

**THE PROBLEM OF DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE IN
THE TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE INTO SEPEDI
“BIBELE YA TABA YE BOTSE” WITH SPECIAL
REFERENCE TO THE BOOK OF “REVELATION”.**

2008

N.V. MASHAO

**THE PROBLEM OF DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE IN THE TRANSLATION
OF**

**THE BIBLE INTO SEPEDI “BIBELE YA TABA YE BOTSE” WITH
SPECIAL**

REFERENCE TO THE BOOK OF “REVELATION”.

By

NTSHIBUDI VERONICA MASHAO

Submitted in the fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the

TRANSLATION STUDIES AND LINGUISTICS

at the

UNIVERSITY OF LIMPOPO

SUPERVISOR: DR MOGALE J.R. RAMMALA

NOVEMBER 2008

“I declare that THE PROBLEM OF DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE IN THE TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE INTO SEPEDI “BIBELE YA TABA YE BOTSE” WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE BOOK OF “REVELATION” is my own work and that all the sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references”.

Mashao N.V.

NTSHIBUDI VERONICA MASHAO

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this mini-dissertation to my husband, Mr Simon Raesibe

Mashao and my children: Malesela, Maiphepi, Mabaile, Pheladi and Tebogo.

Your support and love helped me to reach my goal.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. I thank God for His mercy and love, I will always acknowledge Him in everything I do. In this mini-dissertation research, He guided me, gave me strength and good health.

My sincere gratitude and appreciation to the following people without whose motivation ,support and guidance this study would not have been a success. Dr Mogale J.R. Rammala, my supervisor,who has always been supportive, encouraging and positive throughout this study. He has given his time and energy to help me push to the end. He has been an excellent mentor for me.

Profesor Madazhe supported me throughout my studies, his valuable advice guided and strengthened me.

Mr Saki Shabangu for his editing and compilation of my mini-dissertation, has been a pillar of strength.

I further acknowledge people from different churches ,the respondents to questionnaire who helped me get through with my research “May the good Lord bless and keep you”.

My late brother Jeremiah Matsena was my source of inspiration .He would say: “Kodumela Kgadikea go tshepa” his words motivated me to work hard.

Edgar Mashaba, my son-in-law, “Ke leboga Monareng” I appreciate your support and motivation.

To Simon, my husband and children, without whose unfailing support and guidance I could have not reached thus far. “Kea leboga, Mapodile”! Your patience and encouragement made me perservere to the end. This is appreciated wholeheartedly!

“Ditlou! Dikgomo! Le batho ka moka bao ba nthekgilego ge ke kalokana le dithuto , kea leboga . Ralegohle-Kukama-ditšhaba, a le dire ka botho”.

SUMMARY

This study entails the PROBLEM OF DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE IN THE TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE IN SEPEDI “BIBELE YA TABA YE BOTSE” WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE BOOK OF REVELATION.

It was during the Bible study sessions with friends when I read from BibeLe Ya Taba Ye Botse , that colleagues complained about its translation ,and requested to read from other Translations of other versions, which they understood better.

It was said that the meaning of the verses were clear and straight forward, as compared to BibeLe Ya Taba Ye Botse.

Their comments encouraged me to make a research based on the book of Revelation as we had problems in understanding the meaning of some of the verses. I had to investigate the problem of dynamic equivalence method of translation in BibeLe Ya Taba Ye Botse.

Some of the verses do not bring out clearly the meaning of the original version. In the Good News Bible, the Dynamic Equivalence method of translation is used, some call the Bible the “Common Language”version ...or to put it bluntly, its language level is that of the language used by uneducated people and children. Nida (1960)

Hence the readers feel that it is a Bible for low class people, although it was not intended for that. The result of the translation is not up to standard, suprisingly Sepedi translators used the Bible which is not favoured to do their translation.

Marlowe (2004) claims that the theory of dynamic equivalence is blamed for its over simplification of the Bible and subsequent misinterpretations .

There is nothing wrong with Dynamic Equivalence theory, but translators who do not read the original text with understanding cause the unacceptable type of translation. Marlowe said that the Good News Bible is simplified to the extent that the message in some verses is distorted ,hence the misinterpretation and misunderstanding of its content in some areas.

The translation of the Bible from English into Sepedi is a special translation in that it requires profound factual knowledge .Translating from one language to another poses many problems .Some words simply do not have any direct equivalents in the receptor language . Furthermore, some expressions are idiomatic and cannot be translated as such.With dynamic equivalence ,the meaning and message have to be retained.The research will be based on difficulties encountered by the users of “Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse” and how to find solutions to improve it.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
 <u>Chapter 1</u>	
1.1 Introduction	3
1.2 Problem Statement.....	3-7
1.3 The purpose of the Study.....	7-8
1.3.1 Aim.....	8
1.3.2 Objectives.....	8
1.4 Research Methodology.....	8
1.5 Significance of the study.....	8
1.6 Delimitation of the study.....	9
 <u>Chapter 2</u>	
Translation methods and translation Procedures.	10
 2.1 Translation methods.....	
Introduction	
2.1.1 Word -for-Word Translation(Formal Equivalence Translation) ...	10-12
2.1.2 Semantic Translation.....	12-13
2.1.3 Idiomatic Translation.....	13-14
2.1.4 Communicative Translation.....	14-16
2.1.5 Dynamic Equivalence Method of Translation.....	16-17
2.2 Translation Procedures.....	17
Introduction	17
2.2.1 Transference	17-19
2.2.2 Synonymy	20-21
2.2.3 Shift or Transposition	21-23
2.2.4 Adaptation	23-24
2.2.5 Other Procedures	24-25

2.3 Conclusion 25

Chapter 3

3.1 Theoretical and Conceptual Framework 26-30
3.2 Conclusion30

Chapter 4

Dynamic Equivalence method of Translation as used in Biblele ya Taba Ye Botse

4.1 Dynamic Equivalence Method of Translation31-37
4.2 Conclusion 38

Chapter 5

5.1 Introduction 39
5.1.1 Questionnaire responses..... 40
5.2 Research findings from the three denominations 41-42
5.3 Analysis based on the two key questions of the questionnaire42-43
5.4 Recommendations44
5.6 Conclusion44-45
6. Bibliography 46-47
7. Boitsebišo48-49
8. Questionnaire (Sepedi version)50-53
9. Questionnaire (English version)54-56

CHAPTER 1

1.1 INTRODUCTION

For the Christian community, it is important to have a Bible in every household for it serves as a guide in the community's daily lives. That is the reason why the Bible is translated into thousands of languages. There are many methods of translation, for example, the Formal-, Literal-, and Dynamic Equivalence methods of translation. This envisaged study will examine if the Dynamic Equivalence method of translation is the appropriate method for the translation of the Sepedi *Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse*.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

According to Nida (1960:221),

“Dynamic Equivalence is defined as a translation principle according to which a translator seeks to translate the meaning of the original text in such a way that the target language will trigger the same impact on the target culture audience. The form of the original text is changed, the message is preserved and the translation is faithful.”

For example:

- (1) *Re kgopela sego sa meetse.*
(We are asking for a calabash of water.)

The above-given translation is incorrect because it does not make sense. It is incorrect

because literal or formal translation has been utilised. The correct translation should read as follows:

(2) *Re kgopela sego sa meetse.*

(We are asking for a hand in marriage.)

The examples in Sepedi as reflected in (1& 2) above, which are an idiomatic expression, need an equivalent idiom in the source language. In this envisaged research, the English Bible, *Good News Bible*, will be used as the source text (ST) and the Sepedi Bible, *Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse*, will be used as the target text (TT). Eugene Nida, the American Bible Society Executive Secretary, invented the concept of Dynamic Equivalence. Translators like him opted for this type of translation method because it is more effective in the translation of the Bible because it aims for communication effectiveness so as to have an effect upon the reader. This envisaged research will, therefore, attempt to examine whether Dynamic Equivalence has since been invoked in the correct manner or not. Translation of the Bible from English into Sepedi is a special translation in that it requires profound factual knowledge. Translating from one language to another poses many problems. For instance, some words simply do not have any direct equivalents in the receptor language. Furthermore, some expressions are idiomatic and cannot be translated as such. With Dynamic Equivalence, the meaning and message have to be retained. The main aim of Dynamic Equivalence is not in terms of whether or not the words are understandable and the sentences are grammatically constructed, but it is in terms of the total impact the message has on the one who reads it.

The present researcher would like to study an acceptable type of a dynamic method of translation for the Sepedi speaking people using *Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse* and those who love the language, with special focus on the book of Revelation. Emphasis will be on the difficulties encountered by the users of *Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse* and how to find solutions.

Revelation is the last book of the Bible and it is, for most Christians, one of the least read and most difficult books. The author of the book is John. Most readers find it unintelligible. It has features of its own and is regarded as genuine prophecy.

Revelation is to reveal – the unveiling of something hidden so that it may be seen and known for what it is in Biblical terms, the thought intended is of God the Creator actively disclosing to men his power and glory, his nature and character, his will, ways and plans – in short, himself-in order that men may know Him”. (Douglas, 1982: 1027).

According to Leonardi (2000), the source text, which in this case is the *Good News Bible*,

was written for the primitive tribes. Nida was concerned with the production of the versions of the Bible that could be used in what is perceived as primitive cultures and outside the context of an established church.

Readers of Sepedi Bible have grown to be accustomed to the old Bible Version (Bibele: 1997 13th ed.). Thus, any new translation sounds strange and incorrect. The new Sepedi translation named *Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse* arouses interest, particularly because its language and style are ordinary (see examples 3&5). One is therefore, tempted, to desire

to investigate the content and language used, and wants to check what really makes it strange and unusual.

When a translation is full of flaws, not understood by its readers, and when the message

could not be well interpreted, it poses a problem, as it could not be used effectively.

For

instance:

(3) *Good News Bible (GNB)*(Revelation 16): The bowls of God’s anger.

Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse: Dikotlo tše di šupago tša mafelelo.

The above-mentioned Sepedi translation is anomalous, as it does not make sense. It is thus incorrect because the English word “*bowls*” has been translated as *dikotlo*, which means punishment, whereas this word’s true meaning in Sepedi is *meriswana*.

The correct translation is as follows:

(4) *Meriswana ya kgalefo ya Modimo.*

For example:

The heading in the book of Revelation 16

Good News Bible (GNB): the bowls of God's anger.

Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse: It is supposed to be: *Meriswana ya kgalefo ya Modimo*.

This is Dynamic Equivalence method of translation.

(5) Revelation: 14 the heading of verse 14

Good News Bible (GNB): The harvest of the earth.

Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse: *Pono ya kahlolo ya mafelelo*.

The Sepedi translation in (5) above is still incorrect as its intended meaning is ambiguous. The correct translation should be as follows:

(6) *Puno lefaseng*.

The translation in (6) above is correct, as it is faithful to the original meaning. It is well

understood by the readers because *puno* is harvest and *pono* is vision. Just as much as we

know that any language is not static but dynamic, let us not distort the meaning of the

Word of God.

Words and forms that are not in current or widespread use, as well as unnecessary long words, should be avoided, but this has been ignored in *Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse*, as the following examples indicate:

(7a) *Good News Bible Rev 17:5 the mother of all the prostitutes*

Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse Rev 17: 5 mmagodigwebakathobalano

(7b) *Good News Bible* Rev 21: 8 those who worship idols.

Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse Rev 21:8 bakhunamelamedingwana

As it is evident, the Sepedi translated words are too long and they thus cause confusion.

In order to avoid this shortfall, it would have been better to translate them as follows:

7a. *mmagodigwebakathobalano > mmago dihlola*

7b. *bakhunamelamedingwana > ba go khunamela medingwana*

From this exposition, it is evident that the said Sepedi Bible version has translation problems that need to be highlighted and suggest solutions to them.

1.3 THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

1.3.1 Aim

The aim of this envisaged research is to investigate the problem of Dynamic Equivalence in the translation of the Bible: *The Good News Bible (Today's English Version)* into *Bibele ya Taba ye Botse (Sepedi version)*. In order to achieve this aim, the envisaged study will make an attempt to answer the following question:

- Which methods of translation are appropriate for the translation of the Bible?

1.3.2 Objectives

To encourage accurate translation that will not distort meanings of words and expressions in Sepedi;

- To investigate barriers that hinder correct translation
- To encourage Sepedi speakers to take pride in their language;

- To strive for the retention of the meaning of the translated idiomatic expressions, as close as possible to the original text.

1.4 **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The quantitative and the qualitative method (textual analysis) will be used for this research because questionnaires will be used to collect data (see the attached questionnaire). The statistical analysis of the results will be made to compare the findings of the responses from the three different denominations, that will be used.

Participants will be drawn from the three different denominations, namely, the Charismatic Churches, The Protestants Churches and the Apostolic Churches, from

Polokwane, Seshego and GaMatlala; forty members from each church. Random sampling will be used in order to obtain the views of fifteen (15) adults, fifteen (15) youths and (ten) 10 elderly people per denomination. The total number of the people to be interviewed will be one hundred and twenty (120).

1.5 **SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

The research will benefit translators, students/learners, priests, theologians and researchers who may want to do further research on the Sepedi Bible. There are many believers who are unilingual in as far as the reading of the Bible is concerned, therefore, such will benefit from a good translation. The aged, the youth, the educated and other believers will also benefit from this kind of study. The study will encourage Sepedi speakers to take pride in their language, as it will support them as they adore and worship God in their mother tongue.

1.6 DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The research shall confine itself to *Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse*, with special emphasis to the book of Revelation, and focus is being put on the difficulties encountered by its users and how to find solutions to assist them.

CHAPTER 2

TRANSLATION METHODS AND TRANSLATION PROCEDURES.

2.1. TRANSLATION METHODS

INTRODUCTION

A Bible translation is usually the foundation for all other theology and therefore it is essential that translation be something extremely trustworthy in itself .A poor translation can manipulate the original meaning of the text without giving proper consideration to matters of its historical or cultural context. The Word of God should be taught diligently and often (Deut 6:7),and that study and memorization of it is delightful and valuable.

There are different kinds of translation methods of the Bible. For example: Formal Equivalence (word-for-word) translation, Semantic translation, Idiomatic translation, Communicative translation (Dynamic Equivalence or phrase-for-phrase) translation, etc.

Highlights will be made on the above-mentioned methods only. Emphasis will be made on the dynamic equivalence method of translation as it is the method for the translation of the Good News Bible and Biblele ya Taba Ye Botse on which my research is based.

2.1.1 Word -for-word translation (Formal Equivalence Translation).

Formal equivalence translation tries to give as literal a translation of the original text as possible. Translations using this philosophy try to stick close to the originals, even preserving much of the original word order. The Source Language order is preserved and the words translated singly by their most common meanings, out of context

According to Newmark (1991:46)

“Cultural words are translated literally.

The main use of word-for-word translation is either to Understand the mechanics of the source language or to construe a difficult text as a pre-translation process”.

A formal equivalence translation lets the reader interpret for himself. *But too often the average reader doesn't have the background or tools to interpret accurately. The net result is that he often badly misunderstands the text.*

The disadvantage of the formal equivalent translation is that they are harder to read because more Hebrew and Greek style intrudes into the English text and that poses a problem when translating to other languages. Because of this shortcoming, more readable

Bibles are produced using the dynamic equivalence philosophy.

For example:

New International Version (NIV a dynamic translation), Good News Bible

(GNB a dynamic translation) is called Today's English Version (TEV) .The GNB is especially known for non-traditional renderings .For example, “the abomination of desolation” referred to in the book of Daniel and the Gospel is called “the awful horror”, and the ark of the covenant is called “the covenant box”. The following is an example of word-for-word method of translation from the Good News Bible to Bibeleya Taba Ye Botse.

This is formal translation and not dynamic equivalence method of translation as expected.

Revelation 3:20	Listen!	I stand	At the door	and knock
Kutullo 3:20	Theeletšang	ke ema	mojako	ka kokota

Listen! I stand at the door and knock;
Theeletšang! ke ema mojako ka kokota;
if anyone hears my voice and opens the door,
ge motho a ka re ge a ekwa lentšu laka a mpulela mojako,

I will come in and eat with them, and they will eat with me.
ke tla tsena mme ra ja mmogo.

The last sentence sound as if it is incomplete , it is supposed to be
ke tla tsena mme ra ja mmogo,mme ba tlo ja le nna.

2.1.2 Semantic Translation.

Semantic translation differs from 'faithful translation' only in as far as it must take more account of the aesthetic value (that is, the beautiful and natural sound) of the SL text, comprising of meaning where appropriate so that no assonance, word play or repetition jars in the finished version. Only semantic and communicative translation fulfil the two main aims of translation, which are, first, accuracy, and second, economy.

A semantic translation is written at the author's linguistic level .A semantic translation is normally inferior to its original, as there is both cognitive and pragmatic loss. A semantic translation has to interpret.

For example:

Revelation 6:6

Kutullo 6:6

6. I heard what sounded like a voice coming from among the four living creatures, which said:

6.Ka kwa se nkego ke lentšu le le tšwago mokgahlong ga diphedi tšeo tše nne le re:

“A litre of wheat for a day’s wages,

“Serotwana se tee sa mabele se rekwa ka papetlana ya silibera.

and three litres of barley for a day’s wages.

Tše tharo tša garase le tšona di rekwa ka papetlana ya silibera.

But do not damage the olive-trees and the vineyards!”

Mehlware le merara yona o se e senye”

The above-mentioned example is proof enough to show how the TL becomes inferior to the SL.

For example:

Serotwana se tee sa mabele and *a litre of wheat*, mean two different things; because serotwana is a dishlike container made out of grass; a litre is a measurement that can be in a form of a bottle or a container made out of tin or plastic.

2.1.3 Idiomatic Translation.

Idiomatic translation reproduces the “message” of the original but tends to distort nuances of meaning by preferring colloquialisms and idioms where these do not exist in the original.(Authorities as diverse as Seleskovitch and Stuart Gilbert tend to this form of the lively, “natural” translation). Newmark (1991:47).

The following are examples of idiomatic translations:

Revelation 14:14

Kutullo 14:14

The harvest of the earth.

Pono ya kahlolo ya mafelelo.

It should be: *Puno lefaseng* and not *Pono ya kahlolo ya mafelelo*

Harvest is puno and not pono. Pono is vision.

The heading in: Revelation 16

Hlogo ya ditaba go: Kutullo 16

The bowls of God's anger.

Dikotlo tše di šupago tša mafelelo

It should be: *Meruswi ya kgalefo* and not *Dikotlo tše di šupago tša mafelelo*.

Meriswi are bowls. kgalefo is anger. The words are idiomatically placed therefore they should complement each other

2.1.4 Communicative Translation.

Dynamic equivalence translation which is called a communicative translation is the method of translation that is expected to be used in the translation of Bible ya Taba Ye Botse from the Good News Bible (TEV). The research is specifically based on this method. But it seems as if a combination of methods of translation is used in the translation of Bible ya Taba Ye Botse, looking at the examples given above the researcher is tempted to conclude that more than one method of translation is used in the Sepedi Bible.

According to Newmark (1991:47)

“Communicative translation attempts to render the exact contextual meaning of the original in such a way that both content and language are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the readership.”

Communicative translation is social, concentrates on the message and the main force of the text, tends to under-translate, to be simple, clear and brief, and is always written in a natural and resourceful style. A communicative translation is often better than its original, it has to give explanations. It is not so concerned about the grammatical form of the original. A dynamic equivalence translation is more interpretive-but is also easier to understand .On the other hand, a dynamic equivalence translation , that is the communicative approach is usually clear and quite understandable; it is *this principle that often leads to the looseness in translation*

(<http://www.bpc.org.minerval/trans.html>).

In many cases, it tends up being a dangerous form of tampering with the word of God, all this for the purpose of making the message easy to understand to the reader. The phrase- to- phrase translation's major flaw is in its simplicity of language. The editors wanted to make sure that it was easy to read, in achieving this goal, they often sacrificed accuracy, sentences are shortened, and subordination of thought is lost, conjunctions are deleted. Dynamic translations lose precision because they omit subtle cues to the meaning of a passage that only literal translations preserve.

For example:

Revelation 9:5-6

Kutullo 9: 5-6

5 .The locusts were not allowed to kill these people, but only to torture them for five months.The pain caused by the torture is like pain caused by the scorpion's sting.

5. Ya laelwa gore e se bolaye, fela e ba hlokofatše dikgwedi tše tlhano.

Bohloko bja yona bo swana le bja phepheng ge e lomile motho

“A translator with his eyes on his readership is likely to under-translate, to use more general words in the interest of clarity, simplicity and sometimes brevity, which makes him ‘omit’ to translate words altogether ”. Newmark (1988:80)

6. During those five months they will seek death, but will not find it; they will want to die, but death will flee from them.

6. Dikgweding tše tlhano batho ba tla inyakela lehu, fela ba ka se le hwetše ba tla duma go hwa, fela lehu le tla ba tšhaba.

Verse 6 (six) is pure literal translation, and this is not what is expected in this research.

Care should be taken that dynamic equivalence method of translation is to be used in Biblele ya Taba Ye Botse which is a translation of the Good News Bible which is said to be the dynamic equivalence translation.

2.1.5 Dynamic Equivalence Method of Translation.

Dynamic equivalence is also known as functional equivalence. It is an attempt to convey the thought expressed in a source text at the expense of literalness, original word order the source texts grammatical voice, etc., if necessary. “Dynamic Equivalence is defined as a translation principle according to which a translator seeks to translate the meaning of the original text in such a way that the target language will trigger the same impact on the target culture audience. The form of the original text is changed, the message is preserved and the translation is faithful”. Nida (1960:221)

The TL has failed in displaying the exact meaning in Kutullo (Revelation) 14:14. In the source text the sub-title above verse 14 is quoted as “The harvest of the earth”. But the translation “Pono ya kahlolo ya mafelelo”, does not give the meaning of “The harvest of the earth”. The word “*pono*” is used, when it was supposed to be “*puno*”. Pono is vision, and puno is harvest. This is proof enough that the meaning is distorted.

In yet another example Revelation 16:1 The sub-heading from the source text says: “The bowl’s of God’s anger” has been translated as “Dikotlo tše di šupago tša mafelelo”. The correct translation is “Meruswi ya kgalefo ya Modimo”. It sounds more

correct and therefore a better option. The examples from the Bible Ya Taba Ye Botse are not always accurate, and they do not show the exact dynamic equivalence translation as envisaged.

2.2 TRANSLATION PROCEDURES

INTRODUCTION

Translation procedures are used for sentences and smaller units of language while Translation methods relate to whole texts. The discussion will be based on procedures whose use always depends on a variety of contextual factors. The following translation procedures will be discussed with examples, from the book of Revelation for clarity.

For example:

- Transference
- Synonymy
- Shifts or transpositions
- Other procedures are-Equivalence and Adaptation

2.2.1 Transference.

Transference is the process of transferring SL word to a TL text as a translation procedure. "Catford" transference, includes transliteration, which relates to the conversion of different alphabets e.g. Greek, Arabic, Chinese, etc into English. The word then becomes a "loan" word. The languages used in this research are Sepedi and English, hence examples are given in both languages.

For example:

Good News Bible: Source Language (SL)

Revelation 1:11

It said: “Write down what you see, and send the book to the churches in these seven cities: Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicia.”

Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse TL (Kutullo: 1:11)

Le re “Tše o di bonago di ngwale ka pukung , gomme o romele puku yeo diphuthegong tše di lego metseng ye e šupago ye: Efeso, Smirna, Pergamone, Tiatira, Sardese, Filadelfia, le Laodisea.

The above mentioned cities are transferred, the alphabets are replaced.

For example:

- (a) (Ephesus is transferred to Efeso) **ph** is changed to **f**, and '**sus**' is changed to '**so**'
- (b) (Philadelphia is changed to 'Filadelfia') **ph** is changed to **f**, and '**phia**' to **fia etc**
- (c) (Smyrna is transferred to Smirna) **y** is changed to **i**

The following are normally transferred: names of all living creatures are transferred except the Pope and one or two of the royals and most dead people ;geographical and topographical names including newly independent countries such as le)Zaire, Malawi, unless periodicals and newspapers, titles of as yet untranslated literary works, plays, films; names of private institutions; names of public or nationalized institutions, unless they have recognized translations; street names, addresses, etc. Newmark (1988:82).

The media, the experts, will be transferring words whether the translators like it or not. Perhaps when the translator's professional status is raised, they will not be transferring so many. The argument in favour of transference is that it shows respect for the SL country's culture. The argument against it is that it is the translator's job to translate and explain.

However, when a translator has to decide whether or not to transfer a word unfamiliar in the target language, which in principle should be a SL cultural word whose

referent is peculiar to the SL culture, then he usually complements it with second translation procedure – the two procedures in harness are referred to as a ‘couplet’ generally, only cultural ‘object’ or concepts related to a small group or cult should be transferred; the vogue for transferring so called ‘national characteristics should be abandoned. (SL)

Good News Bible: Revelation 2:7.

“To those who win the victory I will give the right to eat the fruit of the tree of life that grows in the Garden of God (Paradise)”. When a translator has to decide whether or not to transfer a word unfamiliar in the target language, which in principle should be a SL cultural word whose referent is peculiar to the SL culture, then he usually complements it with second translation.

The word Paradise is left out. But it is reflected in the Sepedi translation which is the TL, for example: Kutullo 2:7.

“Yo a ka fenyago ke tla mo fa dikenywa tša sehlare sa bophelo se se lego Paradeiseng Ya Modimo a ja.’

Other translations use “Legodimong” instead of Paradeiseng”. There is transference of words ,from Paradise to Garden of God in English and from Legodimong to Paradeiseng.

2.2.2 Synonymy.

This procedure is used for SL word where there is nuclear one-one equivalent, and the word is not important in the text, in particular for adjectives or adverbs of quality (which in principle are “outside” the grammar and less important than other components of a sentence) thus *personne gentile*, *kind person* *conteste awkward or fussy*, *difficile*. A synonym is only appropriate where literal translation is not possible and because the word is not important enough for componential analysis. For example:

(SL) Revelation 2:9 they are a group that belongs to **Satan!**.

(TL) Kutullo 2:9. Gape bona ke ba phuthego ya **Sathane**.

(SL) Revelation 12:9.

The huge dragon was thrown out-that ancient serpent, called **Devil**, or **Satan**, that deceived the whole world.

(TL) Kutullo 12:9.

Mmamogašwa woo, yona noga yela ya kgale e bitšwago **Diabolose** goba **Sathane** yo a foraforeditšego lefase lohle, o ile a rakwa.

Here economy precedes accuracy. A translator cannot do without synonymy; he has to make do with it as a compromise, in order to translate more important segments of the text, segments of the meaning, more accurately. But unnecessary use of synonyms is a mark of many poor translations. In the extract above “*Diabolose*” is used correctly as a synonym of “*Sathane*” as reflected in Revelation 12:9. There is consistency in the two Bibles as far as synonymy is concerned.

(SL) Revelation 14:12-13.

“Yes indeed!” answers the Spirit.

“They will enjoy rest from their **hard work**, because the results of their service go with them.”

(TL) Kutullo 14: 12 – 13.

“Ee: Ba tla ikhutša **mekatano** ya bona, gobane tše ba di dirilego di sepela nabo.”

Unnecessary use of synonyms is a mark of many poor translations. I would prefer the translation that was used before:

For example:

Ba tla ikhutša **ditapišego** tsa bona, gobane tše ba di dirilego di tlo ba latela.

“Mekatano” is said to be the synonym that brings about a clear and understandable meaning.

2.2.3 Shift or Transposition.

A shift/transposition is a translation procedure involving a change in the grammar from SL to TL. One type, the change from singular to plural e.g. ‘furniture’; des meubles; ‘advice’ des conseils or in the position of an adjective: la maison Blanche, ‘the white house’; is automatic and offers the translator no choice.

The following example shows transposition procedure in Sepedi and English where the plural in English is not always plural in Sepedi.

(SL) Revelation 19:19.

Then I saw the **beast** and the **kings** of the **earth**.

Ka napa ka bona **sebata** sela le **magoši** a **lefase**

And their **armies** gathered to fight against the one
Le **madira** a bona a kgobokanetše go tlo lwa le yola

Who was riding the **horse** and against his **army**
wa go namela **pere** le **madira** a gagwe.

In deed the grammar of the languages differ because the languages are not from the same cultural background. From the example given above it clearly shows how the naming of objects differ and how the plurals of certain words don't follow the pattern that we are used to in Sepedi "*madira*" remains "*madira*" in the example given. But in English the singular form of madira is army and the plural is armies. Horses will be '*dipere*' with '*di*' that shows that it is the plural of '*pere*'. In Sepedi we have "*lefase*" in singular form and '*mafase*' in plural form, but in the source language we have earth as singular and earth in the plural form. This is where we have the shifts in the translation procedure involving a change in grammar. In this case the translator has no choice but to abide by the regulations.

A second type of shift is required when a SL grammatical structure does not exist in the TL. Look at the following example:

Here there are always options: Thus for the neutral adjective as subject e.g.

(Interesting.....)

There is a choice of structure, for example:

'What is interesting is that'

'The interesting thing is that'

'It's interesting that ... '.

'The interest of the matter is that'.

From the book of Revelation 21 : 7, a structure similar to the example given above, is built, for example: (TL) Kutullo 21 : 7.

"Tšeo ka moka ke tla di fa yo a ka fenyago'.

“Ka moka tšeo ke tla di fa yo a ka fenyago”.

“Yo a ka fenyago ke tla mo fa ka moka tšeo ...”.

“Ke tla di fa yo a ka fenyago, tšeo ka moka”.

2.2.4 Adaptation.

Adaptation is a use of a recognized equivalent between two situations. This is a matter of cultural equivalence, such as ‘*Dear Sir*’, Translated as ‘*Thobela Mohlomphegi*’.

‘*Yours faithfully*’ is translated as ‘*Wa gago ka botshepegi*’.

Both highlights what sometimes happens in the process of translating, but they are not usable procedures.

Adaptation is the ‘freest’ form of translation procedure mainly used for plays (comedies) and poetry; the themes ,the characters ,the plots are usually preserved.the SL culture converted to the TL culture and the text-rewritten .The deplorable practice of having a play or poem literally translated and then rewritten by an established dramatist or poet has produced many adaptations, but other adaptations have ‘rescued’ period plays

Here follows a good translation though it is not a dynamic equivalence method of translation but an adaptation because it is written in a poetic form, it is a song; The adaptation method of translation and the adaptation procedure is not popular in the translation in the book of Revelation.The following is one of the visible examples:

Revelation 15:3

Kutullo 15:3

3. And singing the song of Moses, the servant of God, and song of the Lamb:”Lord God Almighty, how great and wonderful are your deeds! king of the nations,how right and true are your ways!.....”

3. Ba opela kopelo ya Moshe, mohlanka wa Modimo, le ya kwana ba re “Morena Modimo Ramaatlaohle,mediro ya gago ke ye megolo,ebile e a makatša! Wena kgoši ya ditšhaba ,tsela tša gago di lokile ebile di a tshepega!.....”

2.2.5. Other Procedures.

Vinay and Darbelnet give:

Equivalence, an unfortunately named term implying approximate equivalence accounting for the same situation in different terms. Judging from Vinay and Darbenet’s examples, they are simply referring to notices, familiar alternatives, phrases and idioms – in other words, different ways of rendering the clichés and standard aspects of language.

(SL) Revelation 20:5.

The rest of the dead did not come to life until the thousand years were over.

This is the first raising of the dead.

(TL) Kutullo 20: 5.

Bahu ba bangwe bona ba ile ba se tsoge, gwa ba gwa feta mengwaga ye sekete.

Ye ke yona tsogo ya mathomo.

The example that is given shows the successful equivalence method of translation because the message is clear, the language is fault free/ Look at the following example which is supposed to be equivalent method of translation:

(SL) Revelations 21: 6.

“..... I am the first and last, the beginning and the end”.

(TL) Kutullo 21: 6.

“Ke nna Alfa le Omega, Mathomo le Bofelo.

The Source Language guides the Target Language, Alfa and Omega is supposed to be reflected in the Source Language first before the Target Language but in this translations, things are not done the proper way, the procedure followed is not allowed.

2.3 Conclusion.

Translation methods of the Bible relate to whole texts while translation procedures are used for sentences and smaller units of language .A clear picture on how translation procedures are utilized in the translation of the Bible are given with examples from the Good News Bible and Bibe le ya Taba Ye Botse.

In transference , names of living creatures are transferred except the Pope and the Royals mostly dead people,etc. The argument in favour of transference is that it shows respect for the SL country's culture. The argument against it is that the translator's job is to translate and to explain whether we like it or not. The translator has to decide whether to transfer a word unfamiliar in the target, which in principle should be a SL cultural word he usually complements it with second translation procedure.

A translator cannot do without synonymy; he has to compromise by using it in order to translate important segments of the text, segments of the meaning more accurately .The translator has to be more careful not to overuse synonyms. The discussions simply indicated procedures based on a variety of contextual factors still based on the following procedures transference ,synonymy , shifts or transpositions and the others .

CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Marlowe (2004) claims that the theory of dynamic equivalence is blamed for its over simplification of the Bible and subsequent misinterpretations. There is nothing wrong with the Dynamic Equivalence theory, but the translators who do not read the original text with understanding cause the unacceptable type of translation. According to the present researcher, Marlowe (2004) had a point when he said that the Good News Bible is over simplified, hence the oversimplification of *Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse*, which is the target text and the closest type of translation. It is simplified to the extent that the message in some verses is distorted, hence the misinterpretation and misunderstanding of its content in some areas.

Eugene A Nida (born November 11, 1914 ,in Oklahoma City)is the developer of the Dynamic equivalence biblical translation of the theory. His occupation is Linguist .His spouse is Althea Sprague(1943-1993(she passed away, his present wife is Dr Elena Fernadez, a translator and interpreter (1997-to present)

Nida began his career with the American Bible Society (ABS) in 1943 and was quickly promoted to Associate Secretary for versions and worked as Executive Secretary for Translations until his retirement. He proved to be instrumental in engineering the joint effort between the Vatican and the United Bible Societies (UBS) to produce cross-denominational Bibles in translations across the globe .This work was begun in 1968 and carried on in accordance with Dr Nida's translation principle of Functional Equivalence.

His most notable and most controversial contribution to translation Theory is Dynamic Equivalence ,also known as Functional Equivalence .This approach to translation aims to reproduce the intention of the original text in the translation ,rather than reproduce the actual words of the original .His dynamic equivalence theory is often held in opposition to the views of philologists who maintain that an understanding of the (ST) can be achieved by assessing the inter-animation of words on the page and that meaning is self-contained within the text (i.e. much more focused on achieving semantic equivalence).

Nida called his theory of translation Dynamic Equivalence. Some translation theorists call it “Common Language” and is defined as the language that is “common to the usage of both the educated and the uneducated” in any given language. The main “market niche” of The *Good News Bible* was, from the beginning, the mainline Protestants churches in America and Great Britain. Bratcher (1976) (Revised with inclusive language, 1992)

Bratcher 1976) openly challenged the conservative evangelicals, and scoffed at their contention that the words of the Bible were inspired and authoritative. As much as he challenged the conservative churches, eventually Bratcher was compelled to resign as the chief translator of the *Good News Bible*. The Bible was called the ‘bloodless Bible’ because blood was equated to death, which is not acceptable. The present researcher concurs with the conservative churches; the word of God need not be changed to suit our interests. As this is The Holy Scriptures, the meaning and message should not be tampered with.

Choosing a Bible: <http://www.anchorlife.org/bible/htm/study-bible.htm> p1 of the present researcher is convinced that Dynamic Equivalence is a good method of translating the Bible. The method of Dynamic Equivalence “is a thought for thought translation” that translates Biblical words and phrases into clear and contemporary equivalents. Priority is on the intended meaning along with comprehension.

These translations are easy to read and faithful to the original message. In a few instances the original meaning of the text is not conveyed clearly. This causes the

translation to other languages to falter if the source text is not up to the required standard.

In this mini-dissertation, clarity is needed as to why the research is urgently needed.

Nida (1960)

Preparations and explanations were unnecessary because the language had to be made simple and less idiomatic, to be understood by the common people; primitive and all the people everywhere.

The message of the Bible should not be compromised to satisfy people. Normally a good translation will not need a lengthy glossary of words. According to the researcher, the message of the Bible should not be compromised; only the truth and the correct 'Word' should be conveyed to the believers. This being the case, it will be appropriate to come up with an improved version, after thorough research has been done.

Nida (1960)

In addition to being a dynamic equivalence version, the *Good News Bible* is also what some call "Common Language" version... or to put it bluntly, its language level is that of the language used by uneducated people and children. Hence the readers feel that it is a Bible for the low class people, although it was not intended for that.

The researcher discovered that the message of the Bible should come up clearly and not be distorted. According to casual observations made during prayer meetings, many congregants detest the over simplification of the language used in *Bibele ya Taba ye Botse*. As such, people are not keen to use it, but rather prefer their old Bible translations, which are a real replica of the original Bible. Good News Bible:[http://www.bible – researcher.com/tev.htm/p.1](http://www.bible-researcher.com/tev.htm/p.1) of 8

Dynamic Equivalence was developed as a method to be followed in the translation of the Bible into the tongues of primitive tribes who were at that time being reached for the first time by missionaries. Although it attempted to reach out to the majority of the people, the intention is for it to be well understood by its readers.

According to the present researcher's discovery during Bible studies, some of the congregants are reluctant to use *Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse*. They are not happy with its translation; it is simplified to the extent that it becomes monotonous to the readers. Hence they resort to the English version, the *Good News Bible* that is not their mother tongue, for clarification of some concepts and verses. They forget that it was written for the primitive people and the uneducated. Leonardi {2000}.

Accordingly, when the Bible speaks of Revelation, the thought intended is of God the Creator actively disclosing to men his power and glory, his nature and character, his will, ways and plans - in short, himself-in order that men may know him.

The book of Revelation contains a disclosure of God being as revealed to the people or His creation. This is clearly portrayed, but the language used needs improvement to bring about the envisaged message. Further research is recommended. Douglas (1982)

The Book of Revelation: The entire book is the exact description of a revelation or vision that John received from God. The revelation is mainly about the last days before the end of the world, and about the final struggle between Christ and Satan.

Clarification on the book of Revelation is accepted to an extent. Looking at the entire book, its translation is not that expected by the perpetrators of Dynamic Equivalence.

The need for further research and another edition is obvious. Hale (1999)

Translators such as David (1986) argued in the following way: "We urge our readers to avoid the *Good News Bible* and to be careful not to give money to support its distribution". "May God open the eyes of many today of these fearful facts about Bible translation work, and may many take an open and bold stand against such error."

The present researcher's contribution is that we should not discredit the work of Dr Bratcher completely because there is a lot of good in his translation, ours is to

improve on it. It is rather too harsh to discourage people from reading it or even to affiliate to the society. Let us continue with our research and make contributions, input and improvements on *Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse*, ignoring Bratchers' criticisms of its source text. David (1986)

Communicative translation(Dynamic Equivalence) is social, concentrates on the message and the main force of the text, tends to under-translate ,to be simple ,clear and brief, and is always written in a natural and resourceful style. A semantic translation(Formal Translation) is normally inferior to its original ,as there is both cognitive and pragmatic loss....At a pinch ,a semantic translation has to interpret, a communicative translation to explain .

The dynamic equivalence method of translation used in the translation is the best method because the language is simplified ,but over-simplification lead to the distortion of the meaning and message of the Bible .*Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse* is over simplified as such it is inferior to its source text ,the examples given from the target text is proof enough to illustrate the point .Newmark{ 1991 }

Conclusion

Many of our languages have been neglected and marginalized in the past and are, as a result, not well developed. As such, they are without established translation traditions.

Very little research in Dynamic Equivalence translation in Sepedi has been done, hence the translation is not wholeheartedly welcome. This shows the urgent need for qualified researchers and translators, especially for the Dynamic Equivalence studies in African Languages.

Dynamic Equivalence translation is not an easy task, hence difficult untranslatable terms are adopted rather than translated. The technical terms are better adopted from another language because then they will not be confused with informal expressions used in our everyday spoken language. God inspires every word in the Bible.

Sometimes it seems that the advocates of “Dynamic Equivalence” think that ordinary people are of low intelligence, and that is fallacy. The truth is, it is done in such a way that all should benefit. Translators should stick to the truth and the real message of the ‘Word’. Bible translators also have to be trained in this field. The translators are to be chosen on their recognized expertise.

CHAPTER 4

DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE METHOD OF TRANSLATION AS USED IN

BIBELE YA TABA YE BOTSE

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Having given all methods of translation with examples, I restrict myself to the Dynamic Equivalence method of translation as this is the purpose of the research .To investigate the problem of dynamic equivalence in the translation of the Good News Bible to Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse with special reference to the book of Revelation. Dynamic equivalence was developed by the linguist Eugene Nida for the translation of the Bible .He insisted that only this approach could create an approachable, meaningful Bible for the masses.

Hence the Sepedi translators of Bibele Ya Taba Ye Botse, opted for the dynamic equivalence method of translation. They thought that, it would succeed and be of help to the Sepedi speaking people and those who have interest in the language.

The interesting approach developed for God's Word translation is called closest natural equivalence translation .They provide readers with meaning, equivalent to the SL.

They express meaning naturally in a way that the native English speaker would have spoken or written. Meaning is expressed in a way that is as close as possible to the

way the SL expressed the meaning. The same is expected from the translation of the Good News Bible to Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse. This is a “thought for thought” translation that translates the biblical words and phrases into clear and contemporary English equivalents

The priority is on the intended meaning along with comprehension. These translations are easy to read and faithful to the original message. There is a drawback that the original meaning of the text is conveyed clearly.

(<http://www.anchorlife.org/bible/html/study-bible.htm>) Accessed 02/09/2005

The American linguist Eugene Nida is usually mentioned in connection with “dynamic equivalence method of translation. He was preoccupied with the problems of translating the Bible into the tongues of the primitive tribes who were at that time being reached for the first time by Christian missionaries, and with the need for new approaches to deal with the kind of linguistic constraints that made translations into these languages so difficult, for example the Sepedi Bible is not for the language speakers only, but it is for all those who have interest in the language, it is for “all people everywhere”.

Eugene Nida’s intention was to have a simple Bible, obviously one that will not require explanations or any introductory preparation of the readers; the versions would have to be made as simple and idiomatic as possible—not only because of the languages, but because of the primitive cultural state of people who spoke these languages. The Bible is delivered to the people in such a form that it may be immediately understood by the common people. Omission of the key word distorts the message and the meaning thereof.

For example :

Revelation 9:5

Kutullo 9:5

5. The locusts were not allowed to kill.

5. Ya laelwa gore e se ba bolaye.

The Sepedi translation is incomplete because of the omission of the word “locust”.

“Ya laelwa gore e se bolaye” .

Then you ask yourself a question; what is it that is instructed not to kill ?

Is it a snake or a lion?

It would be a better translation if the sentence was written as follows:

Ditšie tša laelwa gore di se ba bolaye.

This will also help those who are not the speakers of the language but having an interest in using the Sepedi Bible: "Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse". Because of the omission the dynamic equivalence method of translation has not succeeded in bringing out the intended meaning of the source text. From the Sepedi Bible we find the use of formal translation ,which is word –for- word translation, which is not encouraged when using dynamic equivalence method of translation ,which is phrase-for-phrase translation.

For example:

Listen! I stand at the door and knock;
Theeletšang! Ke ema mojako ka kokota;

In Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse complete dynamic equivalence is expected to be clearly portrayed, but unfortunately we see nearly all methods of translation present in the Bible

The following is a true replica of formal translation. Hence the readers and users of the Bible registers their dissatisfaction.

The following translation is not acceptable because it does not represent what is meant by the source text well. .

For example:

ST: Revelation 6:6

A litre of wheat for a day's wages

TT: Kutullo 6:6

Serotwana se tee sa mabele se rekwa ka papetlana ya silibera

Suggestion: Let it be translated to:

Tefo ya letšatši le tee ka lithara ya mabele

This is a better dynamic equivalence method of translation.

Dynamic equivalence is the opposite approach of literal translation. Its goal is to transfer the same meaning and impact to a modern reader than the original would have to its original readers. It departs from a literal translation for a number of reasons

- (1) Idioms used,
- (2) Words that have several meanings, which you must choose from based on a combination of context and grammar,
- (3) Words that have no direct equivalent in English, so that they are best rendered by a phrase or by choosing a different wording.
- (4) Differences in grammatical and stylistic conventions.

Some translations especially the Good News Bible will go on a whole paragraph as a single sentence. This is not the way we write, and most people find it very confusing to read. But there is a cost to this, too. You often lose features of the original form, particularly in poetic passages.

For example:

From the Good News Bible

Revelation 2:23

I will also kill her followers, and then all the churches will know that I am the one who knows everyone's thoughts and wishes. I will repay each of you according to what you have done.

Go tšwa go Bibe le ya Taba Ye Botse.

Kutullo 2:23

Le gona ke tla bolaya balatedi ba gagwe ka bolwetši bja leuba .Ke mo diphuthego ka moka ditlago tseba gore ke nna ke tsebago tša ka pelong ya motho gabotse

Yo mongwe le yo mongwe wa lena ke tla mo otlaga go ya ka tše a di dirilego.

i) I will also kill his followers,

Ke tla bolaya balatedi ba gagwe **ka bolwetši bja leuba**

ii) and all the churches will know

ke mo diphuthego ka moka ditlago tseba

iii) that I am the one who knows everyone's thoughts and wishes

gore ke nna ke tsebago tša ka pelong ya motho gabotse

iv) I will repay each of you according to what you have done

Yo mongwe le yo mongwe wa lena ke tla mo otlaga go ya ka tše a

di dirilego

The ST has a very long sentence but incomplete. The TT version tells us how the followers of those who practice sexual immorality will be punished ; In the Sepedi Bible as shown in i) the reason for their punishment is indicated how the people will be punished ;

Namely: **ka bolwetši bja leuba.**

The reason for their punishment is not given in the ST as such there is an omission which is not acceptable. On the other hand one is tempted to ask the question , why does the Sepedi translators give the reason whilst the Source Text is without the reason.

We are not to add or to reduce the Word of God; this is clearly stated in the book of Revelation 22:18&19

18.” I John warn everyone who hears the prophetic words of this book : If anyone adds anything to them, God will add to this punishment the plagues described in this book.

19. And if anyone takes away from this prophetic words of this book, God will take away from them their share of fruit of the tree of life and of the Holy City which are described in this book”.

Translators of the Bible are warned in advance, not to add to this book nor to remove anything from it to distort the message of the Almighty God. Features of the original form are lost, most translations are a compromise between the two methods of translation. The Good News Bible is said to be a pure dynamic equivalence translation.

Its sole aim is to give accurate account of the meaning ,but nothing about the word choice or sentence form.

4.2 Conclusion

In the examples given above dynamic equivalence method of translation as the method used in the translation of the two Bibles “The Good News Bible” and “Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse” has not been successfully utilized to bring out the envisaged meaning. This is because of the inaccurate translation of words and omission of some key words and sentences. In some cases the ST is accurate and economic when using the semantic translation meanwhile the TT is inaccurate and uneconomic, the meaning is obscured.

There is a need for further research on dynamic equivalence method of translation for Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse. Its translators had eyes set on the readership hence the under-translation. More general words are used in the interest of clarity, simplicity and sometimes brevity, which compelled them to ‘omit’ to translate words altogether. A translator has to account for every word, which is not translated. It is important to notice that Nida was not primarily concerned with English translations. He was preoccupied with the problems of translating the Bible into the tongues of primitive tribes which were at that time done by Christian missionaries, and with the need for new approaches to deal with the kind of linguistic constraints into these languages so difficult..

CHAPTER 5

QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Christians take Scripture very seriously and assert that the Bible is not merely a Book, but the embodied Word of God. For such Christians the Bible is “breathed out by God”. (2 Timothy 3:16) and is therefore extremely important that it is properly handled. A poor translation can manipulate the original meaning of the text without giving proper consideration to matters of its historical or cultural context. A good translation is especially important to those unable to read the original texts (which are in Koine Greek, ancient Hebrew, and Aramaic), since they will typically be unable to check for themselves what the original said. The questionnaire samples on Biblele ya Taba Ye Botse were in Sepedi as target population for the envisaged research is Sepedi speaking congregants.

The outcome of this research was to demonstrate the problem of dynamic equivalence in the translation of the Bible with reference to the Book of Revelation.

The success of this research will lead us to the most improved translation of the Good News Bible to Biblele ya Taba Ye Botse. We have new emerging translators who are knowledgeable and well qualified in this field. They will come up with the revised Biblele ya Taba Ye Botse

5.1.1 Questionnaire responses

	No. of copies received from congregants per church.			
Congregants	Protestant	Charismatic	Apostolic	No.of copies distributed per Church
Adults	13	10	11	15
Youth	10	9	10	15
Aged	8	6	7	10
Total	25	28	28	40

Total number of copies distributed per congregation was 40. But the totals displayed above shows how each church responded.

5.2 Research findings from the three denominations:

Questionnaire Analysis

5.2.1 Protestant Church

Copies received	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Questions	
13	5	7	3	10	10	9	9	11	10	3	5	3	10	12	11	12	5	7	8	7	157	Adults
10	6	5	9	2	5	6	4	5	6	8	7	8	5	7	5	6	7	9	7	6	123	Youth
8	7	6	5	7	6	4	5	4	7	5	6	3	5	6	4	4	7	7	6	5	109	Aged
31	18	18	17	19	21	19	18	20	23	16	18	14	20	25	20	22	19	23	21	18	389	Total

5.2.2 Charismatic Church

Copies received	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Questions	
10	3	3	4	5	5	6	7	2	8	3	3	8	7	6	5	4	6	8	7	6	106	Adults
9	2	3	2	6	7	7	5	3	6	2	2	7	8	6	4	3	6	6	6	5	96	Youth
6	2	2	3	4	4	5	5	2	4	3	3	5	4	5	2	2	5	4	5	6	75	Aged
25	7	8	9	15	16	18	17	7	18	8	8	20	19	17	11	9	17	18	18	17	277	Total

5.2.3 Apostolic Church

Copies Received	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Questions	
11	4	3	6	7	7	5	6	3	8	4	4	8	9	8	3	3	8	7	9	8	120	Adults
10	2	3	3	5	6	6	5	2	6	4	4	8	7	8	4	3	7	8	8	6	105	Youth
7	2	2	3	4	6	5	6	3	5	3	4	5	4	5	5	2	5	6	5	6	86	Aged
28	8	8	12	16	19	16	17	8	19	11	12	21	20	21	12	8	20	21	22	20	311	Total

- The summary of the three denominations in respect of questions 2 and 4 .
Their responses are negative, which is proof enough that “Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse” is not popular.

5.3 Analysis based on the two key questions of the questionnaire :

Question 4

Phetolelo ya Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse ke ya maemo a fase kudu.

Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse’s standard of translation is too low.

	Adults	Youth	Aged	Total	Copies received	Percentage
Protestants	10	2	7	19	31	61%
Charismatic	5	6	4	15	25	60%
Apostolic	7	5	4	16	28	57%

The percentage of the people not satisfied with the translation of “Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse” is high.

61% of the Protestants say the standard of translation of the Bible is too low.

60% of the Charismatics are of the same opinion; they are worried about the standard of the translation.

57% of the Apostolics are dissatisfied with the translation of “Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse”

Question 2

Ke kwešiša Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse go phala diphetolelo tše dingwe

I understand Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse’s translation better than other translations,

	Adults	Youth	Aged	Total	Copies received	Percentage
Protestants	7	5	6	18	31	58%
Charismatic	3	3	2	8	25	32%
Apostolic	3	3	2	8	28	28,5%

18 out of 31 from the Protestants said they understand Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse

8 out of 25 from the Charismatics said they understand Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse

8 out of 28 From the Apostolics said they understand Bibele ya Taba Ye Botse

This shows that the majority of the people are not happy with the translation.

5.4 Recommendations :

According to the statistics given above in question 4 people who are in favour of Bibelet ya Taba Ye Botse are very few and those who disregard the translation are in the majority.

I therefore suggest that a revised version of Bibelet ya Taba Ye Botse be written. That will improve the standard of the present Bible which is not used by many people. Dynamic equivalence method of translation compromised the Sepedi Bible by over simplifying it to the extent of not delivering the envisaged meaning and message of the Bible. The percentages of the different denominations of the different churches in question 4 are a clear indication of why I suggest the new version, the percentages are high, congregants are not satisfied with the translation.

Question 2 is more on the positive side, I thought more people will respond positively, as people go for more simplified versions. Some stated that "*Bibelet ye e phalwa ke ya rena ya kgale, polelo ya gona ga ya hlaka*". They were not satisfied with the language used and they emphatically said the old "Bibelet" is the best. This is proof enough that congregants are not happy with the translation. Let us opt for the modern revised Bibelet ya Taba Ye Botse that will make the Sepedi Language speakers, and those who love the language proud.

5.5 Conclusion:

"A translator with his eyes on his readership is likely to under-translate, to use more general words in the interest of clarity, simplicity and sometimes brevity, which makes him 'omit' to translate words altogether"
Newmark(1988:80)

The above quotation is true because of what I discovered in the book of Revelation 9:5-6; under-translation took place. Words are omitted, for example:

'Ya laelwa gore e se bolaye, fela e ba hlokofofatše dikgwedi tše tlhano.....'

Then you start to wonder what is it that they are talking about ,is it a snake or a lion ?

It is a locust.

The English version states it clearly:

‘The locusts were not allowed to kill this people, but only to torture them for five months.....’

The dynamic equivalence method of translation is not successfully used in the translation of Bible ya Taba Ye Botse. A poor translation can manipulate the original meaning of the text without giving proper consideration to matters of its historical or cultural context

The success of this research will lead to the most improved translation of the Good News Bible to Bible ya Taba Ye Botse. New emerging translators who are knowledgeable and well qualified in this field are prepared to embark on this project .They will improve the standard of Bible ya Taba Ye Botse that will attract all the language speakers and those who would like to study the language .

Thanks to the translators who made a start ,and came up with the Good News Bible Translation .Translation is not static but dynamic, improvements are to be made to enrich the language.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bible: Bible Society of South Africa. 2000. *Good News Bible*. Cape Town: Bible Society of South Africa.

David, W. Cloud 1986. *A Most Frightful Deception*. Port Huron: Way of Life Literature.

Douglas, J.D. 1982. *New Bible Dictionary, 2nd ed.* Leceister: Intervarsity Press.

Hale, T.D. 1999. *The Applied New Testament Commentary*. Eastbourne: Kingsway Publications.

Bibele: Lekgotla La Bibele La Afrika Borwa, 2000. *Bibele Taba Ye Botse*. Cape Town: Bible Society of South Africa.

Leornadi, V. 2000. Equivalence in Translation Between Myth and Reality. *Translation Journal*, Volume 4, No. 4.

<http://www.anchorlife.org/bible/htm/study-bible.htm>. Accessed on 27.09.2005.

Good News Bible: <http://www.bible-research.com/tev.htm/>.

Marlow, M.D. 2005. www.bible-researcher.com/tev.htm/.

Newmark, P. 1991. *A Textbook of Translation*. Oxford : Prentice Hall

Nida, E. 1960. *Message and Mission*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Nida, E. 1964. *Towards a Science of Translation*. Leiden: Brill.

Zondervan (s.a.) *Bible Translations*. www.zondervanbibles.com/translations.

Accessed on 24.10.2005

7. BOITSEBIŠO

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Swaya ka sefapano mo go nyakegago gona (šomiša pene ye talalerata goba ye ntsho)

Please mark with a cross where necessary (use a blue or black pen)

1.Bong/Gender		Monna/Male <input type="checkbox"/>		Mosadi/Female <input type="checkbox"/>
2. O belegwe neng? 2.Date of birth	Letšatši/Day	Kgwedi/Month	Ngwaga/Year	
3.Maemo a gago ka kerekeng ke afe? 3.What is your position in Church	Ke setho <input type="checkbox"/> Member	Ke mogolo <input type="checkbox"/> Elder	Ke Modeakone <input type="checkbox"/> Deacon	Ke Moruti <input type="checkbox"/> Pastor /Reverend

<p>4. O tsena kereke efe?</p> <p>4. Where do you attend your church services ?</p>	<p>Protestant: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>For example: Uniting Reformed Church .</p>	<p>Charismatic: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>For example : Assemblies of God.</p>	<p>Apostolic: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>For example: Zion Christian Church</p>	
--	---	--	--	--

8. QUESTIONNAIRE (SEPEDI VERSION)

The questionnaire samples on *Bibele Taba ye Botse* will be in Sepedi as the target population for the envisaged research is Sepedi speaking congregants.

BIBELE YA TABA YE BOTSE

Taelo: Araba ka botshepegi ka mokgwa wo o ka kgonago ka gona. Lokologa, ga go na

Karabo ye e phošagetšego goba ye e nepagetšego. Kgetho ke ya gago.

Key:

1 Strongly Disagree (SD)	1 <i>Ke tiišitše ga ke dumele</i>
2 Disagree (D)	2 <i>Ga ke dumele</i>
3 Neutral (N)	3 <i>Ke magareng</i>
4 Agree(A)	4 <i>Ke a dumela</i>

5 Strongly Agree (SA)	5 <i>Ke dumela ke tiišitše</i>
-----------------------	--------------------------------

1. <i>Ke bala Bibe le ya Taba ye Botse ka mehla.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
2. <i>Ke e kwešiša go phala diphelelo tše dingwe.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
3. <i>Bibe le ya Taba ye Botse e bothata.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
4. <i>Phetolelo ya Bibe le ya Taba ye Botse ke ya maemo a fase kudu.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
5. <i>Polelo le mantšu, kudu bukeng ya Kutullo, ga di kwešišege gabotse.</i>	1	2	3	4	5

6.Molaetša ga o tšwelele gabonolo.	1	2	3	4	5
7.Tšweletšo ya mantšu a matelele e dira gore mmadi a se kgahlwe ke go e bala.	1	2	3	4	5
8.Ditemana tše pedi ge di hlahlagantšhitšwe di timetša babadi (phuthego). Kutullo1: 4-5 e le temana ya go hlahlagana.	1	2	3	4	5
9.Nna ke wo mongwe wa bao ba sa nyakego go reka Bibeke ya Taba ye Botse.	1	2	3	4	5
10.Ke rekile Bibeke ya Taba ye Botse ,fela ga ke sa e bala ka mehla. Ke boetše go Bibeke ya kgale.	1	2	3	4	5
11..Ke rata Bibeke ya Taba ye Botse ka gore le ngwana/motho wa go ithuta go bala o a e kwešiša.	1	2	3	4	5
12.Go thwe Bibeke ya Taba Ye Botse e ngwaletšwe basokologi (Primitive tribes) (Vanessa Leonardi, 2000) le (Nida, 1960) Naa o dumelelana le taba ye?	1	2	3	4	5

13. <i>Dikereke ga di hlohleletse diphuthego go e reka. Ke nnete naa?</i>	1	2	3	4	5
14. <i>Ke rata go bala “Good News Bible” e sego Bibeleya Taba ye Botse ka Sepedi</i>	1	2	3	4	5
15. <i>Ga ke dumele tšhomišo ya lentšu le: ‘mmagodigweba- kathobalano’ ke le le telele kudu. (Kutullo 17:5)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
16. <i>Lentšu la 15 le amogelebile, le ge le sa šomišwe ke Bapedi gantšhi.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
17. <i>Tšhišinyo a go šomišwe: “mmago diotswa”/ “mmago dihlola”.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
18. <i>Phetolelo ye: “The Harvest of the Earth” GNT go ya go “Pono ya kahlolo ya mafelelo” Bibeleya Taba ye Botse. Kutullo 14:14 E nepagetše naa?</i>	1	2	3	4	5
19. <i>Tšhišinyo: “Puno lefaseng” o kwana nayo naa?</i>	1	2	3	4	5

<p>20.Go phetolelo ye ya “ BibeLe ya Taba ye Botse” Kutullo 9:11 Re hwetša tše di latelago : matšatši ao a seket le makgolo a mabedi le masome a selelago. Good News Translation Revelation 9:11 we read: 1260 days. Tšhišinyo: “matšatši a 1260” ke bona e le ya maleba, wena o reng?</p>	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

8. QUESTIONNAIRE (ENGLISH VERSION)

The questionnaire samples on *Bibele Ya Taba ye Botse* will be in Sepedi as the target population for the envisaged research is Sepedi speaking congregants.

BIBELE YA TABA YE BOTSE

Instruction: Answer the following questions. Be free and honest, there is no correct or wrong answer.

Key:

1 Strongly Disagree (SD)	1 <i>Ke tiišitše ga ke dumele</i>
2 Disagree (D)	2 <i>Ga ke dumele</i>
3 Neutral (N)	3 <i>Ke magareng</i>
4 Agree(A)	4 <i>Ke a dumela</i>
5 Strongly Agree (SA)	5 <i>Ke dumela ke tiišitše</i>

1.I read BibeLe ya Taba Ye Botse daily.	1	2	3	4	5
2.I understand it better than other translations	1	2	3	4	5
3.BibeLe ya Taba Ye Botse is difficult	1	2	3	4	5
4.The translation of BibeLe ya Taba Ye Botse is of low standard.	1	2	3	4	5
5.The language and the words, especially the book of Revelation, they are difficult to understand.	1	2	3	4	5
6.The message is not clear.	1	2	3	4	5

7. Long words are not comprehensible	1	2	3	4	5
8. Two verses in one confuse the congregation e.g. Revelation 1:4-5.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I am one of those who does not want to buy Bibeles ya Taba YE Botse.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I bought Bibeles ya Taba ye Botse but I do not read it on a daily basis. I prefer the old translation.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I like Bibeles ya Taba Ye Botse because even a child /person who is learning the language understands it.	1	2	3	4	5
12. It is said that Bibeles ya Taba Ye Botse is for the Primitive tribes (Vanessa Leonardi, 2000) and (Nida, 1960) Do you agree?	1	2	3	4	5
13. Congregants are not encouraged to buy Bibeles ya Taba Ye Botse. Is it true?	1	2	3	4	5
14. I like to read the "Good News Bible" and not Bibeles ya Taba Ye Botse.	1	2	3	4	5

<p>15.I do not like the use of this word :“mmagodigwebakathobalano” it is a long word (Revelation 17 : 5)</p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>16. The word used in 15 is acceptable, but it is not often used by the Sepedi speaking people.</p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>17.I suggest the word : “mmago diotswa or mmago dihloa”</p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>18. The translation “The Harvest of the Earth” GNT to “Pono ya kahlolo ya mafelelo” Bibe le ya Taba Ye Botse, Kutullo14:14 Is it the correct translation?</p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>19. Suggestion “Puno lefaseng” Do you agree that this is the best translation?</p>	1	2	3	4	5
<p>20. According to the translation “Bibe le ya Taba Ye Botse” Revelation 9: 11 .It is written : “matsatsi ao a sekete le makgolo a mabedi a masome a selelago” The GNT translation in Revelation 9:11 Is written : “ 1260 days” Suggestion for “Bibe le ya Taba Ye Botse”: “matsatsi a 1260”. this is the correct and relevant translation. Do you agree?</p>	1	2	3	4	5