

**Postcolonialism and hybridity: The translation of
Pastoral Liturgy by G.C. Horak into Setswana.**

by

Phumelelo Ernest Ngxangane

**Dissertation submitted in fulfilment of the requirement for
the degree**

MAGISTER ARTIUM IN TRANSLATION STUDIES

in the Faculty of the Humanities

(Department of Linguistics and Language Practice)

of the University of the Free State,

Bloemfontein, South Africa

Date submitted: 3 July 2015

Supervisor: Prof. K. Marais

Co-supervisor: Prof. P. Verster

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to thank my Heavenly Father, my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ and my Teacher and Comforter the Holy Spirit for a tremendous academic journey. I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my supervisor and co- supervisor Prof. Kobus Marais and Prof. Pieter Verster respectively for their invaluable input and patience in grooming and guiding me through this scholarly journey. I wish them the best that God has to offer them in their intellectual pursuits, the best that they can extract from life and the best that their investigative goals can attract towards them in their pursuit of uncovering new epistemologies for the development of Africa.

Dedication

I dedicate all my efforts in this intellectual pursuit to my late grandmother who never gave up on me; to my beloved wife, Nondlela Portia Ngxangane, for her continued support in all my endeavours to become a better person; to my two daughters, Simphiwe and Nabila, for their sacrifice and support in seeing me through this and to my one and only son, Phumelele jr., who was born in the midst of this project.

I would also like to extend my gratitude to my local church, Living Stones Tabernacle, for financial support for holding the spiritual fort whilst I was pursuing my intellectual advancement. I wish you the best that God has to offer, the best that you can extract from life, the best that your goals can attract towards you and the best that you can become as you are becoming.

DECLARATION

I, Phumelelo Ernest Ngxangane, declare that this research is my own work and that all the sources I have used and quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of a complete list of references. All copyright is ceded to the University of the Free State.

Signed Date

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| CHAPTER 1 | 1 |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1. Background to the study | 1 |
| 1.1.1. The right to experience God in your language and culture | 3 |
| 1.1.2. Indigenisation of pastoral liturgy through translation | 3 |
| 1.1.3. The importance of translation in the development of communities | 4 |
| 1.1.4. The summary of reasons for translating Pastoral Liturgy | 4 |
| 1.2. Research problem and objectives..... | 5 |
| 1.3. Research design and research methodology | 6 |
| 1.4. The value and justification of this research..... | 7 |
| 1.5. Organisation of the study | 8 |
| CHAPTER 2 | 10 |
| POSTCOLONIAL TRANSLATION: THE COLONIAL AND POSTCOLONIAL ENCOUNTERS WITH INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES | 10 |
| 2.1. Introduction..... | 10 |
| 2.1.1. Background of colonial and postcolonial encounters with indigenous people | 11 |
| 2.2. Definition and location of postcolonialism..... | 13 |
| 2.2.1. The significance of ‘post’ in postcolonialism: Understanding ‘post’ in postcolonialism... | 15 |
| 2.3. Colonial translation and its historical evolution | 17 |
| 2.3.1. The colonial missiological perspectives of Africa | 21 |
| 2.4. The significance of contextual theology to African theology | 30 |
| 2.5. The need for postcolonial translation in mission and theology..... | 31 |
| 2.5.1. Postcolonial translation as cultural translation..... | 33 |
| 2.5.2. The significance of postcolonial translation for Africa..... | 35 |
| 2.5.3. The implication of postcolonial translation for South Africa | 36 |
| 2.6. The resultant identities of the indigenous communities emanating from colonial and postcolonial encounters..... | 37 |
| 2.7. Conclusion | 38 |
| CHAPTER 3 | 39 |
| HYBRIDITY: THE NATURE OF POSTCOLONIAL IDENTITIES AND THEIR RELATION TO POSTCOLONIAL TRANSLATION IN SOUTH AFRICA | 39 |
| 3.1. Introduction..... | 39 |
| 3.1.1. My personal background..... | 40 |
| 3.2. Definitions and understandings of hybridity..... | 49 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 3.2.1. Hybridity and infertility | 50 |
| 3.2.2. Globalisation, heterogeneity and hybridity | 52 |
| 3.2.3. Cultural hybridisation and cultural contact zones | 53 |
| 3.2.4. Levels of cultural hybridisation | 55 |
| 3.2.5. The creative impact of cultural hybridisation contact points | 56 |
| 3.3. Conceptualisation of hybridity for cross-cultural communication..... | 58 |
| 3.3.1. Organic hybridity and intentional hybridity..... | 59 |
| 3.4. Hybridity and cultural translation | 62 |
| 3.5. Implications of hybridity to postcolonial mission..... | 63 |
| 3.6. The description of the kingdom of God | 66 |
| 3.7. Conclusion | 67 |
| CHAPTER 4 | 68 |
| POSTCOLONIAL AFRICAN PENTECOSTAL LITURGY | 68 |
| 4.1. Introduction..... | 68 |
| 4.2. Definition of liturgy | 69 |
| 4.2.1. The relationship between liturgy and culture through the ages | 72 |
| 4.2.2. The implications of postcoloniality and hybridity on African Pentecostal epistemologies | 75 |
| 4.3. Pentecostalism, its definition and its various theological perspectives..... | 78 |
| 4.3.1. The background and main emphasis of Pentecostalism..... | 78 |
| 4.3.2. The various Pentecostal movements and their characteristics | 80 |
| 4.4. Problems involved in researching Pentecostal theology | 83 |
| 4.5. Characteristics of Pentecostal thought, method and practice..... | 83 |
| 4.5.1. The crucial role of experience in a Pentecostal life | 83 |
| 4.5.2. Criteria of valid Pentecostal experience..... | 84 |
| 4.6. Pentecostal norms as opposed to Catholicism and Protestantism..... | 85 |
| 4.7. Postmodern Pentecostal liturgy..... | 86 |
| 4.7.1. Pentecostal liturgy..... | 88 |
| 4.7.2. Characteristics of African Classical Pentecostalism | 89 |
| 4.7.3. Types of African Pentecostalism in South Africa..... | 90 |
| 4.8. Conclusion | 94 |
| CHAPTER 5 | 95 |
| THE TRANSLATION OF <i>PASTORAL LITURGY</i> INTO SETSWANA | 95 |
| 5.1. Introduction..... | 95 |
| 5.2. A brief historical overview of the functionalist approach..... | 96 |
| 5.3. Functional theories of translation..... | 97 |
| 5.3.1. Reiss: The text type approach to translation | 98 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 5.3.2. Vermeer: Skopos theory and the skopos approach to translation. | 99 |
| 5.3.3. Nord: A purposeful activity approach to translation..... | 104 |
| 5.4. Conclusion | 109 |
| CHAPTER 6 | 111 |
| TRANSLATION STRATEGIES AND SOME PROBLEMS OF INDIGENISING A POSTCOLONIAL PASTORAL LITURGY TEXT THROUGH TRANSLATION..... | 111 |
| 6.1. Introduction..... | 111 |
| 6.2. The translation brief..... | 112 |
| 6.2.1. Analysis of the translation brief..... | 114 |
| 6.2.2. The source text analysis | 115 |
| 6.3. Translation problems and strategies of indigenising a postcolonial pastoral liturgy text | 125 |
| 6.3.1. Translation problems and strategies on macrotextual level | 127 |
| 6.4. Translation problems and strategies on microtextual level..... | 138 |
| 6.4.1. Organisations, customs, ideas and institutions..... | 139 |
| 6.4.2. Culture..... | 144 |
| 6.5. Conclusion | 146 |
| CHAPTER 6 | 148 |
| SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION..... | 148 |
| 7.1. The main focus of the study and the reasons for the translation | 148 |
| 7.2. Colonial and postcolonial encounters of translation | 149 |
| 7.3. Postcolonial Pentecostal liturgy | 150 |
| 7.4. Translation of <i>Pastoral Liturgy</i> into Setswana | 151 |
| 7.5. Translation problems and strategies for indigenising a postcolonial pastoral liturgy text through translation..... | 151 |
| 7.5.1. The macrotextual strategy | 151 |
| 7.5.2. The microtextual strategy..... | 151 |
| 7.6. Issues to consider in the future..... | 152 |
| REFERENCES | 153 |
| ADDENDUM | 160 |

List of tables

| | |
|--|-----|
| Table 1: Memorial service programme..... | 135 |
| Table 2: Source and target chapters and translated chapter titles | 136 |
| Table 3: Transference (organisational names and biblical compound formulas)..... | 139 |
| Table 4: Transference (Greek words) | 140 |
| Table 5: Naturalisation..... | 141 |
| Table 6: Compound formulas | 142 |
| Table 7: Through-translation | 143 |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the study

Pastoral liturgy by G.C. Horak is a liturgical book for the Full Gospel Church of God, and it is written in English to be used by all in the ministry ranks of the denomination, that is, those who are familiar with the English language for carrying out their liturgical mandate. It has been written in both English and Afrikaans for the English-speaking and Afrikaans-speaking members of the denomination. The Full Gospel Church of God has a membership of people whose home language can be any one of the eleven official languages in South Africa. It is thus linguistically unfair to have its liturgical text only in two of the official languages. Despite the fact that it is a hundred-year-old denomination, few of its publications are in any of the South African indigenous languages. My understanding of Christianity is that it is an incarnational faith and as such would require that all its facets be incarnated into the relevant cultures in which it finds itself. The major tool in missiological incarnation of Christianity has been language, but due to the colonial experience, many African languages find themselves orphans in their country of origin. They find themselves at the periphery, disempowered and underutilised, even in the postcolonial period (Anchimbe 2006:96).

De Lange (2008:89) is of the opinion that the linguistic policies of the colonial era are to blame for such a state of affairs, because they forced colonial languages on the colonised and conquered. This resulted in two concomitant developments: firstly, the development of colonial languages at the expense of indigenous languages, and secondly, the colonial languages and cultures ended up acquiring economic and social status whilst the African languages were relegated to the periphery of social and economic life. But on the other of the same coin one finds that though the colonising missionaries were “children of their times”, some were interested in the development of indigenous people and their languages and cultures. Because of this interest, they translated the scriptures into indigenous languages. This development in mission history made sure that the scriptures were entrusted to the hands of indigenous people, and this resulted in these people’s self-affirmation. Many missiologists view the vernacular translation as the beginning of the demise of the cultural, political and

religious legitimacy of foreign domination of indigenous people by imperialists and colonialists (Ducker 2008:9).

Many missiology scholars are in agreement that literature was the main tool used to propagate the Christian faith and also colonialism. Imperialism employed instruments like education, religion and media to control colonised people (Marandi & Shadpour 2011:48). In order to counter the current development that is empowering languages of technological, industrial and international currency, the same literature can be employed to dethrone them within indigenous communities, to empower indigenous languages through translation and also encourage the use of indigenous languages in social encounters. Through literary translation and research, literature can be used to propagate both liberating ideological instruments and unshackling the colonised mind from indirect colonial rule (Marandi & Shadpour *ibid*:48).

Christianity in South Africa needs to be indigenised and decolonised in the current postcolonial era. This is because indigenisation is centred on the idea of appropriation and reparation, which entail simultaneously educating the colonised and coloniser to co-exist (Bandia 2008:227). This kind of indigenisation and decolonisation is not a reversal of history to a pristine pre-colonial period because such a past cannot be fully reclaimed or reconstituted (Lye 1998:1). The decolonisation and indigenisation I refer to are not based on the recovery of the assumed pure pre-colonial past of the colonised, which is the predominant perspective of almost all postcolonial cultures of the world. According to Robinson (1997:151), this predominant perspective assumes that the pre-colonial indigenous communities possessed harmonious cultural integrity that was completely destroyed by the evil colonialism. According to this assumption, the pre-colonial state of the distant past was pure, good and uncorrupted; the colonial state was impure, evil and corrupting. The postcolonial state is good and evil mixed and hybridised, and the decolonised state would be pure, good and cleansed of colonial evils. If one believes in and lives in the complex world of the mixture of good and evil, one cannot embrace the pre-colonial idea of a pure existence. Mixture was always present in both pre-colonial and colonial existence, it is currently present in the postcolonial existence, and it will be present in the decolonised state. There will never be a complete eradication of all the traces of colonialism. There will only be a new transformation of mixtures, which will be my focus when I deal with the issue of hybridity later in this study (Robinson *ibid*:151). This then calls for identifying these mixed postcolonial identities of the

colonised, and whatever still exists in their indigenous identities can be acknowledged and utilised to form new identities. According to the above-mentioned line of thought, it would then appear that the kind of Christian literature that tries to reconstitute and indigenise postcolonial epistemologies will have to contend with the issue of hybridity (Lye 1998:2), or as Van der Walt (2003:31) perceives it, the merging of Western and African conceptions of reality into one hybrid reality, if possible.

1.1.1. The right to experience God in your language and culture

In Christian practice, pastoral liturgy is about experiencing God. The question is, how is one to experience God? Is it in a foreign tongue and foreign culture? The indigenisation of liturgy implies that liturgy will be incarnated into the indigenous culture and that the indigenous people will experience it in their own language and from their own cultural background. Yet within the Pentecostal movement, there is an incremental use and domination of English in the practice of liturgy that exacerbates the current trend of dominating and dominated languages. Even when all the speakers and the audience speak one language, such as isiXhosa, Sesotho or Setswana, one finds that everything is carried out in English. This kind of development results in the continuation of linguistic power inequalities and the emergence of an asymmetrical reciprocity of texts (Bandia 2008:148). There seems to be an intentional functional disempowerment and functional seclusion of indigenous languages that threatens them with abandonment and ultimately extinction (Anchimbe 2006:94). Sadly, this happens in the current dispensation that recognises multiculturalism and multilingualism in South Africa, where all cultures and languages are equal (Webb 2006:55).

1.1.2. Indigenisation of pastoral liturgy through translation

In this study, I intend to contribute to the indigenisation debate and research by focusing on a translation of a pastoral liturgy text. This is not a new development. In fact, the colonial and postcolonial religious encounters with indigenous communities have always been and will always be through translation. Translation within the African setting is deeply rooted in religious translation, especially in the translation of the Bible. This relationship between religion and translation needs to be continued, because of the dilemma in which African languages find themselves, as stated previously (Anchimbe 2006:96).

1.1.3. The importance of translation in the development of communities

Translation is very important for the development of society and culture. It is an essential part of progress, communication, religious progress and a prerequisite for the spread of scientific knowledge. Without translation, communities stay isolated, localised, unable to cross cultural and language barriers and ignorant of the wisdom and knowledge found in other cultures, times, places and languages. The encounter of colonial communities and indigenous people has been by means of translation, with translation empowering the colonising nations and their colonial system (Naudé & Miller-Naudé 2011:314). Thus, in order to address the above-mentioned issues, the same translation that empowered colonising nations should be employed to empower colonised communities. In this study, I want to argue that postcolonial encounters with indigenous languages can also be employed to empower postcolonial subjects and their indigenous languages. Implicit in this kind of thinking is the belief that translation would help colonised communities in the postcolonial era to find their own voice and, in religion, to experience God and their faith in their own language. In this process they then also create new epistemologies that engage with the current experiences of indigenous people and their languages. Indigenous languages need an elevation that would counter their continued marginalisation, discrimination and exclusion from the social communication space as it was in the colonial era (Kembo-Sure, Mwangi & Ogachi 2006:55). According to Naudé and Miller-Naudé (2011:314), religious translation has been critical in shaping and developing the African society. My argument is that within Christianity it can still be used to continue to shape and develop the African society through translations done by indigenous missionaries and ministers.

1.1.4. The summary of reasons for translating Pastoral Liturgy

In light of the above-mentioned observations, viewpoints and background, I can summarise the reasons of translating *Pastoral liturgy* as follows:

- i. The Full Gospel Church is a multilingual and multicultural denomination and as such, there is a need for the representation of all its members with regard to the production of religious texts. Every member of the church has the right to experience God in his or her language and culture. The denomination recognises this right and it is enshrined in its constitution. The representation of all members and the experience of God in an

indigenous way can be achieved through the translation of the official text of the church.

- ii. Many indigenous people in the denomination do not read or understand English. Therefore, they would need texts in their own languages to facilitate communication and the practice of liturgy.
- iii. This text promotes the issue of order in liturgy, which when translated would introduce that order to indigenous culture but would also highlight the indigenous aspects of Pentecostal worship.
- iv. The employment of lay ministers in the propagation of the gospel demands that texts that suit the profile of those ministers be produced.
- v. The church should also lead the way with regard to promoting language equality by recognising indigenous languages and encouraging their incremental use.
- vi. There is also a need for those in the church to be part of the current debate of postcoloniality and translation, especially amongst those from a marginalised language background.

1.2. Research problem and objectives

There is a prevalence of some disturbing unorthodox practices surfacing in the postcolonial independent Pentecostal and Charismatic churches, concerning the use of mediums in liturgy and the healing movements of the aforementioned churches. Some Pentecostal leaders and pastors feel that the church is now free from Western domination, and therefore they can introduce some suppressed African practices in the liturgy. These practices include the use of blessed cloths, angelic figurines, precious stones and the sale of anointing water, faith water, holy water, anointing oil, blessed candles and framed portraits of movement leaders. What is disturbing is the superstition that these items have power to heal and to ward off misfortune and evil spirits

This study seeks first to establish what constitutes biblical liturgy in the midst of other liturgies. Secondly, it seeks to understand what constitutes Pentecostal liturgy and how that can be employed to expedite the indigenisation of Pentecostal liturgy. Thus, this study seeks to understand the contextual constraints of translating a Pentecostal pastoral liturgy text in a postcolonial religious context, in particular, the translation of such a text from English to Setswana. The text in question was written by an Afrikaans speaking author for an English-

speaking readership and is translated by an isiXhosa-speaking translator for Setswana-speaking readers.

The first objective is to produce an indigenised postcolonial text that highlights the indigenous cultural practices that are not contrary to biblical orthodoxy, Christian orthopraxy or the culture-specific understanding of African Pentecostalism as experienced by the Batswana. The second objective is to identify the postcolonial functionalist problems and difficulties encountered in the translation and how those difficulties and problems are solved. Thirdly, this study will navigate through the postcolonial translation maze and negotiate the outcomes of the encounters of religion and translation, which in turn will assist with the development of an incremental use of indigenous languages in liturgy. Any religious transfer from one language to another needs translation, so it will be interesting to investigate how translation will be employed to manage the postcolonial encounter with indigenous communities. Such encounters, according to Robinson (1997:151), create all sorts of problems. How would translation manage these encounters? What impact will the management of these encounters have on cultural identities? What guarantee does one have with regard to the correct use of these translations, and would they really produce decolonised identities?

1.3. Research design and research methodology

The theoretical framework that will be utilised in this study is Christiane Nord's functionalist approach to translation. I chose this approach because of its translation-oriented analysis of texts that includes an examination of extratextual and intratextual factors emanating from the translation brief and from the source text itself. Secondly, it is a model that offers adequate strategies for translation in general and postcolonial translation in particular, where the most important aspect is the function of target text within the target atmosphere. Thirdly, it is a model that allows certain adaptations to be made to the source text. This bodes well for postcolonial translation in the sense of making the voice of the subaltern heard on certain issues as I will discuss in Chapter Three. Nord's model includes the analysis of extratextual and intratextual elements of the communicative action. The model's main function is to identify the function-relevant aspects or elements of both texts, that is, the source text and target text that emanate from the translation brief. Nord (2007:14) asserts that the venture of comparing the target text's purpose with the source text function prior to translation will assist in identifying and locating problems that would surface in the translation process. This gives the translator a holistic view of the whole process and enables the translator to devise

an appropriate strategy for the proper way of translating a text (Lötter 2001:64). Nord's assumption of translation within her model will be discussed under the following headings: theory of action, translational interaction, intentional interaction, interpersonal interaction, translation as communicative action, translating as intercultural interaction and translation as text processing action. This will be done fully in Chapter Five.

In the study, an extensively adequate postcolonial literature review will be conducted in order to investigate the nature and outcomes of postcolonial encounters with indigenous communities. The concepts associated with postcolonial theory and translation, such as power relations between languages and resistance, will be looked into. The resultant hybridity emanating from these encounters will also be investigated.

1.4. The value and justification of this research.

This research is my contribution to the on-going academic debate about seeing postcolonial translation as a tool to redress and repair some of the language-related conflicts that emanated from the colonial era. It is also an attempt to encourage the incarnation of liturgy into indigenous cultures through the use of indigenous languages. It is an attempt to add a small voice to the cry for decolonising religious encounters and religious practice within the African experience.

Secondly, it is my humble contribution to the cause of the intellectualisation and development of the socio-linguistic capacities of Setswana a marginalised language. I hope to do this by providing visibility and audibility through translation in one of the fastest growing movements in the church and the world, namely Pentecostalism.

Thirdly, this study will contribute to the use of the functionalist translation approach as an indigenising tool to empower grassroots communities through translation.

Fourthly, this study will contribute by introducing another South African Classical Pentecostal voice to the current debate of postcolonial indigenisation of the Christian faith and practice in the new democratic South Africa.

Fifthly, Pentecostalism is over a hundred years old, but many Pentecostal denominations are still trapped in colonising epistemologies and are unable to reach their missiological vision of being autonomous, self-extending and self-sustaining entities. This study is a contribution

towards decolonising Pentecostal epistemologies and encouraging the standardisation of Pentecostal liturgy through translation.

Lastly, this study will assist in sharpening my skills as a translator and will add another skilled person to the profession for assistance with making some of the key developmental documents available to the masses of the South African population.

1.5. Organisation of the study

The present chapter has dealt with the introduction and included, amongst other things, the background of the study, the context of the study, the research problem and objectives, the research design and research methodology, as well as the value and justification of the study. The remainder of this chapter will show how the study is organised.

The second chapter will deal with the colonial and postcolonial encounters with the indigenous languages in the translation of religious texts. In this chapter, I will investigate the colonial missiological perspective of Africa, pre-colonial encounters and colonial encounters of the British missionaries and the Batswana. I will also discuss theological problems that emanate from the discussion of contextual mission and African theology. I will then highlight the need for postcolonial translation in mission theology. The other matter I will look into will be that of postcolonial translation as cultural translation and the significance of postcolonial translation for Africa. Lastly, the chapter will contain a discussion of the implication of postcolonial translation for South Africa.

The third chapter will consist of a discussion of the resultant hybridity that remains after the colonial and postcolonial encounters with indigenous communities. This will include a discussion of the historical background of hybridity and its conceptualisation, as well as hybridity in postcolonial translation.

The fourth chapter will focus on the discussion of Pentecostal pastoral liturgy and some of its ramifications and challenges. The main focus will be on classical Pentecostalism in Africa and South Africa.

The fifth chapter will contain the theoretical framework I will utilise in this translation. I will provide the translation brief, a detailed source text analysis and an exposition of the translation strategies to be followed.

The sixth chapter will deal with the macrotextual and microtextual translation problems. The seventh chapter will be the conclusion, and the translated Setswana text will be included as Addendum A.

CHAPTER 2

POSTCOLONIAL TRANSLATION: THE COLONIAL AND POSTCOLONIAL ENCOUNTERS WITH INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES

2.1. Introduction

The development of translation studies did not occur alone. Alongside this development, there has been another development in the field of research that challenged literary, linguistic and cultural orthodoxies (Bassnett 2014:37). This concomitant development was postcolonialism, and with it came the notion of postcolonial translation. Translation in all its forms has always been and will always be about encountering the other. This is also true for mission, which is about encountering the other through religion. This encounter is about export and import: Whatever is exported becomes part of where it is exported, and similarly, whatever is imported becomes part of the receiving importer's environment. This changes both fields, namely the importing field and the exporting field. With regard to identities, languages and cultures, such an exchange creates new identities, languages and cultures. It is these changes and challenges of encounters that I seek to examine, but my focus will be on translation and religious encounters, especially colonial and postcolonial translation encounters. I seek to examine the nature, characteristics and results of these encounters and to find out how they can be employed in making sure that these encounters promote the equality of the subjects in these encounters and, in the process, uplift what was downtrodden and bring down what was unjustly uplifted. My main focus will be on the Christian encounters between missionaries and indigenous communities. I will focus on how the dissemination of the belief systems of Christianity can be done with respect and without any sense of superiority or inferiority.

Therefore, in this chapter I want to see how postcolonial translation, against the background of colonial translation, can be used to bring about a better understanding of Christianity for the Batswana. Secondly, I shall investigate how postcolonial translation can be employed to enhance the experience of Christianity in an indigenous way. Thirdly, I shall explore how postcolonial translation can be used to decolonise liturgical practices, thus making available an authentic African Pentecostal experience for the Batswana Pentecostals. My approach is

this chapter will be as follows: I shall first examine the background of the nature of colonial and postcolonial encounters with indigenous people to find out what was good and what was bad in these encounters. I do this in order to see what can be improved or discarded in these encounters for the further development of Christianity. Secondly, I shall attempt to put forward a working definition of postcoloniality if possible and in the same breath try to determine the historical, geographical and institutional location of postcolonialism as a theoretical framework. This location is essential for definitions and proper understanding of what postcolonialism is and who the subjects of such a framework are. Thirdly, I shall discuss and evaluate colonial translation and its historical evolution in order to learn lessons from those encounters and to learn how not repeat them in the future. Fourthly, I shall examine the significance of contextual theology to African theology in relation to translation. This serves to highlight the benefits of contextual theology to African theology and how those benefits can enhance the development of postcolonial translation as a liberating theoretical framework. Fifthly, I shall argue the need of postcolonial translation for mission, because mission brought Christianity and translated it in the past. Hence, even in the current dispensation, mission must be involved in how Christianity is disseminated through translation. Lastly, I shall look at the resultant identities of colonial and postcolonial encounters and see how they can be used for the empowerment of indigenous communities as they empowered the colonial system in the past.

2.1.1. Background of colonial and postcolonial encounters with indigenous people

The colonial and postcolonial religious encounters with indigenous communities have always been and will always be through translation. Translation within the African setting is deeply rooted in religious translation, especially in the translation of the Bible. The first Bible translation was done in Africa. According to tradition, a team of Jewish scholars translated the Torah into Greek in Egypt some three centuries BCE (Naudé & Miller-Naudé 2011:314). This relationship between religion and translation needs to be continued because of the dilemma in which African languages find themselves in the present wake of globalisation and the continued empowerment of languages of industrialisation, technology and international currency (Anchimbe 2006:96). Translation is very important for the development of society and culture. It is an essential part of progress, communication, religious progress and a prerequisite for the spreading of scientific knowledge. Without translation, communities stay

isolated, localised, unable to cross cultural and language barriers, and ignorant of the wisdom and knowledge found in other cultures, times, places and languages. The encounters of colonial communities and indigenous people have been through translation, with translation empowering the colonising nations and their colonial system (Naudé & Miller-Naudé 2011:314). Thus, in order to address the dilemma of the subordination and minoritisation of indigenous languages mentioned by Anchimbe, the same translation that empowered colonising nations and their languages should be employed to empower colonised communities and their languages.

In this study, I want to argue that the postcolonial encounters with indigenous languages can also be employed to empower postcolonial subjects and their indigenous languages. Implicit in this kind of thinking is the belief that translation would help colonised communities in the postcolonial era to find their own voice and, in religion, to experience God and their faith in their own language and culture. In order to contain the continued use and dominance of English with its promotion of an Anglo-American view of life that threatens linguistic and cultural diversity, there is a need to find a way to elevate the use of indigenous languages. Indigenous languages need an elevation that would counter their continued marginalisation, discrimination and their exclusion from the social communication space as it was in the colonial era (Kembo-Sure *et al.* 2006:55). According to Naudé and Miller-Naudé(2011:314), religious translation has been critical in shaping and developing the African society. My argument is that within Christianity, religious translation can still be used to continue to shape and develop African society by means of translations done by indigenous missionaries and ministers.

Within my tradition, the Pentecostal and Charismatic tradition, the incremental use and domination of English is very common. In these circles, the use of English is a status symbol indicative of progress and sophistication and involves doing everything in English, including liturgy, even when your audience and the speaker have a common indigenous language. It is clear that these kinds of developments exacerbate the issue of dominating and dominated languages, resulting in linguistic power inequalities and the emergence of an asymmetrical reciprocity of texts (Bandia 2008:148). This functional disempowerment of indigenous languages threatens these languages with extinction if they are not pulled out of this imposed 'functional seclusion', according to Anchimbe (2006:94), and if they are not introduced into spheres of economic, educational, and technological functionality.

2.2. Definition and location of postcolonialism

What then is postcolonialism? What are the basic assumptions of this theory and what kind of critical approaches does it use? As a theoretical framework, what does it have to offer to postcolonial translation? I believe that these questions are common to all those involved in the postcolonial debate. I am going to attempt to find out what it means and how it relates to religious translation.

Though the above-mentioned theoretical framework is the most relevant in my opinion, it is not a simple and straightforward framework to define. This is because, according to Ashcroft (2001:7), postcolonialism means many things and incorporates a dizzying display of critical practices. In academic circles, its temporal, geographical and conceptual spaces are ambiguous. But according to Shohat (1992), as a theoretical framework, it must be located somewhere geographically, historically and institutionally. It is this location that is problematic, because the location will determine the definition. Postcolonialism is viewed as an eclipse of the Third World paradigm that usurped the postcolonial critical discourses space or evolved into existence for critical discourses (Shohat *ibid*). It would then seem that one's understanding of postcolonialism will be determined by the meaning assigned to the prefix 'post' in postcolonialism. This prefix suggests the division of the word, and it is then clear that postcolonialism has something to do with colonial relations or something that emerges out of colonial relations.

According to Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin (2007:168), postcolonialism is a concept that deals with the effects of colonisation on other cultures and societies from the 1970s onwards. Originally, the term had a chronological import, pertaining to the post-independence period of a colonised country or state. It was a reference to cross-cultural interactions within colonial societies in literary circles, but recently it came to signify the political, linguistic and cultural experience of colonised societies.

The term postcolonialism is currently used to include the study and analysis of Western territorial conquests, different Western institutions of colonialism, imperial discursive operations, colonial subject construction and the resistance of those constructed subjects. It further studies and analyses the response to such incursions and present legacies of colonialism in both the pre- and post-independence nations and communities and the impact of Western imperialism on non-Western societies (Ashcroft *et al.* 2007:169). Agreeing with

the above-mentioned argument, Pears (2010:137) points out that the concept emanates from colonialism, imperialism and its resultant impact on communities' representations. Therefore, it is clear that postcolonialism focuses on discursive representation, which is also the focus of postcolonial translation. Colonial translation was about the representation of the 'other', but in postcolonial translation, the 'other' is representing him/herself.

Robert-Kenzo (2012:1) defines postcolonialism as a general theory that studies and analyses the mobile interconnected forms of dominance and resistance, the structure of colonial historical records, the continual racial and class struggles, the meaning of gender and sexuality, as well as the complex forms of the mobilisation by collectives and subjects of power relations and their representation of their cultural ethnographic translation. Knowledge is never neutral or objective but is contextual and involved in power differentials, generating power for its producers in this epistemological terrain. In this terrain, knowledge production serves the interest of its producers (Robert-Kenzo *ibid*:2).

Following Robert-Kenzo's above-mentioned argument, one is bound to conclude that although postcolonialism is not a well-thought-out and clear-cut theory, it is easily identifiable. According to Pears (2010:137), there are key characteristic features that identify postcolonialism and that are important in the cultural analysis and comprehension of the meaning of postcolonialism. These key features include, among others, the following (Pears *ibid*:137–138):

- i. the origins and location of postcolonial theory
- ii. the opposition of Western powers and the vestiges of colonial and imperial legacy through critical destabilisation of socio-linguistic and economic theories that elevated Western perspectives and worldviews over colonised territories
- iii. the creation of a 'new world' through the creation of subaltern intellectual spaces for the articulation of subaltern perceptions and the production of alternative discourses in the post-independence arena
- iv. the search for postcolonial identities amidst the problematic contradictions of decolonisation, incomplete processes of independence and confusing hybrid realities of existence.

2.2.1. The significance of ‘post’ in postcolonialism: Understanding ‘post’ in postcolonialism

According to Shohat (1992:101), the prefix ‘post’ in postcolonialism aligns postcolonialism with other ‘posts’ like post-structuralism, postmodernism, post-Marxism and post-deconstructionism which share the notion of moving beyond something. She suggests that this prefix implies going beyond anti-colonial nationalist theory and beyond colonialism and Third World nationalist struggles. This implies a passage from a certain historical event or age, designated by dates, into a new period, thus signifying an opening and a closure of a period. Shohat (*ibid*:101) further argues that such an ambiguous spatial-temporal space is fraught with the contradictions and confusions of conjoining all those who were colonised, namely the colonised indigenous people and the colonised White settlers. This totalising assumption is very dangerous because it equates the colonisation of indigenous people with that of White settlers and assumes that their liberation from colonial domination was the same. If postcolonialism is understood in that manner, Shohat (*ibid*:102) argues that it is a mask, masking White settler attitudes towards indigenous people before and after independence. She further argues that this is a disorienting space, with no precise indication as to its perspective and location (*ibid*:103).

This leads to the following question: Does postcolonialism indicate the perspective and location of the ex-coloniser, ex-colonised, ex-colonial settler or the displaced hybrids of the First World metropolises? Shohat (1992:103) argues that it is undeniable that the experiences of the ex-colonised and ex-coloniser were asymmetrical with regard to colonialism and imperialism. She perceives postcolonialism as a concept that is not historically specific, but rather as one that is constituted by different chronologies. For example, most White colonial settlers gained their independence in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and most indigenous people from African and Asian countries gained theirs in the twentieth century. Thus, Shohat (*ibid*:103) identifies the following problem: Where can one situate the beginning of the postcolonial period historically? Who is privileged by such a beginning? And what are the dynamics of such a beginning? She suggests that this indefiniteness of the beginning of postcolonialism is problematic in the sense that it is indistinguishable from and equates two asymmetrical independences, namely that of the indigenous people and that of the White settlers (Shohat *ibid*:103). Munday (2008:132) agrees with the above because to him, postcolonial studies have an undefined scope, but a scope that is understood to include

the history of former colonies, powerful European empires, resistance to colonial power and the ensuing imbalances of power relations between colonised and coloniser.

It is Shohat's (1992:102–105) argument that politically and historically, formal independences were not the demise of colonialism and Western hegemony. Thus, the implication that by postcolonialism is meant that colonialism is over, is not a perception and experience of the ex-colonised and is also not endorsed by scholarly work and present conceptual frameworks. There is a persistence of clandestine global hegemony in other forms of colonialism. This makes the prefix 'post' in postcolonialism to produce a vague locus of continuities and discontinuities in its connotation as 'after'. It makes colonialism the central point of reference and undermines the existence of contemporary colonialist structures of domination. Shohat (*ibid*:102–105) insists that if it is understood to mean 'after', it would imply the end of resistance to colonialism which is contrary to the basic premise of postcolonial translation theory. This does not seem to be the case in postcolonial translation studies because according to Munday (2008:132), it is seen as a battleground of languages against domination. Baker and Saldanha (2009) also agree with Munday in their strategies of resistance and decolonisation. They argue that postcolonial translation can serve as resistance to colonisation and neo-colonisation (Baker and Saldanha 2009:202). This is further endorsed by Young (1995:4) when he argues that postcolonialism constructs two antithetical groups, the colonised and the coloniser, the self and the other.

The main questions that I thus have at present are the following: What is the meaning of postcolonial translation in South Africa and where is its historical locus? What kind of translator/translation does a postcolonial translation theory produce in South Africa? Does it produce a postcolonial ex-colonised translator or postcolonial ex-coloniser translator? The main reason for the aforementioned questions is Tymoczko's (2006) argument that most current translation theories are based on Eurocentric presuppositions. According to her any understanding of postcolonial translation, should include indigenous definitions of the word. It should also merge Eurocentric, Afrocentric and Orient-centric perceptions of translation (Tymoczko *ibid*).

In contrast, Robert-Kenzo (2012:1) understands postcolonialism as a temporal marker concept indicative of the post-official decolonisation period, encompassing patterns of dominance and resistance, the constitution of colonial archives, interdependent juggling of social class and race, the importance of gender and sexuality, experiences of subjectivities, the mobilisation

of collectivities and representations and ethnographic translation of cultures. He perceives the cornerstones of postcolonialism as the contextuality of knowledge, knowledge power play, the creation of non-existent reality, the invention of the 'other' and the presence of hegemonic attitudes.

Michael Chapman (2008:1–2) argues that the priority of postcolonialism is political or ideological in nature and that postcolonial theory delves into the antithetical literature of the colonised and coloniser. In this view, the colonised writer is not perceived as the doppelganger of his/her coloniser but as a creative individual in their own right. The notion that postcolonial writers/translators are reactive or resistant is repugnant to Chapman. He argues that this perspective is paraded and endorsed by Western academic elites and that it needs to be wrenched from their totalising perspective and placed in the subaltern space.

It would then suffice to conclude that postcolonialism is an exciting, innovative and challenging theoretical approach incorporating many theories, approaches and literary techniques. It is perceived as a theoretical approach that challenges world power relations and hierarchical power systems that elevate some people to power, privileges and wealth, while relegating others to disempowerment, disenfranchisement and poverty (Pears 2010:134). It attempts to level post-independence fields to egalitarian, equitable fields of operation for the coloniser and colonised. In my opinion, this augurs well for postcolonial translation as a decolonising tool.

Nevertheless, postcolonialism comes from colonialism and its impact. In the following section I shall investigate the impact of colonial translation and its historical evolution.

2.3. Colonial translation and its historical evolution

Colonial translation did not occur in a vacuum; it had a historical context. It is this historical context, I believe, that should inform our understanding of colonial translation, although the understanding would not be complete. Therefore, any measure of understanding, no matter how small, of what transpired in colonial translation will have to include a historical perspective of colonial translation. However, the scope of such a perspective is so vast that it cannot be covered in a master's dissertation or even in a single book (Bassnett 2002:47). Therefore, for this study, I believe that a synoptic overview of certain basic lines of approach to translation, which emerged throughout different periods of European and colonial

domination, will suffice (Bassnett *ibid*:47). The synoptic overview will focus on the different roles and functions of translation through the period under consideration.

Susan Bassnett (2002:48) is of the opinion that a diachronic study of translation is difficult because it is impossible to compartmentalise and periodise literary translation history according to dates, due to the dynamism of human culture. She further suggests that the best way to establish certain lines of approach to translation is to follow a loosely chronological structure that has no clear-cut divisions (*ibid*:48). For the purpose of this study, I believe that this will also be applicable. This loosely chronological structure has about twelve periods of translation, namely Roman translation, Bible translation, educative role of translation, early theorists, Renaissance, seventeenth century translation, eighteenth century translation, Romanticism translation, Post-Romanticism, Victorian translation, Archaising translation and twentieth century translation. I chose to follow this structure because I am new to translation studies and this would assist in grounding me in this discipline. In addition, it would assist me in understanding what has transpired in previous periods of translation and what the good and the bad contributions of colonial translation were.

In Roman translation, the role and function of translation was to enrich the vernacular or their own language, and the principle was sense for sense translation. In the Bible translation period, from the 4th century to the 17th century, the role of translation was, firstly, to disseminate the Word of God. Secondly, it was a political and dogmatic tool leading to the decentralisation of the church and the decline of the use of Latin as the universal language. Thirdly, it had the political function of making the Bible accessible to all (Bassnett 2002:51–57). The didactic role of translation had a clear political function and was employed for improving oratorical style in the medieval education system. English translation was used as a way of recovering from the devastation of the Danish invasion. The invention of printing techniques in the 15th century altered the function of translation and learning. The early theorists emphasised the importance of understanding the source language text as a primary requisite for translation. They also insisted that translation was to avoid word for word renderings and at all cost to attempt to reach the spirit of the original and avoid overly loose translations (Bassnett *ibid*:57–62).

During the Renaissance, translation played a role of central importance. During this period, it was a primary tool for shaping the intellectual life of the age and was also used for revolutionary purposes. In the 17th century, it was perceived as an imitation of the source

language text with no life of its own. Three basic translations were formulated in this period, namely metaphrase, which was changing an author's text, word by word, line by line, from one language to another; paraphrase, which was translation with latitude or a sense for sense view; and imitation, where translators can abandon the original text as they see fit. In the 18th century, translation was seen as a painting or imitation with a moral duty to the original text and its recipients. It was concerned with the recreation of the essential spirit, soul or nature of the work of art. In Romanticism, translation assumed the role of a text inspired by a higher creative force with the loss of the original. Imagination was pre-eminent in this period. In the Post-Romanticism period, the theory of separate language was proposed (Bassnett 2002:63–72).

During the Victorian period, translation was perceived as a minority interest activity. It was supposed to serve the source language text with complete commitment, to report only what the source text said and explain what it meant (Bassnett 2002:74). This happened in the great age of industrial capitalism and colonial expansion and it had the following currency of translation typology (Bassnet *ibid*:76-77):

- i. Translation was a scholarly activity assuming the pre-eminence of the source language text over any target language text version. The source language text was considered superior.
- ii. Translation was a means of encouraging the intelligent reader to return to the original source language text.
- iii. Translation was a means of helping the target language reader to become equal to the better reader of the original through a deliberately contrived foreignness in the target language text.
- iv. Translation was a means by which an individual as an enlightened person could offer his/her own realistic choice to the target language reader.
- v. Translation was a means of upgrading the status of a source text that was perceived to be of a low status.

It was during this period in southern Africa that missionaries discovered that translation was a key to Christianity and to making disciples of all nations. The expansion of Christianity in Africa during this period coincided with European economic and political hegemony and with the above-mentioned perspectives about translation (Makutoane & Naudé 2009:79). Translation in southern Africa was mainly the translation of the Bible in this period. Thus, the

history of translation in southern Africa began with the translation of the Bible and is dominated by it. Therefore, any study on translation in southern Africa will run parallel to Bible translation.

The translation of the Bible in southern Africa went through two periods: firstly, the Missionary Society period and secondly, the Bible Society period. In the missionary society period, both individual missionaries and the missionary society translated the Bible. Although the British Empire insisted on English as the language of education, the nonconformist missionaries insisted on having their sacred texts translated into indigenous vernaculars (Makutoane & Naudé 2009:83). Bible translators in this period had to study Greek, Hebrew and Latin. They used source language texts but also versions of translations into their own language. This translation technique resulted in what is called colonial interference in translation. Makutoane and Naudé (*ibid*:86–87) make the following observations about translation in this period: Firstly, translation was an imperialist tool for the colonisation of peoples. Secondly, it was an integral part of the colonial power differentials responsible for its existence. Thirdly, it was an important channel for the empire with a threefold importance, (1) a colonising channel parallel and connected to education and overt or covert market and institutional control, (2) a ‘lightning rod’ for cultural inequalities’ residuals after the demise of colonialism, (3) and surprisingly, a channel for decolonisation

Subsequent to Victorian translation was the archaising principle of translation, which sought to ‘colonise’ the past through restoring something of the original by introducing an alternate existence of the text (Bassnett 2002:77–78). The first half of the 20th century saw the continuation of the Victorian concepts of translation.

During the second half of the twentieth century, the Bible Society period was inaugurated in southern Africa on 1 November 1965. The translation process involved editorial committees, review committees and consultative committees. Indigenous ministers and missionaries were used as translators.

From the synoptic view above, it is clear that different concepts of translation prevailed at different times and that the role and function of translation has dramatically changed. It is also clear from Bassnett’s original argument that translation history cannot be approached from a narrowly fixed position (2002:80–81)

It is against this background that colonial translation was conceived as a site for the cultivation and reproduction of texts for hegemonic territory expansion. Western anthropologists, linguists, administrators and missionaries translated what they understood about African worldviews into a Western language and culture. The result was that their translations were misrepresentations of these African worldviews, thus creating foreign and incorrect African identities. These exoticised translations were employed to unveil indigenous cultures and facilitated the efforts of colonial rule (Bandia 2008:163).

The colonial invasion of Africa was based on three major motives, namely to gather scientific knowledge, to spread Christianity and to elevate the international economic status of colonising nations (Van der Walt 2003:6). This colonisation was politically, culturally and economically motivated. Colonisation was not a homogeneous exercise, and thus, generalisations will not suffice when it comes to the relationship between the coloniser and the colonised. For example, the British colonisation of Africans was based on separate development; that of the French was based on assimilation and on converting Africans to Frenchmen through acculturation, though of inferior status; and the Portuguese colonisation was based on assimilation and acculturation to the extent of sharing the same ancestry with Africans (Van der Walt *ibid*:7–11). It is clear from the above that the intentions of colonialism were different, and different approaches would be needed in the decolonisation process. Now, just as Christian mission assisted the spread of Eurocentric African identities as indicated above, it is imperative that for former British, Portuguese and French colonies, pertinent strategies be employed in the restoration of postcolonial African identities. My focus in the following section will be on a former British colony, focusing mainly on how the Batswana encountered British missionaries in the former Cape Province, presently North West and Northern Cape.

2.3.1. The colonial missiological perspectives of Africa

In this section, I shall investigate the pre-colonial encounter of indigenous Africa with translation, the colonial encounter of the Batswana and the British missionaries and the translation of the first Setswana text. My focus will be on the nature of the encounters and what they yielded as a result of the encounter.

2.3.1.1. Africa's pre-colonial encounter with translation

The assumption that translation in Africa only started after the alphabetisation of indigenous African languages is erroneous. There is documented evidence that there were many indigenous writing systems, cultural transfer mechanisms and intercultural communications prior to the arrival of the outsiders with their fairly developed writing systems. The latter systems enhanced African translation activities (Bandia 2008:2–3). Translation in Africa is as old as communication. It played the role of ensuring that communication, trade, intercultural exchange and cross-cultural interaction occurred between various African linguistic and ethnocultural groups and other outsiders. What needs to be noted is that most of the African worldview and cultural transfer was expressed through oral traditions (Bandia *ibid*:2).

Pre-colonial translation in Africa had the following characteristics and roles, according to Bandia (2008:3):

- i. It ensured communication among the various peoples of Africa.
- ii. It assisted in the transition of African cultures from oral traditions to writing.
- iii. It enhanced the widespread movement of ideas across ethnic boundaries by means of translation and related forms of communication.
- iv. Translators were professional linguists and were influential in the tribal courts.
- v. Translation in this period was horizontal, among equals.

Missionaries brought Christianity into Africa at two different periods: firstly, just before colonial invasion and secondly, just after colonial invasion. West (2009:34) argues that in most cases missionaries were the vanguard of colonial empires who worked in areas that had not been touched by ideological, institutional or military colonial invasion. With regard to the Batswana in southern Africa, they had already encountered the Bible through pre-colonial traders, explorers or missionaries. This encounter did not take place under colonialism, but under African territorial and political control. In this period, that is prior to the translation of the Bible, African worldviews, institutions and armies had the greatest influence (West *ibid*:34).

The complicity of missionaries as foot soldiers and advance guard of the colonial powers seems to be taken for granted. This association of the church and colonial powers has led to the accusation that Christian mission was the motivation for colonisation or some aspects thereof (Ducker 2008:1). This accusation needs to be researched and delineated by historians

to establish the actual relationship between Church and empire (Makutoane & Naudé 2009:79). The fact is that some missionaries were pro-colonialists and the term colonialist does not justify the conclusion that all missionaries were simply colonialist agents (Robert 2009:56). Ducker (2008:2) argues that according to the traditional view of mission, the British missionary intent was that of cultural imperialism. Makutoane and Naudé (2009:79) seem to confirm this when they conclude that Christian expansion in Asia and Africa resulted in one of the most remarkable cultural transformations in the history of the world. But history does not provide a straightforward relationship between Christian expansionism and colonialism (Robert 2009:56).

There were two sides of the missionary enterprise, one in which Christianity was the forerunner of colonialism with imperialist intent and another in which Christianity was propagated by the nonconformists who used it to empower indigenous communities. The support of colonisation by some missionaries muted the gospel and had shortcomings that continue to haunt the Christian church even today in the postcolonial era. To highlight some of those shortcomings would be educative for present and future missionaries. Some colonial missionaries confused Western civilisation with the gospel. They also lacked spiritual discernment of social issues as they propagated the gospel that only focused on the salvation of the soul (Van der Walt 2003:28). Over and above the aforementioned, missiology is an English-based discipline suggesting cultural superiority. Gospel communications in southern African Pentecostal and Charismatic churches are based on North American Pentecostal and Charismatic liturgical patterns. All in all, even today in postcolonial Africa, mission discourse is ontologically and terminologically a Western construct and a brainchild of colonialism, which continues to exclude the voices of the marginalised, according to Ducker (2008:9).

Ducker (2008:9) sees a missiology that is trapped in a colonising epistemology, a mission enterprise that perpetuates Western protocols of knowledge in its systematic approach of expansionism and global effort of trying to proclaim religious truth. These mission epistemologies knowingly advocate and endorse colonial behaviours. It is a propagation of a faith-centred mission rather than a people-centred mission, which focuses on conversion and not conversation with prospective converts.

The other side of the missionary enterprise is that some missionaries encouraged independence from the empire by raising the national consciousness of the indigenous

people. Others were not allowed by some colonising companies in their acquired territories because they were perceived to be hindrances to the interests of the empire. They also translated the gospel to empower and validate local cultures and indigenous languages. It is clear from the above that Christian mission was never fully in step with colonialism, but it sometimes opposed it. Based on the aforementioned, I want to highlight the fact that Christian mission, as previously stated, had two kinds of missionaries: colonialist and anti-colonialist. The former group propagated the colonising doctrine and the latter group resisted that doctrine by embracing indigenous people and developing their languages (Ducker 2008:9).

As stated above, pre-colonial translation had a horizontal dimension. Colonial translation was characterised by the following: It added a vertical dimension to translation and intercultural African encounters. In this vertical dimension, there were superior and inferior languages and cultures. The European source texts that were translated were regarded as superior to their indigenous translations. The vertical translation practice was based on unequal power relations between African and European languages. European languages had more power than African languages, and they were used in education, commerce and trade. Because of this inequality, translation assumed an ideological basis that determined and influenced its orientation. It had two results. Firstly, it enhanced the large-scale recording and transmission of African oral tradition. Secondly, it also enhanced the importation and imposition of a European worldview on the African and the other (Bandia 2008:6–7).

This vertical translation of European colonisation was also evident in the area of religious translation, according to Bandia (2008:8). In this sphere, it was characterised by the following (Bandia *ibid*:6–9):

- i. The Christianisation of Africans became an invaluable control mechanism ensuring rapid colonisation and exploitation through translation.
- ii. Translation was used to denigrate African religions for the benefit of Christianity.
- iii. Selective translation processes were devised to minimise disagreements between African religions and Christianity.
- iv. Missionary colonialism practiced an interventionist translation which reconstructed certain aspects of African religion and made them compatible with the Christian faith.
- v. The elements that were in conflict with Christianity and its values were omitted or suppressed.

- vi. The 17th century saw a large-scale translation of religious texts.
- vii. The English, through their indirect rule policy, encouraged vernacular language writing and translation for maintaining control over or proselytising colonial subjects by denying them access to a global language.

Ducker (2008:10) still accuses the modern church of being guilty of cultural colonisation through its missionary projects but he also acknowledges the more contextualised mission of the church, which is participative. He argues that there is a greater need to celebrate the pluralities of cultures, languages, theologies and missiologies. He contends that this requires the voices of dominated churches to guide the dominating churches from their excesses, insensitivities, and unnecessary interference. This is where Bandia's notion of translation as reparation fits in. This notion is an undermining of the effects of oppression and colonisation and the restoration of African pride and heritage for the benefit of people of African ancestry on the continent and in the diaspora (Bandia 2008:227).

Missiologically, translation as reparation would have to confront issues of contextualisation. One finds out that Africa has already travelled the path of contextualisation and that in that journey it has emerged with six nuances or models of contextualisation, namely African inculturation theology, Black theology, Liberation theology, African women's theology, Evangelical theology and Reconstruction theology. All these paradigms of contextualisation highlight the importance of the local situation of reception in all nuances of contextualisation. They are an attempt to negate the view that theologies from dominating zones are universal and applicable to all people.

As stated earlier, my focus will be the missiological colonial perspective of southern Africa. I shall attempt to find out what happened when the British missionaries encountered the Batswana people. The reason is that the text I want to translate will be translated from English to Setswana, and these target readers are the descendants of the same Batswana who encountered the British missionaries in the 19th century.

2.3.1.2. Colonial Encounter of the British Missionaries and the Batswana

The encounter of the southern African indigenous people with the Bible is deeply embedded in mission. This encounter was more of a biblical interpretation than it was a translation. As previously stated, this encounter took place in the pre-colonial era through contact with explorers, missionaries and traders (West 2009:33). In this era in Africa, life was under

African territorial and political control. Over and above African worldviews, institutions and armies had the greatest influence. It was during this era that sub-Saharan Africans engaged with the Bible as an iconic object of power and then as aural object.

It was during this era that the Batswana people encountered British missionaries. The Batswana people's perception of the Bible was that it was something with power and knowledge for those who controlled it (West 2009:40). As they asked the missionaries questions, they discovered that their questions were able to prise the Bible from the hands of the missionaries. They felt that they could also access the mysterious power of the Bible for themselves (West *ibid*:41). This idea that when one questions the Bible or Christian religious text, one accesses its power for oneself, is very important for postcolonial mission theology. This means that whenever one translates a religious text from one language to another, one prises it from its source text and the receiver text accesses its power. According to West (*ibid*:42), a translation of a text into a target language has the possibility of accelerating ownership and control of that text by target language people. It also assists the target culture to engage with the Bible on their own terms, allowing the text to speak for itself and find its own voice even if it is translated by those who control it. When a translated text speaks for itself, it creates hybrid target culture people and source text people. The translator tries to represent the target language through translation, but he/she is still embedded in the source culture. So the translator's translation product is done from a source culture perspective with the translator having access to both cultures. The message of the text is revitalised and at the same time, so is the receptor culture. What the Batswana discovered was that the Bible did not speak in accordance with its translators, that once translated, it was free. It became an independent measuring rod to judge Western missionary practices and teachings (West *ibid*:45).

Comaroff and Comaroff (1991:4) say that in the eyes of the Batswana, the struggle has always been about people of different origins trying to impose their particular way of seeing and being upon them over and above the colonisation of their consciousness with alien cultural axioms and aesthetics. The Batswana people saw the dominant motif of their encounter with missionaries or White people as their incorporation into a colonial and postcolonial state.

Who are the South African Batswana? They are the Batswana people who lived between the Vaal and Molopo rivers, namely the Batlhaping, Barolong and Batlharo, in the 19th century.

They were located in the direct path of European traffic beyond the borders of the Cape Colony (Comaroff & Comaroff 1991:39–40). They belonged to several chiefdoms which were beginning to fragment. Different missionaries had the following perspectives about the Batswana. According to Moffat, the Borratshidi chiefdom was a large, densely centralised city state under a powerful ruler who monopolised external relations. Campbell states that the Bahurutse lived in an elaborately structured nation. According to Barrow, the Barolong were part of an extensive settlement that required a whole day's walk from end to end, and Burchell said that the Batlhaping capital had a population of between 10 000 and 15 000 people and was as large as Cape Town (Comaroff & Comaroff *ibid*:127).

Who were the nonconformist missionaries? According to Comaroff and Comaroff (1991:80–81), they were part of the dominated fraction of the dominant class. They came from the rank and file of British society. Some of them were labourers, artisans and peasants. They had little or no schooling at all, with little theological training, and few of them had a university education. It is from this background that mission to the Batswana was born.

One would think that this background concerning the encounter of the Batswana and nonconformist missionaries was ideal for them to meet as equals. However, the missionaries and the Batswana met under incommensurable power relations. The missionaries were aware that they were history makers who could speak of and for the uncultivated Batswana; the Batswana's perspective is not represented (Comaroff & Comaroff 1991:171). The impact of this encounter was based on the missionaries' representations of the Batswana people. Although the Batswana were not passive historical objects, there is no record of their own representations. Maybe it is lost in orality. The Comaroffs state that the colonisation of the Batswana began politely, without military onslaught or economic invasion (Comaroff & Comaroff *ibid*:172). The only available literature of this age is based on the narratives of the missionaries and the Comaroffs characterise these narratives as follows (*ibid*:172):

- They were about imperial frontiers and colonising discourse, exciting the European imagination about the radical others.
- They portrayed their own intellectual domination over the natives.
- They described their exploits and achievement as conquests of civilisation.
- They portrayed African territories as virgin territories without society and history, waiting to be passively watered and tilled by evangelical effort.
- Their texts personalised nature and naturalised the Batswana people.

- Their texts say little about their indigenous interpreters except when it suits their purpose.
- They made the Batswana speak through a foreign text and a foreign voice.

2.3.1.3. The first translation of a text into Setswana

It was against this background that the first Setswana translation from English was produced. The first missionaries from the London Missionary Society, John Edwards and Jan Kok, settled at Gasegonyane fountain. They taught the gospel through interpreters. Chief Mothibi asked for missionaries to be sent to Maropeng and three were sent: James Read, John Evans and Robert Hamilton. Although Evans was proficient in classical languages, he failed at developing a written text in Setswana. Hamilton and Read remained, and they were able to produce the first edition of a basic *Spelling Book in the Bechuana Language* (Lubbe 2009:20).

Around 1820, Robert Moffat joined Read and Hamilton in Dithakong. He lived among the Batswana and began to learn the language until he was able to write it. His spelling book was completed and *A Bechuana Catechism* was completed in which the third chapter of the Gospel of John and the Lord's Prayer were translated. All these were translations and were sent to the Cape to be printed (Lubbe 2009:21).

Moffat learnt to speak Setswana, and this opened the Batswana people's hearts to the gospel. Moffat also lived the message of the Christian faith in the midst of trying circumstances. In July 1829, the first service conducted entirely in Setswana without the aid of interpreters culminated in the baptism of the first twelve Batswana converts. Later, in 1831, the entire Gospel of Luke was translated into Setswana and was printed with 23 hymns translated into Setswana. By 1838, Moffat had completed the translation of the whole New Testament and by 16 September 1857, the entire *Bibela ea Boitshepo* was completed and, in the words of Moffat, '[b]y labour and Patience the voice of the Unseen God in the language of the Bechuana' was heard (quoted in Lubbe 2009:28).

Among the Batswana, the translated Setswana text was still an iconic object of power, but its translation into Setswana substantially accelerated its ownership and control by the Batswana (West 2009:42). As stated above, they were represented by missionaries, but they still controlled their context and reception of the Bible. After translation, the Bible spoke for itself and found its voice among the Batswana. This translation produced a hybrid of the Batswana

and colonial encounter. The translation also introduced the pluralist factor into colonial Christianity (West *ibid*:44). The message of the Bible and the Batswana culture were revitalised through translation. The message of the translated text surpassed the expectation of its translators and became an independent measuring rod for testing the teachings and practices of those who brought it to the Batswana. It became the foundation for the development of a Setswana form of Christianity (West *ibid*:45).

Despite the condescending attitudes and religious, human and cultural superiority complexes of Western missionaries that were prevalent in the colonial era, the translation of the Bible into vernacular languages of indigenous people led to the self-affirmation of those indigenous people (Bevans & Schroeder 2004:230). It was also in this context that the tabula rasa approaches and supremacy of Western culture were questioned. This era saw the missionaries who respected indigenous people opposing the imposition of Western culture on indigenous communities. The promotion of establishing self-reliant Christian communities emerged through Henry Venn and Rufus Anderson, who advocated for the establishment of self-governing, self-expanding and self-supporting indigenous churches (Bevans & Schroeder *ibid*:230). This general concern for indigenous people provided a much needed prophetic conscience to the colonial movement (Bevans & Schroeder *ibid*:231).

The implications for those who come from the non-Western world who became Christians are that they have an opportunity to call for the reinterpretation of the 19th century missions. As scripture began to speak with an indigenous voice, I also believe that all religious texts such as Bible dictionaries, concordance, commentaries and liturgical texts should speak local languages. Within the mainline churches, most of the liturgical texts have been translated into indigenous languages, but this phenomenon seems to be absent in my own tradition of Pentecostalism and in the denomination of the Full Gospel Church of God in southern Africa. There are two liturgical text used by this denomination, one in Afrikaans and the other in English, both by the same author, Dr G.C. Horak. I believe that we as indigenous people are active social beings and arbiters of our destiny and that the translation of texts into our own languages and speaking and serving God with our own voices is essential. I also believe that this engagement can be better served by translation. Translation would assist the present generation of missionaries in southern Africa to contextualise their approach to mission both locally and across the borders.

2.4. The significance of contextual theology to African theology

Despite many arguments against contextualisation as a theological strategy, it still remains a very relevant strategy for African missionaries and for the mission of the church in Africa. This is due to the following reasons gleaned from the history of Christian mission: Firstly, from a perusal of mission literature, it is clear that God is the universal constant who has communicated Himself through variegated and contextual nuances of human language, culture and experiences (Tennent 2010:323). God's dealings with humanity have always been in a specific language that was culturally understandable to a particular generation and people with whom He was communicating. Tennent's perception about the Incarnation is as follows: 'Without ceasing to be God, Jesus fully entered into the frame of reference of a first century Jew' (*ibid*:325). The Incarnation is the ultimate example of what is called the translatability of the gospel. In this context, the translatability of the gospel refers to the ability of the gospel to be articulated, received, appropriated and reproduced into a potentially infinite number of cultural contexts.

Secondly, it is also evident that the gospel was at home in all cultures of the Pauline and post-apostolic churches and was inculturated in Syriac, Greek, Roman, Coptic, Armenian, Ethiopian, Masonite and many other churches. (Brinkman & Van Keulen 2003:216). This further attests to the fact that any church that seeks to translate the gospel for its new situation of reception is functioning within its theological and divine mandate.

Thirdly, African Christians are converts not proselytes. Proselytes give up their beliefs, customs and traditions and adopt those of other people, thus sacrificing their collective and local connections and inheriting the accumulated experiences of others. In contrast, a convert is someone who turns. This turn does not involve a change of substance but of direction. It involves redirecting one's life to Christ, where one does not shake of one's cultural heritage to be Christian. This should not be misconstrued to imply that one's African heritage is sacred and without perversions. The reality of all cultural perversions should always be borne in mind and be responded to according to Christ's benchmark of responding to his Jewish inheritance. Christ indwelt his Jewish inheritance with its aberration, validated many of its sections while invalidating others and refreshed it by bringing in the new (Brinkman & Van Keulen 2003:207–208).

Fourthly, theological methodology is always a product of the philosophical construct of the reception environment. A closer look at occidental theologies reveals that its differences or distinctions are a product of their linguistic infrastructure and their home culture and its dominant metaphysics. Therefore, it stands to reason that African theologies should have native or indigenous metaphysics in the formulation of its theologies. Yet when one scrutinises African Christianity, especially in my own tradition of Pentecostalism, one is inundated with Western, American liturgies, hymns and theologies, thus confirming the suspicion among many that Christianity is foreign to Africa.

Contextualisation challenges the universal legitimacy of Western paradigms that result in polemic accentuations and power struggles. It emphasises the unique function of Third World expressions of faith and theology within the historical ambit of God's relation to mankind. Contextualisation seems to be un-gagging the muted voices of the subaltern theological or missiological narratives that experience God in their own culture. Through contextualisation, one can conclude that the message of Christ must be incarnated in the tongues, traditions and thoughts of all people by means of every possible cultural expression to communicate his saving grace.

But contextualisation is not the all-important element of Christianity. One needs to be cognizant of the fact that no structure of reflection, individual categories, cultural expressions, human words, art or symbols can fully capture the being of God for people (Brinkman & Van Keulen 2003:117). Thus, no contextual understanding can claim to the absolute truth. Brinkman and Van Keulen (*ibid*:127) declare:

The gospel is contextual in that it is inevitably embodied in a particular culture; it is catholic in that it expresses the apostolic faith handed down from generation to generation within the communion of churches of all places and ages.

2.5. The need for postcolonial translation in mission and theology

According to the scenario described above, one must find what needs to be done in translation studies. As indicated in the above-mentioned arguments, the missionary message of the Christian church has been perceived as incarnating itself in the life and world of those who embraced it (Bosch 1991:421). The contextualisation of the church's mission results in two models of the incarnation: the indigenous and socio-economic models. My interest will be the indigenisation motif of mission. My reason is that the indigenous model presents itself

as a translation or inculturation (Bosch *ibid*:421). Bosch (*ibid*:423) is of the opinion that one of the most important arguments presented by contextual theology is that all theology, sociology, political theory or any other theory for that matter is contextual by its very nature. It is evident then that mission as contextualisation is the new emerging paradigm for missionaries and missiologists. This new paradigm negates the view that knowledge is neutral and acknowledges instead that Western science, philosophy and theology were designed to legitimise the Western world and its domination of the Third World. It is also a paradigm that emphasises commitment to the poor and marginalised. It is in this paradigm that credibility for the missionary would emanate from practising mission theology with the marginalised.

It is evident then that contextualisation shares a number of characteristics with postcolonial studies or theory. They are both critical destabilisers of the socio-linguistic and economic theories that have supported Western perspectives and worldviews. Both approaches advocate the creation of a subaltern intellectual space in which subalterns can articulate their own perception and produce their own alternative discourses and in the process, establish a philosophical framework to destabilise the dominant discourses, inherent assumptions and discursive legacies of colonialism. Both contextualisation and postcolonial theory are temporal concepts indicative of the departure and demise of colonial domination. They combat the residual effects of colonialism by clearing the socio-cultural space for all voices to be heard. They give the subaltern space to respond to the legacies of colonisation through the use of colonial language by indigenous people (Robert-Kenzo 2012:1). Robert-Kenzo (*ibid*:1) perceives the cornerstones of postcolonialism as the contextuality of knowledge, knowledge power play, the creation of non-existent reality, the invention of the 'other' and the presence of hegemonic attitudes.

If contextualisation is perceived as translation, according to Bosch's argument (1991:421), then it can be employed as a strategy for resistance and for the decolonisation of previously dominated cultures. It can be a tool of empowerment for the colonised translator to personally respond to colonisation and contribute to the discourse of decolonisation. Thus, postcolonial translation can serve as the ace up the sleeve of anticolonial and decolonising agendas (Baker & Saldanha 2009:202). This understanding and approach will assist in unshackling Christian mission from its ideological motives of the past. Pentecostal gospel communications, which are guilty of such an accusation, would then find a way of dissociating themselves from

American forms of worship. It would ultimately assist African Pentecostals to find biblical priorities in the gospel rather than imbibing other cultural elements (Ducker 2008:9). Postcolonial Pentecostal mission is still ontologically and terminologically a Western imperial construct and a brainchild of colonialism that continues to exclude marginalised voices.

Since colonialism saw the incursion and subjugation of others as providential, the Christian nations of Europe felt the need to universalise their Christian values in support of the universal vision of the empire. They promulgated the greater good of the empire through the introduction of social structures for permanent, good legislation, political betterment and cohesion (Robert 2009:57). This kind of perception cannot be left as it is; it needs to be challenged by the contextualisation of mission through postcolonial translation.

Therefore, contextualisation will have to interrogate and correct the three reasons of colonialism's theological significance through postcolonial translation. Those three reasons for colonialism's theological significance are (1) the existence of a theological justification for colonial incursion and subjugation found in colonial theology, (2) the exclusion of religion from postcolonialism by postcolonial theorists and the exclusion of postcolonialism from theology by theologians and (3) the coherence-focused Western theologies.

The above-mentioned shared characteristics of contextualisation and postcolonial theory are the premise upon which I argue that the most pertinent theoretical framework for translation of religious texts in the present era will be well served by postcolonial theory.

2.5.1. Postcolonial translation as cultural translation

According to Baker and Saldanha (2009:200), translation has in recent times been studied as a cultural objet d'art that is deeply embedded in its historical context. The implication of this fact is that translation has to be studied in the target culture. Since translation is an intercultural transfer product, its reality of power relations remains, and this is attested to by most scholars. The reality of the matter is that cultural confluence is not an egalitarian process; there is always the element of dominating and being dominated. According to Munday (2008:132), the central intersection of translation studies and postcolonial theory is that of power relations. Thus, Baker and Saldanha (2009:200) deem it imperative for postcolonial translation to confront issues of power disparities, expose colonial legacies, and challenge neo-colonial proclivities in the present postcolonial era. Their reason is that

colonial translation was used by the West as a form of intelligence gathering for the sustenance of colonial rule through persuasion. This view is also shared by Munday (2008:132), who argues that translation was a significant tool in the colonisation process and the dissemination of an ideologically motivated image of the colonised.

Baker and Saldanha (2009:202) argue that postcolonial translation can serve as a resistance to colonisation and neo-colonisation, as a decolonising tool for dominated cultures and can also empower colonised cultures. They further argue that it can be employed to expose the shameful history of exploiting translation to justify colonial dominance and also impact present perspectives on translation in relation to power, ideology and empire building. Young (2011:13) sees postcolonial theories of translation as focusing on questions of power, resistance and domination.

One element of postcolonial translation that cannot be avoided is that of cultural translation. This, according to Pym, occurs when linguistic, cultural, social, and gender borders are crossed. He asserts that cultural translation occurs in the 'third space' or the space between cultures (Pym 2010:147). He argues that cultural translation moves beyond the concept of viewing translations as finite linguistic products and instead, sees them as cultural processes. He concludes by saying that translation should be viewed as a process and not a product, perceiving all interlingual, intralingual and intersemiotic translations as a translation process (*ibid*:150). Thus, it is clear that translation took a cultural turn, and the main question is, 'Why did that happen?'

Bassnet (2007:14–20) tries to answer the above question in the following manner: Firstly, she attributes the cultural turn of translation to a mediatorship that involves power relations and ideological implications of translation by the translator. Secondly, she asserts that poststructural approaches possess cultural dimensions. Thirdly, the cultural turn in the humanities dictated the cultural turn in translation. Fourthly, although translation is about language, it cannot be divorced from its cultural context. Therefore, according to the aforementioned arguments, the cultural turn was due to the historical context of the receiving cultures.

Young (2011:4–12) perceives cultural translation as a mediator between primitive cultures and Western cultures. He is of the opinion that cultural translation seeks to determine what happens to the negotiated borders of cultural translation, transmission, re-interpretation and

re-alignment through local languages and the response of those who encounter these negotiated borders. He seems to agree with the idea that cultural translation is a process of cultural exchange, dialogue or negotiation that produces knowledge transformation and cultural respect, thus making cultural translation reciprocal. He argues that cultural translation produces a change in the target culture but leaves the source culture as it was. Furthermore, cultures are not holistic, static and authentic entities, but are rather syncretic, hybrid mishmashes. This makes cultural translation a transient, transitory experiment that can be achieved but not fully. This fluidity, mobility and mixing of cultures is also applicable to languages (Young *ibid*:20)

According to Young (2011:24), cultural translation has the following characteristics:

- It starts when certain elements of the source culture have no exact equivalence anywhere.
- It mediates between specific non-equivalent entities.
- It is deployed at a level where individual cultural differences are untranslatable.
- It starts with the failure of translation.
- It causes the target culture to translate itself into a foreign idiom in order to affect understanding.
- It is foreignising and partial as it deals with untranslatability.
- Its translator is responsible to insert the untranslatable into the target culture.
- It is an oxymoron as it deals with what cannot be translated.

2.5.2. The significance of postcolonial translation for Africa

Paul F. Bandia (2008:14) says, ‘The importance of translation for postcolonial writing has been well established.’ It is true that in Africa, translation has continued to play a significant role in communicating and writing African thoughts and perspectives just before and after independence. Missionaries continued unabatedly to translate religious texts. In that process, newer forms of translation emerged that sought to represent African worldviews and culture in the form of postcolonial translation (Bandia *ibid*:11). According to Bandia (*ibid*:12-14), postcolonial translation has been significant for Africa in the following ways:

- It has represented the African worldview and culture on the world stage.
- It has assisted Africa to travel across the world through translation.

- It gave African intellectuals a platform to assert African identities in the postcolonial and global space.
- It has assisted peripheral writers to diminish the distance to the centre of the metropolis imposed on them by hegemonic cultures.
- It has assisted oral cultures to overcome its lack of literary capital by writing them in international languages.
- Marginalised cultures have accessed the international literary space through translation.
- The survival of indigenous languages is guaranteed through translations if postcolonial writers continue to take advantage of the space provided by translation.
- It has assisted with the framing of the analphabetic cultures worldview.
- It serves as an intermediary that bridges disparate literary worlds.
- It plays a major role in the construction of literary heritage through decolonisation in the postcolonial era.
- It brings indigenous literature to the world and counters hegemonic cultures through writing in colonial languages.
- It affords African writers a space to affirm their difference in colonial languages.
- It acts as a primary instrument in the cultural representation of the otherness.

2.5.3. The implication of postcolonial translation for South Africa

The colonial background is evident in the minimal role played by target language communities in determining the goals of translation. However, recently there seems to be a general consensus among scholars that intended target language communities should be part of the decision-making processes of the translation of a text that affects them (Chemorion 2009:158). Chemorion (*ibid*:159) argues that firstly, such an inclusion would correct the mismatch between translators' perspectives and target communities' expectations of vernacular translations. Secondly, it would assist with the provision of a theoretical framework of target language communities' involvement. Thirdly, it would empower receptor communities to decide on a translation suitable to them. Lastly, it would boost the acceptability and utilisation of the finished translated product.

The implications of postcolonial translation for South Africa are that it has to confront the philosophies and models of organisations that sponsor translations. It has to advocate for the

needs and expectations of target language communities. This is applicable to all forms of postcolonial translation (Chemorion 2009:159). Postcolonial translation also has to deal with the knowledge of who translates what for whom and why and must create social structures that have enabling and constraining powers with regard to what is being translated (Beukes 2006:1). South African postcolonial translation should be extricated from its own underestimation of itself and should fulfil its role as a developmental and intellectualisation tool. If this is done, postcolonial translation will expand discursive spaces by developing new lexical items, registers and genres to facilitate its function as a vehicle for increasing linguistic social domains (Beukes *ibid*:2–5). There is a need to elevate the status of translation in South Africa to an empowering and developmental role by establishing routinised translation practices that foster a culture of translation. The essential reconciliatory role of translation to engender tolerance, mutual respect, understanding and nation building should be acknowledged by the South African populace. Furthermore, the role of translation as a facilitator of the government's legal obligation to provide equal access to service without the hindrance of language barriers should be pursued (*ibid* 2006:6).

With these implications for postcolonial translation for South Africa in mind, the question remains what kind of translators would South Africa need? What kind of translators were produced by colonial encounters and are currently being produced by postcolonial encounters? What are their identities? In the the following section, I shall try to answer these questions and address the questions of indigenous identities after the encounters.

2.6. The resultant identities of the indigenous communities emanating from colonial and postcolonial encounters

The cultural life of Black Africa remained unchanged for a while until around the end of the 19th century. The colonial encounter of indigenous communities with Europeans left its mark on African identities (Appiah 2001:222). According to Appiah (*ibid*:223), identities are complex and multiple historical products that respond to the changing economic, political and cultural forces. They flourish without any permission, whether we acknowledge them or not, and they are constructed without any major reason. The relationship between the colonised and coloniser was not innocent and without results. What resulted from these relationships was the formation of hybrid identities. Hybridity marks the links of colonialism and its failure to totally control the colonised. With regard to postcolonial encounters of indigenous communities with other communities, one comes face to face with the notion of a hybrid

condition that applies to all postcolonial subjects (Abrahamsen 2003:203). In other words, whether we agree with this notion or not, all postcolonial communities that were once touched by colonialism are hybrid. Yet the recognition of the hybrid character of postcolonial societies does not negate the existence of national or local identities (Abrahamsen *ibid*:207). Thus, I believe it is reasonable to conclude that the resultant identities of the indigenous communities emanating from colonial and postcolonial encounters has resulted in the production of hybrid identities, which will receive an in-depth analysis and investigation in the next chapter.

2.7. Conclusion

It is clear from the above that literature has been a central factor in colonisation missiology. Imperialism employed various ideological instruments like education, religion and media to control colonised people (Marandi & Shadpour 2011:48). Literary translation can still play a pivotal role in propagating liberating alternative ideological instruments, unshackling the colonised from indirect colonial rule in a post-colony. Although it is a problematic framework, postcolonialism can still be employed to deal with the aftereffects of colonialism because of its resistant and empowering nature. Thus, postcolonial translation, just like colonial translation, can assist postcolonial mission by providing the necessary framework to assess the dynamics of political power between languages and the position of translation in linguistic or cultural context. Secondly, it can assist with the shifting of Western epistemological frameworks of knowledge towards broader and more pluralistic perspectives or epistemologies. Thirdly, it can interrogate Anglo-American systems of knowledge and introduce native systems of knowledge through indigenised translations. Finally, it can help to combat the trend of the declining use of indigenous languages by advocating for horizontal translations and translations into indigenous languages.

CHAPTER 3

HYBRIDITY: THE NATURE OF POSTCOLONIAL IDENTITIES AND THEIR RELATION TO POSTCOLONIAL TRANSLATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

3.1. Introduction

The South African postcolonial and post-apartheid cultural scenery is a mixture of cross-cultural contacts and influences. This uncontrolled, flowing, interstitial movement of cultures between spaces of meaning leaves postcolonial identities hybrid. Both the identities of the coloniser and the colonised, the self and the other, Black and White and the Western and the non-Western are hybrid (Yazdih 2010:31). In this chapter, I intend to investigate the relevance of hybridity in postcolonial and post-apartheid translation studies in South Africa, or *Umzantsi*, as the country is fondly called in the townships.

I am engaging this investigation or examination from a Pentecostal Christian missiological perspective, which is conceptualised in a hybrid space from the onset. Mission communication is a translation and involves cultural and linguistic contact. To me, this cross-cultural contact is like a marriage in which both parties constitute a unit but still maintain their separate identities which are affected and infected by this union. When I officiate at weddings, I usually illustrate this by dunking two separate pages in water and then applying pressure to them for five days. On the wedding day, when the pages are completely glued to each other, I ask the couple to unglue them. In my experience, the result has been the same every time the couple tries to unglue the pages: A part of one page will always remain with the other page. This is what the Christian faith has done to people of the world who came in contact with it. One cannot come into contact with the Christian faith and remain the same.

A key problem that one encounters in Africa is that of its people's unity of identity or an essentialised identity. Our shared borders, shared history of conquest by the West, shared domination and imposed imperialism gives us the bases to claim that we share the same origin and destiny as a people. The real problem here is not the use of the adjective 'African' but how differently we practice our Africanness in different parts of the continent (Omotoso 1996:165).

In this chapter, as stated above, I shall argue that postcolonial identities, especially religious identities, are hybrid identities. I shall also argue that hybridity and heterogeneity negates the essentialist homogeneous identities of African people and their cultures. I shall argue that translation is found in a hybrid space and is itself a hybrid, and such a space can be meaningfully employed by postcolonial translation for decolonising religious practice and liturgy. In this chapter, I shall first give my personal background concerning my current identity in a post-colony. Secondly, I shall try to define hybridity for this study. Thirdly, I shall investigate the historical evolution of hybridity. Fourthly, I shall attempt to conceptualise hybridity for translation or cross-cultural communication. Fifthly, I shall deal with issues pertinent to hybridity and cultural translation, and lastly, I shall look at the implications of hybridity for postcolonial mission.

3.1.1. My personal background

I am a subaltern and an African subaltern. Therefore, I am an African. Consequently, I have decided to preface my personal background with Thabo Mbeki's poem or speech, 'I am an African', as a way of introducing my engagement with cultural hybridity.

I am an African

Chairperson,

Esteemed President of the democratic Republic,

Honourable Members of the Constitutional Assembly,

Our distinguished domestic and foreign guests,

Friends,

On an occasion such as this, we should, perhaps, start from the beginning.

So, let me begin.

I am an African.

I owe my being to the hills and the valleys, the mountains and the glades, the rivers, the deserts, the trees, the flowers, the seas and the ever-changing seasons that define the face of our native land.

My body has frozen in our frosts and in our latter day snows. It has thawed in the warmth of our sunshine and melted in the heat of the midday sun. The crack and the rumble of the summer thunders, lashed by startling lightning, have been a cause both of trembling and of hope.

The fragrances of nature have been as pleasant to us as the sight of the wild blooms of the citizens of the veld.

The dramatic shapes of the Drakensberg, the soil-coloured waters of the Lekoa, iGqili noThukela, and the sands of the Kgalagadi, have all been panels of the set on the natural stage on which we act out the foolish deeds of the theatre of our day.

At times, and in fear, I have wondered whether I should concede equal citizenship of our country to the leopard and the lion, the elephant and the springbok, the hyena, the black mamba and the pestilential mosquito.

A human presence among all these, a feature on the face of our native land thus defined, I know that none dare challenge me when I say – I am an African!

I owe my being to the Khoi and the San whose desolate souls haunt the great expanses of the beautiful Cape – they who fell victim to the most merciless genocide our native land has ever seen, they who were the first to lose their lives in the struggle to defend our freedom and dependence and they who, as a people, perished in the result.

Today, as a country, we keep an audible silence about these ancestors of the generations that live, fearful to admit the horror of a former deed, seeking to obliterate from our memories a cruel occurrence which, in its remembering, should teach us not and never to be inhuman again.

I am formed of the migrants who left Europe to find a new home on our native land. Whatever their own actions, they remain still, part of me.

In my veins courses the blood of the Malay slaves who came from the East. Their proud dignity informs my bearing, their culture a part of my essence. The stripes they bore on their bodies from the lash of the slave master are a reminder embossed on my consciousness of what should not be done.

I am the grandchild of the warrior men and women that Hintsa and Sekhukhune led, the patriots that Cetshwayo and Mphephu took to battle, the soldiers Moshoeshoe and Ngungunyane taught never to dishonour the cause of freedom.

My mind and my knowledge of myself is formed by the victories that are the jewels in our African crown, the victories we earned from Isandhlwana to Khartoum, as Ethiopians and as the Ashanti of Ghana, as the Berbers of the desert.

I am the grandchild who lays fresh flowers on the Boer graves at St Helena and the Bahamas, who sees in the mind's eye and suffers the suffering of a simple peasant folk, death, concentration camps, destroyed homesteads, a dream in ruins.

I am the child of Nongqause. I am he who made it possible to trade in the world markets in diamonds, in gold, in the same food for which my stomach yearns.

I come of those who were transported from India and China, whose being resided in the fact, solely, that they were able to provide physical labour, who taught me that we could both be at home and be foreign, who taught me that human existence itself demanded that freedom was a necessary condition for that human existence.

Being part of all these people, and in the knowledge that none dare contest that assertion, I shall claim that – I am an African.

I have seen our country torn asunder as these, all of whom are my people, engaged one another in a titanic battle, the one redress a wrong that had been caused by one to another and the other, to defend the indefensible.

I have seen what happens when one person has superiority of force over another, when the stronger appropriate to themselves the prerogative even to annul the injunction that God created all men and women in His image.

I know what it signifies when race and colour are used to determine who is human and who, subhuman.

I have seen the destruction of all sense of self-esteem, the consequent striving to be what one is not, simply to acquire some of the benefits which those who had improved themselves as masters had ensured that they enjoy.

I have experience of the situation in which race and colour is used to enrich some and impoverish the rest.

I have seen the corruption of minds and souls in the pursuit of an ignoble effort to perpetrate a veritable crime against humanity.

I have seen concrete expression of the denial of the dignity of a human being emanating from the conscious, systemic and systematic oppressive and repressive activities of other human beings.

There the victims parade with no mask to hide the brutish reality – the beggars, the prostitutes, the street children, those who seek solace in substance abuse, those who have to steal to assuage hunger, those who have to lose their sanity because to be sane is to invite pain.

Perhaps the worst among these, who are my people, are those who have learnt to kill for a wage. To these the extent of death is directly proportional to their personal welfare.

And so, like pawns in the service of demented souls, they kill in furtherance of the political violence in KwaZulu-Natal. They murder the innocent in the taxi wars.

They kill slowly or quickly in order to make profits from the illegal trade in narcotics. They are available for hire when husband wants to murder wife and wife, husband.

Among us prowl the products of our immoral and amoral past – killers who have no sense of the worth of human life, rapists who have absolute disdain for the women of our country, animals who would seek to benefit from the vulnerability of the children, the disabled and the old, the rapacious who brook no obstacle in their quest for self-enrichment.

All this I know and know to be true because I am an African!

Because of that, I am also able to state this fundamental truth that I am born of a people who are heroes and heroines.

I am born of a people who would not tolerate oppression.

I am of a nation that would not allow that fear of death, torture, imprisonment, exile or persecution should result in the perpetuation of injustice.

The great masses who are our mother and father will not permit that the behaviour of the few results in the description of our country and people as barbaric.

Patient because history is on their side, these masses do not despair because today the weather is bad.

Nor do they turn triumphalist when, tomorrow, the sun shines. Whatever the circumstances they have lived through and because of that experience, they are determined to define for themselves who they are and who they should be.

We are assembled here today to mark their victory in acquiring and exercising their right to formulate their own definition of what it means to be African.

The constitution whose adoption we celebrate constitutes an unequivocal statement that we refuse to accept that our Africanness shall be defined by our race, colour, gender or historical origins.

It is a firm assertion made by ourselves that South Africa belongs to all who live in it, black and white.

It gives concrete expression to the sentiment we share as Africans, and will defend to the death, that the people shall govern.

It recognises the fact that the dignity of the individual is both an objective which society must pursue, and is a goal which cannot be separated from the material well-being of that individual.

It seeks to create the situation in which all our people shall be free from fear, including the fear of the oppression of one national group by another, the fear of the disempowerment of one social echelon by another, the fear of the use of state power to deny anybody their fundamental human rights and the fear of tyranny.

It aims to open the doors so that those who were disadvantaged can assume their place in society as equals with their fellow human beings without regard to colour, race, gender, age or geographic dispersal.

It provides the opportunity to enable each one and all to state their views, promote them, strive for their implementation in the process of governance without fear that a contrary view will be met with repression.

It creates a law-governed society which shall be inimical to arbitrary rule.

It enables the resolution of conflicts by peaceful means rather than resort to force.

It rejoices in the diversity of our people and creates the space for all of us voluntarily to define ourselves as one people.

As an African, this is an achievement of which I am proud, proud without reservation and proud without any feeling of conceit.

Our sense of elevation at this moment also derives from the fact that this magnificent product is the unique creation of African hands and African minds.

But it also constitutes a tribute to our loss of vanity that we could, despite the temptation to treat ourselves as an exceptional fragment of humanity, draw on the accumulated experience and wisdom of all humankind, to define for ourselves what we want to be.

Together with the best in the world, we too are prone to pettiness, petulance, selfishness and shortsightedness.

But it seems to have happened that we looked at ourselves and said the time had come that we make a super-human effort to be other than human, to respond to the call to create for ourselves a glorious future, to remind ourselves of the Latin saying: Gloria est consequenda - Glory must be sought after!

Today it feels good to be an African.

It feels good that I can stand here as a South African and as a foot soldier of a titanic African army, the African National Congress, to say to all the parties represented here, to the millions who made an input into the processes we are concluding, to our outstanding compatriots who have presided over the birth of our founding document, to the negotiators who pitted their wits one against the other, to the unseen stars who shone unseen as the management and administration of the Constitutional Assembly, the advisers, experts and

publicists, to the mass communication media, to our friends across the globe – congratulations and well done!

I am an African.

I am born of the peoples of the continent of Africa.

The pain of the violent conflict that the peoples of Liberia, Somalia, the Sudan, Burundi and Algeria are a pain I also bear.

The dismal shame of poverty, suffering and human degradation of my continent is a blight that we share.

The blight on our happiness that derives from this and from our drift to the periphery of the ordering of human affairs leaves us in a persistent shadow of despair.

This is a savage road to which nobody should be condemned.

This thing that we have done today, in this small corner of a great continent that has contributed so decisively to the evolution of humanity says that Africa reaffirms that she is continuing her rise from the ashes.

Whatever the setbacks of the moment, nothing can stop us now!

Whatever the difficulties, Africa shall be at peace!

However improbable it may sound to the skeptics, Africa will prosper!

Whoever we may be, whatever our immediate interest, however much we carry baggage from our past, however much we have been caught by the fashion of cynicism and loss of faith in the capacity of the people, let us err today and say – nothing can stop us now!

Thank you (Mbeki 1996).

I am from a Rastafarian background, and was a great fan of the late Bob Marley and Peter McIntosh before I became a Christian. One song by Peter McIntosh, 'African', has the following lyrics: 'Don't care where you come from / As long as you're a black man, you're an

African / No mind your nationality. / You have got the identity of an African.’ This is what I used to believe, and I knew from the bottom of my heart that I was an African. So when I first heard the speech quoted above, I also knew that I am an African. But now I am confused because the colour of my skin is not the determining factor of my identity. Mbeki seems to propose a new political identity where everyone who lives and finds him/herself on this continent is an African and is connected to each other. It is this new identity that I believe needs to be infused into my theological and missiological thinking. Ingleby (2006:1) argues that just as Mbeki has stopped, according to his speech or poem, employing the ‘us and them’ thinking of the colonial era, the church, especially in mission, should begin to think in the same way in South Africa.

This African identity about which Mbeki speaks is also envisaged by Appiah (2001:223) as a new emerging African identity. Appiah’s view about human identities is that they are constructed and historical and that all have their share of false assumptions, are erroneous and are inaccurate. Their errors and inaccuracies are labelled as a ‘myth’ by courtesy, ‘heresy’ by religion and ‘magic’ by science. If this is true, then I do not think that it will be a problem for postcolonial mission to construct such identities.

In the speech above, Mbeki states that he also owes his being to the victimised Khoi and San people as well as the migrants who left Europe to reside in Africa. He claims to be a consanguineous relative of the Malay slaves and a grandchild of South African warriors. He says that he is a product of the victories that adorn the African crown, a grandchild of the Boers, a child of Nongqause and a part of the Asian indentured labourers who were brought to the African continent. He says that being part of these people and these people being part of him makes him and all those people Africans. This negates the essentialist perspective of my former Rastafarian identity, which was only based on the colour of my skin. This, to me, is the generosity of the African spirit, to want to share what is one’s own with others by embracing them in one destiny.

Thabo Mbeki’s starting point is that he is an African. My starting point is confused; I do not know what I am. Where do I begin? Who am I? What am I? Before I began to study translation and came across concepts like postcolonialism, hybridity, archaeology and evolution, I knew who I was, or so I thought. What am I if I was born into a Xhosa family and raised in a Setswana environment? What am I if I was acculturated in Setswana? Who am I when my mother tongue was isiXhosa but according to the education system it was

Setswana? Who am I when I am more fluent in Setswana and English, yet I have an isiXhosa surname? If I am Xhosa what kind of Xhosa am I? Can I confidently say, like Mbeki said that he is an African, that ‘I am a Xhosa or I am a hybrid’ and expect no one to dispute that? Can I say that without offending anyone? And what does that mean, being a Xhosa or a hybrid? Is hybridity an identity?

It is with these questions in mind that I want to engage the concept of postcolonial hybridity. As a missionary, pastor and evangelist, I have predominantly worked with the Batswana people in Botswana and in North West. I grew up in North West being called *Tebele*, which is a derogatory label given to Xhosa people who find themselves in that province. I view myself as a South African, but without any clear-cut identity, a hybrid because of my birth and upbringing and because of my faith. I do not know who my father was; they tell me he was a Xhosa, but from which clan or tribe I do not know. I have, however, made peace with that.

As a hybrid, do I have any authority to do a translation in Setswana? How will that make the Batswana to feel? I feel like Rizpah in the king’s courtyard, Japheth in his father’s household, Rahab in the economy of deliverance or Ruth in the preparation of the lineage of the Messiah. In short, I am an outsider trying to do an insider’s job. I believe that my experiences have empowered me to be effective in this space. I believe that I will be bringing to the academic table new knowledge and new data for translation studies in the hybrid space. Although my contribution in the generation of knowledge will not be significantly large, I hope that it will still be a contribution that might be used in the field.

If I give myself the permission to do the translation of this liturgical text, what kind of translation would that be? Do I approach this task as an assimilated hybrid into the Setswana culture or as someone with an ambiguous identity? Will I, in this case, be able to valorise my ambiguous identity and experiences of the culture into which I have been acculturated? What comforts me is that there is no correct or perfect translation, that even if a Motswana were to do this translation, it would not have the stamp of correctness or perfection. I am engaging in this exercise not to represent the Batswana but to identify with them as they have given me my identity and a language in which I express myself well.

This strategy of identification with the respondents is not original. It was employed by the apostle Paul in adjusting to his audiences when propagating the gospel. Paul put himself in

the position of those with whom he was communicating, whether Jews or Gentiles (Hesselgrave 1999:177). This is what he meant when he said (1 Cor 9:20–23):

And to the Jews I became a Jew, that I might win the Jews; to those who are under the law, as under the law, that I might win those under the law; to those without the law, as without the law (not being without the law toward God, but under the law of Christ), that I might win those without the law; to the weak I became as weak, that I might win the weak. I have become all things to all men that I might by all means save some. Now this I do for the gospel's sake, that I might be partaker of with you.

It seems to me that although Mbeki is not a missionary, he has taken Paul's strategy of identification. He identifies with the Khoi and San, former migrants who left Europe, Malay slaves, amaXhosa, the Bapedi, Bavhenda, amaZulu, AmaNdebele, the Boers, the African people and the Asians. What really challenges my perception and understanding of myself is the following words from Mbeki (1996):

We are assembled here today to mark their victory in acquiring and exercising their right to formulate their own definition of what it means to be African.

The constitution, whose adoption we celebrate constitutes and unequivocal statement that we refuse to accept that our Africanness shall be defined by our race, colour, gender or historical origins.

It is a firm assertion made by ourselves that South Africa belongs to all who live in it, black and white.

This means that I will have to conceive of a new way of perceiving myself and that my national identity will be one of identification and inclusivity. The idea that all men and women are my brothers and sisters in the kingdom of God has always been part of my Christian training. This means that essentialist perceptions of myself and of others are untenable.

3.2. Definitions and understandings of hybridity

One of the characteristics of the cultural movement that emerged from capitalist development in the nineteenth century was the simultaneous process of the unification of the West against the other and differentiation of the other from the West. The globalisation of imperialist power through integrated economic and political rule, which was imposed on the world's

peoples and cultures, were achieved through dislocation. This was experienced in the disruption of local cultures, racial difference anxiety and the apparent racial amalgamation (Young 1995:4).

Presently there is that sense of heterogeneity, cultural interchange and diversity in the identity of modern society. Both in the past and currently, colonialism has constructed two antithetical groups: the colonised and the coloniser, self and other, occident and orient, where the dominated can only know themselves through false and foreign representation (Ingleby 2006:1).

What happens to cultures when they come into contact with each other, intrude on each other's space, fuse with each other or into disjunctive cultures? What are the results of racial, religious, cultural and linguistic hybridisation?

All these types of hybridisation lead to hybrid results. Races, religions, cultures and languages merge to produce something different and something new. The word hybrid is a botanical and biological word of Latin origin, which means, 'the offspring of a tame sow and wild boar'. The Old English Dictionary defines it as, 'of human parents of different race, half-breed'. Hybridity is originally a 19th century word referring to physiological phenomena that played a major role in racialised formations about miscegenation and racial mixtures during that period, and today, it refers to a cultural phenomenon (Cieslik & Verkuyten 2006:78). Hybridity emerges from the intricate process of cultural contact, interference, blending and disjunction (Young 1995:5). My own paraphrase of Bhabha's (1994:112) definition of hybridity is that it is an indication of the output of colonial power, its ever-changing forces and fixities, a name given to the premeditated reversal of the process of supremacy through renunciation of the pure and original identity of authority. In contrast, Young (1995:1–28) defines hybridity as a mere product of disruptions and dislocation of any system.

3.2.1. Hybridity and infertility

Hybridity was an issue of key cultural debate in the 19th and early 20th centuries (Young 1995:6). The most contested ideology was that of humans having different origins and belonging to different species. The idea that the Black race was not part of the human race was contested as being unbiblical by the anti-slavery activists. They argued that humans belonged to the same family, and thus slavery was wrong (Young *ibid*:7). According to

Young (*ibid*:7), it was during this era that the question of species and hybridity took centre stage and was consistently and comprehensively treated.

From the cross between a horse and a donkey, which produced a mule or a hinny that was infertile, a generalisation was made that hybrids were infertile and could not produce any offspring. This idea was applied to human interracial unions and led to the pre-American civil war positions of monogenesis and polygenesis, which were highly contested (Young 1995:8).

Theories of race in the 19th century were more about sexuality and sexual union between Black and White people. Thus, the term hybridity was employed to describe the offspring of humans of different races, which implied that different races were different species (Young 1995:9).

It was these theories that projected hybridity as an invocation of contemporary culture as being a contrafusion and disjunction; fusion and assimilation. This led to several possible positions regarding hybridity. Firstly, the straightforward polygenist species argument was a denial that different people could not mix at all. If they mixed, their progenies would be barren or barren after a generation or two. Secondly, the amalgamation thesis advocated for the prolific and unrestrained interbreeding of people to produce a new mixed race. Thirdly, the decomposition thesis admitted that the amalgamation of different people was possible, but the resultant mix breeds had short lives or reverted to one of the permanent parent types. Fourthly, the notion of proximate and distant species variation hybridity propagates the notion that allied unions are fertile and distant unions are not fertile and are sometimes degenerate. Fifthly, the negative amalgamation thesis claimed that miscegenation would result in a raceless chaos (Young 1995:18).

The above-mentioned ways of understanding hybridity need to be applied to our understanding of translation as a metaphor or a hybrid product. Firstly, from the polygenist species point of view, can it be argued that any mix of any languages or cultures is sterile after one generation? Or is it possible, according to the amalgamation thesis, that languages and cultures can simply mix without restraint and produce more mixed languages and cultures? Is it like in the decomposition thesis where the amalgamation of languages and cultures is possible but short lived? Would hybrid translations yield to the proximate and distant variation of species where allied languages and cultures are productive in terms of

language growth and distant languages are infertile? Or would linguistic hybridisation lead to the languageless mixture of the negative amalgamation thesis?

3.2.2. Globalisation, heterogeneity and hybridity

Globalisation is part of our postcolonial and postmodernist reality. It is also part of the anti-globalisation perspective. Current literature on globalisation claims that globalisation has led to a fragmentation and hybridisation of national, ethnic and cultural identities (Cieslik & Verkuyten 2006:77). This kind of milieu thrusts humanity into the midst of complex phenomena with complex spaces of existence (Van Kooten Niekerk & Buhl 2004:1). One of these spaces is the hybrid space which, on its own, is also complex. Globalisation has led to an increase of these various complex hybrid mixes (Cieslik & Verkuyten 2006:78). Sten Pultz Moslund (2010:2) has this to say about our age:

So our age is supposed to be an age of unparalleled mobility, migration and border crossing. Reading the literature of globalisation the whole world appears to be on the move. It is the grand spectacle of a virtual surge of people flowing across the surface of the globe; refugees, exiles, expatriates, international vagrants, guest workers, immigrants, globetrotting travellers and package tourist, wanderers of all kinds crisscrossing the planet and all its national, ethnic, cultural, social and linguistic borders. It seems as if we are witnessing a massive international and transnational defeat of gravity, an immense uprooting of origin and belonging, an immense displacement of borders, with all clashes, meetings, fusions and intermixings it entails, reshaping the cultural landscapes of the world's countries and cities.

Moslund (2010:2) argues that human history is characterised by constant mobility from time immemorial and that this constant mobility has affected human identities, cultural identities and national identities, which have been transformed in motion. This constant movement and intermixing has rendered all human identities and cultures hybrid.

It is these complex hybrid mixes that Ella Shohat argues need to be researched. She states that the researchers of hybridity should be aware of the various modalities of hybridity, like forced assimilation, internalised self-rejection, political co-optation, social conformism, cultural mimicry and creative transcendence (Shohat 1992:110). This is a task I will attempt when I try to conceptualise hybridity, but my main focus will be on cultural hybridisation and cultural contact points that occur because of translation. As I have previously shown, hybridity in the 19th century was based on racial identities, while its recent theoretical

thematization dates from the 1980s. Currently, it is predominantly used to describe cultural phenomena and identities. It refers to different lifestyles, behaviours, practices and orientations that result in multiple identities. Normatively, hybridity and its related terms are used to critique ethnic boundaries and essentialisms and in the process to valorise mixture and change. If handled correctly, it could constitute a liberating human condition and a political alternative to exclusionary and racist consequences of social categorisation, like national, religious and ethnic categorisation (Cieslik & Verkuyten 2006:78). With this in mind, I would like to examine what happens in cultural hybridisation as well as the cultural contact points of hybridisation.

3.2.3. Cultural hybridisation and cultural contact zones

Hybridisation is a preferred strategy of coping with cultural difference. It happens when people from different cultural backgrounds are willing to let go and open up to new possibilities during cultural contact (Kwok-Bun & Peverreli 2012:138). Kwok-Bun and Peverreli (*ibid*:141) compare cultural hybridisation to ‘crossvergence’, a term they use to describe deliberate adaptation to local culture as an alternative to convergence and divergence. According to advocates of convergence in cultural interaction, when different cultural role players interact, the resultant product is a culture-free system, which implies that when role players interact, they forget or ignore each other role player’s culture. In my opinion, this is an untenable situation. The advocates of divergence counter the former assertion by arguing that cultural difference is an ever-present fact of existence and an influence of interaction and that no amount of interaction can cancel cultural difference (Kwok-Bun & Peverreli *ibid*:138). In this section I want to examine the validity of the two above-mentioned assertions.

The movement of people from an ‘original’ cultural setting to a new cultural setting leads to cultural contact that yields various cultural contact zones. According to Kwok-Bun and Peverreli (2012:141–146), there are basically five cultural hybridisation zones:

- **Essentialising cultural contact zone:** In this space, there is an essentialisation and ossification of encounters with difference, where inflexibility to change is experienced, which ultimately becomes a breeding ground for prejudice, discrimination and racism through exaggeration and manufacturing difference, which in turn results in the destructive use of contact or cultural contact.

- **Alternating cultural contact zone:** There is an internalisation of the new culture through socialisation, but both cultures coexist in the person's mind in a compartmentalised form. The person has alternate identities, with oscillations and a juggling of identities according to context. The person thus has what is referred to as positional identity, which is what I currently am as a missiologist and translator.
- **Converting cultural contact zone:** This is an assimilative, acculturative and converting cultural contact. One culture is either replaced or displaced by another due to the uprooting of the subject (p. 141).
- **Hybridising cultural contact zone:** This is a hybridisation that is conducive to and has a high tolerance level for various contexts of existence. It intentionally allows for new possibilities and is able to open up for new cultural developments.
- **Innovating cultural contact zone:** This is the cultural melting pot of hybridity or cultural hybridity. There is a mixing that produces a new culture or a hybrid. This entanglement sometimes leads to undesirable outcomes like chaos, strain, existential pain and a dialectic of opposites deteriorating into a pathology of various kinds, for example the coloured people of South Africa and the African-Americans (p. 142).

Based on the above-mentioned cultural contact zones, I would like to make the following observations: Firstly, in essentialising cultural contact zones, differences are maintained and there is a divergent orientation of cultural contact. Cultures remain the same after contact. This seems to prove the view of the advocates of divergence that no amount of contact can cancel cultural difference. Secondly, in alternating cultural contacting zones, there is convergence and divergence, but still cultural difference is maintained. Thirdly, in converting cultural contact zones, there is a proclivity towards contact with the creation of new culture while the old cultures are displaced or replaced, but I would argue that difference is maintained. Fourthly, in hybridising cultural contact zones, there is tolerance for coexistence and for the mutual development of cultures through contact. Lastly, in innovating cultural contact zones, there is what is referred to above as crossvergence, a deliberate adaptation of the cultures to produce a new or hybridised culture. But even in this type of contact zone one cannot speak about the absence of cultural difference or of a cultureless system.

It is in these diverse contact zones described above that Montuori and Stephenson identify the creativity of diversity (2012:190). According to them, cultural hybridisation theories explore cultural fluidity emphasised in cosmopolitan discourses. By that I mean multicultural

discourse. They see this as a process of adaptation, fusion and transformation occurring when various cultures interact with or contact each other. Montuori and Stephenson (*ibid*:190) further assert that cultural interaction usually results in cultural transformation of both interacting cultures and groups. Although cultural diversity is situated in a context of contention and conflict, Montuori and Stephenson argue that human history has not necessarily been about one continuous cultural war, appropriation and oppression. They claim that there were moments of representation of exchanges, hybridisations and creativities of cultural contact and human diversity (*ibid*:192). They see in cultural contact the emergence of innovative and creative contact spaces, for example, many traditional dishes and traditional condiments, jazz music, complementary forms of medicine and hybridised political theories, to mention just a few (Montuori& Stephenson *ibid*:192).

3.2.4. Levels of cultural hybridisation

In contrast, Kwok-Bun and Peverreli (2012:146) perceive the emergence of a new model with its own levels of hybridisation, from cultural hybridisation and social integration theory. The model is new because of the levels of hybridisation that investigate the extent of hybridisation. The old model of hybridisation only looked at mixture without looking at the degree or extent of that mixture, and the whole mixture was lumped together as one impurity. These levels of cultural hybridisation have the capacity to explain the way culture is amalgamated and applied to various cultural entanglement backgrounds. They say that during cultural interaction, there will be four levels of cultural hybridisation, namely partial hybridisation, secondary hybridisation, functional and dysfunctional hybridisation and degrees of hybridisation.

At the partial hybridisation level, hybridisation is not equal. One finds that in some groups there is more hybridisation than in others due to the contexts of the actors. There are a limited number of interactions among the role players in the social interaction continuum. The ‘us-and-them’ attitude is very strong, and foreign practises are only learned for information, not for transformation. What is learnt is not practised. The role players are not ready to accept other cultural practices, and there is resistance to practices that seem to be in conflict with local cultural practices.

In secondary hybridisation, there is no interaction with foreigners except through the hybridised local groups, for example, a local theological student from an English-

medium university or an English-medium Bible College, who comes back home to pastor local church that has never encountered English in their entire lives. A primary hybridised local person interacts with a non-hybridised local person. Secondary hybridisation is an unintentional occurrence with the primary hybridised person volunteering to explain the practices of the foreign culture. Being hybridised is viewed as a source of identity.

The functional hybridisation level is when hybridisation is a positive way of interaction. It means that whatever hybridisation interaction occurs amongst the subjects, the result is that there is a positive assimilation of this interaction. There is acceptance of what is happening. Dysfunctional hybridisation is when hybridisation results in a negative way of interaction, when the outcomes of the interaction are not positively assimilated. The hybridisation is rejected and nothing positive really occurs during the interaction.

At the level of degrees of hybridisation, one would encounter a social interaction that leads to an exchange of cognitive matter between actors participating in the interaction. Some ideas and perceptions are exchanged, and they become part of the participants. The resultant interaction can lead to a near complete hybridisation or no hybridisation at all. The reason is that in this level, the hybridization ranges from zero on the interaction continuum to a positive number. At level zero there is interaction, but nothing really happens. Yet from point one on the interaction continuum onwards, there are degrees of hybridisation (Kwok-Bun & Peverreli 2012:146–147).

From the theorisation of the aforementioned contact zones and cultural interaction levels, one can safely conclude that there is some degree of creativity that can be expected from such contacts and interactions. The resultant creative impact of cultural contact zones is described in the following section.

3.2.5. The creative impact of cultural hybridisation contact points

In essentialising cultural contact, the assumption is that cultures are closed systems and that, as such, they remain the same on contact, without any crosses or ‘contaminations’ whatsoever.

In alternating cultural contact, there are shifts between identities, with subjects assuming different identities at different times. For example, a student at a university would adopt the

university culture and language and, when going back home, revert to parental and local culture.

In conversion cultural contact, a subject is assimilated into a dominant culture and gives up his/her original identity. This happens during immigration, especially when children are introduced into the different culture at an early age.

In hybridising cultural contact, cultures are viewed as open systems. This kind of contact involves adapting to the conditions of a new culture and is a common existential practice of immigrants. It usually results in different products, different possibilities and the evolution of different tastes. In this regard, Ladele (2009:72) states that,

Identities of individuals, cultures, and even nations, may be defined along sexual lines; that is, male/female, or in gender terms; masculine/feminine, which include all their spiritual, historical, emotional and social configurations.

The following identity issues are affected, to mention just a few: Firstly, personal identity is affected, including issues like being an African, Christian or Black academic, not simply an academic. The second issue that is affected is national identity, for example, South Africa is now a 'rainbow nation', no longer a divided one. Additionally, issues of belonging are affected, as in the example of Marais (2014:2) when he says that he simultaneously belongs to the colonising and the colonised groups.

Innovating cultural contact is a highly speculative form of cultural contact. It involves hybridity, cosmopolitanism, *metissage* and creativity. It is characterised by a focus on the centrality of creativity and interactions. Montuori and Stephenson (2012:195) perceive human history as inundated with cultural contacts that have resulted in various innovations, with examples ranging from the renaissance and the birth of jazz, to the development of hybrid forms of religious and spiritual practices. World history is a history of cultural creativity emanating from cultural contact, but due to the fact that culture is not static, some cultures do change without contact. They change internally through value conversion, which is the replacement of old value systems with new ones. Other such cultures change through value creation, which is the development of new ideas to deal with new situations, or through value connection, which is the development of conceptual links between what was previously thought to be unconnected (Rochon 1998:55–56). But those who favour a closed system of cultural essentialism would like us to believe that cultures are pure and impenetrable, with

cultural contact and interactions playing no role at all. This has led to the propagation of bigoted monocultural understandings of life.

There is a need to develop a broader understanding of cultural interaction, which would require three minimum shifts:

- i. going further than the view of human interaction that is based completely on power
- ii. admitting the essential role of creativity in life and social contact
- iii. learning to think in non-essential ways that account for the complexity of human interaction.

How are these contacts and interactions relevant in conceptualising hybridity for translation or cross-cultural communication? I shall answer this question by first conceptualising the notion of hybridity in translation or cross-cultural communication and, from that conceptualisation, indicate how it is relevant to cross-cultural communication and translation.

3.3. Conceptualisation of hybridity for cross-cultural communication

How does one conceptualise hybridity? Hybridity and a hybrid space can be conceptualised when one imposes homogeneity on other cultures and languages. Yet this homogeneity seems to be absent in any culture, especially when one believes that all cultures are hybrid and that there is no pure culture (Moslund 2010:34). What, then, would be the identities at opposite ends of the hybrid space look like? Are they homogeneous or heterogeneous? Hybridity seems to be a contradictory term, as it implies an assumption of pure identities or culture prior to its existence.

Hybridity is a highly problematic term, because it is used to describe states of cultural fusion and multiplication or amalgamation and doubleness. According to Young (1995:22), hybridity is a doubleness that combines and fuses but also separates and keeps apart. Thus, it produces a contraction and fusion as well as an expansion and doubling of cultures (Moslund 2010:15). It is also heterogeneous, containing multiple voices and languages that clash and fuse. Hybridity can be a force of homogenisation and heterogenisation, with a centripetal direction toward cultural sameness and homogenisation or centrifugally directed toward cultural difference and heterogenisation (Moslund *ibid*:16). Is it possible for people to live together in difference? We live in a world in which it is difficult to differentiate between ‘us’

and 'them'. Ang (2003:2) sees hybridity as an essential concept in our globally mixed-up existence because it centres on problematic entanglements rather than particularistic identities, togetherness-in-difference rather than distinctiveness and simulated apartheid. Therefore, Ang advocates seeing hybridity as a concept that does not allow difference to be absorbed into a hegemonic homogeneity.

According to Ang, hybridity is a theory that tackles and problematises restrictions without obliterating them. It is an unsettling of identities. It is a heuristic or an investigative device for exploring the complex entanglements of essentialised cultures and identities. By that, I mean what people used to believe about identities and cultures, that there are pure identities and cultures, a belief that is not necessarily true. Hybridity produces a sense of cultural permeability and hesitance which is a necessary condition for living together (Ang 2003:7). To find oneself in this complex mess makes one neither truly Western nor authentically African, a coconut of some sort. One is one thing on the outside and another on the inside, and one is accused of being unpatriotic or a sell-out. Hybridity is seen as a destabiliser of cultural power relations and questions the subsequent binaries through boundary-blurring transculturation (Ang *ibid*:9).

This notion of complicated entanglements is aptly applied by Marais (2014:2) when he speaks about his identity. He sees himself as an African with a European ancestry or origin, who has to deal with his hybrid identity. He simultaneously belongs to the colonisers and the colonised. He is searching for himself in Africa and searching for Africa in himself. His identity makes him an enemy of Africa but also a progeny of Africa. What a complicated entanglement he finds himself in, and like Mbeki, although from a different perspective, Marais declares himself an African.

Identities are shaped by a myriad of interrelationships invested with power dynamics. Hybridity challenges us to think for the world as a whole rather than to think of our own myopic particular identities (Ang 2003:11).

3.3.1. Organic hybridity and intentional hybridity

Organic hybridity occurs when difference is unconsciously and slowly incorporated into a culture, causing a slow change over a long period. Intentional hybridity, in contrast, occurs when cultural incorporation is done consciously and at high speed (Moslund 2010:21).

3.3.1.1. The differentiation of hybridity as organic and intentional

How does hybridity work in an already hybrid and heterogeneous context? Hybridity seems to be immersed in spaces that are already mixed, heteroglot and changing. When differentiated, it yields multiple forms of cultural hybridity and heterogeneity (Moslund 2010:37). When hybridity is differentiated, one discovers organic/unconscious hybridity and intentional/conscious hybridity. An example of organic hybridity can be found in the evolution of languages through unconscious borrowings of words from other languages, thus making all borrowing languages hybrid. In this instance, new words are domesticated. Intentional hybridity is an ironic double consciousness, a deliberate collision of various points of view, resulting in a contesting form of hybridity (Moslund *ibid*:37). Moslund perceives translation as an operation of incorporating difference into a structure of sameness, as a domesticating difference that turns a foreign text into one's own text by constantly effacing difference in the continuity of the culture of sameness. He sees the speed of transforming transcultural discourse as directly proportional to the discontinuation of radical cultural sameness or the survival of difference in cultural translation (Moslund *ibid*:21).

3.3.1.2. Domestication of difference in organic hybridity

Culture is not something that is fixed or homogeneous; it is a heterogeneous system in a state of perpetual transformation and becoming (Moslund 2010:49). The domestication of difference in organic hybridity is achieved through the process of translation, which grows the target culture without completely eradicating difference or leaving sameness unaffected. This translation inevitably results in a hybridisation between a foreign and a local code. It results in muted or opaque hybridity. Although in this interaction, mutual influence and contamination occur in the act of translation, it is still an asymmetrical exchange, guaranteeing continuity with only a minor and gradual alteration of what constitutes sameness within the translating culture (Moslund *ibid*:53). Difference is never cancelled in organic hybridity; it only disappears from view or from the surface (Moslund *ibid*:55).

It is possible to draw the following conclusions on the conceptualisation of organic hybridity (Moslund 2010:64):

- i. Organic hybridity negates the notion of simple opposition between difference as becoming and sameness as being. It shows that there is difference and becoming in sameness.

- ii. In organic hybridity, there is a continual subjection of newness to conscious, semiconscious and subconscious acts of translation.
- iii. Difference continues to be part of sameness and continues to change sameness.
- iv. Sameness and its codifications are continually affected by modified speeds of difference.
- v. With regard to cultural contact or translation, one cannot speak of fixed being an opposition to becoming, but only of a slow becoming.
- vi. Recognising the existence of organic hybridity in all cultures negates any notion of absolute sameness or absolute purity because of the existence of the discourse of difference.
- vii. In organic hybridity there is therefore no such thing as a pure, unchanging homogeneity, no fixed idea of being but an idea of slow becoming.

3.3.1.3. Forces of sameness and difference in intentional hybridity

Intentional hybridity is a conspicuous and consciously voiced form of hybridity, which is often expressed in hyphenated identities (Moslund 2010:66). Missionaries and their converts are characterised by hyphenated identities: reformed-Christian, protestant-Christian, catholic-Christians or African-Pentecostals. Intentional hybridity is achieved in two principal ways: The first is by asserting difference and the second, by de-territorialising sameness (Moslund *ibid*:66). A pluralist hybrid subject incorporates several cultural identities, and this is what is seen in Mbeki's speech or poem, 'I am an African'.

In hyphenated identities, hybridity is expressed by the hyphen. Although it is a small dash between identities, it constitutes a limitless third space, a third space of suspension between de-territorialisation and re-territorialisation, never touching ground on either side of the hyphen. This is how I sometimes feel as a missionary; I am neither here or there.

3.3.1.4. Different speeds of difference in intentional hybridity

Intentional hybridity can release difference in a text (Moslund 2010:78). As a hyphenated discourse, it has its heteroglossia and groundlessness infused with monoglossia and centripetal forces of re-territorialisation. Hyphenated identities have asymmetrical power

relations in which the hyphen is affected by the same asymmetry, rendering the hyphen hierarchical (Moslund 2010:79). Intentional hybridity is the perception of one language by another language because in order to incorporate another language into another, the incorporator must incorporate it from a certain understanding. The highlighting of hybrid identities in hyphenated discourses covers up many differences, heterogeneities, hybridities and becomings by implying categories of an identity and another identity.

Although I have argued above that one needs to go beyond views of interaction based on domination, I do not believe one can ignore this premise and be taken seriously. The notion that one needs to go beyond assumes beginning somewhere. So I suggest that the beginning of the conceptualisation of hybridity should start with addressing the asymmetrical power dynamics of human interaction. Secondly, the notion of pure originals should be rejected as they are unfounded. Hybridity should be conceptualised from a ubiquitous contaminated space, with no culture or language regarded as pure or superior. Thirdly, the pull and push factors of difference and sameness should be acknowledged, with a pull towards sameness producing homogeneity and the pull towards difference producing heterogeneity. Fourthly, I suggest that hybridity should be employed as a heuristic tool for exploring hybrid spaces and thus empower those who are doing the exploration. Fifthly, the two above-mentioned capacities of hybridity must be researched and possible outcomes published so that the field of hybrid studies does not stagnate in past epistemologies. And lastly, the two types of hybridisation, intentional and organic, should be embraced and further explored.

3.4. Hybridity and cultural translation

How does hybridity relate to translation, to postcolonial translation in particular? Young (2011:1), in a paper on cultural translation and hybridity, tries to find out how hybridity is related to cultural translation. Cultural translation seeks to determine what happens to cultures in the process of translation. How does the process of postcolonial translation accommodate cultural translation in its theories? What is the model of cultural translation? Firstly, I shall argue that cultural translation is different from the translation of a written text, that it involves cultural exchange, dialogue and negotiation that involve knowledge transformation and cultural respect. My second argument will be that cultural translation involves a conceptual expansion of the different cultures involved that renders cultural translation a reciprocal process (Young *ibid*:12).

In essence, cultures are not holistic, authentic and static, timeless entities, but are syncretistic, hybrid and time-bound, transformative mishmashes (Young 2011:15). Translation, on the other hand, is a transient, transitory experiment, which is never fully achieved. Young (*ibid*:20) argues that cultures and languages share the same fluidity, mobility and mixing. Both are transitory, syncretistic and mixed. This makes cultural translation a double edged needle that pricks both the garment and the tailor. By this I mean that in the process of cultural translation, both the translating and translated culture suffer the same consequences (Young *ibid*:23).

Cultural translation moves beyond the concept of viewing translations as texts and focuses on the general cultural process instead of the finite linguistic product (Pym 2010:147). This kind of translation occurs when cultural boundaries are crossed in the hybrid space.

Young (2011:24) concludes by saying that cultural translation begins when certain elements of the source culture have no exact equivalents in the target culture and where individual cultural differences are untranslatable and the translation has failed. Secondly, he states that cultural translation mediates between specific non-equivalent entities. Thirdly, it causes the target culture to translate itself into the foreign idiom of the source culture, thus affecting understanding. Fourthly, cultural translation is foreignising and partial, as it deals with the untranslatable and inserts it into the target culture. And lastly, cultural translation is an oxymoron dealing with the impossibility of translation.

3.5. Implications of hybridity to postcolonial mission

Scholars, missiologists, academics and theorists all seem to be making the clarion call for transformed thinking in all spheres of knowledge generation. It is a call to liberate knowledge and knowledge generation from their entanglement with the past (Ingleby 2006:1). Ingleby (*ibid*:1) is of the opinion that past knowledge generation is trapped in the dualism of us and them, with people's identities emphasising their difference. He proposes that there is a need in mission thinking to develop ways of cross-cultural interaction and community construction that obliterate the common existing oppositions and create newness in the process (Ingleby *ibid*:1).

Historically, there are scant intellectual resources to enable the construction of such a community. In the past, people were either neighbours or aliens. Neighbours could venture

into our social space as friends and be accommodated, aliens as enemies to be repelled or guests to be assimilated (Ingleby 2006:1).

Aliens have invaded our social spaces and it seems they are here to stay. We have no choice but face these intruders in our social space. Because we do not understand them, they confuse us and cause us to develop proteophobia – the dislike of that which confuses us. But according to Ingleby, confusion makes communities thrive more than certainty does (2006:1).

The anthropophagic and anthropoemic strategy of communities are the result of our fear of what confuses us and what we cannot control. The problem is that this is as a result of ‘the Fall’. Since our cultures are fallen, there seems to be no hope of a peaceful world within the dispensation of ‘The Fall’. This is because by its nature and character, hybridity is a confronting concept that unsettles identities and that confronts and problematises boundaries without erasing them. There are perceptions that one is normal and others are exotic in both the Western and non-Western mind-sets. In the West, it is recorded as such, and with the rest of the world, it is found within our systems of thinking. In the kingdom of God, Christians should treat each other as equals for the purpose of knowing themselves as the Christian community. We will be able to learn from each other if we change the present power and fear relations to relations of equality and love (Ingleby 2006:2).

Ingleby (2006:2) suggests that the best way of accommodating our differences is through the creation of in-between spaces by accepting hybridity. Hybridity rejects a cosmopolitan universalism and particularistic multiculturalism (Ingleby *ibid*:2). Ingleby asserts that this third space is more about identification than it is about identity, where identification is not about me and another who is the other, different from me. When this happens, there is a notion of non-sovereignty with regard to cultural identities. My culture becomes just another culture among other cultures. This throws us into the ‘Lion’s den of uncertainty’ with which we are not comfortable (Ingleby *ibid*:2). As human beings, we need certainty and this where essentialism has its origins. We not only need certainty but we also thrive and survive on essentialism. The issue is that even though we are essentialist in our perceptions, we need to acknowledge the existence of hybridity in ourselves. I am stating this not to prescribe it to anyone, but merely as fact of life that needs to be acknowledged. What people do with that fact is up to them.

Christianity, just like culture, is found in in-between spaces. These are places of negotiation and translation, completely different from what we know. For missiology, this kind of in-between space means that as a missionary, the spread of the gospel in the 21st century should be negotiated with those one reaches. This means that one cannot treat those that one reaches as ‘clean slates’, people who have absolutely no knowledge of God. There is a potential in this space of negotiation and translation to create the multicultural mission teams that are the desire of many. The biblical text speaks of a situation where there is neither a Jew nor a Greek. The question is, what is there then? If one is neither a Jew nor a Greek, who or what is one? This concept of neither/nor identities challenges the notion of mission to homogeneous units, which is very inadequate in today’s globalised world because it is premised on cultural purity, which is not a reality of life.

The accusation that ‘these are they that turn the world upside down’ is true of hybridity and the kingdom of God. Hybridity challenges cultural and linguistic orthodoxy. It appears as a heretical notion but so is the kingdom of God. It is heretical with regard to nationalism and world religions since it is always turning the world of nationalism and world religions upside down (Ingleby 2006:3).

Hybridity embraces issues of identity. According to postcolonial discourse, cultural identity is a human construct (Ingleby 2006:3). This makes the third space important if one has a confused identity due to living between cultures. One can easily construct or negotiate one’s culture. This concept of negotiated or constructed culture is indicative of the fact that culture is not perfect, that systems of knowledge are imperfect and cluttered (Ingleby *ibid*:3). From all this flotsam and jetsam of human culture, we find a cultural-flotsam-and-jetsam-heap which denies the purity of any culture, as I have argued above. The idea of thoroughbred cultures is without substance when faced with such understanding. As Bevans and Schroeder (2004:348) argue, the church that is founded on the self-emptying and saving God cannot think of itself as culturally superior to those to whom it ministers. Therefore, mission should proceed from dialogical humility, but this should be bold humility, according to David Bosch (1991:489)

The above-mentioned argument calls for the creation of a new identity, especially in the church, a negotiated identity that is spiritual or religious, like Codesa. In this negotiation, the recipients of the gospel message are given the space to create a new identity for themselves as

equals, not subordinates, and no culture is seen as superior to others. The identity that comes to mind here is an individual's identity in the community of the Kingdom of God.

3.6. The description of the kingdom of God

Jesus began to build the kingdom by creating a community of disciples or learners. This is very important in the sense that disciples are not experts but pilgrims. The metaphors of the kingdom suggested by Ingleby (2006:7) are as follows: (1) the picture of a house falling, (2) the idea of neighbourliness and (3) the idea of fruitfulness.

In the picture of a house falling it implies that those who are offered the new kingdom or membership in the new community reject it. They refuse the terms of entry. They do not want to forsake their old patterns of interpreting the kingdom. In every generation and in every culture, Jesus is calling people from their traditions and their interpretations of those traditions. Ingleby (2006:7) calls these traditions colonialism and globalisation. He says that the house of colonialism and globalisation are falling apart because of their unjust wealth, superior attitude and determination to rule others and to be in control.

Ingleby's (2006:7) second idea of neighbourliness can be redefined by saying that it includes egalitarianism, communal dependence and affirmation and the promotion of diversity in the kingdom. He says that in the kingdom, we discover ourselves by knowing and loving God through the experience of loving the neighbour who is the image of God.

One's neighbour in this context could be the marginalised colonised people who are minoritised and made subservient with no voice of their own. It can be those who speak through somebody else's language, those who love and worship God with a strange tongue in the land of their own tongue. These people must be given a space where they can worship and serve God in their own cultural context.

Lastly, the image of fruitfulness refers to the fact that the gospel must bear fruit everywhere it goes. It must bear fruit in the language and culture of the recipients. The most vulnerable must be served. Their culture and linguistic vulnerability must be served through recognition and use. Abundant life can never be exactly that in a foreign tongue and in a foreign space; it must be in a space with which one is familiar or with which one is negotiating to be familiar.

3.7. Conclusion

I began this chapter by investigating the relevance of hybridity in postcolonial translation in South Africa. Hybridity, if understood and applied correctly in our current globalised world, can be of benefit. Based on the premise that mission communication is cross-cultural and as such hybrid, hybridity would be a relevant tool for mission communication. Hybridity would assist in the process of identification similar to the Pauline strategy mentioned earlier. It would also assist with allowing all communities to participate in the saving grace and mission of God. New conceptualisations of hybridity, mission communication and mission practice should be developed by all involved in this encounter. Furthermore, those new understandings of cultural interactions and contact points should be researched. Hybridity is a heuristic tool for marginalised languages to challenge the reductionist perceptions and representations of marginalised and formerly dominated communities. Hybridity should not be understood as an essentialising concept but rather as a space in a continuum of homogeneity and heterogeneity. Hybridity does not deal with what is fixed but focuses on what is becoming, and this becoming should be explored and the results of these explorations should be made available in the academic space and other social spaces.

CHAPTER 4

POSTCOLONIAL AFRICAN PENTECOSTAL LITURGY

4.1. Introduction

A postcolonial hybrid subaltern missionary finds him/herself in an intellectual quagmire, especially when he/she tries to intellectually address or critique some African theologies. The problem is that my theological training is Western and South African Indian. For my diploma, I studied at an Indian theological institution of the Full Gospel Church of God and am completing my university education at the University of the Free State. The question then arises of how I am expected to deal with the following liturgical developments in South Africa: Some unorthodox liturgical practices have developed among Pentecostals and Charismatics. These practices concern the various uses of mediums in liturgy and the healing ministry. They include the use of blessed cloths by Ernest Angley, the sale of angelic figurines by Robert Schuller, the sale of precious stones by Benny Hinn, the use and sale of anointing water by T.B. Joshua and the use and sale of faith water to cure AIDS and many other diseases by Bishop Nala. Bishop Zondo, who sells anointing oil, holy water and candles charges ordinary people R80 for such a package, while for business people, it costs R1500. Framed pictures of Rev. Modise, who is known as the incarnation of the Holy Spirit, are sold to the members of the IPCC. These pictures are then hanged in people's houses to protect them from evil spirits. Additionally and more recently, a Pretoria pastor, Lesego Daniel, ordered his congregation to eat grass in order for them to be closer to God (Reilly 2014:1).

Anderson's (2000:xvii) view concerning the above is that literature on Christian mission is biased towards the activity of Western-based mission. He says that most of the discussion of African missions is dominated by epistemologies that come from European imperialism. African initiatives on mission or recipients' perspective about mission are given little attention. Therefore, it would sometimes be difficult to provide an authoritative answer regarding these questions, especially when one thinks about indigenising the Christian faith. But I cannot stop wondering about these developments, so I believe it is necessary to ask the following questions:

Are these new postcolonial epistemologies simply biblical aberrations or interpretations of scripture? How biblically accurate is the sale of oil for exorcism and warding off evil spirits?

Is this the resurfacing of the superstition of the medieval era? I believe that these questions deserve answers and in this chapter I shall attempt to answer some of these questions from the background of my religious tradition.

The present dissertation is about the translation of a Pentecostal pastoral liturgy book, but liturgy is common to all Christian traditions. Therefore, my focus will be on investigating the development of pastoral liturgy in the church of Jesus Christ. As a Pentecostal missionary, this study will be carried out against a Pentecostal missiological background.

This chapter will be structured as follows: Firstly, I shall highlight the implications of postcoloniality and hybridity on African Pentecostal epistemologies. Secondly, I shall attempt to answer the question, ‘What is liturgy?’ In this attempt, I shall trace the etymological origin of the word, how it developed its current meaning and its postcolonial usage. I shall also provide a working definition for this study and highlight the communal nature of liturgy and the necessity of theological integrity for practising liturgy. I shall highlight the involvement of God in the liturgy. I shall then present a synoptic overview of the historical and cultural background of the liturgy through the following periods: early church, late antiquity, medieval, reformation, post-reformation, rationalist, revivalist, romantic, modern and postmodern. I shall attempt to highlight how the liturgy has adapted itself in various cultures and historical periods. Thirdly, I shall discuss the background of Pentecostalism and its theologies. This discussion will include the definition of Pentecostalism, its main emphasis, its various movements, problems of researching Pentecostal liturgy, characteristics of Pentecostal thought, method and practice, Pentecostal norms as opposed to Catholicism and Protestantism, Pentecostal liturgy and types Pentecostalism in South Africa. Lastly I shall conduct an investigation into the nature and characteristics of postmodern Pentecostal liturgy with a focus on the inculturation of liturgy in a postmodern world and the challenges of postmodern liturgical inculturation in Pentecostal thought and practice.

4.2. Definition of liturgy

Liturgy does not occur in vacuum. It has a history and a cultural context in which it is practised. It is also within this particular historical and cultural context and theological tradition that an individual is developed. I, for one, have been formed in an ecumenical tradition that includes the traditions of Catholicism, Protestantism and Pentecostalism. Thus, my engagement with the present topic is from that ecumenical background.

The word 'liturgy' is a relatively modern word in Western theology (Martimort *et al.* 1987:7). In the 18th century, the Latin adjective *liturgicus* and noun *liturgia* acquired a new meaning that referred to the entire cultic activity of the church. In the Greek Church, as well as from the Middle Ages and later periods, the noun *leitourgia* and its related terms *leitourgos* and *leitourgikos* referred solely to the Eucharist celebration (Martimort *et al.* *ibid*:8). In classical Greek, the word *leitourgia* meant 'public work' (Senn 2012:5). The Septuagint, meanwhile, reserved *leitourgein* and its derivatives to describe the activity of the Levites or the service rendered by a priest in a temple. This Septuagint meaning was carried over to the New Testament with regard to Zechariah's service and Christ's high priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary (Senn *ibid*:5). In the Book of Acts 13:2, the word refers to the worship of the church. According to the above understanding, it is clear that the Christian usage of the word liturgy is independent of the religious vocabulary of Hellenism (Martimort *et al.* 1987:8).

Liturgy is one of those concepts that evade definition as it cannot be reduced to concepts but is a living thing that can only be understood through participation. Martimort *et al.* (1987:9) assert that any attempt at defining liturgy would be inadequate, but what one can do is try to explain the activity. They further give the following explanation of the liturgy: Firstly, the liturgy is a sacred sign with its visible elements being efficacious signs of the supernatural reality, thus making it a mystery. Secondly, the liturgy is a divine and ecclesiastical exchange, which means that in its actions, the church directs prayer, petition, worship and adoration towards God and He responds with redemptive graces to the church. Thirdly, the liturgy can be true only if it is located in the economy of salvation. Thus, it belongs to Christians who are authorised by their baptism to take part in the liturgy and the life of the church under the guidance of ministers (Martimort *et al.* *ibid*:12). According to Jones, Wainwright and Yarnold (1980:16) this means that the liturgy makes the paschal mystery of Christ present in word, symbol and sacrament so that those who celebrate it may encounter Christ. This group of Christians is called the assembly, translated from the word *ekklesia*, which means 'a called out gathering'.

It is clear then that the liturgy is the communal and public practice of the church or the vehicle for performing public worship to God (Senn 2012:5; Jones *et al.* 1980:25). Frank C. Senn states that the liturgy can only be perceived and practised in well-planned public rituals of the church (*ibid*:5). Although liturgy and worship are translated as having a common and

interchangeable meaning, they are different. Liturgy, as indicated above, has to do with communal and public ministrations, and worship has to do with the honour and praise accorded to God individually or communally in the public assembly or in worldly activity (Senn *ibid*:5). Thus, the liturgy is the standardised order of religious service which includes the following: gathering for worship, the interactions of prescribed and non-prescribed procedures as well as parting or exiting activities. All of the aforementioned implies that the liturgy is everything that the assembly does when it gathers to do public work before God and the world (Senn *ibid*:6).

There is a biblical injunction that the liturgy must be ‘done decently and in order’, which, according to Senn (2012:8–9), means that it must be theologically grounded and communally sensitive. There must be a theological integrity in doing liturgy. He continues to assert that order means that there is an order to be followed, a progression of activities that gives the liturgy shape. Ministers must also be chosen by the assembly to exercise leadership roles and to involve all those present in the liturgy.

Having said that, even as a postcolonial Pentecostal, I do not find any justification for the selling of consecrated oil in order to ward off demons or exorcise someone. Buying a picture of a pastor or being commanded to eat grass to access divine power cannot be said to be a theologically sound liturgical exercise. I also do not think that it can be said to be a postcolonial African theological liturgical perspective. The reason is that I believe in the priesthood of all believers and that all people have access to God through prayer. Therefore, no one can justify praying over olive oil or a picture, or calling these items holy and sell them for R1500 to strengthen and protect assets of those who buy them. For those who buy such items, it is just a superstitious exercise, and for those who sell them, it is just a fundraising and self-promotion exercise. Even when subalterns regain their voices, those voices must be biblically sound. Therefore, the use of mediums should be approached with caution in the liturgy. Christians’ faith should be in Christ, not in things.

My view is confirmed to by Anderson’s (2000:42) research in which he describes a number of findings. Firstly, Pentecostals are consistently opposed to traditional spiritual practices like consulting diviners and making ritual killings for ancestors. Secondly, they reject the use of symbolic objects like staffs, holy water, ropes and papers in their ministry to others.

How does one then discern the meaning in liturgy? In an answer to that question, Frank C. Senn (2012:14) says that the liturgy is a symbolic activity and a whole symbolic system. This creates problems because symbols are complex. Unlike signs, they do not have one meaning but accrue meaning from context and sacred texts in religion. Thus, the meaning of symbols and symbolic systems are best when they are derived from a text, object or symbolic activity but not imposed from outside.

Furthermore, Martimort *et al.* (1987:87) have the following to say about the liturgy:

The liturgy is a set of institutions that can be described, studied and compared with other institutions by jurists, sociologists and historians. At the same time, it is a mystery because God is present and gives Himself therein, in other words it is a supernatural reality which is grasped only by faith and on which reflection is possible only by using a method of theology.

In the context of postcoloniality and hybridity, this means that the liturgy is not confined to the church and its activities. It is a natural and supernatural phenomenon that encounters other cultures. The implication is that the liturgy will be hybrid in nature. Although the liturgy is a service rendered for public good, it is also a service that God undertakes for the good of his creation, especially his human creation. Although human beings perform liturgical rites, the sacraments are God's acts performed by human beings on behalf of Christ (Senn 2012:15; Jones *et al.* 1980:7). This means that church liturgy is Divine Liturgy because God acts in his word and in the sacraments of Christ to reconcile humanity with Him.

4.2.1. The relationship between liturgy and culture through the ages

Liturgy has been exposed to various cultural influences throughout the ages. For the purpose of this study, I shall single out a few of these influences for each period discussed below to indicate the process of inculturation and the evolution of the liturgy.

In early antiquity, the liturgy was influenced by Judaism and Hellenism. The idea of gathering on a fixed day every week for reading and expounding scripture and that of celebrating annual festivals comes from Judaism. The Greco-Roman world, with its pervasive Hellenistic culture, influenced Christianity and Judaism alike. Roman bathing technology influenced the practice of baptism. The manumission of slaves influenced the custom of the

laying on of hands. Roman wedding and burial customs influenced the Christian practice of similar events (Senn 2012:31).

In late antiquity, the granting of special privileges to bishops shaped the ceremonial entrance rites seen in the Roman Catholic Church (Senn 2012:31). In the early Middle Ages, the emperor had a say in the organisation of the liturgy and in the appointment of liturgists. The emperor would appoint someone to the office or sell it to anyone who was loyal to him, and the bishop would crown the emperor who appointed him. Thus, the liturgy became a state law enforced by civil authorities (Senn *ibid*:33). During the late Middle Ages, the architecture of the day influenced church architecture. The main influence was Gothic architecture. One characteristic practice was that of saying prayers for the dead, which is still practised in Catholicism today, and the establishment of burial societies for decent funerals, which has become part of the traditions of South African township communities (Senn *ibid*:34).

During the reformation, the printed word assisted in the spread of written liturgy. This led to the introduction of benches in churches, because people would need them in order to sit and read or listen to a homily. They were also used for the storage of reading materials for lay people. In this period, worship became a rational exercise rather than a spiritual one (Senn 2012:34). In the post-reformation period, Baroque architecture and music became the main influences in church architecture and music (Senn *ibid*:35).

In the enlightenment period, rationalism entered the liturgical arena, and preachers were urged to inculcate practical virtues rather than dogmatic propositions. Worship was more about the edification of the congregation than the exaltation of God (Senn 2012:35)

The revivalism period, in contrast, saw the liturgy as something that appealed to the heart, and religion became intensely personal. The congregation became emotionally involved in their faith. No longer passive listeners, they joined in the singing and interjected ‘amens and hallelujahs’ during the sermon (Senn 2012:36).

Romanticism was a revolt against the aristocratic social and political norms of the day and an attempt to retrieve and restore old forms and styles of liturgical celebration. In contrast, modernity was an age in which public participation was propagated, and this spilled over to people participating in their liturgy. New technologies were employed, and they changed the way people worshipped. In the modern era, cultural liturgical resources were shared by many, making local assemblies cross-cultural assemblies. This includes, for example, the singing of

Vine songs and Hillsong worship songs across the globe in Pentecostal and Charismatic churches (Senn 2012:38).

With this historical background, there arises a very pertinent question: ‘How can the church adapt the strategies of relating liturgy to culture?’ The structuring of a relationship between liturgy and culture is a perennial pastoral concern. The postmodern individual participates in several cultures simultaneously. He/she has to deal with national culture, regional culture, racial culture, local culture, ethnic culture, family culture and religious culture. Thus, when one says that liturgy must be culturally relevant, to which culture is one referring?

In an attempt to answer the above-mentioned questions, I propose that because liturgy is an expression of religious belief, it should be religiously relevant. Having said that, liturgy cannot and must not ignore the cultures of the world in which it is practiced. The strategic relationship between Christianity and culture is very complex and has various patterns and outcomes. H.R. Niebuhr (1951:190–229) identified five relationships between Christianity and culture, namely Christ against culture, Christ of culture, Christ above culture, Christ and culture in paradox and Christ the transformer of culture. These relationships have been tested through the passage of time, and each of them has advantages and disadvantages. In missionary circles, these issues loom large and are a field of fierce contestation.

According to the 1996 Lutheran World Federation Study of Worship and Culture, there are four major ways in which culture relates to liturgy. Firstly, liturgy is transcultural, which shows that the church is a global phenomenon. Secondly, it is contextual, which means that it is able to adopt and adapt natural or cultural symbols of local communities. Thirdly, it is countercultural, since it envisions an alternative worldview and lifestyle. And lastly, it is cross-cultural, employing cultural expressions from different cultures.

Therefore, in an attempt to answer the question I posed about ‘how the church adapt can the strategies of relating liturgy to culture, I suggest that firstly, the church should adopt and adapt all these strategies in an attempt to express all these above-mentioned cultural characteristics simultaneously. Secondly, the liturgical practices of the church must be relevant to local faith communities. Thirdly, liturgy must be rooted in the culture of the people (Senn 2012:38).

Having dealt with liturgy as a concept, its definition and its historical background, I deem it necessary to also give a background of Pentecostalism and its various theologies. Firstly, this

background is important because Pentecostalism, as a Christian tradition, is an enigma to many and sometimes confusing to Pentecostals themselves. Secondly, Pentecostalism is predominantly the religion of subalterns and a resistance faith in Third World countries. Thirdly, it is different in the Occident, Orient, Africa and the South. I hope that the synoptic overview below will at least remove some of the confusion surrounding Pentecostalism. The following section will be a brief discussion of the nature and characteristics of the Pentecostal movement.

4.2.2. The implications of postcoloniality and hybridity on African Pentecostal epistemologies

In my discussion of postcolonialism in Chapter One, I highlighted the dominance of English, and I identified its promotion of an Anglo-American view of life and resulting discrimination, marginalisation and exclusion of indigenous languages as something to be curbed. I also indicated that the continuous and incremental use of English threatens indigenous languages with extinction through linguistic functional disempowerment. Furthermore, translation could be one of the tools employed to curb the dominance of English.

As a missiologist, I also highlighted the fact of the entrapment of missiology in colonising epistemologies. These epistemologies perpetuate Western protocols of knowledge at the expense of indigenous knowledge systems and result in the disempowerment of indigenous languages and cultures. They propagate and endorse colonial behaviours and Western superiority complexes. They focus on conversion rather than conversation with the prospective converts. This has led to the modern church being complicit in cultural colonisation through its missionary projects. This needs to be corrected by advocating the celebration of pluralities of cultures, languages, theologies and missiologies. This is not something new, because the church has always adapted its message to cultures it encountered, as indicated previously.

The above-mentioned correction would lead to empowering epistemologies that stem from target cultures questioning source cultures. When a target culture or text questions the source culture or text, it inadvertently removes it from its source environment to the target environment. It thus allows target or recipient cultures to take ownership of the text. This removal and taking ownership result in target language speakers becoming arbiters of their

own destiny. In the process of prising and taking ownership of the source text, the gospel is inculturated into the target culture.

It should be categorically stated that Christian converts through the ages were never proselytes who abandoned their beliefs, customs and traditions and adopted those of others. Rather, they were converts who only took a turn and moved in a different direction. Most members of Western Christianity were not proselytised but were converts to Christianity (Kalu 2008:191). The theological methodology of Christianity has always been a product of a philosophical construct of the receiving culture. This calls for African theologies to incorporate African or indigenous metaphysics in their formulation, which would require the contextualisation and incarnation of the Christian liturgy.

Contextualisation would assist to un-gag the muted voices of subaltern theologies. Contextualisation seeks to incarnate the message of Christ into the tongues, traditions and thoughts of all people by means of diverse cultural expressions. The understanding that no structure of reflection, individual categories, cultural expression, human words, art or symbols can fully capture the being of God renders all contextual understanding non-absolute expressions of truth.

Postcoloniality and contextualisation are both critical destabilisers of dominating Western epistemologies. They advocate the creation of subaltern intellectual spaces to destabilise dominant discourses. They say that all voices must be heard. It is within subaltern intellectual spaces that hybridity would assist postcolonial translators to generate new or empowering epistemologies.

In Chapter Two, the emphasis was on the Pentecostal Christian perspective conceptualised in a hybrid space that resulted in cross-cultural and linguistic contact. Paul's identification strategy for propagating the gospel would be relevant to hybrid postcolonial translators. This strategy of placing oneself within the receiving cultures or languages seems to be a strategy employed by most translators.

I also indicated that postcolonial identities are hybrid identities and that this fact negated the essentialist homogeneous identities of African people and cultures. This also made religious identities hybrid, and as a consequence, liturgies were also perceived as being hybrid. Human identities, from time immemorial, were affected by constant mobility that moved and mixed languages, cultures and people, thus rendering almost all cultures and human identities

hybrid. With this kind of mixture arises concepts like forced assimilation, internalised self-rejection, political co-optation, social conformism, cultural mimicry and creative transcendence.

I also established the fact that social interaction leads to the exchange of cognitive matter between actors participating in the interaction with the following hybridisations: partial, secondary, functional and dysfunctional.

I also argued that cultural contact results several cultural contact zones: essentialising, alternating, conversion, hybridising and innovating. The process of Christian hybridisation in colonised communities has been both organic and intentional hybridisation.

Translation results in hybridisation between foreign and local codes. There is interaction, mutual influence, contamination and outside interference. As stated in Chapter Three, organic hybridity negates the idea of opposition between difference as becoming and sameness as being. It continually subjects newness to conscious, semiconscious and subconscious acts of translation. Organic hybridity seems to be present in all cultures and it denies the notion of absolute sameness and absolute purity.

Intentional hybridity results in hyphenated identities. Christianity is inundated with these hyphenated identities, as mentioned previously. This is predominantly a reality of Pentecostalism, where there are various kinds of Pentecostalism, as will be seen later in this chapter.

The implications of hybridity to mission is that there must be a transformation of thinking in all spheres of knowledge generation. Another implication is the notion that cultures and systems of knowledge are imperfect and that they are a chaos of calls for dialogical humility. This is a call for new or negotiated identities. The recipients of the gospel message are given a space in which to create a new identity for themselves as equals, not as subordinates.

These negotiated identities must be biblical, in the first place. They must adhere to the terms of entry into the new kingdom, which include forsaking old patterns of interpreting the kingdom. In every generation, Jesus calls people away from their traditions and their interpretations of those traditions. People must be given the opportunity to serve and worship God in their own cultural context. The gospel must bear fruit in the languages and cultures of

those who receive it. Life can only be considered abundant in one's own language and culture, not in a foreign one.

In conclusion, hybridity is relevant for mission communication and liturgy because of the strategy of identification and a new conceptualisation of hybridity. Hybridity is a heuristic tool for marginalised languages to challenge reductionist perceptions and representations. Hybridity is focused on what is becoming.

4.3. Pentecostalism, its definition and its various theological perspectives

According to Lovett (1995a:84), Pentecostalism is a movement that encompasses various denominations professing a belief in Spirit baptism accompanied by various signs, including speaking in tongues, with its historic roots endorsing both the Wesleyan-Arminian and finished work of Calvary orientations. Ogbu Kalu (2008:6) agrees with the above notion, but due to the amoebic character of Pentecostalism, he suggests that one speaks of 'Pentecostals', given the complexities and ironies that inundate the movement. In contrast, Donald Dayton (1987:9) perceives Pentecostalism as a revivalist movement, emphasising charisma, conversion and sanctification. According to him, the movement has a strong Christology, suggesting a personal relationship with Christ and the concept of being born again.

McBride's (1993:1) understanding of Pentecostalism is that of a synthesis of the teachings of the holiness movement, with the key distinctive factor of baptism in the Holy Spirit and speaking in tongues as the initial evidence of being baptised in the Spirit.

Pentecostalism is that movement in the Christian world that teaches that the baptism of the Holy Spirit is a specific experience after regeneration, which is accompanied by speaking in supernatural tongues (Anderson 1992:2).

4.3.1. The background and main emphasis of Pentecostalism

Dennis McBride (1993) argues that to understand the present charismatic movement, one needs to understand the history of Pentecostal thought. McBride (*ibid*:1) states,

Early Pentecostalism was a synthesis of the teachings of the holiness churches and movements, but its key distinctive was the Baptism of the Holy Spirit as evidenced by speaking in tongues.

Schlemmer (2008:12) says that this baptism in or of the Holy Spirit harks back to the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the first Christians in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost or Shavuot (Ac 2–4). Pentecostals believe that those baptised in the Holy Spirit are able to receive supernatural gifts that existed in the early church, such as prophecy, interpretation of strange languages and healing. There is also an emphasis on moral rigour, a literal interpretation of the Bible and a commitment to seek salvation before the Parousia (Schlemmer *ibid*:10). Charles Fox Parham and William Seymour are viewed as central figures in Pentecostalism (McBride 1993:2). The movement emerged in the church's historical scene at the turn of the 20th century, first in Topeka, Kansas, and then in Azusa street in Los Angeles under the leadership of Parham and Seymour respectively. McBride (*ibid*:3–4) argues that the progress of Pentecostalism led to the development of five characteristics (discussed below), which are still prevalent in the classical Pentecostal churches.

The first of these characteristics is Pentecostalism's restorative orientation, in which God is seen as restoring the church to its lost historical power, restoring apostolic authority and power. Its second characteristic is the exaltation of spiritual manifestations. Pentecostals insist on experiencing God in the form of the Holy Spirit. Thirdly, Pentecostalism is characterised by the exaltation of personalities, such as high profile preachers and persons. Fourthly, there is an emphasis on Pentecostal distinctives like healing, baptism of the Holy Spirit, speaking in tongues and the second coming of Christ. Lastly, ecumenical tendencies are a feature of Pentecostalism. It is easy for Pentecostals to work with others, although sometimes for the wrong reasons. They associate with others in order to influence them with the Pentecostal message (McBride 1993:4).

Clark and Lederle (1989:17) add three further characteristics of Pentecostalism, namely a genuine personal encounter with Jesus Christ as saviour, sincere repentance and regeneration of the sinner. The second added characteristic is the revelation of God's power in individuals and communities, where every member is expected to carry the message out to others. Lastly, saved members are expected to manifest a Christian lifestyle that reflects being a disciple of Jesus Christ.

Pentecostals are divided by doctrinal differences and have been unable to form a single coherent movement (Schlemmer 2008:13). Thus, Pentecostalism is not a single movement but is constituted by different movements, all of which have their origins in classical Pentecostalism. This has led to the formation of Pentecostal subtypes and categories, all

placing different emphasis on beliefs and all with different forms of organisation. These subtypes and categories can be broadly be classified as follows: Classical Pentecostalism, Neo-Pentecostalism, the Deliverance Revival Movement, the Latter Day Rain Movement, the Full Gospel Business Men's fellowship, the Charismatic Movement, the Manifested Sons of God, the Positive Confession Movement and the New Charismatics (McBride 1993:3–17).

Schlemmer (2008:11–12) sees the dominant common features of the different types of Pentecostalism as revivalism and fundamentalism. They also share an intense spirituality, expressed in the experience of being born again and the expectation of the supernatural manifestation of God. Pentecostalism also has participative, enthusiastic and spontaneous forms of worship. It is a non-hierarchical and decentralised organisation with high levels of local and individual initiative promoting entrepreneurial motivations and participation by all. Finally, the movement is characterised by a relative accessibility and informality in terms of leadership and ordination, where the main qualifications are Spirit baptism and knowledge of the scriptures.

According to Schlemmer (2008:13), there are some qualifications, however. Some Pentecostal churches are more complex and formal than others, with more developed liturgy, more demanding training and complex governance and ordination. These are predominantly classified under the Classical Pentecostal churches, of which the Full Gospel Church of God is part and of which I am also part.

4.3.2. The various Pentecostal movements and their characteristics

McBride (1993) offers a comprehensive but succinct presentation of the characteristics of the various Pentecostal movements, to which I will adhere in this section. As the characteristics of classical Pentecostalism have been adumbrated above, I shall concentrate on discussion of other movements in the following sections, namely the Neo-Pentecostal Deliverance Revival, the Latter Day Rain Movement, the Manifested Sons of God and the Positive Confession Movement.

4.3.3.1. The Neo-Pentecostal Deliverance Revival

This movement was chiefly spread by independent preachers who were not associated with any Pentecostal denomination. The movement places a great deal of emphasis on the manifestation of the miraculous. Some of its prominent characteristics, according to

Asamoah-Giyadu (2009:38), are a doctrine of salvation that included physical health and healing as part of the complete deliverance of the believer, a central focus on the miraculous, questionable methods and motives of fundraising, questionable teachings of faith that turned God into a God of utility, preoccupation with the satanic realm and spiritual warfare and an anti-intellectual spirit.

4.3.3.2. The Latter Day Rain Movement

In an article by Riss in the *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic movements* (1995:534), this movement is seen as the mid-twentieth century Pentecostal movement. Its theological distinctive, according to Riss (1995:534) includes, inter alia, the following characteristics:

- the restoration of first century truths beginning in the reformation
- the restoration of the fivefold ministry with the restoration of apostles and prophets that makes the fivefold ministry operational in the church
- the importance to the church of spiritual disciplines such as exorcism, fasting and laying on of hands and the restoration of prophecy and personal prophecy
- the immortalisation of all the saints who move in the truth of the Latter Rain restoration and the belief that the unity of faith will be attained before Christ returns
- the teaching that the church is the incarnation of Christ on earth and that all born-again believers in the Latter Rain restoration are the Manifest Sons of God, according to Romans 8:19–22.

4.3.3.3. The Charismatic Movement

This is a movement that penetrated the mainline churches with the Pentecostal message around the 1960s. Its main characteristics are: the notion of experiencing Jesus, spiritual power for godly living and contemporary worship. These reinforce other Pentecostal characteristics like praying in the spirit, experiencing new revelations and emphasising the preaching of the word of God. Members of this movement are also evangelistic, which means that they always reach out to communities by preaching the gospel (McBride 1993:11–12).

4.3.3.4. The Manifested Sons of God

Riss (1995:533) states that this group perceives the church as the on-going incarnation of Christ. McBride (1993:12) sees it as the most militant charismatic group, known as the

church of the living word. This group emphasises new levels of authority through apostles and elders. It teaches three unorthodox doctrines: that human beings can be divine, that they can attain sinless perfection and that Christians can become Christ (McBride *ibid*:12).

4.3.3.5. The Positive Confession Movement

The proponents of this movement are '[t]hose promulgating positive confessions because faith is a confession and the tongue is a force. Many televangelists push this doctrine as a key to health, wealth, and happiness' (Moriarty, cited by McBride 1993:12). It was founded by E.W. Kenyon, a controversial pastor, evangelist and author. He was not a Pentecostal but was widely read by them. Lovett (1995b:720) says, in his article in the *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic movement*, that the crux of this movement is based on how Jesus believed rather than Jesus as the object of faith. The movement avidly promotes divine healing linked to one's faith. It teaches that Jesus was imputed with Satan's nature at the cross. The movement's cardinal doctrines include guaranteed health (if one lives by faith, one will be healed), guaranteed wealth and prosperity, the idea that Christ died spiritually and lastly, that Christians are little gods (Riss 1995:534).

The main problem of the Positive Confession Movement is its disregard for textual context (Lovett 1995b:720).

4.3.3.6. The New Charismatics

This group's theological agenda is to Christianise the world so that Christ will return, to restore the church to the first century authority and power, the recovery of all divine principles, the fivefold ministry, walking in present day truth, unity of faith for the return of Christ, dominionism, the restoration of the prophets, prophecy and the prophetic movement, the restoration of the apostolic movement, signs and wonders, guaranteed healing and prosperity, teaching that humans are little gods and restorationism (Riss 1995:534).

Based on the various Pentecostal movements and characteristics described above, one can clearly see why it so difficult, even after hundred years, to put forward a standard Pentecostal theology (Clark & Lederle 1989:3). Whether such a standard theology will be reached in our lifetime remains to be seen.

4.4. Problems involved in researching Pentecostal theology

Based on the above-mentioned summaries of Pentecostal movements and their various characteristics, it is not surprising that after a century of existence, there is no standard Pentecostal theology in the form of Western Post-reformation theology (Clark & Lederle 1989:3). It would seem that a standard theology of Pentecostalism cannot be attained because Pentecostal theology is conducted on the intuitive rather than analytical plane and tends to be experiential rather than doctrinal. Despite the above-mentioned pluralistic characteristics and manifestations of this movement, there is a very definite nucleus of doctrines that are held to be non-negotiable by Pentecostals themselves (Clark & Lederle *ibid*:16). These include the following: Firstly, Jesus Christ should be personally encountered by a repented sinner for salvation, leading to regeneration and transformation of the repented sinner. Secondly, every believer can experience Spirit baptism similar to the one experienced by the disciples in the Book of Acts. Thirdly, individuals and communities can experience the power of God today just as it was revealed in the Early Church Christian communities. Fourthly, the saved ones are obliged to manifest a distinctly Christian lifestyle befitting a disciple of Jesus Christ. Fifthly, the individual, the local church and the broader Pentecostal community have one goal, that is to further the mission of Jesus Christ. And lastly, the return of Christ, to judge the world and apocalyptically renew creation, is imminent (Clark & Lederle *ibid*:17).

4.5. Characteristics of Pentecostal thought, method and practice

Pentecostals take the experience of God seriously in their theologies. This religious experience or theology has a number of implications for Pentecostal theology. Firstly, formal theology is not essential for the continuation of Pentecostalism. Secondly, an emphasis on experience leads to a relativisation of external rituals, for example, water baptism and the laying on of hands are essential but are not treated as sacraments. This is because for most Pentecostals, an external rite does not convey any spiritual benefit.

4.5.1. The crucial role of experience in a Pentecostal life

Christ lies at the heart of Pentecostal experience. Pentecostals go to church or turn to scripture to encounter or experience Jesus Christ, and it is this experience that associates them with the Book of Acts. They are sceptical of any dialogical Christianity that sees the Holy Spirit operating in non-Christian religion. According to Pentecostals, it is the Spirit of

Christ that delivers those who receive the gospel from the non-Christian religious spirit (Clark & Lederle 1989:43–44).

Experience is normal for Pentecostals, but Christ is the dominant theme of that experience. For Pentecostals to know Christ is to experience Him and his power (Clark & Lederle 1989:45). They believe that to encounter Jesus you must first experience his transforming power and become involved in the dynamics of faith, love, devotion and power relationships. This does not mean that Pentecostal theology is experienced-centred theology. Rather, it is a Christ-centred experience-certified theology. This encounter has subjective elements (Clark & Lederle *ibid*:45). Sacramentality is foreign to Pentecostals because they avoid philosophical gymnastics and juggling religious symbols. Their main focus is experiencing the power of God and demonstrating it (Clark & Lederle *ibid*:47).

This idea of experiencing or encountering Christ or truth is not originally a Pentecostal one (Jones *et al.* 1980:16–20). According to Solle (1967:7), the idea that truth is concrete is in harmony with Christianity because in most of the Christian worldview, Christ is the embodiment and essence of truth. Christianity considers people's situations in life and their needs. These are the determinants of Christian truth. Christianity sees truth as concrete, historical and partisan. Thus, if Christian truth meets the aforementioned criteria, it can be experienced. This means that truth or Christianity changes according to the situation and according to human needs. It is able to adapt itself to any situation it encounters and liberate those who embrace it (Solle 1967:7–8).

4.5.2. Criteria of valid Pentecostal experience

The normative Pentecostal experience is non-ecstatic but does not deny the possibility of the ecstatic, which is a working of God's spirit. Pentecostals are evangelical, and therefore there is an experience of personal salvation. They see themselves as 'New Creation', translated from the kingdom of darkness to the kingdom of light (Clark & Lederle 1989:52). A Pentecostal experience, according to Clark and Lederle, (*ibid*:52) is validated by several characteristics. If it is true, such an experience must result in a changed lifestyle. If no lifestyle change is made, then the experience was possibly false. A Pentecostal experience must involve an observable manifestation of the Holy Spirit or a personal intervention by God in the life of a believer, meaning that God must be seen to be performing his word in the service of the life of the individual. It must be shown by a commitment to Jesus Christ, that

is, a person who has encountered Christ must show that they have had the encounter by the way in which they live for Christ. In practice, Pentecostals should live a holy life, which means that individuals stop swearing, drinking, smoking, clubbing, being promiscuous, behaving immorally, dressing immodestly, gambling, participating in worldly entertainment, etc. Lastly, a Pentecostal experience must show a commitment to the mission of Christ in which the believer obeys the commission to preach the gospel on a daily basis.

4.6. Pentecostal norms as opposed to Catholicism and Protestantism

For a better understanding of Pentecostalism, one needs to consider Pentecostal norms in comparison with those of Catholicism and Protestantism. According to Clark and Lederle (1989:63–65), the following can be observed in this regard: Pentecostalism originates from the environment of Protestantism and its spirit, but it also shares some practices with Catholics, such as the laying on of hands as the bestowal of the Holy Spirit. However, they differ in their institutional and sacramental frameworks. For Catholics, the church as an institution and the sacraments are seen as primary facets of the Christian faith, whereas for Pentecostals, personal experience is seen as the primary facet of Christianity and sacrament as an impersonal part of the faith. Protestantism, in contrast, is based on the four Solae: Christ alone, scripture alone, grace alone and faith alone.

In Pentecostalism, the institution, which is the church and the office, are played down, and the community and ministry receive preference. In Catholicism, the institution and office are elevated, and the community is relegated to a subservient role. Pentecostal sacramentology tends to be Zwinglian with regard to the Lord's Supper and Anabaptist with regard to baptism, which is completely dissimilar from Catholic sacramentology. This means that in Pentecostalism, the elements in the Eucharist are seen as symbols representing the blood and the body of Christ. Secondly, when one receives the Pentecostal faith, one has to be baptised, because Pentecostals do not recognise any baptism performed by non-Pentecostals. Protestantism and Catholicism can be authentically extended into the future without losing their identity. Pentecostalism, on the other hand, defies this notion due to the cardinal role of experience. Over and above all of the aforementioned, Protestants and Catholics emphasise orthodoxy, whereas Pentecostals emphasize orthopraxy (Clark & Lederle 1989:64). By that I mean that Protestants and Catholics are more concerned with the right belief and Pentecostals with the right practice of that belief. This does not mean that Pentecostals deny orthodoxy but just that they take it further and want to see it practiced or incarnated.

Pentecostalism is not simple, as there are variations thereof, but my focus in the present liturgical study will be on the liturgy of classical Pentecostalism or Missional Pentecostalism. Most liturgical works of the mainline missionary churches have been translated. This is the reason why I intend to translate the liturgical book which is the object of this study.

4.7. Postmodern Pentecostal liturgy

The way one reads and interprets the scriptures and one's perception about the authority of the scriptures (or lack thereof) is a critical issue in the postmodern era. This reading and perception determines everything concerning Christian belief and Christian practice. Pentecostals, especially classical Pentecostals, take this very seriously. Their main quest from the beginning of the movement has been 'to guard the truth' (2 Tm 1:14) and 'to guard what has been entrusted to you' (1Tm 6:20). As for me, I believe that, as humans' response to God's demands, liturgy must have a dynamic but solid theological foundation and should be a Bible-based practice. By dynamic, I mean that it should be adapted to different contexts but should still adhere to the non-negotiable aspects of the faith.

Pentecostal liturgy is not only incarnation liturgy, it is also an inculturation of liturgy. Inculturation of liturgy implies two things: firstly, incarnating the gospel into a particular culture and secondly, incarnating a particular culture into the gospel (Phan 2003:55).

Postmodern liturgy is also incarnational and is also an inculturation of liturgy. The inculturation of liturgy is a challenge for the West, the South and the East (Phan 2003:55). This is because of the postmodern ethos which includes, among other things, pessimism, holism, communitarianism and relativistic pluralism. Postmodernism is pessimistic because it rejects the enlightenment myth of unavoidable progress and instead highlights the fragility of human existence. It is holistic because it rejects the privileging of rationality by modern society and as an alternative, embraces and celebrates emotions and intuition. It is communitarian because it avoids individualism and seeks for the universal in everything, emphasising the role of community in the creation of truth. It is pluralistic and relativistic because its perception is that because there are many human communities, there must also be many different truths (Phan *ibid*:59).

When this kind of postmodern understanding is applied to culture, culture, according to Phan (2003:61), is no longer a sharply demarcated, self-contained, homogeneous and integrated whole, but a ground of contest in relations and a historical, evolving, fragmented,

inconsistent, conflicted, constructed, ever-shifting and porous social reality. And this poses a great challenge for liturgical inculturation. Phan (*ibid*:64–67) highlights the following seven general challenges to liturgical inculturation, which I shall take the liberty to apply to postmodern Pentecostal liturgical inculturation.

The first challenge is the concept inculturation itself. When one views the gospel as a timeless message from God for salvation (as in the Pentecostal movement), and the liturgy as a cultural, symbolic ‘world’ and a social construct with its own idiosyncrasies, then inculturation is no longer an incarnation of something timeless but an intercultural encounter. Therefore, the question is what, then, should be the dynamics and rules of intercultural communication that should be incorporated in liturgical inculturation for successful or effective prophetic dialogue?

Secondly, the issue of power is of paramount importance in intercultural encounters concerning the relationships between local churches and sending churches. In light of this, why should local churches translate the liturgy of their Mother church? Why not come up with a liturgy of their own that is not translated but is a product of the effort of the community of faith? Is not the translation of any liturgical text from a European to a non-European language an imposition of European culture on a non-European community?

Thirdly, encounters of power relations are also manifested in the choice of culture in which the liturgy is to be inculturated. For example, there are two Batswana cultures, namely the South African and the Botswana Batswana cultures. Who decides which culture is to be translated?

Fourthly, encounters of power relations are also an issue when it comes to the inculturation of popular religion, which is seen as the religion of the poor and dispossessed. This is the case with many Pentecostal churches in the Third World. Here, inculturation becomes an identity affirmation and resistance of the subaltern. The question in this regard is who does the translation, the academic middle class or the illiterate subalterns themselves?

Fourthly, Pentecostalism elevates the Christian metanarratives and places them above those of other religions. Postmodernism, on the other hand, rejects the re-enactment of Christian metanarratives when they compete with metanarratives of other religions. Three questions that come to mind will be: Is there a possibility of inculturating liturgy without effective dialogue with other religious metanarratives? What is the relationship between liturgical

inculturation and prophetic dialogue? Can the rituals of other religions be used for liturgical inculturation?

Sixthly, postmodern liturgical inculturation includes the sacred texts, rituals, music, songs, musical instruments, gesture, dance, art and architecture of local culture. Some of the aforementioned aspects are antichristian. How then does one overcome this problem in order to produce a Christian product?

Finally, liturgical inculturation must be aligned with theology. How can this be achieved in the radical religious pluralism of postmodernism? In an attempt to overcome these challenges, I offer the following answers from various missiologists who have tried to deal with the issues.

The call for new epistemologies in postmodern and postcolonial mission is a real and relevant call (Harries 2010:310). Western institutions function differently in Africa, and it is for this reason that new epistemologies for mission in Africa must be found and developed. Harries (*ibid*:311) argues that Western institutions propagate Western ideals, languages, traditions and cultures that inhibit African institutions' response to their local context. I find the above idea truer in Pentecostal and charismatic churches in South Africa, especially the Classical Pentecostal or Pentecostal mission churches.

4.7.1. Pentecostal liturgy

Based on the fact that Pentecostal ministry is a grass-roots ministry that is averse to formal liturgies and restrictive structures, I find myself in a dilemma of trying to translate what others feel is untranslatable and not necessary to translate (Clark & Lederle 1989:66). But due to the reasons I have given above, I deem it important to continue with the translation. Before that, I would like to explain how Pentecostal liturgy is different from other liturgies of the church.

Pentecostal liturgy is said to be controlled by the Holy Spirit, and is seen as an encounter between God and humans. In this encounter God and humans both play their own significant role, but the terms of the encounter are set by God. Pentecostal liturgy is concerned with God and humanity and is an expectant and concrete encounter. It is an exuberant, enthusiastic, and experience-dominated encounter with God. There is considerable audience participation in the liturgy through song, choir items, testimonies and group prayer (Anderson 2000:146).

The ideal of ‘freedom in the Spirit’ entails the inherent dangers of extreme extra-biblical application, as seen in the introduction (Clark & Lederle 1989:74). Other Pentecostal denominations have introduced structure into their liturgy, and this is what I want to translate into Setswana.

4.7.2. Characteristics of African Classical Pentecostalism

The African Classical Pentecostal churches were initiated by White missionaries. These churches have a strong conviction of being ‘saved’ or ‘born again’ at a certain time in their life. This saved status is characterised by a lifestyle transformed from a worldly way of life to a Christian ethic. African Classical Pentecostal churches practice baptism by single or triple immersion. They believe in baptism in the Holy Spirit and in speaking in tongues. They do not have prophets or bishops. These churches are highly committed to church activities. They are opposed to traditional religious practices like consulting diviners and making ritual killings for ancestors or venerating them, although they respect them. The churches are opposed to the use of symbolic objects, such as water, salt or ashes, in healing practices. They abstain from alcoholic beverages, smoking tobacco and do not allow polygamy. They do not wear church uniforms and have their own buildings (Anderson 1992:64–65).

4.7.2.1. African Classical Pentecostal Liturgy

African Classical Pentecostal liturgy is exuberant, enthusiastic, and experience-dominated. Due to its African roots, it is more acceptable in an African context than a European one. There is one service on a Sunday that lasts between two and three hours. In this experiential liturgy, there is considerable audience participation through united song, simultaneous and spontaneous uninhibited prayer, performances by choirs and other groups as well as testimonies. Pentecostals use praise and worship groups, with band accompaniment, to lead the service with English and vernacular songs. There is also rhythmic dancing to the music, a lifting of hands and ululation. Furthermore, there is testimony time and an altar call after the service (Anderson 2000:146–161).

Hollenweger (1976:457) is of the opinion that Pentecostalism is identified with the poor and the oppressed, with non-racialism, reconciliation, Black leadership, Black power and dignity. Anderson (1992:33) points out that African Pentecostalism is characterised by meeting the physical, spiritual and emotional needs of Africa offering solutions to all of life’s problems. He says that although the churches have little or no formal theology, they have the following

perspectives: The same God who saves the soul also heals the body and delivers people from evil forces. God forgives sin but is also concerned with poverty, oppression and liberation from all that afflicts people. God and the Holy Spirit are involved in the daily lives of people (Anderson *ibid*:32).

4.7.3. Types of African Pentecostalism in South Africa

Pentecostalism has the remarkable ability to transplant itself in almost all African communities because it is an authentic expression of African Christianity. It has the ability to adapt to its context (Kalu 2008:187–205).

Anderson (1992:4) points out that in South Africa, there has been an adaptation of Pentecostalism to suit the African situation. In South Africa, Pentecostals are called *Bazalwane*, which is originally a Zulu name, meaning a group of people doing things together. According to Anderson (*ibid*:7), there are three types of Pentecostal church. The first type is Pentecostal mission churches, so called because they were started by White mission churches. The second type is independent Pentecostal churches, which have exclusively Black leadership. They are also independent of White control. Lastly, there are the indigenous Pentecostal churches known as spirit-type churches with the words ‘Zion’ or ‘Apostolic’ in their names.

As stated above my focus will be liturgy in the Pentecostal mission churches or South African Classical Pentecostal churches. They are connected to ‘White Pentecostal’ churches. Maybe that is the reason why they have failed the indigeneity test based on the three self-characteristics of indigenous churches. They are neither self-governing nor self-supporting but are often self-propagating (Anderson 1992:8). Yet they still possess an African character with a highly developed organisational structure and complex constitutions. They are an example of a hybrid church (Anderson *ibid*:8).

In my own experience, most of their official documents are in English and Afrikaans. When it comes to liturgical books, the Assemblies of God uses the Methodist Hymn book and Amaxilongo Evangeli, which means gospel songs. The Full Gospel Church uses a book by Dr. H.C. Horak, called *Pastoral Liturgy*, which I will be translating as it is only found in English and Afrikaans.

4.7.3.1. Pentecostalism in townships

South African Pentecostal churches are strongly influenced by global Pentecostalism, with dominant strands emanating from the United States, West Africa and Latin America. But South African Pentecostal churches also have South African characteristics due to the contact between them and African Independent Churches (Schlemmer 2008:28).

The above-mentioned aspects of Pentecostals' lives indicate that although Pentecostal Christianity does not have a great deal of written or recorded material in South Africa, it nevertheless can assist township communities to develop their own voice as subalterns. On the impact of Pentecostal churches in townships, I shall draw on Johnston's report: Johnston (2008:19) divides the township Pentecostal congregations into Old Black Pentecostals and New Black Pentecostals, and the profiles of these congregations are as follows: The Old Black Pentecostals have the an empowering liturgy that teaches saving money even in poverty, above-average commitment to their children's education, a tendency to translate faith into discipline, working hard, improving oneself and shaping one's own future. Old Black Pentecostals believe that God helps those who help themselves. The Black New Pentecostals are characterised by reaching out to the marginalised and disenfranchised. This opens the door for the translation of any liturgical work from the West, and I believe that it empowers communities to speak with their own voice in their own language. But having said that, Pentecostalism today finds itself in a postmodern and postcolonial era, and its liturgy is also practised in that era. What does Pentecostal liturgy look like in this postmodern era?

Bevans and Schroeder (2004) perceive mission in the 20th century as having three strains that grounded its theology. Firstly, mission is the participation in the life and mission of the Trinity. Secondly, it is the continuation of the mission of Jesus Christ, which is to preach, serve and witness to the justice of God. Thirdly, mission is the proclamation that Christ is the only saviour of the world. In the first strain, the whole being participates, which means that one engages in it body, soul and spirit. The second strain includes teaching, preaching, healing and serving others. The third strain involves speech or speaking. All three strains will be impossible to achieve without language. The question is whose language will be used or will be effective in such an exercise. Finding out which language is relevant for a postcolonial Pentecostal liturgy in the 21st century will be the focus of this chapter.

Thus, mission in the 21st century should consist of participation in the prophetic dialogical life and mission of the Trinity. This would lead to what Bevans and Schroeder (2004:395) call prophetic dialogue, in which there is an encouragement of human freedom and dignity. In prophetic dialogue, the mission of the church is not an imposition of one's faith but a persuasion, while maintaining respect for other people's faith. The reason is that Christianity is a kenotic faith that cannot think of itself as superior to those to whom it ministers. This calls for bold dialogical humility, according to Bosch (1991:489). As a missionary, one needs to maintain the conviction that Jesus is the way, the truth and the life but at the same time appreciate the truth of other religions.

The main premise of prophetic dialogue is effective communication, which is based on a mutual comprehension of the communicator's and respondent's contexts. All words derive their meaning from contexts; a word could mean different things depending on the context in which it is used. What becomes the main problem of globalisation is that although globalisation has globalised communication, it has failed to globalise contexts (Bevans & Schroeder: 2004:348–352).

In the previous era, missionaries emphasised culture more than context. This constituted an unbalanced view of cross-cultural communication. Many missionaries from the West were monolingual native English speakers, who had limited appreciation for the translation dynamics involved in the propagation of the gospel (Harries 2010:316).

African indigenous communities, in contrast, experience a transformed message during this cross-cultural encounter. On hearing an English word, they translate it into their mother tongue, which is sometimes not what was originally intended by the English speaker.

I can illustrate this from my personal educational journey. Firstly, my formal education was from the West, taught by indigenous African teachers. In other words, it was a translated and hybrid education. The problem is that the global world was closed to Africans at that time, so I received an education that was separated from its context. I could read about *Oliver Twist*, *Huckleberry Finn* and *Monte Cristo* and only experience their world through the written word. This also seems to be the case with my faith. I used to think that Jerusalem and Egypt were in heaven, because most of our preachers and Bible teachers did not know a great deal.

Secondly, my acquisition of a European language was through formal education. I acquired this language coming from an isiXhosa and Setswana background which I could not shake

off. My teachers required me to learn English by expressing it in Setswana and isiXhosa. Thus, I have always understood English and Afrikaans in Setswana and isiXhosa. Growing up in a mining compound, I learnt the other languages that were available, namely isiZulu, Sesotho and Sepedi.

Lastly, even my theological training and professional training as a translator is in English, and by providence, I preach to the Batswana, AmaXhosa and Basotho in English through interpreters. Everything I learn and do is always translated and in the translation space. Right now, as I am writing this sentence, I am writing it and, at the same time, translating it from two languages, isiXhosa and Setswana.

The communication revolution with its speed and accessibility is unable to cause the meaning of words to travel with it. This communication of education and religion in a foreign European language is detrimental to African languages' empowerment. It is only beneficial to those who know these European languages as it offers them access to international networks (Harries 2010:321).

I tend to agree with Harries (2010:323) when he says that English cannot be an effective tool for building African societies from grass-roots level up, as it detracts from real issues. This brings a number of questions to mind. Firstly, can Africa really be understood through English? Are the philosophical assumptions of the West applicable to Africa? What is the importance of knowing English for the indigenous African people, and does it affect any part of their worldview? How should Africans understand God? Is it through Western-coloured theological glasses? Should God be seen working in 'the other' or be understood by 'the self'?

In trying to answer the above-mentioned questions, Harries (2010:327) makes the following concluding remarks concerning the West and Africa. Firstly, Western scholarship can be helpful to the African context if it is translated properly with an indigenising perspective. Secondly, African institutions need to be run with an understanding of African worldview, experience and reality. Thirdly, Africa needs a religious conviction that can be an effective tool for societal transformation, and in that case, there is a need for a communication revolution that is able to transport both African languages and contexts. And lastly, biblical teaching needs to be applied to contextual African reality.

4.8. Conclusion

It is clear that Pentecostal liturgy has to contend with the issues of the historical and cultural nature of liturgy. It has to study its own context and the recipients of its message for it to be relevant and effective. It must never ignore the culture of the recipients of its message, but it must also not deviate from sound theology of liturgy. Liturgy as a culturally and contextually constructed activity must respect the cultures of the world and have the flexibility to adapt itself without compromising the message of the gospel of Jesus Christ. The various perceptions of Pentecostal theology and doctrine should not detract the Pentecostal churches from engaging in research and making their voice heard.

The challenges of postmodern Pentecostalism should be faced head-on and the dialogue with Pentecostal minds and perceptions must be engaged in. The postmodern world needs answers due to its pessimism. The Bible is also pessimistic about human progress and reason (Cassidy 2005:158). I believe Pentecostalism can offer solace and hope that there is a specific way to practise and live out one's faith. Since postmodernists are looking for answers, answers that can really work for them, I believe that postcolonial Pentecostal liturgy can provide such answers by creating new liturgical epistemologies. These epistemologies should be in the language and culture of the recipient communities. Postcolonial translation will be a catalyst, and this is the reason for this project.

Pentecostalism can achieve the above-mentioned goals by propagating a changeless gospel in a changing world. It must continue to uncompromisingly hold on to the full deity and uniqueness of Jesus Christ, it must adhere to biblical absolutes and a firm moral code of right and wrong, and it must affirm that truth is both universal and personal in Christ (Cassidy 2005:165). Pentecostalism must continue to hold on to the notion that no two contradictory statements can both be simultaneously true. This needs to be clearly brought into our liturgy, which is in our language and also relevant to our culture. This is when postcolonial translation comes onto the scene.

CHAPTER 5

THE TRANSLATION OF *PASTORAL LITURGY* INTO SETSWANA

5.1. Introduction

In the previous chapters, I have looked at postcoloniality and hybridity as theoretical frameworks for this study. I have established in those chapters that postcolonial translation seeks to achieve the following: to reverse the impact of colonisation and exploitation enhanced by colonial translations and to decolonise translation in order to empower subalterns. The employment of translation is a tool for understanding and appreciating African religious beliefs and to engage in dialogue with the elements of those religious beliefs that are not compatible with Christianity. Postcolonial translation also aims to ensure that liturgy is incarnated in the subaltern culture without ceasing to be liturgy. Therefore, in this study, the translation of *Pastoral Liturgy* will be employed to incarnate the liturgy in the Setswana culture.

In this chapter, my aim is to propose an appropriate model for translating *Pastoral Liturgy* by G.C. Horak into Setswana and to explain why this model is seen as the most suitable for the translation of the aforementioned text. Therefore, in this chapter, I will focus on the conceptualisation of the intended translation and the discussion of that translation will be done in the next chapter.

The text that needs to be translated is a religious text. The translation of religious texts has been used throughout history to disseminate the divine message and teach converts the basics of their faith. As a result, translation has been employed as a powerful missionary tool in the propagation of faith (Elewa 2014:25). But from a postcolonial translation perspective, as stated previously, such a tool should be used in the creation of empowering epistemologies. It is with this perspective in mind that I seek to propose an appropriate model for the present translation.

There are as many translation models as there are translators because each translator, as an expert, creates his/her own model according to what he/she deems to be the most effective model for his/her translation. One fact that needs to be borne in mind about translation models and theories is that they are all limited. For example, if one confines oneself to

prescriptive translation theories, the limitations of such theories will be their disregard for the sociocultural conditions under which those translations are produced in order to be effective means of communication within the receiving cultures or target cultures. Translations have temporal and cultural contexts that need to be taken into cognizance when translating. When translation theorists embraced the fact that translations were not produced in a vacuum but were products of a particular time and culture, there was a shift from normative, prescriptive approaches to translation to descriptive and functionalist approaches to translation (Lötter 2001:61–62). The descriptive approach studied the by-product of translation, and the functionalist approach studied the process of translation.

The model or approach that I have chosen for the present study is Christiane Nord's functionalist approach to translation. I chose this approach because of its translation-oriented analysis of texts that includes an examination of extratextual and intratextual factors emanating from the translation brief and the source text itself (Nord 2007:14). Secondly, it is a model that, so far, offers an appropriate framework for translation and postcolonial translation in particular, where the most important aspect is the function of the target text within the target atmosphere. Thirdly, it is a model that allows for certain adaptations to be made to the source text, which bodes well for postcolonial translation in the sense of having the voice of the subaltern heard on certain issues, as stated in Chapter Two.

Therefore, in this chapter, I shall give a brief historical overview of the functionalist approach to translation, including a discussion of functionalist theories of translation and the translation theorists who postulated those theories. The translation theorists and their theories who I shall discuss are Reiss and her text type approach to translation, Vermeer and his Skopos theory and Nord and her purposeful activity approach to translation (Nord 2007:9–26).

5.2. A brief historical overview of the functionalist approach

Functionalist approaches to translation have long been part of translation history. A number of Bible translators have held the view that various contexts demanded various renderings of translation. They observed that the process of translation required adjustment in certain contexts and faithful renderings in other contexts. They therefore advocated verbatim renderings for some situations and sense for sense renderings for others (Nord 2007:5).

From the 1940s to the 1960s, Nida discarded the old terms like literal, free and faithful translation in favour of two basic orientations, namely formal and dynamic equivalence. His

translation theories developed a functional definition of meaning that highlighted the fact that words did not have fixed meanings but acquired meaning through their various contexts (Nida 1964/2004:131ff). Formal equivalence refers to a faithful reproduction of the source text into the target text, and dynamic equivalence takes into cognizance the extralinguistic communicative effect of a translation in the production of the target text (Nord 2007:5).

Formal equivalence has a source text orientation, and the accuracy of the translation is judged by the extent to which a translator is true to the reproduction of the source text in the target text. It is more about learning the source language and its customs and culture (Nida1964/2004:129).

Dynamic equivalence or functional equivalence is based on the principle of equivalent effect. The translation has to be structured in such a way that it meets the linguistic needs and cultural expectations of target receivers of the text. This minimises the foreignness of the source text setting and enhances the naturalness of the translation in the target language. This, according to Munday, means that for Nida, successful translation is based on achieving an equivalent effect or response. Therefore, according to Nida, translation had to meet four basic requirements. It has to make sense, convey the spirit and manner of the original, be natural and easy to express in the target language and culture and produce a response similar to that of the source text on the source culture and language (Nida 1964/2004:129).

Nord (2007:8) asserts that equivalence approaches to translation are confusing as they have different or contradictory standards for selecting transfer procedures for different text types. Due to this confusion, translation scholars started to search for a new theory of translation, and they began to make a functionalist approach to translation a priority. This is where the German school of functionalist translation, which will be discussed below, gained its prominence.

5.3. Functional theories of translation

Functionalist and communicative translation theories came to the forefront in Germany in the 1970s and 1980s. These translation theories tended to move away from static linguistic typologies of translation to viewing translations as intercultural communicative events (Munday 2008:87). In this section, I shall consider the following translators: Katharina Reiss, Hans J. Vermeer and Christiane Nord.

5.3.1. Reiss: The text type approach to translation

The above translators' work is categorised as follows: Katharina Reiss focuses on text types, Hans J. Vermeer on the skopos theory, which concentrates on the purpose of the target text and Christiane Nord focuses on a detailed text analysis model (Munday 2008:72).

Reiss' work builds on the concept of equivalence, but to her, the text (not the word or sentence) is the level at which communication is achieved and it is where equivalence should be considered. The text type approach to translation has the following three text types, each with its own set of characteristics (Reiss & Vermeer 2013:182): An informative text is a text in which plain facts, information, knowledge and opinions are communicated. The language employed is logical, and its content is the main focus. An expressive text focuses on creative composition in which the author uses the aesthetic components of language. The operative text type has an appellative function in which it induces behavioural response. It appeals to or persuades the receiver of the text.

Thus, Reiss' work can be seen as linking language function, text type, genre and translation strategy. Her argument on the relevance of the classification of text type and text variety to the process of translation is that the text type determines the general method of translation. The text variety requires reflection on language and text structure (Reiss 1971/2004:160). She suggests that specific translation methods should be used according to text types. For example, an informative text should transmit the full referential or intangible content of the source text. An expressive text should adhere to the transmission of the aesthetic and artistic aspects of the source text. As for the operative text, it should produce the desired response in the target text receiver (Reiss & Vermeer 2013:188–189).

The categorisation of text types is not clear cut as there are hybrid types of those categorisations. The three text types do not always occur in pure form. For example, in longer texts, one may find both the informative and operative functions present in a text, or all three. One example cited by Reiss is that of defence lawyer's closing arguments for a lighter sentence for the accused. The lawyer's speech can be an operative text type requiring persuasive strategies but also informative to the court about the personal circumstances of the accused (Reiss & Vermeer *ibid*:184). Thus, a text may be operative as well as informative, like the text that I shall translate in the present study. It provides information as to how a

baptism or communion is to be performed, but it also appeals to decorum and order in the worship service.

5.3.1.1. The role of text types or classification in translation

Text typologies, according to Reiss, assist the translator in specifying the correct order of equivalence ranks essential for a particular translation purpose. Text types are classified according to their communicative function and their linguistic conventions or characteristics (Reiss & Vermeer 2013:156). The communicative function of the text has to do with whether it is an informative, expressive or operative text. The linguistic characteristics deal with issues pertaining to whether a text is a reference, satire, lecture or advertisement. A brief summary of the communicative functions of texts types will follow in the paragraphs below to highlight some of the characteristics of those texts as described by Reiss in her text typologies.

The main function of the informative text is to inform the reader about what is happening in the real world. The informative text is a universal text, so in translation, the translator must make sure that he/she gives a correct and complete representation of the source text's contents. This should be guided by dominant norms of the target language and culture with regard to stylistic choice

The main function of the expressive text is to highlight the aesthetic aspects emanating from the source text that, in translation, need to be retained in the target text in order to achieve a similar effect in both texts. The translator should strive for the production of an appealing effect and a corresponding stylistic effect in their translation

The main function of the operative text is to produce the same reaction in both the source addressees and target addressees. This might involve changing content and stylistic features of the original text. This text function makes the content and arrangement of a text subservient to the extralinguistic effects that the text is intended to achieve (Reiss 1971/2004:167–168).

5.3.2. Vermeer: Skopos theory and the skopos approach to translation.

Hans J. Vermeer introduced the technical term skopos to translation as a term for the purpose of translation and the translation action (Munday 2008:79). Skopos theory (from the German

Skopostheorie) focuses on the main purpose of the translation. This purpose determines the translation methods and strategies that will be employed to produce a functionally adequate result (Munday 2008:79). In Vermeer's skopos theory, the reason for translating the source text and the function of the target text in the target language are of paramount importance. According to Lötter (2001:63), in skopos theory the source text is less important as it is only considered an offer of information that is to be converted into an offer of information for the target audience. The main concepts of skopos theory will be discussed in greater detail in the following section.

5.3.2.1. Skopos theory

Skopos theory is Hans J. Vermeer's general theory of translation. In this section, I shall address Vermeer's skopostheory and some of the fundamental concepts of the theory. Of note will be the relationship between Vermeer's general theory and the concepts of skopos, coherence and culture.

Vermeer (1989/2004:221) asserts that skopos theory is part of the theory of translation action. This is premised on the understanding that translation is a specific variation of translation action emanating from a source text. All translation actions, including translation itself, are conceived as actions with an aim or purpose. The technical term for that purpose or aim of a translation is skopos, which is a Greek word meaning purpose. Any action leads to a result or a new situation or event. Therefore, a translation action leads to a target text. The translator needs a precise specification of skopos and an adequately defined mode of realisation in order to perform an adequate translation.

5.3.2.2. Skopos and translation

The main principle determining any translation, according to skopos theory, is the purpose or skopos of the overall translation process. 'The skopos refers to the purpose of the target text' (Nord 2007:28). According to Vermeer, the teleological concepts aim, purpose, intention and function are equivalent, and skopos is the generic term that is inclusive of all the others. But Vermeer distinguishes between aim and purpose. He defines aim as the agent's final intended result of his/her action. The purpose, on the other hand, is defined as the provisional stage in the process of attaining an aim (Reiss & Vermeer 2013:86). Nord (2007:28) further disentangles the conceptual confusion by proposing a distinction between intention and function, asserting that such a distinction is useful in translation. To her, intention is defined

from the sender's viewpoint who desires to achieve a certain purpose with the text, and function is defined from the receivers' use of the text with reference to their expectations, needs, background and situational conditions.

According to the skopos rule, the highest rule of this theory of translation action, any action is determined by its purpose. This means that each text is produced for a specific purpose and should serve the purpose for which it was produced (Reiss & Vermeer 2013:90). The implication is that a translator must translate a text in such a way that it is able to function in its target situation in the way in which the target receivers want it to function.

The skopos rule's main purpose was to address the problems with the criteria of faithful or free, dynamic or formal equivalence by introducing the concept of purposeful translation. This does not do away with literal or word-for-word translation, as some suppose. Rather, skopos theory suggests that a translation should follow a specific principle and that each translation must have its own principle that is different from others. This does not mean that a good translation has to adapt or conform to target culture behaviour or expectations (Nord 2007:29). The client is the one who decides on the specifics of translation. In the present study, it will be me, as I am both the initiator and translator. As stated previously, the translator is an expert in this matter and the competence of the translator will determine all the necessary aspects of the translation process. The translator is responsible for performing the commissioned task and to decide what role the source text will play in his or her translational action, as determined by the purpose of the communicative situation (Vermeer 1989/2004:222).

According to Vermeer (1989/2004:223), the source text, which can fulfil any particular function, is composed for and also is oriented towards the source culture, as the name suggests. The target text is therefore oriented towards the target culture and its adequacy is defined by that orientation. This implies that it is possible for the source text and target text to have divergent goals with regard to the formulation, distribution and arrangement of content. Yet this does not exclude the possibility that both the source and target text can have the same function or purpose. However, this cannot be the case in the present study, due to the postcolonial bias of the translation in question.

5.3.2.3. *Textual coherence*

The relationship between the source text and target text is important within a functionalist framework. In skopos theory, the usefulness of the translation brief is entirely dependent on the target culture, not on the source culture. In terms of the theory of action, the sender, receiver, initiator and translator play the most significant parts in the process. Thus, it is difficult to speak about the source text in this situation. A text is made meaningful by its receivers, so the meaning of the text lies with its receivers. Consequently, a translator needs to produce a text that will be meaningful to the target-culture receiver. Such a text is said to intratextually coherent because the receivers understand it, and it can only be a successful translation if the receivers feel that it is coherent with their particular situation. According to Vermeer, the extent to which a translator judges the form and function of a source text to be adequate according to a predetermined skopos in the target text determines the degree of intratextual coherence. This type of coherence occurs when the recipients interpret the target text as sufficiently coherent in itself and with their reception situation (Reiss & Vermeer 2013:98).

Just as Vermeer considers the source text an offer of information, it can be said that the target text is an offer of information formulated by the translator in a target culture and language about a source text information offer (Reiss & Vermeer 2013:67ff). Vermeer says that this offer of information, or a specific form of transfer that imitates the source text, requires a second form of coherence, namely between source text and target text. This is intertextual coherence and is determined by the translator's understanding of the source text and by the skopos of the translation. Yet this intertextual coherence is secondary to the intratextual coherence of the translated text (Reiss & Vermeer *ibid*:102).

Another important principle of Vermeer's skopos theory is the 'coherence rule', which specifies that a translation should be acceptable because it is coherent with the receivers' situation (Reiss & Vermeer 2013:98). In this rule, there needs to be correspondence between the source text and target text, or simply, there must be intertextual coherence (Nord 2007:32). This intertextual coherence is dependent on the translator's interpretation of the source text and the skopos of the translation. Nord (*ibid*:32) asserts that intertextual coherence is a faithful imitation of the source text, which is sometimes the goal of translation. But intertextual coherence plays second fiddle to intratextual coherence, and they are both subordinate to the skopos rule. Whatever type of coherence is demanded by the skopos takes

precedence. If the skopos calls for a change of function, then intertextual coherence is dropped as a standard and adequacy or appropriateness with the skopos is adopted as the standard for the translation (Reiss & Vermeer 2013:139).

5.3.2.4. Culture and culture-specificity

According to Nord, culture is everything that a person has to know, master or feel in order to judge if a particular form of behaviour by certain members of a particular community is consistent with their overall expectation from that community. Cultural specificity or a culture-specific phenomenon is found when that phenomenon occurs in a particular form or function in only one of the two cultures compared (Nord 2007:33–34).

Nord's (2007:34) view is that a translation is a comparison of cultures. It is during this comparison that translators interpret source culture phenomena in light of their own culture-specific knowledge that comes from the knowledge of their own culture. For example, a concept like *tladimothwana*, a lightning created by an *inyanga* to destroy one's enemies, only exists in Setswana and not in English culture or cultures of European origin. Another issue is the recitation of totem praise poems which are unique parts of Black culture at funerals. These can only be approximated when translated. This means that a foreign culture can only be perceived through comparison with one's own culture, but this comparison does not prevent a translator from navigating both cultures with ease. It is required of a translator to navigate both cultures without imposing culture-specific concepts on members of those cultures.

5.3.2.5. The adequacy of a translation

An offer of information presented by the source text is mainly for the source text addressees and their sociocultural context. Even when it is produced to be translated, the producer usually thinks in terms of the source text addressees and cultural background, because he/she does not necessarily possess all the necessary knowledge of the target culture (Nord 2007:35).

In a translation, the translator is a receiver of the source text offer of information who converts it to another offer of information in the target culture and language. As such, a translation will reflect the translator's own assumptions about the needs, expectations and background of the target addressees. If the target text is thus based on the translator's

assumptions, it is highly improbable that he/she will be able to reproduce the exact offer of information to the target audience that the source text producer offered to the source text audience. This is because of their differing backgrounds with regard to language and culture (Reiss & Vermeer 2013:123). Therefore, the translator must offer another kind of information in another form (Lötter 2001:76).

This view challenges the traditional concept of equivalence, in other words, that a translation must consist of an equivalent rendering of the source text offer information in the target text. It seems to negate the concept of equivalence entirely, but Reiss shows that it is not necessarily so. She relates the concept of equivalence to adequacy. For her, adequacy refers to the qualities of the target text with regard to the translation brief within skopos theory (Reiss & Vermeer 1984:124). What is evaluated here is whether the target text was adequately translated so as to satisfy the requirements of the translation brief (Nord 2007:35).

Adequacy is the dynamic concept that has to do with the translational action selecting goal-oriented signs that are relevant to the communicative purpose of the translation commission. Equivalence, in contrast, is a static, result-oriented concept that is based on the description of the relationship of equal communication value of source text and target text. The skopos determines the form of equivalence required for adequate translation (Nord 2007:35).

5.3.3. Nord: A purposeful activity approach to translation

Christiane Nord, a trained translator who teaches translation at Heidelberg University, developed a language-independent model of translation which she calls a ‘translation-oriented model of text analysis in translation’ (2007:14). Her model includes the analysis of extratextual and intratextual elements of the communicative action. The model’s main function is to identify the function-relevant aspects or elements of both the source text and target text that emanate from the translation brief. Nord (*ibid*:14) asserts that the venture of comparing the purpose with the source text function prior to translation will assist in identifying and locating problems that might surface in the translation process. This gives the translator a holistic view of the whole process and enables the translator to devise an appropriate strategy for the proper way of translating a text (Lötter 2001:64). Nord’s assumption of translation in her model will be discussed under the following headings: theory of action, translational interaction, intentional interaction, interpersonal interaction,

translation as communicative action, translation as intercultural interaction and translation as text processing action.

5.3.3.1. Theory of action

Nord's (2007:16) model is entrenched in the theory of action and as such needs the theory of action to explicate certain aspects of translation, with action being defined as the intentional transformation or transition from one state of affairs to another. Nord (*ibid*:17) perceives translation as intercultural communication and includes forms of communication other than just texts, and this intercultural communication needs intermediaries who straddle both of the cultures involved.

5.3.3.2. Translational interaction

Intercultural communication is an example of interpersonal interaction, based on communication theory, and involves two or more agents known as the receiver and the sender. This interaction turns the theory of action into a theory of interaction, and because human are involved here, it is known as human interaction. Human interaction is the intentional exchange of a state of affairs involving two or more people (Nord 2007:16). The environment of the communication interaction is governed by the existence of the participants in the communication and includes, among other things, their background, culture, verbal and non-verbal communication peculiarities and their expectations of each other in the communication situation (Lötter 2001:65). These communication interactions are products of time and space, which means that they have historical and cultural dimensions (Nord: 2007:16).

Communication takes place easily when participants have the same cultural background and language but is hampered when the participants belong to different culture and language groups. In such cases, an intermediary is needed to facilitate communication, and the translator becomes such an intermediary (Lötter 2001:65). This makes a translation an intentional interpersonal, partially intercultural interaction that is based on the source text, which means that there can be no translation without the source text (Nord 2007:18).

5.3.3.3. *Intentional interaction*

Any intentional action implies the existence of the option to choose to act in a particular way or not to act at all and the reason for that choice. Nord (2007:19) says that for a translation to be an intentional interaction means first and foremost, that it is intended to bring about some change in an existing situation or state of affairs. The intentionality of the text may be associated with the initiator or translator in the process of translation.

5.3.3.4. *Interpersonal interaction*

As stated previously, in the translational interpersonal interaction, there are certain functions or roles carried out by the participants in the translation process. These roles or functions are interconnected in a complicated network of mutual relations. In this section, I shall show their relevance and their workings in the present study. I shall analyse the functions as they pertain to the present study. It is a widely established fact that in the professional practice of intercultural communication, a translator seldom starts any work of translation on his/her own. He/she is usually hired by a client to do a translation for the client or the client's institution (Nord 2007:20). In the aforementioned scenario, the client is the initiator who needs a particular text to be translated into a target text for a particular purpose.

The roles of the initiator and commissioner

In the present study, the initiator and commissioner is the same person, namely the translator himself. As the initiator and the translator, I have started the translation process and have determined its course by defining the reason for which the translation is needed in the target text (Nord 2007:20). This is possible due to the fact that Nord (*ibid*:20) declares that the role of the initiator may be taken by any one of the agents in the translational interaction. The purpose of this translation will be dealt with in the translation brief, which I shall provide later in this study.

The role of the translator

The translation process cannot be complete without the translator, who plays a crucial role as an expert in the process. He/she is responsible for carrying out the task of translating and for ensuring the desired results of the process. He/she is the receiver of the translation brief and source text in the translation process (Nord 2007:21). The translator's task, according to

Vermeer (1989/2004:229ff), is to scrutinise the tolerability and practicality of the translation brief in terms of its legal, economic or ideological implications as well as to assess whether the translation is necessary or needed. The translator is also tasked with specifying activities that are unavoidable in carrying out the instructions of the translation brief. Finally he/she must perform the translation action that produces the target text. These are the roles I intend to fulfil in the translation I am going to undertake.

The role of the source text producer

He/she is the author of the source text. In this case, the source text is G.C. Horak. Horak produced the text, firstly, for the Full Gospel Church of God and, secondly, for other classical Pentecostal churches. This text is predominantly used by English-speaking ministry students and by the ministry order of the Full Gospel Church of God. Therefore, the sender of this text is the Full Gospel Church of God. G.C. Horak was responsible for the linguistic and stylistic choices of producing the source text, which expresses the Full Gospel Church of God's communicative intentions (Nord 2007:21). The communicative intentions of the source text were to produce a text that would serve as a guide to those in the pastoral calling within their various traditional and ethnic groups. It is a text that serves as a guide within a particular context, in this case classical Pentecostalism, and could be adapted to various Pentecostal groups to fit their contexts and backgrounds. It explains some of the principles and directions involved in Pentecostal pastoral liturgy (Horak 2007:ix).

The target-text receiver

The target-text receiver is the addressee of the translation. In this case, it is the Setswana-speaking members of the Full Gospel Church of God, and they are a key factor in the production of the target text (Nord 2007:22). Their definition will follow in the translation brief. According to Nord (*ibid*:22), there is a difference between the addressee and receiver. The addressee is the prospective receiver as perceived by the text producer. The receiver is a group or institution that actually uses the text after its production. What is crucial for me as a translator is the sociocultural background of the Batswana people in the Full Gospel Church of God in the Kgalagadi and Bophirima regions, as well as their expectations, sensitivity, world knowledge and educational background.

The role of the target-text user

This is the person who will ultimately use the text as a handbook of liturgy or as a training manual. The ministers and elders in the local churches in the Kgalagadi and Bophirima regions of the Full Gospel Church of God will be the target text users in this case.

5.3.3.5. *Translation as a communicative action*

According to Nord (2007:23), based on communication theory, communication is carried out by verbal or non-verbal signs associated with concepts or meaning by a producer, receiver or both. Signs have teleological use because they aim at a particular result or goal. In order for the producer and receiver to achieve their intended goal, there needs to be an agreement between them as to the meaning of the signs they will use in their communication (Nord *ibid*:23).

In the present translation, as the translator, I shall produce signs for the target audience using our common or shared signs that are known by all of us.

5.3.3.6. *Translating as intercultural action*

Translation takes place in a concrete and a definable situation where members of different cultures come into contact with each other and, through language, try to enter each other's cultural situations. From the understanding that culture is knowledge in its most general sense with language as its intrinsic part, one becomes aware of the fact that the two cannot be separated. According to Nord (2007:24), in intercultural encounters, the participants are free to adapt to each other's patterns of behaviour or to do the opposite and experience the consequences of contrary cultural expectations. Cultural encounters normally manifest culturally rich points of which a translator needs to be aware in the translation task. These rich points are dissimilarities in conduct that result in cultural clashes or communication failure between two groups of people who come into contact with each other (Nord *ibid*:23).

The North West Province, just like the rest of South Africa, is an example a multi-cultural and multi-lingual society. In the north eastern part of the North West Province, one encounters English-speaking, Xhosa-speaking, Zulu-speaking, Shona-speaking, Setswana-speaking, IsiNdebele-speaking and Afrikaans-speaking people due to the mining industry. In the south western part of the same province one predominantly encounters English-speaking, Setswana-speaking and Afrikaans-speaking people (Lötter 2001:70). Each of these groups

has linguistic behaviour that differs from that of the others, although they share some very similar values, especially when they are Christians from the same tradition. The postcolonial context allows for the existence of all these different groups without one group dominating the others through its language. This context also promotes the use of indigenous languages in all matters of communication, thus resisting the dominance of those languages by English or any language of European origin.

5.3.3.7. Translation as a text-processing action

When translation is based on some kind of text, it is defined as translational action and the verbalisation and non-verbalisation of certain elements of the text are determined by their cultural-specificity (Nord 2007:25). For example, members of one group would verbalise their gratitude and those of another group would use gesture to convey the same sentiment. Both expressions would have the same connotation, but they are manifested differently. As stated previously, the source text in this context is just another offer of information in the translational action. If such an offer of information is adhered to or embraced, the translator has considerable latitude to choose which offer of information is interesting, useful or adequate to the desired purpose as stated in the translation brief (Nord *ibid*:26).

5.4. Conclusion

In this chapter, I started by proposing an appropriate model for translating *Pastoral Liturgy* by G.C. Horak, and I also explained why that model was suitable. The model I chose for this translation is Christiane Nord's functionalist approach to translation. I also gave some reasons as to why I think it is an appropriate model. I then gave a brief historical overview of the model and highlighted some of its key theorists and their contributions. It is a model that focusses on the target text and its environment and the function of that text in its target environment.

Nord's functionalist approach to translation identifies function-relevant aspects in both the source text and the target text as defined in the translation brief. It also involves the analysis of the source text which assists with deciding on the most suitable translation strategies to meeting the translation brief's requirements. The source text analysis and the translation brief analysis will be done in the following chapter.

In the following chapter, I shall attempt to identify the problems encountered in this translation and thereafter to suggest strategies for dealing with those problems.

CHAPTER 6

TRANSLATION STRATEGIES AND SOME PROBLEMS OF INDIGENISING A POSTCOLONIAL PASTORAL LITURGY TEXT THROUGH TRANSLATION

6.1. Introduction

The main focus of the present study is to produce a translation that is able to indigenise liturgical practices in Setswana in the Full Gospel Church of God for its Setswana-speaking members. This indigenisation of liturgical practices will take cognizance of previous religious encounters involving translation. It will employ some of these previous religious encounters as enabling contact points for exploring cultural difference as well as for exploring the resultant creative encounters of various cultures (Bassnett 2014:57). In this chapter, I shall consider the strategies for indigenising a liturgical text, with my main strategy being the production of an instrumental translation as defined by Nord (2007:139):

An instrumental translation by definition is a type of translation procedure which has as its goal the production of an instrument for a new communicative interaction in the target language which is between source-culture sender and target-culture audience using certain aspects of the source text as a model.

According to Nord (2007:50), an instrumental translation is normally a target text that may or may not achieve the same functions as the source text. If the functions of the source text and target text are the same, it is called an equifunctional translation, and if they are different, it is called a heterofunctional translation. If the literary statuses of the source and target texts correspond within their respective cultures, it is called a homologous translation. For the postcolonial translation in this study, which seeks to indigenise the translation, I have chosen a heterofunctional translation because it is used when one cannot preserve the functions of the original due to the cultural and temporal distance between the texts.

In the present chapter, I shall discuss the translation brief, its analysis, the source text analysis, translation strategies and problems at the macrotextual level and translation strategies and problems at the microtextual level. Any problems I encounter during the translation will be highlighted and pertinent strategies for solving them will be provided.

6.2. The translation brief

A translation brief implies that a translator has basic information and instructions and is thus free, as an expert, to carry out the translation to the best of his/her ability and as he/she deems fit (Nord 2007:30). The translation brief in this study is as follows:

- **The intended text function:** The aim is to produce an indigenised postcolonial translation that functions as an operative and informative liturgical text in the target culture. The translation will inform recipients about how to conduct liturgy in a local church and how to fill in certain forms. It also informs them about how to perform certain functions in a culturally and indigenously relevant way.
- **Addressees of the text:** They are the Setswana-speaking members of the Full Gospel Church of God in the Kgalagadi and Bophirima regions as well as Setswana-speaking local churches in other regions in South Africa and those who minister to them.
- **Time and place of reception:** This includes the whole of the Kgalagadi and Bophirima regions and all Setswana-speaking local churches in other regions in the current postcolonial and post-apartheid South Africa.
- **Medium:** A monolingual liturgical text with forms and programs.
- **Reason for text production and reception:** The reason for producing this text and its reception is to decolonise liturgy, encourage the use and appreciation of indigenous languages in liturgy and the production of such texts within the Pentecostal movement in the postcolonial era.
- The translation should indigenise the liturgy and liturgical practices in *Pastoral Liturgy*.

The information emanating from the translation brief allows me to deduce several general requirements for translating *Pastoral Liturgy*. For me to be able to achieve the above-mentioned intended functions as they appear in the brief, the translated text should conform to the text type and general style conventions and make use of an indigenised postcolonial register. I should take into account the Batswana's culture-specific knowledge presuppositions in the two above-mentioned regions of the Full Gospel Church of God. The main point of reference will be the Kgalagadi and Bophirima regions and their liturgical practices. The text must contain the translated liturgy, forms and programs. The indigenised informative and operative liturgical aspects of the text will take priority over other material in the text (Nord 2007:62).

I saw a need to translate the source text, *Pastoral Liturgy* by H.C. Horak, because during an interview with Dr Horak, who is the author of the booklet, in September 2011, he made me understand the following about the booklet: Firstly, it was written as a liturgical guide for various Pentecostal churches and cultural groups in South Africa and abroad. Secondly, he also intended it to be adapted and used by various Pentecostal denominations. Thirdly, the author intended it to be adapted to the various cultural groups within the Full Gospel Church, and he had already prepared an Afrikaans version of the booklet.

Thus, I decided to translate this booklet into Setswana, firstly, because there was no such document within the Batswana Pentecostal churches in the North West province and more specifically in the Full Gospel Church of God. Secondly, the descendants of the earlier Pentecostals are living in the postcolonial era and are now educated and have studied at universities. When they mix with other Pentecostals, both within the denomination and from other denominations, they discover that the liturgies of these other denominations have been formalised but find no such formalisation within their own denomination. They want to know why there was no indigenous publication in their denomination, which is over a century old. As stated previously, postcoloniality demands that the gospel be articulated, received, appropriated and reproduced into various cultures, and consequently, I saw the need to inculturate it into Setswana through translation. Thirdly, postcolonial Pentecostal mission is still ontologically and terminologically a Western imperial construct that excludes marginalised voices. Therefore, there is a need to indigenise the above-mentioned liturgical text by translating its expressions and experiences into indigenous languages. Lastly, because of the postcolonial influence, these aforementioned descendants of earlier Pentecostals are beginning to search for some form of order and commonality with regard to liturgy in their own denomination. For example, among African Pentecostals in the ranks of the Full Gospel Church of God, liturgy is very diverse with individual pastors doing as they please. A practical example would be the burial rites and unveiling of tombstones, of which I shall provide details in the source text analysis. Therefore, through this translation, I shall attempt to provide an indigenised liturgy with some kind of order.

The target readership of this text consists of Setswana-speaking members of the Full Gospel Church of God in the Kgalagadi and Bophirima regions. According to the Full Gospel Church of God Constitution (2013:11–15), this denomination is a classical Pentecostal church that believes in the divine inspiration of the Bible. It is a Trinitarian denomination that

believes in one God eternally existing in three persons, namely Father, Son and Holy Spirit. It believes in the Incarnation of Christ, which means that in Christ, God manifested Himself as a human being to save humanity. The denomination also believes in the existence of Satan. It believes that all mankind is in a fallen state and can only change that position through regeneration or by undergoing the 'born again' experience through the impartation of the divine nature. It believes in reconciliation, where God and humans are reconciled through the finished work of the cross. It believes in justification by faith, water baptism and baptism in the Holy Spirit with initial evidence of speaking in tongues. It also believes in divine healing and the manifestation and operation of spiritual gifts just as they happened in the Book of Acts and as explained in the epistles. The denomination believes in the pre-tribulation rapture, which means that the second coming of Christ and the rapture of the believers will happen before the great tribulation. Finally, it believes in the millennial reign of Christ and the ultimate punishment of the wicked in Hell.

The denomination is divided into 27 regions covering the whole of South Africa, and it is found in all nine of the country's provinces. The delimitations of these regions are made on the basis of language and cultural preferences as expressed by local churches (Full Gospel Church Constitution 2013:50). The above-mentioned regions, Kgalagadi and Bophirima, are Setswana-speaking regions in the North West Province but my translation is not only limited to these two regions only and can also be used by other Setswana-speaking local churches found in other regions. Therefore, it will be used by the following members of the Full Gospel Church of God:

- i. all Setswana-speaking pastors in the full-time ministry of the Full Gospel Church of God
- ii. all presiding elders who lead a church where there is no qualified pastor to lead it
- iii. local preachers with privileges to carry out the liturgy under the supervision of a senior pastor
- iv. Evangelists and missionaries to the Setswana-speaking people.

6.2.1. Analysis of the translation brief

The translation is intended to serve a different purpose than that which the source text serves among the English-speaking members of the Full Gospel Church of God ministry ranks.

The function of the target text is that it will be an indigenised source book for liturgy amongst the Setswana-speaking members of the Full Gospel Church of God. As a straightforward guide with its simple pastoral vocabulary, the source text's style of presentation will be retained but adapted where necessary with regard to social, cultural and ecclesiastical proclivities of the Batswana Pentecostals.

The brief states categorically that the target addressees are the Setswana-speaking members of the Full Gospel Church of God, whose first language is predominantly Setswana. They are male and female between the ages 16 to 90 and above, they are semi-literate, able to read Setswana and also have a minimal understanding of English and Afrikaans. As this is a church publication, the social status of the addressees (or similar issues) is not a major concern. This translation is for Setswana-speaking people from all walks of life within the denomination.

The time and place of reception is within the local church and wherever the local church is required to conduct the liturgy, for example, at funerals and weddings outside the church.

The medium of the text will be similar to the source text: a small paper-back booklet.

The reason for the production of the text is to make *Pastoral Liturgy* available in Setswana as one of the official South African languages.

I am going to do an instrumental translation of *Pastoral Liturgy* in Setswana, and I shall consider loyalty to the source text with regard to decisions while translating this text. I shall decide which macrotextual and microtextual strategies will be used, keeping in mind that the most important element of this translation is its function in the target language. But this is not the only important aspect of this translation. The other important task is to conduct a source text analysis in order to produce an adequate translation.

6.2.2. The source text analysis

It is a known fact that in a functionalist translation, the translation type is not determined by the source text, but by the purpose of the translation process. Hence, the question is what the role of source text analysis is in the translation process (Nord 2007:62).

Nord (2007:62) has the following answer with regard to the above-mentioned question: Firstly, she argues that although the purpose of the target text is prioritised, it does not render

the source text an irrelevant offer of information as assumed by others. Secondly, she asserts that the source text is the first offer of information, which means that it is the starting point from which the target text offer of information will be formulated. Thirdly, the purpose of the source text analysis is to guide the translation process with regard to three decisions. Is the translation assignment feasible? Which source text units are relevant for functional translation? Which translation strategies will be appropriate for the target text to meet the requirements of the translation brief?

In addition, Lötter (2001:62) adds that source text analysis is relevant in meeting the requirement of functionality and loyalty to the source text, and it also assists with deciding which functions are to be retained and which are to be adapted in the target text.

Therefore, in the present translation process, I shall use various text-linguistic models to analyse the source text by focusing on the pragmatic analysis of the communicative situations involved, as Nord suggests. I shall employ the same model for both the source text and the translation brief and highlight the differences between source text and target text addressees with respect to sociocultural background, world knowledge and cultural expectations (Nord 2007:62).

6.2.2.1. Text type

Before I can proceed, I need to classify the text as belonging to a particular text type.

According to Reiss, text types are universal phenomena in any communicative situation. There are three basic communicative types of texts, namely informative, expressive and operative texts (Reiss & Vermeer 2013:182). This allocation of texts to any of the translation-oriented text types assists with the specification of a hierarchy of criteria in any translation (Reiss & Vermeer *ibid*:142).

The informative text mainly seeks to pass on information such as news, opinions, knowledge, etc. to the reader or receiver of the text, and its main function is to inform (Nord 2007:37). In the translation of *Pastoral Liturgy*, an informative text, the referential content takes the highest priority over all other equivalence requirements. This implies that I should try to give a precise and comprehensive representation of the source text according to the overriding norms of the target language and culture (Reiss & Vermeer 2013:142).

The expressive text, in contrast, mainly seeks to organise information as artistic content with aesthetic criteria, and its main function is to produce an aesthetic effect. The author's stylistic choices, which produce an aesthetic effect on receivers, contribute to the meaning of the text and their effect should be considered in a translation. For texts (source and target) belonging to the same category, a translator should attempt to produce a comparable effect in translating an expressive text (Nord 2007:38).

The operative text mainly seeks to persuade and encourage the text receiver to act according to the text sender's intention. Its main function is to have a certain effect on the receivers of the text. In an operative text, equivalence is focused on reproducing the persuasive characteristics of the text in a translation. This implies that connotative and associative elements are ranked higher than denotative-referential ones. The focus here is on the fact that the text should bring about the same reaction from different audiences, the source text and target text audiences, which might lead to some changes in target text content to produce a similar response (Nord 2007:38).

Pastoral Liturgy can be categorised as a practical theology text. It is specifically called a pastoral liturgy because it aims at providing the clergy and the lay clergy with a resource for assisting church members with the practice of their faith. It is the study and application of liturgy in the actual life of the church. The text grounds practice in the history of liturgy and theology of worship, but at the same time it is sensitive to the cultural background of the assembly. It provides guidance to pastoral leaders about their liturgical tradition, in this case, the Pentecostal liturgical tradition.

Therefore, from the above-mentioned analysis, it is clear that the text I shall translate is a hybrid text because it is both an informative and operative text. The operative part will be found when dealing with issues of protocol, directing various programmes and rendering various services like serving communion or officiating at marriages. As stated previously, this is a pastoral liturgy guide, and by definition, a guide is a book providing information on a subject. This makes it an informative text because of its function of informing its users on how to practise the liturgy. It is not only a guide, but it also functions as a manual for liturgy. For example, it guides one in how to perform a funeral, a baptism or a dedication of a building. All these events produce the same effect on the participants, for example, a funeral service is a solemn event and has an elements of sadness for both the source text and target text audiences. The baptism service and the dedication of a new building produce joy and

celebration in both audiences. Since the text is a hybrid of both functions, the informative and operative have equal weight in English and most probably in Setswana. I shall ultimately decide which function to retain in the translation because it is my prerogative as a translator, unless the target text allows for both functions (Reiss & Vermeer 2013:184). As the translator, if there are any deviations from the norm, I shall indicate them and translate according to the dictates of context. The writing style of the source text is fairly simple, instructional, operational and practical. The source text analysis has two distinct components, namely extratextual analysis and intratextual analysis, which will be discussed hereunder.

6.2.2.2. Extratextual analysis of Pastoral Liturgy

The author of the text is G.C. Horak who is a pastor, regional overseer and a member of the Executive Council of the Full Gospel Church of God in southern Africa. He is an Afrikaans-speaking pastor who has written the same text in English and Afrikaans. I happen to know the author personally, so before starting with the translation, I asked him for an interview. During the interview, I asked first about his intentions with the production of the text. His answer was that the text was just a guide for those who were training for ministry and those who were already in ministry to bring a semblance of order to their ministration. His aim was to produce a text that would be adaptable to other Pentecostals of various persuasions or traditions, but it is, first and foremost, a liturgy book for the Full Gospel Church of God. He said that he was aware that our cultural backgrounds dictated our practice of liturgy and that I could adapt the text as I saw fit in Setswana.

The source text's addressees are the ordained ministers of the Full Gospel Church of God, those in the ministry undergoing training in the denomination and other Pentecostals who are interested in using the text.

The text is a written communication in the form of a booklet. It is written in English for an English-speaking audience. The source text is an English source book for liturgy and the target text will be a Setswana source book for liturgy.

The text was produced in 2007 in Bloemfontein, in the Free State Province in South Africa, and was written in South African English by an Afrikaans-speaking author. The Free State is predominantly a Sesotho and Afrikaans province due to its neighbouring borders and vast farming areas.

The text was received throughout South Africa by the English-speaking members of the Full Gospel Church of God. After its publication in 2007, it has been used as an official liturgical book of the denomination.

The motive of communication, as stated in the preface by the author's friend and colleague, is to articulate the final decision a liturgist should make in performing the liturgy and to pursue a pastoral liturgy relevant to the Full Gospel Church of God. It also aims to provide a called person with a foundation upon which he/she can develop their own pastoral liturgy practice. The motive is also to give those in the ministry competence to minister the Word of God effectively and efficiently. When such competence is attained, the ideal of empowering postcolonial epistemologies will begin to be realised, although in small ways.

6.2.2.3. Intratextual analysis of Pastoral Liturgy

Subject matter

The subject matter of this text is the practice of liturgy within a local church situation where the ministers and members are given the opportunity to practice their faith. It deals with pulpit manners and how to conduct certain services in the local church. It also explains some of the concepts that pertain to liturgy, their meaning and significance. It gives the minister tools of competence with regard to the carrying out of his/her ministerial responsibilities in the local church. For example, it guides the minister as to how he/she can conduct a funeral or prepare a military funeral program, to mention just a few.

Except for the fact that 'The Preliminary' is at the beginning of the text and 'Benedictions' is at the end, in the source text, there is no chronological order of services. I think that is why the author wrote it in small stand-alone chapters that treat each topic separately. Cohesion of the text is found only in the chapters themselves, for example, the topics of dying and the funeral of the dead are linked in one chapter. Basically, there is no flow of subject matter from chapter to chapter. For example, the third chapter on pastoral care for the dying is followed by a chapter on the baptismal service.

Content and composition

The content is presented in chapters in a very simple presentation. There is no special order of the chapters, and each chapter is a stand-alone chapter that can be read and be understood

on its own. There are no events or practices that chronologically follow each other. My observation is that this is conventional for pastoral liturgy or minister's service books; one book would start with the order of a funeral service, another would start with the solemnisation of a matrimonial service, still another would start with a church service order, whilst others would have introductory explanations as to how the text might be used. Typical examples would be the Baptist liturgical book; *Buka Ya Baruti* and the *Methodist Service Book*.

In short, the source text is organised in the following way: an introductory explanation of what the liturgy is with regard to classical Pentecostalism, the order and execution of various services, ministerial etiquette, protocol and benediction. In this translation, I believe it would be better to start with 'The Preliminary' as the first chapter, which was the second chapter in the source text. The reason is that the preliminary explains the theology behind the liturgy and also gives definitions of the theological concepts, terms and liturgical aspects practiced in the church. It also highlights the doctrinal biases of the Full Gospel Church of God. The solemnisation of marriage will be in chapter two so that, in a way, the beginning of liturgy will be like the biblical origin of the worshippers of Jehovah, who were a couple (Gn 1). In the middle chapters, I shall arrange the activities of the church that constitute the life of the church and group them according to their similarities or chronology with regard to the life of the church. The last chapters will be on death and dying and benedictions.

Presuppositions

As stated previously, the text is informative and operative. With respect to its informative aspects, the text contains some presuppositions as it is written for people who are ministry practitioners. These are people who are familiar with ministerial decorum and execution. Thus, the presupposition is that the text serves as a reminder or guide with regard to the execution of pastoral duties. Those in the pastoral ministry are aware of how they should behave and how they should practice their faith.

Concerning its operative aspects, the translation will consistently follow the general rules that are common to source culture and target culture practice because these are distinct doctrinal matters of the denomination, like those of baptising by immersion only once or the ordination of ministers by a member of the executive council.

The system of presentation of subject matter is that of a guide, with an explanation of subject matter and the order of execution with regard to the subject matter. It is like a how-to book of pastoral liturgy, but it also respects the backgrounds of its various users.

The language structure follows easy English grammar rules. The communicative situation is at its simplest level. The author wishes to provide information concerning the understanding and the how-to of the liturgy. This is done in the hope that it will assist the minister to bring members closer to God. The text is written in a simple style of writing so that for each service or chapter, there is simplicity in execution.

6.2.2.4. The source text-in-situation and target text-in-situation comparison

The intended functions of the source text and the target text are generally different, although they are similar in some instances. The similarity is that both texts are guides for pastoral liturgy within the Pentecostal tradition. Both texts are informative and operative texts. The function of the source text is that of a guide for ministry students and ministers in the Full Gospel Church of God. The function of the target text or translation, as stated previously, is to be an indigenised source book for liturgy amongst the Setswana-speaking members of the Full Gospel Church of God, for those in the ministry of the church, the lay ministers and qualified ministers of the denomination. This means that in order to fulfil the requirements of the translation brief, the translation has to be a heterofunctional instrumental translation. This is because of the difference in the functions of the two texts and because the functions of the original cannot be completely preserved due to cultural or temporal distance (Nord 2007:50–51). The informative and operative aspects of the text will have the same status or preference in the translation.

The source text addressees are ordained ministers and students, and their level of education implies a slightly higher competence than that of the target addressees. The target addressees are a mixture of semi-literate and literate ministers whose competence levels are lower than those of the source addressees. Thus, for the target addressees, I shall make adjustments to ensure that both explicit and implicit cultural knowledge is simplified and explained (this should not be misunderstood as undermining anyone but rather as clarifying matters and making them simple for users). The difference in the cultural background of the addressees is acknowledged and whatever cultural adaptation, stylistic conventions and target-culture textual conventions are needed will be adhered to (Nord 2007:63).

The source text was produced in Bloemfontein in 2007 for English-speaking members of the Full Gospel Church of God throughout South Africa and has been used as an official liturgical book of the denomination. The target text will be produced in Bloemfontein for Setswana-speaking members of the Full Gospel Church of God in the Kgalagadi and Bophirima regions and other places where Setswana-speaking people are found. There will be problems regarding the time of reception, and the text might be accepted or rejected. Because this is a postcolonial text, purists and Setswana language activists would probably reject the target text because it does not retain the pre-colonial usage but only deals with the current postcolonial situation.

The medium will be the same for both the source and target texts.

The reason for producing the source text was to articulate a relevant pastoral liturgy to be constituted in the Full Gospel Church of God. The reason for producing the target text is to encourage the use and appreciation of indigenous languages in liturgy and the production of such texts within the Pentecostal movement in the postcolonial era. Both the informative and operative functions will have the same priority in the target text.

One advantage of comparing source text-in-situation and target text-in-situation is that it will assist me with identifying problems in advance. This comparison between the source language text and the target language text also assists me with choosing which elements I shall change and which elements I shall adjust to the requirement of the purpose of the translation (Nord 2007).

6.2.2.5. The categorisation of translation problems

Within a teaching environment and for teaching purposes, translation problems are categorised as pragmatic, cultural and linguistic translation problems. I intend to apply this categorisation to the present translation (Nord 2005:174).

Pragmatic translation problems in the present translation are as follows: I, the sender or translator, as stated previously, am not a Motswana but an umXhosa who has been inculturated in Setswana. This is a problem because Setswana and English are my second languages at home, but in the academic world, Setswana is my home language or mother tongue and English is my second language. My handling of everything in this translation is from a hybrid perspective.

The receivers of the text will not be aware that the text is a translation, and due to the level of education of some of the receivers, I am compelled to explain a great deal to clarify matters in the target text. The receivers of the source text are people of mixed cultural groups, including Asians, White people and the Black middle class who all have different cultures. The receivers of the target text are predominantly Setswana-speaking and predominantly Batswana who share the same cultural background. Therefore, these problems will be solved by always referring to Setswana culture and by grounding the translation in a Setswana cultural background. This means that the translation will first of all be done in such a way that it recognises the cultural proclivities of the Batswana people.

Cultural translation problems will also surface. For example, among the Batswana, the most senior or elderly person is given preference. For instance, if the regional overseer and local pastor are at the same funeral, it is expected that the junior pastor should hand over the proceedings to the senior member in status or in age. Or in the wedding programme, the senior uncle represents the woman's family or the man's family. Once this uncle has spoken, there is no need for other members of the family to give a speech. For the preparation of baptism, a senior woman will attend to issues of decorum that are relevant to women who are going to be baptised, and a senior man will attend to those that are relevant to men. These conventions are problematic because in the source text the issues of seniority are not by age but by virtue of position. When one implements these conventions in translation it would as if one has changed the source text and mistranslated it. In my translation, these problems have been solved through an explication regarding these processes. Other cultural problems emanating from the two cultures are those of burial rites and procedures. Within the English community, a funeral is a solemn activity in which no singing is allowed, but for the Batswana, singing is part of the therapy for bereavement. There is a great deal of singing at the cemetery to help the bereaved come to terms with grief. This has been incorporated in the funeral program.

When it comes to linguistic translation problems, I would like to highlight some of the general rules that apply to the Setswana language. I shall mention a few general rules that will be applied to the present translation and these fall under grammar, syntax and orthographic conventions. According to Berg, Pretorius and Pretorius (2013:1), Setswana is an agglutinative language with rich verbal inflections, and words in Setswana sentences are arranged in a subject-verb-object order.

The general rule of handling adjectives in Setswana is that adjectives are used with a noun. They precede a noun for emphasis in a sentence and can also be used without the noun but with the noun implied in the sentence. This will be accordingly applied in the translation.

Capital letters in Setswana should only be used at the beginning of a sentence and to refer to proper names of people, places, months, etc. English tends to overuse capitals, but in my translation I shall not do that. Instead I shall adhere to my knowledge of Setswana spelling conventions.

Compounding in Setswana is for coining new terminology. For example the translation for [Program Director], is *Motsamaisa Tirelo* to *motsamaisatiro* I shall apply this rule throughout the translation if there is a need for me to coin a new word.

Regarding gender, there is a balance in the translation when it comes to assigning roles and functions to men and women. In the Pentecostal movement, ministry roles are fulfilled by both males and females, for example, *Moruti*, [pastor] is both male and female, as is *Moreri* [preacher]. There is a common understanding that when referring to these individuals, issues of gender are mute. This is also assisted by Setswana pronouns that refer to people and animals as the neuter case. For example, *Moreri o rera Lentswe la Modimo* [The preacher preaches the Word of God]. ‘He/she is preaching the Word of God’ is translated with the same pronoun, *O: O rera Lentswe la Modimo*. This augurs well for postcolonial translation, as this type of translation resists dominance and sexism. Postcolonialism addresses issues of identities and gender issues and identities feature prominently in postcolonial theory.

English nouns are used as loan words and then later integrated into Setswana, thus taking part of the dominating language’s words and using them to empower the dominated language. But, as stated above, this is done within the confines of Setswana orthography, by adding vowels that make the word sound like a Setswana word. Plurals in Setswana are formed by adding prefixes according to the noun classes to which they belong, while in English, suffixes are added to form plurals. An example will be the word protocol, which I have translated as *phorotokholo*.

In Setswana, the following punctuation rules have been observed in the translation: The comma is used to separate words in a list and to indicate a slight pause. A colon is used to separate a sentence from examples or elaborations. The hyphen is used to link compound words (Otlogetswe 2012:appendix).

Lastly, there is a difference between English and Setswana syntax and register in that Setswana is more descriptive and elaborate than English. In Setswana, one generally describes the action before stating its purpose. I shall observe the above-mentioned rules in my translation.

6.3. Translation problems and strategies of indigenising a postcolonial pastoral liturgy text

My main focus is that the translation should indigenise the liturgy and liturgical practices in *Pastoral Liturgy*. This means that I will be producing a postcolonial, indigenised Setswana target text of *Pastoral Liturgy* by G.C. Horak that will be accessible to Pentecostal Setswana people. Among other things, I need to produce an indigenised Setswana pastoral liturgy text that will be culturally relevant to Setswana speaking congregations in the Kgalagadi and Bophirima regions of the Full Gospel Church of God. In this section, I shall consider essential strategies for indigenising a practical theology translation both on the macrotextual and microtextual level, and I shall also focus on postcolonial functional aspects of translating the text. I shall highlight the translation problems arising from this translation and suggest strategies for dealing with them. As stated previously, this is a translation of a religious text, and I deem it necessary to present a discussion of the features of religious translation and religious colonial and postcolonial encounters.

The translation of religious texts as a way of disseminating faith messages has certain features that need to be highlighted (Elewa 2014:25). Elewa (2014:26) mentions about six such features, of which two will be relevant for this study. The first one is the archaic morphological features of religious texts and the lexical aspects of religious texts. Some archaic morphological forms used in the source text of the present study are: thee, thou, thine, wedded, betwixt, ye and doth, to mention just a few. Religious texts are also characterised by special lexical items or specialised vocabulary found only in the context of religion, like the distinctive theological words such as Calvary, passion, Eucharist, etc. David Crystal suggests that these can be roughly categorised into seven categories (Crystal 1964:154–155):

- i. vocabulary that requires explicit historical elucidation, usually with considerable emotional overtones, like crucifix, martyr or disciple
- ii. vocabulary requiring historical elucidation but without definable emotional overtones, like centurion, synagogue, cubit or talent

- iii. vocabulary of personal qualities and activities with no explicit correlation with the past, but that needs to be interpreted in light of Christ's own usage and example, like mercy, pity, charity or prayer
- iv. vocabulary referring to commonly used, specifically religious concepts that can be given a universal definition, like heaven, hell or heresy
- v. technical terms like sermon, collect missal or cruet
- vi. theological terms like consubstantiation, only-begotten or transubstantiation
- vii. vocabulary that frequently occurs in liturgical language, like exorcism, transgression, partake, or admonish.

With regard to translation in colonial and postcolonial encounters with indigenous people, Naudé and Miller-Naudé (2011:314–315) make these assumptions about the translation of religious texts:

- The translation of religious texts is normal, like the translation of texts belonging to a culture that is remote from the target text.
- The translation of a sacred text is an opening up of a foreign text.
- Translation of sacred texts is done for specific purposes.
- Translators of religious texts should utilise translation strategies instead of striving for equivalence.
- Strategies that are relevant for the transfer of culture-specific terms include transference, indigenisation/domestication, cultural substitution, generalisation, specification, mutation, etc.
- Instead of the normative analysis of the translation of sacred texts, there should be description and explanation of the translation in light of the translator's ideology, strategies and cultural norms.
- The cultural knowledge in the translation of a sacred text is shaped by the epistemology, hermeneutics and religious spirituality of translators.
- The four dimensions of translating a sacred text are unregulated translation, regulated translation, a transitional phase between closed and open translation and finally, open translation.

The main difference between the source text and the target text is that they are each written in a different cultural context that needs to be highlighted. The source text was written in

English, but the author also intended for it to be adapted to a liturgical viewpoint inherent in a particular local church (Horak 2007:1).

6.3.1. Translation problems and strategies on macrotextual level

The macrotextual strategy chosen for this study is an indigenisation of the source text so that it would feel as natural as a text first produced in Setswana. As stated previously, a postcolonial translation must speak with the voice of the subaltern and must resist being foreign to the target addressees. But as I have established in Chapter Three, the postcolonial subject is hybrid, and therefore there will be elements of hybridity in the target text.

6.3.1.1. Cohesion

Newmark (1988:23) asserts that the cohesive level follows both the structure and the moods of the text. Because the structure follows a train of thought, it gives direction to the text. The source text, as indicated above, is written in standalone chapters which I have rearranged to establish chronology and some sort of liturgical order. For example, the second chapter in the original text just after the introduction is about caring for the sick, dying and funerals. This is culturally inappropriate because for the Batswana, death is the last event in a person's life. Therefore, it cannot be at the beginning of anything – it is always at the end. Consequently, I replaced the second chapter with the marriage service, which is how life started in the beginning when God brought a couple together and blessed them. I put the chapter on caring for the sick, dying and funerals at the end because life progresses that way.

The examples of changes made in the text are indicated below for the sake of clarity and easy understanding:

- i. layout of text
- ii. sections that have been joined for the sake of cohesion.
- iii. sections that have been added/deleted for indigenisation.

Layout of text

The text is arranged in chapters with headings and subheadings. All the programmes and application forms are inserted in text boxes with bold margins to highlight them and to create templates for target text users. Each new chapter starts on a new page, which is similar to the source text's layout. When a chapter ends in the middle or beginning of a page, the next

chapter will always be on the next new page. The division of paragraphs is changed to form a cohesive whole in the target text, and some of the bulleted sections have been converted to single paragraphs. The headings and subheadings are written in bold capital letters to let them stand out. For example, ‘Pulpit decorum’ is written in the following manner in the translation:

MAITSHOLO A PULIPITI

Sections that have been joined for the sake of cohesion.

Chapter, One, Eighteen and Nineteen have been combined to form Chapter Eleven as they all deal with ministerial etiquette. I did this for the sake of cohesion. The source text’s Chapter One is inserted in Chapter Eleven as point 11.3 and it is as follows:

11.3 MAITSHOLO A “PULIPITI”

In English, (1), (2), (3) and (4) below are bulleted and are not paragraphs. They are as follows but I changed them into paragraphs for cohesion and because they make more sense together in a paragraph.

Source text:

- The minister should come to his pulpit conscious that he is an ambassador of God to his people.
- It is in the Name and on the authority of Jesus Christ that he stands there.
- He should therefore take heed of himself and his actions and his speech.

Target text:

(1)

Moreri wa lefoko la Modimo o tshwanetse go tlaa mo pulipiting ya gagwe ka maikutlo a a feletseng a gore ke moemedi wa Modimo mo bathong ba One [go latela tsamaiso ya kereke ya Full Gospel Church of God e ka nna wa mme kgotsa wa rre]. O eme moo ka ntlha ya Leina la Modimo le ka nonofo ya ga Jesu Keresete. Ka jalo o tshwanetse go ikela tlhoko mo puong le mo ditrong tsa gagwe.

In (2) below, the source text is made up of two bulleted sections that I changed into one paragraph for cohesion because they were addressing the issue of how a minister should respond to scriptural injunction.

Source text:

- The scriptural rule for this office is that everything should be done “decently and in order”.
- The minister has the opportunity to touch the lives of those who wait on his ministry in their most solemn and sacred moments.
- He must always remember that a great responsibility rests on the servant of the Lord and he is accountable to God and not to man.
- The question that should be continuously asked is, how best can these high and holy obligations be discharged?

Target text:

(2)

Dikwalo tse di Boitshepo di laela gore sengwe le sengwe se se diriwang ke motlhankedi wa tsa tumelo ya Bokeresete di dirwe ka masisi le ka tolamo. Ka nltha ya gore Moreri wa lefoko la modimo o tshwanetse go gopola ka nako tshotlhe gore o nale tshono ya go ka ama ba ba mo reeditse mo tshisibalong ya bone e e kwa godimo le mo nakong eo ba letileng dilo tse galalelang. O tshwanetse go gopola gore o nale maikarabelo a magolo jaaka motlhanka wa Modimo le gore o ikarabela mo Modimong e seng mo mothong. Potso e e tshwanetseng go nna le ena ka metlha ke ya gore aka dira jang go dira tiro e e itshepileng e le e e kwa godimo jana ka matseseleko a magolo.

Source text:

- The minister must watch his spirit. Nothing is as important as heart-interest in the spiritual welfare of those who look to the minister for help. It is well to precede the service time with a time of communion with God to be able to stand in the pulpit and declare “thus sayeth the Lord.”

Target text:

(3)

Moreri o tshwanetse go ela tlhoko mowa wa gagwe. Ga go na sepe se botlhokwa jaaka katlhegelo ya pelo ya gagwe mo maemong a semowa a ba o ba tlhokometseng le go ba thusa.

O tshwanetse go simolola sengwe le sengwe ka go nna le nako ya kabelano le Modimo go ka kgona go ema mo pulipiting le go bua se se batliwang ke Modimo ka nako eo.

Source text:

- The sermon should be well prepared and be delivered in the fear of the Lord. The minister must seek to speak word of edification, exhortation and comfort.

Target text:(4)

Molaetsa wa Modimo o tshwanetse go ka bakangwa ka matsetseleko mme o rerwe ka pontsho ya go tshaba Modimo. Moreri o tshwanetse go rera mantswa a a godisang, a rotloetsang le a a kgothatsang.

Sections that have been added/deleted for indigenisation

In Chapter Two, which is the chapter on holy matrimony, in order to indigenise the marriage, I first added an explanation of the background of a Setswana marriage. Most of this section is rewritten in order to accommodate the Setswana culture and also allow the church to engage with the Setswana culture. In the West, a marriage is an agreement between two people who love each other and is based on Western individualism. In the Setswana culture, marriage is a communal matter and more people than just the couple are involved. In the source text, the liturgy starts with pre-marital counselling by the minister and excludes the parents and relatives until the day of the wedding. In my translation, I included the family in the liturgy and pre-marital counselling because that is what really happens in Setswana marriages. One cannot get married without parental counsel and that of one's close relatives.

In a pre-colonial setting, this is what happened in Setswana culture:

Lenyalo la Setswana kgotsa la Motswana le ne le tshimologa ka bagolo ba banyalani, lekau le ne le batlelwa mosadi. [Previously, a Setswana marriage started with parents. The man's parents would search for a wife for him from an eligible family, an agreement would be reached and the children would be married.]

Then, after the Batswana encountered other groups of indigenous people, the following happened:

Mme erile mo tsamaong ya nako fa Batswana ba kopana le merafe e mengwe dilo tsa fetoga mme jaanong le tshimologa ka baratani. [But currently, things have changed because as the Batswana met other tribes, their culture had to accommodate those tribes; now marriage starts with the couple.] *Mme fa ba fetsa go utlwana ka mafoko, ba itsise batsadi mme go rulagangwe letsatsi la Patlo e e kopaneng le dipuisano tsa magadi.* [When the couple agree to marry, they inform their parents, then the date for *lobola* negotiations would be set.] *Morago go ntshiwa magadi, morago ga magadi batsadi ba neela moradi wa bona go ka nyalwa* (Mareme 2008:xxvi–xxxiv). [After *lobola* has been paid, the parents would give over their daughter for marriage.] *Mo Setswaneng lenyalo ke magadi, mo Molaong ke go saena, mo Sekereseteng ke go segofadiwa ga Lenyalo.* [In Setswana, marriage is solemnised through *lobola*, in the state it is solemnised through the signing of the marriage register and the presentation of the marriage certificate and in Christianity it is solemnised through the blessing by a minister or pastor designated as a marriage officer.]

The above background section has been added to explain the process of traditional marriage and the involvement of the family in the whole process. It has been inserted because the Pentecostal church in the postcolonial era has to confront such issues, and decide whether or not it recognises such a marriage. This presents a challenge to the church to devise solutions that are relevant for the postcolonial Pentecostal experience. The above-mentioned addition to the target text explains that in Setswana culture, the negotiations and payment of the bride price are what constitute a marriage. According to South African laws, signing the marriage register constitutes a marriage. In Christianity, it is the blessing by the pastor. This is a problem because the source text only speaks about the Christian and legal aspects.

In the following section I have adapted marriage to the Full Gospel Church of God among the Batswana. I have grounded the proceedings in the Setswana culture as I found nothing offensive or contradictory to the practice of Christianity. Thus, the new translated section inserted is as follows:

Lenyalo la Setswana le tshimolola ka baratani ba babedi, mme ba itsise batsadi. [A Setswana marriage starts with a couple, and after their agreement to marry, they inform their parents.] *Morago ga moo go dirwa dithulaganyo tsa go buisana ka bogadi kgotsa magadi.* [Thereafter, the bride price negotiations are commenced and

the relevant people are sent.] *Fa e le bakaulengwe ba ba pholositsweng, fa batsadi ba fetsa go buisana mme go na le ditumalano tsa gore nyalo e tlaa nna teng, go itsisiwe Moruti.* [If the couple are born-again believers, when the bride price negotiations have been finalised, then the pastor is informed and then he starts with pre-marital counselling.] *Mo Bazalwaneng nyalo e a neelwa ga e iphiwe.* [In Pentecostal churches, you do not marry yourself without parental consent; you are given consent, then you can marry, no matter your age.] *Tshegofatso ya pele ya lenyalo e tswa mo batsading, jaanong morago ga moo kereke e tsene.* [The first blessing for marriage is from the couple's parents and thereafter the church can bless your union.] *Go ya ka tsamaiso ya Full Gospel Church lenyalo le tsamaisiwa ke kereke ya lekgarebe.* [According to the Full Gospel Church, the marriage ceremony is officiated by the bride's local assembly and any contrary procedure is negotiated with the local pastor.] *[Lenyalo la Bazalwane ba Full Gospel Church lona lo ntse jaana:* [The Pentecostal marriage of the Full Gospel Church is as follows:]

Patlo e tsamaisana le tshepiso ya lenyalo, ke gore fa morweetsana a fetsa go batliwa kereke e tlhaloganya seo jaaka tshepiso. [The bride price negotiations go hand in hand with betrothal or a promise to marry, after the afore-mentioned negotiations, the church understands that as an engagement or promise to marry.] *Kereke e a itsisiwe ke batsadi fa ba tsena kereke e le ngwe mme fa e le ba kereke e sele mongwe le mongwe o tlaa itsisi moruti wa gagwe.* [When the parents and the couple belong to the same church, then the church will be notified, if they belong to different churches they would each inform their respective pastors.] *Mme moruti o tlaa dira dithulaganyo tsa Tirelo ya go Laya ya Pele ga Lenyalo (Premarital Counselling).* [The pastor would then plan a pre-marital counselling program.] *Fa magadi kgotsa karolo ya magadi e fetswa go ntshiwa jaanong Tirelo ya go Laya ya Pele ga Lenyalo e ya tshimologo.* [When a portion of the *lobola* has been received, then the pastor would initiate the official pre-marital counselling service.] *Jaanong baratani ba babedi batlaa emisiwa kwa kerekeng ka mokgwa wa go beya letlhokwa (engagement) kgotsa wa go tlhagisiwa (official announcement of courtship).* [Then the church would make an official announcement of the engagement at a particular service in the church and the courtship would be public.]

Fa magadi a fetsa go ntshiwa go tlaa latela letsatsi la nyalo, mo moruti kgotsa moruti yo o nyadisang o tlaa segofatsang lenyalo mme batsadi ba neele bana Lenyalo. [When the bride price has been fully paid, then the wedding day will be announced and then the marriage officer or the pastor would solemnise and bless the marriage.] *Morago ga moo ngwetsi e tlaa isiwa kwa ga bo motlhankana mme tirelo ya lenyalo e khutlaa moo.* [After that, the bride would be taken to her in-laws and the matrimonial service would be concluded.]

In the current Setswana marriage, the couple meet and when they agree that they are compatible and want to marry, they tell their parents. The negotiations then start for *lobola* or *magadi*, marriage negotiations for the bride price. If they are both born again, the church will be informed after the negotiations by informing the pastor. This now becomes a church and a family event with the pastor giving pre-marital counselling and helping with the planning of the wedding day. It is a custom for born-again believers that one is given marriage and given to marriage. One does not marry on one's own or elope. The first blessing comes from the parents and is followed by the church's blessing. According to the Full Gospel Church of God, the woman's church handles all the wedding arrangements with regard to church proceedings. The wedding will also be officiated at the bride's local church, and the bride's pastor will officiate and solemnise the marriage.

The other section that has been indigenised is the one dealing with funerals. The whole section about the funeral service differs significantly in the source culture and target culture. This can be seen in the way the minister gets involved and the way comfort is brought to the bereaved. For example, there are five days' condolence services for the Batswana that start on the Monday after someone's death. This is a common practice among all Christians in the Black community. The only differences are how the services are conducted.

The condolence services have their own programmes and programme directors until the Saturday, when it is the minister's turn to offer condolence to the bereaved. There is also a new trend that is evolving that involves a memorial service held by colleagues to celebrate the contribution of the deceased and also to share some humorous anecdotes about his/her life. Consequently, this section had to be completely adapted and rewritten. The whole section is therefore an indigenised translation. It has been adapted to suit the Batswana in a village and also in a township. The time of the funeral also had to be adapted as the Batswana do not bury anyone after twelve.

Three programmes were added: the condolence service programme, the memorial service programme and a funeral programme.

Services that need to be noted are committal services. Among the Batswana Pentecostals, these rituals have been changed. They use 1 Corinthians 15 as a committal scripture. In performing the committal ritual the “ashes to ashes” recital has been omitted because they say that if the person was not burnt, he/she cannot be ashes. The other recital that has been omitted is “dust to dust” because they believe that what they are doing is sowing the body of the deceased and firmly believe that the body will be resurrected. In addition, they interpret those words as God’s curse towards Adam and Eve, but now, because of Jesus Christ, they are redeemed from the curse of the law.

In the source text culture, there is no singing of hymns, but for the target text culture, singing is encouraged as many declare that a song is soothing to them. This section of the programme has been added so as to indigenise the whole process of burying. Most Black communities observe condolence services from Monday until Friday during which various people come to share the word of God with the family of the deceased. This is due to the migrant labour system that has led to people staying far from each other and because there is a need to wait for those who are working to return home. What is also important to know is that each service has its own programme director. This is accompanied by a great deal of singing choruses and worship songs.

The section on cremation is skipped and deleted. The Batswana do not cremate their dead as it is a great taboo. Here I deleted the whole section because it was culturally offensive.

An example of how the translation has been adapted is the inclusion of the memorial service in the translated text. There is background information on how it came about in the indigenous communities:

Tirelo e e tsalegile fa batho ba bantsho ba ntse ba itlhabolola ka thuto gonna batho ba “porofeshenale”. [The memorial service was as a result of the development of the indigenous people in the professional careers.] *Ke tirelo e gopolang kabelo ya moswi mo botshelong jwa gagwe jwa kwa gae, mo tirong ya gagwe le mo botshelong ka kakaretso.* [It was introduced to celebrate the deceased’s contribution to his family, work and life in general.] *Mme yona e tshwarwa ka tsela e e jaana:* [It is conducted as follows:]

Table 1: Memorial service programme

| Setswana | English |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| <i>Tirelo ya Segopotso</i> | Memorial Service |
| <i>Moradisi (go tswa kwa tirong ya moswi)</i> | Program director (from work) |
| <i>Pulo ka thapelo</i> | Opening prayer |
| <i>Thoriso le kobamelo</i> | Praise and worship |
| <i>Tatelano ya dibui</i> | Speakers' schedule |
| 1. <i>Tsala ya botshelo</i> | 1. Life friend |
| 2. <i>Tsala ya kwa tirong</i> | 2. Work friend |
| 3. <i>Moagisane</i> | 3. Neighbour |
| 4. <i>Modiramongo</i> | 4. Co-worker |
| 5. <i>Supavaesara</i> | 5. Supervisor |
| 6. <i>Mokhanselara/ moemedi wa kgosi</i> | 6. Counsellor/tribal authority rep. |
| <i>Tirelo ya lentswe ka Moruti</i> | Word of encouragement by pastor |
| <i>Dikitsiso</i> | Announcements |
| <i>Tebogo ka wa legae</i> | Vote of thanks by family member |

6.3.1.2. Translation strategies for the whole text

The first problem encountered in the source text is the fact that it consists of 20 standalone chapters of different lengths. If they are translated as they are and if the chapter layout is retained, the target text will not be coherent. The target text will also be used by semi-literate people, so in order to simplify the text for them, I believe grouping chapters with similar or

chronological events together would provide that coherence. Therefore, I have grouped together chapters that treat similar or chronological events and reduced the number of chapters, for example, caring for the sick and terminally ill, death bed vigil and funerals will be in the second-last chapter, just before the chapter on benedictions. The actual grouping of chapters will be as follows: Chapter 2 of the source text will be Chapter 1 of the translated text. Chapter 6 will be Chapter 2. The source text's Chapters 4 and 7 will constitute Chapter 3 of the target text. Chapters 5, 8 and 9 will be Chapter 4 in the translation. Chapters 10 and 11 will become Chapter 5. Chapter 12 will be Chapter 6, Chapters 13 and 14 will be Chapter 7 and Chapter 15 will be Chapter 8. Chapter 16 will become Chapter 9 while Chapter 17 will be Chapter 10. Chapters 1, 18 and 19 will be Chapter 11. Chapters 3 and 20 will be Chapter 12 and chapter 21 will be Chapter 13. The title of the text is translated as "*Buka Ya Tirelo Ya Boruti*" and is nearly equivalent to pastoral liturgy. I did not translate it as *Buka Ya Baruti*, which means a minister's manual, as it will also be used by lay preachers.

Table 2: Source and target chapters and translated chapter titles

| Source Text Chapters | Target text | Combinations | Translation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1. Pulpit Decorum | 1. Preliminary | Chapter 1 was Chapter 2 | <i>1. Dintlha-tlhaloso tsa Pele</i> |
| 2. Preliminary | 2. The marriage service | Chapter 2 was Chapter 6 | <i>2. Lenyalo le le Boitshepo</i> |
| 3. Pastoral Care for the Dying | 3. Dedication of Babies, Baptism | Combination of Chapter 7 and 4 to form Chapter 3 | <i>3. Tshegofatso ya Bana Dikolobetso le Kamogelo ya Maloko a Mašwa</i> |
| 4. The Baptismal Service | 4. Holy Communion, Reception of New Members and Installation of Church Officials | Combination of Chapter 5, 8 and 9 to form Chapter 4 | <i>4. Selalelo, Kamogelo ya Maloko a Mašwa le go tlhomiwa ga Batlhankedi ba Kereke</i> |
| 5. Holy Communion | 5. The Welcome, Induction and Ordination of a Pastor | Combination of Chapter 10 and 11 to form Chapter 5 | <i>5. Kamogelo ya Moruti, Go Tlhomiwa ga gagwe mo Phuthegong le go tlodiwa ga gagwe</i> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| 6. The Marriage Service | 6. Ladies Meetings | Chapter 12 become Chapter 6 | <i>6. Tirelo ya Thapelo ya Bomme le Dikopona tse dingwe tsa bona</i> |
| 7. The Dedication of Babies | 7. Ground Breaking and Dedication Ceremonies | Combination of Chapter 13 and 14 to form Chapter 7 | <i>7. Tirelo ya go Kgakola Lapatlelo le go Neela Kago ya Kereke</i> |
| 8. Reception of new members | 8. The Regional Overseer's Visit and Notification | Chapter 15 became Chapter 8 | <i>8. Kopano ya Ketelo ya Mookamedi wa Setereke</i> |
| 9. Installation of Church Officials | 9. Notification of Meeting | Chapter 16 became Chapter 9 | <i>9. Kitsiso ya Kopano</i> |
| 10. The welcome and Induction of a Pastor | 10. Testimonial | Chapter 17 became Chapter 10 | <i>10. Tesethimoniale</i> |
| 11. Ordination of a minister | 11. Pastoral Etiquette and Protocol | Combination of Chapter 1, 18 and 19 to form Chapter 11 | <i>11. Maitshola a Seruti le Phorotokholo</i> |
| 12. Ladies meetings | 12. Pastoral Care of the Sick, Dying and the Funeral Service | Combination of Chapter 3 and 20 to form Chapter 12 | <i>12. Tiro ya Boruti ya go Tlhokomela Balwetsi le Tirelo ya Phitlho</i> |
| 13. Ground Breaking Ceremony | 13. Benedictions | Chapter 21 became Chapter 13 | <i>13. Mekgwa ya go Tsaya Tshwaro</i> |
| 14. Dedication of a Building | | | |
| 15. The Regional Overseer-Questionnaire and Notification | | | |
| 16. Notification of Meetings | | | |
| 17. Testimonial/CV | | | |
| 18. Pastoral etiquette | | | |
| 19. Protocol and forms of Address | | | |
| 20. Pastoral care of the sick | | | |
| 21. Benedictions | | | |

6.4. Translation problems and strategies on microtextual level

The translation of a religious text is a powerful tool for missionary purposes, and it must be in accord with sound belief even if it is done in a postcolonial era (Elewa 2014:25). And as previously stated, it will depend on the skopos of the translation as found in the translation brief. Translation decisions are based on the semantic meaning of words as well as sociolinguistic and cultural factors. According to Newmark (1988:103) there are five categories for comparing cultures but only two of the five will be relevant for the present translation, and they are:

- i. political, social, legal, religious and artistic organisations, customs and ideas
- ii. culture.

Employing the above-mentioned categories is useful as they assist in the classification of culture-specific items in the translation process, which involves more than just comparing source text and target text (Lötter 2001:104). Elewa (2014:28) is of the opinion that for the translation of religion-specific terms, the procedures proposed by Newmark are applicable. Therefore, in this translation, I shall also adopt procedures proposed by Newmark. Those strategies and procedures are (Newmark 1988:81–93):

- i. Transference is a strategy employed when a source language word is transferred into the target text just as it is without change, and the word becomes a loan word.
- ii. Naturalisation is a procedure that adapts a source language first to the normal pronunciation of the target text, then to the target text's normal morphology.
- iii. Indigenisation is similar to transference, but involves slight modification to remove some of the text's foreignness.
- iv. A cultural equivalent is used when a source language item is translated by an equivalent target language item while maintaining the same meaning.
- v. Functional equivalence is a procedure that requires religion-neutral translation. It involves neutralisation and generalisation and entails the use of culturally neutral words or terms.
- vi. Descriptive is a term used for the process during which the translator paraphrases or explains an item or a term.
- vii. Specification involves the use of a culturally specific target language item to define a culturally specific source language item.

- viii. Mutation takes place when an item is completely deleted or when adding linguistic, cultural or textual items that do not occur in the source text.
- ix. Transposition is a change in drama from source language to target text language.
- x. A translation couplet occurs when mutation and transposition are combined in the translation.
- xi. Through-translation is also called a calque or loan translation. It is a literal translation of a phrase or compound from another language.

6.4.1. Organisations, customs, ideas and institutions

This category of microtextual problems is about social organisation, and it includes items referring to present and historical government, administrative institutions and concepts, international institutional terms and their acronyms, religious and artistic terms referring to movement, processes and organisations.

6.4.1.1. Transference

All organisational names and biblical compound formulas have been transferred as they appear in the source language. The reason is that biblical compound formulas have a straightforward integration into the Setswana noun class system and orthography and are found in most Setswana dictionaries. They are also not English words but have been transferred from biblical languages without change in many Bible translations. Organisational names, in contrast, are those names that denominations have been declared as legal persons and registered with such names. Therefore, changing them in translation would require legal documentation.

I have transferred these religious formulas as shown in table 3:

Table 3: Transference (organisational names and biblical compound formulas)

| Source text | Target text |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| Maranatha | <i>Maranatha</i> |
| Amen | <i>Amen</i> |
| Halleluja | <i>Halleluja</i> |
| Hosanna | <i>Hosanna</i> |
| Abba | <i>Abba</i> |

The following Greek words have also been transferred as they are because they have no indigenous equivalents and because they are used to describe a concept that is not English and only gives etymological information.

Table 4: Transference (Greek words)

| Source text | Target text |
|-------------|-------------------|
| Leitourgia | <i>Leitourgia</i> |
| Leito | <i>Leito</i> |
| Laos | <i>Laos</i> |
| Ergon | <i>Ergon</i> |

6.4.1.2. Indigenisation

The word “Tswana” has been indigenised to its current usage ‘Setswana’ which has recently become the popular usage in English. Therefore the recent convention of referring to indigenous languages as Sesotho, isiXhosa or isiZulu is observed in the translation.

In South Africa, Pentecostals are called *Bazalwane*, which is originally a Zulu name, meaning a group of people doing things together, those who are born again or, literally, brethren. The proper name for Pentecostals in Setswana is *ba ba pholositsweng*, but the predominantly used designation by all speakers of indigenous languages is *Bazalwane*. According to Anderson (1992:4), *Bazalwane* is an isiZulu word meaning brethren, but in the townships its meaning has evolved to mean Pentecostals. This is because members of these church address each other as brethren and have thus earned the name *Bazalwane*.

6.4.1.3. Naturalisation

The following words have been naturalised because they can be easily integrated into Setswana orthography. Some of them are already part of the Setswana lexicon and can be found in the two recent dictionaries of Setswana, namely *Thanodi ya Setswana* and *Tlhalosi ya medi ya Setswana*. These words are *tesetamente*, [testament], *tesethimoniale* [testimonial], *saense* [science], *rejisetara* [register], *Paulo* [Paul], *phorotokholo* [protocol], *Kana wa Galalea* [Cana of Galilea] and *pulipiti* [pulpit]. The Setswana word for testament is *kgolagano*, but the synonym *tesetamente* is acceptable and is commonly used among Pentecostals, and thus I have chosen it for my translation. The second reason for this choice is

that the present translation is a postcolonial translation, and the use of the naturalised word shows that the encounter with the Bible brought about some changes in the Setswana language. This is not a change in structure but a borrowing of words to effect communication, and it is done by a postcolonial translator. The word *saense* is used here because the proper Setswana name for science, which is *bonetetshi*, is not well-known among lay Setswana-speaking Pentecostal preachers. *Bonetetshi* is an academic word only employed in academic circles. It is an old word that never really reached semi-literate people. *Tesethimoniale*, a letter saying something about someone, would also do better in postcolonial translation than the word *lekwalotshupo*, because it is commonly used in everyday conversations. I also used the word *Ikonomi*, [economy], which is *tsa itsholêlo* when properly translated in Setswana.

Table 5: Naturalisation

| Section | Source text | Target text |
|---------|-----------------|------------------------|
| 1. | Testament | <i>Tesetamente</i> |
| 1. | Science | <i>Saense</i> |
| 1.5.2 | Paul | <i>Paulo</i> |
| 2.1.1 | Economy | <i>Ikonomi</i> |
| 2.5.1.1 | Register | <i>Rejisetara</i> |
| 2.5.1.2 | Cana of Galilea | <i>Kana wa Galalea</i> |
| 10. | Testimonial | <i>Tesitimoniale</i> |
| 11. | Protocol | <i>Phorotokholo</i> |
| 11.3 | Pulpit | <i>Pulipiti</i> |

6.4.1.4. Mutation

In section 1, paragraph 1 (p. 4) there is no single word for liturgy in Setswana, so the word has been translated as *tsamaiso ya tirelo Modimo*, which means the order of the liturgy. In this case, it is consistent with the context, but in other contexts, it translated as *tirelo Modimo*. In this particular sentence I added *tsamaiso ya* [order of], which explains liturgy as a process and gives information about what the document is about, thus fulfilling the text's informative function.

In section 1 (p. 4) the heading of Chapter One, the English word preliminary means something done first to introduce or prepare for later things or preparing for something to follow. In the old Educumus dictionary, the word for this heading is given as *tshimologo*, which means the beginning or preface, but it is clear from the context of the source text that it is an explanatory preliminary, not a preface. In the context of the source text, the word preliminary refers to the explanation of some commonly used words in liturgy. To translate that in Setswana would result in *dintlha tsa pele tse di tshalosang*, and this is very long. Therefore, I decided to form a compound because there is no single word for preliminary in Setswana. Thus, I translated the word as *dintlha-tshaloso tsa pele*, which means first explanatory aspects, introductory explanation or a preliminary.

In section 1.1. (p. 4) I made use of deletion. The name used in the source text is Holy Communion, which is normally translated as *Selalelo se se Boitshepo*. In the text, I simply translated it as *Selalelo* and deleted *se seBoitshepo*. Among the *Bazalwane*, other mainline denominations and African independent churches in Black communities, Holy Communion is just called *Selalelo*.

In section 1.3. (p. 4) I found out that the word cultic is very difficult to translate. The word cult means a system of religious worship directed towards a particular figure or object, therefore I translated cultic as *tirelo ya kobamelo*.

In section 1.8. (p. 6) in order to translate the words doxology and eulogy, I added *kgalaletso le poko ya modimo; ya modimo* to indicate who is praised in this context.

In section 1.7. (p. 5) the compound formulas (*mafoko a a sa fetogeng mo malemeng a mantsi/otlhe. Mo malemeng a mantsi/otlhe*), words that are spelt almost the same in most languages, are added to explain the extent of fixedness of formulas.

The whole section on confirmation in the preliminary has been deleted and does not appear in the target text because Pentecostals only observe two ordinances: baptism and Holy Communion.

Table 6: Compound formulas

| Section | English | Setswana | Addition | Deletion |
|---------|---------|----------------------|--------------------|----------|
| 1. | Liturgy | <i>Tirelo modimo</i> | <i>Tsamaiso ya</i> | |

| | | | | |
|------|------------------------|--|--|------------------------|
| 1. | Preliminary | <i>Dintlha-tlhaloso tsa pele</i> | <i>Tsa pele</i> | |
| 1.1. | Holy communion | <i>Selalelo se se Boitshepo</i> | | <i>Se se Boitshepo</i> |
| 1.3. | Cultic | <i>Tirelo ya kobamelo</i> | <i>Tirelo ya</i> | |
| 1.7. | Compound formulas | <i>Mafoko a a sa fetogeng mo malemeng a mantsi</i> | <i>Mafoko a a sa fetogeng mo malemeng a mantsi</i> | |
| 1.8. | Doxology and eulogy | <i>Kgalaletso le poko ya modimo</i> | <i>Ya modimo</i> | |

6.1.4.5. Transposition

This a strategy that involves a change in grammar from source text to the target text.

Section 1.3. (p. 4) is about liturgy having ‘a significant cultic meaning’. I translated this as *e na le bokao jwa tirelo-kobamelo e e kgethegileng* [the meaning of a cultic service that has significance]. A direct translation of the source text sentence does not make sense.

In section 2.1.1. (p. 10) I translated the aspects of premarital counselling as follows: the social aspect became *dintlha tsa loago*, the economic aspect became *dintlha tsa Ikonomi*, the personal aspect became *dintlha tsa botho* and the spiritual aspect became *dintlha tsa semowa*. A direct translation of the above phrases would not make any sense in the target language.

6.1.4.6. Through-translation

This a literal translation of a phrase or compound from another language, which is also called a calque, as stated previously.

Table 7: Through-translation

| Section | Source text | Target text |
|----------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| 1.2. | Form of service | <i>Mokgwa wa tirelo</i> |

| | | |
|-------|--|--|
| 11.2. | Pastoral etiquette in the congregation | <i>Maitsholo a seruti mo phuthegong</i> |
| 11.2. | Familiarity breeds contempt | <i>Tlwaelo e tsala go lathegelwa ke tlotlo</i> |

6.4.2. Culture

The culture category is very broad, and in the present study it will not be limited to the limits established by Newmark but will include aspects of social interaction between Christians, ministers and the laity. It includes terms of address and descriptions of how certain things are done within the Pentecostal movement in the Black community. This is a category that includes geographical references like places and physical features occurring in nature like rivers, mountains, climate, seasons, plants and animals. In this study I shall focus on places of worship, cemeteries, baptismal places and communion tables.

In section 1.16. (p. 8) the last part of the sixth paragraph in this section was adapted to suit target culture architecture. In the White community, a baptismal bath forms part of the church building. In the Black community, a baptism can take place anywhere, for example, in a river, swimming pool or dam. If baptismal baths are built, they are normally built outside. The last part of the paragraph in question reads as follows: ‘namely that the pulpit should always be higher than the Baptismal-bath and the communion table.’ I translated this with *gore pulipiti e tshwanetse ka nako tsothle go nna kwa godimo ga Tafole ya selalelo*. The baptismal bath is deleted from the sentence because it is not usually part of the indigenous community’s architecture for building churches. Communion table is translated as *Tafole ya selalelo*, where the word *Tafole* is a loan word from Afrikaans *tafel* that has been naturalised in Setswana.

6.4.2.1. Mutation: Addition

In section 11.3 the source text sentence reads: ‘The minister should come to his pulpit conscious that he is an ambassador of God to His people.’ In Setswana, this would be translated as follows: *Moreri wa lefoko la modimo o tshwanetse go tlaa mo pulipiting ya*

gagwe ka maikutlo a a feletseng a gore ke moemedi wa Modimo mo bathung ba One. The first sentence in this section was problematic for the several reasons. Firstly, this is a Pentecostal postcolonial translation, and ministers are both male and female. Consequently, the use of pronouns is a problem because English and Setswana pronouns differ significantly in terms of type, number and grammatical categories of case and gender (Alimi 2008:88). Masculine and feminine gender pronouns are translated the same without showing any distinction. For example, if the minister was female, the above sentence would be the same in the Setswana the translation. To solve the above problem, I added the following phrase in brackets: *go latela tsamaiso ya kereke ya Full Gospel Church of God e ka nna wa mme kgotsa wa rre* [According to the Full Gospel Church of God this includes both male and female ministers].

The second reason for the problematic nature of the sentence in question is that the word minister in this context would be a pastor, which is *Moruti* in Setswana. However, because of the context, I used the Setswana word *Moreri wa Lefoko la Modimo*. The reason is that not only the pastor does the pastoral work in the context of the Batswana. Due to the scarcity of trained ministers, lay preachers are appointed to function as pastors in the absence of a pastor. The translation of this paragraph also contained the problematic word pulpit. Prior to the advent of Christianity and the pulpit, the Batswana did not use a podium when addressing issues at a *lekgotlaa*. A person would just stand in the midst of the *lekgotlaa* and address the masses. Consequently, when Christianity arrived, Setswana speakers borrowed the word pulpit and it became *pulipiti* in Setswana. There is currently an official academic word that has been developed for naming this podium of address, namely *seporathero*, but it is not known to many people. It is not even found in the current Setswana Dictionary, *Thanodi Ya Setswana*. The only word one finds in that dictionary is the word *sepora* [a wooden stool]. The official academic word is a translation from Afrikaans *preekstoel*, translated into Setswana as *seporathero* [a preaching chair]. Thus, the word did not become popular with the Batswana from South Africa because they usually call a *sepora* a *setilo* or *setulo*. The word *pulipiti* is the common word used by many. The word conscious is *maikutlo* in Setswana, but it does not transfer the full meaning. The implication in the source text is that one should be fully aware and therefore I added *a feletseng* in the Setswana text. It thus became *maikutlo a a feletseng*. In the other two sentences, only the order of words has been changed to allow easy flow and comprehension.

In section 12.3.1. (p. 48) the first sentence has been added; it does not appear in the source text. This added sentence serves an introduction. A direct translation starting with the second sentence does not give the full meaning of the communication scene. Caring for the terminally ill is a sensitive issue that requires a high level of kindness and compassion. The added sentence is as follows: *Tirelo e ke tirelo e e masisi le e e tlhokang bopelonolo le kutlwelo-botlhoko e e kwa godimo*. I added it to explain the subheading and what is involved in the realisation of what the subheading is addressing.

6.4.2.2. Transposition

In Section 12.4., paragraph 2 (p. 49) the whole section has been indigenised and explains how the grieving process is handled by the pastor: *Moruti o tshwanetse ke go rulaganya ditirelo tsa go tshidisa tsa beke yotlhe*. [The pastor must arrange the midweek condolence services.]

In Chapter 11, the heading of the chapter (p. 40) which is ‘Pastoral etiquette’ has been translated as *Maitsholo a seruti*. There was a change in word order. A direct translation does not make sense. Again, instead of using the translation *Boruti*, which is the pastoral vocation or profession, I chose *seruti*, which is a group of pastors in a particular denomination or place.

In section 11.3. (p. 42) I translated pulpit decorum as Maitsholo a ‘pulipiti’.

6.5. Conclusion

The aim of this chapter was to propose a suitable and appropriate model for translating *Pastoral Liturgy* by G.C. Horak. I chose Christiane Nord’s model. It is a model relevant for producing a translation in which the function of the target text in a target environment is important. It is also a relevant framework for postcolonial translation. It is a model that includes the analysis of extratextual and intratextual elements of the communicative action. The main function of this analysis is to identify the function-relevant aspects or elements of both texts, that is, the source text and target text. These function-relevant aspects emanate from the translation brief (Nord 2007:14). I considered the necessary macrotextual and microtextual strategies before deciding on the translation. The overall macrotextual strategy of indigenising the target text has led to a translation with many adaptations of large sections of the target text. Where relevant, I applied Newmark’s microtextual strategies. The final summary of the translation will be discussed in Chapter Seven.

CHAPTER 7

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

7.1. The main focus of the study and the reasons for the translation

This chapter concludes my attempt at academic writing and thinking, and I am well aware that, being a novice, this study might not even amount to the proverbial drop in the ocean of scholarly engagement. I started this study as a novice with regard to a scholarly understanding of postcolonialism and hybridity. I have tried to grow intellectually and in my scholarly thinking. The little that I have read concerning colonialism, postcolonialism and hybridity in mission has opened my eyes and really revealed my ignorance of the subjects. As a fundamental Pentecostal, I found myself swimming upstream until the end.

In Chapter One, I indicated that the main focus of this study was to produce an indigenised postcolonial translation that highlighted the indigenous Batswana Pentecostal cultural practices that are not contrary to biblical orthodoxy and Pentecostal Christian orthopraxy. I also indicated that the booklet or guide, *Pastoral Liturgy*, was written to assist those in the ministry ranks of the Full Gospel Church of God to be efficient and effective in their ministration of the word and in the ordering of the liturgy. I also showed that not all of these men and women of God could speak or read English but that they can read their indigenous languages. I indicated this fact as one of the reasons for translating *Pastoral Liturgy*, but there are another five reasons for undertaking this translation.

Firstly, the Full Gospel Church of God is a multilingual and multicultural denomination, and as such, there is a need for the representation of all its members in the production of religious texts. Every member of the church has the right to experience God in his/her language and culture, a right that the denomination recognises and that is enshrined in its constitution. This representation and experiencing of God in an indigenous way can be achieved through the translation of the official texts of the church. Secondly, *Pastoral Liturgy* promotes the issue of order in liturgy, which, when translated, would introduce this order to indigenous cultures but would also highlight the indigenous aspects of Pentecostal worship. Thirdly, in the postcolonial era, the employment of lay ministers to propagate the Gospel within the denomination demands that denominational texts should suit the profiles of those ministers. Fourthly, the church should also take the lead when it comes to promoting language equality

by recognising indigenous languages and encouraging their incremental use. Finally, there is also a need for those in the church to be part of the current debate of postcolonialism and translation, especially those who are from marginalised language backgrounds.

7.2. Colonial and postcolonial encounters of translation

In Chapter Two, I sought to investigate the nature and characteristics of colonial and postcolonial encounters with indigenous communities. I had to investigate the precolonial encounters first, then colonial encounters and finally postcolonial encounters. One fact that was established is that all religious encounters with African communities have been through translation. This led to my investigation of these translation encounters.

I discussed some of the important aspects of these encounters. For example, I discovered that translation was a formidable instrument in the hands of the colonisers in their quest to colonise indigenous people. But there were also missionaries who used translation to empower local communities. It was the translated text that informed the indigenous communities that their colonisation was not right but something to be fought and defeated.

I highlighted the fact that the difficulty of providing a precise definition of postcolonialism enables it, as a theory, to deal with most of the legacy of colonialism. I also indicated that postcolonialism's resistant nature is an advantage for those who want to reclaim assumed identities or form new identities. I then considered the notion of postcolonial identities and their implications for missions and the propagation of the gospel in the postcolonial era.

I argued that literary translation can still play a pivotal role in the decolonisation process, unshackling the colonised from indirect colonial rule in a post-colony. Postcolonialism, though a problematic framework, can still be employed to deal with the aftereffects of colonialism because of its resistant and empowering nature. Thus, postcolonial translation, just like colonial translation, can assist postcolonial mission by providing the necessary framework to assess the dynamics of political power between languages and the position of translation in linguistic or cultural contexts. Secondly, it can assist in shifting Western epistemological frameworks of knowledge to broader and more pluralistic perspectives or epistemologies. Thirdly, it can interrogate Anglo-American systems of knowledge and introduce native systems of knowledge through indigenised translations. Lastly, it can help to mitigate the trend of the declining use of indigenous languages by advocating for horizontal translations and translations into indigenous languages.

One of the surprising results of the above-mentioned encounters was the creation of new identities. The encounters affected the missionaries or colonialists as well as indigenous communities. The resultant identities were hybrid. I showed that hybrid identities are complex identities, but they are also a permanent result of postcolonialism. One important aspect about the hybrid nature of postcolonial identities is that in Africa, people were militating against essential notions of identities and these hybrid postcolonial identities were resulting in the formation of new African identities like the one hinted at by Thabo Mbeki in 'I am an African'.

I then argued that if hybridity is understood and applied correctly in our current globalised world, it can benefit our understanding of human encounters. Hybridity would assist in the process of identification similar to the Pauline strategy mentioned in Chapter Three. It would also assist with allowing all communities to participate in the saving grace and mission of God. Hybridity could be used as a heuristic tool for marginalised languages to challenge the reductionist perceptions and representations of marginalised and formerly dominated communities. It could also be employed to reveal what we are becoming because all human being are in the process of becoming.

7.3. Postcolonial Pentecostal liturgy

One other concept that I investigated is Pentecostalism and its amoebic nature. I discovered that its liturgy from the classical Pentecostal background was still trapped in Western epistemologies and that through postcolonialism and hybridity, the liturgy could unshackle itself. I highlighted the concept of proselytes and converts and noted that converts did not throw away their cultural practice but incorporated them into their new faith. However, only those cultural practices that were not forbidden in the Bible could be practised. Thus, postcolonialism and hybridity could help in establishing indigenous epistemologies and liturgies.

In my investigation of Pentecostal liturgy, I argued that the contextualisation of liturgy would help to un-gag the muted voices of subaltern theologies. It would also incarnate the message of Christ in the tongues, traditions and thoughts of all people by means of diverse cultural expressions. Furthermore, I argued that postcolonial Pentecostal liturgy can assist in creating new liturgical epistemologies and that these liturgies should be in the language and culture of the recipient communities.

7.4. Translation of *Pastoral Liturgy* into Setswana

In Chapter Five, I started by proposing an appropriate model for translating *Pastoral Liturgy* by G.C. Horak and also to explain why that model is suitable. I then argued that for this translation, Christiane Nord's functionalist approach to translation was an appropriate model. The first reason for this choice is that it is a model that is focussed on the target text and its environment and on the function of that text in its target environment. Secondly, it is a model that identifies function-relevant aspects in both the source text and the target text. It also involves the analysis of the source text which assists in deciding on the most suitable translation strategies to deal with the translation problems that arise.

7.5. Translation problems and strategies for indigenising a postcolonial pastoral liturgy text through translation

In Chapter Six, I started with a discussion of the translation brief and its analysis, source text analysis, translation strategies and problems at a macrotextual level as well as translation strategies and problems at a microtextual level. I then proceeded to the identification of problems, and I highlighted the relevant strategies for solving those problems on two levels, namely the macrotextual and microtextual levels.

7.5.1. The macrotextual strategy

The macrotextual strategy chosen for this study was an indigenisation of the original text, so that it would feel as natural as a text first produced in Setswana. As stated previously, a postcolonial translation must speak with the voice of the subaltern and must resist being foreign to the target text receivers. However, because I argued in Chapters Two and Three that postcolonial missiological subjects are hybrid, I introduced elements of hybridity in the target text.

7.5.2. The microtextual strategy

I argued that the translation of a religious text is a powerful tool for missionary purposes, especially if it is in accordance with sound belief and even if it finds itself in a postcolonial era. And I also indicated that the most dominant factor in my translation was the purpose of the target text in the target culture. I based my translation decisions on the semantic meaning

of words as well as sociolinguistic and cultural factors. I also employed the translation procedures proposed by Newmark as they are applicable to religious translation.

7.6. Issues to consider in the future

This study is my initial contribution to postcolonial religious translation. I know that I come from a background of not knowing much about this field, but one thing is sure: I have learnt a great deal. As I studied this topic, I came across some issues that will be pertinent for future research in this interdisciplinary field.

Firstly, I think that this interdisciplinary field would do well to research the qualitative aspects of the impact of hybridity and essentialising epistemologies. Such research will help scholars to find out what non-academic people really think about hybridity and the identities it has yielded as well as about their perceptions about essentialising epistemologies. Secondly, I think that the impact of postcolonial translation on indigenous Pentecostal communities should be investigated. Thirdly, I think that research on postcolonial mission can employ hybridity and postcolonial identities to form communities with new identities. I would also like to see a study on indigenous African hybridities and the kind of identities to which they lead.

In conclusion I am fascinated by postcolonialism and hybridity in mission, and I do not think that this study is the end of my investigation into these concepts.

REFERENCES

- Abrahamsen, R., 2003, 'African studies and the postcolonial challenge', *African Affairs*, 102, 189–210.
- Alimi, M.M., 2008, 'English pronouns in the writing of some Batswana students', *Marang: Journal of Language and Literature*, 18, 85–101.
- Anchimbe, E.A., 2006, 'Functional seclusion and the future of indigenous languages in Africa: The case of Cameroon', in J. Mugane, J.P. Hutchinson & D.A. Worman (eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 35th annual conference on African linguistics*, pp. 94–103, Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville.
- Anderson, A., 1992, *Bazalwane: African Pentecostals in South Africa*, University of South Africa Press, Pretoria.
- Anderson, A., 2000, *Zion and Pentecost: The spirituality and experience of Pentecostal and Zionist/apostolic churches in South Africa*, University of South Africa Press, Pretoria.
- Ang, I., 2003, 'Together in difference: Beyond diaspora, into hybridity', *Asian Studies Review*, 27(2), 141–154.
- Appiah, K.A., 2001, 'African identities', in G. Castle (ed.), *Postcolonial discourses: An anthology*, pp. 222–231, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.
- Asamoah-Giyadu, J.K., 2009, 'Did Jesus wear designer robes?', *Christianity Today International*, 53(11), 1.
- Ashcroft, B., 2001, *Postcolonial transformation*, Routledge, London.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. & Tiffin, H., 2007, *Postcolonial studies: Key concepts*, Routledge, London.
- Baker, M. & Saldanha, G. (eds.), 2009, *Encyclopedia of translation studies*, Routledge, New York.
- Bandia, P.F., 2008, *Translation as reparation: Writing and translation in postcolonial Africa*, St. Jerome, Manchester.

- Bassnett, S., 2002, *Translation studies*, Routledge, London.
- Bassnett, S., 2014, *Translation: The new critical idiom*, Routledge, London.
- Berg, A., Pretorius, R. & Pretorius, L., 2013, 'The representation of Setswana double objects in LFG', in M. Butt & T.H. King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG13 Conference*, CSLI Publications, Stanford.
- Beukes, A-M., 2006, 'Translation in South Africa: The politics of transmission', *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 24(1), 1–6.
- Bevans, S.B. & Schroeder, R.P., 2004, *Constants in context: A theology of mission for today*, Orbis Books, New York.
- Bhabha, H.K., 1994, *The location of culture*, Routledge, London.
- Bosch, D.J., 1991, *Transforming mission: Paradigm shifts in theology of mission*, Orbis Books, New York.
- Brinkman, M.E. & Van Keulen, D., 2003, *Christian identity in cross cultural perspective*, Meimema, Zoetermeer.
- Cassidy, M., 2005, *Getting to the heart of things: Reflections on Christian basics*, Christian Art Publishers, Vereeniging.
- Chapman, M., 2008, 'Postcolonialism: A literary turn', in M. Chapman (ed.), *Postcolonialism: A South African perspective*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle.
- Chemorion, D.C., 2009, 'Towards participatory approach to Bible translation (PABT)', *Acta Theologica*, suppl. 12, 157–171.
- Cieslik, A. & Verkuyten, M., 2006, 'National, ethnic and religious identities: Hybridity and the case of the Polish Tatars', *National Identities*, 8(2), 77–93.
- Clark, M.S. & Lederle, H.I., 1989, *What is distinctive about Pentecostal theology?*, University of South Africa Press, Pretoria.
- Comaroff, J. & Comaroff, J., 1991, *Of revelation and revolution: Christianity, colonialism and consciousness in South Africa*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.

Crystal, D., 1964, 'A liturgical language in a linguistic perspective', *New Blackfriars* 46(534), 148–156.

Dayton, D.W., 1987, *Theological roots of Pentecostalism*, Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids.

De Lange, M., 2008, 'Translation and nation building in post-apartheid South Africa', in S. Linn, M. Vogel & M. Mous (eds.), *Translation and interculturality: Africa and the West*, pp. 87–93, Peter Lang, Frankfurt.

Ducker, J., 2008, *Despite the collapse of Europe's' empires, colonialism has never really gone away*, viewed 30 March 2011, from www.theduckers.org/media/postcolonialism%20and%20mission.pdf.

Elewa, A., 2014, 'Features of translating religious texts', *Journal of Translation*, 10(1), 25–33.

Harries, J., 2010, *Mission in a postmodern world: Issues of language and dependency in post-colonial Africa*, Brill, Leiden.

Hesselgrave, D.J., 1999, *Communicating Christ cross-culturally: An introduction to missionary communication*, Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids.

Hollenweger, W.J., 1976, *The Pentecostals*, SCM, London.

Horak, G.C., 2007, *Pastoral liturgy*, Full Gospel Church of God, Bloemfontein.

Ingleby, J., 2006, 'Hybridity or third space and how shall we describe the kingdom of God', *Encounters Mission Ezine*, 11, 1–10.

Jones, C., Wainwright, G. & Yarnold, E., 1980, *The study of liturgy*, SPCK, London.

Kalu, O., 2008, *African Pentecostalism: An introduction*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Kwok-Bun, C., & Peverreli, P.J., (eds.), 2012, 'Cultural hybridization: A third way between divergence and convergence', in C. Kwok-Bun & P.J. Peverreli (eds.), *Cultural hybridity: Contradictions and dilemmas*, pp. 138–161, Routledge, New York.

- Ladele, O., 2009, 'Reconstructing identities through resistance in postcolonial women's writing: A reading of Ezeigbo's "The last strong ones"', *Nebula*, 6(3), 70–84
- Lötter, N.J., 2001, 'Translating culture-specific elements in a South African novel for young adults, "By die lêplek van die leeus": An experiment in postcolonial translation studies', Unpublished M.A. mini-dissertation, Department of Linguistics and Language Practice, University of the Free State.
- Lovett, L., 1995a, 'Black holiness: Pentecostalism', in S.M. Burgess, G.B. McGee & P.H. Alexander (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic movements*, p. 84, Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids.
- Lovett, L., 1995b, 'Positive Confession Movement', in S.M. Burgess, G.B. McGee & P.H. Alexander (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic movements*, p. 720, Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids.
- Lubbe, J.J., 2009, "'By patience, labour and prayer. The voice of the Unseen God in the language of the Bechuana nation." A reflection on the history of Robert Moffat's Setswana Bible (1857)', *Acta Theologica*, suppl.29, 16–32.
- Lye, J., 1998, *Some issues in postcolonial theory*, viewed 23 January 2012, from <http://www.brosku.ca/english/courses/4F70/postcol.php>
- Makutoane, T.J. & Naudé, J.A., 2009, 'Colonial interference in the translation of the Bible into Southern Sotho', *Acta Theologica*, suppl. 12, 79–94.
- Marais, K., 2014, *Translation theory and development studies*, Routledge, New York.
- Marandi, S.M. & Shadpour, R.S., 2011, 'Christianity as an ideological instrument: A postcolonial reading of Chinua Achebe's "Arrow of God"', *African Journal of History and Culture*, 3(4), 48–53.
- Mareme, G.B., 2008, *Thanodi ya Setswana*, Nutrend Publishers, Pietermaritzburg.
- Martimort, A.G., Dalamais, I.H., Rabie, R., Evenou, J., Gy, P.M., Jounel, P., Nocent, A. & Sicard, D., 1987, *Principles of the liturgy*, Geoffrey Chapman, London.

Mbeki, T.M., 1996, *I am an African. Thabo Mbeki's speech at the adoption of the The Republic of South Africa Constitution Bill*, viewed 21 June 2013, from www.anc.org.za/show.php.

McBride, D., 1993, *A survey of the history and distinctives of Pentecostalism*, viewed 20 November 2009, from www.yoyomaster.com/ministry.file/Pentecostalism.

Montuori, A. & Stephenson, H., 2012, *Creativity, culture contact, and diversity*, Routledge, New York and Oxon.

Moslund, P.S., 2010, *Migration literature and hybridity: The different speeds of transcultural change*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.

Munday, J., 2008, *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications*, Routledge, London and New York.

Naudé, J.A. & Miller-Naudé, C.L., 2011, 'Colonial and postcolonial encounters with the indigenous: The case of religious translation in Africa', *South African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies Journal*, 29(3), 313–326.

Neibuhr, H.R., 1951, *Christ and culture*, Harper & Row, San Francisco.

Newmark, P., 1988, *A textbook of translation*, Prentice Hall, New York.

Nida, E., 1964/2004, 'Principles of correspondence', in L. Venuti (ed.), *The translation studies reader*, pp. 153–167, Routledge, London.

Nord, C., 2005, *Text analysis in translation: Theory, methodology, and didactic application of a model for translation-oriented text analysis*, Rodopi B.V., Amsterdam.

Nord, C., 2007, *Translating as a purposeful activity: Functionalist approaches explained*, St. Jerome, Manchester.

Omotoso, K., 1996, 'Traditional African capital accumulation: A corrective to Western thinking', in M.E. Steyn & K.B. Motshabi (eds.), *Cultural synergy in South Africa: Weaving strands of Africa and Europe I*, pp. 1–25, Knowledge Resources, Randburg.

Otlogetswe, T.J., 2012, *Tlhalosi ya medi ya Setswana*, Medi Publishing, Gaborone.

- Pears, A., 2010, *Doing contextual theology*, Routledge, London and New York.
- Phan, P., 2003, 'Liturgical inculturation: Diveristy in the postmodern age', in K.F. Pecklers(ed.), *Liturgy in a postmodern world: Liturgical inculturation: Unity in diversity in the postmodern age*, pp. 55–86, Continuum, London.
- Pym, A., 2010, *Exploring translation theories*, Routledge, London and New York.
- Reilly, J., 2014, "'Lawn again Christians": Pastor makes congregation eat grass to be closer to God', *Daily Sun*, 10 January, p. 1.
- Reiss, K. & Vermeer, H.J., 2013, *Towards a general theory of translation action*, St. Jerome, Manchester.
- Reiss, K., 1971/2004, 'Type, kind and individuality of text', in L. Venuti (ed.), *The translation studies reader*, pp. 168–179, Routledge, London.
- Riss, R.M., 'Latter Rain Movement', in S.M. Burgess, G.B. McGee & P.H. Alexander (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic movements*, pp. 532-534, Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids.
- Robert, D.L., 2009, *Christian mission: How Christianity became a world religion*, Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester.
- Robert-Kenzo, M.J., 2012, *What is postcolonialism and why does it matter: An African perspective*, viewed 5 July 2013, from <http://www.amahoro-africa.org/files/23/07/2012>.
- Robinson, D., 1997, 'Tejaswini Niranjana, retranslation and the problem of foreignism', *TRAD TERM*, (4)2, 149–165.
- Rochon, T.R., 1998, *Culture moves: Ideas, activism, and changing values*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Schlemmer, L., 2008, *Under the radar: Pentecostalism in South Africa and its potential social and economic role*, The Centre for Development and Enterprise, Johannesburg.
- Senn, F.C., 2012, *Introduction to Christian liturgy*, Fortress press, Minneapolis.
- Shohat, E., 1992, 'Third world and post-colonial issues', *Social Text*, 31/32, 99–113.

Solle, D., 1967, *The truth is concrete*, Burn and Oates, London.

Tennent, T.C., 2010, *Invitation to world missions: A trinitarian missiology for the twenty-first century*, Kregel Publications, Grand Rapids.

The Full Gospel Church of God, 2013, *Constitution*, The Full Gospel Church of God, Pretoria.

Tymoczko, M., 2006, 'Enlarging Western translation theory: Intergrating non-Western thought about translation', in T. Hermans (ed.), *Translating others*, pp. 13–32, St. Jerome, Manchester.

Van der Walt, B.J., 2003, *Understanding and rebuilding Africa*, The Institute for Contemporary Christianity in Africa, Potchefstroom.

Van Kooten Niekerk, K. & Buhl, H., 2004, 'Introduction: Comprehending complexity', in K. van Kooten Niekerk & H. Buhl (eds.), *The significance of complexity: Approaching a complex world through science, theology and humanities*, pp. 1–8, Ashgate, Burlington.

Vermeer, H.J., 1989/2004, 'Skopos and commission in translation action', in L. Venuti (ed.), *The translation studies reader*, pp. 227–238, Routledge, London.

Webb, V., 2006, 'Language management in South Africa: What is going on?', in E. Kembo-Sure, S. Mwangi & N.O. Ogachi (eds.), *Language planning for development in Africa*, Moi University Press, Eldoret.

West, G., 2009, 'The beginning of an African Biblical interpretation: The Bible among the Batlhaping', *Acta Theologica*, suppl. 29, 33–47.

Yazdiha, H., 2010, 'Conceptualizing hybridity: Deconstructing boundaries through the hybrid', *Formations*, 1(1), 31–38.

Young, R.C., 1995, *Colonial desire: Hybridity in theory, culture and race*, Routledge, London.

Young, R.C., 2011, *Cultural translation and hybridity*, Routledge, London.

ADDENDUM

Buka Ya Tirelo Ya Boruti/

Buka Ya Tirelo

G.C. Horak

E Fetoletswe ke P.E.

Ngxangane

TSE ETELETSENG PELE

Go tlaa tswelera gontse go na le tlhokego ya go ka phatlaalatsa gape tshwetso ya bofelo le go samagana gape le tsa Tirelo ya Boruti, ka ntlha ya go re maitlhommo a tirelo Modimo a itshetlegile ka kereke eo a diragatswang mo go yone. Ka ntlha ya seo go ilwe ga lekwa ka bojotlhe mo bukeng e go khutsafatsa dikarolo tsa tirelo ya Boruti go lebeletswe thata-thata ditlhokego tse dirileng tsa maemo a a rileng. Mmadi o tshwanetse go itse phitlelelo eo dipuisano le dikaelo tse di ka nang le mosola mo go ene ka gona.

Mokwadi o ile a ela tlhoko ditlhokego tse di leng teng mabapi le tirelo Modimo. Ka tsela e e ntseng jalo o ile a kokoanya le go khutsafatsa di puisano tse di mosola. Jaaka gale puisano e, ke e e enamileng tota, le fa gontse jalo ga gona maipato a botlhoka-kitso jwa melawana ya motheo le dikaelo tse di maleba. Mokwadi o tlhalositse melawana le dikaelo gore motho yo o ineetseng mo pitsong ya Boruti a kgone go ka aga mo go se ka kitso e e tsepameng ya gore tshimologo ya gagwe ke e e siameng e e senang selabe le gore a kgone go ka leka go ka fitlhelela maikarabelo a a kwa godimo a a nang le boitshwaro jo bo nang le boikarabelo jwa Boruti.

Phatlaalatso e e ka balwa ka tsholofelo ya gore botlhe ba ba leng mo tirelong ya Boruti, ba ka e tsaya tsiya ka boitlhommo jwa gore e tlaa ba naya maatlaametlo a magolo mo go direleng ka lentswe la Modimo, mo go galaletseng Modimo.

Dr Reuben K van Eijk

DITENG

| | |
|--|-----|
| TSE ETELETSENG PELE..... | 161 |
| 1. DINTLHA-TLHALOSO TSA PELE | 165 |
| 1.1 SELALELO | 165 |
| 1.2 MOKGWA WA TIRELO..... | 165 |
| 1.3 BOKAO JWA TIRELO-KOBAMELO E E KGETHEGILENG | 166 |
| 1.4 TIRELO E E FELETSENG YA MODIMO | 166 |
| 1.5 TAELO YA GO RERA EFANGELI..... | 166 |
| TAELO YA GO KOLOBETSA | 166 |
| TAELO YA GO JA SELALELO SE SE BOITSHEPO | 167 |
| TAELO YA GO ITSHOKA MO THAPELONG | 167 |
| 1.6 DIKAROLO TSE DINGWE TSA KOBAMELO MODIMO MO TESETAMENTENG E NTŠHA: | 167 |
| 1.7 MAFOKO A A FETOGENG MO MALEMENG OTLHE (DIFOMULA TSA SEKERESETE) | 167 |
| 1.7.1. MARANATHA..... | 167 |
| 1.7.2. AMEN..... | 167 |
| 1.8 KGALALETSE LE POKO YA MODIMO..... | 168 |
| 1.9 PALO YA LENTSWE LA MODIMO | 168 |
| 1.10 THERO YA LENTSWE LA MODIMO | 168 |
| 1.11 DITHAPELO TSA MEFUTAFUTA..... | 168 |
| 1.12 GO OPELA..... | 169 |
| 1.13 TSHWARO..... | 169 |
| 1.14 KOLOBETSO..... | 169 |
| 1.15 TIRELO MODIMO LE KGOLOLSEGO YA MOWA..... | 170 |
| 2. LENYALO LE LE BOITSHEPO | 172 |
| 2.1 GO LAIWA GA BA BA NYALANANG | 172 |
| 2.2 GO LAIWA KE MORUTI | 172 |
| 2.3 DINTLHA TSA SEMOLAWO | 174 |
| 2.4 DINTLHA TSA SETSO KGOTSA TSA KWA GAE KGOTSA TSA BATSADI..... | 175 |
| 2.5 DINTLHA TSA KEREKE..... | 175 |
| 2.6 LENANE TSAMAISO LA TIRELO YA LENYALO | 176 |
| TSAMAISO YA TIRELO: KA MORADISI..... | 176 |
| 3. TSHEGOFATSO YA BANA, DIKOLOBETSO LE KAMOGELO YA MALOKO A MAŠWA | 182 |
| 3.1 MOTLHALA WA FOROMO YA LEKWALOKOPO LA TSHEGOFATSO YA BANA | 183 |
| 3.1.1 TSAMAISO YA TIRELO YA TSHEGOFATSO YA NGWANA | 185 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 3.1.2 BOKAO JWA TSHEGOFATSO YA BANA..... | 185 |
| 3.1.3 BA BA SA ITEKANELANG MO TLHALOGANYONG..... | 186 |
| 3.2 KOLOBETSO..... | 186 |
| 4. SELALELO | 189 |
| 4.1 SELALELO LE PAAKANYO | 189 |
| 4.2 KAMOGELO YA MALOKO A MAŠWA | 191 |
| 4.3 GO BEWA GA BATLHANKEDI BA KEREKE | 195 |
| 4.3.1 TSAMAISO YA TIRELO YA GO BEWA GA BATLHANKEDI..... | 196 |
| 4.3.2 GO LAIWA GA BA BA BEWANG BAGOLO LE BADIAKONE | 197 |
| 5. KAMOGELO YA MORUTI LE GO TLHOMIWA GA GAGWE MO PHUTHEGONG | 198 |
| 5.1 GO TLODIWA GA MORUTI..... | 199 |
| GO TLODIWA KE ENG?..... | 199 |
| 5.2 LENAANE- TSAMAISO LA TIRELO YA TLOTSO | 200 |
| 6. TIRELO YA THAPELO YA BOMME LE DIKOPANO TSE DINGWE TSA BONA | 201 |
| 6.1 TSE DI TLAANG PELE MO TIRELONG YA BOMME | 201 |
| 6.2 MAEMO MO MOKGATLONG | 201 |
| 6.3 SEKAI SA METSOTSO YA KOPANO | 203 |
| 6.4 MELAWANA YA SELEGAE | 204 |
| 6.5 TIRISANO MMOGO YA BOMME BOTLHE..... | 204 |
| 6.6 MERAPELO YA BOMME | 204 |
| 6.7 BORAPELEDI..... | 205 |
| 7.1 TIRELO YA GO TSHEGOFATSA LE GO NEELA KAGO YA KEREKE..... | 206 |
| 7.2 LENANETSAMAISO LA TIRELO YA GO TSHEGOFATSA LE GO NEELA KAGO YA KEREKE..... | 207 |
| 7.3 GO THAYA MOTHEO WA KEREKE | 208 |
| 8. KOPANO YA KETELO YA MOOKAMEDI WA SETEREKE | 209 |
| 9. KITSISO YA KOPANO | 213 |
| 10. TESETHIMONIALE..... | 215 |
| 11. MAITSHOLO A SERUTI/ PHOROTOKHOLO MO KEREKENG | 218 |
| 11.1 MATSENO KGOTSA TSE TLAANG PELE | 218 |
| 11.2 MAITSHOLO A SERUTI MO PHUTHEGONG..... | 218 |
| 11.3 MAITSHOLO A “PULIPITI” | 220 |
| 11.4 MAITSHOLO A SERUTI LE BOTSHELO JWA MO SETSHABENG | 221 |
| 11.5 MAITSHOLO A A AMOGELESEGANG A GO ITSISE BATLHANKEDI SEMMUSO (POROTOKOLO)..... | 222 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 11.6 MAITSHOLO A A AMOGELESEGANG A GO ITSISE BATLHANKEDI SEMMUSO MO KEREKENG..... | 223 |
| 11.7 IPAAKANYETSO YA TIRELO E E KGETHEGILENG | 223 |
| 11.8 KITSISO YA BAENG LE BAENG BA TLOTLEGO..... | 224 |
| 12 TIRO YA BORUTI YA GO TLHOKOMELA BALWETSI | 225 |
| 12.1 GO TLHOKOMELA BALWETSI BA BA KWA SEPETLELA | 225 |
| 12.2 TSHEKATSHEKO YA KETELO..... | 227 |
| 12.3 TIRELO BORUTI YA GO TLHOKOMELA BA BA MO DIPHATENG TSE DI BOLLO | 228 |
| 12.4 TIRELO YA PHITLHO..... | 229 |
| 12.5 TIRELO YA SEGOPOTSO..... | 231 |
| Moradisi (Go tswa kwa tirong ya moswi) | 231 |
| Pula ka thapelo | 231 |
| Thoriso le kobamelo | 231 |
| Tatelano ya dibui | 231 |
| 1. Tsala ya botshelo..... | 231 |
| 2. Tsala ya kwa tirong | 231 |
| 3. Moagisane | 231 |
| 4. Modirammmogo..... | 231 |
| 5.“Supavaesara” | 231 |
| 6. Mokhanselara/ moemedi wa kgosi..... | 231 |
| Tirelo ya lentswe ka moruti | 231 |
| Dikitsiso | 231 |
| Tebogo ka wa leage | 231 |
| 12.6 LENAANE TSAMAISO LA TIRELO YA PHITLHO KA LETSATSI LA MATLHATSO | 232 |
| 12.7 TIRELO YA PHITLHO YA MASOLE LE MAPODISA..... | 235 |
| 12.8 TSAMAO YA NAKO YA KUTLOBOTLHOKO | 237 |
| 13 MEKGWA YA GO TSAYA TSHWARO..... | 239 |

1. DINTLHA-TLHALOSO TSA PELE

Tsamaiso ya tirelo Modimo ke “saense” e e itshetlegileng ka go batlisisa mekgwa ya kobamelo ya mo patlaalatseng.

Lefoko le “Liturgy” leo le fetoletsweng mo Setswaneng, e le “tsamaiso ya tirelo Modimo” letswa mo lefokong la Segerika e leng “Leitourgia” e e leng lekopangwa la mafoko a mabedi e leng “Leito” le le tswang mo lefokong “Laos” le le tlhalosang ‘setshaba’ le ‘Ērgon’. Mme fa lefeletse le kaya gore; ‘tirelo setshaba kgotsa tiro e e dirwang go tswela morafe mosola’.

Mo Tesetamenteng Ya Kgale ka nako ya tsamaiso ya Borara Jwa Iseraele, dilo tse di neng di supa tirelo ya bodumedi e ne e le ‘setlhabelo’ le ‘thapelo’ mme rre jaaka tlhogo ya legae e ne e le morapeledi le moetapele wa legae.

Mme e rile mo kgorogong ya kobamelo e e tlleng ka Mošhe, dilo tsa fetoga gotlhelele, ka ntlha ya gore Modimo ka Boone, o ile a neela Israele tsela ya kobamelo e e nang le dikaelo tse dirileng.

Jaaka sekai sa setlhabelo sa mabutswapele a thobo Duteronome 26:3-10 Tsela ya go tsaya Tshwaro Diaplo 6:24-26 Tsela ya go rwala areka ya kogolagano (letlole la tlolaganyo)

Ka jalo lefoko le Liturgy le dirisiwa go kaya tirelo Modimo ya sekeresete kgotsa kobamelo ya sekeresete. Ke lefoko kakaretso la tirelo Modimo mme fela le le na le bokao jo bo farologaneng jaaka bokao jo bo latelang

1.1 SELALELO

Fa go tliwa mo Selalelong tirelo ya kobamelo e kaya ditiragatso le mafoko a a buiwang fa go jewa Selalelo khotsa ‘yukarisite’. Mme e ka nna le bokao jo bo khutsafaditsweng jwa go kaya didiriswa, e leng veine le bogobe tse di dirisiwang go fa thero le Selalelo se se boitshepo tshobotsi khotsa sebopego.

1.2 MOKGWA WA TIRELO

Tirelo ya kobamelo e itshetlegile ka mokgwa wa tsamaiso ya tirelo kobamelo ka tolamo mo ntlheng e ya mokgwa wa tirelo.

1.3 BOKAO JWA TIRELO-KOBAMELO E E KGETHEGILENG

Tirelo e itsege go tswa mo lemoragong la tirelo Modimo e e kgethegileng e e nang le bokao jwa go ka tlisa tshegofastso ya Modimo. E itsege jaaka tirelo e e itshepisitsweng go dira dilo tse di galalelang. Tirelo Modimo e, e amagangwa thata le go tlaa ga Morena Jesu mo nameng mme tirelo e e tshwantshangwa le tswेतso ya gonna mo nameng ya ga keresete. Ka nako tse dingwe e tsewa jaaka ponagatso ya kobamelo e e kwa legodimong e e diragadiwang mo lefatsheng. E tsewa jaaka tebelelo ya kobamelo ya bofelo kwa legodimong.

1.4 TIRELO E E FELETSENG YA MODIMO

Go latela kutlwisiso e Tirelo Modimo e ama botshelo jwa motho letsatsi le lengwe le le lengwe e bile e diragadiwa ka matsatsi otlhe le dinako tshotlhe. Ke tirelo Modimo e e feletseng mme e itepatepantse le sengwe le sengwe se se diragalang mo tirelong Modimo jaaka e ntse e tswेतse.

Tlhaloso e e khutsafaditsweng ya tirelo Modimo ke e: Tirelo Modimo ke mafoko otlhe a a buiwang le ditiro tshotlhe tse di dirwang tsa tirelo Modimo yotlhe e e tsenyeleditseng thero le go ja selalelo se se boitshepo mme e tsenyeleditse le ditiro tse di jaaka kolobetso, Kamogelo ya Badiredi, tirelo ya thapelo, go ithutha dikwalo tse di boitshepo, go kopanya banyalani le tirelo ya phitlho le sengew le sengwe se se diragalang mo tsamaong ya botshelo ya tswेतso ya go obamela le go tshelela Modimo.

Jaanong fa re seka-seka ditaello tsa tirelo, re itemogela gore Morena Jesu o file barutwa ba gagwe ditiro tse nne tse di mo pepeneneng mme di tsenyeleditse le kereke ya gagwe. Ditiro tse ke tse di latelang mme di tsamaisana le thomo ya kereke.

1.5 TAELO YA GO RERA EFANGELI

Taelo ya kolobetso e samagane taelo ya go ruta efangedi (Mathaio 28:19)

TAELO YA GO KOLOBETSA

Taelo ya kolobetso e samagane taelo ya go ruta efangedi (Mathaio 28:19)

TAELO YA GO JA SELALELO SE SE BOITSHEPO

Mo Luke Morena Jesu o bua jaana: “Dirang seo go nkgopola”. Moapostolo Paulo o boeletsa taolo eo ya Morena mo Lekwalong la I Bakorinte 11:24-25 mme se se tshwanetse go tswelala go fitlhela Morena a boa gape.

TAELO YA GO ITSHOKA MO THAPELONG

Taelo e e bonwa mo makwalong a a latelang Mathaio 24:41; Mathaio 7:7; Luke 11:9; Johane 16:24

1.6 DIKAROLO TSE DINGWE TSA KOBAMELO MODIMO MO

TESETAMENTENG E NTŠHA:

Mo Tesetamenteng e Ntšha go na le dikarolo dingwe tse di sa laelwang jaaka taelo, mme di tlwaelegile mo dikerekeng tsa Bazalwane lefatshe ka bophara, tsona ke tse e seng ka go latelana ga tsona.

1.7 MAFOKO A A FETOGENG MO MALEMENG OTLHE (DIFOMULA TSA SEKERESETE)

1.7.1. MARANATHAI Bakorinthe 16:22; Tshenolo 22:20 Lefoko le le ka ne le tswa mo tirelong Modimo mme bokao jwa lone e ka nna: “Morena wa rona o tlile”, khotsa “Morena wa rona o tlaatlaa” le gape gore “A Morena wa rona a tle”

1.7.2. AMENI Bakorinthe 14:16 Mo moetlong wa Sejuda go se tlwaedi gore lefoko le “amen” ga le buiwe ke motho yo o rapelang kgotsa yo o buwang mme le buiwa ke ba ba mo reeditseng go bontsha gore ba dumalana le ena. Jaaka re tlhalositse gore ga gona molao o o re laelang go dirisa mafoko a, mo dikerekeng tsa Bazalwane le dirisiwa ke mongwe le mongwe, sebui kgotsa moretsi.

1.7.3. HALELUYA (Tshenolo 19:1, 3, 4, 6)

Se ke khutsafatso ya kobamelo le thoriso kgotsa poko ya Modimo.

1.7.4. HOSANA (Mareko 11:9) Se ke kgoeletso mo thapelong e e kayang gore “tswée tswée thusa”

1.7.5. ABBA/ ABA (Baroma 8:15; Bagalatia 4:6) lefoko le le kaya gore “Papa” mme le bontsha kamano e ntšha e e kgethegileng magareng ga modumedi le Modimo ka Jesu Keresete.

1.8 KGALALETSO LE POKO YA MODIMO

Kgalaletso kgotsa poko le thorisho e itshetlegile ka go galaletsa le go tsholetsa bogolo jwa Modimo le tiro ya one mo popong, poloshong, go galalediweng le kgalalelo e e tlaang. (Baroma 11:33-36; 16:25-27; Baefeso 3:20-21; Juta 23-24; Bahebere 13:20-21; I Timotheo 6:14-16; 1:17)

Poko ya Modimo ke thapelo ya tebogo, ke setshwantsho sa lefoko la Sehebere e leng *Baracha* le le kayang gore, tshegofatso. Go na le bopaki jo bo tseneletseng jwa gore kgalaletso le poko ya Modimo di tswa mo Bajuteng mme tiriso ya tsone mo Tsesamenteng e Ntsha di bontsha gore e ne e le karolo ya kobamelo Modimo.

1.9 PALO YA LENTSWE LA MODIMO

Palo ya Tsesamente e Kgologolo e ne e le selo se se tlwaelegileng mo tirelong ya Senagoge. Tlwaelo e, e ntse e tswelela le mo Tsesamenteng e Ntšha jaaka e ka bonwa mo diepisetoleng tsa baaposetole le dikwalo tse dingwe (Bakolose 4:16 I Bathesolonika 5:27 I Timotheo 4:13; Tshenolo 1:3 Mathaio 24:15).

1.10 THERO YA LENTSWE LA MODIMO

E ne e le tlwaelo le moetlo mo senagogeng le mo kerekeng gore tlhaloso le thero ya lentswe la Modimo e ne e tshwanetse go itepatepnya le lefoko le le buisitsweng mme gape go ne go na le phuthulola ya se se badilweng.

1.11 DITHAPELO TSA MEFUTAFUTA

Beibele mo lokwalong la Ditiro re bona Phuthego ya Bazalwane (Pentekoste) e ile ya itshoka mo thapelong mme re bona gape mo makwalong a mangwe gore go na le dithapelo tsa mefuta-futa jaaka thapelo ya tebogo, thapelo ya poko le ya go rapelela (Ditoro 1:4; 2:42; 4:31; 12:5; Baroma 15:30; II Bakorinthe 1:11; Baefeso 6:8; Bakolose 4:23; I Bathesolonika 5:17; II Bathesolonika 3:1; I Timotheo 2:1)

1.12 GO OPELA

Gore pina ke karolo ya kobamelo ya senagoge ke selo se se itsegaleng thata ntle le pelaelo (Mathaio 26:30; Ditiro 16:25; I Bakorinthe 14:26; Baefeso 5:19; Bakolose 3:16).

1.13 TSHWARO

Tshegofatso ya pele ke e; “Tshwaro go wena le kagiso e e tswang mo Modimong Rara le Morena Jesu Keresete (Baroma1:7; I Bakorinthe 1:3; II Bakorinthe 1:2 Bagalata 1:3; Baefeso 1:2; Bafilipi 1:2; Bakolose 1:2; I Bathesolonika 1:1; II Bathesolonika 2:1).

Kwa ntle ga tshegofatso ya ga Arone go ne go maleba gore gonne le tshegofatso ya Tesetamente e Ntsha ya go neelana ka tlotlo e e tshwanetseng ya Boraro Jo bo Boitshepo (II Bakorinthe 13:13).

1.14 KOLOBETSO

Mo lekwalong la Baroma 6:3-4 re kopana le kolobetso ya go kolobeltswa mo mmeleng wa ga Keresete. Se ke letshwao la boineelo mo Keresete le nna leloko la kereke. Mme fa re shobokanya se go a bonagala gore go ne go le mokgwa o tirelo e diriwang ka gone morago ga molaetsa wa ga Petoro ka letsatsi la Pentekoste fa mowa wa Modimo o tshelwa mo bazalwaneng.

Mme yona e ntse jaana

1. Petoro o ile a ema ka dinao a rera a tsholeditse lentswe
2. Ba ile ba tlhabega mo dipelong tsa bona, ba botsa Petoro le ba bangwe, gore banna bagaetsho le bakaulengwe re ka dira eng
3. Ditiro 2:38
 - 3.1. Shokologang
 - 3.2. Kolobetswang
 - 3.3. Lo tlaa newa neo ya mowa o o galalelang
 - 3.4. Pakang le kgothatse ba bangwe
 - 3.5. Ba amogela lentswe ka boitumelo
 - 3.6. Ba kolobetswa

Jaanong go a bonala gore go tswa mo Tesetamenteng e Ntsha gore go na le matshwao a a mo pepeneneng ka ga tsamaiso ya tirelo Modimo. Le gore tirelo eo e tshwanetse go latela

mokgwa o fe wa tsamaiso (I Bakorinthe 14:40). Mme gape go na le ditao tsa gore dineo tsa mowa o o boitshepo di tsamaiswe jang mo Phuthegong. Dikopo, thapelo, dithapelelo le tebogo di direlwe phuthego . Bakolose 3:1 go rutana le go kgalema kgotsa go layana ka dipesalema le difela le dipina tsa semowa.

1.15 TIRELO MODIMO LE KGOLOLSEGO YA MOWA

Tirelo Modimo le kgololesego ya mowa ke di ya thoteng dibapile. Di a tlaatsana ga di ganetsane. Buka e e kwetswe ka mokgwa o o tlaagisang tsela tirelo Modimo ya Bazalwane ba kereke ya rona e seng go e fitlha. Mme ka mo letlhakoreng le lengwe e rotloetsa kgololesgo e e maleba ka tsela e e tshwanetseng le mokgwa o o tshwanetseng.

Kgololesego ya nnete e nna teng fela fa go na le melao le dipeelo. Mme go na le kgololesego e batho ba buang ka yona mme e re fa o lebelo o bo o bona boitalo fela jo bo senang Modimo. Go tswa mo dikwalong tse di Boitshepo go totobetse gore tirelo Modimo ke tiragatso e e nang le maikarabelo.

Batho ba bantsi ba rata go tsamaiswa ke mowa, go sena tsela le mokgwa o o totobetseng wa go tsamaisa tirelo ka ntlha ya gore Keresete a re golotse mo molaong.

Se ke nnete, Modimo a roriswe ka seo, mme fela re tshwanela ke go gakologelwa ka dianko tshotlhe gore Mowa o o Boitshepo o dira ka fat lase ga meelwane ya Lentswe La Modimo (Johane 16:3). Lefoko ke lone motheo o o lehang tiro yotlhe e e dirwang ke Mowa o o Boitshepo.

Ka tsela e entseng jalo ga re a tshwanela go ikgolega ka meetlo le melao e e sa laelwang mme gape re sa e neelwa go e diragatsa go ya ka Tesetamente e Ntšha.

Mme fa Lefoko la Modimo le re kaela le re fa seo re tshwanetseng go se dira le tsamaiso e re tshwanetseng go e sala morago re dire fela jalo ka matsetseleko le manontlhotlho. Ntlha kgolo ke e ke gore Lefoko la Modimo ke lone motheo was sengwe le sengwe se se tsamaisanang le Tirelo Modimo. Le tsela e go agiwang ka gone kago ya kobamelo; sekai ka mogare pulipiti e tshwanetse go nna kwa godimo ka boemo go na le lefelo la go kolobetsa. Se se kaya gore lefelo le go rerelwang mo go lone ga le a tshwanela go nna mo boemong bo le bongwe fela le dikarolo tse dingwe tsa mo go direlwang teng. Tafole ya Selalelo ga e

tshwanela go nna kwa godimo ga pulipiti. Se se bontsha gore Lefoko la Modimo le okametse sengwe le sengwe.

Kakanyo e ya go siamisa tsela ya tsamaisa ya Tirelo Modimo ga e bolele gore re tshwanetse go fana ka mokgwa wa tsamaiso re latlhela kwa ntle botho le botsamaisi jwa motsamaisi wa Tirelo ya Modimo. Se e nna sekao fela se motho yo mongwe yo mongwe a nang le kgololesego ya go ka etelwa ke Mowa o Boitshepo go tlisa tirelo e e maleba le e e nang le seriti sa tirelo Modimo.

Moradisi kgotsa motsamaisi wa Tirelo Modimo o mongwe le o mongwe o tshwanetse go nagana thata ka ga maikarebelo a gagwe a semowa go Modimo, gape a ntse a lebeletse maikarabelo a go itshola sentle ga Phuthego gore ke selo sa botlhokwa mo tsamaisong ya Tirelo Modimo.

Ke kopa Modimo go matlaafatsa bukana e gore e kgone go ka thusa mo tirelong ya go tsamaisa tirelo Modimo mo Phuthegong le mo magareng ga batho. A e tlise kgalalelo go Motsamaisa Tirelo Modimo yo Mogolo e bong Keresete Jesu.

Kwa bokhutlong bukana e ga e se ya thuta-boModimo mme kaelo ya tsamaisa le mokgwa o tirelo Modimo e ka dirwang ka gone.

2. LENYALO LE LE BOITSHEPO

2.1 GO LAIWA GA BA BA NYALANANG

Lenyalo la Setswana mo segompienong le tshimolola ka baratani ba babedi, mme ba itsise batsadi. Morago ga moo go dirwa dithulaganyo tsa go buisana ka bogadi kgotsa magadi. Fa e le bakaulengwe ba ba pholositsweng, fa batsadi ba fetsa go buisana mme go na le ditumalano tsa gore nyalo e tlaa nna teng, go itsisiwe moruti. Mo Bazalwaneng nyalo e a neelwa ga e iphiwe. Tshegofatso ya pele ya lenyalo e tswa mo batsading, jaanong morago ga moo kereke e tsene. Go ya ka tsamaiso ya Full Gospel Church lenyalo le tsamaisiwa ke kereke ya lekgarebe.

Banyalani ba tshimolowa go laiwa kwa lapeng ke bomalome, borakgadi, borrangwane le bagolo botlhe ba ba santseng ba tshela ba ba amanang le masika a banyalani.

2.2 GO LAIWA KE MORUTI

Moruti o tshwanetse ke go leka go thusa banyalani ka dintlha tse pedi tse tsa motheo wa tsamaiso ya lenyalo:

- a) Go thusana le go simega banyalani gore ba tsene mo nyalong e e laotsweng ke Modimo e bile e segafaditswe ke ene
- b) Go thusana le banyalani mo kamanong ya bona ya lenyalo le go ba lemosa gore lenyalo le na le maemo a a farologaneng go latela dingwaga tsa nyalo. Mme o tshwanetse go ba kaele dibuka tse ba ka dibuisang mo tsamaong ya nyalo.

Moruti o tshwanetse ke go direla banyalani ka go ba simega ka botlhale jwa go tshegetsa lenyalo le jwa go kaela banyalani gore lenyalo le tshwarwa jang, mme a boe a ba simege thata mo go kgetheng molekane wa lenyalo.

- i. Banyalani e tshwanetse e nne batho ba ba kgonang go ka itepatepanya le maemo a dikamano tsa setho.
- ii. Botho jwa bone e tshwanetse e nne jo bo ka ba kgontshang go itepatepanya le maemo a lenyalo

iii. Maikalelo a bone ba le babedi a tshwanetse gore e nne a a kgothaletsang tswelelopele ya botshelo jwa bone.

iv. Le maemo a thutego ya bone a botlhokwa ka ntlha ya gore dipuisano tsa bone di tshwanetse gore e nne tsa maemo a a lekanang (Se ga se bolele thuto ya dipampiri, mme thuto ya botshelo).

v. Lerato la go intshana se inong le tshwanetse gore le lebelelwe sentle go bona gore a ba tshwanelana mo leratong le.

Maikaelelo magolo a go laiwa mo lenyalong ke go netefatsa gore banyalani ba tlhaloganye sentle gore fa ba tsaya maikano a nyalo ka letsatsi la go nyala go kaya eng le gore ditlaamorago tsa seo ke di ntseng jang.

Go botlhokwa thata gore moruti a buisane le banyalani ka ditlha tse di latelang:

Dintlha tsa loago

1. Lo na le nako e kae lo itsane le gore kamano e, e e isang nyalong e tshimologile leng?
2. Lo na le nako e kae lo tshepisane lenyalo?
3. A go na le mongwe yo lo kileng lwa mo tshepisa lenyalo?
4. Ke dikgatlego tse di ntseng jang tse lo di itumelelang mmogo?
5. Maikutlo a gago ka ba bogogadi le ba bogweng jwa gago ke a fe?

Dintlha ikhonomi

1. A lo tlaa bo lo dira mmogo kgotsa go tlaa dira a le mongwe fela?
2. Letseno la lona e tlaa bo e le bokae?
3. A lo setse lo ithulagantse go dira bajete?
4. A lo a go hira kgotsa go reka ntlo?
5. Ke mang yo o tlaa tlhokomelang tsamaiso ya madi?

Dintlha tsa botho

Go botlhokwa gore banyalani ba itlhatlhobe kwa ngakeng go bona gore mang o na le malwetsi a fe.

1. Maikutlo a lona ke a fe a go nna le bana?
2. A lo ake lo fapane ka mafoko kgotsa lo omane?
3. A go na le yo o tenegang tenegang fela mo go lona?
4. Ke mekgwa e fe e lo e dirisang go itapolosa ga mmogo?
5. A go na le bothato bongwe bo bo rileng jo bo lo tshwenyang?
6. A lo ratana e le tota go sena go itirisa?

Dintlha tsa semowa

1. A lo tsena kereke e le ngwe fela kgotsa dikereke tsa lona di farologane
2. A lo batumelo e le ngwe kgotsa tse di farolganeng, mme lo nagana gore lo tlaa dira eng mo isagong go rarabolola bothatha jo jwa tumelo tse di farologaneng
3. A lo na le mathatha a go rapela mmogo
4. Ntlha e ya gore re tlaa kgaoganwa ke loso lo e tlhaloganya jang?

2.3 DINTLHA TSA SEMOLAWO

Go na le ditlhokego tsa semolawo mabapi le go kopanya batho ka nyalo. Sengwe le sengwe se tshwanetse go dirwa go latela Mametlelelo ya Molao wa Manyalo- Molao wa 51 wa 1970 e e fetotsweng ya manyalo ya go latela Buka ya Bantlhankedi Ba Ba nyadisang e e phatlaaladitswen ke Lefapha la Puso-Selegae, ka 1972, e e tsenyeleditseng le melao yotlhe e e tsamaisang le go kopangwa ga manyalo mme e itsisiwe Batlhankedi Ba Ba Nyadisang.

Kereke yona e ikamagana le melawana e ya Lefapha la Puso-Selegae ka mokgwa o:

1. Selo sa ntlha se se botlhokwa ke go netefats gore a banyalani ba na le tetelelo ya semolawo go ka kopangwa ka lenyalo go latela melawana e e mo molaong jaaka e tlhagelela mo Bukeng Ya Batlhankedi ba ba Nyadisang.

2. Makwaloitshupo a tshwanetse go tlišwa gape diforomo tse dilatelang di tshwanetse go tlaadiwa e leng B130, B131, B132 le B137.

3. Fa banyalani ba batlaa go nyalana ntle le tlhakanelo ya dithotho ba tshwanetse go tliša bopaki jo bo tswang kwa mmueleding kgotsa mokwadisi wa manyalo a a ntseng jalo mo Motlhankedi Yo o Nyadisang pele ga lenyalo le ka segofadiwa kgotsa banyalani ba ka kopangwa.

2.4 DINTLHA TSA SETSO KGOTSA TSA KWA GAE KGOTSA TSA BATSADI

Lenyalo la Setswana kgotsa la Motswana le tshimologa ka baratani, mme fa ba fetsa go utlwana ka mafoko, ba itsise batsadi mme go rulagangwe letsatsi la Patlo e e kopaneng le dipuisano tsa magadi. Morago go ntshiwa magadi, morago ga magadi batsadi ba neela moradi wa bona go ka nyalwa. Mo Setswaneng lenyalo ke magadi, mo Molaong ke go saena, mo Sekereseteng ke go segofadiwa ga lenyalo.

2.5 DINTLHA TSA KEREKE

Dithulaganyo di tshwanetse go dirwa nako e sa le teng go netefatsa tse di latelang:

1. Moruti yo o Nyadisang/ Motlhankedi yo o Nyadisang
2. Letlha, nako le tulo e go tlaa tshwarelwang lenyalo mo go yone
3. Tsamaiso ya tirelo ya letsatsi

Go botlhokwa go ikwetlisetsa ditiragalo tsa letsatsi la lenyalo le tsamaiso ya tirelo eo le banyalani le baetsana letsatsi pele ga lenyalo go direla gore tshotlhe di tsamae ka thelelo le botswerere.

Lenyalo la Bazalwane ba Full Gospel Church of God lona lo ntse jaana:

Patlo e tsamaisana le tshepiso ya lenyalo, ke gore fa morweetsana a fetsa go batliwa kereke e tlhaloganya seo jaaka tshepiso. Kereke e a itsisiwe ke batsadi fa ba tsena kereke e le ngwe mme fa e le bakereke e sele morweetsana o tlaa itsisi moruti wa gagwe. Mme moruti o tlaa dira dithulaganyo tsa Tirelo ya go Laya ya Pele ga Lenyalo (Premarital Counselling). Fa magadi kgotsa karolo ya magadi e fetswa go ntshiwa jaanong Tirelo ya go Laya ya Pele ga Lenyalo e ya tshimologa. Jaanong baratani ba babedi batlaa emisiwa kwa kerekeng ka

mokgwa wa go baya letlhokwa (engagement) kgotsa wa go tlhagisiwa (official announcement of courtship).

Fa magadi a fetswa go tlaa latela letsatsi la nyalo, mo moruti kgotsa moruti yo o nyadisang o tlaa segofatsang lenyalo mme batsadi ba neele bana lenyalo. Morago ga moo ngwetsi e tlaa isiwa kwa ga bo motlhankana mme tirelo ya lenyalo e khutlaa moo.

2.6 LENANE TSAMAISO LA TIRELO YA LENYALO

Re tshwanetse go gakologelwa rotlhe gore letsatsi le ke la banyalani, jaanong re tshwanetse go leka ka bojotlhe gore dikeletso tsa bona tsa letsatsi di fitlhelelwe. Ka tsela e e ntseng jalo lenane tsamaiso le tshwanetswe go dirwa ke bona gore sengwe le sengwe se ba eletsang go se tsenya se tsengwe, fa fela di dumalana le lenyalo la Sezalwane.

TSAMAISO YA TIRELO: KA MORADISI

KWA GABO MORWEETSANA

1. Motantabelo wa baetsana go baakanyetsa go tsena ga monyadi le monyadiwa.
2. Go tsena monyadi a tsengwa ke mme kgotsa rakgadi kgotsa mmamalome pele, a bo a ema go lebagana le fa monyadiwa a tlaa tlhagang teng le motho yo o mo tsentseng.
3. Fa go tsena monyadiwa pina e ka fetolwa go nna “Here comes the bride”kgotsa pina e e rulagantsweng bakeng sa letsatsi leo. Mme ene o tsengwa ke rragwe fa a le teng kgotsa motho yo kgethilweng ka ba losika. Fa ba fitlha mo aletareng o tlaa ema mme go tlaa bitswa tsala e kgolo ya monyadi le ya monyadiwa go dira gore ba diragatse tsela ya bona ya letsatsi. Ba tlaa ya gonna fa fatshe mo tafoleng e ba e baakanyeditweng. Monyadi o tlaa dula mo setulong se se kwa ntle thata kwa mojeng, mme monyadiwa ene a dule mo go se kwa ntle kwa molemeng. Mme baetsana bagolo bone ba tlaa dula mo ditulong tse di mo gare. Se ke seshupo sa gore batho ba ga e se ba neelwe nyalo.
4. Ba kwa gagabo monyadiwa batlaa amogela batlaa-lenyalong, mme morago moradisi o tlaa neela tiro go Moruti yo Nyadisang go tswelala ka tshegofatso ya lenyalo.
5. Tirelo ya lenyalo: puiso ya lekwalo. Tlhaloso ya Lefoko kgotsa Tirelo ya Lefoko

6. Phatlaalatso ya maikalelo a letsatsi- fomula ya lenyalo-diphatlaalatso tsa semolawo- maikano- go neelana ka dipalamononwa- tlhagiso ya lenyalo
7. Tshegofatso ya lenyalo fa banyalani ba khubama go rapelelwa ke baruti botlhe ba ba leng teng ka go ba baya matshogo
8. Tshaeno ya rejisetara ya lenyalo.
9. Phatlaalatso ya gore ke monna le mosadi
10. Go ka nna le selalelo se se jesiwang banyalani fa ba kgethile jalo
11. Dikitsiso
12. Tshwaro

TIRELO YA GO ITSHEPISA NYALO

Fa morago ga thero moruti o tlaa bitsa banyalani go tlaa go ema fa pele ga gagwe. Monyadiwa o tshwanela ke go ema ka fa letsogong je le tshegadi la monyadi, fa pele ga moruti.

Jaanong moruti o tlaa bua a re:

Re phutegile mmogo fano go tlaa go bona motlhankana (monna) yo le morweetsana (mosadi) yo ba kopanngwa mmogo mo nyalong e e boitshepo, e leng kgolaganyo e e boitshepo, go utlwa dikano tsa bone, le go ba eleletsa letshego je le tswang kwa Modimong, yoo ba emeng fa pele ga Ona.

Ka tsela e e ntseng jalo, re tshwanela go gopola gore lenyalo le tlhomilwe ke Modimo, go atisa batho mo lefatsheng, ka moo thatong ya One, gore go tle go nne le kutlwano, thusano, le boitumelo jo yo mongwe le yo mongwe a tshwanelang go bo bona mo go yo mongwe mo katlegong le mo bothateng, gore malapa a laolwe ke lorato, botlhale le kobamelo Modimo. Lenyalo le tshegofaditswe ke Morena wa rona ka go nna teng gagwe kwa lenyalong la Kana wa Galalea, le ka mafoko a gagwe.

Mo Beibeleng lenyalo ke setshwantsho sa kopano e e Boitshepo ya ga keresete le phuthego ya gagwe, gape Beibele e re bolelela gore lo tlotlega mo bathong botlhe. Ka ntlha ya se motho ga tshwanela go tsaya nyalo e le bonyana fela, kgotsa a sa akanya sentle, o tshwanela go tsena mo nyalong ka tlotlo, kakanyo e e boteng, le ka go boifa Modimo.

Batho ba babedi ba, ba tlile fano go kopanngwa mmogo mo kemong e e Boitshepo. Mme fa go na le motho mongwe yo ka shupang sekgoreletsi se se siameng sa gore ga ba a tshwanelwa ke go kopanngwa mmogo ka fa molaong, a a bue jaanong, mme fa go sa nna jalo a didimalele ruri.

Jaanong moruti o tlaa bua le monyadi le monyaduwa a re:

Ke a lo bolelela e bile gape ke a lo laya gore fa mongwe wa lona a itse sekgoreletsi sengwe se ka sone lo sa tshwanelwang ke go kopanngwa mmogo mo nyalong ka fa molaong a a bue jaanong.

Fa go sena sekgoreletsi sepe, ke gone monna o tlaa bua mafoko a, ka go sala moruti morago:

Ke a dumela le go tlhomamisa gore ga ke itse sekgoreletsi sepe ka fa molaong se ka ntlha ya sone nna..... (Leina la lekawana/monna) ke sa tshwanelwang ke go kopanngwa le(leina la morweetsana/ mosadi)

Jaanong morweetsana o tlaa boeletsa mafoko ao morago ga moruti

Ke a dumela le go tlhomamisa gore ga ke itse sekgoreletsi sepe ka fa molaong se ka ntlha ya sone nna..... (Leina la morweetsana/ mosadi) ke sa tshwanelwang ke go kopanngwa le (leina la lekawana/monna)

Jaanong fa banyalani ba kgethile go buisa maikano a bona a a seng mo bukeng ya go nyadisa moruti o tlaa neela tshono eo (mme maikano a tshwanetse go tsamaelana le a mo bukeng ya lenyalo a gore batlaa kgaoganwa ke loso).

Mme fa ba kgethile go dirisa mantswe a buka moruti o tlaa raya lekawana/monna a re:

.....(leina la lekawana/monna) a o rata go tsaya morweetsana /mosadi yo go nna mogatso wa nyalo, go tshela mmogo le ena ka fa taolong ya Modimo, mo kemong e e Boitshepo ya nyalo? A o tlaa mo rata, o mo gomotse, o mo tlotle, o mmoloke mo pobolong le mo boitekanelong mme o tlogele ba bangwe botlhe, o itshegeletse mo go ene a le esi, ka nako yotlhe ya go tshela ga lona loobabedi?

Lekawana/ monna o tlaa araba ka gore:

Ke a rata

Jaanong moruti o tlaa raya mosadi a re:

.....(leina la morweetsana/mosadi) a o rata go tsaya morweetsana /mosadi yo go nna mogatso wa nyalo, go tshela mmogo le ena ka fa taolong ya Modimo, mo kemong e e Boitshepo ya nyalo? A o tlaa mo rata, o mo gomotse, o mo tlotle, o mmoloke mo pobolong le mo boitekanelong mme o tlogele ba bangwe botlhe, o itshegeletse mo go ene a le esi, ka nako yotlhe ya go tshela ga lona loobabedi?

Mosadi o tlaa araba a re:

Ke a rata

Morago ga moo moruti o tlaa botsa potso e:

Ke mang yo o neelang ka morweetsana yo go nyalwa ke lekawana le?

Rre, kgotsa malome, kgotsa rrangwane, kgotsa rkgadi o tlaa araba a re:

Ke nna

Lekau/ Monna o tlaa tsaya seatlaa se se siameng sa gagwe a tshware seatlaa se se siameng sa morweetsana/mosadi ka sona mme a latele moruti ka mafoko a:

Ke bitsa batho botlhe ba ba fano ba go nna dipaki tsa gore nna..... ke tsaya wena..... go nna mosadi wa me wa nyalo ka fa molaong le ka fa tumelong ya sekeresete, go nna nao, le go go kgomarela, go tloga gompijeno, go tswelela pele mo molemong le mo bosuleng, mo khumong le mo khumanegong, mo pobolong le mo boitekanelong, go go rata le go go tlaamela, go tsamaya loso lo re kgaoganya, ka fa taolong e e Boitshepo ya Modimo. Tse tsotlhe ka Tshwaro ya Modimo ke di dumela fa pele ga lona

Diatlaa di ntse di tshwarane mosadi le ene o tlaa latela mafoko a moruti a re:

Ke bitsa batho botlhe ba ba fano ba go nna dipaki tsa gore nna..... ke tsaya wena..... go nna monna wa me wa nyalo ka fa molaong le ka fa tumelong ya sekeresete, go nna nao, le go go kgomarela, go tloga gompijeno, go tswelela pele mo molemong le mo bosuleng, mo khumong le mo khumanegong, mo pobolong le mo boitekanelong, go go rata le go go tlaamela, le go go utlwa, go tsamaya loso lo re kgaoganya, ka fa taolong e e Boitshepo ya Modimo. Tse tsotlhe ka Tshwaro ya Modimo ke di dumela fa pele ga lona

Go tlaa tlisiwa direng mme baruti botlhe le bafumagadi ba bona batlaatlaa go tshagofatsa direng tseo moruti a di beile mo godimo ga Beibele

Lekau le tlaa tsenya reng a bua mafoko fa a ntse a e tsenya a re:

Ke go naya reng e jaaka sesupo sa lerato lwa me le segopotso sa gore mo letsatsing le ke ile ka go tsaya go nna mosadi wa me wa nyalo.

Mosadi le ene o tlaa bua mafoko a go tsenya reng a re:

Ke go naya reng e jaaka sesupo sa lerato lwa me le segopotso sa gore mo letsatsing le ke ile ka go tsaya go nna monna wa me wa nyalo.

Jaanong moruti o tlaa bua jaana a re:

Ba Modimo o ba kopantseng mmogo, a go se nne motho ope yo o ba kgaoganyang. E re ka le ba dumalanye mmogo mo nyalong e e Boitshepo, mme ba supile jalo fa pele ga Modimo le kokwaano e, mme ikanyalanye mmogo mongwe mo go yo mongwe, mme ba boletse jalo ka go nayana direng le go di amogela, le go tshwaranya ka diatlaa, ka thata e ke neilweng ke puso ya Aferika Borwa le thata ya pitso ya me ke ba kaya e le monna le mosadi wa gagwe , mo leineng la Rara le ja Morwa le Mowa o o Boitshepo.

Jaanong moruti o tlaa bua mafoko a go monna a re:

O ka suna monyadiwa

Jaanong moruti o tlaa bitsa baruti botlhe le bommamoruti go tlaa go rapelela banyadi tshagofatso ya Modimo. Mme banyadi ba tlaa khubama mme baruti ba tlaa ba rapelela tshagofatso ka nako e le ngwe. Morago ga moo moruti o tlaa tsaya Tshwaro, mme morago ga Tshwaro ba tlaa saena rejisetara ya manyalo.

Wa losika o tlaa neelana ka Dikitsiso tsa gore fa go tswiwa fao go iwa kae.

LENANE TSAMAISO LA GO SEGWA GA KUKU

KWA GABO MOTLHANKANA

1. Pulo ka thapelo
2. Tlhaloso ya maikaelelo a letsatsi
3. Thotloetso ya lentswe
4. Tlhaloso le bokao jwa tshego ya kuku
5. Kgaogano ya kuku
6. Tebogo
7. Tshwaro

3. TSHEGOFATSO YA BANA, DIKOLOBETSO LE KAMOGELO YA MALOKO A MAŠWA

Tshegofatso ya bana ke e ngwe ya ditirelo tse di tsosang dikgang ka maikutlo a mantši a a farologaneng. Ka nako e go segofadiwang bana go ka nna le balosika ba ba dumelang ka tsela e e sa tshwaneng le Full Gospels Church, se se neela moruti tshono wa go dira tirelo e ka seriti le masisi a tsamaelana le Keresete.

Tirelo e ga se ya tllhasela dikereke tse dingwe le go ruta thuto ya kereke ya gago. Mme ke nako ya rera nnete, ka tsela e e ka dirang gore batho ba tllhaloganye gore ke eng mo kerekeng ya rona e dirwang ka tsela ee farologaneng. Le fa o kile wa segofatsa bana o tshwanetse go ipaakanya ka botlaalo gonne tshegofatso e ke ngwana o sele yo o sa tshwaneng le ba o kileng wa ba segofatsa.

Kotsi ya tirelo e ke gore e ka nna ya tsewa fela jaaka e e oketsang e mametlelela tirelo. Ngwana yo ke thaka ya leitlho la batsadi ba gagwe a bokao jwa tirelo e bo bona le ka gore tshegofatso ga e se tshegofatso fela mme e na le ditlaamorago tse di ka amang ngwana yo morago ga nako e telele.

Kopo ya go segofaletswa ngwana e tshwanetse go diriwa go sale gale go dira gore dilo tse di tsamaisang le tirelo ya kereke di seke tsa kgoreletswa. Motlhala wa lekwelokopo e ka nna o o latelang o tshwanang le foromo e:

**3.1 MOTLHALA WA FOROMO YA LEKWALOKOPO LA TSHEGOFATSO YA
BANA**

FULL GOSPEL CHURCH OF GOD

LEKWALOKOPO LA TSHEGOFATSO YA NGWANA

Nomore ya mogala:Aterese ya Kereke

Tse di amang ngwana

Sefane

Maina ka botlaalo.....

Letsatsi la tsalo.....Lefelo la tsalo

Tse di amang mme

Sefane

Sefane sa borweetsana

Maina ka botlaalo

Tse di amang rre

Sefane

Maina ka botlaalo.....

Botokololo jwa kereke

Rre Mme.....

Aterese ya batsadi

Letlha kopo ya go segofadiwa ga ngwana

Letlha la tshegofatso ya ngwana

Tshaeno ka mokwaledi wa kereke:

Maina a mokwaledi.....

Tshaeno ka Moruti:

Maina a moruti:

Go siamisa tsamaiso le go e dira bonolo rekoto ya ditshegofatso e ka dirwa ka tsela e e latelang.

Setifikeite sa tshegofatso a senne le dinomore tse: sekai fa e le ngwana wa ntlha go segofadiwa mo ngwageng, a e nne jaana 01/12 kgotsa 1/ 2012 yo o latelang 02/12 kgotsa 02/2012 jalo jalo. Mme ngwaga o olatelang e 01/13 kgotsa 01/2013 mokgwa o thusa thata mo go faneng ka dipalo-palo fa ngwaga o fela.

3.1.1 TSAMAISO YA TIRELO YA TSHEGOFATSO YA NGWANA

- Batsadi batlaa kopiwa go tlaa go ema mo pele ga pulipiti le ngwana wa bone fo gontse go binwa sefela se se maleba ke setlhopa sa kobamelo
- Fa ngwana a lela batsadi ba tlaa leka go mo didimatsa ka yona nako eo
- Lekwalo le le maleba le tlaa buisiwa mme go abelwane ka dintlha tse di maleba tse di mmalwa
- Fa go na le sengwe se moruti a batlaang go se tlhalosa ka bophara a ka dira jalo pele ga a ka bitsa batsadi kgotsa morago ga go segofatsa ngwana
- Go gatelela botlhokwa jwa tshegofatso ya ngwana taelo e ka balelwa batsadi: “Wena Rre le Mme lo tlile mo go tlisa ngwana yo go mo neela go Modimo gore a segofadiwe, mme mo go direng jalo lo tsena mo kamanong e e masisi le mmupi yo o tshegetsang ditshepiso go ya kwa melokong e e sekete.
- Jaaka lo dumela gore ngwana yo ke mpho go tswa go Modimo le gore o lo naya maikarabelo a ngwana yo, a naa lo a ikana gore lo tlaa mo neela gore a direle Modimo? A lo tlaa rapela gammogo le e ne lo mo rute thuto ya lefoko la Modimo, lo mo tlise mo tlung ya Modimo mme lo dire tsotlhe tse di mo matleng a lona go tlisa mo kitsong ya go itse Morena Jesu Keresete Mopholosi wa rona”.
- Batsadi ba tlaa araba go ya ka tsela e batshwanetseng fa ba dumalana go dira tiro e.
- Phuthego e tlaa ema fa go dirwa tiro ya tshegofatso

3.1.2 BOKAO JWA TSHEGOFATSO YA BANA

Go botlhokwa thata go moruti gore a itse bokao jwa go segofatsa bana.

1. Selo sa ntlha ke gore tshegofatso ga e tsamaisane le go fiwa ga ngwana leina; kgotsa go mo tsenya mo kgolaganong kgotsa go netefatsa pholoso ya gagwe
2. Lekwalo lo lo dirsiwang ke lo Mareko 10:13-16. Selo sa botlhokwa se o tshwanetseng go se tlhalosetsa batho ke se; “Mmuso wa magodimo ke wa bana”. Go latela lekwalo la Baroma 3:23 Rotlhe re leofile go tsenyeletsa le bana ka ntlha ya sebe sa ga Atamo, rrabatho botlhe. Mme fela Paulo o a tlhalosa gore ngwana ga a na maikarabelo a ditlolo ka ntlha ya gore ga a

e se a gole sentle mo tlhaloganyong go itse se se mo teng ga molao (Baroma 3:20; 4:15 le 5:14).

Potso ke gore go diragala eng ka sebe sa ga Atamo mo mothung? Motho ga se moleofi ka ntlha y a gore o dirile sengwe kgotsa o dira sengwe, mme ke moleofi go latela tlhago ya gagwe. Paulo o fana ka karabo mo II Bakorinthe 5:18,19 gore Jesu o swetse batho botlhe go tsenyeletsa le bana. Go tswa mo nakong ya tsalo go fitlhelela ngwana a fitlha mo dingwageng tsa go nna le maikarabelo a dibe tsa gagwe, mmuso wa magodimo ke wa gagwe.

3.1.3 BA BA SA ITEKANELANG MO TLHALOGANYONG

Lekwalo lo lo reng go sego ba ba humanegileng mo moweng ga le tsamaisane le batho ba ba sa itekanelang mo tlhaloganyong. Se se tshwanetseng go netefatswa ke gore motho yoo ga itekanela go fitlhela kwa kae. Mme fa a godile mo mmeleng mme a sa itekanela mo tlhaloganyong o wela mo tlaase ga bana.

3.2 KOLOBETSO

Moruti o tshwanestse go nna le bonnete jwa gore mokaulengwe yo o batlaang go kolobediwa o tlhaloganya gore dikwalo tse di Boitshepo dire ke motho yo ntseng jang yo o tshwanelwang ke kolobetso le gore a tlhaloganye gore bokao jwa kolobetso ke eng. Moruti o tshwanela go ruta ka dintlha dingwe tsa kolobetso go netefatsa gore mokaulengwe yo o kolobediwang a tseye karolo e e feletseng ya semowa le gore tirelo ya kolobetso e nne le seriti mme e dirwe kwa ntle ga dikgoreletsi. Dintlha tse di latelang di tshwanelwa ke go dirwa:

1. Tshokologo ya mokaulengwe yo o kolobediwang e tshwanetswe ke go netefatswa, ka ntlha ya gore batho ba bantsi jaka basha ba rata go kolobetswa ka ntata ya kgatelelo ya ditsala.
2. Mokaulengwe yo o kolobediwang o tshwanelwa ke go rutwa pele ka mokgwa le tsamaiso ya kolobetsa.
3. Go botlhokwa thata gore go nne le mme yo o tlaa tsayang maikarabelo a go ruta bomme ka moaparo o o siametseng bomme le barweetsana ba ba kolobediwang. Mme o tshwanetse go ba eletsa gore battle ka diaparo tse dingwe le toulo.
4. Go dira dithulaganyo tse di maleba go botlhokwa go kaya letlha la letsatsi la go kolobetsa, mme bakaulengwe ba ba ratang go kolobetswa ba tshwanetse go tlaatsa

foromo ya lekwalo kopo la go kolobediwa ka potlaako. Foromo e eka dirisiwa gape
jaka e ngwe ya ditlaankana tsa tsamaiso.

MOTLHALA WA FOROMO YA KOPO YA GO KOLOBETSWA

FULL GOSPEL CHURCH OF GOD

KOPO YA GO KOLOBETSWA

(Dinomore tsa mogala)

(Aterese ya Kereke)

SEFANE

MAINA KA BOTLAALO

ATERESE

BOLOKO JWA KEREKE

LETHLA LA MATSALO

A O BATLAA GO NNA TOKOLOLO YA KEREKE?

TSHAENO

LETLHA LA KOPO

TSAMAISO YA TIRELO YA DIKOLOBETSO

1. Morago ga thero ya Lentswe; maina a batho ba ba kolobediwang a tlaa balwa mme ba atamela fa pele ga letamo kgotsa pulipiti.
2. Mme ba tlaa botsoloswa dipotso ka setlhopa kgotsa ka bongwe ka bongwe. Dipotso tsona ke tse di latelang: A ga jana o a ipolela ka letswalo le le phepha, mo pele ga Modimo le dipaki tse gore o a dumela gore o ngwana wa Modimo, ka ntlha ya gore o amogetse Jesu Keresete jaaka Morena le Mopholosi wa gago? A ke keletso ya gago ya go latlha tsotlhe o mo sale morago mo botshelong jo bontšha jo, jo tirelo e e bo shupang?
3. Mme go tlaa dirwa thapelo ya botlhe mme moruti ka boena kgotsa le maloko a lekgotlaa la kereke ba tlaa dumedisana le batho ba ba fetsang go kolobetswa ka matsogo ba ba neele di setifikeiti tsa kolobetsa. Mme morago bomme le borre ba tlaa ya kwa dikamotshaneg tsa go fetola moaparo go ipakanyetsa Kolobetso.
4. Tsela e ba tlaa tsenag ka yona mo metsing e tlaa e tshetlega ka gore go kolobeletswa fa kae.
5. Fa nako e dumela mokaulengwe o mongwe le o mongwe o tlaa fiwa nako ya go paka pele ga a ka kolobetswa. Mme kolobetso e tlaa tsamaisiwa ka mokgwa o: “(Leina ka botlaalo) ka ntlha ya gore o ipoletse gore o amogetse Morena Jesu Keresete jaaka Morena le mopholosi wa botshelo jwa gago e bile gape ke keletso ya gago go mo sala morago mo losong le mo tsogong ya baswi, ke go kolobetsa ka leina la Rara, Le la Morwa le la Mowa o o Boitshepo”. Kotsa “go latela kutlo ya thomo e kgolo le go latela tumelo ya gago le boipolelo jwa gago mo go Jesu Keresete, ke kolobetsa wena, (Leina ka botlaalo) mo Leineng la Rara, le la Morwa le la Mowa o o Boitshepo.
6. Ka ntlha ya gore dikolobetso di na le go tsaya nako e telele mme di se tlise tshegofatso moruti o tshwanetse go ela tlhoko gore o a dikhutsafatsa ka go dira gore morago ga motho wa bofelo mo metsing a bo a tsaya tshwaro a le mo metsing. Go direla gore fa a tswa mo metsing go be go phatlhalalwa. Leka go boloka nako ya batho ka dirisa botlhale jwa go khutsafatso tirelo e gore e nne tshegofatso mo bathung.

4. SELALELO

Tirelo ya Selalelo e tlisa boikutlwelo-Modimo jo bo kwa godimo magareng ga modumedi le Keresete yo o tsogileng mo baswing. E dira gore pelo le tlhaloganyo di kopangwe mo bongweng fela jwa boineelo mo tirong le mo Bothong jwa ga Keresete. Mme tirelo e e ntseng jalo e na le meetlo e mentsi mo e ka feleletsang e sena bokao mme e shule. Jaanong ka nako tshotlhe re tshwanetse go ela tlhoko dintlha tse di latelang:

1. Selalelo ga se tlaaleletso ya tirelo Modimo, ke tirelo Modimo e e ikemetseng ka bo yona.
2. E tshwanetse go nna karolo ya tirelo ka botlaalo le go felela, ke gore ga dirwe tirelo e ngwe e re fa e fela go bo tshimololwa ka selalelo.
3. Selalelo ga se jwe ka lobelo, go a iketlwa mme go na le go thugisa le nagana go go tseneletseng ka ga tirelo e.

Botlhokwa jwa go tsaya karolo ga badumedi botlhe bo tshwanetse ba tlhagisiwa go tlisa go tlhaloganya tirelo e, le bokao jwa yone jaaka go boletswe mo lokwalong lwa 1 Bakorinthe 11:23-24.

1. Selalelo se bua ka ga go **gopola**- go nkgopola temana 24
2. Selalelo se bua ka ga go **kaya**- go kaya temana 26
3. Selalelo se bua ka go **itekola**- a mongwe le mongwe a itekole temana 26
4. Selalelo se bua ka go **ikamagana**- letelanang temana 33
5. Selalelo se bua ka ga go **lebelela**- go fitlhela a tlaa temana 26

Go latela dintlha tse di fa godimo tse go a bonala gore selalelo ke sa badumedi fela mme e seng batho botlhe.

4.1 SELALELO LE PAAKANYO

Mathaio 5:23-24 mareko 11:25-26

Ditemana tse pedi tse di na le melawana e mebedi

1. Fa go na le mokaulegwe yo o nang le sengwe kगतलhanong le wena e ya kwa go ene o bakanye dikgang
2. Mareko e ne a re fa o na le sengwe kगतलhanong le mokaulengwe o mo itshwarele. Se se bontsha gore maikarabelo otlhe a go baakanya a mo go wena.

Ka ntlha ya bokao jwa selalelo go a kgonagala gore batho ba baakanye pele ga go jewa selalelo. Mme go tsibogela ntlha e moruti o tshwanetse gona a tsepame ka nako tsotlhe go se fetole seo Modimo a se direleng go nna se se galalelang, se se tlhwekisang le go aga gona motantabelo wa ditshebo le nyenyefatso ya batho.

GOPOLA TSE DI LATELANG

1. Ke ipolela maleo a ka go Modimo fela (1 Tim. 2:5 Pes.32:5).
2. Ke ipolela go motho yo ke mo leofetseng fela(Jak.5:16)
3. Go itlotlaa le go naganela Phuthego le baeti go tshwanetse ga tlaa pele

TSAMAISO YA SELALELO

Selalelo ke tirelo e e kgethegileleng, ka ga jalo ga kgonagale go itse gore go tlaa diaragalang mo tirelong e bogolo re lebeletse tirelo ya bazlwane. Jaanong fatlaase fa re tlaa neela fela dikaelo tsa go dira tirelo e:

1. Totloetso kgotsa tshimologo ya tirelo
2. Molaetsa wa letsasti
3. Madikone ba potapota tafole ya selalelo mme moruti e ne o nna mo magareg
4. Tshagofatso ya Tafole
5. Palo ya lekwalo la selalelo
6. Tlhaloso ya gore ke bo mang ba ba tshwanetseng go ka tsaya karolo (tlhokagalo ke ya gore motho yo mongwe le yo mongwe yo o pholositsweng)
7. Fa bogobe bo nathogangwa mafoko a a ka buiwa “Mmele wa Morena jesu Keresete o le o neetsweng, a o lo bolokele botshelo jo bosakhutleng. Tsaya o je se ke segopotso sa gore Keresete o go shwetse. Ja mmele o ka tumelo mo pelong ya gago ka ditebogo.
Motho yo mongwe le yo mongwe o tlaa leta ba bangwe gore be fiwe gore ba tlee go ja mmogo ka nako e le ngwe.
8. Badikone ba ja pele kgotsa morago ga Phuthego e fetsa go jesiwa.
9. Senwelo se tseiwa ka tsela e tshwanang le ya bogobe, mme go tlaa dirisiwa mafoko a “Madi a Morena Jesu Keresete a tshololetsweng wena”. E tlaa re fa batho ba fiwa senweelo setlhopha sa kobamelo se tlaa bina dipina tse di tsamaisanang le selalelo. Pele ga batho ba ka ja botlhe go tlaa netefatswa gore batho botlhe ba amogetse, morago ga moo go tlaa taolo ya go ja mmogo le go nwa mmogo
10. Moruti a ka nna a e jesa selalelo kgotsa a jesiwa ke o mongwe wa badikone

11. Go tlaa binwa sefela sa go tswala fa go tsewa dikabelo le boshome
12. Thapelo ya go tswala
13. Go kgabisa Selalelo le go dira gore tiro e kgatlise matlho e seng go dira molao go ka kgatlisa fa badiakone ba apare disutu tse dintsho le dihempe tse tshweu
14. Fa go nwelwa mo senwelong se le sengwe a badiakone ba phimole senwelo ka letsela kgotsa diseefeete morago ga gore motho yo mongwe le yo mongwe a nwe.

BANA LE SELALELO

Se ke kgwetlo e kgolo go moruti mongwe le mongwe gore a bana ba fiwe selalelo kgotsa nyaya. Selalelo le Kolobetso ke ditirelo tse pedi tseo Full Gospel Church e di tsenyang mo tirisong mme ditlhokego tsa tsone ka bobedi gore di diragatswe mo mothong ke gore a dumele mo go Morena Jesu Keresete jaaka mopholosi.

Go botlhokwa gore ba tsaya karolo mo tirelong e baitse ka botlaalo gore selalelo se kaya eng le gore tiro ya sone ke efe mme ba kgone le go diragatsa melawana yotlhe go latela Lentswe la Modimo. Paulo o kgalema botlhe ba ba tsayang karolo mo selalelong go itekola, ba sekeke ba se ja ka mokgwa o o sa tshwanelang o o ka ba tllisetsang katlholo ya Modimo.

4.2 KAMOGELO YA MALOKO A MAŠWA

Kamogelo ya ditkololo tse dintšha e ka nna ka tsela tse tharo tse di latelang:

1. Motho ya fetsang go amogela Morena Jesu
2. Leloko go tswa kerekeng e ngwe
3. Batho ba e leng gone ba fitlhang mo tulong

MALOKO A A FETSANG GO PHOLOSWA

FOROMO E E MALEBA KE E:

THE FULL GOSPEL CHURCH OF GOD

KOPO YA GO NNA LELOKO

Leina la Phuthego le aterese

Sefane

Sefane la Borweetsana

Maina ka botlaalo.....

Nomere ya lekwaloitshupo.....

Letsatsi la tsalo..... Lefelo la tsalo.....

Lefelo la tsokologo Lefelo.....

Letsatsi la kolobetsa Lefelo.....

Letsatsi la botokololo

Aterese (ya legae) Ya Poso.....

Mogala wa legae Wa kwa tirong

Wa letheke

Tshaeno

TSA BOTAMAISI

Letsatsi la lenyalo

Maina a molekane ka botlaalo

Bana le matsalo a bona

matsalo

- | | |
|---------|-------|
| 1. | |
| 2. | |
| 3. | |
| 4. | |

E neetswe lekgotlaa la kereke ka

Mokwaledi..... Modulasetulo.....

Tirelo e e ka kgatlisa thata fa e ka nna ka letsatsi la selalelo. Moruti o tshwanetse go ela tlhoko gore a seke a gatelela botokololo thata mo e bileng a sa lebeleleng boleng mme a shebile dipalopalo. Go gatelela selo se se fosagetseng go senya boleng jwa matlaa le kopano ya kereke.

MALOKO A A TSWANG MO DIKEREKENG TSE DINGWE

- Go tshwanetse ga nna le bopaki jo bo bontshang gore motho e ne e le tokololo ya kereke e a tswang kwa go yone
- Gore re nne batho ba nnete le go nna le Maitsholo a mantle ka thokgamo e e tshwanelang motlhanka wa Modimo, go a tshwanela go ka buisana le moruti yo moPhuthego a tswang kwa go ene pele o ka amogela motho yoo mo Phuthegong.

- Jaanong foromo e e tlaaditsweng le repoto go tswa go moruti wa mokaulengwe di tlišiwa fa pele ga lekgotlaa la kereke go ka tšhimolola go amogela mokaulengwe.

BATHO BA E LENG GONA BA GOROGANG MO TULONG

- Go latela tsamaiso ya kereke moruti o tšhwanetse go neelana ka setefekeiti sa phitisetso botokololo go tswa Phuthegong e ngwe go ya go e ngwe mo mokaulengwe a tlaa obamelang gone mo isagong
- Mo maamong a a tlwaelegileng setifikeiti sa phitisetso mo Phuthegong e ngwe ga se tlišiwe mo lekgotleng la kereke go pakela mokaulengwe

TSELA TSA TSAMAISO

Foromo ya lekwelokopo la botokololo kgotsa foromo ya phitisetso e ka dirisiwa go tlaatsa rejisetara ya botokololo le karata ya botokololo

TSAMAISO YA TIRELO YA GO AMOGELA MALOKO

- Ka nako e e rileng maina a batho ba ba batlaang go nna maloko a tlaa balwa mme ba biletswe go tlaa fa pele ga pulipiti
- Go latela molaotheo wa Full Gospel Church of God ditlokego tsa botokololo jwa go nna leloko la kereke di ka balwa kgotsa ga buisiwa lekwalo le le bontshang botokololo jwa mmele wa Keresete mme seo sa tšhalosiwa.
- Tao e e kgethedileng e ka balwa mme ba kopiwa go fana ka maikano a gore tlaa amogela maikarabelo a bona a botokololo go latela ditlhokego tsa botokololo jwa kereke ka Tšhwaro ya Modimo
- Mme Phuthego e tlaa botswa gore a e ya ba amaogela jaaka maloko a maswa mo go Keresete
- Phuthego e santse e eme ka dinao go tlaa dirwa thapelo ya tšhegofatso mme moruti le maloko a lekgotlaa la kereke ba tlaa amogela maloko ka go ba naya seatlaa sa moja sa bokaulengwe.

4.3 GO BEWA GA BATLHANKEDI BA KEREKE

Dikaelo tsa go kgetha kgotsa go bewa ga makgotlaa a a farologaneng go tšhaloswa sentle mo molaotheong wa kereke.

1. Go tlhopiwa le go bewa ga bagolwane: Molaotheo wa Full Gospel Church of God phetolelo ya senyesemane (tsebe 126 karolwana 9:4:22; tsebe 92 karolwana 9:1:3).
2. Go tlhopiwa le bewa ga badiakone: Molaotheo wa Full Gospel Church of God phetolelo ya senyesemane (tsebe 128 karolwana 9:4:24; tsebe 93 karolwana 9:1:3:2)

4.3.1 TSAMAISO YA TIRELO YA GO BEWA GA BATLHANKEDI

Morago ga gore maina a maloko a a kgethilweng a fetsa go bidiwa ba tlaa ema mo pele ga pulipiti bone le balekane ba bone.

Se ke tshono e e ntle go ka tthalosetsa batlhankedi le badumedi gore tulo ya bona le tiro ya bona ke efe mmo mmeleng wa ga Keresete.

Kereke ga e se sephidi fela mme ke mokgatlo o o phelang gape o o matlhagatlhaga mme Keresete ke tlhogo ya one mme re gokagantswe ka tirisano-mmogo le le tiro ya rona. Go kgontsha mmele go dira sentle le ka phutologo o feletseng, tokololo e ngwe le ngwe e tlaa nna le boikarabelo jwa go diragatsa tiro ya yone.

Lekgotlaa la kereke le tshwanetse go nna sekai mo ntlheng e ya go tsaya maikarabelo a go diragatsa tiro ya yone le shutisa dikgoreletsi tshotlhe tse di golafatsang tirelo ya mmele wa ga Keresete. Mme maikarabelo ga a tlisiwe ke go nna le maemo mo kerekeng, mme ke ka ntlha ya go lomangwa kgotsa go kopangwa le Keresete.

Lekwalo la I Timotheo 3:1-18 le ka balwa kgotsa go ka balwa go tswa mo molaotheong go bontsha ditlhokego tsa go nna mogolwane kgotsa modikone wa kereke. Bantlhankedi ba tshwanetse go ka lemosiwa gore tiro e ngwe le e ngwe e direlwang kgalaletso ya Modimo ga e potlaana, mme ba gopotswe gore maemo a bone a botlhokwa ka e le badirammo go le Modimo. Mantswe a a latelang a ka dirisiwa fa ba bewa mo maemong a bona:

Bakaulengwe le kgethilwe ke Phuthego gore lo nne mo maemong a lo leng mo go one. Ka jalo ke maikarabelo a me a a galalelang go gatelela bogolo, botlhokwa le boseriti jwa tiro e. dirang gore lo nne dikai mo Phuthegong le mo matshelong a lona a letsatsi le letsatsi. Ka go amogela maemo a lo gatisa tlokego ya boineelo jwa lona jotlhe le go tshepagalela molaetsa, lenane tsamaiso, molaotheo le melao ya kereke e.

4.3.2 GO LAIWA GA BA BA BEWANG BAGOLO LE BADIKONE

KAMOGELO YA GO BEWA

A o amogela bothankedi jo jaaka maemo a a galalelang mme o tshepisa fa pele ga Modimo le Phuthego gore o tlaa tiro ya ka bojotlhe jwa bokgoni jwa gago le ka Tshwaro ya Modimo.

MO PHUTHEGONG

Baratiwa mo go Keresete re lo kopa gore lo amogele go tlotsiwa ga bona. A lo a tshepisa gore le tlaa tsaya karolo ka go diragatsa maikarabelo a lona mo mmeleng wa ga Keresete? A lo tshepisa gore lo tlaa tlotlaa le go ba rotloetsa, go ba tshegetsatshegetsa e go ba rapelela jaaka re laelwa ke Lentswe la Modimo? Go bontsha gore loa dumalana emang ka dinao.

Morago ga thapelo ya ba segofatsa ba tlaa amogelwa ka go dumedisiwa a matsogo

5. KAMOGELO YA MORUTI LE GO TLHOMIWA GA GAGWE MO PHUTHEGONG

Go tlhophelwa tirelo ya Boruti ke tiro e e masisi gape e e nang le seriti se se galalelang, go matshwanedi gore tirelo ya Boruti jwa moruti mo Phuthegong e e ntšha e dirwe ka one masisi ao le bogalaledi.

Tirelo ya go amogela moruti e tshwanetse go dirwa fela fa a fetsa go goroga mo Phuthegong e e ntšha pele kgotsa ka sonaga wa pele e a amogetsweng ka yona. Baruti ba ba gaufi ba ka lalediwa go tlaa tirelong e.

Mme fa e le gore tiro ya go amogela le go tlhoma moruti e diragala ka letsatsi la kobamelo lenaane tsamaiso e ka nna le le latelang:

Lenaane tsamaiso

Leina la Moradisi:

1. Pulo ka thapelo
2. Sefela se se maleba
3. Palo ya Lentswe la Modimo
4. Tumediso le molaetsa wa takaletso masego go tswa go Mookamedi wa Setereke sa Lekgotlaa la Setereke se se amegang
5. Tumediso le kamogelo motlaatsi wa moruti kgotsa kemedi ya Phuthego. Dilo tse di ka buiwang mo kamogelong
 - 5.1. Kamogelo ya semmuso ya Phuthego ka moemedi wa lekgotlaa la kereke

- 5.2. Tsholefelo ya gore go tlaa ga moruti go tlaa tlisa, boitumelo, tshegofatso, le maungo a semowa mo Phuthengong yotlhe
- 5.3. Phuthego e tlaa rotloetswa go rata, go tshegetsana, go rapela le go dira-mmogo le moruti le mmamoruti
6. Thomo le tao e tlaa balelwa moruti ke moemedi wa kereke go tswa mo makwalong a (I Timotheo 2:1-13; II Timotheo 4:1-5)
7. Thomo le tao ya Phuthego e tlaa balelwa Phuthego ke moemedi wa kereke go tswa mo lokwalong lo (Baroma 12:9-21)
8. Karabo ka moruti yo montšha
9. Sefela sa go tswala
10. Tshwaro ka moruti

5.1 GO TLODIWA GA MORUTI

GO TLODIWA KE ENG?

Diteng tsa tirelo e ya go tlotsa moruti di itshetlegile ka bokao jwa lefoko le go tlotsa.

Go tlotsa go kaya go beela motho kwa thoko yo o nang le pitso ya Modimo ya go dira tiro e e rileng mo kerekeng. Tlotsa ga e kae gore motho o neelwa matlaa le taolo, mme e kaya gore kereke e amogela matlaa a Modimo a a mo mothong yo o biditsweng le go neelana ka taelo ya gore motho yo o biditsweng a tswelotse neo le pitso ya gagwe. Jaanong kamogelo e ga e diriwe fela ka lentse la kereke gape e bonwa ka nako e e ikgethileng ya thapelo le go bewa matsogo

(Ditiro 6:5-6; 14:23 I Timotheo 4:14; 5:22) Motho yo o biditsweng o tshwanetse go netefatsa ka boena gore o na le pitso. (I Bakorinthe 9:16; I Timotheo 1:2) mme le kereke le yone e

tshwanetse go netefatsa pitso ya motho pele ga e ka mo neela Boruti (I Timotheo3:2-7; 4:14; Tito 1:6-9).

Go tlotswa ga moruti ke tiragatso e e diriwang ke kereke fela mme e bonwa mo go yona fela, motho yo o tloditsweng o tlaa nna fela jalo fa e santse e tokololo ya kereke e e mo tloditseng

Tshwetso ya gore motho o batlaa go tloletswa kae ke ya gagwe. Fa a batlaa go tloletswa kwa Phuthegong ya gagwe kgotsa mo seterekeng sa gagwe ke ene fela a ka tsayang tshwetso eo go ya ka molaotheo wa kereke.

5.2 LENAANE- TSAMAISO LA TIRELO YA TLOTSO

1. Ka nako e e rileng Motlolwa o tlaa kopiwa go tsaya manno a gagwe fela jaaka go dumalwane
2. Thotloetso kgotsa tshwetso ya go dumela gore motlolwa a tlotswa ke lekgotlaa le le maleba e tlaa balwa
3. Go tlaa nna le puo e e buwang ka botlhokwa jwa tirelo Modimo le jwa moruti bo tlaa gatelelwang
4. Thomo ya gotlotswa e ka balwa go tswa mo makwalong a I Timotheo 3:1-16; 5:1-16; 2: 14-26; 6:9-21;II Timotheo 4:1-16; 3:12-17; 4:1-5
5. Baruti ba ba tloditsweng ba tlaatlaa go beya mokaulengwe yo o tlodiwang matsogo fa go ntse go diriwa thapelo ya go tlotswa.
6. O tlaanewa seatlaa se se siameng sa bokaulengwe mme a eleletswe masego le matlhogonolo
7. Mme go opelwe pina e e tsamaisanang le go tshololelwa ga mowa o o Boitshepo

6. TIRELO YA THAPELO YA BOMME LE DIKOPANO TSE DINGWE TSA BONA

6.1 TSE DI TLAANG PELE MO TIRELONG YA BOMME

Tirelo ya bomme ke mokgatlo o o ikemetseng wa bomme o o fanang ka tirelo e e botlhokwa mo Phuthegong bakeng sa Phuthego. Bomme e sale ba direla kereke ka botswapelo le manontlhotlho ka tse di tshwaregang, tsa semowa le tsa loago.

Mokgatlo wa bomme wa kereke ya selegae o eteletswe pele ke mmamoruti jaaka moperesidente. Ke maikaelelo gore mme mongwe le mongwe a thuse go tswelletsa tiro ya Morena ka thapelo le go dira

Mme mokgatlo o o tshwanetse go sekwasekwa go bona gore mekgwa ya go tsamaisa mokgatlo le tiro ya ona e ntse e na le tswelelopele. Tsamaiso e ngwe le e ngwe o tshwanelwa ke go itlhatlhoa go netefatsa gore ga e fatele kwa morago.

6.2 MAEMO MO MOKGATLONG

KOMITI

Komiti ya kereke ya selegae e ka nna le maloko a mantsi fela go latela ditlhokego tsa kereke le maemo a yona, mme e tshwanetse go fetolwa fa morago ga dingwaga di le nne kgotsa jaaka go ka tlhokafala

MOPERESIDENTE

Mmamoruti ke moperesidente wa mokgatlo wa bomme. Ke ene a tsamaisang mokgatlo le go nna modulasetulo wa dikopano tshotlhe tsa bomme. O leka ka nako tshotlhe go dirisa melao ya Tirelo Ya Bomme le tsamaiso ya dikopano.

MOTLAATSA-MOPERESIDENTE

O tshwanetse go itse melao ya tirelo ya bomme le go itse seo se diragalang le dikgatlegelo tsa bomme go direla gore fa go tlhokafala a tsee maemo a moperesidente.

MOKWALEDI

Metsotso, Dikitsiso le dithulaganyetso tsa dikopano tsothle ke tiro ya mokwaledi. Pele ga kopano o bontsha moperesidente makwalo otlhe a a fitlhileng mme o thusa moperesidente go tsamaisa kopano ka tolamo.

MOTSHWARA MATLOTLO

Tiro ya gagwe ke go tsamaisa madi le go tlhokomela gore a dirisiwa sentle mme o tshwanetse go nna matseseleko mo go tlhomaganyeng dintlha tse di tsamaisanang le madi. O tshwanetse go tlhagisa setatamente sa madi ka nako e ngwe le e ngwe mo kopanong mme a kgone go araba dipotso tse di budiwang ka madi.

6.3 SEKAI SA METSOTSO YA KOPANO

LEINA LA MOKGATLO:

TLHALOSO YA KOPANO:

LETLHA:

NAKO:

TULO.....

MAINA A BA BA GONE:

MOPERESIDENTE.....

KOMITI E FELELETSE

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

1. Pulo ka thapelo
2. Kamogelo ka mudalasetulo
3. Metsotso ya kopano e e fetileng
4. Tse di tswang mo metsotsong

5. Makwalo
6. Repoto ya madi
7. Tse di tswang mo repotong ya madi

Dintlha tse dintsha tse go buisanwang ka tsona

6.4 MELAWANA YA SELEGAE

Melao ya tsamaiso ya tirelo ya bomme e tthalosiwa sentle mo bukeng ya Melao Ya Tirelo Ya Bomme. Mme komiti ya selegae e ka ya dira gore melao eo e itepatepanye le maemo a ba iphitlhelang mo go one. Dikomiti tsa kereke di ka nna tsa okediwa go bebofatsa tirelo le go dira gore dilo di tsamaye ka thelelo (sekai Komiti ya ketelo, Komiti ya meletlo, Komiti ya ditšhešhe).

6.5 TIRISANO MMOGO YA BOMME BOTLHE

Lefa komiti e le yone e tsamaisang ditirelo tsa bomme mo Phuthegong, selo sa botlhokwa ke gore bomme ba tswanese go itse gore ntle le tirisano mmogo ya bona dilo di ka se tsamaye ka thelelo. Tokololo e ngwe le e ngwe ya Mokgatlo wa Bomme e tlhoka go tsenya letsogo go dira gore tiro e nne bonolo. Go tlhokafala gore gonne le makwalo a itsising ka tswelelopele ya bomme a kwale ka dinako tsotlhe go kgothatso bomme.

6.6 MERAPELO YA BOMME

A. Thuto ya Beibele

Mmamoruti o tshwanetse go ithuta ka ditsela tsa go ruta Beibele ka go dirisa dibuka tse di mo marekisetso a dibuka tsa sekeresete. O tshwanetse go ruta bomme lentswe la Modimo ka tsela e e botlhokwa go tokafatsa kitso ya bona ya lentswe.

B. MERAPELO YA BOMME

Bomme ba tshwanetse go kgothaletswa go tlaa merapelong ka dinako tsotlhe. Fa go kgonagala go ka nna ga nna le ditlhopa tsa disele tsa thapelo. Thapelo e tliša phepafatso ya loago le lobebe lwa semowa mo Phuthegong.

Go nna moagisane wa botlhokwa go bonala ka go thusa ba bangwe ka teranseporoto le ka tse di tshwaregang ka nako tsa diteko. Ba ithuta go bontsha kutlwelo-botlhoko le kgothatso le go rapelelana mo thapelong. Mme e nna maloko a a direlang e seng a a direwang. Matthaio 20:28

6.7 BORAPELEDI

Ga gona sepe se se ka tsayang maemo a thapelo. Ke kabelano e e tseneletseng le Modimo e e tlišang tshushumetso mo mothung yo o rapelang. Go rapelela go tshwanetse ga diaragatswa go ya ka lekwalo I Timotheo 2:1-2 mme gape go tshwanetse ga rapelelwa ba ba latelang:

- a) Bakaulengwe
- b) Batho ba ba gaufi le rona
- c) Lerato le le galalelang la bao ba sa shokologang
- d) Thomo ya Keresete ya go tliša tokologo go botlhe ka Keresete
- e) Batho ba tshelang mo lefatsheng le la rona le le ratang dilo tsa nama
- f) Batho ba e leng makgoba a boaka
- g) Makgoba a dithetefatse le nnotagi
- h) Batho ba ba letlelelang dilo tsotlhe
- i) Bakaulengwe ba ba tshelang botshelo jwa sephiri jwa dibe
- j) Dikolo, dikholetšhe le di yunibesithi
- k) Mekgwa e mesa, dilo tsa pele tsa botlhokwa le maikarabelo
- l) Baetapele ba naga ya rona
- m) Dira tsa rona tse di batlaang go re utlwisana botlhoko
- n) Malapa a rona le balosika
- o) Le rona gore re kgone go utlwa Mowa o o Boitshepo

7. TIRELO YA GO KGAKOLA LEPATLELO LE GO NEELA KAGO YA KEREKE

Le fa tirelo e e direlwa kwa ntle go tshwanetswe ga itepatepangwa le maemo a bosa

Lenaane Tsamaiso la Tirelo

1. Poko

2. Palo ya lefoko: le lengwe la makwalo a a ka balwang I Ditirafalo 21:22-26; 22:11-16,19 II ditirafalo 2:1-9; Esere 7: 11-26 Pesalema 24; Pesalema 29; Jesaya 12.

3. Kopelo e tsamaisang le tirelo

4. Puo e e khutsane ka Moruti kgotsa sebui sa moeti ka ga kago e e tlaa agwang.

5. Kgakolo ya lepatlelo kgotsa lebala le go tlilweng go agiwa mo go lone; mme ba ba tlhopilweng go latela moruti

6. Thapelo ya tswetso ya tiro gore e tlise tlotlo go Modimo

7. Sefela sa go tswala

8. Tshwaro

7.1 TIRELO YA GO TSHEGOFATSA LE GO NEELA KAGO YA KEREKE

Ga gona motsoso o o botlhokwa jaaka wa tirelo ya tshegofatso ya kago e ntšha ya kereke mo botshelong jwa Phuthego. Ga gona tirelo e e nang le tebelelo e e nang le maikutlo a a kwa godimo go feta tirelo e. Tirelo e e tshwanetse go nna le mowa wa pako o o renang mo dipelong tsa batho mme pako eo e tsholeletswe kwa magodimong kwa e tshwanetseng go ya teng. Pono e e tukang malakabe, go dira go go sa lapiseng, mowa wa go ikhitsa setlhabelo, tebogo go Modimo, lerato le go ikanyegela Keresete le Kereke ya gagwe ke tse dingwe tsa dilo tse di tshwanetseng go nna teng mo tirelong e.

DiPhuthego tse dingwe di rata fa baruti botlhe ba ikileng ya nna baruti mo Phuthegong go nna teng. Mme tse dingwe di rata fa diPhuthego tse di farologaneng le mekgatlo e e farologaneng ya sekeresete e ka nna karolo ya tirelo e.

Mme go botlhokwa go dira gore lenaane tsamaiso le tlaangwe le bo gatisiwe gore tirelo e tsamaye ka tolamo.

7.2 LENANETSAMAISO LA TIRELO YA GO TSHEGOFATSA LE GO NEELA KAGO YA KEREKE

1. Kamogelo le kaelo ka Moradisi
2. Pulo ka thapelo
3. Tirelo ya thoriso le kobamelo Modimo
4. Molaetsa wa tebogo o Modimo o o beileng mo pelong ya moruti
5. Pina ka dikhwaere
6. Tebogo ka leloko la lekgotlaa la kereke le le neng le le teng fa tiro e e tshimologa
7. Tebogo ka kemedi ya lekgotlaa la bomme
8. Puo ya go neela le go tshegofatsa ka moruti wa Phuthego
9. Katlenekiso ke mookamedi wa setereke
10. Sefela
11. Thapelo ya go tshegofatsa dijo le Tshwaro
12. Go iwa dijong

7.3 GO THAYA MOTHEO WA KEREKE

E ke ngwe ya ditirelo tse di bothokwa mo maitemogelong a Phuthego, mme e tlhoka go baakanyediwa sentle go tlhagisa bothokwa jwa yona jwa semowa. Batsayakarolo ba tlaa bolelelwa e sa le gale gore ba tlile go dira eng.

LENANE TSAMAISO LA TIRELO THAYA MOTHEO

1. Kamogelo le kaelo ka Moradisi
2. Pulo ka thapelo
3. Tirelo ya thoriso le kobamelo Modimo
4. Molaetsa wa tebogo o Modimo o o beileng mo pelong ya moruti
5. Pina ka dikhwaere
6. Tebogo ka leloko la lekgotlaa la kereke le le neng le le teng fa tiro e e tshimologa
7. Tebogo ka kemedi ya lekgotlaa la bomme
8. Puo ya go theya motheo ka moruti wa Phuthego
9. Katlenegiso ke mookamedi wa setereke
10. Sefela
11. Thapelo ya go tshegofatsa dijo le Tshwaro
12. Go iwa dijong

8. KOPANO YA KETELO YA MOOKAMEDI WA SETEREKE

KITSISO YA KETEKLO

Mudulasetulo Phuthago

Moruti yo o rategang

Madume a seKeresete

Ke go kwalela mo go go itsisi ka maikalelo a me a go etela Phuthago ka letlha
la..... Ka kgwedi ya ngwaga wa 20.....

Ke kopa ka boikokobetso gore dibuka tse di latelang di nne teng

1. Buka ya metsotso ya Lekgotlaa la kereke, mokgatlo wa bomme, lekgotlaa la basha le sekolo sa sontaga
2. Dibuka tsa tsamaiso ya madi tsa Lekgotlaa la kereke, mokgatlo wa bomme, lekgotlaa la basha le sekolo sa sontaga
3. Ditsheke tsotlhe le dibuka tsa polokelo
4. Rejistara ya kereke
5. Disetifikeiti tsa phetisetso

Fa o na le bothata ka letlha le nkitsise go sa le nako

Modimo a tshegofatse ditiro tsotlhe tsa gago

Mo tirelong ya yo o kwa godimo ga botlhe

.....

Mookamedi wa setereke

THE FULL GOSPEL CHURCH OF GOD

KETELO YA MOOKAMEDI WA SETEREKE

PhuthagoSetereke.....

Letlha la ketelo

Leina la Moruti

BUKA YA METSOTSO

- A metsotso ya makgotlaa a a latelang e kwadilwe sentle
Lekgotlaa la kereke Ee/Nnya Tirelo ya Bomme Ee/ Nnya
Tirelo ya Bana Ee/Nnya Tirelo ya basha Ee/Nnya

- A maina a batlhagisi le batlaatsi gore metsotso e amogelwe a kwadilwe le gore a gape a saenilwe ke mudulasetulo le Mokwadi Ee/Nnya
- A lekgotlaa la kereke le kgona go kopana gangwe mo kgweding tse pedi Ee/Nnya

TSA MADI

Dibuka tsotlhe tsa tsamaiso ya madi, diresiti, le seteitimente sa kwa bankeng di tshwanetse go ronwa ke moruni yo o nang le boiphithelo.

- A rekoto ya madi e dirwa sentle Ee/Nnya
- A direpoto tsa madi di a tlhagisiwa kwa kopang e ngwe le e ngwe Ee/Nnya
- A diseteitimente tsa kgwedi le kgwedi di a tlhagisiwa Ee/Nnya
- A ditsheke di saenwa ke batho ba babedi Ee/Nnya
- A moruti le ene o a saena Ee/Nnya
- A madi a dirisiwa go latela tsamaiso ya molaotheo wa kereke Ee/Nnya
- A bosome bo a isiwa kwa ntlokgolo Ee/Nnya
- A disuga tsa moruti di a duelwa tsa inshoreense ya phitlho, ya botshelo, le ya penshene Ee/Nnya
- A mokgatlo wa Beibele o fiwa sengwe Ee/Nnya
- A mokgatlo wa basha o fiwa sengwe Ee/Nnya
- A tirelo ya bomme e fiwa sengwe? Ee/Nnya
- A kholotshe ya Beibele e fiwa sengwe? Ee/Nnya
- A tirelo ya bana e bona sengwe? Ee/Nnya
- A madi a phatlaaladiwa sentle na? Ee/Nnya
- A Moruti o laola tsamaiso ya madi? Ee/Nnya
- A Moruti o tsamaisa dibuka tsa madi sentle? Ee/Nnya

- A go na le konteraka ya khiro e e fetang R1200 e e dumeletsweng ke setereke?
Ee/Nnya
- A dikago le dilo tsa kereke tse di sa kgoneng go shuta di na le inshoreense?
- A ngwaga wa madi wa kereke o felela ka 28 Tlhakole? Ee/Nnya
- A bosome jwa moruti bontse bontshiwa sentle ntle le go sa kolota kgwedi epe?
Ee/Nnya
- A karolo ya lesome ya maloko a kereke e ntshiwa sentle ntle le go tlovisa? Ee/Nnya

REJISSETARA YA MALOKO A KEREKE

- A rejisetara e siame? Ee/Nnya
- A batho ba ba tlhagelelang mo rejisetareng ba tsamaisana le ditlhokego tsotlhe tsa go nna maloko go ya ka molaotheo? Ee/Nnya
- A disetifikeite tsa go fitisetsa maloko go tswa le go tsena di siame? Ee/Nnya
- A maina a maloko a ntshiwa fela ka tshwetso ya lekgotlaa la kereke fela? Ee/Nnya
- A lekgotlaa le kereke le lekola rejisetara go e bona gore e siame ka dinako tshotlhe?
Ee/Nnya

TSA KAKARETSO

- A maloko a lekgotlaa la kereke a tshegeditse tsamaiso ya kereke go latela molaotheo?
Ee/Nnya
- A kopano kakaretso e ya ngwaga e tshwarwa ngwaga le ngwaga magareng a Mopitlwe le Phatwe? Ee/Nnya
- A go na le diporojeke tse di tlaang le ipaakanyetso ya ngwaga o mošwa? Ee/Nnya
- A go na le ditsoletso tse di rerilweng mo ngwageng o moša o? Ee/Nnya
- Tshekatsheko ya Phuthego:

Maloko a ngwaga o o fetileng Ngwaga ono

PhokotsegoKoketsego.....

Tirelo ya bana: ngwagatlola Ngwaga ono

Dipalopalo tse di magareng tsa go tsena kereke

Dipalopalo tsa letseno tse di magareng.....

Mookamedi wa seterke: tshekatsheko

Tshaeno: mookamedi

Tshaeno: moruti.....

Tshaeno: mokwaledi/ motshwaramatlotlo.....

Letlha le tshekatsheko e konotetsweng ka lone.....

9. KITSISO YA KOPANO

LEINA LE ATERESE YA PHUTHEGO

Kopano e e latelang e tlaa tshwarelwa kwa(lefelo)
ka.....(letsatsi) ka(nako)

DITENG TSA KOPANO

1. Kamogelo, rejisetara, maitoko, ba baseyong
2. Pulo le thapelo
3. Kamogelo ya kopano le go dira lenaane la kopano
4. Metsotso ya nako e e fetileng
5. Dikgang tse ditswang mo metsotsong e e fetileng
 - i.
 - ii.
 - iii.
6. Repoto ya tsamaiso ya madi
 - a.
 - b.
 - c.
7. Makwalo
 - a.
 - b.
 - c.
8. Dintlha tse dintsha
 - a.
 - b.
 - c.
 - d.
 - e.
 - f.

Kopano e yaphatlaalatswa ka.....(nako) ka thapelo

Letlha la kopano e e latelang.....

Mokwaledi.....

Modulasetulo

10. TESETHIMONIALE

Moruti o tlaa kopiwa kgapetsakgapetsa gore a direle batho di tesethimoniale ba ba batlaang tiro kgotsa ba fetsa mo sekolong kgotsa ba batlaa go tswelletsa dithuto tsa bona.

Moruti o tshwanetse go itse ka dinako tsotlhe gore go tshepagala ga gagwe le thokgamo ya gagwe ke selo se se shebilweng thata. Tesetimoniale ke netefatso ya botho le semelo ka jalo go a tlhokafala gore o bo o itse motho yo direlang tesetimoniale. Gape a dule a ntse a nagana gore o fana ka semelo sa kereke ya gagwe jaanong o tshwanelwa ke go ela dilo tse tlhoko:

1. Dirisa lekwalo lo lo nang le betšhe ya kereke
2. Tesetimoniale e tshwanetse go tlaangwa mme e nne ya semmuso
3. Diteng di itsisi le go tthalosa gore o mo itsitse nako e e kae, mme gape gore o mo itse jang. Semelo se sentle sa motho se tshwanetse go itsisiwe mme kwa bofelong a tlotlomatswe.

Mo tesethimomialeng e go ka nna ga tsengwa boiphitlilo jwa gagwe jwa dithuto le tsela e a bidiwang ka yona ke barutegimmogo le ene.

Sekai sa tesethimoniale

KITSISO:

Matshwao a XXX a bontsha diphatlaa mogareng ga mela

GOTSWA GO:

TESETHIMONIALE KGOTSA YO E MO LEBAGANENG

X

X

X

E ke netefatso ya gore

X

X

Maina ka Botlaalo Phumelelo Ernest Ngxangane

X

X

E sale ke mo itse go tloga ka (letlha le ngwaga

X

X

Tlotlomatso

X

X

Tshaeno.....

Moruti

TSHEKATSHEKO YA TESETHIMONIALE

Tlhagisa dilo tse bothokwa tse di itsegeng thata ka motho yo o direlwang tesethimoniale.
Mafapha a a dirileng mo go one le boetapele jo a kileng a botshwara.

SEMELO SA GAGWE

O mo itse e le motho wa maitsholo a a ntseng jang

LEMORAGO LE BATSADI

Ke batho ba ba ntseng jang

TLOTLOMATSO

A o tshwanelwa ke tiro e a e kopileng

11. MAITSHOLO A SERUTI/ PHOROTOKHOLO MO KEREKENG

11.1 MATSENO KGOTSA TSE TLAANG PELE

Boitshwaro jo bosiameng jwa motho ke selo se se tswang kwa ga lowe mo Batswaneng. Mme baruti le bone ba na le tsela e ba tshwanetseng go itshwara ka yone.

Mo setswaneng Maitsholo a mantle ke a batho botlhe, mme baruti ba tsewa jaaka dikai tsa maemo a a kwa godimo a Maitsholo a mantle. Ka gore tirelo Modimo e tsamaisana le go kopana le morafe otlhe le batho ba ba farologaneng go matshwanedi gore gonne tsela ya Maitsholo e e kwadilweng fa fatshe. Moruti a ka se kgone go tshela fa a sena melawana e a e dirisang mo dikamanong tsa gagwe le batho

Maitsholo a mantle ke ditlaamorago tsa dikamano tse di siameng magareng ga moruti le batho ba bangwe. Maitsholo a a tlhagisa maungo a semowa le semelo sa BoKeresete kgotsa go bontsha Maitsholo a ga Keresete. Maitsholo a mantle a seruti a na le dikarolo tse pedi, ke gore Maitsholo a Moruti mo Phuthegong le Maitsholo a Moruti mo morafeng.

Maikalelo magolo ka melawana e ya Maitsholo ke gore moruti a kgone go tshela se a se rerang gonne fa Maitsholo a ganetsana le thero seo ke kotsi e kgolo thata. Katlego ya tirelo e itshetlegile ka go diragatsa se o se rutang ba bangwe.

Maitsholo a mantle a seruti ga a tshwanela go itshetlega ka ditshwanelo tsa motho mme e nne ka ka molao wa lerato. Se se raya gore o tlike go ikitsha setlhabelo gore batho ba bangwe ba tshele.

Maitsholo a mantle a seruti a kaya gore o tshwanetse go bapola bowena. Se se tlaa dira gore o ikitse, makoa, mo o tlhaelang gone le bokgoni le kitso ya gago e e go kgontshang go ka direla ka botlaalo.

11.2 MAITSHOLO A SERUTI MO PHUTHEGONG

Mo go dirisaneng le Phuthego go na le dirai tse moruti a tshwanetseng go di ela tlhoko e leng tse di latelang:

1. Tlwaelo e tliša go latlhelgelwa ke tlotlo. Moruti ga a tshwanela go itsenyatsenya mo gare ga batho a gonne le sekgala se se farologanang moruti le maPhuthego.

2. Ela tlhoko batho ba ba itirileng ditlhodi tsa gago ba ba go tlišetsang ditshebo ke badiredi ba ga satane. Ba kgona go kgabisa ditshebo ka tsa semowa mme seo se ka latlhegisa moruti thata a fitlhela a tsere ditshwetso le dikatlaholo tse di seng maleba.
3. Moruti ga tshwanela go buwa ka moruti yo o tlišeng mo pele ga gagwe le baphutegi kgotsa lekgotlaa la kereke. Se se bontsha gore o tota e le motho wa maemo a a kwa tlaase tota go moruti yo go buiwang ka yena. Se se bontsha go sa tshepagaleng mme se tlaa fitlha kwa Phuthegong yotlhe mme moruti o tlaa di gama a sa di tlhapela ka letsatsi lengwe.
4. Fa go na le tshenyo e moruti yo o fetileng a e dirileng moruti o tshwanetse go e didimalela. Moruti o tshwanetse go eletsa Phuthego go tlogela tse di fetileng go feta. Moruti e seke ya nna lenong le le kakathang masalela a ditopo. Bontsha Phuthego gore motho yo o direleng bosula o samisiwa jang ntle le go mo nyenyefatsa.
5. Fa mokaulengwe a fositse go itshola ka tsela e e tshwanetseng Boruti o tshwanela ke go kgalemelwa go latela tsela e e beilweng mo molaotheong wa kereke
6. Moruti o tshwanetse go ela tlhoko gore a seke a ngongoregela gore o dula fo kae le gore o amogela bokae, Se se tsenya pitso ya gago mo kotsing kgotsa e akabatsa batho gore a o biditswe e le tota. Fa o na le ditlhoko di bue le mookamedi.
7. Moruti ga tshwanela go tlotlela moruti wa moeng ka Phuthego ya gagwe mme moruti yoo a bo dira jaaka e kete o boleletswe ke mowa o o Boitshepo. Se ke se sengwe sa dilo tse diswabising, o seke wa nyatsa Phuthego ya gago gole kalo mo ebileng o buang dikgang tsa bona le baeti.
8. Moruti ga a tshwanela go dirisa pitso ya gagwe go pateletsa Phuthego go mo fa mogôlo kgotsa go ba tshosetsa kgotsa go ba nyatsa. Phuthego e ka nna ya dumalana le wena ka matshosetsi a gago ba go kopa gore o lebogetse tiro. Fa o ka bidiwa go ya go nna moruti wa Phuthego e sele go botokwa go didimalela go fitlhela o tsamaya ka gonne se se ka tsenya ketsaetsego mo Phuthegong
9. Moruti yo o godileng mo moweng o a ikamogela gore ke motho o kgona go dira diphoso. Ka ga jalo ga a tsibogele ngongorego e ngwe le engwe ka mabetwaepelo. Moruti yo o botlhale o sekaseka maemo a a tlišetseng ngongorego gore a ke a utlwe maikutlo a Phuthego yotlhe kgotsa a batho ba sekae fela. O tshwanetse go gopola gore thibelo e phala kalafo

10. Moruti yo o godileng mo semoweng o itse sentle gore ga a itse dilo tshotlhe le gore ga a na bokgoni jwa go dira dilo tshotlhe. Mme o tlaa kgona go ka amogela gore maloko a phuthego ya gagwe a na le ditalente le bokgoni jwa go ka dira ditiro tse di kgonang go phatlaalatsa mmuso wa Modimo. Selo se se mo kgontsha gore a seke a itseela kwa tlaase le go tshosediswa ke ba itseng go mo feta mme se boela se dira maphuthego a ikutlwele a na le mosola mo trelong Modimo. Se se thusa moruti gore a seke a ipeya jaaka mmusaesi, go nna mmusaesi go diriwa ke botlhokakitso.

11. Fa moruti a tlogela tiro ya phuthego o tshwanela ke go kgaola dikamano tshotlhe le yona. A seke a tlhola a ba kwalela, go ba letsetsa mogala, go ba etela le go tlhakanela malatsi a khunologo. Se ke engwe ya dilo tse a tshwanetseng go di naganisisa thata fa a tsaya tshwetso ya go tlogela tiro. Selo se se tlišitse mathata a mantsi, go sa itumeleng, le bobaba jo bo utlwisitseng tiro ya Modimo botlhoko tota. Ka ga jalo se tshwanetse sa tsewa e le go tlhoka maikarabelo le go tlhoka botho fa moruti a henahenana le phuthego e a e tlogetseng.

12. Moruti ga tshwanela go adima madi mo Phuthegong le mo mophuthegong wa gagwe gape ga tshwanela go tlhakanela kgwebo le mophuthego. Selo se sekotsi mme ke se se faposang moruti mo go direng tiro ya gagwe ka sebetse mme a palelwe ke go kgalema fa go na le diphoso. Se se ka boela sa kgoreletsa thero ya Lentswe la Modimo.

13. Baruti ba bangwe ba rata go iterela botsala le go batlwa go ratwa ka go letlelela maloko a phuthego a ba bitsa ka maina a bona a kwa gae kgotsa a mareto go na le gore a bidiwe moruti jaaka e le tlwaelo. Se se tliša lenyatso la pitso ya moruti le taolo e a nang le yona kwa tlaase mme batho ba tshimolola go nna le dipelalelo.

11.3 MAITSHOLO A “PULIPITI”

Moreri wa lefoko la Modimo o tshwanetse go tlaa mo pulipiting ya gagwe ka maikutlo a a feletseng a gore ke moemedi wa Modimo mo bathong ba One. O eme moo ka ntlha ya Leina la Modimo le ka nonofo ya ga Jesu Keresete. Ka jalo o tshwanetse go ikela tlhoko mo puong le mo ditrong tsa gagwe.

Dikwalo tse di Boitshepo di laela gore sengwe le sengwe se diriwang ke motlhankedi wa tsa tumelelo ya Bokeresete di dirwe ka masisi le ka tolamo. Ka ntlha ya gore Moreri wa lefoko la Modimo o tshwanetse go gopola ka nako tshotlhe gore o na le tshono ya go ka ama ba ba mo reeditseng mo tshisibalong ya bone e e kwa godimo le mo nakong eo ba letileng dilo tse

galalelang. O tshwanetse go gopola gore o na le maikarabelo a magolo jaaka motlhanka wa Modimo le gore o ikarabela mo Modimong e seng mo mothong. Potso e e tshwanetseng go nna le ena ka metlha ke ya gore aka dira jang go dira tiro e e itshepileng e le e e kwa godimo jana ka matsetseseleko a magolo.

Moreri o tshwanetse go ela tlhoko mowa wa gagwe. Ga go na sepe se se botlhokwa jaaka katlhegelo ya pelo ya gagwe mo maemong a semowa a ba o ba tlhokometseng le go ba thusa. O tshwanetse go simolola sengwe le sengwe ka go nna le nako ya kabelano le Modimo go ka kgona go ema mo pulipiting le go bua se se batliwang ke Modimo ka nako eo.

Molaetsa wa Modimo o tshwanetse go ka bakangwa ka matsetseseleko mme o rerwe ka pontsho ya go tshaba Modimo. Moreri o tshwanetse go rera mantswe a a godisang, a rotloetsang le a a kgothatsang.

11.4 MAITSHOLO A SERUTI LE BOTSHELO JWA MO SETSHABENG

Moruti ke motho fela jaaka mang le mang, mme le ene o tlhoka go amana le batho ba bangwe ka tsela ya lerato le le tseneletseng. Mme se, fa se ka diragadiwa ka tsela e e fosagetseng, se ka dira mathata a mantsi thata fela.

Phuthego e ka tlhokisa moruti nako le sebaka sa go tshela botshelo jwa gagwe, mme wa fitlhela legae la moruti le nyeuma ka maloko a kereke ka dinako tsotlhe. Mme se se dira gore batho ba tsenatsene lelapa la moruti. Mme lelapa le ikutlwele le le mo tlaase ga kgatelelo ya gotshelela batho le go atlholwa ke bona mo go sengwe le sengwe. Mme o tlaa fitlhela lelapa le kgalwa ka tsela eo ba aparang ka yona, le tsela ya maitiso a bona le gore bana ba lelapa ba itshwere jang.

Se se tliša go galaka ga maikutlo mo baneng. Se be se keketswa ke batsadi fa ba pateletsa bana go tshela botshelo jwa go itirisa jo bo sa tlwaelegang mme bo le kगतlaanong le botho le maikutlo a bana. Se se dira gore bana ba baruti ba itsheme fa bodumedi e le boikaketsi mme kwa pheletsong ba ngalele tumelo ba e latlhe

Gongwe ke sona se se dirang gore go twe bana ba kwa mišhene ke maganagoultwa. Go tshwanetse ga itsiwe gore baruti ba tshela jaaka badiragatsi le batho ba tumileng thata. Ba lebeletswe ka leitlho le le ntshotsho ka nako tsotlhe. Se se na le kotsi ya gore mišhene o tlaa iphitlala o le mo go iponagatseng go na le go nna ntlo ya bokersete.

Bakeresete botlhe ba ba nang le maemo mo kerekeng ba tshwanetse go tshela ka tsela e e tlišang tlotlomatso mo leineng la Modimo. Ka ga jalo kwa mišheneng ga go diriwe dilo tsa sekeresete ka ntlha ya gore rre ke moruti, mme ka ntlha ya gore botlhe ke bakeresete ba ba ipolelang Keresete.

Kwa bokhutlong nako e tshwanetse go tlotlwa ke botlhe. Go tsena thari kwa tirelong le kwa kopanong e e beetsweng nako go bontsha go sa kgathale, semelo se tlhokang boitshwaro le go tlhoka tlotlo. Modimo ke Modimo wa tolamo, selo sa gore go na le nako ya Setswana ke maipato a bo satane fela.

Mme maitsholo a seruti a ka khutsafatswa ka go buisa makwalo a a latelang: Bafilipi 2:14-15 le I Bakorinthe 15:58

11.5 MAITSHOLO A A AMOGELESEGANG A GO ITSISE BATLHANKEDI SEMMUSO (POROTOKOLO)

E ngwe ya ditshobotsi tsa setshaba se se tlabologileng ke tsela eo go bontshiwang tlotlo mo bathung ba ba rileng ka tsela eo ba itsisiweng ka yona go latela maemo a bona mo setshabeng le mo ditirong tsa bona. Tlotlo ke ya maemo a motho e seng motho ka boena. Jaanong kang e e farologane le mo setswaneng le bokeresete ka gonne gone motho ka ntlha ya gore o dirilwe mo setshwanong sa Modimo o tlotlwa ka maemo a gagwe le boena le ka bogolo jwa dingwaga.

Porotokolo ke tsela ya go bontsha maitsholo a a siameng mo puong le go dira gore dipuisano di tsamaye ka thelelo. Thatathata ga e se go dira maemo a tsitsibanyang a go senang phuthologo mo go one. Sentlente ga go na pharologanyo magareng ga Maitsholo le Maitsholo a a amogelesegang a go itsise. Maitsholo one a samagana le motho ka boena le gore o dira eng, mme maitsholo a a amogelesegang go itsise one a lebeletse maemo otlhe le Maitsholo.

Mo setswaneng go na le motho yo o itsiseng mme go na le go dumedisana ka matshogo. Motho yo o itsiseng o tlaa itsise moeng go batho ba ba leng gona mme ene o tlaa naya yo a mo itsisiwang letsogo mme a itlhalose gore ke wa borra mang. Mme go tshimololwa ka bagolo go fitlhela kwa go yo mmotlaana. Batho ba bomme bone ba itsiswe la bofelo. Mo Sekereseteng selo se se fetogile, motho o itsisiwe ka maemo a gagwe mme le gona go na le

tumediso ya matsogo. Mme bomme ba na le teka-tekano le borre, jaanong fa o na le maemo o tlaa itsisiwe pele o le mme kgotsa rre.

Fa e le tiro ya semmuso motho wa maemo a a rileng o itsisiwe ke motho yo mongwe yo o nang le maemo a a batlieng go lekana mo mokgatlong kgotsa phuthegong e a e etetseng. Moruti ke ene fela a itsiseng baeng ba tlotlego kgotsa moakamedi.

Makwalo a semmuso a tlhoka go kwalwa mo pampiring ya boleng jo bo maleba le onofolopo e e tsamaisanang le pampiri eo.

11.6 MAITSHOLO A A AMOGELESEGANG A GO ITSISE BATLHANKEDI SEMMUSO MO KEREKENG

Melawana e e fa godimo e ntse e ka dirisiwa mo kerekeng, fela mo kerekeng go na le pharologano ka dikamano tsa lerato la sekeresete e le tsona tse di laolang. Lerato la bokaulengwe le go eleletsa ba bangwe bontle bo dira gore dilo tse di farologane.

Mo kerekeng Keresete ke ene fela a tshwanelwang ke tlotlo e e kwa godimo. Mme go tshwanetswe ga gopolwa gore Keresete ke ene a fileng batho ba ba mokerekeng maemo a a farologaneng kgotsa direnke.

Jaanong fa re bua ka Maitsholo a a amogeleseng a go itsise batlhankedi mo kerekeng re bua fela ka go bontsha tlotlo mo go ba e batshwanetseng, ke gore baeng ba tlotlo ba ditiro tse dikgethegileng tsa kereke kgotsa baeng fela go tlisa seriti se se tshwanelang Mmuso wa Modimo.

11.7 IPAKANYETSO YA TIRELO E E KGETHEGILENG

Katlego ya tiro e e kgethegileng e ikaegile ka ipaakanyetso e e matssetseleko e e diriwang go sale gale. Mme batlaamoletlong ba tshwanetse go bewa ka lenaneo le le tshwanetseng maemo a bona (sekai baruti le bommamoruti ba dule ba le bosu, bana ba baruti le bone fela jalo). Taletso e tshwanetse go kwalwa sentle mme kwa pheletsong e tsengwe mafokokhutsafatso a Sefora, R.S.V.P a a kayang gore “araba ka tseetswee”. Se se supa gore karabo e tshwanetse go tlaa ka bonako. Go itlhokomolosa taletso le go sa arabe gore a o tlaa nna teng ke pontsho ya Maitsholo a a maswe le go sa kgathale. Fa batho ba arabile jaanong thulaganyo e ka dirwa sentle mme batho ba bewa mo ditulong tse di maleba mme ga dirwa le manaanetsamaiso a tiro a a lekaneng. Gobebofatsa tirelo e go botlhokwa gore moruti a e dire le Phuthego.

Go tshwanetswe ga kgethwa mokaulengwe yo o tlaa amogelang baeng ba tlotlego go ba isa kwa mannong a bona. Mme mongamoletlo ene o ema ka dinao go fitlhela baeng ba tlotlego ba dula fa fatshe.

11.8 KITSISO YA BAENG LE BAENG BA TLOTLEGO

Melawana ya go itsise e go builweng ka yona fa godimo fa e ka dirisiwa.

Go na le go dirisa lefoko le “motlotlegi” tsela e e ka dirisiwang ke e: “Mookamedi wa Rejini ya Kgalagadi Moruti S. Molale mme batho botlhe ba ba latelang ba tlaa itsisiwe ka yona tsela eo.

Morago ga kitsiso batho ba ba ka bidiwa moruti, mookamedi kgotsa modereitara. Mme fa batlhankedi ba kereke ba tlike moletlong ba le bantsi kitsiso e tlaa dirwa go latela tsamaisoya kereke ya go itsise batlhankedi ba yona. Monga moletlo o tshwanetse go itsise batlhankedi ba kereke go baeng ba tlotlego le baeng ba tlotlego go batlhankedi ba kereke.

Fa tiro e tlaa kwa bokhutlong baeng ba tlotlego ba tlaa buledisiwa go ya kwa go jelwang teng kgotsa kwa dikoloing tsa bona.

Phuthego e tshwanetse go dula mo mannong a bona fa baeng ba tlotlego batsena le fa batswa mme ba tlaa ema fela fa baeng ba tswile. Ditiro di tshwanetse go dirwa go latela lenanetsamaiso go sa fetolwe sepe go bontsha gore batlaamoletlong ba a tlotlwa. Se ke tiro ya Moradisi.

12 TIRO YA BORUTI YA GO TLHOKOMELA BALWETSI

Fa o tlhokomela balwetsi maikemisetso a gago a tshwanetse go nna a gore “ke tlaa nna eng mo molwetsing?” e seng “ke tlile go dira eng?” molwetsi o tloka motho yo a ka mo thusang go lebagana le bolwetsi jwa gagwe e seng motho yo o tlileng go baakanya molwetsi kgotsa go mo rerela. Ditlaamorago tsa go lwala di kgona go senya maikutlo a motho jaanong dilo tse di latelang di tshwanetse go gopolwa:

1. Molwetsi o latlhegetswe ke go ikemela mme o ikutlwela go sena thuso epe fela
2. Bolwetsi bo tsamaisana le ditlhabi
3. Bolwetsi bo kgaoganya motho le botshelo jo bo tlwaelegileng mme bo dubakana maikutlo a molwetsi mme o tlaa a tshimolola go bua ka dilo tse di tshosang.
4. Bolwetsi bo ama letseno la madi thata jaaka go duelela kalafi le go latlhegelwa ke moputso fa o lwala.
5. Bolwetsi bo kgaogana molwetsi le ba losika fa a le kwa sepetlela mme se tlisa mathata a katlaatelelo ya botshelo. Bo ka senya lenyalo ga feleletsa go na le tlhalo kgotsa kgaogano.
6. Bolwetsi bo tlisa go tlhoka go tlhomama ka ntlha ya gore molwetsi ga a sa tlhola a kgona go iterela sepe le go dira ditiro tsa gagwe tsa tlwaelo.

12.1 GO TLHOKOMELA BALWETSI BA BA KWA SEPETLELA

Gore o kgone go direla balwetsi sentle o tshwanetse go nna le botho jo bo lerato le jo bo tlhaloganyang maemo a balwetsi mme o latele melawana e e rileng ya tlhokomelo.

1. Selo sa ntlha ke go ikitsise kwa go tsenwang teng mosepetlela gore go seke ga nna le dikgoreletsi le go tlabisiwa ditlhong ka dipotsopotso.
2. Botsa gore molwetsi o kwa kae go na le go tsamaya o ntse o okomela diphaposi o batlaana molwetsi.
3. Itepatpanye le diura tsa go tlhola balwetsi. Mme fa o batlaa go mmona a le esi tlogela balosika go tsamaya mme wena o tlaa ba sala morago, gape o ka nna wa kopa go letlelelwa go mo tlhola ka dinako disele tse e seng tsa go tlhola balwetsi. Gopola gore go tlhola motho ke tshono e seng tshwanelo ya gago

4. Bua le batlhankedi ba sepetlela pele ga o ka tseno mo phaposing ya molwetsi fa mojako o tswetswe kgotsa le fa go na le kitsiso e e rileng kgotsa e le nako ya melemo kgotsa ya go tlhatlhoba.
5. O ka nna wa tswala sesiri fa o batlaa go bua le molwetsi mo sephiring.
6. Mme o tshwanetse go nna pelonolo le kutlwelobotlhoko gore sengwe le sengwe se molwetsi a ka se dirang ka ntlha ya bolwetsi se seke sa mo tlabisa dithong.
7. Ela tsa maphelo tlhoko jaaka go tlhapa legano, go nyenya, maikutlo, dinala le diaparo tsa gago
8. O seke wa etela balwetsi fa o lwala le wena
9. O tshwanetse go ipaakanya mo semoweng pele o ka fitlha kwa sepetlela. Kopa Morena Modimo gore a go dirise jaaka lentswe la gagwe gore o kgone go tliša molaetsa wa gagwe wa phodisho.
10. Itse gore o tletse eng kwa sepetlela gore o seke wa feleletsa o dirile tse di sa go batleng
11. Nako ya ketelo e laolwa ke maemo a molwetsi. Balwetsi ga ba kgone go dula nako e telele kgotsa go bua nako e telele. Mme gape o seke wa bontsha jaaka e kete o motho yo o tlhatlheileng mashi. Dula nakonyana mme e seng mo godimo ga bolao jwa molwetsi.
12. Balwetsi ba karo ga ba rate go etelwa fa ba tswa kwa karong mo malatsing a ntlha a mararo.
13. O seke wa batlaa go itsisiwe gore molwetsi o tshwere ke eng ka go dirisa matlaa. Dirisa se o se bolelelwang go leka go itse gore bothata ke eng
14. O seke wa bolelela molwetsi dikgang dipe tse di maswe jaaka nako e wena o neng o lwala, mathata a kwa tirong le a bana le gore ke mang yo o tlhokafetseng.
15. Amogela molwetsi jaaka a ntse mme o mo fitlhelele mo bodutung jwa gagwe, le mo bogalakeng jwa pelo le go latlhegelwa ke tshepo.
16. Go tshegetsa motho ga go reye go bua, o ka nna wa dira jalo o didimetse o bua kwa ntle ga mafoko mme o bontsha molwetsi gore o a mo kgathalela

Ela maemo a a latelang tlhoko a molwetsi:

GO IKGOGELA MORAGO: Selo se ke kotsi e isang kwa losong ka gonne molwetsi yo o dirang jalo o nagana gore ke maemo a magolo a bogalaledi

GO GANA GO ULTWA: Molwetsi o latlhegetswe ke tshepo mme o ikutlwa a sena le yo o ka mothusang, o bona Modimo molato le batho ba bangwe. O seke wa leka go mo kgalemela kgotsa go motshidisa. Dirisa maemo ao go tlhatlhoba motho wa ka fa gare.

MOLWETSI YO O MATEPE: Molwetsi o itepeletsa thata mme o tshepetse mo bathong ba bangwe ka tsela e e feteletseng mo ebileng a sa dire sepe go tokafatsa maemo a gagwe.

MOLWETSI YO O DIRISANG BOLWETSI GO LAOLA BA BANGWE: Molwetsi yo o dirisang bolwetsi jwa gagwe go dira gore o tseye letlhakore la gagwe mme o baya dingaka molato, mme a tswelele ka go latofatso melemo e a e newang le balosika. O seke wa tseega bonolo itse gore mefuta ya malwetsi e na le ditsela tse farologaneng tseo batho ba a tsibogelang ka gone.

MOLWETSI YO O LWALANG THATA: Molwetsi yo o mo ditlhabing tse dikgolo e bile o tshogile thata fela, go mo etela kgapetsakgapetsa go tlaa mo tshwenya. Molwetsi yo o ntseng jalo o rata dikganetso le go omana thata fela. Go botokwa go mo tlogela a ntshe maikutlo a gagwe ntle le go kgalemelwa.

12.2 TSHEKATSHEKO YA KETELO

Go botlhokwa go sekaseka ketelo e ngwe le e ngwe ka dipotso tse di latelang:

1. A nako e ne e le e e siameng go eta?
2. A molwetsi o ile a itumelela ketelo ya me?
3. Ke karolo e kae ya puo e e neng e le ka nna?
4. Ke karolo e kae ya puo e ke neng ke e laola?
5. Ketelo e nnile nako e kae?
6. Fa puo e ne e fela a ke ile ka ela tlhoko mme ka bona gore ke nako ya go tsamaya
7. A go na le motho yo ke mo kgadileng?
8. A molwetsi o ntebogile ka ketelo?
9. A ketelo e thusitse molwetsi?
10. A ke kgonne go lebagana le ditlhoko tsa molwetsi?
11. A ke tlaa tswelela ka go thusana le molwetsi mo maamong a gagwe?

12.3 TIRELO BORUTI YA GO TLHOKOMELA BA BA MO DIPHATENG TSE DI BOLLO

TIRELO YA GO TLHOKOMELA BA BA MO DIPHATENG TSE DI BOLLO

Tirelo e ke tirelo e e masisi le e e tlhokang bopelonolo le kutlwelobotlhoko e e kwa godimo. Go na le phapang magareng a go tlhokomela balwetsi mo nameng le mo moweng. Tlhokomelo ya mo nameng ke ya go okabatsa ditlhabi ka melemo. Tlhokomelo ya semowa kgotsa tlhaloganyo ke e e bontshang kamano ya go tshepana magareng ga Moruti le molwetsi. Moruti o tshwanetse gore mo dinakong tsa ketelo a tlise tshepo le kgothatso ya Lentswe la Modimo. Re le Bazalwane re dumela mo phodisong ya botho jotle go ya ka Lentswe la Modimo. Fa motho a santse a tshela re mo neela tsholofela ya gore Modimo a ka fetola maemo a gagwe.

Mme gape go botlhokwa go nna le nnete, fa motho a opelwa thata mme a batlaa gore Modimo a mo golole ka tsela ya loso, re tshwanetse go tlisa mafoko a nametshang ka ga loso. Bua nnete le motho gore fa a na le tshabo e e rileng ka loso a kgone go ntsha mafatlha a gagwe gore o kgone go mo thusa go lebagana le loso a sena tshabo epe.

Ka ga jalo Moruti o tshwanetse go nna le boiphitlhelo jwa go tlhaloganyo loso go ya ka thuto ya Beibele. Mme a le lebelela ka tlhaloganyo le maikutlo a a siameng. Mme a seke a fa motho tsholofelo e e seong mme a mo thuse go itepatepanya le maemo a a leng mo go one ka seriti le go tshepa Modimo gore o itse tshotlhe.

Molwetsi o feta mo gareng ga maemo a a latelang fa lwala thata. Maemo a ntlha ke a go sa dumele gore o a swa kgotsa pobolo ya gagwe ke e isang losong. Motho yo o mo maemong a a ntseng jalo ga a atholwe, se se tshwanetse go amogelwa jaaka tsela ya go itshireletsa. Mme fa nako e nntse e tsamaya o tlaa amogela.

1. Morago ga go sa dumele molwetsi o tsena mo maemong a tshakgalo e kgolo ka fa a bona Modimo a sa mo dire sentle ka go mo letlelela go nna mo maemong a a jalo. Motho yo o mmona ka dingogorego le go sa batleng go tlhaloganyo sepe.

2. O tshimolola go nna le dipuisano le Modimo a kopa gore a okeletswe matsatsi, mme a tshepisa gore o tlaa fetoga e nne motho yo o botokwa fa aka fiwa tshono gape.

3. Mme go latele kgatelelo ya maikutlo mme moruti o tshwanetse gonna le botlhale jwa maikutlo jwa go reetsa molwetsi ntle le go fana ka dikarabo kgotsa go bua.

12.4 TIRELO YA PHITLHO

Selo sa ntlha fa motho a fetsa go latolwa, moruti o tshwanetse go itlhaganelela kwa lelapeng leo go ya go kgothatsa bašwelwa. Fa a fitlha teng o tshwanela ke go rapela le balosika. Mme fa a fetsa a ba letlelele go mo latolela mošwi ka tsela ya bona. Fa go kgonagala moruti a ka nna a tshimolola tiro ya go tshidisa ka go thusa ka dithulaganyo tshotlhe tsa tirelo ya phitlho. Sa ntlha ke go šeba gore a diinšhorensa tsa moswi tsa phitlho di momaamong a a siameng. Go bona gore balosika botlhe ba itsisiwe ka tsela e e maleba.

Moruti o tshwanetse ke go rulaganya ditirelo tsa go tshidisa tsa beke yotlhe. Go itse gore a bašwelwa ba batlaa gore moswi a tswela kwa kerekeng kgotsa kwa lapeng. Ka ntlha ya gore maemo a loso ga e se a a tlwaelegileng le gore maikutlo a batho a dubakanye moruti o tshwanetse go tliša maemo a otlhe mo tshisibalong e e tlhokegang. A ritbatse maikutlo a batho.

Melaetsa ya mo gare ga beke e tlaa tlišiwa ke mafapha a a fapaneng a kereke ya moswi. Ka letsatsi la ntlha go tshimolola Moruti, la bobedi go latele motlaatsa moruti, la boraro e nne basha labone e nne bomme labotlhano e nne bareri ka lamalhatso e boele e nne moruti gape. Sentlentke tirelo e ke ya moruti go tliša Matshidiso. Tirelo e ya Matshidiso e dirwa go nna tirelo ya tsoseletso, mme e tshwarwa fela jalo, boitlhomong e le go tshoseletsa mewa ya batho le go ba gopotsa gore loso le kgonwa fela ke go pholoswa.

Tirelo ya dithapelo tsa Matshediso mo gareng ga beke e ka mokgwa o

Moradisi

Pulo ka sefela:

Pulo ka thapelo:

Matshidiso ka pina:

Lefoko la kgothatso:

Dikitsiso:

Tshwaro:

12.5 TIRELO YA SEGOPOTSO

Tirelo e e tsalegile fa batho ba bantsho ba ntse ba itlhabolola ka thuto gona batho ba “porofeshenale”. Ke tirelo e gopolang kabelo ya moswi mo botshelong jwa gagwe jwa kwa gae, mo tirong ya gagwe le mo botshelong ka kakaretso. Mme yona e tshwarwa ka tsela e e jaana:

Moradisi (Go tswa kwa tirong ya moswi)

Pula ka thapelo

Thoriso le kobamelo

Tatelano ya dibui

1. Tsala ya botshelo

2. Tsala ya kwa tirong

3. Moagisane

4. Modirammogo

5. “Supavaesara”

6. Mokhanselara/ moemedi wa kgosi

Tirelo ya lentswe ka moruti

Dikitsiso

Tebogo ka wa leage

**12.6 LENAANE TSAMAISO LA TIRELO YA PHITLHO KA LETSATSI LA
MATLHATSO**

TIRELO YA KWA GAE KA MOGOGI/MORERI

Pulo ka temana ya sefela

Thapelo ya kwa gae

Mokoloko go kerekeng

TIRELO YA KWA KEREKENG

Moradisi (Go tswa kwa kerekeng/ kwa lapeng)

Ditshwaelo tsa tsamaiso ka Moradisi

Sefela

Pulo ka thapelo

Sefela

Tatolo ya moswi fa a sa tsewa ke bolwetsi

Morena wa botshelo o bone go tshwanela go ka tsaya mokaulengwe wa rona
..... mo botshelong jo bo ka kwano a le dingwaga di le
..... DikgwediMatsatsi..... Modimo o a re file mme
Modimo o boetse o tsere; a go bakwe leina la Morena.

Fa a tserwe ke bolwetsi.

Puo ka motlhokomedi/ mooki

Sefela

Palo ya Botshelo jwa moswi (Batho botlhe ba ema ka dinao kwa ntle ga balosika)

Sefela

Puo ka tsala

Sefela

Puo ka moagisane

Puo ka wa losika

Puo kwa wa kwa bogoeng/ bogogadi

Puo ka modiarammogo

Puo ka kemedi ya kereke

Palo ya dikgare

Tirelo ya thoriso le kobamelo e isang kwa lentsweng la Modimo

Kgomotso ka Moruti

Mokoloko go ya mabitleng/ moruti, bareri le baruti ba etelela mokoloko pele go ntšha setopo go se isa kwa hešheng.

Bašwelwa ke bone ba tshwanetseng go tswa pele morago ga setopo, batho ba bangwe ba ntse ba eme.

Tirelo kwa mabitleng

Thapelo ya go matlaafadiwa le ya gore maikutlo a ele

Moruti o tlaa laela gore lekase le tsengwe mo lebitleng

Tirelo ya go hitlha

Mo letsasting la gompieno re tlile mo go jala serepa se sa mokaulengwe wa rona Mme re jala serepa se e le mmele o e le o o tlotlogileng ka tsholofelo ya gore o tlaa tsosiwa e le o o galalelang. Re o jala o le bokoa mme re solofela gore o tlaa tsosiwa o le matlaa. Re o jala e le mmele tlholego mme re solofela gore o tlaa tsoga e le wa semowa. Re o jala mo leineng la Rara, le la Morwa le la Mowa o o Boitshepo; ka tsholofelo ya gore fa terompeta e lela o tl tsogela kgalalelong.

Tebogo ka wa legae

Tebogo ka moemedi wa kgosi

Dikitsiso tsa thulaganyo ya kwa lapeng

Tshwaro

12.7 TIRELO YA PHITLHO YA MASOLE LE MAPODISA

SEKAI SA TIRELO YA PHITLHO SESHOLE KGOTSA SEPODISA

NTLO KGOLO E E AMEGANG

TATELANO YA DI RENKE.....

TAELO KA MOBORIGADIRI

MOKOMODANTA WA KGAOLO YA SESHOLE/SEPODISA

Nomere ya Mogala

Aterese e e feletseng

Tirelo ya phitlho (Nomere ya tiro.....) Leina la moswi

1. Tirelo ya phitlho ya tokololo ya seshole/sepodisa e e boletsweng fa godimo e tlaa nna ka..... (letlha la phitlho)

2. TIRELO

2.1. Tulo leina la kereke le aterese

2.2. Nako

2.3. Baruti ba ba mo tirong

3. SESHOLE/ SEPODISA

- 3.1. Bajari ba setopo: maina le maemo a bone mo sesholeng/ kgotsa seponesa
- 3.2. Karolo ya seshole/ sepodisa e e eteletseng pele
- 3.3. Bafelegetsi
- 3.4. Okesetera ya seshole/sepodisa
- 3.5. Mo ofisiri ya eteletseng pele
- 3.6. Mo ajudanta wa tirelo Nomore le Leina
4. POPAGANO YA SESHOLE
5. MOKOLOKO LE TSAMAISO (Go ya ka buka ya tsamaisa ya seshole/sepodisa sa aferika borwa
- 5.1. Taelo ya go tsamayela ko pele ka mo ofisiri ya eteletseng pele
- 5.2. Go emisiwa ga mokoloko ke mo ofisiri ya eteletseng pele
6. Taolo ya pharakano
7. Teranseporoto
8. Moaparo
- 8.1. Baofisiri le boajudanta
- 8.2. Mophato o o fa pele le mophato o o felegetsang

8.3. Bajari ba setopo

9. PUO E E DIRISIWANG: E tlaa nna e go dumalanweng ka yona

10. Moofisiri ya eteletseng mophato pele o tshwanetse go netefatsa Folaga ya naga le mofapha tlhogo o teng.

Tekeno..... Mokomoanta.....Moborigadiri

12.8 TSAMAO YA NAKO YA KUTLOBOTLHOKO

Go tshwanetswe ga gakologelwa gore phitlho ga e hitlhi kutlobotlhoko, pelobotlhoko le kutlobotlhoko ya loso. Moruti o tshwanetse go thusa bashwelwa ka go ba thusa mo maemong a ba iphitlhelang ba le mo go one.

Bashwelwa ba feta maemong a a farologaneng a kutlobotlhoko, jaanong go a tlhokahala gore moruti a nne le maitemogelo a magolo ka ga kgotlaang le kgatelelo ya maikutlo e e tlisiwang ke go tlhokafalelwa. Maemo a a ka farologangwa jaaka maemo a letshogo, boitshwaro, poelomorago le go amogela.

1. Tsibogo ya pele e tlaa ka mokgwa o o ntseng jaana:

Selo sa ntlha ke go sa dumele le go gana go amogela gore wa losika o tlhokafetse. Go latlhegelwa ke kgatlego go tlisa maemo a tlhaloganyo a a nang le ditlaamorago tse di latelang: go segoga le go dula o ntse o nagana ka moswi a dira tse dingwe tsa ditiro tse o neng a di dira fa sa ntse tshela, go tswelela ka go laola maikutlo mme go latelwe ke kutlobotlhoko ya go swelwa mme la bofelo motho a fetisetse maikutlo a go rata go motho yo mongwe yo o tshelang kgotsa sengwe; go bo go feleletsa ka kutlobotlhoko e e tseneletseng le tepelela.

Mme ka nako tse dingwe moswelwa o ipona a le molato, a ikutlwa jaka e kete o ka bo a diritse moswi sengwe se se botokwa. Mo ntlheng go ka ne go na le maikutlo a go dimofatsa moswi ka tsela ngwe.

2. Mme tsibogo ya morago e diragala ka nako ya go baakanyetsa tirelo ya phitlho mme e nne jalo go fitlhela phitlho e fela le batho botlhe ba tsamaya.
3. Nako e e mo magareng: bašwelwa ba inakanya le maemo a a fetogileng ka o mongwe wa mekgwa e e latelang ya ditsela tsa go iphalosa:
 - 3.1. Go batlaana le tlhokomelo e e feteletseng
 - 3.2. Fa a le mo gare ga batho o a itidimalela
 - 3.3. Go ikgogela morago
 - 3.4. Go amogela mme a tswelala le botshelo jaaka bontse.

13 MEKGWA YA GO TSAYA TSHWARO

“A Jehofa a go segofatse, a go boloke, a Jehofa a go phatsimesetse sefatlhego sa gagwe, a nne pelotshweu go wena, A Jehofa a go tsholeletse sefatlhego sa gagwe a go neye kagsiso”. Amen Dipalo 6:24-26

Jaana ke lo neela Modimo, ke lo neela lefoko la tshegofatso ya one, le le nonofleng go lo agelela, le go lo naya boswa mo go botlhe ba ba itshepisisweng. Amen Ditiro 20:32

Jaana a Modimo wa pelotelele, le wa kgomotso, o le neye gore go nne pelo e le ngwe fela mo go lona ka fa sekaong sa ga Keresete Jesu; gore lo galaletse Modimo le Rra Morena wa rona Jesu Keresete ka bongwe fela jwa pelo le ka molomo o le mongwe fela. Amen Baroma 15:5-6

Jaana a Modimo wa tsholofelo o lo tlaatse boitumelo le kagiso mo go dumeleng, gore lo totafale mo tsholofelong, ka thata ya Mowa o o Boitshepo. Amen Baroma 15:13

Ka re, a tshegofatso e nne le lona, le kagiso e e tswang mo Modimong Rraetsho, le mo go Morena Jesu Keresete. Amen I Bakorinthe 1:3

Kagiso ya Modimo e e fetang tshaloganyo yotlhe, e tlaaa dibela dipelo tsa lona le megopolo ya lona mo go Keresete Jesu. Amen Bafilipi 4:7

Modimo wa tshegofatso yotlhe, o o lo bileditseng kwa kgalalelong ya one, e e sa khutleng mo go Keresete, e tlaaa re lo sena go nna lo boga botlhoko ka lobakanyana, one ka osi o tlaaa lo dira boitekanelo, o lo tiisa, o lo thatafatsa. Puso a e nne kwa go one ka bosakhutleng le bosaengkae. Amen I Petoro 5:10

A tshegofatso ya Morena Jesu Keresete le lorato lwa Modimo le kabelano ya Mowa o o Boitshepo di nne le lona lotlhe. Amen II Bakorinthe 13:14

Jaana One o o nonofileng go dira segolo thata bogolo go tsotlhe tse re di lopang le tse re di gopolang, ka fa nonofong e e dirang mo go rona, kwa go One, a go nne kgalaletso mo phuthegong le mo Keresete Jesu go ya tshikatshikeng ka bosakhutleng le bosaengkae. Amen Baefeso 3:20

Jaana Modimo wa kagiso, o o bileng o busitse Modisa yo Mogolo wa dinku mo baswing, ka madi a kgolagano e e sa khutleng, e bong Morena wa rona Jesu, a lo dire go nna boitekanelo

mo go sengwe le sengwe se se molemo, go dira g raa ga One, ka go dira mo go rona se se kgatlang matlho a One, ka jesu Keresete; yo kgalalelo e ka kang ya nna kwa go Ene ka bosakhutleng le ka bosaengkae. Amen Bahebere 13:20-21