Translation Strategies Used To Handle Non-Equivalence In The Kĩkamba Bible Translation

Eunice N. Musyoka, Nancy W. Mbaka

Kigari Teacher Training College
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Chuka University
Corresponding Author: Eunice N. Musyoka

Abstract: Translation involves a decision-making or problem-solving process. The decisions are taken to be translation strategies.The problems are caused by a number of constraints that the translator goes through and the constraints affect the quality of translation. A translation problem is whatever presents obstacles in transferring the content of the source text into the target text. Translation problems encountered by translators are also referred to as transfer problems of non-equivalence and different translation strategies are explored to solve them. Non-equivalence occurs when a lexical item or an expression in the source language lacks an equivalent item to translate it in the target text. Translation strategies are the conscious plans or procedures which the translator employs in order to solve translation problems.This paper analysis the translation strategies used to handle non-equivalence in the Kĩkamba Bible translation. Relevance Theory was used to explore the translation strategies. A descriptive research design was used to obtain information from a sampled population. The Bible is divided into two sections that is the Old and the New Testament, it is further categorized into seven categories which include; Pentateuch books, historical books, poetical books, prophetic books, the gospels, the early church (Acts) and the epistles. Purposive sampling was used to select one book from each category and one chapter was purposively selected from each book to form the sample for the study. Data was collected through careful study of the English Bible, the Revised Standard Versionto identify non-equivalence and the Kĩkamba Bible to analyse the strategies that are used to handle non-equivalence. The study established twelve translation strategies; cultural filtering, amplification, explicitation, literal translation, hyponymy, naturalization, descriptive equivalent, synonymy, reduction, borrowing, use of paraphrase, and omission. The findings reveal that, cultural filtering, synonymy, reduction and omission strategies resulted to unsuccessful transfer while descriptive equivalent and amplification were successfully used. The unsuccessful transfer of the message resulted from use of the wrong strategy or the inappropriate use of the right strategy. The study suggests that the translator needs a good background on the culture of the two languages and adequate knowledge on the translation strategies in order to use them appropriately.

Key Words: translation, translation strategies, translation problems, non-equivalence,Kĩkamba Bible, successful and unsuccessful transfer.

Date of Submission: 13-09-2019   Date of Acceptance: 30-09-2019

I. INTRODUCTION

According to Baker (1992) translation strategies are the conscious procedures which the translator employs in order to solve translation problems.Translation problems encountered by translators are also referred to as transfer problems of non-equivalence and different translation strategies are explored to solve them. The translator has to read and interpret the source text before rendering the meaning in the target text, this illustrates the two roles of the translator; as a reader and a writer. Translation involves a decision-making process or problem-solving process. The problems are caused by a number of constraints that the translator goes through. The decisions are taken to be translation strategies. Deep (2005) defined a translation problem as whatever presents obstacles in transferring the content of one piece of language into another.

The translator is a mediator between the writer of the source text material and the readers of the translated target material for whom mutual communication is a problem due to language barrier, (Hatim and Mason, 1990). Communication is defined as the transfer of meaning (Oxford Dictionary, 2010). Translation is viewed as a special case of communication process (Aissi, 1987).The strategy used, therefore, should help the translator to communicate the meaning of the source text (ST) to the target text (TT). The strategies which conveyed the meaning of ST into the TT were termed as successful strategies and the ones which did not unsuccessful strategies. Ferch and Kasper (1983) state that strategies emerge as soon as the translation cannot be

carried out automatically while Garcia (1996) asserts that different procedures for the translation are implemented to achieve a partially successful transfer when difficulties in the translation often become unavoidable.

The role of the translator is to encode meaning and forms of the source language into the target language. Equivalence is aimed at so that the texts can be compared in terms of meaning.

Translation is a process that necessities a complex and discourse processing for it to be successful (Blum-Kulka, 1986). This success when dealing with cases of non-equivalence is only achieved if the correct strategy is appropriately used in the context.

A number of scholars have tried to define a theory of translation that captures all the differences in texts types.The earlier approaches to translation used the two old dominant approaches to translation namely; formal correspondence approach and dynamic equivalence approach (also called functional equivalence approach). The literal approach renders the word-for-word, it emphasis on the form of the original text at the expense of context and function while the functional translation places the emphasis on conveying the meaning of the original text through capturing the function and purpose of the original text.According to Majola,(1999) the Christian missionaries generally followed a formal correspondence approach to translating and consequently many of the old Bible translations are quite literal and problematic especially in cases where the original Hebrew and Greek cannot be matched resulting in entirely wrong meanings, obscurity, ambiguity, bad grammar or style and therefore resulting to non-equivalence at different levels.

The original Bible was written in three languages. The Old Testament was written in Hebrew with a small percentage in Aramic. The New Testament was written in Koine Greek. According to Waruta, (1975) the earliest Biblical translations in Africa were the first Christian missionaries. In Kenya it started in 1845 when Krapf, a German C M S missionary started his translations of the scriptures into Kiswahili, Kigalla and Kĩkamba. There were a number of problems during the pioneer period. One, the translators did not know well enough the language into which they were to translate and secondly, they could not get dependable help from their illiterate and semi-literate converts. The other serious problem was that most of the languages had not been reduced to writing. The Bible societies especially the British and Foreign Bible Society (B F B S) played a very important role in helping the translators as well as in printing and publishing what had been translated. Many of the languages had no written symbols beforehand and the translators had to make their own by listening to sounds.

Kĩkambais spoken with different variations largely due to geographical reasons. Maũndũ (1980) distinguished four dialects, that is, the Machakos dialect, the Makuenĩ dialect, the Kĩtui North dialect and Kĩtui central dialect. The dialects are named after the area they are spoken. According to him,Machakos dialect also known as Kĩmasakũ dialect is the one used in important written works like the Kĩkamba Bible, Kĩkamba literature for example story books such as Ngotho (1963) and Kĩmilũ (2013 and instructional materials for lower primary classes. This study used the standardized Kĩkamba dialect.

Bishop Edward Steeretranslated the entire Bible into Kiswahili, which set a standard in the work of translation and became a great reference book for several Bible translations produced in East Africa during the period of the First World War, (Waruta, 1975). He states that the second complete translation of the Bible was in Kĩkamba, the translation in coherent Kĩkamba was started by African Inland Mission (A I M) Christian missionaries.In 1956 the Kĩkamba Bible was completed and published as *MaandĩkoMatheu Ma Ngai MetawaMbiviliaNĩmoũtianĩomũkũũnaũtianĩoMweũ*(the Holy Scriptures of God Called the Bible are the Old and the New Covenant). In 1960 the New Testament was corrected and reset in larger fond and published in1966. Its revision was completed in 1974 under the title *Mbivilia*(Bible). It uses Kĩmasakũ dialect of Kĩkamba.

Another Kĩkamba Bible version, translated by team of translators was published by the Bible Society of Kenya in 2011 under the title *MbiviliaUvooMũseo;Kĩkamba Kya ĩvindaYĩĩ (*the Bible Good News; the updated Kĩkamba). A later edition was done by Mbiti who translated the New Testament direct from Greek to Kĩkamba and produced a new Kĩkamba Bible version in 2015. He asserted that he did this translation single handedly due to the challenges he used to face while using the *Mbilivia* (Bible, 1974). This studyusedthe Kĩkamba BibleVersion (2011)as the target text and the Revised Standard Version (RSV) Bible (2008) as the 'working'source text.

II.   TYPES TRANSLATION STRATEGIES

According to Miremadi (1991) translation problems are divided into two main categories; lexical and syntactic. Lexical problems are experienced because, words are entities which refer to objects or concepts and a word in one language may not to be substituted with a word in another language when referring to the same concept or object. Syntactic problems are concerned with the organization of the language and they include problems such as word class, grammatical relations, word order, style and pragmatic aspects. Bergen (1997) classified the strategies into three categories; comprehension, transfer and production strategies.

Newmark (1988) identifies three basic groups of translation strategies, that is, syntactic or grammatical, semantic and pragmatic. Syntactic strategies are concerned with the organization of units of a text and not with their meaning. The main ones are literal translation, loan/calque and unit shift among others. Semantic strategies have to do with lexical semantics and aspects of clause meaning. They focus on the sense of the language units. They are strategies such as antonymy, synonymy and hyponymy. Pragmatic strategies are concerned with the selection of information in the target language and they include: cultural filtering, explicitness change, illocutionary change and coherence change.

According to Chesterman (2009) the term strategy implies that the translator having encountered a problem keenly chooses between various options to avoid the risk of mistranslation but strives to achieve optimal solutions. He distinguishes between two approaches; comprehension strategies which have to do with the analysis of the source text and production strategies which have to do with the manipulation of the linguistic material in order to produce an appropriate target text.

The goal of translation of every Bible translator is to convey the meaning of the source text in the receptor language. Translators take two aspects of the original into account; its meaning and its form. The form of the text consists of the structural components of the SL, its lexical and the grammatical systems. The meaning is the message conveyed by the text to its readers (Beckman and Callow, 1974). A wrong choice of the strategy leads to mistranslation or partial transfer of the message. Krings (1986) states that the absence of a translation problem coincides with the absence of translation strategies. He states that there are five main sets of strategies; strategies of comprehension, equivalent retrieval, equivalent monitoring, decision-making and reduction.Comprehension problems lead to the use of comprehension strategies which is manifested in inferring meaning and use of reference books, for example, dictionaries. Retrieval strategies refer to the recall of a known lexical item. Monitoring strategies are employed to check items for correctness or appropriateness. Decision making happens during the process of translation and are concerned with choosing between alternatives. The reduction strategy is a specific one that refers to those cases where the translation problem can be solved only by means of formal or functional reduction.

Toury (1995) distinguishes between two types of translation phases, that is, to execute the plan by means of which the translator's communicative intention will (hopefully) be received or to overcome problems that the translator may encounter during the execution of his plan. According to Fawcett, (1997) strategies are the techniques or decisions taken to solve the translation problem. This means that there must be a problem for a strategy to be used.

Lorscher (2000) provides two models of translation quality assessment, that is, equivalence-based approaches and functional approaches. The equivalence-based theorists view translation as the attempt to reproduce the source text at all levels as closely as possible while functional approaches argues that translation is a process of text production on the basis of a source text and the target text in which the target text is considered as a text in its own right.

Venuti (1995:19) claims that 'there are only two methods of translation either the translator leaves the author in peace as much as possible and moves the reader towards him or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible and moves the author towards him'. In this distinction he draws out two contemporary terms in translation; foreignization and domestication. According to Shuttleworth andCowie (1997), foreignisation means retaining something of the foreignness of the original while domestication is a term used to describe the translation strategy in which transparent, fluent style is adopted so as to minimize the strangeness of the foreign text in the TT for its readers. Domestication involves reducing the author's styles to a plain uniformity in the process of translation.

III. UNSUCCESSFUL MESSAGE TRANSFER

In this study unsuccessful message transfer is used to refer to partial or incorrect or mismatch (mistranslation in extreme obvious cases) of the ST message into the TT. The use of strategies to solve the translation problems may lead to errors in translation. The errors are also referred to as mistranslation by Lorscher, (2000) and mismatches by Hatim and Mason (1997). Pym (1992) defines errors as a manifestation of a defect in any of the factors entering into the two skills; the ability to generate a target text series of more than one viable ones for the ST and the ability to select only one target text from the given series. Bastin (2000) acknowledges the existence of two main categories of errors; meaning-based errors and language-based errors. He associates the first to faulty analysis of the source-text and the second to inadequate mastery of the target language and/or of the source language.

Pym (1996) classifies errors into two categories, in reference to translation; binary and non-binary. A binary error opposes a wrong answer to the right while non-binary error can be judged as correct but with some weaknesses not demonstratively right or wrong. The binary errors belong to the level of grammar, morphology, system and lexis, that is, language features. Non-binary errors are more translation-based phenomena, based on the misapplication of the translation strategies such as, omission, reduction, filtering, paraphrase and addition

among others. In this study the strategies are identified and categorized into successful (achievement) and unsuccessful (reduction) strategies.

IV. METHODOLOGY

The study was guided by the principles of descriptive research design. A descriptive research design falls under qualitative research approach.The Bible has 66 books and it is divided into two sections the Old Testament and New Testament. The Old Testament has 39 books and the New Testament has 27 books. The books are further divided into other categories. For the purpose of this study the researcher adapted a religious classification by the Revised Standard Version Bible (Preface, 2008). The religious classification put the Bible books into seven categories; Pentateuch, Historical books, Poetical books, Prophetic books, Gospel, The early church, and the Epistles. The researcher selected one book from each category which included: Genesis, Judges, Song of Solomon, Isaiah, Mathew, Acts of the Apostle and Hebrews. The researcher further purposively sampled the first chapter of each book for the research except the book of Mathew and Hebrew in which the last chapter was sampled. A total of seven chapters formed the sample for the study.

The process involvedtwo phases; the first one involved reading the selected chapters from each book intensively using the Revised Standard Version (2008) to explore non-equivalences guided by the Equivalence theory by proposed by Nida (1964). The verses that reflected cases of non-equivalences were highlighted and recorded. The second phase involved reading of the Kĩkamba Bible (2011) to determine the translation strategies used to solve the problems ofnon-equivalences. The communicative principle and the optimal principle of Relevance Theory (Sperber and Wilson, 1986) were used to analyze the status of the translation strategies, that is, whether they were successful in translating the message of ST or not.

V. DISCUSSION

Different scholars have classified the translation strategies using different approaches but this study adapts Chesterman's (1997, 2009), Newmark (1988) and Baker (1992) categories but does not strictly follow their procedures and categories. The definitions of the strategies are also drawn from their categories.

5.1 Cultural Filtering

This strategy involves adapting some specific cultural expressions or terms to the target culture norms and expectations either through domestication orforeignisation.Language and culture are inseparable, that is, language cannot be understood outside the cultural context and culture can only exist and be spread through language, (Elyildirim, 2008). The cultural filtering strategy in this study is used to translate culture bound words as illustrated in the following texts.

The word 'cart' was used to translator '**chariots'** as seen in Song of Solomon 1:9.
Text 1
ST: I compare you, my love, to a mare of Pharaoh's chariots.
TT:*Mwendwawakwa, nĩkũvw'anany'anambalasiilaikũsasyamakasya ma mũsumbĩwamisili.*
B/T: my love I compare with horses thatpull the carts of king of Egypt.
The 'carts' are common among the targeted readers, which gives a picture of the image used in the comparison, these however are two different objects in terms of their use and value.The 'mare of Pharaoh's chariots' entails a sense of beauty and wealth in the comparison which is lost in the TT, since 'carts' are drawn by bulls or donkeys in the targeted community and are used to run local errands in the homestead like drawing water or carrying farm products.

The lexical item '**whiteropes'**as used in Acts of the Apostles 1:10 was translated as 'white clothes' which is a general term so as to fit in the target culture.
Text: 2
ST: And while they were gazing into heaven as he went, two men stood by them in <u>white ropes,</u>
TT: *Atũmwaasu   o   maendeenakũngelelamatunĩYesuambatite,*
aũmeelĩnĩmaũngamiekwakĩthũlũmũkovakuvĩnamomekĩĩĩte<u>ngũanzaũ.</u>
B/T: those disciples while looking up into the clouds as Jesus was ascending two men stood suddenly near them putting on <u>white clothes</u>.
The core message in the verse is communicated but a different strategy would domesticate the expression'white clothes' better to fit in the TT culture and differentiate the kind of clothes that are referred to.

In Song of Solomon 1:16 and Song of Solomon 1:12the lexical item '**couch'** is domesticated as 'bed' since it is not a common term in the Akamba society's culture. The cultural filtering strategy through adaptation makes it

---

easy for the TT reader to comprehend an item that is not lexicalized in the TT, but in this case it led to unsuccessful transfer.

Other lexical items that were translated through use of cultural adaptation are '**sepulchre**' and '**tomb**' which are used in Mathew 28:1 and Mathew 28:8 respectively. They were both translated as 'grave'. The core message is achieved since the three concepts are used as places to burry dead bodies but they are different in terms of the way they are made. In a 'tomb' and 'sepulchre' the bodies are wrapped in special cloth they are not put in coffin, it's a kind of cave that is closed with a rock and can be used to keep valuable things also (Douglas and Tenny, 1987). The two concepts are not well domesticated in the TT culture and thus the strategy is unsuccessful.

Domesticating in cultural filtering involves moving the text towards the target readers making the text more accessible and familiar. For example in Genesis 1:1 the word '**heaven**' is rendered as 'clouds' in order to accommodate it in the TT culture. The target reader can easily comprehend 'clouds' because they can physically be seen and can use the context to remove the ambiguity. The strategy is successfully used in this case.

The strategy was used to translate culture-specific concepts and the conclusion made here is that cultural concepts are difficult to translate. In this strategy the translator uses domestication and foreignisation to contextualize them in the TT, with little success.

5.2 Amplification
Amplification involves adding some words in the translation to make it more vivid. It has a golden rule: add words but do not add meanings, delete words but do not delete meanings. Amplification is a type of addition in which some certain words are added to explain the sentence that is clearly and easily understood by the source readers in the ST but not the target readers (Newmark, 2001).

In Mathew 28:11, the target reader would have used more processing efforts to understand the kind of guards referred to in the text, but the use of amplification made it easier to comprehend.
Text 3
ST: while they were going, behold; some of the <u>guards</u> went into the city and told the chief priests all that had taken place.
TT: *aka asu me nzĩanĩmaendete, amwe ma asikalĩalamasungaambũanĩmaendiemũsyĩwaYelũsalemu, namatavyaathembianenemaũndũonthealameekĩkĩte.*
B/T: those women when on the way, some of the soldiers <u>who were guarding the grave</u> went tothe city of <u>Jerusalem</u> and told the senior priests all things that had happened.

The word 'guards' is amplified in the TT through description to identify the 'guards' who went to the city to deliver the said information.

Amplification was also used due to the fact that some expressions in the source language were completely different from the corresponding expressions in the target language. For example, in judges 1:35 the house of Joseph is amplified to bring clarity in the TT.
Text: 4
ST: hand of the house of Joseph rested heavily upon them
TT:*mbaĩyaEvalaimunayaManasenĩmaendeeiekũmasumbĩka*
B/T: the people of the <u>tribe of Ephrahim and of Mannasah</u>went on ruling them

It is a kind of an idiomatic expression and the use of the amplification strategy expounded on the content. Without the additional information the expression would be difficult to comprehend, the reader would need to source for information within and without the context which will increase the processing effort. Optimal relevance is achieved through the use of the amplification strategy.

The amplification strategy was used to give more details that did not change the message but made it clear.

5.3 Explicitation
This is the strategy of making explicit in the target text information that is implicit in the source text, (Baker and Saldanha, 2011). This is illustrated in a number of cases in this study, for instance'**she**''**her**' and '**him**' in Judges 1:14are made explicit by using the nouns that they refer to in the TT.
Text: 5
ST: When <u>she</u> came to <u>him</u>, <u>she</u> urged <u>him</u> to ask <u>her</u> father for a field; and <u>she</u> alighted from <u>her</u> ass, and Caleb said to <u>her</u>, 'what do you wish?

TT:*MũthenyanĩwamũtwaanoOthienielinĩweesũvieAkisaakũlyeĩthewakeKalevuamũnengemũũnda.*
Akisanĩwaũmieĩng'oinĩyakenaKalevuamũkũlyaatĩĩ, 'wĩendakyaũ?"
B/T: the day of the wedding Oth'ni-el pleaded with Achsah to ask her/his father Caleb to give a farm. Achsah alighted from her/his donkey and Caleb asked her/him this 'what do you want?'

The names 'Achsah' and 'Oth'ni-el' are made explicit in the TT. The ST also uses 'her father' but in the TT 'her father Caleb' is used. In this text, explicitation of the names is clear but the information of the ST is not successfully conveyed in the TT leading to mistranslation. The ST indicates that it was Achsahwho urged Oth'ni-el to ask Caleb for a field but in the TT it was Oth'niel who urged Achsahto ask Caleb for a field. This results to mistranslation.

In a number of verses the noun implied by the pronoun was used in the TT instead. For example in Mathew 28:12 and Mathew 28: 11. In the two cases the message is conveyed.
Text 6
ST: And when <u>they</u> had assembled with the elders.
TT:*<u>Athembianenenĩmooombanienaatumĩa</u>.*
B/T: the <u>great priests</u> assembled with the elders.
ST: while <u>they</u> were going,
TT:*<u>aka asu</u> me nzĩanĩmaendete*
B/T: while<u>those ladies</u>were on the way going

The translator in this case had to use the nouns'the great priests' and 'thoseladies' because in the target language the use of the pronoun would resort to ambiguity or an unacceptable syntactic construction. The strategy in this case is successful in communicating the message of the ST.

5.4 Literal Translation
In this strategy individual words are translated as literal as possible and grammatical structures of the source text are converted into the nearest equivalents in the target text. It is a kind of word-for-word translation which is used depending on the sentence structures, (Chesterman, 1997, 2009)

In the Song of Solomon 1:5 two similes are used which use images that are familiar in the SL culture but not in the TT culture. For the TT reader to understand the simile there is need to comprehend the images used in the comparison.
Text: 7
ST: am comely like the tents of Kedar,
TT:*nĩmũmbenesata maeema ma Ketali*
B/T: am created beautiful like tents of *Ketali*
ST: am comely like the curtains of Solomon
TT:*nĩmũmbenesa ta vasiaĩlasyĩkwa Solomon*
B/T: am beautiful like the curtains that are there at Solomon's

'The tents of Kedar' and the 'curtains of Solomon' are abstract and thus the comparison is not clear to the targeted audience. The use of literal translation is not successful in this case.

The translator also used this strategy in dealing with idiomatic expressions, for example, in Isaiah 1:15.
Text: 8
 ST: I will hide my eyes yourhands are full of blood
TT:*NgavithaũthyũwakwandikamwoneNĩkwethĩwamokomenyumaũsũĩtenthakame.*
B/T:I will hide my face not to see you Because your hands are full of blood.

The translator used literal interpretation in translating the idiomatic expressions. The implicature is transferred in the TT. An implicature in one language, ST, when translated literally in another language, TT, may lead to ambiguity. In partone, in the TT the word 'eyes' is substituted with 'face' since literally one will hide the face and not the eyes. The literal translation in this expression is not successful in communicating the message of the ST to the TT, since in the target language the implicature suggests a different idea.

Another example is illustrated in the book of Acts 1:13 in which a lexical element that is not lexicalized in the TT language is used in the ST.
Text: 9

ST: the upper room where they used to stay.
TT: *ngolovanĩ vale mekalaa.*
B/T: the flat were they used to live

The expression 'the upper room'is literally interpreted and rendered as 'a flat' with addition 'a place where they used to stay'. In the text the ambiguity led to mistranslation.

With the culturally bound words the translator may provide literal equivalents only without adding any more information. According to Sanchez, (2007) and Homeidi,(2004) this can be used when the translator knows that the TT reader will be familiar with the cultural background reflected in the ST.In this study, however, literal translation did not successfully transfer the intended message into the TT.

5.5 Hyponymy
It is a strategy where the translator uses a member of the larger category to translate a concept that is within that category. This occurred in a number of cases, for example in Acts 1:10 the word '**rope'** is translated as 'clothes' which are described as white in color. The word '**rope'** to refer to clothes that people put on is not lexicalized in Kĩkamba and thus the translator used a superordinate term to transfer it into the TT. In the Hebrew culture the 'rope' meant a special 'cloak' worn by rulers or religious leaders and symbolized power (Douglas and Tenny, 1987).

The word '**ox'** in Isaiah 1:3 is translated as 'cattle' which is a superodinate term for both 'bulls' and 'cows'.
Text 10
ST: the ox knows its owner
TT: *ng'ombeniyisimwenewayo*,
B/T: the cattle knows its owner

This leads to mismatch in terms of equivalence because the word '**ox'** is lexicalized in Kĩkamba with a similar meaning that is reflected in the source text. In the Bible the 'ox' has connotative meaning (Douglas and Tenny, 1987) and thus the strategy is not successful in this context.

On the other hand the hypernym or the superordinate term which describes the entire category was translated to refer to a member of the group, this can be demonstrated inSongs of Solomon 1:7
Text:11
ST: flock
TT:*ndĩthyayambũinamalondu*
B/T: herdof goat and sheep

The translator used the words 'sheep' and 'goats' to translate the hypernym 'flock'. The 'sheep' and 'goats' in the Bible as a religious text have connotative meaning. The use of both terms in this context leads to ambiguity, since in the Bible they are parallel in terms of meaning, sheep refers to God's followers while the goats refer to those who have rebelled against God and are not worthy the inheritance of God's promised kingdom, (Douglas and Tenny, 1987). Since the main task of the translator is to communicate the message of the source text to the target text audience, ambiguity leads to mistranslation.

The use of the word 'horse' in Song of Solomon 1:9 to translate '**mare'** does not fully convey the message in the TT since there is a difference between the male and the female and in the Biblical language, they carry connotative meaning (Douglas and Tenny, 1987). The female is associated with beauty while the male is associated with strength and in this context it is the beauty that the writer/speaker intends to convey.
Text: 12
ST: I compare you my love, to the mare of Pharaoh's chariots.
TT: *mwendwawakwa, nĩkũvwananyanambalasiilaikusasyamakasya ma mũsumbĩwaMisili.*
B/T: my love I compare you with the horses that pull the carts of the king of Egypt.

The hyponym strategy conveyed in this text core message of the ST partially in the TT thus it was unsuccessful. The use of the hyponym strategy in the identified texts was unsuccessful in conveying the message of the ST into the TT.

5.6 Naturalization

This is basically a case where the translator applies target language spelling, morphology and pronunciation to the expression or the word during translation. The SL item or the word is translated into the TLT and its appearance in the written form is adjusted to the TL system of writing to refer to values, beliefs, norms and institutions, (Chesterman, 2009). Naturalization is a form of direct transfer in which an SL word is adapted to the normal pronunciation and the morphology of the TL.

This can be demonstrated in a number of texts, for example, judges 1:15 in translating '**Caleb**' which is translated as '*Kalevu*' and through modification of the spellings to make it adapt to Kĩkamba pronunciation. It is also reflected in Mathew 27:2 in the use of the names '**Pilate**' and '**governor**', they are translated as '*Vilato*' and '*Ngavana*' respectively. In both the terms are have been modified through changing the spellings so that they fit in Kĩkamba pronunciation. Naturalization was successful when used with terms that did not refer to another concept or define a character. For example in translating 'governor' which is a title that denotes position and power the strategy should have been used with commentaries or footnotes to give a clue of the extend of the power and authority the position holds in the given context.

The words 'silver' in Isaiah 1:22 is rendered as '*silĩva*'which in Kĩkamba is commonly used to refer to money that is in form of coins, and therefore it is successful since the term is commonly used by the targeted readers to refer to money. The word '**sabbath**' is also naturalized as '*savato*' in Mathew 28:1. It is used to refer to the day of worship in the Jewish culture (Douglas and Tenny, 1987). The term is commonly used in the targeted community also, although with disparities some holding to the idea that it is the last day of the week hence the day of worship while others taking it as the six day of the week, resulting to ambiguity.

The naturalization strategy is commonly used to translate names of places and people. It is successful when the concept is not foreign or abstract in the target language culture.

5.7 Descriptive Equivalent

This involves translating a source language text word by use of description of the concept it refers to in the TL. A number of words did not have a one-word equivalent and in such a case the translator took a descriptive approach for example words such as '**widow**' and '**fatherless**' in Isaiah 1:17.The descriptive strategy in this case is used because the meaning of the concept is institutionalized in the TT but there is no one-word equivalent.

The concepts '**widow**'is transferred clearly in the target text *'mũndũmũkandĩwa'* (woman whose husband has died) and in the context it clearly defines the intended person in the ST, but the description used to describe the '**fatherless**' has an element of ambiguity since it does not indicate whether they have lost a mother or a father or both, since it is rendered as '*syanandĩwa*' (children without a father or/and mother).The use of a father in the Bible has a connotative meaning, and people were defined using their fore fathers for example in Judges 1:30. Zebulun refers to the people of the tribe of Zebulun. The importance of the father and the state of being fatherless is not relayed in TT.

There are other concepts that were lexicalized in TT culture but do not have a one-word equivalents such as '**inhabitants**' (people who were settled) in Acts of the Apostles 1:19, **lambs** (the young ones of a sheep) in Isaiah 1:11, **thumbs** (the big fingers of the hands) and **toes**(the big toes of the feet)in Judges 1:6 the descriptive strategy was successfully used to render them in the TT. This study concludes that descriptive equivalent strategy is an important strategy in the Bible translation and when appropriately used it makes the ST meaning clear in the TT.

5.8 Synonymy

In this strategy the translator uses a word or an expression in the target language that is similar but not completely equivalent in meaning to translate an item in the ST. A synonymy or a near synonymy in the TT is used, instead of a more immediately available unit, (Chersterman, 1997). For example it is used when the exact word does not exist in the target language but a word close but not exact in meaning exists. This is illustrated in the following verse; in Judges 1:15 where the word '**spring**' of water was translated as a 'well.' Though the words are similar, they do not share connotative meaning; for example in the Bible a 'well' and a 'spring' are used differently and have different senses attached to them. A 'well' connotes a permanent supply while a 'spring' connotes atemporal one, (Douglas and Tenny, 1987).

The word'**guards**' in Mathew 28:11 was rendered as '*asikalĩ*'(soldiers) instead of the more appropriate Kĩkamba word *mũsungi* (Mwau, 2006). In this case the strategy is successful since the core message is conveyed. Although the two terms have different meanings, both 'soldiers' and 'guards' are made to keep guard or keep security, in the context.

Bell (1991) states that even in the same language there is no absolute synonym. This point of view is also supported by Gutt (1991) who asserts that it is impossible to expect perfect translation equivalence between the SL word and its TL correspondent. This study supports both views and affirms that there are no complete correspondents, but the translator should be guided by the context to pick on the successful element in the TT.

5.9 Reduction

This is the removing or reducing elements in translation, it is a type of a shift (Baker, 1992). For instance, the SL phrase as a translation unit is replaced with a TL word. This strategy is used in cases where the translator in the process of translation reduces the ST in terms of content, structure or form.

Reduction strategy is used in translating fixed and idiomatic expressions for example in Judges 1: 22, 27 and 30, reflected in the expressions; drive out *'mayaalũngya'* (they did not chase them), went up with *'maendany'a*(go together) and went up against*'nĩmokitie'* (they fought). The expressions were reduced to one word in the TT successfully transferring the meaning into the TT.

Reduction was also witnessed in cases were figurative use of language was reduced to a paraphrase, for example in Judges 1:8 and judges 1: 25
Text: 14
ST: smote the city with the edge of the sword
TT:*mooaaandũonthealamatwĩendũanĩĩsu*
B/T: they killed all the people who lived in that land

The semantic meaning is retained but the pragmatic meaning is lost. The major problem of transferring the idiomatic expressions from one language to another is linked to their semantic unity and fixedness (Subban, 2007). The idiomatic phrases are specific to ST language and they are often translated by reducing them to paraphrases which reduces the meaning transferred into the TT.

There were cases where an exclamatory sentence was reduced to a statement and thus losing the emotion that is attached to an exclamatory expression. For example, Song of Solomon 1:2.
Text: 15
ST: O that you would kiss me with the kisses of your mouth!
TT:*Ngethyenangethiyawendo, mumunyenaĩlomosyaku,*
B/T: Greet me with greetings of love Kiss me with your lips,

The interjection in the first line is not translated and the exclamation mark in the second line is reduced to a comma. The exclamatory sentence has been reduced to a sentence and thus the intensity of the ST message is reduced in the TT.The reduction strategy is not successful since the emotions in the exclamation statement is lost. According to the equivalence theory the meaning of the original should be translated in such a way that the TL wording will trigger the same impact on the target audience as the original word did upon the ST audience (Nida and Taber, 1982).

The strategy is also used in translating metaphors in which they are reduced to similes, for example, in Song of Solomon 1:15 as illustrated in the following text.
Text: 16
ST: your eyes are doves.
TT:*methomakunĩmauu ta ma ĩvũĩ.*
B/T: your eyes are peaceful like the ones for a dove.

Both metaphors and similes express comparison in one way or another (Lycan, 2000), but a metaphor is more intense in conveying the message. Metaphors are used with expressions that are not easy to explain in literal language, and the ideas are more detailed and compact (Lakoff and Johnsons, 1980), when reduced to a simile the message is still conveyed but the 'vigor' or the 'punch' is lost.

Reduction strategy resortsto formation of new information which is independent of the SL culture, but if in the new information the message of the source text is communicated then the strategy is deemed successful.

5.10Borrowing

It is considered as a direct translation technique. It is the taking of words directly from one language into another without translating them. For example, the word '**Hail**' in Mathew 28:9 which is borrowed from the

Hebrew, was omitted in the TT and its meaning was translated as 'peace be with you.' The loan word should be included in the TT to increase relevance and capture the attention of the reader to assign the content its setting.

Another form of borrowing is loan translation which involves borrowing from one language whereby the semantic components of a given term are literally translated into the near equivalents or similar expressions in the borrowing language. Non-equivalence at the lexical level necessitates the use of the strategy, for example, the word **'angel'**in Mathew 28:2 is translated as '*malaĩka'* which isa borrowed term from Kiswahili. The word is assimilated in Kĩkamba and thus the strategy is successful.The lexical item '*thaavu'*is borrowed from Kiswahili to translate '**gold'** inSong of Solomon 1:11. The strategy is successful because the term exists in the productive vocabulary of the targeted audience.Another word that is borrowed from Kiswahili is '*manemane'* to translate '**myrrh'** in Song of Solomon 1:13 which was unsuccessful because the word is still abstract to the TT reader.

To support the idea of borrowing Teilanyo (2007) states that while philosophical concepts may not be translatable using the basic code of the TL, some lexical items may have to be translocated to the TT as loans or borrowing. Itis concluded that the failure of the strategy occurs when the borrowed word is abstract to the TT readers.

5.11Use of Paraphrase

Paraphrasing is a form of free translation which focuses on the content of the target text at the expense of the form. The content of the source text is transferred into the target text but with different grammatical structures. It is also a form of pro TL translation, which according to Ghazala (2008)is the free translation which is considered appropriate for specific genres like literary, political or cultural texts among others. It is used with texts that are concerned with conveying the content.

In Hebrews 1:4 the expression is compressed in English but in Kĩkamba it is paraphrased;
Text: 17
ST: marriage bed undefiled
 TT: *kĩvetinamũũmenĩmethĩwe me aĩkĩĩkuũmwekwaũlaungĩ*
B/T: a wife and a husband let them be faithful to each other

The core message of 'to be faithful to each other' is communicated but the intensity that is carried in an idiomatic expression is lost.

The use of the paraphrase resulted to ambiguity in some texts, for example, in Song of Solomon 1:16
Text: 18
ST:our coach is green.
TT:*nyekimbĩũnĩyokĩtandakitũ.*
B/T: green grass is our bed.

The expression in the ST is rendered into the TT in a way that it does not convey the intended message. The 'coach' is symbolically used in this metaphorical statement but the translator paraphrased it with additions and lost the message and the metaphorical expression meaning in the ST.

The strategy was used in translating idiomatic expressions which are fixed in the language in which they are used and in the process of translating them the 'force' and the 'intensity' of meaning is reduced in the TT.

5.12Omission

The strategy of omission is a drastic kind of a strategy that is used when other strategies are not applicable and also if the omitted element will not result to great change of meaning in the TT (Baker, 1992). He suggests that omission and deletion strategies can be used to overcome the difficulties associated with culture-specific words.

The word '**Hail'** in Mathew 28:9 which is a loan word in the Hebrew culture was omitted and the meaning is translated as,'peace be with you.' Although the core message is communicated the equivalent effect explored in the Equivalence theory (Nida and Taber, 1982) is not achieved. The concept gives authenticity to the setting, the original culture in which the Bible draws its literature and it also attracts the attention of the reader, for this reason the strategy is unsuccessful.

There was also omission of the words 'cluster' and 'blossoms' as used in the Song of Solomon 1:14.
Text: 19

ST: My beloved is to me a <u>cluster</u> of henna<u>blossoms</u>
TT: *mwendwewakwakwakwanĩ ta Malaa me mũukemũseo ma mũtĩwakwĩyanakavyawĩtawaina*
B/T: my love to me is like flowers with good smell of tree of making oneself beautiful called ina

The omission of 'cluster' and 'blossoms' reduces the intensity of the comparison since a 'cluster of flowers' and 'flowers' will definitely result to different impacts on the readers.

The interjections are also omitted leading to loss of equivalent effect (Nida and Taber, 1982) as reflected in Isaiah 1:2 in which 'O' is omitted.
Text: 20
ST: hear O heavens, and give ear O earth,
TT:*ĩthukĩĩsyeiinyw'imatũ' tea kũtũ we nthĩ,*
B/T: listen you clouds listen carefully you earth.

An interjection arouses emotions to the readers and when they are omitted the message does not have the same effect to the TT reader as it had on the ST readers.

The strategy is only successfully used if what is omitted does not contribute to the meaning of the ST. The intended meaning of the ST writer should be well interpreted before the translator resorts to omission strategy.

VI.   CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the success of the translation strategies to handle non-equivalences in the Kikamba Bible depended on the context in which they were used. The context and content should be well comprehended before the strategy is applied. The study also concludes that the use of omission, literal translation and hyponym failed in translating the ST message to the TT because the translator did not use them appropriately and also used them in the wrong context. The cultural filtering strategy also failed because it was used with culture-specific words or concepts that are difficult to handle in translation since languages express their world differently. A careful study of the source text is important to comprehend the message as whole before the translator embarks on the translating process. The translator needs to have adequate knowledge on the culture of the two languages and also on the use of the translation strategies in order to transfer the message of the ST effectively in the TT.

REFERENCES

[1]. Aissi, L. (1987). *An Analytical Study of the Process of Translation.*University of Salford:Unpublished Ph D Thesis.
[2]. Baker, M. (1992).*In Other Words; A course book on Translation.* London: Routledge.
[3]. Baker, M. and Saldanha, G. (eds) (2011). *3rd Edition, Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies.* London and New York: Routledge.
[4]. Bastin, G. (2000). 'Evaluating Beginers' Re-expression and Creativity: a Positive Approaches,' *The Translator;* Vol. 6. Number 2, pp. 231-245. Manchester: St. Jerome.
[5]. Beekman, J. and Callow J.C. (1974). *Translating the word of God.* Grand Rapids: Zonderman.
[6]. Bell, R. (1991). *Translation and translating*. London: Longman.
[7]. Bergen, D. (1997). Translational Strategies and the students of translation.*JormaTommosa.*1.109-125
[8]. Blum-Kulka, S. (1981). 'The Study of Translation in view of New Development in discourse Analysis,' *Poetics Today* 2:4
[9]. Chesterman A. (1997, 2009). *A meme of Translation.The spread of ideas in Translation Theory.*Amsterdam: Benjamin.
[10]. Deeb, Z. A. (2005). *A taxonomy of translation problems in translating from English to Arabic.* Newcastle University: OUP
[11]. Douglas, J. and Tenny, M. (1987). *The New International Dictionary of the Bible Grand Rapids.*Zonderva: ZondervanPublishingHouse.
[12]. Elyildirim, S. (2008). The Importance of Cultural Knowledge in Translation: A Partial Replication of Olk 2003. *SosyalBilimierDergisi,* 1, 131-144.
[13]. Fawcett, D. (1997). *Translation and Language; Linguistic Theories Explained*: Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.
[14]. Ferch and kasper, G. (1983). *Strategies in Interlanguage Communications.* Harlow: Longman.
[15]. Garciar, F. (1996). On translating figurative language from English into Spanish.A perpetual problem. *BABEL.*42, 3.158-164.

[16]. Ghazala, H. (2008). *Translation as Problems and Solution.*Labanon: Dar El IlmLilmalayin.
[17]. Gutt, E. A. (1991). 11 Issues of Translation Research in the Inferential Paradigm of Communication. *Intercultural Faultiness: Research Models in Translation Studies: v. 1: Textual and Cognitive Aspects*, 161.
[18]. Hatim, B. and Mason I. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Essex.
[19]. Hatim, B. and Mason, I. (1997). *Translator as Communicator*. New York: Routledge.
[20]. Homeidi, M. A. (2004). Arabic Translation Across Cultures' in *Babel*, Vol: 50, Issue: 1, pp. 13-27
[21]. Kimilu, D. N. (2013*).MukaambaWaWo*2nd ed. Nairobi: Kenya Literature Bureau.
[22]. Lakoff, G.and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*: Chicago. University of Chicago Press.
[23]. Lorscher, W. (2000). *Translation performances translation process and translation*
[24]. Lycan, W. G. (2000). *Philosophy of Language*. London: Routlege.
[25]. Majola, A. O. (1999). *God Speaks in Our Own Languages – Bible Translation in East Africa* 1844- 1998. Nairobi: Bible Societies.
[26]. Maundu, P. (1980). *Reconstruction of Kikamba Consonantal Sounds.* University of Nairobi: MA Dissertation.
[27]. *MbiviliaũvooMũseoKĩkambakyaĩvindaYĩĩ*(2011).Nairobi: Bible Society of Kenya.
[28]. Miremadi, S.A. (1991). *Theories of translation and Interpretation.*Tehran: SAMT.
[29]. Mwau, J. (2006). *KĩkambaDictionary*. Nairobi: Regal Printing Ltd.
[30]. Newmark, P. (2001). *Approaches to Translation.*Shangai: Shangai Foreign Language Education   Press.
[31]. Newmark, P. (1991). *About translation*. Hertfordshire: Multilingual matters.
[32]. Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall.
[33]. Ngotho, T. M. (1963).*KimenaKyaNzounaMbiti (the Enmity Between the Elephant and the Goat.* EALB.
[34]. Nida,E.A. (1964). *Towards a Science of Translating*. Leiden: Brill.
[35]. Nida, E. A. and Taber, C. R. (1982).*The theory and practice translation*. Leiden: E. J. Brill
[36]. *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary of Current English 8th Edition* 2010.
[37]. Pym, A. (1996). *Natural and Directional Equivalence in theories of Translation*. Philadelphia: Benjamins.
[38]. Pym, A. (1992). *Translating and Text Transfer: An Essay on the Principles of intercultural Communication.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Langs.
[39]. *Revised Standard Version Bible*(2008).UK: BFBS.
[40]. Sabban, A. (2007). Culture Boundness and Problems of Cross-Cultural Phraseology in H. Burger et al, eds*Phraseology, An introduction of Contemporary Research.* Berlin: Walter pp 590-605.
[41]. Sanchez, M. T. (2007). 'Translation and Sociolinguistics: Can Language Translate Society' in *Babel*, Vol: 53, Issue: 2, pp. 123-13.
[42]. Shuttleworthy, M. and Cowie, M. (1997). *Dictionary of Translation Studies.*Mancherster: St. Jerome.
[43]. Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (1986b). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition. (*2nd edition 1995) Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
[44]. Teilanyo, D. (2007). *Culture in Translation: the example of J.P. Clarks the Ozidi Sage in Babel,* 1(53) issue 1-21.
[45]. Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamin.
[46]. Venuti. A. (1995). Strategies Translation in Baker (Ed), *Encylopedia of Translation Studies.* London: Routledge.
[47]. Venuti, A. (1986). *The Translation Studies Reader.* UK: Routledge.
[48]. Waruta, D.W (1975).*Scripture Translation in Kenya.* University of Nairobi: MA Thesis.