

**AN ANALYSIS OF SEMANTIC AND LEXICAL ERRORS OF TRANSLATING
THE NEW TESTAMENT FROM ENGLISH INTO KISWAHILI: A CASE STUDY
OF BIBLIA YA MAFUNZO YA UZIMA TELE**

JUMBA KENNEDY SALANO

**A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF
MASTERS OF ARTS IN TRANSLATION**

**CENTRE FOR TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION
UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI**

NOVEMBER, 2018

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this is my own work and does not contain other people's work or my own previous work except where due reference has been made in the text. In addition, I certify that no part of this work has been previously submitted for the award of any other degree or diploma in my name in any university or other tertiary institution.

Signed

Date

Jumba Kennedy Salano

Y61/7532/2017

This dissertation has been submitted for examination with the approval of the following

University supervisors:

Signed

Date

DR ALICE WACHIRA

Signed

Date

MR JOHN PAUL WARAMBO

DEDICATION

To my late mother Mary Lyosi and father Mzee Joram Jumba for their exceptional inspiration.

My dear wife Emily Wanjiru for her motivation and prayers.

My spiritual parents Bishop Nuthu and Rev. Jane Nuthu for their support.

My Primary School teacher Mr. Jimmy N'gotho for believing in my potential and lastly my high school principal the Late Professor Lawrence Mukiibi for inculcating in me a sense of purpose and focus in life.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Ebenezer! Is the term I can use to express my heartfelt gratitude to my Lord God for His grace that has proved to be sufficient during my studies. His divine empowerment has been the source of my motivation to complete this Translation Course. Secondly, to my dear wife Emily who has always not only prayed for me but encouraged me to fight on till the end. I also want to register my sincere appreciation to the Center of Interpretation and Translation Director Professor Jayne Mutiga for her mind stretching attitude that kept my cohort on our toes to finish this academic race. I will never forget her academic red flag pet word 'Can't fly' which to me not only acted as a catalyst to widen my scope of thinking but it also propelled me to work hard and smart in completing my thesis. Good God bless you Prof ! Special thanks also to my supervisors Dr. Alice Wachira and Mr. Paul Warambo for going out of their way to help me fine tune my research paper so as to meet the required scholarly threshold. Moreover, I am indebted to my other able lecturers namely Dr Ngure, Dr . Otiso, Dr. Marete, Mr Karani and Mr Gitonga . I will forever treasure your valuable input in shaping me into becoming an effective and competent translator. Mungu awabariki sana nyote !

And to my comrades, you've not only been supportive to me personally but demonstrated beyond any reasonable doubt to be a great God fearing scholarly team! Bernard, Carol, Christine, Damaris, Faith, Grace, Ivy, James, Kalu, Kader, Maureen, Muhoho, Sammy and Ruth. May the Lord grant you victory as you purpose to make a difference in the market place. Thanks a lot also to the CTI staff, cool Purity, ever smiling Evans, and diligent Gertrude. Your contribution to my success cannot go unnoticed. May the Lord grant you favor in all that you endeavor to do.

Finally, Special tribute to Bishop Muhuko of Kenya Assemblies of God Extension Bible School and Members of KAG Kariobangi Church for allowing me to take a special one year sabbatical leave so as complete my studies.

Mwisho Kabisa:

Wakalimani na watafsiri, kituoni tumefika
Makali tumepokea, toka kwa wahadhiri wetu
Sasa kilichobaki, ni kwetu kujitosa uwanjani
Tutekeleze tulojifunza , kwa uaminifu na bidii
Tofauti tuilete, katika kutafsiri na ukalimani
Bwana awe nanyi wapendwa, Kokote muendapo duniani!

TABLE OF CONTENT

DECLARATION	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
TABLE OF CONTENT	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
ABBREVIATIONS.....	viii
ABSTRACT	ix
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.1.1 Benchmarks of Quality and Effective Translation Work	5
1.1.2 History of Bible Translation	8
1.1.3 Kiswahili Bible Translation	11
1.2 Statement of the Problem	14
1.3 Objectives of the study	16
1.4 Research Questions	17
1.5 Rationale of the Study	17
1.6 Scope and Limitations	19
1.7 Theoretical Framework	20
1.8 Literature Review	22
1.9 Methodology.....	25
1.9.1 Data Source.....	25
1.9.2 Data Collection	26
1.9.3 Data Analysis	26
1.9.4 Conclusion	26
CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS OF BIBLE TRANSLATION.....	27
2.0 Introduction	27
2.1 Analysis of Bible Translation Theories	27
2.2 Formal Equivalence.....	27

2.3 Dynamic Equivalence.....	29
2.4 Semantic and Communicative Theory	32
2.5 Semantic Theory.....	34
2.6 Communicative Theory	34
2.7 Skopos Theory.....	37
CHAPTER THREE: DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF SEMANTIC AND LEXICON ERRORS IN RELATION TO BIBLE TRANSLATION	40
3.0 Introduction	40
3.1 Semantic and Lexical Analysis	40
3.2 Conceptual Meaning.....	41
3.3 Associative meaning.....	41
3.4 Lexical Relations Features	41
3.5 Translation Errors Defined.....	43
3.6 Type of Errors in Translation	44
CHAPTER FOUR: MITIGATION MEASURES THAT CAN BE USED TO DEAL WITH BIBLE TRANSLATION ERRORS.....	58
4.1 Introduction	58
4.2 Knowledge of both the SL and TL.....	58
4.3 Dealing with Semantic and Lexicon Errors.....	59
4.4 Borrowing.....	60
4.5 Modulation	60
4.6 Adaptation	61
4.7 Fidelity.....	61
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	63
5.1 Summary.....	63
5.2 Recommendations	65
5.3 Recommendations for Further Studies	65
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	66

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Difference between Semantic and Communicative Theory.....	36
Table 3.1: Over Translation.....	47
Table 3.2: Under Translation.....	48
Table 3.3: Literal translation	49
Table 3.4: Additional Error	51
Table 3.5: Under Translation Error	52
Table 3.6: More Examples of Translation Errors from Source Text to Target Text.....	53

ABBREVIATIONS

BT	Bible Translation
DE	Dynamic Equivalence
FE	Formal Equivalence
RL	Receptor language
SL	Source language
ST	Source text
TL	Target language
TT	Target Text
BMUZH	Bibilia ya Mafunzo ya Uzima Tele
NIV	New International Bible

ABSTRACT

This thesis investigated the semantic and lexical errors found in translation of the New Testament from English into Kiswahili with special analysis of the *Biblia ya Mafunzo ya Uzima Tele*. We generally dealt with the historical background of Bible translation in the first chapter. Similarly, detailed information concerning different translation theories and concepts that are essential to formulating an efficient strategy that will result into a satisfactory and authentic Bible translation were covered in Chapter two while the third chapter focused on the aspect of presenting specific examples of semantic and lexical errors from the *Biblia ya Mafunzo ya Uzima Tele*. We categorically highlighted omission, addition, under translation, over translation and literalness errors as found in different selected verses from the Book of Romans. We also discussed the effects of such semantic and lexical errors in interpretation of a text and subsequently mentioned practical measures that can be undertaken to overcome such translation challenges in Chapter Four. The last chapter culminates with findings, conclusions and future study recommendations that pertain to the entire research.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This research study delves into looking at semantic and lexical errors of translating the New Testament Bible from English into Kiswahili as portrayed in *Biblia ya Mafunzo ya Uzima, Tele* a Kiswahili version of the *NIV Full Life Study Bible*. The first chapter is mainly concerned with the background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives, and significance of the research study, the scope and limitation of the study, theoretical framework, the literature review and finally the methodology to be utilized in the study.

1.1 Background of the Study

The socio-economic and religious transformative nature of translation cannot, by all means, be underestimated. Jenie Gabriel (2017) shares a quote from an American Literature Professor George Steiner who once said: “Without translation, we would be living in provinces bordering on silence.” Steiner’s statement is a perfect demonstration of the value and importance of translation to human form of communication worldwide. Similarly, Gladies Burini in her article entitled, ‘*In Praise of Translators for the Great Work they’ve Done Over the Centuries,*’ (*Daily Nation 30/9/2017*) argued that translation apart from enhancing the capacity for people to transit from one language to another plays a very critical role in promoting literature, culture and individual decision making. Additionally Gerding Salas (200:1) while commenting on the same issue pointed out that the primary purpose of translation is to serve as a cross-cultural, bilingual communication vehicle among peoples and that the translator plays a pivotal role as a bilingual or multi-

lingual cross-cultural transmitter of culture and truths by attempting through all means and skills to interpret concepts and speeches faithfully and accurately.

But the question begs, what is translation? The origin of the word “translation” is the Latin term ‘Translatus’ which basically means transferred. Generally, the dictionary meaning of the word ‘translate’ is “to express or be capable of communicating in another language or dialect. In a more TL oriented perspective, Eugene Nida in his definition declares, ‘Translation involves the skill and ability to reproduce in the target language the nearest natural equivalent of the source text message, first in the form of meaning and secondly in style’ (Nida and Taber, 1982). New Mark (1988), a renowned translation theorist, describes translation as the rendition of the meaning of a text into another language in the way the original author intended the text to appear. He further expounds on this concept by asserting that it can be a science, an art as well as a skill. In nutshell, translation is a social science component of linguistic which major’s on conveying the meaning or meanings of a given source text from one language to another.

But on the other hand, many translation academicians have the conviction that it is not possible to attain an exact translation for there are no two languages that are similar in words or style. Edward Sapir (1995) cited by Susan Bassnett (2010) digs deeper into affirming this argument by explaining the differences in culture that make it difficult for translators to produce a similar translation from one SL to another TL. He concedes that no two languages are ever perfectly equal to be regarded as representing the same social context and that people live in varied environments and not just the same world with

different tags attached to it . It should also be noted that the considerable variation in language structure and vocabulary makes it more difficult to attain the goal of a perfect translation from one language to another (Klein W.William, Blomerg, Jr, Hubbard L. Robert 1993: 125).

Therefore, in the present sense of the term, translation describes both the process and the product of rendering text in one language into another equivalent language without losing the original intent of the source text and while considering the receptivity of the target readers. Roman Jakobson (1959/2004:139), a Russo-American structuralist stretches the discussion on the fundamentals of translation to a higher level by dividing translation into three categories that include:

1. Intralingual translation which deals with translation within the same language and which can involve rewording or paraphrasing.
2. Interlingua translation which consists of translation from one language to another and which can be considered as the most widely used form of translation worldwide.
3. Intersemiotic translation, which embodies conveyance of verbal signs by using nonverbal signs, i.e., through music or audiovisual.

In his view, Jacobson continues to emphasize that the central problem in these types of renditions is that while messages may serve as adequate interpretations of code units or messages, there is ordinarily no full equivalence in the field of translation. In other words, reaching a point of perfect equivalence is a problem faced by most translators in their relentless rendition efforts.

Moreover, Dryden (1680/1992:17) in the preface to his translation of *Ovid's Epistles* makes reduces translation into three categories: Firstly is the 'metaphase': which means 'word by word and line by line translation' and which on the other hand corresponds with formal translation. Secondly, the 'paraphrase' type of translation which he says gives the author an open platform or freedom in translation but also emphasizes the concept of keeping the original writer in perspective, so as never to be lost, but it should also be remembered that his ideas are not so strictly adhered to like his sense to sense theory which in essence means the changing of whole phrases and more or less corresponds to the faithful or sense-for-sense translation, he later mentions 'imitation' which means the translator's failure to use both the sentence to sentence or idea to idea approaches in rendition. On account of Dryden's discovery as outlined above, it is clear that translation as a field covers a wide spectrum that can be utilized by all stakeholders in their translation work.

Finally, it is also important to mention that many scholars have undertaken the responsibility of researching translation and consequently used different titles in connection to this field depending on their area of concentration. For instance, Lefere (1978) called it 'Translation Studies' Nida and Taber (1969) referred to it as "The Science of Translation' while Willis (1982) settled on the title 'Translation Science' and finally Hartman (1981) who opted the usage of the title 'Applied Translation Studies' which consist of translation Pedagogy and Translation criticism. All of these academic works were produced in the tireless effort of throwing more light and clarity concerning

translation as a discipline. In line with that, the term translation in this dissertation is therefore used in connection to the process and the end product of translation.

1.1.1 Benchmarks of Quality and Effective Translation Work

According to Bell (1991), a good translation is “that in which the merit of the original text has been infused into another target language in a manner that it can become distinctly understood and strongly accepted by a native of the country to which that language is associated with and also as it is by those who speak the language of the original work”. In her journal article on medical translation, Alice Carlos (2018) believes that to attain a satisfactory translation of good quality, a translator should strive to adhere to the following nuances:

- i) Accuracy – this refers to correct interpretation of the source message and transfer of the meaning of that message as precisely as possible in the TL by the receptor. Nida (1964) is of the opinion that there is no way of dealing with accuracy except regarding the extent to which the message gets across (or should presumably get across) to the intended receptor. He adds, “accuracy” is meaningless, if treated in isolation from actual decoding by individuals for which the message is intended. Bible translator should therefore strive to embrace the principle of accuracy in translating biblical texts from the ST to TL.
- ii) Clarity – According to Shuttleworth and Cowie (2014) clarity is a term used in the translation domain in reference to the degree under which a translation in the TT matches its original. They further cite Sager (1994:143) who believes that the aspect of accuracy in the science of translation is a challenging task and procedure which

has to be carefully carried out in a systematic manner that largely involves covering unit per unit followed by the scrutiny of the phrase, clause, sentence, paragraph, and finally the entire text. In other words, translation begs for the relayed message to be clear and understandable in a way that ordinary people will be able to comprehend. Shuttleworth and Cowie indicate that clarity in translation facilitates avoidance of confusion and ambiguity in any given text.

- iii) Naturalness—Typically, a good translation should not sound ‘unfamiliar’ in the TL. So as to make his translation as effective and acceptable the translator should endeavor to make his work as natural as possible in the receptor language. Nida’s (1964:164) interpretation of naturalness focused more on the translator sticking to the original intent of the SL text. To him, naturalness meant capturing the intent and the spirit of the original text. Beekman & Callow describes naturalness as “a requirement that helps in understanding a particularly given text” (1974:39). In essence, the translator should make every effort to render their work in a way that the TR will feel its naturalness without any struggle in comprehension. In other words a person engaged in translating should demonstrate naturalness by making sure their respondents react to their work just as the early Bible readers did as they read the Old and the New Testament. In doing that then the principle of naturalness as propagated by Nida will be taking its rightful position. In case of Bible Translation, naturalness comes into play when current recipients of scriptures respond in a similar manner that the earlier Jews or Gentiles responded when the same Word was being conveyed to them. If this is achieved, then the translator

would have arrived at the pinnacle of what this noble component of translation entails.

- iv) Acceptability – A good translation should be one that is acceptable by the TL recipients. Acceptability is when the SL respondent embrace the translated work without any doubt. It is a picture of sense of ownership to the finished product.

In some instances lack of acceptability is born out of the failure of the translator to meet the TL objectives that include readability and authenticity. It should be noted that when cloud of doubt is cast upon any translation piece by the TL readers then it automatically throws spanner into works and ultimately jeopardizes the entire completed translation and questions the competence, faithfulness and integrity of the translator. On the contrary, as the American poet *Henry Wadsworth* said, “A translator, like a witness on stand, should hold up his right hand and swear to tell the truth, and nothing but the truth. This should be even more practical to Bible translators who carry in them a gigantic task of telling the truth and nothing but the truth from one language to another with a sole purpose of seeing lives transformed in a holistic dimension.

In addition , Moises Silva (1990) also outlines the qualities of a good translation work by indicating that a successful translator requires (1) mastery of the sources language (2) excellent interpretation skills and breadth of knowledge so as not to miss the nuances of the original ; and (3) a very high aptitude for writing in the target language so as to express accurately both the cognitive and affective features of the message whereas Vinney and Darbelent wound up these key components in translation by unequivocally maintaining

that ‘professional translators must know all the nuances of the foreign language and have a full command of all the resources of their first language’ (1995:9). Essentially, a skilled and knowledgeable translator is the key determiner of any quality and successful translation work.

1.1.2 History of Bible Translation

The history of translation in its entirety cannot pass without the mention of the Bible Translation. The Bible which stands out as the most translated book in the entire world with over 1700 different languages of translation is made up of 66 divinely inspired books, authored by about 40 writers. The authors (most of them of Jewish background) lived in different geographical locations and in diverse circumstances in over a span of 1600 years (Mcghee and Jones, 1994).

Regarding its originality, Bible translation can be traced back to a time past when the Bible books were translated from Hebrew to Latin and later into Greek, and to English. Necessitated by the need to promote and disseminate the Christian Doctrine universally, Pope Damasus in the 4th Century commissioned Jerome who was a renowned Catholic scholar the responsibility of producing a one standardized Latin Bible translation. In A. D 400, Jerome culminated his work of translation, and his version which was known as the *editio vulgate* (the current text of the Holy Scripture) due to its usage by ordinary citizen and soldiers in the early medieval day, formed the current version of the Holy Scripture. It's also important to observe that the many translational discrepancies found in the New

Testament later compelled Jerome to engage in a revision of the Gospels using the available Greek manuscript which he successfully completed translating in 384 A.D.

In his earlier submission to the style of translation he used, Jerome supported the work done by Cicero by claiming that his rendition was also more inclined to thought for thought rather than literal translation of sentence for sentence. Apparently, the literal style of translation approach was perceived by the church as heretical in its interpretation. According to Bassenet (2010), this type of free stylistic Bible translation continued to be a stumbling block in the translation field for centuries.

In 1382 John Wycliffe, John Purvey, and Nicholas of Hereford collaborated to produce the first complete King James Bible in English from the Latin Vulgate which opened the floodgates for more English translations and which also resulted from a drastic change of opinion concerning the role of translation of the Bible in the church. But despite this ideological shift, Wycliffe and his followers, nicknamed "the Lollards" were termed as heretics and suffered persecution from the church. Purvey and Nicholas were forced by the church leaders to recant their work. In 1408, the Constitution of Oxford included a prohibition against Bible translation except with the authorization of church authorities.

From Wycliffe, came William Tyndale who is considered to be the father of modern Bible translation for his contribution in translating the Bible from Greek to English.

With a purpose of effectively helping their readers to fully understand what was in the original Hebrew and Greek Old Bible manuscripts, many of the translators had to overcome numerous translation challenges in order to provide a more understandable translation from

the source text to the target language. Two of the most significant challenges faced by early translators had everything to do with the contextual and semantic components. The Bible written in three languages, i.e., Hebrew, Aramaic (the Old Testament) and Greek (the New Testament) poses semantic and lexical challenges in translating the Biblical text. A near to the TL translation had to pass the test of considering these two factors in producing adequate and acceptable Bible translations to its readers.

But much emphasis is addressed on semantic and lexical elements which to a larger extent determines and unfolds the main purpose of a message in any narrative. The Collins English Dictionary defines semantics as a branch of linguistics concerned with the nature, the structure, and the development and changes of the meanings of speech forms, or with contextual meaning while lexical is described as the vocabulary of a language or an individual. The two features form what can be referred to as Biblical terminology which describes the special terms used to explain religious and theological words and phrases found in most Bible translations texts. Some examples include words like ‘grace’, ‘crucifixion’, ‘sacrament’ and ‘vicar. These terms and many others form part of the Christian faith terminology. An understating of such terminology make the work of Bible translation easier and relevant to the readers of any given translated text especially when it involves its interpretation.

Additionally, in Bible translation, it is also important to understand that hermeneutical and exegetical processes widely influence biblical terminology translation. Hermeneutic is a branch of theological studies that involves the principles of interpreting the Bible.

'Exegesis' on the other hand is a critical interpretation of any biblical text. The two components cannot be ignored when dealing with translation. In conclusion it is order to state that linguistic, cultural and contextual setting are factors highly considered in Bible translation.

1.1.3 Kiswahili Bible Translation

Johann Ludwig Krapf was a German Lutheran missionary and a linguist, who served with the Anglican Church Missionary Society in the coastal part of Kenya. He is credited with being the father of missions in the East Africa region arriving at a time when the continent of Africa was considered by many people abroad as a dark continent due to its lack of the Gospel and education. Clothed with a passion for reaching out to the local people in a language that they could easily understand, Krapf became the first person to translate the English Bible into Kiswahili language. He notably translated the New Testament and Genesis which is the first book of the Old Testament into Kiswahili. He further wrote the English – Kiswahili Dictionary. In following the footsteps of Dr. Krapf, Bishop Edward Steere from Zanzibar later on in 1891, undertook the massive task of translating the entire Bible into Kiswahili. Similarly, in his research paper on *Biblical Translations of Early Missionaries in East and Central Africa*, Viera PawlikovA-Villanova (2006) asserts that Krapf and other missionaries in general, laid a good foundation and standard to emulate for future Kiswahili Bible and other local languages written resources intended for translation.

The *Biblia ya Mafunzo ya Uzima Tele* which was published by Bible Societies of Kenya and Tanzania in 1997, is therefore, a Kiswahili version of the NIV Bible commentary called the *Full Life Study Bible*. Guthrie (2010) says that the New International Version Bible was established in 1978 through the efforts of 110 renowned theologians representing 34 different religious denominations who diligently participated in assessing the accuracy, clarity, and integrity of its translation into English.

It is in line with this translation objective that he indicates that the NIV strives to create a balance between formal and dynamic equivalence approach in translation while at the same time trying by all means to create a compromise with the current English speaker and reader. He finally reveals that in most cases the Dynamic Equivalence approach prevails over other theories. Above everything, it is imperative to acknowledge that the translation of Kiswahili version of the Bible is also an effort of the NIV authors to render the Scriptures in a language that can enhance the understanding of the truth to many Kiswahili readers in the East Africa region and beyond.

With that in mind, suffice to say that translation of the New Testament is a bit handled with extra caution by translators especially in the application of the thought by thought translation strategy. In essence, translators would want to achieve translations that are truthful and accurate as these are key elements of authentic work. It is in view of this that the New Testament scholars and translators have in the past embraced the key role played by lexicon and sentence structures of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek original Bible writings

in achieving this goal. In particular, they have in most cases advocated for Bible translation that goes beyond the literal translation approach.

Another important issue that pertains to the New Testament are in accordance with the standard of inclusivity that was applied to selecting the books of the Bible especially the New Testament books. The standard measures of authentication which were used were called canon. This is a Greek term that has a connotation of a general rule or principle in which something is judged or approved. Canonization is a reference to acceptable standard measures used to determine which Bible book was to be considered inspired and also included in the official books of the NT in the early apostolic church. The following qualities were used as key indicators for any book to be counted part of the Bible. First, the author must have been an apostle of Christ or a ministry partner. Secondly, the book must have agreed with the accepted and approved doctrinal teachings of the church. Thirdly, the book must have been Christ-centered in the sense that it emphasizes the works of Christ in relation to His redemptive plan. Fourthly, the book must have been divinely inspired Word of God. Finally, the book must have had a wide readership by communities of churches in those days. These are the canonization measures that were used for inclusion of the book of Romans in the New Testament Bible.

The book of Romans which was written by Paul in approximately 57 A.D, is the longest religious book written by the Apostle Paul in the New Testament. With an emphasis on the theme “the righteousness of God revealed” (Romans 1:17), Paul writes to the church in Rome with the primary purpose of unfolding the truth about the perfect and acceptable way

of relating with God. Rome was known as the heart of the Roman Empire and in addressing this cosmopolitan city; Apostle Paul intended to exhaustively explain the doctrine of salvation by faith to both the fundamental Jews and ignorant Gentiles. He engaged them in theologically and intellectually inspired discourse that cover a total of sixteen chapters in number. In this book, Paul wrote and taught on important Christian values that were critical to spiritual formation, growth, and sustainability. This was not only meant for believers in Rome but also to other Christians across the world (Romans 12-16). The book of Romans thus plays a pivotal role in explaining the Christian doctrine of salvation and forms a significant basis of motivation to the researcher to study its translation in the Kiswahili version.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

History of translation will be deemed unfair and unjust if a blind eye is given to the translation of the Bible especially from English to Kiswahili. Scriptural translation has a primary purpose of transferring the Inspired Word of God to the people in a style and language they can easily comprehend and understand. The pragmatic element of Bible translation which embodies the correct interpretation of scripture and whose outcome is the dissemination of sound doctrine to the believers defines an ideal and adequate Bible translation version. In achieving this objective, translators should diligently endeavor to embrace and maintain an attitude of being faithful to the meaning and setting of the original text to avoid issues of translation inadequacies.

But the emergence of hundreds of different Bible translations in the current free market may be a significant setback to the integrity of the scripture hence sabotaging the agenda of the making God known to all people. It is still worth noting that while the original Bible manuscript had no errors, the translations that are currently available are capable of containing translation errors that may have occurred due to translators' limitations, human error, oversight or lack of knowledge in both the source and targeted languages. Given these likely pitfalls, this research paper seeks to identify possible semantic and lexical challenges of translation depicted in the English to Kiswahili translation of the book of Romans. A good example of such challenges is demonstrated in the rendition of Romans 8:22 where the NIV text reads " And we know that the whole creation has been groaning as in the pains of childbirth right up to the present time." In the equivalence rendition efforts, the translators of the Kiswahili version stated, "Kwa maana twajua ya kuwa viumbe vyote pia vinaugua utungu pamoja hata sasa" (Romans 8:22). In analyzing this text, one realizes a semantic gap in translating the terms "in the pains of childbirth" which the translators could have possibly encountered and which if worked on appropriately could have read "uchungu wa kujifungua mtoto" instead of only the word 'utungu.' utungu is a word borrowed from a certain Kiswahili dialect which means pain. But it is clear that the translators omitted the aspect of 'child' in their rendition of this text hence affecting how the TL understood the text.

Similarly, Romans 6:14 is a reflection of an omission error in the TL translation where the Bible says; "For sin shall not be your master, because you are not under the law, but under grace. The BMUZZ render it as: "Kwa maana dhambi haitawatawala ninyi kwasababu

hamwi chini ya sheria, balii chini ya neema.” The underlined word in TL has an omission of the letter ‘U’ which directly affects its meaning and interpretation. Probably the translators intentionally used the term ‘hamwi’ to fit a certain group of Kiswahili speakers that they were targeting. But so as to accommodate a wider population of Kiswahili readers and for clarity purposes it would have been appropriate to include the letter ‘u’ which would have resulted into the word to read ‘ hamuwi’ . Such errors and limitations conveyed in translation work to an extent do influence the acceptability and readability of the Bible among some Kiswahili speakers and can become a huge challenge to the transformative purpose of God’s Word. The errors can also pause as a big bottleneck to the readability and interpretation of the Kiswahili Bible.

Having said that, it is right to admit that BMUZT contains some semantic and lexical errors which can be corrected in order to offer a better and adequate Kiswahili Bible commentary translation of the Old and the New Testament this is what in this research we seek to explore and strive to accomplish.

1.3 Objectives of the study

This research study intends to:

- i) Identify specific semantic and lexical errors of translation from English to Kiswahili as depicted in selected verses from the New Testament Book of Romans.
- ii) Analyze the effects of gaps mentioned above to scriptural readership and interpretation.

- iii) Establish possible mitigation and harmonization strategies that will improve the quality of Bible translation from English into Kiswahili.

1.4 Research Questions

- i) What are the specific semantic and lexical errors evident in translating the New Testament book of Romans from English into Kiswahili?
- ii) What are the effects of lexical and semantic gaps of translation on the readership and interpretation of the scriptures?
- iii) What are the appropriate mitigation strategies that can be employed by translators in addressing the above-mentioned pitfalls of translation?

1.5 Rationale of the Study

The Word of God was never meant to be complicated. The incarnation of Christ (The act of God appearing in the form of man) is a clear description of how God in His sovereignty decided to demystify the concept of divinity by allowing His Son to come into the world in the form of man so as to redeem mankind from eternal condemnation (John 3:16). In relation to this perspective, Arthur (2017) argues that the incarnation of Christ provides for the possibility of translation and indicates that in becoming and leaving heaven for the earth Jesus made a cross-cultural journey which is beyond human imagination and which underscores the truth that there is no human language or culture which cannot appropriate the truth of God's Word in Christ.

Similarly, Bible translation should be conveyed and relayed in simplicity and in a manner that is understandable and easy to interpret. In order to achieve this, the New Testament which fundamentally plays a significant role in the formulation of the Christian doctrine of salvation must relay adequate and reliable translation that can easily be used by preachers, teachers of the Word and Bible scholars in their endeavor to accomplish the mission of God.

The Christian faith is missional in nature. In order to meet this objective which forms part of the Great Commission of impacting people from all nations, the Word of God must be translated in a manner that helps in reaching out to the masses in a language they do comfortably comprehend. With the world having over 6000 languages and dialects, and a population of over 7 billion, the Bible translators must endeavor to do all that is at their disposal to translate the Bible into all these languages.

Consequently, Bible interpretation firstly calls for clarity in understanding the scripture as was translated. Inadequate Bible translation from the ST to the TL can be detrimental to a proper understanding of its application to the congregants. This is because translation and biblical interpretation and application go hand in hand. This makes the nature and complexity of translation to be a continual learning research process. New Mark (1988:6) while commenting on this view, vehemently announces that translation has its excitement and interest. He says that reaching a level of producing a satisfactory translation work is not always possible always possible. But he does not stop there for he adds that this should stimulate and compel translators to keep perfecting their work for there is always room for

improvement. He finally concludes by stating that there is no such thing as a perfect, ideal or correct translation; therefore, a translator is always trying to extend his knowledge and skills in order to improve his style of translation expression.

Finally, there is a dire need to emphasize the importance of consistency and simplicity in Kiswahili Bible Translation as a critical driving force for the English to Kiswahili Bible translators. This is born out of the fact that the majority of the Swahili speakers in Kenya are ordinary people who use pure Kiswahili as a means of communication in their daily activities. Finally, it should be noted that an error in Bible translation will result in an error in interpretation and eventually lead to an error in the application, an issue which can be avoided through the integration of appropriate translation principles and theories.

1.6 Scope and Limitations

This research paper analyses lexical and semantic errors of translating the New Testament from English into Kiswahili with a major focus on selective verses from the book of Romans as depicted in the *Biblia ya Mafunzo ya Uzima Tele*.

The information used to support the main argument of the research was strictly drawn from the English Bible commentary of Full *Life Study Bible* whose equivalent is the *Biblia ya Mafunzo Uzima Tele*.

The concept of semantic and communicative translation by New Mark (1981) was employed in analyzing the above-mentioned translation challenges.

1.7 Theoretical Framework

Translation theory or framework is a concept used to describe the entire study of translation discipline. The term is, to a broader perspective, attributed to New Mark who described it as the amount of knowledge and understanding we possess and still carry concerning the best and most effective strategy of conducting translation. (1981/1988/19).

Besides, Popovic (1976:23) defines it as a discipline engaged in the systematic study of translation whose task consists of “modeling the translation process and text.” And according to Uk Essays (2013) the primary purpose of translation theory includes;

- (1) Identifying and defining a translation error
- (2) Indicating all the factors that have to be taken into account in solving the problem
- (3) Listing all the possible translation procedures
- (4) Recommending the most suitable translation procedure, plus the appropriate translation.

It should be noted that scholars in the translation field continue to advocate for different theories that have been documented in the past. These theories include the literal, dynamic, descriptive, text linguistic, relevance, interpretive and intercultural approaches among others. Regarding Bible Translation, formal and dynamic equivalence are the two predominant theories that were formulated by Nida and Taber (1996). According to them, translating consists of reproducing the closest natural equivalent of the source text message, first in terms of meaning and secondly concerning styles (ibid 1964:117). To him, a translator should strive to adequately convey the translated text in a manner that is understandable to the TL without losing the original meaning from the SL.

Furthermore, Nida (1964) in defining the formal or literal translation states that it refers to a “word for word” type of translation. This was a theory that was mostly used by St Jerome in translating the Bible into Latin. Driven by the zeal to preserve the original meaning and style, he strove for the word for word theory in translation. On the contrary Newmark cites Cicero who had a different opinion quoting a famous the Roman orator who said , ‘ And I did not translate them as an interpreter, but as an orator keeping the same ideas and forms, as one might say, the figure of thought but in language which conforms to our usage. And so doing, I did not hold it necessary to render word for word, but I preserved the general style force ‘(Cicero 46 BC /1960CE:364).

But on expounding on the formal theory, Shekrinia states that “Formal equivalence tries to remain as close to the original text as possible, without adding the translator’s ideas and thoughts into the translation. In other words the more literal the translation, the less danger there is of corrupting original message” (2014). But the Dynamic theory, on the other hand, tends to delve into finding the closest natural equivalent to the targeted language. Jean –Claude Loba (2008) from Hekima College in his thesis asserts that dynamic equivalent aims to communicate a message that is faithful to the original message, but clear and natural in the receptor’s language. In essence, dynamic equivalence seeks to appease and protect the original meaning of the text and at the same time striving to bring out a meaning that is understandable and natural to the TL. Subsequently, Nida developed the principle of ‘equivalent effect’ which contained the notion that the effect produced by a

translation on its audience should be as close as possible to the impact it had on the original recipients in the source language (Nida 1964:159).

The aim of translation is to bring out the meaning of the ST into the TL, and therefore, this research primarily utilizes the Dynamic Equivalence theory in justifying the lexicon and semantic errors in translating the New Testament from English into Kiswahili. We have used a case study of the book of Romans as reflected in the *Biblia ya Mafunzo ya Uzima Tele Bible* to prove the above argument.

1.8 Literature Review

In the book, *Bible Doctrines: 16 Pillars of Truth* which primarily form the fundamental doctrine of the Assemblies of God (the largest evangelical organization in the world), the word of God is considered Holy, (inspired by the Holy Spirit), infallible, (without error and authoritative) (Nelson and Wawire, 1992). But this does not overlook the chances of Bible translation containing some errors that can greatly affect the interpretation and application of the same.

Bannet (2002) engages readers into an in-depth discussion of Bible Translation history citing Jerome's famous New Testament contentious version that was commissioned by Pope Damasus in 384 A.D and which was to have such a huge impact upon many translators who came later. She highlights Jerome's usage of thought for thought rather than word for word approach in his style of rendition of the Bible. She argues that despite the efforts done by Jerome, the problem between what a literary approach entailed and what the church referred to as a purely heretical rendition was to remain a major stumbling

block in the translation of the Bible for some centuries. She further comprehensively shares on how the completion of the first complete Bible translation of the Wycliffe English Bible in 1380 and 1384 marked the start of a mushrooming of English Bible translations. She subsequently delves into the translations process that was employed by early translators and finally highlights the errors made in different versions of the Bible translations. She culminates her findings by introducing the collaborative aspect of Bible translation which is the means by which early Bible translators used in their efforts to fill gaps found in different Bible translation.

On a similar note, Gary Smith (2000) in his dissertation paper from the University of Stellenbosch South Africa investigated the aspect of ‘Bible Translation and Relevance Theory’. His main intent was to explore the viability of direct and indirect translation as approaches to Bible translation citing the book of Titus in the New Testament as his main source of the data analysis. He spells out the theoretical and practical implication of the two above mentioned approaches in an attempt to develop them into a well-defined translation by using the Relevance Theory. Smith consequently, demonstrates how each approach deals with translation challenges of figurative language, ambiguity, and gender bias. He finally shares the sentiment that the study tests the practical effectiveness of each method as he concludes by vouching for relevance theory which provides translators with valuable guidance for making difficult translation decisions.

In dealing with the problems of translating the Bible Ilias Chatzitheodorou (2001) acknowledges that it’s not an easy task since there are many problems inherent in Bible translation. First, he argues concerning the fact that there is no original manuscript of the

Bible available, but a considerable variety of copies which ultimately cause a significant challenge to translators as they are unable to assert which of all these copies are authentic since none of them are identical. Secondly, he indicates that another problem faced by translators is that the Bible is addressed to a divergent audience culturally and contextually hence making it incredibly difficult and challenging for translators to effectively execute their work of BT since they must 'reproduce' an equivalent text in the Target Language, which can be 'used' for the same purposes as that of the Source Language. Thirdly, he mentions the problem of comprehension of the intended meaning of the ST under which the inability of translators to understand the ancient languages and cultural setting in which the Bible was written becomes a major setback. Despite all the challenges, he exudes confidence that more Bible translations should be expected in the future for languages continually change and Bible scholars are continually learning from archeological findings and newly discovered documents that help translators understand the ancient Greek and Hebrew better. Therefore, he, is certain that there will always be a need for new translations of the Bible because of the dire need to learn more about it for both scholarly and spiritual nourishment purposes.

In line with this, it is imperative to conclude that translation gaps in different Bible versions have a long history and the desire to work towards improving on the anomalies is a continued academic assignment and endeavor that will be kept for centuries.

1.9 Methodology

This research primarily utilized the qualitative method of data collection and analysis with the intention of identifying the semantic and lexical errors of relaying the New Testament from English to Kiswahili as reflected in the *Biblia ya Mafunzo ya Uzima*. This type of research zeroes in on specifically gathering information through an in depth interrogation and explanation of facts concerning a certain topic. In most cases the qualitative research relies on documented facts that are sourced from books, stories, narratives or interviews.

In their paper entitled *Qualitative Research and Translation Dilemma's*, Bogusia Temple and Alys Young (2004) are of the idea that this is the most widely used strategy of research by scholars especially in the cross cultural settings of translation spectrum.

The decision to employ this non-statistical analytical method of study in this dissertation is therefore informed by the fact that much of the information needed for this research was elicited from secondary sources, i.e., books, journals and the main text which comprises selected chapters from the book of Romans. This was practically done in form of text study, note taking and analysis followed finally by an interpretation of the specific semantic and lexical errors as presented in both texts.

1.9.1 Data Source

We directly sourced our data which primarily included examining examples of under translation, over translation, omission, addition and mistranslation errors from the Kiswahili version of *Biblia ya Mafunzo ya Uzima Tele* and its main English version *the Full Life Study Bible*.

1.9.2 Data Collection

We studied and critically examined both the English and Kiswahili Bible Version and collected the specific semantic and lexical errors as portrayed in the *Biblia ya Mafunzo ya Uzima Tele*.

1.9.3 Data Analysis

We analytically tabulated (non –statistical) the translations semantic and lexical errors using the source text and the target text. The main highlights were in form of omissions, under translations, additions and over translations errors.

1.9.4 Conclusion

In summary, the purpose of this research was to accomplish the objectives mentioned in the above chapter. The thesis looked at an analytical study of semantic and lexical of Bible translation errors from English into Kiswahili with a case study of the *Biblia ya Mafunzo ya Uzima Tele*. The findings of the study capitalized on the usage of equivalence theory as the best solution to the noted translation pitfalls. We would also recommend other Bible Translators and scholars to undertake the task of engaging in further studies on English to Kiswahili Bible translation.

CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS OF BIBLE TRANSLATION

2.0 Introduction

This chapter examines various theories of translation employed in Bible Translation largely focusing on Nida's Dynamic Equivalence Theory as the overarching theoretical BT strategy. However, in achieving the desired goal of a satisfactory translation strategy, we also look into New Mark's semantic and communicative theories as an integral part in consolidating what is missing in Nida's theory of translation. Finally, a discussion on Skopos theory of translation is mentioned at the end for it also has been used in the past in the Bible translation domain.

2.1 Analysis of Bible Translation Theories

Bible translation theories refer to the methodologies or strategies employed in the rendition of the Bible from one SL to another TL. As earlier stated the two main translation theories which were formulated by Nida and which for many years have been used in the field of Bible translation include the dynamic and formal equivalence. Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) look at equivalence – in translation as a procedure under which it replicates the same situation as in the original, while using completely different wording.

2.2 Formal Equivalence

The formal translation which at times is known as literal translation is the aspect of the word for word translation. The English Standard Version of the Bible is an example of the practical usage of formal translation theory. In its preface, the contributors of the ESV

(2011) declares ‘This is basically word for word translation that seeks as much as possible to render the exact phrases contained in the source text and the style of expression utilized by many of the Bible writers. It strives to be transparent to the original text, letting current literary English and the original languages’. In his view, Nida opines that formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content', unlike dynamic equivalence which is based upon 'the principle of equivalent effect' (1964:159).

Nida and Taber are both in agreement that there are not always formal equivalents between language pairs. They, therefore, suggest that these formal equivalents should be used wherever possible if the translation aims at achieving formal rather than dynamic equivalence. (ibid.201). they reiterate that the intent of a translator who is vouching for formal equivalence is to allow ST to speak “in its own conditions” rather than endeavoring to adjust it to the circumstances of the target language. This therefore practically implies the usage of formal approach as opposed to other methods of translation. (ibid. 1964:165). The major weakness of this type of theory according to Nida is that it “distorts the grammatical and stylistic patterns of the receptor language, and hence distorts the message” (Nida & Taber 1969/1982:201). As a result of this he, therefore, advises that it is necessary to include explanatory notes to help the target reader (ibid. 1964:166). New Mark on his part is of the idea that provided that equivalent-effect is secured, the literal word for word translation is not only the best, but it is also the only valid method of translation (Newmark, 39). The above foundational argument is a clear indication of the critical role theory plays in efficiency in translation.

2.3 Dynamic Equivalence

In Bible translation domain, Formal Equivalence, was a term coined by Nida (1964) in his efforts to explain one of the two main theories and strategies employed by translators in the task of translation. This is a translation approach that emphasizes that the message of the source text should be relayed in such a manner that there is no difference in response between the original recipients and the target language readers (Nida & Taber 1969/1982:200). In other words, the reaction to both the original text and the translated, though different in language, should be the same. This clearly augur well with Bible Translation where being sacred in nature and written with for divine purpose, compels the translator to render it in a way that does not allow any kind of alteration that will affect its interpretation in the TL.

Furthermore, Nida (1964:159) mentions the 'principle of equivalent effect' in Dynamic Equivalence in which he argues that relationship between Target Language recipients and the source text message should substantially be equivalent to that which was there between the original receptor and the translated message. He also introduces the aspect of naturalness by stating that the main objective of the idea of the principle of equivalent effect is to achieve “the closest natural equivalent to the source language” (Nida 1964). In essence naturalness to Nida’s refers adaptation of grammar, cultural references and the lexicon of the TL in the work of translating data from ST to TL. . It should be observed that Nida advocates for the preservation of the text meaning on its style since in his view it gives the translator a leeway to create the same equivalent effects.

It is, therefore, necessary to agree that a translation work that applies the Dynamic Equivalent method has three procedural levels which consist of extensive analysis, transfer, and reorganizing of the ST to TL (Nida & Taber 1969/1982:200). Nida further confirms that working on such a type of translation also involves changing Target language components that are generally acceptable from the Source text so as to make them clear to understand in the receptor context (*ibid.* 1964:131).

He stipulates that 'frequently, the form of the original text is changed; but as long as the change follows the rules of back transformation in the source language, of contextual consistency in the transfer, and of transformation in the receptor language, the message is preserved, and the translation is faithful' (Nida and Taber, 1982:200). He further argues that in such a translation there is no need to be concerned with matching the receptor-language message with the source-language text. The purpose is to have the receptor in the TL be able to comfortably adjust this type of behavior which is relevant and acceptable within the framework of the own culture" (*Ibid.* 1964:159). He however gives a warning concerning the usage of this approach by sharing various limitations it possesses. Of great importance is the keen watch on the culture and language elements from the ST to the TL. He finally states that dynamic equivalence theory best fits in Bible translation because the translation of scriptures does not only have the purpose of disseminating data to people but it has an intention of expecting a transformative response from them. (1969/1982:24).

Additionally, to Nida, the term "equivalence" must be understood in a broad sense of "having essentially the same function" although never possessing an identical function."

Thereby, Nida's dynamic equivalence theory and strategy open up a new perspective to translation studies. (Nida 1969: 24). As such, he possesses a conviction that a translated message should have an immediate meaning— intelligibility—for the target text recipients and that an equivalent receptor response must be evoked. According to him, “intelligibility is not to be gauged in terms of whether the words are understandable and the syntactic are correctly constructed, but they are measured in relation to the impact the text has on the one who receives it” (Nida 1969: 22). Additionally, he believes meaning depends on the context and that the receptors historical-cultural contexts may affect the different meanings of a text and will probably display non-equivalent outcomes. Given this understanding, Nida gives priority to DE over Formal Equivalent and underscore the fact that the emphasis of translation should make a shift from the style of the message to the recipient understanding and response. (Nida 1969: 24). In a nutshell, Dynamic Equivalence should be described by emphasizing the level under which the recipient of the message in the target language responds to it in substantially the same manner as the receptors in the source language.

Anthony Howard Nichols from Sheffield University London, in his thesis *Translating the Bible*, states that Nida provides an excellent discussion on most translation problems, as well as offering useful tools for semantic analysis. He, however, argues that the DE theory is found to be defective for Bible translation. First, it underestimates the intricate relationship of form and meaning in language. Secondly, it is crucial to know that translation evaluation must take account of its intention and targeted audience, 'equivalence' defined in terms of the receptor's reactions is impossible to measure, and blurs

the distinction between 'translation and communication.' Thirdly Nichols declares that the determinative role given to receptor response constantly jeopardizes the historical and cultural uniqueness of the Biblical text. Finally, he states that the drive for explicitness guarantees that indigenous receptors must approach Scripture through a Western grid and hence denying them direct access to the Biblical universe of discourse (1996).

But that not been withstanding, it is easy for one to realize that Nida vouches for the application of dynamic equivalence, as a more effective translation procedure. This is understandable according to the contextual perspective under which Nida was dealing with when translating the Bible. Hence, the outcome of the process of translating from ST to the TL according to him must produce the same result from recipients of the two sides. Nida and Taber's add that the dynamic equivalence approach in translation goes beyond the skill of just sharing the right information to the recipients (ibid: 25). It is in our view that Nida's argument is quite applicable in Bible Translation. He's sense of concern in upholding the integrity of the ST and at the same time considering the response of the TL respondent is what gives theory a clean bill of health.

2.4 Semantic and Communicative Theory

New Mark (1988), a protégé of Nida, developed two theories of translation that he expounds in his book *A Textbook of Translation*. He categorically mentions the following as the benefits of translation:

First, translation as a means of communication is used for multilingual notices, which have appeared increasingly in public places used for instructions and also as a vital tool in culture promotion. Secondly he believes as a strategy for learning other foreign languages, translation is a two-edged tool that has the intention of exhibiting the learner's understanding of the new language and also as a form of control and exercise of his intelligence in order to develop his language competence. This he affirms is a strong and important observation in foreign-language learning classes, which has to be totally distinguished from its normal use in transferring meanings. He further explains the importance of translation theory in which he focuses on a translation strategy that is applied in translating different types of texts, and it is hence totally dependent on a functional theory of language learning.

On a broader perspective, he asserts that a translation theory is the body of knowledge that we possess about translating, extending from general principles to guidelines, suggestions, and hints. At first, translation theory identifies and describes a translation challenge found in a text. In other words where there is no problem then there is no translation theory; secondly it indicates all the factors that have to be taken into account in solving the problem; thirdly, a translation theory gives a list of all the possible translation procedures, and finally, it does recommend the most suitable translation procedure, plus the appropriate translation. Translation theory is pointless and void if it does not arise from the problems of translation practice, from the need to stand back and reflect and consider all the factors that affect this entire process of translation. It is in view of this conviction that prompted him to develop the semantic and communicative theories of translation.

2.5 Semantic Theory

According to Newmark, the semantic theory is one of two modes of translation whereby the translator diligently works within the bare syntactic and semantic constraints of the TL, to reproduce the precise contextual meaning of the author” (1981/1988:22). To him, the translator renders as nearest as possible the meaning and structures of the words of the target text in an exactly contextual setting of the source text. The semantically oriented translator according to Newmark strives to reproduce the style of the original source text as closely as the TL norms will permit. Additionally, he says in semantic theory not much is done to translate the original text into TL cultural setting. The focus is to render the ST concepts in a manner that is satisfying to the TL recipients. Nida suggests that semantic approach to translation will handle the source text with a lot of respect regardless whether this will result in errors and anomalies in the final product. He concludes that this type of strategy thrives in texts that are more technical, artistic and scientific oriented.

2.6 Communicative Theory

Communicative theory in translation is a general term that describes the process linked to the passing of information from a particular social framework to another. (Hatim & Mason 1990:3). Many of the theories will at most describe translation as communication; however, in communicative translation, the focus is typically on the needs of the TL reader. Newmark (1981/1988:22) defined communicative translation theory as a strategy of translation where the translator endeavors to reproduce the same impact on the TL recipients as was rendered by the original text on the SL readers. In essence to Newmark, this theory emphasizes the relaying of the source text in a style which is in conformity to

the language, tradition and practical application of the TL as opposed to producing the exact words of ST. This is done without infringing in any way with the TL norms.

Additionally, Munday (2010) cites Newmark who states that communicative theory of translation endeavors to produce on its readers an impact as close as possible to that reflected on the original text readers. On the other hand Semantic translation attempts to render, as closely as possible, the semantic and syntactic structures of the second language in the exact contextual meaning of the original. (Newmark 1981: 39). In his slide presentation on semantic and communicative translation Hafiz Hazeer (2018:11) from GC University states that generally communicative translation is likely to be smoother, simpler, cleaner, direct, conventional and conforming to a particular register of language.

Table 2.1: Difference between Semantic and Communicative Theory

Parameter	Sematic translation	Communicative Translation
Transmitter /address focus	Focus on the thought process of as an individual/should only help TT reader with connotations if they are a crucial part of the message.	Subjective, TT reader focused, oriented towards as a specific language and culture
Culture	Remains within the SL culture	Transfers foreign elements in the TL culture
Time and origin	Not fixed in any time or local space; translation needs to be done a new with every generation	Ephemeral and rooted in its own contemporary context
Relation to ST	Always ‘inferior’ to ‘ST’ ‘loss of meaning	May be ‘better’ than ST; ‘gain ‘of force and clarity even if loss of semantic content
Parameter	Semantic Translation	Communicative Translation
Use of form of SL	If ST language norms deviate, then this must be replicated in TT; ‘loyalty to ST author.	Respect for the form of the SL But overriding ‘loyalty’ to TL norms
Form of TL	More complex, awkward, detailed, concentrated; tendency to over translate	Smoother, simpler, clearer, more direct, more conventional, tendency to under translate

Appropriateness	For serious literature, autobiography, 'personal effusion, any important political for other) statement	For the vast majority of texts, e.g nonliterary writing, technical and informative texts, publicity, standards types, popular fiction.
Criterion for evaluation	Accuracy of reproduction of the significance of ST	Accuracy of communication of ST message in TT

2.7 Skopos Theory

Proposed by Reiss and Vermeer in the late 70s and early 80s the Skopos theory is a translation approach which according to Christina Schaffner (1998) makes an unusual paradigm shift by moving from language focused translation to a more functional and socio-cultural based form of translation approach. He adds that this strategy prioritizes the aspects of being practical and interactive in translation and culminates the purpose of Skopos Theory should be to determine the shape of TT that it intends to fulfill in the receptor setting.

Munday (2010:81) states that in Skopos Theory, knowing why a Source Text is to be translated and what the purpose of the TT will be crucial to the translator. He adds that the approach dethrones the ST by focusing on TT and its majors on the adequacy and not equivalence. He progressively highlights Vermeer and Reiss basic functional rules for the Skopos Theory which are:

- 1) A translated or a Target Text is identified by its Skopos (goal).

- 2) A target text represents an offer of information in a target culture language and TL concerning certain information in a source language and culture.
- 3) A target text does not give out information in a reversible way.
- 4) A target text should be internally coherent
- 5) A target text should be consistent with the Source Text.
- 6) The above-mentioned rules stand in hierarchical order, with the Skopos rule predominating.

Finally, Munday shares an important advantage of Skopos Theory whereby he says that it creates the possibility of the source text being rendered in different ways according to the intent of the target text and the commission which is given to the translator. He sums up by quoting Vermeer who said that: ‘What the Skopos Theory stipulates is that one must translate, consciously and consistently and in accordance with some principle that shows respect to the target text. On the contrary, he says this theory does not state what the principle therefore must be decided separately in each specific case. (Vermeer 1989/2004: 234).

In Summary, the Skopos Theory tends to focus on making the translator understand the main intention of the Text he is conveying from one language to another. This eventually helps them to know and articulate the translations needs of his target audience in a language that is in harmony to their setting.

Conclusion

The success of any translation is determined by the theory that the translator employed in their effort to come up with an adequate and satisfactory rendition from the ST to the TL. In the just concluded chapter we have highlighted three common translation theories that translators use in dealing with translation errors. The Formal and Equivalence theory which were coined by Nida have been discussed at length at the beginning of the chapter. For the sake of synergy we have also included a discussion on semantic and communicative theories by New Mark. Finally we have explained briefly on what the Skopos Theory encompasses.

CHAPTER THREE

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF SEMANTIC AND LEXICON ERRORS IN RELATION TO BIBLE TRANSLATION

3.0 Introduction

This chapter, by and large, discusses the nature of semantic and lexicon errors in translation. It also delves into identifying and classifying selected translated portions of verses from the NIV Full Life Bible into the Kiswahili version of *Biblia ya Mafunzo ya Uzima Tele* with an intent of examining the semantic and lexical translation errors as conveyed in the TL.

3.1 Semantic and Lexical Analysis

Lexical semantic is a branch of linguistics that is concerned with meaning, understanding concepts, and reference. It primarily explores the idea of conventional sense underscored in the usage of words and phrases within a given context in a sentence. While commenting concerning the history of the word semantic, Crystal, (1988) shares the idea that this term did not come to be widely used until the 20th century, but the subject it represent dates backs to the writings of Plato and Aristotle, and has continued to attract the special interest of philosophers, logicians, and these days linguists. Its role in making communication easier by bringing out meaning in both written and spoken word is something that cannot be underestimated. Moreover, Cotterel and Turner (1989) are of the view that any linguistic theory that fails to integrate meaning into its analysis, is to an extent, already flawed. Semantics and lexicons are therefore crucial in determining the meaning of concepts in any

given piece of discourse or text. Lexical Semantics can be divided into two main categories of meanings which include:

3.2 Conceptual Meaning

This means logical, cognitive or denotative meaning. It is the mental thinking process that involves knowing, learning and understanding. As the term indicates, conceptual meaning investigates the literal definition of a word or phrase based on its structure and form.

3.3 Associative meaning

Associative meaning has everything to do with the expression of the individual mental understanding of the text or spoken word. It implies the extended meaning of word that goes beyond its dictionary meaning and explanation.

3.4 Lexical Relations Features

This refers to group of words that are related in one way or another in language use. Their meanings are frequently known in terms of their relationships in a text. They include lexical items like:

(a) Synonym

Synonyms are two forms of words which have very closely related meaning and are often, but not always, intersubstitutable in a sentence. Examples include broad, wide-hide – conceal, liberty – freedom. Biblical examples of synonyms include power -authority, Bible- Scriptures and love – compassion.

In throwing more light concerning the sameness of synonym Yule (2004) points out that the idea of ‘sameness of meaning’ used in discussing synonym is not ‘total sameness’ for he asserts that there are many occasions when one term is appropriate in a sentence, but its synonym would be odd. And according to Newmark (1988:84), a translator cannot do without synonymy. He states that he has to work with it as a compromise, to translate more critical segments of the text, segments of the meaning, more accurately. But he also warns that unnecessary use of synonyms is a mark of many poor translations.

(b) Antonym

This consists of two forms of words with opposite meanings, i.e., big- small, short – tall, young – old. Antonyms are usually divided into two main types which are namely gradable such as – big – small and finally the non-gradable antonyms such as male-female or true – false. The Bible has various examples of antonym which include: Heaven and hell, light and darkness and love and hate.

(c) Hyponymy

When the meaning of one form of a word is included in the meaning of another, the relationship is described as hyponymy. Good example are: dog – animal, orange – fruit.

(d) Homophony

The Collins dictionary defines homophony as the linguistic phenomenon whereby words of different meanings become identical in pronunciation, i.e., meat, meet, pain, pane be, bee. In essence, homophony represents words that morphologically sound identical but have different meanings.

(e) Homonymy

Homonymy is a semantic phenomenon referring to "lexical items which have the same form but differ in meaning" (Crystal 1991: 167). For example, the word bank means: (1) an organization where people and businesses can invest or borrow which have the same meaning (2) also means the land alongside the river or a lake.

(f) Polysemy

Refers to a lexical item which has different kinds of meanings (Crystal 1991: 267). For instance, plain means level, undecorated, pure, unobstructed, obvious, clear, common and ordinary (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary (2008)).

3.5 Translation Errors Defined

The IGI Global Dictionary (1988–2018) defines translation error as any lack of congruence between the source text and the target text which includes dis-congruities in meaning and failures in use of the target language according to standard norms, as interpreted by the evaluator. It further indicates that a translation error arises from the existence of a relationship between a Target Text and a Source Text during the transfer and movement from the Source Text to the Target Text. It is, therefore, crucial to understand that translation error is an anomaly of translation that occurs when a ST is mistranslated or mismatched in the process of rendition from language A to language B.

According to Waddington (2001) the three main translation errors committed by translators include:

- i) Inappropriate rendition, which affect the understanding of the source text, these are divided into five categories; addition, omission, unresolved extra linguistic

references, loss of meaning, inappropriate linguistic variation (register, style dialect, etc.).

- ii) Inappropriate renderings, which affect expression in the target language; these are divided into five categories; spelling, grammar, lexical items, text, and style.
- iii) Inadequate renderings, which affect the transmission of either the main function or secondary function of the source text.

3.6 Type of Errors in Translation

Translation errors appear in different forms which include:

(A). Addition- An addition error in translation refers to a situation where the translator introduces redundant and unnecessary information that undermines the intent of the ST.

(B). Ambiguity- Ambiguity refers to words and phrases that are open to more than one interpretation, explanation or meaning especially if that meaning cannot be determined from its context. Ambiguity errors in translation appears when parts of ST tend to bring out different meanings and explanations. On the other hand in similar context the TL does not change in meaning.

(C). Cohesion- This denotes the ability of the text to mutually connect and link ideas logically and understandably within a sequential written scope. Cohesion describes the network and harmony of lexical and grammatical features in a text. It should also be imperatively noted that proper cohesion makes it is easy for the reader to understand the flow of thought in a given textual presentation. With translation, a cohesion error takes place when a text becomes confusing to follow because of inconsistent use of terminology, misuse of pronouns, inappropriate conjunctions, or other structural errors.

(D). Faithfulness- A general term employed in defining the level under which a TT is counted as authentic and a good reflection of the original text. In affirming this description, Nida and Taber (1982) paints a picture of faithfulness to be one which basically creates in a target language recipients the same reaction as that demonstrated by the original source text recipients. .

In the contrary, an error that involves faithfulness appears when the target text does not go hand in hand with the meaning of the source text.

(G). False friends- such an error in translation occurs when words which are the same in style and form but differ in meaning cause confusion. The terms may in some languages emanate from the same root which might look similar but with different meaning.

(H). Grammar: This type of a translation error occurs when a word or a phrase in text unit breaks the standard rules of word formation in the receptor language. The grammatical gaps consist of improper use of the subject, verb and nouns whose outcome is a sentence that is difficult to understand.

(I). Literalness- This type of an error emanates from a situation where a translator opts to use the literal approach in rendition of a text from the ST without considering the linguistic, cultural or contextual aspects of the TL recipients. The application of such an approach can in some cases result in distortion of meaning of a text from the ST to TL.

(J) Omission- An omission error is a description of information reduction by translator in their effort of transferring a text from one language to another. The process can at times include the entire text unit depending on both semantic and syntactic features of the translation work. The decision of omission is primarily the prerogative of the translator which many a time is informed by the form and the content of the text. The source text

authorial intention is an important element that any translator must put into account as they engage in their rendition work. It should also be said that the omission element in any given translation work should be done with a lot of caution so as to avoid mistranslating what the original author meant.

(K) Terminology- This type of error applies to words that are meant for specific technical fields such as medical, legal, religious etc. The said error occurs when a terminology is wrongly used in a sentence structure. The inappropriate use result into misinterpretation by the recipients of the finish work of translation. It is always important for a translator to have an in-depth understanding of such terminologies so as to avoid such anomalies in translation.

(L) Over translation – This occurs when a translator takes too many aspects of the source text and translates them in way that he has added more information to the text that was not in the original.

(M) Under translation – a type of error that to larger extent demonstrates the leaving out of information that was in the original text.

Conclusively, Rahimatllah (2013) cites Baker (1992) who resonates that errors in translation mostly result from non-equivalence between the source and target languages. However, he adds that good translators with comprehensive knowledge and linguistically with both the source and target languages know how to deal with them; therefore, errors can indicate the quality of a translation and also act as an indicator of what is going on in the translators thinking process.

Table 3.1: Over Translation

ST	TL	EXPLANATION
Rom 1:8 First, I thank my God through Jesus Christ for all of you, because your faith is <u>being reported</u> all over the world.	Kwanza namshukuru Mungu wangu katika Kristo Yesu kwaajli yenu nyote, kwa kuwa imani yenu <u>inahubiriwa</u> katika dunia yote. Mistralation	The underlined word has been over translated to inahubiriwa hence negatively affecting the TL understanding of the same. The nearest appropriate equivalent would have been ‘inatangazwa’

Discussion

Occasionally in translation one comes across a situation whereby a text has either been under-translated or over translated. According to Mian Huang (2012) in his article on *An Analysis of Over-translation and Under-translation in Perspective of Cultural Connotation*, these two phenomena in the translation scholarly field were first introduced by New Mark in 1976 in his book, *Approaches to Translation* although, he admits that New Mark neither gave the definition or the reason for the phenomena. Romans 1:8, seems to fall under the category of an over translated text where a word has been given a rendition that goes beyond what it means.

It is also clear that Nida's formal equivalence was applied in its translation owing to the usage of exact phrase of ST (English) into TT (Kiswahili). But the rendition of the word 'reported' to kuhubiriwa not only sound over translated but it can also affect both the meaning and interpretation by the TL recipients. In review, the usage of the word kutangaza as substitute can help in solving the equivalence challenge in this text.

Table 3.2: Under Translation

ST	TL	EXPLANATION
Rom 1:24 Therefore God gave them over in the sinful desires of their hearts to <u>sexual impurity</u> for the degrading of their bodies with one another.	Kwaajili ya hayo Mungu aliwaacha katika tamaa za mioyo yao, waufuate uchafu ,	The terminology 'sexual impurity' as it appear in the ST has been under translated to waufuatewe uchafu

Discussion

The translator in the above text used waufuatewe uchafu as equivalent to sexual impurity. In analyzing the text, one notices an error of under translation in the TT. Under translation occurs in a setting where the information relayed in the TT turns out to be less than in the ST. The important and crucial message from the ST is lost in rendition to the TL. This in effect tends to influence how the text is understood and interpreted by the TL recipients. In the above text, the correct word that would have been used in the TL would be uasherati.

The translator's incorporation of dynamic theory which according to Nida emphasizes the aspect of reproducing a word in the TL that is closer to the ST would have played a major part in avoiding such a translation error.

Table 3.3: Literal translation

ST	TL	EXPLANATION
<p>Rom 1:1 Pau 1, a <u>servant</u> of Christ Jesus, called to be an apostle and set apart for the Gospel of God.</p>	<p>Paulo Mtumwa wa Kristo Yesu, aliyeitwa kuwa mtume, na kutengwa aihubiri injli ya Mungu.</p>	<p>The original Greek word for the word <u>Servant</u> was 'doulos' which meant a slave. The underlined word has been directly translated into TL using the ST meaning. In rendition of the second part of the ST , the underlined words have been added . There is inclusion of the kuihubiri Injili which totally was not found in the original text.</p>

Discussion

The translator seems to have applied the dynamic equivalence theory in his translation strategy. Nida & Taber (1974) asserts that dynamic equivalence is a theory that focuses on having the TL message achieve the same effect of the original message in the receptor audience. The responsibility of the translator, therefore, is to determine the reaction of the target reader to the translated text. Nida and Taber promote the idea that in DE when comparison is made, this response is to be like that of the original receptors who received the message in its original setting. They also hold the opinion that DE is more of relationship oriented and, hence, according to some, setting the application of the theory might end up as a mistranslation.

In view of that, the rendition of the word ‘servant’ to ‘mtumwa’ is a clear confirmation of application of this theory. As stated in the analysis above, the word servant was in the early days of the Bible, used, in reference to a slave. But usage of this term in current context might not bring out the correct interpretation. Culture difference might also be an area of conflict between the ST and the TL. With the goal being attaining an equivalent effect it is in view of this study that the recipients of such a text might end up not benefiting regarding readability and interpretation. In this particular text, therefore, it would have been prudent for the translator to consider the Skopos Theory in satisfying the interpretation need of the TL. The Skopos Theory which advocates for adequacy would be more ideal in the translation of the above text. In that case, the correct translation of the word servant would have been mtumishi.

Table 3.4: Additional Error

ST	TL	EXPLANATION
Rom 8:1 Therefore, there is now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus, because through Christ Jesus the law of the Spirit of life set me free from the law	Sasa basi, hakuna hukumu ya adhabu juu yao walio katika Kristo Yesu, Kwasababu sheria ya Roho wa uzima ule ulio katika Kristo Yesu imeniacha huru, mbali na na sheria ya dhambi na mauti Kwasababu sheria ya Roho ya Uzima iliyo katika Yesu imeniweka huru kutoka kwa sheria ya dhambi na mauti.	The translator in an effort to bring out a clear meaning to the TL made some addition in the first verse. The term condemnation means hukumu but to contextualize the text the translator added hukumu ya adhabu. Also the rendition of Roho wa Uzima ule ulio katika Kristo imeniacha huru should read Roho wa Uzima Yule aliye katika Kristo ameniacha huru .

Discussion

Addition is a process in which a translator would add a word to the TT with a purpose of clarity and adding more information concerning the background of the text. Newmark (1988: 91) is of the opinion that addition in translation remains the same for all languages and cultures and that the added data in the rendition is normally culturally different between source text and target. According to Bassett (1992:14) the translator has to make sound

judgment in adopting this technique with the sole purpose to provide the real, relevant, useful translated texts depending upon the culture, styles, religions, etc., of TL and not hurting the basic value, meaning and the intentions of the source texts and the author as well.

Table 3.5: Under Translation Error

ST	TL	EXPLANATION
6:6 For we know that our old self was crucified with him, so that the body of sin might be <u>done away with</u> .	Mkijua neno hili , ya kuwa utu wetu wa kale ulisulubishwa pamoja naye , ili mwili wa dhambi ubatilike..	The equivalent of the underlined word does not strongly represent the ST meaning hence denying the TL the opportunity to capture the meaning clearly. Ubatli means isiyo na nguvu and rendering it to be done away with in a way makes it to lose its meaning in TL. The correct translation would have been ‘ili ule mwili wa dhambi upate kuangamizwa’ Here it portrays total destruction.

Table 3.6: More Examples of Translation Errors from Source Text to Target Text

Found in the Book of Romans

ST	TT	EXPLANATION
8:3 For what the law was powerless to do in that it was weakened by the <u>sinful nature</u> , God did by sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful man to be a sin offering. And so he condemned sin in sinful man,	Maana yale yasiyowezekana kwa sheria kwa vile ilivyokuwa dhaifu kwasababu ya mwili, Mungu, kwa kumtuma mwanawe mwenyewe katika mfano wa mwili ulio wa dhambi, aliihukumu dhambi katika mwili.	The underlined phrases have been mistranslated in TT to bring out a different meaning from the ST. The Tl rendition portrays plurality when it states yale yasiyowezekana. The best rendition would be kile ambacho sheria haikuwa na uwezo wa kufanya. Similarly, the word sinful nature has been mistranslated to mwili in which may pose a big interpretation challenge to a person who is not knowledgeable in the original Greek meaning, The Greek translation of body had the idea of sin as opposed to physical body in English. The best equivalent for sinful nature would be asili ya dhambi
8:23 Not only so, but we ourselves , who have the first fruits of the Spirit	Wala si hivyo tu, ila na sisi wenyewe tulio malimbuko ya Roho.	The lexicon malimbuko which came from a certain Kiswahili dialect might prove to be difficult to interpret for some

		TL recipient. The best translation of the same would be matunda ya kwanza
8:9 You, however, are controlled not by the sinful nature but by the Spirit, if the Spirit of God lives in you.	Lakini, Ikiwa Roho wa Bwana anakaa ndani yenu, niyinyi hamfuati mwili, bali mwafuata Roho.	The translator renders the word ‘controlled’ to ‘kufuata’ which means to follow. The usage of the equivalent term though does not fully distort the context but seems to embrace the spirit of the original author but result into loss of meaning in TL.
3:4 Not at all, let God be true, and every man a liar	Hasha! Mungu aonekane kuwa amini na kila mtu mwongo.	There is inclusion of Mungu aonekane as a modifier. Also ‘be true’ has been translated kuwa amini which cannot be clearly understood in the TL.
3:4b so that you may be proved right when you speak And prevail when you judge	Ili ujulike kuwa una haki katika maneno yako; ukashinde uingiapo katika hukumu	Shortening of the word ‘proved’ to ujulike makes the meaning complicated and ambiguous in the TL. The appropriate would have been ujulikane
1:1b Paul a servant of Christ Jesus	Paulo mtumwa wa Kristo	The word servant has been translated to mtumwa instead of mtumishi.
1:5 Through him and for his name’s sake, we received grace to call	Ambaye katika yeye tulipokea neema na utume	There is an omission of the word ‘for his name sake and mistranslation Gentiles into

people from among all Gentiles	ili matifa yote yapate kujitisha kwa imani	mataifa yote insetad of mataifa
1:7 To all in Rome, who are loved by God and called to be saints	Kwa wote walioko Rumi, wapendwao na Mungu, walioitwa kuwa watakatifu	Correctly translated using formal translation strategy
1:10b and I pray that now <u>at last</u> by God's will, the <u>way may be opened for me</u> to come to you	Nikiomba nje kwenu hivi karibu, Mungu akipenda kuifanikisha safari yangu	There is the omission of the word 'at last' which denies the TL the chances of knowing the entire truth . There is also mistranslation of the underlined words
1:15 That is why I am so eager to preach the gospel also to you who are at Rome	Kwa hiyo, kwa upande wangu , mimi ni tayari kuihubiri Injili hata na kwenu mnaokaa Rumi	There is addition of the phrases kwa hiyo na kwa upande wangu, the word so eager has been translated to ni tayari
1:18 I consider that our present sufferings are not worth comparing with the glory that will be revealed in us.	Kwa maana nayahesabu mateso ya wakati huu wa sasa kuwa si kitu kama utukufu ule utakaofunuliwa kwetu.	There is an omission of the word comparing which in Kiswahili would read ikilinganishwa
1:19 The creation waits in eager expectation for the sons of God to be revealed.	Kwa maana viumbe, vyote pia vinatazama kwa shauku nyingi kufunuliwa kwa wana wa Mungu.	Creation waits' has been mistranslated to viumbe vyote vinatazama. 'Wait' is not Vinatazama but kusubiri. The correct translation should

		have been vinasubiri kwa hamu kubwa
1:20 For the creation was subjected to frustration, not by its own choice, but by the will of the one who subjected it, in hope	Kwa maana viumbe vyote pia vilitishwa vyote chini ya ubatili; si kwa hiari yake, ila kwa sababu yake yeye aliyevitisha katika tumaini.	Mistranslation of the word frustration to vilitishwa is a lexical error that affects interpretation of the text in the SL
21 that the creation itself will be liberated from its bondage of decay and brought into the glorious freedom of the children of God.	Kwa kuwa viumbe vyenyewe navyo vitawekwa huru na kutolewa katika utumwa wa uharibifu, hata viingie katika uhuru wa utukufu wa watoto wa Mungu	FE translation theory correctly applied in rendition of the ST to TL with no loss of meaning.
1:22 We know that the whole creation has been groaning in the pains of child birth upto the present time.	Kwa maana twajua ya kuwa viumbe vyote pia vinaugua utungu pamoja hata sasa.	The word ‘groaning’ in English and in this context means to offer a deep cry. The Kiswahili equivalent used by the translator is the word kuugua which in Swahili brings the connotation of falling sick. Similarly utungu has been used to mean the pain of child birth which to any reader who is not aquatinted to the original context might be find it difficult to understand and interpret
8:28 And we know that in all things God <u>works for</u>	Nasi twajua ya kuwa katika mambo yote Mungu	The words God works for the good have been mistranslated

<p><u>the good of those who</u> love Him, who have been called according to His purpose.</p>	<p>hufanya kazi pamoja na wale wampendao ktika kuwapatia mema, yaan wale walioitwa kwa kusudi lake.</p>	<p>to hufanya kazi pamoja which in literal sense means God works together with. This negatively affect the interpretation in TL</p>
<p>8:31 Now in all things we are more than conquerors, through Him who loved us.</p>	<p>Lakini katika mambo hayo yote tunashinda, na zaidi ya kushinda kwa yeye aliyetupenda.</p>	<p>The Swahili translation seems to convey a message of two victories. The correct translation would have been, katika mambo yote sisi ni zaidi ya washindi, kupitia yeye aliyetupenda. The translator seems to have applied the principle of addition to bring out the meaning of the text into Kiswahili. Correct: Na katika mambo haya yote sisi ni ziadi ya washindi, kupitia kwake aliyetupenda.</p>

Conclusion

This chapter clearly demonstrates semantic and lexical errors as portrayed in the selected chapters from the book of Romans. The errors which affect the meaning and interpretation to the TL recipients are in the forms of under translation, over translation, omission, addition and mistranslations.

CHAPTER FOUR
MITIGATION MEASURES THAT CAN BE USED TO DEAL WITH BIBLE
TRANSLATION ERRORS

4.1 Introduction

Concerning translation errors, this chapter tackles practical mitigation measures a translator can utilize to remain faithful in their rendition from ST to TT. These measures include the following:

4.2 Knowledge of both the SL and TL

On achieving a readable and acceptable Bible translation, the translator must be thoroughly acquainted with the original language, culture, and style of the ST, i.e., Greek and Hebrew. Such knowledge according to many scholars protects the translator against the pitfall of injecting into certain text his personal or organizational conviction that are contrary to the intentions of the original Bible writers. Dohin Kim in his paper entitled *Dynamic Equivalence : Nida's Perspective and Beyond*, provides an example whereby the average person unacquainted with Hebrew will take the Biblical phrase heap coals of fire on his head (Rom. 12: 20) as a brutal torture, rather than the meaning make a person ashamed of his behavior (Nida 1969: 2).

He records that such concern with intelligibility and reader response led Nida (1969: 22) to declare that “Intelligibility is not to be measured merely regarding whether the words are understandable and the sentences grammatically constructed, but in terms of the total impact the message has on the one who receives it.” This concern should inculcate a sense

of both language study on the part of translators to produce a standard Kiswahili translation that is acceptable to the original intentions of authors and the TL recipients. It also calls for the need for the translator to be competent in both English and Kiswahili. In summary efficient and effective Bible translation begins with an understanding of both the ST and TL.

4.3 Dealing with Semantic and Lexicon Errors

Semantic measures deal with the meaning of the words as portrayed in the text. In elaborating on this type of mitigation to translation errors Zohre Owji in his M.A paper on Translation Strategies : on Translation Theories captures Chessterman's (1997) as he cites(Begen n.d) who classifies semantic strategies in the following subcategories :

1. Synonymy: In this strategy, the translator selects the closest equivalent, which is not the first literal translation of the source text word or phrase.
2. Antonymy: In this linguistic strategy, the translator uses a word with the opposite meaning. This word mostly combines with a negation.
3. Hyponymy: This means using a member of larger category (e.g., rose is a hyponym in relation to flower), and also hyponym is a related superordinate term, which describes the entire category with a broader term (e.g., flower is a hyponym in relation to rose).
4. Emphasis change: This strategy increases, decreases or changes the emphasis of thematic focus of the translated text in comparison to the original.
5. Paraphrase strategy: This strategy according to the overall meaning of the source text, it creates a liberal approximate translation; some lexical items may be ignored in this sort of strategy.

4.4 Borrowing

This can be entirely applicable in situation where there are no equivalent in the TL. In most cases, borrowed words are written in italics as they are considered foreign. This a situation in translation process where a translator opts to directly transfer the ST terminology without making any changes or alterations in the TL. This can be entirely applicable in a situation where there is no equivalent in the TL. In most cases it says, ‘And by him we cry, Abba, Father: The Kiswahili version says “ambaye kwa hiyo twalia , Aba, yaani baba”. In this text the word ‘Aba’ is a Hebrew word which has been borrowed from ST to the TL.

In the entire process of borrowing the translator must be strive to appease the cognitive needs of both the SL and the TL recipients. In essence, the translator must seek to remain faithful to original intention of the ST author as well satisfy the TL respondents in their rendition. .

4.5 Modulation

Modulation or generalization concerns the changing the form of the text by introducing a semantic change or perspective. It can also be described as the use of a sentence that is neither from the ST or Tl to pass on a message in a narrative. Chiara Gracill (2016) cites Gérard Hardin and Gynthia Picot (1990) who defined modulation as a change of ideas in a text that permits us to convey the same point in a completely unique manner.

Van Leuven-Zwart’s (1989, 1990) came up with this model of translation technique explaining the comparison between literary translated texts. He further paints a picture where the differences between ST and TT is characterized by a change towards greater

generality in TT in this concept. Modulation enhances the translator's ability to freely change an idea in a written text without necessarily interfering with original meaning. This works for the advantage of the reader for then they are able to receive and understand the message in their own language without difficulty.

4.6 Adaptation

Sometimes referred to as cultural substitution or cultural equivalent, adaptation is a cultural component that replaces the original text with one that is better suited to the culture of the target language. This tends to achieve a more familiar and comprehensive dimension. A translator, in this case, acquires words from ST which do not appear in the TT. Therefore Source Text cultural component that is substituted by a phrase or word in the targeted culture. Adaptation can be used in different settings such as commercial adverts and children storybook. It is imperative to state that Adaptation has to be understood and able to naturalize the TT.

4.7 Fidelity

This is a word used in defining the degree a Target Language Text can be counted as a good representation of the original text. The translator in this case must be consistent in rendering a text in a way that clearly reflect the intent of the source text author.

For many years, fidelity has been the standard measure used by scholars in determining a credible and acceptable translation work. Sager (1994:121) is of the idea that of recent this concept has been substituted with notions like equivalence.

In line with this definition, then Bible translators must endeavour to faithfully render Biblical text without compromising on the original meaning of the ST. Nida & Taber, take fidelity as a property of a text which reflects the DE theory (1969/1982:201). In summary faithfulness in translation plays a very major part in rendition of a text from one language to another.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this final chapter of the study we briefly deal with a summary of the entire thesis. Similarly, we give recommendations to Bible translators and scholars who might engage in further research and study on semantic and lexical translations errors in Kiswahili Bible.

5.1 Summary

This research delved into reviewing semantic and lexical errors of translations as reflected in the New Testament with a special case study of selected chapters from the book of Romans in the Kiswahili version of *Biblia ya Mafunzo ya UzimasTele*. With specifically focusing on the book of Romans, the study analysed the issues to do with under translation, over translation, omission, addition and literalness of errors in the above mentioned Kiswahili Bible commentary.

Guided by the nature of study and academic purpose, the study limited itself to quantitative research method in its data collection and findings. Nida's Dynamic Equivalence theory was used in data analysis of this research study. His emphasis on the form and contextual components of the message makes this theory to be the most appropriate in dealing with any translational errors found in the text. Moreover, Nida is coming from a school of thought that argues that effective translation is dependent on the message that is sense oriented to the TL while retaining the spirit and style of the original source text (Nida 1964:134).

From the study it was discovered that most of the common Bible translation errors found in the BMUZT are semantic and lexical in nature. These challenges might have been caused by either by linguistic, contextual or cultural oversight on the part of translators . The end result has been a production that contains, omission, over-translation and under-translation errors in the English Kiswahili rendition, at least according to the selected verses in the Book of Romans.

Conclusion:

This study had three objectives

- I) Identify specific lexical and semantic errors of translation from English to Kiswahili as depicted in selected verses from the book of Romans and the Gospel of John
- II) Analyze the effects of gaps to scriptural readership and interpretation
- III) Establish possible mitigation and harmonization strategies that will improve the quality of Bible translation from English into Kiswahili.

In as far as objective 1) is concerned we realize the dominant errors are over translations, under translations, additions and omissions. In objective 2 through the analysis we have demonstrated how these errors do affect scriptural readership and interpretation to the TL. Finally objective 3) contain six mitigation strategies that can be employed by translators to overcome such translation errors.

5.2 Recommendations

Based on this finding we recommend that those endeavouring to translate the Bible from English to Kiswahili need to have in depth understanding of the original languages i.e. Hebrew, Greek and Latin, which were used in writing the Bible. A deeper understanding of Kiswahili and English languages by the translator will be essential in offering effective and efficient rendition of the Bible from English into Kiswahili. Additionally, translators need to study exegetical and hermeneutical principles that will enhance their translation capacity and competence in the translation market.

Similarly, revision of the Kiswahili version of *Bibilia ya Mafunzo ya Uzima Tele* with the intention of correcting the errors can be of great help to many Kiswahili speakers who are interested in studying the Bible. In dealing with difficult terminologies, we recommend usage of footnotes in explaining meaning of words to the readers.

5.3 Recommendations for Further Studies

It would be of great interest for future linguistic scholars to delve into further studies on more semantic and lexical translation errors in the *Bibilia ya Mafunzo ya Uzima Tele* with a purpose of improving it in the area of accuracy and clarity. This would in the end result into proper and appropriate interpretation and readability in the TL.

It would also be prudent if a research on using other types of theories can be incorporated in the translation process apart from the most common strategy of Equivalence Theory.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ambiguity Meaning*. (2015, April 18). Retrieved from Youtube.com:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QrBzRpFjotE>
- Bassnett, S. (2002). *Translation Studies*. London;New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.
- Beekman, J., & Callow, J. C. (1974). *Translating the word of God:with scripture and topical indexes*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Burini, G. (2017, September 30). In Praise Of Translators For The Great Work They Have Done Over The Centuries. *Daily Nation*.
- Carlos, A. (2018, october). Retrieved from Quora:
http://www.worldevangelicals.org/resources/rfiles/res3_272_link_1294436357.pd
- Chatzitheodorou, I. (2001). Problems of Bible Translation. *Translation Journal*.
- Chiara, G. (2016, May 2). *Translation Techniques*. Retrieved from A Translator's Thoughts: <http://translathoughts.com/2016/05/modulation/>
- Cotterell, P., & Turner, M. (1989). *Linguistic and Biblical Interpretation*. Intersarsity Press.
- Dohun, K. (2015). Dynamic equivalence,Nida's Perspective and Beyond. Geumjeong-gu Busan, Republic of Korea: Graduate school of Interpretation and Translation.
- Essays, U. (2017, June 27). *Different Translation Theories*. Retrieved from UKEssays: <https://www.ukessays.com/essays/english-language/different-translation-theories-to-literature-translation-english-language-essay.php?vref=1>
- Fengling, L. (2017). A Comparative Study Of Nida's and Newmark's Theories. *International Journal of Liberal Arts And Social Sciences*, 31-39.
- Gill, N. (2017, February 8). *The Vulgate*. Retrieved from Thoughtco.com: thoughtco.com/the-vulgate-definition-121225.
- Gordon, F. D., & Douglas, S. (2003). *How To Read The Bible For all Its Worth*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Hamidreza, H. M. (2011). Standards of Textuality: Rendering English and Persian Texts Based on a Textual Model. *Journal of Universal Language*, 47-74.
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman.

- IGI *Global Dictionary* . (1988-2018). Retrieved from <https://www.igi-global.com/dictionary/the-ata-flowchart-and-framework-as-a-differentiated-error-marking-scale-in-translation-teaching/45029>
- Jenie, G. (2017, July 30). *Blog.gengo.com*. Retrieved from Jenie Gabriel July 31, 201712 best quotes about translators Best-quotes-about-translators-and-translation: Jenie Gabriel July 31, 201712 best quotes <https://blog.gengo.com/12-best-quotes-about-translators-and-translation/>
- Kartini, R. (2013). Translation Errors in the Process of Translation. *Journal of English and Education*, 14-24.
- Klein, W. W., Blomerg, C. L., & Jr, H. R. (2017). *Introduction To Biblical Interpretation*. Zondervan.
- Leonardi, V. (2000). Equivalence in Translation; between Myth and Reality. *Translation Journal*.
- McGhee, Q., & Jones, F. (1994). *Word of Truth*. Nairobi: EAST Books Publishers.
- Munday, J. (2008). *Introducing Translation Studies, Theories and Applications*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Myers, J. (n.d.). *RedeemingGod.com*. Retrieved from The Canonization of Scripture: <https://redeeminggod.com/canonization-of-scripture>
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation and Interpreting*. Kexter, UK: Wheaton and Co, LTD.
- Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1982). *Theory and Practice of Translation*. Brill Archive.
- Ordudari, M. (2007). Translation procedures, strategies and methods. *Translation Journal*.
- Owji, Z. (2013). Translation Strategies. *Translation Journal: A Review of Comparison and Theories*.
- Pawlikova, V. V. (2006). Biblical Translation of Early Missionaries in East and Central Africa. *Asian and African Studies*, 80-90.
- Popovic, A. (1976). *Dictionary For The Analysis of Literary Translation*. Alberta: Edmonton.
- Silva, M. (1991). *God, Language And Scripture*. Zondervan.
- Smith, G. k. (2000). *Bible Translation and Relevance theory*.

- Steve, D. (2016, April 1st). Retrieved from MISSION NEXUS :
<https://missionexus.org/four-qualities-of-a-good-translation-and-the-divine-familial-terms-controversy/>
- Vinay, J.-P., & Darbelnet, j. (1958). *Stylistique Comparee du francais et de l'anglais: Methode de traduction*. (J. Sager, & M. Hamel, Trans.) Paris: P.A John Benjamins.
- Waddington, C. (2001). Different Methods of Evaluating Student Translations: The Question of Validity. *Meta*, 311-325.
- Yule, G. (2004). *The Study of Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Zwart, L. (1989). Translation And Original, Similarities and Dissimilarities. *Target, International Journal of Translation Studies*, 151-181.