

## An Appraisal of *bāḡan-‘ēden*, “Garden of Eden” (Genesis 2:15) in Akan Mother-Tongue Bibles

Emmanuel Twumasi-Ankrah

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6305-2954>

- Theology Department, Faculty of Humanities, Christian Service University, Kumasi, Ghana and Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana
- 

### Abstract

*All the existing Akan Mother-tongue Bibles’ renderings of the phrase, *bāḡan-‘ēden*, from the source text, have seemed partial. This study employed an exegetical method in which Genesis 2:15 was contextually, textually, semantically, and morpho-syntactically analysed and its translations in the Akan Mother-tongue Bibles assessed. Having scrutinised ancient texts such as the Masoretic Text, Septuagint and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and their parallels with Akan Mother-tongue Bibles regarding the text, it is argued in this paper that the Hebrew phrase, *bāḡan-‘ēden* could be suitably translated as **turo fɛɛfɛ**, in the Asante-Twi Bible (AsTB) and Akuapim-Twi Bible (AkTB) and **ture fɛɛfɛw**, “beautiful garden,” in the Mfantse-Twi Bible (MfTB). This is a call to remain faithful to the context of the source text and the target language. The proposed Twi phrase is in keeping with the Septuagint which expresses ‘ēden, (eden) as *παράδεισος* *paradeisō* (beautiful, delightful and blissful). It is believed that this would advance mother-tongue theologising regarding Christian environmental discourse among Akan/Twi readers.*

**Keywords:** Garden of Eden; Genesis 2:15; Akan mother-tongue Bibles; Twi Bible

### Introduction

The challenge with the existing Akan/Twi Mother-tongue Bibles concerning Genesis 2:15 is the unanimous refusal to present fully, *bāḡan-‘ēden* (garden of Eden), except to render *bāḡan*, as **turo**, (AsTB, AkTB) and **ture** (MfTB), “garden.” Meanwhile, the Hebrew phrase under study is a noun construct that ought to be treated together. In ancient Israel, “Eden,” was simply a term, employed to describe their habitation on the Fertile Crescent. “Every part of the Euphrates delta, from Hit to the Persian Gulf, has at some time or another been called “Eden,” the irrigated and cultivated plain, as distinct from ‘Kura,’ the unirrigated hill or plain” (Willcocks, 1912:137). The Babylonian plain was called the Land of Eden by its inhabitants. Thus, Eden signifies a plain in the primitive language of Babylonia. It was on this plain that the theophanic garden was situated. It was not a garden in our sense of the term; the word signified what we would now call a plantation mainly of fruit trees (Willcocks, 1912:145).

Out of the numerous problems that Bible translators encounter in their work is the non-availability of a word in the receptor languages to carry the exact meaning of a word in the source language. “This and other challenges sometimes lead to obscurity in the translated text and the resulting theology” (Twumasi-Ankrah et al, 2022:1). The application of biblical knowledge may be one of if not the greatest goal of exegesis. Thus exegesis, translation and interpretation are bedfellows in biblical scholarship. This paper argues that unlike in some instances where Akan mother-tongues do not easily provide suitable terms and phrases for some literary structures and vocabularies of the source texts, the idea of the phrase, *bəḡan-’ēden* can easily be expressed in the target language (Twi). Therefore, in this paper, the phrase under study is analysed contextually, textually and morpho-syntactically to establish its meaning in the context of the creation narrative. The meaning is then compared to its renderings in three Twi dialects (Asante-Twi, Akuapim-Twi and Mfantse-Twi). A suggestion was then made on the corrections of extant translations of the three Twi dialects addressed.

### **The Yahwist source of the text (Gen. 2:15)**

The creation narratives as related in Genesis 1 and 2 present two complementary accounts. The first (Gen. 1:1–2:4a) belongs to the late Priestly (P) source, while the second (Gen. 2:4b–25) to the Yahwist/Jahwist (J) tradition (Dyrness, 1977:66). This implies that the creation story is told from two angles – perhaps coming from two older traditions that complement each other (Dyrness, 1977:66). It is interesting to note that the J source joins together several old stories and myths, rewriting them to convey its religious message about Yahweh (Dyrness, 1977).

The Old Testament (OT) concept of creation was not based on any philosophical insight, which was totally upheld based on some tangible evidence adduced by world-class thinkers; it was rather a theological position and an expression of faith by a people of faith (Ancient Israel) (von Rad, 1965:339). The story reflects Israel’s thought in the 10<sup>th</sup> Century BC when it had become a nation that could contend with other nations and their beliefs (Dyrness, 1977). Theologically, Israel sought to identify herself within the Ancient Near Eastern (ANE) wider context of the prevailing ideas about the origin of the universe, which included what were then the nations of the world (Walton, 2009). In contrast to Israel’s view was the idea of the origin of nature and / or the world, thought to have been an emanation of the deity (von Rad, 1965: 339). The OT creation narratives could be an attempt by Ancient Israel to re-orient her people as well as contend with the neighbouring and hostile nations about the fact that Israel was a sovereign nation like all other nations and was not meant to be a permanent vassal of any nation (Brueggemann, 1997; Hays, 2014). They possibly wanted to assert that Israel was not a foreign nation to the Fertile Crescent and that no part of the world they fought for, or tilled and occupied, must be denied them. Hence, in the J source, creation begins with humanity; other creatures, including the earth and all that it contains, are made for human benefit. In contrast to J, the P source deals with only a few crucial events, chief among them being the creation of the world. It works out a wider theology around the goodness of God’s creation and focuses more on moments of blessing (Dyrness, 1965:66), of which Israel was a key beneficiary.

All of this is to say that the authors<sup>1</sup> of the Book of Genesis took various ancient stories which were told in oral tradition and used them to relate how God gave “dominion” and responsibility for the world to humanity, the freedom to act on one’s own and the gifts to achieve happiness. Here, only what is essential is recorded: nothing is accidental or included merely because it stood in the received tradition (Babawale and Shogunle, 2020:197). It was more or less a theologically captivating speech, meant to inspire contingents to come to terms with who they are, so that they would take up their religious, social, economic and political roles of defending and protecting their territories.

### **Structure of Genesis 2:4–7, 15**

This section of the creation narrative presents a discrete and independent account of human origins which appears distinct from the former (Candlish, 1979:34). In this pericope, the plot starts in verse 7 with *wayyişer*, “and he formed,” which is a *wayyiqtol* verb. The presence of verbs describing what had “not yet” happened in verse 5, and then verbs with process aspect in verse 6, describing what was happening when the action of verse 7 took place, has been identified (Collins, 1999:273). The plot describes the state of things on earth when it was first created, where the economy of the inanimate kingdom or of the botanical world was fitted instantly to maintain the sovereignty of the LORD God and to provide for the welfare of humanity (Candlish, 1979:36). The first element that appears is the earth itself, endowed with potential to grow all kinds of seeds (Gen. 2:5) to support human life (Juma, 2025). The next to appear is the effect of precipitation (Gen. 2:6). Finally, as an essential factor to effectively achieve the divine intent, is the formation and tending of human hands to work on that aspect of creation (Gen. 2:7) (Hiebert, 2022:82).

In the former account (Gen. 1:26–28), the human is portrayed as a high spiritual being with a heavenly nature, capable of having a strong nexus with God; whereas in the second section (Gen. 2:4-7), the human is depicted as earthly, originating from the earth and having earthly interconnectedness (Simkins, 2022:270–71; Candlish, 1979:34). It is instructive to state that when the two accounts (P and J) are scrutinised fairly, as affirmed further by Candlish (1979:34), one would notice that they are consistent with and supplementary to each other. What one observes in the second pericope (2:4–7) presents an outline that can best be described as a linear structure, describing the storyline. Below is a proposed structure:

- i. An Introduction (v. 4)
- ii. Background/Setting (vv. 5–6)
- iii. Main Event (Formation of human from the ground) (v. 7)
- iv. The planting of a beautiful garden by the LORD God for the human (vv. 8–14)
- v. The LORD God made humans responsible for the upkeep of the garden (v. 15)

---

<sup>1</sup> Authorship of Genesis is disputed among scholars. According to Waltke (2001:21–22), although a good case can be made that Moses authored the essential shape of Genesis and the Pentateuch, Moses was likely not the author of the extant text in our hands. However, traditionally, Jews and Christians alike have held that Moses was the author/compiler of the first five books of the Old Testament.

**Genesis 2:15 in ancient texts**

Text	Masoretic Text (MT)	Targum Pseudo-Jonathan (TPsJ) <sup>2</sup>	Septuagint (LXX)
<b>Transliteration</b>	<p>vayyiqqah 'ādōnāi 'ēlōhim 'et-hā'ādām vayyanniḥēhū bəḡan-'ēden, lə'ābədāh šāmārāh.</p>	<p>ūd̄bar yəyā 'ēlōhim yat 'ādām min thāvār pūlhānā 'atar daitbarəyā mitamān və'ašəreh bəgiynūniytā' də'edēn ləmēhēvey pələḥ bə'orayətā' ūlāmināthar piqūrāhā'</p>	<p>kai elaben kyrios ho theos ton anthropon, hon eplasen, kai etheto auton en to paradeisō ergazesthai auton kai phylassein.</p>
<b>Translation</b>	<p>And the LORD God took the human and put him in the <i>beautiful garden</i> to cultivate and keep it well.<sup>3</sup></p>	<p>And the LORD God took the man from the mountain of worship, where he had been created, and made him dwell in the Garden of Eden, to do service in the law, and to keep its commandments."<sup>4</sup></p>	<p>And the Lord God took the man whom he had formed, and placed him in the <i>garden of delight</i>, to cultivate and keep it.<sup>5</sup></p>

**Textual variants of Genesis 2:15**

The MT presents Genesis 2:15 as: *vayyiqqah 'ādōnāi 'ēlōhim 'et-hā'ādām vayyanniḥēhū bəḡan-'ēden, lə'ābədāh šāmārāh*. This MT (Gen. 2:15) can be translated as: “And the LORD God took the human and put him in the beautiful (Garden of Eden) garden to cultivate and keep it well.” The English rendering of the TPsJ on the other hand, has been presented as: “And the LORD God took the man from the mountain of worship, where he had been created, and made him dwell in the Garden of Eden, to do service in

<sup>2</sup> Targum Pseudo-Jonathan is a western Targum (translation) of the Torah (Pentateuch) traditionally believed to have come from the land of Israel (as opposed to the eastern Babylonian Targum Onkelos). It is an Aramaic translation and interpretation of the Law, done for liturgical purposes. This Aramaic translation was produced at a time when Hebrew had ceased. Its correct title was originally Targum Yerushalmi (Jerusalem Targum), which is how it was known in medieval times.

<sup>3</sup> Author’s translation.

<sup>4</sup> Tov Rose, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, (London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1862–1865), 9.

<sup>5</sup> Author’s translation.

the law, and to keep its commandments” (Rose, 1862–1865:9). It can be observed that though both the MT and TPsJ of Genesis 2:15 were written in Hebrew, there are significant differences at the literary level. This may be a mistake, but it is quite possible that the translators of the TPsJ attempted to include an explanation or expansion of the text. This is not strange since the Targum is not just a translation but also a commentary (Rose, 1862–1865:4). A close look at the text (Gen. 2:15) in the TPsJ, brings out strange phrases such as “the mountain of worship,” “service in the law” and “to keep its commandment.” All these phrases are unknown to the MT and the LXX. They could have been added by a later editor to draw Israel’s attention to her primary duty towards Yahweh – the keeping of the Mosaic Law and the commandments. This (TPsJ) translator refers to the ground from which the human was formed as a “mountain of worship” – a sanctuary, denoting sacredness. Also, the exhortation to “do service in the law” and “keep the commandments” is an expression of what the Israelite community of faith thought to be their main preoccupation, and a commentator would seize every opportunity to highlight it. However, in the MT, human is exhorted rather to “till” or “cultivate” the ground and keep it; no reference is made to the Law.

Rose’s English version of the TPsJ translates *bəḡan-‘ēden* as (Garden of Eden), highlighting the basis for similar renderings in some of the English versions. However, the LXX, which was meant to be read by both Greek-speaking Jews and non-Jews, presents it as *παράδεισος*, *paradeisō* (paradise), which denotes the idea of a delightful, beautiful, pleasurable, pleasant place. The LXX would assume this posture of translating *‘ēden* for its audience, who otherwise would not easily have understood the term. This is in keeping with the idea that translation goes with interpretation. It is against this backdrop that this paper advocates for a suitable translation and interpretation of *bəḡan-‘ēden* in Akan/Twi Bibles, rather than rendering the phrase literally as *Eden turo* (AsTB, AkTB) and *Eden ture* (MfTB).

## **The Yahwist account on the making of humankind (Gen 2:4–7)**

### ***Introduction of the event (v. 4)***

The Yahwist account of creation, characteristically, attempts to give the creation story a universal twist (von Rad, 1961). The narrator indicates that the generations of the world, as well as all the creations in the universe, came from the LORD God (YHWH) (Westermann, 1987). The idea of YHWH being the creator and sustainer of the universe and all the inhabitants in it, both human and non-human entities, is clearly presented by the creation narrator(s). The power and the creative qualities of YHWH are ably articulated in the various events and the teleological nature of elements of nature described by the author(s) (Brueggemann, 1997; Kanu and Ndubisi, 2021).

### ***The setting of the event (vv. 5–6)***

Genesis 2:5–6 introduces the event of the formation of humans by describing the time, place conditions and process prior to that event (Walton, 2015). One comes across the fact that the earth/ground was created and all the plants of the earth were created by YHWH before the human was formed. God caused water to come out of the ground to water the plants he had created. The narration seems to portray the view that a conducive atmosphere was created by God for humans, who were still to be made (Wenham, 1987). This atmosphere was also going to be suitable for flora and fauna to thrive, which could

portray a beautiful scenery. The element of water coming out of the ground and watering the plants that were on the earth also reveals that the ground was moistened enough to be moulded into a shape (Kanu and Pilani, 2025).

**The LORD creates a *ḥāḡan-‘ēden* “beautiful garden” for humankind (vv. 8–14)** *vayyiqqah*, is from the Hebrew primary root, *lāqah*, a *qal waw* consecutive imperfect third masculine singular verb, denoting “to take or receive” (Strong, 1980:3947; Bangsund, 2015:294). In the text, *vayyiqqah*, should be translated as “and he took” (Sawyer, 1976:98), referring to the LORD God as the subject and the human as the object of the sentence. This could reveal an idea of YHWH leading the human to the beautiful environment created for them.

*vayyannahū*, can be analysed morphologically as consisting of a *waw* conjunction, *hiphil*<sup>6</sup> consecutive imperfect third masculine singular verb.<sup>7</sup> Its primary root comes from *yānah*, meaning, (to deposit); by implication, (to allow to stay, lay down, let alone, place, and set down) (Strong, 1980: 3240). The *hiphil* forms of the root, usually come with the *dagesh* as is the case of the text (Gen. 2:15). The verb in context, can therefore be understood as the LORD God, causing the human to stay in the garden. In the simplest term, “he put,” “deposited or placed” the human in the garden. This means that the human’s occupancy of the garden was not a choice he made but rather he was made to stay there to play a role for the creator. Waltke affirms that God’s placement of the human in the beautiful garden suggests that humanity is meant for fellowship in the garden, with God, its creator and chief gardener (Waltke, 2001). This implies that God’s action in making that beautiful garden and placing the human there was pragmatically to create an atmosphere for relationship and interrelationship (Kanu and Pilani, 2025). Thus, Adam and Eve’s expulsion will make them feel like castaways in a strange land (Waltke, 2001:86).

*ḥāḡan-‘ēden*, contains an inseparable preposition, *ḥā*, denoting, “in” or “on.” It is followed by *ḡan* (a garden) (Strong, 1980:1588) which is a noun common singular in construct, properly translated as, “garden of.” This shows a compound relationship between *ḡan* (garden) and the next absolute object, *‘ēden*. Some scholars are of the view that *ḥāḡan-‘ēden* refers to a specific but inaccessible place (Collins, 2020:69; Brown, 1884:3; Lewis, 1968:170). The garden has been understood as representing a territorial space in the created order where God invites human beings to enjoy bliss and harmony –with the divine, with one another, with the animals, and with the land on which they dwell. The goal of this paper is not to wade into the debate on the location of the Garden of Eden but harness its theological meaning and relevance in biblical history and compare it with its parallel renderings in Akan Mother-tongue Bibles. Regardless of the geographical uncertainties, the theological view is that “God is uniquely present in this sacred space” (Waltke, 2001: 85). *‘ēden*, is presented as a proper noun feminine singular, translated as “Eden,” the home region of the human (Strong, 1980:5731). However, this may not be a specific or separate place within the world but a metaphor for the world where humans dwelt. The primary root of this word is *‘ādan*, from which comes the

<sup>6</sup> *Hiphil* stem of a verb is understood to be a causative active form of the verb.

<sup>7</sup> *BibleWorks*, 9.

feminine name, *’ednāh* which means “pleasant/beautiful” (Strong, 1980:5727), (“pleasure, delight”). In Syria, there was a place called *Beyith Eden* (Beth-eden) meaning “house of pleasure”. The term is used here clearly as a geographical designation, which came to be associated, naturally enough, with the homonymous but unrelated Hebrew noun for enjoyment (Speiser, 1964:16). “This garden is described as a place of unparalleled beauty, with rich fertile soil supporting a variety of lush vegetation and fruit-bearing trees. Where air is filled with the sweet fragrance of flowers, while a crystal clear river flows peacefully through its midst, providing nourishment to the land” (Borisov, 2024:198). Ten Hoopen (2021:171) affirms that Eden is a luxurious and fertile place, rich in water and mythically located in the East.

From the analysis, *bəḡan-’ēden* (Garden of Eden) can therefore be translated as “a garden of pleasure,” describing the blissful and recreational nature of the home region of human. The Garden of Eden is a temple garden, represented later in the tabernacle. Angels (*cherubim*) protect its sanctity (Gen. 3:24; Ex. 26:1; 2 Chron. 3:7) so that sin and death are excluded (Gen. 3:23; Rev. 21:8) (Waltke, 2001:85–86). The topography, foliage, and heavenly river all depict a scene of paradise<sup>8</sup> in the Garden of Eden (Waltke, 2001:85–86). It is instructive to note that in the Genesis passages, the narrator is interested in the idea the garden portrays, more than its geography. There, Eden symbolised a state of unbroken fellowship between God and humans. The expulsion from the garden was more than a physical move; it indicated that humans had sinned, disobeying God’s command. It is also significant that Eden was not only a luxurious place to be enjoyed but was also a place where humans were given work to do (Harris et al., 2003:639).

### “Garden of Eden” as rendered in the Akan/Twi Bibles

Current Akan Versions of the Text (Gen. 2:15)	English Equivalence of the Text (Gen. 2:15)
<b>AsTB:</b> <i>Na AWURADE Nyankopɔn de onipa no kɔtenaa Eden turom sɛ ɔnnɔ na ɔnwɛn hɔ.</i> <sup>9</sup>	And the LORD God took the human and settled him in the Garden of Eden to weed and watch it.
<b>AkTB:</b> <i>Na AWURADE Nyankopɔn de onipa no kɔduaa Eden turom sɛ ɔnnɔw na ɔnwɛn hɔ.</i> <sup>10</sup>	And the LORD God took the human and settled him in the Garden of Eden to weed and watch it.
<b>MfTB:</b> <i>Na EWURADZE Nyankopɔn faa nyimpa no, na ɔdze no kɔtoo Eden ture no mu de onsiesie hɔ, na ɔnhwe hɔ.</i> <sup>11</sup>	And the LORD God took the human and sent him to the Garden of Eden to organise it and watch it.

All the three selected Akan/Twi versions of the Bible have avoided translating fully, *bəḡan-’ēden*, (garden of eden), except to render *bəḡan*, as *turo*, (AsTB, AkTB) and *ture*

<sup>8</sup> The term paradise is derived from the LXX’s rendering of Eden by *paradeisos* from Old Persian *pairi-daeza*, which meant, “an enclosed park and pleasure ground.”

<sup>9</sup> New Revised Asante-Twi Bible published as *Twere Kronkron* (Accra, Ghana: The Bible Society of Ghana, 2017), 4.

<sup>10</sup> *Akuapem-Twi Bible published as Kyerew Kronkron* (Accra, Ghana: The Bible Society of Ghana, 2012), 4.

<sup>11</sup> *Revised Mfantse-Twi Bible published as Baebor* (Accra, Ghana: The Bible Society of Ghana, 2019), 4.

(MfTB), (garden). Meanwhile, the Hebrew phrase under study is a noun construct. In the phrase, *bāḡan* is the construct form whereas *‘ēden* is the absolute form. In Biblical Hebrew, a noun that is in construct is expected to be read and treated together as one by readers and interpreters. In addition to this, what the idea the term denotes cannot be left concealed, only for readers to go searching for it in Bible concordances and dictionaries. There is the need to make its meaning clearer in the reader’s context. If the Israelites understood all the nuances that the term, *bāḡan-‘ēden* (Garden of Eden) connoted, the Akan readers cannot be left in the shadows to struggle for its meaning.

The study has established from the morpho-syntactical analysis that the term, *‘ēden*, from its root, denotes a “garden of pleasure” or “blissful and beautiful garden,” largely because of its wonderful varieties of flora and fauna. This idea of the term provides a useful clue for Twi mother-tongue Bible translators to consider translating it fully for a clearer understanding for its readers. The Twi translators, for instance, can make use of Twi adjectives such as *fɛɛfɛ/fɛɛfɛw*, “beautiful,” or “pleasant,” as equivalent for *‘ēden* (Eden).

Thus, one could posit that should the phrase *bāḡan-‘ēden* (Garden of Eden) be translated as *turo fɛɛfɛ* (AsTB/AkTB) or *ture fɛɛfɛw* (MfTB) “pleasant/wonderful/beautiful garden,” the Akan readers would better appreciate the full nuances. This assertion becomes stronger when one considers the fact that the Akan communities in Ghana are mostly located in the forest zone. And the city of Kumasi, where majority of Akan people live, won the accolade, “the Garden City of West Africa,’ due to its beautiful green areas in the 1940s” (Amoako and Adom-Asamoah, 2019:210; Maxwell, 1928:219–223).<sup>12</sup> Thus, fully translating the term, using Akan/Twi adjectives such as have been suggested in this paper to depict the wonderful and beautiful greenery, and varieties of fauna that might have characterised the Garden of Eden in the creation story (Candlish, 1979: 370), can foster a deeper ecological consciousness among Akan readers regarding the sacred responsibility to preserve and care for the environment.

### ***Translation principles employed in the Akan/Twi Mother-tongue Bibles***

Bible translation is the representation of the content of source documents in such a way that the full effect and intent of the source text are made available to the reader (Kuwornu-Adjaottor, 2018:69). This is corroborated by Basil Hatim and Jeremy Munday (2004:6) who view translation as an act of conveying meaning from one language to another while carefully accounting for the unique socio-cultural background of the target audience. Thus, Boaheng (2022:7) urges translators to explore all effective means of transmitting the source text in a way that resonates with and is easily embraced by the intended audience. The principal goal of Bible translation is to convey the sacred content of the source text into a target language in such a manner that its theological, spiritual

<sup>12</sup> See Clifford Amoako and Gifty Adom-Asamoah (2019:210). According to them, established in 1817, Kumasi, Ghana’s second largest city, was accorded the accolade “Garden City of West Africa” in the 1940s due to its beautiful green areas. Today, Kumasi has lost its ‘Garden city’ accolade, owing to poor management of these ‘green areas.’ See also John Maxwell (1928:219–223).

and contextual significance is significantly preserved and rendered intelligible to the receiving audience (Twumasi-Ankrah, 2022:46). Translations ought to be expressed using a kind of language register, which is easily comprehensible and can simultaneously retain the texts’ formality, structure, doctrinal accuracy (Nkwawir, 2013), tense form, and theological message.

Bible translation is the scholarly and linguistic enterprise of rendering the sacred Christian scriptures into a language that is entirely distinct from the original texts. The process aims to communicate the divine message with such clarity and resonance that readers in the target language perceive it as though God is speaking directly to them in their own vernacular. The act of translating the Bible encompasses more than mere linguistic substitution; it involves a faithful and vivid representation of the source material. The objective is to preserve the original intent, theological import, and communicative purpose of the biblical texts, ensuring that these are fully accessible and comprehensible to the target audience without distortion or loss of meaning.

It is worth emphasising that the adoption of a suitable translation approach plays a pivotal role in revitalising ancient sacred scriptures within modern Bible-believing communities. The nexus between ancient Bible believers and contemporary believers is fundamentally theological in nature, rooted in a shared pursuit of divine understanding (Twumasi-Ankrah et al, 2022:50). Among African Bible readers, this theological orientation constitutes a primary motivation for engaging with scripture. Consequently, translating the Bible into indigenous African languages such as Twi has proven to be an effective means of facilitating theological comprehension and spiritual resonance. Such translations enable Twi-speaking Christians to access biblical truths in a culturally and linguistically familiar framework, thereby enhancing their capacity to fulfill theological expectations embedded within the biblical text.

There are several theories or philosophies of translation but literal, and dynamic equivalence are the main ones. Literal translation (Formal equivalence) emphasises accuracy by closely matching the source language’s words and structure in the target language (Kuwarnu-Adjaottor, 2018:80). The approach aims to preserve the original text’s integrity, often resulting in a “word-for-word” translation (Watt, 2002:247). Nevertheless, literal translation presents a significant challenge, given that linguistic meaning is not inherent in words themselves but is instead constructed through the interpretive frameworks individuals apply to them (Kuwarnu-Adjaottor, 2018). It is intellectually sound to assert that the meaning of a word, phrase, or expression is inextricably linked to its contextual framework—encompassing the cultural, ideological, and experiential dimensions that inform and shape the communicative environment in which it is employed (Wilt and Wendland, 2008:249).

An alternative and a more contemporary approach to translation is dynamic or functional equivalence, introduced by Eugene Nida. Grounded in the linguistic concept of “equivalent effect,” this method prioritises conveying the intended meaning of the original text over a literal rendering of its words, promoting the use of clear and accessible language to ensure that the message resonates effectively with the target audience (Nida and Taber, 1982:210). Bible translations employing this approach enhance reader accessibility by faithfully reflecting the original author’s intent to convey scripture in the vernacular of their audience.

However, some scholars have criticised the dynamic equivalence approach, contending that it presents various challenges. Philip Noss (2007), for example, contends that the dynamic method overlooks linguistic theory, a functional element of translation, thereby rendering it inadequate. On their part, Mojola and Wendland (2003) assert that Nida's articulation of translation constitutes a theoretical framework grounded in conduit metaphor, which conceptualises communication as simply a transfer of meaning from sender to receiver. S.E. Porter (2007) argues that Nida does not take the theory far enough, whereas Leland Ryken (2002) believes that Nida has gone too far and would like to retrace his steps to a more literal approach.

A critical examination of the renderings of the Hebrew phrase, *ḥāḡān-ʿēden* in the selected Akan/Twi mother-tongue Bibles suggests that the principle underlining the translation could be largely literal or formal equivalence. For instance, in the translation of *ḥāḡān-ʿēden* in Akan/Twi Bibles, it can be observed that translators consistently adopted a literal approach, preserving *ʿēden* as a proper noun that remains untranslated in Twi. Although, within the larger pericope of Genesis 2:15, translation principles employed vary. One could observe through a close reading that the exegetes occasionally applied the principle of dynamic equivalence in one or two Twi versions regarding particular words/phrases. In all the cases, the principle implemented has in one way or the other helped or twisted the understanding of the text among the indigenous Akan readers.

Multiple elements contribute to flaws in translation within receptor languages. A fundamental difficulty in translation arises from the absence of exact lexical, idiomatic, and rhetorical equivalents in the target language that can fully convey the meaning of the source text, since no two languages articulate thought in precisely the same manner (Rhodes, 2009:26). In certain cases, some translators draw upon prior translations as source material for rendering texts into a third language (Asamoah, 2022:1). Engaging translators who lack proficiency in the source and/or target language inevitably contributes to translation imperfections (Mojola, 2003:156).

One would agree that insufficient understanding of biblical text often leads to misinterpretation and misappropriation of the text, and can sometimes lead to overemphasis and fanaticism which have serious consequences for Christian spirituality, discipleship, and the survival of the church. It is thus imperative for one to study how the text has been rendered in the Akan versions of the Old Testament vis-a-vis the source texts. For a better text, the result of such a critical study may lead to a proposal of alternative renderings. Thus, the current study has attempted to achieve that goal of presenting alternative translations for Twi mother-tongue readers. There are several Akan versions of the Bible, but the study limits itself to the Asante-Twi Bible (AsTB), Mfantse-Twi Bible (MfTB), and the Akuapem-Twi Bible (AkTB).

### **Proposed translation of Genesis 2:15 in Akan/Twi Bibles**

From the foregoing textual and morpho-syntactical analysis of the text (Gen. 2:15), this paper's proposed translations are presented in the tables below for Akan mother-tongue readers:

**Proposed translation of Genesis 2:15 in Asante-Twi**

English	Verse	Asante-Twi (AsTB)
And the LORD God took the human and placed him in the <i>Beautiful Garden</i> to cultivate and to take great care of it.	15	<i>Na AWURADE Nyankopɔn de onipa no kɔduaa turo fɛɛfɛ no mu sɛ, ɔnyɔ mu adwuma na ɔnhwe so yie.</i>

**Proposed translation of Genesis 2:15 in Akuapem-Twi**

English	Verse	Akuapem-Twi (AkTB)
And the LORD God took the human and placed him in the <i>Beautiful Garden</i> to cultivate and to take great care of it.	15	<i>AWURADE Nyankopɔn faa onipa no de no kɔtenaa turo fɛɛfɛ mu hɔ sɛ ɔnye mu adwuma, na ɔnhwe so yie.</i>

**Proposed translation of Genesis 2:15 in Mfantse-Twi**

English	Verse	Mfantse-Twi (MfTB)
And the LORD God took the human and placed him in the <i>Beautiful Garden</i> to cultivate and to take great care of it.	15	<i>Na EWURADZE Nyankopɔn faa nyimpa no, na ɔdze no kɔtenaa ture fɛɛfɛw no mu de onsiesie hɔ, na ɔnhwew do yiye.</i>

**Conclusion**

This paper has drawn attention to inaccuracies in the translation of the Hebrew phrase, *bəḡan-‘ēden*, in some Akan/Twi mother-tongue Bibles. It is proposed that the phrase should be translated to reflect what is in the MT and LXX, *παράδεισος paradeisō* (paradise), “beautiful garden” or garden of delight.” The alternative translations postulated in the study are meant to provide the Akan Christian community with an accurate, faithful, and better translation that enhances mother-tongue theologising. This paper critically studied the Akan translations of Genesis 2:15 and argued that the biblical and theological concept of *bəḡan-‘ēden*, resonates well with the Akan greenery environment, rich in flora and fauna. Given the availability of Twi phrases that can suitably and fully capture the meaning of the term as found in the Masoretic Text (MT) and the Septuagint (LXX), translators and interpreters are encouraged to adopt the proposed renderings. It is believed that the proposed translations could generate an interesting perspective in the ecological discourse of Akan Christians. This paper may therefore prompt a holistic analysis of other Ghanaian mother-tongue translations and probably lead to the revision of existing versions.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amoako, C. and Gifty A. 2019. From the seat of a traditional kingdom to a Garden City: The socio-spatial politics of managing green areas in Kumasi, Ghana, *African Geographical Review* 38(4):310–325. DOI: 10.1080/19376812.2018.1436076 (Accessed: 12 October 2024).
- Asamoah, F.E. 2022. A study of the translation of *proseuche* (Acts 6:4) in the Greek New Testament and Asante-Twi Bible, *International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Studies* 9(2):1–8.
- Babawale, S.T. and Nathaniel, O.S. 2020. Man and environment: Exegesis of Genesis 1:26–28 in Nigerian context, *SMCC Higher Education Research Journal* 7(1): [doi.org/10.18868/sherj7j.07.010120.14](https://doi.org/10.18868/sherj7j.07.010120.14) (Accessed: 15 November 2024).
- Bangsund, C.J. 2015. *You can read biblical Hebrew: Simple lessons and a basic dictionary*. Tanzania: Research Institute of Makumira University College.
- Boaheng, I. 2022. *A handbook for African Mother-tongue Bible translators*. Wilmington: Vernon Press.
- Borisov, K. 2024. The Garden of Eden: A new perspective on its location, *Archaeological Discovery* 12(4):198–223. DOI: 10.4236/ad.2024.124012 (Accessed: 16 November 2024).
- Brown, F. 1884. A recent theory of the Garden of Eden. *The Old Testament Student* IV (I). Online. Available at: [https://www.jstor.org/stable/3156297?seq=1#metadata\\_info\\_tab\\_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/3156297?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents) (Accessed: 12 October 2024).
- Brueggemann, W. 1997. *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, dispute, advocacy*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Candlish, R.S. 1979. *Studies in Genesis*. Michigan: Kregel Publications.
- Cassuto, U. 1989. *A commentary on the Book of Genesis*. Israel Abrahams, Trans. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, Magnes Press.
- Collins, J.C. 1999. Discourse analysis and the interpretation of Genesis 2:4–7, *Westminster theological Journal* 61(2):269–276.
- Collins, J.J. 2020. Models of utopia in the biblical tradition. In Olyan, S.M. and Culley, R.C. (eds), *A wise and discerning mind: Essays in honour of Burke O. Long*. Providence: Brown Judaic Studies. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvzgb93t.1> (Accessed: 12 October 2024).
- Dyrness, W. 1977. *Themes in Old Testament theology*. Downers Grove, USA: InterVarsity Press.
- Hatim, B. and Munday, J. 2004. *Translation: An advance resource book*. London: Routledge.
- Hays, B. C. 2014. *Hidden riches: A sourcebook for the comparative study of the Hebrew Bible and ancient Near East*. United Kingdom: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Hiebert, T. 2022. Genesis. In Marlow, H. and Harris, M. (eds), *The Oxford handbook of the Bible and ecology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 81–94.
- Juma, C.D. 2025. African eco-spiritualities and climate justice: Afro-ecofeminism perspectives on Genesis 2:4–17. *HTS Theologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 81(1): a10449. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v81i1.10449> (Accessed: 8 November 2025).

- Kanu, I.A and Ndubisi, E.J.O. 2021. On the concept of creation in African ontology. In Kanu, I.A. (ed.), *African religion and culture: Honouring the past and shaping the future*. Maryland: Association for the Promotion of African studies.
- Kanu, I.A and Pilani, M.P. 2025. Priestly and religious vocations in the light of Genesis (2:5–9): Insights and actions for the Jubilee Year, *The Catholic Voyage: African Journal of Consecrated Life* 22(1):156–184.
- Kuwornu-Adjaottor, T.E.J. 2018. Assessment of three problematic texts in the Synoptic Gospels of the New Testament of the Dangme Bible. PhD. dissertation, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana.
- Lewis, A. H. 1968. The localization of the Garden of Eden, *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 11(4):169–175.
- Maxwell, J. 1928. Ashanti: Kumasi: The Garden City of West Africa, *Journal of the Royal African Society* 27(107):219–233.  
<https://doi.org/10.28977/jbtr.2003.2.12.141>.
- Mojola, A.O and Wendland, E.R. 2003. Scripture translation in translation studies. In Wilt, T. (ed.), *Bible translation frames of reference*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Mojola, A.O. 2003. Bible translation in the context of the text, church and world matrix – A post Nida perspective. *JBTR* 2(12):141–161.  
<https://doi.org/10.28977/jbtr.2003.2.12.141>.
- Nida, A.E and Taber, C.R. 1982. *The theory and practice of translation*. Leiden: Brill.
- Nkwawir, F.J. 2013. *Impact of translating/reading the Bible in the vernacular in Africa*. Masters thesis, MF Norwegian School of Theology, Oslo, Norway.
- Noss, P. 2007. *A history of Bible translation*. Scotland: Francis Dalrymple-Hamilton.
- Pietersma, A. and Benjamin G.W. 2007. *A new English translation of the Septuagint*. J. V. Hiebert, Trans. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Porter, E.S. 2007. Translations of the Bible (since the KJV). In Porter, S.E. (eds), *Dictionary of biblical criticism and interpretation*. New York: Routledge.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1961. *Genesis: A commentary*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Rhodes, R. 2009. *The complete guide to Bible translations: How they were developed*. Oregon: Harvest House Publishers.
- Rose, T. 1862–1865. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*. London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts.
- Ryken, L. 2002. *The word of God in English: Criteria for excellence in Bible translation: Communicating God’s word to the world*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Sawyer, F.A.J. 1976. *A modern biblical Hebrew*. London, Stocksfield: Oriel Press Ltd Routledge & Kegan Paul plc.
- Simkins, R.A. 2022. Attitudes to nature in the Hebrew Bible and the ancient near east. In Marlow, H. and Harris, M. (eds), *The Oxford handbook of the Bible and ecology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 81–94.
- Speiser, A.E. 1964. Genesis. In *the Anchor Bible*. New York: Doubleday & Company Inc.
- Strong, J. 1980. *Strong’s exhaustive concordance of the Bible*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Ten Hoopen, R.B. 2021. The Garden in Eden: A holy place? In Hartog, P.B., Laderman, S., Tohar, V. and Van Wieringen, A.L.H.M. (eds), *Jerusalem and other holy places as foci of multireligious and ideological confrontation*. Brill Academic

- Publishers (37):170–192. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004437210\\_011](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004437210_011) (Accessed: 15 October 2024).
- Twumasi-Ankrah, E., Emmanuel K. E. A, Frimpong W and Isaac B. 2022. An analytical study of the translations of Genesis 1:26–27 in the Akuapem-Twi Bible. *Journal of Mother-Tongue Biblical Hermeneutics and Theology (MOTBIT)* 4(3):45–56.
- Von Rad, G. 1965. *Old Testament theology*. Trans. D.M.G. Stalker. Edinburg: Oliver and Boyd.
- Waltke, B.K. 2001. *Genesis: A commentary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Walton, H.J. 2009. *The lost world of Genesis one: Ancient cosmology and the origin debate*. Lisle: Intervarsity Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2015. *The lost world of Adam and Eve: Genesis 2–3 and the human origins debate*. Lisle: Intervarsity Press Academic.
- Wenham, J.G. 1987. *Genesis 1–15*. Word Biblical Commentary. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Inc.
- Westermann, C. 1987. *Genesis*. Trans. David E. Greens. London: T&T Clark International.
- Willcocks, W. 1912. The Garden of Eden and its restoration. *The Geographical Journal* 40(2):129–145.
- Wilt, T and Wendland, E. 2008. *Scripture frames and framing*. Stellenbosch: African SunMedia.