

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE INTERFACE BETWEEN MEANING AND
TRANSLATION: A CASE STUDY OF THE NORTHERN SOTHO LORD'S
PRAYER *TATEWEŠO WA MAGODIMONG***

By

LINKIE MATLAKALA KGANYAGO (NEÉ SONO)

Research presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSLATION STUDIES AND LINGUISTICS

in the

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

at the

UNIVERSITY OF LIMPOPO

SUPERVISOR : PROFESSOR R.N. MADADZHE



JANUARY 2008

b11646202
j12381068

(i)

DECLARATION

I, Kganyago Linkie Matlakala (Neé Sono), declare that, **AN ANALYSIS OF THE INTERFACE BETWEEN MEANING AND TRANSLATION: A CASE STUDY OF THE NORTHERN SOTHO LORD'S PRAYER *TATAWEŠO WA MAGODIMONG***, hereby submitted by me, is my own work and that all sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

L. M. Kganyago
Signature

03-04-2018
Date

(ii)

DEDICATION

To the following people:

- My late father and mother : Joseph Serišane Sono and Sarah Lephai Sono (Neé Molepo)
- My beloved husband : Kgabi Doughlas Kganyago
- My late son : Kgoka Frans
- My adorable son : Joseph Serišane
- My lovely daughter : Kgabo Zelpha
- Phutha-Ditšhaba Prayer Group

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to extend my sincere gratitude and appreciation to all the people who contributed towards the success of my study, especially the following:

- Prof. R.N. Maḡadzhe, my supervisor, for his dedicated supervision, expert guidance, motivation, encouragement, and patience to improve and complete my work. Thank you for your unwavering support from the beginning until the end of my study.
- Thanks to the lectures who guided me through the completion of the course work of this programme, Dr J.R. Rammala, Mr M.C. Mphahlele and Mrs M.C. Mayevu, as well as the lecturing staff from the University of Free State: Prof. J.A. Naudé, Ms C. Geldenhuys, and Dr. A. Lotriet.
- To all those people who assisted me with information in relation to this study, especially Reverend M.R. Mahlangu, Edith Mashego, Mr M.J. Kganaga, Mr M. Thupana and Reverend J.M. Louw because they all gave me their valuable time when I consulted with them for information, material and clarification.
- Thanks to Ms C.R. Manaka for her meticulous typing of this paper and also to Prof. M.J. Cloete for editing this work.
- My loving husband, who served as my pillar, supporter and source of inspiration. Thank you for always believing in me, *Mošitwa*, and also my son Seri, who always helped me with the computer. Special thanks to my daughter Kgabo, who always stayed with me until the early hours of the morning.

- I would like to convey my deepest gratitude to my younger sister, Matete, my brothers-in-law, Jerry and Anthony for their undivided attention in times of need, as well as to Sesi Christina for the love and support she has given me since the beginning of this study, *Modimo a go okeletše Mogalemosadi.*
- No words can suffice to convey my special thanks to the Phutha-Ditšhaba Prayer group for always including me in their prayers for the completion of this Lord's Prayer, *Tatawešo wa Magodimong.*
- I would also like to give thanks to our study group with special reference to Gladys, Lydia, Dorcus and Tinyiko and hope that God will also help them to succeed with their studies.
- Sincere gratitude to my niece, Mosebjadi, for the love and support she has shown me as well as my friends who also contributed towards the success of this study with special reference to Makoša Leopeng and Boiki Kwenaita for being there for me during hard times.
- A word of thanks is also due to my late father *Serišane sa Kotolo seokamela mathakeng* and my late mother *Lephai la bo Raseona*. I hope I have met your expectations. *Ke se ke lego sona ka lebaka la lena.*
- Above all, I would like to thank the Lord, for in Him, nothing is impossible.

ABSTRACT

The Bible has been translated by different translators from English, Hebrew, Greek and even Aramaic as source languages into Northern Sotho but the Northern Sotho translation and revisions do not show much improvement on the original translation.

This study analysed the interface between meaning and translation by making a comparative textual analysis of the Lord's Prayer presented by the *Good News Bible* (1995) (English as source language) and *Bibele Taba e Botse* (2000) (Northern Sotho as target language). The comparative textual analysis aided the researcher to establish whether the modern translated version of the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer was in accordance with the modern needs of the Northern Sotho speaking community. The study also determined whether the intentions of the author were adequately fulfilled.

This aim was made possible by analysing the methods and strategies which had an impact on the translation of the Northern Sotho version of the Lord's Prayer *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*. The analysis of both methods and strategies aided the researcher to establish why this text remains as it is, while recommendations were made on how it should be approached in future. This study also looked at how a text can become meaningful to its target receptors by making use of coherence and cohesive devices.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER ONE	
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY	1
1.1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.2 BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM	1
1.3 AIM OF THE STUDY	6
1.4 OBJECTIVES	6
1.5 RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY	7
1.6 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	7
1.7 METHODOLOGY	8
1.7.1 THE QUALITATIVE RESEARCH METHOD	8
1.7.2 COLLECTION OF DATA	8
1.7.2.1 Primary research method	8
1.7.2.2 Secondary data	9
1.8 SCOPE OF DELIMITATION	9
1.9 LITERATURE REVIEW	10
1.9.1 Barrette (1986)	10
1.9.2 Mphahlele (2001)	10
1.9.3 Nida and Taber (1969)	11
1.9.4 Nord (1991)	11
1.9.5 Nkatini (2006)	11
1.9.6 Krieger (2005)	12
1.10 PRACTICAL STEPS TO BE TAKEN IN THE TRANSLATION PROCESS	12
1.11 ORGANISATION OF THE STUDY	15

CHAPTER TWO**ANALYSING THE IMPACT OF TRANSLATION METHODS ON
*TATAWEŠO WA MAGODIMONG***

2.1	INTRODUCTION	16
2.2	THE ROLE OF TRANSLATORS	16
2.3	THE TRANSLATION BRIEF	17
2.4	METHODS HAVING AN IMPACT ON THE TRANSLATION OF <i>TATAWEŠO WA MAGODIMONG</i>	21
2.4.1	Prayer texts from the English language as source texts	23
2.4.2	Prayer texts from the Northern Sotho language as target texts	25
2.4.3	Prayer texts from the Aramaic language as auxiliary source texts	28
2.4.4	The linguistic approach	29
2.4.4.1	Formal equivalence	34
2.4.4.2	Dynamic equivalence	39
2.3	CONCLUSION	46

CHAPTER THREE**TRANSLATION STRATEGIES THAT HAD AN IMPACT ON THE
TRANSLATION OF *TATAWEŠO WA MAGODIMONG***

3.1	INTRODUCTION	48
3.2	TRANSLATION PROCEDURES	48
3.3	GENERAL PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED BY TRANSLATORS IN THE TRANSLATION PROCESS	53
3.3.1	Culture-specific concepts	53
3.3.2	A source language concept is not lexicalized in the target language	53
3.3.3	A word in the source language is semantically complex	54
3.3.4	The source language and target language distinguish divergent meanings	54

	Page
3.3.5 The target language does not have a specific term	54
3.3.6 Difference in physical interpersonal perspective	55
3.3.7 Difference in expressive meaning	55
3.4 TRANSLATION STRATEGIES WHICH HAD AN IMPACT ON <i>TATAWEŠO WA MAGODIMONG</i>	55
3.4.1 Strategies for dealing with non-equivalence	57
3.5 CONCLUSIONS	67

CHAPTER FOUR

THE ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE OF *TATAWEŠO WA MAGODIMONG*: COHESION AND COHERENCE

4.1 INTRODUCTION	69
4.2 DISCOURSE ANALYSIS	69
4.3 THE SPEECH ACT THEORY	71
4.4 CONVERSATIONAL ANALYSIS	74
4.4.1 Conversational Maxims	75
4.5 TEXTUAL EQUIVALANCE COHESION	77
4.6 COHERENCE	86
4.7 CONCLUSION	95

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION	96
5.2 SUMMARY	96
5.3 FINDINGS	97
5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS	98
BIBLIOGRAPHY	100

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
TABLE 1: The old version (Barrette: 1995:277)	23
TABLE 2: New version (<i>Holy Bible</i> : 2000)	24
TABLE 3: New version (<i>Good News Bible</i> : 1995)	24
TABLE 4: Old version (<i>Bibele</i> : 1951)	25
TABLE 5: The new version (<i>Bibele</i> : 2000)	26
TABLE 6: The new version (<i>Bibele Taba e Botse</i> :2000)	27
TABLE 7: First version: Aramaic language (2006)	28
TABLE 8: Second version Aramaic translation (2006)	29

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Translation plays a major role in many spheres such as education, religion and medicine. This is the case because translation helps in conveying messages from one language to another. As Christianity is one of the most important religions on earth, it is crucial to undertake a study on the appropriateness of translation methods with regard to one of the vital aspects of Christianity, namely the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*,

1.2 BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM

The Bible has been translated by different translators from English, Greek, and Hebrew as source languages to Northern Sotho as the target language. Revisions of the Northern Sotho Bibles have been conducted but the translated versions of the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer *Tatawešo wa Magodimong* do not show much improvement. This is the case because *Tatawešo wa Magodimong* consists of expressions whose meanings do not correspond to the English version. This study made a comparative textual analysis of the Lord's Prayer as presented by the *Good News Bible* (1995) in English and *Bibele Taba e Botse* (2000) in Northern Sotho in order to find out why, among other things, the translated version in Northern Sotho does not change according to the needs of the modern Northern Sotho speaking people. Most of the language used in *Bibele* (1951), is still the same as the language used in *Bibele* (2000). The only difference that exists between these Bibles is the orthography. For example, the opening phrase *Tata-wešo wa Maxodimong* was replaced by *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*. The latter expression of course adheres to the current orthography of Northern Sotho.

In this regard, translators seem to have concentrated mainly on the surface structure and did not venture into the deep structure of those sentences and phrases. According to Fromkin and Rodman (1998:138), “the structure of sentences that we actually speak and to which the rules of phonology are applied – are called surface structure”. McGuire (1990) further points out that :

Translation involves the rendering of a source language (SL) text into the target language (TL) so as to ensure that (a) the surface meaning of the two will be approximately similar and (b) the structure of the SL will be preserved as closely as possible, but not so closely that the TL structure will seriously be distorted.

These statements simply mean that if the translator interprets sentences and phrases using the surface structure only, he/she performs a one-to-one correspondence or word-to-word transference. This method is unreliable as words are often translated out of context (Newmark, 1988:46).

It would seem that the translators of the Northern Sotho Lord’s Prayer were trying to preserve the archaic language found in the old version of the English Lord’s Prayer. Interestingly, the *Holy Bible’s* (2000:9) version of the Lord’s Prayer jettisoned some archaic words while the Northern Sotho *Bibele Taba e Botse* (2000) did not follow suit. For example, the archaic opening phrase of the English language, which is well known across the Christian community was “Our Father who art in heaven” which was later changed to “Our Father who is in heaven” (*Holy Bible*; 2000:9). *The Oxford Dictionary* (2001:43) defines the lemma “art” as “an archaic or dialectical 2nd person singular, present of be”. The English translators studied their target audience and realised that not everybody is acquainted with archaic formations and, therefore, made this phrase easily understandable to the target readers.

Finch (2000:10) using the Chomskyan approach, views the deep structure as the propositional core of the sentence. This statement means that if the translator is using the deep structure to interpret a sentence, he/she will be concerned with the actual meaning presented by those sentences or phrases. Finch (2000:10) furthermore argues that sentences are being formed according to an initial mental blueprint or deep structure and then transformed by various grammatical processes involving the assigning of tense and ordering constituents into a surface structure. Therefore, it seems clear that in translation, it is the deep structure which provides the translator with a model or structure which helps in accelerating the translation process, and that is looking at meaning presented by those sentences or phrases. Nkatini (2006:4) confirms this information by mentioning that in translation what gets translated is the meaning structure, that is, deep structure.

In translation, misrepresentation of meaning can make one commit a communication blunder which is irreversible. The language which has been used in the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer needs to be revisited because some items seem to be incomprehensible while some are no longer applicable according to modern standards. For example, the already mentioned opening phrase *Tatawešo* has not been adequately treated to match the contextual meaning as presented by its source form "Our Father". In the possessive construction, "Our Father," the author's intention was to embrace everybody in the prayer, but the Northern Sotho translated version fails to capture that fact because the possessive construction *Tatawešo* only embraces those people that one is related to. The Northern Sotho version seems to exclude others. According to Krieger (2005:1), languages use different pronouns depending on how many people are being addressed. It will seem as if the Northern Sotho translator(s) failed to capture the number of people who are addressed by the possessive pronoun *wešo*. This misrepresentation of meaning may even cause disputes among races because they could argue that this was done deliberately by the colonists and apartheid regime to manipulate the black community as most Bibles were written prior to 1994.

Nida and Taber (1969:1) estimate that in the history of the world there are at least 100,000 persons dedicating most or all of their time to translation, and of these, 3 000 are primarily engaged in the translation of the Bible into about 800 languages, representing at

least 80% of the world's population. The problem is that the underlying theory of translation as far as this situation is concerned, has lagged behind. It is clear that previously, there were no trained translators, and translators were selected and appointed due to their knowledge of the target language. According to an interview conducted with Reverend Louw (2006) who was in charge of the translation of the *Bibele Taba e Botse* (Northern Sotho), a workshop was conducted for the translators in 1975 to guide them in the translation process and those translators were appointed due to their expertise in the target language and their theological background. Reverend Louw (2006) also stated that the reason why the Lord's Prayer was not completely changed was the fact that it was a well known prayer across the Christian community.

Expertise in translation is crucial if one would like to have a credible and acceptable translation. Naudé (2005:20-21) concurs with this statement when he remarks that a translator should have translation competence. This statement simply means translators need to have the necessary training to enable them to master all the strategies and methods essential for the transference of the message from one language to another. This criterion was not taken into account by the Bible Translation Committee of the New International Version (NIV), as Naudé (2000:21) confirms that they did not include trained translators but people were chosen on the basis of their recognized expertise in the books they have worked on and their church affiliation.

Translation began to be taken seriously as a field of study in 1983 when linguistic based theories dominated Bible translations. The dominating concept was "equivalence" which Nida and Taber (1969:12) viewed as "reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style". This thesis implies that the translator must produce a translation which is approximately similar to the source form. This is the approach which was mainly used in the translation of the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer which in general worked while in some cases it did not as already mentioned.

Nord (1991:6) who supports the functionalist approach, states that “it is impossible to produce a translated text as the mirror image of its original in accordance with the equivalence-based prescriptive theories”. The prescriptive theories advocated that for any translation to be good, bad or different, it must be judged according to its equivalence between the two texts. This idea sometimes becomes impossible because of cultural differences that exist between languages involved. Reis and Vermeer (1984:45) thus opted for a translation to be functional. This means that the translator must not aim at achieving equivalence but rather the function the target text has to perform in the target culture. The translator must make use of the translation brief which Naudé (2005:22) defines as a set of instructions that the initiator gives to the translator on why he/she wants the translation to be done and for whom. The translation brief contains the following information:

- ⌚ The intention and profile of the target readership (age, sex and class);
- ⌚ The kind of translation;
- ⌚ The transmission medium; and
- ⌚ The time and place of publication or implementation.

In the same vein, it is thus important to establish the kind of readership that is expected to use the translated versions of Bibles. As the Northern Sotho Lord’s Prayer is meant for everyone, educated and illiterate, it should have been approached with caution because it is one of the most important texts in the Bible. Translators should have established whether the translation of the Lord’s Prayer should be covert or overt. According to House (1977:66), an overt translation is one which the addressees of the translated text are not directly addressed because the discourse worlds in which they operate are not the same. In such a case, House’s (1977) suggests a second-level functional equivalence allowing the target-text (TT) receivers to eavesdrop on the source-text (ST). Nord (1997:24-25) echoes House (1977) sentiments that translators must assist target readers to study and understand the otherness of what is happening over there in the source culture. For example, the word “heaven” has been culturally adopted as *magodimong* (in the sky) without any further explanation. It is the duty of the translator to make his/her readers

aware that “heaven” is a special place in which God is residing. The question is, should it be left that way or is it time that translators ensure that their target readers understand the otherness of what is happening?

This study investigated methods and techniques which should have been applied in the translation of the Northern Sotho Lord’s Prayer *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*. A comparison of meaning as presented by the two texts was made to find out whether the message in the source form is the same as that in the target form.

1.3 AIM OF THE STUDY

The aim of this study was to examine the current versions of the Lord’s Prayer as presented by *The Good News Bible* (1995) in English and *Bibele Taba e Botse* (2000) in the Northern Sotho language from a translation perspective. Emphasis was placed on the meaning presented by these two versions to find out whether the message of the two versions was serving their target readers in the same way. In order to realize the aim of the study, the following questions were addressed:

- ⌚ Did the language used in the modern translated version of the Northern Sotho Lord’s Prayer changed according to the modern needs of the receptors?
- ⌚ Did the meaning of phrases and sentences of the modern translated version of the Northern Sotho Lord’s Prayer represent the author’s intentions?
- ⌚ Did equivalence play a role in the translated version of the Northern Sotho Lord’s Prayer?

1.4 OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the study were as follows:

- ⌚ To analyse the impact of translation methods and strategies on *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*.
- ⌚ To identify words, expressions and sentences which were translated incorrectly from English into Northern Sotho as far as *Tatawešo wa Magodimong* is concerned.
- ⌚ To suggest the correct way of translating the Lord's Prayer from English into Northern Sotho.

1.5 RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

The rationale for this study was situated in the awareness it will bring to the Bible Society that there is an outcry of misrepresentation of meaning in some texts in the Northern Sotho Bibles, and that the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer has been chosen to concretize this fact. As it is evident that the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer reflects a few translation shortcomings, it was, therefore, necessary to undertake a study of this kind as it would highlight the following:

- ⌚ Methods and techniques of dealing with zero-equivalence;
- ⌚ Issue of culturally bound terms;
- ⌚ Danger of using only the surface-structure in interpreting sentences and phrases;
- ⌚ The problem of not realizing the differences of distinction between languages.

1.6 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This study will hopefully assist in bridging the gap that exists between the English Bible, (*The Good News Bible* 1995) and the Northern Sotho Bible, (*Bibele Taba e Botse* 2000) because of their difference in meaning. The study will also benefit the Northern Sotho

speaking community because they will be given a chance of understanding what they are praying for. The Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer will no longer be conducted like a recitation but a prayer with the real emotive and expressive meaning it requires. The research study will also help other Bible researchers who are conducting research across the Bible on which methods and techniques to use in dealing with particular texts.

1.7 METHODOLOGY

The study of this nature warrants the researcher to search for various methodologies so that the study must be effective and credible. The following research methods were thus used:

1.7.1 THE QUALITATIVE RESEARCH METHOD

This method was used in this study because it helped the researcher to compare and analyze the modern versions of the English Lord's Prayer and the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer and interpret the results thereof. In addition, textual analysis was invoked as the two texts were compared and scrutinised.

1.7.2 COLLECTION OF DATA

To gather information in relation to the problems surrounding the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer, the researcher intends to use the following research methods:

1.7.2.1 Primary research method

Relevant people to this study were consulted, that is, unstructured interviews were conducted. Interpersonal interaction was in the form of verbal discussions with local pastors, previous Bible translators, members of the Bible Society, lecturers and also members of the local Christian community. The following people were interviewed:

- 2 members of the Bible Society in Polokwane
- 2 translators who were involved in the formation of *Bibele Taba e Botse*
- 3 pastors of main-line churches in Seshego.
- 3 pastors of African Independent Churches in Seshego
- 10 members of the Seshego Christian community.
- 2 members of the Pan South African Language Board stationed at the University of Limpopo Sesotho sa Leboa Lexicography.
- 2 – Northern Sotho lecturers attached to the University of Limpopo.

Some of the questions which the interviewees were asked appear in the aim of the study.

1.7.2.2 Secondary data

The main aim of using this method was to make use of the information relevant to the research study, which had already been utilised by other scholars. The researcher used library books, articles, dissertations, journals, and the Internet service for reference purposes.

1.8 SCOPE OF DELIMITATION

Even though there were references to the work already done by other scholars, the main emphasis was on a comparative textual analysis where two modern versions of the Lord's Prayer were scrutinised, namely:

- ⌚ *The Good News Bible* (1995) and
- ⌚ *Bibele Taba e Botse* (2000)

1.9 LITERATURE REVIEW

There are various scholars who conducted research studies on Bible translation and translation in general. Their works were be useful to this study because they formed the basis of this research study.

1.9.1 Barrette (1986)

Barrette (1986:277) provided a detailed biblical meaning of phrases and sentences of the English Lord's Prayer as he mentions: "This is the best known of all Christian prayers because it is so well known. We sometimes pray it without thinking what it means."

Barrette also states that there are two versions of this prayer taken from the same source but the translations are not identical to the original source. This information is crucial to this study because Barrettes (1986:278) states that Jesus taught in Aramaic but the Gospels were written in Greek. This implies that the English version was a translation from Greek, while the Greek version was also translated from the Aramaic language. This clearly depicts that if translators are not careful, vital information can be lost during the translation.

1.9.2 Mphahlele (2001)

The selection of suitable translation equivalence has been a problem throughout the ages. Mphahlele (2001:1) reports that zero-equivalence is "a case where a source language form or lemma does not have appropriate and immediate translation equivalent in that target language".

Because of this problem, he points out that one method that one can use is to opt for the use of surrogate equivalence in order to enable the target receiver to understand the meaning presented by the source form. Mphahlele's work benefited this study because one of the research questions to be addressed in this study was the problem of zero-equivalence in the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer.

1.9.3 Nida and Taber (1969)

Nida and Taber are scholars who advocate for the adoption of the notion of equivalence to be the norm of judging whether the translation is good or bad. What dominated Bible translation during the 80s was “equivalence” which Nida and Taber (1969:12) view as “reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style.”

This statement implies that the translator must produce a translation, which is similar to its source. In accordance with this study, this method is only applicable in certain circumstances. It, therefore, warrants the researcher to consult further sources in order to solve the problem of equivalence.

1.9.4 Nord (1991)

Nord is a functionalist who supports the notion of not aiming at achieving equivalence but rather the function the text is going to perform in the target culture. According to Nord (1991:27) “it is impossible to produce a translated text which is the mirror image of its original in accordance with the equivalent-based prescriptive.”

Nord (1991:41) furthermore argues that translators must make use of translation briefs which will enable them to know and understand their target readers. This study benefited from Nord’s work because the researcher was given a direction of how to establish the kind of readership, which was expected to use the Northern Sotho Lord’s Prayer.

1.9.5 Nkatini (2006)

Nkatini supports the idea of using the deep structure of sentences and phrases to avoid any ambiguities. According to Nkatini (2006:4),

At surface structure level translation consistently compares and contrasts different phonological (sound system), morphological (word systems), syntactical (sentence), semantical (meaning of words and sentences), pragmatic (what people achieve by use of sentences) and discourse (analysis of organized sentences) aspects of two languages to find the equivalents.

If the translator employs only the surface structure as indicated above, he/she will be conducting a one-to-one correspondence, which is usually not accurate. This study benefited from Nkatini's work because he is of the idea that what gets translated is the meaning structure, that is, the deep structure.

1.9.6 **Krieger (2005)**

Krieger (2005:1) addresses the question: "Why is Bible translation so hard?" by pointing out that:

Translation is essentially the task of communicating across cultures ... ideally, the translated message should impart the same message as the original but such results are not always possible.

Krieger (2005) is thus trying to create an awareness that it is impossible to produce the same message as the original for the target readers, but that there are some ways which the translators must try to follow in order to avoid translation blunders. This study benefited from Krieger's work because he also cautions that the translator must consider the differences that occur between languages.

1.10 **PRACTICAL STEPS TO BE TAKEN IN THE TRANSLATION PROCESS**

The difference between the source language and the target language and also the variation in their cultures make the process of translating a real challenge. Therefore, practical steps in the translation process need to be taken for proper transference of the message from the source text to the target text. Because of the fact that these strategies and methods of translation cannot be discussed in isolation, practical steps must be taken into consideration as translators cannot start the process of translation without first following these steps.

The Skopos theory which will be discussed as the study unfolds states that translators never work of their own accord but are usually called upon by a client to do a prescribed job. According to Naudé (2002:21), this client is referred to as the initiator who needs a

particular text for a particular purpose and for the receiver in the target culture. In this regard, it is the initiator who is going to define the purpose or function for which the target text is needed. In accordance with this information, it is evident that the source producer participates indirectly, and the people who are directly involved in the translation process are the receivers of both the source and target text. In relation to this study, the Bible Society in South Africa was the initiator.

The purpose or function the initiator has, is usually set out in the translation brief. As the study unfolds the researcher dealt with the information contained in the translation form. House (1977:37) states that in order to characterise the function of an individual specimen, its function has to be defined as "the application or use which the text has in the particular context of a situation". That is the reason why each text needs to be analysed in detail because every text is embedded in a unique situation.

Some of the steps to be taken in the analysis of texts as initiated by Naudé (2002:22) are:

- Distinction be made between the source language and the target language;
- Determine the purpose of the text and put it briefly into words;
- Establish the intended target group;
- Assess the quality of the article, i.e. value judgment;
- Distinguish between direct context of understanding and secondary meaning;
- Determine the style of the text;
- Take note of culture-specific aspects of the text;
- Take into account your own purpose as a translator;
- Translate the passage by taking care of the translation strategies pertaining to the cultural, textual, marked word order, and word levels;
- Revise the translation brief and translate the heading last.

If translators in the translation of the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer could have followed these steps, they could have successfully produced this text. The first step states that translators must realise the differences of distinction that exist between languages. If this step was adequately followed, a realisation could have been established that the pronoun used in the introductory sentence of the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer does not capture all the people addressed by the source-text. This problem is discussed in the next chapter.

The main purpose of the Lord's Prayer is to teach people how to pray. For translators to understand the purpose of this text, they should first understand what the Lord's Prayer is all about. According to Barrette (1985:277), a prayer is considered as a dialogue or personal conversation between a human being and God and through prayer people enter into a relationship with God and make their requests known to Him. The Lord's Prayer is full of petitions made to God, and people have to understand fully what they are requesting from God.

Birdwell (2005 in E/NTLR-3 Prayers.htm) is of the same opinion by stating that "If we cannot bring ourselves to pray to a transcendent, omnipotent, anthropomorphic deity, then should we abandon prayer? No, there is no need to abandon prayer either privately or publicly. I suggest that what we need to do is revise our understanding of prayer." This statement implies that, for translators to adequately bring the message to the target receivers they should revise their understanding of what this prayer is all about. Barrette (1985:277) further states that the Lord's Prayer is so well-known that people sometimes merely recite it without thinking about what it means. Its meaning should be considered in detail. This implies that translators should understand the meaning conveyed by every phrase or sentence in this text, i.e. the deep structure.

In accordance with the skopos theory, it is appropriate to establish the kind of readership expected to use the intended text. The Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer is for everyone, educated or illiterate, young or old. Therefore, this information in itself acts as the function of this text. It is thus advisable for translators to approach this text with care as it is one of the most important texts in the Bible. They should also take into consideration culture specific items and translate the passage by taking care of the translation strategies pertaining to the cultural, textual, marked word order and word levels which will be discussed as the study unfolds.

It is therefore imperative for translators to follow the practical steps of the translation process as this will guide them to successfully deliver the message to the intended recipients.

1.11 ORGANISATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter One outlines the introduction and background of the study.

Chapter Two analyses the impact of methods of translation on *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*.

Chapter Three analyses the impact of translation strategies on *Tatewešo wa Magodimong*.

Chapter Four deals with the organisation structure of *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*.

Chapter Five serves as the conclusion and summary of the study.

CHAPTER TWO

ANALYSING THE IMPACT OF TRANSLATION METHODS ON *TATAWEŠO WA MAGODIMONG*

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this chapter is to analyse the importance of translation methods which had an impact on the translation of *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*. In order to achieve this aim, the chapter concentrates on the following topics:

- a. The translation brief;
- b. Linguistic approach;
- c. Formal equivalence; and
- d. Dynamic equivalence.

As these topics cannot be discussed in isolation, it is also beneficial to this study to tackle issues concerning the role of translators.

2.2 THE ROLE OF TRANSLATORS

According to Campbell (1998:3), the role of translators has recently become a cause for concern unlike 30 years ago. Translators were more or less regarded as invisible instruments since the product of translation and not the process of translation was the focus of attention. In recent studies, scholars have started to admit that a good translation presupposes competence. Toury (1985:189-190) suggests that bilinguals have an “innate translation competence comprising bilingual and interlingual ability” as well as “transfer competence”, which is frequently considered as not sufficient. As a translator, one needs to be fully trained in order to have a command of both methods and strategies which are crucial for the correct transference of the message from one language into another.

Because of this reason, translation has caught the interest of many theorists. Hatim and Mason (1990:13) support this idea because they state: "to study translation in isolation from the factors affecting their production is consequently to miss out an important dimension of the phenomenon". Through this admission, they acknowledge the active and important role the translator plays in the translation process and, therefore, the issue of competence comes into play. Many scholars have written about what translation competence is. One of them is Nord (1992:52) who advocates text analysis as a teaching method which offers competences that should underpin teaching which includes "...competence of text reception and analysis, research competence, transfer competence, competence of text production, competence of translation quality assessment, and, of course, linguistic and cultural competence both on source and target side, which is the main prerequisite of translation activity". If all these activities could be included in the translation teaching method, there will be a clear line of demarcation between academic linguists and professional translators.

2.3 THE TRANSLATION BRIEF

In accordance with the translation profession, before any translation can be conducted, the translator must make use of the "translation brief" which is defined as "a set of instructions that the initiator gives to the translator on why he/she wants the translation to be done and "for whom"" (Naudé, 2005:22). The translation brief, among other things, contains the following information: the intention and the profile of the target readership (age, sex, class, etc.), the kind of translation, the translation medium, and the time and place of publication or implementation.

Nord (1991:6) provides an insight into an interpersonal interaction of the translation process where the initiator, who may be a client, the source text author, the text target reader or, in some instances the translator instigating the translation process, by approaching the translator because he/she needs a certain function (skopos) in the target culture which is contained in the translation brief. The translation brief will be given in the suggested form:

Questions to be asked	What they instruct the translator in this instance
Who transmits	Northern Sotho translators
To whom	Northern Sotho speaking community
What for	To inform
By which medium	Written
Where	Limpopo
When	Within a year
Why	Convert Northern Sotho community into Christians
A text with what function	Inform the Northern Sotho people about Christianity
On what subject matter	Religious texts
In which tone	Powerful and emotive
Age of target group	All ages
Level of education	All levels
Sex	Both male and female

It is also very important to establish the kind of readership that is expected to use the translated versions of Bibles. It is an established fact that Christianity to the Northern Sotho community was introduced by the missionaries who on arrival settled in Sekhukhuneland. In accordance with the Internet article (<http://www.unisa.ac.za>), during the middle of the 19th century, two missionaries, Alexandra Merensky and Heindrich Grützener of the Berlin Missionary Society, arrived in Lydenburg with the hope of establishing a mission station among the Swazi people but the Swazi king refused them to do so. As a result of this, they approached Boleu of the Ba-Kopa tribe to start the mission station and he accepted the proposal. During August 1860, they arrived on the farm Rietkloof and established the first Berlin Mission Station on the land given by Boleu. Due to tribal tensions, the tribe split into two and Rammupudu moved to Botšhabelo. In May 1862, two new missionaries, Endeman and Albert Nachtigal, joined Grützner and Merensky. It was decided that Endeman and Grützner continue working with the tribe while Merensky and Nachtigal explore greener pastures. The latter two eventually

established the mission station Botšhabelo (www.unisa.ca.za). The mission station of Botšhabelo later played an important role in the Ba-Kopa history as well as laying the foundation of the Northern Sotho speaking community's orthography.

Because of the need to write Christian literature for the entire Northern Sotho community, they solely adopted and standardised the Sepedi dialect. The adoption of the Sepedi dialect enabled them to write Christian literature in that language because it helped them to convert the entire Northern Sotho community into Christians. According to an interview conducted with Mr Kganakga (former church elder of Phutha-Ditšhaba congregation), Reverend Serote was one of the translators of the first Northern Sotho Bible and Reverend Serote's place of origin was Sekhukhuneland. Most of the vocabulary used in translated versions of Northern Sotho Bibles is from the Sepedi dialect which is not easily understood by the entire Northern Sotho community because they belong to different dialects.

According to the classification of the dialects of Northern Sotho, five dialect clusters are distinguished (Guide NSE302-4, 1991:54), namely:

- a. Central, with *Pedi* and *Kone* dialects which are found in *Sekhukhuneland* and Lydenburg.
- b. East-Central, with *Kutse* and *Pulana* spoken in the areas of Hazyview, White River and Bushbuckridge.
- c. North-Eastern, with *Lobedu* dialect in the Duiwelskloof area, Phalaborwa and *Khaga* and *Dzwabo* which are concentrated in Tzaneen its surroundings.
- d. Eastern, with *Pai* dialect which is encountered in Hazyview, Numbi and White River.
- e. North-Western, with *Tlokwa* and *Hananwa* dialects found in and around Pietersburg, Bochum, Blouberg, and Alldays. *Hananwa* is also spoken by the *Babirwa* (in Bononong on the border between Zimbabwe and Botswana) and the *Bakwena* of Northern Transvaal.

It is, however, inconvenient for all these different dialects to make use of a standardised language which is mainly based on the *Sepedi* dialect. This can be taken as an accident of

fate because if the missionaries on their arrival had settled at Botlokwa, they would have applied the same method of using Setlokwa as their vehicle of communication. Translators should however not use this as an excuse but should have used other methods to overcome this problem.

For example, the opening phrase of the Lord's Prayer, "Our Father" was translated into Northern Sotho as *Tatawešo*. The original form of this phrase was *Tate wa gešo*, and because of the morphological elision which occurred, the possessive construction *wa gešo* was contracted to *wešo*. According to Van Wyk, Lombard and Mokgokong (1992:64), the forms *gešo* (ours), *geno* (yours), and *gabo* (theirs) are employed when the possession is communal property of the family, household or any other social group. This statement implies that the possession is particularised and not for everybody. The phrase "Our Father" means that the "Father" who is addressed here, is for everyone irrespective of whether a person is a Christian or not, and not the 'Father' of a particular social group or Christians.

Krieger (2005:7) points out that translators must be aware of language distinction. Some languages use different pronouns depending on how many people are being addressed. In this case, the translators have failed to capture the number of people denoted by the possessive pronoun *gešo* because the pronoun limits the number of participants. The problem is that in dialects such as the *Sepedi* dialect, *gešo* may refer to everyone but in other dialects it does not refer to the same thing. In the revised standardised orthography of Northern Sotho, *gešo* refers to people one is related to. Therefore, the translators should have foreseen this problem and referred to this phrase as *Tate wa rena* when revisions were made.

According to *Statistics South Africa* (2001) 3.6 million of people in Limpopo, were classified as belonging to a particular religious group. These religious groups can be divided into three main groups:

- (i) 42% belong to Zion churches, Apostolic and Ethiopian type.
- (ii) 15,8% belong to the mainline churches such as the Lutheran, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Methodist, Presbyterian, and other orthodox churches.

(iii) 13.1% belong to Pentecostal/Charismatic or Born-Again churches.

According to this information, the churches of the first group, which is the largest group, are independently owned by African leaders. The most important fact is most of their priests never had the opportunity of attending Theological Institutions while some of them are not even educated and, therefore, solely rely on the information as presented by the translated versions of Northern Sotho Bibles. According to Krieger (2005:1), "Translation is essentially the task of communicating across cultures. The translator has the job of taking a message formed in one culture and producing a message that is understandable to members of another culture." This simply means that translators have an enormous duty of bridging the gap that exists between cultures and should not widen this gap.

The priests of the second group, which is smaller in number, had the opportunity of attending Theological Institutions and they thus have an advantage of knowing both worlds (i.e. the traditional and modern worlds). The third group, which is also smaller in number, consist of people who qualify to be regarded as educated though they did not all attend Theological Institutions. Therefore, they can read and understand the English language and in most of their churches the medium of instruction is English while in exceptional cases they make use of interpreters. It is, therefore, crucial for the translator to take note of these precautionary measures before attempting any translation. As the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer is for everyone, educated and illiterate, it must be approached with caution because it is one of the most important texts in the Bible.

2.4 METHODS HAVING AN IMPACT ON THE TRANSLATION OF *TATAWEŠO WA MAGODIMONG*

McMillan and Schumacher (1993:8-9) regard methodology as the ways one uses to collect and analyse data. This statement implies that a researcher selects data and analyses them in order to investigate a research problem or it can be regarded as an approach the researcher uses to study a particular phenomenon. Leedy and Ormad (2005:12) confirm this statement by noting that methodology is the general approach one takes in carrying out project. To some extent, this approach dictates the particular tools

the researcher selects. In this case, the researcher must seek and select relevant information concerning the interpretation of meaning in *Tatawešo wa Magodimong* as it is today and conduct a textual analysis.

In this case, different methods were investigated in order to analyse their impact on the translation of the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer, *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*. It was deemed appropriate to look at various versions of the Lord's Prayer from different languages in order to assist this study to establish which method was generally used in the translation of *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*.

Two of the Gospels containing versions of the Lord's Prayer, namely, those of Luke and Matthew were used in this study. According to Barrette (1995:278), the Gospels were written many decades after Jesus had taught the Prayer. Matthew recorded something he heard Jesus say, whereas Luke, who did not meet Jesus in His earthly life, recorded what others told him about the Lord's teachings. It is an established fact that Jesus taught in the Aramaic language, whereas the Gospels were written in Greek (Barrette:278). In order to assist this study in establishing whether the author's intention was adequately captured, the Prayer texts from the Aramaic language will also be presented. The presentation of Prayer texts are as follows:

- The first three Prayer texts contain the prayer texts from the English language as the source texts, namely, Barrett's old version (1995:277), *Holy Bible* (2000), and *Good News Bible* (1995).
- The second group of prayer texts are from the Northern Sotho language as target texts, taken from *Bibele* (1951), *Bibele* (2000), and *Bibele Taba e Botse* (2000).
- The last group of prayer texts are from the Aramaic language which will serve as auxiliary source texts.

2.4.1 Prayer texts from the English language as the source texts

TABLE 1

The old version (Barrette 1995:277)

(Matthew 6:9-13)	(Luke 11:2-4)
<p>Our Father who art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth As it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses As we forgive those who trespass against us. And do not lead us into temptation, But deliver us from the one. For thine is the kingdom and The power and the glory For ever and ever. Amen.</p>	<p>Our Father in heaven Hallowed be your name Your kingdom come Your will be done on earth as it is in Heaven. Give us day by day our daily bread And forgive us our sins, for we also forgive everyone who is indebted to us And do not lead us into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one.</p>

TABLE 2**New version (*Holy Bible 2000*)**

(Matthew 6:9-13)	(Luke 11:2-4)
<p>Our Father in heaven, Hallowed be your name, Your kingdom come, Your will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. Forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors.</p>	<p>Father, Hallowed be your name, Your kingdom come, - Give us this day our daily bread. Forgive us our sins, for we forgive everyone.</p>

TABLE 3**New version (*Good News Bible:1995*)**

(Matthew 6:9-13)	(Luke 11:2-4)
<p>Our father in heaven: May your holy name be honored; May your kingdom come; May your will be done on earth As it is done in heaven Give us today the food we need. Forgive us the wrongs we have done, as we forgive the wrongs that others have done to us. Do not bring us to hard testing, Keep us safe from the evil one.</p>	<p>Father; May your holy name be honored; May your kingdom come. - Give us day by day the food we need. Forgive us our sins, for we forgive everyone who does us wrong. And do not bring us to hard testing.</p>

2.4.2 Prayer texts from the Northern Sotho language as target texts

TABLE 4

Old version (*Bibele:1951*)

(Matthew 6:9-13)	(Luke 11:2-4)
<p><i>Tata-wešo wa maxodimong!</i> <i>Leina la xaxo a le kxêthwê;</i> <i>Mmušô wa xaxo a o tlê;</i> <i>thato ya xaxo a e dirwê mono</i> <i>lefaseng byalo ka xe e dirwa</i> <i>lexodimong;</i> <i>Re fê lehono boxôbê bya</i> <i>rena bya ka mehla;</i> <i>Re lebalêlê melato ya rena</i> <i>byalo ka xe re lebalêla ba</i> <i>ba naxo le melato xo rena;</i> <i>O se re iše melekong;</i> <i>xomme O re phološê bobeng;</i> <i>xobane mmušô ke wa xaxo,</i> <i>le matla, le tumišô,</i> <i>ka xo sa felexo, Amen.</i></p>	<p><i>Tata-wešo wa maxodimong!</i> <i>Leina la xaxo a le kxêthwê;</i> <i>Mmušô wa xaxo a o tlê;</i> <i>thato ya xaxo a e dirwê mono</i> <i>lefaseng byalo ka xe e dirwa</i> <i>lexodimong</i> <i>Re fê lehono boxôbê bya</i> <i>rena bya ka mehla;</i> <i>Re lebalêlê melato ya rena</i> <i>byalo ka xe re lebalêla ba</i> <i>ba naxo le melato xo rena;</i> <i>O se re iše melekong;</i> <i>xomme O re phološê bobeng;</i> <p style="text-align: center;">-</p></p>

TABLE 5**The new version (Bibele:2000)**

(Matthew 6:9-13)	(Luke 11:2-4)
<p><i>Tatawešo wa magodimong!</i> <i>Leina la gago a le kgethwe;</i> <i>thato ya gago a e dirwe mono</i> <i>lefaseng bjalo ka ge e dirwa</i> <i>legodimong;</i> <i>O re fe lehono bogobe bja rena</i> <i>bja ka mehla;</i> <i>re lebalele melato ya rena</i> <i>bjalo ka ge re lebalela ba ba</i> <i>nago le melato go rena;</i> <i>O se re iše melekong; gomme</i> <i>o re phološe bobeng;</i> <i>gobane mmušo ke wa gago,</i> <i>le maatla, le tumišo, ka go</i> <i>sa felego. Amen.</i></p>	<p><i>Tatawešo wa magodimong!</i> <i>Leina la gago a le kgethwe;</i> <i>thato ya gago a e dire mono</i> <i>lefaseng bjalo ka ge e dirwa</i> <i>legodimong;</i> <i>O re fe lehono bogobe bja rena</i> <i>bja ka mehla;</i> <i>re lebalele melato ya rena</i> <i>bjalo ka ge re lebalela ba ba</i> <i>nago le melato go rena;</i> <i>O se re iše melekong; gomme</i> <i>o re phološe bobeng;</i> - </p>

TABLE 6**The New version (*Bibele Taba e Botse:2000*)**

(Matthew 6:9-13)	(Luke 11:2-4)
<p><i>Tatawešo wa magodimong, leina la gago a le kgethwe; mmušo wa gago a o tle; thato ya gago a e dirwe mo lefaseng bjalo ka ge e dirwa legodimong. O re fe bogobe bja rena bja ka mehla. O re lebalele melato ya rena bjalo ka ge re lebalela ba ba nago le melato go rena. O se re iše molekong, o upše o re phološe bobeng.</i></p>	<p><i>Tatawešo, leina la gago a le kgethwe; mmušo wa gago a o tle; - Tšatši le lengwe le le lengwe O re fe mogobe bjo re bo hlokago. O re lebalele dibe tša rena, ka gore le rena re lebalela ba ba re fošetšago. O se re iše melekong, ''</i></p>

2.4.3 Prayer texts from the Aramaic language as auxiliary source texts

TABLE 7

First version: Aramaic language (2006)

This wording and pronunciation are the closest that is known to the form which Jesus spoke.

aboon dabashmaya

Our father who is in heaven,

nethkadash shamak

holy is his name,

tetha malkoothak

your Kingdom is coming,

newe tzevyanak

your will is being done

aykan dabashmaya af bara

on earth as it is in heaven,

hav lan lakma dsoonkanan yamanawashbook lan

give us our bread day by day

kavine aykana daf hanan shabookan lhayavine oolow talahn lanesyana

as we forgive those who trespass and sin against us

ela fatsan men beesha

deliver us from evil.

TABLE 8

Second version Aramaic Translation (2006)

The Lord's Prayer - Aramaic Translation

Our Father in the Universe
Holy be your name
Let come your Kingdom, Let be your desire
As in the universe, So on Earth
Give us bread, our need from day to day
And release us our offences
Even as we also have released our offenders
And do not let us enter into worldliness
But part us from error
Because yours are Kingdom and Power and Glory
From ages through ages,
Sealed in Truth. It is so.
Amen.

2.4.4 The linguistic approach

During the twentieth century, what dominated Bible translations were the linguistic based theories while the dominating concept during that time was equivalence. Translation equivalence is considered to be a central problem in Translation Studies. As a result of the lack of equivalence on linguistic levels, translators encounter translation difficulties. Many linguists fail to give a precise way of how zero-equivalence should be treated when it prevails as Wils (1982:36) states that the science of Translation has so far failed to develop clear-cut criteria for the reassurability of translation equivalence and has failed to explicate the concept of translation equivalence. This statement proves that translators need help in solving the problem presented by zero-equivalence which can appear at any linguistic level.

House (1977:5-7) mentions that "the pre-linguistic scholars tried to undertake a translation study which will account for translation quality and the most important criteria were that the translated text should be faithful to the original, retain the original's specific flavor and local color or spirit." In accordance with this information, it is obvious that pre-linguistic theories were source oriented as they advocated for sameness with the original text. They came up with vague principles that a translation of optimal value should fulfil which are listed by Savory (1963) in House (1977:7) as follows:

1. A translation must give the words of the original.
2. A translation should give the ideas of the original.
3. A translation should read like an original work.
4. A translation should read like a translation.
5. A translation should reflect the style of the original.
6. A translation should possess the style of the original.
7. A translation should read as a contemporary of the original.
8. A translation should read like a contemporary of the translator.

Scholars soon realised that this approach to equivalence was too limiting, and it is obvious that rule (1) is a contradiction of rule (2); rule (3) a contradiction of rule (4); rule (5) a contradiction of rule (6); and rule (7) a contradiction of rule (8). For example, in (1) it may be asked how a translation can give the words of the original and at the same time give ideas of the original as in (2).

Because of this confusion, Naudé (2002:9) states that scholars tried to redefine the concept in many ways, which resulted in two different approaches. Naude (2002:10) indicates that the first one consists of text (linguistic) oriented models of translation which focus on the equivalence problem. Supporters of this model were Juliane House (1981), Neubert and Shreve (1992), and Basil and Mason (1990). These scholars regard translation as a semantic and pragmatic reconstruction of the source text, locating equivalence at a textual and communicative level, not at sentential and lexical levels. It also states that words only interest the translator in so far as they are elements of a text, thus only texts can be translated and never words. The second approach deals with sociolinguistic models of translation which emphasize the function of linguistic structures

in communication, and its supporters were scholars such as De Waard and Nida (1986). These scholars emphasize the function of linguistic structures in communication, i.e. texts were no longer regarded as independent linguistic utterances, but rather as part of the socio-culture to which they belong. These two approaches, even though they differ in the way they view translation, their main concern is the source text and not the target text.

In the quest for trying to find the best way of judging a good translation, Nida (1964:182) postulates the following three criteria:

- (i) General efficiency of the communication process;
- (ii) Comprehension of intent; and
- (iii) Equivalence of response.

The first one implies that the translation should have maximal reception. The second one denotes that the meaning of the source language message should be represented accurately. The last one is not really separable from the second one as the nature of response is closely linked to the intent of the message. The criterion of equivalence of response is closely related to Nida's principle of "Dynamic Equivalence of Translation" (1969:159), which states that the manner in which receptors of the translation text respond to the translation text must be equivalent to the manner in which the receptors of the source-text respond to the source text. The problem with this principle is that the equivalent can never be identical due to different cultures, historical and situational settings.

Owing to this problem, Nida (1964) in Weissbort and Eysteinson (2006: 346) stated that "the problem of zero-equivalence is caused by the fact that no two languages are identical, either in the meanings given to the corresponding symbols in the ways in which such symbols are arranged in phrases and sentences". It is due to this fact that one cannot find absolute correspondence in languages. McQuire (1999:27) concurs by remarking that "equivalence in translation should not be approached as a search for sameness since sameness cannot even exist between two versions of the same texts". This statement implies that it is not appropriate to expect translators to be absolute in their translation. It is an established fact that if one requests different translators to translate the same text,

they will produce different versions of the same text, but what is important is the message.

For example, the two Gospels as in Table (1) from the English language as the source texts, are not the same. It becomes very difficult to establish which one of the two is the correct version of the Lord's Prayer. Both Matthew and Luke claim that they wrote what Jesus said. In the introductory phrase, Matthew presents it as:

(1) Our Farther in Heaven (Barrette: 1995)

while Luke's version is written as:

(2) Father (Barrette: 1995).

In addition, the petition 'may your will be done on earth as it is in heaven' is not included in Luke's version. As Barrette mentions, Matthew recorded something he heard Jesus say, whereas Luke depended on what others told him about Jesus because he had never met Jesus in His earthly life. It thus becomes clearly evident that translations are never identical to the original.

Nida (1964) further states that differences in translations can be generally accounted for by three basic factors in translating:

- (1) the nature of the message;
- (2) the purpose or purposes of the author and by proxy, of the translator; and
- (3) the type of audience.

According to Nida (1964) "messages differ in the degree to which content or form is the dominant consideration". This implies that in certain situations, the content can be of primary consideration while in others the form must be given priority. In order to apply one of them, the translator must take into consideration whether form or content of the message is going to be applicable in relation to the receptor-language audience. For example, in *Tatewešo wa Magodimong* the word 'bread' was translated as *bogobe*

(porridge) which is considered to be something more understandable to the target-language readers.

Nida (1964) furthermore states that the purpose of the translator is also an important factor in dictating the type of translation where the primary aim of the translator may be giving information as to both content and form. It sometimes becomes very difficult for translators to rely on both content and form and the translator's purpose may force him/her to make certain adjustments. In such cases, the translator is advised to aim at full intelligibility to make the target reader understand the full implications of the message for his/her own circumstances as in the cited example above.

Throughout the history of translation, it was discovered that translators felt that difficult situations in the translation process call for desperate measures. Many Bible translators felt that the process of translating should involve a faithful reproduction of the formal source text qualities in one situation and an adjustment to the target audience in another. Scholars such as Luther (1483) in Weissbort and Eysteinnsson (2006:61) held the view that there are passages in the Bible where the translator must reproduce even the order but in other passages they believed it was more important to render the sense or to adjust the text to the target audience's needs and expectations. That is the reason why Luther, translating into German, used the word 'solum'/*allein* in Roman 3, knowing very well that the word was not included in the Latin and Greek text but the word speaks to the sense of the text. In a similar way Nida (1969:159) distinguishes between formal and dynamic equivalence in translation, the former being a faithful reproduction of the source text form and elements and the latter denoting equivalence of extra-linguistic communicative effect. In accordance with this information, it is clear that their main concern is the source text so that its features be preserved in the target text.

As in number (3) above, the translator must also know the type of audience he/she is going to serve. Nida (1964) states that prospective audiences differ both in decoding ability and in potential interest and the decoding ability involves at least four principal levels:

- (1) the capacity of children, whose vocabulary and cultural experience are limited;
- (2) the double-standard capacity of new literates, who can decode oral messages with facility but whose ability to decode written messages is limited;
- (3) the capacity of the average literate adult, who can handle both oral and written with relative ease; and
- (4) the unusually high capacity of specialists (doctors, theologians, philosophers, etc.) when they are decoding messages within their own area of specialisation.

Nida (1964) further states that prospective audiences do not only differ in their decoding ability but also in the area of their interest. Therefore, it is also very important to capture the tone of the translation and deliver it according to the author's intentions. Nida shares this view with the skopos theorist as indicated above in the translation brief, namely, that it is vital for the translator to know the kind of readership that is expected to read the translated text.

In accordance with the above information, Nida and Taber (1969: 12) view "equivalence" as reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message, first in terms of meaning and second in terms of style. This statement implies that the translator must produce a translation which is identical to its source form, i.e. word-for-word correspondence. Nida tries to move away from the old system of translation where they used terms such as "faithful" or "free" translation by introducing two basic orientations or types of equivalence, namely, formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence which will be discussed below.

2.4.4.1 Formal equivalence

According to Nida and Taber (1969:24), "formal equivalence is considered as to reproduce in the target language, the source language surface structure as exactly as possible". According to Radford (1999:94), "in the standard theory of transformational grammar, every sentence has two distinct levels of syntactic structure, linked by rules of a particular kind called transformation". These two levels are deep structure and surface structure. They differ formally in that they are generated by rules of a different kind. For our purpose, deep structure is more intimately connected with sentence meaning than surface structure is. Surface structure, on the one hand, is more intimately connected with

the way the sentence is pronounced. Meaning is interpreted as the propositional core of a sentence.

If the translator is looking at the surface structure of sentences he/she will be looking at the grammatical elements of the supposed sentence and will, therefore, be performing literal translation. Newmark (1988:45) views literal translation as "the source-language constructions which are converted to their nearest target-language equivalents whereas the lexical words are for their part translated singly, and out of context". This kind of approach can best be used as a pre-translation process. Nida argues that this will provide the translator with a technique for decoding the source text and a procedure for encoding the target text. Cardford (1965: 27) considers this as "formal correspondence" where any TL category (unit, class, element, and structure) can be said to occupy as nearly as possible, the same place in the economy of the TL as the given SL category occupies in the SL.

Formal equivalence is source-oriented because translators in this regard try to reproduce several formal elements including grammatical units, consistency of words and meanings of words in relation to the source context, that is, trying to translate a noun for a noun, a verb for a verb. Translators try to preserve everything in the source text and by so doing, they perform a word-for-word correspondence. Therefore, most of the formal equivalence translations usually contain much which is not intelligible enough to an average reader. For example, the petition:

- (3) May your holy name be honoured (*The Good News Bible* 1995) is translated into Northern Sotho as:
- (4) *Leina la gago a le kgethwe* (*Bibele Taba e Botse* 2000)

The passive verb *kgethwe* means "to be chosen". In this regard, the translator avoided translating the word "holy" because there is no direct equivalent in the Northern Sotho language. The translators tried to capture the essence of "holiness" by selecting the verb *kgetha* which they may have conceptualised from the noun *mokgethwa* of which the literal translation is "the chosen one". Another reason why they did not capture the essence of "holiness" may be that they decided to cling to the archaic version of this

petition written as “hallowed be thy name” (Barrette 1995). In most of the Northern Sotho speaking churches, the use of the word *mokgethwa* is interpreted as a “holy person”. The same applies to the “Holy Spirit” which is translated into Northern Sotho as *Moyamokgethwa* while its literal meaning is “the chosen spirit”. It is thus evident that translators adopted the formal equivalent principle to translate some of the concepts in the Northern Sotho Lord’s Prayer. In order to avoid this literal translation, they should have adopted the following approach:

(5) *Leina la gago leo le kgethegilego a le tumišwe.*

(May your holy name be honoured).

or

(6) *Leina la gago a le tumišwe.*

(May your name be honoured).

In accordance with the *Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (2004:57), the word *kgethego* signifies consecration or holiness. Translators in this regard could have used this word as it is the closest translation equivalent in meaning.

According to Nida (1964), “the kind of translation which typifies the structural equivalence might be called “gloss translation”, in which the translator attempts to reproduce as literally as possible and meaningfully as possible the form and content of the original”. A gloss translation is designed to permit the reader to identify himself/herself as fully as possible with a person in the source language context, and understand as he/she can of the customs, manner of thought, and means of expression. It is evident in the Northern Sotho Lord’s Prayer that some of the concepts were glossed. In the introductory sentence of the Lord’s Prayer

(7) Our Father who is in Heaven (*The Good News Bible*:1995)

is translated into Northern Sotho as:

(8) *Tatawešo wa Magodimong* (*Bibele Taba e Botse*:2000)

The word “heaven” has been captured by the Northern Sotho translators as *magodimong* and its literal meaning is “in the skies”. The word “heaven” appears again in the petition;

(9) may your will be done on earth as it is in heaven (*The Good News Bible*: 1995).

but translated into Northern Sotho as

(10) *thato ya gago a e dirwe mo lefaseng bjale ka ge e dirwa legodimong* (*Bibele Taba e Botse*: 2000).

It is surprising to find that in the introductory sentence of the Northern Sotho translated version, the word “heaven”, appears in the plural formation while in the latter it appears in its singular form. It is clearly not understandable what the translators were trying to accomplish in differentiating the same concept. The translators might have avoided the use of the plural formation in the second instant because *lefase* (earth) and *legodimo* (sky), are members of the same noun class prefix, that is class 5 (*le-*). In order to avoid a translation blunder, they switched to the usage of the singular class prefix so that both nouns could correspond. The issue at stake here is the fact that there is no direct equivalent in Northern Sotho for the word heaven.

The word “heaven” as described by the *Oxford Dictionary* (2001:415) is “the place where God or gods live and where good people go after death”. According to Sawyerr (1970:ix), “Africans are struck by two significant features concerning the concept of God, that is they associate Him with the sky and elements”. This statement signifies the fact that Africans know that God is in the sky but the concept of heaven does not exist in the African literature. Semantically, heaven represents a special place where God is residing up in the skies. Therefore, it will be inappropriate to deny the Northern Sotho speaking community an understanding of what heaven is all about. It is thus the duty of translators to give their receptor readers a glimpse of what is in the source culture. The word ‘heaven’ may be translated into Northern Sotho as *legaeng leo le kgethegilego*. Therefore, the sentences in (6) and (8) should -be captured as:

(11) *Tate wa rena wa legaeng leo lekgethegilego*

(Our Father in Heaven)

and

(12) *Thato ya gago a dirwe mo lefaseng bjale ka ge e dirwa legaeng
leo le kgethegilego*

(May your will be done as it is in heaven).

According to Nida (1964) in Naudé (2005: 54), "in formal equivalence, the focus is on the message in both form and content". In such translations, one is concerned with correspondence from sentence to sentence and concept for concept which implies that the translator must match the message of the target receivers to different elements in the source language. Nida (1964) further argues that the type of translation that completely typifies structural equivalence might be called a gloss translation because the translator wants to translate the form and content of the original as literally and meaningfully as possible.

In the same petition which was used above, 'may your will be done on earth as it is in heaven', the verb 'one' was translated into Northern Sotho as *dirwe*. The Northern Sotho verb *dirwe* is the direct equivalent of the source form done. The problem lies with the deep structure of this sentence. To understand this petition clearly, one needs to look at the Latin translated version of this phrase which reads:

Thy wyll be fulfilled as well in erthe, as it is in heuen (William Maskell 1882) (in

(The Lord's Prayer.htm)

and the Aramaic one which states:

Let be your desire As in the universe, So on Earth (SmartWomenInvest_ htm 2006).

In this case, where translation equivalents are synonymous, translators need to locate the type of divergence which occurs between the synonyms. According to Gouws in Mphahlele (2004:2), divergence is a prevailing equivalent relation where one item has more than one translation equivalent and there are different types of divergence. The divergence that is applicable in this case is a semantic divergence. The verb 'done' has a

sense of completeness and the corresponding translated one should be able to capture that sense of completeness. It is true that *dirwe* is a translation equivalent for the verb “done”, but the translated verb does not completely capture the intention of the author and translators should have considered the other synonym which is *phetha* as it has that sense of completeness. In the Latin construction, the verb “done” is replaced by “fulfil” which can be translated into Northern Sotho as *phetha* and in Aramaic ‘let be’ can be translated to Northern Sotho as *go be bjalo*. The verb “done” has three translation equivalents and should be treated with caution. This idea is cemented by the works of Bidwell (2005 in E/NTLR - 3 Prayers.htm) when reconstructing the Lords Prayer and capturing this sentence as:

We will work to see your divine intent become a reality where we live.

This means that the will of God must be manifested here on earth and thus become a reality, that is the will of God must be fulfilled. Therefore, this sentence should have been translated as:

(13) *Thato ya gago a e phethege mo lefaseng bjale*

ka ge go le bjalo tulong e kgethegilego

According to this information, it is evident that most of the Northern Sotho Lord’s Prayer translations were done in accordance with the formal equivalence perspective while in some cases the translators applied the dynamic equivalence orientation as will be discussed below.

2.4.4.2 Dynamic equivalence

In accordance with Riew and Phillips (1954) in Nida (1964: 159), "in contrast, a translation which attempts to produce a dynamic rather than a formal equivalence is based upon “the principle of dynamic effect”. In this type of translation, the translator is not concerned with matching the receptor-language message with the source-language message, but seeks the relationship that exists between the receptor and message, which must be substantially the same as that which exists between the relationships that exist between the original receptors and the message. Therefore, Nida and Taber (1964:166) describe dynamic equivalence as "the closest natural equivalent to the source-language

message". According to Nida and Taber (1964), this type of definition contains three essential terms:

- (1) equivalent, which points towards the source-language message;
- (2) natural, which points towards the receptor language; and
- (3) closest, which binds the two orientations together on the basis of the highest degree of approximation.

One of the requirements of dynamic equivalence as mentioned above is the naturalness of expression. Campbell (1789) in Naudé (2004:58) states that the requirement of sensitivity to the style of the original is the need for a "natural and easy" form of expression in the language into which one is translating. This implies that if the translator fails to be natural in expression, the translation can be doomed to failure as the readers will read the text like a translation. Goodspeed (1945) in Naudé (2004:59) echoes the same sentiment with respect to Bible translating by declaring: "The best translation is not one that keeps forever before the reader's mind the fact that this it is a translation, not an original English composition, but that makes the reader forget that he is looking into the ancient writer's mind, as he would into that of a contemporary." Phillips (1953) in Naudé (2004:59) utters the same idea: "The test of a real translation is that it should not read like a translation at all."

As dynamic equivalence is primarily directed towards the equivalence of response rather than equivalence of form, the word 'natural' need to be extensively explained. In accordance with Nida (1964), the word 'natural' is basically applicable to three areas of the communication process:

- (1) the receptor language and culture as a whole;
- (2) the context of the particular message; and
- (3) the receptor-language audience.

If the translator wants to achieve a stylistically acceptable translation, the conformance of translation to the receptor language and culture as a whole is an essential ingredient. A natural translation will, therefore, involve grammatical and lexicon adaptation. Grammatical adaptations are easy to apply because the structure of the receptor-language will dictate those grammatical changes such as the shifting of the word order and using verbs in the place of nouns. In accordance with the dynamic equivalent principle, there are three lexical levels to be considered:

- (1) terms for which there are readily available parallels, e.g. tree and river;
- (2) terms which identify culturally different objects, but with somewhat similar functions, e.g. in *Tatawešo wa Magodimong* the word 'bread' substituted by the term *bogobe* as they are said to have similar functions.
- (3) terms which identify cultural specialties, e.g. amen, and jubilee.

Newmark (1988) in Naudé (2004:200) categorises the translation of 'foreign' cultural words, adapting Nida, in this sense:

- (1) Ecology
 - (a) Flora
 - (b) Fauna
 - (c) Winds
 - (d) Plains
 - (e) Hills.
- (2) Material culture (artifacts)
 - (a) Food
 - (b) Clothes
 - (c) Houses and towns
 - (d) Transport
- (3) Social culture - work and leisure type of dances and music.
- (4) Organisations, customs, activities, procedures, and concepts.
 - (a) Political administration.
 - (b) Religious: 'temple', and karma.
 - (c) Artistic.
- (5) Gestures and habits, such as spitting.

Nida and Newmark admit that translation takes place in concrete situations and thus, involves members of different cultures. The first set in Nida's lexical levels, which Newmark regards as ecology, do not present problems as there are usually parallel correspondences to that effect. In the second set of terms which Newmark mentions the list material culture artifacts, so confusion can arise if another term used reflects the form of the referent though not the equivalent function or which identifies the equivalent function at the expense of formal identity. For example, the petition:

(14) Give us our daily bread (*Holy Bible:2000*)

was translated into Northern Sotho as:

(15) *O re fe lehono bogobe bja rena bja ka mehla*
(*Bibele:2000*).

The word 'bread' is considered as the staple food of the English cultural community and in accordance with the dynamic principle, it might be rendered by the staple food of the target culture in question. In the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer it was rendered as *bogobe* which implies 'porridge'. Nida and Taber were concentrating mainly on the surface structure and not venturing further into the deep structure, which Chomsky (1978:145) views as "providing an analysis into phrase structure that is much more revealing than the surface structure, as to the logical form of the sentence".

The translators in this case should also have concentrated on the deep structure presented by this phrase to unravel the problem of meaning. The translators adopted the strategy of translation through cultural substitution which is applied when a target language item does not have the same prepositional meaning, but which will have the same impact on the target reader (Baker, 1992:33). The question which arises is whether the translators have successfully captured the intention of the author. It is also questionable whether porridge (*bogobe*) is still regarded as a staple food for the Northern Sotho speaking community. Currently, most of the Northern Sotho community are influenced by Western culture and most families use bread as their staple food. As mentioned in the previous chapter, there are some translated versions of the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer that do not change according to the modern needs of its receptors.

In the third class, certain foreign associations can rarely be avoided. In the doxology of the Lord's Prayer, the prayer ends by saying 'amen' which can be translated into Northern as *a go be bjalo* (let it be) but it remains unchanged. Even if translations try to bridge this cultural gap, there are certain traces of the foreign expressions which are deeply embedded in the structure of the message and thus make it impossible to remove such foreign objects. This brings home the fact that there are certain basic themes that can not be naturalised by the process of translating due to cultural differences. In accordance with the dynamic principle, such cases can be solved by supplying footnotes to point out the basis of cultural diversity to make the target group understand other people's cultural difference.

The receptor language and culture must be in accordance with the context of the particular message. According to Nida (1964), "a true natural translation can in some respects be described in terms of what it avoids rather than what it actually states, for it is the presence of serious anomalies, avoided in a successful translation which immediately strikes the reader as being out of place in the context". This statement implies that message presented by translated versions must match the cultural aspects of the particular language in question, and translators should not avoid translating certain concepts as they are not applicable in the particular culture. In Bible translation, what is regarded as important is the content and not the form. If a source-language phrase is regarded as misleading when translated literally into the receptor language, translators are obliged to make adjustments in a dynamic equivalent translation. The petition:

(16) And lead us not into temptation
but deliver us from the evil one (*Holy Bible* 2000).

was translated into Northern Sotho as

(17) *o se re iše melekong;*
gomme o re phološe bobeng (*Bibele* 2000).

What the translators did in this petition was to conduct a literal translation which can be regarded as misleading to the target readers. The translators should have consulted other sources if they felt this petition was rather misleading. From the onset, it seems that the English version also failed to capture the intentions of the author. If one looks at the versions of the Aramaic language, one may bring a new insight to this problem. This petition was presented as:

(18) *ela fatsan men beesha* (2.4.3.1)
(deliver us from evil)

(19) And do not let us enter into worldliness
but part us from error (2.4.3.2).

The first version did not capture the whole petition, but the second version explains this petition very well. It pleads with God to guide us not to do wrong. In accordance with other Bible texts of this petition, rather misleading due to the fact that it seems as if God is responsible for guiding people to do evil things. This is of course not the case because according to the Christian belief, it is the Devil which is the tempter and not God. Barrette (1995:283) states that this petition must be considered from the Jewish belief that literarily everything is in God's hands and under his control. Nothing can happen unless is the will of God and if one is tempted, it is God who allows this to happen. Therefore, it implies asking him not to make the cross one has to bear too heavy for one. *The Good News Bible* (1997), therefore, captures this petition as:

(20) Do not bring us to hard testing,
but keep us safe from the evil one

Bidwell (2005 in E/NTRL - 3 Prayers.htm) in the revision of the Lord's Prayer, presents this petition as follows:

We recognize the presence of evil in our world and strive to avoid being part of it as well as pointing it out whenever we are aware of it.

If the translators tried to consult other sources they would have recognised that there is something lacking in the original source text. Bidwell's version has nothing to do with God causing people to do evil, instead it is the people who must work hard in order to avoid evil deeds so that they must not fall into the trap of Satan. The Northern Sotho translated version of this petition should have been:

(21) *O se re fe diteko tse boima, eupša o re phološe go yo mobe*

(Do not bring us to hard testing, but keep us safe from the evil one) .

It is, therefore, imperative for translators to consider the use of other sources before attempting any translation. In this regard, the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer was translated straight from the English language, while on the other hand the English translators took it from other languages. The English translators may have translated from the Greek language and the Greeks translated the Lord's Prayer from the Aramaic language. It is very possible that much information can be lost along the translation process. Therefore, translators are advised not to stick to one method of translation but try to venture further into other translation methods as this approach can supply them with vital information. This is also evident in the petition:

Forgive us the wrongs we have done, as we forgive others the wrongs they have done to us. (*Good News Bible:1995*)

was translated into Northern Sotho as:

O re lebalele melato ya rena, bjalo ka ge re lebalela ba ba nago le melato le rena (Bible Taba e Botse:2000)

The earlier versions wrote this phrase as “Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us”, which was later changed to “Forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors”, which brought more confusion to translators because they translated it literally which in turn did not capture the essence of the petition. By this petition we are asking God to forgive us our sins because we acknowledge that we have sinned against him. It is a known fact that a wrong can be corrected by a right. We petition him to forgive us because in turn we have already forgiven those who wronged us.

The term ‘debt’ was translated to Northern Sotho as *molato*. In the Northern Sotho language when you owe someone, especially something which has to do with money, it is expressed as *o na le molato* (you have committed a debt). Again the same concept could be used for referring to a case. Biblically, this term does not mean ‘debt’ in its literal sense, but means that you have done something wrong, that is, you have committed a sin. The word *molato* is, therefore, inappropriate with regard to the contextual meaning it has. In this regard it is not yet a case but a wrong deed. Translators should have established that the author in this regard was referring to sins that mankind commit against God, and they are, therefore, asking for forgiveness which is conditional on the basis that they also have forgiven those who wronged them. *Bibele Taba e Botse* (2000) has successfully captured this information by giving their target readers the contextual meaning of this petition, that is:

*O re lebalele dibe tša rena, bjale ka
ge re lebalela bao ba re fošetšago*

2.3 CONCLUSION

It is clearly evident from the information used above that translators in the translation of the Northern Sotho Lord’s Prayer *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*, used the linguistic approach. Most of the concepts were translated using the formal and dynamic principles as advocated by Nida. If the translators had considered using other methods in the translation of *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*, the misrepresentation of meaning could have been avoided and its message could also have reached the target audience the way it

should do. If handled adequately, the Lord's Prayer will have a chance of being taken as a prayer and not conducted like a recitation as many do. The next chapter will deal with strategies which had an impact on the translation of *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*. Before the discussion of translation strategies could be made, a review must be given of the following changes which have been made to the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer:

<i>Bible Taba e botse (2000)</i>	Changed to
(1) <i>Tatewešo wa Magodimong</i> (Our Father in Heaven)	<i>Tate wa rena wa legaeng leo le kgethegilego</i>
(2) <i>Leina la gago a le kgethwe</i> (May your holy name be honored) (May your holy name be honored)	<i>Leina la gag oleo le kgethegilego a le tumišwe</i>
(3) <i>Thato ya gago a e dirwe mono lefaseng, bjale ka ge e dirwa legodimong</i> (May your will be done on earth, as it is done in Heaven)	<i>Thato ya gago a e phethege mono lefaseng, bjale ka ge go le bjalo legaeng leo le kgethegilego.</i>
(4) <i>O re lebalele melato ya rena, Bjale ka ge re lebalela bao ba nago le melato le rena</i> (Forgive us our wrongs, as we forgive the wrongs others have done to us)	<i>O re lebalele dibe tša rena, bjalo ka ge re lebalela bao ba re fošetšago</i>
(5) <i>O se re iše melekong, upše o re phološe bobeng</i> (Do not bring us to hard testing, but keep us from the Evil One.	<i>O se re fe diteko tše boima, upše o re phološe go yo mobe</i>

CHAPTER THREE

TRANSLATION STRATEGIES THAT HAD AN IMPACT ON THE TRANSLATION OF *TATAWEŠO WA MAGODIMONG*

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter aims at providing information on strategies that had an impact on the translation of the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*. As already mentioned in (1.1), translation is taken as a vehicle for communication to communicate cross-culturally, therefore, the best methods and strategies should be utilised by Bible translators. Because translation strategies cannot be discussed in isolation, the following topics are going to be discussed:

- (a) Procedures to be followed in the translation;
- (b) General problems encountered by translators while translating; and
- (c) Translation strategies that had an impact on *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*.

3.2 TRANSLATION PROCEDURES

Newmark (1988: 81) mentions the difference between translation methods and translation procedures by stating that "while translation methods relate to whole texts, translation procedures are used for sentences and the smaller units of language". This statement implies that for a proper translation process to take place, words and sentences need to be analysed. The translating procedures, as depicted by Nida (1964: 45), are as follows:

Technical procedures:

- (a) analysis of the source and target languages;
- (b) a through study of the source language text before making attempts to translate it; and

(c) Making judgments of the semantic and syntactic approximations.

In this regard, translators are advised to make a thorough analysis of both texts, that is establishing a distinction between the two languages or cultures involved. Nida stresses the point that the source text must be studied thoroughly because it is considered to be the source information. It is the source-text producer who produces the text which is going to be used as a source of information in the translation process.

Even if the functionalists do not regard the source text but the purpose of the translation process, the source text is still taken as a point of departure for the offering information to be formulated in the target text. House (1977:37) shares this view because he states that "in order to be able to establish functional equivalence, the source text needs to be analysed first, such that equivalence which needs to be sought for source text and translation text can be stated precisely". It is thus important to make a source text analysis before any translation process can take place.

According to Nord (1991) in Naudé (2004:190) the analysis of the source text guides in the translation process in that it provides the basis for decisions about (a) the feasibility of the translation assignment, (b) which source text units are relevant to a functional translation, and (c) which translation strategy will lead to a target-text meeting the requirements of the translation brief. Nord (1991) in Naudé (2004:190) states that it is very important to compare the source-text in situation with the target-text in situation in relation with the translation brief in order to achieve optimal transfer procedure. In this regard the translator will be able to identify the difference in cultural knowledge of the two communities involved, and be able to make adjustments which can sometimes lead to textual expansions.

The translator is also advised to make value judgments about the semantic and syntactic approximation. A thorough knowledge of semantic implications on texts is crucial for translators because it enables them to deal with the problem of non-equivalents in some cases. It also enables to locate similarities and differences which are found in the two languages involved as well as the gap that exists between them. It is also vital to make syntactic evaluations because some of the choices of appropriate equivalents in a given context are strictly linguistic while some originate from extra-linguistic factors.

Organisational procedures:

- (a) constant re-evaluation of the attempt be made;
- (b) contrasting it with the existing available translations of the same text done by other translators; and
- (c) checking the text's communicative effectiveness by asking the target language readers to evaluate its accuracy and effectiveness and study their reactions (Nida, 1964:246-47).

In accordance with this information, it is important for the translators to reevaluate their work to make sure that they have succeeded in conveying the intention of the author to the target audience. Translators are encouraged to consult other similar sources as this study did in giving different types of text versions from various languages on *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*. By doing this, translators are able to locate if any information was lost during the process of translation. Newmark (1988) in Naudé (2004:24) also contributed to different translation procedures in relation to culture-bound terms (CBT). Some of them are the following:

- *Transference*: It is the ocess of transferring an SL word to a TL text. It includes transliteration and is the same as what Harvey (2000:5) names transcription (Newmark, 1988b:82). In this regard the transference of the source language item to a target language remains unchanged, as such, so that the SL item becomes a loan word in the TL.
- *Naturalisation*: It adapts the SL word first to the normal pronunciation, then to the normal morphology of the TL (Newmark, 1988b:82). This procedure does not differ much from transference but only in the sense that there will be some morphological modification to remove some traces of foreignness. Naudé (2002:24) regards naturalisation as indigenisation or domestication.

- *Cultural equivalent*: It means replacing a cultural word in the SL with a TL one. However, "they are not accurate" (Newmark, 1988b:83). In these case, there is a replacement of a culture-specific item of the source language with a target language item which does not have the same propositional meaning but can have the same impact on the minds of the target audience. In *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*, the word 'bread' has been replaced by a culturally equivalent concept *bogobe* (porridge) as porridge is regarded as the staple food for the Northern Sotho speaking community.
- *Functional equivalent*: It requires the use of a culture-neutral word (Newmark, 1988b:83). Generalisation is used in this regard by selecting a neutral term that can define the source language culture-specific item which is less expressive. In relation to the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer, the word *mmušo* (government) has been used as a functional equivalent to denote 'Kingdom'.
- *Descriptive equivalent*: In this procedure the meaning of the culture-bound terms (CB) is explained in several words (Newmark, 1988b:83). If the target language does not have a term corresponding to to SL item, the meaning can be conveyed by means of an explanation in the target language. In *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*, the translators avoided following this procedure but opted for the above-mentioned procedure.
- *Shifts or transpositions*: It involves a change in the grammar from SL to TL, for instance, (i) change from singular to plural, (ii) the change required when a specific SL structure does not exist in the TL, (iii) change of an SL verb to a TL word, change of an SL noun group to a TL noun, and so forth (Newmark, 1988b:86). The translator may even go to an extent of changing the voice, that is from the active voice to the passive voice. In this regard, the Northern Sotho translators changed the singular form of the word 'heaven' to the plural formation and referred to this word as *Magodimong* (in the skies). They also changed the noun 'Evil One' to the locative *bobeng* (where evil deeds are done).
- *Paraphrase*: In this procedure the meaning of the CBT is explained. Here the explanation is much more detailed than that of *descriptive equivalent* (Newmark, 1988b:91). In this regard, as explained above, the meaning of the culture-specific

item is given together with an explanation in relation to the linguistic gap that exists between those two languages. This procedure was also avoided and it could have solved translation problems in *Tatawešo wa Magodimong* as will be discussed later in this study.

- *Couplets*: It occurs when the translator combines two different procedures (Newmark, 1988b:91). The translator may not render a SL item in the TT at all and at the same time add a cultural item which did not occur in the ST. In the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer, translators only applied modulation by using deletion in that the ST item was not rendered in the TT at all. For example, the word 'holy' was not included in *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*.
- *Notes*: Notes are additional information in a translation (Newmark, 1988b:91). In this regard, translators are given permission of writing foot-notes in order to explain incomprehensible items in the target text as Nida (1964) has suggested in the previous chapter.

Although some stylists consider a translation sprinkled with footnotes undesirable with regard to appearance, their use can nonetheless assist the TT readers to make better judgments of the ST contents. Nida (1964:237-39) advocates the use of footnotes to fulfil at least the following two functions:

- (i) to provide supplementary information; and
- (ii) to call attention to the original's discrepancies.

The most important fact in translation studies is that the translation must communicate effectively with the intended target recipient. If it does not, then the translator must consider applying the practical steps in the translation process as mentioned in Chapter One.

3.3 GENERAL PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED BY TRANSLATORS IN THE TRANSLATION PROCESS

It has already been established in this study that no two languages are the same due to cultural diversities and this brings in the question of zero-equivalence. The choice translators make on adequate equivalence depends on a multitude of factors which can involve linguistic systems in which the author of the source text and the text produce (translator) make use of those linguistic systems. Naudé (2002:35) states that various types of strategies can be adopted by the translator, but there are general problems which can be encountered when non-equivalence strikes and these are some of the problems the translators can encounter:

3.3.1 Culture-specific concepts

According to Baker (1992:21), the source language may use a word or describe a concept that is totally unknown in the target culture. Such a concept may be concrete or abstract, religious, a social tradition, or even a type of food. For example, in the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer, the word 'heaven' has been established as totally absent in African literature and was translated into Northern Sotho as *Magodimong* or *Legodimong* and its literal meaning is "in the sky/skies." This translation poses a problem because the translators did not actually capture the intentions of the source author as *magodimong* has no reference to where God is residing.

3.3.2 A source language concept is not lexicalised in the target language

"Sometimes words in a source language may express a concept that is known in the target culture but which is not lexicalised, that is, a word has not been assigned in the target language" (Baker, 1992:21). In *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*, the petition:

- (1) May your holy name be honoured (*The Good News Bible*:1995)

was translated into Northern Sotho as:

- (2) *Leina la gago a le kgethwe* (*Bibele Taba e Botse*:2000).

In this regard, the word “holy” was omitted due to the fact that in Northern Sotho, there is no adequate concept which has been specifically assigned for this purpose.

3.3.3 A word in the source language is semantically complex

This is considered to be a common problem in translation because a word does not have to be morphologically complex to be semantically complex. A single word may sometimes express a complex array of meanings (Baker, 1992:22). The translators sometimes do not realise how semantically complex a word is and this can pose problems as those words can be taken for granted. As already mentioned in (2.3), the introductory phrase of the Lord’s Prayer, “Our Father” has been translated into Northern Sotho as *Tatawešo*, and the possessive construction *wešo* does not quite capture the number of people denoted by its source form.

3.3.4 The source language and target language distinguish between divergent meanings

A target language may distinguish greater or lesser meanings than the source language, that is, what is an important semantic distinction in meaning in a particular language may not necessarily apply to another language (Baker, 1992:22). In *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*, the word “Kingdom” was translated into Northern Sotho as *mmušo*, and in this sense the word is rendered less expressive in the target language as *mmušo* usually refers to “the government” which is not equal in status with the Kingdom. In accordance with Baker (1992:22), such words generally denote sensitive issues such as faith, politics and sex.

3.3.5 The target language does not have a specific term

This occurs when the target language does not have a super ordinate, thus, a language may have a general word, but not a specific word for a certain concept. In most cases this occurs because each language distinguishes meanings that are relevant to its environment (Baker, 1992: 23). As indicated above, the Northern Sotho language does not have the Kingdom in its environment and that is the reason why the translators have adopted the use of the general concept *mmušo*.

3.3.6 Difference in physical or interpersonal perspective

In some languages the physical or interpersonal perspective may be more important than in other languages. Interpersonal perspective refers to the relationship between people or things and these inter-relationships are generally expressed in word pairs which also include the relationship among participants in the discourse (Baker, 1992:23). In *Tatawešo wa Magodimong* the word “done” has been translated into Northern Sotho as *dirwe* which is its literal translation but there are other equivalents to the word done which are *phethega*, *go be bjalo*, and *feleletša*. (*Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary*, 2004:235).

3.3.7 Difference in expressive meaning

A word in the target language may have the same propositional meaning as a word in the source language, but may then encapsulate a different expressive meaning (Baker, 1992:23). In this regard, the meaning of that word in the target language may be less expressive even if the propositional meaning seems to be the same. In the above cited example, the word *dirwe* is appropriate but it is less expressive and as such affect the meaning of the entire sentence and thus causes misrepresentation of meaning.

If these common problems are identified by translators in the translation process, it will lessen their chances of committing translation blunders. Therefore, the process of locating strategies in the translation of *Tatawešo wa Magodimong* will be made easier.

3.4 TRANSLATION STRATEGIES WHICH HAD AN IMPACT ON

TATAWEŠO WA MAGODIMONG

Translators encounter problems when transferring information from the source text to the target text due to non-equivalence brought by those languages not belonging to the same culture. In the case of *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*, the problem is caused by the fact that these two languages, English as the source language and Northern Sotho as the target, belong to different language families. Another problem is that the English language is more developed than the Northern Sotho language. To overcome such problems, translators are compelled to employ translation strategies which can be on word, phrase, sentence, and textual levels.

It is considered that the term, strategy is conceptually broader than procedure, hence its use to refer to a method employed to translate a given element/unit (including a whole text), making use of one or more procedures selected on the basis of relevant parameters. A strategy thus links procedures with the conditions which are obtained when they are used, these being specified in terms of parameter (<http://accurapid>.). In relation to this information, translators are able to select strategies to be used in a translation in accordance with the procedures listed above. Unlike procedures, strategies are not directly visible as part of the observable translation output. Mailhac (2007:33) states that in principle, translation strategies fall into three categories: they can be conscious, potentially conscious, or totally subconscious. Whenever strategies are not directly accessible through the translator, they need to be hypothesized from the available data.

On the other hand, Krings (1986:18) considers the translation strategy as "the translator's potentially conscious plans for solving concrete translation problems in the framework of a concrete translation task". This information concretises the fact that translators are faced with an enormous duty of communicating cross culturally and they must, therefore, develop some plans to solve those issues listed above. Moreover, Loescher (1991:8) concurs with this idea because translation strategy is viewed as "a potentially conscious procedure for solving a problem faced in translating a text, or any segment of it." As it is stated in these two definitions, the notion of consciousness which is a mental behaviour is significant in distinguishing strategies which are used by translators. In this regard, Cohen (1998:4) asserts that "the element of consciousness is what distinguishes strategies from these processes that are not strategic". This implies that translators are fully aware of what they are doing and, therefore, can account for the actions taken and also make calculated decisions on which strategies to employ.

Furthermore, Bell (1998:188) differentiates between global (those dealing with whole texts) and local (those dealing with text segments) strategies and confirms that this distinction results from various kinds of translation problems. In this regard, the global strategies are concerned with what happens to texts in the translation process, while local strategies deal with what happens in the translation process to achieve the intended purpose. Taking into account the process and product of translation, Jaaskelainen (2005) in (<http://www.hum.expertise.workshop>) divides strategies into two major categories: some strategies relate to what happens to texts, while other strategies relate to what

happens in the process. Jaaskelainen (2005) in (<http://www.hum.expertise.workshop>) , regards global strategies as process-related because they refer to general principles and modes of action, while local strategies are product-oriented as they refer to specific activities in relation to the translator's problem-solving and decision-making. These process-related strategies are rules or principles which the translator uses to reach the goals determined by the translating situation. Therefore, Northern Sotho translators should in this regard opt for local strategies as they will help them to achieve the desired results.

According to Toury (1995:54), translation can be described as subject to constraints of several types and varying degrees and translators perform under different conditions (e.g. translating texts of different kinds, and/or for different audiences) often adopt different strategies, and ultimately produce markedly different products. This statement implies that owing to linguistic and cultural differences between languages, translators meet obstacles due to a lack of corresponding items. This matter can only be resolved by using translation strategies. If a good or bad translation can be measured by what constitutes equivalence to the source text then translators are destined to fail their target audience.

Naudš (2002:13) advocates that socio-cultural conditions under which translations are produced in order to comply with the requirements of acts of communication in the receiving culture need to be taken into consideration. Heylen (1993:4) stipulates that the conditions for the attainment of equivalence differ from one language to another. A valid translation strategy in the past may be completely unacceptable today. That is the reason why some of the strategies employed in the translation of the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer are still questionable in accordance with the modern needs of the receiving culture. The following strategies are considered to have been used in the translation of *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*:

3.4.1 Strategies for dealing with non-equivalence

Non-equivalence which is sometimes referred to as zero-equivalence, is defined as a case where a source language form does not have an appropriate and immediate translation in

the target language and is usually referred to as untranslatable (Mphahlele 2002:26). This statement means that there is no one target language item to describe its corresponding source language form. Therefore, strategies are used to describe the transfer of culture-specific terms.

(1) Translation by a more neutral word

Baker (1992:28-9) states that translation is done when the translator uses a more roughly fitting word which will be closer to both the propositional and expressive meaning. A general word or a more neutral word is used in this case to overcome the lack of specificity in the target text. Baker (1992:29) furthermore explains that the translator moves up a level in the given semantic field to obtain a more general concept that conveys the core propositional meaning of hyponym in the target text. In the translation procedures as indicated above the problem with this approach is that it is destined to bring a less expressive meaning than its corresponding form in the source text.

In the opening phrase of the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer, *Tatawešo wa Magodimong* (Our Father in Heaven), the adverb of place *Magodimong*, was used to define the source item "heaven", and its literal meaning is "in the skies" as already mentioned. The problem with using generalisation is that it does not render the exact meaning the way it is supposed to. In relation to House's model, translators should have the ability to establish whether any translation is "covert" or "overt". According to House (1981:66), an "overt translation" is "one which the addressees of the translated text are not directly addressed because the discourse worlds in which they operate are not the same". In such a case, he suggests a 'second-level functional equivalence' allowing the TT receivers to "eavesdrop" on the ST.

Nord (1997:24-25) concurs with this statement by noting that "translators must assist target readers to peep across and understand the otherness of what is happening over there in the source culture". For example, the word 'heaven' has been culturally adopted as *magodimong* (in the sky) without any further explanation. It is, however, the duty of the translators to make their readers aware that 'heaven' is a special place in which God is residing as already mentioned in the study. The question is, should it be left that way or

should the translators ensure that their target readers understand the otherness of what is happening up there?

Translators are not lexicographers but there are strategies and techniques, which could be applicable in such cases because as translators, they must know the rules that govern the study of meaning. Instead, they should have established the kind of 'lexical gap' that exists between the two languages. According to Prinsloo and de Schryver (2002:163), a lexical gap is considered to be a lack of translation equivalence for culture-specific vocabulary terms across languages. Prinsloo and de Schryver (2002) furthermore state that in the translation of culture-specific vocabulary, the explanation or a phrase by means of a surrogate paraphrase in the target language should be used rather than a one-to-one equivalent.

Mphahlele (2002:26) regards surrogate equivalent as "a case when a phrase or sentence in the target language is included as an equivalent to the lemma". It is very important for translators to establish the nature of the lexical gap that prevails in the target language. Two types of lexical gaps have been distinguished, namely, the 'linguistic gap' and the 'referential gap' and Gouws (1999) in Mphahlele (2002:27) argues that "the distinction between linguistic and referential gaps plays an important role". A linguistic gap occurs when a given referent is known to the speakers of both languages but one language has such a lexical item to express that particular meaning while the other language does not. In case of a linguistic gap, the description of the source language form will be brief. A referential gap occurs when the referent is known to one language while in the other language it is not. If it is the case of a referential gap, a comprehensive description will have to be conducted, because target users need an intensive explanation to understand the meaning of the source language form. It is the duty of the translator to establish whether the referent has a linguistic or referential gap so that they will not commit a translation blunder.

In the opening phrase of the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer, this adverb of place *Magodimong*, should have been located as a referential gap because the concept 'heaven' is not known to the Northern Sotho community as already established. The question is whether this information is in accordance with the author's intention. If this concept remains unattended, the Northern Sotho speaking community will be denied the

opportunity of understanding this concept the way the source audience understands it. It is the duty of translators to give their receptor readers a glimpse of what exists in the source culture.

Nord (1997:41) adheres to the same principle but refers to this referential gap as the “appellative function of translation” where the “referential” function is oriented towards objects in the real or fictitious world and the world models are determined by cultural perspectives and traditions. Receivers in the source culture may interpret the referential function differently to those in the target culture. The function poses problems when source and target readers do not share the same amount of previous knowledge about the objects and phenomena referred to, as is the case with the source language item “heaven” which has been translated into the Northern Sotho Lord’s Prayer as *Magodimong*. What the translators were supposed to do in this case, was to create a surrogate equivalent.

Baker (1992:39) regards this as “translation through paraphrasing” which is used when a concept expressed in the source text is not lexicalised in the target language. This is done by broadening the meaning of the source item, especially if the item is semantically complex. According to Baker (1992:40), this type of translation is disadvantageous because it may not capture the expressive meaning the way the source item does. This can be resolved by having a slot where explanations could be written of various items, or as Nida (1964) suggests that footnotes be employed for this particular purpose.

Conrad (1994 in C25001cc@WVUD.BIDNET) supports this idea by stating:

I think I would probably agree that there is not a real difference between a translation and a paraphrase, unless by translation one means a word-for-word reconstruction of the original text in the target language, in which case the translation is likely to be more of a parody of the original than a serious attempt to reproduce the sense of the original.

Both of them are of the opinion that if non-equivalence prevails, if need be, the translator is free to broaden the meaning of the source item.

A “covert translation” is “the one which enjoys the status of an original source text in the target culture” House (1981:69). In this case, the source-text is not linked particularly to

the source-text culture, i.e. both the source-text and target-text address their respective receivers directly. This can be illustrated by a letter from a company of which the contents should be reproduced without taking the target-text reader into the discourse world of the source-text. It is obvious that most of the concepts translated in *Tatewešo wa Magodimong* were covertly translated, that is, not taking the target audiences into the discourse world of the original source-text. Therefore, this phrase should be written as suggested in example (11 and 12) in 2.4.4.1.

The petition:

(3) May your kingdom come (*Good News Bible*:1995)

was translated into Northern Sotho as:

(4) *Mmušo wa gago a o tle* (*Bibele Taba e Botse*:2000)

According to the *Oxford Dictionary* (2001:496), the word 'kingdom' refers to the state or territory ruled by a king or queen, eg. the territory of Zululand. Biblically this phrase refers to the rule of God, that is, Jesus has conquered sin and death and returned to His Father to rule as King over His Kingdom, and his rule will be made perfect or complete when He returns during the 'second coming'. According to Barrette (1995:280), one is praying that God's name be honoured and known to the world and that it be made perfect by Christ's second coming. It is an established fact that the second coming of Christ is for people's judgment, which simply means that they accept his rule and his authority and are willing to obey Him.

The Northern Sotho translated version captures the word kingdom as *mmušo*. *The Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (1997:95) regards these term *mmušo* as the government or empire. However, the Kingdom of God is greater or more powerful than the government or empire because the two can easily be replaceable but the rule of God will never be replaced. The kingdom of God is not something that comes and goes but remains solid. The translators should have established this word as something more powerful than the government or empire in order to express the author's intentions in accordance with this petition. Instead, they should have opted for the term *borena* as it has more power than *mmušo*. *The Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary* (1997:16 and 108)

refers to *Morena* as “God” or “Lord” and *borena* as “kingship” or “authority”. Therefore this expression should have been written as:

Borena bja gago a bo tle.

The word *borena* will also be applicable to the doxology (conclusion) of this prayer which was written as:

*gobane mmušo ke wa gago, le maatla, le tumišo,
ka sa felego, Amen (Bibele Taba e Botse:2000)*

and will now be captured as:

*gobane borena ke bja gago, le maatla, le tumišo,
ka go sa felego, Amen.*

(2) **Active and passive voice**

According to Naude (2005:62) ‘active’ and ‘passive’ voice refers to a grammatical category which indicates the relationship between a verb and subject. In sentences in the active voice, the subject is responsible for performing an action while in sentences in the passive voice, the subject of the action receives the action. According to Baker (1992:103), sentences in the passive voice are used with the purpose of creating objectivity, and indicating that the author distances himself/herself from the statement in the text and this kind of norm is mainly used in scientific articles.

Baker (1992:106) states that replacing the passive form with the active voice, and vice versa, may impact on the amount of information included in a phrase. If this strategy is applied, it may influence the forms of meaning in a phrase. Therefore, translators are advised to compare this categories in both the source and the target languages to make appropriate choices. The sentence “May your holy name be honoured” (*Good News Bible* 1995:9) was translated into Northern Sotho as *leina la gago a le kgethwe*. This sentence was adequately treated but the problem lies with the selection of correct correspondence of the verb which was used in the English version.

According to Barrette (1995:280), this phrase means the name “God” describes his uniqueness and no one resembles him and bears his name. Therefore, his name must be honored and respected. The earlier English versions used the term ‘hallowed’ which is derived from the Greek word *hagios* meaning to be different. The modern English version changed it to “honored” to make it more understandable. The Northern Sotho version captured this word as *kgethwe*, which means to “be chosen”. The translators may have directly translated this word from the Greek terminology. To capture the essence of the word, the translators should have used the modern English version perspective as presented by the *Good News Bible* to translate this petition. This Northern Sotho version creates a sense of ambiguity because the translator might mean that you must select his name only among others, or maybe he/she wanted to say *leina la gago a le kgethege* which means “may your name be holy”. The word *kgethwe* is a passive word for *kgetha* (to choose). The verb which must be chosen in this respect should be the one that captures the essence of honour and respect as in example (5 and 6) in 2.4.4.1.

(3) Translation through cultural substitution

Naudé (2002:39) regards cultural substitution as a target language item that does not have the same propositional meaning, but which will have the same impact if the target reader replaces a culture-specific item. This statement signifies that the translator will have to choose a corresponding item in the target language which is not the same as the one used in the source text but both of them are serving the same purpose, that is, capturing the essence of the text and which the target reader may readily identify.

This petition, “Give us today our daily food we need” (*Good News Bible* 1995:9) was translated into the Northern Sotho (*Bibele* 2000:196) as *o re fe lehono bogobe bja rena bja ka mehla* where the noun “food” was captured as *bogobe* signifying “porridge”. The Northern Sotho translators captured this word from maybe the *Holy Bible* (2000:7) which reads as follows: “Give us today our daily bread”, and the noun “bread” was substituted by the noun *bogobe* which is regarded as a staple food of the Northern Sotho speaking community. The phrase “daily bread” signifies that the person is not praying for luxuries but necessities that one needs for survival. According to Mt 6:8, the Father knows what you need even before you ask him and it is, therefore, not necessary to make a list. This

statement is also supported by text found in Mt 7:9-11 when Jesus remarked: “fathers will never give their sons a stone when they ask for bread.”

The modern English version differs with the old one because they looked at the functionality of this phrase and changed the word “bread” to “food” in order to capture the message signified by this petition. The *Bibele Taba e Botse* (2000:10) translators also followed suit and decided to rewrite this sentence as it appeared in the earlier of Northern Sotho Bibles of Northern Sotho. In this regard, the translators should have considered culture specific items and translated the passage by taking care of the translation strategies pertaining to the cultural, textual, marked word order and word levels. This petition can be explained as follows:

(5) Give us our daily bread (*Holy Bible:2000*)

was translated into Northern Sotho as:

(6) *re fe lehono bogobe bja rena bja ka mehla* (Matthew’s version)

(*Bibele Taba e Botse:2000*)

In this case, the word ‘bread’ was translated as *bogobe* (porridge) in accordance with the dynamic principle as mentioned in Chapter Two. *The Good News Bible* (1995) used the functionalist principle in approaching this petition by changing it to:

(7) Give us today the food we need

According to Conrad (1994 in C25001cc@WUVM.D.BITNET), "a good translation is one that conveys the sense of the original text in the target language clearly and intelligibly, not necessarily in a construction that imitates that of the original text in its own language". The translators in this regard did not follow the archaic version of the Lord’s Prayer but decided to capture the sense clearly and intelligibly. *Bibele Taba e Botse* (2000) nearly captured this sense in Luke’s version by stating this petition as:

- (8) *Tšatši le lengwe le lengwe o re fe bogobe bjo re bo hlokago*
(Give us today the bread we need).

In this case, they should also have changed *bogobe* (porridge) to *dijo* (food) in order to capture the complete sense. According to the Aramaic text, this petition was written as:

- (9) Give us bread, our need from day to day.

This petition can be interpreted as a plea to God for the provision of bread and their daily needs, which implies that the author did not only teach the people to pray for bread only but also but their daily needs for the purpose of survival. Bidwell (2005 in E/NTRL-3 Prayers.htm) concretises this information when revising the Lord's Prayer by stating:

We will work to see that everyone has the food they need to live and have health and energy to contribute to the welfare of the Earth and its life systems.

In accordance with this information, it is clear that Jesus was not teaching people to pray for bread only, but also for their basic needs. Therefore, this petition should have been written as:

- (10) *Tšatši le lengwe le lengwe, o re fe dijo tšeo re di hlokago*
(Give us today the food we need)

or

- (11) *Re fe lehono dinyakwa tšeo re di hlokago*
(Give us today our daily needs)

(4) **Language distinction**

A target language may distinguish a greater or lesser variety of meanings than the source language. What is important in this regard is that the semantic distinction in meaning in a particular language may not necessarily apply to another language (Naudé, 2002:36). Translators must thus have first the ability to identify the primary sense of the word or the first thing that comes to mind when a person hears that word. The primary sense will help them to conjure up secondary senses which are distanced from the primary sense by the lack of certain components (Krieger 2005 in <http://www.ginsey.com>). For example if one

hears the word “donkey”, it refers primarily the domestic animal but if someone calls a person a “donkey”, he/she is using secondary sense meaning that a person is foolish in behaviour.

To have this ability one must possess ‘grammatical competence’, which Chomsky (1978:59) views as the cognitive state that encompasses all those aspects of form and meaning and their relation, including underlying structures, that enter into that relation, which are properly assigned to the specific subsystem of the human mind that relates to representation of form and meaning. It is possible for a person to possess that competence but be unable to use the language appropriately.

This implies that a person must also be able to perform in that particular language. One may be grammatically competent but fail to perform because in performance, the concerns lies with the process of production, interpretation, and the like, which make use of knowledge attained (Chomsky, 1978:202). In attaining all these competencies, a translator will be able discern differences of distinction that are found in languages. According to Barrette (1995:279), this opening phrase "Our Father" describes our relationship with our fellow human beings because the author did not say "My Father". This phrase simply means, that all are related biblically as long as you are human and there is no segregation irrespective of colour, religious belief or country. According to the Northern Sotho translated versions, the phrase uses *Tatawešo*, where *Tata* means father while the possessive pronoun *wešo* (our) in Northern Sotho refers to only those to whom people are related and know each other. Therefore, this possessive pronoun is a misrepresentation of the author’s intention because the implication of this phrase denotes that human beings are all one family while the head of this family is God.

Krieger (2005:11 in <http://www.ginseys.com>) concurs with this idea because of stipulating that some languages use different pronouns depending on how many people are being addressed, and whether the pronoun “we” includes the speaker or not. In some cases these distinctions may be technical but in others, they may directly affect the meaning of the translated text. In this case, the translators failed to capture the number of people addressed. Another case that can be sited is in Psalm 23 which is well known across the Christian community where this declarative sentence:

(12) I will dwell in the house of the LORD for ever (*Holy Bible*, 2000:611)

was translated into Northern Sotho as

(13) *ke tlo fetša bontši bja matšatši ke dutše ngwakong wa Morena*
(*Bibele: 2000*)

The quantitative pronoun *bontši* refers to ‘most’ and not all the days. It is crucial for the translators to take note of language distinction and what to do in such situations. Therefore, this introductory phrase should have been written as *Tate wa rena*.

3.5 CONCLUSIONS

Although some scholars consider a translation which is full of footnotes as undesirable, their uses can assist the TT readers to make better judgments of the ST contents. In general, it seems that the procedures and ‘notes’ would have a higher potential for conveying the concepts underlying the culture-specific terms embedded in a text. Various strategies opted for by translators seem to play a crucial role in the translation process.

If a novice translator renders a literary text without paying attention to adequate practical steps to be taken in the translation process, he/she will entirely lose the majority of the TL readers; consequently, the translation will be ineffective. In other words, a competent translator is advised not to deprive the TL reader of enjoying the type of information that is supposed to reach him/her. Employing “notes” in the translation, both as a translation strategy and a translation procedure, seems to be very important so that the target language readership may benefit from the text as much as the ST readers do. By adhering to the mentioned topics, *Tatawešo wa Magodimong* will be a good text in the Bible as the target readers will be able to understand its actual contents. In this chapter, the changes which were made to the expressions of this version of the Lord’s Prayer are:

<p>(1) <i>O re fe lehono bogobe bja rena bja ka mehla;</i> (Give us today our daily bread)</p>	<p><i>O re fe lehono dinyakwa tša rena tša ka mehla</i></p>
<p>(2) <i>Mmušo wa gago a o tle;</i> (May your Kingdom come)</p>	<p><i>Borena bja gago a bo tle;</i></p>
<p>(3) <i>Gobane mmušo ke wag ago, le maatla, le tumišo, ka go sa felego, Amen.</i> (For thine is the Kingdom, the power, and the glory, forever and ever, Amen.)</p>	<p><i>Gobane borena bja gago, le maatla, le tumišo, ka go sa felego, Amen.</i></p>

CHAPTER FOUR

THE ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE OF *TATAWEŠO WA MAGODIMONG*: COHESION AND COHERENCE

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter aims at providing information on how a text has to be translated to make sense to its target audience. It mainly concentrates on how utterances are used in a communicative situation and the way the readers can interpret those utterances in a given context. Therefore, the two terms, ‘cohesion’ and ‘coherence’ are discussed in relation to the Northern Sotho Lords Prayer, *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*. Before any discussion can be made on the above topics, the following topics need to be looked at:

- (a) Discourse analysis
- (b) The Speech-Act theory
- (c) Conversational analysis

4.2 DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

According to Littlejohn (2005:76), “the term discourse refers to all structured and non-structured textual (written and non-verbal) communication and forms the basis of our interaction and deliberations”. This statement implies that discourse can be taken as the way humans communicate, either in a written or spoken form. Littlejohn (2005:76) furthermore states that “discourse can be equated with the complex act we know as message and more specifically the structured message in written or verbal form”. Powers concurs with this information because messages were identified as central to the communication process and have the following three structural properties:

- (a) Relatively independent signs and symbols;
- (b) Language as a formal code; and
- (c) Relatively interconnected discourse structures.

This study concentrates on the third aspect, namely, looking at how discourse structures are interconnected because discourse analysis will help in understanding how these messages are organised, used and interpreted. Hatim and Mason (1996:216) echo these sentiments because they view discourse as “realisations of socio-cultural messages and power relations which involve social groups in adopting a particular attitude towards areas of socio-cultural activity”. This implies that the messages presented by various texts are going to be interpreted by the text receivers. Therefore, discourse refers to those processes and acts which are involved in the production and interpretation of messages. Discourse analysis usually focuses on the following three dimensions of discourse:

- (a) Its meaning - how people understand messages;
- (b) Its action - how one gets something done through talk; and
- (c) Its coherence - how patterns of talk are construed in a sensible and logical manner (Littlejohn, 2005:77).

In accordance with these dimensions, the messages as presented by translated texts, must be produced in such a manner that these messages are easily understandable by the target receivers and also relate to them. Target receivers must be able to identify what kind of information is embedded in the structure of the statement. Because of this understanding, they will act the way the message requires them to, that is, to take action. Target receivers will be able to interpret these texts adequately because the message will have been presented in a logical and sensible manner. The message as presented by *Tatawešo wa Magodimong* should also be produced in such a manner that it is easily interpreted by its intended target readers. As Littlejohn (2005:77) views discourse as a language of games, a discussion on the Speech-Act theory is, therefore, imperative.

Shimanoff in Littlejohn (2005:77) asserts this statement by stating:

In order for communication to exist, or continue, two or more interacting individuals must share rules for using symbols. Not only must they have rules for individual symbols, but they must also agree on such matters as how to take turns in speaking, how to be polite or insult and so forth...”

Therefore, it is vital to have rules to govern the communication process and discourse should be used to accomplish the intended goals.

4.3 THE SPEECH ACT THEORY

Speech-Act theory takes its cue from the idea of discourse as language games, which was a notion coined by Wittgenstein (Naudé 2002:101). Games are considered as structured actions and differ in terms of various sets of rules, that is, a game of soccer cannot be played according to tennis rules. Those who are involved in this game must agree on a particular set of rules and the referee should see to it that those rules are applied. The same notion is applicable to all languages. In short, in communication contexts people are competent in the use of different discourses depending on the circumstances or situations he/she finds himself/herself in. For example, a preacher delivering a sermon knows a set of rules applicable in that particular field. According to Littlejohn (2005:78), "it is not the object of communication that determines the particular discourse, but the rules applied and it is possible to have different language games about the same object in reality". For example, one may request, praise, or apologise in the same text.

The important thing to remember is that language games are differentiated in terms of their rules. In the Speech-Act theory one knows how to apply rules to produce a particular game. If someone makes a prayer request, that particular person must also know the rules to decode or interpret the language game of requests. Searle in Naudé (2002:105) fundamentally states that "speaking a language is engaging in a rule-governed form of behavior". It is, therefore, imperative for translators to know the rules that govern language games. Two types of rules are distinguished, namely, the 'constitutive' and the 'regulative'. Searle regards constitutive rules as create games, that is, the game is created or constituted by its rules. For example, if you see people in a room kneeling down, eyes closed, hands together, and speaking to the unknown, you will realise that those people are conducting a prayer. When you observe people following that particular set of rules, you will definitely know that this is a prayer session. The rules will tell you that this is not a ritual setting but a prayer session.

Naudé (2002:106) remarks that “regulative rules provide guidelines for acting within a game and the behaviors are therefore known and available”. This statement implies that regulative rules will give information on how to use speech to accomplish a particular intention or action. For example, if one makes a request, that particular person knows that the specific request may be granted or rejected. If the speech-act is not adequately presented, the recipient may misinterpret the message. A request may be rejected because the essential rules for executing a request have not been met. As the Northern Sotho Lord’s Prayer is full of requests and petitions, it is vital for translators to follow the essential rules in its translation because the prayer may be rejected on the grounds of distorted information. The petition:

(1) And lead us not to temptation; (*Holy Bible:2000*)

which was translated into Northern Sotho as;

(2) *O se re iše melekong; (Bibele:2000)*

was not adequately treated because it had already been established (2.4.4.2) that it is not God who is the Tempter but the Evil One. If it was possible that God could answer for Himself, the request will surely not be granted because the essential rules for the execution of this request was not properly followed.

When one speaks, he/she performs an act. Speech, then, is not just used to designate something, but does something. That is the reason why it is called a speech act. If you promise, you are actually communicating an intention of doing something in the future. If you make a statement, “I will honor your name”, you are performing may be three of four acts, i.e. that is an utterance act, a propositional act because you are saying something you believe is the truth, you are making a promise and finally, performing a perlocutionary act - to have an effect on another person’s behaviour. It is thus very important for the translator to acquaint himself/herself with notions such as illocution, perlocution and propositional act

Since there is a thin line that exists between illocution and perlocution, that these two terms should be explained. According to Searle (1975 in Naudé (2002:104) “an illocution is an act in which the speaker’s primary concern is that the listener understands the intention to make a promise, a request or whatever... A perlocution is an act in which the speaker expects the listener not only to understand but to act in a particular way because of that understanding. If you say “I am hungry”, you want the listener to understand that you want something to eat. Is this an illocutionary act. It can also be viewed as an indirect request; therefore, it is both illocutionary and perlocutionary”. Searle (1975) in Naudé (2002:104) continues: “proposition can thus be seen as one aspect of content of a statement”. If you remark “Your name is holy”, it is taken that what the speaker is uttering is considered to be the truth. Propositions are valued in terms of truth while speech act is in terms of felicity, that is, whether a promise has been met or not.

If you say “Give us today our daily bread”, on the surface it can be seen as a mere statement, but in actuality it is an indirect request or even a command. Searle (1975) in Naudé (2002:106) outlines five types of illocutionary acts:

- (a) Assertive - a statement that commits the speaker to advocate the truth of the proposition, including acts such as stating, affirming, concluding, and believing;
- (b) Directives - illocutions that attempt to get the listener to do something. They are commands, requests, pleadings, and prayers;
- (c) Commissive - commit the speaker to a future act. They consist of things such as promises, vowing, pledging, contracting, and guaranteeing;
- (d) Expressive - communicate some aspect of the speaker’s psychological state, such as thanking, apologising and welcoming; and
- (e) Declarations - are designated to create a proposition that, by its assertion, makes it so, such as appointing, marrying, firing, and resigning.

In accordance with the above information, it is therefore vital for translators to be able to locate the type of illocutionary force used in texts. The text of *Tatawešo wa Magodimong* contains numerous directives because in most cases the speaker attempts to get the Listener to do something, for example, in the petition:

- (3) Forgive us the wrongs we have done,
as we forgive the wrongs that others
have done to us. (*Good News Bible*:1995)

Searle (1975) in Naudé (2002:106) opines that speech acts are rarely isolated, but that they are part of ongoing conversations. How conversations are organized is a fascinating and important question in communication theory. Naudé (2002:106) states that:

In Speech-Act theory, truth is not considered central, and the question is what the speaker intends to do by uttering a proposition. Therefore, propositions must be viewed as part of an illocutionary context because the meaning of a speech act is its illocutionary force.

People tend to use language as a manipulation weapon. As already mentioned in Chapter 1, an innocent introductory phrase in the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer *Tatawešo* (Our Father), can have such an illocutionary force that it may even cause disputes among races because they could argue that this was done deliberately by the colonists and apartheid regime to manipulate the black community as most Bibles were written prior to 1994.

4.4 CONVERSATIONAL ANALYSIS

In conversational analysis, the main focus is on what speakers and listeners do when they communicate with one another. Littlejohn (2005:79) postulates that "the participants are guided by principles of speech organization to create a degree of stability in order to prevent absolute chaos or constant misreading". Naudé (2002:107), in turn, states that "a conversation, like any aspect of social life is viewed as a social achievement because it requires that we get certain things done cooperatively through talk". Conversational analysis will, therefore, take a closer look at how those social achievements are attained.

Naudé (2002) furthermore propounds that conversational analysis is characterised by a careful examination of actual sequences of talk. As such, the utmost importance in conversation analysis is the way in which communicators create stability and organisation in their talk because when you explain an event, it is usually a joint achievement of both the speaker and the listeners. Littlejohn (2005:79) states that

conversation analysis is concerned with a variety of issues. Firstly, it deals with what speakers need to know to have a conversation and knowing the rules of conversation. Secondly, it also concerns rule violations and the ways people prevent and repair errors in talk. The most important aspect in communication is conversational coherence. Coherence is usually taken for granted, yet the production of it is complex. Before any discussion can be made on coherence, it is advisable to look at the theory of conversational maxims.

4.4.1 Conversational Maxims

Littlejohn (2005:82) mentions that it was Grice (1975) who proposed a set of general assumptions to which all conversationalists must subscribe in order to be perceived as competent. The first and most general is the cooperative principle which implies that one contribution must be appropriate. This statement implies that a person must be willing to contribute something in line with the purpose of the conversation, that is, if someone asks you a question, you are obliged to answer, otherwise you will be taken as rude. In accordance with this principle, cooperation is achieved by the following the four maxims:

- (a) Quantity maxims: One's contribution should provide sufficient, but not too much information;
 - (b) Quality maxims: One's contribution should be truthful;
 - (c) Relevancy maxim: Comments must be pertinent, that is one's contribution should not be regarded as irrelevant; and
 - (d) Manner maxim: Do not be obscure, ambiguous or disorganised.
- (Searle:1975) in Baker (1992:225).

The maxims seem rather simple to follow but in most cases, they re violated. If you violate a maxim people start wondering whether or not it is done on purpose. As already mentioned, the introductory phrase *Tatawešo*, can be associated with the maxim of quality because what translators reported in this regard is not in accordance with the intention of the author. The Father who is referred to by this phrase, is for everyone and not for a particular group. The violation of maxims, if done on purpose, is managed by making certain interpretations called conversational implicatures that help a person to

understand what is being implied by the apparent violation. The study of conversational implicatures is the study of rules people use to justify violations of other rules, and these implicatures are important for overall management of conversation.

Grice (1975) in Baker (1992:223) regards implicatures as “what the speaker means or implies rather than what s/he literally says and this must not be confused with non-literal meaning”. The petition:

(4) Give us today our daily bread; (*Holy Bible:2000*)

which was translated into Northern Sotho as:

(5) *Re fe lehono bogobe bja rena bja ka mehla;* (*Bibele:2000*)

was literally translated because of what has already been said in (2.4.4.2). In order to capture this petition successfully, one needs a good mastery of the linguistic system rather than a successful interpretation of a particular speaker’s intended or implied meaning in a given context.

In accordance with this principle, another way to violate the cooperative principle is by using clues called license for violations (Baker, 1992:223). In the petition:

(6) And lead us not into temptation,
but deliver us from the evil one; (*Holy Bible:2000*)

the speaker knew that there is a violation of truth and that is why he made an extended statement to qualify the first one. By doing this, the speaker was asking for a license to violate one or more maxims, for example, by deceiving the text readers, the speaker is violating the quality maxim, by referring to God as the Tempter; the speaker is violating the maxim of relevancy because the information is not relevant in accordance to the Christian perspective. The assertion that people intentionally deceive by violating the maxims is actually true. If you want to lie you violate the quality maxim, if you want to be ambiguous you violate the quantity maxim, and if you distract you violate the relevancy maxim.

4.5 TEXTUAL EQUIVALENCE COHESION

Newmark (1987:295) propounds that “the topic of cohesion has always been the most useful constituent of discourse analysis or text linguistic applicable to translation”. Cohesion is defined as the network of lexical, grammatical, and other relations which provides links between various parts of text. (Baker, 1992:180). These relations may sometimes require the reader to interpret words and expressions by referring to other words or expressions in the surrounding sentences or paragraphs. Baker (1992:180) continues by stating that cohesion is a surface relation because it connects the actual words and expressions either in written or spoken communication. This approach can benefit translators because they may be able to draw detailed cohesion mechanisms available in the source language in order to give the appropriate texture to the target language text. In most cases, the texture in the source language cannot provide guidance for the translators, and translators usually consult other sources for information such as contrastive grammars or dictionaries but in most cases these are of no help.

Baker (1992:180) states that “cohesion is a reflection of how knowledge is organized”. The conceptual structure of the text must be clear to the translator before a cohesive textual structure can be created. Understanding the knowledge structure is crucial in technical translation. Because of this problem, Halliday and Mason (1985) in Baker (1992:180) identified five main cohesive devices, namely:

(a) **Reference**

The term reference is traditionally used in semantics for the relationship which holds between a word and what it points to in the real world (Baker, 1992:181). If reference is made to a Bible, it will imply that the particular Bible is available at that moment and is in full view of both the speaker and the listener. Baker (1992:182) furthermore states that reference is also used by Halliday and Mason (1976) but in a different context. In their model, instead of denoting a direct relationship between words and extra-linguistic objects, reference is limited to the relationship of identity which holds between two linguistic expressions. For example, in

- (7) *Tatawešo wa Magodimong;*
O re fe lehono bogobe bja rena bja ka mehla; (Bibele:2000)
(Our Father in Heaven;
Give us today our daily bread)

the pronoun *O* points to *Tate* (Father) within the textual world. In this case, reference is both textual and semantic because the reader has to retrieve the identity by referring to another expression in the immediate context. Halliday and Mason (1976) in Baker (1992:181) mention that the resulting cohesion “lies in the continuity of reference, whereby the same thing enters into discourse a second time”.

It can, therefore, be stated that, reference is a cohesive device which helps the reader to locate participants elsewhere in the text. It is thus advisable to instantly mention the participant in a discourse, and then use pronouns to refer back to the same participant in the immediate context. Languages which have a number of pronouns and gender distinctions have an added advantage in using reference as a cohesive device. The Northern Sotho language may pose gender problems because it does have a pronoun which distinguishes between male and female.

Baker (1992) furthermore indicates that another type of reference relation which is not strictly textual is that of ‘co-reference’. In this case, in the Northern Sotho language, *Modimo* (God) may be referred to as *Ralegohle* (One who is everywhere) or *Ramatlaohle* (One who is having all powers). In order to recognise what those concepts refer to, you must possess Christian knowledge rather the textual competence. Hoey (1988) in Baker (1992:182) echoes the same sentiments by stating that co-reference ‘is not strictly a linguistic feature at all but a matter of real-world knowledge’. In the Lord’s Prayer this petition is written as:

- (8) Do not bring us to hard testing,
but deliver us from the Evil One. (*Good News Bible:1995*)

If one does not possess knowledge of the world, one will not recognise that the Evil One who is referred to in this petition is the Devil.

Patterns of reference, also known as ‘anaphora’, can differ considerably both within and across languages (Baker, 1992:183). This implies that it is the language in question which has to determine the preferred pattern. Some languages may prefer to mention the name of the participant several times before using the anaphora, while others may mention the name once and continue using pronouns. The Northern Sotho language, like the English language, relies heavily on the use of pronominal references. In *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*, Tate (Father) was only mentioned once and after that they switched to pronominal references as in;

- (9) *Tatawešo wa Magodimong!*
Leina la gago a le kgethwe;
Q se re iše melekong;
gomme o re phološe bobeng; (Bibele 2000)
 (Our Father in Heaven),
 hallowed be your name,
 And lead us not into temptation.
 but deliver us from the evil one)

This example clearly signifies that the Northern Sotho language does not have problems in using pronominal references. The reader can easily retrieve the name of the participant from the immediate context.

(b) **Substitution and Ellipsis**

In accordance to Naudé (2002:67), substitution and ellipsis are grammatical rather than semantic relationships. In substitution, an item(s) are replaced by another item(s) as in:

- (10) *Thato ya gago a e phethege mo lefaseng,*
bjale ka ge go le bjalo tulong e kgethegilego (revised
expression in 2.4.4.1 (13))
 (May your will be done on earth,
 as it is done in heaven).

In this petition, the word *phethege* (done), has been substituted by *go le bjalo* (as it is so). The petition:

- (11) And lead us not into temptations,
but deliver us from the Evil One (*Holy Bible:2000*)

was translated into Northern Sotho as:

- (11) *O se iše melekong, gomme o re phološe bobeng* (*Bibele:2000*)

The noun ‘Evil One’ was replaced by the locative *bobeng* (where evil deeds are done).

Ellipsis involves the omission of an item and this implies that the omitted word is not replaced by anything. In such cases, leaving something unsaid does not hamper the understanding of what is said because the grammatical structure will point to an item(s) that can fill the slot in question. For example, in this petition:

- (11) May your holy name be honored; (*Good News Bible:1995*)

was translated into Northern Sotho as:

- (12) *Leina la gago a le kgethwe* (*Bibele Taba e Botse:2000*)

The word ‘holy’ was omitted in the Northern Sotho version by filling the slot with the passive construction *kgethwe* (to be chosen) but this was not the case because it was not adequately treated as already mentioned in 2.4.4.1. The translators tried to capture the essence of “holiness” by selecting the verb *kgetha* which they may have conceptualised from the noun *mokgwehwa* of which the literal translation is ‘the chosen one’. In most of the Northern Sotho speaking churches, the use of the word *mokgwehwa* is interpreted as a ‘holy person’. The same applies to the “Holy Spirit” which is translated into Northern Sotho as *Moyamokgwehwa* while its literal meaning is “the chosen spirit”. Baker (1992:190) concurs by stating that every language has its own devices for establishing cohesiveness. The grammatical system of each language will show a preference for

certain means to others, and the text type must, therefore, be taken into account in the translation process.

(c) **Conjunction**

Naudé (2002:68) states that conjunction refers to the use of formal markers to establish a relatedness among sentences, phrases and paragraphs. The employment of conjunctions enables the reader to easily obtain information rather than to provide omitted information by looking in another places in order to fill the empty slot. The following forms of conjunctive cohesion are distinguished amongst others:

- a. Additive: and, or, and besides;
- b. Adversative/Contrastive: but, yet, instead, and on the other hand;
- c. Causal: so, consequently, and because;
- d. Temporal: then, next, and finally; and
- e. Continuative/miscellaneous: now, well, and after all (Naudé, 2002:68).

It must be noted that the same conjunction can be used to signal different relations depending on the context. It is not only conjunctions which can be employed to signify relationships but also other forms for example, verbs such as ‘follow’, and ‘precede’ can express temporal and cause while ‘lead’ can signify the causal relation. There are some uncertainties of whether conjunctions occurring within the sentences are cohesive devices as cohesion deals mostly with relations between sentences and not within. Halliday and Hasan (1976) in Baker (1992:191) supply the following example:

After they have fought a battle, it snowed.

‘After’ is not regarded as a conjunction because it subordinates one part of the sentence to another and directly establishes a link with another sentence. In the Northern Sotho Lord’s Prayer, this part was not employed. What is visible in this text is the use of the above mentioned conjunctive cohesion types as in:

- (14) *O re lebalele dibe tša rena,*
ka gore le rena re lebalela
ba ba re fosešago (Bibele Taba e Botse:2000)
(Forgive us our sins, because we also
forgive those who do us wrong).

The causal conjunctive cohesion *ka gore* (because) is employed to signal the relationship between the two sentences. This cohesive device is also visible in the petition:

- (15) *O se iše melekong, o upše o re phološe bobeng (Bibele Taba e Botse 2000)*
(Do not lead us to trials, instead save us from evil deeds)

and

- (16) *O se re iše melekong, gomme o re phološe bobeng (Bibele:2000)*
(Do not lead us to trials, but save us from evil deeds)

The two Northern Sotho Bible versions used different conjunctions but both of them agree on the point that they are both contrastive. Baker (1992:202) stresses the point that the decision whether a translation is going to conform to the patterns of cohesion of the source text, or will adapt to the patterns of the target text, depends in the final instance on the purposes of the translation, and the measure of freedom given to the translator to regroup the information or change the relationship between groups.

d. **Lexical cohesion**

Lexical cohesion refers to the role of choosing vocabulary to organise relationships within a text (Baker, 1992:202). A lexical item may enter into a cohesive relationship with other items in the text. This statement implies that a lexical item alone cannot assume a cohesive function but it may exist if it enters into a cohesive relation with other lexical items. The occurrence of related items in sentences creates a patterned lexical chain in a text, because these lexical items run through the text and are linked together in various ways and form an integrated lexical networks. Halliday and Mason (1976) in Baker (1992:203) divide lexical cohesion into two main categories:

- a. Reiteration: It involves repetition of lexical items. The reiterated item may be a repetition of an earlier item, a synonym or near-synonym, a superordinate, or a general word. However, it is not the same as reference because this phenomenon does not necessarily refer back to the same identity.
- b. Collocations: It involves a pair of lexical items that are associated with each other in a language in some way, for example, boy/girl, and Tuesday/Thursday.

In these petitions:

(17) *Tatawešo wa Magodimong* (*Bibele Taba e Botse:2000*)
(Our Father in Heaven)

and

(18) *Thato ya gago a e dirwe mo lefaseng, bjalo*
ka ge dirwa Legodimong (*Bibele Taba e Botse:2000*)
(may your will be done on earth, as it is done in Heaven)

Lexical items *Magodimong* (in the skies) and *Legodimong* (in the sky) may be regarded as reiteration even if the concepts are not in the same class. Reiteration is considered as repetition which is not monotonous. You restate an item later in the text by direct repetition or by using other items related to it. Discourse analysis has not provided restriction rules with regard to the choice of synonyms. Other languages such as African languages, prefer repetition rather than using synonyms because if they are used in certain contexts they may not be interchangeable in other contexts. Translators should know that too much repetition can be monotonous, while on the other hand, if not done it might not be acceptable in certain languages.

According to Baker (1992:204), lexical cohesion is not a relation between pairs of words as the above discussion may suggest. On the contrary, lexical cohesion typically operates through lexical chains. For example:

(19) *Tatewešo wa Magodimong;*

(20) *Leina la gago a le kgethwe;*

- (21) *Mmušo wa gago a o tle;*
- (22) *Thato ya gago a e dire m lefaseng; (Bibele Taba e Botse:2000)*
 (Our Father in Heaven;
 May your name be chosen;
 May your kingdom come
 May your will be done on earth)

In these expressions, *Tatawešo* (Our Father), *Leina la gago* (Your name), *wa gago* (your), and *ya gago* (your), refer to one person who is the Father. The notion lexical cohesion is, therefore, dependent on the presence of lexical items rather than the presence of any specific class or type of items. Halliday and Mason (1976) in Baker (1992:205) call them ‘instantial meanings’ or text meaning and notes that:

Without our being aware of it, each occurrence of lexical item carries with it its own textual history, a particular collocation environment that has been built up in the course of the creation of the text and that will provide the context within which the item will be incarnated on this particular occasion. The environment determines the ‘instantial meaning’, or text meaning, of the item, meaning which is unique to each specific instance.

This statement implies that translators are at liberty to employ strategies such as the use of paraphrase or loan words to reflect the cohesive pattern of the source text and the result is always a lexical chain that is different from the source text.

Naudé (2002:69) opines that grammatical structures may sometimes require omission or addition of information. This may at times affect the cohesion and coherence of the target text but it is the duty of a competent translator to manipulate the level of lexical cohesion in such a way that it yields acceptable results. Collocation sometimes seems to be problematic because it is considered as a semantic occurrence that must result from occurrence of lexical items associated with another. These items turn to appear in similar context. It can be regarded as words commonly used together, e.g. forks and knives. If you look at them closely, there is absence of their being equivalent, but these collocations help to maintain cohesion. That is why when you see a road sign with a drawing

indicating a fork and knife, you immediately associate it with a restaurant and not a petrol station. Here are some forms of collocation:

- a. Synonyms: They help to indicate a relationship and not repetition, for example, cross x angry x furious, happy x thrilled x joyful;
- b. Antonyms: black x white, asleep x awake;
- c. Complementary: day x night, hell x heaven;
- d. Idiomatic opposites: *mabu x matlakala* (soil and leaves);
pap x vleis (porridge and meat);
- e. Ordered lexical sets: one x ten x hundred x thousand;
June x July;
- f. Unordered sets: house x bricks, person x eyes
- g. Co-hyponym: black & white (colour);
- h. Collocation proper: Christian x priest, congregation x church
teacher x lecturer x principal x rector; and
- i. Parallelism: It is used when two or more sentences have identical structures. It connects sentences and the connection is reinforced by use of equivalence, for example, My paintings ... My sculptures ... (Rammala: 2005:6).

This collocation structures help translators to understand why special semantic meanings exist between lexical items. Collocations which are visible in *Tatawešo wa Magodimong* are found in these petitions:

- (23) *Thato ya gago a e dirwe mo lefaseng,*
bjalo ka ge e dirwa legodimong (Bibele Taba e Botse:2000)
(may your will be done on earth as it is done in heaven).

In this petition, collocation which embraces antonyms *lefaseng* (earth) and *legodimong* (in the sky) have been employed. In the petition:

- (24) *Leina la gago a le kgethwe (Bibele Taba e Botse:2000)*
 (may your name be honored)
 and the doxology
- (25) *Gobane mmušo ke wa gago, le maatla,*
le tumišo (Bibele Taba e Botse:2000)
 (For thine is the kingdom, the power,
 and the glory).

In this regard, the translators have used a collocation that embraces near-synonyms as in *kgethwe* which was misinterpreted as “to be holy” and *tumišwe* “glorified”. These petitions also show collocations:

- (27) *O re lebalele dibe tša rena,*
ka gore le rena re lebalela
ba ba re fošetšago (Bibele Taba e Botse:2000)
 (forgive us our sins as we forgive those
 who do us wrong)
 and
- (28) *O se re iše melekong, upše o re*
phološe bobeng (Bibele Taba e Botse)
 (Do not lead us into temptations, but
 save us from evil deeds).

The concepts *dibe* (sins), *fošetšago* (to do wrong) and *melekong* (trials), are considered to be near-synonyms as they revolve around the same concept, to do wrong. In this regard, it is the duty of translators to ensure that the target text reflects a satisfactory level of lexical cohesion even if enormous changes are sometimes unavoidable.

4.6 COHERENCE

Baker (1992:219) regards coherence as a network of relations which organise and create text. On the other hand, cohesion is the network of surface relations which link words and expressions to other words and expressions in a text but the most important thing is that

both concern the way stretches of language are connected to each other. In cohesion the stretches of language are lexical and grammatical items while in coherence they are connected by virtue of meaning as seen by users. In cohesion one looks at the properties of the text while coherence is how one evaluates the text. It can thus be stated that cohesion is the surface expression of coherence. For example, if one uses the causal conjunctive cohesion 'therefore', and one cannot see how those two sentences relate, one may infer that cohesive markers cannot make the text coherent. Cohesive markers must then facilitate and control the interpretation of underlying semantic relations.

Naudé (2002:70) advocates that a reader's expectation of the world determines his/her ability to make sense of language. Individuals within the same community have different experiences and views of the world and the way situations are related to each other, therefore, the acceptability of a text will depend on whether it is a representation of the real world situation. Naudé (2002) furthermore states that coherence of a text is the result of an interaction between the information in the text, and the reader's own knowledge and experience of the world. There are factors that can influence the world knowledge of the reader such as age, gender, race, and level of education. In accordance with the translation brief as already mentioned in Chapter 2, it is crucial for translators to identify the kind of readership that is going to use the translated text as well as their expectations.

It is thus possible that a text can be regarded as coherent to a particular reader but this may not necessarily be the case with another reader. Coherence depends on the ability of the reader to make sense of the text by establishing the links between the information in the text and what he/she already knows. It is, therefore, vital to also consider the reader's cultural as well as intellectual background because they can assist in measuring the ability to decode a text. Baker (1992:222) concurs by stating that coherence is not characteristics of the text but rather the judgment that a reader passes in assessing a text.

Baker (1992) furthermore states that the translator must take into consideration the knowledge and expectation of the readers. This statement implies that translation problems experienced by translators are not rooted in the source text, but in the way the produced text has been adequately done. To be successful in rendering the production of a translated text, translators are thus advised to take into consideration the culture, knowledge, judgment, and perception of the target readers which they have developed.

a. **Is coherence a feature of text or situation?**

As already mentioned the ability to make sense of a produced text lies with the reader's expectations and experience of the world. Charolles (1983) in Baker (1992:219) is of the same idea by stating that:

No text is inherently coherent or incoherent. In the end, it all depends on the receiver, and on his ability to interpret the indications present in the discourse so that, finally, he manages to understand it in a way which seems coherent to him - in a way which corresponds with his idea of what it is that makes a series of actions an integrated whole.

In accordance with this information, the onus lies with the reader to make sense of the information as presented by the text as well as his/her own experience. Coherence of a text is, therefore, the result of the interaction between the presented knowledge in the text and the reader's own experience in the world. Reis and Vermeer (1984) in Munday (2001:79) support this idea by stating that the TT must be interpretable as coherent with the TT receiver's situation. This statement implies that the target text must be translated in such a manner that it is interpretable by the target receivers given their circumstances and knowledge.

There are different views as to whether coherence is a property of a text or a property of a communicative situation. Blum-Kulka (1986) in Baker (1992:221) defines coherence as "a covert potential meaning relationships among parts of a text, made overt by the reader or listener through the process of interpretation". This statement implies that meaning is seen as a property of the text and not of a situation. Contrary to this information, Malmkjaer in Baker (1992:221) rejects this idea that meaning is in the text and suggests instead that meanings arise out of situations involving language. Even if other linguists do not hold this view that meanings are found in texts, the fact remains that it is the cultural and intellectual background that enables readers to interpret texts successfully.

b. Coherence and interpretations

Grice (1975) in Baker (1992:223), regards implicatures as what the speaker means or implies rather than what he/she literally utters and this must not be confused with non-literal meaning. This statement refers to the speaker's intention of what he/she actually means rather than what he/she literally implies. Charolles (1983) in Baker (1992:223) identifies two types of coherence, namely:

- a. Supplementary coherence: It justifies continuity in such a manner that it leads to the manifestation of the reason why a certain thing is said supple-mentally about an element; and
- b. Explanatory coherence: It leads to the explication of a thematic continuity (they indicate an element is repeated from one segment to another).

Consider the following stretches of language in these expressions:

(23) Our Father in Heaven

(24) May your will be done on earth,
as it is done in Heaven (Good News Bible:1997)

In these expressions, there is nothing in the text which indicates what transpires in Heaven, but the speaker is praying for that to happen on earth. It is only through the worldly experience that the reader can interpret this expression. It is thus believed that everything is perfect in Heaven; therefore, the same must be applicable on earth. Note that there is nothing in the above expressions which explicitly tells one about Heaven, but one naturally provides the necessary links to render the discourse coherent, and that is called supplementary coherence.

Explanatory coherence can only be achieved if one has been provided with the necessary knowledge of the settings, which can enable one to reach an interpretation such as this. As human-beings people often find it hard to accept the will of God because if one is faced with difficult situations, one assumes it is the will of God and this is not in accordance with the Christian belief. As a Christian, one must believe and trust in the

Farther because He wants the best for His believers. Therefore, the will which is referred to here, is to let God do the best for His people. The question which arises is how can one achieve explanatory coherence.

Implicatures are considered to be the answer to this problem because they help in establishing the correct interpretation of a particular speaker's intended or implied meaning in a given context. Consider the following expression:

- (25) Forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors
(*Good News Bible*:1995)

which was interpreted into Northern Sotho as:

- (26) *O re le balele dibe tša rena, ka gore le rena re le balela ba ba re fošetšago* (*Bibele Taba e Botse*:2000)

The question which arises is how this expression relates with the text (or particularly the heading) because the preceding one did not mention anything about debts. In order to successfully interpret this expression, one must maintain the assumption of coherence. It has already been established that Our Father expects the best of his people, and this petition can be taken as one of the conditions of doing their best in order to please Him so that He can do the same to them. Grice (1975) in Baker (1992:224) suggests that a speaker can signal an implied meaning conventionally or non-conventionally. By signaling an implied meaning a speaker can use textual resources which are conventionally understood to signal certain relationships between propositions. In this case the conjunction *ka gore* (because), is used as a textual resource between the two expressions.

Another problem which emanates is how to solve problems which are not conventionally coded in the language. Grice (1975) in Baker (1992:224) indicates that implicatures suggest that discourse has certain important features, that is, it is connected, has a purpose and is a co-operative effort. These features, therefore, give rise to a general principle of communication called the co-operative principle which participants are

obliged to observe. It has four maxims as already indicated but will be revisited again for the clarity of this study:

1. Quantity
 - (a) Make your contributions as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange);
 - (b) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required;
2. Quality (try to make your contribution one that is true, specifically)
 - (a) Do not say what you believe is false;
 - (b) Do not say that you lack adequate evidence;
3. Relevance
Make your contribution relevant to the current exchange;
4. Manner (Be perspicuous, specific)
 - (a) Avoid obscurity of expression;
 - (b) Avoid ambiguity;
 - (c) Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity);
 - (d) Be orderly (Baker, 1990:225).

Translators are not obliged to strictly adhere to this principle because there may sometimes be a need to violate them due to the purpose of the intended text or in accordance with the translation brief as required by the client. Implicatures therefore, help in achieving information over and above the literal conventional of an utterance and depend on the interpretation on recognition of those maxims. These maxims help in establishing whether *Tatawešo wa Magodimong* has been adequately translated as already mentioned. The literal translation of implicatures generally distorts the meaning or effect of the implications (Baker 1992:230). This problem has already been identified when a discussion was made on the substitution of the word 'bread' by *bogobe* (porridge) in *Tatawešo wa Magodimong* because it was violating the maxim of relevance as it was not in accordance with the current exchange.

c. **The conventional meaning of words and structures**

Meanings of words in a text must be presented in such a manner that the reader is able to understand what is being said in order to determine the implied meaning of the text. According to Naudé (2002:71), the knowledge of the language system is, therefore, essential if one wants to gain an understanding of any verbal communication. Baker (1992:229) supports this by stating that any inaccurate translations of words and structures in the source languages may impact on the intentionality or implicatures that are encapsulated in the target text. For example, the expression

(27) And lead us not into temptations,
but deliver us from the Evil One (Holy Bible:2000)

was not adequately treated in the source text and, therefore, had an impact on the translated version of the Northern Sotho language because it was misinterpreted by the translators. The Good News Bible realised this mistake and, therefore, change this petition to

(28) Do not bring us hard testing,
but keep us from the Evil One (Good News Bible: 1997)

This was not the case with the Northern Sotho translators because they clung to the old version and never changed this petition so that it is still written as

(29) *O se re iše melekong, upše o re phološe bobeng (Bibele Taba e Botse:2000).*

Translators are advised to have the ability to identify references to participants for drawing inferences and for maintaining the coherency of a text as already discussed in the study. Baker (1992:231) states that a proper name or even a type of food which is unknown to the reader can disrupt the continuity of the text and obscure the relevance of any statement associated with it. This problem also has already been dealt with when translation by cultural substitution was discussed. Baker (1992:231) furthermore propounds that identifying reference is not just a question of identifying who or what the

referent is but, crucially, of knowing enough about the referent to interpret the particular associations it is meant to trigger in the readers' minds in a given context. This problem has already been discussed under translation using a more neutral word, and paraphrasing was recommended to solve the problem.

d. The co-operative principle

Grice (1975) in Naudé (2002:72) suggests that the co-operative principle and its maxims are not arbitrary but are a feature of any rational behaviour, be it linguistic or non-linguistic. This statement implies that this principle is not only applicable to linguistic behaviour but also in individual behaviours of people. For example, if you ask for food, you do not expect to be handed money because money at that particular moment is irrelevant, therefore, the person will be violating the maxim for relevancy and this is considered to be a non-linguistic behaviour but the maxims are applicable in this case.

In some languages, there are certain contexts where one or more of these maxims do not apply because of cultural divergence. Naudé (2002:72) states that in some cultures, politeness is more important as a behaviour than manners. This statement implies that translators, instead of telling the truth will rather settle for politeness. In this regard the translators will be violating the maxim of quality. Because of this problem, linguists started questioning whether the list of maxims suggested by Grice is exhaustive and whether these maxims have the same value in all cultures. Grice (1976) in Baker (1992) concedes that the four maxims do not represent an exhaustive list and suggests that other maxims such as 'Be polite' may be added to the list. Therefore, it is up to the translator to decide to omit or replace certain parts of the text that do not agree with the target user's expectations.

e. The context of the utterance

The context in which an utterance occurs, determines the implicature that can be generated (Naudé, 2002:73). This statement implies that if the reader does not have an understanding of what is said, or relate the information of the text with his/her worldly experience, interpretation will become a problem. Naudé (2002:73) mentions that the

context also includes strategies one may use to impose some kind of structure on the world. For example, if one may be asked to describe an accident one witnessed, it is proper to offer information in a sequential order. That is applying the maxim of manner by being orderly. The same is applicable to the Lord's Prayer because it is presented in a sequential order as in the following:

(1) The address: *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*

(2) Glorification: *Leina la gago a le kgethwe*

Mmušo wa gago a o tle

Thato ya gago a e dirwe mono lefaseng

bjalo ka ge e dirwa legodimong

(3) Divine assistance: *Re fe lehono bogobe bja rena bja ka mehla*

O re lebalele melato ya rena, bjalo ka ge re

lebalela ba ba nago le melato go rena

O se re iše melekong, gomme o re phološe

bobeng

(4) Doxology: *Gobane mmušo ke wa gago, le maatla, le*

tumišo, ka go sa felego, Amen (Encyclopedia:2005)

(The English version is in Chaper 2, Table 2)

In accordance with this information, the Lord's Prayer has its own format as presented above. It starts with an introductory sentence, followed by seven petitions which are divided into two categories. The first three petitions are concerned with the glorification of God, while the last four are requests for divine intervention to humankind. When the translator produces this text, the order must be preserved, that is, adhering to the maxim of manner by being orderly.

The Lord's Prayer was taught by Jesus himself. It is an assumption that Jesus gave his disciples a basic formula for a private prayer, that is, a framework upon which a private prayer could be built, rather than an exact prayer (Barrette, 1995:278) Therefore, translators need extra-linguistic knowledge to render an exact interpretation of this text. This information implies that when someone is conducting a private prayer, he/she must follow the suggested order as presented above, that is, one must start the prayer with an

introductory sentence, followed by glorification, divine assistance, and finally, the conclusion. The implication here is that when someone is praying, the maxim of manner must be respected because one cannot start a prayer with divine intervention and after that acknowledge The Father's presence, that is, glorifying the Lord.

4.7 CONCLUSION

This chapter has indicated that translators are faced with an enormous task of bridging the gap between two different languages with divergent cultures, especially when working with a well developed language such as English. In accordance with the above information, it is vital for translators to have knowledge of discourse theories as this will enable them to look closely at how messages are organised, used and understood. The speech-act also helps translators to realise how language games are being played. To be a successful translator, one should be an expert in the textual critical approach to the sources, that is, to accumulate, evaluate the evidences and to analyse the probabilities. To be able to accomplish this, the translator must have an extensive knowledge of how coherence and cohesion relate to texts as this will help in identifying the text type.

It is evident from the suggested format of the Northern Sotho Lords Prayer that the translators have to resolve a number of difficulties at all levels of linguistic organisation in the text. A successful translator will always know that a good translation is the one that sounds natural in the target language rather than one which is completely accurate.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides a summary of the study, presents its conclusions and makes recommendations in order to assist other Bible researchers on which methods and techniques to use in dealing with particular texts.

5.2 SUMMARY

The main concern of this study was to establish whether the meaning presented by the current versions of the Lord's Prayer as presented by *Good News Bible* (1995), English being the source language and *Bible Taba e Botse* (2000), Northern Sotho as the target language, serves the target receptors in the same way. This will be achieved by giving a summary of each chapter as well as suggesting recommendations with regard to the importance of the interpretation of texts in the translation process.

Chapter One serves as the introduction to the study as well as providing the background to the study. This chapter also provides the aim of the study, the significance of the study, the rationale for the study, the methodology, and the delimitation of the study. The views from different scholars such as Barrette (1986), Mphahlele (2001), Nida and Taber (1969), Nord (1991), Nkatini (2006), and Krieger (2005), as well as practical steps to be taken in the translation process are given.

Chapter Two analyses the impact of translation methods on *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*. Before any discussion could be made on these methods, the role of translators as well as the importance of the translation brief was outlined. Different texts from three different languages (English as the source language, Northern Sotho as the target language and Aramaic as an auxiliary source language) are provided to make the task of comparing these texts easier. It was established that the linguistic method played a major role in the translation of *Tatawešo wa Magodimong* and that most of the concepts from this prayer were translated using the formal and dynamic principles as advocated by Nida.

Chapter Three analyses translation strategies that had an impact on the translation of *Tatawešo wa Magodimong*. For a proper translation process to take place, words, phrases and sentences need to be analysed. This chapter provides a detailed analysis of translation procedures as well as locating general problems encountered by translators in the translation process. Translation strategies used for dealing with non-equivalence in *Tatawešo wa Magodimong* are translation by a more neutral word, active and passive voice, translation through cultural substitution, and language distinction.

Chapter Four deals with the organisational structure of *Tatawešo wa Magodimong* with special reference to cohesion and coherence. This chapter aims at providing information on how texts can make sense to the intended readership. To achieve this, a discussion on discourse analysis, the Speech Act theory, and conversational analysis was deemed imperative. Textual equivalence coherence is also located to look at how lexical, grammatical and other relations such as reference, substitution and ellipsis, conjunctions and lexical cohesion link with various parts of this text. This chapter also discusses coherence to establish how the lexical and grammatical items are connected by virtue of meaning as interpreted by the target users.

5.3 FINDINGS

The findings that one arrives at in connection with *Tatawešo wa Magodimong* are the following:

- Most concepts used in the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer were translated using the formal and dynamic principle.
- The translators in this regard did not adhere to the strategy of language distinction because they failed to capture the number of people denoted by the introductory phrase *Tatawešo*.
- The translators avoided the use of paraphrasing as a translation strategy but opted for the use of gloss translation.

- The translators did not make use of implicatures which might have guided them to capture the intentions of the author, that is, what the author implies and not what is literally said.
- The co-operative principles were in most cases violated, for example, the maxim of quality was violated where one is supposed to tell the truth or the maxim of relevance where one is supposed to make a contribution relevant to the current exchange.
- The lexical gap was not located especially in culturally adopted terms because they could have used surrogate equivalents.

5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are thus made:

- Consider the use of other approaches like, the functionalist approach, and descriptive translation studies. These approaches do not regard the source text as an instrument for measuring equivalence but rather to be used as a source of information unlike the linguistic approaches which were mentioned earlier in this study. In these, the translators regarded a translation as translation when it functions as a text in the target culture. The aim of translation in this regard is to make the target receivers understand what is happening in source the culture and not to please the source author but rather to capture his/her intentions.
- Have a thorough theological background of the text to be translated so as to clearly understand the background of that text. A wider theological understanding of the Bible will assist the translator to evaluate the vocabulary, style, and theological intentions of the author.
- Make use of other related sources in order to establish how others approached the particular text. In this study the Aramaic versions were also presented because it has been established that this text originated from that language.

- Make use of translation strategies and exactly know how they can have an impact on the text to be translated, that is, establish whether they can have a more or less expressive meaning. The translator must take into consideration the issue of omissions, additions, transposition of words, and substitutions.
- Consider the way utterances are used in communicative situations and the way they can be interpreted by target receivers in context, that is, how utterances in the text make sense to the intended reader. The translator must, therefore, make a discourse analysis of the particular text. In this regard the translator will make use of cohesion and cohesive devices in order to maneuver the information in the presented text, that is, making use of devices such as the speech-act theory, implicatures, illocutionary meaning, and co-operative principle.

Finally, the suggested format of the Northern Sotho Lord's Prayer will be as follows:

Tate wa rena wa legaeng le le kgethegilego;

Leina la gago leo le kgethegilego, a le tumišwe;

*Thato ya gago a e phethege mo lefaseng,
bjale ka ge go le bjalo legaeng le le kgethegilego;*

Borena bja gago a bo tle;

Re fe lehono dinyakwa tšeo re di hlokago;

*O re lebalele dibe tša rena, bjale ka
ge re lebalela bao ba re fosetsago;*

*O se re fe diteko tše boima,
upše o re phološe go yo mobe;*

*Gobane borena ke bja gago, le maatla,
le tumišo, ka go sa felego, Amen.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barrette, M.J. 1986. *That We May Love*. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman.
- Baker, M. 1992. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bassnett-McGuire, S. 1988. *Translation Studies*. Third edition. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bell, R.T. 1998. Psychological/Cognitive Approaches. In M. Baker (Ed). *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Bibele*. 2000. Cape Town: South Africa: Bible Society of South Africa.
- Bibele Taba e Botse*. 2000. Cape Town: South Africa: Bible Society of South Africa.
- Birdwell, C. 2005. Non-theistic Liturgy Resources - 3. Prayers. *United Methodist Hymnal*. E/NTLR-3, Prayers.htm. Accessed on 2007/04/17.
- Campbell, S. 1998. *Translation into the Second Language*. London and New York: Longman.
- Cardford, J. 1965. *A Linguistics Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chomsky, N. 1978. *Rules and Representations*. New York: Colombia University Press.
- Cohen, A.D. 1984. On taking tests: what the students report. *Language Testing*, 11 (1). 70-81.
- Conrad, C. 1994. Re: Evangelicals and Dynamic Equivalence. <C25001CC@wuvmd.wustl.edu>. Accessed on 2006/06/28.

- De Waard, J. and Nida, E.A. 1986. *From One Language to Another. Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- Finch, G. 2000. *Linguistics Terms and Concepts*. New York: McMillan Press Ltd.
- Fromkin, V. and Rodman, R. 1974. *An Introduction to Language*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Good News Bible*. 1995. Cape Town: South Africa: Bible Society of South Africa.
- Hatim, B. and Mason, I. 1990. *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman.
- Hervey, S. and Higgins, I. 1992. *Thinking Translation*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Heylen, R. 1993. *Introduction. Translation, Poetics and the Stage: Six French 'Hamlets'*. London: Routledge.
- Holy Bible*, 2000. South Africa: Bible Society of South Africa.
- House, J. 1981. *A Model in Translation Quality*. Tübingen: Gunther Narr.
<http://www.unisa.ac.za/contents/faculties/theology/maleoskop>. Accessed on 2007/11/09.
- Jaaskelainen, R. 2005. Translation Studies: What are they? <http://www.hum.expertise.workshop>. Accessed on 2007/11/09.
- Kosch, I.M., Louwrens, L.Z. and Barnard, R. 1991. *Northern Sotho Only Study Guide for NSE302-4*. Pretoria: University of South Africa.

- Krieger, J. 2005. Why is Bible Translation So Hard?
<http://www.ginesys.com/bibletranslation.htm>. Accessed on 2006/02/16.
- Krings, H.P. 1986. Translation Problems and Translation Strategies of Advanced German Learners of French. In J. House & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication..* Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Leedy, P.D. and Ormord, J.E. 2005. *Practical Research Planning and Design*. New Jersey: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Littlejohn, S.W. 2005. *Theories on Human Communication*. Australia Thomson Wadsworth.
- Loescher, W. 1991. *Translation Performance, Translation Process and Translation Strategies*. Tübingen: Guten Narr.
- Mailhac, J.P. 2000. *In Developing Translation Competence*. Schäffner: Christina and Bervely Adab.
- McMillan, J.H. and Schumacher, S. 1993. Harper Collins College Publishers.
- Microsoft ® Encyclopedia ® 2005 © 1993-2004 Microsoft Corporation. Accessed on 2007/11/05.
- Mphahlele, M.C. 2002. *Transliteration Principle: Is this the Best Solution in Lexicography and African Languages Terminology?* Sovenga: University of the North.
- Munday, J. 2005. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London: Routledge.
- Naudé, J.A. 2002. *Translation Strategies*. Bloemfontein: University of Free State.
- Naudé, J. 2004. *Course Manual for TPV744*. Bloemfontein: University of Free State.

- Naudé, J.A. 2005. *Translation Models*. Bloemfontein: University of Free State.
- Newmark, P. 1988a. *A Textbook of Translation*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall.
- Newmark, P. 1988b. *Approaches to Translation*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall.
- Newmark, P. 1991. *About Translation: Multilingual Matters*. Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Nida, E.A. and Taber, C. 1969. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill.
- Nida, E.A. 1964. *Towards a Science of Translation, with special reference to Principles and Procedures involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- Nida, E.A. and Taber, C.R. 1974. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. E.J. Brill, Leiden: Brill.
- Nkatini, N.L. 2006. *The Myth Around Translation*. Sovenga: University of Limpopo.
- Nord, C. 1991. *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Nord, C. 1992. *Text Analysis in Translator Training*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nord, C. 1997. *Translating as Purposeful Activity*. Manchester, UK: St Jerome Publishers.
- Oxford Paperback Dictionary Thesaurus and Wordpower Guide*. 2001. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Prinsloo, D.J. and de Schryver, G. Reversing an African-Language Lexicon : :The Northern Sotho. *Terminology and Orthography* No. 4 as a case in point. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.

- Radford, A. 1999. *Linguistics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: The Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.
- Rammala, J.R. 2005., Lecture No. 2. Sovenga: University of Limpopo.
- Reis, K. and Vermeer, H.J. 1984. Adequacy and Equivalence in Translation, The Bible Translator. *Hermes, Journal of Linguistics* 3. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Reverend Louw, J.M. 2006. Unstructured interview. Accessed on 26 September 2006.
- Sawyer, H. 1970. *God Ancestor or Creator? Aspects of Traditional Belief in Ghana, Nigeria and Sierra Leone*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Segler, F.M. 1996. *Understanding, Preparing for, and Practising Christian Worship* (Second edition) revised by Randall Bradley. London: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- E:/SmartWomanInvest_com Busy woman investing in life, liberty and pursuit of happiness. <http://go.microsof.com/finlink/?Linklol=69157>. Accessed on 2007/04/17.
- Snell-Hornby, M. 2006. *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Statistics South Africa, 2001. *Publication of Government of South Africa*. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- Toury, G. 1985. *A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Toury, G. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Van Wyk, E.B., Lombard, D.P., Mokgokong, P.C. 1992. *Northern Sotho for First Years*. Pretoria: J.L. Van Schaik.
- Weissbort, D. and Eysteinnsson, A. 2006. *Translation - Theory and Practice: A Historical Reader*. Great Britain: Oxford University Press.
- William -Maskell, M.A. 1982. *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, Oxford: Clarendon Press. E/The Lord's Prayer.htm. Accessed on 2007/04/17.
- Wilss, W. 1982. *The Science of Translation : Problems and Methods*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr

