Examining Some Adapted Personal and Place Names in the Ewe Bible

Jonas Agyemfra[a],*; Gabriel Kwasi Nyantakyi[a]; Judith Sena Agbevenu[a]; John Samuel Boamah Poupiel Win-Mmal[a]

[a]Lecturer, St. Ambrose College of Education, Dormaa Akwamu, Ghana.
* Corresponding author.

Abstract

This study examined some adapted personal and place names in the Ewe Bible. The purpose of the study was to: (i) find out how personal and place names were adapted from the English Holy Bible into the Ewe Bible by the translators (ii) find out the various forms of adaptation strategies employed and finally (iii) find out if the various adaptation strategies employed suffice the phonotactics of the Ewe language for the realization of their surface forms. The qualitative type of research design was employed in the study. The source of data was purely secondary since the English Holy Bible and the Ewe Holy Bible served as source of data. The study brought to light that non-native segments, clusters and codas were the illicitness the translators employed loanword adaptation strategies such as segmental adaptation, deletion and insertion/epenthesis to repair. Though the Ewe language recognizes these three loanword adaptation strategies, how the translators employed these strategies in adapting the personal and place names from the English Holy Bible into the Ewe Holy Bible does not suffice the phonotactics of the Ewe language. This has the tendency of making reading difficult on the part of readers of the Ewe Bible. Suggestion is therefore made that in future revision of the Ewe Bible, the translators should thoroughly abreast themselves with the grammars of both the source language and target language, so that the repair strategies would be employed judiciously in repairing various illicitness that may be found in the source document.

Key words: Ewe; English; Bible; Loanword; Adaptation; Syllable

INTRODUCTION

This study examines some adapted personal and place names in the Ewe Bible. For the purpose of making reading easier on the part of native speakers of languages worldwide, the Bible, which is a reading material for Christians has become a document that has been translated enormously. In order to satisfy native speakers of a language when it comes to the reading of the Bible, the language tries to translate the Bible to fit into the grammatical and meaningful dictates of the language, of which the Ewe language is not an exception. When one reads the Ewe Bible, he or she is bound to come across names which are foreign to the language. Therefore, it is expected that these names are adapted to suit the phonotactics of the Ewe language so that both the educated and uneducated Ewe speakers would find reading easier. One of such aspects of the Bible that is foreign to the Ewe luuage are personal and place names. In as much as the English Holy Bible has readily become the most commonly used Bible when it comes to the translation of the Bible into other languages, of which the Ewe Bible is part, the original language of the Bible is traced to Greek, Aramaic and Hebrew. Due to this, a lot of personal and place names are foreign to the Ewe language. To make reading easier for native speakers of the language, it is expected of translators to adapt these personal and place names to suit the Ewe phonotactics. Therefore, this study is to find out the strategies employed by the translators of the Ewe Bible. With this, we find out how personal and place names were adapted from the

English Holy Bible into the Ewe Bible by the translators. Again, we find out the various forms of adaptation strategies employed by the translators in translating the personal and place names into the Ewe Bible. Finally, we find out if the various adaptation strategies employed by the translators suffice the phonotactics of the Ewe language for the derivation of their surface forms.

The Ewe Language

The Ewe language belongs to the Kwa branch of the Niger-Congo family (Greensberg, 1963). According to Capo (1991) cited in Ameka (2001), Ewe or Ewegbe written in the indigenous orthography as Eʋe or Eʋegbe is a major dialect cluster of the language cluster that has come to be known as Gbe or Tadoid. It is pronounced based on one's dialect as əβə, εβε or eβe. Other major members of the Gbe cluster that are the closest relatives of Ewe are Gen, Aja and Fon. The Ewe language is spoken around the Southeastern part of Ghana, Togo, Benin and also parts of the Ogun and Lagos states of Nigeria

The dialects of Ewe have been categorized geographically into inland dialects (also known as northern dialects or Eʋedome), southern or coastal dialects and western dialects. The inland and southern dialects are spoken in Ghana while the western dialect is spoken in Togo. The northern dialect is spoken in the northern half of the Volta Region of Ghana with major dialect clusters in Ho (Stahlke, 1971; Clements, 1974; Kpodo, 2017). Avenɔ, Tɔŋú, etc. are coastal or southern dialects while some northern dialects are Gbi, Kpando, Fódome, etc.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study is situated in the larger framework of onomastics. Onomastics is the study of names, and according to Crystal (1999), it is a branch of semantics that looks at the etymology of proper names. There are two types of onomastics. These include; anthroponomastics and toponomastics. Anthroponomastics deals with the study of personal names while toponomastics deals with the study of place names. This theory befits the current study because the study focuses on personal names and place names in both the English Holy Bible and the Ewe Holy Bible. With this, how personal and place names were adapted from the English Holy Bible into the Ewe Holy Bible by the translators is investigated.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research design employed in the study was qualitative. Being qualitative, it sought to describe how translators of the Ewe Bible adapted some personal and place names from the English Holy Bible into the Ewe Bible. The source of data was purely secondary, in that the English Holy Bible (New International Version) and the Ewe Holy

Bible, named in Ewe as *Agbenya La* served as source of data. The New International Version of the English Bible was used owing to the fact that it is the version that served as the source document to the translators of the Ewe Bible. Again, the 2021 edition of the Ewe Bible named as Ewe Contemporary Scriptures was used owing to the fact that it is the newest edition in the system now. The names (personal and place) were collected from both the Old Testament and New Testament of both bibles. Coding and Categorization were used to group the names under their respective adaptation processes, that is, the names were coded under various adaptation processes, after which they were categorized under these adaptation processes as segmental adaptation, insertion/epenthesis and deletion. The study focused on such illicitness as clusters, codas and non-native segments in the source document and how they were adapted in the target document. Notably, we do not have any motivation or reason behind the choice of the names from a particular book of both the source document and target document; the fact that a particular name conforms to the purpose of the study lent itself to be taken.

THE EWE SYLLABLE STRUCTURE

The Ewe language is one of the languages that subscribe to open syllables, that is, it prefers open syllables to closed ones. Being open syllables, the syllables that are operational in the Ewe language are without codas. Therefore, the language operates with three basic syllable structures or types. These are; CV, V and CCV.

The CV syllable type is composed of consonant as onset and a vowel sound as nucleus. This type of syllable structure is also referred to as one margin, tone and nucleus, with the one margin composed of a consonant sound as onset and the tone and nucleus being a vowel sound assigned with a tone in some cases. The sounds which are usually accepted at the onset are the following:

(1) /p,b,t,d,k,g,gb,kp,Φ,β,f,v,s,z, ts,dz, x,γ, h,m,n, ŋ,l. w,j/

It can therefore be seen from (1) that apart from /r/, all consonant sounds in Ewe can be onsets. This type of syllable structure exemplified in (2) below:

(2) CV-syllable type
    a. ké   'sand'
    b. tó   'to stop'
    c. fi   'steal'

The second syllable type is *only the nucleus*. It is also referred to as tone and nucleus, with the nucleus which is usually a vowel sound or syllabic consonant assigned with tone. This type of syllable is composed of either a vowel or syllabic consonant. And this is the type of syllable labelled as V. The syllabic consonants that can occupy the nucleus position are; /m, n, ŋ/. When this syllable type is a vowel sound, it occurs in two environments. The first

one is when we have a vowel sound assigned with tone standing alone as a word. And the second one is when a vowel sound which starts a word is immediately followed by a consonant sound. Also, the syllabic consonant also occurs as only the nucleus or V-syllable type when any of these syllabic consonants begins a word and it is immediately followed by another consonant sound or it occurs when any of these sounds ends a word or syllable. This syllable type is exemplified in (3) below:

(3) V-only syllable type
    a. é   'he/she/it'
    b. è   'you-SG'
    c. à.zì   'egg'
    d. ŋ̀.kú   'eye'
    e. flé.ḿ,   'pluck'

The third type of the Ewe syllable structure is the CCV. It is also referred to as two margins, tone and nucleus. The onset is occupied by a consonant cluster and the nucleus occupied by a vowel sound. The nucleus being a vowel in some cases could be assigned with tone. Notably, the second position of this type of syllable structure is occupied by few sounds. Thus, the second position is usually occupied by either /l/ or /r/, depending on the type of sound which occupies the first C-slot. If the first C-slot is occupied by dentals, alveolars and palato-alveolars, they are followed by /r/. And with other consonants such as labials and velars, they are followed by /l/. Conclusively, the nature of the CC which serves as the onset is Cl or Cr. This syllable type is exemplified in (4) below:

(4) CCV-syllable type
    a. blè   'deceive'
    b. dzrá   'sell'
    c. ƒlè   'buy'
    d. trɔ́   'return'

(cf: Duthie, 1996; Agbedor, 2002; Agbadah, 2018; Deklu, 2021).

LOANWORD ADAPTATION STRATEGIES IN EWE

In the contexts of education, governance, sports, religion, etc, languages are bound to interact. During the interaction, languages usually loan or borrow words from other languages. Languages usually loan words from other languages based on simplicity and in some cases prestige. On simplicity, since some of these words do not have equivalents in the receptor language, the words are loaned and the fact that the donor language and the receptor or native languages may not have the same phonotactics, these words are adapted or nativized to fit the context of the phonotactics of the receptor language. Davis (1993) notes that the way loanwords are pronounced and heard in the target language are very different from the way they are pronounced and heard in the source language. He adds that the difference in how the words are pronounced

and heard is due to the fact that segments of the words borrowed may differ from the segments in the language receiving the words. Wornyo (2016:45) suggests one of the ways through which loanwords can be adapted, as he states that, "…as words from a particular language enter another language, the people who speak the language that is borrowing are challenged in the way they perceive the incoming acoustic signal because their phonological system tends to differ from that of the lending language." He adds that as a result of this, the segments which are phonologically foreign to the phonological system of the receiving language are matched onto segments which are phonetically and acoustically closer to the illicit segments.

It is therefore clear that when one language loans a word from another language, there is always the tendency of adapting the loaned word so that it will fit into the phonotactics of the receptor or target language. Ewe is one of the languages that has borrowed immensely from the English language. Since the Ewe and the English language differ in some areas of their phonotactics, the Ewe language, being the recipient language always employs some adaptation strategies to make the borrowed words more nativised for use by speakers of the language. This section of the study therefore spells out some of the adaptation strategies involved in the English loanwords in Ewe.

Segmental Adaptation

Segmental adaptation in loanword adaptation is the process of matching illicit or foreign segments in the words of the donor language onto segments in the recipient language which are phonetically and acoustically closer. Wornyo (ibid.) states that in as much as Ewe has rich phonemic sound inventory which is able to match most sounds of the English language, some matches clearly show that the Ewe loanword phonology is influenced by segmental constraints and perception. Therefore, in cases where speakers of the Ewe language are confronted with segments whose feature matrix in English does not exist in Ewe, the English segments are represented by native segments whose phonetic and acoustic features are closely related. Some of the segmental adaptations are exemplified below.

(5)

	English	Ewe
a.	sh [ʃ]	s
b.	th [ɵ]	t
c.	j [dʒ]	y [j]
d.	ch [ʧ] / [k]	k
e.	c [s]	k
f.	ph	f
g.	x [z]/[ks]	z/s

Insertion/Epenthesis

Ewe employs insertion or epenthesis as one of its loanword adaptation strategies. In as much as the Ewe language may have some segment equivalents in English,

it is not the case when it comes to their syllable structures. Since Ewe prefers open syllables to closed ones, it is expected that in a case where an English word has closed syllable, the closed syllable be re-syllabified to make it open. This is usually done by inserting an appropriate vowel sound. Again, apart from the Cl or Cr consonant cluster at syllable onsets, Ewe prefers that consonant clusters be parsed. And this is usually done by inserting an appropriate vowel sound between the two consonant sounds. Therefore, these two forms of re-syllabification through insertion are exemplified in (6) below.

(6)	**Input**		**Adapted Form**
	a. ball	[bɔlu]	*[bɔ:l]
	vote	[voti]	*[vəʊt]
	b. school	[sukulu]	*[sku:l]
	smoke	[sumoki]	*[sməʊk]

Deletion

We have already claimed that one of the ways of splitting consonant clusters which are unfamiliar to the Ewe language in loanwords is through vowel insertion. Apart from this strategy, another adaptation strategy employed to make unfamiliar consonant clusters at syllable boundary in loanwords to conform to the phonotactics of Ewe is through consonant deletion. This means that each of these consonants are seen in different syllables. Therefore, since Ewe disprefers codas, the first consonant is usually deleted. This is exemplified in (7) below:

(7)	**Input**		**Adapted Form**
	a. tractor	[trata]	*[træktə]
	b. picture	[pitsa]	*[pɪkʧə]

Sometimes, a vowel sound is inserted between the two consonants at syllable boundary. This is also exemplified in (8) below:

(8)	**Input**		**Adapted Form**
	a. master	[masita]	*[mæstə]
	b. doctor	[dɔkita]	*[dɒktə]

(See: Wornyo, 2016, pp.46-47)

Having looked at the syllable structure and some loanword adaptation strategies in Ewe, we now shift our attention to some adaptation strategies employed by the translators of the Ewe Bible in translating personal and place names. In fact, having gotten the overview of the syllable structure and loanword adaptation strategies in Ewe will help us to compare how the translators went about their translation process to these Ewe adaptation strategies to see if the strategies they employed suffice the phonotactics of the Ewe language.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Segmental adaptation of personal and place names in the Ewe bible

In this section, we look at how the translators of the Ewe Bible employed segmental adaptation in translating personal and place names. We have already learnt that in as much as the Ewe language is rich in phonemic consonant inventory, there are some segments we find in English that are foreign to Ewe, and as such, these segments are usually adapted by matching them to the Ewe segments which have close phonetic and acoustic features. Therefore, we check as to whether the English sound equivalents and the adapted segments are really reflected in the personal and place names in the Ewe Bible. Let us note that all affected sounds are in boldface font for easy identification.

The source orthographic letter <j> which is phonetically realized as [ʤ] is adapted as <y>, which is phonetically realized as [j]. This is exemplified in some of the place and personal names in (9) below.

(9)	j [ʤ]	y [j]	
	Adapted Form	**Source Name**	
	a. **Y**erusalem	**J**erusalem	(Matthew 2:1)
	b. **Y**ared	**J**ared	(Luke 3:37)
	c. **Y**usto	**J**ustus	(Acts 1:23)
	d. **Y**uda	**J**uda	(Matthew 1:2)
	e. **Y**eremia	**J**eremiah	(Matthew 16:14)
	f. **Y**ason	**J**ason	(Romans 16:21)
	g. **Y**avan	**J**avan	(Genesis 10:2)
	h. **Y**afia	**J**aphia	(Joshua 10:3)
	i. **Y**ezebel	**J**ezebel	(Revelation 2:20)
	j. **Y**eriko	**J**ericho	(Numbers 22:1)
	k. **Y**esu	**J**esus	(Mark 1:1)
	l. **Y**ese	**J**esse	(Matthew 1:6)
	m. Abi**y**a	Abi**j**ah	(Matthew 1:7)
	n. **Y**osia	**J**osiah	(Matthew 1:10)
	o. **Y**ɔdan	**J**ordan	(Matthew 2:15)

From the data in (9) above, the source orthographic letter <j>, phonetically realized as [ʤ] has been adapted as <y>, which is phonetically realized as [j] in the Ewe Bible, though the source sound [ʤ] has its equivalent in the Ewe language as [dz]. In fact, the sound [dz] is realized same in its orthographic form as <dz> in Ewe. Therefore, there would have been consistency if the translators had considered those equivalents. As to why the translators of the Ewe Bible decided to go for y [j] instead of <dz> [dz] is not known. However, we suspect that they didn't take into cognizance the phonetic realization of <j> in those names, thus, assuming that if <j> has been used in the source names, then the best orthographic letter to opt for is <y>, whose sound [j] is quite different from [ʤ] in the source names.

The source orthographic letter <c> which is phonetically realized as [s] in the source document is adapted as [k] in the target document. We present examples for illustration in (10) below.

(10)	c [s]	k [k]	
	Adapted Form	**Source Name**	
	a. Gri**k**	Gree**c**e	(Daniel 11:2)

b. Pris**k**ila   Pris**c**illa   (2Timothy 4:19)
c. Samotra**k**e   Samothra**c**e (Acts 16:11)
d. **K**efas   **C**ephas   (1Corintians 1:12)
e. **K**irene   **C**yrene   (John 2:10)
f. **K**ilikia   **C**ilicia   (Acts 6:9)
g. Ma**k**edonia   Ma**c**edonia (Acts 16:9)
h. **K**ipro   **C**yprus   (Acts 4:36)
i. Laodi**k**ia   Laodi**c**ea   (Colossians 4:13)
j. S**k**eva   S**c**eva   (Acts 19:14)
k. Nar**k**iso   Nar**c**issus (Romans 16:11)
 l. Enui**k**e   Euni**c**e   (2Timothy 1:5)
m. Kres**k**en   Cres**c**ens (2Timothy 4:10)
n. **K**nido   **C**nidus   (Acts 18:18)
o. **K**enkrea   **C**enchreae (Acts 27:7)

From the data in (10) above, we observe that the orthographic letter <c> which is realized as [s] phonetically has been adapted as [k] in the Ewe Bible, though [s] is an orthographic letter and at the same time a sound in the Ewe sound inventory. We do not know the motivation behind the choice of [k] by the translators, but we suspect that since there are other names in the source document with the orthographic letter <c>, phonetically realized as [k] (Corinth – Korinto [Acts 18:12]; Stoic – Stoik [Acts 17:18], etc), the translators were influenced by this phenomena and therefore, wherever they saw <c> in the source names, they simply replaced it with [k] in the target names.

In as much as the translators went about replacing every <c> they saw in the source names with [k], there are other names in the source document which have the same orthographic letter <c> (sh), realized phonetically as [ʃ] but the translators still went about adapting it as [k]. This is illustrated with the examples in (11) below.

(11) c (sh) [ʃ]   [k]
    Adapted Form   **Source Name**
    a. Kili**k**ia   Cili**c**ia   (Acts 6:9)
    b. Lu**k**io   Lu**c**ius   (Acts 13:1)
    c. Kappado**k**ia   Cappado**c**ia (1Peter 1:1)

In fact, we still observe that the same orthographic letter <c>, realized phonetically as [s] in some of the names was rightly adapted as [s], which is indeed the actual sound and letter the names in (10) and (11) should have been adapted to. Examples on this instance is used for illustration in (12) below.

(12) c [s]   s
    Adapted Form   **Source Name**
    a. Beni**s**   Berni**c**e (Acts 25:13)
    b. Foeni**s**ia   Phoeni**c**ia (Acts 11:19)
    c. **S**irus   **C**yrus   (Ezra 1:1)

Therefore, the fact that the translators adapted the orthographic letter <c> [s, ʃ] in the source names as [k] instead of [s] in the target names poses a challenge on the part of readers of the Ewe Bible because the readers would be confused in respect to which sound the orthographic letter <c> should be mapped onto, that is, either [k] or [s]

Moving on, there are instances where the source orthographic letter <ch> which is phonetically realized as [ʧ] is adapted as [k] in some of the target names, though the Ewe language has an equivalent sound realized orthographically and phonetically as <ts> [ts]. As to why the translators ignored the native sound and went for [k] is also not known, but we suspect that their choice was influenced by the same orthographic letter <ch> phonetically realized as [k] in some of the names as: (Zechariah – Zekaria [Matt. 23:35]; Enoch - Enɔk [Luke 3:37], etc). Therefore, the norm was for them to adapt every <ch> in the names as [k]. This instance is illustrated with examples in (13) below.

(13) ch [ʧ]   k
    Adapted Form   **Source Name**
    a. Ar**k**elao   Ar**ch**elaus (Matthew 2:22)
    b. **K**eran   **Ch**eran (Genesis 36:26)
    c. **K**esed   **Ch**esed (Genesis 22:22)
    d. **K**esil   **Ch**esil   (Joshua 15:30)
    e. **K**emos   **Ch**emosh (Judges 11:24)
    f. **K**aldea   **Ch**aldees (Genesis 15:7)

We observe from the data we have presented so far that though the source segments in some of the names have their equivalents in Ewe, the translators went about to choose segments in the latter they deemed had close phonetic and acoustic features with segments of the former, thus, posing the challenge of inconsistency to readers of the Ewe Bible.

Another segmental adaptation is where the source orthographic letter <sh> which is phonetically realized as [ʃ] is adapted as [s] in the target names. As discussed earlier, since the Ewe language lacks the alveo-palatal fricative sh [ʃ] in its sound inventory, it usually adapts it as [s], which is seen as having close phonetic and acoustic features with the former segment. We illustrate this instance of segmental adaptation in the Ewe Bible in (14) below.

(14) sh [ʃ]   s
    Adapted Form   **Source Name**
    a. **S**eba   **Sh**eba (Matthew 12:42)
    b. La**s**a   La**sh**a (Genesis 10:19)
    c. Me**s**a   Me**sh**a (Genesis 10:30)
    d. **S**efo   **Sh**efo (Genesis 36:23)
    e. **S**ua   **Sh**ua   (Genesis 25:2)
    f. Ger**s**on   Ger**sh**on (Genesis 46:11)
    g. Ki**s**ion   Ki**sh**ion (Joshua 19:20)
    h. **S**ema   **Sh**ema (Joshua 15:26)
    i. **S**obi   **Sh**obi   (2Samuel 17:27)
    j. Abi**s**ua   Abi**sh**ua (1Chronicles 8:4)
    k. Ge**s**em   Ge**sh**em (Nehemiah 6:2)
    l. Kar**s**ena   Car**sh**ena (Esther 1:14)
    m. Mi**s**al   Mi**sh**al (Joshua 19:26)
    n. **S**ilo   **Sh**iloh (Judges 2:12)
    o. Nim**s**i   Nim**sh**i (Judges 19:16)

Again, the source orthographic letter <th> which is

phonetically realized as [ɵ] is adapted as [t] in the Ewe Bible. Since the Ewe language does not have <th> [ɵ] in its sound inventory, any loaned word having this sound is usually adapted as [t] into the Ewe language; and that is what we find in some of the names in the Ewe Bible. This is illustrated with examples in (15) below.

(15) th [ɵ]   t

Adapted Form	Source Name
a. Mar**t**a	Mar**th**a (John 11:19)
b. Timo**t**eo	Timo**th**y (Acts 16:1)
c. Tabi**t**a	Tabi**th**a (Acts 9:36)
d. Bi**t**inia	Bi**th**ynia (1Peter 1:1)
e. Zare**t**an	Zare**th**an (Joshua 3:16)
f. Selomi**t**	Shelomi**th** (Leviticus 24:10)
g. Pi**t**om	Pi**th**om (Exodus 1:11)
h. Pe**t**or	Pe**th**or (Numbers 22:5)
i. Abia**t**a	Abia**th**ar (Mark 2:26)
j. Ru**t**	Ru**th** (Matthew 1:5)
k. Arima**t**ia	Arima**th**ea (Matthew 27:57)
l. Elizabe**t**	Elizabe**th** (Luke 1:5)
m. Na**t**an	Na**th**an (Luke 3:31)
n. **T**esalonika	**Th**essalonica (Acts 17:1)
o. Me**t**usael	Me**th**ushael (Genesis 4:18)

Thus far, we have looked at how segments in some of the source names were adapted into the Ewe Bible. We now shift our attention as we look at deletion as another repair strategy employed by the translators in translating some personal and place names of the English Bible into the Ewe Bible.

Deletion in personal and place names in the Ewe Bible

This section looks at how the translators employed deletion as a repair strategy in adapting personal and place names into the Ewe Bible. We have already learnt that one of the ways of repairing words loaned into the Ewe language which have clusters (initial and medial) and codas is through deletion. On cluster, anytime there is a sequence of two consonant sounds at syllable boundary, the first consonant sound (apart from /m, n, ŋ/) is deleted to break the cluster. Since the first consonant sound ending the first syllable forms a coda, and codas are not preferred in Ewe, it becomes the target sound that deletes, thereby resulting in cluster reduction. In fact, this is the form of deletion found in the literature, as seen in (Wornyo, 2016). In this study, such form of deletion is not found in the Ewe Bible, rather, the deletion is employed to delete codas, not at syllable boundaries or within clusters but at word final, where we have coda in the last syllable ending the word.

We observe two forms of coda deletion at word final in the Ewe Bible. The first form of coda deletion is when [s] ending a personal or place name is deleted. This is illustrated with examples in (16) below.

(16) /s/   Ø

Adapted Form	Source Name

a. Mose	Mose**s** (Matthew 17:4)
b. Toma	Thoma**s** ((Mark 3:18)
c. Ponto	Pontu**s** (Acts 2:9)
d. Troa	Troa**s** (Acts 16:8)
e. Tibero	Tiberiu**s** (Luke 3:1)
f. Tarso	Tarsu**s** (Acts 9:1)
g. Neopoli	Neopoli**s** (Acts 16:11)
h. Patmo	Patmo**s** (Revelation 1:9)
i. Onesimo	Onesimu**s** (Colossians 4:9)
j. Tito	Titu**s** (2Corinthians 7:6)
k. Dema	Dema**s** (Colossians 4:14
l. Epafra	Epaphra**s** (Colossians 1:7)
m. Nikodemo	Nichodemu**s** (John 3:1)
n. Aristobulo	Aristobulu**s** (Romans 16:10)
o. Lazaro	Lazaru**s** (Luke 16:20)

The second form of coda deletion is when /m/ is seen at the end of a syllable which is at word final. In fact, in as much as /m/ could serve as syllabic consonant at word final in Ewe, the translators went ahead to delete it in some of the names. Such instance is illustrated with examples in (17) below.

(17) /m/   Ø

Adapted Form	Source Name
a. Ikonio	Iconiu**m** (Acts 14:21)
b. Adramitio	Addramyttiu**m** (Acts 27:2)
c. Regio	Rhegiu**m** (Acts 28:13)
d. Pergamo	Pergamu**m** (Revelation 1:11)

As we have claimed above that clusters are not preferred in Ewe, and that loanwords in Ewe which are found with clusters, especially at word medial are repaired through cluster reduction (by deleting the first consonant sound), we observe that the translators failed to employ this strategy, but left most clusters unrepaired in some of the names. This result in unfamiliarity on the part of the readers of the Ewe Bible. Such non-adaptation of clusters is illustrated in (18) below.

(18) Unrepaired Clusters

Adapted Form	Source Name
a. Egi**pt**e	Egypt (Genesis 9:6)
b. Dama**sk**o	Damascus (Acts 9:2)
c. Bla**st**o	Blastus (Acts 12:20)
d. Era**st**o	Erastus (Acts 19:22)
e. Kri**sp**o	Crispus (Acts 18:8)
f. So**s**tene	Sosthenes (Acts 18:17)
g. Pa**tm**o	Patmos (Revelations 1:9)
h. Be**tf**age	Bethphage (Matthew 21:1)
i. Be**ts**aida	Bethsaida (Matthew 11:21)
j. Yɔ**kt**eel	Joktheel (Numbers 15:38)

Having looked at how deletion was employed in adapting some of the names into the Ewe Bible, we will now look at insertion or epenthesis as one of the repair strategies employed by the translators in adapting some of the names into the Ewe Bible. As discussed earlier, insertion or epenthesis is employed in loanword adaptation to re-syllabify clusters and codas. This is done

by inserting a vowel. In the study, the form of insertion or epenthesis found is the insertion of vowel sound to re-syllabify codas at word final. Such vowel sounds as /i, e, a, o/ were used in the epenthetic process. This is illustrated with examples in (19) below.

(19) Re-syllabification of codas

Adapted Form	Source Name
a. Kristo	Christ (Mark 1:1)
b. Korinto	Corinth (Acts 18:12)
c. Paradiso	Paradise (2Corinthians 12:3)
d. Marko	Mark (Acts 15:39)
e. Filipo	Philip (Matthew 10:3)
f. Pilato	Pilate (Matthew 27:2)
g. Roma	Rome (Acts 2:10)
h. Kreta	Krete (Acts 2:11)
i. Luka	Luke (Colossians 4:14)
j. Sirakusa	Syracuse (Acts 28:12)
k. Satana	Satan (Job 2:1)
l. Atene	Athens (Acts 18:1)
m. Egipte	Egypt (Genesis 9:6)
n. Pitolemia	Ptolemas (Acts 21:7)
o. Arodi	Arod (Genesis 46:16)

The data in (19) above shows how the translators re-syllabified codas in some source names into the Ewe Bible through vowel epenthesis. In (19g), we observe that though /m/ could form syllabic consonant, the translators went about to insert /a/ to re-syllabify it. The reason behind that is not known but we suspect that they took the consonant sound /m/ ending the word as forming a coda, and therefore tried to re-syllabify it. The same instance is found in (19k) and (19l), where /n/, which could form a syllabic consonant is treated as forming a coda, thus, re-syllabified with the insertion of /a/ and /e/ respectively. Though /p/, which begins the source name in (19n) is silent, and does not form a cluster with /t/ phonetically, the translators went ahead to treat them as cluster by inserting the vowel /i/. All these instances result in inconsistency which may put readers of the Ewe Bible in confusion.

Though the data we have in (19) shows how the translators re-syllabified codas at word final, we observe a lot of names with codas at word final in the Ewe Bible which should have been repaired through insertion or deletion, but they are left unrepaired. Again, this poses the challenge of inconsistency by putting readers of the Ewe Bible in confusion. We illustrate such instance of unrepaired codas in (20) below.

(20) Unrepaired Codas

Adapted Form	Source Name
a. Azmavet	Azmaveth (1Chronicles 9:38)
b. Meronot	Meronoth (Nehemiah 3:7)
c. Alemet	Alemeth (1Chronicles 7:8)
d. Zeret	Zereth (1Chronicles 4:7)
e. Anatɔt	Anathoth (1Chronicles 7:8)
f. Seles	Shelesh (1Chronicles 7:35)
g. Hores	Horesh (1Samuel 23:15)
h. Hatus	Hattush (Nehemiah 3:10)
i. Yoas	Joash (Judges 6:11)
j. Yabes	Jabesh (Judges 28:12)
k. Festus	Festus (Acts 25:1)
l. Antipas	Antipas (Revelations 2:13)
m. Luz	Luz (Genesis 28:19)
n. Ararat	Ararat (Genesis 8:4)
o. Kemuel	Kemuel (Genesis 22:21)

From the data in (20) above, it is observed from (20a-j) that whenever such illicitness as non-native segment is found in the source name and it is adapted with its close sound, that is, [t] and [s] respectively in the target name, the translators end it there without checking to see if these sounds form codas or not. In (20k-o), all the consonant sounds ending those names form codas, but as usual, they are not re-syllabified to make them open. The conclusion drawn from this is that in any of such cases where a consonant sound ends a name, thereby forming coda, it is left unrepaired. Again, leaving such codas unrepaired poses a challenge to the readers of the Ewe Bible.

DISCUSSION

Heretofore, we have presented data on how the translators of the Ewe Bible adapted personal and place names from the English Holy Bible through such adaptation strategies as segmental adaptation, deletion and insertion. Critically looking at how the translators employed these strategies in repairing such illicitness as clusters, codas and non-native segments, at least three forms of adaptation can be deduced. These are; Full Adaptation, Partial Adaptation and No Adaptation. These three are discussed below.

Full Adaptation

Here, full adaptation is used to refer to a situation where with a minimum of one illicitness, every illicitness in a source name is repaired to ensure absolute nativization in the Ewe Bible. This form of adaptation can also be referred to as full nativization. This means that the pronunciation of such name suffices the phonotactics of the Ewe language. This is illustrated with examples in (21) below.

(21) Full Adaptation in the Ewe Bible

Adapted Form	Source Name
a. Sitri	Sithri (Exodus 6:22)
b. Partia	Parthia (Acts 2:9)
c. Etam	Etham (Exodus 13:20)
d. Betlehem	Bethlehem (Genesis 48:7)
e. Simron	Shimron (Joshua 11:1)
f. Simei	Shimei (Exodus 6:17)
g. Musi	Mushi (Numbers 3:33)
h. Efeso	Ephesus (Romans 16:8)
i. Kornelio	Cornelius (Acts 10:1)
j. Apolo	Apollos (Acts 18:24)

From (21a-d), the source orthographic letter <th> realized phonetically as [θ] in the source names has been

adapted as [t] in the Ewe Bible to realize full adaptation or nativization in those names. In (21e-g), the source orthographic letter <sh> phonetically realized as [ʃ] has been adapted as [s] in the target names for full nativization of those names to be realized. Finally, in (21h-j), /s/ as coda at the end of each of the source names has been deleted in the target names for full nativization to be realized.

Partial Adaptation

We use partial adaptation to refer to an instance where with a minimum of two illicitness found in some of the names in the source document, one is repaired and the other is left unrepaired in the target document. This is illustrated with the examples in (22) below.

(22) Partial Adaptation in the Ewe Bible

Adapted Form	**Source Name**
a. Teofilus	**Th**eophilu**s** (Luke 1:3)
b. Matatias	Matta**th**ia**s** (Luke 3:24)
c. Natanel	Na**th**ane**l** (Numbers 10:15)
d. Eliasib	Elia**sh**i**b** (Nehemiah 3:1)
e. Selef	**Sh**ele**ph** (Genesis 10:26)
f. Sobab	**Sh**oba**b** (Joshua 5:14)
g. Eston	E**sht**on (1Chronicles 4:11)
h. Vasti	Va**sht**i (Esther 1:9)
i. Hesbon	He**shb**on (Numbers 21:25)
j. Bizta	Bi**zth**a (Esther 1:10)
k. Bigta	Bi**gth**a (Esther 1:10)
l. Abagta	Aba**gth**a (Esther 1:10)

From the data in (22) above, three kinds of partial adaptation can be observed. In (22a-c), there are two illicitness that needed repair, that is, a non-native segment: <th> [ө] and a coda: /s/ and /l/ at syllable or word final. Out of the two, the non-native segment is adapted and the coda is left unrepaired. Again, in (22d-f), two illicitness needed repair, that is, a non-native segment: <sh> [ʃ] and a coda: /b/ and /f/ at syllable or word final. The non-native segments in the names are repaired while the codas in those names are unrepaired. In (22g-l), out of the two illicitness that needed repair, that is, non-native segments (<sh> [ʃ] and <th> [ө]) and clusters respectively, the non-native segments are repaired with close segments in the target language while the clusters are left unrepaired, thus, partial adaptation.

No Adaptation

Here, no adaptation is used to refer to the context of having a minimum of one illicitness in the source names but is not repaired in the Ewe Bible. Such illicitness found in the study were clusters and codas, with most of them being codas at word final. We illustrate this with examples in (23) below.

(23) No Adaptation in the Ewe Bible

Adapted Form	**Source Name**
a. Boaz	Boaz (Matthew 1:5)
b. Salamis	Salamis (Acts 13:5)
c. Serug	Serug (Luke 3:35)
d. Hermes	Hermes (Acts 14:12)
e. Barnabas	Barnabas (Acts 13:1)
f. Lois	Lois (2Timothy 1:5)
g. Barak	Barak (Hebrews 11:32)
h. Magog	Magog (Genesis 10:2)
i. Rehob	Rehob (Numbers 13:21)
j. Atad	Atad (Genesis 50:10)
k. Pispa	Pispa (1Chronicles 7:38)
l. Mibsam	Mibsam (Genesis 25:13)
m. Mibzar	Mibzar (Genesis 36:42)
n. Zabdi	Zabdi (Joshua 2:1)
o. Absalom	Absalom (2Samuel 3:3)

From the data in (23) above, we observe two forms of unrepaired illicitness (codas and clusters) that result in no adaptation. This means that the translators as a norm just lifted these names from the source document into the target document without repairing them. In (23a-j) are names with codas which were left unrepaired. Names with clusters seen in (23k-o) were left unrepaired in the Ewe Bible.

General observation

With the data presented and discussion done so far, the general observation made is that how the translators adapted personal and place names from the English Holy Bible into the Ewe Bible does not suffice the phonotactics or grammar of the Ewe language. In as much as the Ewe language has its repair strategies used in repairing such illicitness as non-native segments, codas and clusters in loanwords, the translators employed them unsystematically. There are inconsistencies in respect to how the strategies were used to adapt the names in the Ewe Bible. Where codas in some of the names are to be repaired by either the deletion strategy or insertion strategy, some are adapted while others are not adapted. Also, where clusters are supposed to be adapted with either the deletion strategy or insertion strategy, such affected names are not adapted at all. On segmental adaptation (where non-native sounds in the source names are mapped onto segments in the target language), though some of the segments in the source names have their equivalents in Ewe, the translators opted for sounds which have their pronunciation quite different from the source segments, among others.

The resultant effect of these inconsistencies found in how the translators adapted personal and place names from the English Holy Bible into the Ewe Bible poses the challenge of difficulty in pronunciation on the part of readers of the Ewe Bible. Difficulty in pronunciation resulting from this will negatively affect reading, and onwardly, comprehension of the various names would become a problem.

Suggestion

In every translation practice, the audience is one of the

key factors that needs to be considered by the translator. Therefore, readers of the Ewe Bible (which has its content translated from the English Holy Bible), are the audience or target. Within this group are both the educated and uneducated. Since this group of people are more familiar with the phonotactics of the Ewe language, any translation they find in the Ewe Bible that does not conform to these phonotactics poses a challenge to their reading and comprehension. With the various inconsistencies found in the adaptation of personal and place names into the Ewe Bible in this study, we suggest that in future revision of the Bible, attention should be paid to the difference and similarity between the orthographic letters and sounds found in both the source language (English) and the target language (Ewe) for proper mapping to be done. The translators should thoroughly abreast themselves with the constraints governing the syllable structure of the Ewe language; knowing the actual syllable structures permitted in the language, so that in cases of clusters and codas, they would know the appropriate repair strategies to employ.

CONCLUSION

This study has served to analyze how personal and place names were adapted from the English Holy Bible into the Ewe Bible. The study focused on such illicitness as non-native segments, clusters and codas in the source document and how they were adapted into the Ewe language by the translators. Segmental adaptation, deletion and insertion/epenthesis were the adaptation or repair strategies employed by the translators in their quest of nativizing the names in the Ewe Bible. These three strategies have been found in the literature to be the repair strategies used in adapting loanwords in the Ewe language, which the translators should have used them judiciously in adapting the personal and place names, but we find inconsistences in how they employed these strategies. This has made us to suggest that in future revision of the Ewe Bible, the translators should study the sound system of both the source and target languages very well, so that mapping of non-native segments in the source language onto segments of the target language would be consistent and systematic. Again, the syllable structure of the Ewe language should be studied well, so

that in cases of clusters and codas, the appropriate repair strategies would be employed to repair such illicitness, for easy pronunciation to be realized on the part of the readers.

REFERENCES

Agbadah, A. K. (2018). *Compounding in Ewe.* (M.Phil Thesis). University of Ghana, Legon.

Agbedor, P. K. (2002). *Phonetics and Phonology of Ewe*. University of Ghana, Legon.

Ameka, F. K. (2001). Ewe. In J. Gary & C. Rubino (Eds.), *Facts About the World's Languages: An Encyclopedia of the World's Major Languages, Past and Present* (pp. 207-213). New York: HW Wilson Press.

Biblica Africa. (2021). *Agbenya La.* Accra: Bible Society of Ghana.

Biblica. (2011). *The Holy Bible, New International Version*. Nashville, U.S: HarperCollins Christian Publishing.

Capo, H.B.C. (1991). *A Comparative Phonology of Gbe.* New York: Foris Publications.

Clements, G.N. (1974). Vowel Harmony in Ewe. *Studies in African Linguistics, 5*(3), 281-301.

Crystal, D. (1999). *The Penguin Dictionary of Language*. London: Penguin Books.

Davis, S. (1993). *Loanwords, Phonological Treatment: The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Deklu, G. (2021). *Ewe Vowel Harmony: Implications for Theories of Underspecification.* (PhD Thesis). Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Duthie, A.S. (1996). *Introduction to Ewe Linguistic Patterns: A Textbook of Phonology*, Grammar and Semantics. Accra: Ghana Universities Press.

Greenberg, J.H. (1963). The Languages of Africa. *International Journal of American Linguistics, 25*(1), 1-171.

Kpodo, P. (2017). Vowel Height Agreement in Ewe. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 4*(7), 206-216.

Stahlke, H. (1971). *Topics in Ewe Phonology*. (PhD Dissertation). University of California.

Wornyo, A. A. (2016). English Loanwords in Ewe: A Phonological Analysis. *Journal of Literature and Linguistics, 22*, 42-51.