W. GERALD KENDRICK

AUTHORITY, WOMEN, AND ANGELS
Translating 1 Corinthians 11.10

The author is a UBS Translation Consultant based in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

The Greek of 1 Cor 11.10 reads: *dia touto opheilei hē gunē exousian echein epi tēs kephalēs dia tous angelous*. The meaning of each individual word is clear, yet how to determine what the sentence says as a whole, and to interpret it in its context, is widely regarded as one of the most difficult problems of the New Testament. Questions arise particularly about the meaning of *exousia*, whether the preposition *epi* means "on" or "over," and the identification of *tous angelous*. This paper surveys the ways these components of the sentence have been dealt with, and gives special attention to what seem to be the two most viable proposals for translating the verse.

Translating *exousia*

1. One explanation views *exousia* as a metonym for "veil." The primary meaning of *exousia* is "power of choice," "freedom of action," "authority," "right or ability to do something."[1] Several ancient versions and patristic witnesses, perhaps perplexed by its occurrence, assumed that *exousia* was a metonym for *kalumma*, "a veil."[2] In 1920 Gerhard Kittel suggested that Paul's use of the Greek word could be traced to an Aramaic root for "veil," which was also the root for authority, and that either through mistranslation or a deliberate pun, Paul used the word to represent "veil."[3] Werner Foerster records Kittel's conjecture[4] in his word study of *exousia*, and it is also noted without attribution to Kittel in a comment on the verse in NAB. Various scholars, however have raised a difficulty about Kittel's explanation: how would Greeks in the city of Corinth, who knew nothing of Aramaic, be expected to appreciate and understand the subtle derivation? In any case, RSV translates, "That is why a woman ought to have a veil on her head," and explains in a note that the veil is a symbol of authority. Note that the preposition *epi* is understood as "on."

2. Probably the most widely held view understands *exousia* as a sign or symbol of authority to which the woman is subject. Many translations state that the woman should have this sign or symbol on her head, without specifying who exercises the authority (ASV, NASB, NIV, NRSV, SpCL). Other translations specifically state that the authority is exercised by the man (or husband) over the woman (or wife). For example, TEV has, "On account of the angels, then, a woman should have a covering on her head to show that she is under her husband's authority." Similar translations include Moffatt, Goodspeed, Phillips, FrCL, and CEV. NJB differs in

1 See J.H. Moulton and George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament*, 1930; Walter Bauer, W.F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, F.W. Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 2d ed., Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1979.

2 Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, London & New York: United Bible Societies 1975, 562.

3 The relevant information is summarized in Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of 1 Cor 11.10," 193-94, in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, Missoula, Montana: SBL 1974; published originally in *NTS* 4 (1957-58) 48-58.

4 *TDNT* 2:574.

not naming who exercises the authority—"and this is why it is right for a woman to wear on her head a sign of authority over her"—but within the context leaves no doubt that the man exercises authority over the woman.

Although Robertson and Plummer give the paraphrase, "For this reason she ought, by covering her head, publicly to acknowledge her subjection,"[1] they are puzzled by Paul's language, and seem to be of two minds about it. On the one hand they write, "This passage is unique, no satisfactory parallel having been found. There is no real doubt as to its meaning, which is clear from the context. The difficulty is to see why the Apostle has expressed himself in this extraordinary manner. That 'authority' *(exousia)* is put for 'sign of authority' is not difficult; but why does St. Paul say 'authority' when he means 'subjection'?" They suggest that the woman "is morally bound to have [the mark of *his*] authority on her head" but a few sentences later say "the word in square brackets can scarcely be the true explanation."[2]

3. Finally what appeals to Robertson and Plummer is William M. Ramsey's explanation that *exousia* is a mark of dignity and honor. Ramsey rejects outright a passive understanding of *exousia*, that is, that the woman wears on her head a symbol of authority to which she is subject. This he says is "a preposterous idea which a Greek scholar would laugh at anywhere except in the New Testament, where (as they seem to think) Greek words may mean anything that commentators choose."[3] Paul uses *exousia* for veil because "the woman who has a veil on her head wears authority on her head." For the Eastern woman, Ramsey continues, "the veil is the power and the honor and dignity of the woman. With the veil on her head, she can go anywhere in security and profound respect... But without the veil, the woman is a thing of nought, whom any one may insult... A woman's authority and dignity vanish along with the all-covering veil that she discards."[4] Morna Hooker notes that this view is adopted in the NEB marginal reading, "therefore a woman should keep her dignity on her head, for fear of the angels," but she correctly regards this as a forced meaning, irrelevant to the context.[5] Gordon Fee rejects Ramsey's explanation on two counts.[6] The veil imagined is one that covers the face and head completely, but the evidence that such a veil was worn in New Testament times is lacking, and the discussion in 1 Corinthians is not about a woman's general appearance in public, but about her praying and prophesying in the Christian assembly.

If Ramsey is incorrect in suggesting "dignity" for its meaning, he expresses a correct insight about an active sense for *exousia*. Fee observes[7] that the word occurs 103 times in the New Testament[8], always in the active sense, and that the same thing holds for the word's occurrences in the LXX, Philo and Josephus; further the

1 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians*, 2d ed., ICC, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark 1914, 227.

2 *Ibid.*, 232.

3 W.M. Ramsey, *The Cities of St. Paul: Their Influence on His Life and Thought*, London 1907; reprint Grand Rapids: Baker 1960, 203.

4 *Ibid.*, 203-205.

5 Morna Hooker, "Authority on Her Head: An Examination of 1 Cor. xi.10," *NTS* 10 (1963/64), 413.

6 Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NIC, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1987, 520, n 26.

7 *Ibid.*, 519; *cf. TOB*, note *a* to 1 Cor 11.10.

8 For a convenient listing, see W.F. Moulton, A.S. Geden, H.K. Moulton, *A Greek Concordance to the New Testament*, 5th ed. rev.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark 1978.

idiom "to have authority over" (*exousian echein epi*) is always used of authority exercised, never of authority submitted to.

To this point then we may state the following. In translating the sentence, *exousia* should not be construed as a metonym for "veil," nor should it be construed as having the meaning "subjection," the very opposite of what is intended; neither does it mean "dignity." Statements either in the translation itself, or supplied as a note, to the effect that the woman must wear on her head a sign of subjection to the man (or to her husband), do not provide implicit information, but rather incorrect information. Before considering two more promising proposals for dealing with the verse, we pause to examine the phrase *dia tous angelous*, since something more than a literal rendering "because of the angels" is involved in one of them.

Who are the angels?

1. A frequent suggestion, going back at least to Tertullian[1], is that these are evil or fallen angels, or angels with the potential for becoming evil, who are sexually attracted to the women. They are usually equated with beings like "the sons of God" of Gen 6.1-2, who took for themselves the daughters of men. It is urged that the reason Paul requires the woman to wear a veil or power on her head is in order to avoid inciting lust in these beings. Against this suggestion, one may ask how would these angels carry out their lust?[2] Does Paul think the women are actually in danger, because the angels are going to take some sort of physical form and attack them? How is a head-covering going to stop angels from seeing the charms of the women? Some have suggested that a veil functioned as a kind of charm to frighten away such beings, but there is no evidence that a veil was so used.[3] Why, some ask, would angels be tempted by the women only during worship? Would not the women be most safe from such intrusions when engaged in prophecy and prayer?[4] Robertson and Plummer hold that the occurrence of the Greek article rules out evil angels, since in all other cases in the New Testament *hoi angeloi* means good angels.[5]

2. From time to time it has been suggested that the angels are human messengers. A recent proponent of this interpretation, Jerome Murphy-O'Conner, changing his earlier views set forth in a 1980 article,[6] now says that the angels are envoys from other churches, who must not be scandalized by the conduct and dress of women.[7] He cites Gal 4.14; Lk 7.24; 9.52 to substantiate this. The two references from Luke do refer to human messengers, but Gal 4.14 seems more likely to be a reference to a divine being than to a human messenger.[8]

3. Fitzmyer presents a more plausible interpretation than either of the above. He picks up on James Moffatt's suggestion that Paul had in mind a midrash on Gen 1.26-27, which described the angels as mediators of Torah, as in Gal 3.19, and also

1 Fitzmyer, "Qumran," 196.

2 Cf. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 521, especially note 33.

3 See the 1966 "Postscript" in Fitzmyer, "Qumran," 204, who easily refutes an assertion that b. *Shabbat* 156b establishes such a use of the veil.

4 Cf. Hooker, 412; C.K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, HNTC, New York 1968, 253; Fitzmyer, 197, points out that Paul says nothing about the "weakness" of the women making them especially susceptible to attacks from angels during periods of spiritual ecstasy.

5 *First Corinthians*, 233; they note 1 Cor 13.1; Mt 13.49; 25.31; Lk 16.22; Heb 1.4, 5.

6 In "Sex and Logic in 1 Corinthians 11.2-16," *CBQ* 42 (1980), 496-97, Murphy-O'Conner said the angels watched for breaches of the Law.

7 "The First Letter to the Corinthians," 809, in Raymond Brown, Joseph Fitzmyer, and Roland Murphy, eds., *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall 1990.

8 This is the conclusion of most modern commentators on Galatians; see e.g. Bruce, Burton, Betz.

as guardians of the created order.[1] Moffatt notes that Philo explained that the "Let us" of Gen 1.26 included the angels. Accordingly, out of respect for the angels who guard the created order, the woman should wear a veil (vv 8-9). But Moffatt also adds that the angels assisted at public worship, and Fitzmyer elicits support for this idea from two sources, the Bible, both Old and New Testaments, and Qumran.[2] For biblical support Fitzmyer cites Ps 138.1, which reads in the LXX, "before angels I sing to you,"[3] and Rev 8.3, where an angel aids God's people in offering their prayers, as pointing to angels being present and assisting in worship (also Tobit 12.12; 1 Cor 4.9; Eph 3.10; 1 Tim 5.21; Heb 1.12).

The passages from Qumran are 1QM 7.4-6 and 1QSa 2.3-11. The first of these from the *War Scroll* prohibits anyone with any kind of defect from participating in the eschatological war, "for holy angels accompany the armies." The second speaks of exclusion from "the assembly of God" of any uncleanness or bodily defect "for the holy angels are (present) in the congregation." Fitzmyer notes similar bodily defects barred the descendants of Aaron from temple service (Lev 21.17-23). He thinks this is the most probable clue for interpreting "because of the angels" in 1 Corinthians. For women to participate in worship with uncovered heads would be regarded as indecent to the angels, and equivalent to a bodily defect.

A note in 1 Cor 11.10 in TOB cites Deut 23.15 [Heb], which says that because the Lord travels with Israel, the camp must be holy, devoid of any indecency. According to this note the Qumran citations have replaced the name of God with the angels out of respect for divine transcendence, and Paul has used the same procedure here, replacing God's name with that of the angels.[4]

4. A number of interpreters look more directly to 1 Corinthians itself for clues. Hooker appeals to 1 Cor 4.9, where angels are said to watch over human actions. She suggests that the angels of 11.10 are guardians of the natural order and wish to see that worship offered to God takes place in a fitting manner,[5] which accords with Fitzmyer's suggestion. L. Anne Jervis, noting that the creation accounts of Gen 1.26-27 and Genesis 2 are the background for Paul's teaching (see vv 3, 7-9), suggests that the angels are the cherubim who guarded the tree of life (Genesis 3; they are called angels in *Apocalypse of Moses* 27.1, 2), who now watch over the redeemed creation at worship[6]. Philip Payne appeals to 1 Cor 6.3 for the explanation. If the women are one day to be involved in the judgment of angels, then they should handle with ease less significant matters such as exercising authority over their own heads.[7] Fee suggests that the Corinthian women may have argued that they were permitted to keep their heads uncovered because they were already like the angels (7.1)[8], or were already speaking the language of angels

1 See "Qumran," 197-98; for Moffatt's views, to which Fitzmyer alludes, see Moffatt's *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, New York: Harper & Brothers 1947, 152.

2 "Qumran," 198-204.

3 This is Psalm 137 in the LXX; Robertson and Plummer, 233, had already noted this Psalm, and also Song of the Three Children, v 37, "O you angels of the Lord, bless you the Lord."

4 The reference is Deut 23.14 in most translations; NJB has a similar note. Although the TOB note says that this is "without doubt" the explanation, quite obviously a great number of scholars do have doubts.

5 "Authority," 413.

6 "'But I Want You To Know ...': Paul's Midrashic Intertextual Response to the Corinthian Worshipers (1 Cor 11.2-16)," *JBL* 112 (1993) 243-244.

7 Fee, 522, mentions Payne's interpretation.

8 That is, genderless beings without sexual desires.

(13.1)[1]. Given this situation, v 11 would caution that neither man nor woman is yet delivered from existence in the present world.

Two suggestions for translating 1 Corinthians 11.10

We now consider two proposals for translating the verse, looking first at Hooker's views,[2] which have been adopted by C.K. Barrett[3], recommended by Paul Ellingworth and Howard Hatton in their UBS Translator's Handbook,[4] and evaluated seriously in a number of other recent sources. At least two major translations, REB and GeCL, agree with Hooker's suggestions. Hooker's argument and conclusions are here summarized in some detail.

In v 3 Paul states that the head of every man is Christ, the head of the woman is man, and the head of Christ is God. Vv 4-6 are then related to this statement. The man or woman who dishonors his or her head in the literal sense brings dishonor also on his or her metaphorical head.

V 7 then introduces a new point and gives the first of the reasons picked up by *dia touto* in v 10. Man should not cover his head because he is the image and glory of God," and woman should cover her head because she is "the glory of man." Paul's argument is based on Gen 1.27, although there "image" is applied to both man and woman. Paul does not deny the image of God to woman, but ignores it as perhaps irrelevant to his immediate purpose, because he wishes to contrast "glory." Adam's glory in Jewish thought is closely linked to the image of God, indeed, is dependent upon it. Since Paul's argument hinges on glory and not image, the discussion of head-coverings deals with this word. We expect Paul to say in v 10, "For this reason she ought to have her head covered," but instead he says, "she ought to have authority on her head." The second of Paul's reasons is "because of the angels," who Hooker understands, as we saw above, to be watching to see that worship is conducted properly.

Taking a cue from Dr. Else Kahler[5] that a woman is obedient in prayer and prophecy to God alone, Hooker notes that a head-covering cannot be a symbol of obedience to her husband. If a head-covering served as a sign of obedience to God, then it would seem the man ought to wear it as well. In vv 3-6, the ideas of "shame" and "dishonor" are invoked. The man's covered head brings shame, while the woman's uncovered head brings dishonor. So how does one deal with this? Hooker answers that the context is worship, in which the concerned man and woman are engaged in prayer and prophecy. Since man's head in some way reflects God's glory, he should not attempt to mask this glory. Here Hooker calls attention to 2 Corinthians 3, where the face of Moses shone with God's glory and Moses removed the veil he was wearing when he went into the presence of God. For Paul man's head reflects God's glory in the creation and Christ's glory in the new creation. To conceal that glory would be to conceal God's glory and shame both God and Christ.

---

1 Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*, New York: Crossroad 1992, 228, says that the angels mediate the "words of prophecy" to the women in the pneumatic service where the "tongues of angels" are spoken.

2 "Authority," 410-416.

3 *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 253-255.

4 *A Translator's Handbook on Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians*, New York: United Bible Societies 1985, 218-19.

5 Here Hooker refers to Kahler's *Die Frau in den Paulinischen Briefe*, Zurich: 1960, 43ff.

The woman must wear the veil because her head somehow reflects man's glory, and it is not appropriate to show that glory in the presence of God. God himself must receive all the glory. With an uncovered head she would be glorifying man, rather than God. Hooker observes that although Paul's argument is based upon theological premises, he may have a practical expedient in mind, namely, it is likely that the men at Corinth, rather than the angels, were being attracted to the women's uncovered locks, and having their attention diverted from the worship[1].

As for why Paul uses the word *exousia*, Hooker comments that a new power has been given to woman who now participates in worship. Jewish exegesis neglected to read Gen 1.26-27 as giving power to both man and woman. As woman is now empowered both to pray and to prophesy, there is need for new authority from God. The head-covering both effaces the glory of man, and exalts the glory of God. "Far from being a symbol of the woman's subjection to man, therefore, her head-covering is what Paul calls it—authority: in prayer and prophecy she, like man, is under the authority of God. Although the differences of creation remain, and are reflected in differences of dress, it is nevertheless true that in relation to God, 'there is neither male nor female, for you are one in Christ Jesus.'"[2]

Ellingworth and Hatton[3] suggest that if Hooker's conclusions are correct, one may translate: "That is why a woman should wear on her head the sign that she is authorized to pray and declare God's message, so that the angels may know that she has this authority." To this one may compare REB, "and therefore a woman must have a sign of her authority on her head, out of regard for the angels." GeCL has supplied what is regarded as implied information about the angels watching over the decorum of the worship, "For this reason the woman must wear a head scarf as a sign of her authority, and in this way satisfy the order over which the angels watch." To indicate that *dia touto* points in both directions, as Hooker suggests, the translation might be modified to read, "For this reason and to satisfy the order over which the angels watch, the woman must wear a head scarf as a sign of her authority."

Gordon Fee thinks that Hooker has made an attractive suggestion, but he believes that it does not fully satisfy the requirements of Greek usage, so he holds out for another translation.[4] The Greek phrase *exousian echein epi* occurs only here in Paul. Elsewhere in the New Testament it is found four times in Revelation (11.6; 14.18; 16.9; 20.6) with the meaning of "to have authority over." Additionally *exousian epi*, meaning "authority over," is found five times in the New Testament (Lk 9.1; 10.19; Rev 2.26; 6.8; 22.14). Fee argues reasonably that since "over" and not "on" is the ordinary meaning of the preposition in this phrase, it should be expected to mean the same here[5]. Taking *exousia* in its ordinary sense of "freedom or right to choose" and *epi* to mean "over," Fee proposes to translate, "For this reason the woman ought to have the freedom over her head to do as she

1 "Authority," 415.

2 *Ibid.*, 416.

3 *Translator's Handbook*, 219.

4 *First Corinthians*, 520-21. Fee is as convinced as Hooker that the verse says nothing about an authority to which the woman must submit, and that she is empowered to pray and prophesy in the assembly. Indeed he challenges the interpretation that "head" in v 3 means "superior to," arguing that it rather means "source," as vv 8-9 seem to suggest.

5 *Ibid.*, 520, n 29; cf. William F. Orr and James Arthur Walther, *I Corinthians*, AB 32, New York: Doubleday 1976, 261.

wishes."[1] This is apparently also the basis of the NRSV marginal translation, "have freedom of choice regarding her head."

But Fee notes that since Paul has said that the man ought not to have his head covered, and that the woman should, one must ask why he would speak this way now, so as to apparently contradict what he has been saying. He suggests that *exousia* is doubtless one of the Corinthians' own words. In 6.12 Paul has quoted what appears to be one of their slogans, "All things are lawful (*exestin*) for me." In 8.9 he cautions the Corinthians not to let their freedom (*exousia*) become a cause of stumbling to others, and in chapter 9 he uses *exousia* repeatedly to show how one can forego rights for the greater good of the Christian community (vv 4-6, 12, 18). Quite possibly some of the Corinthians have asserted something about the right of a woman to do as she pleases with regard to covering her head, and this would account for Paul's using the unexpected word, even though the exact nature of their assertion cannot be determined. While agreeing with those who said that a woman ought to have freedom regarding her head, the apostle still suggests that for the sake of propriety, just as the man should not cover his head when praying or prophesying (vv 4, 7), so the woman should cover her head when exercising these functions[2]. Distinctions of gender should not be blurred, both because of propriety and because of the angels[3]. Just as freedom must be exercised responsibly in regard to other matters, so also in matters regarding head coverings. Like Fee I find Hooker's argument attractive, but believe that Fee has made the better case. Following his logic, one can translate, "Because of this, and on account of the angels, a woman ought to have freedom over her head to do as she wishes."[4]

Abbreviations for Bible Translations

ASV: American Standard Version
CEV (ABS): Contemporary English Version
FrCL (UBS French Common Language): Français Courant
GeCL (UBS German Common Language): Die Gute Nachricht
NASB: New American Standard Version
NIV: New International Version

1 As Fee notes, John Lightfoot had proposed this translation over a century ago in *A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica*, Oxford 1859; reprint Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1979, 236-239. It may be noted here that Katherine C. Bushnell, who was a missionary to China at the beginning of the twentieth century, published a book, *God's Word to Women* (privately printed, Oakland, Calif: 1923), in which she acknowledged indebtedness to Lightfoot at many points and recommended his translation of v 10. Her work has been accessible to me only through references in Fee's commentary and in some extended notes in Willard M. Swartley, *Slavery, Sabbath, War, and Women: Case Studies in Biblical Interpretation*, Scottdale, Penn.: Herald Press 1984. Bushnell's book is now available from Ray B. Munson, Box 52, North Collins, NY 14111.

2 Richard E. Oster, "When Men Wore Veils to Worship: the Historical Context of 1 Corinthians 11.4," *NTS* 34 (1988) 481-505, has demonstrated that there was a sizable Roman population in Corinth at the time of Paul's writing, and that the issue addressed has arisen because of Roman worship customs carried over into Christian worship, in which men covered their heads, as did Roman women. "Specifically, while praying and prophesying some men were wearing head coverings and some women were not. According to Paul, these practices should be reversed, since in his judgment the semantic significance of men covering their heads was antithetical to male 'headship' affirmed in 11.3" (504). Paul's instructions, accordingly, address practices of both men and women, and, given the Roman background, one cannot assume that the apostle is simply binding Jewish customs on a predominantly Gentile church.

3 Jervis, "Paul's Response," 246, comments, "What Paul wants his readers to know is that the unity of man and woman in Christ does not obliterate the diversity of the sexes, but rather establishes it in all its glory—and believers should not disguise this." Jervis thinks the women will properly exercise their authority by "garbing their heads in a feminine way" (244).

4 Fee, 520.

NJB: New Jerusalem Bible
NRSV: New Revised Standard Version
Phillips: New Testament translated by J.B. Phillips
RSV: Revised Standard Version
SpCL (UBS Spanish Common Language): Versión Popular
TEV (ABS/UBS): Today's English Version/Good News Bible
TOB (French Bible Society): La Bible: Traduction Œcuménique

DAVID J. CLARK

THE TRANSCRIPTION OF PROPER NAMES

The author is a UBS Translation Consultant based in Woking, England.

Introduction

The question of the transcription of proper names is one which is of growing concern in a number of projects with which I am at present associated. Yet it is also a topic which as far as I can find out, has never been dealt with in a thorough and systematic manner, at least in a UBS context.[1] It seems then that the time is ripe for a more detailed consideration of the question. The following discussion cannot hope to be exhaustive, and readers may be able to add to the list of problems raised.

Basic decision

The first decision to be made is whether the spellings in the Receptor Language (RL) are to be based on the written forms of the Hebrew and Greek names, or on the common pronunciation of those names in the RL. From a technical point of view and for academic purposes, it might be preferable to base the transcription on the written form of the Source Language (SL), but from a practical point of view it may often be necessary to allow the common pronunciation to be the guide. Either way, there are numerous complicating factors.

Based on SL script

A) A comparison needs to be made of the SL script (Hebrew/Greek) and the RL script (Sami/Latvian/Bulgarian/Thai...). On the basis of this comparison, a set of general rules for transliteration can be drawn up. The correspondences are orthographic rather than phonological. This is the principle on which words borrowed from Sanskrit and Pali are written in modern Thai.

B) As the rules are applied, various problems will be encountered. They need to be listed and classified, so that principles can be drawn up for handling them consistently (or at least having good reasons for inconsistencies).

C) Classification of problems. Problems may be sorted into categories such as the following:

1 The references I have found in readily available sources are few, namely: Nida, Eugene A. *Toward a Science of Translating* (1964), 193-4. Munthali, Priest (1981) "Is your Bible disfigured? Transliterating Biblical Names" TBT 32.2:225-7. Loewen, Jacob A. and Gilbert Ansre (1982) "Adjusting Biblical Names: the Nzema Case" TBT 33.2:229-235. The latter two deal only with specific problems in certain African languages rather than dealing with general principles.