Cacophony in unison: Translation strategies in achieving 'singability' in the Silozi and Citonga versions of the Zambian National Anthem

Mildred Nkolola Wakumelo
University of Zambia

Abstract

This paper examines the translation strategies that were employed in the translation of the Zambian national anthem from English into two Zambian languages, Silozi and Citonga. The paper employs a comparative approach in an attempt to show that, in the translation of the national anthem into the two languages, the translators used various strategies in order to achieve 'singability' in the translated versions. Some of these strategies have compromised the source meanings of the national anthem to the extent that even if the singers of the three versions are singing the same tune, the semantic content in the different versions of the national anthem is not always the same.

Introduction

The Zambian national anthem is meant to be sung at all national and state functions as a symbol of unity and patriotism. It has been translated into the seven so-called regional lingua francas; these enjoy semi-official status for use alongside English in education in their respective parts of the country. These languages are Cinyanja, Citonga, Icibemba, Kiikaonde, Lunda, Luvale and Silozi. In this paper we consider the strategies that have been utilised in the translation of the national anthem from English into Citonga and Silozi.[1] The two languages have been chosen for the analysis because they are the ones the author is most familiar with.

Newmark (1988, p. 7) describes translation as "a craft consisting of the attempt to replace a written message and/or statement in one language by the same message and/or statement in another". According to Shi (2005, p. 6), in undertaking a translation the translator should achieve three things: text function, cultural distance and text effect. He postulates that in text function the translator needs to verbalise the "sender's intention in such a way that the target text is able to achieve the same function in the target culture as that which the source text achieved in the source culture." With regard to cultural distance, "the target receiver should understand the text world of the translation in the same way as the source receivers understood the text world of the original." Text effect ensures "that the effect the translation has on its target readers should be the same as the one the source text has on its readers" (Shi 2005, p. 6).

Dr Mildred Nkolola-Wakumelo is a Senior Lecturer of language and linguistics. She has taught courses in general linguistics, theoretical linguistics, language policy and planning and sociolinguistics at the following universities: Catholic University of Eastern Africa, National University of Lesotho, University of Botswana, University of Witwatersrand and University of Zambia. E-mail address: mwakumelo@yahoo.com

It has been recognised that translation equivalence in general is difficult to achieve, as certain texts are (or may be) untranslatable. Niknasab and Pishbin (2011, p. 3) indicate that Catford has postulated two types of untranslatability: the linguistic and cultural. The former is a result of lack of a lexical or syntactical substitute for the source language item in the target language. It is a "situation in which the linguistic elements of the original cannot be replaced adequately in structural, linear, functional or semantic terms in consequence of a lack of denotation or connotation" (Niknasab and Pishbin 2011, p. 4). The latter emanates from the absence of a relevant situational feature from the source language text in the target language culture. "It is a situation where the relation between the creative subject and its linguistic expression in the original does not find an adequate expression in the translation" Niknasab and Pishbin 2011, p. 4). Because of the untranslatability of some texts each translation imposes on the translator the necessity to twist the original text in order for it to be expressible in the target language. In relation to this, Newmark (1995, p. 7) notes that in any translation activity there is necessarily some kind of loss of meaning. This means that as pointed out by Ginter (2002, p. 30) "all translated texts are to some degree hybrids since each of them can be viewed as a transplant of the source text into an alien, target culture environment. In the process of translation the form-content unity of the source text is disrupted. Inevitably some pressure is exerted upon the target language, as the transfer of foreign elements is impossible without a certain 'violence'." This is easily detected by a person who is competent in both the source language and the target language.

The translation of songs
Songs belong to the genre of oral poetry. Because most vocal music is set to regular verse, the translation of a song into another language (sometimes called 'singing translation') is closely linked to the translation of poetry. Sung texts and poetry are different from prose. Cudden (1976) explains what makes poetry and music different from other kinds of compositions:

> ... the secret [to which] lies in the way the words lean upon each other, are linked and interlocked in sense and rhythm, and thus elicit from each other's syllables a kind of tune whose beat and melody varies subtly and which is different from that of prose.

Although every kind of translation presents some problems and challenges, these are more pronounced with regard to songs. This is mainly attributed to the value attached to the elements of form and content in songs. In the translation of songs, one has to deal with the formal features and properties of a song, which according to Franzon (2008, p. 373) include (among other things) lyrics, performance, melody, harmony and musical sense. Hence, in addition to possible linguistic and cultural untranslatability, in the case of songs linguistic untranslatability in connection with form would be possible.

Songs can be translated for various purposes and Franzon (2008, p. 376) notes that, depending on the purpose of the translation, the translator may employ various options. These will be determined by such factors as whether the translation is simply for the purpose of understanding the lyrics or for performance (singing). The former requires semantically close prose translation. But if the song is to be sung in the target language, the aim is to produce a

'singable' translation. In order to attain this, the translator may retain meanings determined not only by the desire to make the texts understandable, but also by the requirement to retain structure and 'singability'.

Low (2005, p. 192-3) uses the term 'singability' to refer to the "phonetic suitability of the translated lyrics and to words being easy to sing to particular note values." However, Franzon (2008) defines 'singability' as the attainment of musico-verbal unity between the text and the composition. In cases where the song is to be performed, the aim of the translator should be to find ways of matching music and lyrics and to assign "syllables to specific notes in the original musical setting." Low (2005) lists four aspects related to music and performance. These are 'singability', rhyme, rhythm and naturalness, and must be balanced with fidelity. "Fidelity refers to the limits to which a translation work precisely depicts the underlying message or meaning of the source text without distorting it, without intensifying or weakening any part of its context, and without subtracting from or adding to it", (http://onehourtranslation.com/translation-services/fidelity-versus-transparency-in-translation/), This is to be contrasted with transparency, "which pertains to the degree to which a translation caters to native speakers and the target audience such that idiomatic, syntactic and grammatical conventions are followed while the cultural, political and social contexts are kept in mind" during the translation process", (http://onehourtranslation.com/translation-services/fidelity-versus-transparency-in-translation/). Adaptation and localization of concepts in the course of translation are the characteristics of transparency.

In the translation of a song that is meant to be performed, sound is a matter of primary concern. When translating, the sound of the text is steadily in the translators' ears, not merely in the back of his or her mind (Archana 2011). Because of this, the translator cannot maintain fidelity and render a "faithful" word-by-word translation of the original (Archana 2011). Hence song translation may also involve transparency, an adjustment of vocabulary to the metrical system, subtraction or addition of some syllables in some stanzas; this could involve the subdivision or combination of some notes. Ultimately the success of the translation will be judged by the ease with which the song can be sung with the same elegance and sonority as the source-language song. This is the mark of 'singability'. In our analysis of the translation of the Zambian national anthem into Citonga and Silozi we will see how these challenges have been handled.

Overview of some translation strategies
The term 'strategy' in translation can assume different interpretations. According to Chesterman (2000), translation strategies have the following characteristics:
(a)   They apply to a process;
(b)   They involve text manipulation;
(c)   They are goal oriented and potentially conscious; and
(d)   They are intersubjective, meaning that they can be experienced and understood by someone other than the person using them.

In our paper we will be using the term strategy firstly as a process of translation, and secondly as the mechanism that the translator uses to manipulate the text to achieve his goal. When translating music that is meant to be 'singable', a translator is faced with different options. Following Franzon (2008,

p. 376) these can be outlined as follows:
(a)   Not translating the lyrics;
(b)   Translating the lyrics without taking the music into consideration;
(c)   Writing new lyrics;
(d)   Adapting the music to the translation; and
(e)   Adapting the translation to the music.

The choice of any of these will depend on what the translator intends to prioritise. If the translator wants to give priority to the lyrics of the song, then he or she will go for option (b), for example. However, if the priority is the music, then option (c) will be the focus. On the other hand, the translator may compromise fidelity to the lyrics and music in order to render the song to be 'singable' in all versions, in which case his or her options would be (d) and (e). These options can sometimes be combined in order to enhance the quality of the translation, and depending on the purpose of the translation. Adhering to semantic closeness with the source song (option (b)) may produce a translation that cannot be sung to the music of the original lyrics. Therefore the quest for a translation that is 'singable' usually results in a translation of compromised fidelity, which corresponds to options (c), (d) and (e).

In the translation of the Zambian national anthem the intention was to produce a 'singable' song. This entailed modifying the lyrics and adapting the music accordingly, as in options (d) and (e) above. By translating the lyrics and adapting the music, the lyrics were also deemed to be important, while at the same time ensuring that the anthem was still capable of being sung. This entailed a line by line translation of the song, which in some cases ended up producing a fairly close (or in some cases partial) approximation of the original lyrics. In some cases, however, the lyrics have been substantially modified or new lyrics written.

'Singable' translations of a song must fit the music and the situation in which they will be performed, while approximating the source text as closely as possible. The option of adapting a translation to music while allowing for some deviation in meaning is suitable in many instances. However, this is not the case for the Zambian national anthem, whose different translations are often sung in melodic unison with each other. To achieve this, the translators had to employ a number of strategies which included modifying the verbal rendering, paraphrasing, as well as deleting from and adding to the content of the source lyrics. The various versions of the national anthem are 'singable' at the melodic level, but display no unity of meaning at the lyrical level. At many places, the meaning has been sacrificed, so that singers of the different versions seem to be singing different songs in terms of meaning.

According to Franzon (2008, p. 390) a 'singable' song must have prosodic match melody, poetic match structure and semantic reflexive expression. Prosodic match melody refers to music that is notated, producing lyrics that are comprehensible and that sound natural when sung. These lyrics should also have appropriate syllable count, rhythm, intonation, stress and sounds for easy singing. Poetic match structure reflects music as performed. It refers to lyrics that attract the audience's attention and it achieves poetic effect or rhyme by means of segmentation of phrases/lines/stanzas, parallelism and contrast, and location of key words. On the other hand, in a semantic reflexive match expression, music

is perceived as meaningful. It should produce lyrics that reflect or explain what the music 'says' (the story told), the mood conveyed, the character(s) expressed, description and metaphor. In our discussion, we shall show that translations of the Zambian national anthem are mainly focused on ensuring a prosodic and poetic match. In the process there is a compromise with regard to the semantic reflexive expression.

Strategies used in the translation of the Zambian national anthem

In what follows we discuss some of the strategies utilised in the translation of the Zambian national anthem from English into Citonga and Silozi. In our analysis we mainly focus on the content and meaning of the translated versions in an attempt to show that even if the Zambian people sing the national anthem in unison this is only limited to the melody. It will be shown that some of the translation strategies used have transformed the content and meaning to the extent that the different language groups sing variants with different meanings. The English version of the national anthem and the translated Citonga and Silozi versions have been analysed as follows:

(a)   Sourcing the original anthem and the translated versions;
(b)   Studying the contents of the source anthem and the translated versions;
(c)   Back translating the translated versions to determine their content and meanings;
(d)   Gathering data on strategies used in the translation process based on the content of the back-translated versions; and
(c)   Discussion and presentation of the conclusions.

The English, Citonga and Silozi versions of the national anthem and the back-translations are given in Table 1 below.

Table 1: English, Silozi and Citonga versions of the national anthem and the Silozi and Citonga back translations

Verse	English version	Silozi version	Citonga version
	Stanza 1		
1	Stand and sing of Zambia proud and free	*Yemeñi lubinele Zambia* Let us stand and dance for Zambia	*Atumutembaule Zambia* Let us praise Zambia
2	Land of work and joy in unity	*Naha ya kutwano ni tabo* Land of unity and joy	*Mbotubelekela an-toomwe* Where we work together
3	Victors in the struggle for the right	*Bahali ba ndwa ya buiketo* Heroes of the fight for well-being	*Twakazunda akwan-guluka* We conquered and became free
4	We've won freedom's fight	*Lu lwanezi kozo* We fought for peace	*Akulilela* And to rule ourselves

	All one, strong and free	*Lwiine ka kutwano* Let us live in harmony	*Toonse tuswangane* All of us should unite
	Stanza 2		
1	Africa is our own motherland	*Afrika lifasi laluna* Africa our world	*Afrika mbabamaama besu* Africa is our mother
2	Fashioned with and blessed by God's good hand	*Ka limbuyoti za mulimo* By the blessings of God	*Cisi cakalelekwa Leza* A country that was blessed by God
3	Let us all her people join as one	*A lu kopaneñi ka nyakalo* Let us meet in happiness	*Toonse tobantu tuswaangane* Let us all people unite
4	Brothers under the sun.	*Luna bana ba mba* We children of one womb	*Mubwana bokwabo* In brotherhood
5	All one strong and free	*Lwiine kakutwano* Let us live in harmony	*Toonse tuswangane* All of us should unite
	Stanza 3		
1	One land and one nation is our cry	*Tapelo ya luna ki iliñi* Our prayer is only one	*Ciinga comwe ncotulilila* We long for one grouping
2	Dignity and peace 'neath Zambia's sky	*Butumo ni puso ya naha* Fame and governance of country	*Bulemu luumuno mucisi* Respect, peace in the country
3	Like a noble eagle in its flight	*Sina mbande ye fa ndembela* Like the eagle which is on the flag	*Mbuli sikwaze mbwau-luka* Like the way the eagle flies
4	Zambia, praise to thee	*Zambia lwa ku lumba* Zambia we thank you	*Zambia omubotu* Zambia beautiful one
5	All one, strong and free	*Lwiine kakutwano* Let us live in harmony	*Toonse tuswaangane* All of us should unite
	Chorus		
1	Praise be to God	*Kulumbekwe* Let it be praised	*Atulumbe* Let us thank
2	Praise be, praise be, praise be	*Moya , moya, moya* Spirit, spirit, spirit	*Leza, Leza, Leza wesu* Our Lord, Lord, Lord

3	Bless our great nation	*Ku fuyolwe* Let it be praised	*Cisi cesu* Our country
4	Zambia, Zambia, Zambia	*Zambia, Zambia, Zambia* Zambia, Zambia, Zambia	*Zambia, Zambia, Zambia* Zambia, Zambia, Zambia
5	Free men we stand	*Tukuluho* Freedom	*Andembela* On the flag
6	Under the flag of our land	*Mwatasa puso yaluna* Under self govern-ance	*Yuunga mucisi cesu* Which is flying in our country
7	Zambia, praise to thee	*Zambia lwa kulumba* Zambia we praise you	*Zambia omubotu* Zambia beautiful one
8	All one strong and free	*Tukongote wino* Let us hold ourselves well	*Toonse tuswaangane* All of us let us all unite

Silozi and Citonga are Bantu languages which differ significantly in many linguistic features from English, the source language of the national anthem. The translation of the anthem from English to Silozi and Citonga involves cultural filtering of form and content in order to improve the song in the target languages. Some of these issues will be touched on in the discussion which follows.

The translation of the national anthem retained the melody, rhythm, syllabic structure and stanzas of the original. The English version has three stanzas and a chorus, as do the Citonga and Silozi versions. Within the stanzas and the chorus the number of verses is the same in all three versions. This is clearly because the translations were being made for the purpose of performance, and the aim was to produce translations which could be sung in unison despite being in different languages. 'Singability' was the paramount goal, and indeed was achieved. The principle strategy was to retain the prosodic match melody and the poetic match structure between the source text and the target texts (refer to Franzon 2008).

Edward (2011) states that bringing a musical element into a new language implies more than just a translation. It is a work of adaptation, and rhyme is not the only challenge. The translator wants to maintain the original rhythm of the song, while at the same time preserving the meaning. It is usually not possible to stick to the exact metaphors or vocabulary of the original lyrics or to convey the ideas and feelings of the original text. Instead there is sometimes a need to depart from the original meaning of text. This is clearly the case with the Zambian national anthem at the content and semantic level. Very few lines have been literally or directly translated. The desire to retain the melody of the original version resulted in the lyrics often being changed. The source and target songs are melodically similar, but lyrically different. In coming up with the lyrics of the translated versions the translators evidently went for the options

Franzon (2008) outlines as follows:
(a)   Translating the lyrics and adapting the music accordingly, sometimes to the extent that a brand new composition is deemed necessary; and
(b)   Adapting the translation to the original music.

The translators wanted as much as possible to retain the rhythmic form. In their effort to achieve this, the translators employed various strategies. Following Chesterman (2000), we have identified syntactic, semantic and pragmatic strategies. The syntactic and semantic strategies form the bulk of the strategies that were employed. Before we show how they have been used, we define each of these according to Chesterman (2000).

(a)   Syntactic strategies
These include the following:
(i)   Literal translation: Here the translator follows the source-text forms as closely as possible without jeopardising grammaticality.
(ii)   Transposition: This refers to change in word-class, for example from verb to noun.
(iii)   Phrase structure change: These are changes which take place within the internal structure of the phrase, such as changes in number, definitiveness and modification of person, tense or mood.
(iv)   Clause structure change: These changes affect the organisation of the constituents, such as change from the active to the passive, from the finite to the non-finite, transitive to intransitive in the verb phrase, or rearrangement of the clause constituents.
(v)   Sentence structure change: This affects the structure of the sentence unit, such as a change in the relationship between the main clauses and the subordinate clauses.

(b)   Semantic strategies
These comprise the following:
(i)   Synonymy: This is where the translator uses a similar word (synonym or near-synonym), which may not be the literal translation of the source language word or phrase.
(ii)   Abstraction change: This is a shift either from using more concrete terms to more abstract terms or vice versa.
(iii)   Distribution change: This is where the same semantic component is used more times (expansion) or fewer times (compression).
(iv)   Emphasis change: This increases, decreases or changes the emphasis of thematic focus of the text in the translation as compared to the original.
(v)   Paraphrase: This is the effect of creating a liberal, approximate translation of the source language text, often concentrating on the overall meaning of the message and ignoring certain semantic components at the lexical level.
(vi)   Cultural filtering: This refers to the domestication of a culture-centred translation, used when translating culture-bound terms.
(vii)   Explicitness change: This makes the text either more (explication) or less (implication) by adding or deleting information that could in principle be deduced from the source text.
(viii) Information change: Here information is added or deleted which is not implicit in the source language text.

(c)   Pragmatic strategies
(i)   Illocutionary change: These are changes in the nature of the source text speech act, for example from reporting to a command, or from direct to indirect speech. These changes often include obligatory changes at other levels (e.g., mood or tense).
(ii)   Coherence change: This works on the micro-level, usually within a single sentence or paragraph, and involves changes on the higher, textual level. It may include re-arranging, combining or splitting paragraphs or larger sections of text.

In the section that follows we discuss the various components of the national anthem translations in order to indicate how these strategies have been utilised.

Analysis of text from the Zambian national anthem in Silozi and Citonga
In our analysis of the translation strategies of the national anthem we have adopted an approach where we consider each and every stanza and verse. This is in order to be able to elicit data from the whole national anthem so as to demonstrate that the translation process has been undertaken to achieve melodic 'singability' even at the expense of uniformity at the semantic level.

Stanza 1
Verse 1
The first verse of Stanza 1 in the Silozi version manifests information change. The concepts of 'pride' and 'freedom' in the source text have been deleted and 'singing' has been replaced by 'dancing' (*kubina*). This leads to a meaning not reflected in the source text being brought into the target text. This information change also indicates some aspect of cultural filtering. In the Silozi culture, in common with most other African cultures, singing is almost invariably accompanied by dancing. The translators seem to have used the concept of 'dancing' for cultural filtering while at the same time exhibiting abstraction change. The act of standing and singing is made more concrete in the Lozi culture by introducing the concept of dancing.

In the Citonga translation, the first verse of the first stanza reveals illocution change, emphasis change and information change. In the English version the illocution is a command to the Zambian people to 'stand and sing of Zambia proud and free', but in the Citonga version the illocution is that the Zambian people themselves are offering to praise to Zambia. There is also emphasis change because the focus of the activity has changed from standing and singing for Zambia to praising Zambia (*kutembaula*). While some singing can be associated with praise, it can be argued that not all singing is about praise. There is also information change in this verse between the source text and the target text. As in the Silozi version, the concepts 'proud' and 'free' have been dropped.

Verse 2
The second verse of Stanza 1 of the Silozi version of the national anthem involves information change. This is evident from the fact that the source text concept of 'work' has been deleted. There is also emphasis change in that while in the source text it is the 'work and joy' that is in unity, in the Silozi version 'joy' (*tabo*) is a quality now associated with the country. For the Citonga version there is sentence structure change, emphasis change and information change. In the

source text we have a declarative descriptive statement that refers to the country, Zambia. But in the Citonga version we have a subordinate clause which refers back to the first verse of the stanza. This is also reminiscent of distribution change. In the process the thematic focus and information content of the verse has changed, resulting in the adaptation of the verse to the extent where a brand new composition has resulted and the original meaning has been lost. It is not recovered anywhere in the anthem.

Verse 3
In the Silozi version of this verse the concept 'fight' has been replaced by the concept 'battle' (*ndwa*). There is furthermore some element of cultural filtering. In the Lozi culture to engage in 'battle' is more dignified than to merely 'fight'. Battle is associated with heroism and is what is expected of heroes (*bahali*) in the prosecution of a just cause. Fighting lightens the whole process and has negative connotations. We also see some element of information change where the word 'right' has been replaced by the word 'well-being' (*buiketo*).

In the Citonga version, Verse 3 exhibits abstraction change because the action being referred to is concretised to reflect that the Zambian people were actually involved in the struggle being referred to. In the process there is emphasis change as the focus of the information content changes. Additionally, there is also clause change in the process of concretising the activity; in the source text there is seemingly a noun phrase referring to the Zambian people as victors, which in the Citonga version has been changed to an active sentence talking about what the Zambian people have done.

Verse 4
Verse 4 of the Silozi version reveals emphasis and information change; in the translation from source text to target text, the activity has changed from 'winning' to 'fighting' (*kulwana*). Information change is evident in the introduction of the idea of 'peace' (*kozo*), which is absent from the source text. The Citonga version of this verse contains clause change, consisting in an active sentence being replaced by a subordinate clause referring back to the previous verse – the people are ruling themselves because they have freed themselves. There is some element of distribution change and coherence change because the idea of 'freedom' in Verse 4 in the source text has been moved and distributed between Verses 3 and 4 in the target text.

Verse 5
For this verse in the Silozi version there is illocution change. While the source text contains a declarative statement here, this is replaced by a command in the target text. Emphasis change is also present because the focus in the target text has changed from 'strong' and 'free' to people living in 'harmony' (*kutwano*). In this verse, the Citonga version exhibits explicitness change which leads to information change. The theme of 'unity' which is recoverable from 'all one' in the source text is emphasised, but with the deletion of 'strong' and 'free'. Illocutionary change is also evident as the Citonga translation of this verse results in a command.

Stanza 2
Verse 1
The use of a synonym in the Silozi version is manifested in this verse. In this case

'motherland' is replaced by 'world' (*lifasi*). To some extent this also serves to make what is in reference more concrete, which is reminiscent of abstractness change. In the Citonga version there is an attempt at a literal rendering of the source text, but a change is that personifies the continent of Africa as a 'mother' (*bamaama*).

Verse 2
Here there is sentence change in the Silozi version. The source text has a sentence with a conjunction, while the Silozi version makes do with a prepositional phrase. In Silozi there is also a deviation in the dialect being used for the translation. In this verse a word drawn from Luyana rather than Silozi has been used.[2] The word '*limbuyoti*' is a Luyana word. The Silozi equivalent for 'blessings' is '*tohonolofazo*', which could have fitted into the rhythmic structure of the anthemin place of '*limbuyoti*'. It seems as though the translators used the Luyana word for aesthetic purposes. In the Citonga anthem, this verse results in a changein the sentence structure. In the English version, the subject is deduced to be Africa from the previous verse, while in the Citonga version the subject is specified. As some of the content of the source text is deleted in the target language, there is also information change. The concept of 'good hand' is not reflected in either the Citonga or Silozi versions.

Verse 3
In the source text and the Silozi and Citonga versions the illocution is the same. However in Citonga, the source text has been paraphrased so that 'people joining as one' has been paraphrased to 'let us unite' (*tuswangane*). This seems to have been for the purpose of making the expression more explicit. In the case of Silozi there is emphasis and information change. Instead of the people 'joining as one' they are to 'meet in happiness' (*kopaneñi kanyakalo*). The lyrics have been completely changed.

Verse 4
For this verse, the Citonga version shows some element of phrase structure and information change. In the English version we have a noun phrase, which is replaced by a prepositional phrase in Citonga. This change has resulted in information change, so that the concept of 'brotherhood' being 'under the sun' is lost. The Silozi translation exhibits information change as a result of cultural filtering and explicitness. Brotherhood is associated with being born from the same womb (*mba*) as opposed to just being in the same environment 'under the sun', as implied in the English version.

Verse 5
The Silozi version of this verse contains illocution change. The source text contains a declarative statement, which is replaced by a command in the target text. As the focus of the verse has changed from 'strong' and 'free' to living in 'harmony' (*kakutwano*) there is emphasis change. In the Citonga version there is also explicitness change, which leads to information change. The theme of 'unity' which is recoverable from 'all one' in the source text is emphasised, while there is the deletion of 'strong' and 'free'. Illocutionary change is also evident, as the Citonga version is a command.

Stanza 3
Verse 1
In Citonga for this verse there is the use of a paraphrase where 'land and nation' are paraphrased to 'grouping' (*ciinga*). On the other hand, for the Silozi version there is emphasis change. The semantic content of the source text has been changed, and some ideas in the original text ('land and nation') have been deleted. There is some form of cultural filtering where 'cry' has been replaced with 'prayer' (*tapelo*). This is because in the target cultural context a cry can be a form of lamentation, whereby someone could be appealing to the gods to intervene in their situation.

Verse 2
Here we see information and emphasis change in the Silozi version, and this verse has been adapted to the extent that new lyrics have been introduced which are different from those in the source text. The source text talks about 'dignity and peace beneath Zambia's sky' while the target text refers to 'fame and governance of the country'. In the Citonga version, there is paraphrasing and information change. Paraphrase is evident in the use of the concept of 'respect' (*bulemu*) in place of 'dignity'. Information change is manifested by the deletion of the concepts of 'respect' and 'peace' being beneath Zambia's skies'.

Verse 3
In Silozi there is abstraction and explicitness change in this verse. The target text is more explicit and concrete in its reference to the eagle by adverting to its presence on the Zambian flag. On the flag, the eagles symbolises the people's desire to rise above their problems. The Silozi text makes reference to this by means of the Luyana term ('*mbande*' for eagle), despite the fact that the Silozi word '*ñwanyi*' could have been used without affecting the melody of the anthem. With reference to Citonga there is simply a paraphrase, and the source text information content is retained.

Verse 4
In Citonga, this verse contains illocution change. The source text is in the form of an address to the country, 'Zambia praise to thee', while the Tonga version describes the country, 'Zambia the beautiful one' (*Zambia omubotu*). This results in a complete change of the lyrics. In the Silozi text there is emphasis change through alteration of the semantic content and theme of the source text; instead of Zambia being praised it is being thanked. While it is the case that one might praise someone as an expression of gratitude, the two actions are not always interchangeable.

Verse 5
For this verse in the Silozi version there is illocution change. While the source text contains a declarative statement, this is replaced by a command in the target text. There is also emphasis change in that the focus changes from 'strong' and 'free' to people living in harmony (*kakutwano*). The Citonga version exhibits explicitness change which leads to information change. The theme of 'unity' is recoverable from 'all one' in the source text, while 'strong' and 'free' is deleted. Because the Citonga version is a command, illocutionary change is evident.

Chorus
Verse 1
In the first verse of the chorus of the Silozi version, it is seen that an exclamatory form in the source text has been changed to an infinitive form, which is an example of illocutionary change. Emphasis change is also observed because the focus has changed. Thus, the English version identifies who the praise is directed to ('God'), the Silozi version does not do so. However the information on the referent seems to be recoverable from the refrain which comes in the next verse and which refers to the 'spirit' (*moya*) – in this case we assume this is the 'Holy Spirit'. In the case of Citonga there is illocutionary change since the exclamatory form has changed to a command. Also present is some element of paraphrase inasmuch as the concept 'praising' is changed to 'thanking' (*kulumba*). However, as in the Silozi version, the referent only becomes apparent in the next verse in which 'Lord' (*Leza*). Hence in both the Citonga and Silozi versions there is distribution change because the semantic content of the first verse of the source text now occupies two verses.

Verse 2
In both Silozi and Citonga this verse manifests distribution change in conjunction with Verse 1, as has been indicated above. It is an extension of content from Verse 1. Because of this there is information change in the second verse in both target languages, as lyrics different from those in the source are used. In a way we could say that there is transposition involved in both cases: exclamatory statements in the source text have been replaced by nouns in both target texts.

Verse 3
Both the Silozi and Citonga versions of this verse contain illocutionary change. A command in English has changed to an infinitive in Silozi and a noun phrase in Citonga. In Silozi this verse also mirrors Verse 1 of the chorus in terms of meaning, and is hence distributively connected to Verses 1 and 2. The lyrics of Verse 2 in the source text are not recovered anywhere in the Silozi version. However it is interesting to note that this is another instance of the use of a Luyana concept ('*kufuyolwe*' for 'to be praised'). In the Citonga version there is a paraphrase of the concept of 'country' to 'nation'. At the same time the terms 'bless' and 'great' are dropped.

Verse 4
For this verse both target texts reflect literal translation, as the concept of 'Zambia' is simply reproduced in both the Silozi and the Citonga versions. In fact this verse is the only one in the whole anthem where both target realisations of the source text are the same.

Verse 5
The Silozi and Citonga versions of this verse exhibit clause change, where a declarative clause in the source text is realised by a noun phrase in Silozi and a prepositional phrase in Citonga. 'Free men we stand' is simply rendered by 'freedom' (*tukuluho*) in the Silozi version and 'on the flag' (*andembela*) in Citonga. This results in emphasis change, as the theme focus of the source text changes. However the information content of this verse is distributed to the next verse (Verse 6) where 'free men' is subsumed from the concept of self-governance

in Silozi, hence manifesting distribution change as well. In the case of Citonga there is a complete change of the lyrics, and the concept of freedom manifested in the source text (and to some extent in Silozi) is completely lost. Instead there is distribution change: the content of this verse is linked up with the content of Verse 6 which follows. In Citonga there is reference to the 'flag' (*andembela*), an idea which is continued in the next verse.

Verse 6
In Citonga, as mentioned above, this verse continues with the idea of the flag (*ndembela*) from Verse 5. However in comparison with the source text there is emphasis change because of the manner in which this flag is referred to. In the case of Citonga there is a simple reference to the flag as 'flying over the Zambian country'. In the English version, the concept of the flag is brought in with reference to the Zambian people's freedom, symbolised by the flag towering over them. As for Silozi, there is emphasis and information change because the referent is no longer the 'flag' but the self-governance of the Zambian people upon attainment of independence. It is only by extension that the reference to the 'flag' can be deduced from this target text, in the sense that the raising of one's flag in a territory symbolises mastery of the area.

Verse 7
In both Citonga and Silozi this verse is realised in the same way as its equivalent in Verse 4 of the third stanza of the anthem. The source text is in the form of an address to the country, 'Zambia praise to thee', which is rendered faithfully in Silozi (*Zambia lwakulumba*). However, the Citonga version describes the country, 'Zambia beautiful one' (*Zambia omubotu*). This results in a complete change of the lyrics. In the Silozi text, there is emphasis change consisting in the semantic content and theme of the source text being altered: instead of Zambia being praised, the country is being thanked.

Verse 8
In Citonga, this verse is realised with the same lyrics as its equivalent Verse 5 of Stanzas 2 and 3. Explicitness is in evidence and this leads to information change. The theme of 'unity' which is recoverable from 'all one' in the source text is emphasised, with attendant deletion of 'strong' and 'free'. Furthermore, since the declarative form is realised by a command or directive, there is illocutionary change as well. As for the Silozi version, instead of using the lyrics (*lwiine kakutwano*) which are used in the Verses 5 of Stanzas 2 and 3, there is the use of 'kongota' which is again borrowed from Luyana. Since the lyrics used earlier for the Silozi version could have been used again here, it seems as if the decision to use a Luyana concept is for aesthetic reasons. In addition, in the Silozi version there is illocution change. A declarative statement in the source text is replaced by a command in the target text. Also present is emphasis change arising from the fact that 'strong' and 'free' in the source text changes people 'uniting', implied by 'holding themselves' by 'holding themselves'.

Conclusion
This paper has shown that none of the translation strategies used in the translation of the Zambian national anthem from English to Silozi and Citonga has achieved a complete transfer of the content and semantic form of the source lyrics into the target languages. In many instances, in terms of content and

meaning, the English version bears little thematic relationship to the Citonga and Silozi versions. It has been shown that the translators applied the various translation strategies differently to the various components of the anthem. This variation could be attributed to differences in the phonological and morphological structures of the lexical items that realise certain English concepts in the two languages. This would have posed problems in ensuring that similar syllabic units of the anthem were realised in both the target languages. In some instances cultural filtering occurred through the use of semantic forms more relevant to the target languages. It is interesting to note that in some cases, the translations drew from a wide range of cultural perspectives of the target communities. Since the translators sometimes introduced culture-bound images and features so as to make references more explicit, this affected the choice of vocabulary.

The translations have to a large extent achieved prosodic match melody and poetic match structure, but have attained minimal semantic reflexive expression. Whereas the rhythmic, syllabic and melodic structures of the source song have mostly been retained in the target songs, the semantic content has been lost. This is as a consequence of the translators focusing on fidelity to the rhythmic pattern of the original version in order to achieve 'singability'. In such instances the translations cannot evoke the same response and feelings as the original, since the new versions have distorted the meaning. A national anthem is a means of expressing national feelings and attitudes. By singing the national anthem in unison, different peoples and cultures of a nation are brought to share common feelings of unity and purpose. This underscores the need for them to be singing the same message in unison. When the messages contained in the different versions of the national anthem are not the same, this is not attained.

---

[1] In this semi-official language designation, Silozi is the regional lingua franca for the Western Province, Livingstone Urban and Mambova area, while Citonga is designated for use in the Southern Province, Kabwe Rural and Mumbwa District. Guthrie (1967-71) has classified Silozi under the Sotho-Tswana (Zone S.30) group. On the other hand Doke has placed Silozi under the South-Eastern Bantu group, Zone 60 (Cole 1959). Specifically he places Silozi under Zone 60/2/4. Guthrie (1948) classifies Tonga under Zone M64 in the Lenje-Tonga group.

[2] Luyana is one of the languages from which the present Silozi is said to have derived from. It is believed that the current Silozi is a hybrid between Luyana and Sesotho.

References

Archana, S. (2011). *Translation Challenges*.
http://panjjakpanjjak.wordpress.com/2011/05/11/translation-challenges/ (retrieved 25/8/2013).

Chesterman, A. (2000). *Memes of translation*. 2nd Ed. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins Publishing Company.

Cole, D. (1959). *Doke's classification of Bantu languages*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Cudden, J. A. (1976). *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. England: Penguin Reference.

Edward. J. (2011). *Translating Musicals*.
http://wikitranslation.org/blog/translating-musicals/ (retrieved 20/9/2013).

Franzon, J. (2008). Choices in song translation: Singability in priont, subtitles and sung performance. *The Translator 14 (2)*, 373-99.

Ginter, A. (2002). Cultural Issues in Translation. *Studies about Language*, 3, 27-31.

Guthrie, M. (1948). *The Classification of the African Languages*. London: Oxford University Press.

Guthrie, M. (1967-71). *Comparative Bantu.* London: Gregg.

Low, P. (2005). The pantathlon approach to translating songs. In Dinda, L. Gorlée (Ed.) *Song and siginificance: Virtues and vices of vocal translation.* Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 182-212.

Niknasab, Leila & Elham Pishbin. (2011). On the Translation of Poetry: A Look at Sohrab Sepehri's Traveller. *SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation* (online) 5 (1).
Also at http://www.pulib.sk/skase/Volumes/JTI05/pdf_doc/01.pdf (retrieved 27/9/2013.)

Newmark, P. (1988b). *Approaches to Translation*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall.

Shi, A. (2005). Translatability and Poetic Translation Part2. *Translatum Journal, 5*,
http://www.translatum.gr/journal/5/literary-translation.htm (retrieved 7/10/2013).
http://blog.onehourtranslation.com/translation-services/fidelity-versus-transparency-in-translation/