer – it needs to be formatted differently so that it stands out from the rest of the text. In Moffat, however, it is not formatted to appear as an intervention/parenthesis in the TT, so it is likely to break the flow of the story and act as interference for the TT audience. Such a functional shift would result in an unnatural literary style. An organisational CFR pertaining to methodology can be deemed as responsible for this decision since it resembles the KJV's formatting style.

In Wookey 1992 and BSSA 1987,⁷⁴ the verse is formatted to stand as an independent paragraph, but that is the same case as the other paragraphs surrounding it. Moreover, the paragraphs are too condensed together to make the parenthesis stand out. Nothing in verse 7's paragraph prepares the audience for the parenthesis, which is generally more disruptive than other elements of the narrative. Wookey and BSSA, therefore, can also be deemed to manifest a functional shift. The shift is literary because it represents unnatural TT form. It is also literary because it pertains to naturalness in communication or presentation. The shift can be regarded as non-linguistic because it is caused by formatting rather than by the meaning of the TT's *semes*. As for why the translators did not account for the parenthesis, I postulate that the

⁷⁴ Wookey 1908 and BSSA 1970 did not use paragraph demarcations, but all verses stood as autonomous paragraphs.

translators were preoccupied with the direct interpretation and rendering of the verse and were not alert to the need for special formatting. That involves an exegetical frame and a textual CFR.

The parenthesis may be captured by marking the break more liberally. For example, indents and parenthetical marks can be put around the verse, or line spacing before and after it can be created.

6.4.37 Ruth 4:10

| | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|---|
| קָנִיתִי לִי לְאִשָּׁה | Ke mo rekile go nna mosadi wa me (I bought her to become my wife) | Ke mo rekile gore a tle a nne mosadi wa me (I bought her to become my wife) | Ke tsaya Ruthe gore a nne mosadi wa me (I take Ruth to become my wife). |
|------------------------|---|---|---|

This clause literally means “I have acquired her to become my wife.” The verb קָנָה is an economic (commercial) term, with its antonym מָכַר, meaning “to sell” (Lipinski 2004: 59). Its prototypical meaning is “acquire” or “take possession of something,” although acquisition by monetary or compensatory terms is only one aspect of this primary meaning (*ibid.*). It can be argued, therefore, since the translation “buy” is inappropriate, “acquire” should be used (De Waard and Nida 1991: 68). Ruth the Moabite was acquired as a sociological consequence of the commercial transaction of buying Naomi’s piece of land, rather than as the direct, primary object of that purchase. No wonder Boaz’s guise was that Naomi is selling a field, instead of “Ruth the Moabite is for sale,” even though his main target is really Ruth the Moabite. Thus, Bush translates the verse as “I am also hereby acquiring the right to take Ruth the Moabite [...] as my wife” (1998: 96).

Moffat’s and Wookey’s rendering *ke mo rekile* (I bought her) can be judged as a formal and functional shift in the context of acquiring a wife. A wife could not be purchased in the commercial context that Boaz created for the selling of Naomi’s field (see De Waard and Nida 1973: 51). In another context it could have been correct to translate *qana* as “he bought.” Moffat’s and Wookey’s error emanates from translating a Hebrew term according to one of its most prototypical senses without considering which aspect of its semantic potential is really profiled in a particular Hebrew co-text and socio-cultural context. The functional shift of the

two Bibles is due to an erroneous TL meaning. In turn, the shifts represent incompatibilities between the Hebrew text’s socio-cultural frames and those evoked by the TT. Factors that influenced the decisions for these renderings can be postulated as emanating from the organisational CFR that is linked to Moffat’s methodology of choosing formal correspondence at the expense of functional correspondence. For Wookey, however, the other possible influential frame involves a textual CFR. The rationale for this proposal is that the translator could possibly have mistaken the Hebrew to profile buying as opposed to acquiring.

BSSA uses *tsaya*, a verb that corresponds formally and referentially to “acquire,” in contrast to “buy.” It avoids both a functional shift as well as a formal one. Its rendering, *I take Ruth to become my wife*, is a good suggestion for this unit.

| | | | |
|---------------------|--|---|--|
| וּמִשַׁעַר מְקוֹמוֹ | Le mo kgorong ya felo ga gagwe (And from the gate of his place) | Le mo kgotleng ya felo ga gagwe (And from the ward/court of his place) | Le mo lekgotleng la motse wa ga gabo (And from the assembly or council of his town) |
|---------------------|--|---|--|

This phrase corresponds formally to “And from the gate of his place.” Functionally, it means that his name should not be removed “from his position at the gate.” The expression continues Boaz’s strategy from the beginning of this verse for linking Ruth to the land transaction. The land will continue to be in Elimelech’s name, and “his family line will continue among his people and in his hometown” (Block 1999: 88; De Waard and Nida 1973: 69; cf. also NET). It means that through the offspring that will be raised for him, he would continue to be mentioned and represented in family and public affairs.

Moffat and Wookey keep the Hebrew form word for word. However, they manifest a functional shift. That is because the technical and cultural reality of Elimelech’s recognition in his community is missing in a literal formulation of “the gate or court of his place.” On the one hand, the word, *kgorong*, in reference to “ward” is outdated, and nowadays refers almost strictly to “gate, entrance or door.” It will probably misinform the TT audience and manifest an erroneous meaning. *Kgotleng ya felo ga gagwe* (ward of his place), on the other hand, profiles prototypically the physical meeting place, and is likely to be ambiguous to the TT audience. Moreover, in the Setswana clause, the addition of the phrase “of his place” is quite

confusing, and its function is unclear. It is a word for word rendering which avoids a formal shift but then leads to a functional one.

In view of the foregoing elaboration, the functional shift can be said to represent a mismatch between the Hebrew text's and the TT's socio-cultural contexts. The factors that influenced Moffat can be assumed to be the organisational CFR that relates to its methodology. That is because, in accordance with its convention, it renders the clause literally and word for word. As for Wookey, the rendering is more interpretive and idiomatic, but does not complete the movement towards a correct interpretation. In other words, it represents incomplete exegesis. In this regard, the concept "of his place," creates an exegetical problem because, while it seems important in the Hebrew text, it is redundant in the Setswana renderings. Realising that the concept is redundant would have completed the exegetical movement towards accuracy. Consequently, the conceptual textual CFR can also be postulated for this Bible's error.

BSSA's reconstruction of the clause avoids the functional shifts that the other two Bibles manifest. It also introduces the forms "counsel" and "town." Whereas *kgotla* and *kgoro* profile mostly the physical meeting place, *lekgotla* denotes a council or assembly, especially of men (Brown 1980: 154; Snyman et al. 1990: 68). The word *motse* is more definite, and its function is less ambiguous than *felo* (place). The phrase, *le mo lekgotleng la motse wa ga gabo* (and from the assembly/council of his town) can refer generally to the affairs (or life) of his town/village or community.⁷⁵ Thus, BSSA captures the idea that Elimelech's name will not be cut off from communal matters and from the affairs of the town. Nonetheless, this Bible's movement towards the functional correspondent of the clause is incomplete. That is because it is still not clear how Boaz' marriage to the widow would maintain the dead man's name at the gate of his place. That represents a functional shift. Thus, there remains an information gap, especially since the Setswana counterpart – the Setswana *levirate* – is not evoked. The functional shift in this regard represents an exegetical insufficiency and a resultant mismatch between the socio-cultural frames of the Hebrew text and TT. The CFRs that led to the decision can be regarded as incompatible communication situation frames. Among the lexical, syntagmatic and extralinguistic elements of the Hebrew unit's

⁷⁵ De Waard and Nida (1973: 56) indicate that "gate" signifies the centre of town life, and thus can refer to the whole town.

communication CFR, the ones that are causing the information gap are primarily extralinguistic (i.e., the socio-cultural frame of “gate of his place”).

A good suggestion for translating this unit would be to employ the BSSA rendering with an accompanying footnote that fills the socio-cultural information gap. The footnote would explain briefly what makes “raising the dead man’s name at the gate of his place” possible. For example, it could read “The council of his town means the affairs of his village. According to the practice, all the widow’s future children and property would be regarded as the dead man’s. That way, the dead man’s name will not fade away in his town.”

6.4.38 Ruth 4:12

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| וַיְהִי בַיְתֵדָּבָר כְּבֵית פֶּרֶץ | A ntlo ya gago e nne jaaka ntlo ya ga Paretse (May your house be like the house of Perez) | A ntlo ya gago e tshwane le ntlo ya ga Perese (May your house be like the house of Perez) | A lelapa la gago le tshwane le la ga Pherese (May your family be like that of Perez) |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|

The phrase corresponds formally to “May your house be like the house of Perez.” It refers to “May your family be like the family of Perez” (De Waard and Nida 1991: 75). This comparison with Perez is significant because he was an ancestor of Boaz, was born by a widow (Tamar) and a surrogate father (Judah), and had an unbroken line of male descendants extending over several generations (NET; cf. also vv. 4:18-22).⁷⁶ The comparison relates to the example of the levirate, importance in relation to Davidic lineage, and family size. Moreover, Perez almost never existed because of a complicated levirate relationship between his parents. Therefore, despite the initial difficulties that the present levirate relationship faced, so wish the people at the gate, may the resultant family prosper.

The three Bibles render the clause in a similar manner, generally as “May your house/family be like that of Perez.” The renderings represent a functional shift because they do not indicate that Tamar and Judah were in a levirate relationship like the present parents, namely, Boaz and Ruth. The shift represents an inexact TT meaning. As for the cause of this shift, it can be

⁷⁶ The narrator invokes striking parallels between this story and that of Genesis 38 (Block 1999: 89-90).

assumed that the translators were aware of the striking similarities between the present narrative and that of Tamar, Judah and Perez, but deemed it either as unnecessary or distracting to mention them. Therefore, the influences that led to this rendering can be understood as intertextual frames. They are intertextual because they are evoked by frames of a different biblical book.⁷⁷

For a translation suggestion, a footnote could complement the BSSA rendering, which employs the idiomatic form, *lelapa* (family, rather than house). The footnote would explain that the comparison to Perez relates to the example of the levirate, the connection with the Davidic lineage, and to numerous descendants.

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|---|--|
| אָשֶׁר-יָלְדָה תָּמָר לַיהוּדָה | Yo Tamare a neng a mo tsalela Yuda (Whom Tamar bore to Judah) | Yo Tamare a neng a mmona le Juta (Whom Tamar saw with Judah) | Yo Thamare a neng a mo tsholela Juta (Whom Tamar bore to Judah) |
|---------------------------------|--|---|--|

The phrase corresponds literally to “whom Tamar bore to Judah.”

Moffat uses the closest correspondent for “giving birth,” namely, *tsalela*. However, it could cause a functional shift because it may be distracting to the TT audience. That is because Setswana speakers tend to use a euphemism for “give birth,” believing *tsalela* to be too explicit and socially impolite. The shift is due to an unnatural form in the TT and represents literary incompatibilities between the Hebrew lexical form and the TT correspondent. The organisational CFR that relates to Moffat’s word for word methodology can be postulated for this shift.

Wookey also represents a functional shift here because it uses the wrong euphemism for “give birth,” viz., *mmona*, which leads to an unnatural formulation. Because of the present co-text, it primarily profiles “see,” while “give birth” is one of its peripheral senses. It erroneously sounds like all it meant to say was that Tamar and Judah met Perez by chance on a certain day. In the next verse, this Bible repeats the same euphemism, but there it communicates

⁷⁷ Attempts to account for such frames adequately can lead to distractions, so the frames can be difficult to represent.

clearly the concept of “give birth.” The shift here is, therefore, formal and functional. It is literary because of unnatural communication from a stylistic viewpoint, but also produces an erroneous TL meaning. The factors that led to this decision can be linked to the organisational CFR that pertains to methodology. In many instances, Wookey provides idiomatic expressions which do not do full justice to the ST’s interpretation.

BSSA uses a common euphemism for “give birth,” which does not represent any formal or functional shift. This rendering is the most appropriate for the unit.

6.4.39 Ruth 4:13

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| <p>וַיָּבֵא אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה לָהּ הַרְיוֹן וַתֵּלֶד בֵּן</p> | <p>A tsena mo go ene; mme Jehova a mo naya ithwalo; mme a tsala mosimane (He entered into her; and Yahweh gave her pregnancy; and she gave birth to a boy)</p> | <p>A tsena kwa go ene; Jehofa a mo naya boimana, a bona ngwana wa mosimane (He went to her; Yahweh gave her pregnancy, and she had a son)</p> | <p>Ya re a sena go tsena kwa go ene, MORENA a mo naya boimana, mme a belega ngwana wa mosimane (After he went to her, the LORD gave her pregnancy, and she had a son)</p> |
|--|--|---|---|

The Hebrew text corresponds formally to “And he went in to her, and Yahweh gave her conception, and she gave birth to a son.” It referentially means “He had sex with her and Yahweh gave her conception; then she gave birth to a son.” To “go in” is a Hebrew euphemism for sex (Block 1999: 91; De Waard and Nida 1991: 58). Clearly, a sub-Saharan TL translation also needs to find euphemisms for that expression as well as for “conceive” and “give birth.”

The three Bibles manifest functional shifts in different ways for this unit. For a start, Wookey and BSSA translate “go into her” literally as “enter at her place” – *tsena kwa go ene*. The Setswana expression manifests an insignificant formal shift because it uses “at” (*kwa*) instead of “in” (*mo*). It manifests a significant functional shift, however, because the TL meaning is ambiguous. “Arrive at her place” does not indicate that there was sexual contact. On the contrary, the Hebrew text does indicate, albeit euphemistically, that there were sexual

relations. The shift represents an inexact meaning in the TL. A socio-cultural CFR that pertains to the subject of sex can be deemed to have influenced this decision. That is because, whilst euphemisms for sex are common in Setswana, it appears that the translators still considered them to be too explicit and awkward.

Moffat renders “went in to her” word for word and produces a socio-culturally impolite expression, viz., *tse na mo go ene*. The expression is sexually explicit. It avoids a formal shift, but is likely to be distracting to the audience, who might disapprove of sexually explicit terminology in a sacred document. Therefore, Moffat can be deemed to manifest a significant functional shift in this regard. An organisational CFR can be postulated as occasioning this rendering because Moffat follows the KJV text strictly, as per its convention.⁷⁸ Throughout the shifts of Ruth, Moffat tends to make grammatically and socio-culturally awkward mistakes that could best be linked to a limited knowledge of the Setswana language and culture. It is possible, however, that the translator was aware that the present rendering was socially awkward, but insisted on strict formal correspondence. It is also possible that he did not realise the awkwardness of the expression. Ultimately, the most obvious observation is that the translator followed word for word correspondence strictly, so the CFR that can be hypothesised with certainty is organisational.

Concerning the concept of conception, the Bibles have followed the lexeme formally. They use the words *ithwalo* and *boimana*, which are synonyms.⁷⁹ Unfortunately this time, formal correspondence led to a socio-culturally awkward TL expression. The TL expression is akin to the choice “pregnancy” (*boimana*) instead of “expectancy” (*itsholofela*) except that in Setswana, the difference is more glaring. Pregnancy is socially awkward and is considered private. In a public document like the Bible, it is best rendered euphemistically. Therefore, the Bibles represent a functional shift. This shift yields unnatural communication which may be distracting or offensive to the audience. It is difficult to postulate the respective CFRs that influenced this decision for Wookey and BSSA because their method of translating sexual and reproductive content is inconsistent. At times, it is formal – like in the present verse – whilst at other times it chooses a euphemism instead of a formal correspondent (as in their

⁷⁸ To my knowledge, there is no Setswana euphemism for sex in all three Setswana Bibles – the other Hebrew euphemism, *ידע*, is also translated formally, viz., as “know” (*itse*).

⁷⁹ Setswana does not lexicalise the idea of conception, but describes it as pregnancy.

treatment of Naomi’s question, “are there still sons for me in my bowels?”). Moffat, however, was probably influenced by an organisational CFR, as regards methodology. It follows the Hebrew form strictly and explicitly.

Another notion that needed attention is that of giving birth. Moffat renders this form, too, literally and explicitly with *tsala*. The effects are similar to those described above – it is a socio-culturally awkward expression. It is used commonly for livestock and animals, but very rarely for human beings (cf. Dent 1992: 11; Hartshorne et al. 1984: 534). Therefore, it can be argued that this Bible manifests a functional shift in the area of natural communication. The CFR that probably gave rise to this shift is organisational, for the Bible follows strict formal correspondence. The other two Bibles use different euphemisms for this expression. Hence, they do not represent functional shifts.

To capture adequately the intended sense of the Hebrew unit, a translation would need to capture euphemistically and precisely the ideas of sex, conception and giving birth. It cannot legitimately avoid accounting for such concepts. That is partly because whilst some communication frames of a unit may imply sex, Setswana has a few euphemisms for sex, which include *robala le* (sleep with – cf. the shift at Ruth 1:12). The common one for pregnancy/conception is *itsholofela* (expect oneself). For “give birth,” the most common euphemism is *tshola* (hold).⁸⁰ The Hebrew unit could, therefore, be rendered as, *A robala le ene. Jehofa a mo thusa gore a itsholofele. Mme a tshola ngwana wa mosimane* (In word-for-word back translation – “He slept with her. Yahweh helped her to expect herself. And she held a son”).⁸¹

6.4.40 Ruth 4:17

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| וַתִּקְרָאנָהּ לוֹ שֵׁם לְאִמֶּר יְלֶד־בֶּן לְנִעֲמִי | Ba mo fa leina ba re, “Naomi o tsaletswe ngwana wa mosimane” (They gave him the name, | Ba mo raya leina ba re, “Naomi o tsaletswe ngwana wa mosimane” (They gave him the name, | Ba re, “Naomi o belegetswe ngwana” (They said, “a child has been born to Naomi”) |
|--|---|---|--|

⁸⁰ Cf. section 3.13.

⁸¹ There are differences between the three Bibles which indicate other vague or slight shifts. Such shifts are so minor that they are not discussed here.

| | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| | “a son has been born to Naomi”) | “a son has been born to Naomi”) | |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|

The Hebrew text corresponds formally to “They called him a name saying, ‘A son has been born to Naomi.’” Its understanding is that when the neighbours gave the child a name, they said, “A son has been born to Naomi.” Apparently, the Hebrew construction “they gave him a name saying [...]” is a redundant literary form in most target languages which needs to be discarded for proper interpretation and translation of the sentence (Block 1999: 94; De Waard and Nida 1973: 78). It does not mean that the long clause that the neighbours are “saying” is a name. Later in the sentence, it says “they called his name,” which turns out to be the actual naming, “Obed.” Thus, the long clause could best be revised to read “they said, ‘a son has been born to Naomi’” (NRSV).⁸²

Moffat and Wookey follow literally the Hebrew construction and end up with, firstly, a very long name. Secondly, they end up with two names, one being “a son has been born to Naomi,” and the other being “Obed.” This represents a functional shift because it gives an erroneous TL meaning. Moreover, in the TL, it represents an awkward way to name an individual. As a result, it is also an unnatural TL form. It is unlikely that the Hebrew ST presents two names, or that it sounds awkward in the original like it does in the TT. Primarily, an organisational CFR can be hypothesised as originating this problem because it is the two Bibles’ methodology to follow as closely as possible the Hebrew forms, although Wookey is not consistent in that approach. Other frames that could have influenced the Bibles, especially Wookey, are textual frames, particularly owing to the complex grammatical expression in the Hebrew text.

BSSA shifts formally from “they called him a name saying” to “they said.” This rendering gives an unambiguous functional interpretation of the Hebrew text and is a good suggestion for a Setswana translation. It avoids a formal or functional shift. However, as the unit goes further, BSSA manifests a formal and functional shift by omitting the element of “son.” It opts for the form, *ngwana* (child), and discards the fuller form, *ngwana wa mosimane* (male

⁸² The NIV’s “Naomi has a son” is even shorter. However, its Setswana version could be confusing since, instead, it is Ruth who bears a son. Moreover, Setswana culture has scenarios where, figuratively, a child can be born on behalf of another person.

child/son), which the other two Bibles use. It is a functional shift because *ngwana* (child) gives a different lexeme and meaning from those profiled by the Hebrew text. The child in reference is indeed a son – therefore, as far as this latter portion is concerned, BSSA represents an inexact TL meaning. Apart from appealing to the fact that “child” is one of the peripheral possibilities for rendering בן , it is difficult to explain BSSA’s decision. It is not supported by major English Bibles, either. At best, one can postulate that the translators have failed to exegete the unit correctly, which means that a lexical CFR, which is a subtype of textual frames, has influenced this decision.

As a suggestion for the best interpretation of this text, BSSA’s first portion “They said” and Moffat’s and Wookey’s latter part “a son has been born to Naomi” could be used. The rendering would be *Ba re, “Naomi o tsaletswe ngwana wa mosimane”* (They said, “A son has been born to Naomi”).

6.5 Summary and Conclusion

In this chapter, I discussed some of the major shifts that occur when the three Setswana translations of Ruth are paired against the Hebrew text of Ruth. I discussed only some of the most illustrative and significant shifts as far as the model of CFRs is concerned. Such shifts were both formal and functional. In other words, I focused on occasions where the Setswana units differed with their Hebrew correspondents in form and function. In that regard, the TTs differed from the Hebrew text in lexical form, grammatical form, stylistic naturalness and semantic interpretation. My examination of these differences ultimately concentrated on how the TTs failed to match an exegetically justifiable interpretation of the Hebrew text, which is admittedly functional because of my CFR methodological framework. After the discussion of each unit, I gave suggestions for an exegetically justifiable Setswana rendering of the Hebrew text, some of which were my own, while others were a commendation of those already given by one or more of the three Setswana Bibles. Such suggestions sought to take cognisance of all the cognitive CFRs relevant for the Hebrew unit.

The discussions of the CFRs in the chapter sought to link the choices that led to the translation shifts with the hypothetical cognitive contexts under which the three Bibles were translated and under which the Hebrew text was written. The basis for making that link was the general assumption that the cognitive contexts under which the Bibles were translated were problematic for the translation process, and could be the cause of either avoidable or

unavoidable differences between a TT and a ST. This chapter used the three Setswana versions of Ruth to test such an assumption. It demonstrated the interplay of organisational, socio-cultural, communicational and textual cognitive contexts involving the ancient Israelites, several recent generations of Setswana speakers and the translators that probably led to the significant shifts.

Moffat manifested the most glaring and numerous shifts per unit among the three Bibles primarily because of an organisational CFR. This organisational CFR included an inclination towards a formal rendering of the original unit as well as an apparently deficient mother tongue input. These two organisational factors caused almost all of Moffat's shifts. It was hard to find traces of socio-cultural, communicational and textual CFRs in Moffat's decisions. As far as the concept of exegetical justifiability is concerned, this chapter revealed that Moffat gave the least exegetically justifiable interpretation among the three Bibles.

For Wookey, a pattern that sometimes stood out was hybridity in methodology which led to shifts. Verboseness and word for word correspondence alternated in several instances, so such organisational subframes were the most frequent of Wookey's CFRs. Verboseness tended to lead to minor shifts while word for word correspondence led to major shifts. Yet, the reason why this organisational CFR stood out was because it was more repetitive than the other CFRs, rather than because it was more glaring. Instead, multiples of socio-cultural, communicational and textual subframes caused more glaring shifts in the Wookey Bible, but their subframes were not repetitive. As far as the standard of exegetically justifiable interpretation is concerned, this chapter revealed that Wookey's interpretation was almost always more exegetically justifiable than Moffat but less so than BSSA.

BSSA did not have a specific CFR that stood out among others which was frequently problematic for decision making. The pattern that BSSA manifested was that its CFRs were the least problematic among the three Bibles. On the Hebrew units discussed, BSSA's shifts were less in number and generally minor. BSSA's exegetical interpretation of the unit was therefore much more exegetically justifiable than that of Moffat and Wookey. Incidentally, the least problematic CFR for BSSA was the most frequently problematic frame in Moffat and Wookey – the organisational CFR that relates to methodology. Nonetheless, BSSA's socio-cultural, communicational and textual CFRs still caused numerous glaring shifts.

Chapter 7: Summary, Findings and Recommendations

7.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I present briefly the summary and findings of this study as well as recommendations for future research. My study was a comparative analysis of the contextual frames of Moffat, Wookey and BSSA against the corresponding frames of the Hebrew source text of Ruth.

7.2 Summary

This study was inspired by recent developments in CL, translation studies and biblical studies which took a functionalist approach to communication – they argued that communication (and by implication, translation) is embedded in its cultural context. Therefore, this study was undertaken to demonstrate that a translation analysis must take cognisance of the translation’s contextual “frames.” The first chapter presented the research problem, focus, hypothesis, research goals and theoretical points of departure of the study. In the second chapter, I discussed the integrated approach of cognitive Contextual Frames of Reference (CFR) for analysing the Setswana translations of the book of Ruth. The primary focus of the third chapter was the socio-cultural CFR of the Setswana MT speakers. The fourth chapter discussed mainly the postulated organisational CFRs of the translators of the three Setswana Bibles. In the fifth chapter, I focused on the assumed socio-cultural CFR of the original audience of the Hebrew source text (ST), viz., the people of ancient Israel. The three aforementioned chapters also covered to a lesser extent the linguistic frames of the Setswana target audience, the translators, and the Hebrew ST’s original audience. In chapter six, I presented and analysed the research data of the present study where I identified various translation shifts, described their nature, hypothesised the cognitive frames that could have caused them, and made my own suggestions for better renderings. The most pertinent findings of this study are as follows:

7.3 Findings

My research has confirmed that each of the three Setswana TTs of the book of Ruth differ from the Hebrew ST in various ways and in multiple instances when the model of CFR is employed to analyse them. The way they differ from the Hebrew ST can indeed be considered as a departure from an exegetically justifiable interpretation of the Hebrew ST. I endeavoured to demonstrate the need to take cognisance of all the relevant socio-cultural, textual,

communicational and organisational CFRs during translation and/or the analysis of a translation in order to anticipate or prevent translation shifts. Indeed, it was possible to find hypothetical links between the shifts manifested by the Setswana TTs and the probable CFRs under which they were translated. The summary of my findings is as follows:

1. For socio-cultural CFRs, firstly, the cognitive context of the Hebrew text's audience is, by nature, difficult to interpret because it is ancient. There are mismatches between the socio-cultural CFRs of the Batswana and those of ancient Israel because they are separated in time and space. These two realities were problematic for the Setswana Bible translation projects and probably led to many of the shifts.
2. The heuristic textual frames entailed significant differences between Setswana and Hebrew because the two languages are unrelated, and Hebrew is an ancient dead language. In addition, there were occasional textual problems or ambiguities that pertained to the text's composition. These facts hypothetically led to exegetical difficulties for the Setswana translators and resulted in shifts.
3. For communicational CFRs, the inter-twined lexical, syntactical and socio-cultural features (text, cotext and context) that produced meaning in the ST unit were not always easy to interpret or render in Setswana. The reasons include those given in numbers 1 and 2 above as well as the potential difficulties of interpreting complex cognitive semantic constructions in general. In the communicational CFR, the influential frames that tended to overlap were socio-cultural and linguistic CFRs.
4. Some shifts were deemed to be unavoidable because of unresolvable mismatches between the socio-linguistic factors of the ST and target audience as well as textual problems.
5. The organisational contexts of the three projects were also problematic for translators' interpretation and rendering of the Hebrew ST. Embedded within the respective stages of the history of Bible translation, the organisational frames of the Bibles exhibited patterns that were challenging, occasionally more so for some Bibles than for others. Along these lines, it appears that methodology, translator training, conditions of service, mother tongue input and other factors improved progressively throughout Setswana translation history. For example, in declining order, the most organisationally disadvantaged Bibles were Moffat – Wookey – BSSA. Moffat exhibited shifts that seemed to have resulted mostly from a slavish dependence on the KJV, from a strict word for word rendering of the unit, and from deficient mother

tongue input. Wookey's primary weakness was an ambiguity of method or a hybrid identity where in most of the shifts he was either formal to the neglect of the original unit's meaning or unnecessarily verbose. BSSA's shifts were seldom attributed to organisational problems, but were largely socio-linguistic and exegetical in nature.

6. Many translation shifts resulted from a lack of adequate background information, including those that may not be deemed as exegetically wrong *per se*. The greatest need for background material seemed to arise when a Bible chose a word for word rendering for a given unit of meaning. For that reason, my CFR framework can be said to lean towards functional correspondence in the analysis of shifts, recommendations concerning the best among the three Bibles' renderings, and in suggesting the best possible rendering for a unit. My suggestions for renderings recommended explanatory footnotes in several instances to fill such conceptual knowledge gaps.

7.4 Recommendations

I sought to apply the framework of cognitive CFR to the Setswana translations of the book of Ruth within the parameters explained in the study, but other parameters remain that can be explored in the following ways:

1. Since the translation shifts discussed in this study are theoretical, it would be interesting to test their actual occurrence on an audience such as by means of field work – in focus group discussions, for example. The same applies to the kinds of suggestions I made for the best possible renderings.
2. While it would entail more organisational work, the CFR model could be effectively used in Bible translation projects during the processes of biblical interpretation, research into the socio-cultural and linguistic background of the TT audiences, rendering and testing of translations, and analysis of translations. A critical awareness of the dynamic interplay of these vital cognitive, cultural, functional, linguistic, textual, organisational and situational complexes in translation would be advantageous for Bible translation.
3. The use of explanatory footnotes could provide essential exegetical and socio-cultural background material to aid TT audiences during interpretation (to contribute towards the prevention of shifts) in new Bibles in sub-Saharan Africa. Such footnotes could be used in new versions to supplement the extant Bibles.

4. The concept of orality may also be incorporated in the integrated CFR model to further examine the possibility of shifts occurring primarily due to oral-aural features of TT renderings. In my examination of one of the shifts, I hypothesised that oral readings of a TT rendering could lead to two different interpretations because of a lexeme's phonetic potentials.
5. The tabled shifts of the book of Ruth, some of which were dealt with while others were appended to the thesis (cf. Appendix F), could be a helpful methodology towards a contextualised interpretation of the book in the future because they take cognisance of the various problematic factors that can affect its interpretation. I make this recommendation in light of a seemingly unlimited scholarly interest in the Ruth narrative.

Appendix A: The Book of Ruth from Moffat 1857

BUKA

EA

RUTE.

KHAOLO I.

MI ga rihala ga na loshekeri hatsiñ ka basiamisi ba siamisa. Mi monona moñue oa Beta-lehema-yuda a ea go tloatlola hatsiñ ya Moaba, éna, le mosari oa gague, le bomoroaue ba tu.

2 Mi leina ya monona e le le Elimeleke, mi leina ya mogatse e le le Naome, mi maina a bomoroaue e le le Mahelone, le Kilione, Baeferata ba Beta-lehema-yuda. Mi ba hitla hatsiñ ya Moaba, mi bo ba le gona.

3 Mi Elimeleke monona oa Naome a shua: mi a sala, le bomoroaue ba tu.

4 Mi ba itséla basari ba Semoaba; leina ya moñue e le le Orepe, mi leina ya eo moñue e le le Rute: mi ba nna gona ekane e le nyaga li ten.

5 Mi Mahelone le Kilione le bona ba shua; mi mosari eo, a léla a sala morago ga bomoroaue ba tu le monona oa gague.

6 ¶ Ercha gona o nanogañ le bétsi ba gague, a boea hatsiñ ya Moaba: gone a la a utlua a le hatsiñ ya Moaba, ha Yehova a leko-tse bathu ba gague, a ba naea liyo.

7 Mi a coa heloñ ha o la le gona, le bétsi ba gague ba tu ba nae; mi ba ea tseleñ go boéla hatsiñ ya Yuda.

8 Mi Naome a raea bétsi ba gague ba tu, Eañ, lo boéle, moñue le

moñue tluñ ea mague: a Yehova a lo rihéle ka pelunomi, yaka lo rihetse bashui, le 'na.

9 A Yehova a lo née, gore lo bone ikhuco, moñue le moñue tluñ ea monona oa gague. Mi a ba atla; mi ba culetsa koru tsa bona ba lela.

10 Mi ba mo raea, Rure, re tla ea bathuñ ba gago nau.

11 Mi Naome a re, Boeañ, bomoroariaka: lo élañ le 'na? a go sa le tsimane meleñ oa me, gore ba ne banona ba lona?

12 Bomoroariaka, boeañ, lo eé; gone ki cohetse go na le monona. Ha 'nka re, Go sa le culuhélo, leha 'nka na le monona sigoñ yonu; le go tsala basimane;

13 A lo ka ba leta ba tsamaea ba gola? a lo ka rioa ki mouo go cula banona? Nyaea, bomoroariaka; gone ki utlua bogalaka bogolu go lona ka atla sa Yehova se 'ncogetse.

14 Mi ba culetsa koru tsa bona, mi ba ba ba lela: mi Orepe a atla matsalague; mi Rute a mo ñaparéla.

15 Mi a re, Bona, moguakau o boetse bathuñ ba gague le merimoñ ea gague: le uéna, u latéle moguakau.

16 Mi Rute a re, Si 'nthibéle, gore ki gu tlogéle, go gu boéla morago: gone kua u eañ gona, ki tla ea gona, le kua u tloañ sigo gona, ki tla tloa sigo gona: bathu ba gago ki bathu ba me, le Morimo oa gago Morimo oa me.

17 Kua u shuélañ gona, ki tla shuéla gona, mi ki tla hitloa gona: a Yehova a 'ntihéle yalo le yalo, ha re ka khaogana ha e si ka loshu.

18 Mi ka a bona a itlomamisa go ea nae, a khutla go bua nae.

19 ¶ Mi ba tu ba, ba ea ba hitla Beta-lehema. Mi ga rihala ka ba hitla Beta-lehema, motse otle o lo o ba huruegela, mi ba re, A eo ki Naome?

20 Mi a ba raea, Si 'mpitseñ Naome, 'mpitsañ Mare: gone Mothati-etle o 'ntihetse bogalaka yo bogolu.

21 Ki le ka bolola ki tletse, mi Yehova o 'ntlisitse ki loleä: lo 'mpiletsañ Naome, ecua Yehova o shupa ga me, mi Mothati-etle o 'nculaharitse?

22 Naome a boea yalo, le Rute oa Semoaba, nuétsi oa gague nae, eo o-la a boea hatsiñ ya Moaba: mi ba tla Beta-lehema tsimologoñ ea thobo ea barele.

KHAOLO II.

MI Naome a na le tsala ea monona oa gague ea mari, senatla sa lohomo, oa sika loa Elimeleke; mi leina ya gague e le le Boase.

2 Mi Rute oa Semoaba, a raea Naome, A ko 'me ki eé leoteñ go ronopa ako tsa mabéle, morago ga gague eo ki tla bonañ tsalano maitloñ a gague. Mi a mo raea, Moroariaka, ea.

3 Mi a ea a hitla, mi a ronopa leoteñ morago ga barobi: mi ga mo rihaléla go na eintleñ ea leota ya Boase, eo e leñ oa sika loa Elimeleke.

4 Mi bonañ, Boase a coa Beta-lehema, mi a raea barobi, A Yehova a ne le lona. Mi ba araba, A Yehova a gu tsegahatse.

5 Mi Boase a raea lekau ya gague, ye le laorisioañ barobi ba gague, Moroótsana eo, oa mañ?

6 Mi lekau ye le laorisioañ barobi ya araba ya re, Eo ki moroótsana oa Semoaba, eo o ruleñ le Naome hatsiñ ya Moaba:

7 Mi o la a re, A ko 'me ki rorope, ki kokoanye morago ga barobi mo liñateñ: mi o tsile yalo, mi a éma go simolola ka ka mosho le go yana, mi yana a tloa gole gonye mo tluñ.

8 Ereha gona Boase o raeañ Rute, Moroariaka a gu utlue? U si eé go ronopa leoteñ le sele, le gona u si coe monu, mi u ñaparele baroótsana ba me:

9 A maitlo a gago a ne leoteñ ye ba le robañ, mi u ba sale morago; a ga kia ka ka laola makau gore ba si gu ame? mi ha u nyoroa, u eé liñkhoñ, u noe ga se makau a se gileñ.

10 Mi a oéla ka hatlogo sa gague, mi a ikobéla ha hatsi, mi a mo raea, Ki bonye tsalano maitloñ a gago yañ, ka u 'nñoka ki le moeñ?

11 Mi Boase a araba a mo raea, Ki bulelecoe rure cotle tse u lu ua li rihéla matsalago, morago ga loshu loa monona oa gago: le kaha u tlogetseñ rago le mago, le lehatsi ya botsalélo yoa gago, mi ua tla bathuñ, ba u lu u si ka ua ba itse pele.

12 A Yehova a gu ruéléle tiho ea gago, mi a tuélo e e tletseñ u e néoe ki Yehova Morimo oa Bayerela, eo phuka tsa gague u tsileñ go ikanya go cona.

13 Mi a re, Muñoaka, a ki bone tsalano maitloñ a gago, ka u 'nkhomoritse, ka u huile le lelata ya gago ka kobisho pelu, leha ki sa cuane le leñue ya malata a gago.

14 Mi Boase a mo raea, ka baka loa go ya, Ataméla kuanu, mi u

ye ga señkhue, mi u ine thathana ea gago boyaloefi yo bo berilefi. Mi a lula le barobi: mi a mo naea mabéle a a besicoefi, mi a ya a khora, a sarisa.

15 Mi ka a nanoga go ronopa, Boase a laola makau a gague, a re, A a ronope le mo lifiatefi, mi si mo tlabisefi litlofi:

16 Mi le gona mo latlélefi ka hōmu mañuenyana lo a tlogéle, gore a a ronope, mi lo si mo khome.

17 Mi a ronopa leotefi go ea matsiboeefi, mi a phota se o se ronopilefi: mi ekane e le le efa ea barele.

18 ¶ Mi a se cula a ea motsefi: mi matsalague a bona se o se ronopilefi: mi le gona a entsa se se setsefi sa khoro ea gague, a se mo naea.

19 Mi matsalague a mo raea, U ronopile kae ka yenu? mi u rihile kae? a go tsegaharioe eo o gu fiokilefi. Mi a kakanyetsa matsalague eo, o rihilefi ha go éna, a re, Leina ya monona eo ki rihilefi ha go éna ka yenu ki Boase.

20 Mi Naome a raea fuétsi oa gague, Go tsegaharioe Yehova eo o sa tlogélafi go tsalana le batseri le bashui. Mi Naome a mo raea, Monona eo ki tsala e e gauhe le rona, moñue oa barékolori ba rona.

21 Mi Rute oa Semoaba a re, Le gona a 'nthaca, U ñaparéle baroétsana ba me, e tsamaeé ba uétse thobo eotle.

22 Mi Naome a raea Rute fuétsi oa gague, Moroariaka, goa gu lemohaléla go ea le baroétsana ba gague, gore ba si gu khatlane leotefi le sele.

23 Mi a ñaparéla baroétsana ba Boase go ronopa go ea khutlofi sa thobo ea barele, le sa thobo ea mabéle; mi a nna le matsalague.

KHIAOLO III.

MI Naome matsalague a mo raea, Moroariaka, a ga 'nkitla ki gu battéla ikhuco, gore go gu lemohaléle?

2 Mi yana Boase eo baroétsana ba gague u lu u na nabo, a ga si tsala ea rona ea mari? Bona oa olosa barele mo sebupifi sigoñ yonu.

3 Ki gona itlapise, u tlole, u apare aparo tsa gago, u eé sebupifi: u si ikitsise mononefi e tsamaeé a uétse go ya le go noa.

4 Mi go tla rihala mogañ o itelega, u tlokoméle helo ha o tla itelega gona, mi u eé, u hénole nao tsa gague, u itelege; mi o tla gu buleléla se u tla se rihafi.

5 Mi a mo raea, Cotle tse u li buafi ki tla li riha.

6 ¶ Mi a ea sebupifi, a riha kaka cotlefi tse matsalague a li mo laoletsefi.

7 Boase a sina go ya le go noa, mi pelu ea gague e natehala, a eago itelega ha tlatse ga mokōa *oa mabéle*: mi a ea ka nyanyaélo, a hénola nao tsa gague, mi a itelega.

8 Mi ga rihala gare ga bosigo, monona eo, a coga ka a ipitikola: gone bona, mosari a letse ha ñaofi tsa gague.

9 Mi a re, U mañ? Mi a araba, Ki Rute lelata ya gago: ki gona phuthololéla lelata ya gago lohuka loa gago; gone u morékolori.

10 Mi Boase a mo raea, Moroariaka, u tsegaharioe ki Yehova: u rihile pelunomi e ea bohéle ea gago go sita ea eintla, ka u si ka ua latéla makau a a humanegilefi khotsa a a humilefi.

11 Mi yana, moroariaka, u si boihe; ki tla gu rihéla cotle tse u li builefi: gone motse otle oa bathu ba me oa itse, u mosari oa matlametlo.

12 Mi yana, rure ki morékolori

oa gago: leha gontse yalo morékolori o gona eo o gauhe bogolu go 'na.

13 Tlola sigo yonu, mi go tla rihala ka moshu, ha a gu rékolola, go siame, a a rékolole: mi ha a sa khatlloe go gu rékolola, ki gona ki tla gu rékololañ, yaka Yehova a tserife: itelegela moshuñ.

14 Mi a itelega naoñ tsa gague go ea moshuñ: mi a coga pele ga moñue a e si a ñoke eo moñue, gone monona a la a re, A go si itsege ha mosari a la a tla sebupiuñ.

15 Le gona a re, Kuaea kobo e e go uéna, u e tsegétse. Mi a e tsegétsa, mi a lekanya *lilekanyo* li sekese tsa barele, a li melesa; mi a ea motseñ.

16 Mi erile a hitla go matsalagae, a mo raea, U mañ, moroaria-ka? Mi a muleléla cotle tse monona o li mo rihetseñ.

17 Mi a re, *Lilekanyo* li sekese tsa barele o li 'nnéile; gone o 'nthéile, Si eé u iphotleri go matsalago.

18 Ereha gona o reñ, Moroaria-riaka, lula e tle e tsamaeé u itse kaha seo se se tla nañ ka gona; gone monona eo a si kitla a ikhutsa a tla a tsamaea a uétsa seo se ka yenu.

KHAOLO IV.

MI Boase a ea khoruñ, mi a lula gona: mi bonañ, morékolori eo Boase o la a bua gagague a héta; eo, o mo réileñ, Hé seléyaua, hapogéla, u lule ha. Mi a hapoga a lula.

2 Mi a tsaea banona ba bagolu ba ten ba motse, a re, Lulañ ha. Mi ba lula.

3 Ereha gona o raeañ morékolori, a re, Naome, eo o boileñ hatsiñ ya Moaba, o nā le leota go le ba-

patsa, ye e le le ya Elimeleke mokauleñue oa rona:

4 Mi ki le ka re, Ki tla kabolola tsébe ea gago, ka re, U le réke ha pele ga banni le ha pele ga bagolu ba bathu ba me. Ha u tla le rékolola, u le rékolole: mi ha u sa le rékolole, 'mpuleléla, gore ki itse: gone go si ope eo o cuanetseñ go le rékolola, ha e si uéna, le 'na, eo ki leñ morago ga gago. Mi a re, Ki tla le rékolola.

5 Ereha gona Boase o reñ, Motsiñ o u rékañ leota atleñ sa Naome, u le réke le go Rute oa Semoaba, mosari oa moshui, go cosetsa leina ya moshui boshueñ yoa gague.

6 Mi morékolori a re, Ga 'nka-ke ka le ithékolola, gore e si re khotsa ka senya boshua yoa me: u ithékololéle thékololo ea me: gone ga 'nkake ka e rékolola.

7 Mi o e le le *mokhua* mo Bayesereleñ metleñ e e hétéleñ kaga thékololo le kaga kananyo, go tlomamisana cotle; monona a rola tlaku sa gague a se naea moñ ka éna: mi se e le le seshupo mo Bayesereleñ.

8 Ki gona morékolori eo, a raea Boase, *Leithékéle*. Mi a rola tlaku sa gague.

9 Mi Boase a raea bagolu, le bathu botle, Lo bashupi ka yenu ha ki rékile cotle tsa Elimeleke, le cotle tsa Kilione, le tsa Mahelone, atleñ sa Naome.

10 Le gona Rute oa Semoaba, mosari oa Mahelone, ki mo rékile go 'na mosari oa me go cosetsa leina ya moshui boshueñ yoa gague, gore leina ya moshui le si khaoloe bakauleñueñ ba gague, le mo khoruñ ea helo ga gague: lo bashupi ka yenu.

11 Mi bathu botle ba ba mo khoruñ, le bagolu, ba re, *Re* bashupi. A Yehova a rihe mosari eo, eo o tsileñ tluñ ea gago yaka Rakele

le Lie, ba tu ba ba le ba aga gago: gone ñuetsi oa gago, eo o eintlu ea Yeserele: a a mo atla- gu ratañ, a mo tsetse, eo o gu le- metlise mo Eferata, le leina ya mohalélañ bogolu go tsimane e le tumo mo Beta-lehema: seven.

12 Mi a eintlu ea gago e ne ya- 16 Mi Naome a tsaea ñuana, a ka eintlu ea Paretse, (eo Tamare o mo hara, mi a na mootli oa gague. la a mo tsaléla Yuda,) peñ e Ye- 17 Mi basari kãe ba mo sha lei- hova o tla e gu naeañ ka moroétsa- na, ba re, Naome o tsalecoe mosi- na eo. mane, mi ba mo sha leina ya Obe- de, eo, ki ra Yeshae, ra Davide.

13 ¶ Mi Boase a tsaea Rute, mi 18 Mi tse ki kokomana tsa Pa- a na mosari oa gague, mi a tséna retse: Paretse a tsala Hetserone, mo go éna, mi Yehova a mo naea ithualo, mi a tsala mosimane.

14 Mi basari ba raea Naome, 19 Mi Hetserone a tsala Rame, Go bakoe Yehova eo o sa gu khu- mi Rame a tsala Aminadabe, tlisetsañ morékolori ka yenu, eo 20 Mi Aminadabe a tsala Na- leina ya gague le tumañ mo Baye- shone, mi Nashone a tsala Saleme, sereleñ. 21 Mi Saleme a tsala Boase, mi Boase a tsala Obede,

15 Mi o tla na motserisi oa gago, 22 Mi Obede a tsala Yeshae, mi mi o tla gu otlá bocoheñ yoa Yeshae a tsala Davide.

Appendix B: The Book of Ruth from Wookey 1908

LOKWALŌ LOA GA

R U T H E

- 1 **M**E ga dihala e rile mo metlhen̄ ea ha baatlhodi ba atihola, ga bo go le leuba mo lehatshiñ. Me monna moñwe oa Bethe-lehema-yuda a ea go yaka mo lehatshiñ ya Moaba, èna le mosadi oa gagwè, le bomorwawè ba babedi.
- 2 Me leina ya monna eouō e ne le Elimeleke, leina ya mosadi oa gagwè e ne e le Naomi, me maina a bomorwawè ba babedi e ne e le Mahelone, le Kilione, e ne e le Baferatha ba Bethe-lehema-yuda. Me ba tla mo lehatshiñ ya Moaba, ba aga-aga gōna.
- 3 Me Elimeleke monna oa ga Naomi a shwa; me mosadi a tlogelwa, le bomorwawè ba babedi.
- 4 Me ba itseèla basadi mo basadiñ ba Moaba; leina ya eo moñwe e ne e le Orepa, me leina ya eo moñwe e ne e le Ruthe: me ba aga gōna e ka na e le dinyaga di le shomè.
- 5 Me Mahelone le Kilione ba shwa boo babedi; me mosadi a tlogelwa ke bana ba gagwè ba babedi, le ke monna oa gagwè.
6. Hoñ a nanoga le betsi ba gagwè, a re o boea kwa lehatshiñ ya Moaba: gonne e ne ea re a le mo lehatshiñ ya Moaba a utlwa ha Yehofa a na a lekotsè batho ba ga gabō ka go ba naea diyō.
- 7 Me a cwa heloñ ha o na a le gōna, le betsi ba gagwè ba babedi ba na naè; me ba cwelèla mo tseleñ, ba re ba boèla lehatshiñ ya Yuda.
- 8 Me Naomi a raea betsi ba gagwè ba babedi, a re, Tsamaean̄, a moñwe

RUTHE 1. 2.

le moñwe oa lona a boèlè kwa ga mmagwè : a Yehofa a lo dihèlè ka pelonomi, yaka lona lo dihètse bashwi, le nna.

9 A Yehofa a lo neè gore lo bònè boikhucō, moñwe le moñwe oa lona mo tluñ ea monna oa gagwè. Hoñ a ba atla ; me ba choletsa mancwe ba lela.

10 Me ba mo raea, ba re, Nya, me re tla boea nau re ea kwa bathuñ ba ga eno.

11 Me Naomi a re, Bañ lo boeè, bomorwadiaka ; lo bo lo elañ le nna ? A ke sa na le bana ba basimane mo sehobeloñ sa me, gore ba tlè ba nnè banna ba lona ?

12 Bañ lo boeè, bomorwadiaka, lo tsamaeè ; gonne nna, ke cohetse bobe, ga ke na go bōna monna. Ha nka bo ke re, ke na le cholohèlō, ha nka bo ke ne ke ka bōna monna hēla bosigoñ yono, me ke bōna bana ba basimane :

13 Ka re, a lo no lo tla ba leta go tsamaea ba gola ? a lo no lo tla ithiba mo go tseweñ ke banna ka ntlha ea mouō ? Nya, bomorwadiaka ; gonne goa nkhusahatsa thata ka ntlha ea lona, gonne lecōgō ya ga Yehofa le nkwetse go tthabana le nna.

14 Me ba choletsa mancwe, ba lela gapè : me Orepā a atla matsalaagwè ; Ruthe èna a mo ñaparèla.

15 Me a re, Bōna, mogwakao o boetse kwa bathuñ ba ga gabō, le kwa modimoñ oa gagwè : boea le wēna u latèlè mogwakao.

16 Me Ruthe a re, U se ka ua nthapèla gore ke gu tlogèlè, ke boeè, ke kgaoganè le go gu sala moragō : gonne kwa u ean gōna, ke tla ea gōna ; kwa u lalañ gōna, ke tla lala gōna : batho ba ga eno e tla nna batho ba ga echo, le Modimo oa gago e tla nna Modimo oa me :

17 Kwa u shwèlañ gōna ke tla shwèla gōna, ke ba ke hitlhwa gōna : a Yehofa a ntihèlè yalo, a ba a hetisè, ha señwe se ka nkgaoganya nau ha e se loho hēla.

18 Me e rīle a bōna ha a ithōmami-seditse rure go ēa naè, a lesa go tlhōla a bua naè.

19 Yalo ba babedi bauō ba tsamaca

hēla ba hitlha mo Bethe-lehema. Me ga dihala ea re ba tla mo Bethe-lehema, motse otlhe oa huduēga kaga bōnè, me basadi ba re, A ke èna Naomi ?

20 Me a ba raea, a re, Lo se ka loa mpitsa Naomi, lo mpitsè Mara : gonne Mothataeotlhe o ntihètse mo go botlhoko thata.

21 Ka cwa ke tletse, me Yehofa o mposeditse gae ke iphotlhere hēla : lo mpiletsañ Naomi, ka e le ha Yehofa a nchupile ka go nnyatsa, le Mothataeotlhe o nkutlwisitse botlhoko ?

22 Yalo Naomi a boea, le Ruthe oa Momoaba, ñwetsi oa gagwè a nna naè, eo o boileñ kwa lehatshiñ ya Moaba : me ba tla mo Bethe-lehema ka tshimologō ea thōbō ea barele.

2 ME Naomi o na a na le tsala ea losika loa monna oa gagwè, a le senatla se se humileñ, oa losika loa ga Elimeleke ; leina ya gagwè go no go twe Boase.

2 Me Ruthe oa Momoaba a raea Naomi, a re, Mma ke eè kwa masimo, ke eè go rōnōpa mo gare ga diakō tsa mabèlè ke setse moñwe moragō eo ke tla bōnañ botsalanō mo matlhoñ a gagwè. Me a mo raea, a re, Ea morwadiaka.

3 Me a ea, me a hitlha a rōnōpa mo masimo, a setse basegi moragō : me a chogana ka a wēla ntlheñ ea maota mo e leñ ga Boase, eo e neñ e le oa losika loa ga Elimeleke.

4 Me bōnañ, Elimeleke a cwa Bethe-lehema, me a hitlha a raea basegi ba mabèlè, a re, A Yehofa a nnè le lona. Me bōnè ba mo hetola, ba re, a Yehofa a gu segōhatsè.

5 Hoñ Boase a raea motlhanka oa gagwè eo o beilweñ mogolo oa basegi ba mabèlè, a re, Mosetsana eo, ke oa ga mañ ?

6 Me motlhanka eo o beilweñ mogolo oa basegi ba mabèlè a mo hetola, a re, Ke mosetsana oa Momoaba eo o boileñ le Naomi kwa lehatshiñ ya Moaba :

7 Me o na a nthaea, a re, A lo ko lo mmè ke rōnōpè ke setse basegi mo-

RUTHE 2. 3.

ragō mo gare ga diñata : me a tla, me o sa le a diha ka moshō le yana, ha e se go re, o kile a nna ka loba-kanyana mo tluñ.

8 Hoñ Boase a raea Ruthe, a re, A ga ua utlwa, morwadiaka ? U se ka ua ea go rōnōpa mo tshimoñ epè e sele, u se ka ua cwa hano ha, me u tlhōmamè gōna ha, le barweetsana ba ga echo.

9 A matlhō a gago a nnè mo tshimoñ e ba e segañ, me u ba salè moragō : a ga kea laëla makau, go re, ba se ka ba gu ama ? Me ha u le lenyōra, u eè dinkgwaneñ, me u nwè se makau a se gileñ.

10 Hoñ a wèla ha hatshe ka seha-tlhōgō, a ikōbèla ha hatshe, me a mo raea, a re, Ana ke bonye botsalanō mo matlhoñ a gago ka ntlha eañ, ha e bo ne ne u ntihokometse yana ke le moeñ ?

11 Me Boase a mo hetola, a mo raea a re, Ke bolelecwè ka botlalō gotlhe mo u go dihetseñ matsalaago, monna oa gago a sena go shwa : le yaka u tlogetse rrago le mmago, le lehatshe ya ga eno, me u tsile mo bathuñ ba u sa ba itseñ galè.

12 A Yehofa a lebogè tihō ea gago, u bo u nèwè tuèlō e e tletseñ ke Yehofa, Modimo oa Iseraela, eo u tsileñ botshabeloñ tihatse ga dipuka tsa gagwè.

13 Hoñ Ruthe a re, A nkè ke bōnè botsalanō mo matlhoñ a gago, morèna oa me ka gonne u nkgomoditse, le ka gonne u buile ka pelonomi le lelata ya gago, leha ke sa nna yaka leñwe ya malata a gago.

14 Me e rile go yewa Boase a mo raea, a re, Tla kwano, u yè diyō, me u inè thathana ea gago mo bocarareñ. Me a dula ha basegiñ : me ba mo ha mabèlè a a gadikilweñ, me a ya, a kgora, a ba a sadisa.

15 Me e rile a tlogile a ile go rōnōpa, Boase a laola makau a gagwè, a re, A a rōnōpè hèla mo teñ ga diñata, me lo se ka loa mo òmanyana :

16 Me le gōna lo mo shomolèlè mañwe mo diñateñ, lo a tlogèlè, me a a rōnōpè hèla, me lo se ka loa mo òmanyana.

17 Yalo a rōnōpa mo tshimoñ go ea

maitsiboeñ, me a photha mo o na a go ronopile, me ea nna e ka ne e ne e le emere ea barele.

18 Me a a tsaea, a ea motsiñ : me matsalaagwè a bōna mo o na a go ronopile : a ba a ntsha a mo naea mo o na a go beile a sena go kgora.

19 Me matsalaagwè a mo raea, a re, U tlhotse u rōnōpa kae ? Me u tlhotse u diha kae ? A go segōhalè monna eo o gu tlhokometseñ. Me a bolèlèla matsalaagwè eo o tlhotseñ a diha naè, a ba a re, Leina ya monna eo ke tlhotseñ ke diha naè ke Boase.

20 Me Naomi a raea ñwetsi oa gagwè, a re, A a segōhadiwè mo go Yehofa, eo o se kañ a khutlisetsa batshedi le bashwi bopelonomi yoa gagwè. Me Naomi a mo raea, a re, Monna eouō ke oa losika loa rona eo o gauhi le rona, ke moñwe oa ba ba gauhi le rona ka go tsalwa.

21 Me Ruthe oa Momoaba a re, Rure, o ntheile, a re, Tlhōmama mo akauñ a ga echo, go tlo go tsamaeè ba wetsè thōbō ea me eotlhe hèla.

22 Me Naomi a raea Ruthe ñwetsi oa gagwè, a re, Go molemō, morwadiaka, ha u ka cwa le barweetsana ba gagwè, me ba se ka ba kōpana nau mo tshimoñ epè e sele.

23 Yalo a tlhōmama mo barweetsaneñ ba ga Boase go rōnōpa, go ea bokhutloñ yoa thōbō ea barele, le yoa thōbō ea mabèlè a masesane ; me a aga le matsalaagwè.

3 ME Naomi matsalaagwè a mo raea, a re, Morwadiaka, A ga nka ke gu senkèla boikhucō, gore go tlè go nnè molemō mo go wèna ?

2 Me yana, a ga go Boase oa tsala ea rona ea losika, eo barweetsana ba gagwè u nu ua na nahō ? Bōna, o olosa barele bosigoñ yono mo sebopiñ.

3 Ke gōna tlhapa, me u iphōrōlè, u aparè, u eè kwa sebopiñ : me u se ka ua ikitsise motho opè, go tsamae a shwetse go ya le go nwa.

4 Me go tla dihala, ha a ea go rōbala, u tlhōkomèlè thata golō ha o rōbalañ gōna, me u tsenè, u henolè dinaō tsa gagwè, u rōbalè ; me o tla gu bolèlèla se u tla se dihañ.

RUTHE 3. 4.

5 Me a mo raea, a re, Gotlhe mo u go buaŋ, ke tla go diha.

6 Me a ea kwa sebopiŋ, a diha yaka cotlhe tse matsalaagwè o di mo kaetsefi.

7 Me e rile Boase a sena go ya le go nwa, me pelo ea gagwè e le mokete, a ea go rōbala kwa ntlhefi ea mokoa oa mabelè : me Ruthe a tla ka bonya, a henola dinao tsa gagwè, a rōbala.

8 Me ga dihala ea re bosigo gare, monna eouo a choga, me a ipitokolola : me a hitlhela mosadi moŋwe a robetse ha dinaoŋ tsa gagwè.

9 Me a re, U maŋ? Me a mo hetola, a re, Ke Rutha lelata ya gago : me ke gōna phuthololèla lelata ya gago kobō ea gago ; gonne u oa losika gauhi le rona ka go tsalwa.

10 Me a re, U segōhadiwè mo go Yehofa, morwadiaka : u ichupile pelo-nomi mo bokhutloŋ bogolo go mo tshimologoŋ, ka u se ka ua latèla a e lefi makau a a humanegilefi kgotsa a a humilefi.

11 Me yana, morwadiaka, u se ka ua boiha ; ke tla gu dihela gotlhe mo u go buaŋ : gonne motse otlhe oa batho ba ga echo oa itse ha u le mosadi eo o siamefi.

12 Me rure ke oa losika loa gago, gauhi ka go tsalwa : leha go nntse yalo, go na le monna moŋwe oa losika eo o gauhi bogolo go nna.

13 Lala bosigo yono, me go tla dihala e tla re ka moshō, ha a tla gu dihela chwanelō ea monna oa losika, go tla nna molemō ; a a dihe chwanelō ea monna oa losika : me e tla re ha a gana go gu dihela chwanelō ea monna oa losika, hoŋ ke tla gu dihela chwanelō ea monna oa losika, yaka Yehofa a tshedile ; u rōbalè go ea moshōfi.

14 Me a rōbala ha dinaoŋ tsa gagwè go ea moshōfi : me a coga bosigo bo e se bo se ha go ka lemoganwa. Gonne Boase o na a rile, A go se itsiwe ha mosadi eo a na a tsile mo sebopiŋ.

15 Me a re, Lere kobō e e mo go wena, me u e tshegetsè ; me a e tshegetsa, me a èla dielō di le thataro tsa barele, me a di baea mo go èna : me Boase a ea motsiŋ.

16 Me e rile Ruthe a hitlha kwa go matsalaagwè, a re, Go rilefi, morwadiaka? Me a mmolèlèla gotlhe mo monna eouo o go mo dihetsèfi.

17 Me a re, A nnaea dielō tse thataro tse, tsa barele ; gonne a re, U se ka ua ea kwa go matsalaago u iphotlhere hēla.

18 Hoŋ a re, Dula hēla, morwadiaka, go tsamaee u itse kaha go tla nnaŋ ka gōna : gonne monna eouo ga a ketla a ikhutsisa, a e se a a shwetse selō se gompinyeno.

4 **M**E Boase a ea kgotlefi a dula gōna : me bōnaŋ, monna oa losika eo o gauhi, eo Boase o na a buile kaga gagwè, a tla ka gōna ; me a mo raea, a re, Hē, wena semaŋmaŋ, hapoga, u tlè go dula ha. Me a hapoga, a dula.

2 Me a tsaea banna ba le shomè ba bagolwane ba motse, me a re, Dulafi ha ; me ba dula.

3 Me a raea monna oa losika eo o gauhi ka go tsalwa, a re, Naomi, eo o bilefi a tsile a cwa kwa lehatshifi ya Moaba, o rekisa sebata sa lehatshie se e neŋ e le sa ŋwana a rra rona Elimelèke :

4 Me ke gopotsè go gu loma tsèbè, ke re, a ko u se rèkè ha pele ga bōnè ba ba dutsefi ha, le ha pele ga bagolwane ba batho ba ga echo. Ha u rata go se rekolola u se rekololè : me ha u gana go se rekolola, hoŋ u mpolèlèlè, gore ke tlè ke itse : gonne ga go na opè eo o ka se rekololaŋ kwa ntlè ga gago ; me nna ke tla moragō ga gago. Me a re, Ke tla se rekolola.

5 Hoŋ Boase a re, Tsatsiŋ ye u rēkaŋ lotlhagare mo seatlefi sa ga Naomi, u na le go se rēka le mo go Ruthe oa Momoaba, mosadi oa moshwi, go cosa leina ya moshwi mo boshwefi yoa gagwè.

6 Me monna oa losika eo o gauhi, a re, Ga nkake ka se ithèkololèla, nka tla ka senya yo e lefi boshwa yoa me : u itseèlè tshiamō ea me ea go rekolola ; gonne nna ga nkake ka se rekolola.

7 Me galè mo Iseraela, mokgwa oa go rekolola le oa go ananya, go tlhōmamisana dilō cotlhe, e ne e le o; motho o na a tla a role setlhako, me a se nēe oa ga gabō: me e ne e le oña mokgwa oa go tlhōmamisana mo Iseraela.

8 Me monna oa losika eo o gauhi a raea Boase, a re, A ko u se ithèkèlè. Me a rola setlhako.

9 Me Boase a raea bagolwane, le batho botlhe, a re, Lo bashupi gompiyeno, ha ke rekile gotlhe mo e ne e le ga Elimeleke, le gotlhe mo e ne e le ga Kilione, le ga Mahelone, mo seatlèñ sa ga Naomi.

10 Gapè Ruthe oa Momoaba, mosadi oa ga Mahelone, ke mo rekiile gore a tlè a nnè mosadi oa me, go cosa leina ya moshwi mo boshweñ yoa gagwè, gore leina ya moshwi le se ka ya kgaolwa ya cwa mo baneñ ba ga rragwè, le mo kgotleñ ea helō ga gagwè: lo bashupi gompiyeno.

11 Me batho botlhe ba ba mo kgotlèñ le bagolwane botlhe, ba re, Re bashupi. Mosadi eo o tsileñ mo tluñ ea gago, a Yehofa a mo dihè yaka Ragele le yaka Lea, ba e leñ bōnè ba agileñ ntlo ea Iseraela ka bobedi yoa bōnè: me u dihè mo go chwanetseñ mo Eferatha, u bo u nnè motho eo o itsegeñ mo Bethe-lehema:

12 Me a ntlo ea gago e chwanè le ntlo ea ga Perese eo Tamare o na a

mmōna le Yuda, ea losika lo Yehofe o tla lo gu naeañ ka morweetsana eo.

13 Yalo Boase a tsaea Ruthe, a nna mosadi oa gagwè; me a tsena kwa go èna; me Yehofa a mo naea ithwalō, me a bōna ñwana oa mosimane.

14 Me basadi ba raea Naomi, ba re, A go bakweñ Yehofa, eo o sa gu tlogelañ gompiyeno u sena monna oa losika eo o gauhi ka go tsalwa, me a leina ya gagwè le itsegeñ mo Iseraela.

15 Me o tla nna mo go wèna morudisi oa botshelō, le mootli oa bocohe yoa gago: gone ñwetsi oa gago, eo o gu ratañ, eo o molemō mo go wèna bogolo go bana ba basimane bashupa, o mmelege.

16 Me Naomi a tsaea ñwana, me a mmaea mo schubeñ sa gagwè, a nna mmelegi oa gagwè.

17 Me basadi ba ga gabō ba mo raea leina, ba re, Naomi o tsalecwe ñwana oa mosimane; me ba mo raea leina, ba re, Obede; ke èna rragwè Yese, rragwè Dafide.

18 Me tse ke dikokomana tsa ga Perese.

19 Perese a tsala Heserone; Heserone a tsala Rame, Rame a tsala Aminadabe;

20 Aminadabe a tsala Nashone, Nashone a tsala Sa'mone;

21 Salemone a sala Boase, Boase a tsala Obede;

22 Obede a tsala Yese, me Yese a tsala Dafide.

Appendix C: The Book of Ruth from Wookey 1992¹

LOKWALO LWA GA

RUTHE

Elimeleke le bantlo ya gagwe ba hudugela kwa Moabe

1 Ga dirala e rile mo metlheng ya fa baatlhodi ba athlola, ga bo go le leuba mo lefatsheng. Monna mongwe wa Bethlehem wa Juta a ya go jaka mo lefatsheng la Moabe, ene le mosadi wa gagwe, le bomorwawe ba le babedi. **2** Leina la monna yoo e ne e le Elimeleke, leina la mosadi wa gagwe e le Naomi, maina a bomorwawe ba babedi e le Mahelone, le Kilione, e le Baferatha ba Bethlehehema wa Juta. Ba tla mo lefatsheng la Moabe, ba agaaga gone. **3** Elimeleke monna wa ga Naomi a swa; mme mosadi a tlogelwa, le bomorwawe ba babedi. **4** Mme ba itseela basadi mo basading ba Moabe; leina la mongwe e ne e le Orepa, leina la yo mongwe e le Ruthe. Ba aga gone e ka ne e le dinyaga di le some. **5** Mahelone le Kilione ba swa boo babedi; mme mosadi a tlogelwa ke bana ba gagwe ba babedi, le ke monna wa gagwe.

6 Foo a nanoga le betsi ba gagwe, a re o boa kwa lefatsheng la Moabe, gone e ne ya re a le mo lefatsheng la Moabe a utlwa fa Jehofa a lekotse batho ba ga gabo ka go ba naya dijo.

7 A tswa felong fa o ne a le gone, le betsi ba gagwe ba babedi ba na nae; ba tswela mo tseleng, ba re ba boela lefatsheng la Juta. **8** Naomi a raya betsi ba gagwe ba babedi a re: "Tsamayang,

mongwe le mongwe wa lona a boete kwa ga mmaagwe; a Jehofa a lo direle ka pelonomi, jaaka lona lo diretse baswi le nna. **9** A Jehofa a lo neye gore lo bone boikhutso, mongwe le mongwe wa lona mo ntlong ya monna wa gagwe." Foo a ba atla; mme ba tsholetsa mantsewe ba lela. **10** Ba mo raya ba re: "Nnyaa, re tlaa boa nao re ya kwa bathong ba gaeno."

11 Naomi a re: "Bang lo boe bomorwadiaka; lo bo lo elang le nna? A ke sa na le bana ba basimane mo sebopele sa me, gore ba tle ba nne banna ba lona? **12** Bang lo boe bomorwadiaka, lo tsamaye; gone nna ke tsofetse bobee, ga ke na go bona monna. Fa nka bo ke re, ke na le tsholofelo, fa nka bo ke ne ke ka bona monna fela bosigong jono, ka bona bana ba basimane, **13** ka re: A lo ne lo tlaa ba leta go tsamaya ba gola? A lo ne lo tlaa ithiba mo go tseweng ke banna ka ntlha ya moo? Nnyaa, bomorwadiaka; gone go a nkhotsafatsa thata ka ntlha ya lona, gone letsogo la ga Jehofa le nkwetse go tlabana le nna."

14 Ba tsholetsa mantsewe ba lela gape; Orepa a atla matsalaagwe; mme Ruthe ene a mo ngaparela. **15** A re: "Bona, mogwakao o boetse kwa bathong ba ga gabo, le kwa modimong wa gagwe; boa le wena o latele mogwakao."

16 Ruthe a re: "O se ka wa nthapela gore ke go tlogele, ke boe, ke kgaogane

¹ This Bible book was taken from the Bible in Setswana © Bible Society of South Africa 1992. Used with permission. All rights reserved.

le go go sala morago; gonne kwa o yang gone, ke tlaa ya gone; kwa o lalang gone, ke tlaa lala gone; batho ba gaeno e tlaa nna batho ba gaetsho, le Modimo wa gago e tlaa nna Modimo wa me; **17** kwa o swelang gone ke tlaa swela gone, ke ba ke fitlha gone; a Jehofa a ntirele jalo, a ba a fetise, fa sengwe se ka nkgaganya nao fa e se loso fela.”

18 E rile a bona fa a itlhomamiseditse ruri go ya nae, a lesa go tlhola a bua nae.

19 Jalo ba babedi bao ba tsamaya fela ba fitlha mo Bethelhehema. Ga dirala ya re ba tla mo Bethelhehema, motse otlhe wa huduega ka ga bone, mme basadi ba re: “A ke ene Naomi?”

20 A ba raya a re: “Lo se ka lwa mpitsa Naomi, mme lo mpitse Mara: gonne Mothatayotlhe o ntiretse mo go bothoko thata. **21** Ka tswa ke tletse, mme Jehofa o mpuseditse gae ke iphotlhere fela; lo mpiletsang Naomi, ka e le fa Jehofa a ntshupile ka go nnyatsa, le Mothatayotlhe o nkuhlwisitse bothoko?”

22 Jalo Naomi a boa, le Ruthe wa Momoabe, ngwetsi wa gagwe a nna nae, yo o boileng kwa lefatsheng la Moabe; mme ba tla mo Bethelhehema ka tshimologo ya thobo ya barele.

Ruthe o dira mo tshimong ya ga Boase

2 Naomi o ne a na le tsala ya losika lwa monna wa gagwe, a le senatla se se humileng, wa losika lwa ga Elimeleke; leina la gagwe go twe Boase.

2 Ruthe wa Momoabe a raya Naomi a re: “Mma ke ye kwa masimo, ke ye go ronopa mo gare ga diako tsa mabele ke setse mongwe morago yo ke tlaa bonang botsalano mo matlhong a gagwe.” Mme a mo raya a re: “Ya morwadiaka.”

3 A ya, mme a fitlha a ronopa mo masimong, a setse basegi morago; mme

a tshogana ka a wela ntlheng ya maota mo e leng ga Boase, yo e neng e le wa losika lwa ga Elimeleke.

4 Mme bonang, Boase a tswa Bethelhehema, a fitlha a raya basegi ba mabele a re: “A Jehofa a nne le lona,” bone ba mo fetola ba re: “A Jehofa a go segofatse.”

5 Foo Boase a raya motlhanka wa gagwe yo o beilweng mogolo wa basegi ba mabele a re: “Morweetsana yo ke wa ga mang?”

6 Motlhanka yo o beilweng mogolo wa basegi ba mabele a mo fetola a re: “Ke morweetsana wa Momoabe yo o boileng le Naomi kwa lefatsheng la Moabe. **7** O ne a nthaya a re: ‘A ko lo mme ke ronope ke setse basegi morago mo gare ga dingata;’ mme a tla. O sa le a dira ka moso le jaana, fa e se gore, o kile a nna ka lobakanyana mo ntlong.”

8 Foo Boase a raya Ruthe a re: “A ga o a utlwa, morwadiaka? O se ka wa ya go ronopa mo tshimong epe e sele, o se ka wa tswa fano fa; o tlhomame gone fa, le barweetsana ba gaetsho. **9** A matlho a gago a nne mo tshimong e ba e segang, mme o ba sale morago; a ga ke a laela makau gore ba se ka ba go ama? Fa o le lenyora, o ye dinkgwaneng, o nwe se makau a se gileng.”

10 Foo a wela fa fatshe ka sefathlogo, a ikobela fa fatshe, a mo raya a re: “Ana ke bonye botsalano mo matlhong a gago ka ntlha yang, fa e bo ne ne o ntlhokometse jaana ke le moeng?”

11 Boase a mo fetola, a mo raya a re: “Ke boleletswe ka botlalo gotlhe mo o go diretseng matsalaago, monna wa gago a sena go swa; le jaaka o tlogetse rraago le mmaago, le lefatsheng la gaeno, mme o tsile mo bathong ba o sa ba itseng gale. **12** A Jehofa a lebogetse tiro ya gago, o bo o newe tuelo e e tletseng ke Jehofa Modimo wa Iseraele, yo tsileng

2:2 Lef 19:9-10; Duter 24:19

botshabelong tlase ga diphuka tsa gagwe.”

13 Foo Ruthe a re: “A nke ke bone botsalano mo matlhong a gago, morna wa me gonne o nkgomoditse, le gonne o buile ka pelonomi le lelata la gago, le fa ke sa nna jaaka lengwe la malata a gago.”

14 E rile go jewa, Boase a mo raya a re: “Tla kwano, o je dijo, o ine thathana ya gago mo botšarareng.” Mme a dula fa baseging; a mo fa mabele a a gadikilweng; a ja, a kgora, a ba a sadisa. **15** E rile a tlogile a ile go ronopa, Boase a laola makau a gagwe a re: “A a ronope fela mo teng ga dingata, mme lo se ka lwa mo omanyana. **16** Le gone lo mo somolele mangwe mo dingateng lo a tlogele, a a ronope fela, lo se ka lwa mo omanyana.”

17 Jalo a ronopa mo tshimong go ya maitseboeng, a photha mo o ne a go ronopile, ya nna e ka ne e ne e le emere ya barele. **18** A a tsaya, a ya motseng; mme matsalaagwe a bona mo o ne a go ronopile; a ba a ntsha a mo naya mo o ne a go beile a sena go kgora. **19** Matsalaagwe a mo raya a re: “O tlhotse o ronopa kae? O tlhotse o dira kae? A go segofale monna yo o go tlhokometseng.” A bolelela matsalaagwe yo o tlhotseng a dira nae, a ba a re: “Leina la monna yo ke tlhotseng ke dira nae ke Boase.”

20 Naomi a raya ngwetsi ya gagwe a re: “A a segofadiwe ke Jehofa, yo o se kang a khutlisetsa batschedi le baswi bopelonomi jwa gagwe.” Naomi a mo raya a re: “Monna yo ke wa losika lwa rona yo o gaufi le rona, ke mongwe wa ba ba gaufi le rona ka go tsalwa.”

21 Ruthe wa Momoabe a re: “Ruri, o nthebile a re: ‘Tlhomama mo makaung a gaetsho, go tle go tsamaye ba wetse thobo ya me yotlhe fela.’”

22 Naomi a raya Ruthe ngwetsi wa gagwe a re: “Go molemo morwadiaka, fa o ka tswa le barweetsana ba gagwe, gonne kwa tshimong ya motho o sele o ka tla wa tshwenyega.” **23** Jalo a tlhomama mo barweetsaneng ba ga Boase go ronopa, go ya bokhutlong jwa thobo ya barele, le jwa thobo ya mabele; mme a aga le matsalaagwe.

Ruthe o a tsewa

3 Naomi matsalaagwe a mo raya a re: “Morwadiaka, a ga o mme ka go senkela boikhutso, gore go tle go nne molemo mo go wena? **2** Jaana a Boase ga se wa losika lwa rona, yo barwetsana ba gagwe o ne wa nna nabo? Bona, o olosa barele bosigong jono mo seboping. **3** Ke gone tlhapa, o iphorole, o apare, o ye kwa seboping; mme o se ka wa ikitsise motho ope, go tsamaye a swetse go ja le go nwa. **4** Mme, fa a ya go robala, o tlhokomele thata golo fa o robalang gone, mme o tsene, o fenole dinao tsa gagwe, o robale; mme ene o tlaa go bolelela se o tlaa se dirang.”

5 A mo raya a re: “Gotlhe mo o go buang, ke tlaa go dira.”

6 A ya kwa seboping, a dira jaaka tsotlhe tse matsalaagwe o di mo kaetseng. **7** E rile Boase a sena go ja le go nwa, pelo ya gagwe e le mokete, a ya go robala kwa ntlheng ya mokoja wa mabele; Ruthe a tla ka bonya, a fenola dinao tsa gagwe, a robala. **8** Ga dirala ya re bosigogare, monna yo a tshoga, a ipitokolola; a fitlhela mosadi mongwe a robetse fa dinaong tsa gagwe. **9** A re: “O mang?” A mo fetola a re: “Ke Ruthe lelata la gago; ke gone phutholelela lelata la gago kobo ya gago; gonne o wa losika gaufi le rona ka go tsalwa.”

10 A re: “O segofadiwe mo go Jehofa, morwadiaka; o itshupile pelonomi mo bokhutlong bogolo go mo tshimologong,

ka o se ka wa latela a e leng makau a a humanegileng kgotsa a a humileng.

11 Jaana, morwadiaka, o se ka wa boifa; ke tlaa go direla gotlhe mo o go buang, gonne motse otlhe wa batho ba gaetsho o a itse fa o le mosadi yo o siameng.

12 Ruri ke wa losika lwa gago, gaufi ka go tsalwa, le fa go ntse jalo, go na le monna mongwe wa losika yo o gaufi bogolo go nna. **13** Lala bosigo jono; mme go tlaa dirala e tlaa re ka moso, fa a tla go direla tshwanelo ya monna wa losika, go tlaa nna molemo; a a dire tshwanelo ya monna wa losika; e tlaa re fa a gana go go direla tshwanelo ya monna wa losika, foo ke tlaa go direla tshwanelo ya monna wa losika, jaaka Jehofa a tshedile; o robale go ya mosong.”

14 Mme a robala fa dinaong tsa gagwe go ya mosong; mme a tsoga bosigo bo ise bo se mo batho ba ka lemoganang gonne Boase o ne a rile: “A go se itsiwe fa mosadi yo a ne a tsile mo seboping.” **15** A re: “Lere kobo e e mo go wena o e tshegetse;” mme a e tshegetsa, a ela dielo di le thataro tsa barele, a di baya mo go ene; mme Ruthe a ya motseng. **16** E rile Ruthe a fitlha kwa go matsalaagwe, a re: “Go rileng, morwadiaka?” A mmolelela gotlhe mo monna yo o go mo diretseng. **17** Mme a re: “A nnaya dielo tse thataro tse, tsa barele; gonne a re: ‘O se ka wa ya go matsalaago o iphotlhere fela.’” **18** Foo a re: “Dula fela, morwadiaka, go tsamaye o itse ka fa go tlaa nnang ka gone, gonne monna yo ga a ketla a ikhutsisa, a ise a swetse selo se gompieno.”

Boase o nyala Ruthe

4 Boase a ya kgotleng a dula gone. Mme bonang, monna wa losika yo o gaufi, yo Boase o ne a buile ka ga gagwe, a tla gone. A mo raya a re:

“He, wena semangmang, fapoga, o tle go dula fa.” A fapoga, a dula. **2** A tsaya banna ba le some ba bagolwane ba motse a re: “Dulang fa”; mme ba dula.

3 A raya monna wa losika yo o gaufi ka go tsalwa a re: “Naomi, yo o bileng a tsile a tswa kwa lefatsheng la Moabe, o rekisa sebata sa lefatshe se e neng e le sa ngwanaa rra rona Elimeleke. **4** Ke gopotse go go loma tsebe ke re: A ko o se reke fa pele ga bone ba ba dutseng fa, le fa pele ga bagolwane ba batho ba gaetsho. Fa o rata go se rekolola o se rekolole; fa o gana go se rekolola, foo o mpolelele, gore ke tle ke itse; gonne ga go na ope yo o ka se rekolang kwa ntle ga gago; nna ke tla morago ga gago.” Mme a re: “Ke tla se rekolola.”

5 Foo Boase a re: “Tsatsing le o rekang lotlhagare mo seatleng sa ga Naomi, o na le go se reka le mo go Ruthe wa Momoabe, mosadi wa moswi, go tsosa leina la moswi mo bosweng jwa gagwe.”

6 Monna wa losika yo o gaufi, a re: “Ga nkake ka se ithekololela, nka tla ka senya jo e leng boswa jwa me; o itseele tshiamo ya me ya go rekolola; gonne nna ga nkake ka se rekolola.”

7 Gale mo Iseraele, mokgwa wa go rekolola le wa go ananya, go tlhomamisa dilo tsotlhe, e ne e le o: Motho o ne a tle a role setlhako, mme a se neye wa ga gabo; e ne e le one mokgwa wa go tlhomamisa mo Iseraele.

8 Monna wa losika yo o gaufi a raya Boase, a re: “A ko o se ithekele.” Mme a rola setlhako. **9** Boase a raya bagolwane, le batho botlhe, a re: “Lo basupi gompieno, fa ke rekile gotlhe mo e neng e le ga Elimeleke, le gotlhe mo e ne e le ga Kilion, le ga Mahelone, mo seatleng sa ga Naomi. **10** Gape Ruthe wa Momoabe, mosadi wa ga Mahelone, ke mo rekile gore a tle a nne

mosadi wa me, go tsosa leina la moswi mo bosweng jwa gagwe, gore leina la moswi le se ka la kgaolwa la tswa mo baneng ba ga rraagwe, le mo kgotleng ya felo ga gagwe; lo basupi gompieno.”

11 Batho botlhe ba ba mo kgotleng le bagolwane botlhe ba re: “Re basupi, mosadi yo o tsileng mo ntlong ya gago, a Jehofa a mo dire jaaka Ragele le jaaka Lea, ba e leng bone ba agileng ntlo ya Iseraele ka bobedi jwa bone; o dire mo go tshwanetseng mo Eferatha, o bo o nne motho yo o itsegeng mo Bethelihema. **12** A ntlo ya gago e tshwane le ntlo ya ga Perese yo Tamare o ne a mmona le Juta, wa losika lo Jehofa o tlaa lo go nayang ka morweetsana yo.”

Boase le dikokomana tsa gagwe

13 Jalo Boase a tsaya Ruthe a nna mosadi wa gagwe, mme a tsena kwa go ene; Jehofa a mo naya boimana, a bona ngwana wa mosimane. **14** Basadi

ba raya Naomi ba re: “A go bakweng Jehofa, yo o sa go tlogelang gompieno o se na monna wa losika yo o gaufi ka go tsalwa, a leina la gagwe le itsege mo Iseraele. **15** O tlaa nna mo go wena morudisi wa botshelo, le mootli wa botsofe jwa gago; gone ngwetsi wa gago, yo o go ratang, yo o molemo mo go wena bogolo go bana ba basimane basupa, o mmelege.” **16** Naomi a tsaya ngwana, a mmaye mo sehubeng sa gagwe, a nna mmelegi wa gagwe.

17 Basadi ba ga gabo ba mo raya leina ba re: “Naomi o tsaletswe ngwana wa mosimane”; ba mo raya leina ba re, Obete; ke ene rraagwe Jese rraagwe Dafite.

18 Tse ke dikokomana tsa ga Perese: **19** Perese a tsala Heserone; Heserone a tsala Rame, Rame a tsala Aminatabe; **20** Aminatabe a tsala Našone, Našone a tsala Salemone; **21** Salemone a tsala Boase, Boase a tsala Obete; **22** Obete a tsala Jese, mme Jese a tsala Dafite.

Appendix D: The Book of Ruth from BSSA 1970²

LOKWALO LWA GA

RUTHE

Naomi le ngwetsi wa gagwe ba boela kwa gae

1 Erile ka malatsi a puso ya baatlhodi ga nna tlala mo lefatsheng. Ke fa monna mongwe wa kwa Betleheme wa Juta a ya go jaka kwa nageng ya Moabe, ene le mosadi wa gagwe le bomorwawe ka bobedi.

2 Leina la monna yoo e ne e le Elimelege, leina la mosadi wa gagwe e le Naomi, maina a bomorwawe ba babedi e le Magelone le Kileone. E ne e le Baferathi ba Betleheme wa Juta. Jaanong ba fitlha kwa nageng ya Moabe, ba nna teng.

3 Mme Elimelege, monna wa ga Naomi, a swa, ga sala Naomi le bomorwawe ba babedi.

4 Bone ba nyala basadi ba Bamoabe; leina la mongwe e le Orephta, leina la yo mo-

ngwe e le Ruthe. Yare ba sena go nna teng dinyaga tse e ka nnang di le some,

5 ga ba gaa swa Magelone le Kileone ka bobedi jwa bone; mosadi a sala a tlogetswe ke bana ba babedi ba gagwe le monna wa gagwe.

6 Jaanong a nanoga, a na le betsi ba gagwe, a boa kwa nageng ya Moabe; gonne o na a utlwetse mo nageng ya Moabe ga twe: MORENA o babaletse batho ba gagwe, a ba naya dijo.

7 A tloga kwa felong fa a neng a le teng, betsi ba babedi ba gagwe ba na nae. Yare ba le mo tseleng go boela kwa lefatsheng la Juta,

8 Naomi a raya betsi ba babedi ba gagwe a re: Eyang lo boele kwa gae, mongwe le mongwe kwa lapeng la ga mmaagwe. A

297.

² This Bible book was taken from the Bible in Setswana © Bible Society of South Africa 1970. Used with permission. All rights reserved.

RUTHE 1

MORENA a lo direle ka lorato jaaka lo diretse baswi le nna.

9 A MORENA a lo thuse go bona boikhu-tso, mongwe le mongwe mo lapeng la monna wa gagwe. A ba a ba atla. Ke fa ba tsholetsa mantswa, ba lla,

10 ba mo raya ba re: Nyaa, re tlaa boela nao kwa morafeng wa ga eno.

11 Mme Naomi a re: Boang, bomorwadiaka! Lo ka elang le nna? A loa re, ke sa ntse ke ka belega bomorwa go nna banna ba lona?

12 Boang, bomorwadiaka, lo ye kwa gae. Gonne ke tsofetse, mo ke sa kakeng ka tihola ke nyalwa ke monna. Le fa nka re, ke na le tsholofelo, ka tsewa ke monna bosigo jo, ka belega bomorwa:

13 A lo ka ba leta go tsamaya ba gola? A lo ka ithibeilla nyalo ka ntsha ya bone? Nyaa, bomorwadiaka! Kana ke lo tlhomogela pelo thata, ka e le fa letsogo la MORENA le nkotlile.

14 Ke fa ba tsholetsa mantswa, ba lla gape; mme Orepha a atla matsalaagwe, a boela kwa morafeng wa ga gabo. Ruthe ene a mo ngaparela.

15 Ke fa Naomi a re: Bona, monnao o boetse kwa morafeng wa ga gabo le kwa modimong wa ga gabo. Le wena, boa o latele monnao.

16 Mme Ruthe a re: Se nkemelle gore ke go tlogele, ke boe, ke se ye nao. Gonne kwa o yang teng, ke tlaa ya teng; kwa o nnang teng, ke tlaa nna teng. Morafe wa ga eno ke morafe wa ga etsho. Modimo wa gago ke Modimo wa me.

17 Kwa o swelang teng, ke tlaa swela teng, ke be ke fitlha gona. Le fa MORENA a ka ntirela jang le jang -- ke loso fela lo lo ka nkaoganyang nao.

18 Yare Naomi a lemoga gore Ruthe o ikaletse ka tlhomamo go ya nae, a khutla go bua nae.

19 Bone babedi ba fetela pele go ya ba tsena mo Betleheme; mme yare ba fitlha mo Betleheme, motse otlhe wa huduega ka ntsha ya bone. Basadi ba re: A ke ene Naomi?

20 Mme a ba raya a re: Se mpitseng

Naomi¹. Mpitseng Mara². Gonne Mong wa thata yotlhe o ntiretse tse di galakang thata.

21 Ke hudugile ke humile; MORENA a mpusetsa kwano gae ke iphotlhere. Lo mpiletsang Naomi, ka e le fa MORENA a supile molato mo go nna; Mong wa thata yotlhe a nkutlwa botlhoko.

22 Naomi o ne a boela jalo kwa gae, a na le ngwetsi wa gagwe, Ruthe wa Moabe, yo o neng a boile nae kwa nageng ya Moabe. Ba fitlha mo Betleheme ka tshimologo ya thobo ya garase.

Ruthe a sela diako

2 Naomi o na a na le tsala ya monna wa gagwe, e le monna wa senatla yo o humileng wa losika lwa ga Elimelege; leina la gagwe e ne e le Boase.

2 Tsatsi le lengwe Ruthe wa Moabe a kopa Naomi a re: Nte ke ye go ronopa diako kwa masimo, ke latele yo ke bonang bope-lotlhomogi mo mathlong a gagwe. A mo araba a re: Eya, morwadiaka!

3 A ya a fitlha a sela mo tshimong, a setse basegi morago; mme a dirafalelwa ke le-tlhogonolo ka go tsena mo tshimong ya ga Boase, yo e leng losika le Elimelege.

4 Erile go ise go ye kgakala, Boase a ba a goroga, a tswa kwa Betleheme, a dumedisa basegi a re: A MORENA a nne le lona! Ba mo araba ba re: A MORENA a go tshogofatse!

5 Mme Boase a botsa motlhanka wa gagwe, ebong mookamedi wa basegi, a re: Mosetsana yole ke wa ga mang?

6 Mookamedi wa basegi a mo araba a re: Ke ene mosetsana wa Moabe yo o tsileng le Naomi kwa nageng ya Moabe.

7 O kopile a re: Ka thapelo, nte ke ronope, ke sele diako mo gare ga dingata, ke sale basegi morago. Fa e sa le a tla, o ntse a tshwere go tloga mo mosong go fitlha jaa-nong. Ga a nne fa fatshe mo tshimong.

8 Ke fa Boase a raya Ruthe a re: Reetsa fa, morwadiaka! O se ka wa ya go sela kwa tshimong e sele; le gona o se ka wa tloga fa, mme o nne le basetsana ba me fano.

9 Lebisa matlho a gago mo tshimong e ba e robang, o ba sale morago. Ke laetse batlhanka gore ba se ka ba go tshwenya. Fa o nyo-

1.9: Ruthe 3, 1.
1.13: Jobe 19, 21.
1.16: 2. Sam. 15, 21.
1.20: Ekes. 15, 23.

1. Ke go re: Bontle.
2. Ke go re: Bogalaka.

RUTHE 3

riiwe, yaa kwa dinkgong, ò nwe metsi a a gilweng ke bathhanka.

10 Ke fa Ruthe a wela fa fatshe ka sefathhego, a ikoba, a mò raya a re: Ke ka nthlang, fa ke bonye bopelothomogi mo matlhong a gago, wa nthokomela ka tsalano kè le moeng?

11 Boase a araba, a mo raya a re: Kana ke boleletswe tsotlhe sentle tse ò di diretseng matsalaago, monna wa gago a sena go swa, wa tlogela rrago le mmago le lefatshe la ga eno, wa tla kwa morafeng o ò neng ò sa o itse pele.

12 A MORENA a go duelle tiro ya gago; tuelo e e tietseng ò e fiwe ke MORENA, Modimo wa Iseraele, yo ò tllileng go batla boshabelo fa tlase ga diphuka tsa gagwe.

13 Ruthe a re: A ke nne ke bone bopelothomogi mo matlhong a gago, morena wa me! Gonne ò nkgomoditse, wa bua le lelata la gago ka bopelontle, le fa ke sa tshwane le ope wa malata a gago.

14 Ka nako ya go ja Boase a mo raya a re: Atamela kwano ò itselele dijo ò je, ò ine thantana ya gago mo motatsweng. A tla a nnà fa thoko ga basegi, mme Boase a mo abela dipabe. A ja, a kgora, a ba a sadisa.

15 Yare a nanoga go sela, Boase a laela bathhanka ba gagwe a re: A a sele le mo gare ga dingata! Se mo tlabiseng diithong!

16 Le gona lo nne lo mo somolele diako mo dingateng; lo di tlogele gore a di sele, mme lo se ka lwa mo omanya.

17 A sela jalo mo tshimong go ya mantsi-boeng, a photha tse a di sedileng. Ya nna makapa a le mabedi a garase.

18 A e rwala, a ya kwa motseng, a bontsha matsalaagwe tse a di sedileng. A ba a ntsha dijo tse a di sadisitseng, a sena go ja, a di mo naya.

19 Ke fa matsalaagwe a mmotsa a re: Ò tlhotse ò sedile kae kajeno, ò tswa go dira kwa kae? A go tshhegofadiwe yo o go tlhokomseng ka tsalano! Mme a bolella matsalaagwe gore o na a tlhotse a dira le mang a re: Leina la monna yo ke tlhotseng ke dira fa go ene kajeno ke Boase.

20 Mme Naomi a raya ngwetsi wa gagwe a re: A a tshhegofadiwe ke MORENA, yo o se kang a tlhokisa baphedi le baswi lorato lwa gagwe! Naomi a ba a mo raya a re: Monna

yoo ke wa ga etsho; ke mongwe wa bagolodi ba rona.

21 Ruthe wa Moaba a re: O bile a nthaa a re: O nne le malata a me go fithella ba fetse thobo yotlhe ya me.

22 Ke fa Naomi a araba Ruthe, ngwetsi wa gagwe, a re: Go molemo, morwadiaka, fa ò ya le basetsana ba gagwe; foo ga ò ne o tshwenyega mo masimong a sele.

23 A nna jalo le basetsana ba ga Boase, a ntse a sela go ya bokhutlong jwa thobo ya garase le jwa thobo ya mabele a korong. O na a ntse a nna le matsalaagwe.

Naomi o fa Ruthe leano gore a nyalwe ke Boase.

3 Mme Naomi a raya ngwetsi wa gagwe a re: Morwadiaka, kana ke tshwanetse go go batlela legae la boikhutso gore ò phele sentle.

2 Jaanong Boase yo ò neng ò na le basetsana ba gagwe, kana ene ke wa ga etsho. Bona, o tlaa lala a olosa garase mo seboaneng bosigong jono.

3 Tlhapa o iphotle o apare diaparo tsa gago tsa moggabo, ò fologele kwa seboaneng; ò se ka wa nta monna yoo a go lemoga a ise a fetse go ja le go nwa.

4 Mme ere a ya go robala, ò lebele fa a robalang teng, ò ye ò bipolle fa dinaong tsa gagwe, ò robale; foo ene ò tlaa go bolella se ò tshwanetseng go se dira.

5 Ruthe a mo araba a re: Ke tlaa dira tsotlhe tse ò di ntaetseng.

6 A fologela kwa seboaneng, a dira tsotlhe fela jaaka matsalaagwe a mo laetse.

7 Erile Boase a sena go ja le go nwa, mme pelo ya gagwe e itumetse, a ya a robala fa thoko ga mokoa wa garase; ke fa Ruthe a tla a ngwangwaela, a bipolla fa dinaong tsa gagwe, a robala.

8 Yare gare ga bosigo, monna yoo a tshoga, a kanamologa, a fithela mosadi a robetse fa dinaong tsa gagwe.

9 A botsa a re: Ò mang? A araba a re: Ke nna Ruthe, lelata la gago; phuthollela lelata la gago diphuka tsa gago; gonne ke wena mogolodi.

10 Boase a re: Ò tshhegofadiwe ke MORE-

3.11: Ruthe 1, 9.
3.9: Doit. 25, 5; Hes. 16, 8.
3.10: Ruthe 2, 11.

2.11: Ruthe 1, 16.17.

RUTHE 3

NA, morwadiaka. Lorato lo lwa gago lo gaisa lwa pele, ka ò se ka wa latela makau, le fa e le a a humanegileng gongwe a a humileng.

11 Mme jaanong, morwadiaka, se boife. Tsothe tse ò di buileng, ke tlaa di go direla. Kana go itse mongwe le mongwe mo lekgotleng la morafe wa ga etsho, fa ò le mosadi yo o maatlametlo.

12 Jaanong he, ke nnete, ke nna mogolodi; mme le gona go na le mogolodi yo o tshwanetseng bogolo go nna.

13 Lala fano bosigong jono. Ere mo mosong, fa a ka go golola, go siame, a a go golole! Mme fa a sa kgarlwe ke go go golola, foo nna - ka bophelo jwa MORENA - ke tlaa go golola! Robala fano go ya mosong.

14 Ruthe a robala fa dinaong tsa gagwe go ya mosong, mme a tsoga phakela go ise go bonale. Gonne Boase o na a re: A go se ka ga itsiwe gore mosadi yoo, o letse kwa seboaneng.

15 Boase a mo raya a re: Tlisa kobo e ò e apereng, ò e ntshwarelle; a e mo tshwarella, mme Boase a mo tshella dielo di le thataro tsa garase, a e mo rwea. Jaanong Ruthe a ya kwa motseng.

16 Yare a fitlha, matsalaagwe a mmotsa a re: Go ntse jang, morwadiaka? Ruthe a mmolella tsothe tse monna yoo a di mo diretseng.

17 a re: O mphile dielo di le thataro tseo tsa garase a re: Ga òa tshwanela go fitlha kwa go matsalaago, ò iphotlhere fela.

18 Mme Naomi a re: Iketle, morwadiaka, go fitlhella ò be ò itse gore kang e, e fella kae; gonne monna yoo ga a kitla a ikhutsa a ise a fetse kang e kajeno.

Boase o nyala Ruthe. Losika lwa ga Dafita

4 Boase a ya kwa kgotleng, a feta a nna fatshe. Ke fa mogolodi yole a feta yo Boase a buileng kaga gagwe. Boase a mmita a re: Tlaa jaana, o nne fatshe, wena mangmang. A fapogela teng, a nna fatshe.

2 Jaanong Boase a bitsa banna ba bagolo ba motse ba le some a re: Nnang fa! Mme ba nna fatshe.

3 Ke fa a raya mogolodi yole a re: Naomi yo o boileng kwa nageng ya Moabe o rata go rekisa kabelo ya tshimo e e neng e le ya

monna wa ga etsho, ebong Elimelege.

4 Ke ne ka re, ke tlaa go begela jalo, ke re: E reke fa pele ga ba ba dutseng fa le fa pele ga bagolo ba morafe wa ga rona. Fa ò rata go e rekolla, e rekolle; fa ò sa rate go e rekolla, ò bofele gore ke itse. Gonne ga go na ope yo o ka e rekollang fa e se wena le nna yo ke fa morago ga gago. A araba a re: Ke tlaa e rekolla.

5 Mme Boase a re: Ka letsatsi le ò rekang tshimo eo mo diatleng tsa ga Naomi ka lone, ò bile ò amogela le Ruthe wa Moabe, mosadi wa moswi, gore ò tsose leina la moswi mo bosweng jwa gagwe.

6 Ke fa mogolodi yoo a re: Ke pallwa ke go e ithekollela, e se re gongwe ka senya boswa jwa me. E ithekollele, e ke neng ke tshwanetse go e rekolla; gonne kea pallwa.

7 Jaanong mo methheng ya pele go ne go le mokgwa mo Iseraeleng wa gore: Fa go rekollwa gongwe go ananngwa, motho a role setlhako sa gagwe, a se neele mongwe ka-ene, e le go tihomamisa mafoko aotlhe. Go rialo e ne e le tshupo ya teng mo Iseraeleng.

8 Mme mogolodi yoo a raya Boase a re: E ithekele! A ba a rola setlhako sa gagwe, a se mo neela.

9 Ke fa Boase a raya bagolo le batho botlhe a re: Lona lo basupi kajeno ba gore: Ke rekile tsothe tse e neng e le tsa ga Elimelege le tsa ga Kileone le Magelone mo diatleng tsa ga Naomi.

10 Le gona ke tsaya Ruthe wa Moabe, mosadi wa ga Magelone, gore a nne mosadi wa me, mme ke tsose leina la moswi mo bosweng jwa gagwe, mme leina la moswi le se ka la nyelediwa mo gare ga bomorwa-rraagwe le mo lekgotleng la motse wa ga gabò. Lona lo basupi kajeno.

11 Batho botlhe ba ba neng ba le mo lekgotleng le bagolo ba araba ba re: Re basupi! Mosadi yo o tlaa tsenang mo lapeng la gago a MORENA a mo dire jaaka Ragele le Lea ba ba agileng lelapa la ga Iseraele ka bobedi jwa bone. Dira tse dikgolo mo Eferatha, gore ò nne le leina mo Betlehem.

12 A lelapa la gago le tshwane le la ga Pherese, yo Thamare a neng a mo tsholela

4:4: Lef. 25, 25.

4:5: Doit. 25, 5-6.

4:7: Doit. 25, 7-10.

4:12: Gen. 38, 29.

1 SAMUELE 1

Juta, a le nne jalo ka bana ba MORENA o tlaa ba go nayang ka mosadi yoo, ka a sa le moša.

13 Jaanong Boase a tsaya Ruthe, a nna mosadi wa gagwe; yare a sena go tsena kwa go ene, MORENA a mo naya boimana, mme a belega ngwana wa mosimane.

14 Ke fa basadi ba raya Naomi ba re: A go bakwe MORENA yo o se kang a go tihokisa mogolodi kajeno. A leina la gagwe le tumisiwe mo Iseraeleng!

15 E tlaa nna ene yo o go lapolosang pelo, yo o go tlamelang mo botsofeng jwa gago; gonne ngwetsi wa gago yo o go ratang, o mmelege, ene yo o molemo mo go wena go phala bomorwa ba ba supang.

16 Mme Naomi a tsaya ngwana, a mo

fara, a nna mmelegi wa gagwe.

17 Basadi ba ba neng ba agile go bapanae ba re: Naomi o beletswe ngwana. Ba mo taa leina la Obete. Ke ene rraagwe Isai, yo e leng rraagwe Dafita.

18 Losika lwa ga Pherese ke lo: Pherese o na a tsala Heserone;

19 Heserone a tsala Rame; Rame a tsala Aminatabe;

20 Aminatabe a tsala Nasone; Nasone a tsala Salema;

21 Salema a tsala Boase; Boase a tsala Obete;

22 Obete a tsala Isai; Isai a tsala Dafita.

4.17: Math. 1, 5-6; Luk. 3, 32.

4.18: Gen. 46, 12; 1. Ditiraf. 2, 5.

4.19: 1. Ditiraf. 2, 9-15.

4.20: Dipalo 1, 7.

4.22: 1. Sam. 16, 1.11-13.

4.13: Pes. 127, 3.

Appendix E: The Book of Ruth from BSSA 1987³

LOKWALO LWA GA

RUTHE

*Elimelege le ba lapa la gagwe
ba hudugela kwa Moabe*

1 E rile ka malatsi a puso ya baatlhodi ga nna tlala mo lefatsheng. Ke fa monna mongwe wa kwa Betleheme wa Juta a ya go jaka kwa nageng ya Moabe, ene le mosadi wa gagwe le bomorwawe ka bobedi. ²Leina la monna yoo e ne e le Elimelege, leina la mosadi wa gagwe e le Naomi, maina a bomorwawe ba babedi e le Magelone le Kileone. E ne e le Baeferathi ba Betleheme wa Juta. Jaanong ba fitlha kwa nageng ya Moabe, ba nna teng. ³Mme Elimelege monna wa ga Naomi a swa, ga sala Naomi le bomorwawe ba babedi. ⁴Bone ba nyala basadi ba Bamoabe; leina la mongwe e le Orepha, leina la yo mongwe e le Ruthe. Ya re ba sena go nna teng dinyaga tse e ka nnang di le some, ⁵ga ba ga swa Magelone le Kileone ka bobedi jwa bone; mosadi a sala a tlogetswe ke bana ba babedi ba gagwe le monna wa gagwe.

a) Ruthe 3:1.

*Naomi le Ruthe ba boela kwa
Betleheme*

⁶Jaanong a nanoga a na le betsi ba gagwe, a boa kwa nageng ya Moabe; gonne o ne a utlwetse mo nageng ya Moabe ga twe, MORENA o babaletse batho ba gagwe, a ba naya dijo. ⁷A tloga kwa felong fa a neng a le teng, betsi ba babedi ba gagwe ba na nae. Ya re ba le mo tseleng go boela kwa lefatsheng la Juta, ⁸Naomi a raya betsi ba babedi ba gagwe a re: "Yaang lo boele kwa gae, mongwe le mongwe kwa lapeng la ga mmaagwe. A MORENA a lo direle ka lorato jaaka lo diretse baswi le nna. ⁹A MORENA a lo thuse go bona boikhutso, mongwe le mongwe mo lapeng la monna wa gagwe." A ba a ba atla. Ke fa ba tsholetsa mantsewe ba lela, ¹⁰ba mo raya ba re: "Nnyaya, re tla boela nao kwa morafeng wa ga eno." ¹¹Mme Naomi a re: "Boang, bomorwadiaka! Lo ka elang le nna? A lo a re, ke sa ntse ke ka belega bomorwa go nna banna ba lona?"

339

³ This Bible book was taken from the Bible in Setswana © Bible Society of South Africa 1970, 1987.

Used with permission. All rights reserved.

¹²Boang, bomorwadiaka, lo ye kwa gae. Gonne ke tsofetse, mo ke sa ka keng ka tlhola ke nyalwa ke monna. Le fa nka re, ke na le tsholofelo, ka tsewa ke monna bosigo jo, ka belega bomorwa: ¹³A lo ka ba leta go tsamaya ba gola? A lo ka ithibeleda nyalo ka ntlha ya bone? Nnyaya, bomorwadiaka! Kana ke lo tlhomogela pelo thata, ka e le fa letsogo la MORENA le nkotlile.”^b

¹⁴Ke fa ba tsholetsa mantswe, ba lela gape; mme Orepha a atla matsalaagwe, a boela kwa morafeng wa ga gabo. Ruthe ene a mo ngaparela. ¹⁵Ke fa Naomi a re: “Bona, monnao o boetse kwa morafeng wa ga gabo le kwa modimong wa ga gabo. Le wena, boa o latele monnao.”

¹⁶Mme Ruthe a re: “Se nkemelele gore ke go tlogele, ke boe ke se ye nao. Gonne kwa o yang teng, ke tla ya teng; kwa o nnang teng, ke tla nna teng. Morafe wa ga eno ke morafe wa ga etsho. Modimo wa gago ke Modimo wa me.”^c ¹⁷Kwa o swelang teng, ke tla swela teng, ke be ke fitlha gona. Le fa MORENA a ka ntirela jang le jang – ke loso fela lo lo ka nkgaganyang nao.”

¹⁸Ya re Naomi a lemoga gore Ruthe o ikaletse ka tlhomamo go ya nae, a khutla go bua nae.

¹⁹Bone babedi ba fetela pele go ya ba tsena mo Betleheme; mme ya re ba fitlha mo Betleheme, motse otlhe wa huduega ka ntlha ya bone. Basadi ba re: “A ke ene Naomi?”

²⁰Mme a ba raya a re: “Se mpitseng Naomi^d. Mpitseng Mara^e. Gonne Mong-wa-thata-yotlhe o ntiretse tse di galakang thata.”^f ²¹Ke hudugile ke humile; MORENA a mpusetse kwano gae ke iphotlhere. Lo mpiletsang Naomi, ka e le fa MORENA a supile molato mo go nna; Mong-wa-thata-yotlhe a nkutlwisa bothhoko.”

²²Naomi o ne a boela jalo kwa gae, a na le ngwetsi wa gagwe, Ruthe wa Moabe yo o neng a boile nae kwa nageng ya Moabe. Ba fitlha mo Betleheme ka tshimologo ya thobo ya garase.

Ruthe a sela diako mo tshimong ya ga Boase

2 Naomi o ne a na le tsala ya monna wa gagwe, e le monna wa senatla yo o humileng wa losika lwa ga Elimelege; leina la gagwe e ne e le Boase. ²Tsatsi le lengwe Ruthe wa Moabe a kopa Naomi a re: “Nte ke ye go ronopa diako kwa masimo, ke latele yo ke bonang bopelotlhomogi mo matlhong a gagwe.” A mo araba a re: “Yaa, morwadiaka!”

³A ya a fitlha a sela mo tshimong, a setse basegi morago; mme a dirafalelwa ke letlhogonolo ka go tsena mo tshimong ya ga Boase yo e leng losika le Elimelege.

⁴E rile go ise go ye kgakala, Boase a ba a goroga, a tswa kwa Betleheme, a dumedisa basegi a re: “A MORENA a nne le lona!” Ba mo araba ba re: “A MORENA a go tshogofatse!”

⁵Mme Boase a botsa motlhanka wa gagwe, e bong mookamedi wa basegi, a re: “Mosetsana yole ke wa ga mang?”

⁶Mookamedi wa basegi a mo araba a re: “Ke ene mosetsana wa Moabe yo o tsileng le Naomi kwa nageng ya Moabe.”⁷O kopile a re: “Ka thapelo, nte ke ronope, ke sele diako mo gare ga dingata, ke sale basegi morago.” Fa e sa le a tla, o ntse a tshwere go tloga mo mosong go fitlha jaanong. Ga a nne fa fatshe mo tshimong.”

⁸Ke fa Boase a raya Ruthe a re: “Reetsa fa, morwadiaka! O se ka wa ya go sela kwa tshimong e sele; le gona o se ka wa tloga fa, mme o nne le basetsana ba me fano.”⁹Lebisa matlho a gago mo tshimong e ba e robang, o ba sale morago. Ke laetse

b) Jobe 19:21. c) 2 Sam. 15:21. d) Ke go re: Bontle. e) Ke go re: Bogalaka. f) Ekes. 15:23.

batlhanka gore ba se ka ba go tshwenya. Fa o nyorilwe ya kwa dinkgong, o nwe metsi a a gilweng ke batlhanka.”

¹⁰Ke fa Ruthe a wela fa fatshe ka sefatlhego, a ikoba, a mo raya a re: “Ke ka ntlha ya eng, fa ke bonye bopelotlhomogi mo matlhong a gago, wa ntlhokomela ka tsalano ke le moeng?”

¹¹Boase a araba, a mo raya a re: “Kana ke boleletswe tsotlhe sentle tse o di diretseng matsalaago, monna wa gago a sena go swa, wa tlogela rraago le mmaago le lefatshe la ga eno, wa tla kwa morafeng o ò neng o sa o itse pele.^g ¹²A MORENA, a go duelele tiro ya gago; tuelo e e tletseng o e fiwe ke MORENA, Modimo wa Iseraele, yo ò tlileng go batla botshabelo fa tlase ga diphuka tsa gagwe.”

¹³Ruthe a re: “A ke nne ke bone bopelotlhomogi mo matlhong a gago, morena wa me! Gonne o nkogomoditse, wa bua le lelata la gago ka bopelontle, le fa ke sa tshwane le ope wa malata a gago.”

¹⁴Ka nako ya go ja Boase a mo raya a re: “Atamela kwano o itseele dijo o je, o ine thathana ya gago mo motatsweng.” A tla a nna fa thoko ga basegi mme Boase a mo abela dipabe. A ja, a kgora, a ba a sadisa. ¹⁵Ya re a nanoga go sela, Boase a laela batlhanka ba gagwe a re: “A a sele le mo gare ga dingata! Se mo tllhabiseng ditlhong! ¹⁶Le gona lo nne lo mo somolele diako mo dingateng, lo di tlogele gore a di sele, mme lo se ka lwa mo omanya.”

¹⁷A sela jalo mo tshimong go ya mantsiboeng, a photha tse a di sedileng. Ya nna makapa a le mabedi a garase. ¹⁸A e rwala, a ya kwa motseng, a bontsha matsalaagwe tse a di sedileng. A ba a ntsha dijo tse a di sadisitseng a sena go ja, a di mo naya. ¹⁹Ke fa matsalaagwe a mmotsa

a re: “O tlotse o sedile kae kajeno, o tswa go dira kwa kae? A go tshegofadiwe yo o go tlhokometseng ka tsalano!” Mme a bolelela matsalaagwe gore o ne a tlotse a dira le mang a re: “Leina la monna yo ke tlhotseng ke dira fa go ene kajeno ke Boase.”

²⁰Mme Naomi a raya ngwetsi wa gagwe a re: “A a tshegofadiwe ke MORENA yo o se kang a tlhokisa baphedi le baswi lorato lwa gagwe!” Naomi a ba a mo raya a re: “Monna yoo ke wa ga etsho; ke mongwe wa bagolodi ba rona.”

²¹Ruthe wa Moaba a re: “O bile a nthaya a re: ‘O nne le malata a me go fitlhelela ba fetse thobo yotlhe ya me.’”

²²Ke fa Naomi a araba Ruthe ngwetsi wa gagwe a re: “Go molemo, morwadiaka, fa o ya le basetsana ba gagwe; foo ga o ne o tshwenyega mo masimong a sele.” ²³A nna jalo le basetsana ba ga Boase, a ntse a sela go ya bokhutlong jwa thobo ya garase le jwa thobo ya mabele a korong. O ne a ntse a nna le matsalaagwe.

Ruthe o bona monna

3 Mme Naomi a raya ngwetsi wa gagwe a re: “Morwadiaka, kana ke tshwanetse go go batlela legae la boikhutso gore o phele sentle.^h

²Jaanong Boase yo ò neng o na le basetsana ba gagwe, kana ene ke wa ga etsho. Bona, o tla lala a olosa garase mo seboaneng bosigong jono.

³Tlhapa o iphotle o apare diaparo tsa gago tsa mokgabo, o fologele kwa seboaneng; o se ka wa nta monna yoo a go lemoga a ise a fetse go ja le go nwa. ⁴Mme e re a ya go robala, o lebelele fa a robalang teng, o ye o bipolele fa dinaong tsa gagwe, o robale; foo ene o tla go bolelela se o tshwanetseng go se dira.”

⁵Ruthe a mo araba a re: “Ke tla dira tsotlhe tse o di ntaetseng.”

g) Ruthe 1:16,17. h) Ruthe 1:9.

⁶A fologela kwa seboaneng, a dira tsotlhe fela jaaka matsalaagwe a mo laetse. ⁷E rile Boase a sena go ja le go nwa, mme pelo ya gagwe e itumetse, a ya a robala fa thoko ga moko a wa garase; ke fa Ruthe a tla a ngwangwaela, a bipolela fa dinaong tsa gagwe, a robala. ⁸Ya re gare ga bosigo monna yoo a tshoga, a kanamologa, a fitlhela mosadi a robetse fa dinaong tsa gagwe. ⁹A botsa a re: “O mang?” A araba a re: “Ke nna Ruthe, lelata la gago; phuthololela lelata la gago diphuka tsa gago; gonne ke wena mogolodi.”ⁱ

¹⁰Boase a re: “O tshagofadiwe ke MORENA, morwadiaka. Lorato lo lwa gago lo gaisa lwa pele, ka o se ka wa latela makau, le fa e le a a humanegileng gongwe a a humileng.”^j ¹¹Mme jaanong, morwadiaka, se boife. Tsotlhe tse o di buileng ke tla di go direla. Kana go itse mongwe le mongwe mo lekgotleng la morafe wa ga etsho, fa o le mosadi yo o maatlametlo. ¹²Jaanong he, ke nnete, ke nna mogolodi; mme le gona go na le mogolodi yo o tshwanetseng bogolo go nna. ¹³Lala fano bosigong jono. E re mo mosong, fa a ka go golola, go siame, a a go golole! Mme fa a sa kgatlhwe ke go go golola, foo nna – ka bophelo jwa MORENA – ke tla go golola! Robala fano go ya mosong.”

¹⁴Ruthe a robala fa dinaong tsa gagwe go ya mosong, mme a tsoga phakela go ise go bonale. Gonne Boase o ne a re: “A go se ka ga itsiwe gore mosadi yoo o letse kwa seboaneng.” ¹⁵Boase a mo raya a re: “Tlisa kobo e o e apereng, o e ntshwarelele.” A e mo tshwarelela, mme Boase a mo tshela dielo di le thataro tsa garase, a e mo rwsa. Jaanong Ruthe a ya kwa motseng. ¹⁶Ya re a fitlha, matsalaagwe a mmotsa a re: “Go ntse jang, morwadiaka?” Ruthe a mmolelela

tsotlhe tse monna yoo o di mo diretseng, ¹⁷a re: “O mphile dielo di le thataro tseo tsa garase a re: ‘Ga o a tshwanela go fitlha kwa go matsalaago o iphotlhere fela.’”

¹⁸Mme Naomi a re: “Iketle, morwadiaka, go fitlhelela o be o itse gore kgang e, e felela kae; gonne monna yoo ga a kitla a ikhutsa a ise a fetse kgang e kajeno.”

Boase o nyala Ruthe

4 Boase a ya kwa kgotleng, a feta a nna fatshe. Ke fa mogolodi yole a feta, yo Boase a buileng ka ga gagwe. Boase a mmitsa a re: “Tlaa jaana, o nne fatshe, wena mangmang.” A fapogela teng, a nna fatshe. ²Jaanong Boase a bitsa banna ba bagolo ba motse ba le some a re: “Nnang fa!” Mme ba nna fatshe. ³Ke fa a raya mogolodi yole a re: “Naomi yo o boileng kwa nageng ya Moabe o rata go rekisa kabelo ya tshimo e e neng e le ya monna wa ga etsho, e bong Elimelege.”^k ⁴Ke ne ka re, ke tla go begela jalo ke re: E reke fa pele ga ba ba dutseng fa le fa pele ga bagolo ba morafe wa ga rona. Fa o rata go e rekolola, e rekolole; fa o sa raté go e rekolola, o bolele gore ke itse. Gonne ga go na ope yo o ka e rekololang fa e se wena le nna yo ke fa morago ga gago.” A araba a re: “Ke tla e rekolola.”^l

⁵Mme Boase a re: “Ka letsatsi le o rekang tshimo eo mo diatleng tsa ga Naomi ka lone, o bile o amogela le Ruthe wa Moabe, mosadi wa moswi gore o tsose leina la moswi mo bosweng jwa gagwe.”^m

⁶Ke fa mogolodi yoo a re: “Ke palelwa ke go e ithekololela, e se re gongwe ka senya boswa jwa me. E ithekololele e ke neng ke tshwanetse go e rekolola; gonne ke a palelwa.”

⁷Jaanong mo metlheng ya pele go ne go le mkgwa mo Iseraeleng wa go re: Fa go rekololwa gongwe go

i) Doit. 25:5; Hes. 16:8. j) Ruthe 2:11. k) Lef. 25:25. l) Lef. 25:25. m) Doit. 25:5-6.

ananngwa, motho a role setlhako sa gagwe, a se neele mongwe-ka-ene, e le go tlhomamisa mafoko aotlhe. Go re jalo e ne e le tshupo ya teng mo Iseraeleng.⁷

⁸Mme mogolodi yoo a raya Boase a re: “E ithekele!” A ba a rola setlhako sa gagwe, a se mo neela. ⁹Ke fa Boase a raya bagolo le batho botlhe a re: “Lona lo basupi kajeno ba go re, ke rekile tsotlhe tse e neng e le tsa ga Elimelege le tsa ga Kileone le Magelone mo diatleng tsa ga Naomi. ¹⁰Le gona ke tsaya Ruthe wa Moabe, mosadi wa ga Magelone gore a nne mosadi wa me, mme ke tsose leina la moswi mo bosweng jwa gagwe, mme leina la moswi le se ka la nyelediwa mo gare ga bomorwa-rraagwe le mo lekgotleng la motse wa ga gabo. Lona lo basupi kajeno.”

¹¹Batho botlhe ba ba neng ba le mo lekotleng le bagolo ba araba ba re: “Re basupi! Mosadi yo o tla tsenang mo lapeng la gago a MORENA a mo dire jaaka Ragele le Lea ba ba agileng lelapa la ga Iseraele ka bobedi jwa bone. Dira tse dikgolo mo Eferatha gore o nne le leina mo Betlehereme. ¹²A lelapa la gago le tshwane le la ga Pherese yo Thamare a neng a mo tsholela Juta, a le nne jalo ka bana ba

MORENA o tla ba go nayang ka mosadi yoo, ka a sa le mošwa.”^o

Ditlogolwana tsa ga Boase

¹³Jaanong Boase a tsaya Ruthe, a nna mosadi wa gagwe; ya re a sena go tsena kwa go ene, MORENA a mo naya boimana, mme a belega ngwana wa mosimane.^p ¹⁴Ke fa basadi ba raya Naomi ba re: “A go bakwe MORENA yo o se kang a go tlhokisa mogolodi kajeno. A leina la gagwe le tumisiwe mo Iseraeleng! ¹⁵E tla nna ene yo o go lapolosang pelo, yo o go tlamelang mo botsofeng jwa gago; gone ngwetsi wa gago yo o go ratang o mmelege, ene o molemo mo go wena go feta bomorwa ba supa.” ¹⁶Mme Naomi a tsaya ngwana, a mo fara, a nna mmelegi wa gagwe. ¹⁷Basadi ba ba neng ba agile go bapa nae ba re: “Naomi o belegetswe ngwana.” Ba mo taya leina la Obete. Ke ene rraagwe Isai yo e leng rraagwe Dafita.^q ¹⁸Losika lwa ga Pherese ke lo: Pherese o ne a tsala Heserone;^r ¹⁹Heserone a tsala Rame; Rame a tsala Aminatabe;^s ²⁰Aminatabe a tsala Nasone; Nasone a tsala Salema;^t ²¹Salema a tsala Boase; Boase a tsala Obete; ²²Obete a tsala Isai; Isai a tsala Dafita.^u

n) Doit. 25:7-10. o) Gen. 38:29. p) Pes. 127:3. q) Math. 1:5-6; Luka 3:32.

r) Gen. 46:12; 1 Ditiraf. 2:5. s) 1 Ditiraf. 2:9-15. t) Num. 1:7. u) 1 Sam. 16:1,11-13.

Appendix F: Copyrights Letter from the Bible Society of South Africa

From: Ilse van Dyk <ilsevandyk@biblesociety.co.za>

To:

'Hanlie Rossouw' rossouw@biblesociety.co.za]] ;Berman, SK, Mnr <16876520@sun.ac.za>

Cc:

Lourens Geldenhuys za].geldenhuys@biblesociety.co] ;Talitha Huysamer talitha@biblesociety.co.za]] ;Janine le Roux janine@biblesociety.co.za]]

Monday, July 08, 2013 11:53 AM

Dear Sydney

Copyright: Use of Ruth in your PhD dissertation

Thank you for your copyright application signed 2 July 2013.

The Bible Society hereby gives you permission to use the book of Ruth as addendums in the following Setswana translations:

1. Wookey 1908/1992 (revision/new orthography)
2. Central Tswana 1970
3. Central Tswana 1987 (revision)
4. The Moffat 1857 and Wookey 1908 does not fall under BSSA copyright therefore you do not need permission to use it.

The following copyright acknowledgements (*in italic*) should be applied to the addendums where the texts are shown:

1. Wookey 1908/1992 (revision/new orthography):

This Bible book was taken from the Bible in Setswana © Bible Society of South Africa 1992. Used with permission. All rights reserved.

2. Central Tswana 1970

This Bible book was taken from the Bible in Setswana © Bible Society of South Africa 1970. Used with permission. All rights reserved.

3. Central Tswana 1987 (revision)

This Bible book was taken from the Bible in Setswana © Bible Society of South Africa 1970, 1987. Used with permission. All rights reserved.

No royalties are payable for this use since it is considered as non-commercial.

On completion one copyright copy should be supplied to the BSSA free of charge. An electronic version will be acceptable.

I wish you the best of luck with the completion of this great task.

Kind regards

ilse van dyk

copyright manager

publications and scripture programmes

t +27 (0)21 910 8742 / f +27 (0)21 910 8772

bible society of south africa

134 edward street, bellville / po box 5500 tyger valley 7536

www.biblesociety.co.za

Appendix G: More Shifts from the Translation of the Book of Ruth⁴

| Hebrew ST | Moffat | Wookey | BSSA |
|---|--|---|---|
| בְּיָמָיו During the days of (1:1) | Ka malatsi a (when) | Mo metlheng ya (during the times of) | Ka malatsi a (during the days of) |
| רָעָב Famine (1:1) | Loshekere (dryness) | Leuba (drought) | Tlala (hunger) |
| שֹׁפְטֵי הַשְּׁפָטִים Judging of the judges (1:1) | Basiami ba siamisa (Correctors correcting) | Baatlhodi ba athola (Judges judging/judges ruling) | Puso ya baatlhodi (Rule of the judges) |
| בְּשָׂדֵי מוֹאָב Country/fields of Moab (1:1) | Hatsheng ja Moaba (Country of Moab) | Lefatsheng la Moaba (Country of Moab) | Nageng ya Moaba (Country of Moab) |
| וַיִּהְיוּ שָׁמָּה And they were there (1:2) | Bo ba le gona (They were present/there) | Ba aga-aga gone (They settled there for a while) | Ba nna teng (They stayed/lived there) |
| וַתִּשָּׂאֵר And she was left behind (1:3) | A sala, (She remained) | Mosadi a tlogelwa, (The woman was left behind). | Ga sala Naomi (There remained Naomi). |
| הִיא וּשְׁנֵי בָנֶיהָ She and the two of her sons (1:3) | Le bomorwawe ba tu (And his/her two sons) | Le bomorwawe ba babedi (And his/her two sons) | Naomi le bomorwawe ba babedi (And his/her two sons). |
| וַיִּשְׂאוּ לָהֶם נָשִׁים They lifted for themselves wives (1:4) | Ba itseela basadi (They took for themselves women) | Ba itseela basadi (They took for themselves women) | Ba nyala basadi (They married women) |

⁴ These shifts were identified in my exegetical and translational study of the entire book of Ruth and can be analysed in the manner illustrated in chapter six.

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| נָשִׁים מֵאֲבֵי Wives from among the women of Moab (1:4) | Basadi ba Semoaba (Moabite-ish wives) | Basadi mo basading ba Moabe (Wives from among Moabite women) | Basadi ba Bamoabe (Moabite wives) |
| שְׁנֵיהֶם The two of them (1:5) | [no rendering] | Boo babedi (The two of them) | Ka bobedi jwa bone (The two of them) |
| וַתֵּשָׂאֵר הָאִשָּׁה מִשְׁנֵי יְלָדֶיהָ וּמֵאִישָׁהּ And the woman was left behind without her two boys and her husband (1:5) | Mosadi a hela a sala morago ga bomorwawe ba tu le monna wa gagwe (The woman ended up following after her sons and husband) | Mosadi a tlogelwa ke bana ba gagwe ba babedi le monna wa gagwe (The woman was left behind by her two sons and husband) | The woman a sala a tlogetswe ke bana ba babedi ba gagwe le monna (The woman remained left behind by her two children and her husband) |
| כִּי שָׁמְעָה בְּשׂוּדָה מוֹאָב For she had heard in the country of Moab (1:6) | Gonne a ne a utlwa a le hatsheng ya Moaba (She heard while in the country of Moab) | Gonne e ne ya re a le mo lefatshing la Moabe a utlwa (For it happened that while she was in the country of Moab she heard) | Gonne o ne a utlwetse mo nageng ya Moabe (For she had heard in the country of Moab) |
| יְהוָה Yahweh (1:6) | Yehova (Jehovah) | Jehofa (Jehovah) | MORENA (the LORD) |
| לְבַיִת אִמָּהּ To the house of her mother (1:8) | Tlung ya mmaagwe (To the house of her mother) | Kwa ga mmaagwe (To her mother's home) | Kwa lapeng la ga mmaagwe (To the home of her mother). |
| לְעַמֶּךָ To your people (1:10) | Bathong ba gago (Your [singular] people/persons) | Bathong ba ga eno (Your [plural] people) | Morafeng wa ga eno (Your [plural] community) |
| כִּי Negated “but” (1:10) | Ruri (surely) | Nnyaya (no) | Nnyaya (no) |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p>זָקַנְתִּי מִהָיִוֹת לְאִישׁ I am too old to have a husband (1:12)</p> | <p>Ke tsofetse go nna le monna (I am old to have a man)</p> | <p>Ke tsofetse bobé, ga ke na go bona monna (I am very old, I will not find a man)</p> | <p>Ke tsofetse mo ke sa kakeng ka tlhola ke nyalwa ke monna (I am so old that I can no longer be married by a man)</p> |
| <p>מִרְרֵי מְאֹד בְּכֶם It is bitter for me for your sakes/it is more bitter for me than for you (1:13).</p> | <p>Ke utlwa bogalaka bogolo go lona (I feel bitterness more than you)</p> | <p>Go a nkhotsafatsa ka ntlha ya lona (It makes me sad for your sakes)</p> | <p>Ke lo tlhomogela pelo (I pity you).</p> |
| <p>כִּי־יָצְאָה בִּי יַד־יְהוָה For the hand of Yahweh went out against me (1:13)</p> | <p>Ka atla sa Jehova se ntsogetse (For the hand of Jehovah has risen against me)</p> | <p>Gonne letsogo la ga Jehofa le nkwetse go tlhabana le nna (For the arm of Yahweh has fallen on me to fight against me)</p> | <p>Ka e le fa letsogo la MORENA le nkotlile (For the arm of The LORD has struck me)</p> |
| <p>וַתִּשַׁק עֹרְפָּהּ לְחֻמוֹתֶיהָ וְרוּת דָּבְקָה בָּהּ Orpah kissed her mother-in-law, but Ruth clung to her (1:14)</p> | <p>Mme Orepe a atla matsalaagwe; mme Rute a mo ngaparela (And Orpah kissed her mother-in-law, but Ruth clung to her)</p> | <p>Orepa a atla matsalaagwe; mme Ruthe ene a mo ngaparela (Orpah kissed her mother-in-law; but Ruth clung to her)</p> | <p>Mme Orepha a atla matsalaagwe. Ruthe ene a mo ngaparela (Orpah kissed her mother-in-law. Ruth clung to her)</p> |
| <p>יְבִמְתְּךָ Your sister-in-law (1:15)</p> | <p>Mogwakao (Your sister-in-law)</p> | <p>Mogwakao (Your sister-in-law)</p> | <p>Monnao (Your younger sibling)</p> |
| <p>אֱלֹהֶיהָ Her God or gods (1:15)</p> | <p>Medimo (gods)</p> | <p>Modimo (God)</p> | <p>Modimo (God)</p> |
| <p>שׁוּבִי Return (1:15)</p> | <p>O latele (Go after)</p> | <p>Boa o latele (Return after)</p> | <p>Boa o latele (Return after)</p> |
| <p>שַׁדַּי Shadday (1:20)</p> | <p>Mothata-yotlhe (The Almighty)</p> | <p>Mothatayotlhe (The Almighty)</p> | <p>Mong-wa-thata-yotlhe (He-who-possesses-all-strength)</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| מְלֵאָה Full, complete or rich (1:21) | Tletse (full) | Tletse (full) | Humile (rich) |
| עָנָה בִּי He has testified against me (1:21) | O supa ga me (Testifies about me) | A ntshupile ka go nnyatsa (Pointed at me with contempt) | A supile molato mo go nna (Has pointed out a fault in me) |
| אִישׁ גְּבוּרַת חַיִל A man mighty of wealth (2:1) | [Tsala] ya madi, senatla sa lehumo (Financially well-off, powerful man of wealth) | Senatla se se humileng (A powerful man of wealth) | [Monna] wa senatla yo o humileng (A powerful man of wealth) |
| אֲשֶׁר אֶמְצֵא־חֵן בְּעֵינָיו Anyone in whose eyes I may find favour (2:2) | Yo ke tlaa bonang tsalano matlhong a gagwe (The one in whose eyes I will see friendliness) | Yo ke tlaa bonang botsalano mo matlhong a gagwe (The one in whose eyes I will see friendliness) | Yo ke bonang bopelotlhomogi mo matlhong a gagwe (The one in whose eyes I will see compassion) |
| וַיִּקַּר מִקְרָהָ And her chance happened upon her (2:3) | Mme ga mo dirafalela (And it happened to her) | Mme a tshogana (And by chance) | Mme a dirafalelwa ke letlhogonolo (And she experienced a blessing) |
| הַקְצָרִים Reapers/harvesters (2:3) | Barobi (reapers/harvesters) | Basegi (cutters) | Basegi (cutters) |
| לְמִי הַנְּעָרָה הַזֹּאת For whom is this young woman? (2:5) | Morweetsana yo wa mang? (Whose is this young woman?) | Morweetsana yo ke wa ga mang? (Whose is this young woman?) | Mosetsanyana yole ke wa ga mang? (Whose is that young woman?) |
| זֶה שֹׁבֶתָהּ הַבַּיִת מְעַט This her sitting the house is little (2:7) | A tlhola go le gonnye mo tlung (She stayed a little in the house) | O kile a nna ka lobakanyana mo tlung (She once stayed in the house shortly) | Ga a nne fa fatshe mo tshimong (She does not sit down in the field) |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>וַתִּפֹּל עַל־פְּנֵיהָ וַתִּשְׁתַּחוּ אָרְצָה</p> <p>She fell on her face and bowed herself to the ground (2:10)</p> | <p>Mme a wela ka sefathlago sa gagwe, mme a ikobela fa fatshe (Then she fell on her face and bowed down)</p> | <p>Foo a wela fa fatshe ka sefathlago, a ikobela fa fatshe (Then she fell on her face and bowed down)</p> | <p>A wela fa fatshe ka sefathlago, a ikoba (She fell on her face and humbled herself)</p> |
| <p>נָכְרִיָּה</p> <p>A foreigner (2:10)</p> | <p>Moeng (a guest/foreigner)</p> | <p>Moeng (a guest/foreigner)</p> | <p>Moeng (a guest/foreigner)</p> |
| <p>וְאֶרֶץ מוֹלְדוֹתָּךְ</p> <p>The land of your birth (2:11)</p> | <p>Lefatshe la botsalelo jwa gago (The land/country of your birth)</p> | <p>Lefatshe la gaeno (Your land/country)</p> | <p>Lefatshe la gaeno (Your land/country)</p> |
| <p>יִשְׁלַם יְהוָה</p> <p>May Yahweh reward (2:12)</p> | <p>A Jehova a duelele (May Yahweh reward/repay)</p> | <p>A Jehofa a leboge (May Yahweh thank)</p> | <p>A MORENA a go duelele (May Yahweh reward/repay)</p> |
| <p>דַּבַּרְתָּ עַל־לֵב שְׂפָתְךָ</p> <p>You have spoken to the heart of your servant (2:13)</p> | <p>O buile le lelata la gago ka kobiso pelo (You have talked to your servant with a humble heart)</p> | <p>O buile ka pelonomi le lelata la gago (You talked goodheartedly to your servant)</p> | <p>Wa bua le lelata la gago ka bopelontle (You talked to your servant goodheartedly)</p> |
| <p>בַּהֶמְזִין</p> <p>In the wine vinegar (2:14)</p> | <p>Mo bojalweng jo bo bedileng (In the fermented alcohol)</p> | <p>Mo botšarareng (In the sourness)</p> | <p>Mo motatsweng (In the soup)</p> |
| <p>וְלֹא תִקְלִימוּהָ</p> <p>Do not humiliate her (2:15)</p> | <p>Se mo tlhabiseng ditlhong (Do not humiliate her)</p> | <p>Lo se ka lwa mo omanya (Do not rebuke her)</p> | <p>Se mo tlhabiseng ditlhong (Do not humiliate her)</p> |
| <p>מְכַרְךָ</p> <p>The one who regarded you with favour (2:19)</p> | <p>Yo o go ngokileng (The one who attracted/enticed you)</p> | <p>Monna yo o go tlhokometseng (The man who took care of you)</p> | <p>Yo o go tlhokometseng ka tsalano (Who took care of you with kindness)</p> |
| <p>בָּרוּךְ הוּא לַיהוָה</p> <p>May he be blessed by Yahweh (2:20)</p> | <p>Go segofadiwe Jehova (May Yahweh be blessed)</p> | <p>A a segofadiwe ke Jehofa (May he be blessed by Yahweh)</p> | <p>A a tshegofadiwe ke MORENA (May he be blessed by the LORD)</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| <p>קרוב לנו Our close relative (2:20)</p> | <p>Tsala e e gaufi le rona (A close acquaintance or friend to us)</p> | <p>Lesika la rona yo o gaufi le rona (Our relative who is close to us)</p> | <p>Wa ga etsho (Our relative)</p> |
| <p>ולא יפגעו־בך בשדה אחר And they will not touch you in another field (2:22)</p> | <p>Gore ba se go kgatlhane leoteng le lengwe (So that they do not antagonise you in another field)</p> | <p>Kwa tshimong ya motho yo mongwe o ka tla wa tshwenyega (In another person's field you will be troubled)</p> | <p>Ga o ne o tshwenyega mo masimong a mangwe (You will not be troubled in another field)</p> |
| <p>ותדבק בנערות So she clung to the maidservants (2:23)</p> | <p>Mme a ngaparela barweetsana (So she clung to the maidservants)</p> | <p>Mme a tlhomama mo barweetsaneng (So she was steadfast with the maidservants)</p> | <p>A nna jalo le barweetsana (So she stayed with the maidservants)</p> |
| <p>ותשב את־המטה And she lived with her mother-in-law (2:23)</p> | <p>Mme a nna le matsalaagwe (Then she lived with her mother- in-law)</p> | <p>Mme a aga le matsalaagwe (Then she settled/lived with her mother-in- law)</p> | <p>O ne a ntse a nna le matsalaagwe (She was living with her mother-in-law)</p> |
| <p>הלא אבקש־לך מנוח Must I not seek for you a resting place? (3:1)</p> | <p>A ga nkitla ke go batlela ikhutso? (Will I never seek rest for you?)</p> | <p>A ga o mme ka go senkela boikhutso? (Why don't you let me seek rest for you?)</p> | <p>Kana ke tshwanetse go go batlela legae la boikhutso (Surely, I should seek for you a home for your rest)</p> |
| <p>אשר ייטב־לך That it may be good for you (3:1)</p> | <p>Gore go go lemohalele (So that it may be good for you)</p> | <p>Gore go tle go nne molemo mo go wena (So that it may be well with you)</p> | <p>Gore o phele sentle (So that you may live well)</p> |
| <p>מדעתנו Our relative (3:1)</p> | <p>Tsala ya rona ya madi (Our blood friend/acquaintance)</p> | <p>Wa lesika la rona (Our relative)</p> | <p>Wa ga etsho (Our relative)</p> |
| <p>ורחצת וסכת ושמנת [כ= שמלתך] [ק= שמלתך] עליך Wash, anoint, put your clothing on you</p> | <p>Itlhapise, o tlole, o apare diaparo tsa gago o bo o ye sebuping (Wash yourself, anoint yourself, wear your</p> | <p>Tlhapa, o iphorole, o apare, o ye kwa seboping (Wash, anoint yourself, get dressed)</p> | <p>Tlhapa o iphotle o apare diaparo tsa gago tsa mokgabo (Wash, anoint yourself, dress your</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| (3:3) | clothes) | | best). |
| וַתֹּאמֶר אֵלֶיהָ And she said to her (3:5) | Mme a mo raya a re (And she said to her) | A mo raya a re (She said to her) | Ruthe a mo araba a re (Ruth answered her and said) |
| בְּלֵט Secretly (3:7) | Ka nyanyaelo (Slinking) | Ka bonya (Slowly) | A ngwangwaela (Slinking) |
| כִּי גֹאֵל אַתָּה For you are a <i>goel</i> (3:9) | Gonne o morekolodi (Because you are a redeemer) | Gonne o wa losika gaufi le rona ka go tsalwa (For you are our relative close to us by birth). | Gonne ke wena mogolodi (Because you are a redeemer) |
| אִם יִגְאָלְךָ If he will <i>gaal</i> you, good (3:13) | Fa a go rekolola, go siam e a a rekolole (If he redeems you, alright, let him redeem) | Fa a tla go direla tshwanelo ya monna wa losika, go tlaa nna molemo (If he will perform the right of the kinsman for you, it will be good) | Fa a ka go golola, go siam e, aa go golole! (If he redeems you, alright, let him redeem you) |
| וַתִּקָּם [כ= בְּטָרוֹם] [ק=] בְּטָרוֹם] יָכִיר אִישׁ אֶת־רֵעֵהוּ And she arose before a man could see another/recognise his companion (3:14) | Mme a tsoga pele ga mongwe a ise a ngoke yo mongwe (And she rose before someone nudged another) | Mme a tsoga bosigo bo ise bo se mo batho ba ka lemoganang (She arose before the night had passed to the extent that people could recognise each other) | Mme a tsoga phakela go ise go bonale (And she arose in the morning before it was light) |
| שֵׁשׁ־הַשְּׁעָרִים הָאֵלֶּה נָתַן לִי These six measures of barley he gave me (3:17) | Dilekanyo di le sekese tse tsa barele o di nneile (These six measures of barley he gave to me) | A nnaya dielo tse thataro tse, tsa barele (The gave me these six measures of barley) | O mphile dielo di le thataro tseo tsa garase (The gave me those six measures of barley) |
| סֵלֶנְיָנָא אֶלְמָנִי So and so (4:1) | Selenyana (So-and-so) | Semangmang (So- and-so) | Mangmang (So-and- so) |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p>וְאִם־לֹא יִגְאֹל</p> <p>But if you do not redeem (<i>gaal</i>) it (4:4)</p> | <p>Mme fa o sa le rekolole (But if you do not redeem it)</p> | <p>Fa o gana go se rekolola (If you refuse to redeem it)</p> | <p>Fa o sa rate go e rekolola (If you do not want to redeem it)</p> |
| <p>כִּי אֵין זֹולָתְךָ לְגֹאֹל וְאֲנִי אֶחְרִיךְ</p> <p>For there is none to redeem (<i>gaal</i>) it except you, and I am after you (4:4)</p> | <p>Gonne go se ope yo o tshwanetseng go le rekolola, fa e se wena, le nna, yo ke leng morago ga gago (For there is none to redeem it except you and I who am after you)</p> | <p>Gonne ga go na ope yo o ka se rekololang kwa ntle ga gago; nna ke tla morago ga gago (For there is none to redeem it except you; I am after you)</p> | <p>Gonne ga go na ope yoo ka e rekololang fa e se wena le nna yo ke fa morago ga gago (For there is no one to redeem it except you and I who am after you).</p> |
| <p>בְּיוֹם־קְנוֹתְךָ הַשָּׂדֶה מִיַּד נָעֻמִי וּמֵאֵת רוּת הַמּוֹאָבִיָּה אֲשֶׁת־הַמֵּת [כ= קְנִיתִי] [ק= קְנִיתָה]</p> <p>When you acquire the field from Naomi/and from Ruth the Moabitess/ you must acquire Ruth the Moabitess, the wife of the deceased</p> <p>Or</p> <p>When you acquire the field from Naomi then I acquire Ruth the Moabitess, the wife of the deceased (4:5)</p> | <p>Motsing o o rekang leota atlang sa Naomi, o le reke le go Rute wa semoaba, mosadi wa moswi (When you buy the field from the hand of Naomi, buy it also from Ruth the Moabitess, the wife of the deceased)</p> | <p>Tsatsing le o rekang lotlhagare mo seatlang sa ga Naomi, o na le go se reka le mo go Ruthe wa Momoabe, mosadi wa moswi (The day you buy the field from the hand of Naomi, you also need to buy it from the hand of Ruth the Moabitess, the wife of the deceased)</p> | <p>Ka tsatsi le o rekang tshimo eo mo diatlang tsa ga Naomi ka lone, o bile o amogela le Ruthe wa Moabe, mosadi wa moswi (The day you buy that field from the hands of Naomi, you also receive Ruth the Moabitess, the wife of the deceased)</p> |
| <p>לְהָקִים שְׁמֵה־הַמֵּת עַל־נַחֲלָתוֹ</p> <p>In order to raise up the name of the deceased over his inheritance (4:5)</p> | <p>Go tsoetsa leina la moswi bosweng jwa gagwe (To raise the name of the deceased into his inheritance)</p> | <p>Go tsoa leina la moswi mo bosweng jwa gagwe (To raise the name of the deceased in his inheritance)</p> | <p>Gore o tsose leina la moswi mo bosweng jwa gagwe (To raise the name of the deceased in his inheritance)</p> |
| <p>לֹא אֹכֵל [כ= לְגֹאֹל] [ק= לְגֹאֹל]־לִי</p> | <p>Ga nkake ka le ithekololela (I refuse to</p> | <p>Ga nkake ka se rekolola (I refuse to</p> | <p>Ke palelwa ke go e ithekololela (I am unable/I am failing</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| I cannot redeem (gaal) it (4:6) | redeem it for myself) | redeem it) | to redeem it for myself) |
| וְזֹאת לְפָנִים בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל עַל־ הַגְּאוּלָּה וְעַל־הַתְּמוּרָה לְמִנִּים כָּל־דָּבָר And this formerly in Israel concerning redemption and concerning a transfer to ratify every matter (4:7) | Mo e ne e le mokgwa mo Baiseraeleng metlha e e fetileng ka ga thekololo le ka ga kananyo, go tlhomamisa dilo tsothle (This was the custom among Israelites in former times concerning redemption and exchange, to certify all things) | Gale mo Iseraele, mokgwa wa go rekolola le wa go ananya, go tlhomamisa dilo tsothle, e ne e le o: (Formerly in Israel, the custom of redemption and exchange, to certify all things was this:) | Jaanong mo metlheng ya pele, go ne go le mokgwa mo Iseraele wa gore: fa go rekollwa gongwe go ananngwa, e le go tlhomamisa mafoko aotlhe (Now, in former times in Israel, there was a custom in Israel that: during redemption or exchange, to certify all procedure) |
| שָׁלַף אִישׁ בַּעֲלוֹ וְנָתַן לְרֵעֵהוּ A man removed his sandal and gave [it] to his companion/gave it to another (4:7) | Monna a rola setlhako sa gagwe a se naya mong ka ene (A man took off his shoe and gave it to his neighbour) | Motho o ne a tle a role setlhako, mme a se neye wa ga gabo (A person would take off his shoe and give it to his relative) | Motho a role setlhako sa gagwe a se neele mongwe ka ene (A person took off his shoe and gave it to his neighbour) |
| אִשְׁתׁ מַחְלוֹן Mahlon's widow (4:10) | Mosadi wa ga Mahelone, ke mo rekile (Mahlon's wife, I bought her) | Mosadi wa ga Mahelone, ke mo rekile (Mahlon's wife, I have bought her) | Ke tsaya [...] mosadi wa ga Magelone (I take [...] the wife of Mahlon) |
| וְעָשָׂה־חֵיל בְּאַפְרָתָה that you may do/achieve might/moral value/wealth in Ephrathah (4:11) | A a mo atlametlise mo Eferata (May he make him great in Ephrathah) | O dire mo go tshwanetseng mo Eferata (Do the right thing in Ephrathah) | Dira tse dikgolo mo Eferatha (Do greatness in Ephrathah) |
| וְיִקְרָא שְׁמוֹ May his name be called (4:14) | Yo leina la gagwe le tumisiwang (Whose name is being made famous) | A leina la gagwe le itsege (May his name be well-known) | A leina la gagwe le tumisiwe (May his name be made famous) |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>לְמַשִּׁיב נְפֶשׁ וּלְכֹלֵל אֶת־ שִׁבְתָּךְ</p> <p>Restorer of life and a nourisher of your old age (4:15)</p> | <p>Motshidisi wa gago, mme o tla a go o tla botsofeng jwa gago (Your reviver, he will nurture you in your old age)</p> | <p>Morudisi wa botshelo, le mootli wa botsofe jwa gago (The reviver of life, and the nourisher of your old age)</p> | <p>Yo o go lapolosang pelo, yo o go tlamelang mo botsofeng jwa gago (Who will refresh your heart, who will nurture you in your old age)</p> |
| <p>וַתִּשְׁתְּהוּ בְחֵיקָהּ</p> <p>She laid him in her lap/bosom (4:16)</p> | <p>A mo fara (She laid him in her lap)</p> | <p>A mmaya mo sehubeng sa gagwe (She laid him in her bosom)</p> | <p>A mo fara (She laid him in her lap)</p> |
| <p>וַתְּהִי־לוֹ לְאֹמָנָה</p> <p>And she became his nurse (4:16)</p> | <p>A nna mootli wa gagwe (She became his nourisher)</p> | <p>A nna mmelegi wa gagwe (She became his caretaker)</p> | <p>A nna mmelegi wa gagwe (She became his caretaker)</p> |

Bibliography

Alfredo, J. M. 2010. *ገገ and Ikharari: The Book of Ruth from a Lomwe Perspective*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University.

Alverson, H. 1978. *Mind in the Heart of Darkness: Value and Self-Identity among the Tswana of Southern Africa*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Amanze, J. N. 1998. *African Christianity in Botswana: The Case of African Independent Churches*. Gweru, Zimbabwe: Mambo Press.

Andre, G. 2003. ገገ. In Botterweck, G. J., Ringgren, H. and Fabry, H. -J. (editors), *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. 11, 50-63. Grand Rapids, Michigan and Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Baebele ee Boitshepo. 1992. Cape Town: Bible Society of South Africa.

Baer, D. A. and Gordon R. P. 1997. ገገ. In VanGemeren, W. A. (editor.). *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* Vol. 2, 211-218. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing.

Bandia, P. 2001. African Tradition. In Baker, M. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 295-304. London and New York: Routledge.

Beattie, D. R. G. 1974. The Book of Ruth as Evidence for Israelite Legal Practice. *Vetus Testamentum*, 24 (3), 251-267. Retrieved March 28, 2013 from the World Wide Web: www.jstor.org/stable/1517452.

Beibele. 1970. Cape Town: Bible Society of South Africa.

Beibele. 1987. Cape Town: Bible Society of South Africa.

Bernstein, M. J. 1982. Ruth, Book of. In Douglas, J. D. and Hillyer, N. (editors). *New Bible Dictionary* (second edition), 1040-1042. Leicester and Wheaton: Intervarsity Press and Tyndale House Publishers, Inc.

Beyse, K. -M. 1986. רֹּחַ. In Botterweck, G. J., Ringgren, H. and Fabry, H. -J. (editors), *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. 10, 72-76. Grand Rapids, Michigan and Cambridge, UK: William Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Bibela ea Boitsepho ee Cutseng Kholagano e Kholugolu le e Nca, tse ri Hetolecoeng mo Puon ea Sechuana. 1857. London: British and Foreign Bible Society.

Bibela ee Boitshupo. 1908. London: British and Foreign Bible Society.

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. 1990. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Block, D. I. (1999). Judges, Ruth. *The New American Commentary*, Vol. 6. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers. Exported from Logos Bible Software, 28 January 2014.

Block, D. I. 2008. Ruth I: Book of. *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Wisdom, Poetry and Writings*, 672-687. Downer's Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity Academic Press.

Botterweck, G. J. 1990. רֹּחַ. In Botterweck, G. J. and Ringgren, H. (editors), *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. 6, 76-81. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Breutz, P. L. 1956. *The Tribes of Mafikeng District*. Pretoria: Department of Native Affairs. Ethnological Publications, No. 32.

Breutz, P. L. 1968. *The Tribes of the Districts of Taung and Herbert*. Pretoria: Department of Native Affairs. Ethnological Publications, No. 48.

Brown, J. T. 1925. *Among the Bantu Nomads: A Record of Forty Years Spent among the Bechuana, a Numerous and Famous Branch of the Central South African Bantu, with the*

First Full Description of their Ancient Customs, Manners and Beliefs. London: Seeley Service.

Brown, F., Driver, S. R. and Briggs, C. A. 1907. *The New Brown, Driver, Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament Based on the Lexicon of William Gesenius.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Brown, J. T. 1980. *Setswana Dictionary: Setswana-English and English-Setswana.* Johannesburg, South Africa: Pula Press.

Brummerhoff, O. 1959. *Report on Translation Work on Central Setswana.* Cape Town: The British and Foreign Bible Society.

Brummerhoff, O. 1961. *Report on the Work of the Central Setswana Translation Committee.* Cape Town: The British and Foreign Bible Society.

Brummerhoff, O. 1964. *Tswana (Central) Final report.* Cape Town: The British and Foreign Bible Society.

Burke, D. G. 2007. The First Versions: The Septuagint, the Targums, and the Latin. In Noss, P. A. (editor), *A History of Bible Translation*, 59-89. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

Bush, F. W. 1996/1998. Ruth, Esther. *Word Biblical Commentary*, Vol. 9. Dallas, Texas: Word Books Publisher.

Carson, D. A. 1993. New Bible Translations: An Assessment and Prospect. In Kee, H. C. *The Bible in the Twenty-First Century.* New York: American Bible Society.

Catford, J. C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics.* London: Oxford University Press.

Cryer, N. 1979. *Bibles Across the World.* London; Oxford: Mowbray.

Chebanne, A., Mokitimi, M., Matlosa, L., Nakin, R., Nkolola, M. W., Mokgoatshana, S. and Machobane, M. 2003. *The Standard Unified Orthography for Sotho/Tswana Languages: (Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia, South Africa, Zambia and Zimbabwe)*. Monograph Series No. 31. Cape Town: The Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society (CASAS).

Coldham, G. E. 1966. *A Bibliography of Scriptures in African Languages*. London: The British and Foreign Bible Society.

Coldham, G. E. 1975. *Supplement (1964-1974) to A Bibliography of Scriptures in African Languages (BFBS, London, 1966)*. London: The British and Foreign Bible Society.

Cole, D. T. 1955. *An Introduction to Tswana Grammar*. London: Longmans and Green.

Collins English Dictionary. 1999. Glasgow: HarperCollins Publishers.

Comaroff, J. 1980. Healing and the Cultural Order: The Case of the Barolong Boo Ratshidi of Southern Africa. *American Ethnologist*, 7 (4), 637-657. Retrieved November 10, 2012 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/643474>.

Conklin, B. 2011. *Oath Formulas in Biblical Hebrew*. Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic 5. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

Conrad, J. 1980. אָוֶן. In Botterweck, G. J. and Ringgren, H. -J. (editors), *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. 4, 122-124. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Cotterell, P. 1997. Linguistics, Meaning, Semantics, and Discourse Analysis. In VanGemenen, W. A. (editor). *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, 134-160. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Croft, W. and Cruse, D. A. 2004. *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge, New York and Madrid: Cambridge University Press.

Cuyckens, H. and Geeraerts, D. 2007. *Introducing Cognitive Linguistics*. In Geeraerts, D. and Cuyckens, H. (editors), *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*, 1-21. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

De Blois, R. 2004. *Lexicography and Cognitive Linguistics: Hebrew Metaphors from a Cognitive Perspective*. DavarLogos. Retrieved February 25, 2012 from the World Wide Web: http://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/dfichero_articulo?codigo=2313980&orden=84210.

De Blois, R. 2006. *Semantic Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*. Reading: United Bible Societies.

Dent, G. R. 1992. *Compact Setswana Dictionary*. Pietermaritzburg, Cape Town and Johannesburg: Shuter and Shooter.

De Waard, J. and Nida, E. A. 1973/1991. *A Translator's Handbook on the Book of Ruth*. London and New York: United Bible Societies.

De Waard, J. and E. A. Nida. 1986. *From One Language to Another. Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

Dommershausen, W. 1995. מִשְׁפָּחָהּ. In Botterweck, G. J., Ringgren, H. and Fabry, H. -J. (editors), *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. 7, 229-231. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Duggan-Cronin, A. M. 1929. *The Bechuana: The Bantu Tribes of South Africa: Reproductions of Photographic Studies*. Kimberley and Cambridge: Deighton and Bell and Company.

Encyclopaedia Britannica Online. 2014. <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/174607/Dutch-Reformed-Mission-Church-in-South-Africa>

Endi. 2012. *Drought in Botswana Claims Over 10 000 Cattle*. China.Org.Cn. Retrieved March 15, 2013 from the World Wide Web: http://www.china.org.cn/world/Off_the_Wire/2012-12/21/content_27475191.htm.

Evans, V. 2006. Lexical Concepts, Cognitive Models and Meaning-construction. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 17, 491-534.

Evans, V. and Green, M. 2006. *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

Fabry, H. J. 1995. מִלֵּךְ. In Botterweck, G. J., Ringgren, H. and Fabry, H. -J. (editors), *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. 7, 521-529. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Fillmore, C. J. 2006. Frame Semantics. In Geeraerts, D. (editor), *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings*, 373-400. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Geeraerts, D. 2006. A Rough Guide to Cognitive Linguistics. In Geeraerts, D. (editor), *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings*, 1-28. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Geeraerts, D. 2010. *Theories of Lexical Semantics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Goffman, E. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organisation of Experience*. Cambridge and Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Gower, R. 2004. The New Manners and Customs of Bible Times. *BibleWorks 7*. CD-Rom 2005. Norfolk: BibleWorks.

Gutt, E. A. 2000. *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*. Second Edition. Manchester and Boston: St Jerome Publishing.

Gutt, E. A. 2004. Challenges of Metarepresentation to Translation Competence. Pre-publication draft of article published in Fleischmann, E., Schmitt, P. A. and Wotjak, G. (editors). *Translationskompetenz. Tagungsberichte der LICTRA (Leipzig International Conference on Translation Studies 4.- 6.10.200, 77-89*. Stauffenberg: Tübingen.

Haag, H. 1975. ןַז. In Botterweck, G. J. and Ringgren, H. (editors), *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. 2, 145-159. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Haram, L. 1991. Tswana Medicine in Interaction with Biomedicine. *Social Science Medicine*, 33 (2), 167-175. Retrieved November 11, 2012 from the World Wide Web: http://ac.els-cdn.com/027795369190177E/1-s2.0-027795369190177E-main.pdf?_tid=77d3691c-2b7a-11e2-8c87-00000aab0f26&acdnat=1352581757_f69e26247331486b51b1017a2b31c487.

Hartshorne, K. B., Swart, J. H. J. and Rantao, B. J. 1984. *Dictionary of Basic English Tswana*. Johannesburg: Educum Publishers.

Hawthorn, T. 1960. *Letter to Rev. J. T. M. de Jong van Arkel*. Cape Town: The British and Foreign Bible Society.

Helfmeyer, F. J. 1974. ךֿאָ. In Botterweck, G. J. and Ringgren, H. (editors), *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. 1, 204-207. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Hermanson, E. A. 2002. *A Brief Overview of Bible Translation in South Africa*. *Acta Theologica Supplementum*, 2, 8-18.

Hjort, J. 2010. Precolonial Culture, Postcolonial Economic Success? The Tswana and the African Economic Miracle. *Economic History Preview*, 63 (3), 688-709. Retrieved November 11, 2012 from the World Wide Web: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.ez.sun.ac.za/doi/10.1111/j.1468-0289.2009.00495.x/pdf>.

Holz-Mäntärri, J. 1984. *Translational Action: Theory and Method*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

Hubbard, R. L. 1988. *The Book of Ruth: The New International Commentary of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Hubbard, R. L. 1997. רָלָה. In VanGemenen, W. A. (editor). *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Vol. 2, 796-797. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing.

Index Mundi. 2012. *Botswana Population*. Retrieved February 25, 2013 from the World Wide Web <http://www.indexmundi.com/botswana/population.html>.

Irwin, B. P. 2008. Ruth 3: History of Interpretation: In Longman, T. and Enns, P. (editors), *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Wisdom, Poetry and Writings*, 693-699. Nottingham, England: Intervarsity Press.

Jinbachian, M. 2007. Introduction: The Septuagint to the Vernaculars. In Noss, P. A. (editor), *A History of Bible Translation*, 29-57. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

Jones, J. D., Reyneke, J. L. and Sandilands, A. 1989. *The History of the Setswana Bible*. Cape Town: Bible Society of South Africa.

Jones, J. D. 1975. *Setswana Orthography: An Open Letter*. Cape Town: Bible Society of South Africa. Unpublished Letter.

Katan, D. 2004. *Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and mediators*. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

Kellermann, D. 1975. רָלָה. In Botterweck, G. J. and Ringgren, H. (editors), *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. 2, 339-449. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Koehler, L. and Baumgartner, W. 2000. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Brill: New York.

Kooijman, K. F. M. 1978. *Social and Economic Change in a Tswana Village*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Leiden: Afrika-Studiecentrum.

Kroeze, J. H., Van den Heever, M. and Van Rooy, B. 2011. Just How Literal is the King James Version? *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*, 37 (1), 27-52.

Kruger, C. J. H. 2006. *Introduction to the Morphology of Setswana*. LINCOM Studies in African Linguistics. Munich: LINCOM Europa.

LaCoque, A. 2004. *Ruth: A Continental Commentary*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press.

Le Roux, J. C. 1991. Tswana/English/Afrikaans. In Reinierse, C. (editor), *South African Multi-Language Dictionary and Phrase Book: English Afrikaans Northern Sotho Sesotho Tswana Xhosa Zulu*, 321-368. Cape Town, South Africa: Reader's Digest Association South Africa.

Lehman, H. 1974. *150 Jahre Berliner Mission*. Erlangen.
en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Berlin_Missionary_Society#cite_Note-2.

Lewis, M. P. (editor), 2009. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*, 16th edition. Dallas, Tex.: SIL International. Retrieved February 25, 2013 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.ethnologue.com/>.

Lichtenstein, W. H. C. 1973. *Foundation of the Cape: About the Bechuanas*. Cape Town: A. A. Balkema.

Lipinski, E. 2004. אֱלֹהִים. In Botterweck, G. J., Ringgren, H. and Fabry, H. -J. (editors), *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. 13, 58-65. Grand Rapids, Michigan and Cambridge: William Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Louw, J.P. and Nida, E.A. 1988. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. New York: UBS.

Langacker, R. W. 2007: Cognitive Grammar. In Geeraerts, D. and Cuyckens, H. (editors), *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*, 421-462. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Loba-Mkole, J.C. 2008. History and Theory of Scripture Translations. *Acta Patristica et Byzantine*, 19 (1), 253-266.

L.M.S. 1814. *The Report of the Directors*. London: Williams and Son.

Lubbe, J. J. 2009. "By Patience, Labour and Prayer. The Voice of the Unseen God in the Language of the Bechuana Nation." A Reflection on the History of Robert Moffat's Setswana Bible (1857). *Acta Theologica Supplementum*, 12, 16-32.

Makutoane, T. J. and Naude, J. A. 2009. Colonial Interference in the Translations of the Bible into Southern Sotho. *Acta Theologica Supplementum*, 12, 79-94.

Mason, I. 2001. Communicative/Functional Approaches. In Baker, M. (editor), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 29-32. London and New York: Routledge.

Masubelele, M. R. 2009. Missionary Interventions in Zulu Religious Practices: The Term for the Supreme Being. *Acta Theologica Supplementum*, 12, 63-78.

Mbuwayesango, D. R. 2001. How Local Divine Powers were Suppressed: A Case of Mwari of the Shona. In Dube, M. W. *Other Ways of Reading: African Women and the Bible*, 63-77. Atlanta and Geneva: Society of Biblical Literature and WCC Publications.

Merrill, E. H. 1985. The Book of Ruth: Narration and Shared Themes. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April-June, 130-141.

Metzger, B. M. 2001. *The Bible in Translation: Ancient and English Versions*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.

Mgadla, P. T. 2003. *A History of Education in the Bechuanaland Protectorate to 1965*. Lanham, New York, Oxford: University Press of America.

Moffat, R. 1842. *Missionary Labours and Scenes in Southern Africa*. London: John Snow, Paternoster-Row.

Moffat, J. S. 1889. *The Lives of Robert and Mary Moffat*. London: T. Fisher Unwin, Paternoster Square.

Moffat, R. 1951. *Apprenticeship at Kuruman: Being the Journals and Letters of Robert and Mary Moffat, 1820-1828* (edited by Isaac Schapera). London: Chatto and Windus.

Mogapi, K. 1991. *Ngwao ya Setswana*. Mabopane: Sikwane Publishers.

Mojola, A. O. 2002. Bible Translation in Africa: What Implication Does the New UBS Approach Have for Africa? An Overview in the Light of Emerging New UBS Translation Initiative. *Acta Theologica Supplementum*, 2, 200-213.

Mojola, A. O. 2004. Postcolonial Translation Theory and the Swahili Bible. In York, G. L. O. R. and Renju, P. M. (editors), *Bible Translation and African Languages*. Nairobi, Kenya: Acton Publishers.

Mojola, A. O. 2007. The Bible in Africa. In Noss, P. A. (editor), *A History of Bible Translation*, 141-162. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

Moore, E. 2008. Ruth 2: Ancient Near Eastern Background. In Longman, T. and Enns, P. (editors), *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Wisdom, Poetry and Writings*, 687-693. Nottingham, England: Intervarsity Press.

Morapedi, W. G. 1999. Migrant Labour and Peasantry in the Bechuanaland Protectorate, 1930-1965. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 197-214. 25 (2), June. Retrieved November 11, 2012 from the World Wide Web: <http://web.ebscohost.com.ez.sun.ac.za/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=139b34b8-f70a-402f-ac7a-c7cc386a23e1%40sessionmgr12&vid=2&hid=14>.

Muller, K. O. E. 1958. Report on the Translation of the Bible into Central Tswana during the Years 1929, 1939 and 1950 to 1958 by a Translating Commission. Cape Town: The British and Foreign Bible Society.

Munday, J. 2008. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications* (second edition). London and New York: Routledge.

Naude, J. A. 2005. The Shaping of Cultural Knowledge in South African Translation, *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics*, 36, 35-58.

Nida, E. A. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Nida, E. A. and Taber, C. R. 1969. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill.

Nida, E. A. 1992. Theories of Translation. In Freedman, D. N. (editor), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 512-515. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney and Auckland: Doubleday.

Niehr, H. 2006. טַפְּשׁוֹ. In Botterweck, G. J., Ringgren, H. and Fabry, H. -J. (editors), *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. 15, 411-431. Grand Rapids, Michigan and Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Nord, C. 1997. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

Nord, C. 2005. *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis*. Amsterdam and New York: Editions Rodopi.

Nord, C. 2011. *Defining Translation Functions: The Translation Brief as a Guideline for the Trainee Translator*. Retrieved August 15, 2011 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/39090525/NORD>.

Noss, P. A. 1998. Scripture Translation in Africa: The State of the Art. *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*, 24 (2), 63-67.

Ntloedibe-Kuswani, G. S. 2006. Translating the Divine: The Case of Modimo in the Setswana Bible. In Dube, M. W. (editor). *Other Ways of Reading: African Women and the Bible*, 78-97. Atlanta and Geneva: Society of Biblical Literature and WCC Publications.

Ntseane, P. G. 2004. *Cultural Dimensions of Sexuality: Empowerment Challenge for HIV/AIDS Prevention in Botswana*. Paper presented at the International Seminar/Workshop on “Learning and Empowerment: Key Issues in Strategies for HIV/AIDS Prevention held in Chiangmai, Thailand, March 1-5, 2004. Retrieved September 10, 2011 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.unesco.org/education/uie/pdf/Ntseane.pdf>.

O’Connell, R. H. 1997. מִלֵּוֹעַ. In VanGemenen, W. A. (editor). *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Vol. 2, 854-855. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing. 854-855.

Oikonomou, E. B. 1995. לֵוִי. In Botterweck, G. J., Ringgren, H. and Fabry, H. -J. (editors), *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. 7, 543-546. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Otto, E. 2006. שְׁעָרַי. In Botterweck, G. J., Ringgren, H. and Fabry, H. -J. (editors), *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. 15, 359-405. Grand Rapids, Michigan and Cambridge, UK: William Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Orlinsky, H. M. and Bratcher, R. G. 1991. *A History of Bible Translation and the North American Contribution*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholar Press.

Palmer, G. B. 1996. *Toward a Theory of Cultural Linguistics*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Palumbo, G. 2009. *Key Terms in Translation Studies*. London and New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

- Pattermore, S. 2007. Framing Nida: The Relevance of Translation Theory in the United Bible Societies. In Noss, P. A. (editor), *A History of Bible Translation*, 217-263. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.
- Pilch, J. J. 1999. *The Cultural Dictionary of the Bible*. Collegeville, Minnesota Liturgical Press.
- Pym, A. 2010. *Exploring Translation Theories*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Reyneke, J. L. 1987. *The Tswana (Central) Bible (Revised in 1987)*. Cape Town: Bible Society of South Africa. Unpublished Letter.
- Ringgren, H. 1975. לָּאָלָּ. In Botterweck, G. J. and Ringgren, H. (editors), *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. 2, 350-355. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Sandilands, A. 1953. *Introduction to Tswana Grammar*. Tigerkloof, Cape Town, South Africa: The London Missionary Society.
- Sasson, J. M. 1979. *Ruth: A New Translation with a Philological Commentary and a Formalist-Folklorist Interpretation*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Schaffner, C. 2009a. Action (Theory of Translatorial Action). In Baker, M. and Saldhana, G. (editors), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 3-5. London and New York: Routledge.
- Schaffner, C. 2009b. Functionalist Approaches. In Baker, M. and Saldanha, G. (editors), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 115-121. London and New York: Routledge.
- Schaffner, C. 2009c. Skopos Theory. In Baker, M. and Saldhana, G. (editors), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 235-238. London and New York: Routledge.

Schapera, I. 1952. *The Ethnic Composition of Tswana Tribes*. London School of Economics and Political Science. Monographs on Social Anthropology, No. 11, London and New York: University of London, The Athlone Press and Humanities Press.

Schapera, I. 1970. *Tribal Innovators: Tswana Chiefs and Social Change, 1795-1940*. London School of Economics Monographs on Social Anthropology, No. 43. London and New York: University of London, The Athlone Press and Humanities Press.

Schapera, I. 1984. *The Tswana*. London: Kegan Paul International.

Schapera, I. 1994. *A Handbook of Tswana Law and Custom: Compiled for the Bechuanaland Protectorate Administration*. Munster, Hamburg: LIT Verlag.

Schapera, I. and Comaroff, J. L. 1991. *The Tswana*. Revised edition. London and New York: Kegan Paul International and International African Institute.

Setiloane, G. M. 1976. *The Image of God Among the Sotho-Tswana*. Rotterdam: A. A. Balkema.

Shillington, K. 1985. *The Colonisation of the Southern Tswana 1870-1900*. Johannesburg: Ravan.

Smit, A. P. 1970. *God Made It Grow: History of the Bible Society Movement in Southern Africa 1820-1970*. Cape Town: The Bible Society of South Africa.

Smith, K. 2002. Translation as Secondary Communication: The Relevance Theory Perspective of Ernst-August Gutt. *Acta Theologica Supplementum*, 2, 107-117. Bloemfontein: University of the Free State. Retrieved May 30, 2012 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.ajol.info/index.php/actat/article/viewFile/5456/29594>.

Snell-Hornby, M. 2006. *The Turns of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Snyman, J. W., Shole, J. H. J. and Le Roux, J. C. 1990. *Dikisinare ya Setswana English Afrikaans Dictionary Woordeboek*. Pretoria, South Africa: Via Afrika Limited.

Sperber, D., and Wilson, D. 1995. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sterk, J. P. 2004. Bible Translation in Africa: Keeping up with the Times. In Yorke, G. L. O. R. and Renju, P. M. (editors), *Bible Translation and African Languages*. Nairobi, Kenya: Acton Publishers.

Stoebe, H. J. 1997. $\tau\upsilon\pi$. In Jenni, E. and Westermann, C. (editors). *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. 2. Massachusetts: Hendrickson. 449-464.

Sundkler, B. and Steed, C. 2000. *A History of the Church in Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swanson, J. 1997. *A Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains: Hebrew Old Testament*. Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems.

Taylor, J., R. 2003. *Linguistic Categorisation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

The Geneva Bible. 1560. Geneva: Tolle Lege Press. Logos Research Systems. Exported from Logos Bible Software, 15 November 2012.

The Good News Bible. 1976. New York: Bible Societies, HarperCollins. Logos Research Systems. Exported from Logos Bible Software, 15 November 2012.

The King James Version. 1611. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons. Logos Research Systems. Exported from Logos Bible Software, 15 November 2012.

The New American Bible. 1970. Patterson, New Jersey: St. Anthony Guild Press. Logos Research Systems. Exported from Logos Bible Software, 15 November 2012.

The New American Standard Version. 1971. California: Lockman Foundation. Logos Research Systems. Exported from Logos Bible Software, 15 November 2012.

The New English Translation. 2006. Bellingham: Biblical Studies Press. Logos Research Systems. Exported from Logos Bible Software, 15 November 2012.

The New International Version. 1978. Michigan and London: Zondervan and Hodder and Stoughton. Logos Research Systems. Exported from Logos Bible Software, 15 November 2012.

The New King James Version. 1982. Nashville: Thomas Nelson. Logos Research Systems. Exported from Logos Bible Software, 15 November 2012.

The New Revised Standard Version. 1995. USA: National Council of the Churches of Christ. Logos Research Systems. Exported from Logos Bible Software, 15 November 2012.

Togarasei, L. 2009. The Shona Bible and the Politics of Bible Translation. *Studies in World Christianity*, 52-64. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Toury, G. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Toury, G. 2000. The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation. In Venutti, L. (editor). *The Translation Studies Reader*, 198-211. London and New York: Routledge.

Tswana Terminology and Orthography. No. 3. 1972. Pretoria: The Government Printer. South Africa Department of Bantu Education.

Tswana: Memo of Conversation with the Rev. A. W. Sandilands, L. M. S., 29.12.60. Cape Town: British and Foreign Bible Society.

Trible, P. 1992. Ruth, Book of. In Freedman, D. N., Herion, G. A., Graf, D. F., Pleins, J. D., Beck, A. B., Schmitz, P. C. and Barkley, L. (editors). *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Vol. 5, 842-847. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney and Auckland: A.B.D. Doubleday.

Ullin, P. R. 1975. *The Traditional Healer of Botswana in a Changing Society*. Botswana Notes and Records, Vol. 7, 95-102. Retrieved November 10, 2012 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40979430>

University of Botswana 2001. *The Sound System of Setswana*. Retrieved February 27, 2013 from the World Wide Web http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tswana_language#CITEREFUniversity_of_Botswana2001.

Ungerer, F. and Schmid, H. J. 1996. *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. London and New York: Longman.

Van Arkel, J. T. M. de Jong. 1956. *Tswana Conference: Minutes of the Proceedings of the Conference held in Johannesburg, 18 September 1956*. Cape Town: British and Foreign Bible Society.

Van Arkel, J. T. M. de Jong. 1960a. *Tswana: Letter to Rev. T. Hawthorn*. Cape Town: The British and Foreign Bible Society.

Van Arkel, J. T. M. de Jong. 1960b. *Letter to Rev. H. K. Moulton*. Cape Town: The British and Foreign Bible Society.

Van der Merwe, C. H. J. 1999. The Elusive Biblical Hebrew Term קָדָשׁ : A Perspective in Terms of Its Syntax, Semantics and Pragmatics in 1 Samuel. *Hebrew Studies*, 40, 83-114.

Van der Merwe, C. H. J. 2004. Towards a Principled Working Model for Biblical Hebrew Lexicography. *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*, 30 (1), 119-137. Retrieved April 5, 2012 from the World Wide Web: http://search.sabinet.co.za.ez.sun.ac.za/WebZ/images/ejour/semlang/semlang_v30_n1_a8.pdf?sessionid=01-59462-1182565785&format=F.

Van der Merwe, C. H. J. 2006. Biblical Exegesis, Cognitive Linguistics and Hypertext. In Lemaire, A. (editor), *Congress Volume, Leiden 2004*, 255-280, *Vetus Testamentum* 109. Leiden: Brill.

Van der Merwe, C. H. J. 2012. The Bible in Afrikaans: A Direct Translation – A New Type of Church Bible. *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 68 (1), Art. # 1204, 8 pages. Retrieved October 11, 2012 from the World Wide Web: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v68i1.1204>.

Van der Merwe, C. H. J., Naudé, J. A. and Kroeze, J. H. 2002. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*. London: Sheffield Academic Press.

Van der Merwe, D. F. and Schapera, I. 1943. *A Comparative Study of Kgalagadi, Kwena and Other Sotho Dialects*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town.

Van Steenberg, G. J. 2002. *Semantics, Worldview and Bible Translation: An Integrated Analysis of a Selection of Hebrew Lexical Items Referring to Negative Behaviour in the Book of Isaiah*. Doctoral dissertation. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University.

Van Wolde, E. 1997. *Ruth and Naomi*. London: SCM Press Ltd.

Van Wolde, E. 2009. *Reframing Biblical Studies: When Language and Text Meet Culture, Cognition and Context*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

Vermeer, H. J. 2004. Skopos and Commission in Translational Action. In Venuti, L. (editor), *The Translation Studies Reader*, 221-232. London and New York: Routledge.

Waltke, B. K. and O'Connor, M. 1990. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

Wendland, E. R. 1987. *The Cultural Factor in Bible Translation: A Study of Communicating the Word of God in a Central African Cultural Context*. London, New York and Stuttgart: United Bible Societies.

Wendland, E. R. 1988. Structural Symmetry and Its Significance in the Book of Ruth. In Stine, P. C. (editor), *Issues in Bible Translation*. UBS Monograph Series 3. London, New York, Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, pp. 30-63.

Wendland, E. R. 2002. Towards a Literary Translation of the Scriptures with Special Reference to a Poetic Rendition. *Acta Theologica Supplementum*, 2, 164-201.

Wendland, E. R. 2008. *Contextual Frames of Reference in Translation: A Coursebook for Bible Translators and Teachers*. Manchester and Kinderhook (NY): St Jerome Publishing.

Wendland, E. R. 2010. Framing the Frames: A Theoretical Framework for the Cognitive Notion of “Frames of Reference.” *Journal of Translation*, 6 (1), 27-50. Retrieved June 3, 2012 from the World Wide Web: <http://sil.org/siljot/2010/1/928474542779/siljot2010-1-03.pdf>.

Wendland, E. R. 2012. Review Article: Jeremy Munday, *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. *Old Testament Essays*, 25 (2), 421-454.

Wendland, E. R. and Noss, P. 2013. Bible Translation. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Retrieved August 14, 2013 from the World Wide Web: <http://online.library.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9781405198431/wbeal0089/pdf>.

West, G. 2009. The Beginning of African Biblical Interpretation: The Bible Among the Bathaping. *Acta Theologica Supplementum*, 12, 33-47.

Westermann, C. 1999. Structure and Intention of the Book of Ruth. *Word and World*, 19 (3), 285-302.

Williams, T. F. 1997. $\eta\eta\eta$. In VanGemenen, W. A. (editor). *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Vol. 3, 657-663. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing.

Wilson, G. H. 1997. תְּבִיאָה. In VanGemeren, W. A. (editor). *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Vol. 1, 655-656. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing.

Wilt, T. 2002. A New Framework for Bible Translation. *Acta Theologica Supplementum*, 2, 140-163.

Wilt, T. 2003. Translation and Communication. In Wilt, T. (editor). *Bible Translation: Frames of Reference*, 28-80. Manchester and Northampton, MA: St Jerome Publishing.

Wilt, T. and Wendland, E. 2008. *Scripture Frames and Framing: A Workbook for Bible Translators*. Stellenbosch: SUN Media Press.

Zobel, H. -J. 1986. תְּבִיאָה. In Botterweck, G. J., Ringgren, H. and Fabry, H. -J. (editors), *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. 5, 44-64. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William Eerdmans Publishing Company.