



# Double negatives in New Testament Greek texts and their translations in the Dangme Bible

**Authors:**

Jonathan E.T.  
Kuwornu-Adjaottor<sup>1,2</sup>   
Ebenezer Quay<sup>3</sup> 

**Affiliations:**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Religious Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana

<sup>2</sup>Department of New Testament and Related Literature, Faculty of Theology and Religion, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Theology, Valley View University, Dodowa, Ghana

**Corresponding author:**

Jonathan Kuwornu-Adjaottor,  
jetkuwornu-adjaottor.cass@knust.edu.gh

**Dates:**

Received: 04 Mar. 2025

Accepted: 27 May 2025

Published: 13 Aug. 2025

**How to cite this article:**

Kuwornu-Adjaottor, J.E.T. & Quay, E., 2025, 'Double negatives in New Testament Greek texts and their translations in the Dangme Bible', *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 81(1), a10632. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v81i1.10632>

**Copyright:**

© 2025. The Authors.  
Licensee: AOSIS. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution License.

**Read online:**

Scan this QR code with your smart phone or mobile device to read online.

The Greek negatives, *μή* and *οὐκ* (which also appear as *οὐ*, and *οὐχ* depending on the type of beginning alphabet of the word that it precedes), are variedly used in the Greek New Testament and at various instances. With all the relevance of the use of these negatives in New Testament Studies, of special attention is the appearance of the double negative as the combination of *οὐ μή*. Although the double negatives are not translated to stand on their own, their combination in English denotes *not at all*, *in no wise* or *by no means*. Further, this combination has both exegetical and theological significance and implications. This article, therefore, opines that as the double negative places stronger emphasis and vehement force or augments negation or prohibition, it must reflect in the Dangme Bible, *Ngmami Klɔuklɔu* ɔ (Holy writing), because the force is somehow silent in some of the texts used in the Greek text. It is, therefore, appropriate for biblical exegetes as well as translators to provide the needed attention to this in their attempts to bring the text alive to contemporary audience readers, practitioners and students of the biblical texts.

**Contribution:** This article, therefore, attempted to analyse the translation of the double negative combination in Dangme Bible, *Ngmami Klɔuklɔu* ɔ reflecting on the implications of its usage.

**Keywords:** New Testament; Greek Texts; Dangme Bible; *Ngmami Klɔuklɔu* ɔ; mother tongue; Biblical Hermeneutics; Biblical Studies.

## Introduction

The Greek language, as unique as it may be, used in the writing of the New Testament, provides certain unique opportunities in terms of its unambiguity in deciphering nuances. For instance, in Greek, when one is referring to the second person, it is distinctly clear whether he or she is talking about the singular as well in diverse ways or plural unlike the English language for instance. Some of these categories make its usage in both exegetical and theological works very welcoming. However, it gives rise to some difficulties for its readers, translators and/or users in diverse ways. These difficulties discussed in this article include the use of the double negative, that is, the *οὐ μή* combination.

In the *Ngmami Klɔuklɔu* ɔ, that is the Dangme<sup>1</sup> Bible as observed in this article, the translators were somehow silent about some of the *οὐ μή* combinations in some of the texts. This, without any prevarication, might be a challenge to draw on the very intent of the text for its readers in the local parlance. As the Greek text has used the double negatives, it has both syntactical and theological significance. This of essence, is difficult to be entirely avoided in any exegetical, theological or translation work.

Although it may seem 'clumsy' in the attempt to make what may be seen as an overly emphasised translation, the Greek New Testament, however, made use of the double negatives. This kind of syntactical expression cannot be overlooked in the attempt to make the word of God relevant to its audience in the various local settings and languages. The questions of interest are: Firstly, why should various authors make use of the double negative in the first place in the Greek text? Secondly, what is the significance in its usage? And thirdly, how does its translation in the texts of the mother tongues as in the *Ngmami Klɔuklɔu* ɔ impart meaning and impact readers of the text? To this end, this article attempts to explore the usage, significance and implications of the Greek negative particles in the first place and the use of the double negative especially. This attempt

1. Dangme is spoken in Ghana by the people of Ada, Ningbo, Kpone, Prapram, Osudoku. Shai (Se), Many Krobo and Yilo Krobo. It is the aboriginal language, tonal and the above-mentioned Dangme dialectal strands have their unique linguistic characteristics.

**Note:** The manuscript is a contribution to the themed collection titled 'Africa Platform for NT Scholars', under the expert guidance of guest editor Prof. Ernest van Eck.

is to further see how the double negative is translated in the *Ngmami Klɔ̀klɔ̀* as it appears in the Greek Text of the New Testament. This would help in bringing out the theological and exegetical implications of the usage of the double negatives to readers of the *Ngmami Klɔ̀klɔ̀*.

The above notwithstanding, it is appreciated that translations of the biblical texts into mother tongues have their own challenges. Among these are the types of meanings that are generated from the source text and their effects on the receptor communities. To overcome these difficulties in the translation work, one has to follow some laid down principles as a guide to do the work of venturing into vernacular languages. Contextual consistency, aural forms of language, functional equivalence and forms used by the intended audience are some of the relevant guides to such translations (Nida & Taber 1969 [1982]:14). Keeping the foregoing principles in mind, the choice of words or other expressions in the translation depends upon the context rather than a fixed system of verbal consistency. The fact that each language covers the total sum of knowledge with symbols and each language has its own system of symbolisation of meanings, are two key reasons to support this position (Bediako 1995:60). In this article, such guides to the translation of the *Ngmami Klɔ̀klɔ̀* are appreciated. Nonetheless, the use of the double negative in the Greek text is not an issue that can be merely washed away; hence, the need to give attention to it in this study.

## Research methods and design

This study applies the mother tongue biblical hermeneutics approach to address the translational issues identified (Kuwornu-Adjaottor 2012a). There is now an emerging relevance to looking at the biblical text from the perspective of the mother tongue theology and hermeneutical approach. Kuwornu-Adjaottor, in his work, *Mother-Tongue Biblical Hermeneutics: A Current Trend in Biblical Studies in Ghana*, observed that Biblical Studies involves the study of the Judeo-Christian<sup>2</sup> Scripture and related texts. In his view, Biblical Studies as an academic subject seeks to find out the meaning of the biblical books, given passages, verse(s) or phrase(s) and even words, especially, as intended by the biblical writers for their addressees (Kuwornu-Adjaottor 2012b:575). It is to this end that mother tongue biblical hermeneutics has arguably found a place in academia as a means to exegete the biblical text to arrive at understandings relevant to the audience or recipients of the biblical text (Kuwornu-Adjaottor 2014). This is, especially, for audiences in the context of their mother tongue. One of the earliest architects of mother tongue biblical hermeneutics, Ekem, posited that the importance of the various mother tongues of Africa as essential in biblical interpretation, writing study notes and commentaries cannot be denied (Ekem 2007:48). He further opined that the relevance of the mother tongue biblical hermeneutics cannot be overemphasised as it provides a sensitive explanatory

methodological approach to specific issues in African cultures. He believes there is a need for a context-sensitive interpretation of the Bible to meet the worldviews of various target groups as receptors of the biblical text in Africa (Ekem 2008:16). Kuwornu-Adjaottor furthered this understanding by expounding that Ekem's view helps to explain 'theological, linguistic and anthropological issues in the Mother-Tongues of people' (Kuwornu-Adjaottor 2018:9).

The mother tongue biblical hermeneutics category of reading the biblical text, by reading in front of it,<sup>3</sup> orients itself towards the reader(s) or reading communities and the part they play in the communication process (Tate 2008). In this way, the readers bring their points of view and concerns to the text and may end up with different or varied meanings. This, again, has opened the way for Biblical Studies to be undertaken using the mother tongue translations. Mother tongue is 'a linguistics category that is used to denote origin – the language one learned firstly, and secondly, in which one has established the first long-lasting verbal contacts' (Kuwornu-Adjaottor 2021:1–5). Its relevance is the identification of the user of the language, especially in his or her locale and cultural context. This provides contextual understanding of the translated text to make meaning to the reader. Mother tongue, defined in another way, is one's native language, the language that 'one is born into' and grows up with. This is usually one's first language of instruction, or an Indigenous language of one's heritage which is part and parcel of his or her identity (Quarshie 2002:4–14). It is, therefore, appropriate that translators should consider the worldview of its recipients in the translational work.

As much as one cannot expect a perfect translation, its appropriateness should be prioritised. This said, in the communicative process of translation, specific mechanical and grammatical underpinnings are hardly to be overlooked to reach this appropriateness. This means that mother tongue biblical hermeneutics, to a large extent, highlights the appropriateness of the translated text. Aryeh observed that mother tongue biblical hermeneutics aims towards translations of the biblical text and commentaries in African local languages, dialects or vernacular. In doing this, it will consider the religio-cultural and the social norms of African societies in the biblical interpretation process (Aryeh 2016:140–160). As would be observed, foreign perspectives unconsciously accompany translations and exegetical procedures developed by missional cultures for receptor cultures. In view of this, to really appreciate the textual nuances within the African context, there should be a conscious and intentional but cautious effort to either do away with or reduce foreign intrusions. In addition, one should carefully and possibly replace foreign thoughts with religio-cultural and social norms of African societies within the settings of the African reader or interpreter of the Bible (Aryeh 2016:147). This underscores the need for the mother

2. The term Judeo-Christian is used variously in diverse situations. Here, it embraces what is common to both Judaism and Christianity. For instance, Judeo-Christian Scripture represents the text that both Judaism and Christianity use.

3. Biblical Studies, by way of interpretation, has three broad areas being, firstly, the world behind the text which emphasises the historicity and the history behind the text; secondly, locating the meaning of the text within the world of the text itself; and thirdly, finding meaning of the text in the world in front of the text.

tongue as a prerequisite for dialogical exegesis, hence, the need for Bible translations in African languages and, possibly, with necessary considerations of dialectical strands (Ekem 2003:31).

To appreciate the translational works by using mother tongues biblical hermeneutics, especially, in terms of their appropriateness, Kuwornu-Adjaottor posited a methodological step-by-step approach as to how it can be done. According to him, the mother tongue biblical hermeneutics approach to interpreting the biblical text uses an eclectic methodology. It, therefore, borrows and applies principles of biblical interpretation from the fields of Biblical Studies, Bible Translation Studies and Language Studies, that is, biblical languages comprising Ancient Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek as well as local African and/or Ghanaian languages (Kuwornu-Adjaottor 2012b:577). Using this approach, this work underscores the usefulness of the double negative in the Greek text and how it is translated in the Dangme Bible, *Ngmami Klouklou*.

## The Greek negatives

In New Testament Greek, the particles, *μή* and *οὐκ* (which also appear as *οὐ*, *οὐχι* and *οὐχ* depending on the first alphabet of the word that it precedes) are used for negation. Their usage with verbs especially depends on the various moods in New Testament Greek. *Μή* is usually used with all moods, including the imperative, subjunctive and optative, except the indicative mood (Wenham 1965:75). It, therefore, indicates that *οὐκ* is used with the indicative mood. The negative *οὐκ* negates the thing, the action itself. Technically, it denies the thing, the action simply, absolutely, categorically, directly or objectively. *Μή* on the other hand, repudiates the thought or supposed idea of the thing or action. This is technically viewed as denying the thing according to the judgement, opinion, will, purpose, preference of someone. Hence, *μή* denies the thing indirectly or hypothetically. Whereas *οὐκ* denies the thing or action objectively, *μή* also denies the thing subjectively. These distinctions also hold for the compounds, *οὐδεις*, *μήδεις*, *οὐκετι*, *μήκετι* etc. (Thayer 1998–2000). According to Friberg, *μή* is used to deny or prohibit a thing, action in the form of assumption, hesitation or that which is indefinite whereas *οὐ* is used to deny or prohibit the fact of the thing or action (Friberg & Friberg 1981). This is to say that whilst *μή* denies the idea of a thing or an action generally including its use with the infinitive and participle, *οὐ* is used to negate the factual indicative.

As a negative adverb, *μή* is used: (1) universally as in 2 Peter 1:9: *ᾧ γὰρ μή πάρεστιν ταῦτα* – where *μή* is used because allusion is made merely to the thought that there are those who lack these things. This use is also seen in Colossians 2:8, John 3:18, 1 John 5:10 and Titus 1:11; (2) in deliberative questions with the subjunctive as in *δῶμεν ἢ μή δῶμεν*; Mark 12:14; (3) in conditional and final sentences using *εἰ μή* as in Mark 12:19, James 2:14, *ἵνα μή* in Romans 11:25 etc. translated as *unless, if not*; (4) joined with the infinitive as in Luke 20:7, Hebrews 3:18 – *μή εἰσελεύσεσθαι*; (5) joined with a participle in sentences

expressing a command, exhortation, purpose, etcetera; and (6) in independent sentences of forbidding, admonishing, desiring known as *μή* prohibitive (Thayer 1998–2000). This *μή* has other functions as it can be used as a conjunction and an interrogative particle when a negative answer is expected (Moulton & Miligan 1930).

The negative particle *οὐ*, on the other hand, has a regular use with the indicative mood as stated earlier. This is usually or frequently found together with the participle. It is apparently because its suitable use is for the negation of a statement of fact. Its use in this way is an emphatic negation (Louw & Nida 1989; Moulton & Miligan 1930). Gingrich also observed that *οὐ* with an accent means ‘no’ as illustrated in Matthew 5:37; Mark 12:14; Luke 14:3; John 1:21; 7:12; 21:5; 2 Corinthians 1:17–19; James 5:12; Romans 7:18. It is used as an enclitic means not in different shades or with varied uses with examples as found in Matthew 1:25; 7:21; Mark 4:25; Acts 12:9; 13:10; 17:4, 12; Romans 7:7; 1 Corinthians 15:51; 2 Corinthians 2:11; Hebrews 12:25 (Gingrich 1979). It is of relevance to understand the various uses of the Greek negative particles as their combination is of essence to this article.

In their presentation in the Greek texts, it is observed that ‘Where *οὐ* or *μή* negates the finite verb, the negative appears regularly just before the verb’ (Funk 1973). By their placement before the verb, it would seem, though, as it was negating only a single element, that is the verb, and not the entire clause. Porter, however, gave his view, which is very different, by showing that ‘Clause negation often but not always appears at the beginning of a clause or proximate to the verb’ (Porter 1999:282). These two views seem to view negation as two different variants of verb and clause negation. However, there is no such conclusive idea but rather the negation of the verb as functionally equivalent to clause negation.

## The use and significance of the double negative

Descriptions and discussions of negation in New Testament Greek studies are usually concerned with stressing the peculiarities and dissimilarities between the use of the Greek negatives *οὐ* and *μή*. With this, not much consideration is given to the variation in the syntax of negation constructions. In this case, the use of the negatives in collocation is also not often emphasised. However, the biblical writers recurrently used the negation to describe what did not happen. This was a means of adding emphasis to what did happen (Runge 2007). Although not too pronounced, Thayer observed that ‘the particles *οὐ μή* in combination augment the force of the negation, and signify not at all, in no wise, by no means’ (Thayer 1998–2000). Originally, the double negative combination indicates a strong prohibition of things and situations. These are found in the New Testament in Matthew 5:18, 26; 18:3; Luke 18:17; 22:16; John 4:48; 20:25; 1 Thessalonians 5:3 (Thayer 1998–2000). Gingrich emphasised that *οὐ μή* strengthens the negation or prohibition in the sense



of whatever assertion, statement etc. as never or certainly not (Gingrich 1979). This shows how strong the force of the double negative could be.

The combination is used in various ways. For instance, it is used: firstly, with the future indicative as in 'οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο' – 'This shall never happen to you' (Mt 16:22, RSV); 'οὐ μὴ σε ἀπαρνήσομαι' – 'I will not deny you' (Mt 26:35, RSV); καὶ ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ διψήσει πώποτε – 'and he who believes in me shall never thirst' (Jn 6:35, RSV). The same use is also found in Mark 13:31, John 13:38, Hebrews 10:17. This use is also found in the variations in manuscripts between the indicative future and the subjunctive aorist. One of the critical questions is found in Luke 18:7 – οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃ τὴν ἐκδίκησιν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν. Secondly, is the use of οὐ and μὴ with the aorist subjunctive. This use can hardly be distinguished from that of the future indicative shown earlier in the text as in the case of Luke 18:7. Its use in the negation of confident assertions, the subjunctive of the first aorist is used as in Matthew 24:2; Mark 13:2; Luke 6:37; John 13:8; Hebrews 8:12; 1 Peter 2:6; Revelation 2:11; 7:16; 18:21,22,23; 21:27, etc.; first aorist middle subjunctive as in John 8:52. The subjunctive of second aorist is also used as in Matthew 5:18,20, 26; Mark 10:15; Luke 1:15; 12:59; John 10:28; 11:26; 1 Corinthians 8:13; Hebrews 13:5; Revelation 3:3. These though not exhaustive, have been diversely used in the New Testament. Thirdly, the οὐ μὴ combination is also used with the present subjunctive as in Hebrews 13:5 (Thayer 1998–2000). In these negations, the force of the negation is augmented.

## Double negative and their translations in the Dangme Bible: Analysis and implications

The Bible Translation Agencies in Ghana, Bible Society of Ghana, the Ghana Institute of Linguistics, Literacy and Bible Translation and the International Bible Society have translated the New Testament into several Ghanaian languages including the Dangme (Ghana. Bureau of Ghana Languages 1990:5). The Dangme has three versions of the New Testament: *Somi He* ɔ by the Bible Society of Ghana in 1977; *Wami Munyu* ɔ: *Somi He* ɔ *Ke La ame* by the International Bible Society in 1997 and the *Ngmami Klɔuklɔ* ɔ by the Bible Society of Ghana and the United Bible Societies in 1999 (Kuwornu-Adjaottor 2018:23). In this work, the *Ngmami Klɔuklɔ* ɔ is used as it is the full Bible translation in Dangme and it happened to be the latest among the Dangme translations.<sup>4</sup>

Being aware of the challenges of translation, 'the translators used a combination of the three philosophies of Bible translation' (Kuwornu-Adjaottor 2013:001–006). This is an attempt to forestall the difficulties of translating work from one language of the original manuscript to another. These are formal equivalence, the word-for-word translation; dynamic equivalence the thought-for-thought translation

and the paraphrase approach (Quaye 2024). Each of these approaches has its pros and cons. Therefore, such an attempt of an eclectic approach to the translation is of essence. For instance, the formal equivalence approach endeavours to reproduce Greek and Hebrew as source languages into the receptor languages with possible exactitude. In this attempt, words, figures of speech as well as, sometimes, even the structure of the sentence of the original or source languages are reproduced (Quaye 2024; Van der Watt 2002:246–265). This seemed to be an impossible task as translation is more than getting word equivalents in receptors' language to match words from the source language. Languages can hardly correspond at that level. The dynamic equivalence approach on the other hand approaches the work of translation on the basis that any message can be communicated to any audience from one language to another if the most effective form of expression, having the necessary meaning is found (Nida 1991:5–25; Nida & Taber [1969] 1982; Quaye 2024; Nida [1964] 2003). This approach seeks to convey the meaning of the text into the receptor's language as much as possible rather than finding exact words, expressions and/or phrases as in the source language to replace them. Then thirdly, the paraphrase approach may not necessarily be considered as translation. One might think of it as rewording, interpretation or rephrasing of the biblical text. The proponents of the paraphrase approach had the assumption that the New Testament was written in *Koine* or Common Greek and that it was a common language of the people and not that of playwrights or philosophers (Quaye 2024). Therefore, it is their objective to have the Bible translated into everyday language. This would enable many people to read and understand its message. The aim is to express scripture in everyday language and not to give the most exact translation of scripture (Quaye 2024). Therefore, a paraphrase translation only seeks to convey the meaning of the text to an understandable to the reader better.

As observed earlier, the *Ngmami Klɔuklɔ* ɔ is used in the attempt to observe, present and analyse how the translators treated the double negatives in the Dangme translation of the biblical text. The force of the double negative that augments the negation or prohibition of a thing, person or action of the verb would be assessed. The relevance of such usages in the Greek text cannot be denied. Translation work as we know it, takes place in a way that the text is virtually transmitted from one context to another context. The communicative process is, indeed, difficult. Gutt's Relevance Theory in translation work sees translation as an interlingual interpretive process (Gutt 2014:105). It is the transfer of understanding in a communicative process to bring meaning to the same text in a different context.

Amongst the several texts in the New Testament Greek that have the οὐ μὴ combination, some texts translated in the *Ngmami Klɔuklɔ* ɔ have the full force of the double negative retained. These are, Matthew 16:22; Matthew 24:35; Matthew 26:29; Matthew 26:35; Mark 10:15; Mark 13:31; John 6:35; John 8:52; John 10:28; John 11:26; John 13:8; Acts 13:41; 1 Corinthians 8:13; 1 Thessalonians 5:3; Hebrews 8:12; Hebrews 13:5;

<sup>4</sup>There is currently a group of translators working on a new translation of the Dangme Bible. This is because of various indications of some challenges and difficulties found with previous translations, including the *Ngmami Klɔuklɔ* ɔ. One of such challenges could be how the double negative is treated in some of the texts as this article is trying to address.

1 Peter 2:6; Revelation 18:21; Revelation 18:22. The translators of the *Ngmami Klɔuklɔu* ♂ either used the words, *kɔkɔkɔ* or *gblegbleegble* in translating the *oʋ μῆ* combination which the English versions have as 'by no means', 'never' or when in the future, used 'shall not' instead of 'will not.' These words, *kɔkɔkɔ* and *gblegbleegble* in the Dangme appropriately translated the negative double, the *oʋ μῆ* combination with such stronger emphasis of vehement force and augments the negation or prohibition of the person, things or the action of verbs. They represent the ideas of by no means, never, not at all, in no wise as the English versions translate the *oʋ μῆ* combination.

It is observed that there are instances where it is possible and appropriate to use *kɔkɔkɔ* and/or *gblegbleegble* in the Dangme to translate the *oʋ μῆ* combination to emphasise the force of the negation. However, such force of the negation somehow did not show up in the translation. For instance, Matthew 5:18 could have translated as 'Niine, i nge nye dee ke, be abɔ ne hiɔwe ke zugba nge ne ♂, a be nɔ nyafii tsle po jee ke je mlaa a mi gblegbleegble ke yaa si a maa gbe nɔ tsuaa nɔ nya'. However, the translators did not use the word, *gblegbleegble* which vehemently negates in the Dangme to show strong abhorrence as suggested in the use of the double negative in the Greek text. It may be observed that probably the translators used *nɔ nyafii tsle po* ('one jot or one tittle' as in New King James Version), which already has the idea of the slightest possibility to have done the duty for the *oʋ μῆ* combination as well. Other verses in which the translation of the *oʋ μῆ* combination seemed silent in the *Ngmami Klɔuklɔu* ♂ are Matthew 18:3; Matthew 24:2; Hebrews 10:17; 1 Thessalonians 4:15; Matthew 24:34; Luke 13:35; Matthew 16:28; Mark 9:1; Revelation 2:1; Revelation 18:23; Matthew 5:26; Luke 1:15; John 4:48.

In John 20:25, the part of the text that has the double negative is embellished as '... *loko ma he ye*' which means 'then I will believe'. In doing this, the force of the *oʋ μῆ* combination is avoided completely. To retain the force of the double negative, it could be translated as '... *le i be yi hee gblegbleegble* or *kɔkɔkɔ*' literally meaning, 'I shall never believe it'. Such is also the case in Luke 18:30 where the statement is put in positive to mean the same thing instead of retaining the negative. Retaining the double negative force in Luke 18:7 would be quite difficult because it involves God. The translators probably considered the theology of God in order not to convey a wrong notion about God to the receptor community. However, the expression *tete po* could have been used, which also, to an extent, respectfully conveys the same force. In Luke 6:37, the use of *kɔkɔkɔ* or *gblegbleegble* is possible. Still, translators may have avoided translating the double negative in order to create evenness in the use of the negative to negate the listed items or else, readers would feel God abhors one more than the others. Such is also the case for Revelation 7:16 and 21:27. It may also be appropriate to have used the double negative force at the end of the list of negated items as God abhors all of them. In Matthew 5:20 it is possible to translate the double negative but that part of the verse is treated as a conditional statement avoiding the force of the

double negative entirely. In Luke 12:59, instead of 'you shall never or by no means depart', it is translated as 'you shall be there' which to an extent also represents the impossibility of departing until the condition is fulfilled. However, in doing this, the double negative did not reflect to show the vehement force in the negation. Revelation 3:3, based on the context, is difficult to translate but translators could have used *ke o kuaa peemi ♂* [if you refuse to do that] instead of *ke o pee we ja a*. Although both translations appear the same in this context and conditional, *ke o kuaa peemi ♂* has a higher force than *ke o pee we ja*. As for Revelation 15:4, the double negative line did not appear in the Dangme translation at all. This might be informed by the source(s) used in the translation. In John 18:11 it is difficult to retain the force of the double negative in the translation and again, the context would not favour its translation.

In the following texts, it would be observed that certain particles have been used to somehow serves the purpose of the double negative. For instance, in Luke 18:17, *kulaa* meaning, 'at all' in context is used; in Luke 22:16, *hu* being also; in Luke 10:19, the repetition *nɔ ko nɔ ko* being nothing somehow serves the purpose of the double negative; in Mark 13:2, *eko tsuaa eko* being anything or everything somehow also expresses some emphasis; in Romans 4:8 *ko* in this sentence would mean 'not at all' which helps to see the emphasis of the double negative. It could have translated *A gbaa nɔ ne Nyɔmtse ♂ ne yayami nge e he!* but translates as *A gbaa nɔ ne Nyɔmtse ♂ ne yayami ko nge e he!* Therefore, in these specific cases, the double negative might appear silent, but these particles somehow gave some emphasis of a sort to help appreciate the same force.

## Conclusion

From the discussions presented earlier in the text, the translators of the *Ngmami Klɔuklɔu* ♂, largely in considering the *oʋ μῆ* combination, have done a yeoman's job. However, some texts quite demand the preservation of the effect of the *oʋ μῆ* combination to augment the force of the negation, as clearly shown in the analysis. We have observed that there are three categories related to how translators dealt with the double negatives from the Greek text into the Dangme Bible: (1) those that the force of the double negative fully reflected in the translation; (2) those that mildly translated the double negatives; and (3) situations where the double negatives are ignored entirely. It is observed that it is the case as the translators did not strictly follow the Greek text. Again, as the agenda is not necessary to create an equivalent text from a source language into a receptor's language, such avoidances for the purpose of helping to convey meaning to receptors are appreciated. However, this article has shown that in certain specific instances, consideration should be given to the double negative, that is, the *oʋ μῆ* combination in subsequent works, as they have both syntactical, exegetical and theological implications.

## Acknowledgements

The authors thank Ernest Frimpong Jr and Patrick Yankyera.

## Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no financial or personal relationships that may have inappropriately influenced them in writing this article.

## Authors' contributions

J.E.T.K-A. proposed the topic and wrote the introduction and conclusion. E.Q. was responsible for the exegesis and analysis.

## Ethical considerations

This article followed all ethical standards for research without direct contact with human or animal subjects.

## Funding information

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

## Data availability

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analysed in this study.

## Disclaimer

The views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the authors and are the product of professional research. It does not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of any affiliated institution, funder, agency or that of the publisher. The authors are responsible for this article's results, findings and content.

## References

- Aryeh, D.N.A., 2016, 'Inductive biblical interpretation and mother-tongue biblical hermeneutics: A proposal for Pentecostal/Charismatic Ministries in Ghana Today', *The Journal of Inductive Biblical Studies* 3(2), 140–160.
- Bediako, K., 1995, *Christianity in Africa: The renewal of Non-Western religion*, Orbis, Maryknoll, New York, NY.
- Ekem, J.D.K., 2003, 'Biblical exegesis in an African Pluralistic context: Some reflections', *Journal of African Christian Thought* 6(1), 31.
- Ekem, J.D.K., 2007, 'Interpreting "The Lord's Prayer" in the context of Ghanaian mother-tongue hermeneutics', *Journal of African Christian Thought* 10(2), 48.
- Ekem, J.D.K., 2008, *Priesthood in context: A study of priesthood in some Christian and Primal communities of Ghana and its Relevance for Mother-Tongue Biblical Interpretation*, p. 16, SonLife Press, Accra.
- Friberg, B. & Friberg, T., 1981, "*καί*." *analytical Greek New Testament: Greek text analysis*, Baker Books, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Funk, W.R., 1992, *A beginning-intermediate grammar of Hellenistic Greek*, vol. III, Scholar's Press, Missoula, Montana.
- Ghana (Bureau of Ghana Languages), 1990, *Language guide: (Dangme version)*, 4th edn., Bureau of Ghana Languages, Accra.
- Gingrich, F.W., 1979, *Lexicon of the Greek New Testament*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Gutt, E.A., 2014, *Translation and relevance: Cognition and context*, 2nd edn., p. 105, Routledge, London.
- Kuwornu-Adjaottor, J.E.T., 2012a, 'Mother-tongue Bible, resources for African Biblical studies', A PhD thesis submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology.
- Kuwornu-Adjaottor, J.E.T., 2012b, 'Mother-tongue biblical hermeneutics: A current trend in biblical studies in Ghana', *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies* 3(4), 575.
- Kuwornu-Adjaottor, J.E.T., 2013, 'A critical study of the translations of logos in John 1:1 and 14', *Global Advanced Research Journal of Arts and Humanities* 2(1), 001–006.
- Kuwornu-Adjaottor, J.E.T., 2014, 'The translation of Kristos as Kristo in the Dangme mother tongue translation of the New Testament visited', *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies* 5(8), 203–208.
- Kuwornu-Adjaottor, J.E.T., 2018, 'Assessment of three problematic texts in the synoptic Gospels of the New Testament of the Dangme Bible', p. 9, PhD dissertation, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi.
- Kuwornu-Adjaottor, J.E.T., 2021, 'Translations and interpretations of *baptizontes* (Mt 28:19–20) in some Ghanaian mother tongue translations of the Bible', *HTS Theologies Studies/Theological Studies* 77(1), 1–5, a6859. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v77i1.6859>
- Louw, E.J. & Nida, E.A., 1989, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament based on semantic domains*, 2nd edn., United Bible Societies, New York, NY.
- Moulton, J.H. & Milligan, G., 1930, "*μή*," *Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament*, Hodder and Stoughton, London.
- Nida, E.A., [1964] 2003, *Towards a science of translating*, Brill, Leiden.
- Nida, E.A., 1991, 'The paradoxes of translation', *The Bible Translator* 42(2a), 5–25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026009439104202A03>
- Nida, E.A. & Taber, C.R., [1969] 1982, *The theory and practice of translation*, Brill, Leiden.
- Porter, S.E., 1999, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, p. 282, JSOT, Sheffield.
- Quaye, E., 2024, 'Resolving the problem of the expression "Faith as Small as a Mustard Seed" in Matthew 17:20', *E-Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences (EHASS)* 5(14), 2480–2489. <https://doi.org/10.38159/ehass.20245143>
- Quarshie, B.Y., 2002, 'Doing biblical studies in the African context: The challenge of mother-tongue scriptures', *Journal of African Christian Thought* 5(1), 4–14.
- Runge, E.S., 2007, 'Teaching them what NOT to do: The nuances of negation in the Greek New Testament', A Paper Presented at the Evangelical Theological Society Annual Meeting, San Diego, CA, 13–16 November.
- Tate, R.W., 2008, *Biblical interpretation: An integrated approach*, 3rd edn., Hendrickson Publishers, Massachusetts.
- Thayer, J.H., 1998–2000, "*μή*." *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, International Bible Translators: Bible Works 7 software for biblical exegesis & research, Norfolk, Virginia.
- Van der Watt, J.G., 2002, 'What happens when one picks up the Greek text?', *Acta Theologica Supplementum* 2, 246–265.
- Wenham, J.W., 1965, *The elements of New Testament Greek*, p. 75, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1965.