

## The Dynamics of the Principles of Determinacy and Indeterminacy in Sesotho Translation

Edwin Joseph Mohatlane

*University of the Free State, Department of African Languages, P. O. Box 339,  
Bloemfontein, 9300, South Africa  
E-mail: mohatlaneej@ufs.ac.za*

**KEYWORDS** Extrinsic Approach. Determinacy. Epistemology. Ontology

**ABSTRACT** The study investigates the possibility of the indeterminacy principle being a perpetual feature of Sesotho translation. As *modus operandi* the researcher deals with the language propositions that scholars postulated regarding the dynamics of determinacy and indeterminacy. The text type, the *skopos* or purpose of translation and the translation strategy would be applied as operative principles. The results in this work reflect that translation is not reproduction but transformation of attempt to express meaning. The conclusion actually signifies that the principle of indeterminacy tends to be inherent translation feature depending on the complexity or complication of the source text to be translated. The study therefore sensitises both the professional and budding translators that there would possibly be alternatives to every translation rendered. The study recommends that the translator should be mindful of the possibilities of being subjected to the dynamics of determinacy and indeterminacy when dealing with language and meaning.

### INTRODUCTION

The principle of indeterminacy is discussed in this study with the understanding that translation is not reproduction of meaning but transformation of meaning. The principle of indeterminacy actually refers to the uncertainty principle or the equivalence principle. It is for this purpose that the hypothesis in this paper implies that anything that concerns language and meaning involves the principle of indeterminacy. Within the parameters of translation, this argument refers to the shortfalls of the equivalence principle.

Many theories have been postulated in order to define the principle of determinacy and indeterminacy. Some translation scholars apply an intrinsic or intra-lingual approach to determinacy and indeterminacy. However, some scholars resort to the extrinsic or extra-lingual approach to the establishment of determinacy and indeterminacy in translation.

The intrinsic approach in this work implies a focus on the factors causing determinacy or indeterminacy within a specific language itself. In other words, the idea is to “unpack” the internal structure of the source text in order to determine its effect on determinacy and/or indeterminacy. Among the scholars who seem to approach the problem of indeterminacy from an intrinsic linguistic point of view, the study will focus mainly on Derrida (2004) and De Saussure (2012).

The extrinsic approach refers to an external perspective where the relationship between two or more languages may be significant to establish the determinacy or indeterminacy principles in translation. The scholars who will represent this category will be Quine (2000), Pym (1992), Toury (1980), Jakobson (1959) as well as Chesterman and Arrojo (2000).

Derrida (2004) through the theory of deconstruction attacks the possibility of stability of meaning as deconstruction deals with deconstructing the very meaning that one tries to develop. The principle of indeterminacy remains undefined and appears to run parallel to all the translation theories. Derrida (2004) shows that words and language lack stability of meaning. Every language is interrelated with other languages and it underlyingly affects the determination of meaning.

De Saussure (2012) maintains that the relationship between the words (signifiers) and the referents (signifieds) in any language tends to be arbitrary and causes the uncertainty of meaning. De Saussure (2012) states categorically that:

*“The basic principle of the arbitrariness of the sign is that there is no natural reason why a particular sign should be attracted to a particular concept.”*

The arbitrariness of words and objects brings about indeterminacy. Translations are not always adequate to their source text. There are always propositions or translation options based on one source text.

What we think we know is actually not certain. Anything that concerns meaning and language involves the indeterminacy element. This implies that there could be other alternatives. Indeterminacy is an important theory that runs parallel to any theory that we know about. There is no absolute objectivity in what we say as our observations. In translation as well, there is no reason for us to believe that what we observe can attain likeness or objectivity among different people. Indeterminacy therefore in general refers to all the possible propositions that are based on language or meaning. Quine (2000:409) admits that:

*“the indeterminacy of translation was always a conjecture, albeit a plausible one”.*

The indeterminacy principle therefore influenced the various translation scholars to theorise about translation and to come up with the total epistemological break in different translation paradigms. However, the paradigms or propositions themselves lack the element of determinacy or certainty and therefore constantly cause a series of changes in focus on translation. This phenomenon serves as one of the issues that influenced the researcher to reflect on the dynamics of determinacy and indeterminacy with special focus on Sesotho translation.

In 1958 and 1959, the Harvard Professor of Philosophy, namely, Quine (2000) used translation to illustrate the principle of indeterminacy. Quine (2000) has made a discovery that the principle of determinacy in translation is not quite possible as it deals with languages that are different structurally and culturally. This is the reason Quine (2000) believes that there is no possibility of a radical translation. In the case where it appears as if there is equivalence or determinacy, then it is reckoned as a specific scenario that only occurs occasionally. Indeterminacy principle therefore has to do with a fundamental doubt that we have when we use language. It is easy on the basis of the language differences and the possibility of shifts in meaning that it had been possible for Quine (2000) to illustrate the principle of indeterminacy in translation.

In translation, the source text may be rendered in different ways. You may find a source text having more or less 3 possible translation options that are different but based on the same original text. In the case where we find one possible way of translating a source text, the possibility is that it would pose some doubts as to

whether it is a translation proper. This point is strongly supported by Bar-on (1993). It could perhaps be a case of terminology differences or grammatical differences. Indeterminacy at this stage could mean weighing possibilities or calculating risks in order to try to establish the determinacy or the principle of equivalence. The relationship between the source text and the target text could be that all possible translations (target texts) could be equivalent to the source text but not the source text being equivalent to the target text. In other words, the relationship based on the indeterminacy principle is one-directional or one-dimensional. It moves from one point to the other but not the other way round.

However, Croce (1902:73) is of the opinion that:

*... the relative possibility of translations; not as reproductions of the same original expressions (which it would be in vain to attempt) but as productions of similar expressions more or less nearly resembling the originals. The translation called good is an approximation which has original value as work of art and can stand by itself.*

This implies that any possible translation that has been formulated from the source text has to have its own independent status as an original text. The formulated optional translations are not dependent on equivalence. On that note, Toury (1980) maintains that there could be no total equivalence. He also believes that translations are different yet belong to a common set. In other words, even though the translations can be different in terms of articulation of the basic structure, they originate from the same source text. However, Chesterman (2000) argues that the relation between a translation and its source text is not determined by difference only. Change of meaning is set to be dependent in some cases on the context. This point is strongly motivated by Arrojo (2000) in her firm assumption that:

*“Meanings are always context-bound ... depending on our viewpoint and our circumstances, we may perceive them to be either ‘more’ or ‘less’ stable but all of them are always equally dependent on a certain context.”* (in Chesterman and Arrojo 2000: 10).

The above point gives an indication that one possible method of dealing with the uncertainty principle in translation could be the establish-

ment of context within which the indeterminate meaning is applied.

If there would be only one way of rendering a translation, then it would certainly not confirm the translation proper. There is always an option – a way of probabilities and the calculation of risks. Many theorists applied this theory to translation or interpreting. Many translations are not equivalent to their sources but similar. Translation is not the same but similar to the original. In the same vein, we say that the translation is like the original English source text but we don't say that the original is like the Sesotho target translation.

Similarity is one-directional and not two-directional. Similarity presupposes time difference and value difference. It is time difference because readers are interested in what came first. It is value difference because readers are interested in what is more significant. This belief justifies the paradigm that says that the source text is more important (dominant; the norm) that determines the adequacy of the translation (equivalence paradigm).

The above suggests a hierarchical relationship between the English source text and the Sesotho target text in the sense that the Sesotho target text tends to imitate the English source text. But, the two languages (English and Sesotho) are not the same. Where Sesotho serves as the source text and English as the target text, the situation would be different.

Indeterminacy is not determined by the source text but the way the nature of the translation involves indeterminacy (uncertainty). In other words, it is not only the case that the source text will regulate the indeterminacy but the translation itself involves the uncertainty principle or lack of equivalence.

Derrida (2004) maintains that the signifiers that we use to point at the signifieds are somehow inadequate, that is, they cause doubt or uncertainty in terms of the meaning. Derrida (2004) maintains that the words that we use deconstruct the very meaning that we try to develop. Derrida (2004) says that when we speak, we always use more than one language. So, instead of getting straight to the meaning, you tend to ask questions regarding the nature of the concepts, the lexical items and ultimately the meaning becomes deconstructed. Therefore translation does not mean reproduction of meaning but transformation of meaning. Translation

is translation and can never be absolute in terms of the meaning. It always leaves room for indeterminacy.

### **Aim of the Study**

The aim in this study is to demonstrate the dynamics of determinacy and indeterminacy in Sesotho translation. It is ideal to establish when translation is determinate and when it is indeterminate. The determinants of determinacy and indeterminacy in Sesotho among the Sesotho translators are quite phenomenal. It is imperative that the principles be explicated in Sesotho translation with a view to improve on the quality of translation expertise and informed decision-making skills among the Sesotho translators. In the same vein it would be imperative to establish whether translation options of the same source text are equally determinate or indeterminate. Comparing the source text and the target text, it would be prudent to establish the extent of Quine's (2000) the inscrutability of reference, that is, the influence of terminology in relation to the text as a whole.

It is important in this study to verify whether the principle of indeterminacy only happens between different languages in a specific language combination. For that matter, Bishop (2005) makes a clear distinction between the principle of determinacy and indeterminacy. It could also be significant to determine whether the uncertainty principle is enshrined within the very nature of each language itself. In other words, it would be ideal to determine the reason we talk of language dynamics as well as the text type as embedding the whole issue of indeterminacy.

The researcher wonders whether the shifts in translation paradigms do not have any relationship with the indeterminacy principle. It is for the same purpose that the study focuses and discusses the observations regarding the epistemological changes within the development of Sesotho translation.

### **Literature Review**

Quine (2000) took an adventure to establish how indeterminacy can affect language and meaning. He made an important discovery that language in translation involves a lot of interpretations and that the meaning entails a lot of shifts without any element of precision or absolute certainty.

At a later stage, Pym (2008) reports that Quine (2000) decided to focus on the influence of indeterminacy to translation. The basis of argument that prompted this study came when Quine (1960) emphasized that in as far as translation is concerned, the indeterminacy will always result between the source text and the target text. In his own words, Quine (1987) states that "... *indeterminacy will never completely go away*". This probably serves as the reason that, more often than not, causes the source text to be followed by the possibility of more than one translation. This marks indeterminacy in translation. One therefore wonders whether this could also be the case in Sesotho translation.

It had always been apparent that translators produce different translations based on one source text. The translations produced are perceived as feasible and relevant in as far as the message of the source text is concerned. This implies that it is not necessarily common to have one single translation that does not warrant any variation or reformulation whatsoever. This then indicates the possibility of indeterminacy in translation. But, the formidable question would then be the cause of indeterminacy in translation. As indicated that different translation options all claim to be equivalent or determinate to the source text, it then follows that the whole issue of indeterminacy serves as a challenge to the validity of the equivalence. The equivalence paradigm is being put to test in this case.

There are various scholars who reflected on the determinacy and indeterminacy in translation with particular focus on various language and translation theories. Noam Chomsky (2008) is one of the known linguistic exponents who expressed an observation that linguistic theories are underdetermined by evidence and as such seem to enshrine indeterminacy. Within the parameters of translation, it is also apparent that indeterminacy seems to be embedded in them as they are introduced one after the other with a view to try to express equivalence or determinacy in relation to the source text. The same phenomenon is also relevant to literature where texts are accounted for by a succession of literary paradigms such as, romanticism, new criticism, structuralism, Marxism, post-structuralism, psychoanalysis as well as reader-response theories. These are all the attempts to deal with the dynamics of indeterminacy in literature.

Pym (1992) has made a discovery that the 20<sup>th</sup> century Western translation theories, had equivalence as a functional illusion. However, the principle of equivalence has always been challenged or undermined by indeterminacy or the uncertainty principle. The controversy between indeterminacy and equivalence existed from the very inception of all the translation theories. The reason that might have caused the introduction of the variety of the translation theories is, in fact, to try to deal with the whole concept of uncertainty embedded in all these theories.

In trying to provide the partial resolutions to indeterminacy and probably to ensure the continuity of equivalence or determinacy that supposedly would prevail, the following paradigm shifts occurred in their chronological order but in different time lines:

#### **Equivalence Paradigm**

Theories of equivalence operated under the impression that equivalence would serve as a linguistic fact between the source and the target text. However, it has been soon discovered by various translators that the uncertainty principle still remains persistent.

#### **Skopos Theory**

The *skopos* or purpose-based theories developed with the understanding that translating with a particular purpose may guarantee an element of certainty. Carrying out actions and doing away with the earlier linguistic phenomena in translation could not be enough to ensure determinacy. As a matter of fact, the lapse of time revealed that *skopos* theory also falls short to provide a convincing degree of determinacy in translation.

#### **Descriptive Paradigm**

The descriptive paradigm concentrated on issues that occur out in the world or the social systems that have pertinent relationship with the development of translation in order to do away with the principle of indeterminacy. However, it could not be enough to operate only on these observations as the problem of indeterminacy in translation seemed to be too intricate to be resolved through this mechanism only. De-

scriptive translation studies introduce a new paradigm in the sense that it suggests a descriptive as opposed to a prescriptive approach to translation studies.

### **Localisation**

Technology was introduced to standardise language in order to do away with, supposedly, the indeterminacy and perhaps allow the equivalence or determinacy principle to be reintroduced. Even though, the uncertainty principle still remained prevalent in most translations, including even the machine translation.

We realize that society operates through shared illusions. For every theory that has been presented in the above paragraphs, it is clear that every paradigm has its own criticism centered on the whole issue of indeterminacy. With this background information, readers therefore understand that the translation paradigms had to change in order to cope with the demands of trying to establish the determinacy in the development of translation.

### **METHODS**

In order to put the determinacy and indeterminacy principles into proper perspective to Sesotho readers in general, and the Sesotho translators in particular, the researcher would divide the scholars' perceptions regarding their observations about the indeterminacy principle into two categories. The first category would be those scholars who tend to apply the intrinsic or intra-linguistic approach to the identification of indeterminacy. The second category would be those who deal with the external factors or extra-linguistic factors of indeterminacy. Within the parameters of this article, the intrinsic factors would be those that deal with the language specific issues. In other words, here the reader deals with the linguistic phenomena in order to explain the occurrence of indeterminacy in Sesotho translation. The extrinsic or extra-textual factors are those interested on issues beyond the internal structure of a specific language.

The scholars whom we identify in this work to be focusing on intra-linguistic factors in order to establish the indeterminacy cases in translation will be Derrida (2004), De Saussure (2012)

and Noam Chomsky (2008). On the other side of the coin, the scholars who mostly emphasise on the extra-linguistic factors will be Quine and his radical translation, as well as Pym and the dynamics of transference from one language to the other.

The researcher applied the three basic methods to judge or determine the contrasting principles – determinacy and indeterminacy. These principles will be discussed in this work within the context of an epistemological or methodological point of view. In other words, it will be interesting to try to determine how the body of knowledge underlying the development of translation had been functional in explicating the two basic principles.

The three principles that would be applied with concise examples from English to Sesotho are the text type, the purpose as well as the translation strategy that has been applied. These principles are selected to try to situate the discussions in this study in relation to Quine's (2000) observations in translation in other languages. It is therefore proper to establish how the principles would feature in the case of translation from English to Sesotho language.

The whole idea in applying these principles is to try to follow the three basic arguments postulated by Quine (2000). The three arguments or propositions that would be raised and analysed in this work are the following:

#### **Text Type as Determinant Variable**

The application of text type may result in determinate or indeterminate translation. In other words, it appears that different types of texts produce difference in terms of the level of determinacy or indeterminacy (minimal, maximal or zero indeterminate). If one possible target text or translation is proliferated in terms of the application of the text type principle, then the translation would be said to be determinate.

On the other side of the coin, if more than one translation options are yielded in terms of the text type principle, then the produced translations would be indeterminate

#### **Skopos (Purpose) As Determinant Variable**

The purpose of translation can serve as the regulating principle that provides evidence to argue that translation is determinate or indeterminate; and

### The Translation Strategy As Determinant Variable

The translation strategy applied during the translation process has an effect to give a sense as to whether translation would be determinate or indeterminate.

Quine (2000) has added another dimension in the assessment of determinate or indeterminate translations. He raised an "Exact Translation Hypothesis" where he contemplates that "*anything that can be said in one natural language can be translated exactly into any other language*". The researcher intends to consider how the tentative statement is applicable and perhaps relevant to the Sesotho translation situation.

Given the three methods, the researcher will obviously apply them within the context of Sesotho translation. As a matter of necessity, the concluding arguments would be based on these hypotheses.

### Operationalisation

The various English source texts derived from the various fields are selected and translated to demonstrate the dynamics of determinacy and indeterminacy in Sesotho translation.

#### *Example 1: How to start the engine (4A-GE engine)*

**ST1:** The electronic fuel injection system in your engine automatically controls the proper air/fuel mixture for starting. So you can start the cold or hot engine as follows:

Press the clutch pedal to the floor and shift the transmission into neutral.

#### **Ka moo o ka qalang ho dumisa enjene ka teng (enjene ya 4A-GE)**

**TT:** *Tshebediso ya taolo ya petrolo ka hara enjene e laola ka boyona motswako o loket-seng wa moya/petrolo bakeng sa ho dumisa koloi. Ka tsela e jwalo, o ka qala ho dumisa enjene e batang kapa e tjhesang ka mokgwa ona:*

*Hatella sekgoqetsane sa tlelatjhe fatshe ho leba folurung mme o fetolele phetisetso ho ya ho nyutrale.*

#### *Example 2: A culture specific word that is not lexicalised in Sesotho language*

**ST2:** He goes to the bank to cash a cheque

**TT1:** *O ya bankeng ho a tjhentjha tjeheke*

**TT2:** *O ya bankeng ho a tjhwatla tjeheke*

**TT3:** *O ya bankeng ho kopa tjehelete e lewana bakeng sa tjeheke*

#### *Example 3: Irrelevant context*

**ST3:** They requested him to propose a toast during the ceremony

**TT:** *Ba mo kopile ho qhatsetsa bamemunya hore ba fupe methangwana moketeng*

#### *Example 4: Idiomatic expression*

**ST4:** Birds of a feather flock together

**TT:** *Nonyana tsa siba le le leng di fofa mmoho*

#### *Example 5: Replacement of proverb with a proverb*

**ST5:** Once bitten twice shy

**TT1:** *Mmutla-kotlwa-tsebe o tshoha difotle*

**TT2:** *Monna ha a bone habedi*

#### *Example 6: Colloquial language*

**ST6:** He drives the car under the influence of liquor

**TT1:** *O kganna koloi a le tlasa tshusumetso ya tahi*

**TT2:** *O kganna koloi a tahlwe*

**TT3:** *O kganna koloi a itjeletse*

Our discussion of the various translation options is based on the understanding that the various translation options are not necessarily right or wrong. There is no element of precision or certainty as to which translation is correct or incorrect. Friedman (2000) supports this view as he claims that:

*"The point is not that we cannot be sure whether the analytical hypothesis is right, but that there is not even ...an objective matter to be right or wrong about."*

It is for this reason that readers will realize that the indeterminacy principle is an embedded feature in the languages used as English-Sesotho language combination.

## RESULTS

The production of translations takes into consideration the fact that the two languages are not the same and that the difference in itself implies the indeterminacy in terms of meaning and language usage.

The determinants of indeterminacy in the examples discussed in the paragraph of operationalization are the following:

- Culture and culture based words are influential towards the indeterminacy.
- The use of language.
- The context in which the statement is made.
- The form or format in which the statement is presented, that is, figuratively or literally.
- The complexity of the statement.
- The complication of the statement.

In responding to the question as to when translation options are determinate or indeterminate; the study has demonstrated that a text that has more possibilities of ambiguity. The language usage and absurdity of meaning become indeterminate whereas the determinacy does not necessarily warrants any additional translations.

Translations are not equally determinate or indeterminate because language usage in different languages is not the same. Languages in translation differ in terms of degree of indeterminacy. It happens sometimes that readers of the same source text would translate the text differently in terms of their language competence, personal experience, educational standard and cultural background.

It is possible that the more complex the source text is, the more indeterminate it becomes. This analogy is also maintained by Pena (1988). The complexity is brought about by the fact that the keywords in a complex text are arranged and configured in a network. In this way, when you translate one keyword, it will give you a clue as to how to deal with other linked or related words. In other words, it will be easier to translate other lexical items that are coherent to the meaning communicated by the keyword. In this way, the indeterminacy of the text becomes diminished with a view to try to build up the determinacy or equivalence in the translated text.

### Example 1

This is a complicated text that involves technical terms. However, it is still translatable and determinate because the basic meaning is still

easily accessible. But, it is possible that given the same text for Sesotho translation, another translator can produce a different version of the text in terms of the choice of words that could be made.

As a result, this text is determinate but there could still be other options to translate it for perhaps another target group. Given the fact that it could need other interpretations for the other target group, it is still liable to be indeterminate.

### Example 2

It identifies itself as purely indeterminate. This is so, because the language used is heavily dependent on borrowed words that are not culturally lexicalised in Sesotho. The complicated nature of borrowed words may result in the possibility of indeterminacy. This example demonstrates Quine's (2000) inscrutability of reference as it shows how a specific term affects the meaning within the context of the translation as a whole.

### Example 3

The source text becomes too difficult to translate (indeterminate) seeing that it is out of the conventional Basotho cultural context. The translator would therefore doubt whether the translation rendered is correct seeing that it is not *in sync* with the cultural practices as well as the language expressions of the Basotho. De Mendoza (2008) makes reflections on cross-cultural references between the source and the target texts and confirms this particular view. It then appears that any expression that is not in line with the culture of the custodians of the target language, would be more indeterminate than being determinate. It warrants the readers to delve deep in making appropriate decisions to yield determinate meanings.

### Example 4

The text type contributes towards the indeterminacy of the translation. In this case, it becomes highly incumbent upon the translator to know the meaning of the idiomatic expression before he could transfer it to Sesotho language.

It is at this point where we recall and realize the importance of Nord's (1997) text analysis prior the translation process.

***Example 5: Overcome the indeterminacy through replacement***

Though example 5 consists of an idiomatic expression as example 4, the researcher may apply it to illustrate the replacement of source text concept with equivalent target text concept as possible method of resolving the indeterminacy. The principle of indeterminacy seems not to be avoidable as two different languages are involved. This example illustrates the determinacy principle in the sense that it does not involve high activity on the part of the translator. The translator is not expected to make many translation decisions but is only engaged in the replacement of equivalent idiomatic expressions. In this way the translation options are maximally determinate and minimally indeterminate.

**DISCUSSION**

This study has demonstrated that intrinsically and extrinsically Sesotho translation involves determinacy and indeterminacy. Both the determinacy and indeterminacy principles are caused by the text type, the purpose of translation and the translation strategy applied.

The results in this work in relation to the translated texts have proven that indeterminacy is always enshrined in the use of language and meaning. It then gives the translator and the reading public a clue that indeterminacy will always be implied when language is used. The arbitrariness that is implied by Ferdinand de Saussure between the word (signifier) and the referent (signified) ensures the indeterminacy between the source text and the target text. It tends to provide a linguistic justification of an intrinsic approach to this study.

The study reflects that all languages are not equally determined, because the development of terminology and grammatical rules between those two languages is not the same. In other words, when you translate, you will tend to agree on certain aspects but not in all aspects.

It is possible that the more complex the text or speech, the more indeterminate it becomes. However, when you look at a complex text, you find that there are keywords that form a network. Such a network will inform you about the manner in which other words in the text should be translated. It only challenges the translator to work hard in making translation decisions.

Example 1 identifies itself as an example of a complex German text. If you decide on keywords or keynotes, then the whole lot of other things will be decided upon. The more the keynotes in a complex text, the more decisions that have to be made and the more indeterminate the text tends to be.

But, if a text has quite a number of difficult words to translate, it then becomes a complicated but not necessarily a complex text. The complexity of the text applies when the translator has to make a variety of decisions for the keywords. But, when a text involves scattered bits of difficult lexical items, it does not necessarily become complex but complicated.

Some texts can be complicated but can still be translated as determinate translations. A legal contract can be very complicated but can be translated because it is not complex. We recognize the difficult words and we deal with them and as such the complication is over. Kruger (2002) maintains that legal language could be defined as a special type of language which shares basic linguistic features with general language but displays other specific characteristics used only in the field of law – the “*legalese*” or a typical language of the law. It is the nature of the language used that causes the indeterminacy effect in the interpretation of the text.

“*Legalese*” carries connotations of legal mannerisms such as wordiness, lack of clarity, pomposity and dullness. The implications of an inadequate legal text translation may vary from losing a client to being sued.

**The Difference between a Complex and Complicated Text and Its Effect on Indeterminacy**

The more keynotes or keywords are found in the source text, the more decisions pertaining to the method of translation that the translator has to make. This observation justifies the notion that translation is a decision-making process. The key-terms in the target text may be scattered around the entire text as a result of which the target text becomes complex and quite indeterminate on the part of the reader or even the translator himself. A complex text tends to be indeterminate as it poses more translation problems. Complexity has direct reference and relevance to indeterminacy. A text of a foreign language altogether serves as the example as it



involves a lot of calculation of risks and decision-making processes along the pipeline.

With regard to a complicated text, there are fewer terms that may be problematic for transference but are not actually linked in such a manner that they disturb the accessibility of the textual message. The text becomes complicated but not necessarily complex. A legal contract may have some concepts that are available in the text but not necessarily central to the accessibility of the underlying message. Unlike in the case of a complex text, a complicated text involves fewer opportunities of decision-making than a complex text.

### CONCLUSION

The study has reflected on the experiences and the epistemological background of the translator in trying to develop perfect translations in Sesotho translation. It therefore depicted that Sesotho translations may not necessarily be said to be perfect but meaningful and relevant towards the purpose for which they were intended. It is clear that Sesotho language also includes other languages in its development. The indeterminacy element within these translations is therefore generated by the use of concepts from other languages and that eventually causes changes in meaning.

Based on the observations derived from the literature review, it follows that the question of indeterminacy in Sesotho needs to last forever. It has been indicated in the literature review that there had to be paradigm shifts based on the effects of the indeterminacy principle. In Sesotho translation, indeterminacy degree fluctuates from minimal to maximal levels depending on the purpose (*skopos*) as well as the text types.

The principle of indeterminacy in Sesotho translation is assumed to last as Sesotho language as the target language will never be the same as any source text language. The meaning embedded in Sesotho words may not be absolute to maintain determinacy or equivalence in relation to the source text. In other words, even though the ST and the TT may appear to be equivalent, the meaning will always entail indeterminacy.

Within the Structuralist theoretical framework, the study has shown that the relationship between the word (signifier) and the referent (signified) is totally arbitrary. With this information

as background, it therefore speaks on its own that indeterminacy is unavoidable and will always account for a series of paradigm shifts in language, literature and translation.

Another possibility among the factors influencing indeterminacy in translation is the difference in concepts or terminology used by the various social institutions. The social institutions that could be cited here are the political institution against the educational institution – The religious and the scientific social institution - the railways as opposed to the airways. All these social situations could result in the possibility of indeterminacy as readers will have to work hard, think deep in order to get to grips with the meaning. In this case we realize that the epistemological background accounts for the indeterminacy between the said social institutions.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

Though indeterminacy may not completely be done away with, it is important that the translator should make relevant decisions to deal with uncertainties in the text. Translation identifies itself always as a decision-making process. It is therefore incumbent upon the translator to take meaningful decisions for the benefit of the target group that he translates for, the initiator who entrusted him with the job as well as the general reading public.

Within the South African dispensation where there is an influx of many languages, it is ideal that the notion of indeterminacy be clearly explicated, demonstrated and articulated in Sesotho translation.

Indeterminacy appears to be always embedded in our languages and we should therefore be aware thereof. We should not put ourselves in stressful situations that people do not understand or cannot conceive our messages. It should be borne in our minds as custodians of our Sesotho language that other languages are not the same as Sesotho and can never be. It is therefore self-evident that the uncertainty principle will be obvious in translating from any language to Sesotho or *vice versa*.

Taken from the fact that language involves words as signifiers that are arbitrarily related to the referents or concepts that they refer to, translators should observe the possibility of shifts of meaning and uncertainties in the articulation of meaning. As other languages develop through

borrowing words from other languages, *foreignisation* and *indigenisation* of concepts in the translation process, it tends to be meaningful to think that translators should continue to accept that indeterminacy runs parallel to Sesotho language usage. It gives challenges to Sesotho translators to deal quite meaningfully with determinate and indeterminate meaning and language aspects in Sesotho translation with a view to build stronger and meaningful future opportunities for the developing translations into Sesotho language.

Within our Sesotho social communities, this study recommends a number of mechanisms through which people can actually deal with indeterminacy. If people apply and actually follow the social norms within the parameters of their language usage and their cultural experiences, that could serve as a reliable mechanism to deal with uncertainties (indeterminacy) and to promote the certainty principle (determinacy) in Sesotho social environments.

Focusing exclusively on Sesotho translation, it should be acceptable that language is in a constant state of flux. Language is changing with time and context and therefore tends to be liable to produce uncertainties (due to the dynamics of determinacy and indeterminacy paradigm). Translators cannot expect one possible type of rendition in a form of translation. Translating a source text will always subject itself to a variety of different interpretations (translation options).

We have realized in this particular study how the translator can use one single source text to actually produce a number of translation options. We also have to emphasise that there is no distinct translation options that can make a claim of being more meaningful, linguistically accessible and culturally acceptable than other translation options. That could be a fallacy that cannot benefit the development of Sesotho translation in anyway.

#### REFERENCES

- Bar-On D 1993. Indeterminacy of Translation – Theory and Practice. *Journal of Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 53: 781-810.
- Bishop R C 2005. *Determinism and Indeterminism*. Faculty of Philosophy, University of Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chesterman A, Arrojo R 2000. Forum, shared ground in translation studies. *Target*, 12: 151-160.
- Chomsky N 2008. *Reflections on Language*. London: Temple Smith.
- Croce B 1902. *Estetica come scienza dell' espressione e linguistica generale*. Translated by Douglas Ainslie as *Aesthetic as a Science of Expression and General Linguistic*. London: Noonday.
- De Mendoza A H 2008. The problem of translation in cross-cultural research on emotion concepts. *The International Journal for Diagonal Science*, 3: 241-248.
- Derrida J 2004. Des Tours de Babel (English and French versions). In: JF Graham, (Ed.): *Difference in Translation*. Ithaca New York: Cornell University Press, pp. 165-207.
- De Saussure F 2012. *Course in General Linguistics*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Friedman M 2000. Physicalism and the indeterminacy of translation. *Nous*, 9: 353-374.
- Heidegger M 1957. *Der Satz Vom Grund*. Pfullingen: Neske.
- Jakobson R 1959. On linguistic aspects of translation. In: RA Brower (Ed.): *On Translation*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, pp. 34-47.
- Kruger A 2002. Corpus-based translation research: its development and implications for general, literary and Bible translation. *Acta Theologica Supplement*, 5: 70-106.
- Levy J 1967. Translation as a Decision Process. In: A Chesterman (Ed.): *To Honour Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 73-81.
- Nord C 1997. *Translating As a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Oy Finn Lectura 1989. The translation studies reader. In: L Venuti (Ed.): *On the Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 148-159.
- Pena L 1988. *Indeterminacy of Translation as a Hermeneutic Doctrine*. *Hermeneutics and the Tradition*. Washington: American Catholic Philosophical Association.
- Pym A 1992. Translation error analysis and the interface with language teaching. In: Cay Dollerup, Anne Loddegaard (Eds.): *The Teaching of Translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 279-288.
- Pym A 2008. *On Indeterminacy in Translation in Translation. A Survey Of Western Theories*. Tarragona, Spain: Intercultural Studies Group Universitat Rovira I Virgili.
- Quine W V 1960. *Word and Object*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press.
- Quine W V 1987. Indeterminacy of translation again. *Journal of Philosophy*, 84: 5-10.
- Quine W V 2000. Quine's responses. In: Alex Orenstein, Petr Kotatko (Eds.): *Knowledge, Language and Logic. Question for Quine, Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 407-430.
- Toury G 1980. *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv: Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.