

Department of Linguistics

June 2014



MODULE:	Linguistics 3A (LIN3AA3)
PAPER 2:	Text Editing and Translation Studies Practical Text Editing and Translation (<i>Open Book: Use of computers (MS Word), dictionaries and other suitable reference works allowed</i>)
INTERNAL EXAMINERS:	Dr E Cornelius Ms T Adams
EXTERNAL EXAMINER:	Mr J Blaauw (North-West University)
DATE:	14 JUNE 2014 [08:30]
MARKS:	200
TIME:	2 hours

SECTION A: Text Editing (answer either Question 1 or Question 2)

Question 1

According to Crystal (1992:387) text linguistics studies the “defining properties of texts – what constitutes their **textuality** or **texture** ...”. Define the notion of text by providing a detailed exposition of at least four principles or standards of textuality, and indicate how knowledge of text linguistics can help editors in their work. (50)

OR

Question 2

Write an essay on the four types of editing outlined by Mossop (2007). Provide a brief description of the type of amending work that is done in each case. (50)

SECTION B: Translation Studies (answer either Question 3 or Question 4)

Question 3

Discuss, in an essay, Nord’s (1991; 1992) systematic model of translation-oriented text analysis. In your essay, indicate which questions the translator would typically ask to determine the factors that will influence the translation process. (50)

OR

Question 4

In an essay, distinguish between documentary and instrumental translation processes. In each case, provide information, with appropriate examples, of the various forms of documentary and instrumental translation. (50)

SECTION C: Practical Text Editing and Translation (answer either Question 5 or Question 6)

- Students with the following L1s must answer **Question 5**: isiZulu, isiXhosa, Sepedi, Afrikaans and Setswana.
- Students with English as L1 and Afrikaans as L2 must answer **Question 6**.

Question 5

Refer to **TEXT 1: English source text** (on page 4)

A. Text Editing

1. Identify the genre to which the source text (Text 1) belongs.
2. What is the function of the source text (Text 1)? Elaborate on the context in which it was produced and the intended target audience.
3. Edit the text below, in Track Changes.
4. Provide at least five annotations (reasoned accounts) in which you explain important editing problems you have experienced and indicate how you solved these problems.
5. Subsequently edit your own translation in Track Changes. Save your edited text as follows: SURNAME + EDITED TEXT (e.g. CORNELIUS EDITED TEXT).

(50)

B. Translation

6. Write a translation brief for Text 1, including all the explicit or implicit information the brief should contain.
7. Translate the text into **one** of the following languages (select your L1 from the list): isiZulu, isiXhosa, Sepedi, Afrikaans and Setswana.
8. Save your translation as follows: SURNAME + TRANSLATION (e.g. CORNELIUS TRANSLATION).

(50)

OR

Question 6

Refer to **TEXT 2: Afrikaans source text** (on page 5)

A. Translation

1. Identify the genre to which the source text (Text 2) belongs.
2. What is the function of the source text (Text 2)? Elaborate on the context in which it was produced and the intended target audience.

3. Write a translation brief for the text, including all the explicit or implicit information the brief should contain.
4. Translate the text into English, your L1.
5. Save your translation as follows: SURNAME + TRANSLATION (e.g. CORNELIUS TRANSLATION).
6. Submit your translation.

(50)

[Please note: Text 3, that pertains to Section B below, will only be provided to students for editing once they submitted their translation of Text 2.]

Refer to TEXT 3: English target text (on page 6)

B. Text Editing

7. Edit Text 3 (a translation of the same source text you have just translated), and do so in Track Changes.
8. Provide at least five annotations (reasoned accounts) in which you explain important editing problems you have experienced and indicate how you solved these problems.
9. Subsequently edit your own translation in Track Changes. Save your edited text as follows: SURNAME + EDITED TEXT (e.g. CORNELIUS EDITED TEXT).

(50)

Text 1: English source text**To intervene or not to intervene? What is our moral obligation?**

Since yesterday my telephone has been ringing non-stop and I have received numerous emails alerting us to the predicament of a young male lion in the southern region of the Sabi Sands. It is one the reserves adjoining the Kruger National Park. Fences have been removed between the park and various private propertie's and wild animals move freely between the areas

It appears that a young male lion known as the Styx Male Lion by rangers and guest are trying to establish a new territory after he had been driven from his pride. About it month ago (so we are told) this young lion was unfortunately badly injured in a territorial fight. As a direct result of a bad injury to one of his back leg or hip his physical condition started to decline. In his weakened state this young lion's misfortune was not yet over and he was soon involved in yet another territorial dispute and sustained further injuries. One injury saw his eyelid ripped open. Fortunately his eye (so it seems from photograph's) remained intact. Whatever the full extent of his injury is, his physical condition continue to deteriorate and many wild rangers and their guest have found this unfortunate creature's obvious suffering emotionally distressing.

Sadly life for lions in the wild can be extremely difficult and what may seem cruel to us is a natural occurrence in the wild and many lions faces serious injury and death as a result. It is part of nature; fortunately or unfortunately.

Now let's for a moment address moral and ethical issues here. If and when wild animals find themselves in trouble national and provincial authorities and parks managers will in most instances when confronted by animal lovers immediately refer to their respective policies which in most instances are to not interfere with nature, but after receiving the email below this morning asking me what our position would be on the matter I felt compelled to reply. I have removed the identification of the individual who emailed me as well as the names of the respective lodges simple as it really does not matter where this tragedy is playing out. What matters is how we as humans respond to those in need – be it another suffering human being or animal.

Adapted from: <http://sanwildsite.wordpress.com/2012/08/08/to-intervene-or-not-to-intervene-what-is-our-moral-obligation/#more-781> [390 words]

Text 2: Afrikaans source text**Heinings moet 'res nullius' verhoed**

Die geslag wat aan die begin van die vorige eeu gelewe het, het van wild as 'res nullius' gepraat - 'n bekende Latynse regsterm wat aangedui het dat die wild 'aan niemand behoort nie'. Sedert die mensdom se getalle egter 'n paar dekades gelede 3 biljoen oorskry het, is hierdie beginsel totaal onvanpas as dit kom by die suksesvolle bewaring van wild. Wilde diere het geen kans op oorlewing as hulle aan niemand behoort nie. Die suksesvolle Noord-Amerikaanse model van bewaring is daarop gevestig dat wild kollektief aan ál die mense behoort, en dat daardie besitters die diere besit en bestuur. Hierdie model is ook in ons land se parke van toepassing. Die Suider-Afrikaanse model weer, wat vir die mees suksesvolle bewaringsverhaal van alle tye gesorg het, is gevestig op die beginsel dat wild aan 'n individuele grondbesitter behoort. 70% van alle wilde diere in Suid-Afrika behoort aan boere. En hierdie suksesverhaal is gebaseer op die noodsaaklikheid van heinings om dit moontlik te maak om die wild te besit en bestuur.

Alle wild op hierdie planeet het grense wat hulle inperk. Baie se ruimte word beperk deur natuurlike topografie, of die beskikbaarheid van geskikte habitat. Die meeste word omring en ingeperk deur menslike vestiging. Heinings is slegs nóg 'n begrensing van hulle beweegvermoë – maar in 'n wêreld met bevolkingsdruk soos tans, is dít 'n noodsaaklikheid vir hulle voortbestaan.

Op omheinde eiendom, vereis die beginsels van etiese jag dat die gejagte dier oor die vermoë beskik om sy agtervolger te ontwyk, en verder dat die dier in habitat gehuisves word waar hy selfversorgend kan wees. Die oorgrote meerderheid van Suid-Afrika se wildplase voldoen aan hierdie vereistes, en gevolglik kan ons tot die slotsom kom dat bewaringsnoodsaaklike heinings nie botsend met die beginsels van etiese jag is nie.

Die laaste paar jaar het daar egter 'n praktyk ontstaan waar leeus in kampe 'gejag' word waar hulle geen billike kans het om van hulle agtervolgers te ontsnap nie. Jagters verwerp hierdie geblikte skiet van leeus. Maar ons verwerp soortgelyks die 'jag' van enige ander spesie onder sulke omstandighede.

Mense wat ernstig is oor bewaring, sal die bestuur van leeus en wildsbokke volgens eenderse standarde hanteer. Wanneer ons dan die skiet van geblikte leeus afkeur moet ons nie die baba saam met die badwater uitgooi en alle vorme van leeujag afkeur nie.

Adapted from: <http://www.bosveldjagters.co.za/index.cfm?Aid=1885887708> (394 words)

Text 3: English target text

Please note: Page 6 must be provided to students for editing after they submitted their translation of Text 2.

Fences must avoid ‘res nullius’

The generation that at the beginning of the previous century, spoke of the wild as ‘res nullius’ – a well-known legal Latin term that indicated that the wild ‘does not belong to anyone’. Since humankind’s numbers exceeded 3 billion a few decades ago, this principle is completely unfitting when it comes to the successful conservation of the wild. Wild animals have no chance to survive if they do not belong to anyone. The successful northern American model of conservation is based on the fact that the wild collectively belongs to all people, and that those owners own and manage the animals. This model is also applicable in our country’s parks. The Southern African model on its part, is based on the principle that wild animals belong to an individual land owner. 70% of all wild animals in South Africa belong to boers. And this success story is based on the necessity of fences to make it possible to own and manage the wild.

All game on this planet have boundaries that limit them. The space of many is limited by natural topography, or the availability of appropriate habitat. The majority is surrounded by and fenced in by human settlement. Fences are simply another limitation of their ability to move around – but in a world with population pressure as we currently experience, it is a necessity for their continued existence.

On fenced-in property, the principals of ethical hunting require that the hunted animal must have the ability to dodge his follower, and furthermore, that the animal be kept in a habitat where he can be self-supporting. The biggest majority of South-African game farms adhere to these requirements and we can therefore come to the conclusion that the conservation required fences are not in conflict with the principles of ethical hunting.

The last few years a few practices came to the fore where lions are ‘hunted’ in camps where they have no equitable chance to escape from their followers. Hunters reject this canned shooting of lions. But we similarly reject the ‘hunting’ of any other species under such circumstances.

People who are serious about conservation, will handle the management of lions and antelopes according to similar standards. When we then reject the shooting of canned lions we should not throw out the baby with the bathwater and reject all forms of lion hunting.