*Jacobus Naudé*

# The cultural turn in South African translation: rehabilitation, subversion and resistance

For many years translation was viewed as a faithful equivalent substitute for the source text. The cultural turn of the 1980s heralded a move on the part of contemporary translation studies away from the straightjacket of the earlier prescriptive and normative approaches. Two approaches to translation, the functionalist and the descriptive, developed independently but simultaneously and dethroned the primacy of the source text. Both proposed translation as a new communicative act that must fulfil a purpose for the target culture, so that target texts could potentially differ significantly from source texts. The establishment of postcolonial translation studies in the mid-1990s led to translations created to benefit the culture of the colonised at the expense of the culture of the coloniser/imperialist. The objective of this study is to indicate by means of critical analysis of several translations how a dominated target culture is rehabilitated, how a dominant source culture is subverted and how a dominant target culture is resisted by means of maintenance of the dominated source culture.

## Die kulturele wending in Suid-Afrikaanse vertaling: rehabilitasie, subversie en weerstand

Vertaling is lank beskou as 'n getroue, ekwivalente substituut van die bronteks. Met die kulturele wending in die 1980's het kontemporêre vertaalkunde wegbeweeg van die dwangbuis van preskriptiewe en normatiewe benaderings. Twee benaderings tot vertaling, naamlik die funksionalistiese en deskriptiewe, het onafhanklik en gelyktydig ontwikkel en sodoende die primaat van die bronteks onttroon. Beide impliseer dat vertaling 'n nuwe kommunikatiewe handeling is wat betekenisvol vir die doelkultuur moet wees en daarom van die bronteks kan verskil. Met die totstandkoming van postkoloniale vertaalkunde in die middelnegentigerjare van die vorige eeu is vertalings geskep wat die kultuur van die gekoloniseerde bevoordeel ten koste van die kultuur van die koloniseerder/imperialis. Die doel met hierdie bydrae is om deur 'n vertaalkritiese analise aan te toon hoe dat die gedomineerde doelkultuur gerehabiliteer word, hoe die dominante bronkultuur ondergrawe word en hoe weerstand teen die dominante doelkultuur gebied word deur die gedomineerde bronkultuur te behou.

*Prof J A Naudé, Dept of Afro-Asiatic Studies, Sign Language and Language Practice, University of the Free State, P O Box 339, Bloemfontein 9300; E-mail: naudej. hum@mail.uovs.ac.za*

I t is safe to say that translators have never been unaware of cultural differences and their significance for translation.[1] The fact that a text has to be translated implies a distance between two cultures that must be bridged, as a text can be transferred adequately through time and space without translation if there is cultural continuity. What is new in recent translation scholarship on culture in general is its increasing emphasis on the collective control or shaping of cultural knowledge, such as the role of ideology in the construction and maintenance of cultural knowledge and in policing transfers across cultural barriers.

This issue may be approached in numerous ways. Firstly, the focus could be placed on the control of translations in general such as the manner in which transmission by translation over cultural borders is promoted or discouraged, and so forth. Sociolinguistics would be a suitable discipline for the launch of such an inquiry. Secondly, the manipulation of readers' views, values, and so on by translation could be studied. Critical linguistics would be the appropriate tool in this case. Thirdly, ideological aspects like rehabilitation, subversion and resistance in translations could be described within discourse theory. However, the objective of this paper is to focus on the role of culture in translation, specifically in South African translations. Three sets of translations will be analysed within the framework of descriptive translation studies (DTS) in order to determine the strategies of cultural transmission: how cultural knowledge is controlled, shaped and construed within translations.

This paper is organised in the following manner: The focus is in the first place on the cultural turn within translation studies (1-3). Secondly, developments within descriptive translation studies is described: the

cultural studies paradigm and resistive approaches to translation (3.2 and 4). The analytical framework is then exposed (5), whereupon three sets of texts are analised (6).

# 1. The cultural turn in translation studies

## 1.1 The rise of translation studies as a discipline

From the 1950s to the 1970s translation studies was an integral part of applied and general linguistics, which were often regarded as the sole source of translation studies. In the past thirty years, however, translation studies has emerged as an entirely novel and interdisciplinary academic field.

James Holmes (1988: 67-80) was the first to provide a framework for this discipline, dividing it into two principal areas: on the one hand, translation theory as well as the descriptive science of translation, and on the other hand, applied translation studies dealing with activities such as the training of translators, the provision of translation aids, translation criticism and policy. In addition, Holmes also incorporated the historiography of the discipline as well as the study of the research methodology of translation studies. Holmes invented his classification of the discipline as early as 1972. It has lost none of its validity as far as modern scholars in the field are concerned.[2]

From the 1980s onwards, the interdisciplinary approach took off. Scholars of translation studies made use of frameworks and methodologies borrowed from disciplines such as psychology, the theory of communication, literary theory, anthropology, philosophy and, more recently, cultural studies (cf Bassnett & Lefevere 1990). During this period translation studies was justifiably regarded as a multidisciplinary science (Snell-Hornby 1995: 7-35). The distinctive methodologies and theoretical frameworks derived from other disciplines were continually adapted and re-evaluated in order to serve the needs of translation studies as an autonomous discipline. A variety of distinctive theoretical perspectives developed from which translation may be studied, such as the linguistic approach, the communicative/functional approach,

2 Compare, for instance, the classifications of Snell-Hornby 1995: 13-37; Van Leuven-Zwart 1992: 67-157, and Baker 1998: 227-80.

the psycholinguistic/cognitive approach and polysystem theory. The multiple perspectives which came to characterise the discipline were typified as essentially complementary, rather than mutually exclusive.

During the 1990s the developing discipline of translation studies achieved a certain institutional authority, manifested by a worldwide proliferation of translator-training programmes[3] and a flood of scholarly publications.

At the dawn of the new millennium, translation studies has emerged as an international network of scholarly communities conducting research and debate across conceptual and disciplinary divisions. Translation research is animated by the diverse mix of theories that has characterised translation studies since the 1980s (the polysystem, the *skopos*, poststructuralism, and feminism) and reflects developments in traditional academic disciplines such as linguistics (pragmatics, critical discourse analysis, and computational *corpora*) as well as literary criticism, philosophy, anthropology and cultural theory (postcolonialism, sexuality, and globalisation).

## 1.2 The cultural turn

Linguistically-based theories (cf Fawcett 1997) dominated translation studies until the cultural turn at the beginning of the 1980s. The dominant idea was dynamic equivalence. Nida & Taber (1969: 12) viewed translation as reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style. The fundamental assumption of Nida's theory was that languages agree more closely on the level of "kernels" than on the level of more elaborate structures. Thus, it followed that if one could reduce grammatical structures to the kernel level, they could be transferred more readily and with the minimum distortion. Accordingly, Nida elaborated his theory of translation by identifying three stages: analysis, transfer, and restructuring. Analysis is essentially the back-transformation of complex surface structures onto an underlying level of kernels, of which the fundamental elements are objects, events, abstracts and relations (Nida & Taber 1969: 39). The readers of the

3    More than 250, according to Venuti 2000: 1.

translation must experience the same effect as the source text produced in its original readers.

The most familiar theoretical development of this period was the appearance of choices between translation as cultivating pragmatic equivalence immediately intelligible to the receptor,[4] and translation as formal equivalence designed to approximate the linguistic and cultural features of the foreign text.[5] A translation is judged as good, bad or indifferent in terms of what constitutes equivalence to the source text. The latter is offered as the yardstick/criterion in terms of which translators should judge their translations.

Nonetheless, because of the linguistic and cultural differences between languages, translations inevitably fall short of the equivalence ideal. As Heylen (1993: 2) remarks:

> The main objective critics had was to find fault with the translator and to pinpoint 'mistakes' in the translation. The assumption was that all translations were in some way destined to fail the original, neatly reducing the critic's task to that of deciding whether or not a translation was faithful to the original text. Such an ideal was and is based on the principle of complete equivalence, which is thought to ensure the accuracy of a translation. It is impossible to produce a translated text as mirror image of its original in accordance with the equivalence-based prescriptive/normative theories. Therefore it is also inevitable that a certain amount of subjectivity and reformulation is involved in translating.

The principal shortcoming of prescriptive/normative translation theories is their complete disregard of the sociocultural conditions under which translations are produced in order to comply with the requirements of acts of communication in the receiving culture (Bassnett-McGuire 1991; Bassnett & Lefevere 1990). The conditions prerequisite to the attainment of equivalence differ from one language and culture to another. A valid translation strategy of the past, such as turning prose into verse, may therefore be completely unacceptable today (Heylen 1993: 4). The realisation that translations are never produced in a

---

4    For example, sense-for-sense translation, including dynamic equivalence (Nida 1964; Nida & Taber 1969); functional equivalence (De Waard & Nida 1986); communicative translation (Newmark 1988); covert translation (House 1981).

5    For example, word-for-word translation; formal equivalence (Nida 1964; Nida & Taber 1969); semantic translation (Newmark 1988); overt translation (House 1981).

vacuum, regardless of time and culture, along with the desire to explain the time- and culture-bound criteria at play, resulted in a shift away from normative, prescriptive methodology towards descriptive methodology (cf Hermans 1985). This tendency within translation studies becomes noticeable from the early eighties onwards and is related to the linguistic turn from an ahistorical and apolitical approach to language towards a critical approach (Kress & Hodge 1979; Fairclough 1989). It also relates to the influence of semiotics, as derived from the work of Roland Barthes and the Soviet literary theorists Mikhail Bakhtin and Valentin Voloshinov.

The move from translation as text to translation as culture and politics is what Mary Snell-Hornby (1990: 79-86) terms the "cultural turn". Bassnett & Lefevere (1990: 11) take this as a metaphor for the cultural move beyond language in order to focus on the interaction between translation and culture, but also on the way in which culture impacts on and constrains translation, as well as on the much broader issues of context, history and convention. These include studies of changing standards in translation over time; the power exercised in and on the publishing industry in pursuit of specific ideologies; feminist writing and translation; translation as appropriation; translation and colonisation, and translation as rewriting, including film versions (Munday 2001: 127).

Two approaches to translation, the functionalist and the descriptive, developed independently, though simultaneously, and thus were able to dethrone the primacy of the source text. Both present translation as a new communicative act that must serve a purpose for the target culture, thus possibly resulting in differences from the source text.

## 2.   Functionalist approaches to translation

Functionalist approaches seek to liberate translators from an excessively servile adherence to the source text. Translation is approached as an entirely new communicative act that has to serve a purpose for the translator's client and readership.

As an alternative to equivalence, Katharina Reiss introduced a functional category into her translation model and Hans Vermeer formulated his *skopos* theory to accommodate function or aim (*skopos*) as key

concepts. The intended function (*skopos*) of the target text, rather than the translation methods and strategies determines the function of the source text (Reiss & Vermeer 1984). In this way, Vermeer dethroned both the source text as the norm and the concept of equivalence. The difference between linguistically-orientated models of equivalence and Vermeer's functionalist model lies in their attitudes towards the source text. The former group of theorists regards the source text as a norm and accords acceptability to a translation only insofar as it is equivalent to the source text. Vermeer, on the other hand, regards a translation as a true rendition insofar as it functions as a text in the target culture. The function of the translation in the target culture determines which aspects of the source text should be transferred to the translation. Hence the source text has lost its function as a criterion for measuring equivalence.

Christiane Nord (1991; 1997) provided another insight into the interpersonal interaction of the translation process. The initiator — who may be a client, the source text author, the target text reader or, in some cases, the translator — instigates the translation process by approaching a translator because s/he needs to fulfill a certain function (or *skopos*) in the target culture (Nord 1991: 6). This *skopos* is contained in the translation brief: the set of translating instructions issued by the client when ordering the translation. Ideally, the client will give as many details as possible about the intended text's purpose, occasion, medium, and so on. A translator begins by analysing the translation *skopos* as contained in the initiator's brief. S/he determines the gist of the source text, enabling him/her to decide whether the given translation task is feasible.

The next step involves a detailed analysis of the source text. It is necessary to "loop back" continually to the translation *skopos*, which acts as a guide, suggesting which source texts elements are to be preserved and which will have to be adapted. This circular process ensures that the translator takes into consideration all factors relevant to the translation task. The target text should therefore fulfil its intended function in the target culture. Thus, the initiator, or the person playing the role of initiator, decides on the translation *skopos*, even though the brief as such may be explicit about the conditions.

Any translation *skopos* may be formulated for a particular original and there are no limits on the translator's licence to diverge from the source text. However, Nord (1997: 63) makes the point that the *skopos* rule "is a very general rule which does not account for specific conventions prevalent in a particular culture community". She therefore modifies the conventional *skopos* theory by adding the concepts of loyalty and convention, in this way limiting the variety of possible functions or *skopos*. In her view, the concept of loyalty takes account of the fact that the ultimate responsibility does not rest with the initiator, but with the translator, who in the final analysis is the only person qualified to judge whether the transfer has taken place satisfactorily. Loyalty may be defined as a moral category which permits the integration of culture-specific conventions into the functionalist model of translation (Nord 1997: 125). Loyalty implies that translators are required to take the conventions of the particular translation situation into account. In Nord's view, conventions rank below translation norms in that they are not imperative. This means that the translator is free to flout existing conventions. The combination of functionality and loyalty means that the translator can aim at producing a functional target text which conforms to the requirements of the initiator's brief and which will be accepted by the target culture. This runs counter to equivalence-based translation theories, as the demand for faithfulness or equivalence is subordinate to the *skopos* rule. In other words, if the translating instructions require a change of function, source text equivalence is no longer a priority. The translator is therefore free to focus on particular aspects of the source text to the neglect of all others, if this is the requirement of the translation brief. But loyalty towards both the author and the readers of the translation compels the translator to specify exactly which aspects of the original have been taken into account and which have been adapted (Nord 1992: 40).

## 3. Developments within descriptive translation studies

### 3.1 Descriptive system- and reception-orientated approaches

The notion of literary systems has contributed towards the revolution in translation studies since the 1970s. Even-Zohar's polysystem theory moved the study of translations to an investigation of the position of translated literature as a whole *vis-à-vis* the historical and literary systems of the target culture. As a key constituent of many descriptive approaches, it has broken with the prescription of what translation should be, encouraging researchers to ask rather what translation does in specific cultural settings (cf Hermans 1999). The most common theoretical assumption is the relative autonomy of the product of translation — the translated text.

Toury (2000, 1995) focused attention on finding a methodology for descriptive translation studies. The descriptive translation theorist starts with a practical examination of a corpus of texts and then seeks to determine the norms and constraints operating on these texts in a specific culture and at a specific moment in history. In other words, the theorist attempts to account not only for textual strategies in the translated text, but also for the way in which the translation functions in the target cultural and literary system (cf Even-Zohar 1990). This approach has far-reaching implications, particularly for equivalence, which is seen not as an abstract, unattainable ideal to which the translator can only aspire, but rather as an instrument used to examine the actual relationship between a translation and its original (cf Hermans 1985). In other words, the researcher describes and explains the specific characteristics of a translated text (or multiple translations of the same original) in terms of the constraints or norms reigning in the target system at a particular time which may have influenced the method of translating and hence the ensuing product (Even-Zohar 1990: 45-51).

The relation between translations and their originals may be described in terms of shifts or manipulations, hence scholars such as Gideon Toury, André Lefevere, José Lambert, Hendrik van Gorp, Theo Hermans, Susan Bassnett, among others, are referred to as the "Manipu-

lation School". Descriptive reception-orientated models offer a method for the comparative analysis of source and (already translated) target texts (Gentzler 1993).

## 3.2 The cultural studies paradigm

Basnett & Lefevere (1990: 4), working originally from within systems theory, dismissed painstaking comparisons between original texts and translations which do not consider the text in its cultural environment. They examined translation as rewriting as well as the ideological tensions surrounding the text.

Culturally orientated research stems from the influence of post-structuralism and emphasises the social and historical differences of translation. It views with suspicion universals and formalisations which might have been emancipatory in the Enlightenment, but now appear totalising and repressive of local differences. The emphasis is on specific languages and discourses, cultures and sexualities, thus questioning any universalist assumptions (cf Wallmach 2000). Poststructuralist translation theory calls attention to the exclusions and hierarchies masked by the realist illusion of transparent language and the role played by translation in the creation and functioning of social movements and institutions.

### 3.2.1   Postcolonial translation theory

Arising from cultural anthropology in the late 1980s and early 1990s, postcolonial translation theory is based on the observation that translation has often served as an important tool of imperalism in the colonisation of peoples, in the survival of colonial attitudes in the translation marketplace, and in the decolonising of the mind (Robinson 1997). Europe was seen as the original with the colonies as copies or translations of it (Bassnett & Trivedi 1999: 4).

Momentous trends in postcolonial studies were set by the study of globalisation, tribalisation and cultural identities. Globalisation, or the worldwide tendency to standardisation, provided a foreseeable, commercially homogeneous global network linked by technology, ecology, communications and commerce. Linguistic retribalisation, involving people belonging to particular language and culture groups experiencing the sometimes very violent rediscovery of their own cultural

heritages, was also an object of study (Snell-Hornby 2000). Linguistic retribalisation has been particularly active in some Eastern European countries, and also occurred to a certain extent in post-apartheid South Africa (cf Naudé 2000). Situated between these two poles is the concept of cultural identity, indicating a community's awareness of and pride in its own unmistakable features and its sense of belonging. The assumption is that such a community can live in harmony with, and communicate with other communities around the world.

The implication for translation is that cultural words and concepts are utilised in the target text (the technique of foreignisation) to allow the clear demarcation of each cultural group. The terms "resistancy" and "resistance" are used by Venuti (1995: 309-11) to refer to the strategy of translating a literary text in such a way that it retains something of its foreignness. This is called a resistive approach to translation (Wallmach 2000). Such an approach challenges the assumption that the only acceptable translation is one which reads fluently and idiomatically and is so transparent in reflecting the source text author's intention in the target language that it could be mistaken for an original text. Derrida (2001) also questioned what he calls relevant translation. He called attention not only to its ethnocentric violence but also to its simultaneous mystification of that violence through language that is seemingly transparent because it is univocal and idiomatic. This happens because the signifiers constituting the foreign text are replaced with another signifying chain, attempting to fix a signified that can be no more than an interpretation according to the intelligibilities and interests of the receiving language and culture. Venuti's (2000: 341) objection to this is reflected in the following question:

> If translation fails to communicate the source text but disfigures it with the concepts and interests of the translating culture, what hope is there for a translated text to reach the ethical and political goal of building a community with foreign cultures, and a shared understanding with and of them?

Venuti joins with Derrida's view that if there is no single origin, no transcendent meaning, and therefore no stable source text, one can no longer talk of translation as transfer of meaning or as passive reproduction (Davis 2001: 91-3). The autonomy of the translated text is redefined as the target-language residue which the translator releases

in the hope of bridging the linguistic and cultural boundaries among readerships.

In practice, following a resistive approach to translation may involve choosing to translate a text that challenges the contemporary canon of foreign literature in the target language, or it may mean that the translator uses unidiomatic expressions and other linguistically and culturally alienating features in the translated text in order to create an impression of foreignness, to provide readers of the translation with an alien reading experience.

### 3.2.2   Gender-based approaches to translation

The last thirty years of intellectual and artistic creativity in the twentieth century was marked by gender issues, and translation studies has also felt the powerful effect of this focus on gender. As a result of feminist praxis and criticism and the simultaneous emphasis on culture in translation studies, translation has become an important focus for the exploration of the cultural impact of gender and the gender-specific influence of culture (Simon 1996). With the dismantling of universal meaning and the struggle for a female presence, as well as the dominant interest in translation as a perceptible factor in cultural change and exchange, the linking of gender and translation has created fertile ground for explorations of writing, rewriting and reading. This includes the critique of patriarchal language; translation practices derived from experimental feminist writing; the development of openly interventionist translation practices, and translation as a means of recovering the women's writings lost when patriarchy was in vogue (Von Flotow 1997).

## 4.   The relationship between culture and language

Culture is a word susceptible of much variety in meaning. The nature of culture is best understood in terms of the different approaches to its study (cf Deist 2000, Katan 1999):

- The evolutionist approach places emphasis on the origins of human culture and the mechanisms that caused it.
- The ethnohistorical approach stresses the cultural mutations perceptible in the history of a particular group.

- The behaviourist approach emphasises discrete behaviour, shared and observed (selected facts about what people do and refrain from doing). It tends towards ethnocentricity.

- Structuralist studies of culture regard perceptible human behaviour as nothing more than the local surface of culture itself. Individual cultures differ quite considerably, but these differences are negligible. They are caused by physical, social and historical factors on a deeper level but they all share a single mental structure.

- The functionalist approach deals with shared rules pertaining to behaviour, and recognisable through behaviour. It seeks to examine what underlies certain behaviours and account for them. It accomplishes this by means of culture-bound evaluations made within the context of one particular culture.

- The configurationalist approach emphasises the unifying role of meaning in cultural systems. Cultural behaviour in its entirety is symbolic, conveying a meaning shared by the group and abstracted from the social system by individuals through participatory interaction.

- The cognitive approach deals with the shape of things that people have in their minds, as well as their models for perceiving, relating and otherwise interpreting them.

- The dynamic approach considers the dynamic interplay of internal models of the world and external reality.

David Katan (1999) perceives culture as a system directed towards orienting experience with the basic presupposition that the organisation of experience does not amount to reality, but rather to a simplification or even a distortion, varying from culture to culture. Every culture acts as a frame within which external reality is interpreted.

A very close relationship exists between culture and language. This relationship may be approached from two viewpoints: the universalist and the relativist. According to the universalist viewpoint, a direct relationship exists between the structure of reality (culture) and the human mind on the one hand, and the structure of language, on the other. The human mind is universal, consequently every language is founded on the same conceptual system, different languages being merely different expressions of the same concepts. According to the relativist

viewpoint, different languages are considered equally divergent in their expression of different realities. Differences between languages are not considered superficial, but profound or even radical, as each language is firmly rooted in a different conceptual system.[6]

Language plays a role in its wider social and cultural context by forging and sustaining cultural practices and social structures, thus entertaining metonymic relations with society and culture (Talgeri & Verma 1988). It is part and parcel of culture; considered a cultural product and, at the same time, part of the manifestation of culture-specific behaviour. The linguistic system permeates all other systems within a culture. Speaking is a culturally constructed act reflecting politeness, personality, gender, social standing, socialisation, and so forth (Duranti 1997: 336; Foley 1997: 247-358). The way people act, the things they say, the things they make and the way they interpret their everyday experiences are all closely linked to their particular worldview. It is also reference to this worldview which enables people to explain and understand phenomena and events in reality (Deist 2000: 92).

Language is important as a means of expressing ethnic or cultural identity. The knowledge, beliefs and practices of a particular society are reflected in its language. When people speak, they are not merely uttering sounds with structure and meaning, expressing intention. And that intention is entrenched in their entire material culture (the things people do, for example, feed and shelter themselves, procreate, dress, mourn, rejoice, till their land, fight, etc), habitual culture (how they do things or get them done, for instance, through distributing labour and responsibilities, marrying, trading, making war, solving disputes, and so on) and mental culture (their reasons for doing these things in the way they do, for example, why they prefer a particular kind of social or economic organisation, offer sacrifices, contract marriages in the way they do, organise inheritance in a particular manner, and so forth). Language is an integral part of culture. People socialise in the culture of a speaker. In ideal circumstances they understand his

---

6    The so-called Sapir-Whorf hypothesis combines linguistic determinism (the view that language determines thought) with linguistic relativity (the view that there is no limit to the structural diversity of languages).

or her speech spontaneously, automatically and instantaneously. For outsiders to understand that same speech, they have to acquire as much as possible of the intimate knowledge presupposed by the speaker. What is required, of course, includes linguistic proficiency, but also, and importantly, knowledge of the relevant culture of which the language forms an integral part. In real communication people not only follow the rules of language but also adhere to certain pragmatic principles. This means detecting the presuppositions and implications behind the actual words used. Understanding a text means comprehending more than the logical structure and the purely designative or defining meanings of its lexical and grammatical structures. Communication requires lexical, grammatical and cultural competence.

Linguistic and cultural items often resemble one another and cannot easily be differentiated. People from different cultures have divergent mental images of apparently simple items such as a house or a taxi, as well as of the complex terms at the centre of human life, like a family, a marriage or a funeral. All people know words, but they may have different images in their minds and different ideas of their meaning. For each one the connotations may therefore be different. Take the word "marriage" as an example. It would seem that a cultural framework is necessary in order to interpret the meaning of such a term satisfactorily. Language is intertwined with culture, and yet they are often apart. Cultural information is omitted from dictionaries on the grounds that it is extraneous or, more pragmatically, that the space can be more fruitfully devoted to lexical information. It is impossible to include everything, but a more complete cultural picture could be provided in many instances. The same is true of names. Names also convey cultural information and have particular connotations ("Sainsbury" — supermarket; "Boots" — pharmacy chain). They play an important part in the understanding of an expression but are seldom found in dictionaries. Knowledge of the cultural connotations of a word, the names of famous people and what they stand for, major events in a people's history, its institutions, and even the names of shops or brand names, are major factors in understanding a written text or simply participating in a casual conversation.

In sum, successful communication is dependent upon an adequate level of cultural as well as linguistic understanding. It involves back-

ground knowledge; collective information about context, traditions, and attitudes; joint images in the mind's eye. Problems encountered in cross-cultural communication are not necessarily due to a misunderstanding of words, but rather to a lack of understanding of the concepts behind them. Language is itself part of culture and reflects social structures and attitudes.

One way of "opening up" a foreign culture is by way of interlingual translation. Translation is regarded as the reproduction of culture in that the act of translating literary texts, in particular, involves transferring aspects of the culture belonging to one group to that of another. Over the centuries, translation has played an important role in enrichment, so much so that it may be said that the inception of modern national literatures, and that of minority languages in particular, is often traceable to translations of originals from prestigious literary systems. Complex and dynamic interaction takes place between translated texts and the receiving culture's own literary production. In instances where the minority literature is still young, it is open to foreign influences, and translated literature can make a considerable active contribution to the development of its language and culture (cf Delisle & Woodsworth 1995: 7-24; 45-54; 159-190).

## 5. Implications for translation practice

### 5.1 A translation type for a specific purpose

Translation invariably implies a degree of manipulation of the source text in order to achieve a certain purpose, viewed from the perspective of the target literature. According to Toury (1980: 55) the initial norm governs the basic choice a translator makes between adherence to the source text's structure and the source culture's norms, on the one hand, and striving to meet the linguistic, literary and cultural norms of the prospective new readership in the target culture, on the other. Heylen (1993: 23-4) allows the translation critic to identify at least three kinds of translation:

- Translations making no attempt to acculturate the original work in that the translator retains as many of the foreign cultural codes

as possible. Translations in this category would be source-orientated and are likely to remain on the periphery of the receiving culture.

- Translations that negotiate and introduce a cultural compromise by selecting those characteristics common to both the source and the receiving culture. Here the translator will effect alterations to the codes of the receiving culture, while at the same time recognising existing norms. Such translations may occupy a canonised position in the receiving culture.

- Translations that completely acculturate the original work, with the translator adhering to the codes of the receiving culture. Translations in this category may either occupy a canonised position or remain on the periphery of the receiving culture.

In practice, however, a translation is generally a compromise between two extremes (as below) and will be either primarily (not entirely) source-orientated or primarily (not entirely) target-orientated (Newmark 1988: 45). The actual choice is pragmatically determined by the purpose of the intercultural communication:

| SL emphasis | TL emphasis |
|---|---|
| Word-for-word translation | Adaptation |
| Literal translation | Free translation |
| Faithful translation | Idiomatic translation |
| Semantic translation | Communicative translation |

## 5.2 Implementing translation strategies rather than striving towards equivalence

Translation occurs by way of a series of decisions made by the translator. The conflicting requirements of the source text and source culture, on the one hand, and the target language and target culture, on the other, are considered in the light of the purpose of the intercultural communication. Actual decisions are made in the translation process resulting, for example, in additions and omissions as well as textual norms revealing linguistic and stylistic preferences, which Toury (1980: 53-6) called operational norms. The categories are very broad[7] and a categorisation of strategies to describe the transfer of culture-specific

---

7    Cf Delabastita 1993, Newmark 1988, Williams 1990 and Baker 1992, 1993.

terms might include transference, indigenisation/domestication, cultural substitution, generalisation, specification (intensification/explication), mutation (deletion and addition), and so on.

## 5.3 Descriptive rather than normative analysis of translations

Translation theorists adopt approaches to translation criticism according to the translation models they have developed (Holms 1988: 67-80; Hulst 1988: 8). In Section 1 it was indicated that from the early 1980s onwards translation studies has moved away from the normative approach, which deemed a translation as good/faithful, bad or indifferent in terms of what was seen to constitute equivalence between two texts. The new focus was on the description and explanation of the translation in terms of the translator's ideology, strategies, cultural norms, and so on. Lambert & Van Gorp (1985: 52-3) provide some practical guidelines for the descriptive analysis of translations and their originals. The following guidelines may be employed.[8]

### 5.3.1   Preliminary data

As a first step the researcher/critic is required to collect general information about the translation, such as contained in the title and on the title page, as well as regarding the strategy of the translator(s) in the metatexts (eg the preface and footnotes). This supplies the initial data from which a provisional hypothesis may be formulated.

### 5.3.2   Macrostructural (global) features

The second stage offers an opportunity for the analysis of the general macrostructural (global) features found in the translation. These may include a scrutiny of the various divisions of the text, the titles of the various divisions, the internal structure, comments by the translator(s), or other directions and explanations.

---

8    Cf Naudé 1999: 73-93 for an example of a comparative analysis of the Schocken Bible.

### 5.3.3 Microstructural features

It is only at the third stage (the micro level) that the selected chapters are considered. The survey probes detail such as shifts on the phonic, graphic, syntactical, stylistic and elocutionary levels, such as the selection of words, dominant grammatical patterns, modalities, and so on.

### 5.3.4   Systemic context

The final step in the Lambert & Van Gorp model collects all the data from the survey and considers it in relation to the system as a whole. The entire process is viewed in terms of the target cultural system and the place the translation occupies in this particular system.

### 5.3.5   The *tertium comparationis*

The question then arises as to just how one sets about comparing anything? According to James (1980:169) the first point is to make sure that like is compared to like: this means that the two (or more) entities to be compared, while differing in some respects, must share certain attributes. This requirement is especially strong in the process of contrasting, ie looking for differences, since it is only against a background of sameness that the differences are significant. The sameness is called the "constant", and the differences, the "variables". In the theory of contrastive analysis the constant has traditionally been known as the *tertium comparationis* or TC, for short. Toury (1995: 80) reminds us that:

> i. every comparison is partial only: it is not really performed on the objects as such, only on certain aspects thereof;
>
> ii. a comparison is also indirect in its very essence; it can proceed only by means of some intermediary concepts, which should be germane to the compared aspects of both texts.

In light of the above, a TC will therefore comprise an independent, constant (invariable) set of dimensions in terms of which segments of the TT and ST can be compared or mapped onto each other. As far as culture is concerned, the ST can be compared to the TT in terms of cultural dimensions, as in Newmark (1988:103):

> i.   ecology: animals, plants, local winds, etc;
>
> ii.  material culture (artefacts): food, clothes, housing, etc;
>
> iii. social culture: work and leisure;

iv.  organisations, customs, ideas — political, social, legal, religious, etc, and

v.  gestures and habits.

Aspects of culture such as the above will then constitute the TC. In a comparative analysis between two texts, the translation critic has to take into account a complex network of relations between, on the one hand, the ST and the political, social, cultural, literary and textual norms and conventions of the source system and, on the other hand, the TT(s) and the political, social, cultural, literary and textual norms and conventions of the target system (cf Hermans 1991).

## 6.  Analyses of translations

### 6.1 Rehabilitation of culture

In this section the strategy of the rehabilitation of culture will be discussed with reference to the Zulu translation of H Rider Haggard's *Nada the Lily* (1892) by F L Ntuli as *Umbuso KaShaka*, 'The Reign of Shaka' (1930/1979, seventh reprint). *Nada the Lily* was written as if it constituted a direct translation from Zulu into English of a tale of Zulu history as told by a white fictional narrator attempting to make the cultural elements of the tale accessible to nineteenth-century English readers unfamiliar with Zulu culture. In the Zulu translation, *Umbuso KaShaka*, these cultural elements are "rehabilitated" — restored to their original (authentic) form, function and significance, so that they truly reflect Zulu culture (Gauton 2000: 103-29).

Rider Haggard (1856-1925) wrote at least 58 volumes of fiction and served the British government for many years on Royal Commissions (Cohen 1968: 15). His *Nada the Lily* is representative of the literature of the age of British imperialism (c 1870 to 1914). According to Katz (1987: 4, 16), Rider Haggard occupies a minor place in the history of literature; nonetheless, he is of considerable cultural significance. He was part of this period's popular culture, and he contributed to a certain state of mind. He assisted in the propagation of imperial ideas and created for Britain an image of greatness and superiority, an image of the world with the British in control. It is in this sense that he is a force to be reckoned with, a shaper of the mentality of Empire.

Rider Haggard's work, firmly embedded in its historical context, is characterised not only by a deep-rooted imperialist ideology, but also by an idealisation and consequent distortion of reality, an admiration of militancy and manhood, and an all-pervasive racism and arrogant paternalism. According to Katz (1987: 32-3, 59) romance involves a distortion of reality, sentimentalising and idealising images such as those of "the African", the child, the woman, the past and Nature. In Rider Haggard's novels, the romance of the "noble savage" is rekindled, strength and valour are emphasised and there is a preoccupation with manhood.

It may be assumed that the reason why *Umbuso KaShaka* was published during the period 1930 to 1979 was that the subject matter posed no threat to the regime, and in fact even supported its long-term aims by fostering Zulu nationalism and ethnicity (Gauton 2000: 112). That this work was originally written by an English author steeped in the supremacist ideals of the British Empire may even have increased the acceptability of the translated version.

In the translation, all the so-called editor's annotations explaining aspects of Zulu culture and words as they appear in the text are omitted, as the target Zulu readers are already familiar with the cultural concepts in question. Moreover, in the translation the focus has shifted away from the unnamed white narrator, who occupies a central position in the source text. It would seem that Ntuli has tried to remove the remaining vestiges of racism and paternalism in his translation and that he has attempted to present it as an account of Zulu history, albeit largely fictional. Ntuli translated the title of the ST as *Umbuso KaShaka* "The Reign of Shaka", and not as *UNada uNozimbali* or "Nada the Flower/Blossom", thus shifting the focus away from the central character Nada, towards the history of the Zulu people. *Umbuso KaShaka* omits the introduction, allowing the salient facts to be summarised in a paragraph in the preface, written by John L Dube. This omission would seem to tie in with the translator's attempt to shift the emphasis towards the history of the Zulus. Furthermore, the introduction, written from the viewpoint of an unnamed white man, has a definite paternalistic slant with clear racist undertones; its omission seems to support the contention that Ntuli was attempting to curb instances of racial bias.

In the translation, the Zulu proper names and terms to which Rider Haggard had given English spellings that would supposedly be easier for an English reader to read and pronounce are restored to their correct Zulu orthography and pronunciation (Gauton 2000: 120):

| ST: Rider Haggard (1892) | TT: Ntuli (1979) | South African English |
|---|---|---|
| Chaka | uShaka | Shaka |
| Umslopogaas | uMhlophekazi | Mhlophekazi |
| Quathlamba | oKhahlamba | Drakensberg (Lit dragon mountain) |
| Amaboona | amaBhunu | Boers |
| the Maquilisini | abaQulusi | Lit the Qulusi clan |
| Bulalio | uMbulali | Mbulali |
| Zweete | uZwide | Zwide |
| Inkosikaas | inkosikazi | Lit principal wife of a chief |
| maas | amasi | Lit curdled milk |
| Ehlosé | idlozi | Lit guardian/ancestral spirit |

Examples of the rehabilitation of cultural artefacts will now be discussed (Gauton 2000: 120-1), starting with drinking vessels:

> ST: We are thirsty with long travel; will you not, then give us a *cup* of water? (Rider Haggard 1892: 8).
>
> TT: Somile siphuma kude; pho, ungesiphe yini amanzi *ngendebe* na? (Ntuli 1979: 12).
>
> Lit. We are thirsty, we have come from afar; won't you then give us a *ladle* of water?

A cup of water in the source text is translated with the term *indebe* to refer to a traditional Zulu drinking vessel that can be characterised as half of a split gourd, used as a ladle.

So, too, the corner of the hut is translated by Ntuli (1979: 19) as *emsamo*, which is the correct term for that part of the hut where artefacts such as a knobkierie and a small shield are traditionally stored:

> ST: I went *to the corner of* my *hut*, Noma watching me all the while, and took a kerrie and my small shield (Rider Haggard 1892: 15).
>
> TT: Ngase ngiya *emsamo*, uNoma engibhekile, ngafike ngathatha iwisa nehawu lami elincane (Ntuli 1979: 19).
>
> Lit: I went to the *umsamo* [= (back] part of the hut, opposite the doorway), while Noma was watching me and I took a knobkierie and my small shield.

Ntuli (1979: 273) also translates girdle as *isigege*, the correct term to use for this piece of traditional clothing worn by Zulu maidens. According to Doke *et al* (1990: 240) the *isigege* is a girl's frontal covering, formed from an oblong patch of beadwork. Msimang (1975: 176) indicates that this covering is about the size of a person's hand, and that it is worn by a girl just entering puberty, referred to as an *itshitshi*:

> ST: It had been a custom with Nada from childhood not to go about as do other girls, naked except for their *girdles*, for she would always find some rag or skin to lie upon her breast (Rider Haggard 1892: 254).

> TT: Wayekujwayele uNada kusukela ebuntwaneni bakhe ukuba angalingisi amanye amantombazana ngokuhamba engembethe lutho ngaphandle *kwesigege*, yena wayefuna ingqeshana noma eyesikhumba embese isifuba (Ntuli 1979: 273).

> Lit: Nada was accustomed from childhood on not to be like other girls by walking around wearing nothing but a *beaded frontal covering*, she by contrast always looked for a small piece of rag or skin and covered up her bosom.

Rider Haggard (1892: 53) uses the term "wand" to refer to a fly-switch, generally made from the tail of a gnu, or wildebeest, and customarily used by the diviner (*isanusi*) during Shaka's time to "smell out" a witch by hitting him/her. The term is rehabilitated in Ntuli's translation by the use of the correct Zulu term *ishoba lenkonkoni* ("gnu's tail").

The same pertains to cultural institutions. The ST refers to divorce (Rider Haggard 1892: 73), a practice that was unknown in Zulu culture during Shaka's reign. In the translation Ntuli (1979: 79) rehabilitates this concept by translating it as *sengamxosha* (lit "I chased her away").

Concerning cultural practices, Mbophe describes how he came to be a diviner. He often refers to his "snake", his *'Ehlosé'* or his "Spirit", that assists him in his divination:

> ST: Peace, and let me see if my *snake* will tell me where the cattle are (Haggard 1892:13).

> TT: Thulani kengibone ukuthi *idlozi* lami, alizukungitshela yini ukuthi izinkomo zingaphi na? (Ntuli 1979:17).

> Lit: Quiet, and let me see if my *ancestral spirit* won't tell me where the cattle are.

## 6.2 Subversion of the source culture

The macro strategy for the translation of the American *Five foundations for marriage* into Southern Sotho, by M I Mpoba (2001), results in the complete acculturation, indigenisation and domestication of the source text in the target culture. All American names are replaced by South African ones. The main character, Robert, is called Mafotha. The name *Salem*, associated with a great riverside holiday resort, is translated as *Parys* in the Free State. America becomes *Afrika Borwa* and all cultural aspects are changed to fit South African circumstances. Statistics and currency, for example, are adapted. The process of building an American house is used in the source text as a metaphor for marriage. In the translation, this is replaced by a typical township house. The American concept of a beautiful woman is also replaced by the African equivalent.

Speakers of Southern Sotho do not understand the meaning of the term "compromise" as meeting halfway, but rather as abandoning what one holds dear, giving up or surrendering to an opposing force. Within African culture a husband must always have his way. The translator thus utilised the strategy of mutation and translated "to compromise" with the term *to consider*.

Introducing children to sexuality refers is not yet acceptable among most African people. The translator thus utilised the strategy of generalisation to convey this aspect by a phrase couched in neutral terms.

The issue of a husband and a wife having separate/private funds is not at all acceptable among African people, where a husband is the head of the household. It would be regarded as a form of mistrust between husband and wife. The husband decides on which property money should be spent. The strategy of mutation was applied, emphasising that both parties must decide on spending.

The concept or custom of a honeymoon does not exist in the Southern Sotho culture. Generalisation was thus utilised to indicate the time for a couple to be alone together. The Southern Sotho term *leqatheng* was used, referring to a house with no inhabitants other than the couple, but in close proximity to the main or parental house. The couple would be alone there, especially at night, but unlike honeymooners they would continue to perform their daily chores, as usual.

## 6.3 Resistance against the target culture

The novel *By die lêplek van die leeus* (*In the lions' den*) by Louise Prinsloo is a South African story written for and about young South Africans in a modern context which has been translated into English by Nannette Lötter (2001). In its original form, this story has recently been prescribed for schoolchildren in Grade 11 in the Limpopo Province and it is hoped that other provinces will follow suit. The story is written in Afrikaans and is about a Zulu-speaking girl who leaves her home and family to go to an Afrikaans university, where she is obliged to lodge with a white, Afrikaans-speaking family. The work contains elements derived from various cultures and languages: there is an Afrikaner community, a Zulu community, and a Mosotho boyfriend, not really acceptable to the Zulu community. The inter-cultural and inter-racial issues of post-apartheid South Africa are dealt with, such as racial politics, social interaction between members of different cultural, linguistic and social groups, and religious beliefs. Customs are dealt with in a matter-of-fact, straightforward manner, which appeals to young people who have to cope with such issues in their daily lives.

The English translation has been achieved without downplaying the African culture, but rather promoting understanding among various cultures. Strategies associated with the transfer of culture-specific elements are utilised in such a way as to incorporate the cultures of all of the protagonists. The translated text is meant to be acceptable to the various cultural groupings of South Africa in such a way that people of different cultural groups should be able to identify with it.

It is not easy for white writers of books for the youth to portray black people authentically, or to create plots which portray black and white people interacting in a realistic manner. All too often blacks are marginalised, given subordinate roles, or portrayed as helpless victims. By contrast, in *By die lêplek van die leeus* the author has attempted to portray a situation in which all the characters are largely on an equal footing. Similarities can be found in the portrayal of the grandmothers, who represent the old way of thinking, and who, although they may become more sympathetic towards people of other races, will never accept them. A parallel may also be drawn between the book's two fathers. They each represent specific political and cultural viewpoints: Johan Visser, the typical white Afrikaner Nationalist, and Vusi Ny-

embezi, the radical left-wing black. This novel, with its incorporation of the languages of various cultural groups, is cast in the postcolonial mould. The translation, *In the lions' den*, is placed even more firmly within this mould because of the fact that yet another language and culture come into play.

The concept of cultural identities is particularly relevant to the English translation of *By die lêplek van die leeus*. The emphasis in this translation is on highlighting cultural identities: the use of cultural words and concepts along with the technique of foreignisation allow for clear demarcation of each cultural group, with the cultural gaps not to be bridged, but to be created. The reason for highlighting cultural identities is to promote the understanding of different cultures as well as the appreciation that each culture has its own unmistakable features and an equal right to exist as a community.

When it comes to the matter of language, however, it must inevitably be acknowledged that English is no longer spoken around the world in the same way as by the British. It has become a *lingua franca* and developed into a hybrid language, because of its various points of contact all over the world. The reason for this, other than colonial contact, is the fact that English lends itself to hybridity because it has, according to Snell-Hornby (2000: 14), structural flexibility and non-puristic openness.

Postcolonial studies tends to see the mixing of languages lexically and syntactically as a cultural enrichment. When this happens, the product may be seen as a variation of one or other of the languages. Such enrichment should be considered for new linguistic possibilities. South African English is a language that has already been enriched by the incorporation of loan words and terms from many (if not all) of our indigenous languages, as well as from Afrikaans.

The translation of *By die lêplek van die leeus* seeks to accomplish the promotion of understanding among various cultures by including elements from indigenous languages in the English text in such a manner as to retain the spirit of the indigenous cultures. To achieve this aim, the existing version of English known as South African English is utilised to a great extent.

The macrotextual strategy is to retain as many of the foreign codes as possible (Heylen 1993). The various cultural groups are illuminated, enhancing the portrayal of cultural identities. At the same time the conventions of the English language must be observed in order to produce a readable literary translation. The microtextual strategies of transference and domestication/indigenisation are used for this purpose. Within the framework of postcolonial translation the meanings of most of the cultural words that have been transferred are clarified by their contexts. This, however, is not done in an explicit way as would be the case in a colonial translation, where direct explanations are given either in the text or as footnotes. Newmark's (1988) categories for comparing culture-specific items are valuable as a framework for classifying such items.

In terms of social culture, the following terms of address are transferred from the source text to the target text:

> Zulu: Gog (granny), Malume (uncle), Sangoma ("witchdoctor", traditional healer);
>
> Afrikaans: Hottie (name, probably short for Hottentot), Miesies (madam, from Mrs), Ouma (granny), Oom(uncle), Baas (Master), Tannie (aunty), Swaer (brother-in-law), Kleinbaas (young master) and Dominee (Reverend).

It was decided that all of the characters would retain the names they had been given in the source text. Afrikaans names would retain their Afrikaans form (Gerrie, Magrieta, Chris, Helga), and Zulu names their Zulu form (Buza, Thandi, Zeli), since these names tend to reflect the language and culture of the person named.

Much of the impact of this story is based on contrast: the two grandmothers are contrasted, as are the two fathers. Pairs are found to be strikingly similar in many ways. While Ouma Magrieta and Gog Thandi represent their own cultures and ways of life, they both also represent the old ways, and neither will ever really change, even though they may develop a little empathy for each other's culture. Each of the fathers, too, represents a way of life and an entire cultural history. Johan Visser is the typical white Afrikaner, probably also still a little "verkramp", while Vusi Nyembezi is in his heart a freedom fighter. Duduzile and Melanie are also quite clearly meant to be compared with each other. Although there is an evident contrast between the "haves" and the "have-nots", the similarity lies in the fact that neither is substantially

better or worse than the other in any way. By transferring the names into the target text this contrast is highlighted.

Although the source text uses *Ouma* Thandi and *Gog* Thandi interchangeably, it was decided to use only *Gog* Thandi in the target text, as it is more functional to demarcate the culture. It was also felt that the Zulu speakers in the story would probably be less likely to use the term *Ouma* in view of their political feelings about the Afrikaans language. Since they probably would be speaking Zulu, they would not be likely to use *Granny*. Where *Oom* Buza is used in the source text, *Malume* Buza is used in the target text, for the same reasons.

*Kleinmeid* (literally a young girl) is not always transferred unchanged. When first used by the grandmother, it is an insulting term. It is translated first as *meid*, as this is in fact even more insulting than *kleinmeid* and is a taboo term in South Africa ("If I had known a *meid* was coming to stay, I would have given the money to the church!" and "What? Over my dead body will a *meid* sleep on my bed!"). Later in the story the grandmother uses the term with affection, and in these instances, *kleinmeid* is used. For example:

> ST: "Dina! *Kleinmeid*! Waar's jy?" roep ouma Magrieta. "Gaan jy nie stem nie? Ek dog jy is so erg oor Mandela."
> "Ek kom, Ouma!" Sy stap die woonkamer binne waar ouma Magrieta op haar sit en wag. "Hoe hou Ouma van my hare?"
> TT: "Dina! Kleinmeid! Where are you?" called Ouma Magrieta. "Aren't you going to vote? I thought you were so mad about Mandela."
> "I'm coming, Ouma!" She walked into the living-room where Ouma Magrieta was sitting waiting for her. "How do you like my hair, Ouma?"

As far as material culture is concerned, words for the food, drink, clothing, medicine and housing belonging to a particular culture are transferred: *koeksisters* (twisted confectionary, dipped in syrup); *braaivleis* (barbecue); *pap* (mealie-meal porridge); *seshebo* (tomato, onion and chillie mixture); *umqombothi* (traditional home-brewed beer); *karos* (a small blanket made from cured skins); *kierie* (a long stick with a knob at one end, similar to a walking stick, sometimes traditionally used for fighting or even hunting); *stoep* (verandah); *witdulsies en rooilaventel* (traditional Afrikaner home remedies which serve to emphasise Ouma Magrieta's culture).

For example:

> ST: Ouma Magrieta kom die kamer in haar lang wit nagrok inge-skuifel met 'n medisynekissie onder haar arm. "Ek het vir die *klein-meid* iets gebring."… "My ma het altyd geglo in witdulsies en rooi-lavental. Sit, Dina."

> TT: Ouma Magrieta shuffled into the room in her long white night-dress with her medicine chest under her arm. "I've brought some-thing for the *kleinmeid*." … "My mother always believed in *witdulsies* and *rooilavental*. Sit, Dina."

It is worth noting that many of these words are mentioned in Branford's *Dictionary* (1993) as acceptable in English.

All traditional names referring to religious and social customs are transferred in the form of their source language: *nagmaal* (communion, but with different connotations from the English); *dominee* (reverend); *sangoma* ("witchdoctor", traditional healer); *dolosse* (bones and other articles such as special stones thrown on the ground by "witchdoctors" or traditional healers to foretell the future); *stormjaer* (storm-troops, members of the *Ossewa-Brandwag*); *Ossewa-Brandwag* (a very right-wing Afrikaner organisation dating from the Second World War, when many Afrikaners objected to fighting on the side of the British); Zulu *kraal* (a Zulu village); *tikoloshe* (a small, ape-like creature that terrifies many of the indigenous peoples of SA, a gremlin of sorts); *UmThakathi* (the Great Evil One, a god).

For example:

> ST: Ouma Thandi se dis *umThakathi* se werk dat Alfred se een been korter is as die ander een. "*umThakathi* is boos," se ouma Thandi altyd. "Baie boos. Hy stuur hekse om mense te toor."

> TT: *Gog* Thandi said that it was the work of *umThakathi* that had made Alfred's one leg shorter than the other. "umThakathi is evil," *Gog* Thandi always said. "Very evil. He sends witches to put spells on people."

*Lobolo* (bride price, used to be in cattle, but nowadays often in cur-rency). For example:

> ST: "Mans betaal nie *lobolo* nie," help Dudu haar dadelik reg …. "Die man se familie gee *lobolo* in ruil vir die vrou en goeie verhou-dinge tussen die twee families."

> TT: "Men don't pay *lobolo*," Dudu corrected her. … "The man's family give *lobolo* in exchange for the woman and good relationships between the two families."

Exclamations, greetings and orders may be regarded as gestures, and the following are transferred: *phangisa*! (hurry up); *sawubona* (a greeting, I see you); *hamba* (go away); *ngiyabonga* (thank you); *hawu*! (an exclamation, similar to Oh!), and *yebo*! (yes).

The foreignising of a fairly large number of words has led to a translation in which cultural groupings are clearly defined. This is in keeping with the intention of establishing cultural identities in the story and, in so doing, fostering understanding of other cultures. Readers of the source text and the translation are aware of their cultural heritage and are brought into contact with the realities of cultures which differ greatly from their own. Mutual respect and affection is developed by means of this understanding.

## 7. Conclusion

The advent of postcolonial translation studies in the mid-1990s has led to translations created to benefit the culture of the colonised at the expense of the culture of the coloniser/imperialist. This study has shown by critical analysis how in various South African translations a target culture may be rehabilitated, a source culture may be subverted and a target culture may be resisted by maintaining the source culture, thus fostering intercultural respect and understanding.

# Bibliography

BAKER M
1992. *In other words: a coursebook on translation*. London: Routledge.

1993. Corpus linguistics and translation studies: implications and applications. Baker & Tognini-Bonelli (eds) 1993: 233-250.

1998. *Encyclopedia of translation studies*. London: Routledge.

BAKER M, G FRANCIS & E TOGNINI-BONELLI (eds)
1993. *Text and technology: in honour of John Sinclair*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

BASSNETT-MCGUIRE S
1991 [1980]. *Translation studies*. 2nd rev ed. London: Methuen.

BASSNETT S & A LEFEVERE (eds)
1990. *Translation, history and culture*. London: Pinter.

BASSNETT S & H TRIVEDI
1999. *Postcolonial translation: theory and practice*. London: Routledge.

BRANFORD J & W BRANFORD
1993. *A dictionary of South African English*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

COHEN M
1968. *Rider Haggard: his life and work*. London: Macmillan.

DAVIS K
2001. *Deconstruction and translation*. Manchester: St Jerome.

DEIST F E
2000. *The material culture of the Bible. An introduction*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

DELABASTITA D
1993. *There's a double tongue: an investigation into the translation of Shakespeare's wordplay, with special reference to 'Hamlet'*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

DELISLE J & J WOODSWORTH
1995. *Translators through history*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

DERRIDA J
2001. What is a 'relevant' translation? *Critical Inquiry* 27(2): 174-200.

DE WAARD J & E A NIDA
1986. *From one language to another. Functional equivalence in Bible translating*. Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

DOLLERUP C & A LODDEGAARD (eds)
1992. *Teaching translation and interpreting: training, talent and experience*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

DURANTI A
1997. *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

EVEN-ZOHAR I
1990. Polysystem theory. *Poetics Today* 11(1): 45-51.

FAIRCLOUGH N L
1989. *Language and power*. London: Longman.

FAWCETT P
1997. *Translation and language. Linguistic theories explained*. Manchester: St Jerome.

FOLEY W A
1997. *Anthropological linguistics. An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwells.

GAUTON R
2000. The transfer and 'rehabilitation' of culture in the Zulu translation of H Rider Haggard's 'Nada the Lily'. *Language Matters* 31: 103-29.

GENTZLER E
1993. *Contemporary translation theories*. London: Routledge.

HERMANS T
1985. Translation studies and a new paradigm. Hermans 1985: 7-15.

1985. *The manipulation of literature: studies in literary translation*. London: Croom Helm.

1991. Translational norms and correct translations. Van Leuven-Zwart & Naaijkens (eds) 1991: 155-70.

1999. *Translation in systems. Descriptive and system-oriented approaches explained*. Manchester: St Jerome.

HEYLEN R
1993. *Translation, poetics and the stage: six French 'Hamlets'*. London: Routledge.

HOLMES J S
1988 [1972]. The name and nature of translation studies. Van den Broeck (ed) 1988: 67-80.

HOUSE J
1981. *A model for translation quality assessment*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

HULST J S
1988. *De doeltekst central*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.

JAMES C
1980. *Contrastive analysis*. London: Longman.

KATAN D
1999. *Translating cultures. An introduction for translators, interpreters and mediators*. Manchester: St Jerome.

KATZ W R
1987. *Rider Haggard and the fiction of empire. A critical study of British imperial fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

KRESS G & R HODGE
1979. *Language as ideology*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

LAMBERT J & H VAN GORP
1985. On describing translations. Hermans 1985: 42-53.

LÖTTER N J
2001. Translating culture-specific elements in a South African novel for young adults, *By die lêplek van die leeus*. An experiment in post-colonial translation studies. Unpubl MA minithesis. Bloemfontein: University of the Free State.

MPOBA M I
2001. A functionalist approach towards translating premarital counselling literature into Southern Sotho. Unpubl MA minithesis. Bloemfontein: University of the Free State.

MUNDAY J
2001. *Introducing translation studies. Theories and applications*. Routledge: London & New York.

NAUDÉ J A
1999. A descriptive translation analysis of the Schocken Bible. *Old Testament Essays* 12(1): 73-93.

2000. Review of Schäffner, C (ed). 2000: *Translation in the global village*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. *Linguist List* 11-2325.

NEWMARK P
1988. *A textbook of translation*. London: Pergamon.

NIDA E A
1964. *Towards a science of translating*. Leiden: Brill.

NIDA E A & C TABER
1969. *The theory and practice of translation*. Leiden: Brill.

NORD C
1991. *Text analysis in translation: theory, methodology, and didactic application of a model for translation-oriented text analysis*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

1992. Text analysis in translator training. Dollerup & Loddegaard (eds) 1992: 39-48.

1997. *Translating as a purposeful activity: functionalist approaches explained*. Manchester: St Jerome.

NTULI F L
1930/1979. *Umbuso KaShaka*. Marianhill: Marianhill Mission Press.

REISS K & H J VERMEER
1984. *Grundlegung einer Allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

RIDER HAGGARD H
1892. *Nada the Lily*. London: Longmans.

ROBINSON D
1997. *Translation and empire. Post-colonial theories explained*. Manchester: St Jerome.

SCHÄFFNER C (ed)
2000. *Translation in the global village*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

SIMON S
1996. *Gender in translation*. Routledge: London.

SNELL-HORNBY M
1990. Linguistic transcoding or cultural transfer. A critique of translation theory in Germany. Bassnett & Lefevere (eds) 1990: 79-86.

1995. *Translation studies. An integrated approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

2000. Communicating in the global village: on language, translation and cultural identity. Schäffner (ed) 2000: 11-28.

TALGERI P & S B VERMA
1988. *Literature in translation: from cultural transference to metonymic displacement*. New Delhi: Sangam Books.

TOURY G
2000[1978]. The nature and role of norms in literary translation. Venuti (ed) 2000: 198-211.

1980. *In search of a theory of translation*. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, Tel Aviv University.

1995. *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

VAN DEN BROECK R (ed)
1988. *Translated! Papers on literary translation and translation studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

VAN LEUUEN-ZWART K M
1992. *Vertaalwetenschap: omtwikkelingen en perspectieven*. Muiderberg: Coutinho.

VAN LEUVEN-ZWART K M & T NAAIJKENS (eds)
1991. *Translation studies: the state of the art*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

VENUTI L
1995. *The translator's invisibility: a history of translation*. London: Routledge.

2000. *The translation studies reader*. Routledge: London.

VON FLOTOW L
1997. *Translation and gender. Translating in the 'era of feminism'*. Manchester: St Jerome.

WALLMACH K
2000. 'Get them lost just as in the narrow streets of the casbah': metaphors of resistance and subversion in translation. *Hermeneus* 2: 235-58.

WILLIAMS J
1990. The translation of culture-specific terms. *Lebende Sprachen* 35(2): 55-8.