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**DEFINITION OF TERMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encode</td>
<td>It is an act of putting a message into a meaningful code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decode</td>
<td>Refers to the act of changing a code into a language people can understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional Equivalence</strong></td>
<td>Is what is provided as a practical and working meaning of the mistranslated word(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreter</td>
<td>Someone who translates the sermon from English to Kiswahili and conveys the meaning of what is said.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>It refers to the task of rendering meaning to expressions from one language to another. The meaning has to be as close as possible to the original text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistranslation</td>
<td>It occurs when meaning of the source text (English) does not correspond with the receptor or target text (Kiswahili).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Language (SL)</td>
<td>It is the language from which a source text (ST) is interpreted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>In this study this refers to the preacher who delivers the sermon in English Language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Language</td>
<td>It is the language in which a target text (TT) is interpreted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Is the rendering of message from one language to another.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABBREVIATIONS

E  English
F.E  Functional Equivalence
K  Kiswahili
R.L.  Receptor Language
S.L.  Source Language
S.T.  Source Text
T.T.  Target Text
TAPOT  Theory and Practice of Translation
V.O.K.  Voice of Kenya
ABSTRACT

The study investigates mistranslation of word classes occurring during interpretation of church sermons, in Kasarani Division, Nairobi, Kenya. It identifies some categories of the words prone to mistranslation; the differences between what is said by the speaker and what is interpreted and the ways in which the mistranslations can be avoided.

This research dissertation is presented under five main chapters. The first chapter outlines the background to the study. It clearly states the research problem and goes on to list the questions, objectives and assumptions that guide the study. Lastly, it explains the scope and limitations of the study and gives the rationale behind conducting the study.

Chapter two deals with an interactive review under which various related literature on the importance of the study are systematically winnowed to provide much needed linguistic insights. The section begins by tackling works done on translation and communication. It also puts the study within its context by analysing the language of the church. This is followed by literature on court interpretation which highlights a number of parallels between the role of the interpreter in a court situation and that of a sermon interpreter in a church environment. Lastly in this chapter, the theoretical frame work upon which the study is based, is discussed.
The third chapter which deals with methodology tackles issues such as the study area population, sampling procedure, sample size, data elicitation and presentation. As a significant measure, a pilot study was carried out to provide a vital guide to the collection of data. Chapter four deals with data presentation and analysis, while chapter five ties together the whole study by giving a summary, recommendations and a conclusion to the entire study.
CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In many parts of the world, interpretation of oral messages has become apparent especially if people congregating do not understand the language in use and therefore to communicate, there has to be somebody assuming the role of the communicator. This phenomenon is not only common in social, political and economic spheres, but also in religious settings.

This study is therefore based on two languages: English and Kiswahili. Our focus is based on the interpreter’s oral utterances, as a transfer of meaning from English to Kiswahili. For this purpose, we consider translation as a form of rendering a message from one language into another. The message being conveyed has to be made clear and unambiguous. It is in this regard that interpretation of the message has also to be done.

As a process, interpretation calls for discernment, mainly to understand what the text actually says. For this study, the utterances by the preacher are viewed as texts presented in piecemeal. From the preacher’s utterance the one who transfers meaning is the interpreter who has to understand the language the preacher is using which is
English. The interpreter therefore puts the meaning of what has been said into Kiswahili language hence interpretation process.

In this study English is considered to be the S.T. and Kiswahili the R.L. as a result the interpreter in his endeavour has to transfer meaning from S.T. into R.L. words and phrases. At each point he or she must make decisions on which words or phrases are appropriate. Additionally he or she has to restructure the text to translate well and the meaning put in perspective. From this point interpretation becomes part of translation with the interpreter consciously, or intentionally impacting on meaning.

Considering that Pentecostal church gatherings are a popular attraction and also among the fastest growing religious groups in Kenya, a linguistic study seeking to find out what happens when two languages are in contact, is necessary. In such a setting, one language has to be promptly translated into another for the sake of the majority who do not understand the language of the preacher. Kruger (1994), posits the need to have an interpreter in order to prevent linguistic exclusions. He particularly calls for the removal of obstacles to communication. This he says is enhanced by providing a clear, direct and effective voice to those who would otherwise not understand what is being said in a different language.

Additionally, to enhance communication, the interpreter has to remove obstacles to understanding by providing those who depend on the interpreter with a full and
complete message as that received by those who listen directly. As a process therefore, the result of transferring the text from a source language into a target language is necessary. Available research shows that translation is necessary if people speaking different languages have to communicate effectively.

In this study, we use the terms translation and interpretation because they involve transferring language from one code into another. Essentially, the oral transfer of message or the utterance of the preacher as per the concern of this work, the terms; interpreter, interpreting and translation are adopted.

From the interpretation of the sermon, a category of word classes prone to mistranslation are analysed. In line with mistranslation, Wangia (2003), examines and describes problems that contribute to mistranslation in view of the Luloogoli Bible. So borrowing from her school of thought this study approaches mistranslation from the church interpreter’s perspective. The interpreter may or may not be immediately aware of the mistranslations that may have occurred during the interpreting exercise. This is therefore a crucial element because the church congregation depends entirely on him for the meaning of the message. He acts as the mouth-piece of the preacher because the message intended has to be delivered clearly and simultaneously. Similarly, the message has to be communicated effectively and understandably.

As a process that elicits the reaction of the receptor in accordance with the intention of the preacher, this act of communication is apparent. The receptor in this case is the
church congregation and the communicator is the interpreter while the preacher's language acts as the source. In view of this, the communicator decodes what the preacher says and has to convey a logical message patterned in Kiswahili code as mentioned in paragraph two of page two.

According to Lyovin A. (1997), a language has to be classified into its type and structure and the verbal symbols have to consequently bring out the exact meaning as intended regardless of the voice quality and code difference. To bring this to fruition, a case study of Redeemed Gospel Church-Kasarani, Nairobi was done. This church falls in the category of the Pentecostal churches that carry out sermon interpretations during church service. The congregation comprises people who prefer or use either Kiswahili or English language, so to reach the majority of the congregation, the preacher is obliged to have the message interpreted simultaneously.

Worth noting is that the preacher is an African of Kenyan nationality. He speaks both English and Kiswahili. However he chooses to preach in English because he is more conversant and comfortable with the English language. Also important is the congregation since it comprises people who may prefer English or Kiswahili. It therefore becomes necessary that both languages be applied.

Simultaneous interpretation is defined by Hatim and Mason (1997). In their view discourse processing that is related to translation should be done piece meal. In this
case the input from the first speaker has to be received in bits so that the task of the interpreter is to basically react and interact with the utterance and allow for any inevitable overlap between the various elements of the sequence.

From this view we realize that a lot depends on the interpreter who at every point has to rely on his short-term memory to decode the message and pass it to the audience as intended. Mistranslation may at some point be inevitable. This therefore forms the basis for this research although there are many other factors that could hamper the reception of the intended message, for example wrong pronunciation of words. The communicator decodes what is logical about the code as derived from the patterns of another code. It is in this sense that each language creates its own kind of logic.

Besides being a kind of arbitrary code, language is also connected with an arbitrary system of patterns of behaviour which is spoken of as the culture of a people. Language may be viewed as a reflection of culture and a part of it. Based upon the entire background of a culture, a message can only be communicated in the form of a code employed by the society in question and upon the experience of the communicator. The dependence of meaning upon the experience of the communicator who communicates through verbal symbols means that, if two people make exactly the same statement including substantially identical information and voice quality they will not mean the same thing.

In the light of this a number of observations can be made concerning the context of communication in general and interpretation in particular. According to Lyovin A.
(1997), the context of speaker and hearer must be shared. First, there is need for some adjustment on the part of the hearer if he or she is to avoid distortion of the original message. The message will, nevertheless, be received in a slightly varied manner.

Secondly, there is no real communication unless someone is listening. Thirdly, the factor of intent is crucial. The translator has to reckon with what is intended. He or she has to choose words which will presumably bring out the same meaning whether ideational or practical. According to Lock (1977), meaning originates in the mind and man has to look for signs to express those meanings.

There is often mistranslation leading to loss of information considering what was intended by the first speaker whose message has to be interpreted from English to Kiswahili. The act of interpretation is an apparent tool for verbal interaction between the speaker and the hearer. Typically an interpreter will operate on verbal record of an act of communication from the source speaker which he/she will seek to relay the intended meaning values to a group of target language receivers as a separate act of communication with the source language intended directly.
1.1 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Mistranslation of religious messages in Pentecostal Church services has become common. Every time a speaker sends out a verbal signal he or she intends to convey a message to his or her hearer. When the hearer interprets the message appropriately, communication process has been successful. On the other hand, if the hearer has interpreted the message, communication takes place but in a different dimension from the one that the speaker intended.

This study focuses on a situation whereby the hearer, who in this study will be considered to be the interpreter, may misinterpret the speaker’s message and pass it on to the audience according to his understanding. This phenomenon can sometimes hamper communication. For example:-

Preacher: The sun of righteousness shall shine upon you.

Interpreter: *Mwana wa haki atawaangazia* (The child of righteousness will shine upon you)

The correct interpretation is: *Jua la haki litawaangazia* (The sun of righteousness will shine upon you)

The interpreter heard *son* instead of *sun*. The meaning of what was intended is lost.

The researcher also examined the relationship between extraneous variables such as speed, interpreter’s level of education and the utterance.
This study concentrates on bridging the aspects of communication process. And to the best of my knowledge not much has been done especially in the area of Church sermon interpretation. This will include the following:

- The role of the interpreter
- Causes and effects of mistranslation
- Possible solutions to mistranslation

1.2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What are the categories of words prone to mistranslation?
2. What are the differences between what is said by the speaker and what is interpreted?
3. In what ways can the mistranslations be avoided?

1.3 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1. To identify the word classes that are prone to mistranslation.
2. To highlight difference between what is said by the speaker and what is interpreted.
3. To suggest possible solutions to overcoming the mistranslation.

1.4 RESEARCH ASSUMPTIONS

1. Some categories of words are prone to mistranslation.
2. There are some differences in what the speaker says and what is interpreted
3. There are certain ways of translation that interpreters can employ to overcome mistranslation of church sermons.
1.5 RATIONALE

In a broad sense, translation refers to the process and result of transferring a text from the source language into the target language. This could occur between many languages. For example: rendering of text from one native language to another – between Gikuyu and Luo, Meru and Luhya, Kegusii to Kimijikenda etc. or from one foreign language to another: English-Arabic, French-German; Portuguese-Hindu etc.

This study focuses on interpretation between English and Kiswahili. In this study, interpretation refers to rendering of text into another language in a spoken form. The sermon in this study is regarded as the basic means of spoken or oral communication. It is a dynamic oral transfer of meaning from one language into another and from one speaker to another.

It is worth noting that most communication models make assumptions that the message encoded is usually the one decoded. These models only focus on two people, the encoder and the decoder and overlook the interpreter’s role.

This study will merge the three – the three point communication. The channel being held constant, misunderstanding can still occur. This reveals the fact that the process of encoding and decoding can in itself be flawed. In view of this the interpreter then is charged with both the roles of decoding the speaker’s message before (s)he encodes for the audience. If the interpreters encoding and decoding have any flaws then mistranslation is bound to occur. Sometimes it is the speaker who encodes wrongly
and so the interpreter has to decode and encode correctly in order to convey the right message to the congregation.

This study will therefore focus on two factors: first the discrepancy between decoding and encoding, secondly the interpreters' deliberate effort to deliver the intended meaning which may be different from what he received. Since the major barrier has been the channel and the way the message is interpreted, this study will focus on the interpreter who is the major source of information. The study also hopes to work as a building block for future studies in the light of what has not been done. The researcher has not come across works on simultaneous interpretation of a church sermon. In the light of this the study focuses on word class categories that are prone to mistranslations and the factors that contribute to the same.

1.6 SCOPE AND LIMITATION

This study focuses on mistranslation at the level of the interpreter. It is easier to capture how the interpreter decoded the message than getting to find out how the congregation received the message. The congregation would be too large a group to study because we may sample only those who got the message correctly or incorrectly.

One church was purposely sampled and from it three sermons were recorded. The three sermons were appropriate because one would end up being coincidental, two
would be contrasting and three might portray at least some consistent patterns either towards correct translation or mistranslation.

The study was limited to one Pentecostal church in Kasarani Division – Nairobi. The aim was to get one sermon per service on different Sundays from the church. The choice of the area was to target people who speak either English or Kiswahili, so when they congregate in a place the two codes are likely to be used concurrently. The entire population of the area comprises middle class people who may speak either language. It is worth noting that interpretation of sermon is a common phenomenon in Pentecostal Churches whereby there is an attempt to render the verbal utterances into another language (Kiswahili) with similar semantic representation as that of English.

Translation studies have been conducted in various fields but to the best of my knowledge, the area of simultaneous interpretation of a church sermon has not been covered. In this light, the study will focus on category of words prone to mistranslation, the difference in what is said and what is interpreted and lastly highlight factors that contribute to the same.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION
This study falls under the broad area of Discourse Analysis. It specifically deals with translation and communication. This literature review section will therefore begin with an outline of related works that have been done in Translation and then go on to discuss several works on communication and the language of the church. It will also provide a brief literature on the role of the court interpreter(s) and show it’s parallel to the church sermon interpretation. Theories that are related to the proposed study will also be outlined. Lastly, it will provide a theoretical framework under which this work falls.

2.2 WORKS DONE ON TRANSLATION
Ali (1981) analysed the problems of translating news from English to Kiswahili using the former Voice of Kenya (V.O.K) radio broadcasting. Her work was based on the errors that occurred in the then V.O.K. Kiswahili news broadcasting and demonstrated that bad translation affected communication between V.O.K. announcers and their listeners. Such problems, she concluded, were caused by lack of competence among translators, the short length of time within which the news was written and other non-linguistic factors.
Omboga (1986) examined the weaknesses in a Kiswahili translation of an English novel *The Beautiful Ones are not Yet Born* by Ayi Kwei Armah using the Communicative Theory. He cited the following reasons as major causes for the poor translation.

That translation was poor because it had no proper theoretical basis; and the translator did not understand his task; he did not understand the culture of the languages involved and therefore he translated only the language and ignored other features of the text. Omboga concluded that lack of understanding of translation theory was a big contributor to the weaknesses in the translation and that it was not accessible to the Kiswahili reader.

Shitemi (1990) examined translation theories in relation to practice used in literary translation. The following issues were identified. Extraneous meaning can result into wrong translation, use of foreign expressions, and concept affects translation, and therefore a good translation stays within the boundaries of semantic style of the original and equivalence between S.T. and T.T. is affected by environmental and cultural differences and the translator’s competence. The conclusion was that meaning is key to the receptor understanding of target text.

The studies cited so far relate to this current study in the sense that they are all concerned with explaining the translation problems involved in translating into a local language.
Mutahi (1987) on the other hand, examined the problems of translating from an African language (Gikuyu) to English. He dealt with the translation of “Gicondi”, a Gikuyu poem into English by non-native Gikuyu speakers. He said that translation fell below expectation.

He notes the following; the main problem rotates around the use of figurative language that would require a deep knowledge of the people and their culture before one interprets them, and one also needs a good knowledge of the grammar of this language.

The use of figurative language such as idioms relates to this study, that is, the rendering of the literal sense that leads to loss or change in meaning.

Wangia (2003) examines and describes translation problems that constitute mistranslation. She says that translation is a complex language activity which involves reconstructing and transferring of a text message from one language to another. Nida and Taber, (1969) say that the success of a translation is measured by how well or how meaningfully a source text message is captured in a text. The following factors are identified in the light of equivalence between an original text and a translation: linguistic form, for example, shows how closely related the languages are involved or how far apart they are. House, (1981), says that there are also cultural factors. And that texts normally reflect the culture of the community for which they were intended (Leppihame, 1979).
Culture takes different forms, for instance, material culture, religious culture and aesthetic culture. Translation may also be affected by differences in ideologies, ecology and technology Nida and Taber, (1969). For total equivalence to be realised where there is a total diversity between source text receptors and target text receptions, all the variable factors have to be transferred into the target language in a way that its receptions will respond to it in the same way that the source language receptors responded to the original text. (Hatim, 2004).

Wangia (2003) therefore looks at different types of translation problems using various linguistic indicators. The Lulogooli Bible is an example of a translation with great historical, cultural and linguistic contrasts from the original text perspective. Language problems that are the centre of translation problems are cited, with language issues of structure, ambiguity, obscurity and figurative expressions taking the centre stage. These issues would easily lead to mistranslation and therefore need to be resolved.

Kariuki (2004), analysed comprehension problems the Gikuyu speakers could face in trying to understand the 2004 Draft Constitution of Kenya. He outlines the discrepancies men and women exhibit in comprehension and interpretation of the constitution. He also notes the need to preserve important documents in a first language. Hence the need for translation strategies that would bear the equivalence of an important document.
Wanjohi (2004), highlights a systematic procedure that could be followed in creation of Gikuyu neologism. Considering the fact that some professionals are compelled by the nature of their work to engage in a lot of translation, she underscores the importance of the media in the propagation of new terminologies. She also identifies some scientific and technical terms that the Gikuyu F.M radio presenters encounter in their effort to provide equivalent terms. She notes that some strategies would not be effective tools of propagating indigenous vocabulary.

2.3 SEMANTIC REPRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

Patrizia Tabossi (1991) says that the semantic information about words must be recovered from the mental lexicon and combined according to the syntax of the language before more complex elaborative processes can take place. Thus, the individual words constitute the building blocks of comprehension. But, not only do words contribute to make up the meaning of the sentence in which they occur, in many occasions the reverse may also be true and the internal representation constructed from a sentential context may help the various processes connected with the comprehension of a lexical item as considered in the sentence below:

*The cook put the sugar on the cake and left it in the fridge.*

'It' may either refer to sugar or cake and in order to resolve the referential indeterminacy and interpret it correctly as referring to cake, one has to take into account the overall meaning of the sentence and the general knowledge it elicits, in particular, the fact that sugar is not kept in the fridge, whereas cakes often are.
The illustration above shows the contribution that context can give to the comprehension of anaphoric expressions. The phenomenon however is not restricted to these words. It is to the more general case of sentential context on the comprehension of content nouns that the present study is also devoted.

But what is a word? A word can be considered fully comprehended when it has been adequately interpreted in its context of occurrence. It is understood not when it has been recognised as the neutral pronoun, but when it has been interpreted as referring to cake, and before this result can be achieved several processes must take place.

There is considerable disagreement among researchers as to how these processes should be characterised and the terminology heterogeneity of the current literature does not clarify the matter of processes that are the object of interest, namely;

- lexical interpretation
- word recognition or identification
- lexical access

Lexical interpretation is illustrated in the above example whereby 'it' receives its interpretation according to context.

Word recognition is used to refer to the processes by which the visual sound or sound pattern corresponding to a word makes contact with the various kinds of information, that is, semantic, phonological and syntactic, available to the reader/listener about that word. Lexical access is the retrieval of semantic information related to a word when a word is recognised. For example, what information about the meaning of the word
'dog' becomes available to the listener/reader when he/she recognises the word? Does one recover all the available information about dogs or only that which is contextually relevant?

This literature helps us to understand what goes on between the source of the message, the interpreter and the message itself.

Greg B. Simpson (1991) claims that although hardly noticed, the most obvious case of sentential context effects on the interpretation of a lexical item is ambiguity. It is a common phenomenon in language and it is handled so efficiently by the language system that people feel easier to deal with relatively small numbers of ambiguous words than with large numbers of ambiguous words.

Millers (1951), says that the more frequently a word is used the more likely it is to be ambiguous. Context plays a central role in the comprehension of ambiguous words, and indeed it seems easier to understand an ambiguous item in context than to think of its meaning in isolation.

John-Laird (1983) illustrates this by considering the various meanings of 'plane' as follows:

- The plane landed on the runway.
- Imagine a sphere divided equally by a plane.
- The carpenter smoothed the surface of the wood with a plane.
- All the trees have been cut down except the tall plane at the end.
Although ambiguity is the most striking example of sentential context effects, the phenomenon also applies to unambiguous words which can be flexibly interpreted. In a cued recall study, Barclay, Bransford, Franks, McCarrel and Hitsch (1974) presented their subjects with sentences such as:

1. The man lifted the piano.

2. The man tuned the piano.

They found that ‘something heavy’ was a better memory cue for sentence 1 than for 2 whereas the reverse was true when ‘something with a nice sound’ was the cue.

Studies show that not all the aspects of meaning of a word are equally prone to context effects. Rather, some aspects, like the ‘core’ meaning of the word, tend always to be present, whereas peripheral aspects may become less or more less salient depending on the contexts of occurrence of the word (Bansalou, 1982; Greenspan 1986).

Our study therefore attempts to find out whether ambiguity of words and phrases may lead to mistranslation.

Related to semantic flexibility is the instantiation of general terms. Anderson and Ortony (1975) presented their subjects with sentences like the following:

3. The container held the apples.

4. The container held the cola.
They found that the subjects were better at remembering sentence 3 when the cue was 'basket' than when it was bottle, whereas the reverse was true for sentence 4. Anderson, Pchert, Goetz, Schallert, Stevens and Trollip (1976), extended these results showing that 'basket', which did not occur in sentence 3 was a better memory cue for that sentence than 'container', which did occur in it. 'Container' however was better than basket for the sentence as considered below:-

5. The container stood near the apples.

The example above shows that 'basket' is not in general a better memory cue than 'container'.

These data suggest that when people encounter general terms, like container, they tend to interpret them as more specific ones, according to context. The container was likely to be a basket in the situation described in sentence 3 and a bottle in the situation described in sentence 4. This is why the two words were better cues for sentence 3 and 4 respectively. In contrast, sentence 5 did not provide enough information to instantiate the general term that was therefore held unspecified.

Disambiguation, semantic flexibility and instantiation show unquestionably that sentential context can affect the interpretation of a word. In addition to being well established these phenomena have also been given a convincing theoretical account within the framework of the Mental Model Theory (Johnson-Laird, 1983).
According to this theory, understanding a sentence involves building a mental model of the state of affairs described by the sentence. A mental model is not a description of a sentence. It is the mental construction of the situation described by it and its structure is analogous to the corresponding events in the world. Within this theory words are cues to the construction of the model, and their meanings are functions which contribute to determine the referents of the words in the model.

A central assumption of the theory is that understanding requires linguistic capability to interact with knowledge of the world. Thus information provided by individual words in the sentence is understood in relation to sentential context knowledge reducing the indeterminacy, vagueness and ambiguity of lexical items.

The theory provides a homogeneous account of ambiguity, lexical flexibility and instantiation. In all cases linguistic and non-linguistic contexts sharpen their interpretation but interpretation is a late process in the comprehension of a word which in order to be interpreted must previously be identified.

Our study will borrow from these studies the theoretical model of accounting for ambiguity, lexical flexibility and instantiation.

2.4 TRANSLATION AS COMMUNICATION

Proper interpretation yields successful communication. Communication is a process involving two information-processing devices. One device modifies the physical
environment of the other. In return, the second device constructs representations similar to representations already stored in the first device.

According to Sperber and Wilson (1986:2), there are three main things that are passed on in communication. These are:

- Thoughts: conceptual representations.
- Assumptions: thoughts treated by the individual as representations of the actual world.
- Information: facts, dubious and false assumptions presented as facts.

Two main communication models have been advanced to explain how communication is achieved. These are:

a) The Code Model
b) Inferential Model

The Code Model is one of the oldest models of communication. Its development is attributed to scholars like Aristotle. It claims that communication is achieved by encoding and decoding messages. One person encodes a message and sends it through some channel to the recipient who decodes to get the meaning. The Inferential Model was advanced by Grice, and Lewis, (1957). They claim that communication is achieved by producing and interpreting evidence. The speaker/sender needs to provide some evidence or clues as to what he/she intends to communicate and the hearer will interpret the clues to get the speaker's intention.
communicating devices. A signal is a modification of the external environment which can be produced by one device and be recognised by the other.

Shannon and Weaver (1949) in Sperber and Wilson (1986:4) simplify these concepts by representing them diagrammatically thus:

![Shannon and Weaver Communication Model](image)

**Figure 1: Shannon and Weaver Communication Model**

For instance, a speaker S, may feel hungry and therefore encode the message as “I am hungry”. He will then send out a signal, that is, verbalize the words through the air (channel). This message will be received by a hearer H. H will then decode the received acoustic signals to get a meaningful message before acting accordingly.

Assuming that S and H were seated far apart and there were hoardes of people talking loudly in between them as well as a power-saw machine making some noise outside, it is possible that the signal may be interfered with along the channel. Thus, in the end H may decode the message as “I am in a hurry” and so instead of bringing S something to eat, he/she may call a taxi to pick up S. this shows that interference within the channel by such things like noise can distort the signal.
Frisch (1967) in Sperber and Wilson (1986:5) improved on the model above. He based his new model on the behaviour exhibited by bees when they are informing others about the presence of nectar. This model can be summarised as follows:

Frisch postulates that a message begins as a thought in the speaker’s mind which is then encoded linguistically. It may be sent out as a verbal, written or gestural signal through the air or paper/fax machine/computer for written messages. The hearer then receives this acoustic/visual signal and decodes it to infer meaning.

Utterances are analysed in pragmatic dimensions while sentences are looked at using syntactic rules. Sentences merely focus on rules of grammar but utterances must be interpreted in the view of pragmatic features like the speaker (Who), intention (why), time (when), manner (how) and receiver (to who).
For example:

I will come there today.

As a sentence; I - the first person is the speaker
today - the day the sentence was spoken/written
there - a place far from the speaker.

As an utterance; I - a specific person e.g. Mary
there - a place known to both the speaker and the hear e.g. Kisumu.
today - a specific day e.g. Wednesday.

Thus, as an utterance it will be interpreted as:

Mary will come to Kisumu on Wednesday

Utterances perform ‘speech acts’ or carry ‘illocutionary force’. An inferential process
starts from a set of premises and results in a set of conclusions which follow logically
from, or are at least warranted by the premises. A decoding process on the other hand,
starts from a signal and results in the recovery of a message which is associated to the
signal by an underlying code.

The Mutual-Knowledge Hypothesis was developed by Lewis (1969) and Schiffe
(1972). Lewis calls the concept common knowledge while Schiffe calls it mutual
knowledge. The Mutual-Knowledge Hypothesis states that if a hearer is to be sure of
recovering the correct interpretation, the one intended by the speaker, every item of
contextual information used in interpreting the utterance must not only be known by
the speaker and hearer, but mutually known.
The speaker and hearer must establish or at least assume that they share some knowledge to avoid misinterpretation. For instance, for a preacher (P), to tell a congregation (C), that “you must be born-again,” P assumes that C knows what it means to be born-again, C assumes that P knows what it means to be born-again, P assumes that C knows that P knows what it means to be born-again and C assumes that P knows that C knows that P knows that C knows what it means to be born-again. These series of assumptions about mutual knowledge will help C to interpret P’s use of the words born-again appropriately.

This literature on communication will help our work in understanding the roles of the source (speaker), the channel (code) and the interpreter in mistranslation.

2.5 THE LANGUAGE OF THE CHURCH

On the language of the church, Thorne (1997:39) says that the mode of the sermon bridges both written and spoken language: it is written, carefully crafted on the page before being delivered orally to a congregation. The text displays many features of formal written language, but by practising ‘speaking’ a written text, a minister can make the language seem spontaneous. In its spoken form intonation, pitch, pace and emphasis would help the congregation to focus on key elements of the sermon even if they were unaccustomed to listening to complex language structures. The manner is inevitably formal and this reflects the relationship between the minister and his congregation.
In essence, a minister is God’s representative on earth and in preaching his sermon can be seen in the role of mentor, educator and advisor. With a rector who is known to his congregation, however, there is a personal relationship beyond the formality of Sunday services. The field is clearly religious even though the traditional archaic language and verb inflections have been replaced by modern English. The sermon becomes almost a literary text with a religious and spiritual message. It adopts a traditional prose format, using paragraphs rather than the verses of the Bible, and conveys its message using traditional literary and rhetorical techniques.

The sermon usually opens with quotation from the bible in which the concept to be discussed is introduced. Such a direct line provides the congregation with a traditional religious context for the lesson they are about to hear. The moral message that often follows is quite complicated because it is embedded in a philosophical discussion of the present nature of the society.

The subject specific lexis normally identifies it as a religious variety. Using traditional religious allocations like Praise the Lord also helps the congregation to make direct links with traditional religious teaching.

To ensure that members of the congregation are not alienated and that the sermon relates directly to their lives, modern references are widely used. The sermon draws on everyday experiences like interaction/exposure to the media in order to make the spiritual message meaningful in a modern context.
The mood is almost always declarative since most sermons take the form of a sequence of statements. There are usually no explicit imperatives but an entire sermon is an implied command. Rhetorical questions are often used to provoke the congregation to think about the issues at hand.

Pronouns help to create a personal relationship between minister and congregation.

Metaphorical language is a central part of the emotive appeal to the congregation.

Sermons are very rhetorical because they try to persuade people to act in a certain way. Key words are usually repeated to establish the theme.

Thorne continues to say that the function of religious language is to preserve and promote a particular spiritual belief system; to persuade the congregation or individual worshippers to live their lives in a certain way.

To a large extent, traditional texts like the Authorised Version and the Book of Common Prayer play an important role in defining the nature of religious language: archaic features provide links with the past; well-known phrases and clauses from the Bible embedded in everyday conversation mean that religious language is recognised even by people who have no religious affiliations.

Semantically, the language of the church must be accessible, so although it changes very little, it must adopt in some ways to the expectations of a modern congregation. Religious utterances can be statements of belief, prayers of supplication, narratives with spiritual or moral message, or celebrations of important days or occasions.
This study will find out whether church language which uses traditional prose format, complicated philosophical approach, metaphorical language and rhetorical questions, contribute to mistranslation by interpreters.

2.6 LITERATURE ON COURT INTERPRETATION

The role of the court interpreter is to facilitate communication between the two contesting parties as a neutral party who, by duty, has to serve the two impartially. Devitt (1942:41) concurs that the presence of the court interpreter is essential for the administration of justice. It is solely through his language proficiency and his familiarity with the cultures of the defendant and the court-room, that the court can even think of proceeding.

To begin with, court interpreters have an obligation to provide an accurate and complete interpretation of messages from one language to another, secondly, words have no meaning without context and thirdly, since the language of the law is full of excess verbiage, it is clear that verbatim interpretation of court-room proceedings is meaningless if not impossible. In practice, interpreters have learned to disregard instructions from the bench such as 'don't interpret just translate' or to just translate word for word what is being said. The interpreter has to aim at conveying the meaning of the source-language message as precisely as (s)he can within the limits of the target language's grammar and syntax.
According to Gonzalez et. al. (1991:16-17) in a court environment, the equivalence of what is being interpreted must be carried one step further by including the form and style of the message. These are important elements. They contend that the interpreter must mediate between these two extremes: the verbatim requirement of the legal record and the need to convey a meaningful message in the TL. These requirements basically mean; one has to account for every word of the SL message without compromising the syntactic and semantic structure of the TL which is seemingly mutually exclusive. However, the dichotomy is resolved by focusing on conceptual units that must be conserved, not word – by – word but concept-by-concept. To be true to the global SL messages, paralinguistic elements such as hesitations, false starts, hedges and repetition must be conserved in a verbatim style and inserted in corresponding points of the TL message (Gonzalez et. al. (1991:17)

There are a number of parallels between the role of the interpreter in a court situation and that of the sermon interpreter in a church situation. We infer this from Davitt (1942:41), who states that the work of the interpreter in the court is to serve justice because of his or her familiarity with the culture of the defendant and the court-room as well as his language proficiency. This is the same principle in a sermon which guides the interpreter in a church service situation.

Although courtroom translation emphasises the verbatim dimension just like in the church situation the concept-by-concept aspect ultimately over-rides other considerations. Both the church and courtroom interpreters are eventually cultural
brokers whose participation involves mediating ideas, laws, customs and symbolism (Mek Kelson: 1998).

2.7 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.7.1 Introduction

A theory is a set of hypotheses harmonising the relationship between a set of variables. In so doing it provides: a conceptual framework, basis for a acquisition of knowledge by offering insights, direction and depth of inquiry (Jones, 1983). The theories that will guide the analysis and interpretation of data in this study will be the Interpretive Theory Gutt (1991) and Speech Act Theory Austin (1962). Other relevant theories have been reviewed in the literature review presented earlier in this work.

2.7.2 Theories on Translation Works

According to Cartford (1975) translation can be performed between any pairs of languages related or unrelated at a linguistic level. Linguistic theory is therefore useful for translating texts types. The surface as well as the underlying structures have to be considered in rendering meaning from one language to another.

Nida and Taber (1969) advocate dynamic equivalence for translation. This type of translation refers to meaning for meaning translation. It is represented as formal correspondence except under certain specified conditions, for instance, when a literal rendering gives an entirely wrong meaning or incorrect grammar or style in the receptor language.
There may be considerable similarities in syntax and expression between the source and the receptor languages. It is therefore safer to emphasise the possibilities of the source language still being completely different from the receptor language.

The dynamic equivalence approach of TAPOT also presupposes and utilizes the untrained translator’s bottom-up, and quite unscientific perception that non-word-for-word rendering in the target language are arrived at by a kind of syntactical surgery on the source language forms. Thus TAPOT speaks of adjustment of source language forms. To adjust, this calls for: ‘revamp’, ‘subtract’, ‘add’, ‘change’, ‘shift’, ‘correct’, ‘modify’, ‘fill out’, ‘amplify’, ‘expand’, or ‘alter’ the source language form. From a scientific view point, to revamp is to translate keeping in mind the fact that the S.L. equivalent has a completely different structure from the R.L. construction. To subtract, is to translate keeping in mind the fact that the R.L. equivalent has component(s) which the S.L. construction does not have.

Dynamic equivalence is relevant to the study in pointing to the fact that it will enable the audience to respond to the message in substantially the same manner as the receptor of the S.L. text. This goal is underpinned by a theory of three universal language functions: the informative, the expressive and the imperative functions.

The informative function denotes the way language conveys intellectual meaning and the way it brings about understanding in the mind of the hearer. The expressive is the way in which language conveys feelings and the imperative, is the way a language
conveys a speaker’s intention to influence the behaviour of the hearer. This study will also borrow from aspects of Relevance Theory. On this theory, Sperber and Wilson (1986), highlight the notion of inference which is defined as an inference gained by a receiver from the utterances made by a sender. Communication is thus made possible because of certain standards of acceptable beliefs shared by the speaker. The beliefs are said to govern people’s norms and expectations. On the basis of these beliefs the process of communication succeeds because of the principle of relevance.

A proposition is said to obtain optimum relevance when a hearer can interpret it at a minimum processing cost within a given cost. The notion of relevance enables people to know which inferences the communicator intended. In this light the sermon interpretation will be analysed using the parameter of relevance, for example, the choice of wrong words or use of unusual words will determine the success of translation according to how relevant it is to the context. The notion of implicature in the theory of Implicature by Grice (1975), accounts for the information that is implied but not actually uttered by the speaker. It is grounded on what Grice describes as Cooperative Principle (C.P.) according to which certain aspects of conversational behaviour cannot be accounted for unless it is assumed that people are cooperative, and people assume other people are cooperative. Thus cooperation between the speaker and hearer control the way in which conversation proceeds. The conversation contribution of each of the two parts should fit in the context, purpose and direction of the exchange.
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To fulfil this assumption Grice (Ibid.) proposes certain conditions or general rules — maxims which must be obeyed for conversation to be complete. The maxim of quantity requires a contribution in a conversation which is just the right amount. It should be as informative as required and not more than what is required. The maxim of quality puts emphasis on truth, that a speaker should not say what he believes to be false. In addition, he should not say what he has no adequate evidence for. The maxim of relation is based on giving information that is relevant. Under the maxim of manner, one has to be perspicuous with emphasis laid on brevity, clarity and orderliness.

The literature on translation theories will be useful to us in the analysis of data, due to the fact that there is a very close relationship between translation and interpretation. However not all aspects of these theories will apply to our work. The two theories adopted for this study are discussed below.

2.7.3 The Interpretive Theory

To understand not only the meaning of words, sentence or discourse structure a translator will have to familiarise himself or herself with the interpretive approach. This is done when an utterance is used to represent another. The interpretive resemblance is achieved if both the speaker and hearer have shared context. It is an approach that not only aids the meaning of such utterance but also the symbolic nature of events and other features that surround a discourse.
The circumstances under which the translator has to introduce what somebody uttered has to do with the notion of semblance between utterances and meanings. Gutt (1991), highlights ideational factors of utterances in the resemblance of their phonological properties, inferentially or in meanings. In view of the subject matter, the way in which a given term is rendered on each occasion is determined by the context which may vary in extent according to the nature of the subject matter.”

Each word, Gutt notes, is the centre of focus of a whole circle of meaning and the circles in several languages may overlap but seldom coincide with an exact equivalent covering precisely the same area of meaning.

Consequently, it is vital that the translator decodes meaning using the strategy of getting round the message before passing it to the audience considering the awareness of the implication of mistranslation.

2.7.4 The Speech Act Theory

Also relevant to the study is the Speech Act Theory developed by the Oxford philosopher Austin (1962). His main concern was how to do things with words. His work is in many respects a reaction to some traditional and influential attitudes to language. In this respect the attitudes are said to involve three related assumptions; first, that the basic sentence type in language is declarative, a statement or an assertion; secondly that the principle use of a language is to describe states of affairs -
by using statements and thirdly that the meaning of utterances can be described in terms of felicity conditions.

Austin further observes that language can be used for making statements and that for most parts utterances cannot be said to be either true or false. He argues by saying that not all sentences are statements and that such a conversation is made up of questions, exclamations, commands and expressions or wishes like:

- Excuse me
- Are you serving?
- Hello
- Oh Peter, O my!

Such sentences are neither descriptive nor can they be said to be true or false.

It is also noted that not all-grammatical form of declarative are used to make statements. Subjects of declaratives could be identified as:

- I promise to take a matatu
- I bet you five shillings
- I declare you husband and wife
- I warn you that legal action will be filed against you.
- I name this Bus, the flying object.

Therefore by uttering a speaker makes a promise rather than just describing. This kind of utterance is called performative utterance. In Austin’s terminology a performative that worsens is called felicitous and one that does not infelicitous. For such utterances to work they must satisfy the social conventions: For example renaming something by
walking up to it as in naming it 'a flying Dutchman, or flying bus' That social conventions would govern the giving of orders or greetings.

Sincerity clauses were also discussed under Austin’s observation. It rests on the claim that participants must have the requisite thoughts, feelings and intentions as specified by the procedure, and that if subsequent conduct is called for, the participants must so conduct themselves.

Austin proposed that communicating a speech act consists of three elements: the speakers say something, the speaker signals an associated speech act and the speech act causes an effect on her listeners or the participants. The first element he called the locutionary act, the second he termed illocutionary act and the third element is the perlocutionary act.

In distinguishing locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts, Austin (Ibid.) was referring to what a person says, does and brings about is likely to bring about, in or on somebody respectively. In uttering a certain sentence, a speaker may say something — thus performing a locutionary act such as ‘Get lost!’ ‘Go away!’ ‘Leave!’ etc. This form is distinguished from the illocutionary act that may involve insulting or giving command. The effect of this is realized in the perlocutionary act perhaps causing the hearer to feel upset and go away or leave as stated in the locutionary act.
The three ‘acts’ are inextricably interrelated as to be regarded as different perspectives of one and the same transaction. On perlocution, Austin (1962:101) wrote:

Saying something will often, or even normally, produce certain consequential effects upon the feeling, thoughts, or actions of the audience or of the speaker, or of other persons: and it may be done with the design, intention, or purpose of producing them; and we may then say, thinking of this, that the speaker has performed an act... We shall call... the act performed, where suitable... a ‘perlocution’.

He further describes a perlocutionary act as ‘what we bring about as achieved by saying something, such as convincing, persuading, deterring, or even say, surprising or misleading’. (p. 109).

Davis (1980:39) distinguishes the perlocutionary act (the speaker causing the hearer to do something or something to be done to the hearer). The perlocutionary cause: the speaker saying something and the perlocution effect: the hearer’s doing something or what happens in, on or to the hearer.

In view of communicative speech acts, the speaker performs a locutionary act by uttering an utterance, which has an illocutionary force that cause the interpreter to respond immediately by interpreting what the speaker has said; the effect is then realized in the perlocutionary act. The interpreter will eventually interpret the message correctly or incorrectly based on how he decoded the speaker’s utterances. Since our study’s main focus is on the utterances as interpreted from the church
sermon, the Speech Act theory will help us in analysing the sentences pragmatically and syntactically. The Interpretive Theory on the other hand will be useful in pointing out the mistranslated items and show how best mistranslations can be avoided by providing a functional equivalence.

3.2 PILOT STUDY

This was done to provide a pilot to the collection of data for the study. As recommended by Mincer (1981:69), it guides researchers to identify a representative sample of opinion and attitudes from an enumerated population. The researcher filters out all information that cannot be coded in the scheme developed. For this purpose five churches were visited in Kenneth division where 30 people was interviewed per single church with different interpreters was appropriate as a sample.

The researcher also interviewed twenty minutes sermon preceding for the study. Since the sermon was recorded and used as the second source, seemed to continually sustain the same interpretation of terms and messages.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with the entire methodology employed by the researcher. It outlines the pilot study, study area and population, sample size, data elicitation, data presentation and analysis procedures. It begins by tabling a pilot study that was conducted prior to the study. The findings of the pilot study have a large bearing on the methodology.

3.2 PILOT STUDY

This was done to provide a guide to the collection of data. As a survey methodology that is recommended by Milroy (1981:69), it guides a researcher to obtain a representative sample of opinion and attitudes from an enumerated population. It also filters out all information that cannot be coded in the scheme developed. For this purpose five churches were visited in Kasarani division where it emerged that a single church with different interpreters was appropriate as a sample.

The researcher also discovered that a twenty minutes sermon provided sufficient data for the study. Since the sermons were centred around one theme and that interpreters seemed to continually retain the same interpretation of terms over and over, it was
deemed necessary that we work with a portion of the sermon, hence the choice of a twenty minutes tape recording of the sermons.

3.3 STUDY AREA AND POPULATION

The target population of this study encompasses essentially all Pentecostal churches that carry out sermon interpretation, from English to Kiswahili as a consistent feature of the service. However, this was too large a group for a thorough study. Consequently, our sample population consisted one type of Pentecostal congregation namely: Redeemed Gospel Church in Sports View Estate of Kasarani Division in Nairobi Province.

The population of this congregation was considered fairly representative of Kenyan Pentecostal brand of Christianity in an urban setting. The majority of the people in this church prefer Kiswahili to English language. Therefore if the preacher gives his sermon in English it has to be interpreted into Kiswahili by the interpreters assigned to do so. In this regard, the church has a number of designated interpreters conversant with Kiswahili and English language. Consequently in a situation where there are two services in a day, there will be two different interpreters who operate on a duty roster. For the purpose of this study, therefore, this congregation provided variety of interpreters for purposes of the comparative element and sufficient data analysis. (See map attached).
Figure 3: Location of Kasarani Division in Nairobi Province, Kenya.
3.4 SAMPLING PROCEDURE

Based on the findings from the pilot study, we adopted purposive sampling in selecting the church from which data was collected. Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) say that purposive sampling is a sampling technique that allows a researcher to use cases that have the required information with respect to the objectives of his or her study. They continue to say that samples are therefore hand picked because they are informative or they possess the required characteristics.

Redeemed Gospel Church – Kasarani was deliberately selected because it has several interpreters. It was representative because it was selected from the entire population; it also exhibited the characteristics of Pentecostal churches that form the target population. It was then possible to generalise the data and the findings obtained from the selected church and the target population.

3.5 SAMPLE SIZE

Following the pilot study, twenty minutes of sermons were tape recorded for analysis. The five interpreters who worked with Redeemed Gospel Church were the ones whose interpretations were studied to identify mistranslations.

3.6 DATA ELICITATION

Two methods of data elicitation were adopted. These were tape recording and unstructured interview schedule. Use of a tape recorder was overtly done. Milroy
(1987:88) advises that the speakers need be informed prior to the exercises. She observes: it is wrong to record speakers without their knowledge and that the subject is entitled to be aware that a permanent record is being made. For this purpose, the researcher informed the church administration and the speakers prior to recording. Then attended the respective services and recorded the first twenty minutes of the sermon after commencement. In addition tape-recording of sermons is normal in many churches. It is done for either future references or for sale. It does not therefore cause any undue concern or inhibition.

Unstructured interview schedule was also used during data elicitation. This is an oral administration of a questionnaire or an interview schedule. Borg et. al., (1997) in Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) says that unstructured interview guides have a general plan that the interviewer follows. They say that in this kind of an interview, the interviewer asks questions or makes comments intended to lead the respondent towards giving data to meet the study objectives. In this regard, subjects whose sermons were recorded, were interviewed. This was done to elicit information about their level of education and experience in relation to the interpretation exercise. The guiding questions for the unstructured interview schedule are listed in appendix II.

### 3.7 DATA PRESENTATION

Data is presented in a table which shows the mistranslated items depicting both the English and Kiswahili versions and their functional equivalents. The pie chart on the
other hand shows the frequency of misinterpretations that occurred when the preacher’s sermon was being interpreted.

3.8 DATA ANALYSIS

Qualitative as well as quantitative approaches of data analysis have been used in this study. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999:115), qualitative analysis of data refers to non-empirical analysis with the interest of analysing information in a systematic way in order to come up with useful conclusions and recommendations.

Quantitative approach was used to record the frequency of mistranslations that occurred during sermon interpretation. Consequently data presentation is tabulated on a pie chart showing the percentage scores of the word class category mistranslated.

To ensure that categorisation was systematic, the word class categories were differentiated as: Verbs, nouns, adjectives, prepositions, adverbs, interjections, conjunctions and pronouns.

In line with qualitative analysis the tape recorded sermons were written and studied to identify categories of the mistranslated word class. Notes from unstructured interviews schedule were also studied to establish background information against which to make recommendations pertaining to the subject of translation. From this point the difference between what was said by the preacher and what was interpreted demonstrated the category of words that contributed to loss of meaning.
CHAPTER IV
DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1 INTRODUCTION
The data presented in this section was elicited from the church sermons. It comprises twenty minutes interpreted and tape-recorded messages of the preacher. Our target sample was mainly what the interpreter gave as the intended meaning of the message.

4.2 PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND EXPLANATION
The study uses the qualitative approach in data analysis. All the tape recorded data was transcribed and a detailed description of trends exhibited by the data are presented and analyzed. Quantitative analysis is also employed in the presentation through the use of a pie chart to represent the frequency of mistranslation among word classes. The data has been analyzed in the view of the Interpretive Theory and Speech Act Theory. In data presentation the abbreviations E, K and B.T. have been used. E represents the English version, K the Kiswahili version, B.T. back translation respectively, and F. E. to show functional equivalence as the intended meaning for the mistranslated form.

All the italicised items in table 1 below constitute mistranslations that occurred during the church sermon interpretation. As a result, analysis of the various word classes was done to determine the frequency of mistranslation in the respective word class.
category. The data with mistranslations back translation and their functional equivalants appear in Appendix I.

**TABLE 1: MISTRANSLATIONS BY THE INTERPRETER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREACHER</th>
<th>INTERPRETER</th>
<th>BACK TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job was tested by God.</td>
<td>Ayubu alitahiniwa na Mungu</td>
<td>Job was examined by God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Finally you agree that God is faithful</td>
<td>Mwishowe unaamini kwamba Mungu ni mwaminifu</td>
<td>Finally you believe that God is faithful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Their boat continued sinking.</td>
<td>Meli yao ilizidi kuungia majini.</td>
<td>Their ship continued getting into the water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. They were baptised in the Holy Spirit.</td>
<td>Walijazwa na Roho Mtakatifu.</td>
<td>They were filled by the Holy Spirit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The prophet warned them against disobeying</td>
<td>Nabii aliwajulisha majuto ya kutotiti.</td>
<td>The prophet informed them about the consequences of disobedience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Those who are limited.</td>
<td>Wale wali na kwango.</td>
<td>Those who have an extent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Stand on the promises of God.</td>
<td>Simamia ahadi za Mungu</td>
<td>Stand for the promises of God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. After he had squandered everything.</td>
<td>Baaada ya kubadhiri mali yote.</td>
<td>Kila kitu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The prodigal son ran away from his father.</td>
<td>Mwana mpotevu alienda mbali na baba yake.</td>
<td>The prodigal son went far away with his father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> You are greedy before God.</td>
<td><strong>13.</strong> It is freedom from tradition.</td>
<td><strong>14.</strong> See, even though they were born again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15.</strong> It is sealed by the blood of the covenant.</td>
<td><strong>16.</strong> The policy and principle of giving.</td>
<td><strong>17.</strong> I am not concerned about your tearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18.</strong> God will intervene in your situation.</td>
<td><strong>19.</strong> You are ushered into the fold</td>
<td><strong>20.</strong> Then you end up with confusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21.</strong> I am in full-time ministry.</td>
<td><strong>22.</strong> Then this man reckoned how God had stood by his side.</td>
<td><strong>23.</strong> How do you reason?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24.</strong> When temptations come.</td>
<td><strong>25.</strong> What is the preacher saying?</td>
<td><strong>26.</strong> He lives down in Uganda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27.</strong> Respect your position at work.</td>
<td><strong>28.</strong> In what way do you think?</td>
<td><strong>29.</strong> He lives down there in Uganda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anda <em>uchungu</em> kwa Mungu</td>
<td>You have <em>bitterness</em> with God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ni ukombozi <em>wa utamaduni</em>.</td>
<td>It is the freedom of <em>culture</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Angalia, ijapokuwa walikuwa wamezaliwa mara ya pilifu</em></td>
<td>Look, even though they were born again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inasfinikwa na damu ya ahadi.</td>
<td>It is <em>covered</em> by the blood of the promise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mawazo <em>na maagizo ya kupeana</em>.</td>
<td>The <em>thoughts/ideas</em> and instructions of giving out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sijishugulishi na kubomoana kwenu</td>
<td>I am not concerned about your tearing one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mungu <em>ataingilia kati ya hali yako</em>.</td>
<td>God will <em>come in between</em> in your situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unaingizwa ndani ya kundi la kondoo.</td>
<td>You are <em>put</em> among the sheep-fold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kisha <em>umamalizia na kuchanganyikiwa</em>.</td>
<td>Then you <em>finish by</em> being confused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Niko katika huduma ya wazi wazi.</td>
<td>I am in an <em>open/public</em> ministry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kisha mtu huyu alikumbuka vile Mungu alivyosimama upande wake.</td>
<td>Then this man <em>remembered</em> how God stood by his side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Je <em>unafikiria</em> namna gani?</td>
<td>In what way do you think?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mateso yanapo kuja.</td>
<td>When <em>tribulations</em> come.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mchungaji</em> anasema nini?</td>
<td>What is the <em>pastor</em> saying?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anaishi <em>hapo chini</em> Uganda.</td>
<td>He lives <em>down there</em> in Uganda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heshimu nafasi ya kazi.</td>
<td>Respect the chance to work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To illustrate analysis from table 1 above, a sample of sentences have been selected for explanation and further discussed under word class categories.

In example 12 the word *greedy* is a descriptive adjective that is used to qualify the pronoun *you*. The preacher used this word to warn believers against being mean. And since God had been generous in supplying their material needs, they should not withhold their offering and tithes. He consequently said in E: *You are greedy before God.* This was interpreted in K as *Unauchungu kwa Mungu.* This we can say was not appropriate as a translation. It reads in B.T. *You have bitterness before God.* The meaning of the entire message was changed, for *greedy* and *bitterness* have two separate meanings. An interpretation for this kind of problem should be provided in F. E. as *Una tamaa mbele za Mungu.* The word *tamaa* literally means *desire.* This captures the concept of greed to prevent mistranslation.

In the next illustration the preposition from in example 13 is interpreted as of the preacher used it in the following sentence: E. *It is freedom from tradition.* The preacher said this to imply that the congregation should separate themselves from a sinful nature. This was interpreted as in K. *Ni ukombozi wa utamaduni.* Its B.T. is as follows: *You have redemption from tradition.* The word *from* and *of* connote two different meanings. And so to retain the original meaning an F.E. should be provided thus: *Ni ukombozi kutoka kwa utamaduni.*
In view of this there has to be a notion of resemblance between the utterance of the preacher and the meaning conveyed by the interpreter.

As a grammatical term in yet another illustration, interjections indicate an emotional state or attitude. They not only express exclamations but sometimes call for attention. The word *see* in example 14 is a verb although in this study it was observed as an interjection used to call for attention. The word was translated verbatim from E. *See! Even though they were born again* to K as: *Angalia i japokuwa walikuwa wamezaliwa tena* The B.T. form of the sentence is as follows:- *Look even if they were born again.* In this example *look* is regarded as the equivalent of *see.* Although both terms fall in the category of verbs they are not synonymous in meaning. An F.E. would provide an appropriate way of interpreting a similar meaning.

Austin (1962) says that: not all sentences are statements as is the case in the example above. The statement is an exclamation. However when interpreted with an F.E. the exclamation changes to an expression. So the functional term is *tazama* to be used emphatically and optionally. The sentence should in F.E. read: *I japokuwa walikuwa wamezaliwa mara ya pili.* As a locutionary act it will convey the intended meaning.

The word *covenant* of the noun category in example 15 was mistranslated to mean *promise.* The preacher used this word to imply an agreement that cements a relationship between believers (congregations) and God. The sentence in E was said
thus: *It is sealed by the blood covenant*. This was interpreted in K as: *imefunikwa na damu ya ahadi*. The B.T. of the sentence is: *It is sealed by the blood of the promise*.

Although the words *Covenant* and *Promise* are both nouns they are not synonymous. The difference in meaning is thus regarded as a mistranslation. A functional equivalence would therefore suffice to avoid mistranslations. For example the correct interpretation can be stated in F.E. thus: *Inetiwa muhuri na damu ya agano*. In view of this there has to be resemblance between what was uttered and what was interpreted. *Covenant* in E should imply *Agano* in K.

In example 17 of the sentence: *I am not concerned about your tearing* (E) was interpreted as *sijishugulishi na kuhomoana kwemtu* (K). The speaker uttered the word tearing /tiɔrŋ/ when cautioning his congregation against pretence that is depicted by their outward show of shedding tears /tiɔrs/, and that their tearing should be an inward expression coupled with good deeds. The verb /tiɔrŋ/ changes to /tɔrŋ/. This occurs due to lack of inference on the part of the interpreter. He thus captures the wrong meaning because the speakers pronunciation of the word was inappropriate. The interpreter should have said *sijishugulishi na machozi yenyu* (K). *Machozi* implies tears. The correct interpretation at this point is *Tears- /tiɔrs/*. It has to receive its interpretation depending on the context of situation and topic. Word recognition as noted earlier on page 17 of this research is used to refer to the processes by which sound patterns that corresponds to a word makes contact with various kinds of elements such as information, semantic, phonological or syntactic. The interpreter has
at all times to infer meaning in unclear circumstances to recover contextual relevance. Lack of inference can therefore lead to mistranslations.

According to Sperber and Wilson (1986), the interpretive approach should be at play to render the correct interpretation. In view of this approach the translator has to familiarise himself with the meaning of words, sentences or the discourse structure. The interpretive resemblance has to be rendered if both the speaker and hearer have got to have shared context.

As the data shows, the interpreter was faced with a challenge when the speaker’s choice of words did not tally with the meaning intended. What the speaker said in most cases could only be correctly interpreted by the interpreter using his inference of what the speaker intended to say. To harmonize the speaker’s meaning of the message and what he actually said, the interpreter would choose a word that was appropriate to put the communication on track. In so doing, the interpreter ended up mistranslating the speaker’s message because what the former said was not equivalent to what the speaker had said, although it might actually have been the relevant information.

In example 4 inference comes into play to correct the speaker’s choice of words. He pronounced tearing as /tɔːrdʒ/ rather than / tɔːrɪŋ / which would be appropriate. The interpreter infers in the latter meaning and gives its interpretation leading to mistranslation.
The notion of implicature as developed by Grice (ibid), accounts for the information that is implied but not actually uttered by the speaker. It is grounded on what Grice describes as the Cooperative principles (CP) according to which certain aspects of conversational behaviour cannot be accounted for unless it is assumed that people are cooperative, and people assume other people are cooperative. This cooperation between the speaker and hearer controls the way in which conversation proceeds. The conversation contribution of each of the two parts should also fit in the context, purpose and direction of the exchange.

To fulfill this assumption, Grice proposes certain maxims that must be fulfilled to make communication complete. The maxim of quantity requires that a contribution in a conversation should be just the right amount. The maxim of quality emphasizes truth. The maxim of relation is based on giving information that is relevant while the maxim of manner calls for brevity, clarity and orderliness.

Sometimes an interpreter made use of the notion of implicature and therefore filled the gaps left by the speaker or offered clarifications of what had been said. The extra information that the interpreter introduced often led to the mistranslation.
In example 10 of table 1 the following sentence is considered.

E: After he had squandered everything.

K: *Baada ya kutumia mali yote.*

In 10 the speaker is rather too general with the specific message being implied by the phrases there and everything. The interpreter fills in the specific information in his translation, *mali yote* (all the wealth). In most cases the notion of dynamic equivalence has to be applied in order to render meaning for meaning translation. This calls for adjustments such as revamping and subtracting. To revamp is to translate keeping in mind the fact that the S.L. equivalent has a completely different structure from the R.L. construction. To subtract is to translate keeping in mind the fact that the R.L. equivalent has (a) component(s) which the S.L. construction does not have.

### 4.2.0 WORD CLASS CATEGORIES

The success of communication at the pulpit will largely depend on the interpreter’s ability to work out the rules of grammar and how the sentential elements are structured. The word class categories have therefore been considered in this section. These are nouns, verbs, adjectives, prepositions, expressions, interjections, pronouns and adverbs. The aim of the study has been to find out whether there are any traces of mistranslations in as far as these word categories are concerned. The word classes discussed below depicted traces of mistranslations in varied frequencies.
4.2.1 NOUNS

Nouns often refer to the types of concrete objects in the world (e.g. cake, engine, and moon). Most nouns have special forms for the plural for example engine-engines. A noun can combine with other words to form phrases in distinct ways. For example a noun will be found preceded by a definite (the) or indefinite (a/an) article.

The covenant
An angel

If we form a phrase consisting of an article and a noun, this can follow a verb to form a larger phrase.

Open the door

We say that the door acts as a direct object of the verb in this construction.

The basic word order in Kiswahili is SVO and modifiers generally follow what they modify. As earlier stated assertive and interrogative sentences have the same word order. To express possession, Kiswahili uses the following construction: possessive noun + concord prefix agreeing with the Noun Clause of the possessive noun + possessive marker + possessor noun.

E: The child’s book
K: Kitabu cha mtoto

In some cases the interpreter assumed the meaning of some nouns to be carried within an entire phrase thereby necessitating mistranslations. For example as shown in number 6 of table one.
E: The prophet warned them against disobeying God

K: Nabii aliwajulisha majuto ya kutotii

B.T: The prophet warned them of the wrath of disobeying.

F.E.: Nabii aliwaonyo juu ya kutotii.

The interpreter retains 'the prophet' and omits 'God' in his translation. The effect of this is a reduced level of understanding. The congregation is likely not to know the 'who' that they are being told not to disobey.

In example 11 of the construction below, the interpreter does not have the exact equivalent for 'policy' and 'principle'. He then settles for 'mawazo' and 'maagizo', respectively. The Kiswahili version would change the words to 'thoughts' and 'instructions' in that order. It is clear then that the linguistic alternatives available to the interpreter are relatively few. The sentence depicted thus.

E: The policy and principle of giving

K: Mawazo na maagizo ya kupeana

B.T: Thought and promise of giving

F.E.: Maongozi na kanuni za kutoa.
Similarly, the last Noun Phrase (giving) is mistranslated. The closest alternative ought to be ‘offering’ ‘Kutoa’ to give, to offer, kupeana raises an haphazard state of doing something yet ‘Kutoa’ retains the succinctly intended. Let us consider more examples as depicted in table 2 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREACHER</th>
<th>INTERPRETER</th>
<th>FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) boat</td>
<td>Meli</td>
<td>Jahazi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) woman</td>
<td>Mama</td>
<td>mwanamakene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) tradition</td>
<td>utamaduni</td>
<td>Desturi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) covenant</td>
<td>Ahadi</td>
<td>Agano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) temptations</td>
<td>Mateso</td>
<td>Majaribu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) preacher</td>
<td>mchungaji</td>
<td>Mhubiri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Some mistranslated nouns from the church sermon

In example (a) in table 2 the interpreter uses the term meli since he knows that many people do not make a distinction between ‘meli’ and ‘jahazi’. He assumes that the congregation will understand regardless of the word he uses, which is also the case for (c), (d) and (e).

In (b) the interpreter deliberately avoids the term mwanamakene as it is viewed as being disrespectful. He uses mama as a euphemism because the latter term may be taken to be offensive. For (f) the translator seems to be translating from a background in which the preacher usually doubles as a pastor and thus the terms mchungaji and mhubiri can be used interchangeably to describe him/her.
4.2.2 VERBS

The morphology of English and Kiswahili differ greatly. For instance, although the English verb may be marked for aspects such as person and number it still varies very greatly from the verb phrase in Kiswahili. Kiswahili is an agglutinative language whose verb morphology contains a subject marker, object marker, tense, number, aspect, voice and person all fused into a single element. A lot of mistranslation occurred when individual verbal elements in English were given separate meanings in Kiswahili.

The following two examples, 8 and 11 of table one shows mistranslation that occurred due to word for word translation.

8 Preacher: Stand on the promises of God
Interpreter: Simamia ahadi za Mungu.
F. E.: Shikilia ahadi za Mungu.

11 Preacher: The prodigal son ran away from the father.
Interpreter: Mwana mpotevu alienda mbali na baba yake.
F. E.: Mwana mpotevu alimtoroka baba yake.
The functional equivalent for this construction should be *Yesu tawala maisha yangu* the meaning intended was to be conveyed perspicuously. The Oxford Dictionary of phrasal verbs defines a phrasal verb as the combination of a verb and an adverb, a verb and a preposition, or a verb, an adverb and a preposition, which functions as a unit of meaning. The meaning of phrasal verbs must be interpreted as one unit as shown below:

- **Break + out** = **breakout**
- **Come + into** = **come into**
- **Put + up + with** = **put up with**

Start suddenly/violently V+ preposition
Enter
Tolerate

Phrasal verbs may also have multiple meanings e.g. *let off*

1. allow (sb) to disembark or alight (from sth)
2. release (sb) without punishing him.
3. allow (sb) not to do (an unpleasant task)
4. fire (sth), explode (sth)

Some phrasal verbs have collocates i.e. contexts into which they are used e.g.

...come into your presence

...*tukikaribia uwepo wako*

...*tukisongea uwepo wako*

...*tukiingia ndani ya uwepo wako*
Examples of mistranslated phrasal verbs as portrayed in number 9 of the table one:-

E: Jesus take over my life.
K: Yesu endeleza maisha yangu (Jesus promote my life)
F: Yesu yamudu maisha yangu

and the following sentence of number 20 of the same table:

E: Then you end up with confusion
K: Kisha unamaliza na kuchanganyikiwa (Then you conclude with confusion).
F.E.: Kisha unachanganyikiwa

A main verb in English can be inflected for tense but the same cannot be said of Kiswahili. Kiswahili is an agglutinative language so the auxiliary inflects for tense. Thus an interpreter may leave out the inflection leading to mistranslation. Certain main verbs seem to lack equivalents in Kiswahili and thus the interpreter fumbled to get a word with the closest meaning. For example-

E. Love, like, fond of
K. Penda
F.E. Jaribu

In some instances the interpreters were not well versed with the Kiswahili equivalents of the English verb eventually picking a word from their experiential vocabulary that closely related to the English word.
Most languages of the world are divided into three types:–

a) Inflectional e.g. Latin

b) Agglutinative e.g. Kiswahili

c) Isolating e.g. Chinese

In agglutinative languages, there are no distinct forms of words. Forms can be replaced by similar elements e.g.

E: He will come

K: *Atakuja, Anakuja, Alikuja, Wamekuja, Utakuja.*

In inflectional languages the grammatical elements cannot be separated (Latin)

E.g. amo-I love amamus-we love amass-thou lovest

amat-he loves amatis-you love

amabam-I loved amant-they love

In isolating languages, forms are always made up of clearly identifiable parts. In comparing the English verb phrase with others, Frank Palmer (1984) says that “many other languages have highly complex verb morphology, for example the Bantu languages such as Nyanja, Kikuyu and Swahili, and American Indian languages. He further claims that Swahili is not wholly agglutinative, but has some inflection in the strict sense.
In most cases the entire verb phrase expresses a single idea within various dimensions such as tense, mood, voice aspect, among others. When an interpreter begins to give each verbal element an independent translation, mistranslation is bound to occur.

Besides, English is an isolating language thus it lists each verbal element separately while Kiswahili is an agglutinative language in which all the verbal elements are fused into one word for phonetic realization. And so, when the speaker was too fast the interpreter lacked the time to pick all the verbal elements and fuse them together in order to give a correct interpretation.

We can further note that meaning is important in translation and a translation should have the same meaning as the original. Dostert defines translation as ‘that branch of the applied science of language which is specifically concerned with the problem-or the fact-of the transference of meaning from one set of patterned symbols into another set of patterned symbols.

J.R. Firth holds the view that SL and TL text ‘have the same meaning’ or that ‘transference of meaning occurring in translation is untenable. He defines meaning as the total network of relations entered into by any linguistic form-text, item in text, structure, element of structure, and class term in a system.
Meaning is therefore a property of language because an SL text has an SL meaning and a TL text has a TL meaning. In this regard, an English text has an English meaning and a Kiswahili text has a Kiswahili meaning which in a translation should have an equivalent English meaning.

The relations entered into by the formal linguistic of grammar and lexis are of two kinds, formal relations and contextual relation. The latter is the main focus of this study. It is the relationship of grammatical; or lexical items to linguistically relevant elements in the situation in which the items operate as, or in, texts. The situational elements which are contextually ‘relevant’ to a given grammatical or lexical item are discovered the same way translation equivalents are discovered by commutation.

In normal translation, The TL text has TL meaning that the ‘values’ of TL items are entirely those set up by formal and contextual relations in the TL itself. However it is possible to carry out an operation in which part of the TL text has values set up in the SL hence SL meaning leading to a process referred to as transference. Formal and contextual meanings of lexical items provide a good example of transference.

In example 2 of table one as presented below;

E: Finally you agree that God is faithful

K: Mwishowe unaamini kwamba Bwana ni mwaminifu

Both SL and TL have adverbials initially and relative clauses within.
The formal meaning of English is different from contextual meaning in Kiswahili. In addition, transference can also be carried out at the level of grammar in grammatical transference. SL grammatical items are represented in the TL text by quasi-TL grammatical items deriving their formal and contextual meanings from the systems and structure of the S.L., not the T.L.

4.2.3 ADJECTIVES

Traditional grammar recognized adjectives as the third major word class. These typically refer to properties which people or things possess and they are used to modify nouns e.g. *happy men, *noisy child, etc.

Although they share with articles the property of appearing in front of a noun, if an article and an adjective both combine with a noun, they do so in a fixed order, that is article, adjectives and nouns.

For example: - *A happy man, the noisy child (attributive)
but not *Happy a man, noisy the child

We can also ascribe a property by putting men the adjectives after a form of the verb ‘to be, to form a sentence. (The man is happy, the child was noisy) (Predicative)

Like nouns and verbs many adjectives have special forms indicating the extent to which a property is true of something, the comparative form *happier of happy is the greater degree than and the superlative form, *happiest that is happy to the greatest degree.
The orders in which adjectives occur, whether they are attributively or predicatively used, was the cause of mistranslation. This is depicted in example 21 of table 1 as shown below.

E: I am in full-time ministry.

K: Niko katika huduma ya wazi wazi

B.T: I am in open ministry

In the above example, the preacher wishes to convey the fact that his ministry is an occupation. In the translation, the interpreter misunderstands the adjective, 'full-time' and denotes the aspect of 'openness'. The interpreter relies heavily on the first part of the compound adjective to denote meaning.

In the following example, the interpreter shows an apparent disconnect between him and the English language diction in so far as choice of inference is concerned:

Example 12 of table 1:E: You are greedy before God

K: Una uchungu kwa Mungu

B.T: You have bitterness before God

The correct Kiswahili equivalent for greedy is 'ulafi'. The interpreter uses 'uchungu' which translates to bitterness in English. First and foremost, as has been suggested earlier in this study, it is possible that the interpreter ought to place communicative
importance of the occasion at the core. It was also evident that the interpreter was not competent as the pressures that attend the pace of the speaker conjoined with first time interpretation could have led to this mistranslation.

In the following example mistranslation is of a most unique nature. It is an inter-class mistranslation. The interpreter mistranslates one word class to another as shown below. (Example 14, table 1)

E: See! Even if they were born again
K. Angalia hata kama wamezaliwa tena

The appropriate translation within the church context for 'born again' should be kuzaliwa mara ya pili. This emphasizes the whole point of Christian salvation. It should be noted that the adjective phrase born again is here used as a complement of the verb, yet in translation, the interpreter changes it to a verb.

4.2.4 ADVERBS

While an adjective modifies a noun, an adverb typically modifies a verb, adjective or another adverb indicating how, when, or why something happened or the degree to which a property characterized an individual or an event.

Adverbs are important in grammatical constructions and this cannot be overemphasized. The most heterogeneous word class in English grammar, the adverb performs a wide variety of functions within a sentence. Traditional grammar includes
under this class not only such items as *quickly* and *soon* which are representative of large groups of words but also idiosyncratic items as *no, not* and *the* as in *the sooner the better*. Largely one supposes this because there was no other class to which they could easily be assigned.

Modern grammars try to make adverbs less of a dust-bin class by identifying their main functions and setting up their sub-classes to handle the most divergent types. Adverbs have significant uses. Most adverbs can act as an element of clause structure usually relating directly to the meaning of the verb (for instance.....*as we are leaving tonight*) but often to some of the elements of the clause or to the clause as a whole (as in: Morally, he should resign).

For the purposes of this study, it should be noted that adverbs affect the meaning of the adjacent word or phrase by attaching themselves to it as in *very anxious*, and *quite a party*, or *the day before*.

There were no mistranslations in the sample data insofar as adverbs were concerned though.

4.2.5 PREPOSITIONS

A preposition is placed before a noun or a pronoun. It defines the relationship to the noun or pronoun. The preposition *from* as evidenced below is used by the preacher to
show origin. In interpretation, from becomes of in Kiswahili. Essentially, the mistranslation occurs within the same class as observed below: (Example 13, table 1).

E: It is freedom from tradition
K: Ni ukombozi ya utamaduni
B.T: You have redemption of culture

Suffice it to say, the Kiswahili version is also ungrammatical occasioned by the word to in the translation of the preacher’s sentence

In example 6 of table 1, the interpreter omits the preposition against.

E: The prophet warned them against disobeying God.
K: Nabii aliwajulisha majuto ya kutotii.
B.T: Prophets informed them the wrath of disobedience.

The congregation receives a less powerful message. The correct Kiswahili equivalent ought to capture the preposition so as to retain the primary message in F.E. thus:

F.E: Nabii aliwatahadharisha dhidi ya kutomtii Mungu.
B.T: The prophet warned them against disobedience to God.

4.2.6 INTERJECTIONS

This is the grammatical term for an exclamation word. Although the definition suggests that interjections are words expressing exclamations, not all interjections
express that fact, some interjections are used to call for attention. One such interjection was misinterpreted as shown below:

*See* even though they were born again.

ATIO, iapokuwa walikuwa wamezaliwa mara ya pili. The word *see* can function both as a verb and an interjection. The interpreter treated the term *see* as a verb and gave it a literal translation. However, the term was functioning as an interjection in this case and thus its appropriate interpretation should have been *tazama*.

### 4.2.7 IDIOMATIC EXPRESSIONS

In many African conversations, the idiom is a powerful tool of communication. One employs the idiom to achieve several effects including connecting primarily with the audience and perhaps to indicate a marked awareness of the target language. Therefore when an idiom is not properly interpreted, the intended communication misses its mark. It should be noted that an idiom ought not to be translated word for word. It should be given an equivalent for it to retain its distinct original flavour. In Christian teaching, the Christian idiom commands a great communicative respect. Misinterpretation of idiomatic expressions was a consequence of misinterpreting certain word classes. In view of Dynamic Equivalence notion, meaning for meaning translation has to be provided. The S.L and the R.L have in some cases different structures.
As a result the interpreter needs to be aware of this. In example 15 of table 1, considered is the following:

E: It is sealed by the blood of the covenant
K: *Imefunikwa na damu ya ahadi*
B.T: It is covered by the blood of the promise

Shows that the preacher uses the verb 'seal' to denote 'protection'. The interpreter chooses 'imefunikwa' which translates to English as covered. The Kiswahili *imefunikwa* further drives in the sense of being hidden from view and this limits the effectiveness of the entire phrase. The blood of the covenant is intended to shelter or protect, so the preacher wished to say.

The noun 'covenant' in example 15 of table 1 suffers a mistranslation too. The interpreter uses 'ahadi' which means promise. In another construction as shown below 'ameniahidi' will be *she has promised me*. Should the interpreter be faced with a succession of such construction, the following mistranslation will occur as presented below:-

Example 20 (table 1);

E: It is sealed by the blood of the covenant.
K: *Imefunikwa na damu ya ahadi*
B.T: It is covered by the blood of the promise.
And in:

E: He has promised me eternal life
K: Ameniahidi uzima wa milele
B.T: I have been promised eternal life

Instead of the interpreter bringing out the idea of an agreement he ends up mistranslating the noun *covenant* to *promise*. It is thus presented as shown:-

E: Promise; covenant
K: Ahadi; agano

### 4.2.8 Suprasegmental Links to Mistranslation

Not to be left out is the role of suprasegmental features to the church sermon interpretation. For a clear communication of any piece of discourse, the use and understanding of the prosodic features of that language is paramount. Often in pulpit communication, the preacher relies heavily on his tone, pitch stress and generally intonation to not only communicate, but more so to emphasize a point. It was apparent in the study, that at times the preacher would use prosody to relay the message yet the interpreter will miss the cue, as a result, a deliberate high pitch note followed by a flat one would go unnoticed.
If we consider the example below, the interpreter overlooked or did not grasp the presence of a grammatical stop and by extension that the speech continuum had two sentences. The interpreter went ahead and used the two as one in sentence 14 of table 1.

E: See! Even though they were born again
K: Angalia hata kama wamezaliwa tena

One of the Tenets of relevance theory as developed by Sperber and Wilson (1986) is inference. This involves knowing what the speaker’s intention is. In communication, as seen above the Kiswahili version produces the notion of having to look ‘angalia’ physically instead of expressing a surprise. The interpreter was therefore faced with a challenge of choice of word which does not tally with the preacher’s intention and of course leading to mistranslation.

In yet another example showing lack of the interpreter’s inference skills as shown in sentence 17 of table one.

E: I am not concerned about your tearing one another.
K: Sijishughulishi na kubomoana kwenu.
B.T.: I am concerned with your tearing.

The preacher pronounced the verb tearing /tlɔrəŋ/ as tearing /tərəŋ/. As a result the interpreter gave the wrong interpretation. He did not infer meaning from the context of the sentence. In this regard, the theory of the mental model Johnson L. (ibid), understanding a sentence, involves building a mental model of the state of affairs by
for instance words used in a sentence. For the interpreter in the example provided above, he should have used the words in the environment of tearing as clues to determine the intended meaning. Lack of inference on the part of the interpreter led to mistranslations.

4.2.9 WORD CLASS ANALYSIS IN PERCENTAGE

Presented below is an analysis in percentage of word class mistranslation. The twenty seven sentences constitute a data sample of forty (40) mistranslated features.

From these, verbs accounted for 45%, Nouns 22.5%, Adjectives 10%, Prepositions 20%, Adverbs 0%. The calculation is thus shown below.

Verbs 18/40 = 45%
Nouns 9/40 = 22.5%
Adjectives 4/40 = 10%
Prepositions 8/40 = 20%
Adverbs 0/40 = 0%
Interjections 1/40 = 2.5%
Conjunctions 0/40 = 0%
Pronouns 0/40 = 0%
Figure 4: Distribution of Word Class Mistranslations

Generally, verbs appear to be the class most plagued by mistranslation for the reason that preachers often rely heavily on action words and this can perhaps explain this state of affairs.

Nouns are the second most mistranslated class and this may be due to their being content words— they carry much meaning in terms of subject and object.

The other word classes, namely adverbs, conjunctions and pronouns did not indicate mistranslation. The interpreter was indebted to interpret these constructions.

We can treat verbs separately to see how the mistranslations were distributed within that word class.

Main verb 20/34 = 58.8%
Phrasal verb 8/34 = 23.5%
Entire clause 6/34 = 17.6%
Figure 5: Distribution of Mistranslation Within the Verb Class

It was necessary to explain why the verb class had the highest percentage in this study. This was attributed to one; preacher’s tendency to using action words. As earlier discussed in this research, certain utterances according to Austin (1962), must certify certain conventions. A preacher as already observed was bound to make requests, give orders, or plead etc. with the intention of having to see what he says producing effects. Two, the language at play that is Kiswahili could in many occasions not find its equivalence. In this regard the interpreter would pick for instance a word form from his experiential vocabulary that was closely related to English. Three, the interpreter was not aware that an entire verb phrase sometimes expresses a single idea. As a result, he began to interpret each element separately as he tried to give a Kiswahili equivalent. This eventually led to mistranslation.
Conclusion

The data discussed in this section is a collection of utterances from the interpreter’s point of view. We note that the interpreter was supposed to be aware of the intention of the preacher as he gave the sermon. With regard to what is being referred to in a sermon, Gutt, (1992:22), posits that a subject of the hearers belief about the world is psychologically known. More precisely, it refers to a part of the cognitive environment of the hearer. Therefore the cognitive environment of an individual consists of all the facts an individual is capable of representing in his mind and accepting as true or probably true. These are terms that have different forms, and meanings as well as different contextual meanings.

Therefore in real life transference it is not very common although it seems as if the use by a translator of an SL lexical item embedded in a TL is pure transference. Yet in theory, it is evident that an SL lexical item in these circumstances does not fully retain its SL meanings. The example below shows a word that does not bring out the real meaning as is the intention of the preacher.

E: You begin to feel unworthy
K: Sikia or hisi.
B.T: I hear or feel.

This does not fully represent ‘feel’. The word sikia does not refer to ‘feel’. The correct translation is hisi.
From the examples given above, an appropriate meaning will entirely depend on context. An utterance is therefore regarded as relevant or appropriate if it is linked to context. The technical notion by which relevance theory captures, establishes a link up between an utterance and its context, for it to bring contextual effects. In order to be perceived as relevant an utterance must have contextual effects.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATION AND CONCLUSION

5.1 SUMMARY

The two languages being researched (English and Kiswahili) fall under different language groups. This in itself may be a possible reason for mistranslation due to lack of equivalents. In most cases, an entire English verb phrase expresses a single idea with various dimensions such as tense, mood, voice, aspect and person. When an interpreter begins to give each verbal element an independent translation, mistranslation is bound to occur.

Besides, English is an inflectional language that uses independent lexical items to represent various verbal elements while Kiswahili being an agglutinative language, fuses all verbal elements into one word for phonetic realization.

Whenever a speaker was too fast, the interpreter lacked the time to pick all the verbal elements and fuse them together in order to give an appropriate interpretation. An independent main verb in English can be inflected for tense but not in Kiswahili. In Kiswahili, auxiliaries are responsible for marking tense, aspect and other 'meanings' within the verb phrase. Thus, an interpreter may fail to cater for all the inflections carried in the English word in his/her interpretation.
Certain verbs in English seem to lack equivalents in Kiswahili and thus, interpreters fumbled to get a word with the closest meaning. For example: *Like, Love, Fond of, Prefer* can be represented with a single word ‘*penda*’ and *jaribu* for dare or try respectively. In some instances, the interpreters were not well versed with the Kiswahili equivalents of the English verb eventually picking a word from their experiential vocabulary that closely related to the English word.

Phrasal verbs were also prone to mistranslation. The Oxford dictionary of Phrasal verbs defines a phrasal verb as the combination of a verb and an adverb, a verb and a preposition, or a verb, an adverb and a preposition, which functions as a unit of meaning. The meaning of phrasal verbs must be interpreted as one unit. For example, Verb + adverb (particle), Break + out = breakout, meaning to start suddenly/violently. Verb + preposition, Come + into = come into meaning to enter, Verb + adverb + preposition, Put + up + with = put up with meaning to tolerate.

Phrasal verbs may also have multiple meanings. For example, let us consider the following examples:-

1. allow (s) disembark or alight (from sth).
2. release (sb) without punishing him.
3. allow (sb) not to do (an unpleasant task).
4. Fire (sth); explode (sth).
Mistranslation occurred when an inappropriate meaning of the phrasal verb was expressed by the interpreter.

Some phrasal verbs have collocates. For example

E: As we come into your presence come into is given the following interpretation:

K: Tukikaribia
Tukisongea
Tukiingia

A translation must be given within a context to avoid mistranslation.

Kiswahili did not seem to have phrasal verbs thus interpreters attempted to translate the verbs as separate entities leading to mistranslation.

Another big disparity between English and Kiswahili lies with the modals. Kiswahili expresses the meaning of the modal rather than the modal itself.

For example;

E: He can come
K: Anaweza kuja
(He is able to come/he has the possibility of coming)

E: You must do that
K: Ni lazima ufanye hivyo
(It is a must that you do that/It is compulsory that you do that)

Translating modal expressions therefore often leads to mistranslation.
5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

Mistranslations occur in most churches due to incorrect interpretation of linguistic units. Kiswahili is only but one of the many languages used in Kenyan churches today. There are far too many languages used in church interpretation, therefore, further studies different from it should be undertaken. Proper communication is important in any church discourse and this will among other things, expose the salient linguistic problems that bedevil our everyday communication when interpreting.

During the study period, it emerged that most interpreters lacked formal training in the field. Churches ought to invest in training for such staff as a way of ensuring quality and standards; after all, the word of God must not be seen to be misinterpreted.

Furthermore church interpreters should be exposed to works by other seasoned interpreters by way of video or other means. In this respect vital aspects like the appropriate prosodic skills are likely to be gained and or enhanced.

1. The interpreter is required to portray communicative competence. This is the ability that does not apply to grammatical rules of a language in order to form grammatically correct sentences but also to know when and where to use these sentences and to whom. Thus;
Communicative competence includes knowledge of the grammar and vocabulary of the language; Knowledge of the rules of speaking, that is knowing how to begin and how to end an utterance, what topics may be talked about in different situations and which address form should be used within different persons in different situations and knowing how to use language appropriately.

The use of paraphrase also adds to communicative competence. In this regard an interpreter should be aware of which types of expressions he needs for example, lexical expansions and which types require lexical reduction. This will render the intended message clear.

Newmark (1981) couples this, within the concept of unpacking with definition of terms. In the light of this, the term to be translated is reversed as a descriptive term.

2. The interpreter may require preview of the message to be preached. He or she will familiarize with the Bible version to be used. This is so because there are different Bible versions which present similar messages with a slightly different dimension and vocabulary.
In preview, the interpreter is allowed room to employ anticipatory strategies as she or he thinks the message over prior to actual preaching or sermon time.

3. Interpreters should attend workshops, seminars or training. The focus is on equipping them with translation strategies, definition in operational terms and the selection of subjects, among others.

4. Relevance Theory offers inferential approach which is important for anyone intending to be an interpreter. As a sharper tool for exegesis it provides means for analysis. One among the tenets of this theory is that it can lead to a much deeper understanding of the meaning of the original text. The inferential approach on which the belief is based guides the interpreter to construct an inferential argument. In this respect the accessibility of information to be supplied plays an important role. It paves room for critical thinking in order to get a proper understanding of the text.

Besides, understanding translation problems will enable the interpreter to arrive at better solution. Often times the information expressed in the utterances needs to be processed inferentially in order to recover the intended meaning. Indeed, just correct encoding and decoding does not guarantee successful communication.
5. The speaker may be too fast for the interpreter to carry out his task effectively. In this regard it would be advisable for him/her to negotiate within the speaker to adjust or tone down his or her speed to render interpretation manageable.

6. To familiarise himself or herself with the message or words and phrases the preacher intends to use, the interpreter can have a copy of the sermon well in advance. This will lessen the problem of mistranslation that is likely to occur in simultaneous interpretation of the church sermon.

5.3 CONCLUSION

Communication entails the exchange of ideas, information etc. between two or more persons. In an act of communication there is usually at least one speaker or sender, a message which is being transmitted and for whom the message is intended.

Communication is said to be successful when the audience infers or understands the informative intention of the communicator. Therefore the interpreters play a major role in letting the congregation in a church setting understand the sermon. The section of the congregation who do not understand English (the language the speaker or preacher uses) will understand the message if and only if verbal translation is done appropriately. It is therefore important for the interpreter to portray competence of both English and Kiswahili codes in use.
The main problem in interpretation is not just finding the right target-language expression for the meaning intended in the source language. It is falsely assumed that correct coding will ensure correct understanding. Even a correctly encoded message can be seriously misunderstood. Therefore an inferential approach strategy has to be integrated with the encoding and decoding devices for proper interpretation of the utterances.

The recommendations made in this study give insight on the causes of mistranslation. They can form a good basis for training interpreters to avoid further mistranslations, which will in turn enhance communication.

In this research the category of word classes that are prone to mistranslation were identified. It also highlighted the differences between what is said by the preacher who is the speaker and suggested possible solutions of overcoming mistranslations during the church sermon oral interpretation.
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### APPENDIX 1

**TABLE 2: MISTRANSLATIONS BY THE INTERPRETER WITH BACK TRANSLATION AND FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREACHER</th>
<th>INTERPRETER</th>
<th>BACK TRANSLATION</th>
<th>FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job was <em>tested</em> by God.</td>
<td>Ayubu <em>alitahiniwa</em> na Mungu</td>
<td>Job was <em>examined</em> by God.</td>
<td>Ayubu alijaribiwa na Mungu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Finally you <em>agree</em> that God is faithful</td>
<td>Mwishowe <em>unaamini</em> kwamba Mungu ni mwaminifu</td>
<td>Finally you <em>believe</em> that God is faithful.</td>
<td>Mwishowe unakubali kwamba Mungu ni mwaminifu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Their <em>boat</em> continued <em>sinking.</em></td>
<td><em>Meli</em> yao ilizidi <em>kuingia</em> majini.</td>
<td>Their <em>ship</em> continued <em>getting into</em> the water.</td>
<td>Jahazi lao lilizidi kuzama majini.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. They were <em>baptised</em> in the Holy Spirit.</td>
<td><em>Walijazwa</em> na Roho Mtakatifu.</td>
<td>They were <em>filled</em> by the Holy Spirit.</td>
<td>Walibatizwa kwa Roho Mtakatifu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The prophet <em>warned</em> them <em>against</em> disobeying</td>
<td>Nabii <em>aliwajulisha</em> majuto <em>ya kutotii.</em></td>
<td>The prophet <em>informed</em> them <em>about</em> the consequences of disobedience.</td>
<td>Nabii aliwaonya didhi ya kutotii.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Those who are <em>limited.</em></td>
<td>Wale wario na <em>kiwango.</em></td>
<td>Those who have an <em>extent.</em></td>
<td>Wale wario lemewa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Swahili</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td><strong>Stand on the promises of God.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Simamia ahadi za Mungu</strong></td>
<td><strong>Stand for the promises of God.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>After he had <em>squared</em> everything</td>
<td>Baada ya <em>kubadhiri</em> mali yote.</td>
<td>After he had everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>The prodigal son <em>ran away</em> from his father.</td>
<td>Mwana mpotevu <em>alienda mbali na</em> baba yake.</td>
<td>The prodigal son went <em>far away with</em> his father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>You are <em>greedy</em> before God.</td>
<td>Una <em>uchungu</em> kwa Mungu</td>
<td>You have <em>bitterness</em> with God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>It is freedom <em>from tradition.</em></td>
<td>Ni ukombozi wa <em>utamaduni.</em></td>
<td>It is the freedom of <em>tradition.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>See, even though they were born again.</td>
<td><em>Angalia, ijapokuwa walikuwa wamezaliwa mara ya pili.</em></td>
<td><em>Look, even though they were born again.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. <strong>It is sealed by the blood of the covenant.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Inafunikwa na damu ya ahadi.</strong></td>
<td><strong>It is covered by the blood of the promise.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Imetiwa muhuri na damu ya agano.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. <strong>The policy and principle of giving.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mawazo na maagizo ya kupeana.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The thoughts/ideas and instructions of giving out.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Maongozi na kanuni za kutoa.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. <strong>I am not concerned about your tearing.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sijishugulishi na kubomoana kwenu</strong></td>
<td><strong>I am not concerned about your tearing one another.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sijishughulishi na machozi yenu.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. <strong>God will intervene in your situation.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mungu ataingilia kati ya hali yako.</strong></td>
<td><strong>God will come in between in your situation.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mungu atatatua matatizo yako.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. <strong>You are ushered into the fold</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unaingizwa ndani ya kundi la kondoo.</strong></td>
<td><strong>You are put among the sheep-fold.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unakaribishwa kwenye kundi la wanakondoo.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. <strong>Then you end up with confusion.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Kisha unamalizia na kuchanganyikiwa.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Then you finish by being confused.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Kisha unachanganyikiwa.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. <strong>I am in full-time ministry.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Niko katika huduma ya wazi wazi.</strong></td>
<td><strong>I am in an open/public ministry.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Niko katika huduma kamilifu.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. <strong>Then this man reckoned how God had stood by his side.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Kisha mtu huyu alikumbuka vile Mungu alivyosimama upande wake.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Then this man remembered how God stood by his side.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Kisha mtu huyu alisadiki jinsi Mungu alivyokua pamoja naye.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. <strong>How do you reason?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Je unafikiria namna gani?</strong></td>
<td><strong>In what way do you think?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Je. unawaza vipi?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>What is the <em>preacher</em> saying?</td>
<td><em>Mchungaji anasema nini?</em></td>
<td>What is the <em>pastor</em> saying?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Respect your position <em>at work.</em></td>
<td><em>Heshimu nafasi ya kazi.</em></td>
<td>Respect the <em>chance to work.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guiding questions for the main research:

1. For how long have you been interpreting sermons?

2. What are some of the problems you encounter in the process of interpreting sermons?

3. Have you taken any form of training to prepare for this task?

4. Do you find some of the words difficult to interpret?

5. Does your knowledge of the congregation influence your choice of words?