St. John's University
St. John's Scholar

Theses and Dissertations

2023

“SLAVE GUYS O NOT SLAVE GUYS:” TRACING COLONIALISM AND RESISTANCE IN THE HAWAIIAN PIDGIN BIBLE

Aleena Jacob

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholar.stjohns.edu/theses_dissertations

Part of the American Studies Commons

“SLAVE GUYS O NOT SLAVE GUYS:” TRACING COLONIALISM AND RESISTANCE IN THE HAWAIIAN PIDGIN BIBLE

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

to the faculty of the

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
of
ST. JOHN’S COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES

at

ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY
New York

by

Aleena Jacob

Date Submitted: 04/21/2023 Date Approved: 04/21/2023

_________________________ _________________________

Aleena Jacob Dr. Dohra Ahmad

© Copyright by Aleena Jacob 2023

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

“SLAVE GUYS O NOT SLAVE GUYS:” TRACING COLONIALISM AND RESISTANCE IN THE HAWAIIAN PIDGIN BIBLE

Aleena Jacob

On the one hand, colonial-era Bibles represented powerful rhetorical devices for imperialists; on the other hand, Bibles offered a voice of justice that baited hope in marginalized readers. During the U.S. settler colonial movement, Bibles equipped U.S. missionaries with the authority to force assimilation practices, including the extermination of indigenous languages with English-only laws. In Hawai'i, English-only policies functioned to not only dispossess indigenous populations of their native languages, land, and sense of belonging, but they also began a century-plus tradition of monolingualist policy in the U.S. that continues into the present day. Such policies, along with standardized English ideologies throughout the U.S., intend to endanger rather than preserve Hawaiian Pidgin English.

The study will examine the agency that Hawaiian Pidgin English inherits from *Da Good An Spesho Book,* the Hawaiian Pidgin English translation of the Bible. It will analyze the implications such authority has on power dynamics in a monolingual-forward nation in addition to an extensive breakdown of the interconnections between settler monolingualism, translation, postcolonial Bible criticism, and the historical development of Hawaiian Pidgin English. Furthermore, this thesis will conduct a textual analysis of the introductory statements, discourses of oppression and resistance through the term “freedom,” and its translation to “slave guys no moa," and issues of copyright authority in *Da Good an Spesho Book*. Finally, this thesis will examine the translation values

behind the Hawaiian Pidgin Bible. Published by Wycliffe Bible Translators, the Hawaiian Pidgin Bible observes the translation standards of the Forum of Bible Agencies International. Analyzing certain aspects of these standards as presenting a modern post-colonial Bible “translation theory,” and their application of such “theory” via the Hawai'ian Pidgin Bible as a practice of this theory, this thesis will ultimately draw claims on the contradictions between postcolonial Bible translation theory and its practice in *Da Good An Spesho Book.*

DEDICATION

First and foremost, I dedicate this thesis to my friends— without you all, this thesis would have never been possible. Thank you for cooking when I didn't have the time to think about food, for helping me clean my room when I couldn't, for being in my corner through loss and accomplishment. Your care has driven this thesis more than what I could have done alone. Thanks for opening my blinds and making me take walks outside when all I wanted to do was sit in the shadows of imposter syndrome. You all knew how much I needed the sun and fresh air, far more than I ever did. Thank you for your care, for sustaining me in ups and downs, for planning all our adventures, for doing the most to help me romanticize the brutal process of writing through self-doubt. You are all so deserving.

To my family, thank you for always being my example of dedication. I stand on your shoulders and am grateful for all the labor you have put into creating a life where I can pursue every endeavor. Thank you for providing stability to my life as a writer, for being my first writing teachers, and for creating a life where I have the choice to explore opportunities. To my siblings, as much as it is traditionally said that younger siblings look up to the older one, know that I look up to you just as much. You have always been a source of inspiration and your presence is always felt. All my success has been and will always be dedicated to you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As I come to the end of my academic journey, I am in awe of the unwavering support I have received from my professors and peers at St. John's. I would first like to acknowledge Dr. Ahmad, whose confidence in me has always been a source of motivation and inspiration. One of my very first English classes as a freshman was with Dr. Ahmad, and I remember admiring her and her work before I had ever stepped into her classroom. She curated a classroom space where I felt comfortable and motivated in my creative writing, and I never really had that opportunity before. The seeds of this thesis were planted in her graduate class on vernacular literature, and her feedback and encouragement have been invaluable to the growth of this thesis. Without Dr. Ahmad, I never would have embarked on this journey, and I will forever be grateful for her mentorship and care.

There are so many professors whose expertise and insights have been instrumental in shaping my ideas and perspectives, and I am truly fortunate to have had the opportunity to work with them. My second reader Dr. Alvarez has always been an admirable professor and has made impacts in my life through his teaching. Dr. King provided me with an exceptional education, nurturing my intellectual growth through a rigorous academic environment. My undergraduate classes with Dr. Chetty always challenged me to think critically and creatively. Thank you for offering me a space to think aloud and vent when I needed to.

I want to extend my thanks to the Writing Center as the space where I have sharpened my leadership in the past year. My Director, Dr. Lubey and Assistant Director, Thomas Seweid-DeAngelis have both shaped how I approach leadership. I am fortunate

to have had their mentorship in my research endeavors and in my day-to-day work as a graduate assistant. To my fellow GAs, there's no dream team without you both. Thank you for checking in on me, for keeping me on track, and for letting me lean on you. To the staff at the Writing Center, thank you for the daily comedic relief, your support as a writing community, and the memories we have shared together.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION……………………………………………………………………………ii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS……………………………………………….………………iii

INTRODUCTION……………………………………………………………...…………1

CHAPTER 1…………………………………………………………………………………6

CHAPTER 2……………………………………………………………………………..27

CHAPTER 3……………………………………………………………………………..37

On the Introductory Statements……………………………………………….………37

On the Translation of “Freedom” to “Slave Guys No Moa” …………………………41

On Copyright and Authority Beyond the Private……………………………………..45

On Bible Translation Standards…………………………………………………………48

CONCLUSION…………………………………………………………….............53

REFERENCES…………………………………………………………….............57

INTRODUCTION

In 2022, the Hawaiian legislature recognized Hawaiian as an official language of Hawaii alongside English, marking a significant shift from the English-only language policies established two centuries prior. However, the recognition of Hawaiian as an official language is not without its limitations and preferences. If there is “any radical and irreconcilable difference” between the English and Hawaiian version of state laws, “the English version shall be binding” (Relating). Moreover, this Act does not mandate “legislative bills and other official documents be written in Hawaiian” (Relating). As the stipulations to Hawaiian’s official language status increase, the act’s allocations of meaning-making authority undercut its commitment to the revitalization of indigenous language authority. Even more so, the United States’ continued attempts to officiate standardized English to eliminate indigenous presence extends into the dispossession of other Englishes that threaten the supremacy of standardized English. In Hawaii, Hawaiian Pidgin English (HPE)—an English formed from the interaction of English-only laws and the diverse languages of Asian migrant laborers on colonial sugar plantations in Hawaii—has been the center of several English-only language policies since its inception in the late 19th century. Often stereotyped as an inferior, illegitimate, and low-intelligent vernacular, HPE’s presence in Hawaii has resulted in language-based segregation in schools and legislative proposals to ban HPE from the classroom. However, while the secular sector of Empire is notable for their language surveillance, the religious sector, Christianity specifically, has seemingly opposed this linguistic purity.

U.S. Christian missionaries have a history of translating the Bible under complex motives, often in the interest of Empire. Yet, present day U.S. Bible translation groups

indicate a straying away from the monolingual politics of U.S. Empire. For example, while language politics in education often emphasize the need for students to learn standardized English at the cost of familiarization with their learning, Bible translators emphasize that "no one should have to learn another language to understand God's word" (Wycliffe). On the opening webpage of Wycliffe Bible Translators—a U.S. based nonprofit dedicated to domestic and global Bible translation—testimonials praise Wycliffe's work for creating access to expressing faith in one's own vernacular, championing the movement of saving souls at whatever cost to linguistic purity. However, this assumes that there *would be* a cost to linguistic purity or monolingualism when translating the Bible into vernacular dialects, particularly nonstandardized dialects of English. Despite being a text of powerful authority under Empire, this research will show that at least in the case of the Hawaiian Pidgin English Bible, the translation of the Bible into vernacular Englishes does not push back enough against the mechanisms in place that maintain the linguistic purity of English in the secular sectors of education and law.

The Hawaiian Pidgin English Bible translation, or *Da Good An Spesho Book,* is particularly significant to such an analysis because of the ways by which the language's origins and treatment illustrate the racio-linguistic borders of national identity and belonging. Its shared history with settler colonialism and to a larger extent, settler monolingualism, make HPE and its history vital to understanding the full impact that *Da Good An Spesho Book* has on the illegitimacy of HPE in the classroom and in legislation. Chapter 1 uncovers the intersections between U.S. missionaries and U.S. agro-industrialists in the dispossession of land and language, the imperial circumstances

surrounding the formation of Hawaiian Pidgin English and its stereotypes, and how the language's continued use threatens settler monolingualism and racialization tactics in the U.S. today. Sarah Dowling's article "Elimination, Dispossession, Transcendence: Settler Monolingualism and Racialization in the United States," is particularly vital to examining exactly how the celebration of multilingualism and multiculturalism does not remove monolingualism from the U.S., but rather, positions standardized English as the contrasting "source" or "native" language to the nation's multilingualism. In doing so, this chapter marks the significance of national identity building in both eliminating Indigenous presence and the nation's imperialist origins. This chapter will go on to show how this translation from an imperial U.S. to a national U.S. weaponizes the act of translation itself, as proposed by Vicente Rafael's "Translation, American English, and the National Insecurities of Empire." Political rhetoric on translation point to its function in annihilating linguistic differences for assimilation into an imagined universal lingua franca, standardized English. At once, the U.S. welcomes the realities of multilingualism but enforces the ideal monolingual hierarchy, and translation is implicated in this practice.

Thus, the translation of the Bible-- a fundamental text in the moralization of settler colonialism-- into Hawaiian Pidgin English prompts inquiries into the functions of postcolonial Bible translation in the U.S. On a larger scale, the majority of research regarding postcolonial Bible translations focuses on its implications for identity formation under British Empire. There are fewer sources on the role of colonial Bible translations under U.S. Empire and even less on postcolonial Bible translations in the U.S. despite the threat that vernacular Englishes pose for the survival of settler

supremacy in language. Chapter 2 uncovers the theories that do exist on postcolonial translation, Bible translation, and translation as a whole. This chapter begins with an overview of Lawrence Venuti's theories on ideology in translation, specifically looking at his analysis on the impossibility of equivalency in translation as well as his concepts of domestication and foreignization. Moving into postcolonial translation theory, Bassnett and Trivedi's introduction to *Postcolonial Translation: Theory and Practice,* the works of Eric Cheyfitz and Tejaswini Niranjana, and Homi K. Bhabha's *The Location of Culture* expose the extensive web of hegemony implicated in translations from former colonies or made by former colonizers, as well considering translation as a practice of colonization itself. Finally, this chapter examines the ideological impact of colonial Bible translations. On the one hand, colonial translations of the Bible were crucial to "Christianizing" languages and embedding what R.S. Sugirtharajah names the "Christian mentality" in his book, *The Oxford Handbook of Postcolonial Biblical Criticism***.** On the other hand, these translations were not exempt from decolonial interpretations and discourses of resistance that powered liberation movements. Limitations to this include potential for mimicry, but mimicry too presents a subversive resistance to colonial representation.

Chapter 3 concludes this project. It conducts a textual analysis of *Da Good An Spesho Book,* examining the difference in language authority between secular and religious educational material in a monolingual-forward nation and the overall impact vernacular English Bible translations pose to the rhetoric of a *national* identity and memory, rather than *imperial*. Examining the rhetoric within the introductions, the symbolism of the imagery posed throughout the text, its public perception, as well as

issues of copyright and agency, this chapter outlines the methods by which this translation authorizes and limits a decolonial representation. Furthermore, given that this Bible was written in a language that emerged from colonial contact and has a complicated relationship with U.S. settler colonialism, this chapter's textual analysis also covers *Da Good An Spesho Book's* rhetoric concerning oppression and resistance through its translation of "freedom" as "slave guys no moa." This analysis dives further into issues of identity formation for a postcolonial audience and draws on concepts from postcolonial Bible translation theory. Within this textual analysis, this thesis will finally take on a broader analysis of the standards observed and not observed in this translation. Published by Wycliffe Bible Translators, the Hawaiian Pidgin Bible adheres to the rules and standards for translation as set forth by the Forum of Bible Agencies International. If one understands these guidelines as a present-day postcolonial Bible "translation theory," then an analysis of the contradictions between this "theory" and the practice of this "theory" via the translation of the Hawaiian Pidgin English Bible ultimately showcases the actual implications of postcolonial vernacular Bible translation under U.S. Empire.

CHAPTER 1

In the 21st century, English holds dominance in the United States, often posing itself as a "natural" necessity of Western assimilation and economic success. The logic of one global lingua franca for economic and communicative means has often functioned to rationalize the standardization of English as a natural process, rather than a metamorphosis of settler monolingualism, or the "the naturalization of English as the 'native' language of the United States" (Dowling 440). This is particularly true for Hawaii, as a major component of education policy has included bans and discriminations against vernacular dialects ever since American colonists occupied Hawaii in the nineteenth century. As Patrick Wolfe writes, "when invasion is recognized as a structure rather than an event, its history does not stop" (402). Hawaiian Pidgin English (HPE) formed as the result of global U.S. imperialism, whereas the original speakers were Asian migrant laborers who left their homelands after they were made unlivable due to U.S. invasion. With no citizenship, these migrant laborers were employed on Hawaii's sugar plantations in the late 19th century as commodified bodies. Christian missionaries, as they had done for the Doctrine of Discovery, provided moral approval to not only scale agriculture to the size of mainland plantations, but to also enact English-only laws as part of their virtue training for indigenous and migrant groups. As a result of missionary-sponsored English-only laws, English entered plantation life and these migrant laborers formed a pidgin to communicate.

While stripped of citizenship and abused without reparation on 19th century sugar plantations, these Asian migrant laborers would later become the championed model minorities of Hawaii after the lifting of citizenship restrictions in the twentieth century.

Settler colonial narratives in the post-civil rights era would uphold these Asian migrant laborers as overcoming plantation life and colonization with economic success, using this story as evidence of the end of colonialism and the celebratory beginning of multicultural/multilingual era. However, this serves settler colonialism's ultimate agenda of eliminating the native: by contrasting multiculturalism and multilingualism from whiteness and English, the U.S. establishes whiteness and English as the natural and logical "native" race and language of the United States. Hawaiian Pidgin English disrupts these ideologies by its own history and presence as a "product of colonial contact situations" (Mühleisen 255). To acknowledge HPE as valid would mean to reckon with a history that illustrates the forced identity of English as a language "native" to the U.S. Even outside of this historical recognition, HPE as a "colonial corruption" of English (Mühleisen 255) makes visible the possibility of multiple Englishes, delegitimizing the notion and need for a "standard" English. Posing a major threat to the nationalist memory and identity of the imperial United States, Hawaiian Pidgin English has a history of being restricted in educational institutions that continues into the present day.

Before the arrival of the first Christian missionaries in Hawaii in 1820 (Kawamoto 194), English "was only circumstantially introduced" for trading and business communication and so, "its dissemination was limited" (194). Early missionaries held the belief that Hawaiian better suited the transmission of Biblical knowledge and teachings than English. Richard Armstrong—the proclaimed father of American education in Hawaii— "vigorously advocated in his papers that Hawaiian be taught in the schools" despite major opposition from mainland critics (Chapin 30-31). However, Kawamoto notes that such advocacy should be read in caution, as "literacy was

not the prevailing motive for teaching native Hawaiians how to read and write: "conversion to Christianity was" (195). While learning in Hawaiian with persons and lessons "neither familiar nor sympathetic to the manifold expressions which had once given meaning to a way of life known before, they assured the advent of a new way of life in the islands" (195). Similar to global Bible translation groups today, early missionaries reduced Hawaii's oral culture by transforming the language to written form through translations of Christian text. While credited with the preservation of Hawaiian language, Kawamoto notes that "the technology of literacy and the foreign ideology of Christianity were taught simultaneously" (195) as part of the education necessary to "civilize" indigenous groups. In the 30 years following this time, the civilizing practices of missionaries would shift in accordance with the needs of U.S. plantation owners, eventually abandoning Hawaiian for English-only education:

> The language policy of the 30 year period from 1820 to 1850 reflected a systematic and hegemonic program of American/Protestant Christian assimilation. Two concurrent and intertwining motives for teaching the English language were at work: one, to convert the indigenous population to Christianity; the other to lay the foundation for American colonization. This dual mission was undertaken by a complementary relationship between the American religious establishment and the American business establishment, two groups which would effectively align their interests and become the de facto ruling elite in Hawaii even before the overthrow of the monarchy in 1893 (Kawamoto 197).

What Kawamoto describes here are the interest convergences between U.S. plantation owners and U.S. missionaries in Hawaii, proving Christianity as an adaptable force for

developing U.S. settler colonial practices. It was missionaries in the nineteenth century who would “initiate a radical program of social transformation in which English language literacy” would eventually become “necessary and significant” with the introduction of capitalism (Kawamoto 196).

Missionary influence on language policy originates in the convergence of their interests to advance Hawaiians out of “ignorance” and American plantation owners’ interests in acquiring large-scale agricultural production. When missionaries altered their own interpretation of the “civilizing mission” and Western moral development to make way for non-natives to purchase land, they grounded the support structure between Christianity and colonialism to later develop English hegemony. Before the 1850s, missionaries opposed large-scale sugarcane cultivation in fear of “foreign capitalists [who] might import slavery” (Kessler 154) and instead, “prioritized small farming as a means of uplift for common Hawaiians” (150). For example, in 1847 Reverend Ephraim Clark acknowledged that ‘honest and industrious’ foreigners with capital could promote the mission’s agenda,” but “any great monopoly of plantations, and sudden influx of a promiscuous foreign population would… almost inevitably lead to a disregard of native rights, to serious contentions, and to a system of subjection and servitude” (154). While the monarchy still had tight control over land and labor, missionaries pursued small cane farming (151) but several of these farms such as Ladd & Co. and Koloa failed leading into the 1840s. Responding to these failures, missionaries shifted their attitude of indigenous-led growth to one that determined that this “development” was hopeless without the interference of colonial American capitalists and Asian migrant labor.

The embedded ethnocentrism in missionaries influenced their blame on indigenous farmers' deficiency, foregrounding the "closing gap between religious and secular American interests" (Chapin 23). When surveyed by the Minister of Foreign Relations in 1846-47, missionaries "agreed that agriculture suffered from what they perceived as Hawaiian indolence" (153). However, this failure's root cause was not indigenous deficiency, but rather, cultural differences between Hawaiian and haole styles of cane growing. While Hawaiian agriculture prioritized "incremental harvesting,… cut[ting] small amounts of sugarcane as needed," the Western tradition of "agro-industry" required "clear-cutting fields and 'a regimented labor force operating… large areas of cane at once' to generate a profit from the grown sugar" (153). Instilled in the ethnocentric idea of Western farming methods as the sole "correct" approach, the missionaries then shifted their interest from "small farming as a means of uplift for common Hawaiians" (Kessler 150) to industrial scale farming, narrowing the divide between American religious and secular interests. Rampant epidemic diseases in the late 1940s provided more fuel for this deficiency narrative (Kessler 158). Policy changes following this epidemic further caused resistance to large-scale sugarcane planting to fade and initiated the adaption of Christian morals to justify land dispossession via large-scale agriculture. The Polynesian, a nineteenth-century mainland newspaper supported by missionaries and colonial businessmen's subscriptions, showcased the flexibility of Christian morals for colonial interests in their 1847 edition:

> According to the Polynesian, rather than being one avenue toward virtue, industry was [now] a prerequisite. Moreover, the most valuable type of agriculture, according to this reasoning, was not the sort of small farming that

> would support independent yeomen, but larger agriculture that could employ the greatest number of Hawaiians and render them industrious in haole eyes. While the missionaries had earlier feared an influx of the wrong kind of capitalist planters uncommitted to Christian values, the Polynesian suggested that planting was an inherently Christian act by virtue of how it encouraged industry among Hawaiians (158).

Rationalized by Christian virtue, Hawaiian legislature passed the Kuleana Act in 1850, "granting aliens the right to purchase lands in fee simple" (160). Bending "Christian virtue" to include industrialization and capitalist production, missionaries would not only signal the green light for the dispossession of land and wealth, but also prove their flexibility for the settler colonial mission. A century later, the 1969 Missionary Annual compiled by the Hawaiian Mission Children's Society would write that "'without [these mission groups] the American flag would not now be flying over Hawaii'" (qtd. in Kawamoto 195). Important to note, however, is that missionaries' alliance with colonial business interests would, almost simultaneously along with land dispossession, drive them to promote English hegemony. Once the economy of Hawaii opened to large-scale agricultural production, many would become dependent on these plantations as a source of employment or food. This would in turn be used by the United States as leverage to enforce American assimilation and English hegemony.

While missionaries were slowly revising their interpretation of a "virtuous" labor-education for indigenous groups, school language policies in Hawaii quietly followed suit. Richard Armstrong, missionary and minister of public instruction for Hawaii, had earlier "advocated in his papers that Hawaiian be taught in the schools" (Chapin 30-31),

but by the late 1840s, shifted his position. With a “certainty that English would become the language of the Hawaiians,” Armstrong claimed that “mastery of English was essential to Native Hawaiians if they were to be able to cope with their present and future worlds” (31). It was under Armstrong’s administration that the early 1850s, outside of being a time of deficiency narratives about indigenous and migrant laborers, also saw the first establishments of government-sponsored English schools (Lucas 5). Missionaries guided these school, “creating ideological unity, order and morality in Hawaiian society” (197). In this mission for order and form across industries of law, economics, and education, “there were growing calls to have instruction conducted in English in all schools” with “economic incentives for teachers favor[ing] English speakers” (qtd. in Kawamoto 197). This linguistic stratification of white English speakers versus indigenous and migrant Hawaiian speakers happened simultaneously with the production of new class stratifications: the “master” and “laborer” social categories of plantation life. In 1850, the Masters and Servants Act passed in Hawaii, “paving the way for massive labor immigration” (198) in addition to “provid[ing] the legal framework within which Hawaii would receive indentured workers” (Sur). Two years later, a new revision of the constitution would be distributed in English and Hawaiian. Three years later, increased funding for English schools in Hawaii would “lead inexorably to English becoming the compulsory language of instruction” (Chapin 31) with “schools noting incentives for economic mobility despite the fact that missionary-led education’s goals were still only rooted in ‘raising up the whole people to an elevated state of Christian civilization’” (qtd. In Kawamoto 197). The movement toward containing Hawaii under the economic and political control of the United States began with the introduction of

plantation-scale agriculture, the migration of foreign laborers, and the subsequent ideological influence of English as the language of Hawaii's colonial future. By 1896, "the government of the Hawaiian Republic declared English to be the required language of instruction in all schools" (Kawamoto 200) and English use expanded outside and inside the plantation (Drager 63). The impacts of these policies together would lend itself to the development of Hawaiian Pidgin English, forever altering the raciolinguistic and settler/native inequalities in Hawai'i.

To examine the threat that Hawaiian Pidgin English imposed on the growing settler monolingual state and the emerging racial capitalism in Hawaii, an analysis of the settler colonialism within its very formation is required. With "the Hawaiian Kingdom already a nation in distress under Western forces of colonialism… the sugar planters sought to build their empire by securing Asian laborers from China, Japan, Korea, and the Philippines" (Fujikane 17). Hawaiian Pidgin English formed as a result of diverse Asian as well as Portuguese and indigenous Hawaiian laborers who worked on plantations (Kawamoto 200). These migrant laborers were part of the first wave of Asian migration in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, a result of "capitalist and imperial expansion" in Asia "that radically altered relationships within households and villages, destroyed working and rural people's homes and lives, and generally made those lives unlivable" (Man 23). Legally prohibited from naturalizing as citizens, these Asian migrant laborers' "sole function within the capitalist economy was as labor, their value derived from their ability to extract profit" (123). The enactment of the 1850 Masters and Servants Act institutionalized a system of wage-labor that practiced aspects of indentured servitude, such as physical abuse and no legal means of dissent or complaint. Laborers

who made civil complaints and refused to return to work were “primarily criminal defendants having illegally left their jobs and only secondarily civil complainants” (Sur); the crime of refusing objectification as a worker superseded any call for labor rights as a human. As far as 1898, “the Board [of Immigration] acknowledged that workers complained about corporeal punishment” but that many cases were dismissed for lack of witnesses (Sur). The incorporation of such labor practices would result in the replacement of “God hath created all men equal" in the 1852 constitution for a milder statement in the 1864 constitution: “Involuntary servitude, except for the crime, is forever prohibited in this Kingdom” (Sur). Candace Fujikane in her introduction to *Asian Settler Colonialism* summarizes this intricate process of settler colonialism and racial capitalism that would later cause the stratification of HPE:

> the sugar planters established the plantation as an economic base for an American settler colony by exploiting the unstable political and economic conditions in Asian nations resulting from American, British, Spanish, and Japanese imperialism. Hawaiʻi is described in historical accounts as a place that offered early Asian laborers economic opportunities, a political haven from universal conscription or political persecution, or a site from which they believed they could better sustain nationalist struggles in their homelands. On the plantations, however, Asian laborers suffered under horrific conditions of anti-Asian racism. Referred to as “cattle,” viewed as “instruments of production,” and ordered as “supplies” along with “fertilizer,” many Asian laborers were flogged, beaten, imprisoned, and even killed on the plantations. (Fujikane 6-7)

Colonial plantation owners migrated to Hawaii with labor practices influenced by slavery, using inhumane treatment as a means of creating social stratification between colonizer and colonized. “Unwilling recruits swept into the service of empire,” Asian migrant laborers would be exploited for the settler colonial state, having already lost their own homelands to U.S. imperialism (Fujikane 7). However, their utility in twentieth-century colonial enterprise would require a narrative of Asian laborers who succeeded by American assimilation—a narrative that does not comply with the perception of their vernacular, Hawaiian Pidgin English, as deficient.

The formation of Hawaiian Pidgin English on plantations is a story of how language is manipulated to create a racial capitalist order. Plantation owners separated migrant and indigenous laborers by ethnicity and/or language to prevent collective uprising (Kawamoto 198). Pidgin Hawaiian was spoken amongst different ethnic groups, but because plantation owners used ethnic divisions to create competition, independent ethnic group identity intensified despite a common language (Dreger 63). This worked in colonial favor, until English-mandated laws would cause these once divided laborers to use Hawaiian Pidgin English to form alliances and eventually, unionize against labor conditions. Colonial plantation owners’ divide and rule strategy was considered “essential to prevent any one ethnic group from working in collusion against the oppressive Caucasian business establishment” (Kawamoto 198). However, this strategy hindered the desire of American businessmen and missionaries to bring Hawaii under the political control of the United States. The US Congress cited hesitation to accept Hawaii into the Union due to its majority immigrant racial composition, resulting in American missionaries and businessmen to initiate widespread English language assimilation (199-

200). Once English became the language of instruction in the schools of migrant and indigenous laborers' children, English made its way into plantation life, and laborers shifted from using their own languages to Hawaiian Pidgin English. With the overthrow of Hawaii's last reigning monarch in 1893 and English-only policies enacted in 1896, the late 1890s and early 1900s marked the crucial period for HPE's development (200). Hawaiian Pidgin English became instrumental in "forming a single identity among immigrant groups" and this collectivity laid the path to union formation across ethnic lines (201). As laborers tried to leverage power in collective communication, plantation owners used raciolinguistic stratification in response. American missionaries and businessmen, "custodians of American business, government, religion, and education in Hawaii," distributed stereotypes of Pidgin English users as working class, ignorant, uneducated, leading the 20th century with raciolinguistic friction between haole and local groups (200-201). By 1920, the Federal Bureau of Education determined that Hawaiian schools were "'linguistically weak' and the investigators report 'recommended that children be segregated based on English proficiency'" (202). Not only did an oppressive campaign against Hawaiian and Hawaiian Pidgin English ensue in education and law, but the twentieth century saw another subtle "divide and rule" strategy employed by the colonial state, one which involved situating these once inferiorized Asian migrant laborers against Hawaii's indigenous groups. The treatment of Hawaiian Pidgin English in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries emerges out of tension between the dysfunctional relationship between model minority myths, Asian American Hawaiian Pidgin English speakers, and Hawaii's settler colonial tactic of using Asian bodies to irrationalize indigenous rights.

In the twentieth century, Asian civil rights would receive recognition by the colonial state that once barred Asian laborers from citizenship entirely. In doing so, the settler state worked to dispossess indigenous Hawaiians, using the assimilationist rationale predicated on minority equivalence as well as constructions of multiculturalism. Post-World War 2, the Asian migrant laborer was replaced with the Asian citizen. The United States "witnessed the inclusion of racial minorities into the U.S. national life in unprecedented ways" from the 1940s to the 1960s (Man 126). Previous restrictions to citizenship and immigration bans were lifted, "allowing Chinese, Filipinos, South Asians, Japanese, and Koreans to become naturalized citizens" (126) and produce more settlers. The post-World War 2 civil rights era also represented the expansion of global racial capitalism which "required a shift in the management of U.S. racial populations" (125). In Hawaii, this new racial order appeared through the investment of the "ethnic histories written about Asians" that functioned to "demonstrate an investment in an ideal of American democracy… that ends up reproducing the colonial claims made in white settler historiography" (Fujikane 2-3):

> Asian political and economic 'successes' in Hawai'i have been represented as evidence of Hawai'i's exceptionalism as a multicultural state, proof that Asians have been able to overcome the racist treatment and policies of the American sugar planters to form what several scholars have described as a 'harmonious multiculturalism.' Many historians employ a developmental narrative that begins with the colonization of Hawaiians and ends with multicultural democracy in Hawai'i. The story of multiethnic diversity is thus cast as the triumphant 'resolution' to Hawai'i's colonial past (3).

This multiethnic diversity image is essential to U.S. settler colonialism in the 20th and 21st centuries. Patrick Wolfe asserts this as a “logic of elimination,” reminding readers that “settler colonialism destroys to replace” (388). When the narrative of Asian assimilation is used to at once to create closure to its colonial history, yet at the same time, maintains its cohesion, this narrative asserts itself as “a more effective mode of [native] elimination than conventional forms of killing” (Wolfe 402). However, this story of the model Asian migrant laborer turned assimilated citizen requires acquiring whiteness through language. For the model minority Asian citizen to then speak Hawaiian Pidgin English is disrupting settler monolingualism, and thereby, a logic of elimination.

Settler monolingualism works to align place and belonging to language and is instrumental in the naturalization of standardized English as a means of perpetuating logical, linguistic elimination of the indigenous. Sarah Dowling’s article "Elimination, Dispossession, Transcendence: Settler Monolingualism and Racialization in the United States," argues that monolingualism not only functions to destroy indigenous societies, but also “plays a crucial role in the production of more settlers” (449) by creating a global community of monolingual English speakers within U.S. borders. The colonial-era rationale for English as a “business” language continues today as standardized English is perceived as a global lingua franca and can provide—and is often required to-- access Western economic privileges. Within its own borders, the U.S. reiterates the same message to pressure indigenous groups into assimilation: “securing possession of English offers a path to settler sovereignty” (449). However, to produce more settlers in a post-Civil Rights era, the colonial state must now welcome diversity despite its ever-present monolingual agenda. Dowling writes that “the admission of once-alien languages

demonstrates the unique, flexible, and noncoercive forms of freedom, justice, and belonging available in a settler colony" (455). The settler colony then characterizes itself as "transcend[ing] the monolingual structures of the nation-state" even though "the effect of listing dozens of immigrant languages is to position English as the substrate on which they rest" (455-456). Through the opening of Asian citizenship on the cusp of the civil rights movement, the U.S. also positioned itself as removed from its settler monolingualism, entering an era of multilingual and multicultural celebration. Yet, this situates the "point of contrast" as standardized English, eliminating the linguistic presence of the Native by positioning English as "natural, neutral, and ironically native" (456). The welcoming of non-Native languages allows settler colonialism to open borders for more settlers while it continues to triumph the story of Asians in Hawaii moving out of sugar-plantation oppression through capitalism as the example of its colonial end and multicultural beginning.

Whereas this narrative provides a forward-facing view of settler history in the United States, Hawaiian Pidgin English threatens the idea of a clear-cut transition from the end of colonialism to the beginning of multiculturalism, making it a target to ridicule and suppression. For one, HPE makes visible the myth of standardized English as "natural" and "logical" by its historical associations with global U.S. imperialism, which then also restricts the narrative of whiteness as native to the United States. To inscribe the Asian American HPE speaker with stereotypes of low intelligence and a "brokenness" as a result of their "broken" English, the settler colonial state criticizes the figure of the Asian HPE speaker as not assimilated enough whilst also using the socioeconomic growth of these same figures to reinforce the model of an assimilated citizen.

Specifically, this contradiction is a case of “grappling with linguistic difference that affects primarily those deemed internal others” (Yildiz 210). Unlike immigrants who are welcomed into the U.S. with their foreign languages as new settlers (but still subjected to the “necessity” of English), Hawaiian Pidgin English speakers already occupy an English. Its difference from the standardized form illustrates an otherness and its demand to be recognized as the speaker’s rightful property damages the ideology of standard English as a “natural” necessity and “native” tongue. In its illustration of difference, HPE makes standardized English vulnerable to its own mythology in ways that foreign languages do not. When non-English language speakers demand language rights such as in tax form translations or having access to their rights in their own language, this partially works “in tandem with other white supremacist logics in order to produce and perpetuate settler power” (Dowling 440): by using standardized English as the source language, translations into foreign languages reconfigures English as “natural, neutral, and ironically native” (456). Unlike the source and target language in these scenarios, translating between standardized English and Hawaiian Pidgin English does not service settler power. Instead, HPE’s history services the memory of cultural and language dispossession: it places English as an invading language, rather than a native one, as it recalls its own formation from the obtrusive English hegemony in law, education, and in creating social stratifications during the nineteenth century. However, this threat to modern day settler colonialism extends beyond the illogical “temporal-territorial” status of standardized English (455). Legitimizing vernacular Englishes such as HPE would then also mean extending the “boundaries of belonging” (441) beyond properties of whiteness, with standardized English acting as one such property.

The suppression of Hawaiian Pidgin English is integral in maintaining the desire for standardized English as a property of whiteness. By reinforcing new settlers' acquisition for standardized English, and thereby, whiteness, as the natural choice, the United States stabilizes its "English is native" ideology into a "white is native" ideology. To examine this, first consider the contradiction between the narratives "proving that Asians have been able to overcome the racist treatment and policies of the American sugar planters to form what several scholars have described as a 'harmonious multiculturalism'" and the deployment of raciolinguistic prejudice when such Asians speak HPE (Fujikane 3). This shows that language is "co-articulated with race" as a "flexible determinant of citizenship" (Dowling 445) and the full privileges of citizenship are awarded based on assimilation into whiteness vis-à-vis the possession of standardized English. Using whiteness as the point from which difference is defined in the United States, and on top of that, positioning standardized English as one form of acquiring whiteness, the "white as native" ideology is established from language politics. Cheryl Harris in her piece "Whiteness as Property" writes that whiteness is commodified as access to civil rights, or the "possibility of controlling critical aspects to one's life rather than being the object of others' domination" (Harris 1730). Going back to Hawaii, Asians are positioned in the racial order by their ascension from oppression by attaining statehood; however, this narrative matters none when HPE is spoken in replacement of standardized English. By refusing compliance, Asians who use HPE demonstrate that even the "model minority" does not "naturally" desire whiteness through standardized English. Settler colonial logic then "fram[es] [the] racialized subjects' language practices as inadequate for the complex thinking processes needed to navigate the global economy"

(Rosa 627), rearticulating the natural desire of standardized English and whiteness as part and parcel of belonging to the land. To ensure control over the desire for commodities of whiteness, particularly in language, the United States establishes standardized English and whiteness as "the quintessential property for personhood" (Harris 1737).

Evaluating the treatment of Hawaiian Pidgin English in law and education, one can read how the settler colonial state continues to use control over economic mobility and dehumanizing classroom practices as the ultimate response to HPE's threat to the ideologies of a "native" whiteness and standardized English. In 1987, the Board of Education attempted to pass the first piece of "legislation [that] effectively banned the use of Pidgin in the classroom" and only after public outrage was a "weaker version" passed "in which teachers were encouraged to use English only in the classroom" (Drager 70). In the 2009 documentary *Pidgin: The Voice of Hawai'i,* a Hawaii State Board of Education representative showcased the continued settler colonial economic logic amidst sympathy for the implied "necessity" of standardized English in the real world:

> The Hawaii State Board of Education has a policy that states English only in the classroom. If you walk into a restaurant, or a plate lunch place then, you hear folks speaking really heavy Pidgin English. I think the first thought is, oh, they're probably not real educated. They could be brilliant. So it has been an issue in many of our different rural areas where Pidgin is so strong. Personally, it tends to hold some of our students back. Because with it, if they're not able to engage, in proper English during a job interview, or interacting with folks, it can count against them in the private sector when they go out into the so-called real world.

> So we looked at it from an educational standpoint, that they need to have a strong command of proper standard English (Young).

What the Board of Education fails to acknowledge is that the demand of "proper standard English" is not based in innocent and natural necessity, but in a world curated with Western capitalist values of communication and labor. There is no "standard English" but only a standardized English which adapts its standards to what does and does not count as belonging in a world where belonging is predicated on the possession of whiteness through language. In *Pidgin: The Voice of Hawai'i*, Chief Justice William S. Richardson of the Hawaii Supreme Court stated that his teachers would immediately recognize his pidgin and imply that he was "not gonna speak the King's English," once again reiterating the suppression of HPE as a settler colonial practice. Schools in Hawaii became segregated by language testing in the admissions process. The practice of giving speech test to children for admission into English standard schools "based on whether they said "tree" instead of "three" or "dis one boy wen trow da ball" instead of "he threw the ball," would continue up until 1947 (Fox 13). Other interviewees would recall physical abuse in classrooms upon speaking in HPE (Young). Lee Tonouchi in his piece "Da State of Pidgin Address" recalls that "if we wanted for go bachroom, we couldn't tell da teachah, 'Teachah, can go bachroom?' You gotta enunciate and tell, 'May I please use the restroom?'" (Tonouchi 76-77). The correction to "May I please use the restroom" refuses to register one's bodily needs, undermining one's right to use one's own linguistic property. Harris asserts the right of property as one of "use and enjoyment" as resources "deployable at the social, political, and institutional level" (Harris 1734). Removing the agency of HPE at each of these levels is ultimately the forced dispossession of property

considered too ideologically and historically jeopardizing to the needs of the settler colonial state to translate whiteness and English from imperial identities to national identities.

"Translating" imperial identities to national identities in fact relies heavily on translation itself. The relationship between U.S. empire and translation has actually been shown to function in the alteration of national memory by its reorganization of the nation's multilingualism into a hierarchy that "translates" English from an imperial to a national language. Vicente Rafael, in "Translation, American English, and the National Insecurities of Empire," points to the idea of translation as a tool of assimilation into a national memory that "unfold[s] alongside a history of insisting the United States has always been, was meant to be, and must forever remain a monolingual nation" (42). In the early colonial era, many felt that the language of the new Republic required a distinct Americanization. So, for post-colonial Americans, there was a "pressing need to 'improve and perfect' English, to remake it into something wholly American" (Rafael 42). 300 years later, the same hierarchical monolingualism of "American" English can be found in the underlying assumptions of President Bush's 2006 political rhetoric on translation:

> In order to convince people we care about them, we've got to understand their culture and show them we care about their culture. You know, when somebody comes to me and speaks Texan, I know they appreciate Texas culture. When somebody takes time to figure out how to speak Arabic, it means they're interested in somebody else's culture [...]. We need intelligence officers who

> when somebody says something in Arabic or Farsi or Urdu, know what they're talking about (qtd. in Rafael 37).

This 2006 speech from President George W. Bush on the need for translators reveals distinct empire-driven political ideologies on the centrality of English. In comparing his vernacular "Texan" to Arabic, Farsi, and Urdu, Bush indicates their functional equivalency (38). He posits Texan as a "dialectal variations of a universal lingua franca, which no doubt is imagined to be a [standardized] English" (38). In this way, each of these languages are evacuated of their differences and lumped into translatable "foreign" languages, with the corresponding source, or original language as English. In this way, Bush illustrates translation under U.S. Empire as functioning to subsume any linguistic variation from standardized English under the imperial lingua Franca (38). Translation in the secular sector is thus key in pushing the "process of reduction." As reviewed previously, the U.S. builds a national identity of whiteness by welcoming immigrant multiculturalism to the extent that these immigrants reduce their identities in favor of mimicking certain properties of 'native' whiteness. The above political rhetoric shows that translation services are similarly strategized. Multilingual populations are welcome to become settlers only for any linguistic differences to be reduced and replaced into standardized English in the name of assimilation. Translation under American empire functions to posit a standard English, a property of whiteness, alongside citizenship and national identity. Merging polylingual realities into a monolingual hierarchy is ideal for settler colonialism to posit whiteness alongside English as natural and native to the U.S. Vernacular Englishes, such as Bush's "Texan" or Hawaiian Pidgin English, on the one

hand, threaten this logic of elimination, but on the other hand, are used to exemplify-the need for linguistic "reform" in the monolingual nation-state.

While the secular divisions of education, language policy, and translation practices all carry on the political mission of American empire, the role of Christianity and particularly of Bible translation is missing from the conversation, yet still just as essential and relevant to this historical and political analysis. The Bible was and is key to the identity of American empire, as one can see with the multitude of ways Christian missionaries bent Biblical interpretation to moralize settler colonial practices. Biblical translations also have a history of manipulating ideology for the identity formation of the colonizer and the colonized. While research into the Biblical translations under colonial and postcolonial Britain have been extensively studied, there has been less research on the ways in which Bible translations into indigenous languages have functioned for or against American empire. Even less so is the research on the role of Biblical translations into vernacular Englishes, especially considering the threat vernacular Englishes pose to the continuation of settler sovereignty. A translation of a foundational text for settler colonial identity—the Bible—into Hawaiian Pidgin English then raises the questions about Biblical translation under American settler colonialism, the differences in language authority for secular and religious classrooms in a monolingual-forward nation, and its overarching implications for the rhetoric of a national, rather than imperial, memory and identity. Even more so, as a Bible written in a language that emerges from colonial contact and with a complex relationship to U.S. settler colonialism, this text's rhetoric surrounding oppression and resistance marks its influence on modern day postcolonial Bible translation theories.

CHAPTER 2

In the same year that the Board of Education attempted to pass legislation banning the use of Hawaiian Pidgin English in schools across Hawaii (Drager 70), the translation of the Hawaiian Pidgin English Bible began. Translated from 1987 to 2020, *Da Good An Spesho Book* was the first Bible to ever be translated into Hawaiian Pidgin English and its process occurred during the most recent wave of tension between standardized English policies and HPE speakers. Whereas secular public schools actively denied Pidgin speakers their student needs in the 1980s and beyond, churches in Hawaii had adopted the need of learning and expressing in one's own vernacular with little to no pushback. According to research, churches and other domains of religion are one of few spaces where "mother tongues generally dominate Standardized English" (Choy 43) despite the threat such linguistic agency might posit against standardized English's role in settler monolingual logic. Vernacular languages, as with foreign languages, are welcome only so far as they bring more settlers into the U.S.—after that, their multilingual differences are expected to be annihilated for the sake of assimilation and "upward" mobility via the adoption of standardized English. One needs to speak "correct" English to be presentable as intelligent and worthy of learning, careers, and leadership; yet, one is more than welcome to come as is, with all their linguistic differences, to be intelligent enough and worthy enough to know the Christian God. Translations of the Bible are portrayed as a "neutral, legitimate and benevolent" (Kinyua 58) act, most predominately by pointing to equivalent comprehension—rather than any ideological purpose—as the translation's function. However, it is not unknown in history to see an upsurge of Bible translations when there is a need for certain identities to be removed or adopted: For example,

Christianity translated itself out of "Aramaic and Hebrew in order to gain an identity separated from its roots in Judaism" (248). Moreover, as postcolonial and Bible translation theory will show us, equivalency without ideological influence is hardly attainable when considering the translator's historical and rhetorical consciousness in the decision-making process. Altogether, a framework on power dynamics in translation and postcolonial Bible translation theory renders the complexity of the *Da Good An Spesho Book* even further.

In 1986, Lawrence Venuti would establish the translator as a creator of their own right as well as someone who shapes the cultural landscape of the target language despite their "invisibility." Venuti argues that the translator's labor, although often "invisible" when evaluating the text as a whole, is apparent when considering the text as the result of the translator's complex process of limiting loss:

> what usually occurs can be described as a simultaneous excess of target-language meaning and loss of source-language meaning, both of which the translator tries to limit by choosing to communicate a specific signified to the exclusion of others. Yet the signifiers that the translator must choose to perform this limiting function turn out to be not just inefficient, but active in promoting the semantic slide… Since the replacements for these features in the translation come from another language system—with different signifiers and different rules and conventions of signification, with a different history of development and a different social conjuncture—they may well have a density of accumulated meaning that is further complicated by their specific use in the translated text,

> thereby precipitating a second excess and loss which the translator must take into account and restrict, if possible, with a calculated choice (182).

Examining the inherent subjectivity of a translator, Venuti makes clear that attempts at linguistic sameness or equivalency in a translation are rarely possible, despite previous theory that asserted equivalency as the goal of translation (Palumbo 43). Instead, an inevitable asymptomatic relationship opens up between source and target texts due to the "the numerous acts of interpretation that the translator must perform and the irremovable differences between source and target languages" (183). Quoting Althusser, Venuti concludes that translations carry a "tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centers of culture," and that ideological determinations of such cultures are "assimilated or 'quoted' in it, with or without the translator's awareness" (197). The sites of tension or struggle between source and target languages signify "the strategy at work in the translated text and, ultimately, of the cultural determinations that influenced the choice of that strategy" (208). The complex impact of the translator on a target language's cultural landscape underscores the importance of interpreting ideological determinants in a translation, most notably in texts which claim their sole purpose as equivalency.

In *The Scandals of Translation: Toward an Ethics of Difference*, Venuti continues his work on theorizing ideology as a determinant and introduces cultural translation studies, a preface to postcolonial translation studies. Here, Venuti re-introduces the translation strategies of domestication and foreignization as one means of questioning how much a translation assimilates and how much a translation reckons with difference. Domestication is aimed at creating a fluent, transparent text assimilated into the culture of the target language (Palumbo 183); foreignization avoids this fluency or assimilation as a

means of surfacing the "otherness" of a source text—a form of "resistant translation opposing the prevailing ethnocentric modes of transfer" (Palumbo 48). For Venuti, the function of translation is domestic assimilation, but this shadows over the asymmetrical relations of domination and dependence in every act of translating, which he calls the "scandals of translation" (4). The "scandals of translation" alter the cultural identity of the target language speakers. By creating domestic representation of a foreign text, such as domesticating the Bible by translating into local pidgins and creoles, "a domestic subject, a position of intelligibility that is also an ideological position" must be considered (Venuti 68). By the act of translation, the domestic reader approaches the text with their own values and ideologies to inform their interpretations. For translators, this means that it is of utmost importance to consider how a reader's intelligence and ideologies will interact with a text. The domestic subjects, now having new constructions of their identity in a foreign text, are faced with new "development of domestic language" and literacy, such as new reading practices or the source text's cultural values (Venuti 75). When the translations' ideological function is the expansion of an institution, such as the Church, the domestication of a text can dislocate the domestic subject's cultural identity. The function of translating institutional material is to maintain equivalency, "translating that enables and ratifies existing discourses and canons, interpretations and pedagogies, advertising campaigns and liturgies—if only to ensure the continued and unruffled reproduction of the institution" (82). This need for assimilation then takes priority over compatibility with a source's language's cultural differences. However, the institution ultimately cannot avoid the risk of "infiltration from different and even incompatible cultural material that may controvert authoritative texts" (81),

since these cultural ideas exist despite attempts of a foreign culture to domesticate itself through language. A power struggle unfolds between the institutionalized source culture and target language of a translated text, and it is this power struggle that comes to define postcolonial translation studies of Biblical texts.

Postcolonial translation studies expose the hegemonic structures within the translated works of writers from former colonies, from former colonizers, as well as considering translation as a practice of colonization. Issues, such as stereotypes, that emerge from a translated text between dominated and oppressed cultures, the authority of a translation, and the sociopolitical values imparted by a translation are relevant here. In Bassnett and Trivedi's introduction to *Postcolonial Translation: Theory and Practice*, they point to the ways in which the historical Euro-Western relationship between the "original" or source and the translation of the "original" seeps into colonizer modes of logic. Equally significant is that this notion of the original as de facto superior to translation "coincides with the period of early [European] colonial expansion:"

> For Europe was regarded as the great Original, the starting point, and the colonies were therefore copies, or 'translations' of Europe, which they were supposed to duplicate. Moreover, being copies, translations were evaluated as less than originals, and the myth of the translation as something that diminished the greater original established itself… The notion of the colony as a copy or translation of the great European Original inevitably involves a value judgement that ranks the translation in a lesser position in the literary hierarchy. The colony, by this definition, is therefore less than its colonizer, its original (Bassnett 4).

This logic was rationalized further as studies of translation worked under the assumption that something is always lost from the source language to the target language, rather than something gained (4). Other postcolonial translation theorists, such as Eric Cheyfitz and Tejaswini Niranjana also argue that translation forms according to the needs of Empire and takes form from the asymmetrical relations between colonized and colonizer (3-4). Bhabha's *The Location of Culture* expands on this idea by considering how cultural translations of post-colonized groups in postcolonial nations create novel "third spaces." These "third spaces" are sites where the hybridity of the colonized is translated into culture, refashioning the logical structures of the West and thereby, exposing its structural fallacies. In "Cultural Diversity and Cultural Differences," Bhabha writes that "the cutting edge of translation and negotiation, the in-between space—carries the burden of the meaning of culture" (Bhabha 38-39). Since translation allows for colonized groups to bring something politically new out of their negotiations between cultures and power structures, this political act "can have revolutionary, anticolonial dimensions, eschewing stereotypical notions of the colony as a translated copy of the original metropole" (Orsini 328). This notion of postcolonial translation also revises the Western idea of the translated text as a form of loss and therefore, inferior to the original text. However, in instances of Bible translations, this "Third Space" resistance is at once more limited and more interrogatory. The source text is authorized not just by Western logic, but also by Western belief; yet, in translating into vernacular, the colonial Church is faced with culture-bound words or concepts, whose untranslatability reveals a hybridity that unshackles the authority of representation from western Christian-colonial power.

Christianity also has a history of using Bible translation to fashion identities according to political and economic interests. In the past century, Christianity was vital to the political and economic development of colonialism and postcolonialism as Biblical translation "offer[ed] the linguistic bridge needed to order to serve the later colonial mission" (Kinyua 80). The "second major increase" in the development of Bible translations occurs "at the beginning of the nineteenth century" and "coincides precisely with the period of colonial expansion," which characteristically was founded on the Church's reinterpretation of the Bible (Mühleisen 249). The Catholic Church's reinterpretation of the Bible in favor of colonial "discovery" colluded moral good with native elimination and settler production, disguising colonial power situations as legitimate benevolence. "The Western colonial administration," as Fanon writes in *The Wretched of the Earth* is "directed by a Western colonial Christianity." Christianity is accountable for the "foreigner's Church," and the foreigner's Bible, which "does not call the colonized to the ways of God, but to the ways of the white man, to the ways of the master, the ways of the oppressor" (Fanon). Under the Doctrine of Discovery, the Catholic Church gave the power of "discovery" into the hands of European settlers and in addition, justified this by enacting a distinct identity of Europe as God's servant, master and "caretaker" of the Earth. This new identity formation through the Bible is what R.S. Sugirtharajah defines as the "Christian mentality:" the simplistic belief in truth and blasphemy that places individuals into binaries of "elect and damned, polished and primitive, and sophisticated colonizers and naive enslaved" (Sugirtharajah). When it comes to Bible translations, their "neutral, legitimate and benevolent" (Kinyua 58)

perception often disguises colonial power relations and how language itself was weaponized to alter the colonial subject's own personhood:

> Through language, colonialism took upon itself the power of describing, naming, defining, and representing the colonized. Since language is the carrier of culture and values by which we perceive ourselves and our place in the world, colonization by imposing upon the colonized a particular value-system, succeeded in denigrating the colonized's cultural values. Therefore, postcolonial inquiry brings to the fore the questions of language and their importance in answering the question of identity and being (Kinyua 63).

If language itself was vital to the ideological determination of colonist and colonized identity, then the language of Bible translations, the value systems it issues the colonized subjects, and the new identities it creates for the colonized are all of concern. Even more so, by transmitting Christian concepts—often predicates of Western worldviews—through Bible translations, vernacular languages become "Christianized" (Mühleisen 251) while remaining in "the familiar context of the recipient culture and build on structures already existent" (253). "Christianizing" language has the dangerous potential to grow into the rhetoric of "civilizing" a language. Informing the language itself with Christian mentalities, Bible translations thus influence literacy and identity formation. Bible translations were ideologically determined to embed this specific binary-based mentality where the colonized were legible only in subservient positions (Kinyua 61). In this colonial logic, Bible translations serviced "the dynamic of power relations between the educator and those who are to be educated (Viswanathan 4). While Bible translators sometimes included indigenous speakers in addition to translators from Empire, these

translations nonetheless aimed at "dominating and restructuring the colonized's view of reality" (Kinyua 59), revealing an intentional historical and rhetorical consciousness behind the translator's decision-making process. However, the caveat to colonial power Bible translations is that these translations were not immune to decolonial interpretations and their effects on liberation movements.

While the Bible is one tool by which discourses of colonialism emerge, it is also home to discourses of resistance. These discourses form new identities when translated and made familiar to any language group, but is especially so under colonial power dynamics. For example, Orsini points to the term "activist translator" as one definition for the postcolonial Bible translator, since the translator engages "anticolonial sensibility through bold acts of reading" and interpretation in the translation process (328-329). With the agency translators have in posing a new re-interpretation of the Bible through translation, a postcolonial translation appropriates Christian discourse "as a fundamentally political act, an act that can have revolutionary, anticolonial dimensions" (Orsini 328). By proposing new meanings and interpretations that actively seek to challenge colonial power dynamics, translators reject Christianity as the colonizer's culture, and instead, claim an autonomous Christian tradition. Practicing faith in one's own vernacular supports community-building, "creat[ing] solidarity among and within ethnic groups, indexes ethnic identity, and plays an important role identity construction" (Choy 43). Even more so, postcolonial Bible translations demonstrate a "limited usefulness of European languages and cultural norms" (Strother 20) resulting in an inevitable "sacrifice of linguistic purity" for the sake of saving souls (Mühleisen 255). Rather, these translations empower vernacular languages with "the authority of the

written word" (Mühleisen 255), acting as a "stimulus to nationalism" and resistance (Strother 20). However, while Biblical translations into pidgins and creoles achieve a powerful ethos as a language of Biblical authority, many of these same pidgins and creoles still struggle for official recognition and public prestige.

Attempting to attain authority through the written word "reinforces the dichotomy of written versus oral and high prestige versus low prestige language" (Mühleisen 255). In doing so, this ethos still limits itself to power through empire rather than against it, "translat[ing] their cultures into an empowered 'equivalence'" through mimicry (Shaden 10). Bhabha's concept of mimicry can be extended to the identity formation that occurs in postcolonial Bible translations. On the one hand, mimicry is "dependent for its representation upon some strategic limitation or prohibition within the authoritative discourse itself" (Bhabha 127). It often nurtures a self-imposed "colonial-surveillance" (130). In the case of the Hawaiian Pidgin English Bible, its use of HPE while HPE is radically discouraged in secular education is symbolic of "flawed colonial mimesis, in which to be Anglicized, is emphatically not to be English" (128). Yet, mimicry's partiality and incompleteness also create new spaces of negotiating the hybridity of one's own culture and the cultures of the colonizer. In these spaces, the arbitrary nature of colonial authority is exposed: "Mimicry does not merely destroy narcissistic authority through the repetition slippage of difference and desire" (131). By posing that subversive resistance through translations of the Bible—a text foundational to the distribution of colonial identities-- *Da Good An Spesho Book* is caught in the conflicting web of threatening and submitting to settler colonial and settler monolingual dominance.

CHAPTER 3

On The Introductory Statements

Da Good An Spesho Book features two opening statements from the Pidgin Bible Translation Group: “Da Hawaiian Pidgin Bible: Wat Dis Book Tell” and “To Our English Speaking Readers.” Both reiterate similar messages, but with key differences in content and form. Most notably, the earlier is written in Hawaiian Pidgin English and the latter is written in a standardized English, indicating that the translation group welcomes those fluent in one or both language groups. “Da Hawaiian Pidgin Bible: Wat Dis Book Tell” delves into the varying functions of this translation, which reflect back to Venuti’s discussed struggles between the competing interests of domestication, comprehension, and assimilation in Bible translations. According to the opening, the translators “all make shua mean same ting, da Pidgin, da English, an da Hebrew an Aramaic,” indicating equivalency as a goal. However, reflecting on translation and postcolonial translation theory, this is nearly impossible when an asymmetrical power dynamic between a source and target language precedes the creation of a translation and plays a role in the translator’s choice. It assumes that Bible translation is a value free activity where it’s “possible for translators to arrive objectively at a perfect replication of the original text” (Kinyua 66). By assuming the possibility of equivalency, the unequal relationships between the source and target language, as well as the historical consciousness of the translator, are overlooked.

An analysis of the introduction illustrates the translators’ historical and rhetorical consciousness, both of which subtly reflect on the larger colonial and postcolonial power dynamics between standardized English and Hawaiian Pidgin English. For example, the

writers consistently identify why the Hawaiian Pidgin English Bible is necessary when standardized English Bibles exist. The writers point out that while "plenny peopo dat talk Pidgin learn da standard English too,… plenny odda peopo talk Pidgin all da time, an ony use English litto bit. Fo dem, da Pidgin Bible mo easy to undastan den da English Bible" (iii). They go on to make clear of their intended audience (this latter group of Hawaiian Pidgin English speakers) and of their second purpose (comprehension). Acknowledging that "da English language like use fancy kine hybolic words fo ery idea, an get times wen dat make um hard fo understand" (iv), the writers admit a gap in the way that standardized English and Hawaiian Pidgin create meaning. Furthermore, it casts doubt onto how equivalency can be achieved when this Bible means to use "da language dey grow up in, da one dat show how dey tink and how dey feel" (iii). For the Bible to become comprehensible and its values assimilable into one's cultural identity, translators must make calculated choices which, according to Venuti, inevitably result in loss in the original meanings of source translations of the Bible—the Hebrew, Aramaic, and English. Further complicating this decision-making process are the asymmetrical relationships between Hawaiian Pidgin English and standardized English, and its larger history within American Empire. These key moments, amongst others, in the introduction then act as rhetorical responses to some ideological determinants within this translation.

The introductions mark the Pidgin Bible Translation group's goals and purpose, and reveals how this translation deals with difference and Otherness. For one, since the Bible used in HPE churches up till this time has typically consisted of more standardized English Bibles, this translation now domesticates the Bible as belonging to HPE. It diminishes the previous "foreignness" of the Bible. However, the introduction's

acknowledgment of the translation functions, Hawaiian Pidgin English's meaning-making differences from standardized English, and the specific categorization of audience makes Hawaiian Pidgin English 's "Otherness" as a Biblical language apparent. The introductions uncover the translation group's own reckoning with their relationship to standardized English, and in this purposeful dialogue about differences, creates elements of foreignization. Yet, the corresponding introduction-- written in Standardized English-- complicates this. On the one hand, its juxtaposition with the Hawaiian Pidgin English introduction positions Hawaiian Pidgin English in contrast with standardized English and does not allow Hawaiian Pidgin English to stand completely in its own light. On the other hand, the title "To Our English-Speaking Readers" indicates standardized English speakers as the "Other."

With the majority of this second introduction being a translation of "Da Hawaiian Pidgin Bible: Wat Dis Book Tell," "To Our English Speaking Readers" casts standardized English as the secondary, "Other" language within the text—not the primary. Only one aspect of the standardized English translation is not found in the original. Premised as a "a warning to English speakers," this specific section alone surfaces some rhetorical decisions that uncover a deeper, complex double consciousness:

> a warning to English speakers: the laborers from many different countries who formulated Hawaii Pidgin in order to communicate with each other on work teams in the sugar cane and pineapple plantations of Hawaii did not have formal schools to go to in order to learn standard English. Nobody monitored their speech and told them certain words were offensive to English speakers. So when you come to Exodus 3:9 and are told "Da Egypt peopo stay make dem bus ass" for the

> extremely hard work the Egyptians required of their Israeli slaves, that's normal Pidgin. The fact that it would be improper if this were English is obvious to English speakers; but this is not English (vi)

The decision to write a separate introduction for standardized English speakers alone indicates an internal consideration of the dominance it has exerted over Hawaiian Pidgin English. To add a "warning" against the perceived "offensiveness" of HPE indicates a presumption of this critique, likely due to the translator's historical consciousness about the treatment of Hawaiian Pidgin English as of inferior and low-intelligent thought. The narrative of HPE's colonial origins is also made more palatable in contrast to the reviewed literature on Hawaiian Pidgin English's origin. "Work teams" imagines different labor relations between migrant laborers and U.S. plantation owners. "Teams" implies elements of collaboration and fairness that undercut the abuses migrant workers faced from plantation owners who not only imported their virtue for industrialization and capitalism, but also influences from mainland slavery practices (Fujikane 6-7). The larger history of U.S. imperialism in Asia responsible for the mass migration of Asian laborers from their unlivable homelands is missing entirely (Man 23). The significance of Hawaiian Pidgin English's origin in the formation of unions on these sugar plantations is lost as is the origin of its "offensive" stereotypes as an ideological weapon in response to these unions. Instead, the narrative here takes on a more apologetic tone. It claims, "nobody monitored their speech," yet many Hawaiian Pidgin English speakers recall losing educational opportunities, work opportunities, and facing physical or psychological harm when expressing in Hawaiian Pidgin English (Young). Furthermore, asserting that Hawaiian Pidgin English 's perceived "offensiveness" as due to a lack of

language surveillance or "monitoring" creates the foundation for language purification based on the norms of standardized English, a language with norms that only exists in myth and to uphold whiteness as clean, pure, and correct.

On the Translation of "Freedom" to "Slave Guys No Moa"

Consider these translations for "freedom" from the American Standard Version to *Da Good An Spesho Book:*

> John 8:32 (ASV) "and you will know the truth, and the truth will set you **free**"
>
> John 8:32 (HPE) "You guys goin know da true stuff an den you guys **no need be slave guys no moa**"
>
> Galatians 3:28 (ASV) "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor **free**, there is no male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus."
>
> Galatians 3:28 (HPE): Now, no matta Jew o not one Jew, slave o **not one slave**, guy o wahine, you guys all same same cuz you stay tight wit Christ.

While the introduction to *Da Good An Spesho Book* tells readers that translators worked together and with integrity to "make shua mean same ting, da Pidgin, da English, an da Hebrew an Aramaic," the translation of "free" to "slave guys no moa" and "not one slave" raises questions about the text's equivalency in meaning. Freedom is a positive quality of independence, one that suggests an ontology of having an *inherent* ability to exercise agency over choice without external constraints. On the other hand, "slave guys no moa" presents freedom as a negative quality, one that still references a previous state of bondage one has emancipated from. It presents freedom as coming out of one ontology

to another, something that differs from the rhetoric of freedom in the political foundations of the United States. In the United States, freedom is fundamental to national and personal identity. The United States was founded on the idea of individual freedom, with the Declaration of Independence stating that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness" (Declaration). While this was too written under the revolutionary fight for independence from tyranny, freedom here is certainly not synonymous with *not* being a slave: freedom here is natural to the state of being human, it is *"inalienable,"* an illustration that such rights are attached to the being, unavailable for transference, transcendence, or surrenderance. It emphasizes the virtue of existence as the experience of freedom, rather than the act of unchaining oneself from a state of bondage and servitude. Freedom in the Declaration of Independence—which has yet to be translated into Hawaiian Pidgin English—is a master's freedom while in *Da Good An Spesho Book,* ideas of freedom come from the perspective of a slave.

Does this gap in translation then point to the *Da Good An Spesho Book,* as Fanon writes, as calling the (post)colonized "to the ways of the master, the ways of the oppressor" (Fanon)? Why is it that while inalienable freedoms in the Declaration of Independence are "endowed by their Creator," the same Creator in *Da Good An Spesho Book* furnishes a different freedom, one dependent on already being in a state of slavery to emerge from? It questions who creates the translation of the Creator and the Creator's benefactions. More so, it certainly establishes a sort of "Christian mentality" within the reader, whereas the binaries of "elect and damned, polished and primitive, and sophisticated colonizers and naive enslaved" (Sugirtharajah) are extended to include

slave no more and the enslaved. With Christianity's long history of using Bible translations to "describ[e], name[e], defin[e], and represent the colonized" (Kinyua 63) within a particular value system and often, for a political purpose, its certainly concerning to consider how only fashioning identities of slave and slave no more draws boundaries to discourses of resistance and liberation. It creates two identities, neither of which seems fully independent and separate from a presupposed history of bondage. It questions the belonging of Hawaiian Pidgin English speakers to the national identity which champions the innate *right* to freedom more than freedom itself. Consider that there is no Declaration of Independence in Hawaiian Pidgin English that would showcase this theory of independence. In the classroom, where one would likely learn about these dimensions to liberation, Hawaiian Pidgin English is discouraged and often ridiculed. In the religious classroom, a HPE speaker could learn about freedom in a familiar language and expression, while in the secular classroom, notions of freedom outside of emancipation from bondage are limited to the HPE learner by defamiliarization of language. The power of interpreting freedom is thus limited by this segregation of meaning between religious and secular educational material. If one expands this analysis to consider how HPE has historically posed a threat to national identity formation by signifying its own history as a colonial "corruption" of English-only laws and migrated languages, then the exclusion of HPE speakers from national philosophies of independence presents potential for ideological influence. The translation then raises questions about the power dynamics such a definition of freedom might proceed from, and how these power dynamics shape the ultimate impact of meaning.

The translation, as seen from the introductory statements, already contains a certain historical and rhetorical consciousness about the relationship between HPE and standardized English. Overt about its consideration of power dynamics between these two languages, one can consider the interpretation of free as "not one slave" as a possible reference to the origins of Hawaiian Pidgin English on Hawaii's sugar plantations. As examined in Chapter 1, HPE formed from migrant laborers who were prohibited from citizenship and were bound by the 1850 Masters and Servants Act that enabled conditions of abuse and indentured servitude. Identifying the free as "slaves no longer" may be in memory of the colonial reality that the United States attempted to hide for the sake of nationalism, as read in Chapter 2. The introduction itself lacks this bold interpretation of the history of HPE speakers on sugar plantations, instead choosing to coin their labor conditions under the more palatable term "work teams," but that does not have to limit the reality presented in coining freedom as emancipation from slavery. Rather than "dominating and restructuring the colonized's view of reality" (Kinyua 59) according to the nationalist interests of U.S. Empire, this translation of freedom has the disruptive potential to expose imperialist history when historical context informs the reader's interpretation of this term. More so, for the standardized English-speaking reader, "slave guys no moa" foreignizes the idea of "freedom" itself, further calling attention to what history such a perspective of freedom may come from. The translation then could resonate as a powerful metaphor for the early treatment of HPE speakers in the United States, and by this, symbolize a new political thought resistant to existing dominant ideas about freedom and identity. However, the reinforcement of negative stereotypes and positioning the identity of the HPE reader as inherently servile or submissive shares

responsibility in the continued placement of HPE speakers under colonial definitions of personhood and may overlook other cultural concepts of freedom that may share a more nuanced anticolonial sensibility.

On Copyright and Authority Beyond the Private

The allocation of the labor behind translating *Da Good An Spesho Book* is unclear. According to the introductions, written by the Pidgin Translation Group, "29 local peopo dat stay talk Pidgin from small kid time dat wen translate dis book" in addition to "plenny help from da Wycliffe Bible Translators" (iii). Yet, the copyright page itself claims the "entire text of *Da Good An Spesho Book* including headings was examined by a team of trained native speakers of Hawaii Pidgin" (ii). "Examined" imagines the labor of oversight rather than conducting direct translation as implied by the introduction. It supposes that the translation was done by another group of translators other than the 29 native Pidgin speakers and only after, inspected and approved by this group of HPE speakers. This interpretation of labor is further reflected in the copyright ownership of the text. The rest of the copyright page goes on to list the owners of illustrations within the Bible and the institution to which they produce illustrations for: The British & Foreign Bible Society, Biblica, Inc., and David C. Cook Publishing Co., a U.S. based nonprofit publisher specializing in Christian catechism material. The full copyright owner is listed as Wycliffe Bible Translators, Inc. and nowhere is copyright ownership listed for the Pidgin Translation Group. Altogether, this disparity raises the fundamental question of "the authorization of [post]colonial representations" (Bhabha 131) and the relationship between publishers and translators in ownership of Biblical translations.

Under copyright law, the allocation of ownership poses translators and their work as secondary to authors. Under copyright and intellectual property law, translation itself is “perceived to be an infringement of that work, having no claims to its intent nor to the full extent of its originality” (Lee 2). In the U.S., “Code §106(2) grants the owner of the copyright in a work the exclusive right ‘to prepare derivative works’ based upon that work, and pursuant to 17 U.S. Code §101, translations are considered derivative works” (8-9). What this means is that copyright owners authorize “whether a translation can be made at all and in what languages” (10) as part of their right to “prepare derivative works.” Along with these rights is the right to exercise objections to the representations of a translated work on the grounds of integrity. However, Venuti critiques this distribution of power, emphasizing the due-credit for the translator since their work is “an interpretive act that inevitably varies source-text form, meaning and effect according to intelligibilities and interests” of the target audience (Venuti 12-13). Reinterpreting a text for a specific target language and culture, a translation “entails distinguishable alteration to the form of the original work,” which theoretically should allow a translator claim to their original works despite the lack of authorization by U.S. copyright law (Lee 7). Lee analyzes this misjudgment of translation as the prevalence of colonial translation logic underpinning copyright law (2). As per Bassnett and Trivedi’s introduction to *Postcolonial Translation: Theory and Practice,* the Euro-Western ideas of translation evaluate the original as superior to the translated, apparent in their own consideration of colonial as “translations” of the great European original (Bassnett 4). These notions now carry on into postcolonial Bible translations, as evidenced by the confusion of copyright and labor credit in *Da Good An Spesho Book.* Not only does this allocation of intellectual

property rights disadvantage the Pidgin Translation Group and HPE speakers economically, but it also diminishes their claim to cultural ownership and minimizes the impact of attaining language authority through Bible translations.

Given the restrictions to authority of representation against HPE translators and speakers under the copyright law governing the HPE translation of the Bible, the overall translation of the HPE Bible empowers the language only so much as it poses no actual threats. While HPE may benefit from the subversive impact of having a text deemed authoritative in dominant culture in their own vernacular, Wycliffe still holds the power of authorization over any disruptive elements within the text. The question then changes: if Wycliffe holds the power to alter representations as they see morally fit, as per copyright law, why allow any elements that disrupt dominant Western culture? Do Empire and Bible translation institutions, historically aligned in the promotion of colonialism, now share different intentions?

One of the most powerful images in the text is on the very first pages of the *Da Good An Spesho Book:* a world map with Hawaii and the Pacific Islands in the middle, with Europe and Britain to the West and the United States to the East. A complete reorientation of the world from the dominant worldview which places Britain in the middle, and hierarchizes West and East accordingly, this image threatens that dominant worldview. Illustrations throughout the text, while copyrighted by the British & Foreign Bible Society and other non-HPE dominant organizations, showcase a non-white Jesus and other Biblical characters, again disrupting the dominant discourse that implicates Christianity with whiteness. With the expansion of Christianity around the world via Bible translations, there seems to also be an expansion of perspective that the Church

welcomes. Similar to the U.S. in the post-civil war era, the Church has adopted the rhetoric of multicultural and multilingual celebration as part of their global missionary work. The Christian mission "sacrifice[s] linguistic purity" for the sake of saving souls (Mühleisen 255)—but, there is little cost to linguistic purity when translating the Bible.

Vernacular Bible translations rarely, if never, move the subaltern out of their positions, politically or economically. Codifying and standardizing a language by translating it into written word opens the possibility to acquire some prestige (albeit, under dominant notions of prestige), but Wycliffe and other Bible translation services involved do not showcase any work dismantling HPE's stigma as a corrupted English in secular sectors. The stigma maintains its leverage in education policy and other public sectors, mostly since such translations are kept within the private realm. Translating the Bible keeps language authority within the private realm of faith, rather than authorizing change of HPE's perception in the public world. Consider the prevalence of Bibles in hotel rooms, which are mostly, if not always, the King James Version written in a form of standardized English. Even in the public realms of faith, HPE is swept under the rug. While Hawaiian and English have garnered recognition as a official language of Hawaii, Hawaiian Pidgin English is still left without distinct protections and public authority.

On Bible Translation Standards

Since *Da Good An Spesho Book* is published by Wycliffe Bible Translators, the Hawaiian Pidgin Bible observes the translation standards of the Forum of Bible Agencies International. Established in April 2017, these standards are the guidelines by which all vernacular Bible translations by Wycliffe publishers must reflect, and as so, they present a contemporary post-colonial Bible translation "theory," and their application of such

"theory" via the Hawai'ian Pidgin Bible allow us to examine the practice of such "theory." By examining regulations related to the function of translation as well as for the labor of translations, this analysis ultimately shows that the standards and the practice of these standards are at odds with each other when it comes to *Da Good An Spesho Book.*

The first set of rules emphasize the function of pure equivalency in Bible translations, which as postcolonial translation theorists and the analysis of the HPE Bible point out, is not possible when there are asymmetric relationships to be considered in the creation of the text. According to the Forum of Bible Agencies International, it is required of Wycliffe "to translate the Scriptures accurately, without loss, change, distortion or embellishment of the meaning of the original text" (Basic). In addition to this, the translators are required to "to make every effort to ensure that no political, ideological, social, cultural, or theological agenda is allowed to distort the translation" (Basic). When it comes to interpreting the HPE Bible however, the disparity in the translation of "freedom" between translations calls into question the level of distortion in *Da Good An Spesho Book.* Moreover, there are several places where an agenda beyond equivalency is made clear. For example, the rhetoric contained in both introductions, the world map, and non-white illustrations of Biblical scenes are all subversive to the dominance of Euro-American culture in Christian texts. While the translation standards set by the Forum of Bible Agencies International portray a belief in the possibility for pure translations, the practical application challenges this notion entirely. It shows a kind of blindness to the reality of asymmetrical relationships in translation, which comes especially jarring considering that these standards define translations done between colonizer and post-colonized languages. By not addressing the influence of ideology on the translators when

translating Biblical text, these rules illustrate that Bible translation services still consider the translator invisible, as a tool of production perhaps rather than a creator.

Later on in this document are regulations regarding who should translate Bibles as well as how cooperation and partnerships for a translation should be conducted. Regarding production and assessment, the document outlines three sets of procedure relevant to the analysis of the HPE Bible—the first of which refers to assessment of a translation:

> To test the translation as extensively as possible in the receptor community to ensure that it communicates accurately, clearly and naturally, keeping in mind the sensitivities and experience of the receptor audience (Basic).

The rules presented here offer a collaborative approach to Bible translation, calling for the priority of mother-tongue as well as emphasizing sensitivity towards the target audience. While previously discussing the functions a translation should have, these standards were clear on removing influences that could distort the equivalency of meaning from source to target language. However, asking translators to keep in mind "the sensitivities and experience of the receptor audience" initiates a responsibility to adopt a historical and ideological consciousness that then exchanges an objective, value-free translation for one that takes the target-audience's experiences into consideration. While the regulations do not specify which or what kind of experiences to establish sensitivity towards, it's clear that a postcolonial audience's experiences are heavily marked by the impact of colonialism on their identities and perception of reality. By not naming the potential for the ideologies of colonialism to already find themselves within the experiences of the receptor audience, the standards stray away from naming,

recognizing, and holding an accountability for the Bible's role in colonial and postcolonial history. Rather, they touch upon issues of culture in a manner that continues to pose their translations as able to remain neutral.

The other two relevant standards cover the Forum's theorization of the labor behind translation. While giving priority to "mother-tongue" speakers by the written rules, the actual practice of advantaging these "mother-tongue" translators is not visible as per the copyright issues presented in *Da Good An Spesho Book:*

> To recognize that the transfer into the receptor language should be done by trained and competent translators who are translating into their mother tongue. Where this is not possible, mother-tongue speakers should be involved to the greatest extent possible in the translation process (Basic).
>
> To give high priority to training mother-tongue speakers of the receptor language in translation principles and practice and to providing appropriate professional support (Basic).

The emphasis on "mother-tongue" translators ensures that the translation reflects on that translator's experiential knowledge of the language, rather than learned knowledge. It gives agency and authority to the target language speakers themselves, key to translating a Bible that remains sensitive to a language community's historical experiences. However, this written prioritization does not mesh well with the fact that Wycliffe publishers will garner all copyright and intellectual property ownership for these translations. Furthermore, training these mother-tongue translators in their translation principles continues to align the authorization of representation with Wycliffe or another Bible translation institution rather than the translators themselves. The gap between the

prioritization of mother-tongue translators in these standards and the lack of advocacy for these translators to gain property rights enacts a similar performance to vernacular Bible translation itself. In the same wave that vernacular Bible translation barely moves the pedals of justice against linguistic purity, so too is its impact on economically and politically advancing the rights of the translators whose labor they benefit from. It shows that the practice of their theory—that "mother-tongue" translators are essential to the process of familiarizing Bible translations—is undercut when ownership and profit are taken into consideration.

CONCLUSION

In the colonial period, Bibles were used as potent rhetorical tools by imperialists, while simultaneously serving as a source of hope for marginalized readers. During the U.S. settler colonial movement, Bibles were employed by U.S. missionaries to justify the dispossession of land and language. Moreover, the formation of the settler state often depended on the collusion of missionaries and industrial businessmen. It was their interactions that formed Hawaii's agro-industry and laid the (literal) groundwork for Hawaiian Pidgin English's origination on Hawaii's sugar plantations. A language made from settler colonial contact, Hawaiian Pidgin English exemplifies a living memory of the imperial U.S. Doing so, it also represents a larger threat to the construction of a singular national identity and a singular national language that organizes whiteness and standardized English as "native" to the U.S. It has thus been subject to stereotypes of ridicule and inferiority, with HPE speakers often deemed as of low intelligence in the classroom and the workplace. After nearly a century of language surveillance, the 1987 Board of Education attempted to ban Hawaiian Pidgin English from schools, meeting immediate pushback. However, in that same year, the translation of the Hawaiian Pidgin Bible would begin, clearing the way for attaining linguistic agency in the religious sector when the secular sector had failed the needs of HPE speakers needs to learn and live by their own form of expression.

As a postcolonial product in a nation whose occupation was justified by the rhetoric of the Bible, the Hawaiian Pidgin English Bible necessarily draws questions and curiosities about its implications on the language's overall perception and agency under U.S. Empire. Although there has been considerable research on Biblical translations

during and after British colonialism, there has been comparatively little research on the significance of Biblical translations into postcolonial Englishes of states and nations previously or currently under the occupation of U.S. Empire, which is fascinating given the potential threat vernacular Englishes pose to the perpetuation of settler monolingualism. To analyze the role of Hawaiian Pidgin English as a postcolonial Biblical language, this thesis explored postcolonial and Bible translation theories. Postcolonial translation theory challenges the notion of a universal, objective interpretation of the Bible, arguing instead that the meaning of the text is always situated within particular cultural and historical contexts. Bible translation theory, particularly under a postcolonial lens, focuses on the impacts to identity and alterations to a cultures value-systems by the ways in which Bible translations "Christianize" the language and mentality of the target community. Applying this research to a textual analysis of the Hawaiian Pidgin English Bible, *Da Good An Spesho Book,* this thesis concludes that while Bible translations are seemingly benevolent in their mission to save souls at any cost to linguistic purity, there is, in reality, little to no cost to linguistic purity in the public, secular realm of the U.S.

The textual analysis of the *Da Good An Spesho Book* explored the introduction statements, the translation of "freedom" to "slave guys no moa," and copyright issues between Wycliffe publishers and the Pidgin Translation Group. In the introductory statements, the translation's functions and goals of equivalency were examined against theories of power dynamics in postcolonial translation. More so, this introduction poses a narrative of the HPE's history that serves a much more palatable narrative compared to the inhumane labor conditions experienced by the first HPE speaking migrants on

Hawaii's sugar plantations. In examining the translation of "freedom" to "slave guys no moa," this thesis concludes that interpretations of autonomy, independence, and freedom are segregated between the religious and secular sectors of the U.S.: it familiarizes one philosophy of freedom ("slave guys no moa") through the use of HPE in the Bible but defamiliarizes other theories of freedom, such as freedom as an inalienable right, by discouraging the use of HPE to discuss such ideas in the classroom. However, this research also concludes that "slave guys no moa" could pose a subversive resistance in consideration of the historical treatment of HPE speakers on sugar plantations. It carries the potential to disrupt attempts to replace imperial memory with national memory when historical context is considered in this interpretation. Coming to the issue of copyright, the disparity between the labor of translation and the ownership of the translation raises the question of authorization over postcolonial representation.

Finally, this thesis explores the underlying translation principles of the Hawaiian Pidgin Bible set by the Forum of Bible Agencies International. By examining specific elements of these guidelines and their implementation in the Hawaiian Pidgin Bible, this thesis finds contradictions between these guidelines and their practical application in the translation of the Bible into Hawaiian Pidgin. The translation standards illustrate an unresponsiveness to the potential asymmetrical relations within a translation, which is especially concerning considering their role in the overall production of postcolonial Bible translations today. Moreover, regulations on the collaboration between "mother tongue" translators and institutional professional support continue to draw concerns related to the authorization of representation. While there exists a priority to have those who are native to and most familiar with a target language, there is no acknowledgement

within these translation standards that the labor that goes into the creation of a new Biblical interpretation will go without due ownership.

The translation of the Bible into Hawaiian Pidgin English represents a complex intersection of colonial history, postcolonial identity, and linguistic agency. *Da Good An Spesho Book* offers insights into the power dynamics of postcolonial translation under U.S. Empire, and the ways in which Bible translations can both challenge and reinforce dominant cultural values. The analysis of the text itself highlights the need for critical engagement with postcolonial Bible translations and the representation of marginalized communities, particularly when it comes to vernacular Englishes given the threat they pose to national identity formation. Ultimately, the translation of the Hawaiian Pidgin English Bible serves as a reminder of the ongoing struggle for linguistic and cultural recognition in the face of dominant power structures. It calls for a more nuanced understanding of translation and representation in the postcolonial context and the importance of centering the agency and ownership of marginalized linguistic communities in the production of their own representations.

REFERENCES

Asensio, Fernández. "Language Policy in the Kingdom of Hawai'i: A Worldly English Approach." *Second Language Studies*, vol. 28, no. 2, Mar. 2010.

American Standard Version Bible. YouVersion, http://www.bible.com/versions/12-asv-american-standard-version

"Basic Principles and Procedures for Bible Translation." *Forum of Bible Agencies International*, Forum of Bible Agencies International, Apr. 2017, forum-intl.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/FOBAITranslationBasicPrinciplesandProceduresApril2017.pdf

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, 1994.

Bhabha, Homi K. "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse," *Discipleship: A Special Issue on Psychoanalysis* 28 (October 1984): pp. 125-133, https://doi.org/10.2307/778467

Chapin, Helen Geracimos. "The English Flag and the English Language." *Shaping History: The Role of Newspapers in Hawai`i*, University of Hawai'i Press, 1996, pp. 29–31. *JSTOR*, http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt6wqtm0.8. Accessed 4 Mar. 2023.

--- "The Polynesian: In the Service of America and the Kingdom." *Shaping History: The Role of Newspapers in Hawai`i*, University of Hawai'i Press, 1996, pp. 23–28. *JSTOR*, http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt6wqtm0.7. Accessed 4 Mar. 2023.

Césaire, Aimé. *Discourse on Colonialism*. Monthly Review Press, 2000. *EBSCOhost*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=529624&site=ehost-live.

Choy, Andrew. "Researching the Role of Pidgin in Church." *Second Language Studies*, vol. 29, no. 1, Fall 2010, pp. 35–96, http://www.hawaii.edu/sls/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Choy1.pdf.

Cioè-Peña, María. "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's School: Interrogating Settler Colonial Logics in Language Education." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 42, 2022, pp. 25–33., https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190521000209.

Da Good An Spesho Book: Hawaiian Pidgin Bible. 1st ed., Wycliffe Bible Translators, 2020.

"Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776." *Avalon Project – Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776,* avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/declare.asp

Drager, K. "Pidgin and Hawai'i English: An Overview." *International Journal of Language, Translation and Intercultural Communication*, vol. 1, Jan. 2012, pp. 61-73, doi:10.12681/ijltic.10.

Dowling, Sarah. "Elimination, Dispossession, Transcendence: Settler Monolingualism and Racialization in the United States." *American Quarterly*, vol. 73, no. 3, 2021, pp. 439-460. *ProQuest*, https://jerome.stjohns.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/elimination-dispossession-transcendence-settler/docview/2578187952/se-2

Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Grove Press, 2021. *EBSCOhost*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=2632904&site=ehost-live.

Fujikane, Candace. "Introduction: Asian Settler Colonialism in the U.S. Colony of Hawai'i." *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai`i*, edited by Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Y. Okamura, University of Hawai'i Press, 2008, pp. 1–42. *JSTOR*, http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt6wr0h6.6. Accessed 6 Mar. 2023.

Giuseppe, Palumbo. *Key Terms in Translation Studies.* Continuum, 2009. *EBSCOhost,* search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=344441&site=ehost-live.

Harris, Cheryl I. "Whiteness as Property." *Harvard Law Review*, vol. 106, no. 8, 1993, pp. 1707–91. *JSTOR*, https://doi.org/10.2307/1341787. Accessed 8 Mar. 2023.

Iyengar, Malathi. "Not Mere Abstractions: Language Policies and Language Ideologies in U.S. Settler Colonialism." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, vol. 3, no. 2, 2014, pp. 33–59.

Jonathan Rosa and Nelson Flores, "Unsettling Race and Language: Toward a Raciolinguistic Perspective," *Language in Society* 46 (2017): 623.

Kawamoto, Kevin Y. "Hegemony and Language Politics in Hawaii." *World Englishes*, vol. 12, no. 2, 1993, pp. 193–207., doi:10.1111/j.1467-971x.1993.tb00021.x.

Kessler, Lawrence H. "A Plantation upon a Hill; Or, Sugar without Rum: Hawai'i's Missionaries and the Founding of the Sugarcane Plantation System." *Pacific*

Historical Review, vol. 84, no. 2, 2015, pp. 129–62. *JSTOR*, https://doi.org/10.1525/phr.2015.84.2.129. Accessed 4 Mar. 2023.

Kinyua, Johnson Kiriaku. “A Postcolonial Analysis of Bible Translation and Its Effectiveness in Shaping and Enhancing the Discourse of Colonialism and the Discourse of Resistance: The Gĩkũyũ New Testament--a Case Study.” *Black Theology*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2013, pp. 58–95. *EBSCOhost*, https://doi-org.jerome.stjohns.edu/10.1179/17431670X13A.0000000004.

Lee, Tong King. “Translation and Copyright: Towards a Distributed View of Originality and Authorship.” The Translator, vol. 26, no. 3, July 2020, pp. 241–56. DOI.org (Crossref), https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2020.1836770.

Mühleisen, Susanne. “‘How Is It That We Hear in Our Own Languages the Wonders of God?’: Vernacular Bible Translations in Colonial and Postcolonial Contexts.” *Colonies, Missions, Cultures in the English Speaking World: General and Comparative Studies*, edited by Gerhard Stilz, Stauffenburg, 2001, pp. 247–63. *EBSCOhost*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=2003025136&site=ehost-live

Orsini, Francesca, and Neelam Srivastava. “Translation and the Postcolonial: Multiple Geographies, Multilingual Contexts.” *Interventions*, vol. 15, no. 3, Sept. 2013, pp. 323–31. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, https://doi.org/10.1080/1369801X.2013.824749.

Pym, Anthony. *Exploring Translation Theories*. Routledge, 2014.

Relating to the Hawaiian Language. H.B. No. 2491, 2022, https://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/sessions/session2022/bills/HB2491_.HTM.

Shaden M. Tageldin. *Disarming Words : Empire and the Seductions of Translation in Egypt*. University of California Press, 2011. *EBSCOhost*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=373142&site=ehost-live.

Strother, Z. S. "Translator, Anarchist: The Power Dynamics of Translation in the *Longue Durée*." *Art in Translation*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2012, pp. 17–28., doi:10.2752/175613112x13244611239719.

Sugirtharajah, R. S. *Exploring Postcolonial Biblical Criticism: History, Method, Practice*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

---*The Oxford Handbook of Postcolonial Biblical Criticism*. 1st ed., Oxford University Press, 2018. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190888459.001.0001.

Susan Bassnett, et al. *Postcolonial Translation: Theory and Practice*. Routledge, 1999. *EBSCOhost*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=e000xna&AN=495859&site=ehost-live.

Sur, Wilma. "Hawai'i's Masters and Servants Act: Brutal Slavery?" *University of Hawai'i Law Review*, vol. 31, 2008.

Tonouchi, Lee A. "Da State of Pidgin Address." *College English*, vol. 67, no. 1, 2004, pp. 75–82. *JSTOR*, https://doi.org/10.2307/4140726. Accessed 24 Feb. 2023.

Trask, Haunani-kay. "Settlers of Color and 'Immigrant' Hegemony: 'Locals' in Hawai'i." *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of*

Everyday Life in Hawai`i, edited by Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Y. Okamura, University of Hawai'i Press, 2008, pp. 45–65. *JSTOR*, http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt6wr0h6.7. Accessed 6 Mar. 2023.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. Routledge, 1998, *EBSCOhost,* search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=7407&site=ehost-live.

--- *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. Routledge, 1995.

Vicente L. Rafael, "Translation, American English, and the National Insecurities of Empire," in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti, 3rd ed. (London: Routledge, 2012), 453.

Viswanathan, Gauri. *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India*. Columbia University Press, 2015.

Wolfe, Patrick. "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native." *Journal of Genocide Research*, vol. 8, no. 4, Dec. 2006, pp. 387–409. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, https://doi.org/10.1080/14623520601056240.

"Wycliffe Bible Translators | Christian Mission Organizations." *Wycliffe Bible Translators*, https://www.wycliffe.org/. Accessed 19 Apr. 2023.

Yildiz, Yasemin. "CONCLUSION: Toward a Multilingual Paradigm? The Disaggregated Mother Tongue." *Beyond the Mother Tongue: The Postmonolingual Condition*, Fordham University Press, 2012, pp. 203–12. *JSTOR*, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt13x0cqr.10. Accessed 1 Mar. 2023.

Young, Kanalu G. Terry. *Pidgin: The Voice of Hawai'i*. New Day Films, 2009. *KANOPY,* https://www.kanopy.com/en/stjohns/video/153856. Accessed 6 Mar. 2023.

Vita

Name	*Aleena Jacob*
Baccalaureate Degree	*Bachelor of Arts,* *St. John's University,* *Queens, NY* *Majors: English*
Date Graduated	*May, 2022*