religions

MDPI

Article

Unsung Heroes of Mission Bible Translation in Colonial West Africa: Ludwig Adzaklo of the Bremen Mission in German Togoland

Michael F. Wandusim

University of Münster, Center for Religion and Modernity, 48149 Münster, Germany; michael.wandusim@uni-muenster.de

Abstract: The Africanisation of Christianity in Africa is closely linked to the availability of the Bible in African mother tongues. However, mission-led Bible translation in Africa in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was not solely the work of European missionary linguists. Africans, such as Ludwig Adzaklo of the Bremen Mission, played essential roles in this process. Nevertheless, African translators like him were considered as mere *Sprachgehilfe* (language assistants) to the missionaries and not as co-translators. After a postcolonial analysis of archival data on the translation of the Old Testament into Ewe by Ludwig Adzaklo and Jakob Spieth, this study argues that Adzaklo was not just Spieth's *Sprachgehilfe* but a co-translator on the project. Being referred to as Spieth's *Sprachgehilfe* was a colonial-missionary label that denied Adzaklo's agency in mission-led Bible translation in Africa. Therefore, the study suggests that Adzaklo should be viewed as an early Ewe mother-tongue Bible translator in the history of West African Christianity.

Keywords: Bible translation; Ludwig Adzaklo; African Christianity; Sprachgehilfe; Bremen Mission; Ewe Bible; Togoland; Eweland; postcolonialism

Citation: Wandusim, Michael F. 2024. Unsung Heroes of Mission Bible Translation in Colonial West Africa: Ludwig Adzaklo of the Bremen Mission in German Togoland. *Religions* 15: 314. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15030314

Academic Editor: Dyron B. Daughrity

Received: 2 February 2024
Revised: 27 February 2024
Accepted: 28 February 2024
Published: 1 March 2024

1. Introduction

Consensus has long emerged in studies in world Christianity that Christianity in sub-Saharan Africa has become an African religion and no longer a "religion of the white man" as it was once perceived (see Bediako 2014). One of the fundamental factors that contributed to the indigenisation of Christianity on the continent was the availability of the Bible in African mother tongues (i.e., mother-tongue Bibles) (Bediako 2014; Sanneh 2009); the result of a long, tedious translation process that was pioneered by European missionary societies and heavily sponsored by such European Bible societies as the British and Foreign Bible Society (hereafter, BFBS). Such indigenisation efforts were initiated in the early twentieth century by new religious movements in sub-Saharan Africa like the so-called African-initiated churches (AICs), whose emergence has been essentially connected to the availability of mother-tongue Bibles on the continent (Bediako 2014; Kahl 2007; cf. Manus 2017). Recent studies have shown that mission-led translation of the Bible into African mother tongues in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was not the sole work of European missionary linguists but that Africans played active and essential roles in it (Ekem 2011). However, the African translators were considered as mere language assistants to European missionary linguists and not as co-translators along with them. Consequently, their efforts have not received as much academic attention as their European counterparts. This is the case for the many Ewe mother-tongue translators who participated in the pioneering work of the North German Missionary Society (hereafter, Bremen Mission) in translating the Bible into the Ewe language in the former German Togoland. They were simply thought of as *Sprachgehilfe* (i.e., language assistant) to famous Bremen missionary linguist translators such as Bernhard Schlegel, Hermann Weyhe, Johannes Merz, and Jakob Spieth (to name a few). An unmistaken consequence of such a designation was (and still is)

that they became less known, even though they were not less important (cf. Habermas and Przyrembel 2013) in that long, arduous task of translating the Bible into Ewe. This is the fate of Ludwig Adzaklo, a young Togolese teacher and Bible translator of the Bremen Mission who was invited by the mission board in 1904 to join Jakob Spieth in Tübingen, Germany to translate the Old Testament (OT) into Ewe from 1904 to 1909 under the sponsorship of the BFBS.

Little is known about Adzaklo, even though without him there would have hardly been an Ewe Bible during the missionary era in Togoland (cf. Wiegräbe 1970; Ekem 2011). In contrast, his German counterpart, Spieth, is a towering figure in the history of Ewe Bible translation.[1] Adzaklo has been consistently described as Spieth's *Sprachgehilfe*, even though the archival data on the five-year translation project strongly suggests that it is more accurate to describe him as an Ewe mother-tongue co-translator of the Ewe Bible alongside Spieth. This is the central claim of this study after applying a postcolonial analytical framework to the available archival data on the work of Adzaklo and Spieth in Tübingen. It is interesting to note that in the primary data, the designation of Adzaklo as *Sprachgehilfe* to Spieth stands in tension with how his practical role in the translation project was considered. In terms of his practical role, Spieth for instance had no difficulty seeing Adzaklo as a co-translator; however, when it comes to his position, he was simply a *Sprachgehilfe* on the project. It is precisely this colonial-missionary paradox, which from a postcolonial perspective should be viewed as a colonisation of Adzaklo's agency, that forms the point of departure of this study.

Accordingly, the study undertook a postcolonial close reading of the archival data that were sourced from the archives of the BFBS at Cambridge University Library and that of the Bremen Mission in the Staatsarchiv Bremen (Bremen State Archive). The work, therefore, first briefly discusses postcolonial theory and how it has been applied in the study. It then reconstructs Adzaklo's biography from the archival data, before it presents a critical review of the relevant literature, an abridged history of the translation project, highlighting the agency of Ewe mother-tongue translators including Adzaklo in order then to argue for Adzaklo's agency as an early mother-tongue translator of the Ewe Bible in West Africa. In this way, it has succeeded in augmenting the paucity of knowledge on Adzaklo and his work and also decolonised such knowledge, which has remained confined in Europe. The significance of this lies in the fact that the "dearth of evidence" regarding African actors, such as Adzaklo, has been identified as a major reason for the neglect of their essential contributions and agency during the colonial-missionary era (Pugach 2012, p. 142).

In order to keep their effects, some words have been retained in their German forms (with translation at first usage). Among them include *Gehilfe*, *Missionsgehilfe*, and *Sprachgehilfe*, which were used to designate the status of the Ewe mother-tongue translators in the Bible translation work in German Togoland.

2. Postcolonial Analysis—Giving Visibility and Voice to People Written out of Historical Records

The discussion and substantiation of the central claim of the study are undertaken by applying postcolonial theory as an analytical framework to archival material on missionary linguistics and Bible translation in former German Togoland.[2] A brief outline of how this critical perspective is applied in this study is thus relevant. Emerging in the late twentieth century as a critical perspective in literary studies, postcolonial theory has not lent itself to a single definition (Sugirtharajah 2022, p. 2). Hence, in discussing it, practitioners tend to describe its characteristics and functions. For Musa Dube, for instance, it is "an umbrella term" that "is best understood as a complex myriad of methods and theories which study a wide range of texts and their participation in the making or subversion of imperialism" (Dube 1997, p. 14; cf. Sugirtharajah 2022, p. 2). In terms of function, R. S. Sugirtharajah argues that "the central function of postcolonial criticism is to be a contestatory force" (Sugirtharajah 2022, p. 2). He describes it as being "intercessory and intervening, allowing silenced and written-out passages and personalities to have a

visibility and a voice" (Sugirtharajah 2022, p. 2). Notwithstanding its resistance to a single definition, postcolonial criticism could be seen as an "interpretive act" (Sugirtharajah 2010, p. 250) that is critical regarding power dynamics in every setting, textual or non-textual, and at any time, colonial or postcolonial. Particularly, it interrogates how power dynamics function to the domination of the many by a few and how efforts are made to maintain or subvert such a domination. In this way, its contestatory force, as Sugirtharajah proposes, finds application. Intercessory and intervention require that postcolonial analysis takes a critical stand on behalf of the marginalised and subjected. However, siding with the marginalised in terms of giving them "visibility and voice" does not imply absolving them and laying all the blame on the powerful (Sugirtharajah 1999, p. 3).

Emmanuel Lartey's (2022) assessment on the task of postcolonial theory is helpful in putting these views in an applicable, discursive framework for our study. For Lartey, "The task "postcolonializing" activities seek to accomplish entails critique, validation, recovery, and construction" (Lartey 2022, p. 663). Critique involves exposing the rationale of colonial depictions of the colonised by demonstrating the inadequacy and misrepresentation of such depictions. Moreover, criticism involves interrogating the "hegemony" and "control over" (the) underlying discussion on relations between nations and cultures and finally critiquing aims at de-colonising the "thought, theory, and practice of colonized experience" (Lartey 2022, p. 663). After the criticism follows validation, which for Lartey means that "postcolonial interpretations of the realities of the colonized re-value their humanity and (. . .) underscore and strengthen the formerly colonized capacity for authentic selfhood" (Lartey 2022, p. 663). Such a validation should lead to the re-appropriation of "subjugated knowledge and epistemology" through "historical and constructive research and crafting" (Lartey 2022, p. 663). Eventually, the recovered knowledge should be used to construct "new realities, theories, and practices" that will produce "a new consciousness and new orientation to life for all in the future" (Lartey 2022, p. 663).

Applied to the present study, postcolonial analysis is understood as an interrogation of the relevant data sources on Adzaklo. Part of the critique is questioning the extent to which the description of Adzaklo as a *Sprachgehilfe* is historically grounded, given his role in the BFBS-sponsored Ewe OT translation project in Tübingen. As other studies have shown (see Habermas and Przyrembel 2013), the likes of Adzaklo are the forgotten heroes of the colonial-missionary era, hence Adzaklo's agency, not only as a key actor in colonial knowledge production and dissemination but more importantly as a West African mother-tongue Bible translator, is decolonised and emphasised in this work. Ultimately, the study recovers and decolonises source materials holding knowledge on Adzaklo and the translation of the Ewe Bible and uses that to re-construct, biographically, the life and contribution of Adzaklo to a ground-breaking development in the linguistic, religious, and intellectual heritage of Eweland, present-day south-eastern Ghana and southern Togo in West Africa.

3. Ludwig Adzaklo: A Biography of an Early Mother-Tongue Translator of the Ewe Bible

Ludwig Adzaklo was a brilliant, linguistically gifted, and indefatigable young Ewe mother-tongue Bible translator and a professional teacher of the Bremen Mission in the early twentieth century in West Africa. He was born on 28 November 1882 in Anyako (in present-day south-eastern Ghana) and baptised on 29 December 1882.[3] Situating him historically implies that Adzaklo was born two years before Dr. Gustav Nachtigal, who, under imperial orders of German emperor Otto von Bismarck, made Togoland a formal German colony in 1884, two years after Spieth[4] arrived in Keta (in present-day south-eastern Ghana) on 6 July 1880 (Ohly 1920). This sets the study on him in a colonial-missionary context. Adzaklo's parents were Christian converts, but he was brought up by his aunt who was a traditional priestess. In his 1909 report to the BFBS on the progress of the translation work, Spieth stated that Adzaklo's father was a Christian, whereas his mother and aunt were adherents of traditional Ewe religion. However, Adzaklo's own farewell speech in Tübingen in September 1909 gives a different account of the religious affiliation of his

parents, particularly that of his mother. He stated that his parents had no objections to him accepting the task of Bible translation with Spieth in Germany because "(. . .) they knew what it was about; they had experienced the power of the Word of God for themselves in the 30 years they had been Christians" (Adzaklo 1909).[5] His use of the third person plural ("they . . . were") in relation to his parents implies that both father and mother had been Christians for the past thirty years. However, in the case of his priestess aunt, Adzaklo confirmed Spieth's description by noting that "Only my aunt, a priestess with whom I grew up, had various reasons for wanting to hold me back" (Adzaklo 1909). Once back in Togoland, Adzaklo married sometime before 1914, as indicated by a photograph of him and his bride in the Bremen Mission archive.[6]

In terms of his educational background, Adzaklo graduated from the Bremen Mission *Lehrerseminar* (seminary for teacher education) at the end of 1903 in Amedzofe (in present-day south-east of Ghana) as a professional teacher. In the following year, 1904, he was employed at the Amedzofe mission station school as a school teacher (Adzaklo 1909).

A brief look at the education system operated by the Bremen Mission in Togoland will facilitate our appreciation of the kind and quality of the education Adzaklo would have received and how that fed into his competence as a mother-tongue Bible translator. Rainer Alsheimer (2007) notes that the Bremen Mission educational policy envisaged that the founding of a mission station should go hand in hand with the setting up of a mission school. Part of the school system was thus the *Lehrerseminar*, which was meant to train indigenous Ewes as teachers who would take up educational responsibilities in the mission field in order to allow the missionaries room to focus on their main tasks of preaching and evangelisation (Alsheimer 2007, p. 43). Teacher training in the *Lehrerseminar* lasted initially for about five years—three years of middle school (*Mittelschule*) and two years of seminary training (Alsheimer 2007, p. 43). Typical subjects that were taught at the *Lehrerseminar* (in Ewe) at the time were Ewe, English, Bible studies, the Old and New Testaments, catechism, church history (of the Bremen Mission), world history, geography, logic, church dogmatics, music, prayer, theology, and agricultural Science (Jones and Arnold 2003). Moreover, admission into the *Lehrerseminar* required good performance in the mission school and, after a successful graduation, trained teachers were employed in the mission schools to teach (Alsheimer 2007, p. 47). Beyond teaching, indigenous teachers also assisted the missionaries in translation activities; for example, translating German texts into Ewe (Alsheimer 2007, p. 43). Some of them were sent to Germany to participate in the scientific analysis of the Ewe language (Alsheimer 2007, p. 43).

It is in this context that the term *Sprachgehilfe* is used by the Bremen Mission in relation to the indigenous Bible translators like Adzaklo in its Bible translation activities in Togoland. *Gehilfe* because they were seen, consistent with the conception of the educational system by the Bremen Mission, as those who were trained to "assist" the missionaries on the mission field in Togoland (Alsheimer 2007, p. 47). In addition to the teachers[7] who formed the biggest group with a fixed salary, *Gehilfe* also included evangelists and catechists. Alsheimer (2007, p. 47) notes that "From the beginning of the NMG's missionary activities in West Africa, black "*Gehilfe*" were recruited by the missionaries. The *Gehilfen* occupied different positions in the missionary and church hierarchy. Their careers were determined equally by talent and lifestyle". Clearly, then, the *Gehilfen* occupied a subordinate position, inferior to the missionaries (cf. Meyer 2002) and their roles were thus conceived as auxiliary, regardless of their remarkable intellectual competence and their essential role in colonial knowledge production and transfer in general and specifically in Bible translation. In other words, they could not be seen on the same level as the missionaries whose directives they were expected to obey (Meyer 2002; cf. Jensz 2016). Therefore, one understands why Adzaklo would be described consistently as *Gehilfe* or *Sprachgehilfe* despite his competence. Such colonial-missionary (mis)representation of indigenous actors in such critical spheres of West African religious history as Bible translation requires the postcolonial interrogations performed in this study.

Although the missionary education presented above could not certainly be compared with a university theological education mediated by a guild of professors in, say, Tübingen, it thus, however, implies that Adzaklo indeed had the benefit of the highest (?) level of education available and immediately accessible to him in his time. Moreover, it suggests that he was undoubtedly brilliant and intellectually competent among his peers, given the entry requirements of the seminar education, his successful graduation in 1903, and his subsequent employment as a school teacher in Amedzofe.

His intellectual competence would have definitely endeared him to the Bremen Mission board, as they called him in 1904—consistent with his status as a "*Gehilfe*"—to join Spieth in the Ewe Bible translation work in Tübingen. Remarkably, by the time he joined Spieth in Tübingen in May 1904 to start work as a mother-tongue Bible translator, he was only twenty-two years old. In the already cited farewell speech held in German from 1909, Adzaklo vividly recounted how he accepted the invitation, the journey to Germany, and his experiences in the initial days there. For instance, he stated that he sought the consent of his parents and his priestess aunt and that he travelled to Germany together with another Ewe, Gottfried Anipatse, the "*Sprachgehilfe*" (in Adzaklo's own words!) of Dietrich Westermann, on 13 April 1904 from Lomé and arrived in Hamburg on 2 May 1904 (Adzaklo 1909). Additionally, he shared the experience of being followed by crowds in Bremen and Tübingen in the initial days of their arrival in Germany and only until after a while did people stop following them around because they got used to them: "So many people followed us that we often had to make way by force. That's how it was here in Bremen and in Tübingen until people got used to us and left us alone" (Adzaklo 1909). Moreover, he was shocked that not everyone in "the white man's land" really was a confessing Christian like the missionaries:

> We were quite astonished when a passenger on the steamer said that it was not necessary to translate the Bible. It is a struggle for us foreigners to socialise with such people; what one has is stolen away and one remains empty inside (…). That is why this admonition applies to us: "Hold on to what you have, so that no one takes your crown". (Adzaklo 1909)

Subsequently, he mingled with "committed Christians" who had the spread of the Gospel at heart.

We get a glimpse of his time in Tübingen through his numerous letters to the Bremen Mission Inspector A. W. Schreiber, with whom he corresponded several times between 1904 and 1909. Within this period, we have not less than fifteen of his letters, which have received little archival research attention.[8] From this wealth of data, together with the already cited farewell address of September 1909, the rest of the biographical reconstruction would focus on his time in Tübingen, noting the extra activities he did in addition to Bible translation.

Certainly, he needed to learn German for the translation work. His German language course was initially short, as he indicated to Mission Inspector Schreiber in November 1905: "My German [language] lessons were over a long time ago, they only lasted 2 weeks".[9] Relatedly, the farewell speech indicates that Dietrich Westermann played a major role in his German language lessons. Moreover, in the letter cited above and also in the farewell speech, he indicated that he enhanced his German language skills through his social network, mainly his association with the *Jünglingsverein* (Young Men's Association) of Tübingen. Moreover, in another letter to the mission inspector in November 1906, he indicated that he took further German lessons four times a week from one Mr. stud. Immer.[10] According to him, the additional language lessons were necessary "(…) because my work requires me not only to master my mother tongue, but also to have a sufficient knowledge of German".[11] That all his letters were written in German and his public lectures were given in German suggest that Adzaklo acquired proficient German language skills.[12]

Apart from the acquisition of German language skills, he also learned stenography and music, specifically trombone and piano (Yigbe 2014, p. 173). For instance, in his already cited November 1905 letter, he informed the inspector as follows: "My piano lessons

began on 17 October with Miss Gundert. One hour every week, that is, 1/2 an hour every week on Tuesday and 1/2 an hour on Saturday or Friday".[13] Moreover, he acquired his stenographical and musical skills through his membership of the *Jünglingsverein*. On this he wrote in the same letter as follows: "I have joined the local *Jünglingsverein*. There are Bible lessons on Tuesday and Sunday evenings, stenography lessons on Friday evenings and trombone lessons on Saturday evenings".[14]

Undoubtedly, his membership of the *Jünglingsverein* is indicative of his social contact and integration into the German society in Tübingen and beyond. It also explains what he meant by "associating with committed Christians" in his farewell speech. For example, the entry of the Tübingen City Museum on Adzaklo has a photo of the *Stiftkirche*, taken in 1906 (two years after his arrival in Tübingen), which shows Adzaklo as part of a nine-member trombone choir (*Posaunenchor*) posing with their respective instruments; Adzaklo is holding his tenor horn and standing on the far-right side of the picture. Additionally, his social network extended beyond Tübingen and even the region of Württemberg. For instance, in most of his letters, he reported spending holidays with Pastor G. Binder in Kirchheim unter Teck[15] and undertaking several excursions with him and others. Evidence of his social contact in Tübingen is found particularly in the numerous visits he received from several people from the city of Tübingen, including professors, when he fell seriously ill from 18 May to 6 July 1907 (probably as a result of his hard work on the translation project): "I often received visits from the city, and the many flowers I had on the table reminded me of their love afterwards".[16]

A significant aspect of his extra activities apart from Bible translation is the public speeches he delivered at several places in Germany. At these presentations, "He spoke about his homeland, the local agriculture, wildlife, religion and customs" (Stadtmuseum Tübingen n.d.). Already in his November 1905 letter (cited earlier), he reported that he gave a presentation "about the gods Yew'e and Nyigblã"[17] at a mission festival in Thuringia.[18] He added, "The church was completely full (. . .)".[19] That his public speaking events were well patronised is also confirmed in another letter in April 1908, in which he reported holding two lectures in Oberhausen[20] that were well attended: "It was very nice in Oberhausen. On Thursday evening I gave the first lecture there in a large hall; it was very well attended, as was the one on Friday".[21] Moreover, at the founding of the *Frauenmissionsverein* (Women Missionary Association) in Oldenburg on 12 April 1907, he was invited to speak: "That evening I gave a talk in which I showed the participants that the mission is very necessary for us Togo people".[22]

His public lectures achieved three things. First, through that he raised funds for the Bremen Mission. For example, in Oberhausen, he was given a total of 25 Marks for the Mission: "In Oberhausen I was given 20 M. from the offering; furthermore, I received 5 M for the mission in a small children's school totalling 25 M which I will send".[23] Second, through his public lectures, he acted as a "poster boy" for the Bremen Mission, becoming visible evidence of the impact of the mission work itself in West Africa. That in itself would have been an incentive to win new missionaries for the mission work (Stadtmuseum Tübingen n.d.). Third, and most importantly, Adzaklo functioned as an actual actor in colonial knowledge production, transfer, and circulation. This is important because, through his lecture at Oldenburg in April 1907, he was invited by the Duchess of Oldenburg, Großherzogin Elizabeth von Oldenburg (1869–1955), to her castle on 14 April 1907, asking to know more about Togo. According to Adzaklo, the Duchess asked him, "I am very interested in hearing about the missionary work and I would like to hear from an indigenous person".[24] Such a royal audience in itself implies that his lectures resonated with diverse social classes of people in Germany.

Related to his public lectures were his contributions to the *Kinderblatt* (children's magazine) of the Bremen Mission, which also points to his interest in child education. Already in his November 1905 letter, he expressed his interest in contributing an article in the mission *Kinderblatt* but had no idea of a relevant subject matter: "I would very much like to write something for the *Kinderblatt* but I don't know what the children are interested

in. So please let me know".[25] Indeed, he made contributions to the magazine and this is attested in his letter of 4 May 1908 in which he told Inspector Schreiber, "I will also send the essay for the *Kinderblatt* soon".[26] Moreover, his essays would have included fables, as he indicated in a letter on 2 May 1907: "You will have already received the last post of Fables. I tried to write a play, but it was very difficult to write (. . .)".[27] Additionally, it is possible that he also wrote essays for other publications, for in his letter of 14 November 1906 he related the public response to an article he wrote about alcoholic drinkers in Togoland: "People have written me all sorts of things about what people in my homeland have said about my essay. Some people think it would have been better if I had directed the article mainly against Europeans, because they are the worst drinkers in Africa".[28]

In addition to public lectures, essay writing, and Bible translation, Adzaklo also translated into German Ewe texts including Ewe letters from Togoland. This is clear in his letter on 24 July 1906:

> The letters from the Ewe pupils have already been translated (. . .). The pupils have written to the Crown Prince as they would write to an Ewe chief. (. . .) Also, the expressions that you will find in the translation, "your high parents," are not in the letters, because such expressions are not known among us; but at Mr Spieth"s request the "high" has been added. I think the content of the letters is quite good, [reflecting] an independent work of the pupils.[29]

Similarly, he wrote in October 1907 as follows: "Unfortunately, I could not translate the Ewe text to the pictures (. . .) [while] in Tieringen, but I hope to be able to send it to you in the next weeks".[30] Both excerpts, therefore, indicate his other translational activities apart from the Bible.

From the foregoing, it hardly needs stating that beyond his intellectual, linguistic, and Bible translation competences, Adzaklo possessed such other competences as good social skills, music, public speaking, public relations, and writing skills, considering the impact of his lectures and contribution to the *Kinderblatt*. To all this should be mentioned his theological competence, which issued more from his faith as a committed Christian than as a trained theologian. For instance, in his farewell speech, he reflected theologically on the Bible as the "Word of God" and "power of God" that produces life and peace and drives away the power of darkness wherever it makes its entry. However, for Adzaklo, the liberative and life-giving force of the Bible can only be made accessible to people through mother-tongue Bible translation: "How does a people come into actual possession of the Word of God? Only by giving it to them in their own language" (Adzaklo 1909). Consequently, for him, it was thus an opportunity "to help" for five years in such a "glorious work" of translating the Ewe OT in Tübingen (Adzaklo 1909). Also, despite his desire to return to Togo, Adzaklo theologically underlines his commitment to stay until the end of the project: "Of course, I have no choice but to complete what I have started (. . .). I am often happy that I am always healthy, that is a blessing from God, whoever receives something must also give something".[31] In other words, his unyielding commitment to the translation work is understood as a response to God's gift of health to him, that is, alluding to Jesus's statement that to whom much is given, much is expected (Luke 12:48).

Rebekka Habermas and Alexandra Przyrembel (Habermas and Przyrembel 2013, p. 23) wondered how much Spieth would have paid Adzaklo for co-translating the Ewe Bible in Tübingen: "It is uncertain what the Tübingen missionary Spie[th] paid his assistant Ludwig Adzaklo for his translation of the Bible". However, the letters of Adzaklo and Spieth give an indication of how much he was given. Whereas, as already stated, Spieth received a clearly defined annual sum of 4000 Marks[32] from the BFBS for the work of translation, Adzaklo's "allowance" was not well defined from the beginning. What is clear is that the BFBS grant did not have him in mind. On the basis of his letters and those of Spieth, the issue can be reconstructed as follows. Adzaklo's remuneration took the form of material gifts and *Taschengeld* (pocket money). Whereas the material gifts included clothes, books, and probably his piano lessons, which most likely would have been paid for, his *Taschengeld* in 1905 was only 2.50 Marks and he was not given details about it from the onset. For

instance, in his letter on 2 November 1905, he informed the inspector: "Mr Spieth will be so kind and will provide the suit and coat. Thank you very much for the *Taschengeld* of 2.50 Marks. It made me very happy".[33] Two weeks later, on 16 November 1905, he wrote again: "Mr Spieth used the rest of the Berlin money to buy me a beautiful tenor horn through the director of the trombone choir. That is a great pleasure for me".[34] Moreover, in several other letters, he thanked the inspector for gifts (*Geschenke*) received. These writings thus attest to the material gifts that formed one part of his remuneration as shortly stated.

On the monetary part, we get the impression from his letter on 2 November 1905 (cited above) that he received 2.50 Marks monthly as *Taschengeld;* the, one year later, 14 November 1906, he wrote again as follows: "I was delighted to receive your two cards (. . .); I also thank you very much for the increase in my *Taschengeld*".[35] We infer from this, therefore, that his *Taschengeld* of 2.50 Marks was increased in 1906 (to an unknown amount). That he was not given details of his *Taschengeld* from the beginning is also inferred from his letter on 4 May 1908 in which he stated: "I am sending you a summary of the money given to me. (. . .) I have nothing more than 2 Marks left, which I would like to keep in my pocket until my *Taschengeld* arrives. Regarding the *Taschengeld*, Mr. Inspector did not tell me any details at the outset (*damals*); but as always, that remains up to you".[36]

Spieth's letters on the subject bring additional clarity to the issues but also contradictions, especially regarding the exact amount of Adzaklo's pocket money. For example, even though Adzaklo stated 2.50 Marks as his *Taschengeld* in 1905, Spieth's letter on 18(?) May 1908 contradicts this figure:

> At the very beginning, Ludwig [received] 3 Marks per month [as] *Taschengeld* and later received an increase of 2 Marks; thus, he has received 5 Marks [as] *Taschengeld* per month so far. Now I made the suggestion that he should be given additional 2 Marks on top of this 5. Ludwig would, therefore, receive 7 Marks monthly.[37]

From this excerpt, Adzaklo's *Taschengeld* from the onset was 3 Marks, which contradicts Adzaklo's own figure of 2.50 Marks. While this raises an interesting point for interrogation, to explore it further would take the discussion beyond its present scope, especially as the difference of 0.50 Marks does not diminish the fact that his work was poorly remunerated. Beyond this conflicting information, the clarity we get from Spieth's letter is that Adzaklo's referenced increase of his *Taschengeld* in 1906 was an amount of 2 Marks. Additionally, the new information on the issue is that there was a requested second increase in 1908. This second increase is interesting in two respects. Firstly, it seems to have been at Adzaklo's request. This is inferred from Spieth's letter on 8 May 1908 in which the issue of a *Taschengeld* increase is first mentioned:

> With regard to the increase in his *Taschengeld*, he [i.e., Adzaklo] confesses that he has spoken to Mr. Inspector about it and explained his needs to you in detail. I have no knowledge of his actual needs. (. . .) In my opinion, 2 Marks a month should be enough; give him 10 Marks a month and he will use it up and end up with nothing after all.[38]

Thus, Adzaklo might have requested an increase in his *Taschengeld* by sharing "his actual needs" with the mission inspector. Secondly, Spieth might have been consulted on the issue of Adzaklo's *Taschengeld* increase and proposed "2 Marks a month should be enough". That Adzaklo might have requested an increase in his allowance is telling of Adzaklo's agency in a colonial-missionary context with a marked power imbalance: he is only a "*Sprachgehilfe*" to Spieth, for which reason matters of his allowance required Spieth's input. Furthermore, it clearly reveals his character as an assertive person who took initiative on issues important to him. That is a consistent character trait that we find in his other letters, some of which will be engaged shortly below. Undoubtedly, however, it can be argued that the understanding of his role as only a *Sprachgehilfe* affected how much his labour on the translation project was valued—*Taschengeld* of only 6.50/7 Marks,[39] which was not actually a payment for his labour but a pocket money to subsist on. In contrast,

Spieth, who of course is the recipient of the BFBS translation project contract, is *paid* for his work. Thus, Adzaklo was "paid" far less than his colleague Spieth and far less than his contribution to the work in Tübingen deserved.

Beyond the issue of allowance was Adzaklo's longing to return to his home country, Togoland. Several reasons could have accounted for this desire, which he did not fail to disclose to the mission inspector. Apart from the unfamiliar climate and social surroundings of the foreign land (Germany), two factors seemed influential: his family and his job as a school teacher. In January 1907, he wrote to the mission inspector ending with a revealing request:

> Finally, I have one big request. Would Mr. Inspector perhaps have the kindness to let me know whether the gracious Board has in mind to replace me by another *Sprachgehilfe* during the duration of the Bible translation and when (...)? Or whether I should stay here until the Bible translation is finished, because my father would like to know exactly when I can return to Africa.[40]

It is obvious from his request that his family, represented by his father, wanted him back. Moreover, equally obvious is that, just like his *Taschengeld*, neither Adzaklo nor his family was told precisely how long his stay in Germany would last. That is expressed by the fact that "my father would like to know *exactly when* I can return to Africa". Besides that, is the professional factor that comes up strongly in another letter on 31 December 1907,[41] in which Adzaklo reported on the progress of the translation work: it was progressing slower than he wanted. He cited as a major cause several lectures that Spieth was delivering that took a lot of time and made his stay in Tübingen rather boring: "The lectures that Mr. Spieth gave in [the recently ended] year took up so much time that my stay in Tübingen finally became boring".[42] But "if things go on like this, we won't be finished for another 2–3 years, so I humbly ask you to let Mr. Westermann help us if possible".[43] Actually, the reason for his concern about the snail-paced nature of the work was his teaching work in Amedzofe: "I would very much like to return to my work as a teacher in Africa and would be happy if we could finish in one or $1^{1/2}$ years, because then I [would] have been in Germany for 5–6 years".[44]

This letter requires further analysis, for it reveals Adzaklo's agency, as earlier indicated. Within the colonial-missionary context that he found himself, where the balance of power was obviously tilted in favour of Spieth and against him, he found avenues to articulate his views and express his wishes, even if diplomatically. He was not a passive *Sprachgehilfe* who just hung on unconcerned when things went contrary to his expectations and wishes. He employed the medium of the letter—which by itself underlines his intellectual competence—as a communicative vehicle to express his concerns without fearing that that might strain his relationship with Spieth. Admittedly, he indicated in the letter that he was not reporting Spieth to "his superiors" (the mission inspector) but was only asking for assistance: "Forgive me for writing to you in such detail, but I don't want to report Mr. Spieth, I just want to ask you to send some help".[45]

In sum, the foregoing biographical sketch gives us a picture of Adzaklo—by no means a complete one—who was intellectually, linguistically, socioculturally, and rhetorically competent as well as indefatigable in his work ethic and who arguably deserves to be retrospectively called an early mother-tongue translator of the Ewe Bible for the Bremen Mission in West Africa. His status and role in the history of Ewe Bible translation have, however, been viewed differently as the literature review in the following section indicates.

4. Transformative Developments in Adzaklo's Status and Role: A Review of Relevant Literature

As noted in the introduction, the archival data on Adzaklo presents a paradoxical picture of his status and role in the translation project. The paradox is carried over into the secondary literature on the Ewe Bible translation. Consistently, Adzaklo is only mentioned when discussing Jakob Spieth. In other words, he is rarely the main subject of discussion; he stands in the shadows of Spieth (cf. Yigbe 2014). From the colonial to the post-colonial peri-

ods, the colonial-missionary paradox finds increasing transformation in which Adzaklo's agency in the Ewe Bible translation becomes more and more recognised.

Emil Ohly's (1920) *Andreas Jakob Spieth: der Bibelübersetzer des Ewevolkes* sketches biographically the life of Spieth from his early years to death. Ohly (1920, pp. 28–38), who was once a director of the Bremen Mission in 1912, discusses Adzaklo briefly under a section on Spieth's life as a Bible translator. In this section, he presents a portrait of Adzaklo and describes him as "a native *Gehilfe* from Togo" who "stood at the side" of Spieth (Ohly 1920, pp. 31–32). Moreover, he recognises how Adzaklo was specially qualified (*geeignet*) for the translation project. Adzaklo's linguistic and religiocultural competence leads Ohly to argue: "This enabled him [Adzaklo] to decide with great certainty whether an expression correctly translated (*Wiedergabe*) the meaning of the biblical text without leading to misunderstandings among his people (*Volksgenossen*)" (Ohly 1920, p. 32). Nonetheless, he easily describes Adzaklo as the "native *Gehilfe* from Togo". The aforementioned paradox emerges in the literature engaged here and becomes even pronounced in Paul Wiegräbe's (1970) *Gott spricht auch Ewe*.

Wiegräbe (1970) presents the history of Bible translation into the Ewe language by the Bremen Mission. He gives substantial attention to the period in which Spieth and Adzaklo worked on the Ewe Old Testament in Tübingen (Wiegräbe 1970, pp. 32–42). With all clarity, Wiegräbe (1970, p. 35), who was also missionary of the Bremen Mission in Togoland, states that Adzaklo was the "most important *Mitarbeiter* (collaborator) of Spieth" because "without him [i.e., Adzaklo] the Ewe Bible would not have become what it is today". He makes this persuasive assertion after recognising Adzaklo's essential role in the translation work, as outlined in the biographical section above. Moreover, salient in this quote is that he describes Adzaklo as a *Mitarbeiter* and not a *Sprachgehilfe* of Spieth.[46] That notwithstanding, he later describes Adzaklo as an *afrikanischer Helfer* (African helper) that Spieth needed (Wiegräbe 1970, p. 34). Paradoxically, he sees Adzaklo as Spieth's *Mitarbeiter* in so far as the actual work of translation was concerned, but as regarding his status, he was simply a *Helfer*. Moreover, in this section of his book, the main subject is Spieth, whereas Adzaklo is only mentioned as the "suitable man" that was found to help Spieth.

Certainly, the two works discussed above are connected to the Bremen Mission and come from the early to late twentieth century. However, in the post-colonial context, the literature that mention Adzaklo tend to be critical of his designation as a *Sprachgehilfe*, underlining his role as an Ewe mother-tongue Bible translator and his agency in colonial knowledge production and transfer. Illustrative of this development are the following works, beginning with online entries followed by published literature.

The online project of the City Museum of Tübingen, *Koloniale Orte in Tübingen*, has an entry on Adzaklo titled, *Missionsgehilfe in Tübingen: Ludwig Adzaklo*, which recounts Adzaklo's time and activities in Tübingen and other parts of Germany (Stadtmuseum Tübingen n.d.). It describes him as the "*Missionsgehilfe* [mission assistant] (…) who travelled to Europe" from Togo. Even though the title and its description of Adzaklo as a *Missionsgehilfe* makes it problematic and reflects trappings of the colonial-missionary ambivalence stated above, the entry demonstrates that it is critical of such a designation. For, in respect of pupils of the mission schools in former German Togoland, it observes,

> The most talented male students could become "*Missionsgehilfe*." They worked as teachers or translated the Bible from German into a local language such as Ewe. A few travelled to Europe to make a significant contribution to the study (*Erforschung*) of their language and culture as "*Sprachgehilfe*." They carried out a large part of the translation work with which European scientists became known (*bekannt*). So did Ludwig Adzaklo. (Stadtmuseum Tübingen n.d.)

By putting *Missionsgehilfe* and *Sprachgehilfe* in quotation marks, the unstated author(s) of this entry implicitly expresses a critical view of this designation. However, given that the aim of the project, according to the City Museum, is to show the legacy of German colonial history in post-colonial Germany, it would be more consistent to have rather expressed it clearly, like other similar entries elsewhere have done. Moreover, in the spirit of its set

aim, striving for factual accuracy would have been expected, but, as it stands, the entry erroneously presents that Adzaklo was translating the Bible from German (i.e., the Luther Bible) into Ewe: "In Tübingen, he [i.e., Adzaklo] lived with his Togolese colleague Gottfried Anipatse with Dietrich Westermann (…). On behalf of the North German Mission, they translated the Bible from German into Ewe". This is factually inaccurate in light of the archival evidence, as will be demonstrated below; Adzaklo and Spieth translated from the original Hebrew/Aramaic sources (Masoretic text).

Moreover, unlike the City Museum of Tübingen, the online biographic and bibliographic church dictionary—*Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon* (BBKL)—directly expresses Adzaklo's role in Bible translation and captures his significant linguistic contribution to Spieth's scientific works on the Ewe language, religion, and culture (Hübner 2020). Although Sabine Hübner, author of the entry, writes about Spieth, she mentions Adzaklo and his role in Spieth's works and particularly the Bible translation work in Tübingen. What is interesting is that Hübner does not use the colonial-missionary designations, *Gehilfe*/*Sprachgehilfe*, in relation to the indigenous translators of the Ewe Bible. Instead, she describes Adzaklo, for instance, as Spieth's *Mitarbeiter* in relation to Spieth's monumental publication, *Die Ewe-Stämme* (Spieth 1906a): "Ludwig Adzaklo from Togo (born 1882 in Anyako), (…) Spieth's *Mitarbeiter* since 1904, played a key role in shaping the book project [i.e., *Die Ewe-Stämme*]" (Hübner 2020). This is a remarkable transformation of Adzaklo's status, because, given the context in which he is mentioned, he could easily have been designated as "Spieth's *Gehilfe* since 1904". That Hübner is intentional about this description is evident in how she describes as *Sprachexperten* (language experts), fourteen Ewe mother-tongue translators who participated in a three-week Bible translation revision conference held in Ho (in present day Ghana) in 1897 by Spieth and G. Däuble to revise the 1877 Ewe New Testament (Hübner 2020). Moreover, in contrast to the City Museum of Tübingen, Hübner does not, admittedly, have Adzaklo as the main subject of her entry, but rather Spieth. In which case, her contribution unfortunately confirms our earlier observation that Adzaklo stands most often in the shadows of Spieth in the literature.

In addition to these two online entries, the online scientific project *Universität und Kolonialismus—Das Beispiel Göttingen*[47] (Habermas n.d.) is of great interest. An entry in this project, *Intermediaries*, discusses the agency of African actors in the colonial production and transfer of knowledge (Feierabend n.d.). Albert Feierabend counts Adzaklo indirectly as part of the central actors whose mother-tongue language skills (*muttersprachliche Kenntisse*) were indispensable for the linguistic and literary development of their mother tongues. Directly, however, he describes Adzaklo's essential role in the Ewe Bible translation in this manner: "At the beginning of the 20th century, the Togolese, Ludwig Adzaklo did the main work (*Hauptarbeit*) on the extensive and difficult work of translating the Bible into the Ewe language" (Feierabend n.d.). Showing a remarkable development in the post-colonial context similar to Hübner, Feierabend's characterisation of Adzaklo's role in the translation project is remarkable, as he puts the main translational task of the Ewe Bible into the hands of the young Adzaklo without mentioning Spieth!

Similarly, Habermas and Przyrembel's (2013) introduction to their edited volume on colonialism and knowledge discusses Adzaklo in a brief yet interesting manner that requires critical engagement here. They view Adzaklo in two ways in the context of the globalisation of knowledge. First, they count Adzaklo as part of those "less known, yet not less important actors [*Akteure*]" in the globalisation of knowledge, because he (and his likes) contributed to foundational studies (*Grundlagenforschungen*) and transferred and participated in the spread of knowledge (Habermas and Przyrembel 2013, pp. 9, 15). Nevertheless, Adzaklo and other persons in similar positions were considered not important enough to be named as producers of knowledge because of their race, gender, education, religion, and academic rituals (*akademische Rituale*) (Habermas and Przyrembel 2013, p. 15). Consequently, they were also forgotten (*vergessen*) and landed in oblivion: "For example, (…) Ludwig Adzaklo, who was denied any ability to be involved in a process that led to the spread (*Vermehrung*) of knowledge, was forgotten because—according to the popular view in the 19th century—

he was a representative of an inferior race without intellectual potency" (Habermas and Przyrembel 2013, p. 15). Second, they consider Adzaklo's work as part of the central and significant resources that enabled the production of knowledge in the colonial era, even if such a work could have gone unpaid (Habermas and Przyrembel 2013, p. 23). These are transformative developments in the reception of Adzaklo and his work that are consistent with the objective of this study. However, the fact that Habermas and Przyrembel overlook some factual details of Adzaklo's contribution leaves much to be desired. In their opening paragraph, they note 1907 as the year of Adzaklo's arrival in Tübingen (Habermas and Przyrembel 2013, p. 9). But that is a factual error, because he came in 1904 per the available archival data. Moreover, just like the entry in the Tübingen City Museum, they mistakenly state that Adzaklo translated the Luther Bible into Ewe (Habermas and Przyrembel 2013, p. 9).[48]

To conclude this section, attention will be given to two West African authors Gilbert Dotsé Yigbe (2014) and John Ekem (2011), who have also given significant attention to Adzaklo. Yigbe's work clearly recognises and articulates the contribution of indigenous Ewes to the development of the Ewe language and how missionary linguistics was essentially dependent on indigenous people for the success of translation activities in Togoland (Yigbe 2014, p. 160). Moreover, he discusses how the interaction between Spieth and Adzaklo was designed and wherein Adzaklo's task consisted (Yigbe 2014, pp. 160–61). In the context of missionary linguistics, the indigenous co-worker, which Yigbe consistently describes as *Gehilfe* or *Sprachgehilfe*, is a conversation partner and mediator on behalf of his receptor culture (Yigbe 2014, p. 167). For Yigbe, the mother-tongue translator does not act as a representative of the receptor culture since he lacks a comprehensive command of the total knowledge base of his people (Yigbe 2014, p. 167). Nonetheless, he is the language expert and spokesperson for his traditional culture on the translation project (Yigbe 2014, p. 174). In this broader light, Yigbe describes Adzaklo as the "embodiment of the receptor language [i.e., Ewe]" in the Ewe Bible translation project (Yigbe 2014, p. 169). Moreover, he presents Adzaklo as the Togolese *Sprachgehilfe* who was chosen out of the African *Gehilfen* to help Spieth in the translation work in Tübingen (Yigbe 2014, pp. 160–61, 169, 171). Critically viewed, Yigbe subtly carries forth the colonial-missionary ambivalence that acknowledges Adzaklo's essential role in the Ewe Bible translation on the one hand but consistently describes him as a *(Sprach)gehilfe* on the other hand without interrogation.

Finally, Ekem's contribution to the discussion reflects a more careful and sensitive appraisal of the data on the contribution of indigenous Bible translators in the colonial era. In his chapter on the history of the Ewe Bible translation, he makes conscious attempt to project the significant role played by the indigenous Ewe Bible translators whom he describes variously as "African co-workers" or "indigenous partners" of the Bremen Missionaries (Ekem 2011, pp. 116, 118, 123, 141). For instance, after assessing the history of translations of various portions of the Bible into Ewe, he concludes: "The missionaries could not have chalked up these achievements on their own. Teams of indigenous co-workers contributed in giving shape to the draft translations that were finalized for printing" (Ekem 2011, p. 126). On Adzaklo, he engages with some of the primary sources used in this study and describes him as "a competent indigenous Ewe-speaking translator" who "assisted" Spieth in Tübingen (Ekem 2011, p. 130). Additionally, he argues, "Adzaklo deserves more recognition than has hitherto been extended to him. A close look at the available records leaves no room for doubt that this highly gifted young Ewe translator sacrificed immensely, even at the cost of his health, to ensure that the Ewe Old Testament was comprehensively revised" (Ekem 2011, p. 131). Similarly, he depicts Adzaklo as Spieth's colleague when he describes him as Spieth's partner after analysing Adzaklo's farewell speech of 1909: "In a farewell speech (. . .) Adzaklo made (. . .) profound remarks, which reflect the translation philosophy he and *his partner* [i.e., Spieth] adopted"[49] (Ekem 2011, p. 133). Furthermore, he also recognises Adzaklo's linguistic dexterity by observing that "(. . .) Adzaklo demonstrates mastery of the use of Ewe idiomatic expressions in Bible translation (. . .)" (Ekem 2011,

p. 134). Finally, he counts Adzaklo as one of "the most outstanding African co-workers" who contributed to the Ewe Bible translation (Ekem 2011, p. 152).

Doubtlessly, Ekem's work pays deserved attention to Adzaklo in ways that express the objective of our present study. Indeed, he is arguably the earliest to recognise the dearth of studies on Adzaklo's contribution to Bible translation in Eweland. However, given the broader focus of his study, he could not present a comprehensive account of Adzaklo's role. The present study thus builds on his contribution by accessing and analysing many more sources on Adzaklo that Ekem did not include in his work. Also, in a few instances, he undercuts his view of Adzaklo as a co-translator by describing his role in auxiliary terms. For example, in recounting BFBS's offer to fund the Ewe Bible translation, he notes the role of Spieth and indicates that Spieth "(...) was to be *assisted* by Ludwig Adzaklo a competent indigenous Ewe-speaking translator" (Ekem 2011, p. 130).[50] Thinking of Adzaklo as Spieth's assistant and simultaneously as a competent indigenous translator is problematic from a postcolonial perspective, for it is reminiscent of the colonial-missionary paradoxes that have been described so far.

In sum, we note, on the basis of the presented secondary material, that Adzaklo is discussed in various disciplinary fields including history, African studies, German studies, mission history, and biblical studies. Furthermore, the colonial-missionary paradox persists in acknowledging his practical role as a co-translator of the Ewe Old Testament with Spieth, while refusing to describe him as such, instead consistently referring to him as *Sprachgehilfe*. We will return to this paradox later, since it has its root in the primary sources for this study. In the meantime, attention will be turned to a brief history of the Ewe Bible translation, highlighting the role of Ewe co-translators and focusing on 1904–1909 when Adzaklo and Spieth worked together.[51]

5. Holy Scripture in a "Crude" Language: Bible Translation in Togoland 1858–1914

5.1. From B. Schlegel in 1858 to J. Spieth and G. Däuble in 1898

An essential part of Bremen Missionary work among the Ewes was learning the language, producing grammars, coding the Ewe language, and ultimately translating the Christian scripture into it (cf. Meyer 2002).[52] A pioneer missionary linguist in the history of Ewe Bible translation was Bernhard Schlegel. Arriving in Keta (in present day Ghana) in 1854, Schlegel was tasked with the special responsibility of studying the Ewe language due to his linguistic competence (Wiegräbe 1970; Ekem 2011; Meyer 2002). At his death on 1 May 1859, he had, among other Ewe translations, translated the following portions of the New Testament: 1–3 John, Revelations, and the four Gospels (Wiegräbe 1970).

Indubitably, he could not realise these translations without collaborating with mother-tongue speakers. Wiegräbe (1970, p. 18) admits this when he states: "Gratitude and justice demand that a word also be said about the Africans who helped the missionaries in their preaching work and in researching the language and translating the Bible". One of the "Africans" was John Wright,[53] who worked with Schlegel in translating the aforementioned books (see Ekem 2011). Regarding Wright's essential role, Schlegel acknowledged: "Without John, we could have done little" (Wiegräbe 1970, p. 20). Such was the indispensable role of indigenous Bible translators in Togoland that one has had to question why they were only considered as *Sprachgehilfe* and not as *co-translators*.

After Schlegel and Wright, Hermann Weyhe and Aaron Onipayede translated Acts and the Psalms. Weyhe also worked with Johannes Merz on other epistles of the New Testament (NT) (Wiegräbe 1970; Ekem 2011). Indeed, Onipayede was a former slave stolen from northern Togo and sold several times. He was redeemed by Weyhe at a cost of fifty Dollars (USD 50), which was donated by a mission friend in Hamburg. He attended the Basel Mission school at Akropong (on the Gold Coast, now Ghana), learnt New Testament Greek, and became a Catechist of the Bremen Mission (Ekem 2011, pp. 122–23; Wiegräbe 1970, p. 23). Articulating his remarkable role as an indigenous Bible translator, Wiegräbe (1970, p. 23) submits: "If Weyhe found help for the Hebrew language from European scholars, Aaron Onipayede was one of those who assisted him with the Ewe language".

Indeed, Weyhe himself admitted: "He [Onipayede] was a great help to me in translating the Acts of the Apostles" (Wiegräbe 1970, p. 23). Besides Weyhe, Onipayede also worked with Merz. Like Wright, with Onipayede, we again see the central role played by Ewes in the history of Ewe Bible translation in Togoland. However, Onipayede (like Wright) was thought of only as a *Gehilfe* and not a co-translator. Indeed, he was a slave who owed his freedom to the missionaries and thus, in such a social asymmetry, could not be considered a colleague.

Moreover, among other translations, Merz edited the first full Ewe New Testament for publication in 1877 by the Bremen Mission (Wiegräbe 1970, p. 22). It is worth noting that the New Testament was translated from Greek and certainly from Erasmus' Greek New Testament, *Textus Receptus* (cf. Ekem 2011). This was clearly written on the publication title page: "Translated from the original Greek text" (Wiegräbe 1970, p. 25).[54]

Further linguistic study of the Ewe language, however, led to a revision of the 1877 Ewe New Testament that was undertaken by J. Spieth and G. Däuble (Wiegräbe 1970; Ekem 2011). A major development in the history of the Ewe Bible translation at this time was that, for the first time, mention is made of missionary linguists organising a translation revision conference with their indigenous colleagues to vet the translation. In a three-week conference in 1897 in Ho (in present day Ghana), Spieth and Däuble worked with fourteen Ewe men to review the NT. Among them were Immanuel Quist, who is described as possessing "an almost inexhaustible vocabulary" and Rev. Rudolf Mallet, the first Ewe pastor ordained by the Bremen Mission (Wiegräbe 1970, p. 27; Ekem 2011). Moreover, the men were said to possess linguistic facility in not less than five languages and came from five different intra-ethnic groups (Wiegräbe 1970; Ekem 2011). Collectively, they compared every point of the translation with the Greek text and foreign words were replaced with local ones (Wiegräbe 1970, p. 28). Here again, one observes the sterling agency of indigenous Ewe actors in getting the Bible translated into their own mother tongue. Nonetheless, just like Wright and Onipayede above, these fourteen indigenous collaborators, who should be rightly considered as co-translators, were described as "fourteen *Gehilfen*" (Wiegräbe 1970, p. 27). This is equally the fate of Ludwig Adzaklo in the Ewe translation of the Old Testament in Tübingen.

5.2. Towards a Complete Ewe Bible: From Tübingen 1904 to Lomé 1915

J. Spieth and L. Adzaklo in Tübingen (1904–1909): Quest for a Flawless Ewe Bible

From Schlegel and his Ewe colleagues' pioneering translation in 1858 to the revision of the first Ewe NT in 1898 by Spieth, Däuble, and the fourteen indigenous Ewe Bible translators, one observes about forty years of different levels of collaboration between Ewe translators and German missionary linguists in Togoland to translate the Christian scriptures into Ewe (cf. Yigbe 2017). Such a collaborative translation endeavour reached its zenith in the early twentieth century when Spieth and Adzaklo took the BFBS-funded translation project in Tübingen.

In 1903, the Bremen Mission and the BFBS signed a contract with three key important terms: that the BFBS (1) will bind existing Ewe OT translations and send them to Togoland, (2) that it would take over the rest of the 1898 revised Ewe NT and its standing letters (script) for 9000 Marks, and (3) finally, it would, for a good six years, sponsor the production of a full Ewe OT with 4000 Marks yearly (Wiegräbe 1970, pp. 32–33). The Bremen Mission board gave the job to Spieth. Certainly, he was considered the most qualified at the time, having spent, in his own words, "more than twenty years"[55] in Togoland studying the Ewe people and their language and publishing and presenting lectures on them using ethnographic materials he collected over that period of time (Spieth 1906a, 1906b, 1907).

Notwithstanding his linguistic and ethnographic competence in Ewe and on the Ewe people, Spieth needed young Adzaklo as a mother-tongue translator to successfully execute the job. He settled in Tübingen in March 1904 and Adzaklo joined him in May 1904,[56] and they began translation work on 22 May 1904 (Wiegräbe 1970, p. 35). From now until the full Ewe Bible is printed in 1914 and arrives in Eweland in 1915/1916, we gain

access to the various stages of the translation project through correspondences with the Bremen Mission and the BFBS and Adzaklo's own correspondences with Mission Inspector Schreiber. Originally, the task to Spieth for which the BFBS allocated the yearly grant of 4000 Marks was to revise the existing Ewe OT translations for publication. Spieth confirmed this in his April 1909 report to the BFBS: "According to instructions received about five years ago, the work entrusted to me was the revision of the Old Testament in Ewe".[57] However, he and Adzaklo undertook an essentially new translation. According to Spieth, the existing translations had "defects". For instance, published ones like "(. . .) Genesis, Exodus, Joshua Judges, Ruth, First and Second Samuel, First and Second Kings, the Psalms and the prophets Isayah (sic) and Jeremiah" were difficult to read, and the unpublished translations were considered unfit for press because of "(. . .) their altogether unfinished and partly rather faulty character".[58] He stated and clearly explained with examples three reasons for the "faulty character" of the earlier translations: inexperience of the earlier missionary translators, the faulty translation principles they followed, and the lack of education of the "native helpers"[59] involved in those translation activities.

In contrast to these "defects" in the previous translations, "Several favourable circumstances have worked together for the successful performance of our task".[60] The first of these "several favourable circumstances" is Ludwig Adzaklo's competence as a mother-tongue translator:

> The first of these is the ability of the native assistant, who was placed at my disposal by the North German Missionary Society. Ludwig Adzaklo is the son of a Christian father. As such he had an opportunity to acquire some knowledge of the word of God and Christian truth from his very childhood. His mother and her family were heathen. He was thus brought into contact with the conceptions and performances of the heathen religion, which he, however, strictly rejected ever since he came to see the difference. Part of his youth was spent in African liberty, which gave him ample opportunity to learn something of the different occupations, the law and the religion of his heathen fellow countrymen. He has therefore an almost perfect command of the Ewe language, his mother tongue.[61]

Conspicuously, Adzaklo was indeed fit for the job. Moreover, regarding their translation principles, Spieth reported to the BFBS as follows:

> (1) The strictest possible adherence to the Massoretic (sic) Text; (2) the thoughts and not the words or phrases to be taken as the units of translation; (3) the language to be pure and simple, avoiding vulgarisms and misleading expressions. (. . .) Deviations from the Massoretic Text were adopted only in a few cases, and that in accordance with the English Revised and the Lutheran Version.[62]

Thus, we learn that he and his young colleague Adzaklo followed the dynamic equivalence translation philosophy and that they translated from the original sources of Hebrew/Aramaic, deviating only in a few cases. This is where the archival evidence disputes the claim that they translated from German into Ewe (cf. Stadtmuseum Tübingen n.d.; Habermas and Przyrembel 2013).

The actual translation activity, Spieth indicated in his report, was a shared responsibility between him and Adzaklo:

> We have tried to make the best possible use of our time. Daily the time from 8–12 A.M. and from 3–7 P.M. was for the most part employed for the work of translation between myself and Ludwig Adzaklo, whereas the hours of the later evening were made use of for private study of the Hebrew Text to be translated on the foll[ow]ing day. In the case of more difficult portions, such as Job, some of the Psalms, or Isayah (sic), more time, of course, was required for this preliminary study of the Hebrew Text. While I was occupied with this preparatory work, my assistant would be busy with preparing a fair copy of the portions already translated; he is still busily occupied with this work.[63]

This excerpt provides the archival evidence for the already stated colonial-missionary paradox. Therefore, a close reading of this and other similar excerpts will be undertaken below through the theoretical lens of this study.

Furthermore, Adzaklo worked indefatigably in the translation work, as Spieth's letter on 18 August 1907, three years into the project, reveals: "1 Kings completed (. . .) Ludwig is extraordinarily capable" (Wiegräbe 1970, p. 37). Moreover, Adzaklo's essential role to the success of the translation project is well articulated in Spieth letter on 5 September 1907:

> 2 Kings is completed (. . .). About half of the material is done, 181 chapters. (. . .) When I think of the amount of work that has gone into these 181 chapters, then I must thank God for his marvellous help (. . .) one reason for my thanks is that Ludwig has retained the courage to continue working to this day and, even if at times under obvious inner struggles, has remained (. . .). If he stays, then we will have a flawless [Ewe] Bible, and I believe that the [Ewe] people will say: This is flesh of my flesh and bone of my bone!—at least as far as the language is concerned. (Wiegräbe 1970, p. 37)

Beyond his indispensable role in the project, the excerpt further reveals Adzaklo's tenacity and commitment during the translation work, for he "(. . .) has retained the courage to continue working to this day". Consequently, for Spieth, his resilience and commitment meant realising the hope of obtaining a flawless Ewe Bible: "If he stays, then we will have a flawless [Ewe] Bible and I believe, the [Ewe] people would say: This is flesh of my flesh and bone of my bone". By implication, Adzaklo's participation in the translation project guaranteed its quality as an Ewe Bible that was contextually relevant because the Ewes could easily identify with it, hence the Adamic exclamation, "flesh of my flesh and bone of my bone".[64] The Ewe could certainly not receive the Bible in this manner unless it was co-translated by one of their own, just as Adam could only refer to Eve with these words because out of his rib, Eve was formed per the second creation account of Gen 2:23. It is observations such as this that has invited the postcolonial contestation of describing Adzaklo as a *Sprachgehilfe* in the history of the Ewe Bible translation in the early twentieth century.

In fulfilment of Spieth's hope, Adzaklo stayed to co-translate the last verse of the OT (Malachi) into his mother tongue, Ewe, on 23 June 1909 in Tübingen: "This morning, 20 min before 10 o'clock, we translated the last verse of Malachi. This means that the translation of the Old Testament lies before us as a finished work (. . .)" (Wiegräbe 1970, p. 35). Thus, Adzaklo delayed the gratification of his desire to return to the comfort of his hometown in order to bring about the successful translation of the OT into Ewe. Eventually, he himself could write with relief on 2 September 1909 as follows: "Soon the hour I have been longing for will strike and I will leave Tübingen for good".[65] Spieth also wrote on the next day, 3 September 1909: "So the big moment has come for Ludwig and for us, when he could start his return journey home" (Wiegräbe 1970, p. 39).

Beyond Tübingen, Adzaklo participated in the translation revision conference in Togo from October to March 1911 to review their translation and revise the 1898 Ewe New Testament for publication of the first full Ewe Bible.[66] A letter written by A. W. Schreiber on 1 November 1910 to the Secretary of the BFBS outlines the next steps that were to be taken and the request for further financial sponsorship by BFBS:

> On the 9 September [1910] Rev. Spieth and Däuble embarked for Lome, Togo, where they have since arrived. Their instructions are to complete the final revision in Afrika (sic) by the end of March 1911, with the help of three of our most capable converts: the Rev. A. Aku, the head teacher S. Quist and another teacher, named L. Adzaklo, who had already been assisting Mr. Spieth's labours in Germany until about a year ago. In addition to these a church elder from the Keta District, and another from an inland place will take part in the work of revision.[67]

For this revision work, the Bremen Mission requested "that the British and Foreign Bible Society would once more allow the sum of 4000 Marks for Missionary Spieth for 1911, as well as 2000 Marks for each of (. . .) 1912 and 1913 (. . .)".[68]

The full Ewe Bible was eventually printed in Dinglingen, Baden in 1914; however, publication was delayed due to World War I. With the permission of the British colonial administration, however, the first 200 copies were dispatched from Berlin to Amsterdam and from Amsterdam via London to Lomé.[69] The BFBS Berlin agent A. Hartkopf wrote to the Bremen Mission on 30 July 1915 as follows, "(. . .) today I sent 200 Ewe Bibles bound in rexine to the Dutch Bible Society in Amsterdam for onward shipment via London to the North German Mission in Lome (Togo)".[70] On 26 October 1915, the Bremen Mission replied to Hartkopf indicating, "From the reports of our Superintendent Bürgi in Lome, we conclude that the 200 Ewe Bibles have (. . .) safely arrived".[71]

The Ewe Bible was well received in Togoland and on the Gold Coast (now Ghana). A letter from the BFBS West African Agent A. W. Banfield on 26 December 1916 described how well the Christians in Lomé, Agu, Amedzofe, Ho, and Quitta [i.e., Keta] received the Ewe Bible and claimed: "the Ewe Bible is now a standard work and that the idiom is as perfect as it can be made".[72] Similarly, a correspondence of the Bremen Missionary Rev. K. Freybürger, on 7 February 1916 to the BFBS indicates that, on the Gold Coast, the Ewe Bible arrived at the beginning of 1916: "On the 26th January 1916 there was a great, great day for Quitta [Keta] and its surroundings as far as the Ewe Language is spoken and understood. It was the day of the Arrival of the Holy Bible in the Vernacular of the Ewe people".[73]

That the Ewe Bible was that well received reveals the quality of work Adzaklo and Spieth and the others did.[74] Precisely, this is the reason for reconstructing this history of the Ewe Bible: to highlight the productive agency of mother-tongue Bible translators like Ludwig Adzaklo and to interrogate the colonial-missionary paradox of describing him as a *Sprachgehilfe*, notwithstanding his competence and agency in the project. Hence the last section, following the postcolonial framework of recovery and construction of colonised knowledge, we will critically interrogate his depictions in the archival materials, arguing for his recognition as a mother-tongue co-translator of the Ewe Bible alongside Spieth.

6. Ludwig Adzaklo: A Co-Translator by Role but a *Sprachgehilfe* by Status

It has already been stated in the previous sections that the colonial-missionary paradox of seeing Adzaklo as co-translator in terms of his essential role but naming him as *Sprachgehilfe* in terms his status on the BFBS-funded Ewe Old Testament translation project in Tübingen emerges from the archival data used for this study. Among the relevant archives, the already cited report of Spieth to the BFBS is of utmost importance, as it presents in one medium the opportunity to look back at the five years of the translation work between Spieth and Adzaklo. The twelve-paged, eleven-numbered-paragraphed report is detailed, eloquently written, and structured to impress and convince the BFBS for further support of the project.

A close reading of this document reveals Spieth's perception of Adzaklo and his role in the translation project. On the one hand, insofar as the actual work of translation is concerned, Spieth's language in the report, subtly yet strongly, suggests that he considered Adzaklo as a partner, indeed as a co-translator. On the other hand, conceptually, he did not hesitate to label Adzaklo as his "native assistant". Discussing this conspicuous colonial-missionary tension requires a close analysis of the language of the report itself. Spieth's recognition of Adzaklo as a co-translator on the project emerges from his frequent use of the first-person plural, "we," "us," "our," in various sections of his report. For instance, in paragraph 6, he stated and explained "favourable" factors that contributed to the success of the Ewe Bible translation in Tübingen: "Several favourable circumstances have worked together for the successful performance of our task".[75] The phrase, "our task" is noteworthy, because it is stated in contrast to the previous Ewe translations which Spieth had discredited in paragraphs 2, 4–5 as having an "(. . .) altogether unfinished and partly rather faulty character".[76] Therefore, "our task," stated differently, refers to the translation

work of Spieth and Adzaklo—a collective task. Similarly, in explaining the translation principles that they followed, Spieth constructed his opening sentence of paragraph 7 as follows, "The principl[e]s that have guided us in our work may be briefly summ[a]rised as follows (. . .)".[77] Again, indicative are the words "us" and "our work". Spieth thought in terms of a shared responsibility borne by him and Adzaklo and not an individual one. This is even clearer when related to the opening paragraph of his report, where he stated categorically: "According to instructions received about five years ago, the work entrusted to me was the revision of the Old Testament in Ewe".[78] In other words, formally, he does not forget that the task was assigned to him. However, in its execution, he understood it as "our work," that is, he and Adzaklo.

Additionally, in paragraph 8, he described their daily translation routine and its challenges as follows:

Some portions offered almost insurmountable difficulties and took us a particularly long time. Such portions are for instance the description of the Tabernacle, the building of Solomon's temple and houses of the forest of Lebanon. Here we were not unfrequently at a loss for suitable terms of architecture and ornaments. In the book of Job, the Psalms and the prophet Isayah (sic) their respective deep ideas offered problems of a different kind, which however I believe we were enabled to solve satisfactorily. At present we are doing the prophet Ezekiel, whose grant descriptions or word-paintings offer to the translator problems of particular difficulty.[79]

Clearly in this excerpt, Spieth thought in terms of a collective approach in which he and Adzaklo faced together peculiar mother-tongue Bible translation difficulties and resolved them together, as the added italicised sections demonstrate. Even more obvious in relation to our observation is the point: "At present we are doing the prophet Ezekiel". Stated differently, "we are translating the prophet Ezekiel". This is remarkable because, one may contend that his use of the first-person plural is stylistic and may not reflect how Spieth thought of his working relationship with Adzaklo. However, based on this evidence, it is clear that he was relating that he and Adzaklo were co-translating Ezekiel and, by extension, the Ewe Old Testament.

Another compelling evidence is presented in the following excerpt (from paragraph 8 of the report), "A few words may be said on the subject of procedure. We have tried to make the best possible use of our time. Daily the time from 8–12 A.M. and from 3–7 P.M. was for the most part employed for the work of translation between myself and Ludwig Adzaklo". Hard to overlook here is that by stating "the work of translation between myself and Ludwig Adzaklo", Spieth was inevitably expressing Adzaklo's co-agency in the translation project. It was clear to him that the actual work of translation was a shared task between himself and young Adzaklo, just as it was obvious to him that after the occasion of translation, the preparatory work was equally divided between him and Adzaklo, namely that he went to "(. . .) study the Hebrew Text to be translated on the following day", while Adzaklo prepared a "(. . .) fair copy of the portions already translated". Stated differently, he and Adzaklo spent eight hours daily co-translating and the post-translation hours in the evenings were used for their respective translation-related preparatory tasks. Finally, because he recognised Adzaklo as a co-translator, Spieth asserted in paragraph 9 as follows, "Our translation should, of course, be subjected to careful a re-examination and for this purpose a final reading in the Togo country will be urgently needed". Only in terms of an existing understanding of co-translatorship could Spieth describe the output of their work in Tübingen as, "our translation"—indicating shared ownership.

Beyond this report, he expressed the same view of Adzaklo's role in the translation work in his lectures. For example, in his 1907 lecture on the Ewe Bible translation, he indicated, "Since 1904, Teacher Ludw. Adzaklo from Togo and I have also, in service of the British Bible Society, been occupied with partly translating the Old Testament into the Ewe language and partly revising earlier translations" (Spieth 1907, p. 1). Noteworthy is "Teacher Ludw. Adzaklo (. . .) and I (. . .) translating the Old Testament into the Ewe language". He could not have expressed Adzaklo's co-translatorship of the Ewe Bible any

better than this. That he even added the professional title "Teacher" to Adzaklo's name is indicative of this fact and, by extension, acknowledging Adzaklo's educational background, which made him capable for the work.

It is obvious from the foregoing that in terms of the actual work of translation, for Spieth, Adzaklo was co-translating the Ewe Old Testament with him in Tübingen. In tension with this, however, is Spieth's conceptual difficulty in describing him as such. Theoretically, Adzaklo remained for Spieth nothing more than "the native assistant who was placed at my disposal by the North German Missionary Society"[80] or "my assistant . . . [who is] busy with preparing a fair copy of the portions already translated".[81] Interestingly, the switch from a co-translator to "assistant" occurred frequently in the same paragraph or document. As can be seen, in the same report where he clearly presented Adzaklo as a co-translator, he also described him with subordinate, inferior terms such as assistant. Even in the referenced lecture where, doubtlessly, he considered Adzaklo as a co-translator, he later described him as Gehilfe (Spieth 1907, p. 6). From a postcolonial perspective, however, the analysis presented here strongly suggests that the term "*Sprachgehilfe*" should be jettisoned. Instead, Ludwig Adzaklo should be recognised as an early twentieth-century Ewe mother-tongue Bible translator of the Bremen Mission who worked together with Jakob Spieth on the BFBS-sponsored Ewe Old Testament translation project in Tübingen.

7. Conclusions

The hypothesis of this study was that Ludwig Adzaklo, a Togolese school teacher and Bible translator for the Bremen Mission, was a co-translator of the Old Testament into Ewe alongside missionary Jakob Spieth in the early twentieth century and that he was not just as *Sprachgehilfe* with an auxiliary role on that project. Being a *Sprachgehilfe* was an imposition stemming from the purpose for which the Bremen Mission trained teachers (among other professional groups)—to assist the missionaries on the mission field—and not based on his competence and his essential role in the translation project. The postcolonial analysis of the archival data in this study supports the claim that Adzaklo should be considered retrospectively as an early Ewe mother-tongue Bible translator and a colleague of Spieth, who has long been considered as the "great Bible translator of the Ewe people" (Ohly 1920) at the expense of Adzaklo. Seeing Adzaklo this way, however, implies a simultaneous jettisoning of the colonial-missionary imposed description, *Sprachgehilfe*, which will allow for a comprehensive view and analysis of his role in the history of Christianity in West Africa. For his essential role in missionary Bible translation was part of the necessary factors in the successful production of mother-tongue Bibles in West Africa in the early twentieth century. As noted, the availability of the Bible in African mother tongues contributed significantly to the indigenisation of Christianity on the continent, a process that has led scholars to view Christianity as an African religion (Bediako 2014). It follows, therefore, that Adzaklo and others like him made the initial contributions to the emergence of an Africanised Christianity, even though, unlike their European missionary colleagues, their contributions have been less researched. Additionally, the relevance of the Ewe Bible as a foremost part of the intellectual heritage of the Ewe people and the success of Ewe Christianity in West Africa are equally to be seen in light of the significant contributions of early Ewe translators like Adzaklo. Therefore, this study contributes to the surging research attention on mother-tongue translators and thus encourages further studies of their roles, for instance, in the context of the globalisation of knowledge and the trans- and intercultural processes during the colonial-missionary era.

Funding: This research was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation), grant number 508233363 (Global Bible: British and German Bible Societies Translating Colonialism, 1800–1914). I acknowledge support from the Open Access Publication Fund of the University of Münster.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/archival sources under references, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author/s.

Acknowledgments: I acknowledge the constructive reviews provided by the project PI, PD Felicity Jensz, during the preparation of the paper for publication. Further acknowledgement goes to Sven Heidenreich, one of our student research assistants on the project, who proofread the manuscript. Additionally, I acknowledge the administrative support of the Center for Religion and Modernity at the University of Münster. The staff of the Staatsarchiv Bremen (Bremen State Archives) provided valuable assistance during the archival research for this paper, for which I am grateful.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

Notes

1 Several works on Spieth and his work in West Africa exist; see (Hübner 2020; Yigbe 2011; Ustorf 2011; Ohly 1920).
2 On postcolonial perspectives on Bible translation in Africa, see (Mbuwayesango 2019; Israel 2020).
3 Staatsarchiv Bremen (StAB) 7. 1025 29/5 Eingeborene Mitarbeiter in Deutschland. The study did not find documentation on his year of death.
4 With whom he would later work as a Bible translator.
5 Also, unless otherwise indicated, English translations of the German archival materials were done by me.
6 StAB 7.1025 Fotos 0316.
7 A special group among the Ewe teachers was the first batch of Ewe students who were educated in Württemberg by the Bremen Mission in 1884–1900 (see, Azamede 2010; Meyer 2002).
8 His letters can be found in the Bremen State Archives, StAB 7.1025, 29/5 Eingeborene Mitarbeiter in Deutschland.
9 StAB 7. 1025 29/5 Eingeborene Mitarbeiter in Deutschland, Letter Ludwig Adzaklo (Tübingen) to Mission Inspector A. W. Schreiber (Bremen), 2 November 1905.
10 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Adzaklo to Schreiber 14 November 1906. cf. Yigbe (2014, pp. 172–73).
11 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Adzaklo to Schreiber, 14 November 1906.
12 Related to German is his knowledge of biblical languages. Even though the study did not find explicit evidence that he learnt the biblical languages, the fact that biblical studies formed part of the curriculum of his education allows for the speculation that he could most likely have been introduced to these languages.
13 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Adzaklo to Schreiber, 2 November 1905.
14 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Adzaklo to Schreiber, 2 November 1905.
15 Kirchheim unter Teck is in Baden-Württemberg in Germany.
16 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Adzaklo to Schreiber, 18 July 1907.
17 On these gods see Venkatachalam (2015).
18 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Adzaklo to Schreiber, 2 November 1905.
19 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Adzaklo to Schreiber, 2 November 1905.
20 Oberhausen is in the German state of North-Rhine Westphalia.
21 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Adzaklo to Schreiber, 8 April 1908.
22 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Adzaklo to Schreiber, Mein Besuch bei der Groß-Herzogin von Oldenburg, April 1907.
23 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Adzaklo to Schreiber 8 April 1908.
24 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Adzaklo to Schreiber, April 1907. Unfortunately, this is where the archival material ends, and the continuation has not yet been found in the source at the time writing.
25 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Adzaklo to Schreiber, 2 November 1905.
26 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Adzaklo to Schreiber, 4 May 1908.
27 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Adzaklo to Schreiber 2 May 1907.
28 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Adzaklo to Schreiber, 14 November 1906.
29 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Adzaklo to Schreiber, 24 July 1906.
30 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Adzaklo to Schreiber 26 October 1907.
31 StAB 7.1025 60/2, Personalakten zu Mitarbeitern der Norddeutschen Missionsgesellschaft Binder, Johannes, Letter Adzaklo to Schreiber, 31 December 1907.
32 Translating into a monthly allowance of a little above 300 Marks.
33 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Adzaklo to Schreiber, 2 November 1905.
34 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Adzaklo to Schreiber, 16 November 1905.

35 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Adzaklo to Schreiber, 14 November 1906.
36 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Adzaklo to Schreiber, 4 May 1908.
37 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Jakob Spieth to A. W. Schreiber, 18 (?) May 1908.
38 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Spieth to Schreiber, 8 May 1908.
39 Depending on whether one based the calculation on Adzaklo's 2.50 Marks or Spieth's 3 Marks figure.
40 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Adzaklo to Schreiber, 30 January 1907.
41 StAB 7.1025 60/2, Adzaklo to Schreiber, 31 December 1907.
42 StAB 7.1025 60/2, Adzaklo to Schreiber, 31 December 1907.
43 StAB 7.1025 60/2, Adzaklo to Schreiber, 31 December 1907.
44 StAB 7.1025 60/2, Adzaklo to Schreiber, 31 December 1907.
45 StAB 7.1025 60/2, Adzaklo to Schreiber, 31 December 1907.
46 Admittedly, Wiegräbe makes a positive assessment of the role of the Ewe translators in Togoland as he dedicates space in earlier sections of his book to recognising their contribution. He calls them "Mund und Ohr der Missionare" (the mouth and ear of the missionaries) (see Wiegräbe 1970, pp. 18–21).
47 "University and Colonialism: The Case of Göttingen." It is hosted by the Chair of Modern History, late Prof. Dr. Rebekka Habermas, at the University of Göttingen.
48 Moreover, they also use the colonial-missionary description, *Gehilfe*, in relation to Adzaklo (p. 23), even though in the broader light of their presentation they would totally reject such a description.
49 Emphasis added.
50 Emphasis added.
51 A pioneering study on this is given by Ekem (2011).
52 Certainly, Ewe has different dialects, and it was the coastal dialect, Anlo, that eventually became standardised through the linguistic activities of the Bremen missionaries. For further discussions see (Meyer 2002; Ansre 1974).
53 Admittedly, unlike Adzaklo, John Wright was not an Ewe but a Ga (see Ekem 2011).
54 "Übersetzt aus dem Griechischen Urtext." For more on other missionary translators like J. Binder, J. Knüsli, see (Ekem 2011) and (Wiegräbe 1970).
55 Cambridge University Library (CUL), GBR/0374/BFBS/BSA/E3/3/144/1, BFBS Archives, Records of the Editorial/Translations Department 1830–1996, Correspondence: Language files, 1908–1996, Ewe 1909-03–1986-01, Letter Jakob Spieth to Superintendent of the Translating and Editorial Department (TED), 18 April 1909.
56 A joint letter from Adzaklo and his Ewe colleague Gottfried Anipatse (who worked with Dietrich Westermann) to the mission inspector in April 1905 suggests that Adzaklo was already in Tübingen a month prior to the commencement of the translation project. See, StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Ludwig Adzaklo and Gottfried Anipatse to Schreiber, April 1905.
57 CUL, GBR/0374/BFBS/BSA/E3/3/144/1, Spieth to Superintendent of the TED, 18 April 1909.
58 CUL, GBR/0374/BFBS/BSA/E3/3/144/1, Spieth to Superintendent of the TED, 18 April 1909.
59 Spieth's description of the indigenous co-translators like John Wright, Aaron Onipayede, among others.
60 CUL, GBR/0374/BFBS/BSA/E3/3/144/1, Spieth to Superintendent of the TED, 18 April 1909.
61 CUL, GBR/0374/BFBS/BSA/E3/3/144/1, Spieth to Superintendent of the TED, 18 April 1909.
62 CUL, GBR/0374/BFBS/BSA/E3/3/144/1, Spieth to Superintendent of the TED, 18 April 1909.
63 CUL, GBR/0374/BFBS/BSA/E3/3/144/1, Spieth to TED, 18 April 1909.
64 Alluding to Gen 2:23.
65 StAB 7. 1025 29/5, Adzaklo to Schreiber, 2 September 1909.
66 CUL, GBR/0374/BFBS/BSA/E3/3/144/1, Mission Director A. W. Schreiber to Secretary of the BFBS, 1 November 1910.
67 CUL, GBR/0374/BFBS/BSA/E3/3/144/1, Schreiber to Secretary of the BFBS, 1 November 1910.
68 CUL, GBR/0374/BFBS/BSA/E3/3/144/1, Schreiber to Secretary of the BFBS, 1 November 1910.
69 StAB, 7.1025, 119/2 Druck von Ewebüchern, insbesondere der Bibel (BFBS), Letter A. Hartkopf to Norddeutsche Missionsgesellschaft, 30 July 1915.
70 StAB, 7.1025, 119/2, Hartkopf to Norddeutsche Missionsgesellschaft, 30 July 1915.
71 StAB, 7.1025, 119/2, E. Ohly to A. Hartkopf, 26 October 1915.
72 CUL, GBR/0374/BFBS/BSA/E3/3/144/1, A. W. Banfield to Dr. R. Kilgour, 26 December 1916.
73 CUL, GBR/0374/BFBS/BSA/E3/3/144/1, Rev. K. Freybürger to Dr. R. Kilgour, 7 February 1916.

[74] The 1913 Ewe Bible was revised with orthographic changes and in the post-independence era, the Bible Society of Ghana has produced new translations of the Ewe Bible (Ekem 2011). Existing studies find significant faults with missionary translations, see Amevenku (2023).

[75] CUL, GBR/0374/BFBS/BSA/E3/3/144/1, Spieth to Superintendent of the TED, 18 April 1909.

[76] CUL, GBR/0374/BFBS/BSA/E3/3/144/1, Spieth to Superintendent of the TED, 18 April 1909.

[77] CUL, GBR/0374/BFBS/BSA/E3/3/144/1, Spieth to Superintendent of the TED, 18 April 1909.

[78] CUL, GBR/0374/BFBS/BSA/E3/3/144/1, Spieth to Superintendent of the TED, 18 April 1909.

[79] CUL, GBR/0374/BFBS/BSA/E3/3/144/1, Spieth to Superintendent of the TED, 18 April 1909. Emphasis added.

[80] CUL, GBR/0374/BFBS/BSA/E3/3/144/1, Spieth to Superintendent of the TED, 18 April 1909.

[81] CUL, GBR/0374/BFBS/BSA/E3/3/144/1, Spieth to Superintendent of the TED, 18 April 1909.

References

Archival Sources

Cambridge University Library (CUL), GBR/0374/BFBS/BSA/E3/3/144/1, BFBS Archives, Records of the Editorial/Translations Department 1830–1996, Correspondence: Language files, 1908–1996, Ewe 1909-03–1986-01.

North German Missionary Society Archives.

Staatsarchiv Bremen (StAB) 7. 1025 29/5 Eingeborene Mitarbeiter in Deutschland.

StAB 7.1025 60/2, Personalakten zu Mitarbeitern der Norddeutschen Missionsgesellschaft Binder, Johannes.

StAB, 7.1025, 119/2 Druck von Ewebüchern, insbesondere der Bibel (BFBS).

Secondary Sources

Adzaklo, Ludwig. 1909. Abschiedsrede des Sprachgehilfen Ludwig Adzaklo. In *Quartalblatt der Norddeutschen Missionsgesellchaft IV*, 4th ed. Bremen: Norddeutsche Missionsgesellschaft.

Alsheimer, Rainer. 2007. *Zwischen Sklaverei und Christlicher Ethnogenese: Die Vorkoloniale Missionierung der Ewe in Westafrika (1847–ca. 1890)*. Münster: Waxmann.

Amevenku, Frederick Mawusi. 2023. Mother-Tongue Biblical Hermeneutics and the Pursuit of Ethnic Harmony in Ghana. *Religions* 14: 1491. [CrossRef]

Ansre, Gilbert. 1974. Language Standardisation in Sub-Saharan Africa. In *Advances in Language Planning*. Edited by Joshua A. Fishman. Contributions to the Sociology of Language. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, vol. 5, pp. 369–90. [CrossRef]

Azamede, Kokou. 2010. *Transkulturationen? Ewe-Christen zwischen Deutschland und Westafrika, 1884–1939*. Missionsgeschichtliches Archiv. Stuttgart: Steiner, vol. 14.

Bediako, Kwame. 2014. *Christianity in Africa: The Renewal of a Non-Western Religion*. Trends in African Christianity. Akropong-Akwapem: Regnum Africa.

Dube, Musa W. 1997. Toward a Postcolonial Feminist Interpretation of the Bible. In *Reading the Bible as Women: Perspectives from Africa, Asia and Latin America*. Edited by Phyllis Ann Bird. Semeia 78. Atlanta: Scholars Press, pp. 11–26.

Ekem, John D. K. 2011. *Early Scriptures of the Gold Coast (Ghana): The Historical, Linguistic, and Theological Settings of the Ga, Twi, Mfantse, and Ewe Bibles*. History of Bible Translation 2. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Feierabend, Albert. n.d. Intermediaries. Universität und Kolonialismus—Das Beispiel Göttingen. Available online: https://www.goettingenkolonial.uni-goettingen.de/index.php/lehre/personen/intermediaries (accessed on 23 November 2023).

Habermas, Rebekka, and Alexandra Przyrembel. 2013. Einleitung. In *Von Käfern, Märkten und Menschen: Kolonialismus und Wissen*. Edited by Rebekka Habermas and Alexandra Przyrembel. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 9–24.

Habermas, Rebekka. n.d. Home. Universität und Kolonialismus—Das Beispiel Göttingen. Available online: https://www.goettingenkolonial.uni-goettingen.de/index.php (accessed on 23 November 2023).

Hübner, Sabine. 2020. Spieth, Jakob Andreas. In *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*. Nordhausen: Verlag Traugott Bautz GmbH, vol. XLI, Available online: https://www.bbkl.de/index.php/frontend/lexicon/S/Sp-Sq/spieth-jakob-andreas-84087 (accessed on 22 November 2023).

Israel, Hephzibah. 2020. Competing Narratives on Bible Translation in India: Missionary Linguistics, Postcolonial Criticism, and Translation Studies. In *The Oxford Handbook of Postcolonial Biblical Criticism*. Edited by Rasiah S. Sugirtharajah. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 471–94. [CrossRef]

Jensz, Felicity. 2016. Non-European Teachers in Mission Schools: Introduction. *Itinerario* 40: 389–403. [CrossRef]

Jones, Adam, and Anne-Sophie Arnold. 2003. *Berichte einer Exkursion nach Süd-Ghana*. Excursion 3. Leipziger Beiträge zur Geschichte und Kultur in Afrika. Leipzig: University of Leipzig. Available online: https://d-nb.info/125018648X/34 (accessed on 2 November 2023).

Kahl, Werner. 2007. *Jesus als Lebensretter: Westafrikanische Bibelinterpretationen und ihre Relevanz für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*. New Testament Studies in Contextual Exegesis 2. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Lartey, Emmanuel Y. 2022. 'Postcolonial Studies in Practical Theology'. In *Postcolonial Studies in Practical Theology*. Edited by Birgit Weyel, Wilhelm Gräb, Emmanuel Lartey and Cas Wepener. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, pp. 661–76. [CrossRef]

Manus, Ukachukwu C. 2017. The Bible in African Christianity. In *Christianity in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Edited by Kenneth R. Ross, Kwabena J. Asamoah-Gyadu and Todd M. Johnson. Edinburgh Companions to Global Christianity. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 304–10.

Mbuwayesango, Dora R. 2019. Bible Translation in the Colonial Project in Africa and Its Impact on African Languages and Cultures. In *The Oxford Handbook of Postcolonial Biblical Criticism*. Edited by Rasiah S. Sugirtharajah. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 495–509. [CrossRef]

Meyer, Birgit. 2002. Christianity and the Ewe Nation: German Pietist Missionaries, Ewe Converts and the Politics of Culture. *Journal of Religion in Africa* 32: 167–99. [CrossRef]

Ohly, Emil. 1920. *Andreas Jakob Spieth: Der Bibelübersetzer des Ewevolkes: Ein Lebensbild*. Bremen: Verlag der Norddeutschen Missionsgesellschaft.

Pugach, Sara Elizabeth Berg. 2012. *Africa in Translation: A History of Colonial Linguistics in Germany and Beyond, 1814–1945*. Social History, Popular Culture, and Politics in Germany. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Sanneh, Lamin O. 2009. Translating the Message: The Missionary Impact on Culture, 2nd ed.American Society of Missiology Series/American Society of Missiology 42. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.

Spieth, Jakob. 1906a. *Die Ewe-Stämme: Material zur Kunde des Ewe-Volkes in Deutsch-Togo*. Berlin: Reimer.

Spieth, Jakob. 1906b. *Die Religiösen Vorstellungen der Eweer: Vortrag auf dem II. Kolonial-Kongreß*. Bremer Missionsschriften 17. Bremen: Verlag der Norddeutschen Missions-Gesellschaft.

Spieth, Jakob. 1907. *Die Übersetzung der Bibel in die Sprache eines Westafrikanischen Naturvolkes*. Flugschriften der Hanseatisch-Oldenburgischen Missions-Konferenz/Hanseatisch-Oldenburgische Missions-Konferenz 9. Bremen: Morgenbesser.

Stadtmuseum Tübingen. n.d. Missionsgehilfe in Tübingen: Ludwig Adzaklo. Koloniale Orte in Tübingen. Available online: https://koloniale-orte-tuebingen.de/index.html (accessed on 7 November 2023).

Sugirtharajah, Rasiah S. 1999. A Brief Memorandum on Postcolonialism and Biblical Studies. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 21: 3–5. [CrossRef]

Sugirtharajah, Rasiah S. 2010. *The Bible and the Third World: Pre-Colonial, Colonial and Postcolonial Encounters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sugirtharajah, Rasiah S. 2022. Introduction: The Bible, Empires, and Postcolonial Criticism. In *The Oxford Handbook of Postcolonial Biblical Criticism*. Edited by Rasiah S. Sugirtharajah. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1–22. [CrossRef]

Ustorf, Werner. 2011. The Missionary's Progress. Evolving Images of "Self" and "Other" in the Career of Jakob Spieth (1856–1914). In *Protestant Missions and Local Encounters in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. Edited by Hilde Nielssen, Inger Marie Okkenhaug and Karina Hestad-Skeie. Studies in Christian Mission. Leiden: Brill, vol. 40, pp. 71–85. Available online: https://brill.com/display/book/edcoll/9789004207691/Bej.9789004202986.i-337_005.xml (accessed on 24 January 2024).

Venkatachalam, Meera. 2015. *Slavery, Memory and Religion in Southeastern Ghana, c.1850–Present*. The International African Library. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [CrossRef]

Wiegräbe, Paul. 1970. *Gott Spricht auch Ewe: Geschichte einer Bibelübersetzung*. Breklumer Hefte 1. Breklum: Christian Jensen Verlag Breklum.

Yigbe, Dotsé. 2011. Jakob Spieth—Forscher und Übersetzer. In *Zeitgemäß: Das ist unsere Mission. 175 Jahre Norddeutsche Mission 1836–2011*. Edited by Hannes Menke and Antje Wodtke. Bremen: Edition Temmen, pp. 114–16.

Yigbe, Dotsé. 2017. Is Togo a Permanent Model Colony? In *The Cultural Legacy of German Colonial Rule*. Edited by Klaus Mühlhahn. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, pp. 97–112. [CrossRef]

Yigbe, Gilbert Dotsé. 2014. Von Gewährsleuten zu Gehilfen und Gelehrigen. Der Beitrag Afrikanischer Mitarbeiter zur Entstehung einer Verschrifteten Kultur in Deutsch-Togo. In *Mission Global: Eine Verflechtungsgeschichte seit dem 19. Jahrhundert*. Edited by Rebekka Habermas and Richard Hölzl. Köln: Böhlau Verlag, pp. 159–75.