IJLL

ILORIN JOURNAL
OF LANGUAGE
AND LITERATURE

SOME FEATURES AND PROBLEMS OF SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETATION OF CHRISTIAN SERMONS IN YORUBA AND ENGLISH

WALE ADEGBITE
Department of English Obafemi Awolowo University Ile-Ife

ABSTRACT

This paper describes some features and problems of simultaneous interpretation of Christian sermons in Yoruba and English (SICSYE) in Nigeria. It utilizes extracts from texts recorded from several events of SICSYE for illustration. The paper observes that the interpretation often corresponds totally in form and meaning in the source and target texts. However, there are also several occurrences of both partial and non-correspondence between the texts occasioned by syntactic, lexical and semantic errors which are traceable to inadequate language mastery and slips by the interpreters. Lastly, some technical issues are raised over stylistic choices of translation/interpreting techniques in the spontaneous bilingual communicative performance. Apart from identifying features and highlighting problems of simultaneous interpretation, the paper suggests ways by which the practice can be improved upon.

1.   Introduction

The question about translation is not at all as to whether it is possible or not: the possibility has long been justified by the idea of universality of thought (cf. Roger, 1978). Nevertheless, there is a consensus among theoreticians and practitioners of translation that the field is characterized by problems and difficulties which sometimes threaten the adequacy of translation possibilities. In recent times a central issue of translation studies has been the idea of translatability which one may conceptually describe as "the prospects and limitations of translation acts". Describing translatability in terms of prospects and limitations can be seen in two ways. Prospects imply that certain features, which are non-errors, characterize translation texts and make such texts function socially for enhancing communication, enriching languages and cultures and increasing education. On the contrary, limitations imply that certain problems or errors also characterize translation texts and such errors may distort or prevent the accurate transfer of message from a source text to a target one. These viewpoints will ensure that translation events are not observed or described in an entirely positive or negative way.

To identify and describe translation practice, the field has often been subdivided into types: scientific and non-scientific, literary and non-literary, oral (translating) and written (interpreting), implicit and explicit, communicative and semantic, literal, free, idiomatic, paraphrastic or instructive, partial and total.

simultaneous and consecutive, etc. Other issues connected with the translation event are most often specifically linked with these types. Prominent among these are the setting of translation and the linguistic process, translation techniques and translation focus.

In this study we shall describe simultaneous interpretation of Christian sermons in Yoruba and English from a socio-linguistic perspective, using source and target texts from these two languages. Generally, there has been a global bias towards researches in translation as against interpretation; and in Nigeria studies on interpretation have been so few and sporadic. Adeniran (1983: 158) writes on the lopsidedness of research on translation:

> Translation has been extensively and intensively studied under
> the auspices of the United Bible Societies, the UNESCO and
> some other agencies, and has had theory to back it up ... In
> contrast, interpretation has received relatively little attention
> from schools ...

The condition of stable bilingualism makes translation and interpretation essential practices in Nigeria, for mass mobilization and efficient linguistic, information and educational services. Ihenacho (1981) observes that the number of Nigerians engaged in interpreting is indeed very small compared to the active (not to talk of potential) demand. The findings of this study will be relevant to language scholars, translators and interpreters, especially to theoreticians and practitioners of simultaneous interpretation in Nigeria.

2.   *Data Base of Study*

The data of the study derive from tape-recordings and transcriptions of texts from radio and television stations in some Yoruba speaking states of Nigeria - especially Oyo, Ondo and Osun - on the one hand, and open deliveries at fellowships and revival gatherings in these states on the other hand. Over twenty sermon interpretations from Yoruba into English and vice-versa are gathered over some time, and extracts from these are used for illustrations in this work.

The texts in these sermon deliveries are rendered in bits of utterances of various sizes and grammatical units - words, phrases, clauses and sentences; but rarely more than one sentence at a time. Each bit of utterance or `logeme' may have a meaning of its own or express part of the total meaning of several bits of utterances. Nevertheless, each utterance contributes to the message of the whole sermon and its successful interpretation enhances an understanding of the macro-text.

3.   *Studies on Simultaneous Interpreting of Texts*

Adegbite (1988) describes simultaneous interpreting as a process whereby the message of source text (S) is reproduced in a target text (T) by rendering the source instantaneously into a target text. In the literature on translation scholars normally talk of `written translation' and `oral interpreting' based on different features observed in performances in the written and oral media.

Unlike the straightforward distinction between translation and interpretation, the difference between `simultaneous' and `consecutive' has sometimes been confused. Adeniran (1983: 167), for example, distinguishes between two kinds of consecutive interpretation: (i) the kind in which there is a split of one or two seconds between source logemes and their target versions and (ii) that described by Plant (1972) in which an interpreter listens through a speech, takes notes and later interprets in target language. He then describes simultaneous interpretation as an activity in which source and target texts run parallel to each other. While our own conception of `consecutive' tallies with Adeniran's (and Plant's) consecutive `ii' above, our `simultaneous' covers both Adeniran's consecutive `i' and simultaneous. Our own definition, which follows from Kade's (1971: 13), observes that in simultaneous interpreting, `receiving the source text and reproducing it in the target text are successive, not concurrent processes so that a phase shift with regard to the speaker of the source text is inevitable'. Kade (1971) further observes that `at the beginning of simultaneous interpretation, the interpreter must receive parts of the message.' In our own terms consecutive interpreting requires the speaker of the source text to render many utterances at a time or finish rendering all his text before the interpreter takes over (Henderson, 1976). For a specification of features of different kinds of translation and interpretation, see Ihenacho (1979).

In spite of the few feature peculiarities of translation and interpretation, it should be pointed out that similar principles and techniques largely apply to both practices; hence studies in the two areas are relevant to either practice. Meanwhile, several scholars have written on various aspects of the theory and practice of interpretation: principles and techniques (Seleskovitch, 1976 and 1977; Rado, 1979), methodology (Kade, 1971; Henderson, 1976), quality and evaluation (Barik, 1972; Gold, 1976), and the roles and practice in West Africa (Ihenacho, 1979 and 1981; Adeniran, 1983). We shall review below some of these works that are relevant to this study.

On translation focus, theoreticians have at one time or the other suggested the preservation of `sense' or `content', `form', `style', `content and style', `theme and style', `response' or `reaction', etc (Prochazka, 1964; Nida and Taber, 1969; Rado, 1979 and Newmark, 1981).

On the principles and techniques, two major features are most crucial to this study. First is Rado's (1979) suggestion of the `logeme' as a logical unit of translation/ interpretation. The unit cuts across linguistic and extra linguistic boundaries as it can represent all phono-lexico-grammatical units (from the morpheme to the sentence), literary stylistic devices such as alliteration, assonance and metaphor, paralinguistic actions such as nodding and shaking of head and non-lexical acts such as laughter and

hissing. Although scholars admit the principle behind the suggestion, what they sometimes take as unit, e.g., text or utterance, fall short of the above coverage.

Second, Rado (1979) mentions three steps which are taken in the perceptive and reproductive processes of translation. According to him, the translator/interpreter analyses (decomposes) and identifies the source logemes. He/she then decides which logemes to translate/interpret. Lastly, he/she synthesises (recasts and recomposes) the text in target language and then translates. The activities in the steps above can also be evaluated. Rado (1979) lists four criteria through which such evaluation can be done. First, the 'philological' criterion requires that the source logemes are recognised and interpreted. For an omitted logeme, we keep our eyes on the possibility of compensation. Second, the 'selection' criterion assesses whether the interpreter's logemes follow that of the source. If not, which does he/she transpose and which does he/she omit? Third, the 'compensatory' criterion assesses whether omitted logemes are compensated for by other elements in the interpretation. Fourthly, the 'artistic' criterion assesses how an interpreter skillfully or unskillfully reproduces a source text in target language. In this respect, the judgement of a native speaker on the interpretation may have to be asked.

The quantitative and qualitative aspects of interpretation have also been touched upon. Barik (1972), for instance, observes that there is co-variation between source and target texts speech rates, and that the interpreter for one reason or another speaks for a greater proportion of the time than the speaker. For example, he finds that a message in French usually takes more words than the same message in English.

On quality, Barik (1972) examines how close in meaning the interpretation is to the original, how much material is omitted or added, what types of errors are made and what linguistic factors may be responsible for the difficulties encountered. He observes that additions which sometimes result from elaborations of texts and from self-correction are characteristic of experienced interpreters. In contrast, omissions result from skipping material, and feature more with inexperienced interpreters. Errors generally result from confusion and also reveal the weaker language of interpreters; Gold (1976) suggests that interpreters should work into their primary language, in which they have better facility.

Lastly, from the methodological perspective, Kade (1971) gives some practical hints which can aid successful interpretation of texts. For example, he suggests that an interpreter should take advantage of interruptions and breaks as well as redundant parts of the source text (e.g. repetitions) to catch up with the speaker. Some other suggestions are that absolute concentration is necessary for the reception of difficult texts; that rather than delay interpretations when target language equivalents are difficult to find, circumlocutions can be used; and that storage of a source text should not be longer than necessary. He also opines that the general knowledge of the subject matter, interpreter's knowledge of the topic and of the previous parts of source text and of the linguistic habits of the speaker play a positive part in the interpretation process.

Finally, Adeniran's (1983) description of consecutive interpreting of a Christian sermon on the radio as a collaborative bilingual performance deserves special mention in this review. Having set out to describe the collaborative strategies employed by presenter-interpreter in conveying a common message in two different languages, his findings are as follows: (i) the preacher and interpreter have a similar evangelical objective and they share thematic familiarity in the sense of having possibly rehearsed or prepared to deliver messages that are jointly agreed upon; (ii) the preacher's observation of time lag of between two to three seconds in between his logemes is an advantage for the interpreter to re-cast and the audience to understand the textual message; (iii) the preacher's logemes are rendered mainly in simple sentences or lesser units; and (iv) the interpreter has some freedom to demonstrate his skill to transpose source logemes into target text.

Two other findings in Adeniran's (1983) study are incidental to those highlighted above. The first is that the Yoruba target utterances are wordier than English source logemes, in a similar manner to Barik's (1972) observation of French and English. Secondly, Adeniran observes that the preacher of the sermon in his study will pass for a representative user of intelligible Nigerian English, with occasional archaisms in his usage that are appropriate in the domain of Christian sermons.

In this study our analysis of simultaneous interpretation of Christian sermons of Yoruba into and from English (SICSYE) is done in terms of linguistic and non-linguistic features of equivalence between source and target texts. The linguistic features are syntactic, lexical and semantic, while the non-linguistic features pertain to technical issues in the interpretation of texts.

4.   Features of SICSYE Practice
4.1.   The Setting

Simultaneous interpretation has in the recent times become a useful tool in Christian sermon deliveries. On the radio and television as well as in open crusades, sermons are delivered simultaneously in Yoruba and English by preachers and their interpreters from Evangelical ministries and Gospel churches.

The participants in a SICSYE event are usually the preacher and his retinue, on the one hand, and the audience or 'interpretants', on the other. Among the preacher's staff is always the interpreter, a group of singers and lay readers. But while the other staff perform at specific periods in the performance, it is the preacher and interpreter who are actually engaged in the sermon delivery business. The preacher determines, not only the themes, messages and tune of the performance, but also dictates the pace of the delivery. Very often, s/he is bilingual; thus, s/he preaches in Yoruba and lets someone interpret into English or preaches in English for an interpretation to be done in Yoruba.

The interpreter is usually a mother tongue user of Yoruba and a second language

user of English. He normally must have had a secondary education or graduated from a university but he may not have had a formal training as a translator. His performance is, to a great extent, influenced by his level of education, practical experience, familiarity with the subject matter, the preacher's style of speaking and the degree of rehearsals and preparedness before every performance.

Lastly, the audience can be identified as follows: (a) Yoruba monolinguals for whom the Yoruba texts are meant, (b) English or non-Yoruba speakers of English for whom the English texts are meant, and (c) Yoruba-English bilinguals who can understand both texts. The audience are passive participants in the translation event, responding only to the preacher's prayers and exhortations.

4.2.   The Structure of SICSYE Texts

A SICSYE is essentially a collaborative monological piece. It can be divided into five parts, among which two are obligatory and three optional. There is a short preliminary part which consists of one or more songs and interjections that are intended to prepare the mood of interpretants before the sermon delivery. When the preacher and interpreter begin to sermonize they may highlight the topic, but may not go straight to deliver the message for the occasion. Instead, they make a preamble which welcomes interpretants and tells them what they stand to gain by their presence at the occasion. The third part develops the message of the text, with the speakers, using various communicative devices, viz exhortations, analogues, narrations, allusions, etc. The fourth part shows the preacher seeking the attention of interpretants for prayer. This prayer, which is not necessarily translated, concludes the sermon delivery by seeking God's grace and mercies on his or her audience and asking for his power to grant the audience enough willpower to respond appropriately to his or her message to them. Lastly, like at the preliminary stage, the text closes and the choir renders a song to end the performance.

At revivals, open-air crusades and in radio broadcasts, the five parts presented above are often present. But in some formal church services of the Apostolic Faith and Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship, the first, second and last parts are not compulsorily included. Also, the prayer section after the sermon may be conducted as silent prayers.

4.3.   Correspondence of Form and Meaning in SICSYE Texts.

Although the preservation of message is the primary aim of communicative translation (Newmark 1981), the extent of transfer of message can be assessed in a translation by examining the degree of correspondence between source and target messages. Degrees of correspondence or 'equivalence' between source and target texts have been identified in translation theory (Catford 1965, Olorode 1987). For example,

Olorode (1987:56) distinguishes full, partial and zero equivalence conditions in terms of the extent of correspondence between source and target formal, semantic and contextual features. In this study total interpretation implies that both source (S) and target (T) formal features and meaning correspond; otherwise, the degree of difference in form or meaning or both form and meaning will show whether the interpretation is partial or zero.

It is observed that S and T forms of utterances in simultaneous interpretation correspond a lot in meaning and form, but there are also instances of both partial and non-correspondence of either meaning or form or both meaning and form. Below are illustrations of utterances with total correspondence presented and described in terms of units and systemic options of meaning in the functional description of language (Halliday 1970 and 1985).

4.3.1.   Total Correspondence between S and T Utterances.

1.   S: Yóó dára fún wa.

        T: It will be good for us.

        S: A ò ní se àsetì.

        T: We will not do anything in failure.

2.   S: Bí Olórun bá sì ti wà pèlú wa.

        T: If the Lord is with us.

        S: Ó dá mi lójú pé...

        T: I'm very sure that...

        S: Odún 1983 yìí.

        T: This year 1983.

        S: Yoo dara fún wa.

        T: It will be well with us.

3.   .   S: Ohun tí ó jé dandan fún wa ní orílè-èdè yìí.

        T: What is a must for us in this nation.

        S: Ni apapo.

        T: In general.

        S: Àti bí enikòòkan.

        T: And as individuals.

4.   S: Repentance.

T: Ìrònúpìwàdà.

S: Is required for forgiveness

T: Jé dandan fun ìdàríjì.

The S and T logemes above correspond at the units of sentence, clause, phrase and word. For example, both logemes in Ex 1 correspond at the main clause/sentence level; the first logeme in Ex 2 is a subordinate clause, while the third logeme is a group or phrase and the fourth logeme is a main clause/sentence; all logemes in Ex 3 are phrases; the first logeme in Ex 4 is a word.

In terms of message, it is observed that the prayers expressed in Ex 1 and 2 and the advice expressed in Ex 4 are preserved.

Ex. 5   (a)   S: Ó fún wa ní omo rè kan soso.

T: He gave us his only begotten son.

(b)   S: Ránti wípé enìkan tí ó ju ènìyàn lo n wò ó.

T: Remember that someone greater than man is watching you.

(ci)   S: Mò n sòrò bi òkan nínú omo orílè-èdè Nigeria

T: I'm speaking as a Nigerian.

(cii)   S: God says all your worshipping of idols is what has triggered off misfortune in this nation.

T: Olórun so wipe gbogbo ibòrisà yín ní ó kó inilara bá wa ní orilè èdè yìi.

(d)   S: Alelúya klí se ede enikéni.

T: Alleluya is not anybody's language.

(e)   S: E hùwà mímó sí Olórun.

T: Behave righteously tówards God.

In terms of transitivity the process options in Ex 5, (a) physical, (b) mental, (c) verbalized, (d) relational and (e) behavioural, are preserved in the interpretation; so also are the participants' roles, e.g. in Ex. 5a, ó 'he' is the actor/giver, wa 'us' is beneficiary, and omo rè kan soso 'his only begotten son' is the goal/object.

Talking about message, Ex 5a, c and d are informatives (representation in 'a' and 'cii', and explanations for 'b' and 'ci'); Ex 5b and e are directives respectively commanding people towards mental and behavioural activities.

Ex 6   (a)   S: Ěése tí o ó jé onigbàgbó tí ó n dáké?

T: Why should you become a silent Christian?

(b)   S: Let not the mighty man glory in his might.

T: Kí alágbára ó má sògo nínú olá rè.

(c)   S: Come to the altar now.

T: Máa bò niwájú pepe níisinyii.

Ex 6   (a) illustrates an interrogative option, while 6(b) and (c) show correspondence of indirect and direct imperatives respectively. Ex. 5a, c'i' and c'ii' and d are declaratives. Looking at the messages, the uses of the utterances are as follows: Ex 6a is a rhetorical question, 6b and c are advice and instruction respectively. Generally, SICSYE texts serve the uses of prayers (Ex 1&2) and moral education (Ex 4,5 and 6).

Ex 7   (a)   S: A gbódò kórira àwon iwà ibi wònyìi

T: We should hate all these bad things.

(b)   S: You will get hold of his sickness.

T: O ó ra àísan rè.

(c)   S: I want you to dwell in my heart.

T: Mo fé kí o máa gbé inú okàn mi.

The above examples retain the features of modality (underlined) expressed in source text in the target text. The features express obligation, warning and a wish all directed at listeners to the texts.

Ex 8(a)   S: A ti so léèkan pé agbára wà nínú èjè rè.

T: We have said before that there is power in his blood.

(b)   S: Nínú iwà re ní won ó ti mò bóyá o di àtúnbí.

T: Through your character they will know whether you are born-again.

While the unmarked theme in Ex 8 thematizes the subject (speaker) of the utterance, the marked theme thematizes the adverbial (orientation of listeners' behaviour). It is observed the unmarked theme option is most often selected in SICSYE texts.

While the thematic options in the source and target texts above correspond, it is also observed that the messages of information and admonition in the texts are preserved.

4.3.2.   Partial and Zero (Non-) Correspondence between S and T Utterances

Despite the high level of correspondence observed in S and T in SICSYE, some problems of partial and non-correspondence of message still occur in practice (cf. Adegbite 1988). These problems come in form of syntactic, lexical and semantic errors

which are traceable to either inadequate mastery of language or slips by the interpreter. Our experience so far has shown us that errors tend to be fewer when the mother tongue is used as source or target language. While source texts rendered in English are sometimes characterized by interference errors, e.g., Ex. 9a, target texts rendered in English are more prone to them. The pronunciation accent in English is typical of the average fairly educated Nigerian user of the language and does not create any problem of understanding for the target English listeners. In the examples below, the utterances with errors are asterisked while the corrections suggested for them are marked. Also, word-for-word equivalents (marked by `W`) are given to illuminate examples, when necessary.

Ex 9(a) *S: Because of <u>my time</u> I shall go straight into the matter.

T: Nítorí <u>àsiko tí mo ni</u>, mo fé lo tààrà sínú òrò náà.

ÖS: Because of <u>shortness of time</u>, I shall go straight into the matter.

(b) S: Òpòlopò n kú pèlú oyún sísé.

*T: Many people are dying <u>aborting</u>.

ÖT: Many people are dying <u>through abortion</u>.

(c) S: Gbogbo ìka méwèèwá Olórun.

T: All the ten fingers of God.

S: Ni ó fì ti Dáfídì léyìn.

*T: <u>Was</u> what he used to support David.

ÖT: <u>Were</u> what he used to support David.

(d) S: Àwon wo ni ó wà?

*T: Who are those that <u>are existing</u>?

ÖT: Who are those that exist? OR (Who are those not in existence?) OR (Who are those not living?)

In all the above examples the messages of source and target utterances are preserved, but there are syntactic errors (i.e., non-correspondence in the formal features) mainly in the English texts. In Ex 9a `my time` is used instead of `the (short) time I have got`. This error is common in Nigerian English usage, as can be found in this popular expression: *`This is my first time of seeing you` instead of *`This is the first time I'll see you`. In Ex 9b the gerund `aborting` is wrongly used to indicate the cause of death instead of an adverbial. An error of concord is observed in Ex. 9c in the use of `was` instead of `were`. In Ex 9d the verb `exist` is stative and does not take the V progressive form. Someone or something either `exists` or `does not exist`. A similar error is committed in the utterance `We're hearing many voices` instead of `We hear many voices`.

Ex 10(a) S: I want you to <u>examine yourself</u>.

*T: Mo fé kí o <u>ye okàn re wò</u>.

ÖT: Mo fé kí o <u>ye ara re wò</u>.

(b) S: <u>Ará</u>, e jé á <u>tújúká</u>.

*T: <u>People</u>, let's be <u>contented</u>.

ÖT: <u>Fellows</u>, let's be <u>cheerful</u>.

(ci) S: <u>Ogbón</u> wo ni o fé <u>dá</u>?

*T: What kind of <u>wisdom</u> can you <u>play</u>?

(cii) S: Irú <u>ogbon</u> wo ni o fé <u>da</u>?

*T: What kind of wisdom can you play?

ÖT: What kind of <u>trick</u> can you <u>play</u>? (Preacher's prompt) OR (What wisdom can you <u>display</u>?)

(d) S: We talked about the <u>eclipse</u>.

*T: A sòrò nípa <u>àwon ojú òrun tó yí pada</u>.

W: We talk about those eye heaven that change.

ÖT: A sòrò nípa <u>òsán-dòru</u> tó sele.

The examples 10 a-d above are characterized by lexical errors which also affect the messages of the texts. The wrong substitution of words in target texts results in the non-correspondence of meaning between source and target texts. In Ex 10a, the expression `examine yourself` is more inclusive than `ye okan re wo` (examine your heart/mind). The item ara re (your body) can replace yourself in Yoruba, where `body` here includes one's heart. In Ex 10b the items `people` and `contended` are non-equivalents of `ara` and `tujuka` respectively; thus, their substitution for the source texts results in a different meaning between S and T texts. In Ex 10c, the preacher is not satisfied with the interpreter's attempt; he then repeats his earlier utterance. Unsatisfied again with the interpreter's second attempt, the preacher has to stop temporarily in order to prompt the interpreter of the correct interpretation. The problem in 10c(i) is the preacher's preference for the exact equivalent of `ogbón` in English over the interpreters general transposition of sense of the source text. In 10c(ii) the item wisdom does not collocate with `play`, but `trick` does. Note that `ogbón` in Yoruba may mean `trick` or `wisdom`, depending on context. Lastly, in Ex 10d the interpreter misrepresents `eclipse` as `the heaven that changed` instead of the more exact and acceptable `the afternoon that turned into midnight`.

Ex 11(a) S: Ask him to save your soul.

*T: Je kí ó gba okàn re là.

W: Let him save heart/soul your.

ÖT: So fún un kí ó gba okan re là.

(b)

S: E jé kí á wè kí á mó.

W: We let us bathe and we clean.

*T: We should bathe and be clean.

ÖT: Let us bathe and be clean.

(c)

S: Ohun púpò ni mo fé kí a retí lówó Olúwa.

W: Things many are I want us expect from God.

*T: We should expect many things from God.

ÖT: There are many things I want us to expect from God.

In Ex 11(a) a direct command is rendered as an indirect command in the target text, hence the conscious initiation of a verbalized process of 'asking' by the interpretant is missing in the target text. In Ex 11(b) the indirect command in the source text is interpreted as an obligation in the target text. An error is presumed to have been committed by an interpreter if a declarative is interpreted as an interrogative, and vice versa. In Ex 11(c) the speaker's expression of personal wish in the source text is interpreted as a common social obligation. The thematization of 'many things' in our suggestion further ensures a correct interpretation. Below is another illustration of representation of emphasis.

11(d)   S: Dandan ni ìrónúpìwàdà

W: Compulsion is (thematic) repentan e.

*T: Repentance is a must.

ÖT: It is a must that we repent. OR (It is compulsory that...).

4.4.   *Some Technical Features in SICSYE*

Technical features are attributable to the confusion over choices of translation techniques such as literal, free, idiomatic and interpretive translations. Although there may be stylistic preferences for these techniques during interpretation, some of such preferences may result in overtranslation, under translation and unnecessary use of circumlocutions when not appropriately made. Below are a few examples of techniques used in SICSYE

12.   S: Àwáyéèlo ò sí

*T: You can't say you come to the world and you won't go again.

ÖT: Nobody is immortal. No one will live forever.

The example above involves the use of circumlocution where a free translation would have been preferred. The source of the circumlocution here is the agglutinating nature of 'àwáyéèlo' (the act of coming to the world without going). Yoruba is both isolating and agglutinating; thus a few words may present problems this way. While an item such as 'ìgbédúró' (the act of making something to stand) may be substituted for 'establishment' and 'àìnítèlórùn' can be rendered as a phrase 'lack of contentment', an item like 'ìmúpadàbòsípò' (the act of bringing something/ someone back to position) may be better rendered through a free translation.

13.   S: You will then be in real trouble.

T: Wà á gbà pé ayé pé méjì

W: You will then accept that world equal two

ÖT: Wà á wá wà nínú ìyonu gidi

W: You will then be in trouble real

In the above example, the interpreter chooses an idiomatic expression in Yoruba (literally 'you will then realise there are two worlds') to replace a non-idiomatic expression in English. The interpretation may also be rendered literally as can be seen in our suggestion.

14.   S: Olúkúlùkú n bó ikùn rè

W: Everybody be feeding belly/stomach his/her

T: Everybody is feeding his own belly

T: Everyone takes care of himself alone

The interpreter employs a literal translation which retains the colour in the Yoruba text. While this may be acceptable to some listeners, some may prefer the free translation suggested below it.

15.   S: Ká máa gbé ìgbé ayé taa ni ó mú mi?

W: For we be live living life who be will catch/arrest me

T: To be living the Life of who will arrest me?

T: To be living a careless life

The literal translation employed by the interpreter dramatizes the source text in English.

Some listeners may however prefer the free translation suggested. However, a literal translation of <u>Yoo dara fun wa</u> as "It will be good for ... and the ... ... word <u>dara</u> 'good' is vague. A translation like 'May the Lord bless us' may be more appropriate.

16.   S: Mo n se ipa tèmi lórílè èdè yìí

W: I be do part mine in nation this

*T: I'm playing my own part in constructing this nation

OT: I'm playing my own role in this nation.

The interpreter's effort above is an over-translation because 'constructing' is not mentioned in the source text. In contrast, the interpreter's translation of 'examine yourself' into Yoruba as 've òkàn re wo' (literally, 'examine your heart') should be seen as an innovation.

17.   S: Ká máa sáré lé owó, iré àsàkú

W: For us be run after money running the-run-of death

*T: To be running after money and running after money

ÖT: Running after money, running to death

The example above is an undertranslation of the message of the source text into English. Though the idea of running repeatedly is transferred, the idea of 'heedless running' or 'running to death' is lost.

CONCLUSION

This paper has shown that to a great extent simultaneous interpretation in Yoruba and English has been to facilitate communication in Christian sermon delivery in some parts of Nigeria. The possibility of effective translation taking place in such divergent languages as Yoruba and English is no longer in doubt as there are facilities in both languages and capacity of their collaborative users for accommodating and co-expressing diverse experiences and thoughts. Since these facilities and capacity are not foolproof, the paper has also quickly pointed out some linguistic and technical problems that may occur in simultaneous interpretation practice, which, however, are not by any means insurmountable.

Some suggestions of scholars may thus be found relevant for application in simultaneous interpretation events. First, while it is essential that an interpreter have mastery of the source and target languages, the normal thing is for him/her to interpret into his/her primary language. Next, a simultaneous interpreter must be flexible in his/her choice of translation/interpreting techniques because of the communicative nature of

this speech event. Third, in addition to a proper linguistic training which an interpreter must have, he also need ... some ... ... to further equip him for the task of ... ... matter (cf. Ihenacho, 1981). Sometimes, what is translated and interpreted may ... ... part mutual agreement between the interpreter and interpretants, as Opubor (1981) remarks:

> ... there is what is known as courtesy bias in the protocol of our traditional public communication and interpreters may be expected to conform...

Bí wón bá rán ni nísé erú, à fi tomo jée.

Opubor's remark above is however suitable as a rule of thumb in non-formal interpretation situations.

REFERENCES

Adegbite, W. 1988. "Problems of Message Preservation in Simultaneous Translation from Yoruba into English" Ife Studies in English Language Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 15-28.

Adegbite, W. 1991. "Some Formal Features of Texts of Simultaneous Translation from Yoruba into English" Systemic Functional Linguistics Forum Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 25-34.

Adeniran, A. 1983. "ÌGBÉDÈGBEYÒ: Yoruba-English Bilingual Performance" Journal of the Linguistic Association of Nigeria (JOLAN) No. 2, pp. 153-176.

Barik, H.C. 1972. "Interpreters Talk a Lot, among Other Things" BABEL xviii, No. 1, pp. 3-10.

Catford, J.C. 1965. A Linguistic Theory of Translation. London: Oxford Univ. Press.

Gold, D. 1976. "On Quality in Translation II" BABEL xxii, No. 3. pp 117-119.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1970. "Language Structure and Language Functions" In Lyons, J. (ed.) New Horizons in Linguistics. London: Penguin, pp. 140-165.

————. 1985. An Introduction to Functional Grammar. London: Edward Arnold.

Hefzallah, I.M. 1970. "The Art of Translation" BABEL vol. xvi, No. 3, pp. 107-116.

Henderson, J.A. 1976. "Note-taking for Consecutive Interpreting" BABEL, xxii, No. 3, pp. 107-116.

Ihenacho, A. 1979. "The Role of Translation and Interpretation in West Africa", BABEL xxv, 2, pp. 59-71.

———— 1981. "Laying the Foundation for the Future Nigerian Interpreter" BABEL xxvii, No. 1, pp. 21-23.

Kade, O.C. 1971. "Some Methodological Aspects of Simultaneous Interpreting" BABEL xvii, 2, pp. 12-16.

Newmark, P. 1981. Approaches to Translation. Exeter: Wheaton and Co.

Nida, E.A. and Taber, C.R. 1969. The Theory and Practice of Translation Netherlands: E.J. Brill, Leiden.

Olorode, S. 1987. "Parallel Texts, Equivalence Conditions and The Extreme Limits of Translatability between Yoruba and English" Ife Studies in English Language vol. 1, 55-62.

Opubor, A. 1981. "Translating in a Multilingual Society" BABEL xxvii, I, pp. 6-8.

Plant, D. 1972. 'Problems in the Training of Simultaneous and Consecutive Interpreters to International Professional Level' In Filipovic, R. (ed.) Active Methods and Modern Aids in the Teaching of Foreign Languages. London: Oxford University Press, pp. 187-197.

Prochazka, V. 1964. "Notes on Translating Technique" In A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure and Style Institute of Languages and Linguistics, Georgetown University.

Radó, R. 1978. "Language, Thought and Translation" BABEL 3-4, pp. 127-132.

Seleskovitch, D. 1976. "Creation d'un doctorate de ze cycle science et techniques de l'interpretation et de la traduction", BABEL xxii, No. 3.

——— 1977. "Why Interpreting is not Tantamount to Translating Language" Incorporated Linguistics 16 (2), pp. 22-23.

NOTE