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Inaugural Editorial

Scott Berthiaume

Dallas International University
dean-academic@diu.edu

Welcome to the first issue of the *Journal of Language, Culture, and Religion* (JLCR), a new peer reviewed journal established by Dallas International University (DIU) with the purpose of publishing scholarly articles on the relationship and interconnectedness of these three major cultural domains. With the advent of the Information Age, scholarly research and its dissemination is reaching new heights as accessibility to substantial thought and research has radically increased to a more diverse readership. This new era has also augmented the topics of research itself, which have become increasingly integrated as scholars are exposed to cross-disciplinary thought and advances that show promise for new fields to explore. JLCR is intended to offer a platform both for continuing the advancement of domain-specific research in language, culture, and religion, and for encouraging exploratory approaches of a cross-disciplinary focus.

An additional rationale for starting JLCR stems from the mission statement of DIU, which includes the statement, “...to provide training and research opportunities leading to degrees in applied linguistics, culture studies and the development of languages.” Since the inception of the school in 1999, originally named the “Graduate Institute of Applied Linguistics,” DIU’s program offerings have been expanding to include Applied Linguistics, Applied Anthropology, Abrahamic Studies, World Arts and International Studies, all of which draw on the faculty’s strengths and field experience connected to the school mission. A student at DIU can study at the baccalaureate, master’s, or doctoral level resulting in a degree that is regionally accredited and recognized world-wide. JLCR is one venue for DIU faculty and students to submit their research for consideration by highly qualified peers, and to have it made available to any scholar in any locale, furthering the boundaries of knowledge in their respective discipline.

This issue of JLCR reflects much, but not all of Dallas International University’s training, focusing in particular on the Bible translation movement. David and Stacey Hare, DIU alumni who have spent more than three years among the Kwakum people, provide two articles introducing the people group and nuances of its orthography. Larry Jones (Seed Company) makes the claim in his contribution...
that translation consultants must be aware of a post-colonial bias and move toward contributing their efforts through giving input, rather than using authority to “sign off” on a translation project. Karl Franklin (DIU, SIL International) describes in his article efforts to mentor a local Kewa speaker to better understand the structure of his language, relating lessons learned and providing several appendices with Kewa data and resources used throughout the training. The book reviews cover works on international hermeneutics, pragmatics, discourse, and biblical languages.

The Journal of Language, Culture, and Religion is new, but the DIU commitment to documenting new discoveries and analyses related to culture is built on previous institutional publications namely, GIALense, Occasional Papers in Applied Linguistic (OPAL) and other electronic papers and theses, most of which are available on the DIU website. May all of these contributions together with the first volume of JLCR be a valuable resource of information and inspiration for the specialist and the general audience alike, and we invite all of DIU’s partners to consider making this new journal one of their regular sources for vital and important scholarly findings.
Introduction to the Kwakum People and Language

David M. Hare and Stacey A. Hare

World Team
Dave.Hare@worldteam.org
Stacey.Hare@worldteam.org

Abstract: The Kwakum people live primarily in the East Region of Cameroon, located in West and Central Africa. They are primarily an agricultural people and number approximately 10,000. The Kwakum language is situated in the northern borderlands of what is considered Bantu and is traditionally classified as Bantu A91. However, in many ways Kwakum does not adhere to the standard criteria for Bantu languages. This has led some to refer to Kwakum as sub-Bantu or semi-Bantu. This article introduces the Kwakum people and language.

Keywords: Bantu borderlands, West Africa, Kwakum

1 The Kwakum People

According to an SIL 2002 survey (Simons and Fennig 2018), there are approximately 10,000 speakers of Kwakum in the East Region of Cameroon, near the city of Bertoua (which is the capital of the region). They are primarily an agricultural people, most working in their fields during the day. They frequently grow corn, cassava, cocoyam, peanuts, and various types of greens. Nearly every Kwakum meal contains kaandɔ, which is translated in French as couscous, and in English it is referred to as fufu. To prepare it, they remove the outer husk of the cassava root and let it soak in water. Once it has softened, the women dice it, dry it in the sun, and then boil it to create a paste about the consistency of what an American might consider to be a very thick cream-of-wheat. They then serve it with a side of either peanut sauce or boiled greens, often mixed with various types of bush meat.

There are two seasons in the region: the wet season and the dry season. In the first part of the wet season (usually in March), the men hunt since it is easy to see the animals’ tracks in the mud. It is also during this season that people start to sow their seeds: often corn, peanuts, tubers, and okra to prepare for their harvest in November. After the final harvest, in November, the Kwakum clear their fields and rely on hunting and fishing for their daily sustenance.
Kwakum villages are governed by a chiefdom structure, with a third-degree chief in each village who is either appointed by the district's supervising chief or is elected by the community (and subsequently approved by the supervising chief). His roles are as follows:

1. To serve as a liaison between the civil government and the village.
2. To uphold the local village religion.
3. To maintain order, make judgments in a dispute, and execute punishments. If there is a dispute, he has the authority to gather the entire village, hear both sides of the argument, make a judgment, and inflict a punishment. If the issue is not resolved at the village level, then he has the authority to reach out to civil law-enforcement officers.

There are two second-degree chiefs, one in the town of Dimako and the other in Doumé. According to our contacts there is traditionally a first-degree chief, but there is not one currently.

The Kwakum believe in a creator god that they call Sambu. They also believe that the spirits of the dead remain in the village. This belief governs much of their lives as they seek to please and avoid angering these spirits.

Traditional folktales and folk histories are cherished by the Kwakum people and were often told at night around the fire. However, we are told this practice has greatly reduced in recent years due to the arrival of electricity and television. Kwakum folktales often involve various animals that usually start off as friends. However, one character (usually the tortoise) tricks other characters in such a way that normally leads to someone’s death and enmity between this character and the other animals.

The character Bembe also occurs frequently in these stories. Bembe is human, married to Apiki, and has several daughters including Lajisi. He is similar to the tortoise in that he often tricks people or animals. When he is not tricking people, he likes to reveal the trickery of others. Nearly every story involves trickery of some kind, and the moral of many is to be wise enough not to be tricked. To date we have recorded over 100 such tales and have transcribed around 40.

2. The Kwakum Language

The Kwakum language (ISO [kwu]) is classified as belonging to the Bantu subgroup A90 (Kaka) of the Zone “A” Bantu languages, and specifically labelled A91. According to one of the newest updates to the Bantu classification system (Maho 2003), other languages belonging to this subgroup are: Pol (A92a), Pɔmɔ (A92b), Kweso (A92C), and Kakɔ (A93).
2.1 Language classification

According to Guthrie (1948, 9) the term Bantu comes from Bleek (1862) who used it to refer to a family of languages which he encountered in South Africa, but which is “also spread over portions of Western Africa, as far west as Sierra Leone” (Bleek 1862, 2). While Bleek did not attempt to define the term Bantu (which he spelled Bâ-ntu), he did comment on several characteristics which distinguish these languages from other languages (emphasis his):

“[P]ronouns are originally borrowed from the derivative prefixes of the nouns,” (Bleek 1862, 2).

“[C]oncord of the pronouns and of every part of speech, in the formation of which pronouns are employed (e.g. adjectives and verbs) with the nouns to which they respectively refer, and hereby caused distribution of the nouns into classes or genders” (Bleek 1862, 2–3).

Unsatisfied with this and other attempts to characterize Bantu languages, Guthrie (1948, 1ff.) attempted to identify them through two sets of criteria. He referred to the first set as “Principal Criteria” which we have reproduced in full here:

A. Principal Criteria (Guthrie 1948, 11)

1. A system of grammatical genders, usually at least five, with these features:
   (a) The sign of gender is a prefix, by means of which words may be assorted into a number of classes varying roughly from ten to twenty.
   (b) There is a regular association of pairs of classes to indicate the singular and plural of genders where the prefix is sometimes similar to one of the prefixes occurring in a two-class gender, and sometimes similar to one of the plural prefixes.
   (c) When a word has an independent prefix as the sign of its class, any other word which is subordinate to it has to agree with it as to class by means of a dependent prefix.
   (d) There is no correlation of the genders with sex reference or with any other clearly defined idea.

2. A vocabulary, part of which can be related by fixed rules to a set of hypothetical common roots.

Guthrie (1948, 11) also mentions what he calls “Subsidiary Criteria.” He marks this second group of criteria as subsidiary not because they are less important, but “because there are some languages in which contraction and attrition have to be postulated to such an extent that it becomes extremely difficult to apply some of the criteria.”
B. Subsidiary Criteria (Guthrie 1948, 11–12)

3. A set of invariable cores, or radicals, from which almost all words are formed by an agglutinative process, these radicals having the following features:

(a) They are composed of Consonant-Vowel-Consonant.
(b) When a grammatical suffix is attached to the radical there is formed a ‘base’ on which words identifiable as ‘verbals’ are built.
(c) When a non-grammatical, or lexical, suffix is attached to the radical there is formed a ‘stem’ on which words identifiable as nominals are built. When a nominal belongs to a two-class gender the sounds and tones of the stem are the same in both classes.
(d) A radical may be extended by an element found between it and the suffix. Such elements, termed ‘extensions’, are composed either of Vowel-Consonant or of a single vowel.
(e) The only case of a radical occurring without a prefix of any kind occurs in verbals used as interjections.

4. A balanced vowel system in the radicals, consisting of one open vowel ‘a’ with an equal number of back and front vowels.

Guthrie admits that there are some languages that do not meet even the principal criteria to be considered Bantu; however, “their relationship to the Bantu languages is sufficiently close for them to be taken into account.” He refers to these languages as “Sub-Bantu” (Guthrie 1948, 19). Jacquot and Richardson (1956, 13) specify that the Sub-Bantu languages are “those languages to which criterion No. 2 may be successfully applied but whose class and agreement systems are merely fragmentary.” On Guthrie’s authority, they make the claim that all A90 languages (including Kwakum) fall into the category of “Sub-Bantu” (Jacquot and Richardson 1956, 35).

Guthrie developed an extremely thorough classification system within the Bantu languages in his four-volume Comparative Bantu (1967, 1970a, 1970b, 1971). His classification system involves fifteen zones labelled with a capital letter. Within these zones, languages were grouped, and these groups have a multiple of 10 added after the letter (e.g. A80, C70, etc.). Finally, each language is given a three-digit code, with the letter, the tens-digit referring to the language group, and then finally a ones-digit number making the three-digit code unique for that language. So, Kwakum falls in the region A, in the Kaka group (A90) with the final code A91. Maho notes that the regions indicated by a capital letter are more geographic than linguistic. However, “[h]is groups and clusters, on the other hand, are generally assumed to be more or less valid in linguistic-genetic terms” (Maho 1999, 34). One would thus expect little to no cohesiveness among the A languages, but (at least) some linguistic relationship between the A90 languages.
However, “Bantu is not a clearly defined group of languages” and there is a major problem in attempting to “draw the boundary line between Bantu and non-Bantu” (Maho 1999, 40). This is particularly evident in languages like Kwakum, which do not completely fulfill the criteria defining a Bantu language but are no doubt related. At the end of the day, Maho reminds us “that typology is a poor linguistic-genetic classifier. Still, it has not stopped scholars from using typology for such purposes” (Maho 1999, 45).

2.2 **Dialects**

Kwakum is listed by Simons and Fennig (2018) as having three dialects: Til, Beten (or Mbeten, or Petem), and Baki (or Mbaki). We were able to spend some time with each of these groups and perform dialect surveys in (nearly) every village. In these surveys, we asked for approximately 200 vocabulary words using a book with clipart-type images. These vocabulary words were based on the 200-word Swadesh word list, removing words that are not relevant to the environment. When necessary, we gave people the word or a situation in French. In Figure 1, we have shown the general placement of the groups. The Til people are included in the Kwakum section, as they consider themselves to be Kwakum. All dialect surveys have been scanned and are available online at: http://haretranslation.com/the-kwakum-language. All the data collected and analyzed by the authors is also available on this site and is continually being updated.

![Figure 1: Map of Kwakum, Mbeten, and Mbaki](image-url)
2.2.1 Kwakum

The Kwakum people refer to both themselves and their language as either Kwakum or Bakoum (sometimes spelled Bakum). We are told that the Bakoum pronunciation only began after the arrival of Europeans in Cameroon, though it is used frequently today. The Kwakum people live in two main districts (arrondissements in French): Doumé and Dimako. At the center of both these districts is a town that bears the same name as the district. Though these two towns are comprised of several different people groups, they are considered primarily Kwakum. In Figure 2, all the villages south of Djandja are in the Doumé district. Djandja north to Longtimbi are in the Dimako district. Longtimbi is approximately 12 miles southwest of Bertoua.

According to Onésime Ebongué Ebongué (the current mayor of Dimako), there are several sub-divisions among the Kwakum. The people of Mendim north to Loumbou are called Kongandi. The people of Kempong are called Ciŋkolya. The people of Goumbérgérong are called Posombu. The people of Djandja north to Grand Ngolambélé are called Kpeŋge (which is also the name of a neighborhood in Dimako). The Kwakum that live in the two northernmost villages (Baktala and Longtimbi) consider themselves to be Til.

Figure 2: Map of Kwakum villages

Nearly all the Kwakum villages rest alongside the highway known as the N-10, which leads from Yaoundé to Ndoumbi. Longtimbi is approximately 12 miles southwest of Bertoua and 22.4 miles from the southernmost Kwakum village: Mendim. There are two Kwakum villages that veer off of the main highway on a dirt road known as D-29: Kempong and Goumbérgéron.
In analyzing the data from the surveys, we took all the data from the villages and removed all prefixes and known synonyms. We then used the software WordSurv to organize and compare the data. This program calculates the percentage of similar lexical items using cognate sets assigned by the user. We then imported this data into Excel where we compared the nine surveys from the Doumé villages with seven of the villages in the Dimako district (minus Baktala and Longtimbi). The vocabulary similarity is 92.3%. We then compared the vocabulary from the Dimako district villages to that of the two Til villages. The similarity between the two dialects is 91.4%. One main difference between the two dialects is that the Dimako (and Doumé) district has /ʃ/ in the phonemic inventory, whereas in the Til dialect the phoneme /s/ replaces /ʃ/. Though both villages self-identify as Til, this difference in phonemic inventory is mainly manifest in the village of Longtimbi. The survey in Baktala was conducted with the village chief (Pascal Blaise Yala Gaonnga), and he used [ʃ] rather than [s].

2.2.2 Mbeten

There are four villages of people who consider themselves to be Mbeten (sometimes written as Beten, Bethen, or Petem): Mbeten 1, Mbeten 2, Adiah, and Njangane. All four of these villages are north of Bertoua as shown in the map in Figure 3. There are two groupings of villages, with Njangane and Adiah more western and Mbeten 1 and Mbeten 2 more eastern. By car, the two groupings of villages are approximately 50 miles apart. It takes hours to travel between them because the roads are rough. There is, however, a trail through the jungle which spans around 13 miles.

![Figure 3: Map of Mbeten villages](image)

---

1 More information on how we determined cognate sets can be found in Hare (2018, 11–12).
There are significant differences evident between the Kwakum and Mbeten dialects. We calculated the similarity between the surveys in the Dimako villages and the Mbeten villages to be 81.3%. Much of the vocabulary had similar roots with some differences in the phonemic inventory. Like the Til, the Mbeten in the eastward villages use [s] rather than [ʃ]. In Adiah and Njangane [ʃ] is replaced by [z] in certain environments and [s] in others. The Mbeten also use [ʃ] in places where the Kwakum use [dʒ]. Anecdotally, the Kwakum and Mbeten say that they can understand each other. One consultant (Felix Yangman), who grew up in Djandja but spent some of his teenage years in the Mbeten villages, said that it took him some time to get used to the Mbeten dialect when he arrived. Another consultant (Onesime Eboungué Eboongué), who had not spent any time with the Mbeten, was able to communicate using Kwakum during the survey sessions. Though more survey work is needed to be definitive, we consider Mbeten to be a dialect of Kwakum.

2.2.3 Mbaki

The final language group that has been listed as a dialect of Kwakum is Mbaki (or Baki). We travelled to the city of Belabo and spoke with Gaston Yerima, who is Mbaki and was at the time in the process of writing a booklet on the history of the Mbaki (Yerima 2017). According to this interview, many Mbaki live in Belabo and in three villages along the Senaga River named: Mbaki, Mbaki 1, and Mbaki 2. We conducted a survey with Yerima in Belabo; then we travelled to Mbaki 2 where we conducted a survey with an older woman. Based on these surveys, we determined that there is only a 47.4% similarity between the Kwakum spoken in Dimako and the Mbaki language. Based on this evidence we do not consider Mbaki to be a dialect of Kwakum. Table 1 shows the percentage of lexical similarity between the various groupings of villages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dimako</th>
<th>Doumé</th>
<th>Til</th>
<th>Mbeten</th>
<th>Mbaki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Kwakum dialect comparison

According to Yerima (2017, 5), the Mbaki, Mbeten, and Kwakum originate from the same people group. Though their exact origins are unknown, Yerima says that they once lived on the plateau of Adamawa. Around 1780, he claims they came to live in the Woutchaba forest and then later travelled down to the Senaga River. He does not directly mention the Mbeten nor the Kwakum in his booklet;
however, he described their relationship in an interview. After crossing the Senaga, some of the people stayed by the river and are today known as the Mbaki. Those that travelled south even more are the Mbeten. Finally, those that continued south are now the Kwakum. A Kwakum language consultant, Simon Charles Ndengué Ndengué, recounted the Kwakum version of this story. Though he does not mention the Mbaki nor the Mbeten, he does say that they came from the north. He also mentions the Senaga. It seems reasonable that these people groups are related; however, through the course of time their languages have taken different paths.

In Table 2, the similarities between the three groups are immediately recognizable. Mbaki patterns with Mbeten in some words, such as the word for ‘eyes’. Some words are exactly the same in the three language groups, as in the word for ‘tongue’. Some differences are likely the result of varying phonemic inventories, as with the word for ‘heart’. Also, as with the word for ‘fruit’, it seems that there are words that have the same root, but that the noun class system differs. We have found no indication that Mbaki has a ki- ‘NC7’ prefix (contrary to Kwakum). With all of these similarities, words 6–10 in Table 2 are examples of vocabulary where the connection between Kwakum and Mbeten is clear, but there is no connection with Mbaki.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Kwakum</th>
<th>Mbeten</th>
<th>Mbaki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>‘eyes’</td>
<td>[miʃi]</td>
<td>[misi]</td>
<td>[misi]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>‘tongue’</td>
<td>[dem]</td>
<td>[dem]</td>
<td>[dem]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>‘heart’</td>
<td>[fa]</td>
<td>[sa/za]</td>
<td>[dʒa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>‘house’</td>
<td>[too]</td>
<td>[too]</td>
<td>[too]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>‘fruit’</td>
<td>[kibumɔ]</td>
<td>[kibumɔ]</td>
<td>[bumɔ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>‘man’</td>
<td>[paamɔ]</td>
<td>[paam/baam]</td>
<td>[mutʃulum]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>‘woman’</td>
<td>[momja]</td>
<td>[momja]</td>
<td>[mata]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>‘one’</td>
<td>[mɔtu]</td>
<td>[mɔtu]</td>
<td>[fata]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>‘walk’</td>
<td>[dʒaandɔ]</td>
<td>[jaandɔ]</td>
<td>[gendʒi]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>‘I’</td>
<td>[ni]</td>
<td>[ni]</td>
<td>[me]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Vocabulary comparison: Kwakum/Mbeten/Mbaki

Based on the information above, we consider Kwakum and Mbeten to be dialects of the same language, and Mbaki to be a separate language. Based on sheer numbers we consider Kwakum to be the main dialect.

2.3 Data sources

The authors have spent more than three and a half years (Jan 2015–Mar 2017 and Aug 2018–present) living in a village with the Kwakum people. At the beginning
of this time, a Kwakum/Mbeten language committee was formed in Dimako, composed of representatives from each Kwakum and Mbeten village. During this time, we have met with several language consultants selected by the language committee. Language sessions were primarily conducted in our home, usually on weekday evenings. The primary consultants were: Simon CharlesNdengué Ndengué (of Sibita, Doumé district), Jean Bosco Titiké (of Baktala, a Til village), Onésime Ebongué Ebongué (of Beul, Dimako district), and another consultant from Dimako proper who wished to remain anonymous.

Each of the speakers we worked with was informed verbally in French of the nature and purposes of the research and was given the opportunity to ask questions and was also given an informed consent statement written in French (all of these speakers are bilingual to some degree). All participants whose recordings are used in these articles signed the informed consent statement and indicated whether they wished to participate anonymously or under their own name, and if under their own name, whether or not the linguistic data they provided should be identified with their name.

3. CONCLUSION

As most of the Kwakum are agricultural, and the entire family is involved in farming, traditionally little time has been left for school. Though more Kwakum children are attending school now, their literacy rate in French is still quite low and almost non-existent among the women. Our past labors among the Kwakum have been spent in language/culture learning and analysis. With the help of our analysis, in January 2019 the Kwakum language committee came together to vote in an official alphabet, comprised of 26 letters. On March 30, 2019 the committee celebrated the inauguration of Itoo Kwakum ‘the Kwakum House’ in Dimako, which now serves as a headquarters for literacy efforts and for the translation of the Bible in Kwakum. Development of literacy materials has already begun, oral Bible storying began in June 2019, and written Bible translation began in January 2020.

ABBREVIATIONS

| ISO   | International Organization for Standardization |
| NC    | Noun Class                                     |
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Abstract: This paper proposes an orthography for the Kwakum language, including examples of both how to and how not to write different constituents. The guide follows closely the general alphabet for Cameroonian languages, although it differs in use of diacritics. This guide follows over four years of analysis, working with several different groups of Kwakum speakers, and has been accepted by the Kwakum Language Committee.

Keywords: Kwakum, orthography, Bantu, tone

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper proposes an orthography for the approximately 10,000 speakers of Kwakum (ISO language code [kwu]) living in the Eastern province of Cameroon, Africa (GPS coordinates of 4°26'47.5"N 13°37’08.4"E). The Kwakum are concentrated mainly in eighteen different villages situated alongside a major road which starts north of Abong-Mbang and continues north to Bertoua. There are two districts that make up these eighteen villages: the Dimako district and the Doumé district, both of which are part of the Upper Nyong division. There are four additional villages, whose residents refer to themselves as the Mbeten, which are located north of Bertoua in the Bélabo subdivision. The Mbeten language is considered for the purpose of this work as a dialect of Kwakum. Finally, there are three Mbaki villages which are north of Bélabo. The three Mbaki villages have been analyzed as being a separate language and thus were not taken into consideration when creating this orthography (Hare 2018).

This orthography guide is the fruit of work started in October 2016 when a Kwakum working group produced a provisional alphabet. This alphabet was distributed within the Kwakum community and has been used extensively by at least one member of the Kwakum community: Simon Charles Ndengué Ndengué. In June 2018, a revision of the alphabet, along with writing rules, reading rules, and a system for marking tone, was produced by Stacey Hare in her master’s thesis (Hare 2018). Her desire was to produce an orthography similar to the French writing system, particularly in regard to the vowels.
The current orthography draws upon the work done in the first two provisional orthographies. Contrary to Stacey Hare’s thesis, this orthography follows more closely The General Alphabet of Cameroon Languages (Sadembouo and Tadadjeu 1984). The consonants and vowels in the present orthography were accepted by the Kwakum language community on January 15, 2019, and a system for marking tone was agreed upon on March 22, 2019.

This paper is designed mainly for the linguistic community rather than for the Kwakum community at large. However, though it is written for the linguistic community, it should be noted that it is not an exhaustive phonology of the language. To learn more about the phonological processes of Kwakum as well as its syllable structure, distribution of consonants and vowels, and tonal structure, please see Hare (2018). This paper serves as the foundation for how to write the language so that an accessible transitional literacy primer can be designed by and taught to the Kwakum community.

All examples are written in the Kwakum orthography with their gloss in single quotes. When an example is given within the body of the text, the Kwakum word is italicized and then glossed in single quotes (e.g. *bupa* ‘animal’). Phonemic forms are written between slashes */...*/ and phonetic forms between brackets […]. Tone marks are intentionally omitted where they are not necessary.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 Alphabet

The Kwakum alphabet has 26 graphemes (19 consonants and 7 vowels) which are listed in alphabetical order in (1).

(1)  
A a, B b, C c, D d, E e, E ɛ, F f, G g, H h, I i, J j, K k, L l, M m, N n, Ŋ ŋ, O o, Ɔ ɔ, P p, S s, T t, U u, V v, W w, Y y, Z z

The Kwakum language committee chose to name the letters as shown in (2) with the letter name in the orthography followed by its pronunciation in IPA.

(2)  
a [a], be [be], ci [tʃi], de [de], e [e], ɛ [ɛ], ɛf [ɛf], ga [ga], as [af], i [i], ji [dʒi], ka [ka], el [ɛl], ɛm [ɛm], ɛn [ɛn], anŋ [anŋ], o [o], ɔ [ɔ], pe [pe], si [ʃi], te [te], u [u], ve [ve], wa [wa], yi [yi], za [za]

Consonants can be combined to form 13 diagraphs which are listed in (3). The first two diagraphs will be taught in the literacy program. The other diagraphs are prenasalized stops which will not be taught explicitly, unless the loss of distinction between prenasalized stops and syllabic nasals followed by a consonant proves troublesome to Kwakum readers.
kp, gb, mp, mb, mf, mv, nt, nd, nc, nj, ns, ŋk, ŋg

The orthography contains one trigraph ŋgb.

2.2 Consonants

Table 4 (p. 16) lists all the consonantal phonemes and their corresponding graphemes including the 13 diagraphs and the trigraph.

Kwakum has both prenasalized consonants (one underlying segment) as well as syllabic homorganic nasals (two underlying segments) (Hare 2018, §4.1.3). This is demonstrated in Table 3, where the nasal-consonant cluster in mbel ‘breast’ is two segments and the nasal-consonant cluster in mbel ‘door’ is one segment. This distinction, however, is underspecified in the orthography.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Underlying form</th>
<th>Surface form</th>
<th>Orthographic form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>/Ǹ-bɛ́l/</td>
<td>[m̥bɛ́l]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nC</td>
<td>/ᵐbɛ́l/</td>
<td>[ᵐbɛ́l]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Prenasalized consonants vs. homorganic syllabic nasals

Three rules for consonants need to be taught and learned by the Kwakum community.

First, write ŋ rather than n before k and g as illustrated in (4).

(4) Write Do not write
pongo pongo ‘corn’
ŋkela nkela ‘goat’

Second, write words as they are pronounced in isolation. When a word does not end in an n, m, or ŋ in isolation, but ends in one of these letters in the middle of a sentence, do not write these letters at the end of the word. Instead, write these letters at the beginning of the next word as illustrated in (5).

(5) Write Do not write
pamaa nciki pamaan ciki ‘hot water’
A ndaambɔ bupa. An daambo bupa. ‘He cooks the meat.’

Third, when a consonant and vowel can be pronounced as either ‘ti’ or ‘ci’, write ‘ti’ as illustrated in (6).

(6) Write Do not write
teti teci ‘hundred’
mbeti mbeci ‘leaves’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Grapheme</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>bupa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tʃ</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>cila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>dem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>fon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>gumɔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dʒ</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>jɔl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>kemɔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>ɬ</td>
<td>ɬɔmbɔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>mose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n̥</td>
<td>n̥</td>
<td>nɔn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n̥</td>
<td>n̥</td>
<td>nɔn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>pi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>s̩</td>
<td>sɔwo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>tolɔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v̩</td>
<td>v̩</td>
<td>vuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>wunda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>j̩</td>
<td>yeklɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>z̩</td>
<td>zɔpi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Grapheme</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gb</td>
<td>gb</td>
<td>gbala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kp</td>
<td>kp</td>
<td>kpakpati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m̩p</td>
<td>mp</td>
<td>mpakɔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mb</td>
<td>mb</td>
<td>mbayaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʈʃf</td>
<td>mf</td>
<td>mfiyaɑ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɱv</td>
<td>mv</td>
<td>mvye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʈnt</td>
<td>nt</td>
<td>ntɔmbu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʈnd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>ndiŋse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʈʃd</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>incita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʈʃŋm</td>
<td>nj</td>
<td>njimlaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʈʃŋs</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>nsaanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʈʃŋk</td>
<td>nk</td>
<td>nkamlaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʈʃŋg</td>
<td>ng</td>
<td>angisa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trigraph</th>
<th>Grapheme</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ʈʃŋmb</td>
<td>ɾŋgbotaa</td>
<td>‘pinch oneself, V’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The phoneme /l/ is sometimes used in free variation with [ɾ] in words such as [bundɾɛ] ‘undo’ and [sandɾa] ‘urinate’. The /l/ should always be written as l and never as ɾ. Also, the phoneme /l/ can be syllabic and thus can bear tone as in [kítɛkl] ‘waste’ and [mbingl] ‘wild fruit’. This has no bearing on the orthography.

2 The dialects situated north of the village of Baktala pronounce the grapheme s as [s] while those south of Longtimbi pronounce it as [ʃ]. Both dialects will write [s] or [ʃ] as s.
2.3 Vowels

As seen in Table 5, Kwakum has seven vowel phonemes plus contrastive length. Long vowels generally occur in word-medial and word-final position. In fast speech, long vowels can surface as short vowels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Grapheme</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i³</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ibɔmbe ‘nest’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>jii ‘feces’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e⁴</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ikeki ‘upstream’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>ɲkee ‘eggs’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e’e</td>
<td>e’e</td>
<td>ɛe ‘fish’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ape ‘radio’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aa</td>
<td>aa</td>
<td>paam ‘man’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>pon ‘louse’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>itoo ‘house’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɔ</td>
<td>ɔ</td>
<td>ɔɔn ‘chief’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɔɔ</td>
<td>ɔɔ</td>
<td>ɔɔ ‘lower back’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ku ‘burrow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uu</td>
<td>uu</td>
<td>tuu ‘peace’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Vowel graphemes

Four rules for vowels need to be taught and learned by the Kwakum community. First, final vowels in nouns and verbs are written according to their full lexical form even if they are not pronounced when spoken. This is illustrated in (7).

(7) Write Do not write
David ŋkaamɔ Amélie. David ŋkaam Amélie. ‘David loves Amélie.’
Kaandɔ neh ji tambye. Kaand neh ji tambye. ‘This couscous is good.’

Second, excrescent vowels are not written as illustrated in (8). Excrescent vowels are short in duration and inserted between two juxtaposed consonants across a syllable boundary.

---

3 In a closed syllable, the phoneme /i/ often reduces to [ɪ]. It is written as i. For example, [jɪl] is written as jɪl ‘live’.

4 In a closed syllable, the phoneme /e/ often reduces to [ɛ] or [ɪ]. It is written as e. For example, [pɛmle] is written as pemle ‘translate’.

5 See §5.2 “Imperative Mood” for exceptions.
Write | Do not write
---|---
datwε | datuwε | ‘kneel down’
jikšε | jikšε | ‘burn’
joktša | joktšaa | ‘perceive’
bakwε | bakšuwe | ‘hide’

Third, ambiguous segments [i ~ j] and [u ~ w], when part of a vowel cluster within a lexical word, are written as glides as illustrated in (9).\(^6\) Vowel clusters are generally to be avoided.

Write | Do not write
---|---
sej | sei | ‘panther’
tewle | teule | ‘table’

Kwakum | Kuakum | ‘Kwakum’

nyoy | nyoi | ‘bee’

Fourth, long vowels are written according to their full lexical form, even if they reduce to short vowels phrase-medially as illustrated in (10). A good principle to follow is that when one is unsure if the vowel is short or long, it should be written as long. The verbal ending -aa should always be written as -aa rather than -a.

Write | Do not write
---|---
A mi daambo bupa. | A mi dambo bupa. | ‘She is cooking meat.’
A mi boɔmɔ pinga. | A mi bɔmɔ pinga. | ‘She is buying peanuts.’
A mi ketaa nciki. | A mi keta nciki. | ‘She is carrying water.’
kaandɔ nɛh | kandɔ nɛh | ‘this couscous’

3. **Tone**

Kwakum has both lexical and grammatical tone. There are three underlying tone levels: high, mid, and low. These three levels combine to create contour tones, generally on long vowels. Because of the high number of monosyllabic words, tone carries a high functional load.

On March 22, 2019, a working group within the Kwakum language committee met together and decided that marking tone exhaustively (over every vowel, with L being marked as null) was too cumbersome for the writer. After hearing the potential ambiguity that not marking tone could cause for the reader, the group still preferred that tone not be marked exhaustively. Instead, they decided to follow Kwakum’s closest neighbor, Kako, where grammatical and lexical distinctions are marked with diacritics (Ernst et al. 2009). In Kwakum, due to a high number of

---

\(^6\) One exception to this would be if the ambiguous segment in question has a different tone than its preceding or following vowel (e.g. seoseo [sèósèó] ‘hide-and-seek’).
lexical minimal pairs, lexical distinctions are also marked segmentally when the minimal pairs/triplets are semantically close. For each minimal pair or triplet differentiated solely by tone, the questions in (11) and (12) are asked.

(11) Does this minimal pair/triplet fall within the same grammatical category?

If the answer to (11) is no, then generally, no orthographic distinction is made. For example, *saakɔ* ‘chicken’ is a noun and *saako* ‘try’ is a verb, so no orthographic distinction is made. However, if the answer to (11) is yes, then the question in (12) is asked.

(12) Does context adequately disambiguate this minimal pair/triplet?

If the answer to (12) is yes, then generally, no orthographic distinction is made. For example, *taŋ* ‘white person’ and *taŋ* ‘price’ are unlikely to be confused, so no orthographic distinction is made. However, if the answer to (12) is no, then the minimal pair/triplet is differentiated by doubling the last consonant of the word with the lowest tone when the word ends in a consonant; for example, *idɔŋŋ* ‘life’ vs *idɔŋ* ‘room’. When the word ends in a vowel, then an *h* is added to the end of the word; for example, *taalɔ* ‘grandchild’ vs *talɔ* ‘cousin’.

A list of minimal pairs/triplets is found in the Appendix. The Kwakum will need to memorize the different spellings of semantically close minimal pairs/triplets (similar to *to*, *two*, and *too* in English).

Grammatical tone also plays a significant role in Kwakum. The function of a given construction is indicated both through segments and diacritics. The diacritics do not indicate the relative pitch of one’s voice but instead are used to trigger the meaning of the construction in the mind of the reader. For example, imperative mood is indicated by a circumflex on the first vowel of a given verb as illustrated in (13).

(13) Write Do not write

| Kê ! | Kɛ ! | ‘Go!’ |
| Jêɛ ! | Jɛɛ ! | ‘Look!’ |
| Fûu ! | Fuu ! | ‘Leave!’ |
| Kêtaa ! | Ketaa ! | ‘Carry (it)!’ |
| Bîwe ya ! | Bîwe ya ! | ‘Hit them!’ |
| Bek sâa nɔɔ ! | Bek saa nɔɔ ! | ‘Do not do that!’ |

The immediate future is differentiated from a tenseless construction by writing a grave accent over the subject pronoun as illustrated in (14).
The second of two juxtaposed nouns can either have an adjectival sense as in (15) and (16), or be an associated noun as in (17) and (18). Associated nouns are genitive constructions in Kwakum.

(15)  Itoo kwakum
     house kwakum
     'Kwakum house'

(16)  Ibuku faasɔ
     words twin
     'twin words'

(17)  Itoo kwákum
     house kwakum
     'house of the Kwakum'

(18)  Ibuku fáasɔ
     words twin
     'words of the twins'

As seen in (15)–(18), the acute accent on the first vowel of the second word differentiates the two different types of Noun-Noun constructions. With the acute accent, the construction is read as a genitive. Without the acute accent, the second noun is read as having a more adjectival sense.

(19)  Write Do not write
     icilɔ Kwákum icilɔ Kwakum  'the writing of Kwakum'
     ipemle Bíbel ipemle Bíbel  'the translation of the Bible'
     idoŋ jóolah idoŋ jóolah  'the room of washing'
     fela icilɔ kwakum fela icilɔ Kwakum  'the manner of writing Kwakum'
     kidoŋ kicil kibupa kidoŋ kicil kibupa  'the cadaver of half of an animal'
     A'i ne ntutu ɛkɛ. A'i ne ntutu ɛkɛ.  'It has the odor of a fish.'

4. Word divisions

4.1 Nouns and the noun phrase

Noun class prefixes are written together with the noun.
Noun class 1 and 2 prefixes merit special attention. Only four words receive the mo- ‘SG’ or gwo- ‘PL’ prefixes. These four words are to be written as shown in (20). Note the allomorphs mo- and m- along with gwo-, gw-, and gwi-.

(20) Underlying Form Write
mo-mɔ momɔ ‘person’
gwo-mɔ gwomɔ ‘people’
mo-myaa momyaa ‘woman’
gwo-myaa gwomyaa ‘women’
mc-cɔ cɔcɔ ‘child’
gwɔ-cɔ gwɔcɔ ‘children’
m-yaa myaŋ ‘brother’
(a)gwi-yaa (a)gwiyaŋ ‘brothers’

Moɔɔnɔ ‘child/little’ also serves as a diminutive which can surface in many different forms due to phonological processes which are illustrated in (21). However, the full underlying form of the word is to be written as a separate word from the following noun as illustrated in (22). Note that partial reduplication is optional and is written connected to the word which follows.

(21) Underlying form /moɔɔmcɔɔnɔ beetaa/
Partial reduplication momɔɔmcɔɔnɔ beetaa
Final vowel deletion momɔɔmcɔɔnɔ beetaa
Vowel shortening momɔɔmcɔɔnɔ beetaa
Nasal place assimilation momɔɔmcɔɔnɔ beetaa
Surface form [momɔɔnɔ beetaa] ‘little fire’
(22) Write | Do not write
---|---
mɔmɔɔnɔ b\_etaa | mɔmɔm beetaa | ‘little fire’
mɔmɔɔnɔ tewle | mɔmɔn tewle | ‘little table’
mɔmɔm momyaa | mɔmomyaa | ‘little woman (girl)’
gwɔgwormyaa | gwɔgwomyaa | ‘little women (girls)’
cɔkɔɔnɔ cɔcɔc | cɔcɔmc | ‘little child’
gwɔgwormg | cɔcɔmg | ‘little children’
mɔɔnɔ mɔɔnɔ | mɔmɔɔnɔ | ‘little child’
gwɔɔnɔ gwɔɔnɔ | gwɔgwɔɔnɔ | ‘little children’
mɔɔnɔ kɔndu | mɔkɔndu | ‘young woman’
gwɔɔnɔ gwɔɔnɔ | gwɔgwɔɔnɔ | ‘little children’

Demonstrative modifiers are written separate from the head noun they modify as illustrated in (23). Note that the demonstrative *nɛh* ‘DEM’ is written with an *h* to differentiate it from *nɛ* ‘with’.

(23) Write | Do not write
---|---
lɔmbɔ nɛh | lɔmbɔnɛh | ‘this bottle (here)’
lɔmbɔ ke | lɔmbɔkɛ | ‘that bottle (there)’
cɔcɔɔnɔ cɔcɔc | cɔcɔmc | ‘that bottle (by you)’
lɔmbɔ yiikɛ | lɔmbɔyiikɛ | ‘that bottle (way over there)’
lɔmbɔ wɛ | lɔmbɔw | ‘that bottle (unsure of meaning)’

Possessive pronouns follow the noun they modify. Possessive pronouns that begin with a consonant are written as separate words as illustrated in (24). This is also true for prepositional phrases. (Kwakum has both postpositional and prepositional phrases.)

(24) Write | Do not write
---|---
kokaa caambɔ | kocaambɔ | ‘my uncle’
ko wusu | kɔwusu | ‘our navel’
isɛki lin | isɛkilin | ‘your (PL) pineapple’
asɔwo yaambɔ | asɔwoyaambɔ | ‘my soap’
ŋgutɔ maa | ŋgutɔmaa | ‘their oil’
pɔmbu yaambɔ | pɔmbiaambɔ | ‘for me’
pɔmbu cɔc | pɔmbic | ‘for you’
pɔmbu yisi | pɔmbisi | ‘for us’
ibala yin | ibalain | ‘both of you’
sa yɛɛ | sayɛɛ | ‘at his house’

Possessive pronouns that begin with a vowel are joined to the noun without a space between the noun and the pronoun. If a vowel on the noun is deleted, then an apostrophe replaces that vowel as illustrated in (25). If the noun ends with a consonant in isolation, then the possessive pronoun is attached directly to the noun.
Write
nyalaambɔ nyal aambɔ ‘my sister-in-law’
nyaal’aambɔ nyaalɔ aambɔ ‘my friend’
caan’aa caanɔ a ‘their monkey’
mɔɔn’aambɔ mɔɔnɔ aambɔ ‘my child’

Do not write

Numerals are written as separate words without any hyphens as illustrated in (26)–(28).

(26) kaŋgibaa ne towo
twenty and six
‘twenty-six’

(27) teti ne kaŋgisal ne mɔtu
hundred and eighty and one
‘one hundred eighty-one’

(28) tosin ibaa ne kaamɔ ne buye
thousand two and ten and nine
‘two thousand nineteen’

Compounds and words in an associative construction are difficult to distinguish. Therefore, Noun-Noun constructions are written as associatives unless the second noun carries an adjectival sense. This is illustrated in (29).

Write
kal púl kal-pul ‘gun-rain (thunder)’
fyɛtlɛ kɛ́ mbɛ fyɛtlɛ-kɛmbɛ ‘write-pen (secretary)’
sɔku jiki sɔku-jiki ‘elephant-river (hippopotamus)’

Do not write

Reduplicated words which are nouns (whether partially or completely reduplicated) are written as one word as illustrated in (30).

(30) lemeleme ‘middle’
mɔmɔɔnɔ ‘little child’
feŋgefeŋge ‘full moon’
mbumbua ‘poor person’
njaŋjaŋ ‘edible termites’
pampam ‘brick’

Reduplicated words which are not nouns, are analyzed as two separate words and are written accordingly as illustrated in (31).
(31) ciŋ ciŋ  ‘exactly’
naŋ naŋ  ‘far away’
kula kula  ‘different type’
tuku tuku  ‘absent-mindedly’

Adjectives are written as separate words, whether they come before or after
the noun. This is illustrated in (32)–(36).

(32) kɔnde bɛtɛŋ
plantain ripe
‘ripe plantain’

(33) pamaa nciki
hot water
‘hot water’

(34) kɛ jomɛŋ
fish dried
‘dried fish’

(35) paa momyaa
good woman
‘good woman’

(36) poŋgo dambeŋ
corn boiled
boiled corn

4.2 Prepositional / postpositional phrases

Prepositions and postpositions are written separate from their object as illus-
trated in (37)–(40).

(37) ɔ lɔmbɔ ko
LOC bottle on
‘on the bottle’

(38) ɔ lɔmbɔ tee
LOC bottle in
‘in the bottle’

(39) ɔ lɔmbɔ si
LOC bottle under
‘under the bottle’
(40) nɛ lɔmbɔ
with bottle
‘with the bottle’

4.3 **Verbal unit**

The present tense marker /N^H/= is written according to the place of articulation of the consonant that follows it as illustrated in (41)–(43). This marker can also indicate the optative mood. There is no phonetic difference between present tense and optative mood. The reader will need to use context to disambiguate between the two senses.

(41) A mbikɔ kaandɔ.
3SG PRS=stir couscous
‘He stirs the couscous.’ / ‘May he stir the couscous.’

(42) A ŋketaa fon.
3SG PRS=carry wood
‘He carries the wood.’ / ‘May he carry the wood.’

(43) A njoolɛ mɔɔnɔ.
3SG PRS=wash child
‘He washes the child.’ / ‘May he wash the child.’

When the verb that follows the present tense marker begins with a nasal, the present tense nasal is doubled as illustrated in (44) and (45).

(44) A mmaakɔ fyi ti.
3SG PRS=climb tree
‘He climbs the tree.’ / ‘May he climb the tree.’

(45) Ye nnarjwaa ɔ wunda te.
3PL PRS=look LOC window in
‘They look in the window.’ / ‘May they look in the window.’

First and second person singular object pronouns which follow the verb are written as part of the verb, separated by an apostrophe. All other pronouns which follow the verb are written as separate words. The treatment of object pronouns is illustrated in (46).
(46) Write Do not write
A mi biwɔ mɔɔnɔ. A mi biw mɔɔnɔ. ‘He is beating the child.’
A mi biwɛɛ. A mi biwɛɛ. ‘He is beating me.’
A mi biwɔɔ. A mi biwɔɔ. ‘He is beating you.’
A mi biwɔ ye. A mi biw ye. ‘He is beating him.’
A mi biwɔ se. A mi biw se. ‘He is beating us.’
A mi biwɔ jine. A mi biw jine. ‘He is beating you (pl.).’
A mi biwɔ ya. A mi biw ya. ‘He is beating them.’

In non-utterance final position, the final vowel of the verb is never pronounced when it is an -ɔ, sometimes pronounced when it is an -ɛ, and always pronounced when it is an -aa. In all three cases, the final vowel is written. When the final vowel is pronounced, a different pronoun is used for first and second person singular as illustrated in (47). Note that since the -aa is always pronounced, then the first and second pronouns that follow this suffix are always ni ‘1s’ and gwe ‘2s’.

(47) Write Do not write
A mi dowaa mɔɔnɔ. A mi dow mɔɔnɔ. ‘He is calling the child.’
A mi dowaa ni. A mi dowaa ɛɛ. ‘He is calling me.’
A mi dowaa gwe. A mi dowaa ɔɔ. ‘He is calling you.’
A mi dowaa ye. A mi dow ye. ‘He is calling him.’
A mi dowaa se. A mi dow se. ‘He is calling us.’
A mi dowaa jine. A mi dow jine. ‘He is calling you (pl.).’
A mi dowaa ya. A mi dow ya. ‘He is calling them.’

The relative clause marker yi ‘REL’ is written as a separate word. This is illustrated in (48).

(48) Write Do not write
Cak ni ŋkaamɔ yi, Cak ni ŋkaami, ‘That which I like,
a’i bupa. a’i bupa. is meat.’
moo bomsaa yi moo bomsaai ‘the one who sells’

All non-reduced, segmental, tense, aspect, and negation markers are written as separate words with the exception of the present tense clitic /N̄H=/ as illustrated in (49)–(51).

(49) PRS/IPFV A mi ji bupa. ‘He is eating meat.’
PRS/NEG A mee ji bupa. ‘He does not eat meat.’
NEG A bek ji bupa. ‘He does not eat meat (tenseless).’
5. Moods

5.1 Interrogative mood

Interrogative mood is communicated by: 1) raising the pitch of one’s voice at the end of an utterance, and 2) an interrogative particle /[^i] which optionally attaches to the end of question words. The raising of the pitch of one’s voice is signaled in the orthography by a question mark as illustrated in (52).

(52) ʰɛ nsaa na ? ‘What are we to do?’

The interrogative particle is attached to the end of the question word and followed by a question mark as illustrated in (53).

(53) ʰa tai ? ‘who?’
    ʰe kei ? ‘what?’
    ʰa nai ? ‘how?’
    ʰe fei ? ‘where?’

5.2 Imperative mood

All imperatives are marked with a circumflex on the first vowel of the verb. Second person singular imperatives are also indicated by the imperative suffix /[^e]/ which replaces the final vowel of the verb as illustrated in (54). No apostrophe is written in this case. This suffix is not added to verbs whose final vowel is -aa.

(54) Bîwe ! ‘Hit!’
    Bênde ! ‘Look!’

When there is an object following the verb, the 2SG imperative marker is not pronounced as illustrated in (55).
Write  Do not write
Bîwɛ mɔɔnɔ ! biw mɔɔnɔ  ‘Hit the child!’
Bîwɛɛ ! biwɛɛ  ‘Hit me!’
Bîw ye ! biw ye  ‘Hit him!’
Bîwɛ se ! biw se  ‘Hit us!’
Bîw ya ! biw ya  ‘Hit them!’

When the verb ends in -aa, a H replacive tone docks causing the -aa to be pronounced as -áá. Even though the -áá is pronounced with a H tone, the only diacritic on the word is the circumflex over the first vowel as illustrated in (56).

(56)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative form</th>
<th>Imperative form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>komsaa</td>
<td>Kômsaa !</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to get ready’</td>
<td>‘Get ready!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kawaa</td>
<td>Kâwaa !</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to share’</td>
<td>‘Share!’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second person plural imperative marker is the enclitic /=kin/. This enclitic attaches to the word that precedes it as illustrated in (57). The vowel of the verb deletes, but an apostrophe is not added. A -y- is inserted between /=kin/ ‘IMP,PL’ and the first-person singular object -ɛɛ ‘1SG’.

(57)  
Biwkin yɛɛ !  ‘Hit (PL) me!’
Biwkin ye !  ‘Hit (PL) him!’
Biwkin se !  ‘Hit (PL) us!’
Biwkin ya !  ‘Hit (PL) them!’
Pakin bɛ̂ndɔ !  ‘Look (PL)!’

Imperatives are negated with the particle /bɛ́k/. When the second person plural imperative marker -kin ‘IMP,PL’ follows bɛ́k ‘NEG’, one ‘k’ is deleted as illustrated in (58).

(58)  
Write  Do not write
Bekin bîwɔ mɔɔnɔ ! Bekkin bîwɔ mɔɔnɔ !  ‘Do not hit the child!’

Segmentally, second person singular monosyllabic verbs are written the same way as their indicative counterparts in the imperative form. To indicate that they are imperatives, however, a diacritic is added as seen in (59). The plural form of monosyllabic verbs receives -kin ‘IMP,PL’ clitic as illustrated in (59). Note that both the singular and the plural receive the diacritic.

(59)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative</th>
<th>Singular imperative</th>
<th>Plural imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bee ‘to follow’</td>
<td>Bêe ! ‘Follow!’</td>
<td>Bêekin ! ‘Follow (PL)!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jo ‘to command’</td>
<td>Jô ! ‘Command!’</td>
<td>Jôkin ! ‘Command (PL)!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de ‘to throw’</td>
<td>Dê ! ‘Throw!’</td>
<td>Dêkin ! ‘Throw (PL)!’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are four known irregular second person singular imperative forms which are illustrated in (60). The plural imperative forms are not irregular.
Indicative  | Singular imperative  | Plural imperative
--- | --- | ---
se  ‘to come’  | Sôkɔ !  ‘Come!’  | Sékin !  ‘Come (pl)!’
ji  ‘to eat’  | Jîkɔ !  ‘Eat!’  | Jîkin !  ‘Eat (pl)!’
gwi  ‘to die’  | Gwîkɛ !  ‘Die!’  | Gwîkin !  ‘Die (pl)!’
fe  ‘to give’  | Fêkɛ !  ‘Give!’  | Fêkin !  ‘Give (pl)!’

(a) Elision

Final vowels of nouns and verbs which are elided across a word boundary are written in their full lexical form as illustrated in (61).

(61) Write  | Do not write
--- | ---
A ŋkɛkɔ bupa.  | A ŋkɛk bupa.  ‘He cuts the meat.’
A ntoml bupa.  | A ntoml bupa.  ‘He sends the meat.’
A nsiŋ jembo.  | A nsiŋ jembo.  ‘He knows how to dance.’
nsɛk maambɔ  | nsɛk maambɔ  ‘my pineapples’
kaandɔ neh  | kand neh  ‘this couscous’

There are four exceptions to this rule. The first occurs when a noun is followed by a possessive pronoun which begins with a vowel as illustrated in (62). The second occurs when the word is monosyllabic as illustrated in (63). The third occurs when a verb is followed by either a first or second person pronoun as illustrated in (64). The fourth occurs with imperatives as illustrated in (65). In the first three of these exceptions, the elided vowel is replaced by an apostrophe. There is no apostrophe in the case of the imperatives.

(62) Write  | Do not write
--- | ---
caan’ammaambɔ  | caanɔ aambɔ  ‘my monkey’
caan’ɔɔɔɔ  | caanɔ ɔɔ  ‘your (sg) monkey’
caan’ɛ  | caanɔ ɛ  ‘his monkey’
caan’usu  | caanɔ usu  ‘our monkey’
caan’un  | caanɔ un  ‘your (pl) monkey’
caan’a  | caanɔ a  ‘their monkey’

(63) Write  | Do not write
--- | ---
K’ɔ  | Kɔɔ  ‘If you...’
Yɔɔŋɛ  | Yɔɔŋɛ  ‘They will...’

(64) Write  | Do not write
--- | ---
A mi biw’ɛɛ.  | A mi biwɛɛ.  ‘He is beating me.’
A mi biw’ɔɔɔɔ.  | A mi biwɔɔɔɔ.  ‘He is beating you.’
When the present tense indicative mood copula ji ‘PRS.COP’ reduces to -i ‘PRS.COP’, it is written directly after the pronoun subject with an apostrophe. This is illustrated in (66).

(66) Write or Do not write
ni ji ni‘i nii ‘I am’
gwe ji gwe‘i gwei ‘you are’
ɔ ji ɔ‘i ɔi ‘you are’
a ji a‘i7 ai ‘he is’
se ji se‘i sei ‘we are’
ne ji ne‘i nei ‘you (PL) are’
ye ji ye‘i yei ‘they are’

When a pronominal subject is reduced (e.g. se ‘1PL’ becomes s- ‘1PL’) preceding the past tense marker a ‘P2’, it is written directly before the past tense marker with an apostrophe as illustrated in (67).

(67) Write Do not write
nia se ni a se ‘I came’
gw’a se gwa se ‘you came’
aa se a a se ‘he came’
s’a se sa se ‘we came’
n’a se na se ‘you (PL) came’
y’a se ya se ‘they came’

When perfect aspect bɔ ‘PRF’ reduces to -ɔ ‘PRF’, it is written directly after the preceding tense marker with an apostrophe as illustrated in (68).

(68) Write or Write Do not write
Nia’ɔ se. Nia bɔ se. Niaɔ se. ‘I have come.’
Gw’aɔ se. Gw’a bɔ se. Gw‘aɔ se. ‘You have come.’
Aa’ɔ se. Aa bɔ se. Aaɔ se. ‘He has come.’
S’aɔ se. S’a bɔ se. S‘aɔ se. ‘He has come.’
N’aɔ se. N’a bɔ se. N’aɔ se. ‘You (PL) come.’
Y’aɔ se. Y’a bɔ se. Y’aɔ se. ‘They have come.’

---

7 This construction should not be confused with the noun aay ‘grandmother’.
8 An alternative form for 2SG pronouns is ɔ. When this marker is combined with -a ‘P2’ and -ɔ ‘PERF’, the P2 marker elides and the 2SG, P2, PERF construction is written as ɔa as in ɔa jemye ‘You have woken up’.
When imperfective aspect \( ji \) ‘IPFV’ reduces to -\( i \) ‘IPFV’, it is written directly after the preceding tense marker with an apostrophe as illustrated in (69).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(69)</th>
<th>Write or</th>
<th>Write</th>
<th>Do not write</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nia’i se.</td>
<td>Nia ji se.</td>
<td>Nai se.</td>
<td>‘I was coming.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gw’a’i se.</td>
<td>Gw’aj se.</td>
<td>Gw’ai se.</td>
<td>‘You were coming.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aa’i se.</td>
<td>Aa ji se.</td>
<td>Aai se.</td>
<td>‘He was coming.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S’a’i se.</td>
<td>S’a ji se.</td>
<td>S’ai se.</td>
<td>‘We were coming.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N’a’i se.</td>
<td>N’a ji se.</td>
<td>N’ai se.</td>
<td>‘You were coming.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y’a’i se.</td>
<td>Y’a ji se.</td>
<td>Y’ai se.</td>
<td>‘They were coming.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **PUNCTUATION AND CAPITALIZATION**

Punctuation marks and rules governing punctuation and capitalization are the same as those for French. The punctuation marks and capitalization used in Kwakum are:

- Full stop (.)
- Question mark (preceded by a space) (?)
- Exclamation mark (preceded by a space) (!)
- Comma (,)
- Colon (preceded by a space) (:)
- Semicolon (preceded by a space) (;)
- Quotation marks (« ... »)
- Capitalization
- Parentheses

7.1 **Full stop**

The full stop (.) marks the end of a declarative sentence as illustrated in (70).

(70) Ke a’i Camerounaise, a ji kondu Africa.
    if 3SG PRS.COP Cameroonian 3SG PRS.COP young.woman Africa
    ‘If she is Cameroonian, she is African.’

7.2 **Question mark**

The question mark (?) ends an interrogative sentence and is preceded by a single space as illustrated in (71).
(71) Keh pulɔ nno tan, gwɔɔnɔ fɛ ke sukul?
   if rain.NPRS=rain.V outside children 1SG go school
   'If it is raining, will the children go to school?'

7.3 Exclamation mark

The exclamation mark (!) is written at the end of a command or placed following exclamatory words or phrases, proceeded by a single space. It marks interjections, surprises, excitement, and forceful comments as well as simple commands. A sentence expressing surprise is illustrated in (72).

(72) Na? Ndetkele nyamo ibimbu neh!
   how large meat quantity DEM
   'How? This large quantity of meat!'

7.4 Comma

The comma (,) is used to separate clauses as illustrated in (73).

(73) Keh a nlaks'ɔɔ, nia'ɔ bilɔ kaata weɛ.
   if 3SGPRS=ask'2SG 1SG.P2.PRF receive letter 3SG.POSS
   'If he asks you, I received his letter.'

Commas are also used in lists as illustrated in (74).

(74) A nse kumɔ paam, nɛ ŋgwal, nɛ kɔndu yɛɛ.
   3SGPRS=come find man with wife with daughter 3SG.POSS
   'He found a man, (his) wife, and his daughter.'

7.5 Colon

The colon (:) is used to introduce a list of similar items and is preceded by a single space. The word following the colon is not capitalized as illustrated in (75).

(75) A lenɔ me naa a mbɔɔmɔ jasi ibaa : piŋga nɛ ŋguto.
   3SGPRS=want P4 COMP 3SGPRS=buy thing two peanuts and oil
   'He wanted to buy two things: peanuts and oil.'

7.6 Semicolon

The semicolon (;) is used to separate clauses within a sentence as illustrated in (76).
(76) Keh ne bek kusɔ naa, ntwɛɛ jinɛ ko kal
if 2PL NEG leave COMP PRS=show 2PL bullet gun
a’I mbɔɔɔ neh; jasi.
3SG PRS. COP bad DEM thing
‘If you do not leave, I should show you this bullet; it’s a bad thing.’

7.7 Quotation marks

French guillemets (« ... ») are used to indicate reported speech. When there are multiple speakers, they occur only at the beginning and end of an entire dialogue. Note that there is a single space after the first mark and before the second. When the speaker changes in a dialogue, a hyphen is used to communicate the change. Below is an excerpt from the story Bembe which demonstrates the use of quotations and hyphens in a dialogue. The dialogue begins with Bembe talking to the parrot, then there is a back-and-forth. This dialogue is not glossed due to its length.

(77) « Na?! Ndetkele nyamo ibimbu neh! O be ne kanėta kul naa o njolɔ yei?
Bembe laksɛ kosu neŋ.
- Kosu mbanлаа ye naa, O me ʋe naa, ni’i si fene teyɛŋ ʋo kol mɔtu ko
iya kol waambo ʋo ku y’ә bo toklе? Gwɔmo, ye ke ne ikombo te. Ye
ηkeŋe je. Boku ye nje ʋo bupa yi, ye ndoke. Bupa si ji ʋu, ndee
ʋucyeŋ ʋucyeŋ ne soŋ. Gwɔmo, ye baple si bapleŋ bapleŋ.
- Bembe naa, No?
- Ii.
- Nia jokɔ. »

The final punctuation occurs before the final quotation mark (as seen above) when the entire sentence is cited. Otherwise, the final punctuation occurs after the final quotation mark, as seen in (78).

(78) Amélie mɛ kee naa a mfiya « mɛnɔ ».
Amélie P2 say COMP 3SG PRS=come tomorrow
‘Amélie said that she will come tomorrow.’

In the case of a quote within a quote, double quotation marks (“...”) are used. In (79), the tortoise is quoting the water snail, and what the water snail said is within double quotation marks (and bolded for ease of reference).
Moo jaklyɛ meh kɔ suwe fa yi, a ke kumɔ kɔmbu. Je nɛ kɔmbu naa, «Nsolaŋ meh tɔkaa gwɛ naa, “A njih si kɔɔlo.”
- Aayɛɛ ! »
’When the tortoise left there again, he found the monitor lizard. He said to the lizard, “The water snail insulted you saying, ‘He only eats snails.’”
(Then, the lizard responded) “My mother!”’

Notice that in English, single quotation marks (‘...’) are used to indicate a quote within a quote, but that is not the case in French or Kwakum. Also notice that in Kwakum the double quotation marks end the quotation within the quotation, but the final guillemet does not occur until the end of the entire dialogue.

7.8 Capitalization

Capital letters are used at the beginning of sentences as illustrated in (80).

(80) A ŋkɛ sexɛ ngwal nɛ gwɔɔmɔ. 3SG PRS=go deceive wife with child
‘He deceived his wife and children.’

Capital letters are also used for names and places as illustrated in (81).

(81) Mɔɔnɔ neh Lajisi me suwe. child DEM Lajishi P2 leave
‘One of the children, Lajishi, left (the gathering).’

Names are capitalized even if they co-occur with a noun class concord prefix. The name is capitalized, but the prefix is not as illustrated in (82).

(82) Nunɛ, a nlenɔ naa a ŋkaasɔ gwɔɔmɔ kibuku kĩSambu yi. now 3SG PRS=want COMP 3SG PRSSpeak people word God REL
‘Now, he wants to tell people the word of God.’

7.9 Parentheses

Parentheses are used to insert setting information into a text or when the author wants to add additional information not directly part of the storyline. This is illustrated in (83).
In that place (since the Til fought a lot) they fought wars with the tribes of all the people.'

7.10 Diacritics

As described in section 0, diacritics are used to differentiate grammatical categories. Unlike French, diacritics should be marked on both lower case and capital letters. A circumflex indicates imperative mood and is written on the first vowel of the verb (84). A grave accent indicates immediate future tense and is written over subject pronouns (85). An acute accent indicates that the second of two nouns is an associated noun (86). It is written over the first vowel of the second noun, even if the first vowel is a noun class concord marker. It is not written over nasals.

(84) **Circumflex**
   Bënde!
   ‘Look!’

(85) **Grave accent**
   À se.
   3S.F1 come
   ‘He is coming’

(86) **Acute accent**
   kan búpa
type meat
   ‘type of meat.’

8. Loan Words

Loan words (including proper names) are written using the Kwakum alphabet as illustrated in (87).
(87)  Jésus (French) \(\rightarrow\) Yesu ‘Jesus’
Jean (French) \(\rightarrow\) Saŋ ‘John’
muchacho (Spanish) \(\rightarrow\) mucaco ‘guy’
market (English) \(\rightarrow\) makiti ‘market’
cup (English) \(\rightarrow\) kopu ‘cup’
garden (English) \(\rightarrow\) ŋgatin ‘garden’
buy ’em (English) \(\rightarrow\) baym ‘commerce’
ginger (English) \(\rightarrow\) jinja ‘ginger’

However, if a loan word is consistently pronounced with sounds that are not represented in the Kwakum alphabet, then the word is written according to its orthographic system and italicized as illustrated in (88).

(88)  grâce (French) \(\rightarrow\) gracía ‘grace’

If loan words which keep their original pronunciation are used consistently in the language, then the Kwakum language community will need to consider adding these letters to their alphabet (possibly on the bottom of the alphabet chart).

9. Sample Text

The following text is by Jean Bosco Titike, a native speaker of Kwakum.

Atelye


The Sun Bird (English translation)

The bird they call the “Sun bird” is a small bird. It is a type of small bird. It builds its nest suspended on high. It takes the flowers of a baobab tree that are wilted. It pushes them into (the nest) so that it will sleep comfortably. It is a bird that lays two eggs. It also has two offspring: a male and a female.

It is also a little bird that often hovers to drink the nectar of a flower since it drinks
mainly nectar of flowers. It also eats butterflies. It eats little ants. It eats fruit. But the sun bird is a small bird which mainly stays where flowers are because it drinks the nectar that is in the flowers. It is a small bird which is really great. It is really great because it lives only where flowers are. It catches small ants. It drinks nectar which is in flowers, which is sweet.

10. MATTERS FOR FURTHER TESTING

The proposed orthography will be tested through a transitional literacy primer and transitional literacy classes starting in August 2019. Based on the consensus of the participants at the workshops, this document will subsequently be reviewed and revised (January 2020).

Matters for further testing include:

- The semantic meaning of all future markers.
- The facility by which the Kwakum can read and write prenasalized stops vs. syllabic consonants (NC vs N.C).
- If tone needs to be marked.

ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(x)</th>
<th>Optional constituent</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Noun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>First Person</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Second Person</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Immediate Past Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Third Person</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Near Past Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Middle Past Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>Complementizer</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Remote Past Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>Copula</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>Possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Immediate Future Tense</td>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Middle Future Tense</td>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Remote Future Tense</td>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>Present Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>High tone</td>
<td>PRS.COP</td>
<td>Present Indicative Copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPFV</td>
<td>Imperfective Aspect</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>Relativizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA</td>
<td>International Phonetic Alphabet</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Low tone</td>
<td>TBU</td>
<td>Tone Bearing Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>TRANS</td>
<td>Transitive Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mid tone</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX

The words listed below are minimal pairs, triplets, close minimal pairs, or homophones along with their underlying forms and how they are marked in the orthography. Most are within the same grammatical category unless otherwise noted. Words from differing noun classes are listed together because many noun class prefixes are optional in everyday speech. The spelling of words below that are highlighted needs to be memorized by the Kwakum community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonetic Form</th>
<th>Orthographic Form</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[à]</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>‘3PRO’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[á]</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>‘1P’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[à̂āi]</td>
<td>aa’i</td>
<td>‘he was’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[à̄āy] (n)</td>
<td>aay</td>
<td>‘grandmother’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[báà] (v)</td>
<td>baa</td>
<td>‘tighten (a trap)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[bàà] (n)</td>
<td>baa</td>
<td>‘cola nut’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[bààmɔ̀] (v)</td>
<td>baamɔ</td>
<td>‘burst’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[bààmɔ́] (v)</td>
<td>baamɔ</td>
<td>‘throw out’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[bèè] (v)</td>
<td>bee</td>
<td>‘follow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[bèè]</td>
<td>bee</td>
<td>‘so that’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[bènʃɛ̀] (v)</td>
<td>benʃɛ</td>
<td>‘hate’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[bíŋʃɛ̀] (v)  biŋsɛ̀  ‘roll up’
[bɔ̀lɔ̀] (v)  bolɔ̀  ‘discover’
[bɔ̀lɔ̀] (v)  bolɔ̀  ‘envade’
[tʃàánɔ́] (v)  caanɔ̀  ‘arrive’
[tʃàánɔ́] (n)  caanɔ̀  ‘type of monkey’
[’tʃîl] (n)  cill  ‘great grandchild’
[’tʃî] (n)  cil  ‘father-in-law’
[tʃîlɔ̀] (v)  cilɔ̀  ‘write’
[tʃîlɔ̀] (n)  cilɔ̀  ‘gorilla’
[tʃîndì] (n)  cindì  ‘river dam’
[tʃîndì] (n)  cindì  ‘all’
[tʃîndì] (n)  cindì  ‘calf’
[tʃîŋ] (n)  ciŋ  ‘bug’
[tʃîŋ] (n)  ciŋŋ  ‘truth’
[dɔ̀ɔkɔ́] (n)  dɔɔkɔ́  ‘wild mango’
[dɔ̀ɔkɔ̀] (v)  dɔɔkɔ̀  ‘taste with the finger’
[fèè] (v)  fee  ‘become’
[fɛ̀] (v)  fɛ̀  ‘give’
[fɛ̀] (v)  fɛ̀  ‘2’
[fɛ̀mɔ̀] (v)  femɔ̀  ‘rest’
[fɛ̀mɔ̀] (v)  femɔ̀  ‘detest’
[gwà]  gw’a  ‘he has’
[gwà]  gwa  ‘be about to’
[gwàà] (n)  gwaas  ‘namesake’
[gwà]  gwa  ‘them’
[gwè]  gwe   ‘over there’
[gwèè]  gwèè   ‘him’
[gwè]  gwe   ‘you’

[idòŋ] (n)  idonj   ‘life’
[idón] (n)  idonj   ‘room’
[idón] (n)  idonj   ‘cadaver, PL’

[ikân] (n)  ikanj   ‘clump of grass’
[ikàn] (n)  ikanj   ‘shelf’

[ikùm] (n)  ikum   ‘tree stump’
[ikùm] (n)  ikum   ‘owl’
[ikùm] (n)  ikum   ‘riches’

[dzà] (n)  ja   ‘swamp’
[dzà]  ja   ‘them’

[dzáá] (v)  jaa   ‘fry’
[dzáá] (v)  jaa   ‘get lost’

[dzàákɔ́] (v)  jaakɔ   ‘braid’
[dzàákɔ́] (v)  jaakɔ   ‘castrate’

[dzàálɔ́] (v)  jaalɔ   ‘hang’
[dzàálɔ́] (v)  jaalɔ   ‘give birth’

[dzákwáà] (v)  jakwaa   ‘say goodbye’
[dzákwáà] (v)  jakwaa   ‘pay’

[dzályɛ́] (v)  jalyɛ   ‘be born’
[dzályɛ́] (n)  jalyɛ   ‘left’

[dzànʃɛ̀] (v)  Janseh   ‘direct’
[dzànʃɛ̀] (v)  Janse   ‘loose, TRANS’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kwakum Orthography</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[dʒáʃí] jasi</td>
<td></td>
<td>'chin'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[dʒáʃí] jasi</td>
<td></td>
<td>'thing, pl.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[dʒé̯é] jee  (v)</td>
<td></td>
<td>'see'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[dʒé̯] je</td>
<td></td>
<td>'him'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[dʒóŋ] (n) jon</td>
<td></td>
<td>'turbulence'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[dʒóŋ] (n) jon</td>
<td></td>
<td>'fiancé'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[dʒì] ji</td>
<td></td>
<td>'COP/IPFV'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[dʒì] (v) ji</td>
<td></td>
<td>'eat'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[dʒì] (n) ji</td>
<td></td>
<td>'bait'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[dʒíkɔ̀] (v) jikɔ</td>
<td></td>
<td>'push in'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[dʒíkɔ̀] (v) jikɔ</td>
<td></td>
<td>'burn up'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[dʒóɭɔ́] (v) jolɔ</td>
<td></td>
<td>'kill'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[dʒóɭɔ́] (n) jolɔ</td>
<td></td>
<td>'crocodile'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[dʒɔ́sɛ́] jɔsɛ</td>
<td></td>
<td>'hide, TRANS'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[dʒɔ́sɛ́] (v) jɔsɛ</td>
<td></td>
<td>'judge'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[kà] (n) ka</td>
<td></td>
<td>'pangolin‘spinal column'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[kà] (v) ka</td>
<td></td>
<td>'win'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[kàà] (n) kaa</td>
<td></td>
<td>'healer'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[kàà] (n) kaa</td>
<td></td>
<td>'folly, nightmare'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ikàà] (n) ikaa</td>
<td></td>
<td>'savannah, guinea fowl'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[kààmɔ̀] (n) kaamɔ</td>
<td></td>
<td>'reason'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[kààmɔ̀] (n) kaamɔ</td>
<td></td>
<td>'ten'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[kààmɔ̀] (v) kaamɔ</td>
<td></td>
<td>'accept, love'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[kàǎnɔ̄] (n) kaanɔ</td>
<td></td>
<td>'type of weed'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[kàànɔ̄] (n) kaanɔ</td>
<td></td>
<td>'proverb'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[kàl] (n) kall 'sign'
[kàl] (n) kal 'gun'

[kàlà] (n) kala 'same age'
[kàlà] (n) kala 'type of carp'
[kàlàà] (v) kalaa 'transmit'

[kàn] (n) kan 'spice'
[kàn] (n) kan 'quality'

[‘kàŋh] (n) kaŋ 'neighbor'
[kàŋ] (n) kaŋ 'scabies'
[kàŋh] (n) kaŋ 'enclosure'
[kàŋ] (n) kaŋŋ 'hero'

[kàtì] kati 'like'
[kàtì] (n) kati 'level'
[ŋkàtì] (n) ŋkati 'exam'

[kàtá] (n) kata 'tire'
[kàtá] (n) kata 'hold (judo)'
[kààtà] (n) kaata 'book'
[kààtà] (v) kataa 'double'

[ké] keh 'if'
[kè] ke 'what'
[kèè] (v) kee 'say'

[kèŋ] (n) keŋ 'sacrifice'
[kɛŋ] (n) kɛŋ 'pain'
[kikɛŋ] (n) kikɛŋ 'knife'

[kɛ̀] (v) kɛ 'go'
[kɛ́ɛ́] (v) kɛɛ 'hurt'
[kɛ̀ɛ̀] (v) kɛɛ 'shave'
[kibɛkɔ] (n) kibɛkɔ 'shoulder'
[kibɛkɔ] (n) kibɛkɔ 'pan'

[kɔ] (n) kɔ 'bullet'
[kɔ] (n) kɔ 'belly button'
[kɔ] (n) kɔ 'type of tree'

[ikɔkù] (n) ikɔku 'back of the head'
[kökù] (n) koku 'pebble'

[kɔ̄lɔ́] (v) kɔɔlɔ 'tie up'
[kɔ̄lɔ́ (n) kɔɔlɔ 'snail'
[kɔ̄lɔ́ (n) kɔɔlɔ 'basket with holes'

[kol] (n) kol 'high, top'
[kol] (n) kol 'foot'

[kɔkáá] (n) kokaa 'uncle'
[kɔkā] (n) koka 'type of bird'

[kɔmbɔ́] (n) kɔmbɔ́h 'mountain'
[kɔmbɔ́] (n) kɔmbɔ 'porcupine'
[ikɔmbɔ́] (n) ikɔmbɔ 'bush'

[kɔɔkɔ̀] (v) kɔɔkɔ 'crush'
[kɔɔkɔ̀] (n) kɔɔkɔ 'tree trunk'
[kɔɔkɔ̀] (n) kɔɔkɔ 'WC'

[kûl] (n) kull 'wind'
[kûl] (n) kul 'red rabbit'
[kûl] (n) kul 'strength'

[kûmà] (n) kuma 'leftover couscous'
[ikûmà] (n) ikuma 'cassava stick'
[ikûmà] (n) ikumah 'pile'
[kùndú] (n) kundu ‘sterile’
[ìkùndù] (n) ikundu ‘trash can’
[kùwɔ̄] (n) kuwɔ ‘angle’
[kùwɔ̀] (n) kuwɔ ‘shield’
[kwàl] (n) kwal ‘partridge’
[kwàl] (n) kwal ‘little dry season’
[lààtɔ̀] (v) laatɔ ‘stall’
[lààtɔ́] (v) laatɔ ‘sew’
[lènɔ̀] (v) lenɔ ‘cry’
[lènɔ̀] (v) lenɔ ‘desire’
[lɛɛ] (v) lɛɛ ‘dress’
[lɛɛ́] lɛɛ ‘but’
[lò] (v) lo ‘germinate’
[lóó] (v) loo ‘combat’
[lò] (n) lo ‘sperm’
[lɔ̀l] (n) lɔl ‘benediction’
[lɔ̀l] (n) lɔl ‘saliva’
[ᵐbɛ̀ɛ̀] (n) mbɛɛ ‘fault’
[ᵐbɛ̀ɛ́] mbɛɛ ‘window’
[ⁿmɛ́l] (n) mbel ‘breast, PL’
[ⁿmɛ́l] (n) mbel ‘door’
[ⁿmɛ̀l] (n) mbell ‘thigh, PL’
[ᵐbɔkù] (n) mboku ‘prison’
[ᵐbɔkù] (n) mboku ‘squirrel’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mboŋ</td>
<td>'vine'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mboŋ</td>
<td>'furrow'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meh</td>
<td>'P1'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td>'P2'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meɛɛ</td>
<td>'NEG'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misi</td>
<td>'1.POSS'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misi</td>
<td>'eye, PL'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ndeŋ</td>
<td>'hunt'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ndeŋ</td>
<td>'stranger'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neɛ</td>
<td>'with'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neɛ</td>
<td>'DEM'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñgwal</td>
<td>'fruit'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñgwal</td>
<td>'wife'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñgwoŋ</td>
<td>'water current'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñgwoŋ</td>
<td>'eel'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñkwala</td>
<td>'machete'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñkwalaɛɛ</td>
<td>'scratch'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa</td>
<td>'agreement'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paa</td>
<td>'good'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paki</td>
<td>'wage'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paki</td>
<td>'mongoose'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pamsɛɛ</td>
<td>'heat up'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pamsɛɛ</td>
<td>'make hop'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pata</td>
<td>'pastor'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pata</td>
<td>'trace of saliva'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[pátá] (n) pata 'garden'

[pààβ] (v) paasɔ ‘split’
[pàáβ] (v) paasɔ ‘get up’

[pààndʒɔ̀] (v) paanjɔ ‘erase’
[pààndʒɔ] (n) paanjɔ ‘side (of the body)’

[péŋ] (n) peŋ ‘flood’
[pèŋ] (n) peŋ ‘edge’
[péŋ] (n) peŋ ‘wound’
[péŋ] (n) peŋ ‘side’

[pèŋ] (n) peŋ ‘flood’
[pèŋ] (n) peŋ ‘edge’
[pèŋ] (n) peŋ ‘wound’
[pèŋ] (n) peŋ ‘side’

[pààndʒɔ́] (v) paanjɔ́ ‘erase’
[pààndʒɔ] (n) paanjɔ ‘side (of the body)’

[pêŋ] (n) peŋ ‘flood’
[pèŋ] (n) peŋ ‘edge’
[pèŋ] (n) peŋ ‘wound’
[pèŋ] (n) peŋ ‘side’

[pàà] (n) sa ‘heart’
[pàá] (n) sa ‘shae tree’
[pàá] (n) sa ‘traditional dance’
[pàá] (n) sas ‘village’

[pàà] saa ‘at the home of’
[pàá] (n) saa ‘necklace’
[pàá] (v) saa ‘do’

[pààkɔ́] (n) saakɔ ‘chicken’
[pààkɔ́] (v) saakɔ ‘try’

[fè] (v) se ‘come’
[fèë] (v) see ‘appreciate’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ʃɛ́ɛ́]</td>
<td>sɛɛ</td>
<td>‘work’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃɛ̀l]</td>
<td>sɛl</td>
<td>‘pot’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃɛ̂l]</td>
<td>sɛll</td>
<td>‘beard’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃɪkɪ]</td>
<td>siki</td>
<td>‘orphan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃɪkɪ]</td>
<td>siki</td>
<td>‘saw’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃɪŋlɛ̀]</td>
<td>siŋlɛ</td>
<td>‘rub’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃɛ̂ŋlɛ̀]</td>
<td>seŋlɛ</td>
<td>‘know’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃoŋ]</td>
<td>soŋ</td>
<td>‘type of fruit’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃoŋ]</td>
<td>soŋ</td>
<td>‘Kwakum village (Sibita)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃoŋ]</td>
<td>soŋ</td>
<td>‘anger’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃɔ̄ɔ̄]</td>
<td>sɔɔ</td>
<td>‘egg plant’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃɔ̀ɔ̀]</td>
<td>sɔɔ</td>
<td>‘type of basket’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃɔ̌l]</td>
<td>sɔl</td>
<td>‘type of tree’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃɔ̀l]</td>
<td>sɔl</td>
<td>‘foreskin’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃɔ̌n]</td>
<td>sɔn</td>
<td>‘shame’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃɔ̀n]</td>
<td>sɔn</td>
<td>‘hold’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃɔ̂ŋ]</td>
<td>sɔŋ</td>
<td>‘death, funeral’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃɔ̂ŋ]</td>
<td>sɔŋŋ</td>
<td>‘road’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tā]</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>‘who’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tā]</td>
<td>tah</td>
<td>‘like’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tāŋ]</td>
<td>taŋ</td>
<td>‘consideration’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tāŋ]</td>
<td>taŋ</td>
<td>‘price’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tāŋ]</td>
<td>taŋ</td>
<td>‘during’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tāŋ]</td>
<td>taŋ</td>
<td>‘white person’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tàálɔ́] (n)</td>
<td>taalɔ́</td>
<td>'shelf used for drying meat'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[táálo] (n)</td>
<td>taalɔ́</td>
<td>'cousin'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tàálbɔ́] (n)</td>
<td>taalɔ̀</td>
<td>'grandson'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tɛ́ɛ́]</td>
<td>tɛɛ</td>
<td>'NEG'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tɛ́]</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>'in'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tɛ̀] (n)</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>'serpent'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tɛ́ɛ́]</td>
<td>tɛɛ</td>
<td>'NEG'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tɛ́]</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>'in'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tɛ̀] (n)</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>'serpent'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tɔ̄ŋ̧̧̧̧] (n)</td>
<td>tɔŋ</td>
<td>'rattan'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tɔ̀ŋ] (n)</td>
<td>tɔŋ</td>
<td>'pipe'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tukɔ̀] (v)</td>
<td>tukɔ</td>
<td>'crumple'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tukɔ̀] (n)</td>
<td>tukɔ</td>
<td>'pain'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[túlɔ́] (v)</td>
<td>tulɔ́</td>
<td>'grind'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[túlɔ́] (n)</td>
<td>tulɔ</td>
<td>'regime'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[we]</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>'DEM'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[weɛ]</td>
<td>weɛ</td>
<td>'NEG'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INTRODUCTION

The landscape of the Bible translation movement has changed profoundly over the last fifty years. The growth of the Church in the Global South, both numerically and in spiritual vitality, is well-documented and represents a changed reality for all of us who have committed ourselves to this work. The Seed Company was founded in 1993 to respond to the recognition that there were new players in the field of Bible Translation, speakers of the world’s smaller languages, who could play a leading role in translating God’s Word into their respective languages. In 1993, we viewed the
new players on the field primarily as *individuals*. Today we are seeing *organizations*, such as church denominations, local and international mission societies, who are also pressing to join the team committed to bringing God’s message to the nations in the languages of their hearts. The global landscape emphasizing partnership has put pressure on systems and processes for Bible translation which were developed in an earlier era. It also challenges the assumptions that we as lifelong participants in the Bible translation movement bring to our work.

In this paper, I explicate some of the foundational assumptions which have informed our work as Bible translation consultants and compare those assumptions with the realities of our changed context, with special attention to what I see as strategic mismatches between them. I will close with a proposal for recasting how we think about what we do to better align with where we are now in the history of Bible translation and the Church at large.

**SIGNING OFF**

Assumptions are often only partially explicated in our consciousness. We tend to act on them even when we do not always articulate them clearly. Sometimes we use metaphors to stand in for the propositional assumptions which drive our decisions. This is as true in our experience in Bible translation as it is in our whole experience of life. Lakoff and Johnson note:

“We have found...that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action...The concepts that govern our thought...also govern our everyday functioning down to the most mundane details. Our concepts structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people” (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 3).

A metaphor that has powerfully shaped our understanding of translation consulting is drawn from the manufacturing world. We have conceived of our work as a kind of Quality Control function, whereby we as consultants assure ourselves, the translation teams, our organizations, the proposed publishers of a Bible, and the Church at large that a given translation is a faithful rendering of the original message. In the wider manufacturing sector, quality control officers examine the products of a manufacturing process to assure stakeholders that they meet standards of quality as defined by the manufacturer. They then “sign off” on the quality of the product they have examined. The consultant check has served a similar function for translations of the Bible for decades and we have adopted similar language in talking about what we do.

Effective Quality Control efforts share certain common features:

1. A single entity is normally in charge of the process of production from start to finish. That entity uses quality control to ensure its products meet agreed-upon standards.
2. The metrics defining quality are clear.
3. Quality metrics are consistently applied, yielding uniformly reliable results.
4. The quality control check happens, at least, at the end of the production process. (While Total Quality Management maintains that responsibility for quality assurance resides throughout an organization and its manufacturing processes, there is always a final review before the product is released.) It would be impossible to assure the quality of a product which was significantly modified after the last quality control check.

The quality control metaphor reflects an era when the Bible agencies held a monopoly-like position in Bible translation ministry. The global Church, with few exceptions, implicitly delegated to the Bible agencies the responsibility to service the Bible translation needs of the world’s language communities, large and small. Those agencies forged common understandings about how faithfulness of translations was to be maintained and what the role of translation consultants should be in the process. The great challenge for us as Bible translation consultants is to recognize that, today, there are a number of critical mismatches in our practices, our assumptions, and our capacity, which call into question our continued reliance on the quality control metaphor as a way of understanding our work.

**Mismatches in Our Practice**

The way that translation checking actually happens today within the wider circle of Bible agencies has considerably more variation than is implied by the Quality Control metaphor. Although we often talk about the consultant check in terms of quality control, the reality is that what is checked and how it is checked varies considerably. In my early years as a corporate officer in SIL International, I was astonished to discover that some of the features of consultant checks which I had understood to be non-negotiable, distinctive features of SIL consultant checks in Indonesia were optional in the practice of SIL consultants working in other parts of the world. The presence of uninitiated native speakers to verify the comprehensibility of the translation is routinely expected by some consultants, but not by others. Some consultants insist on written back translations prepared ahead of the check, while others are comfortable examining a translation through a dynamic interaction based on oral back translation. Some are willing to conduct a consultant check by correspondence, while others regard that practice as grossly
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irresponsible. For some, the consultant check is best done right before the manuscript is submitted for typesetting, such that the consultant signs off that the manuscript is ready for publication. For others, the consultant check occurs earlier in the process of translation, giving church leaders the opportunity for further revision before typesetting and publication. If revisions are made after the consultant check, some consultants insist on reviewing them before signing off, others do not. Some consultants have learned to check multiple translations of the same text in group checking sessions, while others find the prospect daunting to say the least.

Other variations in the practice of translation checking have to do with our understanding of translation theory. The range of acceptable implicit information made explicit in a translation differs from consultant to consultant. Consultants vary on how heavily they lean toward specific exegetical choices in various biblical passages. Bible translators have often been exasperated by receiving conflicting advice from different consultants looking at the same key terms or reviewing closely parallel passages. All this points to a significant human element in the task of translation checking that reflects more individual preference than is popularly ascribed to our checking processes.

**Mismatches in Our Assumptions**

The Bible agencies have for decades provided what is essentially an outsourced service for the global Church. We were regarded as having the expertise to manage and execute translation programs and produce faithful translations and the Church at large expected us to fulfill our stewardships on their behalf. As a result, most of us in the translation consultant community have grown up regarding the Bible translation task as a job for which we were uniquely qualified. When other groups proposed to do Bible translation, we have tended as a professional community to look askance (to put it mildly).

In the last ten years, I have observed a profound growth in the number of Christian ministries, be they churches or parachurch organizations, who are initiating and executing Bible translation projects. There is a broader appreciation for the effectiveness of translations of Scripture in the language of the heart. There is also a burgeoning impatience on the part of some ministries at the apparent slowness of the Bible agencies to meet what they perceive has been a longstanding, unmet global need. A small but growing group of ministries are championing the cause of *church-centric Bible translation*. The movement’s most passionate advocates assert that the local church has the *right* and the *capacity* to meet its own need for a translation of the Bible and to determine when those translations are faithful. They pursue, almost defiantly, Bible translation projects without any reference to the Bible agencies.
Related to this, the advent of desktop publishing technology has empowered local communities to produce camera-ready versions of their translations which they can duplicate and bind using their own resources, without reference to the traditional publishers of Bible products. As a result, parachurch ministries and churches do not feel the same need to engage with the Bible agencies as they once did.

Finally, international Bible agencies such as SIL and the Seed Company are in a socially weakened position to assert control of the global Bible translation process in a mature post-colonial world. For organizations with North American or European heritage to tell people from Asia, Africa, and Latin America, “We are the ones qualified to determine if translations of Scripture done in your country are faithful” is repellant to those for whom the recollections of their national colonial experience are still fresh.

All this is to say, we need to recognize that more and more translation projects are being executed in multi-agency partnerships which include Bible agencies and other Christian ministry partners. In those contexts, translation consultants from particular organizations risk much when they assume for themselves the controlling role of evaluating the faithfulness of translations done in the collaborative endeavor.

Mismatch in Capacity

Implicit in the quality control metaphor is that the manufacturing entity provides sufficient infrastructure to evaluate the quality of its products in line with its rate of production. In the case of the global Bible translation endeavor, we have long recognized that the growth of the Bible translation enterprise has far outrun the capacity of the translation consultant community to service it in a timely way. Anecdotes of translation teams whose translations have sat for months or even years waiting for a consultant check are widespread and legendary. “Just be patient” is a message that rests on the assumption that we in the Bible agencies control the process and can service the needs in line with our capacity. In situations where we no longer control the processes, that message is less appropriate and certainly less welcome. Our persistent inability to service Bible translation projects in a timely way undercuts our credibility, damages trust, and threatens the role of our organizations in the global Bible translation enterprise in the 21st century.

An Alternative Metaphor—The Collegial Review

In this changing context, where our historic role as primary reviewers of faithfulness in translations is being challenged, it is easy to jump to the conclusion that
we are no longer perceived to be relevant. In a recent conversation with an advocate of church-centric Bible translation, I was confronted with the question: *If this works, won’t you be out of a job?* The short answer to the question was, *Not at all!* As long as Bible translation is being done, Bible translation experts, who through their education and experience understand the challenges of faithfully rendering the biblical message in other languages, will be a treasured human resource for the Church. Our challenge is not that we have no role in the evolving world of Bible translation, but that our role needs to change in line with the times.

One way of framing our new role is to think about it as a *collegial review*. In academic writing, it is common for a scholar to share a written piece with various colleagues and ask their honest feedbacks or comments before submitting the piece for publication. In my experience, the more critical and detailed the feedback, the more helpful it has been in guiding my revisions and improving the paper.

In the same way, we need to frame our roles in translation checking as a collegial review, giving input to help colleagues (the translation teams) make their translations better. This kind of input is generally welcomed by the translation team. In the context of our multi-agency partnerships, we need to share with teammates that this kind of review is crucial to the process of revising and improving translations. The difference in role is more than a slight nuance. We embrace the fact that we are no longer in control and are not in a position of giving approval. Instead, we are sharing based on our experience and the translation team is invited to consider the input as they do their next revision.

I have found that approaching a translation check as a collegial review does not change the mechanics of what I have actually done in the check. It is virtually the same. Far from being a problem, the fact that different translation consultants vary in the type of input they give is embraced as a natural function of different giftings and experiences. It is up to the translation team to incorporate the input they have received according to their own best lights.

The influence the consultant has grows with the value that the translation team gives her input. The more highly the team regards the consultant, the more likely her input will be incorporated to improve the translation.

Who can do a collegial review? Ultimately, in the context of today’s multi-agency partnerships, *this choice is at the discretion of the translation team or the partnership*. The most important thing is to impart the vital role collegial reviews play in the improvement of translations. The better informed the reviewer, the more useful his input will be. In this light, Bible translation consultants, as experts in the field, are potentially the most helpful reviewers that a translation team can have. However, in light of the shortage of translation consultants in comparison to the need, we Bible translation experts would do a great service to our cause by deliberately equipping others to share in the load of reviewing translations and giving timely input to translation teams.
Another way of talking about the difference in our historic translation practice (signing off) and the attitudinal adjustment I propose (giving input) is in terms of hard power and soft power. Joseph Nye wrote an influential book on foreign affairs in which he categorized a nation’s behavior in international relations in terms of hard power and soft power (Nye 2004). Hard power is the ability to coerce, through military and economic means. Soft power is the ability to influence, to winsomely draw others to voluntarily choose to do what you would like them to do. A nation’s soft power lies in the extent to which its culture, values, ideas, and institutions are admired and attractive to others.

Applying these concepts to translation checking, when a translation consultant regards a translation check as an exercise in quality control or “signing off,” he is exerting hard power in his relationship with the translation team. The message, whether articulated or not, is, “I have the power to judge your work as worthy or unworthy of publication.” This can come across as coercive and risks damaging the relationship the translation team has with their consultant, particularly when the translation team is from a partner organization from the Global South.

On the other hand, when a translation consultant regards his contribution in a translation checking session as a collegial review, i.e. “giving input,” she is exercising soft power, influencing a translation team to embrace her values and willingly revise their translation in line with her comments.

Exercising hard power may create a short-term win in that a translation team will knuckle under and comply because they feel they have no choice. However, it damages (or burns) a relational bridge in the long-term and inclines the translation team to avoid going back to that consultant in the future. Ultimately, the more you use hard power, the less influence you have. On the other hand, exercising soft power by giving input is winsome and catalytic. The more you use it, the more trust you build with colleagues and partners, and the more your influence and credibility grows.

CONCLUDING SENTIMENTS

All of us who are Jesus followers long to emulate him in our relationships with others, including the translation teams whose work we review. I close with these pertinent words of Jesus:

Jesus called them together and said, “You know that those who are regarded as rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their high officials exercise authority over them. Not so with you. Instead, whoever wants to become great among you must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must be slave of all. For even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many” (Mark 10:42–45).
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Abstract: Most often expatriate and mother tongue translators form a team to carry out the Bible translation task. Traditionally, the former is charged with the analysis of the phonology and grammar of the receptor language and the latter with decisions relating to the best spoken variety of their language. In this article I suggest how mother tongue translators will not only benefit from the linguistic analysis of their language but can also contribute to it. For this to happen successfully, the expatriate translators must orient and mentor the mother tongue translators, taking full advantage of their innate capacity in the vernacular. In the process, the speakers learn features about their language of which they were unaware and become true partners in the translation work. I provide comprehensive examples of how I mentored a young man in the West Kewa language and what we both learned. The information may be old, dating back to 2003, but the lessons are current and can provide motivation for other translators to embark on a similar task.
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INTRODUCTION

This paper could have been entitled, “Do mother tongue translators need grammars and dictionaries in their own languages?” It would then foretell my assumption that translators (national or expatriate) should understand details about the grammatical structure of their own language. I develop this theme further with another question: How can mother tongue translators investigate the semantic range of lexical items in the source and receptor languages, so that they can better check the translation’s accuracy and explore various alternative renderings? Because mother tongue translators, by definition, should speak their language well, stressing that an intuitive knowledge of the structure of their language may seem redundant or unnecessary. However, I maintain that speaking a language provides no assurance that a speaker understands their own language structure or semantics. By acquiring linguistic skills, they can assist in the translation task to the fullest extent of their abilities.
LANGUAGE STRUCTURE

Every language has a grammar—this is acknowledged by anyone who has been involved in a translation program. What is not as apparent or convincing is the claim by many linguists that every person speaking a language draws from an underlying abstract form of grammar, a Universal Grammar. Let’s assume that this is true and, because language is innate to humans, our use of language is “hard-wired.” In this respect we are completely distinct and different from animals—the point is that we all have creative abilities to use our languages.

We are therefore not surprised to find that languages have nouns, verbs, and other classes of words that represent various objects and events. Furthermore, there are words that modify nouns (adjectives) and words that modify verbs (adverbs), as well as pronouns, numerals, colors, tense-aspect, relative clauses, interrogatives, commands, person-number, case markers, and so on. When fieldworkers write a first grammar, they are expected to analyze and describe such categories, as well as additional features, (cultural categories, metaphors, pragmatics, etc.).

But how do we teach fluent speakers about the structure of their own language? And why should we bother? After all, most mother tongue translators speak their language far better than the expatriate ever will. Further, many fieldworker communities are mainly interested in good Bible translation—not a grammar, and how will teaching translators their own language help in this respect?

For a start, translators need to recognize that the text they are translating can legitimately be expressed in various ways. But they cannot consider options unless they can think deeply about their own language. To do this, they need training, encouragement and mentoring. However, once translators begin to understand and appreciate the creative capacity of their own language, they can move toward becoming original and natural translators. I now turn to some first-hand examples of how, in my case, this mentoring process began.

LINGUISTIC MENTORING

People who have written languages and an effective educational system assume that books are part of society and culture. They find answers to questions by looking in books (or on the Internet). If they want to know the semantic range for a word, they can look it up in a dictionary or thesaurus. If they want to know how things work or learn about the world in general, they can look up the topic in an
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1 Universal grammar is a theory that Noam Chomsky proposed that postulates a set of structural rules which are innate to humans and serves as the basis of all language acquisition. See, in particular, Chomsky 1965 and 1975.
encyclopedia, consult a range of other reference books, or go on-line. And if people do not like to read, they can learn from radio, television, computer programs, the web, or from other people who are experts on the subject. Social media enables a person to find information on almost any subject fairly quickly.

But consider people without such resources. Without access to written experts, they have learned by listening, watching and experimenting. Grandfather may tell them stories about hunting; father may make bows and arrows before onlookers; so learning comes mainly by listening, observing and trying their own hand at the task. They become culturally and linguistically competent not from books, the Internet, or television, but mainly from observation and participation. However, as they enter formal schooling their cultural learning styles, especially experimentation, are largely obliterated.

A young Kewa man (Robert) with whom I worked for several months in 2003 (and for some time in 2002) was no exception to this cultural learning style. However, despite over ten years of formal education, he knew very little about his own language, although he could read, write, and of course speak his language fluently. My goal was to teach him to recognize and think about linguistic aspects of his language—its grammar, lexicon, and phonology—but also something about its semantics and cultural context. What follows is what we did and learned.²

**VERBS AND SYNTAX**

The core of any Papuan grammar is its verb structure, which represents miniature sentences and clauses. I introduced Robert to subjects, objects and verbs to begin with. We looked at the usual SOV structure in Kewa sentence examples and, as a start, demonstrated how these categories were represented in English and Kewa. Then, by means of the 36-cell table that follows, we began to work on the structure of verbs:

The [VERB] at the top of the chart lists the particular verb that I wanted Robert to learn to decline and the 5 names to the right of the first column are the vernacular terms that we used for the tenses: Abia “now;” Aba “before,” Orope “later,” Abasade “some time ago,” and Oro Yaalo “always.” The first column, with Aapi “who” in the top row, has each of the nine free pronouns given in the descending rows—the three singular, dual and plural forms.

² I, of course, relied heavily upon my own published work, such as Franklin 1968, 1971 and 1978; see Appendix D for a full list of materials that assisted me.
I chose verbs that I knew would represent various verb classes and gave Robert some 45 verbs to decline. He caught on immediately and within the next few days filled in charts for all the verbs. We then examined the suffixes of each verb: Which were the same? Which were different? What about the form of the verb stems? Some had changed when certain suffixes were added. Did the sounds or shape of the suffixes and verb stems give us some clues as to what was happening?

I asked Robert to place the charts into piles, based on the similarities of the suffixes and the verbs. He could see that several groups of verbs acted much the same. At this point I had to discuss consonants and vowels, as well as the shape of syllables. We talked about the points in the mouth where sounds are made, what we use to make the sounds (mouth, nose, lips, tongue, teeth), and how we could best write the sounds. I elicited pairs of words that were different by only one sound to illustrate that they had to be written differently. This led us into a discussion (and diversion) about the two mid vowels (one written with a digraph /aa/ and the other as /a/) and tone.

At this time, I was only interested in pointing out contrasts and getting Robert to think about what was happening. How would he write the difference between *laapo* “two” and *lapo* “both”? What about words like “man” and “foot” which were both spelled as *aa*? Was there a difference in the tone? Did he hear the rising and lowering of the voice, the pitch or tone? Should he write it? We discussed how it could be done.

We spent some time looking at the forms of the verbs and their suffixes. For example, verbs that ended in *–la* worked one way, those ending in *–pa* another, and those ending in two vowels were different again. Slowly we established verb classes and gained some understanding of verb allomorphs (although I did not call them by that name).
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![Figure 1: A Kewa Verb Paradigm Matrix](image-url)
I suggested that Robert look at the Kewa dictionary (Franklin and Franklin, 1978) and pull out every instance of a verb (which were labeled). He copied out 719 verbs and as he did so, he found additional definitions (senses) for many of the verbs and, for some of the entries, he suggested corrections for the meanings in the dictionary. I had given some synonyms in the dictionary, dialect variations and other information. We discussed synonyms and antonyms and he added both to hundreds of verbs as well (and later to other words too). The following are three examples of verbs and their senses:

**Awa**: 1) to dig out; 2) to plant; 3) to put a post in the ground; 4) to shoot with a spear; 5) to string a bow; 6) to be waiting. **Synonyms**: yaria, yarua, rekamaa, poa; **Antonym**: yolapaa – to unstring a bow.

**Modopea**: 1) to break and shape tongs; 2) make a path through the bush; 3) weave an arm or leg bracelet; 4) make a hole in the nose; 5) to shape a nose plug; 6) to shoot a gun. **Synonyms**: podopea, robea, rulupia, palubia; **Antonym**: maredopeaaya – to straighten out tongs.

**Rupita**: 1) to be swollen; 2) to retell a story; 3) to throw down forcefully; 4) to split open by hitting with something; 5) to beat upon the chest. **Synonym**: raleb-eta; **Antonym**: akolaeme musaa – to pick up quickly.

**Relative Clauses**

About this time, I received a paper on reason and result markers in Kewa, written by a Kewa speaker who earned a PhD in linguistics, and who was then a lecturer in the Language and Communications Department at a Papua New Guinean university. I discussed the examples in the paper with Robert and our conclusion was that one of the reason markers described also served the role of marking relative clauses (RCs). I then looked up and copied out several dozen examples of RCs from the recently completed Revised West Kewa New Testament (which Robert had also assisted with).

Examining RCs showed how other word classes came into play, so we examined adjectives, adverbs, nouns, and complements (to the already discussed S, O, and IO). I had Robert work on some additional sentences before we began to bracket NPs in the RCs. I explained that a main or headword existed in the NP and that other words described or talked about it in some way. We saw that words of size and other descriptions occurred to the left of the head noun, while numerals were always to the right. The whole expression could be marked optionally with –ae, a relative clause marker. After we had worked through a number of sentences together, I gave Robert additional ones to find the NPs and RC markers. Here are a couple of examples, with square brackets indicating embedded relative clauses.
Mo aame mode Uma ona rumaaria.
That man-S [that Uma woman] he married her
Subject Object V
“The man married the Uma woman.” (Or “the woman who is from Uma”)

Eke laapo waru-a rai kutu saapiri aa lagialo.
sharp two really-SS knife kind holding man I will tell
[Adj Num V N Adj V N] V
“I am talking to the man who is holding the knife that has two sharp sides.”

Again, I was not interested in a precise description at this point. Rather, we were using common terms, such as subject, object, complement, adjective, adverb, noun and verb to talk about the Kewa grammar. I asked questions like: Were adjectives once really verbs? I asked this because the endings on some adjectives seemed similar to the one-syllable verbs that we had examined. I was not interested in the “correct” answer, but I wanted Robert to think about his language.

Later he would ask me about words: “Is this a noun or a verb?” We would talk about it and discover by adding certain suffixes it would be a N but if others were added it would be a V, and in other cases that it could be either. This also led to the discovery of compound nouns and why they could be considered as a single form or word.

I did not have a syllabus—just an intuitive feeling about what Robert seemed to be understanding and what might help him most at the next stage.

A BEGINNING THESAURUS

Robert had now been working on his language for about three weeks, approximately six hours a day, five and a half days a week, for a total of about one hundred hours. He had begun to see and appreciate the intricacies of his language.

I also knew that there were areas of Kewa culture that were changing and that Robert knew little about, such as the traditional counting systems. I wanted to suggest areas of the culture that would excite and interest him. By examining the flora and fauna book that we had published twenty-five years earlier (with over 800 names and descriptions) I could see that Robert did not know many varieties of his own trees, birds, or varieties of sweet potato. How could I get him thinking more deeply about such areas of vocabulary and culture—things he surely knew about but had neglected?

We turned to lexical forms and semantic categories that Robert was already familiar with from the dictionary. He had been using an English dictionary as well, but he was not familiar with a thesaurus. I explained how a thesaurus was constructed, comparing it with the structure of dictionaries. We decided to begin a Kewa thesaurus, starting with two very important and widespread categories:
phrases using agaa “word/talk/language” and those using kone “thought/behaviour /custom.” Five years earlier I had done some preliminary work on the same categories, so I knew how extensive these categories were. (I have attached examples from both in Appendix A.) Of course, and as I have mentioned, my research from prior years allowed me a wealth of information.

MAAPU “GARDEN” AS A DOMAIN

We decided that the first topic to examine and illustrate for our cultural thesaurus was maapu “garden.” It is the core of Kewa culture in many ways: it defines land use and boundaries; it includes physical dimensions, with descriptions of rows, ditches, fences; it has varieties of soil; and foodstuffs are of course in central focus. Robert began a thesaurus, even illustrating the garden with a picture—his mental picture—of an idealized garden (see Appendix C). We ended up with eight pages of data representing 83 lexical forms or phrases and descriptions divided as follows:

Generic terms, such as:

Ee-maapu: generic term for garden. It can be made in grassland (yaki), bush (raa), near the river, near swamps, etc.

Ee – an older bush garden, once made by clearing the bush. Usually there are no mounds or rows and any food remains on cleared ground. There are no drainage ditches like in a normal garden (maapu). People spend less time there than in a true garden.

Maapu: a garden in grassland or near houses, consisting of rows or mounds of sweet potato.

Saapi: sweet potato. Vines (ope) are shoved into the ground (su) through a hole made by a digging stick (roto). In a bush garden most of the area is covered by sweet potato. Here most of the leaves are planted in shallow ground, unlike the leaves planted in mounds and rows. The planting is done by both the men and women, but not by children.

Phrases and words associated with “bush gardens,” such as:

Raani ee: bush garden consisting mainly of greens and vegetables;

Ee ira: bush garden area cleared and burned before planting;

Ee kona: trap made near or in a bush garden to trap animals.

---

3 Sweet potatoes originated in Central America and were introduced into the island of New Guinea over a thousand years ago. There are many varieties (over forty named in Kewa) and they are widely distributed throughout the highlands. A study of their distribution is included in Dutton (1973).
Phrases and words associated with “gardens with rows/mounds,” such as:
   wagalu modo: a round mound of different sizes, with soil that covers a compost heap;
   modo ro: the long row or mound, from its start to the end;
   pau maapu: a garden located in or near a swamp with drainage ditches.

Common foods grown in gardens, such as:
   Saapi: sweet potato, the most common food planted in mounds or rows. The leaves [vines] are shoved into the prepared mounds and are longer than those planted in bush gardens. Other things can be planted along the ditches and sides of the garden;
   Padi: edible pitpit, which has a stem with a short top and is planted along the sides of the rows and a few in the middle. It is harvested first;
   Aai: bananas, two or three planted at the base of a mound or row or along a ditch in the garden at the fertile black soil.

Common foods grown in bush gardens, such as:
   Koba: a variety of greens that has a red liquid when cooked. Seeds are planted and then transplanted later; this is considered sweet, even without salt.
   kaima rusa: a variety of lettuce which is transplanted near where the rubbish from the clearing was burnt.
   Kibita: a variety of greens, something like watercress. It grows fast and is considered sweet with pork.

Types of soil, such as:
   Kobere su: black soil, which is considered the most fertile kind of land;
   Kaane su: red or orange soil; it is not fertile but sweet potato and sugarcane grow well in it; found mostly in the grassland gardens;
   Pau yawe su: watery or swampy ground where drainage and outlets are dug.

IPA “Water” as a Domain

We looked for another cultural category that would be interesting and important and chose IPA “water.” Robert then wrote about rivers, head-waters, outlets, tributaries, river beds, banks, springs, water falls, floods, low water, and bridges; how water acts differently at different times; about the various things that live in the water, for example, how eels are trapped (and much more).

The cultural information that can be drawn out of a single lexical item is almost an inexhaustible reservoir. Here are a few examples from over seventy that Robert described [I have edited some of Robert’s English grammar throughout this paper.]:
Ipa: water. Words and phrases included: rivers, lakes, ponds, springs, streams, creeks, pools, puddles, etc.; all flowing water. Waters are named according to their size, colour, location and many other things.

Pau ipa: swamp water. Greyish or brown coloured, it is unsafe for drinking by people, but animals can drink it.

Yoke ipa: a spring. Considered good for drinking and cooking food. It is said to be part of the headwaters (ipa maa) because it contributes to the rivers and streams to make them bigger. Most springs for drinking are found away from the village, so that the people can be sure that there are no crossings above the spring by humans; no roads, no houses, etc., so that the spring water is healthy without dirt and waste from people.

BODY PARTS AS A DOMAIN

We then began to work on body parts, an area of the Kewa lexicon that has interested me for many years. The work continued to such an extent that Robert began to wonder if the process would ever end. And at one stage he suggested that English was lexically impoverished (my interpretation!) because it often needed phrases to describe what he could say with a single word in Kewa.

I had Robert look up each word that he wanted to illustrate in an English dictionary. He then wrote his summary of the dictionary entry in English and gave it to me to read and, where necessary, to correct. He then gave illustrations in Kewa for the entries and ended up with almost one hundred named body parts. Here is one example:

**Aalu** “head”; also called **asuba** and **mabua**. The part of the body containing the brains, eyes, mouth, ear, etc. that starts from the chin (yagaa) and goes to the top of the head.

**Example:** *Naa aalu radaa pia* “My head is aching.”

Most women use their head to carry net bags containing firewood, babies, and many other things:

**Example:** *Nu aalu madaa madia* “Carry the net bag on your head.”

Young boys use their head to head balls in games and the main sense organs we use are in the head:

**Examples:** *Go baalore aalumi ta* “Head the ball”; *Nena aalu-para niminaawa lagaa* “Use your head and talk.”

**Aalu** can also refer to the top or front of something or the point of something:

**Examples:** *Rudu aalu* “summit/top of the mountain”; *Go kaara aalu ada* “the

---

cabin/front of the car”; Go pensol aaluri kaata “The point (head) of the pencil is red”; Ee modo aalu-nane saapi waru aaya “There are many sweet potatoes at the top (head) rows in the garden.”

**LANGUAGE AND CULTURE: A KINSHIP EXAMPLE**

One of the advantages of having published our information on Kewa over the years is that the materials were readily available for examination (and often revision). I worked through several of our earlier publications with Robert, including the kinship charts. I explained how we did kinship charts and what the abbreviations meant and then explored some. Here is an example of diagramming some Kewa kinship terms, in particular yaake:

In the first column, Father’s Brother (FB) is called *mae*; his Brother’s Son (BS) is called *ame*; and his Brother’s Son’s Wife (BSW) is called *yaake*: The point of the exercise was to demonstrate the wide semantic range of *yaake*, which includes various “wives” and “sons” (Z stands for “sister”; H for husband).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FBSW</th>
<th>FZSW</th>
<th>MZSW</th>
<th>MBSW</th>
<th>HFBS</th>
<th>HFZS</th>
<th>HMBS</th>
<th>HMZS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mae</td>
<td>aaro</td>
<td>papa</td>
<td>awa</td>
<td>akua</td>
<td>akua</td>
<td>aaya</td>
<td>aaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ame</td>
<td>aai</td>
<td>ame</td>
<td>aai</td>
<td>akua</td>
<td>aaya</td>
<td>akua</td>
<td>aaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yaake</td>
<td>yaake</td>
<td>yaake</td>
<td>yaake</td>
<td>yaake</td>
<td>yaake</td>
<td>yaake</td>
<td>yaake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2: Kinship Diagram for Kewa Terms*

**LANGUAGE AND CULTURE: “IDIOMS”**

One of the salient aspects of Kewa culture is the use of figures of speech or idioms in what can be referred to as “hidden speech” (Franklin 1975). Here are a few examples—a fuller list (including the following) can be seen in Appendix B:

1. *Kuba ipa-para akena tea* “to catch an eel in a ditch,” i.e. “to find an unexpected reward”;
2. *Rakia puti-para mena si agialu pimi* “piglets in a vegetable garden,” i.e. “lice in the hair”;
3. *Ipa maa-nane lopawa re-nane rabamina* “throw something in the headwaters and catch it downstream,” i.e. “to give something in compensation and receive more back than expected”;
4. *Ipou ipulae-para roto unu-ugi pagaaya* “to push a stick in a spring of water to block it,” i.e. “to cut off service that is beneficial by doing something bad”;

5. *Adaniaa pataa* “to sleep face down,” i.e. “to say no to someone or refuse to help.”

**CONTINUING TO LEARN**

There are areas of learning in Kewa that were still a challenge to both Robert and me. One of these had to do with tone. Is Kewa really a “tone” language? I gave Robert examples of English stress to show that I as a native speaker usually know the correct syllable to stress. Robert often gets the English stress “wrong” just as I often get the Kewa tone wrong. We examined how stress is marked in an English dictionary and wondered if we needed to mark tone. (One unachieved goal was to record extensive Kewa data for tone analysis and have Robert look at it with me.) By the time Robert left he had spent approximately 360 hours working, often independently, on his language. He wants to continue working on semantic domains for the thesaurus when he returns to High School. (Although Robert wanted to continue working on semantic domains and I gave him additional items to explore, as of February 2020 (my last communication), he is now a policeman working in Wabag.)

Whenever Kewa visitors came (which was often), I would have Robert tell them what he was doing and show them the results of his work. Visitors included two bright young men who had just graduated from High School. In every instance the Kewa people were excited about the work and his uncle told me: “We are not finished with this [thesaurus]. We must involve the people in the village and put all our words into that book. Then I can use it for elementary [vernacular] education.” (This, unfortunately, has not happened.)

What is my summary of the main things that Robert learned? First, he gained an understanding that patterns underlie his grammar. He loved to do jigsaw puzzles, so the idea of pattern was not new. Kewa men who cannot read or write weave intricate designs, so patterns are mentally stored and retrieved, as are linguistic patterns. Secondly, Robert knows that Kewa has a grammar and that it can be quite complicated. He also can see that, despite its complexity, there are parallels with English and other languages. At several stages we have discussed comparative linguistics and I illustrated cognates from other Papuan languages. Thirdly, he developed a curiosity about his own language, and this will enhance any additional formal education that he pursues. But finally, and most importantly, Robert seems sure to continue to think about his language and show others what he has learned about Kewa. In this way the mentoring process will continue.
A PERSONAL TESTIMONY

Here is Robert’s own account of his learning experience:

“When I first came to Ukarumpa last year (2002) to do the revision NT of West Kewa I didn’t fully understand most of the things I was going through with the Franklins. [He worked with us on the language about two months, although during this time he was also assisting two other men with the New Testament revision.] However, this year (2003) I came back to assist in the process leading up to typesetting and came across many other things. [He worked with us almost four months in 2003.] The following is what I learned:

1. Knowing some interesting stories and parables which were meaningful in the Bible when translating it myself.
2. Grammar: I didn’t know that Kewa had a grammar of its own like English and other big languages. Though I was born with a Kewa dialect and used many terms, I never knew whether there were verbs, nouns, etc.
3. The other thing I learned is about the verbs, adverbs, adjectives, nouns, noun phrases, verb phrases, synonyms, antonyms, suffixes, etc., which also helped me with the improvement of my English a bit through Franklin’s help. It was interesting to know and learn all these things in my mother tongue.
4. Speech and behaviour categories. Franklin has also given me a list of speech and behaviour categories which helped me to fully understand the way people talk and behave in Kewa.
5. Pronunciation in English. I learned how to pronounce some English words that I am not really good at.
6. New words. I also learned many new words that I could translate into words and phrases in Kewa and while doing that I also learned many new Kewa words which I recalled in memory by going through the Kewa dictionary.
7. Other things. Idioms, hidden speech, parables, and ancestral goods in Kewa.
8. Finally I learned how to organize words with their meanings in a way that people can understand with common Kewa examples.

“Thank you Franklins, for time and effort to help me know these things. May the Lord bless you. R.Y. Usa, West Kewa, SHP.”

I was somewhat surprised of all the things that Robert listed—his interest in dictionaries and his comments, corrections and additions to our Kewa dictionary.
were impressive. It encouraged me that the process and procedures I used could form the basis for workshops with other translators. Robert asked for notebooks and other materials that he could use to continue his work on Kewa.  

Although the kind of mentoring I did with Robert required an in-depth study and understanding of Kewa, it was worth the effort. Challenging and helping native tongue speakers to think about and work in their own language will go a long way toward helping to preserve it for future generations.

REFERENCES


---

5 Robert later enlisted in the police force and did not continue working on Kewa materials. However, he and I have had email correspondence and he still maintains an interest in his language—which he writes very well.
APPENDIX A: SOME SPEECH AND BEHAVIOR CATEGORIES IN KEWA

There are numerous speech and behavioral categories represented in Kewa speech. The following table outlines some of them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Categories</th>
<th>Behavior Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lorae agaa ‘discontinued talk’ [cut-off talk]</td>
<td>ratu yawe kone ‘anger’ [cooked behaviour]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agaa mana ‘instructions’</td>
<td>ona maaulape kone ‘homosexuality’ [woman changed into behaviour]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agaa mana mana ‘serial instructions’</td>
<td>adawe kone ‘hope’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agaa mea ‘questions’ [talk fetched]</td>
<td>kudiri kone ‘secretiveness’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agaa mimamo ‘feverish talk’</td>
<td>ona paake rume kone ‘adultery’ [woman stealing behaviour]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agaa yola ‘lengthy talk’ [pulled talk]</td>
<td>epe pawa pirape kone ‘patience’ [good, slowly, sitting behaviour]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arere pi agaa ‘arguments’</td>
<td>oro yaalo pirape kone ‘living forever’ [always sitting–living behaviour]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asubaa agaa ‘leader’s talk’</td>
<td>wae puku pi kone ‘evil/stinking ways’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>balina agaa ‘European or white-man talk’</td>
<td>udipaa kone ‘jealousy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>betene agaa ‘prayers’</td>
<td>makuae kone ‘understanding/wisdom’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eke tole ‘tongue tied’</td>
<td>epe kone ‘goodness’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epe agaa ‘good, acceptable talk’</td>
<td>waea abulape kone ‘vengeance’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epe garulae agaa ‘promises’</td>
<td>odo omape kone ‘pity’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epe yaina pi agaa ‘blessings’ [good spell saying talk]</td>
<td>abana kone ‘old ways’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ero agaa ‘insults’</td>
<td>rope pi kone ‘rough, rudeness’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotena agaa ‘God’s talk’</td>
<td>lotu kone ‘religious’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imaa niti ‘taboo talk’</td>
<td>rulae kone ‘belief, faith’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koso lape agaa ‘court talk’</td>
<td>kone mareka ‘excitement’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kudiripu agaa ‘secrets’</td>
<td>rawa pi kone ‘competition, boastful’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kurakura agaa ‘questioning talk’</td>
<td>oyae epame ome kone ‘covetness’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lapedepe agaa ‘confession’</td>
<td>agaa rasini kone ‘disobey’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makirae agaa ‘deliberate deceit’</td>
<td>pepenala rugulape kone ‘divorce’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misini agaa ‘mission talk’</td>
<td>puri mapalape kone ‘encouragement’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mogone agaa ‘learned talk’</td>
<td>epe raba meape kone ‘grace, helpfulness’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mumu ne agaa/ kareme agaa ‘whispering’</td>
<td>yala polape kone ‘indecency’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ora agaa ‘true talk’</td>
<td>omape kone ‘mortality’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa agaa ‘idle conversation’ [just talk]</td>
<td>akotikone ‘proud/arrogant’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pedo pi agaa ‘flattery’</td>
<td>ropo pi kone ‘trade manners’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Dene (Yoruba)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rado rado ne agaa ‘contradictions’</td>
<td>bipa kone surubea ‘self-control’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>redepo ne agaa ‘straight or honest talk’</td>
<td>pupitagi nape kone ‘sinfulness’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reka agaa ‘initiated talk’</td>
<td>robaapara i kone ‘conscience’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rekena agaa ‘ten commandments’</td>
<td>orope ne kone ‘procrastination’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remani agaa ‘courting language’</td>
<td>mudu pirawe kone ‘aspirations’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ribu raguna agaa ‘ribu ceremonial language’</td>
<td>ora lana kone ‘dependability’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[archaic]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rome agaa ‘trade talk’</td>
<td>sukilima kone ‘stubborn’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rugula agaa ‘interrupted talk’</td>
<td>kone laapo ‘doubt’ [two behaviours]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rumula agaa ‘ritual pandanus language’</td>
<td>maraae kone ‘ignorance’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saa pi agaa ‘hidden speech/ parables’</td>
<td>kone mayolo ruba ‘confused’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tasaana agaa ‘teacher’s talk’</td>
<td>kone rugula ‘forget’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tutu agaa ‘imperfect talk’</td>
<td>kone sa ‘think’ [put (one’s) behaviour]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wae agaa ‘bad or indecent speech’</td>
<td>kone rolo rumua pea ‘reluctant’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wae rero pi agaa ‘curse’ or</td>
<td>pedopu rana omape kone ‘love, happiness’ [throat happiness dying behaviour]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wae man yaina pi agaa</td>
<td>kone mea ‘ask what one is thinking’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ya(pi) agaa ‘deceitful talk’</td>
<td>yola mi kone ‘reluctant’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yada maluae agaa ‘challenges’</td>
<td>puri pane agaa ‘instructions’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yaina pi agaa ‘spells’</td>
<td>tata ne agaa ‘incoherent/ baby talk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yaria agaa ‘agreed-upon talk’ [planted talk]</td>
<td>peto ti agaa ‘hoarse/ sorrowful talk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yudaana agaa ‘Hebrew language’ [any language name could be substituted]</td>
<td>aana oraae agaa ‘promise’ Lit: stone touching talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maeyae agaa ‘crazy/ disturbed talk’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**: The table provides translations from English to Dene (Yoruba) for various terms related to language and communication. The Dene (Yoruba) terms are listed alongside their English equivalents for clarity.
APPENDIX B: SOME KEWA FIGURES OF SPEECH

This appendix is included in order to show the depth of creativity and interest by Robert and other native speakers in idioms and figures of speech. The figures of speech that follow are from West Kewa and were supplied mainly by Robert Yomo and Wopa Eka, from the village of Usa in the Southern Highlands Province of Papua New Guinea. I have grouped them into categories for illustrative purposes. Before examining them, I present a summary from older, but well-known works of what is most often defined as a figure of speech, idiom, or some related term.

The term “figure of speech” seems to be a more neutral term than “idiom,” although linguistics dictionaries, such as Crystal (1991), define idioms and not figures of speech. In the process authors assume a certain knowledge of linguistics. For example, when defining an idiom Crystal introduces the terms grammar, lexicology, semantics, utterance and collocation, among others. He follows the traditional viewpoint that “the MEANINGS of the individual words cannot be summed to produce the meaning of the ‘idiomatic’ expression as a whole” (1991, 170). From a syntactic viewpoint, there is not the usual variability, so “it’s raining cats and dogs” does not allow, syntactically, “it’s raining a cat and a dog.”

Richards, et al. (1985) uses “He washed his hands of the matter,” as an idiom to mean “He refused to have anything more to do with the matter.” For Richards, an idiom is “an expression which functions as a single unit and whose meaning cannot be worked out from its separate parts” (1985, 134).

Older standard dictionaries (which we had access to) follow much the same line: Webster’s New World College Dictionary, Fourth Edition (2001, 708) outlines five senses for the term idiom. The third sense is “a phrase, construction, or expression that is recognized as a unit in syntactic patterns or has a meaning that differs from the literal meaning of its parts taken together. The example given is “She heard it straight from the horse’s mouth.”

The Random House Unabridged, Second Edition Dictionary (1987, 951) also gives five senses for idiom, with one sense stating “a construction or expression of one language whose parts correspond to elements of one language but whose total structure or meaning is not matched the same way in the second language.”

These are not simple definitions and even the Collins COBUILD, which is designed to help learners with “real English” says that an idiom is “a group of words which have a different meaning when used together from the one they would have if you took the meaning of each word individually.” The example given is, “The idiom ‘ladies’ man’ is untranslatable into Japanese.”

One way around the problem is to give a list of idiomatic expressions, their meanings and some context. Chambers Idioms (1982) does this, and although it is based on British English (you will not find “he laid an egg” to mean “he failed badly”), it does provide some interesting etymology of how certain idioms got started.
There are also a number of other words or phrases that are often used interchangeably with “idiom,” such as: figure of speech, figurative expression, or (from the second of two senses in The New Collins Dictionary and Thesaurus in One Volume, 1987) jargon, language, mode of expression, parlance, style, talk, usage, and vernacular.

Does using “figure of speech” instead of “idiom” help? Probably not. For example, Webster’s New World College Dictionary, Fourth Edition (2001, 528) defines figure of speech as “an expression, as a metaphor or simile, using words in a nonliteral sense or unusual manner to add vividness, beauty, etc. to what is said or written.” The definition introduces the problem of explaining “metaphor” and “simile” and does not differ much from “idiom.”

All of this demonstrates that it was not a simple matter to explain to a Kewa speaker what an idiom or figure of speech was in his language. I therefore started with expressions that I felt would not be interpreted literally and tried them out. Here are some examples (with the body part or other item noted in bold):

**Figures of Speech that Include Body Parts**

1. Aane po terere aaya “one whose ear is extremely blocked,” meaning “something that is very sweet, sweet as honey.”
2. Aane-para kekapu pea “ears that are hot,” meaning “one who is tired of listening.”
3. Ki rogaা saapiri aa “one who has his hands bound/fastened,” meaning “a man who is very lazy.”
4. Ki-aa rekepene “hands and legs cut off,” also meaning “weak, tired, lazy.”
5. Ki esepene aa “one who has his hands freed,” meaning “a man who is industrious.”
6. Nina ki rudu ta-pulu mada namealua “My hand is short so I can’t reach that thing,” means “I can’t afford to purchase it because it is too expensive.”
7. Eke kagolo rita “it cuts off the tongue,” meaning “something that is bitter tasting.”
8. Ini rasu rita “to pull out the eyes,” means “to hurt the eyes by looking at shiny things.”
9. Ini adupi aa “one who has his eyes closed tightly,” meaning “a man who is dead.”
10. Go-parare naa mogo i-para “the place where my umbilical cord is,” means “where I was born.”
11. *Agina maako ada pua pa pia* “one who is still living in his mother’s pouch,” meaning “an immature person, lacking wisdom.”

12. *Medame i nala* “Someone (says) eat the feces,” meaning “this is an insult that will cause you to die.”

13. *Nena nogo naaki-na maa sekere na-sape* “Don’t put a pearl shell around your child’s neck,” means “Don’t be conceited about your children and let them do as they please.”

14. *Maa-nane rai rataala pea* “axe that disappears from its handle behind the nape of the neck,” means “to have problems or not know how something was lost.”

15. *Agi-na maako ada riripini aa* “a man who breaks his mother’s womb,” means “a man who has intercourse with women from his mother’s clan.”

16. *Maa nea* “to have eaten the neck,” means “to do something offensive towards someone who has looked after you (or your relatives).”

17. *Sekere maa sano ya?* “Should I put a pearl shell on their neck?” means “Should I have mercy on someone who has done wrong?”

18. *Sone agaa pa pirina none agaame eta nanea* “The upper teeth don’t wait while the lower teeth bite.” means “Everyone must benefit or have a part of what is given to a group or clan.”

19. *Maalua aapeminoa lopaaya* “to throw things into the brain by splitting it open,” means “to talk or explain things so that people can understand them.”

20. *Adaniaa pataa ora dia* “to sleep face down,” means to say no to stop one from doing something unlawful.” For example: *Aa meda tulalo pame pare neme adaniaa patawa rabu gimame* “They wanted to kill a man but I laid face down so they wouldn’t do it.”

21. *Aakona ma-aaya* “to make something stand out on your chest” means to be proud of something you have and solicit praise for it.”

**Figures of Speech that Include Animals**

22. *Mena ini ne aa* “a man who steals (eats) a pig’s eye,” meaning “a man who should fear things.”

23. *Mena kebo ini rubu pi* “a blind pregnant sow,” means “one who moves around without planning anything.”

24. *Mena kadesa-para imu eta pia* “shooting arrows into pig’s trunk,” means “to be surrounded by enemies with no way to escape.”

25. *Mena imaa po rita* “carrying a pig’s tusk,” means “to have many experienced and tough warriors.”
26. *Maapu mi mena mone penaloa kepo rere irakuta talae mena radaa nala* “The pig that destroyed the garden escaped but an innocent pig rooting near the fence was killed,” means “The real thief escaped by someone who is innocent interfering and he has gotten the blame.”

27. *Maapu mi mena pa na pirala* “a pig that destroys gardens always likes to go there,” means “those who do evil things always want to something evil (like a prostitute).”


29. *Kuba ipa-para aakena tea* “to get an eel in a ditch,” means “to find something unexpected/ to receive a bonus.”

30. *Rautuame wakemalo tu rita* “an ant carrying a grasshopper,” means “a poor person with only one pig, little money and garden, etc.”

31. *Yana yada aapu wagepano ya?* “Am I a dog so that I can wag my tail?” means “I am very happy.”

32. *Yapi abi naneaina ramaani agaa pu reke* “The wagtail singing before daybreak,” means “to do things at an early age,” or “doing something before the right time.”

33. *Magatame kamamu pala omea* “The Glossy Swiflet fears the kalamu tree because it has thorns,” means “one who believes (based on past experience) that everyone in a group or clan have the same (bad) behavior.”

34. *Ramaanimi itaa yamana iri pudiaaya* “a Wagtail plucking hawk’s feathers,” means “a small man or clan caught between someone of higher and lower status.”

35. *Ramaanimi ada watea* “a Wagtail that shows where its nest is,” means “your talk and actions show what is hidden.”

36. *Yaa ada ta* “to strike a bird’s nest” means “to get nothing.”

37. *Olasubaa agaa mi aa* “an owl with an open mouth,” means “one who is lazy and just likes to eat.”

38. *Gigaame pai raakepeta* “lorikeets shredding the pai nuts,” meaning “everyone talking at the same time.”

39. *Aa medalomame aa-para awa ipipa te me rabu, ‘yaa ratu awa ipulu te me.’* “When some men say, ‘we’ve been chasing birds for the whole day’ in response to a question about where they have been,” they mean “We have been working in the garden for the whole day.”

40. *Yaa ratu aawa pi* “hunting birds for the whole day” [in response to “Where have you been?"], also means “I worked hard in the garden all day.”
41. Yaa kuta pada ti aa “a man like a chicken who scratches the ground,” means “a man who doesn’t care who the woman is he has intercourse with her.”

42. Medame nere yaa bara teare “if someone says that you are a bird of paradise,” it means that you are a person who greets people well but are selfish.

43. Yapa pirapalae repena robea “a tree falling down with a possum in it,” means “a young woman has died.”

44. Yapa yana lapo padane-para namapiraali “You can’t put a possum and a dog in the same cage,” means that “You don’t accommodate a young man and a young woman in the same house.”

45. Yana i pakeato titi ona i rabuaali “to dodge dog’s excrement and step on a nice woman’s feces,” means “avoiding something that is bad but getting something that is even worse in the process.”

46. Kabitumi imaa rita “a crab with a big claw,” refers to “someone wanting something too large and expensive.”

47. Go naakiri paaka yade. “That boy is a snake,” means “He is a boy who is deceitful and causes fights between others.”

48. Kibita wai i aa “someone who has the seeds of the kibita plant,” means “one who has poison.”

49. Yaa kosopea aa “a rooster man,” means “one who bullies and bosses others.”

50. Yapa repena poa “to plant a possum tree,” means “looking after a young girl belonging to someone else in order to eventually get some of the bride price.”

51. Ero page nasalia kone i pare sala “Seeing a python at an unexpected place,” means “An enemy may be met where you least suspect it.”

52. Wabame aapu adea “a gecko that sees its tail,” meaning “one who corrects others but does not see his own faults.”

Figures of Speech that Include Natural Objects (Foodstuffs, Plants, Etc.)

53. Aai maa-para otaaku-daa na-kereali “you can’t pick a cucumber from a banana tree,” means “you harvest what you plant.”

54. Aai kaarane wala mada na-rogaaal “You can’t wrap a bunch of bananas when they are already mature,” means “You need to do something before it is too late in order to tame someone who doesn’t behave.”

55. Aai yore kagaa raburi maa yola papea pare kaapu yoare re-para lopala, “When a banana leaf is young it spreads out from the stem but when it
is dry it falls down on the stem,” means “You can go around where you want to now but when you die your body will still be buried at home.”

56. **Saapi aaya pame moka pita rigitali** “You will think a root of the moka tree is a sweet potato and you might cover it up with soil,” means “See what you have because you may think its good quality by simply looking and not examining it.”

57. **Saapi adoaaria** “one who is waiting for sweet potato,” means “he is dead.”

58. **Ada gaane wabala pe uni rupitali adape** “Look carefully or you’ll fall and break the oil gourd near the house,” means “Don’t be too excited when you arrive near the house thinking you are safe—take extra care.”

59. **Aapu ya-daa kaaru yamali ya** “Do you think it is a victory leaf so you can break it off and wear it,” means “That daughter is reserved for another man.”

60. **Niri saapi noa maa nali ya?** “Will you eat me like sweet potato and taro?” means “Where will you go if you kill me?” (“You can’t kill me and escape.”)

61. **Niri nena saapi-daa dia** “I am not your sweet potato,” means “I can do things that you think are difficult.”

62. **Aga maa-para puru pabalia waru adape.** “Look carefully to make sure the top of the pandanus tree has dried up insects,” means “Do not do bad things or steal from your mother’s clan or you will be cursed to become sick or die.”

63. **Niri abia saapi nola epaana kone sae** “Do you think that I came to eat sweet potato today?” means “I am not a stranger looking for shelter.”

64. **Raani pabopae** “a cooked and common edible green,” refers to “someone who is weak and looks tired and is lazy.”

65. **Waa aawa kibu** “the length of the sugar cane from its base,” means “to have your generation much bigger than the one you have come from.”

66. **Aapu kalakawa re wai** “the shoots of the kalakawa victory leave,” means “women from a clan from which the parents will get the bride price”

67. **Go repena madaa ro palua kone nasape** “Don’t think you are capable to climb that tree,” means “Don’t take something simple and try to be clever with it.”

68. **Iru waapu yago malua** “I will have a payback of my palm tree,” means “I will kill someone as payback.”

69. **Kuba aaluna aapu wai poaaya** “to plant a victory leaf near a drain,” means “something that will be carried on by the next generation.”
70. **Rede pi yaeme kudipaa pagalaa-ga adape** “Look out! Getting a sweet thing sometimes traps your finger (like getting honey and a bee stings you),” means “You may steal from someone all the time but watch out because one day you will be dealt with.”

71. **Konaape wai rini aa** “a man who carries corn seeds,” means “one who lies in order to get what he wants, such as money.”

**Figures of Speech with Actions that Include “Water” or “Ground”**

72. **Ipa maa-nane lopawa re-nane raba mina** “Throw it in the headwaters and retrieve it downstream,” means “to give a compensation (for marriage, etc.) and receive more in return than you gave.”

73. **Ipa ipulae-para roto uni ugi pagaaya** “Push a stick into a spring of water to block it,” means “to cut off service or help that is beneficial to someone.”

74. **Ipa kena-para kibu ropa pagenalo pepa** “We are crossing a river so our leg bracelet must fit securely,” means “When you are in a fight you must be prepared.”

75. **Ipa rikiraane dipi aaya** “the hardwood dipi tree in the middle of a river is shaking,” means “to have problems that leave one exhausted and shaking.”

76. **Ipa ini adaaluna parai sala aaya** “small fish in very deep water,” means “someone who does not settle down in one place.”

77. **Ipa-para rama awo lopae** “throwing a spear into the water,” means “people who refuse to hear what you say.”

78. **Ipa maa-parare ni pi** “I am living at the headwaters,” means “I am the boss and control things.”

79. **Su-para i yae adoa pamua** “one who looks at the ground and walks,” means “a person who is careful.”

80. **Ada rea-ga ipa no ria ipa** “Fetch water because (we hear) the house is on fire,” means “Contribute money, pigs, and shells for compensation, bride price, etc.”

81. **Raa mapo pabea** “Causing trees (in the bush) to be cut improperly,” means “to give someone more work without the first work finished.”

82. **Onaapu yamo palae ipa-para pogolawa** “I jumped into the water without removing my bark belt and net apron,” means “I spent all my wealth and now I have nothing left.”

**Miscellaneous Figures of Speech**
83. **Uguna perekene aa** “one who messes up the **inside wall** of a house,” meaning “a man who steals from his host.”

84. **Medana pere agolaa-para iratata pami aa** “a man who sits around the **fireplace** of other people,” means “someone who is lazy and depends upon the host.”

85. **Aana aapeda-para i ro saa pu** “to put excrement in a **cave** then return home,” means “to steal from a host and think that you won’t go back.”

86. **Ramina ke kalae pa na-sala** “**forks of tongs** not working together,” means “one doesn’t relax while the other works.”

87. **Riabona rai rudu perea nonape** “like taking away the axe of a **poor person,**” means “to covet something valuable or important that belongs to someone who is of low status.”

88. **Rimu irua namakobo raali ya?** “Won’t you get a black face when you paint **charcoal,**” means “You can’t deny it when you are caught stealing.”

89. **Lopape repena rona-daa na-pi** “not sitting on a **wooden bridge** that can easily break,” means “to have plenty and not be in need.”

90. **Kiritae-para onaa akepu raapo te rabu laaposi-daa epame teare** “When someone asks how many people came to the gathering, if the answer is ‘just two,’” the meaning is “many people came.”

91. **Aa medana ore naa ona ta-ga adape** “Hearing a man say, ‘that is my **wife** in reference to a woman,” means “Be careful when looking at another woman.”

92. **Aebo rabu naare pabeare wala na-ipuade** “The **sun** sets in the evening and doesn’t come back,” means “It is impossible for an old person to be young again.”

93. **Go naakiri aana yade.** “That boy is a **stone,**” means “He is a boy who doesn’t listen to others.”

94. **Sumi Samaana Yaki ona ripinaaru.** “I grabbed hold of the **heavenly woman** Sumi Samaan,” means “I got something that I had been longing for and I will not let go of it.”

95. **Yairi raayome ramuamade** “We were all soaked by the **rain,**” means “We are all affected by the problem and feel its burden.”

96. **Padane repena rona pamua epapade** “We two have walked along the same **log bridge,**” means “I sympathize with you because we walk the same road.”

97. **Abiare nena porena moae sala** “now you have **clouds** on your mountain,” means “Now you are happy because you are rich but later you will be poor (like me).”
98. *Naare ipulae-para ade nona pea* “Like looking right into a **rising sun**,” means “ashamed to see someone face to face (perhaps someone you have fought with).”

99. *Otaane pialidere wala mada na-meali* “You can’t get back a **spear** that you have thrown at your enemies,” means “Whatever good or bad speech you make in public is something you can’t get back because it is in the people’s minds."

100. *Pa pare kona pua maeme* “to set a **trap** on someone else’s land,” means “to bribe someone from another clan to kill your enemy.”
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1972. [with Yapua Kirapeasi, eds.] *Akuanuna Iti Remaanu Buku*. Ukarumpa: SIL. 52 pp. (Kewa myth book used as an advanced reader. Edited texts from several men in West Kewa. Each text is followed by questions about the story.)


1974. [with Yapua Kirapeasi and others] *Ne Nane Yae Luabu Buku*. Ukarumpa: SIL. 180 pp. (An alphabetical listing with descriptive sentences on all major fauna and flora types in West Kewa. Designed as an advanced reader. Includes 35 categories and over 800 entries.)


1975. [with Yapua Kirapeasi, and Akera Tua] *Tok Save Long Ol Kain Liklik Tok Kewa*. Ukarumpa, SIL. 53 pp. (A series of dialogues outlining the differences between Kewa dialects. Each lesson is concluded with exercises in English.)


Book Reviews


Unlike the many English Bible translations of the Hebrew Bible available today, readers desirous of studying the Septuagint (LXX) or Old Greek (OG) translation of the Jewish scriptures have settled for either the Brenton translation, the more recent New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS), or the translation in the Orthodox Study Bible, which largely reflects the New King James Version. The Lexham English Septuagint (LES), however, is a completely new translation. Rick Brannan, a scholar for Faithlife Corporation and Ken M. Penner, Professor at Francis Xavier University, were the chief translators/editors of this hardback second edition of the Lexham English LXX, which up to now has been available as a digital resource in the Logos Bible program. While Brannan and Penner carried the load of the translation/revision, a number of additional “contributing editors” and “production editors” helped in this major revision (pp. iv, vii).

A new translation of the LXX into English has been needed since Brenton’s translation reflects the English of the nineteenth century while the NETS version exhibits a rather wooden style and a commitment to using transliterated names and places which often appear strange to the reader. The following are a few distinctive features of the LES.

1. Transliterated names in the footnotes of the 1st edition of the LES have been removed. The LES now uses the familiar names in most English versions (p. xvi).
2. The LES is a translation of the Greek without an eye to the Hebrew. If the LXX translation was “formal” the LES seeks to be “formal.” If the LXX was “idiomatic” or “functional,” the LES is “idiomatic” (p. xiii). The LES is trying to understand the LXX as a “Greek” document (p. xvii).
3. Unlike some recent editions of the LXX which follow an “eclectic” method of choosing readings, the LES follows a “diplomatic” method by rendering Swete’s edition which was largely the text of Vaticanus (p. xi). Since the Greek texts of Daniel and Tobit are so different in the main manuscripts of Codices Vaticanus, Alexandrinus, and Sinaiticus two translations of these books are included.
Instead of simply describing what the volume does, readers can get a sense of the LES approach to translation by actually seeing the results of the translators’ labors. I offer the following example of how the LES renders Gen 4:1–8a (p. 4), accompanied by personal observations about the way in which the translators rendered into English that Greek verse.

1 And Adam knew Eve, his wife, and she conceived and brought forth Cain and said, “I have acquired a man through God.”

Comments: The translation of ἔγνω as “knew” maintains the euphemism of both the LXX and the Hebrew. The translation of διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ as “through God” is also literal.

2 And she proceeded to bring forth his brother, Abel. Abel became a herdsman of sheep, and Cain was working the earth.

Comments: Translation of προσέθηκεν (aorist of προστίθημι) as “proceeded” is a good alternative to the literal “he added” idiom of both the Hebrew and its LXX translation.

3 Now this happened after a number of days: Cain brought some of the fruit of the earth as an offering for the Lord,

Comments: This is a fairly straightforward rendering of Gen 4:3. The translation divides the sentence by inserting a colon—which indicates what it was that “came to pass.”

4 and Abel himself also brought some of the firstborn of his sheep and some of their hard fat parts. God looked upon Abel and upon his gifts,

Comments: The translation of στεάτων as “hard fat parts” is, in my opinion, strange. What does it mean? Muraoka’s Lexicon of the Septuagint defines the word as “fat attached to animal meat, ‘suet.’ The second sentence avoids the parataxis of the repeated ἄκα and before “God.”

5 but he did not pay attention to Cain and upon his offerings. He grieved Cain very much, and he fell in face.
Comments: The translation again avoids the parataxis of the repeated καὶ beginning the second sentence. “Fell in face” is, in my opinion, an overly literal translation of συνέπεσεν τῷ προσώπῳ. It is not an English expression.

6 The Lord God said to Cain, “Why have you become deeply grieved, and why has your face fallen?  
καὶ εἶπεν Κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῷ Κάιν Ἰνα τὶ περίλυπος ἐγένετο, καὶ ἵνα τὶ συνέπεσεν τὸ πρόσωπόν σου;  
Comments: Here the Greek turns back to the literal “your face fell.”

7 Have you not sinned if you offer rightly but do not divide rightly? Calm down!  
οὐκ εὰν ὀρθῶς προσενέγκῃς, ὀρθῶς δὲ μὴ διέλθης, ἡμαρτες; ἡσύχασον· πρὸς σὲ ἡ ἀποστροφὴ αὐτοῦ, καὶ σὺ ἀρξεις αὐτοῦ.  
Comments: I wonder why it is not preferable to just keep the conditional sentence: “If you offer rightly but not divide rightly, you have sinned.” Why change it to a question? Furthermore, who is the “him” in the last statement? Is it the “his” of ‘recourse”?

8 And Cain said to Abel, his brother, “Let’s walk through the field.”  
καὶ εἶπεν Κάιν πρὸς Ἁβελ τὸν ἄδελφον αὐτοῦ Διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδίον  
Comments: The translation includes the words Διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδίον, which Hebrew equivalent is not in the Masoretic Text. I am not sure that “through the field” conveys accurately the εἰς τὸ πεδίον. A better rendering of these words addressed to Abel is: “Let us cross over into the field.”

An important feature of this volume is the inclusion of the dozen or so “Apocryphal” books, which were preserved in ancient copies of the LXX. Another bonus is the addition of some Pseudepigraphal works like the Psalms of Solomon (pp. 1396-1425), Enoch (pp. 1413-25) and the Odes (pp. 1426-41). The volume also includes translations of Third and Fourth Maccabees (pp. 1364-95) which are not always included in the so-called Apocrypha. Readers may be unaware that some of the translations of Daniel and Tobit survive in two different versions in Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus. The alternative Greek versions found in Sinaiticus are also included for the books of Tobit (pp. 1442-56), Daniel (pp. 1457-77), and the additions to Daniel (pp. 1478-82). This translation was also able to benefit from the recent Lexicon of the Septuagint by T. Muraoka (Leuven: Peeters, 2009).

Whether one likes it or not, New Testament scholars know that the LXX/OG versions served as the source for many of the “Old Testament” quotations in the New Testament. In my opinion, a study of any Old Testament passage should include what the Greek says as well as the Hebrew or Aramaic. Furthermore, the
“Bible” of the early church fathers until Jerome consisted of the LXX/OG books. Scholars, pastors, and Bible translators simply need to be more aware of the LXX. A helpful feature of this volume is that it contains a readable version of those Apocryphal Books, as well as some Pseudepigrapha for a ready reference.

I am very positive about the philosophy and methodology of the LES. It provides an accurate and readable alternative to the dated Brenton version while avoiding some of the “quirkiness” of the New English Translation. My advice is to purchase it!

William Varner
The Master's University


Among the teeming choices of introductory biblical Hebrew grammars, veteran instructors Karl Kutz and Rebekah Josberger offer an accessible and versatile option. The thirty-three chapter textbook starts with the basics of reading (alphabet, vowels, syllables), and covers the concepts of gender and number as well as the definite article and conjunction, before focusing on nouns and adjectives, construct forms, prepositions, the directional ending, interrogatives, and pronominal suffixes. Chapters 11–33 focus on the Hebrew verb, with its vowel changes, conjugations, stems, and numerous exceptions for weak verbs. The five appendices cover an introduction to the order of books, names of books, and features found in Hebrew Bibles; an overview of Hebrew accents; how to create grammatical and thematic outlines; transliteration of Hebrew to English characters; and verb paradigm charts for the qal, niphal, piel, pual, hithpael, hiphil, and hophal stems.

*Learning Biblical Hebrew*, like several other modern grammars, offers a companion workbook, *Learning Biblical Hebrew Workbook: A Graded Reader with Exercises*, which aligns with the chapters in the textbook, providing extra practice for the concepts introduced. The workbook includes exercises ranging from writing the alphabet and marking syllabification to reproducing key parts of verb paradigms. A graded reader lets the student engage with the narrative of Genesis 37–50, Ruth, Jonah, and Esther. The reader begins with helps which it progressively removes. For example, the text of Genesis is sometimes simplified, with more difficult sections omitted or reworded for the beginner. Proper names are sometimes given, and sometimes marked (p.n.) under their corresponding greyed-out word. Verbal roots are provided for unusual forms and for words not yet covered in
vocabulary lists. Masoretic accents are not introduced into the printed text until Genesis 40. When the study begins Genesis 50, the printed text from that point onward comes directly from the Hebrew Bible. While the books covered are predominantly narrative, the workbook includes practice with poetry as well, including Jacob’s words to his sons in Genesis 49 and the prayer in Jonah 2. The workbook also provides vocabulary lists for each Bible chapter covered and an answer key for the exercises and translations, including verb parsings.

The appearance, approach, and adaptability of the *Learning Biblical Hebrew* textbook and workbook commend the work of Kutz and Josberger to educators and students of biblical Hebrew. The formatting of the book is easy to read, using red text to highlight key differences in forms, as well as presenting outlines in the margin. Occasional explanatory footnotes at the bottom of the page are helpful for quick reference. Embedded charts and examples demonstrate key rules, concepts, and exceptions. These charts also enlarge the Hebrew font beyond the default text.

These resources facilitate the authors’ burden to get the student into the biblical text soon. Once students have progressed through the alphabet, Hebrew vowels, and syllabification, they are ushered into Genesis 37. This is where Kutz and Josberger especially shine, as many biblical language courses do not have students regularly reading substantial portions of biblical text until much later in their program, sometimes only with second year courses. Reading the biblical text sooner rather than later helps students see the payoff of studying Hebrew and should provide additional motivation to persevere. The practice of regular, oral reading of Gen 1:1–5 and Deut 6:4-9 is another welcome component of their approach.

Kutz and Josberger provide helpful strategies for memorization of key tools. Rather than requiring full paradigms of each verbal stem, they recommend committing the perfect (qatal) and imperfect (yiqtol) conjugations and the participial and infinitive forms of the qal stem. To help the student recognize or reconstruct the other verbal stems, they present the perfect third person masculine singular form as the base for the perfect conjugation, the infinitive construct as the basis for the imperfect, jussive, and imperative conjugations, the infinitive absolute, and the masculine singular participle as the basis for the other participles. This strategy helps students work more efficiently, and maximizes their ability to make use of the relationships between these forms.

This grammar may be adapted for use in one or more traditional courses, online instruction, or by motivated self-learners, depending on how quickly one wishes to proceed through the material. The authors provide motivational and practical tips for its usage in the preface including “teach for long-term retention,” “read biblical text as soon and as much as possible,” and “allow room for failure,” even encouraging self-correction and work in community as encouragements to try and struggle through Hebrew to learn together (pp. xxiii-xiv). A digital option is available as well, with a Logos edition of both the textbook and the workbook,
each with some integration with the user’s resources. Users can print PDFs of workbook exercises, and online instructors could use the digital editions for screencast lectures or tutorials.

*Learning Biblical Hebrew* is a fresh and helpful contribution to the field of introductory grammars. As an introduction, the authors wish to simplify terminology and verb functions, which is helpful for the beginner. However, a brief discussion in an appendix could align and compare various terminologies to which continuing students might be exposed. Students who begin to compare grammars may initially become confused by divergent labels, when reading of the *perfect* in this text and the *qatal* in another, or the *waw consecutive* and seeing the *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal* elsewhere. The authors are certainly aware of current research and refer to topics for advanced study (see notes on 169, 220), but a brief mention of some of the translational issues might help some readers. For example, the waw consecutive imperfect form, though a narrative backbone, sometimes presents actions that are simultaneous. Also, the middle function of the nippal stem, which often has an ambiguous agent producing the action (e.g., the great deeps “burst” and the windows of heaven “opened” in Gen 7:11) merits mention and brief discussion (see Steven W. Boyd, “The Binyanim,” in *Where Shall Wisdom Be Found?*, edited by H. Dallaire et al. [Eisenbrauns, 2017]). The print textbook could also use a Scripture index.

The Logos textbook edition is very usable, but the workbook could be more student-friendly. Perhaps an update could add capability for completing at least some of the exercises within the resource, or include quiz-like capabilities to drill students to help them achieve learning objectives.

Kutz and Josberger deserve commendation for producing a resource helpful to both instructor and student. Those wishing to teach or learn biblical Hebrew should consider their textbook and workbook, as it provides streamlined information and strategies to help the student progressively and joyfully assimilate and use the knowledge of Hebrew to read and understand the biblical text, which in turn should result in their ability to pass on the fruits of that knowledge via teaching, preaching, or Bible translation.

Douglas Smith  
Graham Bible College and Calvary University


Repetition has been studied an aspect of discourse since the 1960s, when discourse analysis (or text-linguistics) was being established as a discipline. Two of the earliest influential studies on repetition were Roland Harweg’s *Pronomina und*
Textkonstitution (Fink, 1968), in which he argues that “syntagmatic substitution” is the basic means of producing texts across successive sentences, and M. Halliday’s and R. Hasan’s well-known Cohesion in English (Longman, 1976), which studied various types of repetition and their contribution to a text’s cohesion and coherence. Since these studies, some works have modified Halliday’s and Hasan’s typology of cohesive devices, but little has served to advance any breakthroughs on how repetition contributes to discourse.

This new work, Repetition in Discourse, “aims to study the phenomenon of repetition on the level of language based on the method of discourse analysis (with the [sic.] elements of critical discourse analysis) and on the level of cognition based on the method provided by the [sic.] Contemporary Metaphor Theory” (p. 3). The authors hope they can “reshape our understanding of the role of repetition in text and discourse” (p. 3). While the authors do deliver on their aim to “study the phenomenon of repetition,” they do not in my judgment improve our understanding of repetition in discourse, either in its function or how it functions in cognition.

The first part of the book considers four types of repetition: phonetic, morphological, lexical, and syntactic. The authors make claims throughout this section that these types of repetition make texts poetically and rhetorically “effective,” but they consistently only provide a sample text and then assert in a sentence or two that such an effect has been achieved. They neither define what they mean by rhetorical or poetic effect, nor demonstrate how repetition creates these effects.

When trying to make a claim that repetition for rhetorical effect is used more frequently in inaugural addresses and campaign speeches than in global community addresses, they cite in full two addresses by President Trump, spanning fourteen pages of this little 81-page book. In three short paragraphs after these fourteen pages of text, they note that Trump’s inaugural address had 41 repetitions, whereas his UN General Assembly has 28 repetitions. They strangely draw the conclusion that this one observation from these two texts “obviously” confirms their claim that inaugural addresses will have more repetition for rhetorical impact (p. 43).

Part two of the book considers the cognitive function of repetition. It is difficult for me to evaluate the argument being made, since it is unclear what the argument is. They begin, “the economic, social, and daily life levels of the existence of person who repeats make up the level of personal perception. The physiological mechanism which motivates the psychic content of the symbolic function also joins this activity. For completion and exteriorization of psychic act, its actions that establish multiplicity in the consciousness cause adoption of a new psychic act. In its turn, the combination of psychic content with the symbolic function demonstrates the acquisition of the action aimed at the future during repetition and the psychic content gradually gains a formal feature in discourse” (p. 53).
Whatever this means, the authors attempt to elaborate for the next thirty pages, but the prose became no clearer in these pages.

The perspective from which this book is written is still somewhat common, in that it gives great priority to cohesion in discourse. They claim, “repetition is considered as one of the most important factors in the way meaning is constructed in discourse” (7). They also claim that “repetition also plays the key role in cognitive processes within discourse” (53). However, studies from the 1970s to the 1990s have demonstrated that cohesion (to which repetition contributes) is neither necessary nor sufficient for discourse coherence, and that coherence should likely be seen as the key factory in cognitive processes when producing and receiving discourse. Yet cohesion does still play a dominant role in some fields, such as Natural Language Processing, where software must operate on explicit linguistic features rather than cognitive constructs such as frames and other global patterns that operate during discourse production and reception.

Studies that would enhance our understanding of repetition and other cohesion-making devices in discourse would be welcomed, especially if they can advance on the work of Halliday and Hasan and how their work has been modified and utilized by later authors.

Todd A. Scacewater
Dallas International University


Koine Greek is both bane and boon for students across the globe. Some of us love it dearly, others struggle, and some eventually give up. But if we are honest, we will admit that we all share some level of difficulty in learning Koine. It is sometimes discouraging to remember that koine means common, and ostensibly refers to one of the easier versions of Greek and should thus be easier to learn. Perhaps some of this struggle, however, is pedagogical in nature. Grammars abound, both introductory, intermediate, and advanced. There is no shortage of information or opinion. Navigating them is the challenge. All seem to have competing understandings of a variety of grammatical issues. This abundance of information may be useful for the professional academic, but it is often overwhelming and likely unnecessary for the ministerial practitioner. What pastor has time to wade through lengthy debates about aspect? Intermediate Greek Grammar cuts through this profusion of information to provide simple clarity on a breadth of issues.

How can this be? If we can truly say that the writing of many Greek grammars is without end, how can another addition help? Because, perhaps ironically, this intermediate grammar simplifies things considerably. You will not find infinite
categories for every potential use of a case. Instead, this grammar follows what it calls a realistic view of grammar. Greek is “not more precise, more expressive, more wonderfully accurate and intricate than any other language, as if it were the only language in which God could have possibly revealed his Second Testament. Greek is no better or worse than any other language” (p. xx). The authors are so committed to this concept that they reject even the comparison mentioned above between Koine and other types of Greek. This is because they mostly favor a synchronic approach over a diachronic approach. “It is our conviction that the job of grammar is to be descriptive of how language is actually used, not to be prescriptive and make judgments about how it ‘ought to be’ used” (p. xx).

Stripped of its mystery and magic, Greek is then analyzed carefully in appropriate discourse units. To begin with, grammar in general is approached from a perspective the authors call minimalistic. This means that the focus is on the meaning of a word in its context, not on how we might label that isolated example. “Words make up phrases, and phrases make up clauses. Clauses make up paragraphs, and paragraphs compose entire discourses. This requires that our analysis move beyond the sentence level to larger units” (p. 271). To understand a language, then, one must read more than a few isolated examples. Consequently, the authors eschew the use of labels like “iterative presents, conative imperfects, or ingressive aorists,” etc. (p. 117). Instead, the authors suggest that such categories do not exist. Instead, “these labels are at most only descriptions, which may or may not be accurate, of actions based on broader contextual information; they are not the meanings of the tenses/aspects themselves” (p. 117, emphasis original). This is perhaps the strongest point of this grammar. While it does use an abundance of examples for each point (many of which are thankfully not the standard examples), it also provides larger sections labeled For Practice. These provide a self-taught student with a ready-made assessment, and a professor with excellent summary assignments. It also underscores the normality of Greek. The more of it you read, the more you are likely to understand. Spend less time trying to categorize the participle. Spend more time reading sentences with participles.

Other differences in this grammar include the most important and recent advances in the study of verbal aspect theory, the voice system, conjunctions, and linguistic & discourse studies. Of these unique contributions, two stand out as particularly helpful. First, following a recent important trend in research, this grammar does a superb job of summarizing verbal aspect theory, siding with Stanley Porter’s work for the most part. This debate has raged through books and articles. The pastoral reader will be happy for the clear summary. The academic reader will appreciate the thorough footnotes leading to further research.

Also following recent developments, this grammar addresses discourse analysis in the final chapter. This should not suggest that it is simply an appendix. (There is a useful appendix which provides the principal parts of verbs occurring
fifty times or more in the New Testament spanning from pp. 291–296.) As alluded to before, discourse units are fundamental to the approach of this grammar. In their own words, “much of the discussion in the previous chapters has tried to keep discourse considerations in mind” (p. 270). This final chapter then ties everything together, introducing the student to four main features of discourse analysis: Cohesion, Boundaries & Units, Prominence, and Participants. This both culminates the groundwork laid in the earlier chapters, provides a helpful summary and introduction to the discipline of discourse analysis, and perhaps most importantly provides rich bibliographic footnotes for every point to aid in further study.

In conclusion, this grammar is highly recommended to both pastor and academic. It is well-written and easy to read. It avoids unnecessary details which are best left for academic debate and focuses on what is necessary for a proper understanding of a Greek text. It is ideal for any student who has finished a year of Greek and wants or needs a next step. Students who want more than this grammar has to offer already have an abundance of options and can even follow the helpful resources footnoted throughout. No matter where you are in your journey, from bane to boon, this work will help press on toward the goal.

Ryan Lytton
Life Pacific University-Virginia


Elizabeth Mburu is an accomplished African author, an Associate Professor of New Testament and Greek at universities in Kenya (including Africa International University), sits on the board of the *Africa Bible Commentary*. Mburu’s brief and readable book, *African Hermeneutics*, is broken into two principal parts (“General Principles of Hermeneutics” and “Specific Principles of Hermeneutics”). Mburu’s concern is to challenge a dichotomised “Sunday Christian” African Christianity. Growing out of her “frustration at only having only textbooks that predominantly followed a Western worldview to teach her African students,” Mburu’s proposed solution is a contextualised African hermeneutic of Scripture.

Part I grounds the reader in the theological and philosophical aspects of the African worldview, warning that each theological and philosophical aspect works in either a positive or negative way in the African context. Mburu then introduces her “four-legged stool” model of interpretation whilst acknowledging that there is both cultural diversity and commonality across the African continent. Therefore, the reader should not be too bothered by generalities in the book that may not apply in specific African situations.
Basing a hermeneutical model on the analogy of a four-legged stool—which is a familiar and tangible object in many African societies—is Mburu’s core contribution. The basic premise is that good application (represented by the “seat”) of the Bible in Africa should be supported adequately (by “legs”). This model proposes “Parallels to the African Context” as the first leg, for Africans can begin nowhere else than with their own experience. The second leg is “Theological Context,” the third “Literary Context” and the fourth “Historical and Cultural Context.” All the legs combined therefore make it possible to then support interpretation and appropriate application. The process is dynamic, just as a carpenter’s process is dynamic, constantly adjusting each stool leg in relation to the others (p. 84).

Presenting the African context as the first leg of the stool should not be too concerning, because Mburu is careful to remind us that the African context helps to “shed light” on a text’s meaning. This is noteworthy, for it is just a starting point for African interpreters of the Bible. That a real stool is unbalanced without all four legs is a key factor of the model.

In Part II, Mburu applies the four-legged stool model to different types of Biblical texts including “Stories,” “Wisdom,” “Songs,” and “Letters.” In accordance with the first leg, Mburu begins each of these chapters with an introduction to African examples of similar material and how these are interpreted in light of their context and purpose. She then considers the other three legs in sequence. When discussing song, Mburu reminds readers that the Bible uses metaphor, personification, anthropomorphism, alliteration, rhyme, and so on. These are all helpful observations, and Mburu does not ignore the well-recognised feature of Hebrew poetry of parallelism. Recognising genre within biblical texts is also important for Mburu. In the case of song, are these love songs? Songs of praise? Thanksgiving? Lament?

Upon introducing a basic outline of both African and Biblical examples of texts, readers are invited to apply the four-legged stool model. After assessing each stool leg, Mburu provides us with a “tentative application” in relation to that particular leg. Then, after all of the elements of each “leg” have been considered, the “seat” forms a final application with the support of the four “legs” together. Often, however, the end product does not seem to be distinctly African. For example, in regard to the interpretation of letters in the Bible, Mburu concedes that letters are “a relatively new genre in Africa” and one that has mostly followed colonial forms (English, French, Portuguese letter-writing customs). By contrast, story and song have a long and rich history in African cultures. There is little in the chapter on letters that is identifiable as characteristically African and so Mburu focuses on the similarity in content between African and biblical letters instead (citing for example, how both Galatians and Africans speak of curses). With this in mind, the universality of this four-legged stool may not be completely apparent for all parts of the Bible.

A strength of *African Hermeneutics* is Mburu’s clarity and apparent desire to be understood throughout the book. At the end of each chapter, Mburu provides review
questions for further reflection and ends many sections with a paragraph that reaffirms what she was saying in that section. These summaries and repetitions may be laborious for some readers, but many African pastors and students will find this helpful, particularly those for whom English is not their first language. Teaching African students and pastors to interpret Scripture using this four-legged stool model will go a long way towards enabling appropriate African interpretation of Biblical texts.

Overall, Mburu is clear but often simplistic in her writing style, which could be seen either negatively or positively, depending on the reader. For more academically inclined readers (not the primary intended audience), this book may be too easy-going, or even redundant at times. For example, Mburu writes that “many psalms are anonymous, for we do not know who wrote them” (p. 176). The explanatory phrase here seems redundant given what anonymous generally means. Another example that highlights such simplicity is Mburu’s claim that “Pharisees and the Sadducees...opposed Jesus at every turn” (p. 105). One thinks of Jesus’ conversation with the Pharisee Nicodemus in the gospel of John to counter this idea of opposition at “every turn.” Mburu may not be mistaken, but the simplicity of such statements does not tell the whole story about the complexity of Jesus’ relationship with religious authorities.

The book ends by suggesting that this is just the beginning of the reader’s journey to getting “started on the road to accurate biblical interpretation” (p. 213). Mburu recommends that students invest in commentaries, Bible atlases, Bible dictionaries and encyclopaedias” (p. 213) which help with understanding the historical and cultural contexts of Scripture. As commendable as this invitation is, the financial ability of many African pastors and students to acquire such resources is severely diminished and is not a reality for many. More achievable to all is Mburu’s invitation to “invest in yourself” (p. 214), by which is meant reliance on the Holy Spirit through such spiritual disciplines as prayer, fasting, and meditation. Finally, even though this book is intended for Africans and entitled African Hermeneutics, the basic premise of comparing cultural parallels could be adopted in many other contexts of the “majority world.” Mburu here provides a refreshing and welcomed tool for African pastors and students who may be frustrated by existing models that were created by foreign, usually Western Christianity.

Tobias J. Houston
Global Interaction Australia


The underlying question for David Miller in his unique data-based study is whether Greek pedagogy needs to be revamped, and if so, how? Greek Pedagogy
in Crisis proceeds in three steps: (1) survey thirty-two New Testament Greek experts; (2) analyze the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) of the Grammar-Translation Method (GTM); and (3) compare second language acquisition strategies to GTM strategies in Greek pedagogy (p. 68).

Initially, Miller lays out information vital for the remainder of the study, such as his research purpose, questions, delimitations, terminology, assumptions, precedent literature, and methodological design (chapter 1). Two intentions fuel the study: discovering the SWOT of GTM and starting to cultivate a greater NT Greek pedagogy for the benefit of students and ministry alike (p. 3). On the one hand, Miller claims his goal is not to “modernize” the pedagogy of GTM, but “complement” it (p. 3). On the other hand, he still feels comfortable saying GTM needs a complete “overhaul,” a rather revisionist sentiment (p. 11). All the while, it is clear the aim of the study intends not to leave GTM high and dry afterwards. Instead, Miller is fully aware of the need for reform amidst pedagogical models, and he desires to begin a new path forward.

These foundations point to further developments as Miller defines several teaching styles, of which his focus remains GTM (chapter two). Chapter two outlines the history of the Greek language and defines GTM, comparing it with other models of language learning, some of which are Greek-specific, and some of which are not. Greek-specific approaches include: (1) Communicative Greek, (2) Usage-Based Greek, (3) Singing Greek, (4) Tools-Based Greek, (5) Practically-Based Greek, and (6) Greek Helps. When it comes to the NT Greek tactics, Miller places “many” of them under the umbrella of “slightly unique renditions of GTM,” yet the pedagogies standing underneath the umbrella are not explicitly named (p. 66). Among pedagogies not limited to Greek, Miller defines and surveys Second Language Acquisition, Task-Based Language Teaching, scaffolding and learning targets, technology in language education, and online education. In many respects, language teaching methodologies (Greek-specific and otherwise) are not limited to one medium or technique. Instead, it would not be farfetched to presume that the classroom may combine many of the above-mentioned pedagogies.

Chapter three briefly presents a more robust explanation of Miller's research methodology. Miller explains how he chose the experts, lists the questions he wishes to answer through the SWOT analysis of GTM, and he fleshes out his intentions for comparing SLA to GTM research. Some may question whether surveying only thirty-two people, all of them professors and no students or administrators, is the best methodology for determining the most effective means of teaching Greek.

Chapter four consists of the results of the survey along with Miller’s explication upon it. Miller starts out by categorizing the experts’ answers in either a strength or weakness subset, then listing every answer given in no particular order.
Miller then walks the reader through the actual survey. Of the ten survey questions, three notable ones stand out: (1) who is responsible for course success (highest percentage: 34%, say professor and student), (2) what learning objectives do NT Greek professors expect out of the first year student (memorization being the favored, while exegesis being the least), and (3) whether students utilize Greek in their ministry (66% answer a resounding “no”). Chapter four provides the reader with the clearest, most concise and coherent explication on where GTM stands and falls.

Chapter five summarizes the SWOT of GTM and proposes a supposedly new method to Greek pedagogy: Exegetical Greek. Miller takes to heart the survey’s result on how low exegesis landed under learning objectives (survey question #3). The Exegetical Greek attempts to alter the present-day learning objectives to place exegesis on top. Miller illustrates Exegetical Greek with a scaffolding pyramid which has students embark through learning the introductory grammar by way of bible software. The next steps of the scaffolding pyramid move toward syntax, word studies alongside verbal aspect, textual criticism beside diagramming, and finally to exegesis—the pinnacle. In some respects, Miller has combined aspects from several of the Greek-specific models with aspects of the newer language-learning methods that are not Greek-specific. Some may have concerns about making exegesis the focal point of language learning from day one. Miller’s point, though, is solely to start the fire for others to blaze new paths in Greek pedagogy, Exegetical Greek being but one option (p. 150).

After Miller summarizes GTM’s state and proposes a new model, three appendices follow. The three appendices consist of (1) the experts surveyed; (2) the survey transcript; and (3) a transcript of the survey’s responses. Throughout the responses it seems clear: the hurdles in front of the present pedagogical approach to NT Greek appear insurmountable (p. 124). Each step provides the reader with valuable insight into the shortcomings of today’s Greek pedagogy through the eyes of its own teachers. Throughout, Miller provides positives and options for moving forward.

Miller’s study provides readers with consistent data-based research on the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of Greek pedagogy. Nonetheless, those teaching Greek will benefit from reading through Miller’s research, even if they disagree with the Exegetical Greek model. Greek Pedagogy in Crisis asks teachers to review their teaching technique, assess it, and reform it for the betterment of both themselves and their students. No matter the usefulness of GTM or Miller’s proposed exegetical model, Miller notes that “More attempts need to be made and more research needs to be done if this generation of theological educators desire [sic] to see biblical languages used in the church for the glory of God” (p. 150). In the end, the conclusions Miller reaches closely align with the consensus of his study. From the outset, it should not be surprising that the
consensus leans towards at least improving GTM. Professors and students alike desperately need refreshment in the classroom and enlivenment amidst the biblical languages.

Kyle J. Keesling Jr.
Erskine Theological Seminary


*Qumran Hebrew* discusses linguistic aspects of the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls (“DSS”). Reymond’s book is not intended to be a comprehensive grammar of DSS Hebrew. Rather, he examines orthographic, phonetic, and morphologic aspects of DSS Hebrew, especially by comparing them to the Hebrew of the Masoretic Text (“MT”).

Before beginning, however, he asks what the significance is of the marks on the scrolls. Do they indicate the writer’s pronunciation, or were the words “written one way and intended to be pronounced an entirely different way” (p. 15)? His assumption is that the writing was pronounced in a way that “will more closely match the spelling of words,” with spoken idiom being an exception (p. 19). For Reymond this means that different spellings reflect “different phonetic realizations” (p. 19).

In the orthography section Reymond both examines and gives examples of many scribal errors: haplography, metathesis, two *maters* written for one vowel, the sound of a word affecting the following word, confusion of similar sounding consonants, confusion of gutters, similarly shaped letters, and others. A few of the differences he mentions are that *aleph* can be used as a *mater* in the DSS, either word-internal or with either *waw* or *yodh*; short /u/ is marked by a *waw* in the DSS; and “an /ō/ from an etymological /u/ in a monosyllabic noun” has a *mater* in the DSS (e.g., לְזַיִּיר (p. 51).

Reymond makes several valuable observations about the phonology of DSS Hebrew. *Nun* does not always assimilate to a following consonant, and *samekh* and *sin* can be used interchangeably, indicating that they were pronounced the same. Reymond also provides many examples in support of his view that gutturals had weakened but that the glottal stop had not entirely vanished. In other words, the distinction in the pronunciation of the gutturals had not been lost. *Aleph* and *yodh/waw* can interchange, and *yod* can also become *waw*, when an /o/ or /u/ vowel follows. He believes that the phonology of DSS Hebrew may have been similar to Tiberian Hebrew; however, he also states that it is unclear whether an ultimate or penultimate accent characterized DSS Hebrew.

Reymond’s examination of the morphology of DSS Hebrew reveals many interesting tendencies. *Qal* imperfects and imperatives often resemble the pausal
form of the MT, and DSS Hebrew also provides evidence of an apparent shift from the preterite to the perfect tense. An initial aleph or a waw mater can appear in words against the MT, and the qamets-heh ending is found on verbs that are not cohortative, as well as on adverbs and adverbial nouns.

Reymond's goal for this book was to address aspects of DSS Hebrew that had not been adequately treated by previous scholars. He has accomplished this goal and, in doing so, made a valuable contribution to DSS and Hebrew studies. Reymond provides the reader with a veritable gold mine of information; however, it is also technical in nature and requires an extensive knowledge of Biblical Hebrew grammar and terminology. Qumran Hebrew is recommended reading for those who wish to improve their grasp of Classical Hebrew, especially by studying the diachronic development of the language.

One particularly helpful feature of the book was found in the conclusion. He lists the traits of DSS Hebrew that a student should be familiar with. He also provides a helpful description of the linguistic setting at the time the DSS were composed. The scrolls

... suggest a context where scribes and writers were speaking and composing in Hebrew as well as Aramaic; a context where scribes and writers were inventing new genres and literary idioms while engaging intensively with former genres and idioms; a context in which the boundaries between spoken and written registers, vernacular and literary idioms, local and distant dialects were constantly mixing and interacting (pp. 20–21).

In Qumran Hebrew, Reymond displays a masterful knowledge of the linguistic aspects of Classical Hebrew; this is a work that will surely be studied for years to come.

Charles Crouch
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary


Alan J. Thompson is a lecturer in New Testament at Sydney Missionary and Bible College. Thompson’s Luke volume is composed similarly to the other volumes of the Exegetical Guide to the Greek New Testament series. It has two main parts: introduction to and exegesis of the book. In the short introduction Thompson covers authorship, date, audience, purpose(s), outline, and recommended commentaries. The exegetical part of the commentary provides a concise discussion of each paragraph of Luke’s Gospel pointing out important aspects of morphology and syntax. The commentary concludes with an exegetical outline, a short appendix on common verbs which were not parsed in the commentary, and grammar and scripture indexes.
In comparing this volume to others in the series (Colossians and Philemon; 1 Peter), I observe first that the section on the structure of the passage in the introduction is more methodologically elaborated. Some can even use this description as a general guide to diagramming. Second, this volume is different because it deals with a large book which is also a narrative. In addition to the narrative nature of the Gospel, we need to pay attention to the implications of Luke being part of the Synoptics even when our primary concern is the grammar. Third, whereas the Colossians and Philemon volume uses “deponent” terminology without any comment, this Luke volume continues to use it but does explain why it is used. In either case it shows me that the publisher, editors, authors and everyone else who was involved in the process of developing these books wants to make them as beneficial and useful as possible.

For this review, I would like to take the statement about the benefits intended for each group of readers and examine how well these aims were achieved using a case-study text. So as it is stated in the introduction:

The EGGNT volumes will serve a variety of readers. Those reading the Greek text for the first time may be content with the assistance with vocabulary, parsing, and translation. Readers with some experience in Greek may want to skip or skim these sections and focus attention on the discussions of grammar. More advanced students may choose to pursue the topics and references to technical works under “For Further Study,” while pastors may be more interested in the movement from grammatical analysis to sermon outline. Teachers may appreciate having a resource that frees them to focus on exegetical details and theological matters (p. xxxi).

Our case study text is going to be from Luke 4:1–13. The beginning reader of the Greek New Testament would find a great amount of help therein. The parsing is given even for the regular or common forms and constrictions (e.g. ἐν τῇ ἐφήμῳ, 4:1; ὐ, 4:3; ζήσεται, 4:4 etc.) (pp. 68–69). The intermediate student of Greek might heed the advice and “skip or skim these sections” (p. xxxi). He or she may prefer and enjoy the discussion on conditional sentences in vv. 3 and 7 or perhaps a word study as that on διάβολος in 4:2 (pp. 68–69). The notes on the usage of the Old Testament (4:6, 8, 10, 12), as well as the structural observations (e.g., repletion of συντελεῖ in vv. 2, 13, etc.), are concise but helpful (pp. 68–70). Books and articles on the temptation of Christ and in relation to the person of Satan and demons are suggested for additional reading. A homiletical outline is provided both for 3:21–4:13 and 4:1–13. Having this resource may allow teachers to discuss other important theological topics, such as the order of the temptations in the Gospels or the place of this story in the larger narrative. This text illustrates for us that the volume splendidly achieves its stated goals. I deeply respect the intense labor and tremendous effort which needs to be done to produce such a volume, taking
into consideration the size of the book and the advanced level of the Greek used throughout.

One way in which the volume could have been enhanced is by discussing Luke’s grammar in comparison with the grammar in parallel passages in the other Gospels. The value of this approach might be shown by Daniel Wallace when he is dealing with conditional sentences:

“By way of illustration, in Matt 18:8 the evangelist portrays the Lord as saying, “If your hand causes you to stumble, cut it off!” He uses the first class condition. But Mark, in the parallel passage (9:43), portrays the Lord as saying this in the third class condition. Now it is possible that one of the two writers got his information wrong. But it is equally likely that the semantic domains of first and third class conditions are not entirely distinct. Perhaps they are elastic enough that both of them can be used, at times, to speak of the same event” (Greek Grammar beyond the Basics [Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996], 685).

Conditional sentences or verb forms could be compared in the parallel accounts of the Gospels to make sure that we do not over-interpret certain grammatical forms. In the Scripture index of this volume on Luke, we can find 31 references to Matthew, 22 to Mark, and 11 to John. I checked all of the eleven references to the Gospel of John, and most of them are related to the content of the stories (pp. 124, 351) or clarify the meaning or usage of certain words (pp. 10, 307, 338, 364). Maybe one could be classified as being related to grammar: “...εἰσῆλθεν, see 1:40; an ingressive aor. Robertson, Pictures 264; cf. John 13:2...” (p. 339).

In conclusion, I believe that this book is an important tool for serious study of the Gospel of Luke in Greek, and that the author has accomplished his stated purposes well.

Volodymyr Lavrushko
Tyndale Theological Seminary


Zacharias is Assistant Professor of New Testament studies at Acadia Divinity College and the developer of FlashGreek and ParseGreek, mobile apps for students. When Acadia moved its elementary Greek class to just one semester, Zacharias surveyed the market and determined that there were not any suitable one-semester Greek grammars available. With his penchant for innovation and embracing the digital age, Zacharias wanted to write a one-semester grammar that was conscious of the increasing promise—and limitations—of Bible software. The result is Biblical Greek Made Simple: All the Basics in One Semester.
Biblical Greek Made Simple consists of eleven chapters of grammar, a final chapter with suggestions for further study, and appendices with charts and vocabulary. Created with a twelve-week class in mind, the grammar covers a lot of ground in each chapter (about twenty to thirty pages each). Each chapter concludes with three sections (in addition to vocabulary) that highlight the distinctives of the work. The section titled “The Least You Need to Know” is not a shortcut for lazy students but rather a short quiz with a link to online flashcards. The “Greek@Logos” section points students to additional resources on Logos Bible Software (produced by Lexham Press’s parent company Faithlife), including exercises designed to help beginning Greek students make use of their software’s language and morphology features. The “Second Time Around” section is meant for students who are using the grammar in a second semester, providing additional learning exercises aimed at greater competency. Though not listed in the Table of Contents, each chapter includes learning exercises, with activities ranging from the basic (e.g., vocabulary and parsing) to the novel (e.g., guided searches in Logos).

Zacharias’s pedagogical concern for students is evident in the book’s tone. While some grammars merely present information and leave the other elements of pedagogy to the instructor, Biblical Greek Made Simple seeks to coach readers through the process of learning a new language. Readers are encouraged: “Learning a language often makes you feel like a kid again. That is okay!” (p. xxi). Discussing indicative verbs, Zacharias writes, “You are likely dazed and confused right now—I don’t blame you. This is a whirlwind of information” (p. 80). Zacharias’s colloquial and sympathetic style stands in a line of contemporary grammars with helpful notes and encouragements for students along the way. These are matched by the numerous links to online resources and videos. Students who take advantage of these additional learning tools will be grateful, even if the clumsiness of printed URLs makes one think that a companion website with a compendium of resources might have been in order. Of course, the digital version of the grammar in Logos makes this simpler.

Instructors of biblical Greek will certainly be divided on the usefulness of Biblical Greek Made Simple. The sheer number and variety of online resources and suggested learning activities integrated with Biblical Greek Made Simple should prove helpful to instructors who want to equip their students, especially those who do not already have a well-formed bevy of activities and lesson plans. However, there are several notable barriers to entry for teachers who might consider adopting Zacharias’s work: the unique contributions of Biblical Greek Made Simple are closely tied to a one-semester format and a heavy integration with not just Bible software in general but Logos in particular. (Of course, one could ignore or augment the Logos-based activities, and the “Second Time Around” sections are built with two-semester grammar classes in mind.) Additionally, instructors using
Biblical Greek Made Simple will need to supplement the discussions of disputed subjects as they see fit. For example, indicating in a footnote that he has “chosen to follow Wallace,” Zacharias briefly instructs students that the “aspect, or viewpoint, of the verb is the more important issue” than time (p. 66).

Biblical Greek Made Simple was not designed primarily to replace the more standard grammars and may not do so in typical, two-semester classes. However, the desire for streamlined curricula, the embrace of digital resources, learner-centric pedagogy, and self-learning are growing trends in biblical education that make Biblical Greek Made Simple a timely and beneficial contribution. The integration of this work with digital resources alone (not only Bible software but the many multimedia teaching resources as well) is worth applauding, and fellow grammarians and writers of textbooks will do well to learn from this element of Biblical Greek Made Simple. Indeed, Zacharias’s labor of love has produced a pace-setter for this sub-genre of grammars, one which all varieties of instructors and administrators in biblical education ought to consider.

Travis J. Montgomery
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary


This textbook provides an overview of implicatures from Grice to the present day. The authors begin with the birth of pragmatics (ch. 1) and its problematic relationship with linguistic frameworks (ch. 2). They then survey how implicatures have fared after Grice within the frameworks relevance theory, neo-Gricean pragmatics, and post-Gricean pragmatics (chs. 3–6). The final part of the book (chs. 7–9) considers empirical studies that have judged the processing of implicatures, focusing especially on the problem of scalar implicatures among adults, children, and second language learners.

This work intends to be and functions as a skillful navigation of the literature on implicatures. The authors rehearse the various types of implicatures and how they have been treated by authors from the three main frameworks mentioned above. They do make many judgments along the way, and provide key areas of research for the future.

Conventional implicatures have mostly been taken over in formal semantics, so the major concern of the authors is conversational implicatures, which divide into generalized and particularized implicatures. The authors consider this divide an unnecessary distinction based on the neo-Gricean semantics-pragmatics interface,
whereas relevance theory can treat all conversational implicatures the same by placing a strong weight on the role of context in the derivation of implicatures, and not needing to allow for default processes of pragmatic enrichment. Rather, the authors advocate for pragmatic enrichment taking place during the process of explicit communication, e.g., through explicature (pp. 45–66). They view relevance theory’s main contribution to be its broadening of the scope of pragmatics from implicit to explicit forms of enrichment.

In the third part of the book, through a number of empirical studies the authors assess a variety of claims that are covered in the second part of the book. The authors focus on scalar implicatures, as these have drawn the most attention from researchers. They argue that studies confirm the predictions of relevance theory that processing time of implicatures depends more on context and ease of cognitive accessibility (pp. 143–166). This evidence contradicts Gricean accounts, which have suggested that generalized implicatures are distinct from particularized implicatures and are costlier to process.

In ch. 8, the authors challenge the notion that children develop pragmatic skills (e.g., the ability to process and understand implicatures) later than semantic skills. Older studies suggested as much, but relied on metapragmatic assessments such as asking children to explain their understanding of pragmatic elements, and ignored external factors (pp. 181–185). Newer studies have asked children to respond with action to implicatures, and they have shown that children develop pragmatic skills around the same time as skills from other domains of language, suggesting that the commonly understood order of acquisition be reconsidered.

Chapter 9 considers what factors lead to second language learners developing a sensitivity to implicatures. The major reasons implicatures are hard to discern in a new language are that implicit premises are culturally dependent, and that it takes language proficiency to recognize language-specific forms that express implicatures. They find that social and cognitive aspects of pragmatics cannot be separated easily.

The authors have provided a comprehensive, up-to-date summary of the state of research on implicatures. They also lead the reader to reasonable conclusions, generally favoring relevance theory over Gricean frameworks. Filled with charts and diagrams, the reader is helped to digest not only the various types of implicatures and aspects of them, but also how they are treated differently within frameworks. Other studies have been published on implicatures, but they have been more specialized, such as C. Pott’s monograph *The Logic of Conversational Implicatures* (Oxford University Press, 2005), which covers the one type of implicature but does not focus on empirical data in the way that this volume does. On the other hand, B. Geurts’s *Quantity Implicatures* (Cambridge University Press, 2011) focuses on scalar implicatures and evaluates his theory with empirical data on psychological processing, but the study is limited in the type of implicature and also favors a
Gricean framework. This new *Implicatures*, then, is probably the most comprehensive account now available, and also thoughtful in its attempt to verify its tendency toward relevance theory with empirical data.

This book would be too detailed for a typical pragmatics course, but will be indispensable for those focusing on implicatures in teaching or research. Most helpful is its consideration of implicatures from within the three different frameworks. I commend the authors for this useful contribution to the field of pragmatics.

Todd A. Scacewater
Dallas International University