



This article is published by Royallite Global, Kenya in the *Research Journal in Modern Languages and Literatures*, Volume 2, Issue 3, 2021



Article Information

Submitted: 4th August 2021

Accepted: 30th Oct 2021

Published: 5th Nov 2021

Additional information is available at the end of the article

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

To read the paper online, please scan this QR code



How to Cite:

Mutacho, R., Mudogo, B., & Mandilla, L. (2021). Translation at crossroads-translating the untranslatable in English-Lubukusu advertisements. *Research Journal in Modern Languages and Literatures*, 2(3). Retrieved from <https://royalliteglobal.com/languages-and-literatures/article/view/704>



Translation at crossroads-Translating the untranslatable in English-Lubukusu advertisements

Rashid Mutacho¹, Benard Mudogo¹, Lucy Mandilla¹

¹Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenya

Correspondence: rashabdy@yahoo.com

Abstract

This paper applies Skopos Theory in the analysis of “the untranslatable” in the translation of English advertisements into Lubukusu. Translation is a process by which meaning and information of a given text in one human language which is the source language (SL) is produced in another human language, the target language (TL). The central issue in translation is equivalence-sameness of the SL and TL. However, there are some items in the source language which do not always attain that degree of sameness in the TL. Those items are often referred to us “untranslatable or non-equivalents” and they form the basis of this paper. Adopting Analytical design, the paper established that there are two types of non-equivalents in the translation of English advertisements into Lubukusu namely; cultural and linguistic non-equivalents. Further, under linguistic non-equivalence, the study reveals three factors which hamper equivalence; words that share different semantic fields, words which lack hyponyms in the target language and words with different senses in the ST and TT. The findings of this paper would be of help and use to translators who wish to translate advertisements texts and to students and trainee translators who wish to acquire knowledge and awareness of the challenges encountered in the translation of advertisements.

Keywords: advertisements, Lubukusu, translation, untranslatable

Public Interest Statement

People need information to make informed decisions, to increase their knowledge and to get direction to essential services. Research has demonstrated that having access to relevant, quality and timely information enables people to access needed services and support (Pullen, Fiandt & Walker, 2011). However, mistranslation of advertisements due to lack of functional equivalence between the languages involved deny them an opportunity to achieve all that. For this reason, there is a need to identify factors that lead to mistranslation and sort for their remedy so as to emancipate the marginalized target language audience.

Introduction

The process of translation has existed for millennia. Nababan (2008), describes translation as process of transferring message from Source Text (ST) to Target Text (TT). Moreover, he argues that in translation one needs to understand the meaning and also the figurative language. As for Samuelson (2010), translation is not a brief process, but it is a creative process which needs some skills to be used together. The translator should understand what the writer means and then transfers it in the target language. The success of the process therefore, heavily rests on the shoulders of the translator. Nida (1997) states that the most important aim for translators should be to achieve the equivalence effect between the original and the translated text. However, the central issue in translation can be said to be functional equivalence. Functional equivalence is achieved when a translated text creates the same association and feelings in the minds of its TL audience as was produced in the minds of the audience of the original text. This is because the notion of equivalence is undoubtedly one of the most problematic and controversial areas in the field of translation. This is attributed to the fact that there are some items in the source language which may lack correspondence in the target text. Such items are referred to as “untranslatable or non-equivalents”, Bond (2005). For this reason, the paper evaluates functional equivalence as the logical rationale of establishing the appropriateness in the rendering of English advertisement into *Lubukusu*.

The paper investigates types of non-equivalents in the translation of English advertisements into *Lubukusu*. Advertising is a form of communication which is used to persuade a specific group of people to take some new action. As a result, advertising is considered as a major and important element for the economic growth of the marketers and different companies in competition, Ryans, (1996). Advertisement should have the ability to hold the attention of an audience and inform them whenever they listen to it. This is made possible through employing various artistic and stylistic means such as unconventional diction or tantalizing questions. An advertisement should also have the power to drag the audience making them persuaded after understanding it. They should be enticed to believe that the product or service is the best and worth going for it.

Translating of advertisements from English to *Lubukusu* is marked with a lot of challenges. This is because the two languages do not belong to the same family. The former belongs to the Indo-European family of languages while the latter is a Bantu language. Larson (1998) observes that different cultures have different focuses. Some societies are more technical and others less technical. This difference is reflected in the amount of vocabulary which is available to talk about a particular topic. He further observes that there may also be both “technical and non-technical” vocabulary to talk about the same thing within a given society. Therefore, if the SL text originates from a highly technical society it may be much more difficult to translate it into the language of a nontechnical society. However, in the case of similar cultures the conditions are not the same. In this view English can be treated as a technical language, a language which has fully grown in terms of vocabulary and has a standard variety, a dictionary and literature while *Lubukusu* has not been standardized and lacks a specific scheme of reference hence non-technical language. Therefore, translation of advertisements across the two cultures is a complex affair.

Translating a word in English into *Lubukusu* once it does not exist in the target language is close to impossible, this is often referred to as untranslatability attributed to non-equivalence.

Catford (1996) observes that there are two factors which affect the equivalence i.e. Linguistic and cultural factors, leading to two types of equivalence i.e. Linguistic and cultural equivalence. The findings of Catford is very significant to the current paper because it informs the researcher on types of non-equivalence in translation hence raising the impetus to investigate of such items exist in translation of English advertisements into *Lubukusu*.

Literature Review

Studies done in the field of translation, specifically English-Luhya translation, content with the fact that interlingual transfer is a complex activity which is hampered with a number of factors. A study done by Wangia (2003) analyzed cases of mistranslated verses in the 1951 King James Bible by comparing the English versions with the translated *Lulogooli* equivalent forms. It revealed that the translation of the 1951 King James Version of the English Bible into *Lulogooli* had a lot of lexical mismatches between the SL and the translated versions. She attributes this to non-native speaker factor on the part of the translators, lack of SL items equivalence in *Lulogooli*, and unavailability of writing system basis among others. In this view, the current paper agrees with Wangia (2003) because it equally observes that there are factors which impede translation at language and cultural level. Nonetheless, it deviates in the sense that this paper sought to investigate types of non-equivalence in the translation of English advertisements into *Lubukusu*. Similarly, Wangia (2014) looked at tense, aspect and case in Bantu and their significance in translation. The study projected that tense, case and aspect were not appropriately captured in the *Lulogooli* Bible translation and hence resulted to many cases of semantic loss. The conclusion can be drawn that if a keen interest is not placed on tense, aspect and case during translation, it can lead to a type of non-equivalent.

Mudogo (2017) investigated word level strategies and their significance in the translation of Mulembe FM newscasts. The study observed that equivalence at word level in the translation of Mulembe FM newscasts by Luhya presenters was undoubtedly attainable. The author observes that there were categories of *Lukabras* non-equivalence which emerged in the translation of Mulembe FM newscasts by the non-Kabras presenters. They include; the SL concept was lexicalized differently in the TL, semantically complex words also formed another category of *Lukabras* non-equivalence and lastly with perfect homonyms. The study by Mudogo differs from this paper in the view that he looked at non-equivalence in translation of informative texts which this paper looks at non-equivalence in translation of operative text. However, the two studies agree that there is non-equivalence in translation and if the right translation approaches are not employed to deal with it, it leads to mistranslation.

Theoretical Framework

The study was guided by the Skopos Theory (ST) was implemented by Reiss, Vermeer (1989). It focuses on the relationship between Source Language (SL) text and Target Language (TL) text and the methods of translation. It holds the view that the criteria for assessing a satisfactory translation vary according to the text type. Reiss (1989) considers the function of the language of a specific text type to be the criterion of a satisfactory translation. The theory has three tenets; **Skopos:** refers to what the translator is aiming at, **Function:** what the text means to a particular

audience in a particular moment of reception and **Intention**: what the author or sender wants to achieve in a translation.

Methodology

The researcher applied the analytical research design. A sample of twenty four advertisement transcripts from the evening Sulwe FM broadcasts was collected, out of which 120 items were investigated. The researcher also sampled 48 Sulwe FM listeners as respondents and 3 translators of advertisements from Sulwe FM as key informants. Data was collected using text analysis of the recorded adverts, interviews for the translators and Focus Group Discussions for the listeners. The researcher used multi stage sampling which involved the use of purposive and systematic random sampling. The data was analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. Content analysis was used to analyze the qualitative data by identifying types of non-equivalents in the translation by comparing the source and target text.

Discussion of Findings

Types of *Lubukusu* Non-Equivalence in translation of Advertisements

This section presents results for types of non-equivalence in translation of English advertisements into *Lubukusu*. Catford (1996) identifies two types of non-equivalence which affect the equivalence namely; linguistic and cultural equivalence. To begin with, the findings of cultural non-equivalents is provided.

1. Culture specific terms

The SL word may express a concept which is totally unknown in the target culture. The concept in question maybe abstract or concrete-it may relate to political field, religious believe or social life. Such concepts are referred to as “culture specific”. We will start by discussing English culture related words and concepts from the advertisements which have no direct *Lubukusu* equivalents. A list of common culture-specific terms in English and how they were translated into *Lubukusu* is first presented in the following table.

Table 4.3: List of English culture specific terms and their translation in the TT.

English term	Translated version into Lubukusu
1.In twitter	<i>Khutwitter</i>
2.Revision content	Revision content
3.Online	Online
4.Birthday shower	Birthday shower
5.Bridal shower	Bridal shower
6.Live	Live
7. Serie A	Serie A

Source: *Field observation Data (2020)*

The section below presents the context where the data was extracted with English (SL) version.

Example 1: (Get sulwe FM online)

Translation: *Nyola Sulwe FM online*

Example 2: (You need baby shower mixes, birthday party, and bridal shower? Don't think about it.)

Translation: *Nawenya chimix cha baby shower, birthday party, birthday shower, bridal shower Okhebasiamo taa.*

Example 3: (Follow us on twitter at Sulwe.)

Translation: *khulonde khutwitter at sulwe*

Example 4: (You can listen to sulwe FM live through RMS)

Translation: *onyala wakhurekeresia live khuvirira muRMS*

The traces of English terms in the target text indicates that the TL version lacks specific cultural items for the SL concepts. For example, the words “live” and “twitter” do not attain correspondence in the target text. This was attributed to the fact that most SL (English) concepts in this section were so specific to the SL and did not have a one-to-one equivalent items in the TL (*Lubukusu*). These results are in line with Reiss (1989) observation that the language dimension used to transmit the information in operative text should be informative and persuasive. Since the research was interested in the extend of translation, the researcher was compelled to investigate the comprehension of the Sulwe FM listeners on the culture specific items translated in *Lubukusu*.

Interviewer: *Norekeresia Nakhalondo ya Sulwe oelewanga kamakhua kakhali kelubukusu taa?*

Translation: To what extent is your comprehension of Sulwe FM advertisements affected by *Lubukusu* non-equivalent items?

Discussant 1: *Khumaoni kange likhua twitter limaanisha khaasipika khatiti nikho vaambasianga nende chimbofu mala kharusia esauti ya soprano.*

Translation: In my opinion, the term “twitter” has been used to refer to a small speaker which is usually connected with big ones although it's used for soprano.

Discussant 2: *Esese chiaina chekimienya echo sengimanya tawe. Manyile sa nicho vavana vemba navasherekea esiku ya khukuivulwa*

Translation: As for me, I don't really understand those categories of songs, however, birthday songs are sung when celebrating their birthday.

Discussant 3: *Likhua “live” limaanisha nabatangasia kamatangaso kaa nakhalondo ya sulwe.*

Translation: (The term ‘live’ means when theyre broadcasting in sulwe FM radio.)

Discussant 4: *Nabaloma bali online bamaanisha bali yani mumutandao. Onyala warekeresia sulwe mumutandao.*

Translation: (When they talk of online they imply in social networks. You can listen to sulwe FM on social networks.)

The above responses from listeners project that translating cultural items is harbored with challenges. For example, discussant one explains that the target text item “twitter” which has been directly borrowed from English due to lack of correspondence, “as a small sized speaker (music instrument) which is always mounted alongside bigger speakers and its designed for the purpose of playing soprano”. This response was not consistent with the meaning of the item, in fact the discussant should have confused “tutor” to “twitter”. The word in question denotes a social network which connects millions of people through the internet. To the discussant, who perhaps may not have been advantaged to own a smart phone or undergo formal education is not in a position to unravel the definition of the term. The term is so specific to the SL culture and it does not exist in the target language.

Extract 2 comprised of SL items purely borrowed into the target language, such as “baby shower, birthday party, birthday shower, bridal shower.” According to discussant 2, she lacks knowledge of the terms, however, for birthday party songs which is a common practice within the locality, she defines as songs sung when an individual celebrates the day they were born. It can be observed that the concepts like “bridal shower” and “baby shower” are unknown in *lubukusu* because they never formed part of *bukusu* culture. The *bukusu* people had their own way of conducting marriage rites and that defined their way of life.

The SL item 3, “live” was a purely borrowed term from English into *Lubukusu*. The term is an English technological concept and it lacks a one to one equivalence in *Lubukusu*. According to discussant 3 he says the term refers to a moment when Sulwe radio is broadcasting. Wikipedia defines live radio as sounds transmitted by radio waves, as the sound happens. Discussant 3 was a youth and had the knowledge of English and media that gave him more advantage to the comprehension of the term. From the above response it can be argued that age and literacy among respondents can contribute to their comprehension of culture specific terms.

Example 4 presents the term ‘online’. The sentence which gives the context of the word is “nyola Sulwe FM online” which translates to get Sulwe FM online. According to discussant 4, he defines ‘online’ as ‘*kumutandao*’ which implies ‘social network’. Therefore, the phrase means ‘you can find sulwe FM radio on social networks’. This explanation is close to the implied meaning of the SL item. From the above items and respondents arguments, it can be concluded that cultural items are not easy to translate. As Larson (1983) puts it “Language is a part of culture, and, therefore, translation from one language to another cannot be done adequately without knowledge of the two cultures as well as the two language structures.” (1983). Therefore, a translator has to be not only bilingual but bicultural as well.

2. Linguistic Non-Equivalence

Language differences may pose a problem in translation. When a single language has got more vocabularies than the other, it becomes difficult to translate some concepts. This translation hurdle that relates to language differences is referred to as “linguistic non-equivalence”. In the translation of Sulwe FM adverts, various categories of *Lubukusu* non-equivalence may emerge. Baker (1992) notes that the difficulty and problem in translating from one language into another is posed by the concept of non-equivalence. She identified various categories of target language non-equivalence attributed to linguistic differences between the SL and the TL such as; source

language concept not lexicalized in the target language, the source language word is semantically complex, the source and target language make different distinctions in meaning, the target language lacks a superordinate and the target language lacks a specific term. In line with Baker's categorization, the current study presents data on the categories present in English-Lubukusu advertisements as shown below.

2.1 Source language words that are semantically complex

A single word which consists of a single morpheme could sometimes express a more complex set of meaning than a whole sentence, Bolinger and Sears, (1968:55). To establish whether or not TL-Lubukusu equivalence was achieved by the translator for the items in this category, the following items were extracted.

Example 5: (We bring you school in your hands.)

Translation: *Khukhurerera sisomelo mumikhono mwoo*

Example 6 : (Press *544*25# to get Maria data pass)

Translation: *Ewe mina *544*25# khunyola Maria deta pass.*

According to Ghazala (2004), untranslatability may occur at the word level due to lack of equivalence between languages. Such untranslatability results from semantically complex words such as "school" translated as "sisomelo" (example 5), and "data pass" (Example 6). However, as argued by Baker (1992) the idea that untranslatable can be translated, leads logically to the negation of the idea of "untranslatability". It is therefore possible to translate what is believed to be untranslatable due to incompatibilities between languages. Therefore, the notion of "untranslatability" is open to dismissal because translation between languages is still possible. Consequently, the translation of such items in operative texts like the case of Sulwe FM advertisements should be done with the TL audience in mind. It is for this reason that the discussants were engaged to establish whether the translated versions for the items in this category conveyed relevant TL products. From the FGDs, Lubukusu discussants' responses were noted as shown below;

Interviewer: *Norekeresia Nakhalondo ya Sulwe oelewanga kamakhua kakhali kelubukusu taa?*

Translation: To what extent is your comprehension of Sulwe FM advertisements affected by Lubukusu non-equivalent items?

Discussant 5: *Likhua sisomelo limaanisha mboo yaani basomi balasoma khubikuli bili simbi nenabo.*

Translation: *The term school has been used to imply that students will attend academic programs from schools near them.*

Discussant 6: *Marias sipindi sibechange Citizen TV. Likhua data pass endiulilanga busaa lakini semanya limaanisha sinanu taa.*

Translation: (Maria is a program on Citizen TV. I have heard of the term "data pass" but I don't know what it implies.)

From the responses from the FGDs, inferences can be drawn regarding the rendering of semantically complex items by the translators. In example 5 for instance, the English expression “We bring you school in your hands” Which was translated as “*Khukhurerera sisomelo mumikhono mwoo*” is semantically complex. First, the term “school” carries two senses; an institution for educating children and the act of educating learners. Secondly, the two senses of the item school qualifies the phrase to be ambiguous; it may imply to bring the institution close to the listener or to educate them from their place of convenience. According to discussant 5, he decodes the first meaning only. As observed by Reiss (1989), an appropriate translation should attempt to render the contextual meaning of the original text in such a way that both content and language are readily acceptable to the TL audience, a fact that is not factored in the current translation.

In example 6 the concept ‘data pass’ has a long meaning which would have brought made the target text longer and lose coherence if it was paraphrased. The term refers to “a fixed amount of data for one to use on their mobile or device that enables them to access or watch a certain program-in this case ‘Maria’ ” According to discussant 6, she commits to have understood the meaning of the term ‘Maria’ which is a program aired out on Citizen TV. However, she remains non-committal to the implication of the item “data pass.” It can be concluded that due to the complexity of the meaning of the item, the translator decided to remain faithful to the source text by borrowing the item directly, ignoring the target text reader. The concept did not attain equivalence. According to Reiss (1989), equivalence is a dynamic, result-oriented concept describing a relationship of ‘equal communicative value’ between two texts or, on lower ranks, between words, phrases, sentences, syntactic structures and so on. This implies that the TL versions in Sulwe FM adverts should have similar communicative equivalence to the SL concepts. Nonetheless In examples 5-6 above, there was no ‘equal communicative value’ between the SL and the TL versions hence evidence of non-equivalence.

2.2 Concepts that lack a hyponym in the target language.

According to Baker (1992), a hyponym is a word with a particular meaning that is included in the meaning of a more general word. There are certain specific English words which may lack one-to-one equivalent items in *Lubukusu* language. This may constraint the translators in finding a functional TL items. The researcher sought to establish how such words were rendered into the TL by the *Bukusu* translators. From transcript 10 and 11, the extracts show the rendering of SL items in this category by the Sulwe FM translators.

Example 9: Symptoms of corona virus.

Translation: *Vimanyisio vye khaukha khano*

Example 10: (Giving a child or any person drugs without the doctor’s prescription)

Translation: *khuwelesia kamalesi omwana nemwe omundu yesiyesi omukhulu bila eparua ya takitari*

Example 11: (Planting variety of crops)

Translation: *Khubiala bimelwa biaukhane.*

The translation trend observed in extracts 9-11 reveal the fact that TL versions lack specific words

for the SL concepts. For instance, in Example 9, “symptoms of corona virus” and in example 10, “Doctor’s prescription.” Newmark (1988), notes that when corresponding SL and TL words do not usually have precisely the same semantic range, the translators may under translate the text. Such under translation in the case of a text which is both informative and persuasive would result into meaning loss of the SL concepts and the end result might not persuade the audience to go for a particular product. For the present case, the researcher’s aim was to establish whether the translators attained TL equivalence when rendering the items in this category. The discussants gave the following responses;

Interviewer: *Norekeresia Nakhalondo ya Sulwe oelewanga kamakhua kakhali kelubukusu taa?*

Translation: To what extent is your comprehension of Sulwe FM advertisements affected by Lubukusu non-equivalent items?)

Discussant 9: *Ngenembelewa habalosela chitalili chebulwalebuya bwekhukholola bufwana mboo khaukha kha muniafu*

Translation: From my point of view in example 9, they refer to signs of a coughing disease which is similar HIV/AIDS)

Discussant 10: *Eparua ya dakitari eli eyokesia mboo omwana omulwale niye mala kenyekhana bamusilikhe.*

Translation: (In example 10, they refer to a letter from the doctor which implies that the child is sick and deserves to be treated.)

Discussant 11: *Bamaanisha mboo khubiala bindu tofautitofauti*

Translation: (They imply growing different variety of staffs)

English is a technical language and therefore is rich in vocabularies that might not be present in Lubukusu. For example, Item 9, “corona virus” lacked a hyponym in Lubukusu and was translated as “*khaukha khano*” which directly implies “*this virus*”. According to discussant 9, the item implies “a disease related HIV/AIDS but with severe cough”. The response from Discussant 9 reveals that the TL version was too general, and therefore led to meaning loss of the SL message.

In example 10, the item “prescription” lacked a hyponym and it was paraphrased as ‘*eparua ya dakitari*’ Discussant 10 noted that the item referred to ‘a letter which implied that the child was sick and deserved treatment.’ The response projected that the listener did not get the intended meaning of the SL item. The SL item meant, “Instruction written by a medical practitioner that authorizes a patient to be issued with a medicine or treatment.” The principle idea in translation according to Pym, (2010) is that the translator should work to achieve the function or “the communicative and persuasive purpose of the translation” rather than just follow the ST. In other words, the dominant factor is “what the end-user wants the translation for”

In extracts 11, the translated versions do not serve the communication and persuasive purpose of the target text. This is because the SL item “crops” lacks a hyponym in the TL and it’s replaced with “*bimelwa*” which is a general term that implies “plants”. There is a distinction between plants and crops. The former is a general terms which denotes anything that grows on soil. Nonetheless, the term “crops” are plants that grow in large scale for food and other

commercial purposes. Consequently, all crops are plants but not all plants are crops. Therefore, using a more general term in translation is what Mudogo (2017) calls over translation. This impedes successful translation.

Moreover, it has been stated that translation is an art (Bignenet and Shulte, 1989). By extension, then, a translator is an artist and language is the translation tool. Translators who want to produce a functionally relevant TL product need to pay skillful attention to the lexical choices they make in the languages they are working in. This is because the intricate nuances of a language are tied to the lexical choices which in some languages dictate the semantic realization and hence cannot be overlooked in translation.

According to Al-Safi (2007), translators should compensate semantic losses in translation when faced with SL concepts that lack one-to-one TL items. Such compensation can be done through use of a loan word and explanation. The aim of compensation is to balance the semantic losses that translation involves. Compensation introduces a SL element of information or in another place in the TL text because it cannot be reflected in the same place as in the SL.

1.3 Source and Target Language Make Differences in Meaning

Baker (1992:11) stated that what one language regards as an important distinction in meaning another language might not perceive as relevant. The following items were identified in this category;

Example 12: (You will be referred to an advanced medical facility)

Translation: *Bakhurume khubumenyelesi bwangaki*

Example 13: (They help mosquitos to breed quickly)

Translation: *Chiyeta ving'enge khukhuibulana khangu*

Example 14: (It will will give you an opportunity to watch Maria)

Translation: *Elakhuwa buvweyangu bwakhulola maria*

Example: (There is no subscription)

Translation: *Mbao khukhuiandikisia tawe*

From the above examples, items, “*bakhurume, khukhuibulana, bubweyangu and khukhwiandikisyia*” denotes different sense from the source language meaning. To establish whether equivalence was achieved for the words, the discussants responded as follows,

Interviewer: *Norekeresia chiatfataiments cha nakhalondo ya Sulwe oelewanga kamakhua niko*

bakalukhasie khulubukusu?

Translation: (When you listen to Sulwe FM adverts do you understand the terms translated into *Lubukusu*)

Discussant 12: *Bamaanisia bali omusilikhi akhulaka ochee muosibito embofu bakucheke.*

Translation: (The term implies that you are sent by a doctor to a bigger hospital for checkup)

Discussant 13: *Ving'eng'e bisalana*

Translation: (Mosquitos give birth to offspring)

Discussant 14: *Limaanisia enafasi ya kukhola sindu alafu kukuandikisia oandika lisina mukandi.*

Translation: (It means the capacity to do something then the last item implies registering your name among others)

None of these words were rendered correctly in the TT. The SL word, “referred” was translated as “*bakhurume*” which means “to send.” To **refer** in this context implies to pass over a patient (due to inability to handle) to the next doctor who has the capacity to handle the patient. However, the TT items reduces the meaning of the SL concept. Breeding was translated as “*khukhibulana*” The SL item means the whole process of mating, laying and hatching of the eggs to reproduce offspring by mosquitos. Nonetheless, the TL term simply means to give birth. Further, “opportunity” which implies “a situation that is made possible to do something” was translated as “*vuvweyangu*” which denotes “the capacity to do something.” Lastly, “subscription” which means “an arrangement to receive something regularly by paying in advance” was substituted for “*khukhuiandikisia*” which refers to “registration.” The above are examples of a concept that exists in the target language but has a different sense. The translation of words that do not share the same semantic fields or words that showed non-equivalence at the sense level posed challenges to the translators leading to partial transfer of the meaning/message of the ST into the TT. The finding is an agreement with Musyoka (2019) who observed a discrepancy in sense between the English and Kamba version of the bible.

Conclusion

Translation equivalence is always long to achieve since it depends on the text, the translator, and the receptors. From this discussion it can be concluded that words that share different semantic fields, words which lack hyponyms in the target language and words with different senses in the ST and TT were the most difficult to translate. This difference is caused by the fact that the STL and TTL belong to different cultures. Culture-specific words also posed a challenge but the translator tried to loan them to the TT with some little success. Words which did not have a one-word equivalent (whose concept exist in the TT) were rendered in the TT using paraphrasing which was quite successful except in a few cases. Therefore, the current paper recommends that translators to apply specific word level approaches suggested by baker (1992) in dealing with the problem of non-equivalence. Baker’s Strategies are exhaustive and can serve as a guide for translating Sulwe FM advertisements and accommodate the audience.

Funding: The researcher received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The researcher declares no conflict of interest.

Disclaimer Statement

This paper obtained data from a thesis titled ‘Functional approaches to the translation of English

advertisements into *Lubukusu* in Sulwe FM” submitted to Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Department of Language and Literature education for the award of master’s degree in applied linguistics. Supervisors: Dr. Mudogo Benard and Dr. Lucy Mandilla.

Author Bionote

Rashid Mutacho, M.A Applied Linguistics, Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology.