COGNITION AND CONTEXT
IN TRANSLATION ANALYSIS:

CONTEXTUAL FRAMES OF REFERENCE
IN BIBLE TRANSLATION

Sidney K Berman

Ancient Studies

Stellenbosch University

Abstract

This article describes the concept of contextual frames of reference (CFR) and explains its importance to the analysis of Bible translations. The article starts by explaining the idea of cognition, which is fundamental to the notion of CFR. Then it briefly sketches the origin of the concept of framing from its broad context of translation studies up to its specific framework in this article. Finally, it elaborates using Ruth 3:9, 3:10, 3:16 and 4:2 to show how the four heuristic CFRs can be used as a tool for analysing translations. The four heuristic classes of CFR are socio-cultural, organisational, communicational and textual. In this article, they are presented as tools that can be used to hypothesise why a translation renders a source text (ST) the way it does, based on an analysis of the probable circumstances surrounding the translation.

Key Words: Bible Translation; Cognition, Frame of Reference; Meaning

Cognition in Contextual Frames of Reference

In order to be more credible, biblical exegesis and translation should take into consideration the concept of cognition, a new insight from the field of Cognitive Linguistics (henceforth CL). Biblical exegetes and translators need historical and theological expository tools as well as the tools of linguistics, especially socio-cultural linguistics, to extract and communicate meaning more effectively (cf. Cotterell 1997:136). They could, for example, 'frame' a distinctive theological usage or terminology contextually in accordance with the historical period and textual context in which it was used.

Background of the Concept of Contextual Frames of Reference

The concept of 'frame analysis' was originally conceived in the field of linguistics by Goffman (1974), who investigated meaning in grammatical constructions. Yet, it has since been refined and diversified by scholars in various disciplines. For example, in secular translation studies, Mona Baker has promoted a version of frame analysis that uses what she calls 'a narrative approach.' Narrative in this version is akin to discourse, rhetoric or myth that makes certain representations acceptable to the public (Baker 2006:3). In her book, *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*, Baker sees translation as an agenda for reframing or legitimising stories that differ from their original version – so the translator deliberately sets out to "accentuate, undermine or modify aspects of the [...] source text" (2006:5). Postcolonial translation theory follows this assumption by arguing that the

translator who translated during colonial times framed the ST's narrative to suit his/her new agenda, namely to undermine the colonised's culture and to present the coloniser's culture as the superior alternative.[1]

The difference with my model is that in my framework, is that it is not a translator's violent agenda that frames a new narrative – rather, it is translation problems or circumstances that frame the translator's rendering. This stance arises from the realisation that translation of the Bible as a religious text tends towards strict correspondence to the ST's meaning. Where this correspondence was not achieved, translation problems that caused the disparity can be identified upon investigation. According to Christianne Nord (2005:167), these problems are as follows: i. Pragmatic translation problems, which pertain to the contrasts between situations under which the ST was produced or used and for which the TT is produced; ii. Convention-related translation problems, which result from socio-cultural differences between the source and target cultures; iii. Linguistic translation problems, which arise from structural differences between the source and target languages; and iv. Text-specific translation problems, which are unique to a particular text. According to this model, where a translation choice appears problematic or different from the ST, a serious investigation of all contextual factors has to be conducted.[2]

The idea of frames in Bible translation has been implicit until Wilt's and Wendland's fairly recent publications on Contextual Frames of Reference (CFR). Wilt edited a collaborative work, *Bible Translation: Frames of Reference* (2003), which draws on insights from recent developments in CL. Other books that seek to demonstrate the vitality of 'frames' to Bible Translation are *Scripture Frames and Framing*, *Contextual Frames of Reference in Translation*, and *Framing the Frames*.[3] These works expound and apply the notion of CFR in Bible translation as a tool for teaching/learning and for composing and analysing vernacular translations (cf. Wendland 2010:1). Wendland 2010 illustrates how conceptual frames and framing, in which Bible translation studies have recently taken a keen interest, already has a well-established place in contemporary CL.

Bible translation is a complex and multifaceted form of communication. From the field of CL, we learn that communication comprises inter-lingual, inter-cultural and inter-cognitive complexities. The perception that Bible translation is complex communication has been a theme of Nida's and other Bible translation scholars "since a half century ago" (Wilt 2002:145). The call for a more adequate communication model than the code model that Nida used was made by Gutt, who pointed out defects in Nida's earlier approaches and advocated for the inference model of communication (Gutt 1991).[4] Viewing Bible translation as communication yields an awareness of the varied contexts within which and for which a particular translation is made, such as the following: The translator's relationship with others involved in the production and use of Scriptures; The communicative goals involved in producing a translation, including those of ritual; The relationship between text,

---

1   For example, Dube (1999) argues from a postcolonial perspective that the translation '*badimo*' (ancestral spirits) for 'demons' in the Setswana Wookey Bible is a missionary reframing of the original narrative with a new agenda to violate Setswana culture.

2   Although he was not familiar with the name 'CFR,' Hermanson (1999) scrutinised all the problematical contextual frames of reference possible for the translation '*badimo*' for 'demons,' especially those that Dube had overlooked. My observation is that Baker's and Dube's models are a restricted version of frame analysis, which sweeps all possible contextual factors under the carpet of a presumed translator's violent agenda – they too undertake some kind of a constrained CFR analysis.

3   These works are, respectively, Wilt & Wendland 2008, Wendland 2008 and Wendland 2010.

4   For use in Bible translation Gutt developed the inference communicative model that was pioneered by Sperber and Wilson (1986).

community and meaning; The notion of frames and framing,[5] and: The relationships between the ST and TT regarding language and context (cf. Wilt 2003:27).

For any real translational communication to occur, translators should extract and translate meaning through exploiting the inter-dependence of text, cotext and context (Cotterell 1997:136; Wilt 2002:145). In this study, text, cotext and context are collectively perceived as different cognitive 'frames' that interact to influence the interpretation and translation of the ST. The preceding list shares some of the features of the different CFRs that play an influential role in the process of translation. The framework of Wilt's and Wendland's CFR merges such assumptions of Translation Studies with the CL notion of cognitive frames. The following section is a summary of Wilt and Wendland's CFR approach that this study will use to analyse and evaluate a sample from the three extant Setswana translations of Ruth.

Classes of Contextual Frames of Reference

CFRs are cognitive factors that influence translators to produce certain renderings for the TT during translation. They often constrain translators during decision making and cause differences between the ST and the TT. These cognitive-based influences can be classified as socio-cultural, organisational, communicational and textual frames of reference (Wilt 2003:43). They often overlap due to the fluid and fuzzy nature of their boundaries. For example, in analysing a translation, it may be unclear whether a word choice was influenced by a lexical frame or a communication situation frame. Yet it is important to categorise them so as to discern more precisely errors, potential problem points and their causes, as well as the means of preventing or solving them. The CFRs are cognitive because they are contexts of the mind that make up an individual's or society's worldview (Wendland 2008:19). Thus, CFRs are also described as psychological, conceptual or mental. They act as a heuristic tool for investigating factors that can determine a translator's choice among various possibilities of rendering.

The concept of CFR utilises much of the perspective of relevance theory namely that assumptions of what a speaker means can be inferred from an utterance. That inference can be achieved by investigating the manifold linguistic and extra-linguistic cognitive communicative environments of the utterance; in the same way, linguistic and extra-linguistic contexts can be inferred or hypothesised from an utterance. In this article, I hypothesise in four categories on the nature of the differences that resulted when the translation of the original (Hebrew ST) was made by the three Bibles.

Socio-cultural Frames

Socio-cultural frames pertain to socio-cultural practices and our internalisation of them (Wilt 2003:44); they are influential factors "passed down formally or informally as 'tradition' from one generation to the next" (Alfredo 2010:24). From a CL point of view, socio-cultural frames should be perceived as inter-connected bodies of knowledge organised and stored as concepts in the mind after real life experience (Fillmore 2006:381). Thus, socio-cultural frames represent encyclopaedic knowledge.

Differing socio-cultural CFRs represent the differing cognitive worlds behind the source language and target language being studied. There are sometimes general similarities and/or superficial similarities between the two sets of cultures, which can distract the translator

---

[5]   In the subsequent paragraph, Wilt explains briefly the notion of frames and framing as "the frames of reference for formulating and interpreting the text" (Wilt 2003:27).

from paying attention to the mismatches between them. This is possible in the case of Old Testament translation in sub-Saharan Africa because it is commonly acknowledged that African culture has many similarities with ancient Israelite culture (Cf. De Waard and Nida 1973:1). Such differences and misleading similarities tend to affect translation.

The ST was written using that context as a frame of reference for its intended audience. However, the target text (TT) audience, translators and other influential stakeholders were brought up in, and influenced by their own contemporary socio-cultural settings and worldview that differ from those of the ST culture. Problematic points of intersection normally arise during verbal and non-verbal interaction between the two cultures, which lead to misinterpretation of the ST by the TT translators and audiences. Nord (2011:45) calls them 'rich points of intersection.'

Organisational Frames

Organisational frames are influences from stakeholder institutions (clients) and the translator's perception of the organisational aspects of his/her work (Wilt 2003:46). That would include his/her training, sense of responsibility, job satisfaction and the exegetical tools and Bible versions availed to him/her or that s/he is directed to use. These can be summarised as the rights and responsibilities of 'allegiance' (Wendland 2008:68). Organisational frames are cognitive in the same sense that socio-cultural frames are. They result from individuals' unified psychological conceptualisations concerning the Bible, translation, methodology, uses of the Bible, the job of translators, his/her employers' expectations, remuneration of translators and countless other factors. Such concepts also come from important communal life experiences. Institutions have their own *cultures* (and languages) that embody their preferences, goals, prejudices, rules, traditions, ways of relating with the translator(s), conditions of service of translators, among others (cf. Wilt and Wendland 2008:107ff). Churches, for example have their own conceptualisation of what a Bible translation should sound like, look like or do. Such organisational factors can constrain a translator in decision making during translation.

Communicational Frames

Communicational (conversational or communication-situational) frames pertain to the immediate physical and temporal setting of the act of communication that includes the medium, codes, roles and goals of the participants and recipients (Wilt 2003:55-58). They are influences that emanate from the immediate communication contexts of the ST communicator and of the TT translators. Meaning can be interpreted only by cognitive processing in a specific context of use (Evans and Green 2006:157; Geeraerts 2006:3-6). Communicative situational context can be broken down into lexical, syntactic and extralinguistic contexts (or text, cotext and context respectively). Lexical context pertains to the summarised meaning of the word observed by itself.[6] Syntactic context considers the meaning of the word in relation to other words in the same sentence, paragraph, chapter, book, or corpus by the same author – a sentence specifies the most appropriate meaning, among several, for a word. Extra-linguistic context pertains to socio-cultural or life-application information associated with the word or construction.

---

[6] Recent developments indicate that this concept is flawed because it is impossible to describe a word by itself without accounting for contexts of usage and the encyclopaedic knowledge that it activates (cf., for example, Geeraerts 2006:1).

According to Relevance theory, a translator may fail to recognise the author's intended assumptions (from the primary communication situation) and instead use other assumptions (secondary communication situation), which would lead to mistranslation (Gutt 2000:76). For example, the rhetorical question, "what is Sam doing?" may not inquire about Sam's actions but may mean that Sam's neighbour should advise Sam to stop what he was doing – or the speaker just wanted to convey his/her disapproval of Sam's actions. Thus, among several situational problems is the fact that natural language allows the twisting (or skewing) of linguistic forms in conveying meaning (Gutt 2000:85). Sometimes it will be impossible to reconstruct or hypothesise on the original communicational setting of the ST and/or the TT.

Textual Frames

Textual frames are formal, semiotic and cognitive frames of the ST and TT. Texts can consist of verbal and nonverbal signs such as "illustrations, tables, text format, etc. in written texts – intonation and pitch, gestures, face and body movements in face-to-face communication" (Nord 2005:43-45). In the words of Evans and Green, "language encodes and externalises our thoughts through means of symbols" (2006:6). The symbols may be spoken, written or signed (Evans and Green 2006:6). The most common signs of biblical texts are written linguistic signs, but they can also be non-linguistic, visual and aural. Examples of non-linguistic texts are audio (e.g., audio Bibles), video (e.g., The Jesus Film), sign language, drama, photographs, art sculptures, paintings and others.

From the cognitive viewpoint that language externalises our thoughts, my CFR model assumes that certain linguistic difficulties constrained the translators from re-capturing accurately or adequately the thoughts of the ST speakers, authors or redactors. Such constraints can be classified as inter-textual, intra-textual, lexical or syntactic frames in addition to the four generic descriptions from the model of CFR (Wendland 2008). The CFR model can be used to examine the problematic aspects of the ST's and TT's textual frames of reference that could cause a translation shift.[7] ST segments would be mapped against their corresponding segments in the TT and then it would be postulated – in terms of textual and other frames of reference – why they are different (Toury 1995:88). These segments may range in size and scope from a lexical item, a phrase, sentence, paragraph, or more, depending on the ST unit that is deemed to be experiencing a shift. The shifts can be inaccurate or erroneous regarding ST meaning, clumsy or unidiomatic regarding TL form, and ambiguous or confusing regarding TL communication.

The study of textual frames stems from several observations, the most important of which is that languages are structurally different from each other. ST and TT segments are likely to yield shifts when paired together. In the case of Bible translation, the ST languages (Hebrew and Greek) and TT languages (Setswana or other contemporary languages) are quite different from each other. In addition, languages cannot be separated from their cultures, and ancient cultures differ from the newer TT cultures (Katan 2004:100). During analysis, many shifts can be attributed to a lack of explanation of certain 'loaded' concepts because many words and linguistic signs are merely "tips of encyclopaedic icebergs," or signs of culture, context and cognition (Van Wolde 2009:51-56).[8] A lack of understanding

---

7   A shift is a formal or functional difference between a TT unit and its ST correspondent (Catford 1965:73).

8   This statement accounts for the fact that culture and worldview are not conveyed or understood through language alone (Palmer 1996:113).

of the world behind a given word, phrase, sentence and other units in the ST is likely to result in a shift.

The CFRs of the Setswana Bibles

As a way of illustration, this section analyses the frames of the Setswana translations of the book of Ruth in 3:9, 3:10, 3:16 and 4:2. The three Bibles are as follows: The Moffat Bible, published in 1857 and known to have been translated by the missionary Robert Moffat; the Wookey Bible, published in 1908 and known to have been translated by the Reverend Alfred Wookey; and BSSA, published in 1970 and known to have been translated by a collaboration of some missions under the supervision of the Bible Society of South Africa (BSSA). This analysis uses the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia as the ideal source.[9]

The Socio-cultural CFR in Ruth 3:9

BHS	Moffat	Wookey	BSSA
וּפָרַשְׂתָּ כְנָפֶךָ עַל־אֲמָתְךָ	Phuthololela lelata la gago lohuka lwa gago (Spread your wing on behalf of your servant)	Phuthololela lelata la gago kobo ya gago (Spread your garment on behalf of your servant)	Phuthololela lelata la gago diphuka tsa gago (Spread your wings on behalf of your servant)

The Hebrew phrase corresponds formally to "Spread out your wing over your maid-servant." כְנָפֶךָ has the semantic potential of "wing, skirt, or corner of a garment." Ruth was referring to the corner of Boaz's garment. The garment's corners were metaphorically called 'wings' (Dommershausen 1995:231). It was used and worn in different ways. Dommershausen explains that "to spread the corner of one's garment over a woman […] means to cover her nakedness, to marry her" (cf. Bush 1998:70; LaCocque 2004:96).[10] Hence, Ruth's request to Boaz invoked a culturally specific metaphor for marriage which can cause translation problems in other socio-cultural settings.

The three Bibles use 'wing' (Moffat), 'garment' (Wookey) and 'wings' (BSSA). Generally, these prevent a formal shift.[11] BSSA opts for the plural 'wings' and can there-fore be said to represent a slight formal shift. Concerning the possibility of functional shifts, one can start by considering the socio-cultural interpretation of Ruth's request. That is, the metaphor she uses would be understood unequivocally as a marriage proposal by the original audience. However, the three Bibles can be said to represent a functional shift because for all three translations, Ruth's request does not even hint at a marriage proposal. The Bibles also represent another, less significant functional shift. For example, the trans-lations all present Ruth as asking Boaz merely to spread his wing (whatever that might mean) or blanket 'on behalf of' or 'for' her. Yet the surface interpretation of the Hebrew forms is that Ruth is asking Boaz to cover her with his garment – referring to *apesa lelata la gago kobo/lefuka la gago* (cover your servant with your wing/garment). It is

---

[9] Muller (1958:2) reports that the English Bible was the ST for Moffat and Wookey but the Hebrew was used for BSSA.

[10] See also Ezekiel 16:8 where God spread the corner of His garment over Israel and covered her nakedness. In that context, God figuratively entered into a marriage covenant with her.

[11] A formal shift is a departure from word for word correspondence. A functional shift is a difference between the meaning/sense of the original and that of the translation.

understandable why the Bibles would be vague. At face value, Ruth's request can easily lead the TT audience to deduce that she is asking for sex, because she is asking to sleep under the same garment with Boaz. The Bibles are probably avoiding the socio-culturally awkward image of Ruth asking for sex. Consequently, the divergent socio-cultural CFR can be cited as the cause of such a shift. For Moffat, this functional shift, and the one that follows in the paragraphs below, can be ascribed to its traditional adherence to word for word correspondence, in which technical expressions and metaphors are left uninterpreted. The major factors of influence, in that case, can be regarded as pertaining to an organisational CFR.

For the two latest Bibles, the absence of connotations of a marriage proposal in the TT can also be ascribed to differing socio-cultural CFRs, because they are more interpretive and can be expected to be more conscious of the marriage proposal than Moffat. Actually, BSSA suggests this awareness with a footnote reference to Ezekiel 16:8. Ruth, being a woman – and the heroine of the story – is not expected to propose marriage (or sex), but can be expected to ask for material assistance from a well-off male relative such as Boaz. The Bibles, presumably, do not want to spoil the sparkle of the story. They avoid what may be deemed socio-culturally awkward or embarrassing in the TT, especially if committed by Ruth. BSSA's footnote cross reference to Ezekiel 16:8, if it were elaborated, would indicate that indeed the unexpected happened – she proposed to Boaz, but rightfully so, and the footnote offers no explanation that this is a metaphor for marriage. It merely presents the cross-reference.

The Textual CFR in Ruth 3:10

BHS	Moffat	Wookey	BSSA
לְבִלְתִּי־לֶכֶת אַחֲרֵי הַבַּחוּרִים	Wa seka wa latela makau (You did not go to young men)	Wa seka wa latela a e leng makau (You did not go to those who are young men)	Wa seka wa latela makau (You did not go to young men)

The Hebrew expression corresponds formally to "You did not go after the young men."[12] Boaz is commending Ruth's *hesed* (in crude terms 'loyal love') in not preferring a younger husband after discovering that her potential husband was old. However, there are three exegetical problems in the Hebrew forms. Firstly, they do not indicate that she would be seeking marriage but leave open the interpretation that she would be promiscuous. Secondly, they do not refer to one young man but to a plurality of them. Thirdly, the Hebrew idiom 'to go or walk after' often has the derogative meaning of 'to whore after' (Bush 1996:77).[13] The three problems are accidental because according to the larger

---

12   Apparently, the expression 'walk after' originated from the context of war where the army or people follow after the commander-in-chief (Helfmeyer 1974:205). Its common contexts are religious and sexual, but other contexts of 'walk after' include servant-master, husband-wife and disciple-master relationships, as well as political affiliation (Block 1999:71; Helfmeyer 1974:204-205).

13   Nevertheless Bush refutes that Boaz may have had this sense in mind. Boaz's use of the noun, *hesed*, implies that Ruth could either select one of the younger men for a husband, or to marry the older Boaz. She picked the more sacrificial choice. [KYK HELOISE! om 'n ryk ou man te vat in plaas van 'n arm jongetjie is "sacrificial"! Delete my opmerking.] The idea of her foregoing another option of promiscuity would not justify the use of the noun, *hesed*.

discourse, Boaz is too kind and wise to tell Ruth that he had expected her to follow after different young men promiscuously. A translation of the text could accidentally give the impression that Boaz expected Ruth to be promiscuous. This interpretation could arise, firstly, if the audience were to attach the stigma of promiscuity to foreign women, or Moabite women in particular. Genesis 19:30-38 and Numbers 25:1 seem to indicate that Moabite women were thought to be promiscuous by nature. Secondly, the interpretation could arise if the audience were to think that Ruth would fail to find a husband and end up desperate. The NET Bible's rendering "You have not sought to marry one of the young men" restores Ruth's need for marriage and reduces the number of the young men to one (cf. De Waard and Nida 1991:40).

The three Bibles' renderings are virtually identical. The only difference is in Wookey's redundant expansion of young men with 'those who are.' Otherwise, the three Bibles follow the Hebrew expression word for word, thereby leaving the clause open to the interpretation that Boaz expected Ruth to be promiscuous. That represents a glaring shift because the Hebrew unit does not mean 'whore after young men.' Whilst the translator might not have known whether the Hebrew audience could make a mistake in interpreting the clause, he would do well to be alert to how the TT audience might understand its formal correspondent. It is difficult to hypothesise whether the translators were unaware of the two possibilities, in which case the exegetical error would be accidental, or they opted to ignore them. The decisions can be said to have been caused by textual CFRs. Specifically, such frames have problematic connotations inherent in the corresponding lexical items of the Hebrew text and TT, even when formal or functional correspondence is accurate.

The NET Bible is arguably the best example for capturing the whole sense of this clause, viz. "You have not sought to marry one of the young men." In Setswana, it would be, *Wa seka wa senka go nyalwa ke mongwe wa makau.*

The Organisational CFR in Ruth 3:16

BHS	Moffat	Wookey	BSSA
מִי־אַתְּ בִּתִּי	O mang, morwadiaka? (Who are you, my daughter?)	Go rileng, morwadiaka? (What is wrong, my daughter?)	Go ntse jang, morwadiaka? (What is it like, my daughter?)

This Hebrew phrase literally corresponds to "Who are you, my daughter?" Here, Naomi is not asking Ruth to identify herself, but is essentially asking, "How did it go?" (De Waard and Nida 1991:44; NET). Naomi wants to find out how the negotiation went between Ruth and Boaz. Ruth's extensive answer indicates that this is indeed the meaning of the question. If left at "who are you" in Setswana like Moffat does, the question could be confusing to an audience.[14] Thus, Moffat causes a shift due to the organisational CFR of following a word for word rendering of the Hebrew text. This frame is organisational because it pertains to methodology – methodologies are institutionally/organisationally agreed upon or assumed, and/or are often embedded within a historical time frame. Missionary-era translations tended towards following the forms and structure of the ST as closely as possible

---

14   Some audiences, especially the less literate, may struggle to make sense of it. To the fully literate, it could be at least distracting. Either way, it would represent a functional shift. NB: Sasson adds the word 'now' to the question to indicate that Naomi was inquiring about new developments from Ruth's mission (1979:101).

(Makutoane and Naude 2009:82). This was the case even when the translators were making a translation or revision from another translation such as the LXX, Latin Vulgate, or an English version, for example, for the institutions normally believed that such a version mirrored the original Hebrew or Greek manuscripts.[15] The question could be rendered as, *Kgang e tsamaile jang, morwadiaka?* (How did the matter go, my daughter?).

The Communicational CFR in Ruth 4:2

BHS	Moffat	Wookey	BSSA
עֲשָׂרָה אֲנָשִׁים מִזִּקְנֵי הָעִיר	Banna ba bagolo ba ten ba motse (Ten big men of the town)	Banna ba le some ba bagolwane ba motse (Ten big men of the town)	Banna ba bagolo ba motse ba le some (Ten big men of the town)

The אֲנָשִׁים מִזִּקְנֵי הָעִיר are "men from the elders of the town." זְקֵנִים refers to old men (although it refers to an old woman once) or elders as officials (Bush 1998:98; Conrad 1980:122). The elders in reference here are not necessarily old, but are men of prominence in the community or who hold an elder's office. The Setswana socio-cultural context has the equivalent of elders too. Such elders are normally senior members of the family lineage. They are recognised as counsellors, intercessors and leaders in the community (Schapera and Comaroff 1991:34, 48). Elders are usually appointed from among elderly senior men, although their ages may vary greatly.

Because in Setswana culture the elders are always men, the addition of the term 'men' to their designation in the Hebrew text has caused a significant translation problem for the translators. As a result, all the Bibles manifest a functional shift because the Hebrew text's meaning is "men from among the elders" whilst the TL meaning is 'big men.' In Setswana, putting the noun *bagolwane* after *banna ba* turns the noun *bagolwane* or *bagolo* into the adjective 'big' (cf. Snyman et al. 1990:37-38).[16] Leaving out the equivalent of אֲנָשִׁים, i.e., *banna* would have solved the problem. It is evident that "ten men from the elders" refers merely to 'ten elders.' It is also ironic that all three translations try to provide an equivalent for a lexeme which would be better left untranslated. In the process, they avoid a formal shift, but they cause a functional one which pertains to an erroneous TL meaning.

For BSSA and to a lesser extent Wookey, this is a good example of an instance where an uncharacteristic attempt towards formal equivalence results in an unforeseen functional shift. I assume that if the translators had been aware of this error, they would have discarded the formal correspondent in favour of a more functional equivalent. They were unaware that their renderings would lead to a wrong meaning. The translators were misled by the apparently simple communication setting of the Hebrew unit and reproduced the unit literally – viz., the words, grammatical construction and socio-cultural hints (or lexical, syntactic and extra-linguistic frames) – unaware that they would communicate unintended

---

15 The Rheims-Douay Bible (1582-1610), for example, "was made not from the original languages but from the Latin Vulgate" (Metzger 2001:68). Similarly, although Moffat mirrors the Hebrew word for word in almost all textual units of Ruth, Moffat evidently used the King James Version as his source.

16 In this discussion, *bagolo* differs from *bagolwane* on the basis that *bagolwane* includes the nuance of 'seniority' which *bagolo* does not have, and *bagolo* includes the sense of old age which *bagolwane* does not have (Snyman et al. 1990:37-38). *Bagolwane* can refer to size and serve as an adjective such as *bagolo* (Snyman et al. 1990:38), but only in a construction that is fashioned to create such a nuance.

information. In that sense, differing communication situation CFRs contributed to this decision.

Summary

In this article, I proposed how analysis of a Bible translation can be done using the notion of CFR. I started by highlighting the idea of cognition, which is fundamental to the CFR model. Next, I briefly surveyed scholarship on the concept of CFR. Lastly, I described the four heuristic CFRs, namely socio-cultural, organisational, communicational and textual CFRs. These are circumstances arising during translation that are likely to dictate the outcome of renderings. Many such circumstances lead to a misinterpretation and/or miscommunication of the original ST's meaning. An awareness of these influential factors can contribute towards a well-adjusted understanding of shifts that occur in Bible translations, as well as towards avoiding the effects of CFRs in new translations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alfredo, JM 2010. חסד *and Ikharari: The Book of Ruth from a Lomwe Perspective*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University.

Baker, M 2006. *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.

Bibela ea Boitsepho ee Cutseng Kholagano e Kholugolu le e Nca, tse ri Hetolecoeng mo Puon ea Sechuana 1857. London: British and Foreign Bible Society.

Bibela ee Boitshepo 1908. London: British and Foreign Bible Society.

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia 1990. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Beibele. 1970 Cape Town: Bible Society of South Africa.

Block, DI 1999 *Judges, Ruth*. The New American Commentary, Vol. 6. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers. Exported from *Logos Bible Software*, 28 January 2014.

Bush, FW 1996/1998. *Ruth, Esther*. Word Biblical Commentary, Vol. 9. Dallas, Texas: Word Books Publisher.

Conrad, J 1980. זָקֵן. In Botterweck, GJ and Ringgren, H-J (editors), *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. 4:122-124. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Cotterell, P 1997. Linguistics, Meaning, Semantics, and Discourse Analysis. In: WA van Gemeren (ed.), *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, pp. 134-160.

Dommershausen, W 1995. כָּנָף. In Botterweck, GJ, Ringgren, H and Fabry, H-J (editors), *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. 7:229-231. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Dube, MW 1999. *Consuming a Colonial Cultural Bomb: Translating Badimo into 'Demons' in the Setswana Bible (Matthew 8:28-34;15.22;10.8)*.

De Waard, J and Nida, EA 1973/1991. *A Translator's Handbook on the Book of Ruth*. London and New York: United Bible Societies.

Evans, V and Green, M 2006. *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

Fillmore, CJ 2006. Frame Semantics. In D Geeraerts (ed.), *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings.* Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 373-400.

Geeraerts, D 2006. A Rough Guide to Cognitive Linguistics. In D Geeraerts (ed.), *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings.* Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 1-28.

Goffman, E 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organisation of Experience.* Cambridge and Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Gutt, EA 2000. *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context.* Second Edition. Manchester and Boston: St Jerome Publishing.

Helfmeyer, FJ 1974. אַחַר. In Botterweck, GJ and Ringgren, H (editors), *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. 1:204-207. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Hermanson, EA 1999. *"Badimo a ba robale ka kagiso" Let the ancestors rest in peace: Colonization or Contextualization in the translation of the Bible in Setswana (Matthew 8:28-34;15:22;10:8).* Paper read at the Post Conference Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas. Hammanskraal Campus, University of Pretoria, 9 August 1999.

Katan, D 2004. *Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and mediators.* Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

LaCoque, A 2004. *Ruth: A Continental Commentary.* Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press.

Makutoane, TJ and Naude, JA 2009. *Colonial Interference in the Translations of the Bible into Southern Sotho.* Acta Theologica Supplementum, 12:79-94.

Metzger, BM 2001. *The Bible in Translation: Ancient and English Versions.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.

Muller, KOE 1958. *Report on the Translation of the Bible into Central Tswana during the Years 1929, 1939 and 1950 to 1958 by a Translating Commission.* Cape Town: The British and Foreign Bible Society.

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

Nord, C 2011. *Defining Translation Functions: The Translation Brief as a Guideline for the Trainee Translator.* [Online]. Retrieved from: http://www.scribd.com/doc/39090525/NORD [2011, 15 August].

Palmer, GB 1996. *Toward a Theory of Cultural Linguistics.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Sasson, JM 1979. *Ruth: A New Translation with a Philological Commentary and a Formalist-Folklorist Interpretation.* Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Schapera, I and Comaroff, JL 1991. *The Tswana.* Revised edition. London and New York: Kegan Paul International and International African Institute.

Snyman, JW, Shole, JHJ. and Le Roux, JC 1990. *Dikisinare ya Setswana English Afrikaans Dictionary Woordeboek.* Pretoria, South Africa: Via Afrika Limited.

Sperber, D and Wilson, D 1995. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

The King James Version 1611. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons. Logos Research Systems. Exported from Logos Bible Software, 15 November 2012.

The New English Translation 2006. Bellingham: Biblical Studies Press. Logos Research Systems. Exported from Logos Bible Software, 15 November 2012.

Toury, G 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Van Wolde, E 2009. *Reframing Biblical Studies: When Language and Text Meet Culture, Cognition and Context*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

Wendland, ER 2008. *Contextual Frames of Reference in Translation: A Coursebook for Bible Translators and Teachers*. Manchester and Kinderhook (NY): St Jerome Publishing.

Wendland, ER 2010. Framing the Frames: A Theoretical Framework for the Cognitive Notion of "Frames of Reference." *Journal of Translation* 6(1):27-50. [Online] Retrieved from: http://sil.org/siljot/2010/1/928474542779/siljot2010-1-03.pdf (2012, 3 June).

Wilt, T 2002. A New Framework for Bible Translation. *Acta Theologica Supplementum* 2:140-163.

Wilt, T 2003. Translation and Communication. In: T Wilt (ed.), *Bible Translation: Frames of Reference.* Manchester and Northampton, MA: St Jerome Publishing, pp. 28-80.

Wilt, T and Wendland, E 2008. *Scripture Frames and Framing: A Workbook for Bible Translators.* Stellenbosch: SUN Media Press.