

**A COMPLEXITY APPROACH
TO THE INCIPIENT SIGN SYSTEM OF ZEPHANIAH
IN THE 1983 AFRIKAANS BIBLE TRANSLATION**

by

FRANCOIS TERTIUS DE VILLIERS

(Student number: 2005023649)

DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE QUALIFICATION

MASTER OF ARTS

WITH SPECIALISATION IN

BIBLE TRANSLATION

IN THE FACULTY OF THEOLOGY AND RELIGION

UNIVERSITY OF THE FREE STATE

BLOEMFONTEIN

SOUTH AFRICA

DATE SUBMITTED: 14 DECEMBER 2022

JOINT SUPERVISORS

PROF JA NAUDÉ AND PROF CL MILLER-NAUDÉ

DECLARATION

I, Francois Tertius de Villiers (student number 2005023649), declare that the thesis hereby submitted for the qualification Master of Arts with specialisation in Bible Translation in the Faculty of the Theology and Religion at the University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa, is my own independent work and that I have not previously submitted the same for qualification at/in another university/faculty.

I also cede the copyright of this dissertation in favour of the University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.



F. T. de Villiers

2022-12-14

ABSTRACT

Traditionally a translation is considered to be the result of the interaction between only two elements – the source text and the target text, each defined as being a single text. From the perspective of complexity, the current study argues that the source of a translation should not be viewed as just one text. The current study demonstrates that a translation emerges from a complex source that consists of various elements such as various texts and other factors. These could include other translations apart from the source text that translators consulted.

The current study uses the Book of Zephaniah in the Afrikaans Bible Translation of 1983 as an example to detect instances where the translators deviated from their source text. Using principles of Descriptive Translation Studies, the current study compares the translation to its explicitly stated source text (i.e. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* of 1977). *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* is a scholarly edition of the Hebrew Bible that contains a critical Hebrew text based on *Codex Leningradensis* supplemented by a text critical apparatus. Using principles of Descriptive Translation Studies, the translation was compared to its source text to determine the translators' translation strategies. Describing translation strategies revealed that translators used the strategies of addition, deletion, specification, and transposition. In cases where the Hebrew source text of *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* was problematic, the translators sometimes deviated from their source text by following neither the Hebrew text nor the text critical apparatus. In such instances, the translators were forced to base their translation on sources beyond their stated source text; at least some of these additional sources can be identified. This study thus demonstrates the presence of a complex source for the Afrikaans 1983 translation of the Bible in particular, but it also has implications for Bible translations in general.

Keywords

Afrikaans, Bible translation, Complexity Theory, Zephaniah, textual criticism, translation studies, Descriptive Translation Studies

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is surely by the grace of God alone, the prayers, love, support, and longsuffering of my wife, Alwin, children, Eileen and John, extended family, and friends both known and unknown to me, that I was able to complete this study.

I thank my parents, Francois and Tertia de Villiers, and their parents who instilled within me already as a child the desire to learn and qualify myself to the best of my ability.

Special thanks to the University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa, that assisted me with a partial bursary, as well as my promotors (Professors Jacobus Naudé and Cynthia Miller-Naudé) who guided and enriched me, and often provided me with their personal resources to assist me.

I thank Hanlie Rossouw at the Bible Society of South Africa for granting me access to archival materials.

I thank both past and current students, Diane Kozelka and Magdalena Lilla Luchici, for providing me with some of the books that I needed for this study at their own expense. I thank Sally Herring for her friendship, prayers, and interest that often helped me to keep going.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Abbreviations	vi
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Background.	1
1.2 Hypothesis and Objective	3
1.3 Structure of the Research	3
Chapter 2: Methodology	
2.1 Introduction	6
2.2 Background of AFR83	7
2.3 Shift towards a Descriptive Approach	14
2.4 A Complexity Approach to a Source Text	17
2.5 Supplementing DTS with Complexity	19
2.6 Conclusion	20
Chapter 3: Complexity Descriptive Study of AFR83 Zephaniah	22
3.1 Introduction	22
3.2 Zephaniah 1:2	25
3.3 Zephaniah 1:4	27
3.4 Zephaniah 1:7	30
3.5 Zephaniah 1:9	32
3.6 Zephaniah 1:12	35
3.7 Zephaniah 1:17a	38
3.8 Zephaniah 2:1	39
3.9 Zephaniah 2:2	41
3.10 Zephaniah 2:8d	43
3.11 Zephaniah 2:11a	44
3.12 Zephaniah 2:15	47
3.13 Zephaniah 3:15	48
3.14 Zephaniah 3:16	50
3.15 Conclusion	51

Chapter 4: Conclusions	53
Bibliography	56
Bibles	60
Archival Materials from the Bible Society of South Africa	61

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AFR33	Afrikaans Bible Translation, 1933
AFR53	Afrikaans Bible Translation, 1953
AFR83	Afrikaans Bible Translation, 1983
AFR92	Afrikaans Bible Translation, 1983, reprinted in 1992 with reformulations
BFBS	British and Foreign Bible Society
BHK	All editions of <i>Biblia Hebraica</i> edited by Rudolf Kittel.
BHK1	<i>Biblia Hebraica</i> edited by Rudolf Kittel, 1 st Edition, 1906
BHK2	<i>Biblia Hebraica</i> edited by Rudolf Kittel, 2 nd Edition, 1913
BHK3	<i>Biblia Hebraica</i> edited by Rudolf Kittel, 3 rd Edition, 1937.
BHS	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i> , 1967/ 1977
DRC	Dutch Reformed Church / Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk
DTS	Descriptive Translation Studies
KJV	King James Version, 1611
NBG-51	Nederlandsch Bijbelgenootschap Vertaling, 1951
SV	Dutch Sates Authorised Version/ <i>Statenvertaling</i> , 1637
ST	Source Text
TT	Target Text

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

Historically, the 1983 Afrikaans Bible translation (AFR83) was one of a group of translations in more than one part of the world that had the explicit purpose to render what it perceived as its source text (ST) into modern speech. In the South African context of the time, it was a corrective translation and was intended to succeed the Afrikaans Bible translation of 1933 (AFR33), and its revision of 1953 (AFR53). It was corrective in the sense that it was based on newer editions of the Hebrew (i.e., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* / BHS of 1977) and Greek source texts and used a more contemporary idiom than that of AFR33 and AFR53 (Joubert 2020:2). AFR33 and AFR53 were formal word-for-word translations that attempted to reflect the formal structures of the source languages. AFR33 and AFR53 followed the wording of the Bible translation that was familiar to the Afrikaans Bible reading public of the time, which was the Dutch Authorised Version, known as the *Statenvertaling* of 1637 (SV), which was also a formal word-for-word translation. In contrast, AFR83 explicitly followed the translation theory of functional equivalence, which was regarded as the result of the best scientific research at the time. According to this theory, translation means to reproduce the meaning of the message of the source language text into the target language (Nida & Taber 1969:12). Preserving the meaning of the source language was more important than its formal structures. Translators were instructed to choose the closest natural equivalent in the target language to convey the source language message (Nida & Taber 1969:13). The theory of functional equivalence was prescriptive in nature in the sense that a particular definition of equivalence (Nida & Taber 1969:12; Naudé 2002:47) was used as an instrument of measurement to judge whether equivalence had indeed been achieved or not. From such a prescriptive approach, a translation was judged in emotive terms such as whether the translation was good, bad, correct, accurate, faithful, or not (Hermans 1985:12; Naudé 1999:74). The theory of functional equivalence had the underlying assumption that translation is the result of an interaction between only two elements – the source text (ST) and the target text (TT), each defined as being a single text. According to this view, the task of a translator is merely to communicate this message of the ST across historical, cultural, and linguistic boundaries in a way that is comprehensible for a contemporary audience (Naudé 2022:1).

In recent years there has been a shift away from a prescriptive to a descriptive approach to translation because equivalence is both impossible to achieve and poorly defined (Rosa 2010:99, Nord 2016:567). Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) does not prescribe what equivalence is or what it should be (Hermans 1985:12, Rosa 2010:100). In DTS the fact of a translation implies that equivalence has already been achieved (Hermans 1985:25). Within DTS, equivalence is not a prescriptive, but a descriptive concept (Rosa 2010:99). A prescriptive approach dictates how a translation *should* be done and a particular definition of equivalence is used like a yardstick to measure whether the desired equivalence has been achieved or not (Hermans 1985:12). Because it is impossible to reproduce in translation an exact copy of the original, the result of such a yardstick test is pre-determined. A translation, when measured against a prescriptive approach to equivalence, is always doomed to fail in conveying the perceived richness of the original and the purpose of the study of a translation is merely to demonstrate its errors (Naudé 2002:47).

In contrast to a prescriptive approach to equivalence that dictates how a translation should be done, DTS attempts to describe a translation that has already been done. Since the assumption of DTS is that equivalence has already been achieved, one of the purposes of DTS is to describe what strategies the translators used to achieve that equivalence. In the case of text-specific problems that translators encountered in the ST, DTS can describe what translators did to solve the unique translation problems that they encountered (Nord 2005:168). According to Toury (1985:25) a translation can be viewed as representing the solutions to translation problems.

From the perspective of a complexity approach, a reductionist approach to all of the above would assume that AFR83, or any other translation, is the result of the interaction between only two elements. These two elements are the translation's stated ST and its envisioned TT. According to this view, if a descriptive study of AFR83 is to be done, the task of DTS would be to describe the relationship only between the Old Testament translation in AFR83 and the Hebrew text of BHS with its text-critical apparatus.

A complexity approach takes the complexity of reality as its point of departure (Marais 2014:46). According to an approach from the perspective of complexity, a translation is not the result of the interaction between only a single ST and a single TT. Instead, a translation is considered to have emerged from a complex source comprising various incipient texts and other factors. A complexity approach does not attempt to replace existing theories but to supplement them. Supplemented with a perspective of complexity, DTS can attempt to

describe not only a translation in relation to its original as if the original were a single text, but it can also describe other influences and texts that were incipient to it. By supplementing DTS with the perspective of complexity, DTS can demonstrate that a translation emerges from a complex source.

1.2.Hypothesis and Objective

The hypothesis of the current study is that AFR83 and specifically its translation of the Book of Zephaniah (hereafter called AFR83 Zephaniah) emerged from a complex source or incipient sign system (i.e. the source of AFR83 Zephaniah was not just one other text or just BHS as its explicitly stated ST). The objective of the current study is to demonstrate this hypothesis by identifying and discussing instances where AFR83 deviated from its stated ST, the BHS edition. Since BHS is a scholarly edition of the Hebrew Bible that contains text-critical information that already refers to sources other than the Hebrew text, the definition of a deviation from the ST would be where AFR83 deviated not only from the Hebrew text, but also from the text-critical apparatus. Such instances will demonstrate that for a particular text the translators did not use their stated ST but would by necessity have used other sources as well. This will demonstrate the presence of a complex source that consists of more than just one other text and other influences besides the translation, a complex incipient sign system from which the translation emerged. Another hypothesis is that part of the complex source or incipient sign system would have been other Bible translations that the translators would have consulted.

1.3.Structure of the Research

To describe a translation in relationship to its ST places the current study within DTS. The current study seeks to combine the insights of DTS with the theoretical insights of complexity. The dissertation will consist of four chapters.

In Chapter 2, I will formulate the theoretical framework and exact procedures of this study in more detail. Chapter 2 will contain four sections. In the first section of Chapter 2, I will give a brief historical background of AFR83. The purpose of the historical section is to indicate that the entire 1983 Afrikaans translation and Zephaniah, in particular, can be positioned within an era in which a prescriptive approach to translation was dominant. The purpose of that

section will be to provide the rationale for considering what other elements or texts besides the stated ST might have been part of the incipient sign system of AFR83 Zephaniah.

In the second section of Chapter 2, I will describe the shift away from a prescriptive approach to DTS. This will be used to indicate that the current study, in which a translation is compared to its original, even if that original is defined as a complex source, still places the current study within DTS.

In a third section of Chapter 2, I will describe some elements of a complexity approach to the source text of a translation and indicate how a complexity approach can supplement DTS. I will pay particular attention to how a complexity approach widens the definition of what is otherwise called the source text. From the perspective of complexity, what is otherwise called the ST should be defined as being part of a larger incipient sign system of which several texts are part amongst other factors.

In a fourth section of Chapter 2, I will formulate some principles and methods that can be used to describe AFR83 Zephaniah in comparison to its original. I will draw from some methods of DTS by specifically referring to the description of translation strategies used by the translators. The purpose of that section will be to form hypotheses about which translation strategies would most likely have been used when translators came across text-specific translation problems such as when the meaning of the source text was unclear (Nord 2005:168). In such situations translators would have been forced to look outside of their stated ST to establish their translation and this would demonstrate the translation's complex source. It is my hypothesis that, in the case of AFR83 Zephaniah, translators would use the strategy of deletion (i.e. an element in the ST is not conveyed in the translation at all), addition (i.e. the TT contains linguistic, cultural, and textual elements that do not appear in the ST at all), transposition (i.e. grammatical structure in ST is conveyed by means of an entirely different grammatical form in the TT), or else a combination of various strategies (Naudé 1999:79). In the same section I will indicate how I intend to combine some elements of DTS with a complexity perspective. According to Marais (2014:15), a complexity approach does not intend to replace reductionist approaches, but to supplement them. I will describe that the specific element of DTS that will be supplemented by a complexity perspective is the definition of the "original" (Lambert & Van Gorp 1985:52-53) that is to be compared to the translation. From the perspective of complexity, the "original" can be considered to be not just one other text, but a complex source consisting of various texts and other factors (Marais 2019:45).

Instances where it seems that translators made use of the strategies of addition, deletion, transposition, or a combination of strategies to overcome text-specific problems, could point to the use of other sources besides the translation's stated source text. Such instances can be compared to other possible incipient texts mentioned in the historical section on AFR83 Zephaniah. If the source of particular readings can be identified as having been imported from other sources, it will not only prove the hypothesis of a complex source for AFR83 Zephaniah as correct, but it will also describe some elements of that complex source even if that is not the main objective of the current study.

In Chapter 3, I will do a descriptive study of AFR83 Zephaniah according to the principles and methods described in Chapter 2. I will refer to a selection of texts from AFR83 Zephaniah that seem to deviate from the stated ST. Since the ST of AFR83 was BHS, this would mean that the translators would have had to deviate from the Hebrew text and the text-critical apparatus concurrently. I will compare such deviations to other possible incipient texts. If it can be indicated that, when they deviated from BHS, the translators of AFR83 Zephaniah made use of such other sources, it will not only prove that the hypothesis of a complex source is correct, but it will also describe some elements of AFR83 Zephaniah's complex incipient sign system.

Chapter 4 will be the conclusion of the current study. The conclusion will answer the question if the initial hypotheses of the current study have been proven as correct or not and suggest possibilities for future research.

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

2.1 Introduction

As indicated in the previous chapter, the purpose of the current study is to approach the source of the 1983 Afrikaans Bible translation of Zephaniah from the perspective of complexity in order to argue for the existence of a complex source. The translators of AFR83 introduced their translation to the reader by means of an introductory note. In this note they informed the reader about their ST:

Die vertaling van die Bybel in Afrikaans wat hiermee aangebied word, is die vrug van vertaalwerk wat in 1970 begin is. Die doel was 'n vertaling wat rekening hou met die ontwikkeling in Afrikaans die afgelope jare en met die resultate van wetenskaplike ondersoek, maar ook so getrou as moontlik aan die grondteks bly; 'n waardige vertaling waardeur Afrikaanssprekendes aangespreek word, buite en binne die kerk, in die erediens en in huislike gebruik, in ons teenwoordige situasie en tyd.

As grondteks vir die Ou Testament is die *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (1977) gebruik. Hierdie uitgawe van die Hebreeuse, en gedeeltelik Aramese, grondteks is gebaseer op die oudste volledig behoue manuskrip, die *Codex Leningradensis* (1008 n.C.). Gegewens uit ouer manuskripte is in die teksgegewens bygewerk.

[The translation of the Bible in Afrikaans that is presented here, is the fruit of translation work that began in 1970. The purpose was a translation that takes into account the development of Afrikaans in the past number of years and the results of scientific research, but which is also as faithful as possible to the source text; a worthy translation that may speak to speakers of Afrikaans, inside and outside of the church, for use in the worship service and at home, in our current circumstances and time.

As source text for the Old Testament the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (1977) was used. This edition of the Hebrew, and partially Aramaic, source

text is based on the oldest complete preserved manuscript, the *Codex Leningradensis* (1008 A.D.). Information from older manuscripts has been incorporated into textual information.]

The above introductory note informs the reader that the ST for the Old Testament was a scholarly edition of the Hebrew Bible and that the translation was intended as a modern speech translation. From a reductionist point of view, the translation is the result of the interaction between only two factors (i.e. the envisioned AFR83 and BHS). From a complexity perspective, it is the assumption that the translators would have consulted other texts apart from their explicit ST. The purpose of the current study is to argue this point by demonstrating that there are instances that the translators deviated from their ST and must have used other resources as well.

The hypothesis of the current study is that the source of AFR83 Zephaniah was not just one other text, but that the translation emerged from an incipient sign system that would have included several texts and other factors. The concept of an incipient sign system includes all influences that contributed to the translation process. These influences can include texts but are not limited to texts only. For the purposes of the current study, I wish to limit the research to consider only possible other incipient *texts*.

Comparing a translation with its original places the current study within the context of Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS). According to Marais (2014:15) a complexity approach is not intended to replace existing approaches that tend to be one-sided or reductionist in nature, but to supplement them. According to Marais et al (2021:119) complexity is not a methodology in the sense that it will provide a researcher with exact procedures. Instead, complexity provides a researcher with an additional framework that will guide his/ her observations.

A descriptive study of the relationship between a translation and its original implies a comparison between a translation and usually only one other text that was supposedly its sole source. If the hypothesis of the current study is that the 1983 Afrikaans translation of Zephaniah emerged from a complex source, the purpose of the current study is to detect places where the AFR83 Zephaniah deviated from BHS and to describe the strategies used to establish the translation, with reference to the additional perspective from a complexity approach. Such a description will reveal whether the translators used other sources to establish their translation as well.

In the following sections, I provide a brief historical background of the 1983 Afrikaans Bible translation as a whole. The purpose of that section will not be to provide an exhaustive description of its historical and socio-political background, but to illustrate how the AFR83 emerged from an era in which a prescriptive approach to translation was dominant. This will provide the rationale for considering which other texts might have been incipient as part of its complex source.

The following section will describe the shift away from a prescriptive to a descriptive approach to translation studies. This will provide the rationale for a method of a descriptive study of AFR83 of Zephaniah that would be able to demonstrate its complex source.

Finally, I will describe some principles of a complexity approach and pay particular attention to how a complexity approach can supplement DTS. This will lay the foundation for the procedures that I will follow in Chapter 3, which I believe will demonstrate that AFR83 Zephaniah emerged from a complex source.

2.2 Background of AFR83

In 1970 the three Afrikaans Reformed Churches in South Africa indicated officially that they would support the project of a new Afrikaans Bible translation (Joubert 2020:172) to succeed the Afrikaans Bible translation of 1933 (AFR33) and its revision of 1953 (AFR53), which was in official use in churches at the time. The decision to support a new translation that would succeed it was the result of an historical process stretching as far back as when the first translation of a biblical book into Afrikaans appeared (Naudé 2009:54).

Prior to 1933, when the first Afrikaans Bible was introduced successfully to the Afrikaans speaking community, the Bible version long accepted was the Dutch Authorised Version/*Statenvertaling* (SV) of 1637. Although the Dutch and Afrikaans languages are similar, by the turn of the 19th century the level of Dutch in the SV was no longer easily understood by speakers of Afrikaans. The first attempts to translate portions of the Bible into Afrikaans were done by S.J. du Toit (Naudé 2009:54). The first translation of a biblical book into Afrikaans was that of Genesis which appeared in 1893. Translations that followed soon after were that of the Gospel of Matthew (1895), the Book of Revelation (1898), Song of Songs (1905), Psalms (1907), Acts, and the Gospel of Mark (1908). These translations were not official in any way,

were not intended to replace the SV, and were indeed never fully accepted. Afrikaans speakers continued to use the SV.

In 1916 the Orange Free State Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church (DRC) expressed its desire for a Bible in Afrikaans, but the Synod realised that support from the DRC Synods in other provinces, as well as the support of the other two Afrikaans Reformed sister churches (i.e. *Nederduitsch Hervormde Kerk van Afrika* and *Gereformeerde Kerke in Suid-Afrika*) was necessary. In 1917 the British and Foreign Bible Society (BFBS) offered to support the translation project and its publication financially. This support was offered on condition that the final product should resemble the wording of the Dutch SV. The SV was to be the source text and a translation into Afrikaans was merely to be checked against the Hebrew and Greek ST (Naudé 2009:55). This trial translation of the four New Testament Gospels and the Psalms was published in 1922 but it was rejected by the Afrikaans Bible reading public. The result was the decision to embark upon a full translation project from the Hebrew and Greek ST. For the Old Testament the ST was to be Rudolf Kittel's 2nd scholarly edition of *Biblia Hebraica*, published in 1913 (BHK2). This edition was based on the Second Rabbinic Bible published in 1524-1525 in Venice by Daniel Bomberg supplemented by a text critical apparatus. The actual Second Rabbinic Bible, which contained the Hebrew text supplemented with Rabbinic commentary, was the source text of both the SV and *King James Version* of 1611 (KJV). The translators of the 1933 Afrikaans translation followed as far as possible the wording of the SV. This included using the same source texts as the SV. For the New Testament the translators of the 1933 Afrikaans Bible used the Greek New Testament prepared by Desiderius Erasmus in 1516 despite having access to later and better editions of the Greek New Testament by then. They did this because they believed that it was the source text of the SV translation of the New Testament (although it was not, according to Naudé 2011:9).

According to Naudé (2009:62) the translators of the 1933 Afrikaans Bible used the translation method of following the ST word-for-word. This translation method was followed by the SV as well as the KJV and was regarded as normative (Naudé 2009:63) at the time. The revision of the 1933 translation published in 1953 was corrective in the sense that some changes in spelling and word choice were incorporated (Naudé 2009:67). By then Rudolf Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* 3rd Scholarly Edition (BHK3) was published in 1937 as well as its successor of 1951, which contained information from the Dead Sea Scrolls, which had been recently discovered in 1947. The significance of BHK3 was that it was based on a different source text than the second edition. The *Codex Leningradensis*, as opposed to the Second Rabbinic Bible, was the

Hebrew source text of BHK3 and of subsequent editions. The Second Rabbinic Bible contained nine textual differences compared to *Codex Leningradensis* and therefore also editions of *Biblia Hebraica* after 1937 (i.e., 1 Kings 20:38; Proverbs 8:16; Isaiah 10:16; Isaiah 27:2; Isaiah 38:14; Jeremiah 34:1; Ezekiel 30:18; Zephaniah 3:15; Malachi 1:12). Relevant to the study of Zephaniah, it is clear from the difference between the rendering of Zephaniah 3:15 in AFR33 and in AFR53 that the revisors of AFR53 indeed did have BHK3 available to them. AFR33 reads Zephaniah 3:15 as *jy sal geen kwaad meer aanskou nie* (“you will see no more evil”). This reading assumes תִּרְאֵי (“you will see” based on the root רָאָה) which appears in the Second Rabbinic Bible and Kittel’s second scholarly edition of the Hebrew Bible. Zephaniah 3:15 in AFR53 reads *jy sal geen kwaad meer vrees nie* (“you will fear no more evil”), which assumes the reading תִּירְאֵי based on the root יָרָא, which is the reading of *Codex Leningradensis*, BHK3, and subsequent editions. It is interesting that the translation of the Dutch Bible Society of 1951 (NBG-51) also followed this reading.

Shortly after the publication of the revision of 1953, a new commission was formed in 1958 tasked with a further revision (Joubert 2020:170). The commission did not function for long since it became clear at an early stage that the changes in the everyday use of Afrikaans, as a new and fast-developing language, meant that AFR53 no longer represented the language use of contemporary Afrikaans speakers. Either a full revision or a fresh translation was necessary. In 1960 Prof. P.F.D. Weiss visited the BFBS in London to request a full revision. The request was granted after some reluctance (Joubert 2020:170). In 1961 a committee was formed with the revision in mind. By 1966 the committee ground to a halt. By then only Prof. B.B. Keet was left as one of its original members, and he vacated his position in favour of Prof. E.P. Groenewald.

A turn towards making a fresh translation came in 1967 when the Bible Society of South Africa organised a translation seminar at Turfloop. Eugene A. Nida, the secretary for translation at the American Bible Society, as well as the person who developed the theory of functional equivalence (Nida & Taber 1969), was invited as the guest speaker. The Secretary of the BFBS, Rev. J.T.M. Arkel was also present. Based on presentations at the seminar regarding difficulties in translating the Old and New Testament, as well as the latest developments in translation theory, Rev. J.T.M. Arkel posed the question whether an entirely new translation into Afrikaans should be pursued rather than another revision (Joubert 2020:170). Nida responded favourably to this proposal. The principles adopted for what would become the 1983 Afrikaans Bible (AFR83) were formulated at that seminar. The main characteristic of

the new translation would be that the meaning of the original text should be transferred in a language that is comprehensible for the lay person and the younger section of the population, and that it should be faithful to the source texts (Joubert 2020:171).

The first meeting of the Translation Commission of what would become AFR83 was held on 2nd of February 1971. The minutes of that meeting contain information that confirm that the 1983 Afrikaans Bible translation emerges from an era of a prescriptive approach to equivalence and translation. In the minutes, there is reference to the translation seminar of 5 July 1968 mentioned above. The Commission stated that they intended to produce a translation into Afrikaans that would follow the principles discussed at the mentioned seminar as opposed to a translation that adheres to the form of the ST such as the AFR53 translation. There is reference to traditional church and technical theological terms that should be avoided and simplified. These include terms such as *geregtigheid* (“justice”), *goedertierenheid* (“lovingkindness”), and *geregtigheid deur geloof* (“justification by faith”). The Commission decided that sentences should be shorter, simplified, and what is implicit in the ST should be made explicit in the TT.

The minutes of the meeting explicitly mention the *New English Bible* (NEB) of 1970. The NEB did not follow the theory of functional equivalence (i.e. the theory adopted by the translators of AFR83), but it did have a similar objective as AFR83 in that it was intended to be a translation into modern speech. The meeting discussed in detail some of what the Commission members felt were errors from the side of the NEB translators. One of these was that the NEB used formal “thee” and “thou” language.

According to the minutes of the meeting on 2nd February 1971, the Commission decided to use BHK3 as ST for the Old Testament since it was the latest critical edition of the Hebrew Bible available at that stage. This is significant, because it means that the ST of the 1983 Afrikaans Bible would be based on the *Codex Leningradensis*, a different Hebrew text from that used by the 1933 translation. Some other decisions include the Commission’s manner of operations, names of representatives of the three Afrikaans Reformed Churches, as well as the allocation of translators to specific biblical books.

The minutes of the Translation Commission meeting of 2nd February 1971, are very significant for the current investigation. One of the main hypotheses of the current study is that not only AFR83’s explicitly stated source text, but also other texts would have been incipient to it. Since the meeting makes mention of various texts and concepts, it is possible to consider that these were also incipient elements that formed part of AFR83.

The Commission decided that BHK3 would be their source text for the Old Testament. This is significant because, when the first edition of AFR83 was published, the introductory note to the reader stated that a different text served as source for the Old Testament by then. According to this introductory note, the source text of the translation was not BHK3, but its successor, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS) of 1977. It surely makes sense that, as a later edition of *Biblia Hebraica* would become available, that the translators would use it and that is why BHK3 was no longer used after 1977. It does, however, also imply that for almost half the time that AFR83 was in the making, translators were using the predecessor of BHS and its text-critical apparatus. It would be worthwhile to consider how some elements of page formatting, contents, or presentation of text-critical notes in the two different publications' apparatus might have influenced the translators.

The Commission decided explicitly to accept the theory of functional equivalence as normative and took further decisions concerning their method of translation and operation. These decisions, influenced by their accepted theory of functional equivalence, included their choice of ST, their vision of what their end-product should look like, and what processes of feedback and cross-checking they would follow to make sure that their translation measured up to their conception of equivalence. Their decision to produce a more “dynamic” translation means that they must have had some conception of how they *did not* want their translation to look. It is possible that the translators would have consulted some formally equivalent translations such as the SV, AFR33, and AFR53, be it as a source of exegesis, text-critical information, or as an example of the kind of translation that they would attempt to move away from.

The Commission mentions the *New English Bible* (NEB) of 1970 by name. Although the Commission proceeded to discuss some elements of the NEB that they did not agree with, the implication is that by the time the translation of the AFR83 was in progress, the NEB would already have formed part of AFR83's incipient complex source and it might already have had an influence on the translators, because they would have consulted it. It also opens the possibility that other translations that had a similar objective as AFR83 would have had an influence upon it as well, such as the *Good News Bible* (GNB) (Naudé 2005:82).

For the purpose of the current study, the name of Prof. P.A. Verhoef in the minutes of 2nd February 1971 is significant for several reasons. First, the Commission decided that he would be part of the committee that would be responsible for the translation of the Old Testament and that he would be responsible for the Book of Zephaniah, amongst others.

Second, the mention of his name is also important because it implies yet another possible incipient text to AFR83. Prof P.A. Verhoef was the promotor for a Master of Theology thesis on Zephaniah by J.P.J. Olivier at the University of Stellenbosch. Olivier (1973:iv) states explicitly that his thesis is intended as a help for the translators of the new Afrikaans translation that was underway at that stage. Olivier's thesis attempts to make his translation according to the theory of functional equivalence and records meticulously how he followed the procedures prescribed by Nida & Taber (1969) and he did extensive research concerning text-critical problems in the Book of Zephaniah.

The above brief historical overview requires a few brief summarising statements to establish a logical connection between the current section of this chapter and the one that follows. These summarising statements concern ultimately which texts might have formed part of AFR83 Zephaniah's complex incipient sign system and are worth comparing to AFR83.

The NEB is mentioned by name in the meeting of 2nd February 1971. This means that they would have consulted it as an example of a modern speech translation. The Commission stated explicitly that they wanted to move away from formally equivalent translations of which the KJV, AFR33, AFR53, and NBG-51 were examples. Since the translators indicate specifically that they wanted to move away from such formally equivalent translations, this would mean that they would have consulted them even if they were examples of how they did not want their translation to look, or that they would have consulted them as a source of exegesis and text-critical information before formulating their own "dynamic" translation. Their decision for which ST to use for the Old Testament is significant, because it means that not only BHS as explicit source text, but also BHK3 would have had at least some influence since the translators would have used it for at least 6 years before AFR83 was published. The mention of Prof. P.A. Verhoef implies that the M.Th. thesis of J.P.J. Olivier would have been taken into account as well; because Prof. P.A. Verhoef, as the one responsible for the translation of Zephaniah would have had to read it by 1973 when J.P.J. Olivier completed his thesis. The Translation Commission decided explicitly that it wanted to follow the theory of translation as formulated by Eugene A. Nida, with the result that the GNB would have had an influence when it became available in 1976 as well. This is because the translators of the GNB, just like the AFR83, desired to follow the theory as formulated by Eugene A. Nida. The decision by the AFR83 translators that this theory of equivalence (Nida & Taber 1969) would be normative to them, implies that the Commission held a prescriptive view of translation. In the following section

of this chapter, I give a brief description of the move away from a prescriptive to a descriptive approach.

2.3 Shift towards a Descriptive Approach

In the previous section I indicated that the 1983 Afrikaans Bible translation finds itself in an historical context in which a prescriptive approach to translation and equivalence was dominant. The movement away from a prescriptive to a descriptive approach to translation in recent years can be attributed to the realisation that equivalence is poorly defined (Nord 2016:567) and, even if it were to be defined more clearly, equivalence is impossible to achieve. To illustrate this, Nord (2016:570) uses the example of the translation of ancient miracle stories. An approach that attempts to achieve equivalence would have to determine what the meaning of the ST was for its original audience and how they would have responded (Nida & Taber 1969:23). Based on that, a translator would have to achieve equivalence by reproducing the meaning of the ST in such a way that it would, if not generating the same effect, at least mean the same to the target audience as it did for the original audience. According to Nord (2016:570) “it would not make any sense to aim at recreating the functions or effects the original texts had or may have been intended to have for their receivers” because the modern context is just so far removed from the original audience that it is not possible for a modern audience to listen to a miracle story with the same expectations as the original ancient audience.

According to Nord (2005:25), the concept of equivalence has been debated since its inception. The aspiration for equivalence gives rise to untenable contradictions (Naudé 1999:74). The reasons why a translation might fail in the ideal of achieving equivalence vary – a translation may be too literal or not literal enough. Measured against the yardstick of equivalence, a translation that follows its original too closely, too faithfully, too literally, is deemed as equally lacking in equivalence as a translation that is not faithful enough or too free. Despite various attempts to define the concept of equivalence and on what levels a translation should be deemed as equivalent, one of the problems in using equivalence as a requirement for what translators *should* be doing, is the “inherent fuzziness” of the concept (Nord 2016:567). According to Hermans (1985:7), if a prescriptive concept of equivalence is used to judge a translation, translation would be a futile exercise by default. This is because a translation, when compared to the perceived richness of its original, would always be found to be wanting. According to Hermans (1985:8), there are those who consider translations not only as “second-hand” but

also as “second-rate”, as an inferior object of study. Such an opinion results that even when a translation is studied, the object of study ultimately remains the ST – the study of a translation would merely be to demonstrate its errors when compared to its original. Such an approach takes the original to be normative, the forever unattainable ideal which a translation can never achieve since it is impossible to produce a translation that is the exact copy of its original (Naudé 1999:74). According to Nord (2005:26) various attempts to define equivalence have not achieved a clearer definition. What has been revealed is rather that the concept is ambiguous. Because equivalence is poorly defined, there has been in recent years a shift away from a prescriptive to a descriptive approach to translation. The shift has been away from defining principles that prescribe how a translation *should* be done, to a description of how a translation has actually been done. Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) analyses existing translations by asking the question, “Why is there what there is?” (Rosa 2010:94). Holmes (1988:72) considers DTS as an attempt to describe, amongst other things, what happens in the “little black box” of the translator’s mind when creating a “more or less matching text” in another language.

According to Holmes (1988:72) there are three objects of study within DTS: translation as product, function, or process. A product oriented DTS examines the translation as a finalised product that describes the translated text itself or different translations of the same original. Function oriented DTS examines what function the translation has in society (e.g., in comparison or in contrast with the translation’s intended function). A process oriented DTS describes the translation process and could focus on internal or external influences upon the translator. According to Hermans (1985:10) DTS arises from the need not for theories about equivalence from which procedures may be prescribed, but rather DTS arises from the need for practical case studies to describe and account for what translators actually did to establish their translation (Hermans 1985:13).

According to Toury (1985:18) translations are phenomena of reality that can be observed. They attest to how translators went about solving translational problems (Toury 1985:21). One of the objectives of DTS is to reconstruct the process that gave rise to practical translation decisions. This reconstruction could entail the description of the norms, constraints, and strategies that determined translation decisions (Toury 1985:22).

Lambert & Van Gorp (1985:52-53) provide some practical guidelines for a descriptive study consisting of four steps to describe the relationship of translated texts to their source texts. The

first step is to collect preliminary data such as the title page, introductions, footnotes, and information regarding the strategy of translation. The second step is to collect data on macro-level (e.g., how titles, chapters, and paragraphs are divided). The third step is to collect micro-level data. It is on this level that a selected text is considered. Under investigation could be a selection of words, dominant grammatical patterns, formal literary features such as meter and rhyme, modality of verbs (e.g. passive or active, subjunctive or indicative), and language levels (e.g. formal, informal, or popular). It is during this third step that translation strategies of specific texts can be described (Naudé 1999:79). The fourth step is to collect data from the translation's system in which it functions. According to Lambert and Van Gorp (1985:49) no study can possibly be exhaustive. Researchers will need to select what specific elements of a translation will be described.

From the above, it can be inferred that the main difference between a prescriptive approach, such as the one followed by AFR83, and a descriptive approach is the definition of equivalence. According to Rosa (2010:97), within DTS, equivalence is a descriptive concept. The observable fact of a translation assumes that equivalence has already been achieved and the task of DTS is to describe what translators did to achieve that. The fact of the translation assumes that translators encountered certain translation problems and their translation represents their solutions.

In order to establish a logical connection from the current to the next section, a few summarising comments are necessary in order to indicate how a study with DTS can be reductionist in nature from the perspective of complexity, but also at which point DTS can be supplemented by a perspective of complexity.

In this section I indicated that a descriptive study of a translation can be conducted at various levels. DTS is the description of the relationship between a translation and its original. One of the ways to describe the relationship between a translation and its original is to consider the use of translation strategies. The assumption is that the translation represents practical examples of what translators did to overcome translation problems. It would seem that, implicit to this view (i.e. DTS is the description of the relationship between a translation and its original) is the assumption that what is to be described in DTS is the relationship between a *single* source text and a *single* target text. It is at this point that a complexity approach can supplement DTS.

2.4 A Complexity Approach to a Source Text

Earlier in this chapter, I indicated that the 1983 Afrikaans Bible translation emerged from an era in which a prescriptive approach to translation and equivalence was dominant. I briefly described the shift away from a prescriptive to a descriptive approach to translation. If a particular text is considered to be a translation of another, equivalence is the relationship between them, and it is assumed to have been achieved already. The task of DTS is to describe and explain that equivalence (Rosa 2010:100).

From the above it can be inferred that the implicit assumption of both a prescriptive and a descriptive approach, is that a translation is the result of the interaction between only two elements defined usually as a single ST and a single TT. ST and TT are considered each to be texts only, that they are fixed, static, and mutually exclusive (Marais 2014:99). From the perspective of complexity, this is a reductionist view. A reductionist approach tends to break down and separate wholes into its constituent parts (Larsen-Freeman 2013:269). Within a paradigm of simplicity or reductionism, each small part is studied in isolation. Reductionism has the tendency to separate and contrast binary relationships, and contradictions are seen as error (Larsen-Freeman 2013:370).

A complexity approach takes the complexity of reality and its interrelatedness as its point of departure (Marais 2014:26). From a complexity perspective, reality is emergent. Reality, such as a Bible translation as an element of reality, is the higher-level result of an interaction of various lower-level incipient elements. Applied to translation, Marais (2014:10) argues that a translation, as a phenomenon, as part of reality, is a new whole that has emerged through the input of various meaning-bearing signs of different types. This means that a translation does not emerge from the interaction between only an ST and a TT, each understood to be a single text, nor solely from the interaction of texts, but from various elements that were incipient to it.

When approached from the perspective of complexity, what is usually called the ST and TT should be defined in a non-reductionist way. Marais (2019:44) does this by redefining what is otherwise called the ST and TT as an incipient text and subsequent text, respectively each being part of a larger incipient and subsequent sign system of which texts are just one element. According to Marais (2019:44) a translation as product and process emerges from a variety of cause-and-effect relationships that gave rise to it. A translation is the “much coming from little” (Marais 2014:48), the new higher-level whole emerging from the interaction of parts at

a lower level. The incipient sign system from which a translation emerged, includes various texts that might have influenced it, as well as non-textual elements such as historical circumstances, the context of the translators themselves, the belief system of the translators, and other meaning-bearing elements that gave input to the translation process (Marais 2019:45).

According to Marais (2019:46) subsequent meanings, texts, or other elements that arise from the translation process, themselves feed into new incipient processes. As an example, Marais (2019:46) specifically mentions how a particular subsequent text, such as a Bible translation's interpretation of a specific text, can be incipient to influence the interpretations of other translations in future to form part of the complex source from which a new translation will emerge.

A complexity approach assumes that the translation is a new whole that emerges. Emergent reality is not merely the result or the sum-total of its parts. From a perspective of complexity, the value of the whole that emerges is more, is different, and has "acquired qualitatively new properties" than the sum-total of its parts (Marais 2014:49). Complexity assumes that reality has a high level of inter-relatedness (Marais 2014:24). Complexity takes a meta-stance in which the tension between binary relationships is not resolved by making a choice for one or the other, but the assumption is that they are both part of reality and that their value lies in their relationship with each other (Marais 2014:15). From a complexity perspective, the value of binaries is that they are both part of the various cause-and-effect relationships from which reality emerges (Marais 2019:43).

A binary usually upheld in translation studies is that of source and target. From the perspective of reductionism, both are seen as fixed, static, and mutually exclusive. From a reductionist point of view, the task of a translator is to communicate the fixed and static meaning of usually a single ST across cultural and linguistic boundaries (Naudé 2022:1) in a single TT of which the meaning is assumed to be equally fixed and static. A complexity approach does not make a choice between source and target in this way (Marais & Meylaerts 2019:6) and it presupposes that neither source nor target is stable and static (Marais 2019:45).

From the meta-stance of a complexity approach, the binary of source and target do not need to be separated from each other. They are in constant and creative tension, being part of the translation process concurrently. Within a complexity approach, both source and target can be accommodated at the same time. From a complexity perspective, reality is not only made up

of things, but also of the relationship between things (Marais 2014:25). According to Marais (2019:49) meaning is not frozen within a source but meaning and translation emerge from the complex interaction between the totality of elements in the incipient system.

According to Marais et al (2021:119) complexity is not a methodology in the sense that it will provide a researcher with exact procedures. Complexity provides a researcher with an additional framework that will guide his/ her observations. A complexity approach does not attempt to replace existing theories but to supplement them.

In order to establish a logical connection between the current section and the following, a few summarising statements are necessary. I have indicated that a complexity approach takes a stance against reductionism and that it takes the complexity and interrelatedness of reality as its point of departure. A complexity approach does not intend to replace existing theories, however reductionist they might be. Instead, its purpose is to supplement these theories and methods by another perspective. I have indicated that a descriptive study compares a translation with its original. A reductionist approach to DTS would assume that what is traditionally considered to be the source text is a single text other than the translation. In the section below I will indicate how this element of DTS can be supplemented by a perspective of complexity.

2.5. Supplementing DTS with Complexity

A complexity approach does not negate the methods of DTS such as that described by Lambert & Van Gorp (1985:52-53) and the description of translation strategies (Naudé 1999:79). A perspective of complexity adds an additional perspective to it.

A central concept in a complexity approach is emergence (Marais 2019:47). A DTS that attempts to describe translation strategies with the perspective of complexity, should proceed from the hypothesis that the translation emerged from a complex source that consisted of more than one text.

In order to conduct a descriptive study from the perspective of complexity, a descriptive study of translation strategies could proceed initially in the way that a reductionist approach usually would. This could be done by comparing only the explicitly stated ST to the translation. One of the ways to compare a translation to its original is to describe the translation strategies used by the translators. This would be a description on the micro-level according to the method

developed by Lambert and Van Gorp (1985:52-53). Such a description should be able to detect where translators deviated from their stated ST. At this point DTS can be supplemented by the insight of complexity that a translation emerges from a complex source that could not have consisted of just one other text. Such deviations from the explicitly stated ST can then be considered as examples of where translators would have used other sources to establish their translation. DTS can be supplemented by the additional question, “If the translators did not use their stated ST in this instance, what did they actually use?” If this question could reveal the use of a source other than the stated source text, it would not only demonstrate that the translation emerged from a complex source that consisted of at least more than one text, but it could also describe some elements of that complex source.

Applied to AFR83 Zephaniah, one of the ways to demonstrate its complex source could be to do a descriptive study according to the methods described by Lambert & Van Gorp (1985:52-53) on the micro-level, but supplement it by the insights of complexity. Such a study could proceed by using a line-for-line or phrase-for-phrase comparison between the stated ST (i.e. BHS) and AFR83 Zephaniah. The description of the translators’ strategies will reveal what the translators did to establish their translation. This should also reveal where they deviated from their ST because they came across text-specific problems. Such text-specific problems would include that the source text is not readily comprehensible (Nord 2005:168). It is my hypothesis that when translators came across text-specific problems where the source text is difficult to understand they would have been more inclined to use some specific strategies more than others, such as deletion (i.e. an element in the ST is not conveyed in the translation at all), addition (i.e. the TT contains linguistic, cultural, and textual elements that do not appear in the ST at all), transposition (i.e. grammatical structure in ST is conveyed by means of an entirely different grammatical form in the TT), or else a combination of various strategies (Naudé 1999:79). Another hypothesis is that, when confronted with such text-specific problems, the translators would have consulted other texts, not only their explicitly stated ST (Reid 2021:45).

2.6. Conclusion

In the current chapter I described that the historical era from which the Afrikaans Bible translation of 1983 emerged was one in which a prescriptive approach to translation was dominant. I indicated that I believe a study within DTS, supplemented by insights from a complexity approach, could be used to compare the translation of Zephaniah with its explicitly

stated ST and then identify instances where AFR83 deviates from BHS. A description of the strategies used at such instances, could reveal that translators used sources other than the explicit ST for their translation.

Since BHS was the explicitly stated ST for AFR83 as a scholarly edition that contained both the Hebrew text and a text-critical apparatus, DTS from the perspective of complexity would have to identify instances where the translators deviated not only from the Hebrew text, but also from suggestions in the text-critical apparatus. This would imply that translators used sources other than their ST to establish their translation and this would prove the main hypothesis of the current study as correct. If a description of some translation strategies reveal that the translators deviated from their ST, it implies that they would have used some other source to establish their translation, even if that source cannot be identified. If the comparison between various possible incipient texts could reveal at least some possible sources that the translators of AFR83 Zephaniah might have used, it could describe some elements of that complex source that was part of AFR83 Zephaniah's incipient sign system.

In the next chapter I will conduct the descriptive study of a selection of texts from the 1983 Afrikaans Bible translation of the Book of Zephaniah from a perspective of complexity. If the comparison of the relationship between AFR83 and its ST reveals influences apart from the translation's explicit source text, it will demonstrate the translation's emergent nature and therefore also its complex source. This would prove the hypothesis of the current study that the 1983 Afrikaans Bible translation of Zephaniah emerged from a complex source as correct. Inadvertently it might also describe elements of that complex source.

CHAPTER 3

COMPLEXITY DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF AFR83 ZEPHANIAH

3.1. Introduction

The translators of the Afrikaans Bible of 1983 (AFR83) informed their readers in the introductory note that the Hebrew text of *Codex Leningradensis* as reproduced in *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS) and its text-critical apparatus served as their source text (ST). This reflects the traditional notion that a translation is the result of the interaction between only two elements (i.e. a source text and a target text) (Naudé 2022:1), each understood to be a single text. From the perspective of complexity, this is a reductionist view. The source of a translation cannot be just one other text. This is because a translation, as an element of reality, is considered to have emerged from the interaction of various elements of an incipient sign system. Such a sign system of various incipient elements would have included other texts, but also other factors. Such an incipient sign system would include other texts and even non-textual factors such as constraints upon the translators, their historical context, their socio-political context, their belief system (Joubert 2020:11), and whatever other elements might have impacted upon the translators (Naudé 2022:1).

From the perspective of complexity, a translation, as an observable element of reality (Toury 1985:19), is considered to have emerged from a complex interaction of various relationships within a complex system, a complex system that would have contained various factors (Marais & Meylaerts 2019:5). This means that, included in this system, are indeed texts, but the incipient sign system does not contain only texts. There would have been various meaning-bearing factors, various elements of different kinds that would have contributed to the translation process. This is what Marais (2019:8) calls an incipient sign system as opposed to referring only to a source text. Since an incipient sign system contains various texts and other factors – texts that are part this system should be called incipient texts and texts that emerge from the translation process should be called subsequent texts (Naudé 2020:1), always bearing in mind that texts are but one element of an incipient sign system. A translation, as a subsequent text, is itself part of new incipient processes from which yet other subsequent translations or texts will emerge (Marais 2019:46).

The above makes it clear that the claim by the translators of AFR83 that their source was just one other text, is reductionist in nature and does not take the complex and emergent nature of translation into account. As indicated earlier in this thesis, the purpose of the current study is to test the hypothesis that the source of AFR83 Zephaniah was not just one other text, as is claimed by the translators, but that AFR83 Zephaniah emerged from a complex incipient sign system that would have consisted of other elements and other texts as well. This means that more texts than just its stated ST would have formed part of AFR83's complex source. To test this hypothesis, it will be necessary to demonstrate instances where the translators of AFR83 Zephaniah must have made use of a source other than BHS to establish their translation. These would be at instances that the translators deviated from their stated ST.

Since the translators of AFR83 claimed that their ST was BHS (i.e. a scholarly edition that includes possible textual variants) it must be clearly defined what should be considered to be a deviation from the ST. Since the source text claimed by the translators of AFR83 contained both the Hebrew Masoretic text accompanied by a text-critical apparatus, a deviation from the ST should be considered as instances where the translators deviated not only from the Hebrew text, but also from the apparatus. This will demonstrate that a particular text's translation must have come from a source other than the stated ST. This will demonstrate that AFR83 Zephaniah emerged from a complex source that consisted of at least more than one other text.

I must state explicitly that I realise that the concept of an incipient sign system encompasses all meaning-bearing factors that could have given an input to the translation process and that texts are but one part of this (Marais 2019:45). However, for the purpose of the current study, I will limit myself to detecting the presence of other possible incipient *texts*. If there are instances in which other incipient elements become evident, these will be noted as well, but they are not the primary purpose of the current study.

I will proceed by selecting texts from the Book of Zephaniah. Using some principles of Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) (Lambert & Van Gorp 1985:52-53) I will compare the Hebrew text and the text-critical apparatus of BHS to the translation. Working on the micro-level (Lambert & Van Gorp 1985:53), I will describe the translation strategies used to establish the translation (Naudé 1999:79). This should reveal instances where the translators deviated from both the Hebrew text and the text-critical apparatus of BHS. I hypothesise that this could have been done especially by the translation strategy of deletion (i.e. instances where translators did not convey an element of the source text into the target text at all), addition (i.e.

the translation contains elements that are not contained in the source text at all), and transposition (i.e. a strategy that involves changing the grammar of the source text by conveying it by means of a different grammatical structure in the translation), or a combination of other strategies.

Earlier in this dissertation I argued what other texts might also have been incipient to AFR83 Zephaniah (i.e. KJV, SV, NBG-51, AFR33, AFR53, NEB, GNB, BHK3, and Olivier's 1973 M.Th. thesis). Instances where AFR83 Zephaniah deviated from both the Hebrew text and the text-critical apparatus of BHS will be compared to these possible incipient texts. From the perspective of complexity, there must have been other incipient texts or other elements besides the ones mentioned above. Due to the sheer vastness of the topic and because it is humanly impossible for any human being to be fully aware of absolutely everything around them (Marais 2019:47), I will pay attention only to the above mentioned possible incipient texts (Marais 2019:47). The reason is that, although a comparison between AFR83 and other incipient texts might even reveal the actual source other than BHS used by translators in specific cases, the ultimate purpose of this study is not to identify those other sources, but merely to demonstrate the fact of a complex incipient system. However, if some of the above texts could be demonstrated as having been incipient in that they had an influence on the translators, it will justify the claim for the presence of a complex source even more.

This chapter is divided into sections as follows. The title of each section will be the verse reference of the text from the Book of Zephaniah under consideration. The Hebrew text of BHS (1977) will be quoted followed by AFR83 for that verse with an English back translation. Then I will present the various other possible incipient texts in chronological order of their publication. Since KJV represents a more word-for-word tradition of translation, I will quote the KJV as well for the sake of having a literal English translation of the Hebrew at hand. I will discuss the text-critical apparatus and translation strategies used by the translators of AFR83 Zephaniah. I will discuss the possible influences that might have guided the translators of AFR83 Zephaniah in each verse. The conclusion of each section will be a determination of whether the translators deviated from their ST (i.e. the translation follows neither the Hebrew text, nor the text-critical apparatus) or not. If so, then it can be inferred that the translators must have used another source to establish their translation and this will demonstrate the presence of a complex source, a complex incipient sign system of which more than one text must have formed a part.

3.2. Zephaniah 1:2

אֶסְרָף אֶתְכֶם כָּל מַעַל פְּגַי הָאֲדָמָה נְאֻם־יְהוָה:

AFR83: Ek gaan 'n einde maak aan alles op aarde, sê die Here.

[I am going to make an end to everything on earth, says the Lord.]

KJV: I will utterly consume all things from off the land, saith the LORD.

SV: Ik zal ganselijk alles wegrapen uit dit land, spreekt de HEERE.

AFR33: Saamskraap, wegraap sal Ek alles van die aarde af weg, spreek die Here.

NBG-51: Volkomen zal Ik alles van de aardbodem wegvagen, luidt het woord des HEREN.

AFR53: Saamskraap, wegraap sal Ek alles van die aardbodem af weg, spreek die Here.

NEB: I will sweep the earth clean of all that is on it, says the Lord.

GNB: The Lord said, "I am going to destroy everything on earth."

AFR83 translates this verse as a simple future tense. The translation reflects only one verb. It is not clear how AFR83 understood the grammar of this very problematic verse. The combination of the Qal infinite absolute אֶסְרָף of the root אֶסַר in combination with the Hiphil imperfective first person common singular אֶסְרָף understood as a volitive (i.e. "let me cause to come to an end") of the root אֶסַר is problematic in the Hebrew text. Text-critically there is no evidence to emend the consonantal text. Ancient versions reflect different vocalisations of what must have been the same consonantal text.

The meaning of the text-critical note in BHS for this verse is not entirely clear. BHS suggests that אֶסְרָף should be vocalised as אֶסַר. What the analysis of אֶסַר is supposed to be, is not clear, because even this vowel pointing can have more than one possible meaning.

BHK3, which was the source of AFR83 Zephaniah initially before the publication of BHS in 1977, contained a text-critical note that suggested that the reading should be emended to read אֶסְרָף אֶסְרָף thus creating a Qal imperfect first person common singular in combination with a Qal infinite absolute of the same root אֶסַר. This would create a tautological infinitive construction that could be translated as *I will surely gather* or *I will utterly take away*. This reading has its origin in the original publication of the Second Rabbinic Bible upon which BHK1 and BHK2 were based. The original publication of the Second Rabbinic Bible edited by Jacob Ben

Chayyim and published by Daniel Bomberg in Venice in 1524-1525, contained commentary of Rashi in the margin of this Hebrew text. According to that commentary the reading represents a misspelling and should be understood as הָבֵטֵּן הָבֵטֵּן . BHK1 and BHK2 presented this commentary in their text-critical apparatus. This text-critical suggestion was contained in BHK3 as well. It seems that this was the understanding of both the KJV and SV which translated this text as a Qal imperfect first person common singular in combination with a Qal infinitive absolute of the root הָבֵט , thus creating a tautological infinitive which it translated as *I will utterly destroy*.

BHS itself presents a briefer text-critical note that proposes that הָבֵטֵּן should be emended to הָבֵטֵּן but without explanation. It is not clear if the intention is that this verb should be understood as a Qal participle with the sense of imminent action which could be translated as *I am surely about to gather/ take away*. It is not clear if this is the reading adopted by AFR83 since it translated this expression as a simple future tense using only one verb. Another possibility of how AFR83 understood this expression is that a letter aleph was omitted by means of haplography or that it is due to the same phenomenon that appears in the Qal Imperfect first person common singular of the verb root אָמַר . The verb for “I will say” appears as אָמַר in the Hebrew Bible. In such a case the assumption is that the visible aleph is the prefix of the Imperfect first person common singular while the root aleph has fallen away due to its function as a silent letter. Whether read with a different vocalisation of either הָבֵטֵּן or assuming that an aleph has fallen away due to haplography and it should therefore be understood as הָבֵטֵּן , the verb הָבֵטֵּן can still be understood as a Qal imperfective verb in the first person common singular that can be translated as *I will gather*. With the combination of the Qal infinitive absolute the tautological infinitive would give rise to the translation *I will surely gather* or *I will gather up/ away*.

Olivier (1973:5) presents extensive research on various possible explanations for the combination of a Qal infinitive absolute and a Hiphil imperfective first person common singular verb. His commentary includes criticising Verhoef, his promotor for the M.Th. dissertation. Verhoef apparently wanted to translate this expression as *I will sweep away entirely*, but Olivier (1973:5) argued against it. Olivier (1973:5) suggested a translation that uses the simple future tense in Afrikaans to indicate the finality of the judgement being announced. He suggests that the Qal infinitive absolute הָבֵטֵּן has the sense of “once again” whilst הָבֵטֵּן as a Hiphil Imperfective may be retained. Olivier (1973:3) suggested a translation that would read *I will once again sweep away everything from the face of the earth, says the*

Lord. The first translation draft during the first phase of the official translation process read *Ek gaan alles van die aarde af wegvee, sê die Here* (“I will sweep away all from the earth, says the Lord”). As of the second phase of translation drafts, the reading was changed to the reading as it was published in 1983.

Ultimately AFR83 translates this expression as a future tense *Ek gaan ’n einde maak aan alles op aarde* (“I will make an end to all things on earth”). AFR83 seems to render only one of the two verbs in translation. AFR83 contains no sense of two verbs present in the source text, no matter from which roots they are assumed to be derived, working in combination. It is interesting that AFR33 conveyed the presence of two different verbs, although it is not clear how the translators of AFR33 understood the roots or the combination of the grammatical forms. AFR33 translates this expression as *Saamskraap, wegraap* (“scrape together, reap away”) without a conjunction, the same as the Hebrew text. AFR83 seems to render only one verb. If so, the translators have used the strategy of omission (Naudé 1999:79). Whether the translators felt that their translation does indeed convey the meaning of the combination of the emended reading (i.e. אָפֵס אָפֵס) it not clear. What is clear, is that AFR83 creates the impression of conveying only one verb and not two as is written in the ST and the text-critical apparatus does not suggest that one of the two verbs should be deleted. This is an example where the translators deviated from both the Hebrew text of BHS and its text-critical apparatus. By analogy, the translators must have used a different source apart from BHS to establish their translation. This demonstrates the presence of a complex source, a complex incipient sign system, that would have consisted of at least more than one text apart from the stated ST. It is not clear in what way or if the NEB and GNB would have influenced the translators of AFR83 directly in this case, but the similarity between AFR83 Zephaniah, NEB, and GNB of this text is remarkable because they all render only one verb in translation.

3.3. Zephaniah 1:4

וְנָטִיתִי יָדִי עַל־יְהוּדָה וְעַל כָּל־יְוֹשְׁבֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם וְהִכֹּרְתִי מִן־הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה אֶת־שְׂאֵר הַבְּעַל אֶת־שָׁם הַכֹּמָרִים עִם־הַפְּהֻגִים:

AFR83: Ek gaan my hand uitsteek teen Juda en teen al die inwoners van Jerusalem, Ek gaan uit hierdie plek uitroei wat daar nog van Baäl oor is: die naam van die afgodspriesters, van alle priesters:

[I will stretch out my hand against Judah and against all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, I will exterminate from this place all that still remains of Baal: the name of the idol priests, of all priests.]

- KJV: I will also stretch out mine hand upon Judah, and upon all the inhabitants of Jerusalem; and I will cut off the remnant of Baal from this place, and the name of the Chemarims with the priests;
- SV: En Ik zal Mijn hand uitstrekken tegen Juda, en tegen alle inwoners van Jeruzalem; en Ik zal uit deze plaats uitroeien het overblijfsel van Baal, *en* den naam der Chemarim met de priesters;
- AFR33: En Ek sal my hand uitstrek teen Juda en teen al die inwoners van Jerusalem; Ek sal ook uit hierdie plek uitroei wat van Baäl oorgebly het, die naam van al die afgodspriesters onder die priesters;
- NBG-51: Ik zal mijn hand uitstrekken tegen Juda en tegen alle inwoners van Jeruzalem, en Ik zal uit deze plaats uitroeien het overblijfsel van Baäl en de naam der afgodsdienaren met de priesters,
- AFR53: En Ek sal my hand uitstrek teen Juda en teen al die inwoners van Jerusalem; Ek sal ook uit hierdie plek uitroei wat van Baäl oorgebly het, die naam van al die afgodsdienaars saam met die priesters;
- NEB: I will stretch my hand over Judah and all who live in Jerusalem. I will wipe out from this place the last remnant of Baal and the very name of the heathen priests.
- GNB: I will punish the people of Jerusalem and of all Judah. I will destroy the last trace of the worship of Baal there, and no one will even remember the pagan priests who serve him.

AFR83 translates אֶת־שְׁמֵם הַכֹּהֲנִים as the object of the verb וְהִכַּרְתִּי but renders עִם־הַכֹּהֲנִים as if it were part of the construct chain, omitting the preposition עִם and assuming that הַכֹּהֲנִים also links to שְׁמֵם. This has the sense that *I will cut off the name of the idolatrous priests, the name of all the priests.*

There are several text-critical considerations in this verse. At least two of these seem to have caused some differences between translations because the text-critical problems result that the meaning of the ST is not clear (Nord 2005:168). According to the text-critical apparatus of BHS, which gives the same information as the apparatus of BHK3 in this case, the phrase עִם־הַכֹּהֲנִים (“with the priests”) is omitted by the Septuagint. The other problem is that the meaning of הכמרים is unclear (Ben-Zvi 1991:67). KJV and SV transliterate this word as *Chemarim*, whilst the other translations vary between interpreting it either as the worshippers of idols or as the priests of idols.

AFR83 omits the *waw* by translating וְנִטִּיתִי only as *Ek gaan uitsteek* (“I will stretch out”) without the conjunction. This does not necessarily mean that AFR83 explicitly followed a different Hebrew reading than its ST in this case. Since the theory of functional equivalence

is more concerned with the transfer of meaning than the forms of the ST, it is possible that the translators of AFR83 did not believe that the omission of the conjunction would diminish the meaning for the target audience and could justify its omission in that way.

The translation of הכמרים seems to have presented problems for the various translations that might have been incipient to AFR83 Zephaniah. The translation of הכמרים is significant because it hints at some of the sources that the translators of AFR83 Zephaniah could have used to establish its meaning. Between AFR33 and its revision (AFR53) there seems to have been a shift in interpretation. AFR33 translates הכמרים as the priests of idols, whilst AFR53 translates it as the servants or worshippers of idols. Due to the proximity of the dates of publication of NBG-51 and AFR53, this might have been because of the influence of NBG-51 upon AFR53. NBG-51 followed the interpretation that הכמרים refers to the worshippers or servants of idols.

Olivier's (1973:14) explanation of this word is quite significant since his research was directly accessible to the translators of AFR83 Zephaniah. Olivier (1973:14) does not seem to entertain the possibility of other translations for הכמרים in detail. He seems to believe that the meaning of הכמרים is not obscure at all even though it appears only four times in the Hebrew Bible. According to Olivier (1973:14) every appearance of this word in the Hebrew Bible (Zephaniah 2:4; 2 Kings 23:5; Hosea 4:4; Hosea 10:5) refers to the priests of idols and that is why this may be accepted as the translation equivalent.

AFR83 Zephaniah does represent a deviation from BHS in their rendition of עם־הכהנים. Some possible incipient texts such as KJV, SV, and AFR53 render it literally as *with the priests* with the sense that the priests (הכהנים) will be annihilated along with the group interpreted either as idol priests or idol worshippers (הכמרים). NEB omits עם־הכהנים following the Septuagint (Brockington 1973:262) as does the GNB. AFR33 translates it as *onder die priesters* ("among the priests") with the sense that הכמרים is a sub-unit that resides among הכהנים who will be annihilated. The sense of AFR33 rendition can be translated as that הכמרים will be annihilated *from among the priests*. Olivier (1973:14) refers to this interpretation and makes the judgement that such a translation will create problems for the perceived rhythmic meter of the verse, but he does not elaborate further. Be that as it may, some of the above translations presuppose that they included the preposition עם ("with") in their reading of the text, although they rendered it in different ways.

AFR83 Zephaniah's translation presents a different interpretation of the syntactical relationship between הכמרים and הכהנים than that contained in the Hebrew text. There is more than one possibility of interpreting how AFR83 read their ST in this case. If AFR83 of Zephaniah 1:4 understood עם־הכהנים as something similar to *I shall annihilate the name of the idol priests* (הכמרים), *in other words/ that is, all the priests* (הכהנים), then AFR83 conveyed the prepositional phrase עם־הכהנים ("with the priests") as an appositive phrase, omitting the preposition עם, thus changing the grammar between the ST and the translation. If AFR83 of Zeph. 1:4 is understood as something similar to *I shall annihilate the name of the idol priests, the name of all the priests*, then they read הכהנים as if it were part of the construct chain that originates from the previous phrase, omitting the preposition עם.

Whichever might represent the understanding of the translators of AFR83 Zephaniah, they conveyed the prepositional phrase עם־הכהנים by using a different grammatical construction in the target text. The translators of AFR83 have followed the translation strategy of transposition which deviates from the Hebrew text by using a different grammatical structure than that of the source text. The translators did not follow the suggestion in the text-critical apparatus of BHS that עם־הכהנים should probably be omitted based on the Septuagint which represents an older (but not necessarily better) reading.

Another remarkable feature of Zeph. 1:4 in AFR83 is the addition of a word that is not present in the ST. AFR83 reads Zeph. 1:4 as *all the priests*. Seen in this way, the translators of AFR83 have employed the translation strategy of addition (Naudé 1999:79). Whichever of these readings represent the actual intention of the translators, is difficult to ascertain. What is clear, is that the translation deviates from its ST both in the way that it rendered the Hebrew text and in that they did not follow the text-critical apparatus in this case. This represents an example where the translators must have drawn from some other source than ST.

3.4. Zephaniah 1:7

הִם מִפְּנֵי אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה כִּי קָרוֹב יוֹם יְהוָה כִּי־יִהְיֶה כִּי־יִתֵּן זָבַח הַקֹּדֶשׁ קִרְאָיו:

AFR83: Wag in stilte op die Here God! Die dag van die Here is naby! Hy het 'n maaltyd voorberei, en dié wat Hy genooi het, gewy.

[Wait upon the Lord God in silence! The day of the Lord is near! He has prepared a meal, and those whom he has invited, he has consecrated.]

- KJV: Hold thy peace at the presence of the Lord GOD: for the day of the LORD is at hand: for the LORD hath prepared a sacrifice, he hath bid his guests.
- SV: Zwijgt voor het aangezicht des Heeren HEEREN; want de dag des HEEREN is nabij; want de HEERE heeft een slachtoffer bereid, Hij heeft Zijn genoden geheiligd.
- AFR33: Swyg voor die Here HERE! Want die dag van die HERE is naby; want die HERE maak 'n offer klaar, Hy heilig sy gaste.
- NBG-51: Zwijg voor het aangezicht van de Here HERE, want nabij is de dag des HEREN; want de HERE heeft een offermaal bereid; Hij heeft zijn genodigden geheiligd.
- AFR53: Swyg voor die Here HERE! Want die dag van die HERE is naby; want die HERE het 'n offer berei, sy gaste geheilig.
- NEB: Silence before the Lord GOD! For the day of the LORD is near. The Lord has prepared a sacrifice and has hallowed his guests.
- GNB: The day is near when the Lord will sit in judgment; so be silent in his presence. The Lord is preparing to sacrifice his people and has invited enemies to plunder Judah.

AFR83 translates שָׁט as an imperative *wag* (“wait!”). The analysis of this verb is not clear. In Hebrew it is not clear whether the word is an interjection (Olivier 1973:26) with the purpose of onomatopoeia in mind (i.e. similar to *hush!* in modern English as an interjection), whether it is a Piel imperative based on the root שָׁט or whether it is derived from the root שָׁט, understood as an imperative in the Qal form. Be that as it may, according to Ben-Zvi (1991:79), the meaning is ultimately inferred from the context. Of the possible incipient texts, it is only NEB that translates שָׁט as an interjection as *silence* followed by an exclamation mark. AFR33 seems to have imitated the Dutch SV with the word *swyg* (“be silent!”), as an imperative, which has been retained in both the AFR53 revision and the NBG-51. The singular word *swyg* in Afrikaans and *swijg* in Dutch might have the characteristic of an interjection despite being imperative verbs, but the KJV and GNB translate שָׁט as a verbal phrase as *hold thy peace* and *be silent* respectively. The translators of AFR83 Zephaniah render שָׁט as *wag in stilte* (“wait in silence”) as an imperative verb followed by an adverbial phrase. The translators of AFR83 Zephaniah have possibly been guided either by their adopted translation approach or by the varying translations that might have influenced them.

The question remains whether this translation represents an instance where the translators of AFR83 Zephaniah deviated from the source text or not. In the meeting of the Translation Commission of 2nd February 1971, one of the guidelines established by the Commission is that

which is implicit in the source text must be made explicit in the target text. **סו** could be interpreted as either an interjection or an imperative verb. The translators decided to render it explicitly as an imperative verb. However, the translators have also employed the strategy of addition (Naudé 1999:79) in this case. The word **סו** does not necessarily mean to “wait”. Be it understood as an imperative from different roots or as an interjection, the meaning is clearly to invoke silence, not the act of waiting. Yet the translators have rendered it so. The translators have decided to use a different grammatical structure to convey the meaning of this word in the ST. The translators have translated the single word **סו** in ST as an imperative verbal phrase and with a different meaning in the TT from the original word in the ST. AFR83 retains the meaning of **סו** (“silence”) by means of an adverbial phrase in the target language. The imperative is translated as *wag* (“wait!”), which is not reflected in the source text, followed by an adverbial prepositional phrase *in stilte* (“in silence”), modifying the Afrikaans verb *wag* (“wait”). The translators of AFR83 Zephaniah seem to have used a combination of the strategy of addition and transposition in this case (Naudé 1999:79). Although it is not certain what informed the translators’ decision, it is clear that the translation represents neither the Hebrew text, nor the suggestions of the text-critical apparatus of BHS. They have deviated from both the Hebrew text and the text-critical notes of BHS in this case not only by adding something in the translation that is not present in the source text, but also by changing the grammatical structure from the source text into the target text. Incipient to this translation is perhaps not another text as such, but simply the desire of the translators to produce a readily understandable translation. This is an illustration of what Marais (2019:45) calls an incipient sign system that includes not only texts, but other meaning-bearing elements as well. In this case not necessarily another text, but the translators’ subjective desire for a comprehensible translation could have been the main incipient factor. Whatever might have informed the decision of the translators of AFR83 Zephaniah in this case, it is clear that they deviated from their ST. This illustrates that the translators would have drawn from a source other than just their explicitly stated source text and that the argument for the presence of a complex incipient sign system is justified in this case.

3.5. Zephaniah 1:9

וּפְקַדְתִּי עַל כָּל־הַדְּלֹגִל עַל־הַמִּפְתָּן בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא הַמְּמַלְאִים בַּיַּת אֲדֹנָיָהם חֲמָס וּמְרִמָּה:

AFR83: Daardie dag sal Ek almal straf wat uit bygeloof nie eens op 'n drumpel trap nie en wat die huis van hulle Koning met geweld en bedrog vul.

[On that day I will punish all who, out of superstition, do not even tread upon the threshold and who fill the house of their King with violence and corruption.]

- KJV: In the same day also will I punish all those that leap on the threshold, which fill their masters' houses with violence and deceit.
- SV: Ook zal Ik ten zelven dage bezoeking doen over al wie over den dorpel springt; die het huis hunner heren vullen met geweld en bedrog.
- AFR33: Ek sal ook op dié dag besoeking doen oor almal wat oor die drumpel spring, wat die huis van hulle here vul met geweld en bedrog.
- NBG-51: Ook zal Ik te dien dage bezoeking doen over allen die over de drempel springen, die het huis hunner heren vullen met geweld en bedrog.
- NEB: I will punish all who dance on the temple terrace, who fill their master's house with crimes of violence and fraud.
- GNB: I will punish all who worship like pagans and who steal and kill in order to fill their master's house with loot.

The KJV represents the literal translation of this verse. The possible differences in the translations originate from the various ways to translate the preposition על which KJV translates as *on*, with the sense that those against whom judgement is proclaimed in Zeph. 1:7 do indeed step upon the threshold. NEB follows this interpretation as well.

The Hebrew word על can be translated in more than one way (e.g. *on, upon, over, above*). This is one of the things that could possibly have given rise to the very different interpretations of this verse when the various other possible incipient texts are compared with each other. The Dutch SV translates this word as *over*. In Dutch this word indeed means “over” with the sense that the person against whom judgement is proclaimed in Zeph. 1:7 steps “over” the threshold (i.e. he does not tread upon the threshold, but steps over it, he avoids stepping upon it). Both AFR33 (AFR53 corresponds verbatim with AFR33 in this case) and NBG-51 follow this interpretation as well.

AFR83 follows the same interpretation as SV, AFR33, and NBG-51, but the translators decided to convey the positive statement of the Hebrew (“they leap *over* the threshold”) as a negative statement in translation that “they do *not* trample upon the threshold.” This is an example of the strategy of transposition and addition by the translators of AFR83 Zephaniah (Naudé 1999:79). There is no negative particle in the Hebrew present in the source text and the Hebrew conveys a positive statement. AFR83 does the opposite (i.e. the translators insert the negative

particle in Afrikaans and translate it as a negative statement), although the meaning of both the positive statement in the Hebrew and the negative statement in Afrikaans is the same.

Another example of the strategy of addition, is that the translators of AFR83 Zephaniah added the words *uit bygeloof* (“out of superstition”) which is not present in the source text at all. The sense of the translation is that the Lord will punish those who do not step upon the threshold because they are superstitious. This could originate from the translation policy that the translation should make explicit that which is implicit in the text by adding, by incorporating the reason for the action into the text of the translation itself.

In their rendition of בית אדניהם (“the house of their lord”) the translators followed the strategy of specification by translating it as *die huis van hulle Koning* (“the house of their King”). The word אדון (“lord”) can certainly be understood as a king, but not necessarily. It would have to be inferred from the context. The fact that AFR83 Zephaniah 1:9 capitalises the word for “king” indicates that the translators wanted to guide the reader that those who are going to be punished are those who fill the house of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, with violence. This is not necessarily the meaning. According to Olivier (1973:36) it could refer to the temples of idols that are being filled with violence and that the act of not stepping over the threshold refers to some superstition within that context. The readings adopted by the GNB, NEB, the Dutch and other Afrikaans translations seem to leave open the interpretation about who exactly the lords and their houses are that are being referred to in Zephaniah 1:9.

In Zephaniah 1:9, the translators of AFR83 Zephaniah have employed the strategies of addition, transposition, and specification (Naudé 1999:79). The strategy of addition indicates that the translators deviated from the Hebrew text of BHS as well as its text-critical apparatus. They also deviated by translating a positive statement in the Hebrew text as a negative statement in translation. This is an example of where the translators must have drawn their translation from a source other than BHS. This can serve as a demonstration that the source of AFR83 translation of Zephaniah 1:9 was not exclusively BHS, but that it points to a complex source that would have consisted of at least more than one text.

3.6. Zephaniah 1:12

וְהָיָה בְּעֵת הַהִיא אֶחָפֵז אֶת־יְרוּשָׁלַם בְּנֵרוֹת וּפְקֻדָתַי עַל־הָאֲנָשִׁים הַקֹּפְאִים עַל־שְׂמֵרֵיהֶם הָאֲמָרִים
בְּלִבָּם לֹא־יִיטִיב יְהוָה וְלֹא יָרַע:

AFR83: Daardie tyd sal Ek Jerusalem met lampe deursoek en die mense straf wat in hulle selftevredenheid dink: die Here doen nie goed óf kwaad nie.

[At that time, I will search Jerusalem with lamps and punish those who think in their indifference/ self-confidence/ self-contentment: the Lord does neither good nor bad.]

KJV: And it shall come to pass at that time, that I will search Jerusalem with candles, and punish the men that are settled on their lees: that say in their heart, The LORD will not do good, neither will he do evil.

SV: En het zal geschieden te dien tijde, Ik zal Jeruzalem met lantaarnen doorzoeken; en Ik zal bezoeking doen over de mannen, die stijf geworden zijn op hun droesem, die in hun hart zeggen: De HEERE doet geen goed, en Hij doet geen kwaad.

AFR33: En in dié tyd sal ek Jerusalem met lanterns deursoek en besoeking doen oor die mense wat dik geword het op hulle afsaksel, wat in hulle hart sê: Die HERE doen geen goed en Hy doen geen kwaad nie.

NBG-51: Het zal te dien tijde geschieden, dat Ik Jeruzalem met lampen zal doorzoeken; Ik zal bezoeking doen over de mannen die dik geworden zijn op hun droesem, en die bij zichzelf denken: De HERE doet geen goed en Hij doet geen kwaad.

AFR53: En in dié tyd sal Ek Jerusalem met lanterns deursoek en besoeking doen oor die manne wat dik geword het op hulle afsaksel, wat in hulle hart sê: Die Here doen geen goed en Hy doen geen kwaad nie.

NEB: At that time I will search Jerusalem with a lantern and punish all who sit in stupor over the dregs of their wine, who say to themselves, 'The Lord will do nothing, good or bad.'

GNB: At that time I will take a lamp and search Jerusalem. I will punish those who are self-satisfied and confident, who say to themselves, 'The Lord never does anything, one way or the other.'

This verse contains an expression that is assumed to be an idiom. Some of the words contained in the idiom are rare and the meaning difficult to determine. The expression *הקפאים על-שמריהם* appears only here in the Hebrew Bible. Literal translations such as KJV and SV translate it as *(those who are) thickening upon their dregs*. The sense is understood that those who are saturated with strong drink, have become indifferent to the Lord and say to themselves that the Lord will not intervene in their lives at all. Such a translation assumes that *שמר* refers to some alcoholic drink, be it that it refers to choice wine, strong drink, or the very last dregs of the

alcoholic drink (Olivier 1973:51). The translation of this expression is difficult because it appears only once in the Hebrew Bible, although there might be a partial reference to the idea in Jeremiah 48:11. This does not solve the problem of this text's meaning because, here in Zephaniah 1:12 the expression has a negative meaning, whilst in Jeremiah שמר has a positive meaning (Ben-Zvi 1991:111). Another problem in the understanding of this idiom is that the root פקא appears only twice in the Hebrew Bible in a clear context (i.e. Exodus 15:8; Job 10:10). One of the possible ways to understand this image is that it is referring to milk that has become thick, but that this imagery is applied to wine. Both Olivier (1973:52) and Ben-Zvi (1991:111) understand it as a metaphor referring to immobility. The metaphor can then be understood that הפקאים refers to those who have consumed שמריהם to the point that they have become so intoxicated that they have become unable to move. NEB follows this sense when it translates it as those *who sit in stupor over the dregs of their wine*.

The text-critical apparatus of BHS, which corresponds with the suggestion in BHK3, suggests that האנשים ("the men") should be emended to השאננים ("those who are at ease"). Olivier (1973:50) comments only briefly on this. According to Olivier (1973:50), the majority of expositors merely ignore this suggestion and he himself does not cast a text-critical judgement on this individual reading. Without much comment Olivier (1973:48) states that the suggestions of BHK3 may merely, or safely be ignored. It is interesting that the text-critical notes of BHK3 and BHS are very brief in this suggestion. The abbreviation "prp" in the text critical apparatus preceding the Hebrew word indicates that this is merely a proposed reading. No reason for the proposal is given in the text-critical note of either BHK3 or BHS.

It is interesting that the predecessors of BHK3 and BHS (i.e. the first and second editions of BHK) have a more elaborate text-critical note in this case. BHK1 and BHK2 are identical in their text-critical apparatus for this verse. Just like BHK3 and BHS, the proposal is made that the Hebrew text should be emended to read השאננים. However, what makes BHK1 and BHK2 different from its successors, is that their text-critical note not only contains the suggestion for the emendation but they also add two Scripture references (i.e. Amos 6:1; Isaiah 37:29) where the same root appears. This seems to serve as motivation for the suggested emendation in BHK1 and BHK2. BHK3 and BHS omitted this from their respective text-critical apparatus. The abbreviation "prp" used in BHS ("prps" in BHK) does indeed suggest that the editors were trying to communicate to their readers that השאננים would be the better reading. However, the lack of motivation for the proposal in BHK3 and BHS might have caused that the proposal would most likely be ignored. The more elaborate text-critical note in BHK1 and BHK2 might

have been given more consideration by translators. It is not clear to what degree the translators of AFR83 Zephaniah would have consulted even older scholarly editions than BHK3. They would probably have consulted at least BHK3 because it is mentioned as the intended source text for the Old Testament in the minutes of the first meeting of the Translation Commission of 2nd February 1971. It is logical that when BHS became available in 1977, the translators would have started to use it. AFR83 also states in its preface to the reader that BHS was their source text. But, the influence of BHK3 cannot be ignored because, for a considerable time, during the making of AFR83 the translators would have used BHK3. Although it is difficult to tell with certainty how much the translators would have consulted BHK3 or even its predecessors after 1977, it is interesting that the suggested emendation can indeed be reconciled with the translation of Zephaniah 1:12 in AFR83. The adjective שׂאֵן refers to one who is silent, secure, docile, self-confident, or content. AFR83 Zephaniah omits the idiom הַקְּפָאִים עַל־שְׁמֵרֵיהֶם itself, but conveys the assumed meaning of the idiom, presumably contained in the emended word, שׂאֵן. Seen in this way, compared to the Hebrew text of BHS, this is an example of where the translators did indeed follow the text-critical apparatus of BHS.

Although the translators of AFR83 Zephaniah might have taken the text-critical note into account and indeed followed its source text in that way, AFR83 Zephaniah still does deviate from both the Hebrew text and text-critical apparatus by omitting הַקְּפָאִים עַל־שְׁמֵרֵיהֶם. Although the text-critical apparatus does suggest a text-critical emendation, BHS does not suggest that the entire phrase הַקְּפָאִים עַל־שְׁמֵרֵיהֶם should be omitted. By doing so, the translators of AFR83 Zephaniah must have based their translation on a different source than their stated source text. This demonstrates the presence of a complex source that would have consisted of other texts as well. Although it cannot be ascertained exactly to what extent the translators would have consulted the GNB, the resemblance between Zephania 1:12 in GNB and AFR83 is remarkable. This could demonstrate as correct an earlier hypothesis of the current study that the translators of AFR83 were aware and would have consulted other translations that followed a similar method of translation, especially GNB since it attempted to follow the same translation theory as AFR83.

3.7. Zephaniah 1:17a

והצרתִי לְאֵלֶם וְהִלְכּוּ כְּעִוְרִים כִּי לַיהוָה חָטְאוּ

- AFR83: Ek laat ang's die mense pak sodat hulle soos blindes loop, want hulle het teen My gesondig.
[I cause anxiety to take hold of people so that they walk like the blind, because they have sinned against Me.]
- KJV: And I will bring distress upon men, that they shall walk like blind men, because they have sinned against the LORD:
- NBG-51: Dan zal Ik de mensen benauwen, zodat zij gaan als blinden, want zij hebben tegen de HERE gezondigd
- AFR53: En Ek sal die mense in benoudheid bring, en hulle sal rondloop soos blindes, omdat hulle teen die Here gesondig het.
- NEB: I will bring dire distress upon men; they shall walk like blind men for their sin against the LORD.
- GNB: The LORD says, "I will bring such disasters on mankind that everyone will grope about like a blind man. They have sinned against me

The Hebrew text opens with a first person common singular verb. *והצרתִי* is understood to be a waw-copulative with a Perfective verb in the first person common singular of the root *צרר*. The Hiphil has the sense that the Lord will cause anxiety to befall the people. The root does indeed appear in other parts of the Hebrew Bible; therefore, the meaning is not unclear. It refers to the anxiety that befalls a city during a siege (Olivier 1973:68). As a first-person verb, it is *יהוה* who is the speaker, referring to himself, referring to what he himself will do to those upon whom judgement is proclaimed. The translators of AFR83 Zephaniah seem to have harmonised the use of the first person by replacing *ליהוה* ("against the Lord") with a first person common singular pronoun, translated as *hulle het teen My gesondig* ("they have sinned against Me") as opposed to literal a translation, *they have sinned against the Lord*. This is an example of the translation strategy of deletion, and addition (Naudé 1999:79). The translators have omitted the proper noun *יהוה* and replaced it with, added, a pronoun. This indicates that the translators interpreted this part of the verse as direct speech and wanted to make sure that their readers grasp it as such. The Hebrew text of *ליהוה* is a prepositional clause ("against the Lord"). In the translation, the translators of AFR83 Zephaniah have deviated from the Hebrew text of BHS. The text critical apparatus does contain a note concerning the phrase *כי ליהוה חטאו* that it is probably an addition, perhaps an interpretative gloss. The text-critical note does not suggest

an emendation such as that followed by AFR83. This is an example where AFR83 Zephaniah deviated from BHS, from both the Hebrew text and the text-critical apparatus. The translators must have established their translation by drawing from a source other than their stated source text. There is a remarkable resemblance between AFR83 and the GNB in this verse.

3.8. Zephaniah 2:1

הַתְּקוּשׁוּ וְקוּשׁוּ הַגּוֹי לֹא נִכְסְרָה:

- AFR83: Ruk julle reg, onbeskaamde nasie,
[Come to your senses, o shameless nation]
- KJV: Gather yourselves together, yea, gather together, O nation not desired
- SV: Doorzoek u zelf nauw, ja, doorzoek nauw, gij volk, dat met geen lust bevangen wordt!
- AFR33: Versamel julle, ja wees versameld, o nasie wat nie skaam word nie!
- NBG-51: Komt tot uzelf, ja, komt tot inkeer, gij schaamteloos volk,
- AFR53: KOM tot julleself, ja, kom tot inkeer, o nasie wat nie skaam word nie!
- NEB: Gather together, you unruly nation, gather together
- GNB: Shameless nation, come to your senses

The first two words of this verse are problematic for several reasons. The verb *הַתְּקוּשׁוּ* can be understood as a Hitpael imperative of the root *קשש* and is translated as *gather together* based on ancient translations such as the Greek Septuagint, Latin Vulgate, and Syriac (Olivier 1973:76). *קוּשׁוּ* can be understood as an imperative as well, but there is no agreement amongst scholars about what the root is, nor whether the two verbs necessarily originate from the same root (i.e. *קשש*, *קוש*, *קש/נקש*, *יקש/נקש*,) nor what the stem formation is (i.e. Piel or Qal) (Ben-Zvi 1991:137; Olivier 1973:76). It is not clear to what degree there would have been a difference even in the Masoretic tradition itself concerning the vocalisation that might influence the recognition of the root and stem formation. For the purpose of this study, it is irrelevant to cast a judgement upon the text-critical and grammatical problems of this phrase, since the current study only wishes to demonstrate a complex source for AFR83 Zephaniah based on examples where the translators deviated from BHS. Therefore, reference to the Aleppo Codex is not relevant to the study of AFR83 Zephaniah to its source text. It is, however, interesting to note that *Codex Leningradensis* and the Aleppo Codex differ in the vowel pointing here. *Codex*

Leningradensis and BHS read הַתְּקוּשׁוּ with the Aleppo Codex reads הַתְּקוּשׁוּ with a reduced vowel which gave rise to some debate about the meaning of the word evens during Medieval times (Ben-Zvi 1991:137).

Olivier (1973:76), whose research would have been at the direct disposal of the translators, seems to favour a reading that assumes הַתְּקוּשׁוּ should be emended to הַתְּקוּשׁוּ based on insights from the Ugaritic language. הַתְּקוּשׁוּ is then considered to be a Qal imperative based on a root that means “to set a snare” assumed to have been derived from a root קוּשׁ which would be related to יקש/נקש in Hebrew. After much philological labour drawing from Ugaritic, Olivier (1973:75) suggested a translation for the whole verse that could have read, *Stel maar die strikke en word self daarin gevang, volk wat na die nietige (afgode) verlang*. This could be translated into English as *Ensnare yourselves and be ensnared, oh nation that desires nothing (but idols)*. Olivier (1973:77) states that such a translation could be used by those who do not wish to follow the reading of the Septuagint unquestioningly.

The translators of AFR83 Zephaniah seem to follow the readings usually followed by translations that do indeed follow ancient versions such as the Septuagint. AFR83 translates הַתְּקוּשׁוּ (“gather yourselves”) with an Afrikaans idiom that has the same meaning as the English idiom as “come to your senses”. The resemblance between AFR83 Zephaniah and the GNB is remarkable. The Dutch SV and NBG-51 translate it with an idiom that would literally mean “come to yourself”, which assumes the same understanding. Although it is difficult to discern what reading AFR83 Zephaniah would have followed here, when considering what translation strategies the translators followed, it is clear is that AFR83 translated only one verb in the case of Zephaniah 2:1a and not two as is reflected in BHS. This is an example of the strategy of deletion (Naudé 1999:79).

The purpose of the above discussion of Zephaniah 2:1 is to answer the question whether the translation emerged from a complex source or whether we may just accept the claim of the translators that BHS was their only source text. From the above, especially when comparing the reading of the Septuagint and GNB with AFR83 in this case, clearly the translators were influenced by sources other than BHS and its apparatus, since BHS has no text-critical note for Zephaniah 2:1.

Another consideration to determine if AFR83 Zephaniah emerged from a complex source or not, is the phrase הַגּוֹי לֹא נִכְסֵף in Zephaniah 2:1. To ascertain what the translators of AFR83 did to establish a translation of this phrase, it will be meaningful first to turn to AFR83’s

predecessors. AFR33 and AFR53 translate Zephaniah 2:1b as *o nasie wat nie skaam word nie* (“o nation that has no shame/ does not become ashamed”). The source text of AFR33 was the 2nd edition of Rudolf Kittel’s *Biblia Hebraica* (BHK2) (Naudé 2009:64). BHK2 had a text-critical note for Zephaniah 2:1 consisting of two parts. According to the text-critical note of BHK2 the editor proposes that הַתְּבוֹשְׁשׁוּ וְקִוְשׁוּ should read הַתְּבוֹשְׁשׁוּ וְבוֹשׁוּ interpreting these two words as a Hitpael and Qal imperative, both from the root בוש which can be translated as *shame yourselves and be ashamed*. The rest of the note states that הגוי לא נכסף is corrupt but makes no suggestion for a different reading. AFR33 did not follow BHK2’s text-critical note’s suggestion for Zephaniah 2:1a, but did translate Zephaniah 2:1b as the direct form of address as *o nasie wat nie skaam word nie* (“Oh nation that does not feel shame/ become ashamed”). Such a reading would assume either that the translators of AFR33 were influenced by the text-critical note of BHK2, or that they themselves might have had access to an edition of the Septuagint.

As for the translators of AFR83 of this verse, it seems that the phrase הגוי לא נכסף seemed incomprehensible to them. It is not clear whether they thought that the root כסף does not make sense in the context, or whether it was unclear whether נִכְסַף should be interpreted as a pausal form of the Niphal perfective, or whether it should be understood as a Niphal participle. Whatever problems the translators of AFR83 perceived in this verse, it is clear that they deviated from BHS in all respects. The translation, *onbeskaamde nasie* (“shameless nation”) reflects the reading followed by the Septuagint. AFR83 deviated from the Hebrew text itself in this case and there is no text-critical note for this verse in BHS. This indicates that the translation is not based on AFR83’s stated source text and points to the presence of a complex source. The similarity between Zephaniah 2:1 in AFR83 and GNB is remarkable.

3.9. Zephaniah 2:2

בְּטֹרֶם לָדַת חֵק כְּמֵץ עֵבֶר יוֹם

- AFR83: voordat die besluit voltrek word, voordat die dag kom en julle soos kaf word
[before the decree comes out, before the day comes and you become like chaff]
- KJV: Before the decree bring forth, before the day pass as the chaff,
- SV: Eer het besluit bare (gelijk kaf gaat de dag voorbij),
- AFR33: Voordat die besluit baar — soos kaf gaan die dag verby
- NBG-51: voordat het besluit tot uitvoering komt - als kaf gaat een dag voorbij

NEB: before you are sent far away and vanish like chaff

GNB: before you wither like a flower

AFR83 translates this verse with the sense that it is still part of the sentence that started in Zephaniah 2:1. According to Ben-Zvi (1991:143), although there has been much scholarly debate about the meaning of Zephaniah 2:2, the Hebrew text as it stands is indeed comprehensible. Ben-Zvi (1991:143) seems to use this statement as motivation for not entertaining the merits of other possible meanings of the text, although he does refer to some scholars who suggested various interpretations in a footnote. Ben-Zvi (1991:41) presents a literal translation *בטרם לדת חק* as, *before the decree is born* (“the decree comes out”). A literal translation of *כמץ עבר יום* as *like chaff the day passed by* is also comprehensible. Olivier (1973:80) discusses in more detail some of the text-critical problems in this verse. The NEB, which was indeed consulted by the translators of AFR83, emended the Hebrew text in two places (Brockington 1973:262). *לדת חק* is emended to *תִּרְחֶקְךָ* translated as *before you are sent away*. The NEB emends *עבר יום* to *עֲבָרִים*, translating the phrase as *[you] vanish like chaff*, translating the participle as a simple present tense. This follows the Septuagint that also reads *עבר* as a participle. The GNB offers a footnote for this verse that the Hebrew text is unclear and that the reading the GNB adopted is following “one ancient translation”. The GNB’s translation deviates greatly from all other translations that could have functioned as incipient texts for AFR83. The GNB reads *before you wither and die like a flower*. Compared to the Septuagint, it is clear that the “one ancient manuscript” that the GNB follows for its reading is the Septuagint.

The presence of many text-critical variants probably influenced the translators’ decision in this text. The translators of AFR83 Zephaniah seem to follow a kind of middle way between the Hebrew text and the Greek of the Septuagint. The Septuagint contains the reading *before you become like a flower*. AFR83 Zephaniah follows this reading but retains the Hebrew *כמץ* (“like chaff”) instead of the Greek word for “flower”. Here is an explicit example that the translators of AFR83 Zephaniah followed a reading from a different source, this time a clearly identifiable source, other than the Hebrew text of BHS. The text-critical notes of BHS do not reference this possible reading from the Septuagint. This means that the translators of AFR83 Zephaniah deviated fully from their stated source text. The translators seem to have been influenced by the Septuagint and GNB. The presence of at least more than one other text besides BHS in this case, points to the complex source from which the translation emerged.

3.10. Zephaniah 2:8d

שְׁמַעְתִּי חֲרַפַּת מוֹאָב וְגִדּוּפֵי בְנֵי עַמּוֹן אֲשֶׁר חֲרַפוּ אֶת-עַמִּי וַיִּגְדְּלוּ עַל-גְּבוּלָם:

AFR83: Ek het gehoor hoe Moab my volk verkleineer het, hoe die Ammoniete hom met minagting behandel het, hoe aanmatigend hulle was teenoor my volk se grondgebied.

[I have heard how Moab humiliated my people, how the Ammonites treated him with contempt, how presumptuous they were against the territory of my people.]

KJV: I have heard the reproach of Moab, and the revilings of the children of Ammon, whereby they have reproached my people, and magnified themselves against their border.

SV: Ik heb de beschimping van Moab gehoord, en de scheldwoorden der kinderen Ammons, waarmede zij Mijn volk beschimpt hebben, en hebben zich groot gemaakt tegen deszelfs landpale.

AFR53: Ek het gehoor die smaadtaal van Moab en die beskimpinge van die kinders van Ammon, waarmee hulle my volk gesmaad het, en hoe hulle hul groot gehou het teen sy grondgebied.

NBG-51: Ik heb gehoord het gesmaad van Moab en het gehoon der Ammonieten, waarmede zij mijn volk smaadden en zich verhieven tegen hun gebied.

NEB: I have heard the insults of Moab, the taunts of Ammon, how they have insulted my people and encroached on their frontiers.

GNB: The LORD Almighty says, “I have heard the people of Moab and Ammon insulting and taunting my people, and boasting that they would seize their land.

For this verse, the Masoretic text is comprehensible and grammatically not problematic at all. The Masoretic text reads גְּבוּלָם (“their territory/ frontier/ boundary”). BHS contains a text-critical note that there is a Septuagint fragment that contains the reading גְּבוּלִי (“my territory”). AFR83 indeed uses a first-person possessive pronoun but translated this as *my volk se grondgebied* (“the territory of my people”). This indicates that AFR83 might have attempted to follow the text-critical suggestion at least partially. The source text of BHS uses a possessive pronoun that can be translated as *their territory*. The third person masculine plural pronominal suffix refers back to whom the territory belongs to (i.e. the territory belongs to the nation). In the translation of AFR83 this meaning is preserved as such, but AFR83 uses a different grammatical construction to convey this meaning. This is an example of the translation strategy of transposition (Naudé 1999:79). AFR83 imposes the emendation for a first-person

possessive pronoun upon עַם translated as *my volk* (“my people”) while the possessive pronoun in the source text that indicates to whom the territory belongs, is transposed as a genitive construction in the translation (“the territory *of* my people”). AFR83 has deviated from both the Hebrew text and the text-critical apparatus of BHS in this case. This points to the presence of a complex incipient sign system, a complex source, since the translation is drawn from a source other than the explicitly stated ST.

3.11. Zephaniah 2:11a

נִרְאָה יְהוָה עֲלֵיהֶם כִּי רָזָה אֶת כָּל־אֱלֹהֵי הָאָרֶץ וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶי-לוֹ אִישׁ מִמְּקוֹמוֹ כֹּל אֲנִי הַגּוֹיִם:

AFR83: Almal moet die Here vrees. Hy laat al die gode op aarde wegteer sonder offers, en al die kuslande van die nasies buig voor Hom, elkeen op sy eie plek.

[All must fear the Lord. He lets all the gods on earth wither away without sacrifices, and all the coastal lands of the nations bow down before Him, each in his own place.]

AFR92: Ontsagwekkend is die Here bo almal. Hy laat al die gode op die aarde wegteer sonder offers, en al die kuslande van die nasies buig voor Hom, elkeen op sy eie plek.

[Awe-inspiring is the Lord above all. He lets all the gods on the earth wither away without sacrifices, and all the coastal lands of the nations bow down before him, each in his own place.]

KJV: The LORD will be terrible unto them: for he will famish all the gods of the earth; and men shall worship him, every one from his place, even all the isles of the heathen.

SV: Vreselijk zal de HEERE tegen hen wezen, want Hij zal al de goden der aarde doen uitteren; en een iegelijk uit zijn plaats zal Hem aanbidden, al de eilanden der heidenen.

AFR33: Vreeslik sal die Here teen hulle wees, want Hy laat al die gode van die aarde wegkwyn; sodat hulle Hom kan aanbid elkeen uit sy woonplek, al die kuslande van die nasies.

NBG-51: Geducht zal de HERE tegen hen wezen, want Hij zal alle goden der aarde doen wegteren, en voor Hem zullen zich neerbuigen, ieder uit zijn plaats, alle kustlanden der volken.

NEB: The LORD will appear against them with all his terrors; for he will reduce to beggary all the gods of the earth, and all the coasts and the islands of the nations will worship him, every man in his own home.

GNB: The LORD will terrify them. He will reduce the gods of the earth to nothing, and then every nation will worship him, each in its own land.

The first edition of AFR83 translated the passive participle נִרְאָה in the Niphal as active, with an auxiliary verb with an imperative sense (“all *must* fear the Lord”). This is an example of transposition because the translators changed the grammar between the source text and the translation. Such a grammatical change deviates from the Hebrew text of BHS whilst the text-critical notes do not make such a suggestion either. This is an example of where the translators of AFR83 deviated from their stated source text and points to the presence of a complex source from which the translators must have drawn to establish this translation.

Another point of difference between AFR83 and BHS is the translation of the preposition על. The Hebrew text with the third person masculine plural pronominal suffix can be translated as *above them*. This is also the explanation that Olivier (1973:114) suggests after some comparison with the use of this preposition in biblical Hebrew and Ugaritic which has a spatial meaning of “before” or “in the presence of”. AFR83 translates it with the sense that the third person masculine plural refers to a subject, the “all” who should fear the Lord. This is another example of the translation strategy of transposition (Naudé 1999:79). The translators changed the grammar between the source text and the translation. The prepositional phrase “above them” (עליהם) is changed in the translation to refer to the subject of the active verb in translation. Changing the grammar between the source text and the translation in this way, deviates from the Hebrew text of BHS and there is no text-critical note that suggests such a change. This points to a deviation from the stated source text by the translators and indicates that the translators must have established their translation from another source. This, in turn, points to the presence of a complex source. Although the purpose of the current study is not necessarily to identify by name other possible texts that could have formed part of AFR83 Zephaniah’s complex incipient sign system, the similarity between Zephaniah 2:11 in its first edition of AFR83 and the GNB is remarkable. Both have translated the Niphal participle not as a passive, but as an active voice.

Archival materials preserved by the Bible Society of South Africa such as translation drafts at various stages of the translation process as well as a later revised publication in 1992 that contained re-formulations, indicate that the wording of this verse was changed more than once during the translation process. It is not clear whether there was disagreement within the translation commission about what the meaning of this verse is or if there was disagreement about the best way to convey its meaning. The first and second translation draft of this text read, *Die Here moet deur almal gevrees word* (“The Lord must be feared by all”). This renders נִרְאָה as a passive participle, in an imperative sense, therefore conveying the Niphal participle

in Hebrew. The preposition על with the pronominal suffix is translated as the agent of the passive verb. The third translation draft contained the same wording on the type-written page as the first and second drafts. Handwritten emendations changed this to the reading later published in the first edition of AFR83, *Almal moet die Here vrees* (“All must fear the Lord”). The fourth draft translation contained the reading for this verse as it appeared in the first publication of AFR83.

The main difference between the revisions between the various phases and the first edition of AFR83 was whether the Niphal participle should be translated by retaining the passive voice or reformulating it as an active voice in Afrikaans. The decision to render it as an active voice in Afrikaans is in agreement with the principle adopted by the Translation Commission on 2nd February 1971. The principle adopted there was that what is implicit in the source text should be made explicit in translation and that sentences should be simplified. The various draft translations do retain the understanding that the participle is to be understood in an imperative sense, (“the Lord *must* be feared by all”).

In contrast to the various translations of נורא as they developed during the process of translation as seen in the various phases of compiling drafts, is the suggestion of Olivier (1971:114) whose research would have been at the direct disposal of the translators. According to Olivier (1971:114), the context of this verse is an announcement of imminent judgement, and the verbless clause should be translated with a future tense as opposed to an imperative sense as the first edition of AFR83 conveyed it. According to the translation presented by Olivier (1971:117) the passive participle must be interpreted as an adjective referring to the Lord with the sense that the Lord himself will be fear- and awe-inspiring as a quality, an attribute within himself (i.e. it does not refer to an action that should be done by the implied agent). The preposition should be translated as indicating a position, “before them” or “above them” (עליהם). Olivier’s (1971:117) translation reads, *Ontzagwekkend sal DIE HERE oor hulle wees, want al die gode van die aarde kwyn weg* (“Awe-inspiring will the Lord be over them, for all the gods of the earth wither away”). When compared to the 1992 revision with re-formulations (AFR92), Olivier (1971:117) was followed as far as his suggestion of *ontzagwekkend* to render the word נורא in the sense of a future tense. Olivier (1971:117) is the only source for the word *ontzagwekkend* (“awesome” or “awe-inspiring”). Some of the more literal translations as well as the GNB that served as incipient texts render some form of the idea of “terrifying” (e.g. KJV, SV, AFR33). Oliver (1971:117) is most likely the source of what would later be published as AFR92 Zephaniah 2:11a, but Olivier (1971:117) was ignored for the first edition

of AFR83. Although the translation of AFR92 does not deviate from BHS, the comparison of this verse with Olivier (1971:117) reveals a possible source of AFR92's word choice. All of this serves to prove the hypothesis of this study that AFR83 Zephaniah emerged from a complex source consisting of various texts and other factors and that Olivier's M.Th. thesis played some role in it. When focusing on texts only, although an incipient sign system does not only consist of texts, it is indeed possible to identify a clear incipient text in the case of Zeph. 2:11a.

3.12. Zephaniah 2:15

כָּל עוֹבֵר עָלֶיהָ יִשְׂרָק יָגִיעַ יָדוֹ

- AFR83: Elkeen wat daar verbykom, sal fluit van verbasing en sy hande saam slaan.
 [All who pass by, will whistle from astonishment and slap his hands together.]
- KJV: every one that passeth by her shall hiss, and wag his hand.
- SV: die daardoor trekt, zal ze aanfluiten, hij zal zijn hand bewegen.
- AFR33: Almal wat daar verbytrek, sal fluit, sal met die hand skud.
- NBG-51: Ieder die haar voorbijgaat, zal fluiten, met de hand schudden.
- AFR53: Almal wat daar verbytrek, spot, skud met die hand.
- NEB: every passer-by shall hiss and shake his fist.
- GNB: Everyone who passes by will shrink back in horror.

The translators of AFR83 Zephaniah understood the expression יִשְׂרָק יָגִיעַ יָדוֹ (“whistle/ hiss, shake his hand”) as two non-verbal acts of communication. AFR83 conveys the meaning of these two non-verbal acts as expressing astonishment. Kruger (1994:213) refers to various ways that such non-verbal acts of communication can be translated. One of these is to translate literally without explanation of its meaning. This seems to be the method followed by the KJV, SV, AFR33, and NEB. Another option is to describe the action literally, but then in such a way that the modern reader will understand its meaning. This can be done by adding an adverbial phrase to indicate its purpose. The GNB has translated the non-verbal communication in the source text with another form of non-verbal communication in the translation. The meaning of the non-verbal communication in the GNB is to convey horror and disgust. The translators of AFR83 Zephaniah follow a middle way between these options.

On the one hand, the AFR83 does describe the non-verbal action. On the other hand, an adverbial phrase is added that conveys the purpose or reason for the non-verbal action so that the reader will understand its meaning as the translators either understood it or wanted the readers to understand it. The translators added the word in Afrikaans *van verbasing* (“in astonishment”) for the sake of the reader grasping the meaning of the non-verbal acts. This is an example of the translation strategy of addition (Naudé 1999:79). According to the translation, the readers will understand the non-verbal communication as conveying a feeling of surprise or astonishment.

According to Kruger (1999:158) the gesture to whistle or hiss and to shake the hand, denotes contempt, not surprise, as is conveyed by AFR83, nor disgust or horror as conveyed by the GNB. Research indicating that the expression ישרק יניע ידו communicates contempt was indeed at the disposal of the translators of AFR83 Zephaniah by means of the research of Olivier (1973:134), but the translators seem to have decided to ignore Olivier (1973:134) in this case. AFR53, which would have been at the translators’ disposal as well, translates the meaning of the non-verbal communication as *spot* (“mock/ make fun of”). Although this might not necessarily be the meaning of this Hebrew expression either, it is clear that the translators of AFR83 did have access to other possible interpretations than the one they decided upon. Apart from a particular interpretation of the meaning of the non-verbal communication in this text, the strategy of addition, which the translators employed here (Naudé 1999:79), implies a deviation from the source text. The word added in translation does not appear in the Hebrew text of BHS, nor is there a text-critical note that suggests it. The translators must have used another source to establish their translation and not only their ST. This points to the presence of a complex source that would have consisted of at least one more text apart from the explicitly stated ST.

3.13. Zephaniah 3:15

וְהִשְׁאַרְתִּי בְקִרְבִּי עִם עַנְי וְגֹל וְחֹסֵי בְנֵי יְהוָה:

AFR83: Ek sal in jou laat oorbly net dié wat nederig en ootmoedig is en vertrou op die Naam van die Here.

[And I will cause to be left over amongst you only those who are humble and contrite and trust in the name of the Lord.]

KJV: I will also leave in the midst of thee an afflicted and poor people, and they shall trust in the name of the LORD.

- SV: Maar Ik zal in het midden van u doen overblijven een ellendig en arm volk; die zullen op den Naam des HEEREN betrouwen. (Zeph. 3:12 SVV)
- AFR33: En Ek sal tussen jou laat oorbly 'n ellendige en armoedige volk wat by die Naam van die HERE skuiling soek.
- NBG-51: En Ik zal in uw midden overlaten een ellendig en gering volk, en wie skuilen bij de naam des HEREN.
- AFR53: En Ek sal tussen jou in laat oorbly 'n ellendige en geringe volk wat by die Naam van die HERE skuiling soek.
- NEB: But I will leave in you a people afflicted and poor. The survivors of Israel shall find refuge in the name of the LORD;
- GNB: I will leave there a humble and lowly people, who will come to me for help.

The translators have rendered the root הסה (“take refuge”) as *vertrou* “trust” which is usually the translation for the root בטח . There is no text-critical note in BHS to suggest such an emendation. The translators deleted the word for “take refuge” and added the word for “trust” in its place. The translators of AFR83 Zephaniah used a different Afrikaans equivalent than the meaning of the Hebrew word and there is no text-critical suggestion for this. This makes it clear that the translators have deviated from their source text by means of the translation strategy of deletion and addition (Naudé 1999:79) in this case. Seen in this way, we have an example of where the translators deviated from their source text (i.e. both the Hebrew text and the text-critical apparatus). This points to another source that the translators would have used to establish their translation. This demonstrates the complex source, the complex incipient sign system, from which the translation emerged. If the translators used another source here, it indicates that the translation emerges from a complex source that would have consisted of various texts and other factors.

A case could be made that the translators did not deviate from their source text, but that their translation theory itself and the process of translation were incipient to their translation choice. The Hebrew root for “trust” is בטח , not הסה as rendered by the translators of AFR83 Zephaniah, but the two do have similar meanings. Perhaps the translators felt that their translation conveys the meaning of the Hebrew better than the literal meaning of הסה . In this sense the translators did indeed deviate from their source text. However, AFR83 is a meaning-oriented translation, not oriented towards the formal structures of the language. This implies that the theory of translation that AFR83 followed (Nida & Taber 1969:12) allowed the translators not to be consistent with which Afrikaans word is used to translate the same Hebrew word, but to choose

the closest natural equivalent in each individual case. Archival materials that preserve the drafts of this translation at various stages, contain evidence that the translation of **סָסָה** in this case was revised frequently during the process of translation. Archival materials from the Bible Society in South Africa reveals that there were four translation drafts during the phases of translation. The translation draft of the first phase contained the wording, *Ek sal in jou laat oorbly net dié wat nederig en ootmoedig is en skuiling vind by die Naam van die Here* (“I will cause to remain in you only those who are humble and contrite and find refuge in the Name of the Lord”). The first phase renders the root **סָסָה** as *skuiling vind* (“find refuge”) which is the usual translation for this word. As of the translation second translation draft and onwards, all the way through to the fourth phase, finding its way into the publication of AFR83 itself, the reading is *vertrou* (“trust”). This could point to a situation where the translators did not intend to deviate from their source text, but that they were confronted with the question of what is the best way to convey the meaning the source text, what is the best way to communicate the idea of taking refuge, as the source text reads, into the target language. Such a situation points not necessarily to another *text* that the translators would have used as their source, but it does demonstrate another particular element that could have formed part of the incipient sign system of AFR83 Zephaniah. This is an illustration of what Marais (2019:44) calls a “complex, emergent, semiotic process”. According to this conception, the complex incipient sign system consists of various meaning-bearing factors. Applied to a study such as the current one that seeks to demonstrate that a particular translation emerged from a complex incipient sign system, this is an illustration that texts are not the only incipient factor in a translation. In this case the determining factor for the translation was not the Hebrew text, nor the text-critical notes of BHS, but a combination of the translators’ desire for a comprehensible translation and the process of revision from which the first edition of AFR83 emerged.

3.14. Zephaniah 3:16

אל־יִרְפוּ יָדֶיךָ

AFR83: moenie jou hande moedeloos laat slap hang nie.

[do not let your hands hang slack hopelessly/ despondently].

KJV: Let not thine hands be slack.

SV: laat uw handen niet slap worden.

AFR33: laat jou hande nie slap hang nie.

NBG-51:laten uw handen niet slap worden.

NEB: let not your hands fall slack.

GNB: Do not let your hands hang limp!

The translators of AFR83 interpreted this expression as an idiom or an act of non-verbal communication that conveys despondency and hopelessness. The root רפה is conveyed as meaning “hang limp” (*slap hang*) which is similar to the GNB. The translators add an adverb *moedeloos* (“hopelessly, despondently”) to describe the manner in which the verb occurs. This also serves to convey the meaning of the non-verbal communication. The translators employed the strategy of addition (Naudé 1999:79) by adding the adverbial phrase with the purpose of conveying the meaning of the expression to the modern readers. The addition implies that the translators deviated from the Hebrew text. There is no text-critical note in BHS that suggests such an addition. This is an example of where the translators deviated from their source text and would have made use of another source to establish their translation. This demonstrates that the source for this verse could not have been just one other text (i.e. the explicitly stated source text), but that there must have been other incipient factors as well. The translation of AFR83 for this verse is remarkable because it is the only translation for this verse that adds such an adverbial phrase to convey the meaning of the non-verbal communication.

3.15. Conclusion

In the above section I have done a descriptive study of a selection of texts from AFR83 Zephaniah. I have used part of the method suggested by Lambert & Van Gorp (1985:53). I have used this method by doing a descriptive study on the micro-level. I have done this by identifying a selection of texts and to describe the translation strategies used by the translators. I have used Naudé (1999:79) to identify the translation strategies in each case.

I have supplemented the descriptive study with the perspective of complexity since a complexity approach does not attempt to negate or replace existing theories, but to supplement them (Marais 2014:15) with an additional perspective that can guide a researcher’s observations (Marais et al 2021:119). Usually DTS entails the comparison between a translation and its original, with the assumption that its original is a single text. I supplemented the DTS with the perspective of a complex source, the perspective that the source of AFR83

could not have been just one other text. I made it the purpose of the current study to argue for the presence of such a complex source by demonstrating that the translation must have emerged from a complex source that would have consisted of more than just one text.

The description of translation strategies revealed that, although other strategies were also used, the translators predominantly added, omitted, or changed the grammatical elements between their stated source text and the translation. This would happen in situations that translators were confronted with text-specific problems. These text-specific problems were at instances that the meaning of the source text was unclear (Nord 2005:168). The descriptive study revealed that at such instances the translations were forced to deviate from their source text. They would deviate not only from the Hebrew text, but also from text-critical suggestions in the stated source text. They would deviate by adding elements in translation that are not in the source text, omit elements from the source text, or that they would reformulate and change the grammatical structure between the source text and target text.

Although it was not the explicit purpose of the descriptive study, the study did progress with an additional hypothesis of what some of the incipient sources of AFR83 Zephaniah might have been in the form of other translations that the translators of AFR83 Zephaniah would have consulted. These were hypothesised as possibly being KJV, SV, AFR33, NBG-51, AFR53, NEB, GNB, and the M.Th. thesis of J.P.J. Olivier (1973). It became clear that the translators of AFR83 Zephaniah seldom seem to have consulted the KJV and SV directly since the assumption of the translators might have been that AFR33, AFR53, and NBG-51 sufficiently represent word-for-word translations already and there is no point in consulting even more such translations. The influence of the NEB, which was explicitly consulted according to the minutes of the Translation Commission of 2nd February 1971, became clear during the current study. The influence of the GNB, despite its appearance at a later stage during the translation process in 1976, also became clear. The translators would have consulted it probably as another source of what a translation could look like that attempted to follow the same translation theory as the AFR83. What also became clear, is that, except for a few instances, in the selection of texts referred to in the current study, the text-critical research and translation suggestions of J.P.J. Olivier were largely ignored.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSIONS

In the current study I indicated that a reductionist approach to a translation would assume that a translation is the result of the interaction between only two elements (i.e. a single source text and a single target text). The purpose of the current study was to demonstrate that a translation emerges from a complex source that would have consisted of several texts and other factors (Naudé 2022:1). I attempted to demonstrate this by referring specifically to AFR83 Zephaniah.

In the current study, I demonstrated the need for a descriptive study. I demonstrated that AFR83 emerged from an era in which a prescriptive approach to translation was dominant. I argued that the recent shift towards a descriptive approach to translation would make a descriptive study meaningful, because the purpose would be to approach AFR83 with the assumption that the translators have already achieved equivalence and that such a study would attempt to describe what strategies they used to do so. I also indicated how a descriptive study could be supplemented by a complexity perspective. A complexity perspective approaches a translation as an element of observable reality with the assumption that reality, and therefore also a translation, is emergent from a complex interaction of various factors and texts which formed part of its complex incipient sign system. This formed the hypothesis that AFR83 Zephaniah must have emerged from a complex source. In this way, I supplemented an existing method of DTS with the perspective of complexity that would guide my observations. The perspective with which I supplemented DTS was the perspective of the presence of a complex source, that if a descriptive study was to be done of AFR83 Zephaniah by comparing the translation with its original, such a descriptive study should be conducted with the hypothesis that the original to be compared with the translation is a complex source, not just the one source text that the translators claimed explicitly that they would use.

The purpose of the current study was to demonstrate the presence of a complex source and to demonstrate that AFR83 Zephaniah emerged from a complex incipient sign system. The descriptive study that was done by considering a selection of texts from the Book of Zephaniah revealed that the translators came across several text-specific problems where the meaning of the source text was not clear. In such instances the translators would use especially the strategies of addition, deletion, and transposition to establish their translation. The presence of a complex source was demonstrated by the fact that in such instances the translators must have

drawn from other sources since their translation seemed to deviate from their stated source text in all respects. In the case of the stated source text being BHS, this meant to identify instances that the translators deviated from both the Hebrew text and the text-critical suggestions contained in BHS, because this would demonstrate that the translators must have drawn from other sources to establish their translation.

I argued that, if the hypothesis is that AFR83 Zephaniah emerged from a complex source, then other specific elements might have been part of AFR83 Zephaniah's complex incipient sign system of which other texts would have been part, amongst other things. Due to the prescriptive approach that the translators would have followed, I formulated my hypothesis about what these sources might have been in the form of other translations that they would have consulted. Although the explicit purpose of the current study was merely to argue for the existence of a complex source, not to identify these other possible incipient texts or necessarily to describe elements of AFR83 Zephaniah's incipient sign system exhaustively, the current study did inadvertently identify some other possible incipient texts and other incipient elements. The comparison between AFR83 Zephaniah revealed that especially the NEB and GNB were influential incipient texts for AFR83 Zephaniah. I indicated that there were situations that the translators must have been guided not by specific other texts but by other meaning-bearing elements that formed part of its complex incipient sign system. These were instances that AFR83 Zephaniah seemed to follow a unique reading when it is compared to other possible incipient texts. In such cases, they seemed to have been guided by their internal belief system, their desire for a comprehensible target text.

Ultimately, the hypothesis that AFR83 Zephaniah emerged from a complex source has been demonstrated by the current study. An additional hypothesis was that, when deviating from their stated source text, the translators would have made use of the translation strategies of addition, deletion, and transposition, has also been demonstrated as correct. Another hypothesis was which other texts might have had an influence, might have been incipient to AFR83 Zephaniah that formed part of its complex source. This hypothesis has also been demonstrated as correct. In future study, the entire text of AFR83 could be analysed to determine how and the extent to which the use of complex source texts was practiced throughout the entire translation. For the discipline of translation studies, the current study demonstrates how DTS can be supplemented by the perspective of a complexity approach.

Referring specifically to the Book of Zephaniah, the complex incipient sign system of AFR83 Zephaniah could be investigated further. The current study focussed mainly on other possible incipient texts, whilst a complex incipient sign system consists of other elements as well. Similar studies could be done to compare the incipient sign systems of other translations of Zephaniah as well.

Possible further research could also entail how a complexity approach could supplement other methods of DTS. When referring to the description of translation strategies, it could be investigated to what degree such an approach might be reductionist in nature (i.e. to what degree is it reductionist in nature to assume that translators would have used only one translation strategy in a particular case). A complexity approach could reveal how various translation strategies have been employed at the same time, that various strategies do not necessarily exclude each other. The hypothesis that certain specific translation strategies reflect situations that translators would have deviated from their source text, therefore demonstrating that translators must have made use of other sources in such cases, could be tested in other translations as well.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ben-Zvi, E. 1991. *A Historical Critical Study of the Book of Zephaniah*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Brockington, L. H. 1973. *The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament: The Readings Adopted by the Translators of the New English Bible*. Oxford/ Cambridge: University Press.

Hermans, T. 1985. Translation Studies and a New Paradigm. In: Hermans, T. (ed). *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. New York: Routledge, pp. 7-15.

Holmes, J. S. 1972/1988. The Name and Nature of Translation Studies. In: James S. Holmes, *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 67–80.

Joubert, M. 2020. *The Influence of Social Righteousness Terminology Employed in the 1983 Afrikaans Bible for Shaping Afrikaner Social Identities*. University of the Free State: Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation.

Kruger, P. A. 1994. Nonverbal Communication and Symbolic Gestures in the Psalms. *Bible Translator* 45(2):F213-222.

Kruger, P. A. 1999. Liggaamstaal as Kommunikasie: Perspektiewe uit die Hebreeuse Bybel. *In die Skriflig* 33(2):145-164.

Lambert, J. & Van Gorp, H. 1985. On Describing Translations. In: Hermans, T. (ed). *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. New York: Routledge, pp. 42-53.

Larsen-Freeman, D. 2013. Complexity Theory: A New Way to Think. *RBLA, Belo Horizonte* 13(2):369-373.

Marais, K. 2014. *Translation Theory and Development Studies: A Complexity Theory Approach*. London: Routledge.

Marais, K. 2019. Translation Complex Rather than Translation Turns? Considering the Complexity of Translation. *Syn-Thèses* 9-10 (2019):43–55.

Marais, K. & Meylaerts, R. 2019. Introduction. In: Marais, K. & Meylaerts, R (eds), *Complexity Thinking in Translation Studies: Methodological Considerations*. New York: Routledge. Pp. 1-18.

Marais, K, Meylaerts, R. & Li, S. 2021. The Methodological Implications of Complexity Thinking in Translation Studies. In: Marais, K. & Meylaerts, R. *Exploring the Implications of Complexity Thinking for Translation Studies*. New York: Routledge. Pp. 119-142.

Minutes of the First Meeting of the Bible Translation Commission of the New Afrikaans Bible on 2nd February 1971 in Pretoria. Cape Town: Bible Society of South Africa, Archive

Naudé, J.A. 1999. A Descriptive Translation Analysis of the Schocken Bible. *Old Testament Essays* 12(1):73-93.

Naudé, J. A. 2001. The Afrikaans Bible Translations and Apartheid. *Acta Theologica* 21(1):106-123.

Naudé, J. A. 2002. An Overview of Recent Developments in Translation Studies with Special Reference to the Implications for Bible Translation. *Acta Theologica Supplementum* 2:44-69.

Naudé, J. A. 2005. Twentieth-Century English Bible Translations. *Acta Theologica* 25(2):70-89.

Naudé, J. A. 2006. The Qur'an in English – an Analysis in Descriptive Translation Studies. *Journal for Semitics* 15(2):431-464.

Naudé, J. A. 2009. “Soos ’n Hamer wat ’n Rots Vermorsel”: Die Afrikaanse Bybel van 1933 as Vertaling. *Acta Theologica* 29(2):54-73.

Naudé, J. A. 2011. A Narrative Frame Analysis of the 1933 Afrikaans Bible. *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae* 37(1):255-274.

Naudé, J. A. 2020. Nuwe en ou skatte: Die 2020- Afrikaanse vertaling van die Bybel as 'n hervertaling. *Tydskrif vir Geesteswetenskappe* 60(4-1):869-891.
doi.10.17159/2224-7912/2020/v60n4-1a2.

Naudé, J. A. 2022. Emergence of the Tyndale–King James Version tradition in English Bible translation. *HTS* 78(1), a7649. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v78i1.7649>.

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

Nord, C. 2005. *Text Analysis in Translation. Theory, Method, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis. Second Edition*. Amsterdam/ New York: Rodopi.

Nord, C. 2016. Function + Loyalty: Theology Meets Skopos. *Open Theology* 2016(2): 566-580

Olivier, J. P. J. 1973. *Sefanja: 'n Gemotiveerde Vertaling uit Hebreeus in Afrikaans*. (Zephaniah: A motivated/reasoned translation from Hebrew into Afrikaans). Unpublished M.Th. thesis: University of Stellenbosch.

Reid, P. M. 2021. *A Preliminary Investigation into the Samaritan Pentateuch as an Intralingual Translation*. Bloemfontein: Unpublished M.A. Thesis: University of the Free State.

Rosa, A 2010: Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) in: *Handbook Translation Studies, Volume 1*, 94-104.

Toury, G. 1985. A Rationale for Descriptive Translation. In: Hermans, T. (ed). *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. New York: Routledge, pp. 16-41.

BIBLES

Die Bybel: Nuwe Vertaling. 1983. Kaapstad: Bybelgenootskap van Suid-Afrika.

Biblia Hebraica: Pars II. 1906. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

Biblia Hebraica: Pars II. 1912. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

Biblia Hebraica. 1937 (1950). Stuttgart: Württemberg Bibelanstalt.

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. 1967 / 1977. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Good News Bible: The Bible in Today's English Version. 1976. New York: American Bible Society.

The Holy Bible: New International Version. 1978. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

The New English Bible. 1970. Oxford/ Cambridge: University Press.

ARCHIVAL MATERIALS FROM THE BIBLE SOCIETY OF SOUTH AFRICA

Notule van die Eerste Vergadering van die Vertalingskommissie vir die Nuwe Afrikaans Bybelvertaling, Gehou in die Ou Raadsaal van die Universiteit van Pretoria op 2 Februarie 1971 om 10:00 vm. (Minutes of the First Meeting of the Translation Commission for the New Afrikaans Bible Translation, held in the Old Council Hall of the University of Pretoria on 2 February 1971 at 10:00 am).

Translation Phase 1

Translation Phase 2

Translation Phase 3

Translation Phase 4