

The Birth of a New Paradigm in Sesotho Translation

Edwin Joseph Mohatlane

*University of the Free State, Department of African Languages, P. O. Box 339,
Bloemfontein, 9300, South Africa
E-mail: mohatlanej@ufs.ac.za*

KEYWORDS Translatorial. Equivalence. *Skopos*. Paradigm. Translation. Project

ABSTRACT The paper introduces the translatorial action theory as a shift from the linguistic to the functional paradigm in Sesotho translation. The reason that prompted this view is that the equivalence principle had always narrowed and limited the scope of operation of the Sesotho translator only to the production of the target text. In doing so, the subject-object dialectical relationship that the Sesotho translator should have with the commissioner as well as the target group that he translates for, is neglected. The paper introduces Holz-Mänttari's translatorial action theory as the birth of a new paradigm in Sesotho translation. The results in this paper reflect the significance of the translation brief as a crucial mechanism that ensures the transactional relationships (between the translator, the initiator and the target readers) in the Sesotho translation. The equivalence principle, which had always been fore-grounded as the determining factor for a good translation, was discovered to be technocratically dehumanising. The study recommends that commissioners should henceforth mind the fact that the translator is not only called upon to produce a translation but the translator goes beyond by being engaged in cross-cultural communication and a mediated communication that qualifies the translatorial action as the new paradigm in Sesotho translation.

INTRODUCTION

The present research analyses the equivalence principle and contravenes the fundamental translation principle. The equivalence principle presupposes that translation has the same function with the source text. In terms of the general translation rule, translation is never meant for the same target group, the same purpose, and probably for the same initiator or commissioner as in the case of the source text.

Pym (1998) comments that there is no such thing as perfect equivalence between languages. Equivalence between the source text and the target text is only assumed to be, but it is not a reality. In the paper, the researcher substantiates the following claims:

As the first argument, the equivalence paradigm suggests that the translator is merely expected to produce the target text with the same purpose as informed by the source text. This means that the translator's role is narrowed to a unilateral and a single role of dealing with the source-target text relationship rather than other personal relationships that goes along with it. In the study, the researcher aims to emphasise the view that the translator plays a dual role, namely, to produce a target text in a different method, of a different purpose, for a new reader and probably for a new client. The translator would engage himself in negotiations with his client or commissioner with a view to translate

for new readers in a different situation, in a different culture and for a different purpose. As the first argument, it implies that the translator's role is elevated to a position of an expert who uses his knowledge and skill to constitute the translation but with special relationship with other intermediaries such as the initiator, the target readership, the source text author as well as the source text reader.

As the second argument that motivated the researcher to undertake this particular study, the whole equivalence theoretical principle of producing the target text of the same purpose, is reduced to the level of a special case scenario. The researcher therefore claims that this view narrows the equivalence paradigm to a specific case. It essentially implies therefore that in this study, the scenario where the purpose of translation is the same as the source text, is reckoned to be a rare and special case. This view is also supported by Pym (1996:13) as he maintains that equivalence generally meant "same function and was seen as a special case scenario". So, the level or scope of operation of the equivalence theory is radically reduced to that of a special case scenario. So the first point is an attack on the equivalence theory as it purports that the dominant aspect in translation is the source text.

The third and the last argument that the researcher presents is an attack on the *skopos* theory. While the *skopos* theory emphasises that the dominant element is the purpose, the re-

searcher investigates that it should not only be the purpose but also involve the social commitment of the commissioner. The purpose would only be legitimate if it is assigned by the initiator through the translation brief. In other words, the study presupposes the use of the translation brief in order to present a professional translation that is all-inclusive, legitimate and transparent to all the participants – hence Nord's (1997) principle of fidelity to the source text and loyalty to all the stakeholders in the translation process.

Aim of the Study

The study attempts to demonstrate the relevance of the functionalist paradigm in the Sesotho translation. The reason for this venture is that in the past, most of the Sesotho translators focused mainly on the equivalence principle in their translations. It appears that within the current South African dispensation where multilingualism is in great demand, the equivalence paradigm seems too limiting. Linked to this issue, Breck (1978:40) wonders how:

“to measure the equivalent effect since no text can have the same effect or elicit the same response in two different cultures in different periods of time.”

Sesotho translations appear to be restricted to express the socio-cultural needs of the Basotho readers. It is for this purpose that House (1981) determines that a functional equivalence assumes primary importance in that:

“The basic requirement for equivalence of ST (source text) and the TT (target text) ... is that a TT, in order to be equivalent to its ST, should have a function ... which is equivalent to ST's function.”

With the above details as background, the aim of this study is to present a new paradigm in the Sesotho translation in terms of the various factors that are in this paper. In fact, the translator is expected to perform a professional job that is not only formulated by him as an individual, but in his relationship with his fellow participants (the initiator, the source text author the target readers). Taken from this basic premise, it is suggested in this work that translation should be construed as a project and not necessarily a once-off task performed by an individual translator.

It is significant to understand that translation should no longer be perceived as the trans-

lator's sole task of producing the target text. It should primarily be perceived to be a process within which a number of participants are involved – not necessarily an idiosyncratic role of the translator as an individual. In this case, it will be prudent to establish whether the translation brief had been available in the production of translation and perhaps, whether the stipulations in the brief had been carefully followed.

Literature Review

The new paradigm that is suggested in this study is what Holz-Mänttari (1984) refers to as the translatorial action theory. This was a result of the thought processes and a rebellion against the ruling dogmas on translation (particularly the equivalence principle). It means therefore that translation is actually focused in two perspectives, namely, the role of the translator (translatorial) and the role of the translator's relationships with other translation actors (action theory). The translatorial action theory is dated back to 1984 with Holz-Mänttari as the founder and the original exponent of the theory. It reflects the everyday routine pursuits of the practising translator.

Holz-Mänttari (1984) believed that translation was fundamentally not a matter of language at all. Her approach was more radical than that of Vermeer (1996) on that particular score. For Holz-Mänttari (1984) translation is basically action, a form of intercultural communication, where language is not content or goal but it is the necessary instrument. The translatorial action theory can be defined according to Holz-Mänttari (1984:3) as:

“Translatorial action is integrated into a system of other actions and is controlled by factors lying outside it.”

The message is central and not only words as lexical items. Holz-Mänttari (1984) coined new terminology that brings about translation as a practical phenomenon and not as a mere linguistic reference. That is the reason Holz-Mänttari (1984) treated translation not only as a linguistic transference but as a professional practice, where the role of the translator in relation to other translation mediators is explicated. With this information as background, the reader understands that the translator does not operate in isolation but work hand in hand with other translation actors.

The new paradigm of translatorial action theory incorporates the basic views of Reiss (2004) and Nord (1997). Reiss (2004) maintains that certain types of translation should be equivalent at certain level. Nord (1997) suggests that the translation analysis should be done in order to reach the purpose of translation. Within the same book, we see Vermeer (1996) developing the new paradigm (through *skopos* theory). Vermeer (1996) maintains that the dominant aspect in translation is the purpose. In other words, the reason for the occurrence of translation is fundamental.

The second book is by a German woman, namely Holz-Mänttari (1984) on translator. This means of the translator; the translatorial action or translator's actions (theories and methods). Holz-Mänttari (1984) is more radical in her approach because she removed translation from the supremacy of the source text. This is where you get translation being connected with action – the relationship between the translator with his target group and the commissioner. The whole set of relationships with clients is very important. This is a double point of departure but very comparable with regard to the main concepts at this stage.

The first variable is what is called the '*skopos rule*' namely that the dominant factor in translation (translation project) (what the translator is doing) is the *skopos* or purpose.

This means that whereas in the equivalence paradigm the dominant factor is the source text; in the functionalist tradition or paradigm, the dominant aspect is the purpose for which translation is performed. That is the analysis of the source text is done in order to reproduce the target text, here the entire focus is shifted into something that is pertinent or actually involved in the translation process itself, namely the purpose. This suggests a shift of paradigm, a new focus in Sesotho translation.

Vermeer (1996) maintains therefore that the source text is dethroned. It was previously the dominant feature, and now it is no longer. The *skopos* or purpose is now the prime focus and that purpose in the target text is only the same as the one of the source text. Unlike in the case of the equivalence principle, the *skopos* rule implies that the same text can be translated for a different purpose. The same text is translated for many different translations. The formulated translations cannot be equally correct or useful

and this marks a new thinking and a new perception in Sesotho translation.

We might think of the Bible and show that it can be translated for children. The Bible can be translated for people who want it to be read easily (reader friendly). The Bible can be translated philologically, that is, in terms of the needs of the people who are interested in its original language(s) such as Hebrew and Greek. The emphasis in the new paradigm is that the same text can be translated in many different ways for different purposes. So, what we should study are the purposes and they would inform us about the strategies in which the translations can be performed. According to this perspective, all the strategies are legitimate if they correspond to a legitimate purpose. In other words, we would realise how the purpose is functional to determine the methods and strategies in the production of a target text.

Therefore, the translator is transformed from someone who merely produces equivalence between the source text and the target text but into someone who performs an active social role. The information that the translator deals with comes from the source text, as well as the client. The translatorial action theory warrants the translator to deal with the information that comes from the source text (as an offer of information) as well as the client or commissioner. Vermeer (1996) uses the term commission. The commission should be negotiated and it forms part of what we should be studying in this research work. It should be the source text and translation, the translation brief, and the target reader and therefore reach the purpose.

The Birth of a Double-sided Paradigm for Purpose and Action

Koller (1995) deals with the Theory of equivalence. The theory of equivalence was related to text types by Reiss (2004). Other people include Nord (1997) who brought a functionalist idea of achieving purpose to analyse the source text efficiently and completely in order to develop translation strategies.

So, among Reiss (2004) and Nord (1997), translation that is based on the source text is still relevant. Holz-Mänttari (1984) is more radical. She maintains that we should actually look at what the translator actually does (action). With that action as background, we are going to

study the translator's role as an expert with other people around him (clients and readers). Vermeer (1996) comes with the purpose as a new focus in translation. This basically illuminates the birth of a new paradigm.

Linked to the new school of thought within the translation practice, the descriptive approach in terms of the Tel Aviv school founded by Even-Zohar (1978) and continued by Toury (1995) depicted the target culture in the translation as a polysystem or a system that comprises other systems. Even-Zohar (1978) distinguishes cases where the target culture can be central or peripheral depending on the relation between the source and the target text culture. The cultural dimension is also included in the new paradigm. In this way, it broadens the horizons of knowledge of the reader regarding the birth of a new paradigm in Sesotho translation.

METHODS

In order to operationalise the theory of translatorial action in Sesotho translation, the researcher will select the relevant English source text with its Sesotho translation.

Of importance, the researcher will have a source text with its translation brief and establish whether it has been translated for the same purpose. It will be prudent to judge if the same text could be translated for a different target group, what could be the differences in terms of the translation strategies, purpose as well as the linguistic style in general. It will also be important to establish whether there were clear-cut instructions from the commissioner and that they had been translated accordingly in the Sesotho translations. Vermeer (1996) perceives translation as an action that has a specific purpose and it culminates in the target text. The translation actors involved in this action are determined by the commission (set by the client or by the translator as an individual).

The commissioner's translation brief will be made available. The translator will then translate the given English source text to Sesotho language according to the given brief. The source text selected in this case is an extract from the children's Bible. However, the translator will try by all means to translate in such a way that language tends to be accessible and be reflective of the intended meaning as well as the intended purpose. Nida (2001) concurs to

this view as he emphasises on a shift from formal equivalence to functional paradigm in his perception that no translation is ever completely equivalent. The linguistic, the cultural and the social needs of the target group will be given first priority to demonstrate the effects of this new paradigm in the Sesotho translation.

Operationalisation

The Translation Brief

It is generally accepted that translation never occurs in a vacuum – there is always a reason why translation should take place. The reasons for translation are usually independent of the reasons for the creation of the source text (Kruger 2006). It very seldom happens that translators (or agencies) decide on their own to translate a text 'for the love of it'. They are usually asked to do so by an initiator, to use Nord's (1997) term. The initiator starts the translation process because he has a specific *skopos* in mind for the translation. This intended purpose of the translation is usually encompassed in the translation brief, which is basically a set of instructions on why the translation is needed and for whom. Translating public health information material is one area where the translator would require a detailed brief as regards the intended function of the translation and, in particular, the target readership. The term 'accessibility' is understood in essentially the same way as broad conceptions of 'readability', defined for example by Mobley (1986: 6 quoted in Sanderson 2005: 55). The translation produced will be read with the above definition of linguistic accessibility and cultural acceptability as background.

Kruger (2006) maintains that every aspect of a text which makes it either easy or difficult to read should be identified. These aspects include its *visual impact* (for example, the clarity of the typeface, the positioning of diagrams and illustrations); its *stylistic features* (for example, the use of familiar words and structures); the *organization* of the information (for example, the contents table, index and headings); its *conceptual level*, and – perhaps the most important – the amount of *interest* aroused in the reader by the text. The following translation brief in the given box hereunder, serves as a model brief within which some of its details will be implemented in this study.

Translation brief: Readership: adults and young people **country-wide**. Your translation should be VERY reader-friendly, make use of very accessible language! ·

Use **direct** language for sensitive/ taboo terms – do NOT use euphemisms! Do not explain unnecessarily - your translation goes into a very colourful booklet with very graphic illustrations ·

Use **short/simple sentences** – shorten sentences if necessary, change passive voice to active voice, convert nouns to verbs if necessary ·

Use **simple vocabulary**: more **common** synonyms, not necessarily “pure” language, loan words and indigenised loan words are allowed. Also, if you use an English loan word, please **add** the meaning of the English loan word in your language ·

Use **extra links** to enhance cohesion between pronouns and the preceding referent within the text (i.e. give clearer references if necessary than the English text.)

The English Source Text and the Sesotho Target Text

ST: He asked Eve, “Did God really say you must not eat any fruit in the garden?”

She told him, “It’s only the fruit from the tree at the center of the garden that we are not allowed to eat. God says we must not eat it or even touch it, or we will die.”

“You won’t die!” the serpent hissed. You will become just like God.”

The woman was convinced. The fruit looked so fresh and delicious, and it would make her so wise! So she ...

TT: O botsa Eva: “Ana Modimo o itse le se ke la ja tholwana tshimong?”

O a araba: “Ke ditholwana feela tsa sefate se mahareng a tshimo seo re se nang tokelo ya sona.” Modimo o itse re se ke ra se ja kapa ho se ama, haeba ho se jwalo, re tla shwa.”

“Le ke ke la shwa, ho araba noha, empa le tla tshwana le Modimo.”

Mosadi o ile a kgolwa, a hlokomela ditholwana di le ntle di kgahla mahlo, mme le yena di tla mo etsa hore a be bohlale. “Yaba o ...”

RESULTS

Based on the observations derived from the translation of the given source text in the para-

graph that deals with Operationalisation, the following results have been drawn:

In the first instance, it is clear that for good translation to be, the translation brief has to be available. Most of the Sesotho translations had been done in the past without the briefs being issued to translators. The new suggested paradigm shift is significant to sensitise translators about the importance of the translation brief towards producing a meaningful, culturally acceptable and linguistically accessible translations. The translation brief does not only have to be available but should also be detailed and comprehensive to give the translator a clearer and better perspective so as to be empowered to eventually produce a meaningful translation.

However, the context with in which the translation should be performed, needs to be in line with the specifications of the translation brief. In other words, the translator has to be loyal to the commissioner by translating the text in such a way that it satisfies the needs of the commissioner. The purpose of translation is not the only an important element to the translator but also the commitment of other participants (loyalty principle applies). It is at this stage where we realise the role of the loyalty principle as part of this new theoretical paradigm, namely, the translatorial action theory in Sesotho translation.

Next, the translator’s field of operation is extended in Sesotho translation. This work reflects the fact that the translator does not only perform a single role of producing a translation derived from the source text; but works in conjunction with the initiator and other participants in the translation project. Translation now becomes a cooperative and collective responsibility of the translator and other translation actors.

Further, the present study demonstrates that translation in a general sense does not necessarily have one single purpose. The general translation rule determines that translation is written for different readers, in different situations and in different cultures and therefore cannot be expected to focus on one specific purpose. The given translation was meant for children but may not always be directed to children at all times and all places. It may be relevant to the elderly people in one context and in one culture but be diversified in terms of the pursuits of life of the custodians of the target language.

In the fifth instance, this study has reflected on the notion that there is no full equivalence

between the source text and the target text. In terms of the English-Sesotho translation in this work, the problem of linguistic differences appears to be still problematic as the two languages are not the same and are not equally developed. Jakobson (2000) pinpoints the structural and terminology differences even though it does not imply that translation would not be possible.

As the sixth and the last point, the translation demonstrates the principle of indeterminacy. It is obvious that the Sesotho translation does not discharge the total equivalence as always specified in terms of the indeterminacy principle. The language used in the translation also reflects that it is not common and natural. In terms of the fidelity principle, that is, the relationship between the source and the target text, it follows that the translator managed to contextualise the intended message within the philosophy of life of our youth and young children.

The translator also had been loyal to other translation mediators by presenting the translation as purposeful, linguistically accessible and culturally acceptable to most of the target readers. This view is confirmed by Baker (1992) in her argument that the primary aim of the translator should be able to recreate the intended message of the source language in such a way that it becomes accessible and comprehensible to the target audience.

DISCUSSION

Based on the translation of the given Bible text, the researcher intends to flag and discuss the following observations:

It is apparent that formal correspondence sometimes distorts the grammatical and stylistic patterns of the target language. It is incumbent upon the translator to translate in such a manner that readers will not struggle to access the intended message. In the event where the translator fails to do so, the trend could be that the message may likely be distorted and the entire translation be ambiguous and questionable (*translationese*). It then implies that within the new functional paradigm, the translator has the capacity to transform the source text and represent it in a form of the translation in such a manner that will be befitting and relevant to the target linguistic and cultural social situation.

Another observation prompted by the given translation, is that in the case where adapta-

tions should be made, the translator is free to do so. The translator operates within a new paradigm that affords him freedom of linguistic and cultural expression in Sesotho translation. The trend among Sesotho translations is that the brief is often not sufficiently explicit because commissioners are not translation experts. They are therefore not aware of what kind of information the translator needs to produce a text that satisfies the needs and expectations of the client or audience.

An important observation displayed in the English-Sesotho translation is that the text has to be thoroughly and appropriately interpreted. This is one area that had been emphatically demonstrated in this study. Parallel texts may also be functional to the translator in the interpretation of the brief. The researcher maintains also that the study reflects that the choice of methods is the basis for loyalty and trust between the translator and other interaction partners in intercultural mediation.

The new functional paradigm suggests that the translator is the expert and should not necessarily be guided by the commissioner about the manner in which he should approach translation. The work demonstrates the expertise and the latitude within which the translator operated in the translation of the given source text. So, the translator is presented as the expert who displays his knowledge of the translation skills and procedures and his responsibility towards his fellow target readers.

The aim of the translation lies outside the linguistic content of the source text. Translational action is not just a mere linguistic transcoding, but consists of a whole complex of actions, involving teamwork among specialists, including the client or initiator who has a role of a professional expert. These translation mediators are fully functional in every translation project. As a result of cooperation between translation mediators, the translatorial action theory contributed not only to the cultural turn of the 1980s but even beyond.

It is once more apparent that the concept of translatorial action has a lot of virtue in terms of the translation presented in this work. Currently, when translators are called upon to do translations, they go beyond just producing a translation. Taken from the philosophy that there should be cooperation of translation actors, it follows that the translator has to try to satisfy

not only the target group, but the initiator and the general reading public. From Nord (1997) we have a reason to admit that there is communication within a wide frame of actions.

Communication can be cross-cultural, mediated or direct. If communication is mediated, we can talk of translatorial action. Under this category, translators can do translatorial actions in producing translations or non-translations. They can produce draft, to give advice on cross-cultural communication, and all lucrative parts of what translators are expected to do. There is no reason that a theory should stand only on translatorial things (achieving a new function or achieving the same function), but should also consider other dynamics that are translation related.

It is also interesting that readers recognise the dual role that translators should perform. Translation now identifies itself as a project that encompasses the involvement of more participants. Translation now features relevantly as a socio-linguistic and a socio-cultural tool that is functional to serve the interests of its general reading public. It also becomes evident in this work that translation is not only a reproduction of message of the text but the transcoding and the transformation of message and culture thereof.

Callon et al. (2006) already observed the role of the relationship of participants in translation in their definition of translation as the way social actors interact. In this way, the sociological significance of this new paradigm is reflected. When we pluck a feather from Renn (2006) we can deduce that translation is the way that groups in postmodern societies manage to communicate. Translation is not only a matter of the relationship between the source and the target text but extended to social relations between all the participants involved in the translation process.

Based on the given English-Sesotho translation, the use of language in this study reflects that the translator tries to be simplistic to be able to come to the level of understanding of our children (particularly on matters that involve religion). In other words, the translation in this study is contextualised within the linguistic competence and the philosophy of life of children for them to come to grips with the intended message. The purpose within which the given translation has been made (for the youth and chil-

dren), may not necessarily be the same as in the case of translation for the elderly people. This observation therefore satisfies the stated basic hypotheses underlying this research study.

CONCLUSION

The application of a functional translatorial action theory proves to be suitable for the English translated Bible text. However, it does not circumvent the problem of equivalence, but rather poses it in different terms rejecting the idea that there should be one single universally applicable concept of equivalence.

The degree of equivalence to be achieved in the translation of a given text is not absolute, but depends on the target text intended function. The translatorial action theory as a new paradigm in Sesotho translation, is not only viable but recommendable as well as effective in consideration of its comprehensiveness and flexibility.

As one of the strong points presented in this study, the translatorial action theory recognises that the translator works in a professional situation. It acknowledges that the *skopos* experiential aspect is what readers are looking for. For translation to be functional, it has to serve the social interests and aspirations of its target society. Even though its fidelity principle of relationship with the source text is still important, the translator is expected to be loyal to the readers and other translation mediators.

That the translator has complex obligations than just dealing with the source text but also with people (initiator, receivers, clients and many intermediaries, other translators, other terminology experts, and so on.)

The functionalist translatorial action paradigm liberates the translator from the theories that formulate linguistic rules. This theory does not legislate on the translator regarding what to do in every translation situation. It all says that the translator is there and exercises his knowledge but should take cognisance of the fact that he is dealing with other translation actors.

As indicated before, the theory invites us to see translation as a project and not as a text but a project with a text, a brief and other participants involved in it.

It can also address ethical issues. The term loyalty was then developed. It allows readers to understand and accept that the translator is faithful to the source text (fidelity principle) but also

loyal to people including the new reader, the client and the source text reader (if and when they are around).

The work has demonstrated that Sesotho translation, according to the translatorial action theory is functionally and culturally oriented. There is a paradigm shift from the linguistic to the functionalist approach and from the source text-driven to the purpose-driven and eventually the Sesotho translation then tends to culminate as a purposeful transcultural action.

Contrary to linguistic-oriented approaches to translation that assume the source text as the supreme position in relation to the target text, within the translatorial action theoretical framework, the source text is merely regarded as the starting point. However, the emphasis is also based on the cultural, historical and socio-political factors surrounding translation. In this way, translation is then perceived as a culture-bound phenomenon. As a matter of necessity, the social needs of the target group for whom the translation is directed, are catered for, in terms of both language and culture.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The birth of a new paradigm in Sesotho translation is demonstrated as a shift from linguistic to functional paradigm in translation and a great contribution to translation theory in the 20th century. The study sensitises the translators to the concept of *skopos* (purpose) as being an idealism itself. So, the problem of equivalence between the source text and the target text (the uncertainty principle) is moved from the source text to a new place, a new reader and a new idealism (purpose).

Translation should reflect the everyday routine of the practising translator. This theory seems to be a rebellion against too much emphasis on the academic significance of translation. Translation is not only a linguistic transference, but, of importance a transcoding of culture or inter-cultural transference. The inter-cultural communication is crucial, especially in multilingual and multi-cultural countries like South Africa.

Translators are reminded of the fact that translation involves action performed within a system of other actions. Translation is never performed in a void but always influenced by other factors that are found outside it. The most

formidable point that the new paradigm emphasise is that translation should not only be viewed as a textual matter; but, that it is prevalent and practical in the life of the translator, in what he does (actions) and how he interprets his experiences in life.

The study sensitises translators and editors about globalisation as producing countless situations in which translation now responds to the movement of people, not texts. Translation is increasingly necessary within our current societies and not just between them. Translation is thus playing a role in which our power relations are enacted rather than ensuring a stable equivalence between texts.

Sesotho translation has to undergo a radical change from a mere production of equivalent translations but also transform the target text into a text that encompasses the social needs of all the social actors in the translation process. If equivalence as a special case does result, it should not simply be perceived as the general trend in translation but only a specific isolated and special case out of the general.

The Sesotho translators are capacitated and empowered through this study to be more considerate to the target readers. They should not only be confined to the source text. The subject-object dialectical relationship between translators and readers should be taken into serious consideration. Translators are reminded of the fact that they do not translate a source text in a void but has to be mindful of the availability of culture, language dynamics as well as the interests of both the commissioner as well as the target group. In other words, it is important to factor in Sesotho translations the cultural, situational and historical factors in order to cater for the social needs of the targeted Basotho reading public.

REFERENCES

- Baker M 1992. *In Other Words: A Course Book on Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Broeck R 1978. The concept of equivalence in translation theory: Some critical reflections. In: JS Holmes, J Lambert, R Broeck (Eds.): *Literature and Translation*. Leuven: Academic, pp. 29-47.
- Callon M, Latour B 2006. Unscrewing the big Leviathan; or how actors macrostructure reality, and how sociologists help them to do so. In: KD Knorr, A Cicourel (Eds.): *Advances in Social Theory and Methodology: Toward and Integration of Micro and Macro Sociologies*, London: Routledge, pp. 10-13.

- Even-Zohar I 1978. *Papers in Historical Poetics*. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University. The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.
- Gentzler E 2001. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. 2nd Edition. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hermans T 1996. Norms and the determination of translation: A theoretical framework. In: A Roman, MCA Vidal (Eds.): *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 25-51.
- Holz-Mänttari J 1984. *Translatorisches Handeln: Theorie und Methode*. New York: Routledge.
- House J 2013. Theory and practice in language studies. *Academy Publishers*, 3: 1-6.
- Jakobson R 2000. On linguistic aspects of translation. In: L Venuti (Ed.): *The Translation Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge, pp. 113-118.
- Koller W 1995. The concept of equivalence and the object of translation studies. *John Benjamins Publishing Company, Target*, 7: 191-222.
- Kruger A, Wallmach K 2006. Research methodology for the description of a source text and its translation(s) – a South African perspective. *South African Journal of African Languages*, 12: 119-126.
- Mobley M 1986. *Evaluating Curriculum Manuals-Unit 2: Readability*. New York: Longman.
- Munday J 2008. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. 2nd Edition. London: Routledge.
- Nida E, Taber CR 2001. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Nord C 1997. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Pym A 1996. Venuti's visibility. *Target*, 8: 165-177.
- Pym A 1998. *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Reiss K 2004. *Translation Criticism: The Potentials and Limitations* (Translated from German by Erroll Rhodes). Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Renn J 2006. *Übersetzungsverhältnisse: Perspektiven einer pragmatistischen Gesellschaftstheorie*. Weilerswist: Velbrück Wissenschaft.
- Sanderson P A. 2005. *Only Study Guide for LIN301-D: Text Quality: Theories, Models and Techniques*. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Snell-Hornby M 1995. *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Snell-Hornby M 2006. *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Toury G 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Vermeer H 1989. Skopos and commission in translational action. In: L Venuti (Ed.): *The Translation Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge, pp. 227-238.
- Vermeer H 1996. *A Skopos Theory of Translation (Some Arguments For and Against)*. Heidelberg: TEXTconTEXT Verlag.