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Abstract

This study examines the challenges that may hinder faithfulness in translation between the English and Igbo languages within the framework of the interpretive theory of translation. The study is purely descriptive and data are derived from the literature as well as from intrinsic evidence. It is established that despite the cultural and structural challenges that exist, it is possible to achieve an acceptable level of fidelity in English-Igbo translations within the framework of the interpretive theory of translation. However, it is further noted that within the scientific and the technical domain, there is a universal acceptance of scientific notations and symbols across languages.

Introduction

1.0 Background of The Study

The quest for food and security makes it unavoidable for speakers of different languages to meet and interact in various contexts. Often, effective communication among them is hindered by lack of mutual intelligibility. The need, therefore, arises for a process of expressing information from one language to another without altering the message. In other words, human interaction requires the practice of translation.

According to Maduka-Durunze in his forward to Eke & Ugoji (1999, P.x), “translation is the process of putting across codified meaning from one cultural-linguistic system to another to aid inter-cultural learning and understanding”. Eke and Ugoji (1999, P.1) further gave an etymological explanation of translation. According to them, the French word “traduction” (Translation) is derived from two Latin words, Trans (across) and ducere (to lead). This means that translation would refer to the process of leading a person across socio-linguistic/cultural boundaries. Several other scholarly definitions of translation abound but the above views are apt for our purpose in this work.

From the foregoing, it is established that the art of translation does not just involve the reproduction of a text in one language into another. It does not also end with
the transfer of message. Translation is a cross linguistic and cross cultural activity. The aim is to bring the source message home to the target language. In other words, the socio-cultural and linguistic background of the source language text need to be rendered appropriately in the target language without losing the message. Ajunwa (2014, P.3) maintains that there is a need to preserve, as much as possible, the source language message and style. In other words, translation is seen as a language barrier breaker through which an author’s message and style is carried over to another language.

Ajunwa (2014) records that according to a recent (2003) BBC guide to languages; there are up to 7,000 languages spoken around the world today with, of course, much more number of dialects. It is a clear linguistic fact that mutual intelligibility disappears as languages separate further from one another, meaning that as one travels in any one direction, dialectal and language differences accumulate until speakers from opposite ends can no longer understand themselves.

The need for mutual interaction among people of the world cannot be gainsaid. In addition to socio-economic and political reasons, several other factors such as religion, recreation, education, natural disaster, wars, etc push man to move from one linguistic area to another. This brings to bare the need for effective communication among different speech communities across the globe and in turn, underscores the role of translation in bridging communication gaps between people who speak different languages.

The Nigerian colonial experience, coupled with its complex linguistic situation of multilingualism has established English as the official language of the country. All aspects of the national life of Nigeria is lived with the English language. Unfortunately, not all citizens of the country are literate enough to communicate effectively with the English language. Yet these illiterate members of the population live and interact with the literate ones in the cities. Communication in the official language is, thus, hindered by the situation.

Perhaps, the generally accepted solution to these complex communication challenges is translation. This can be seen in efforts in the media (print and electronic) to present translated versions of news, reportorial, advertisements, etc, in the various local languages of the people.

The extent to which these and other translations faithfully convey the original messages of their source texts is the focus of this study. However, we shall limit this study to the fidelity challenges in translations between English and Igbo only.

1.1 The Concept of Fidelity in Translation

According to Guralink (1979), faithfulness/fidelity means “the quality of being accurate, reliable and exact”.

Ajunwa (2014) likens fidelity in translation to the Biblical concept of fidelity which requires a wife to be faithful to her husband and vice versa. According to him, fidelity in translations means the extent to which a translator accurately renders a source language text into a target language text without distorting, violating or betraying the message as well as the style of the source language text.

Hurtado-Albir (1990, P. 118) relates fidelity to three things, viz

1. What the author means to say.
2. The target language and
3. The reader.

According to her,

Fidelity is a three-fold relationship starting from the author’s intentions, the target language to the reader of the translation. These three things are indissociable. If one remains faithful to one of these parameters and betrays the remaining ones, he cannot be faithful to the sense.

For Hurtado-Albir, it is as important to grasp the meaning of the source text as it is to understand the intention of the author in order to convey the intentions to the target readers. This is fidelity in translation. It does not only mean faithfulness to the words.

For Toury (1980), Flammant (1983) and Mounin (1995), the most fundamental elements of quality in translation include fidelity, exactness and equivalence. They emphasize the idea of rendering the message of the source text with exactitude. In Mounin’s view, “in our translations, like women, we must be perfect in both faithfulness and beauty”.

The above views seem to insist on perfection and exactness in translations. Likening the practice to a woman, Mounin says that if it is faithful, it is not beautiful, and if it is beautiful, it is not faithful, as if being both is mutually exclusive. But we see faithfulness as a relative term. It could be a principle of loyalty or honesty, a matter of exactness or accuracy, or all. The question then is, is it possible to produce a perfect translation which is thematically and stylistically exact to the original text? Even-Zohar (1973:43) holds that

An adequate translation is one which realizes in the target language the textual relationships of a source language text with no breach of its own basic linguistic system.

In other words, the linguistic system of the target language must not be sacrificed in the name of fidelity to those of the source language.
For the purpose of this study, we accept that fidelity is necessary in translation but must not entail absolute faithfulness to structure and style. We agree with Hurtado-Abir (1990) that faithfulness to meaning overrides faithfulness to word-order and that in being faithful to meaning the target language structure must not be distorted in order to ensure that the target audience receives the message in the same sense as the source audience.

So for us, fidelity in translation is the ability to use target language socio-cultural and structural equivalents to transfer the message of a source language into the target language. This, according to Hurtado-Albir (1991, P. 72) is “sense equivalence”.

2. Theoretical Framework

This study adopts the interpretive theory of translation, also known as the theory of sense translation, as its theoretical framework. This is because the concept of fidelity in translation was developed within this framework with different scholars and translation practitioners applying it in various ways, almost losing the main trust of the theory. Those who insist on faithfulness to word-order and linguistic style of the source language text are operating outside the postulations of the interpretive theory of translation.

The theory was made popular by Seleskovitch and Lederer (1976:1988) and developed at the Ecole Superieure d’interpretes et de Traducteurs (ESIT) of the University of Paris III. The theory has it that the totality of the sense of the source text is understood and transmitted in the target text. This suggests that it is not the languages that are translated but the texts, ie the discourse, in a bid to communicate. Seleskovitch (1976, pp. 23-24) holds that sense is an invariant part of translation, it is the synthesis of style, connotation, the message and every other thing which plays significant roles in the communication process.

The interpretive theory, further postulates that reading is part of the comprehension process of a text. The reader develops an interpretive process whereby he mobilizes all the cognitive operations whose product is the fully understood meaning. The interpretive theory involves a process of comprehension – deverbalization – reexpression. Comprehension requires enough linguistic and non-linguistic knowledge of the source language and the subject to be able to understand the speaker’s intention. Deverbalization links comprehension and reexpression as it frees the translator from the straightjacket of the original source language expression. This is because all that is required is finding the same meaning in the target language. A translator is then described as being faithful in the interpretive conception of translation if he is faithful to the sense and not necessarily the words and expressions in the source language text (Hurtado-Albir 1991, P.72).

As earlier seen, the theory of sense translation postulates that faithfulness to meaning requires interpreting the speaker’s intention, not his words (Toury 1980). To translate, one must transform the message so that it keeps the same meaning and produces the same effect on another recipient in another language. Toury (1995) has this to say
When we translate, we disambiguate ambiguous terms and replace them with new ambiguities. We take a text that is to some extent esoteric and render it exoteric simply by freeing the target language reader to approach the text without a teacher. We shift the context in which a text is read and used. No text would survive these transformations unscathed.

Because meaning of words are said to be arbitrary and depends largely on conventions, translation only changes the linguistic conventions. Linguistic meaning does not operate through words themselves (Christian 2011), but through the speaker’s intention. As long as the intention is preserved, the linguistic changes are insignificant (Lessig 1993, Grafield 2011, Frasheri 2013, Frank 2014).

The theoretical views above converge in the maintenance that fidelity to meaning, to speaker/author intention, is the theme of the theory of sense translation/interpretive theory of translation.

3. **Empirical Studies**

For our empirical studies, we shall review the following works;

a. Eke and Ugorji (1999)
c. Christian (2011)
d. Ajunwa (2014)

a. In their work, *Studies in Translation*, Eke and Ugorji (1999) provide a sample assessment of some challenges in English/Igbo translation. Though they do not discuss the concept of fidelity within any theoretical perspective, they practically examined sample English/Igbo translations and suggested ways of overcoming some challenges of faithfulness.

In their work, they identify the wide cultural and structural gap between English and Igbo as the major challenges to achieving faithfulness in translation between the two languages and suggest that equivalence, modulation and adaptation are the best translation techniques for overcoming these challenges. Some of their instances are viz;

i. Igbo Proverb: Agadi nwaanyị daa ada ugboro abụọ, a gụọ ihe o bu n’iši ọnu.

The above Igbo proverb is acceptable to the Igbo because the situation it depicts is not strange to the Igbo culture, but a strict faithful translation of the proverb into English, thus;

If an old woman falls down two times, one will count what she is carrying on her head

would elicit protest from the English audience whose culture forbids such treatment for women, let alone and old woman. An equivalent proverb in English culture would best
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translate this Igbo proverb to generate the same sense and feeling in the target language, thus;

English equivalent: Once beaten, twice shy.

ii. The English begins their fables with just the opening gambit, “Once upon a time”. But for the Igbo, there is need for full involvement of the audience right from the beginning and this should be reflected in translations. Thus, in translating fables, the English gambit should be adapted into Igbo culture; thus:

“chakpii... wọ; nkịta nyara akpa... nsị agwu n’ọhịja; o ruru otu mgbe…”

In the view of Eke and Ugorji (1999, p.58), the literary translator of English-Igbo texts should be conversant with literary language and figures of speech, he must address himself to the sociology, geography, vegetation, flora and fauna of the target audience because it is cultural acceptability rather than structural fidelity that matters. In order words, they accept the interpretive theory of translation as an acceptable parameter for fidelity assessment.

b. Kolawole and Adewumi’s work titled “The Literary translator and the concept of fidelity: Kirkup’s translation of Camera Laye’s L’enfant noir as a case study” (2008) discusses fidelity in literary translation. They base their work on the interpretive theory which, according to them, is an extension of Saint Jerome’s theory of “non verbum pro verbo, sed sensum experimere du sensu” (Not word-for-word, but sense-for-sense). They believe that fidelity is not strict word-for-word correspondence between Source Language (SL) and Target Language (TL) but sense-for-sense in line with the interpretive theory of translation.

Considering the various diverse opinions among scholars on the criterion of fidelity, Kolawole and Adewumi undertook an assessment of the English translation of Camera Laye’s L’Enfant noir by Kirkup against the fidelity criterion to see if it is possible to actually achieve faithfulness in literary translations.

Their critique of Kirkup’s translation is done in four planes, viz; Stylistic, Semantic, Metalinguistic and Pragmatic planes. In accordance with Newmark (1988:187)’s remark that “good translation can and do tolerate a number of errors”, they conclude that Kirkup is a faithful translator in line with the theory of sense translation.

c. Christian (2011) in “The challenge of a faithful translation” set to x-ray the various scholarly definitions and applications of faithfulness in translation with the attendant challenges. He was a Dharma teacher in India and in this work, he tried to relate the notion of faithfulness in translation to his personal experience as a Dharma teacher and he does this using Lederer (2001)’s model of translation strategy. He maintains that faithfulness depends on how one defines it and what one relates it to. It
could be defined or related to words or meaning, the source language or the target language, the author or the reader.

His Dharma teaching experience and his subsequent attempt to translate the speech of a Tibetan scholar from English to French made him discover that two different linguistic systems will never match completely. In other words, absolute faithfulness is an impossible dream.

He then posits that to translate the message of a text, one need to interpret it in order to translate, one must transform the message so that it keeps the same meaning and produces the same effect on another recipient in another language. For him, word-for-word translation has given way to translation of meaning such that the translated text reads as natural in the TL as the original text did in the SL.

He further identifies 2 indices of fidelity to meaning, viz;

1. The meaning understood by the translator must be the same as what the speaker means.
2. The meaning understood by the hearer/reader of the translation must be the same as that understood by the recipient in the source language.

To achieve these, 3 types of allegiance are required, viz;

1. Speaker intention: The translator must be faithful to what the speaker means.
2. Target language: The translation must not contain language errors, ie it must accommodate target language linguistic conventions (not SL).
3. Recipient of the translation: The target text must be meaningful to the target language recipient and produce the same effect.

d. Ajunwa (2014) titles his work *A textbook of translation theory and practice*. His main objective is to provide a guide to translation practice within the theoretical posulations of previous works. His study attempts to strike a balance between the theory and practice of translation from an African perspective.

He defines fidelity from a moral point of view as meaning faithfulness or loyalty towards someone or something. He likens it to the moral concept of a wife being faithful to her husband and vice versa or a soldier being loyal to his commander. With these inferences, he sees fidelity in translation as the extent to which a translator accurately renders a Source Language Text (SLT) into a Target Language Text (TLT) without distorting, violating or betraying the message as well as the style of the SL.

However, he raises so many questions regarding the possibility of achieving this. In his words;

A translation regarded as “perfect” or “exact” today, will it continue to remain so in the next century? What about cultural divergences and their implications? Assuming a SLT is given to several translators to render, will they produce identical texts, all of which are exact to the SLT?
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The above questions clearly show that attainment of fidelity in translation is rent with many challenges. Because of these many challenges, Ajunwa (2014:18) identifies 2 schools of thought on the issue of achieving faithfulness in translation.

The first is made up of scholars who postulate the theory of untranslatability. For this group, translation is impossible. They support their claim with the Italian aphorism “Traduttore Traditore” meaning “Translator-Traitor” which suggests that every translator is a traitor, an infidel who betrays the intention of the SL author.

The second school of thought are mediatory in their postulation. They accept that translation is possible but absolute fidelity is not. In other words, they support the interpretive approach to translation as postulated in the theory of sense translation.

Yet Ajunwa maintains that fidelity is the hallmark for assessment of quality translation and that every translator must strive to overcome the challenges attaining an acceptable level of fidelity. He further notes that translation of scientific/technical texts requires precision and demands much higher level of fidelity than other domains of translation.

4. Fidelity Challenges In Translation

Our discussion so far establishes the fact that translation is a norm-governed activity involving at least two sets of norm-systems, i.e two languages/two cultures. Translation behaviour within a culture tends to manifest certain regularities such that it is often easy to tell when a translator has failed to adhere to sanctioned practices. Thus, a translator may subject himself either to the SLT with its norms or to the norms active in the target cultures.

Insisting on absolute fidelity as the best translation quality means adopting the norms of the SLT and culture. But this often results in certain incompatibilities with the target norms and practices, especially beyond the mere linguistic ones. But if the norms of the target language and culture are adopted, shifts from the SLT would become inevitable, resulting in what Ajunwa (2014, p.22) explains as fidelity erosion in translation.

4.1 Fidelity Erosion in Translation

Erosion in the physical sciences means the gradual wearing away of the soil or rock by physical breakdown, chemical action, etc. In translation, erosion is the
reduction in the level of faithfulness of a TLT to the SLT. Ajunwa (2014) attributes this to the following factors:

i. The translator’s worldview, ideology and personal interest: It is not usually easy to avoid this kind of influence. For instance, a fanatic Muslim cannot translate a Christian religious text without fidelity erosion caused by the above factor.

ii. Lack of professionalism: Without professional training in translation, one is certain to produce unprofessional translation.

iii. Shallow knowledge of one or both languages: To achieve good translation, good knowledge of both SL and TL is required.

iv. Shallow knowledge of the subject matter: One cannot really translate what one does not understand.

v. Language interference: Naturally, mother tongue influence in translations cannot be avoided, especially when one is working on languages different from the mother tongue.

vi. Ambiguities: When ambiguous expressions are found in the SLT, the translator may translate the wrong sense or create a corresponding ambiguity in the TLT.

vii. Absence of Diacritics: Languages like Igbo make extensive use of diacritics. Wrong placement or non-use of these can seriously affect translation in such languages.

5. Fidelity Challenges In English-Igbo Translation

As already established in this work, the possibility of absolute faithfulness of TLT to SLT is over-ruled. Yet fidelity remains the generally accepted criterion for assessing the quality of a good translation. Between the English and Igbo languages, there are various challenges that widen the fidelity gap in translations. We shall x-ray these within the 3 major domains of translation as classified by Ajunwa (2014, pp.14-16). Thereafter we shall look at some of the general challenges that cut across translation domains.

5.1 The Scientific and Technical Domain

The language of scientific and technical texts is full of notations and symbols and operates within a high level of objectivity. Sometimes, only professionals in the field understand these notations and symbols even in the SL. However, these are universally accepted across languages. English, being more or less the global language, provides the symbol used for most of the scientific language whereas the Igbo language is still developing possible equivalents to various scientific and technical terms. For instance, the following scientific terms and notations may not have faithful Igbo language equivalents;

i. Oxygen

ii. Hydrogen
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iii. H₂O
iv. Tetracycline
v. Bd

However, in translating from English to Igbo, such challenges may be overcome by phonological reconditioning (Igbonization) or by borrowing/loaning, which agrees with Seleskovich (1976)’s process of reformulation within the interpretive theory. According to Hurtado-Albir, this process is called sense equivalence. Example:

i. English: Oxygen reacts with Hydrogen to give water.
   Igbo: Ọ bụrụ na iku ọksijin na haịdrojini agwakọta onwu, ha ga-agha mmiri.

ii. English: H₂ + O₂ = H₂O
    Igbo: H₂ + O₂ = H₂O

iii. English: Tab tetracycline Bd
    Igbo: Mkpurọgwụ Teterasaikliini Bd

Note that scientific notations are universally applied irrespective of language or culture. Hence, the chemical equation in (ii) above is just repeated. Again, there is urgent need for the standardization of various scientific and technical terminologies in Igbo. The effort of the standardization committee of the Society for Promoting Igbo Language and Culture (SPIILC) as seen in the various editions of Ọkaasụṣụ is commendable but should be seriously supported and encouraged. Consider the following terms suggested by Eke and Ugorji (1999:37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Term</th>
<th>Igbo Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Keyboard</td>
<td>Ugbo abijdij</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Mouse</td>
<td>Oginì</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Printer</td>
<td>Mbì</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Hardware</td>
<td>Ngwongwo ike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Software</td>
<td>Ngwongwo mfe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Central Processing Unit (CPU)</td>
<td>Igbe njikọ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Photocopying machine</td>
<td>Igwe kọpị kọpị</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Literary Domain

Literal texts are distinguished from other texts by their literary language which is usually flowery and full of connotations and hidden meanings. The major sources of these are the language culture and the style of the writer.

The main challenge of the literary domain of translation is the cultural norms. This is because the literary language leans very much on the culture of the people. Idioms, proverbs, metaphors, anecdotes, etc draw imageries from the language culture. Therefore, the cultural gap between English and Igbo poses a major challenge in literary translation between the two languages. Consider the following:

a. Proverbs

   i. Igbo: Anaghị agba aka ahụ nwata eze
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English: * One does not see a child’s teeth empty handed.

ii. English: One good turn deserves another
   Igbo: * Otu ezigbo nchigharị kwesịrị ọzọ

iii. English: Make hay while the sun shines
    Igbo: * Kpokọwa ahịa nọrọ mgbe anwụ ka na-acha

iv. Igbo: Agha akara aka anaghị eri ngwụrọ
   English: * An announced war does not eat a cripple.

However, as earlier noted, the use of equivalence, modulation and adaptation techniques helps to overcome such challenges by providing their sense equivalents in the TL. Instances:

b. Proverbs
   i. Igbo: Anaghị agba aka ahụ nwata eze
      (One does not see a child’s teeth empty handed)
      English equivalent: Nothing goes for nothing.
   ii. English: One good turn deserves another
       (Otu ezigbo nchigharị kwesịrị ọzọ)
       Igbo equivalent: Aka nri kwọọaka ekpe, aka ekpe akwọọ aka nri.
   iii. English: Make hay while the sun shines
        (Kpokọwa ahịa nọrọ mgbe anwụ ka na-acha)
        Igbo equivalent: A na eji ehihie achọ ewu ojii
   v. Igbo: Agha akara aka anaghị eri ngwụrọ
       (An announced war does not eat a cripple)
       English equivalent: To be forewarned is to be forearmed.

c. Flora and Fauna

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Igbo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Fox (cunning)</td>
<td>Mbe (Tortoise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Olive branch (peace)</td>
<td>ọmụ (palm tendril)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Dragon (danger/evil)</td>
<td>Ikwiikwii (Owl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Sign post (notice of danger)</td>
<td>ọmụ (palm tendril)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. Ideophones

Igbo language makes use of ideophones to realize various shades of meaning which the English can express ordinarily, eg:

larịlarị - soft and smooth
dụkwùdụkwù - short and ugly
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Igbo</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abadaba</td>
<td>wide and broad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wagwagwụ</td>
<td>narrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kikerere</td>
<td>Hard and strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dékédéké</td>
<td>soft and fragile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Pragmatic and General Domain

This domain covers other subject areas other than the literary and scientific subjects. The language here is usually descriptive and informative. We shall consider fidelity challenges under this domain from the point of view of general linguistic challenges of English-Igbo translations.

a. Terminology/Vocabulary: Apart from technological terms, English vocabulary is far wider than Igbo vocabulary such that while English uses specific terms to express specific shades of meaning, Igbo adopts more general terms e.g

i. Colour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Igbo</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ọchá</td>
<td>White, Milk, Off-white, Silver, Metallic, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ọjị</td>
<td>Black, Blue, Purple, Turquoise, Lemon, Green, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nchara</td>
<td>Brown, Grey, Tan, Orange, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii. Biological Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Igbo</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nwanne</td>
<td>Brother, Sister, Niece, Nephew, Cousin, Half Sister, Half Brother, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nna</td>
<td>Father, Step-Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nne</td>
<td>Mother, Step-Mother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Dialects: Igbo language is multi-dialectal. Most writers are influenced by their dialects and tend to deviate from the standard form. Sometimes, the meaning of certain dialectal expressions may differ from the standard form. Examples:
English: She is a baby-sitter
STD. Igbo: Ọ na-eku nwa
Nteje dialect: Ọ na-ere nwa
Ọhụhụ dialect: Ọ la-akpa nwa

c. **Word-order:** It is a known linguistic fact that English noun phrases are head-final while Igbo noun phrases are head-initial. Strict faithfulness in translation would surely distort this order. Example:

English: NP DET Adj + N (that big house)
Igbo: NP N1 + N2 + DET (ụlọ ukwu ahụ)
*Igbo: Ahụ ukwu ụlọ
*English House big that

d. **Punctuations/Diacritics:** Wrong placements of punctuation marks or diacritics including tone marks could result in the misunderstanding of a text and, thus, lead to wrong translation, especially for a language like Igbo which writing convention demands proper use of diacritics. Examples:

English:

i. Take us to the land, Lord

ii. Take us to the landlord

Igbo:

iii. Ukwu/ukwu (leg/waist/big)
iv. Olu/olu (neck/work or Orlu town)
v. Ilu/ilu (bitter/to marry)
vi. Iri/iri (to eat/to climb)
vii. Imi/imi (nose/suck)

e. **Mass Media Transliteration:** Most times, the mass media have conventionalized wrong translations because of constant use in the news. For example, An Imo Broadcasting Corporation Igbo programme translates “Good morning” as “ụtụtụ ọma” instead of “Ị boọla ọcha” or “Ị saala ọcha” and this wrong translation is gradually becoming a convention within the state.
6. Summary And Conclusion

A perfect translation is an impossible dream. Saying exactly the same thing in another way is not possible (Christian, 2011). Through this work; it has been established that absolute fidelity in translation is difficult to achieve.

However, relying on the interpretive theory of translation, it is possible to achieve good translation without a word-for-word correspondence between SL and TL. The goal of a quality translation is to convey the SLT author’s meaning by adopting the norms of the TL culture such that the target audience receives the message with the same feelings and reactions as the SL audience. In other words, faithfulness to meaning rather than faithfulness to structure is the key to quality translation. A translator is then described as faithful in the interpretive conception of translation if he is faithful to the sense and not necessarily to the words and expressions in the SLT.

We conclude here that despite the wide cultural and structural gap between the English and Igbo languages which present a number of challenges to faithfulness in translation between the two languages, it is possible to achieve quality translation between them within the framework of the interpretive theory.
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