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Abstract

The concept “Translation” has been examined by many scholars from different perspectives, but little attention has been devoted to the personalities of the translators in their translation works. The concern of this essay is to consider the personalities of the translators of D.O. Fagunwa’s novel, *Igbó Olódùmarè* in line with the theories of Natural and Directional equivalence to foreground the idea that translation is heavily dependent on the translators’ personality. It was found that translators’ motive, purpose, language choice, and religious background have an immense influence on their approach to translation.

Introduction

There is no clear cut definition of personality (Karimnia and Mahjubi 2013). However, Lawrie (1974:307) explains three senses of using the term. The first sense is to qualify the characteristics, on account of which an entity is a person at all. When the word is used in this way, personality is being distinguished from animality, vegetability, or materiality. Therefore to this end, all persons have personality. The term is used as a mask or appearance which a man presents to others as the second sense. Personality in this sense is liable to change. This implies that a man is liable to have a series of personalities or masks, and not just one. The third use of the term is applied in the signification of the element of uniqueness in a person. In other words, personality is a special case of particularity or individuality, and that individuality is “roughly
synonymous” with uniqueness. Personality in this third sense is what makes a particular person whom he is and thereby differentiates him from all other persons. It is therefore unrepeatable. This paper is concerned with the third sense of the term ‘personality’.

In line with the Lawrie’s third sense of personality, Karimnia and Mahjubi (2013) explains that personality manifests itself in almost every area of life. This foregrounds that someone’s personality is what makes the person different from other people. They refer to it as the complex of all the behavioural, temperamental, emotional and mental activities that characterise a certain individual. How does personality affect translation? Hutchins (2001:5) reiterates Holmstrom’s definition of translation, which takes into consideration the educational qualification and personality of the translator thus:

Translation is an art; something which at every step involves a personal choice between uncodifiable alternatives; not merely direct substitutions of equated sets of symbols but choices of values dependent for their soundness on the whole antecedent education and personality of the translator.

Hence, no two translators will translate precisely the same way because of the differences in their personalities and choices. Karimnia and Mahjubi (2013:41) also relate personality with translation activities by saying that each translator has his or her traits that uniquely affect his or her behaviour in the act of translation. Therefore, when translators translate the same source text from the source language to the target language, their produced translations differ from one another. This is because translators’ personalities play salient roles in translation. Thus, the thrust of this paper is to examine the personality traits of Wole Soyinka and Gabriel Ajadi and how it played out in their translation of D.O. Fagunwa’s *Igbó Olódúmarè* with the view of explicating the interference of the personalities in their choices of words and style using Natural and Directional Theories of Equivalence.

**The Personality of a Translator**

A common defector is that a translator is expected to be bilingual. Oyel-eye (1995: 364) broadly grouped translators based on their skills into upper and lower zone bilinguals. He believes that a translator’s placement in the bilingual scale influences his/her translation. He explains that Upper zone bilinguals are sophisticated bilingual writers while lower zone bilinguals are non-sophisticated bilingual writers or apparent translators. Such classification is significant only when qualification is to be verified. It will not assist when
the personality of a translator is to be examined. There is a kind of uniqueness associated with a translator even if two of them are of the same bilingual zone and are asked to translate the same expression. The translators’ traits like cognition, emotion, attitude, behaviour, psychological disposition and individual characteristics are responsible for their success or failure in the translation process (Karimnia and Mahjubi, 2013). It also influences their choices of words, approaches to translation and style.

Gbadegesin (2017:42) claims that he could not comment on the personality of Ajadi since he said: “he deliberately sacrificed his stylistic idiosyncrasy in order for the reader to fully enjoy Fagunwa’s seasoned and peculiar literary prowess and power in the translated edition.” Claims like this does not give room not to comment on the author’s style or person. To this paper, Gbadegesin (2017) toddle the easiest path of sacrificing Ajadi for Soyinka whose literary work had received many comments.

Professor Gabriel Ajadi is a retired lecturer of oral literature in the Department of English, University of Ilorin. He is a gospel preacher and an inventor of Ajadilopea (a medicine for malaria treatment). He has a gentle sport for language (whether English and Yoruba). He appears to be formal in his approach to things. The previous submission influences his style of writing and by extension his translation. It must also be noted that Ajadi’s translation is his Ph.D. thesis published in a book form. This suggests why his translation is formal since Ph.D. writings require formality. Ajadi (2005:30) explains the philosophy behind his translation as the semantic-communication translation. “… Such a method imposes a literal translation which retains the sense of words and expressions within the cultural perspective of the original language without blurring the intelligibility of the content in English so that the content is communicative as well…” (Ajadi 2005:30)

Wole Soyinka is a Professor, social activist, a playwright, a poet, and a translator. One can even call him a literary icon. He is one of those Isola (2010:94) called African school-educated elite writers who prefer talking to themselves not only by using a foreign language but by choosing the written medium. Gbadegesin (2017:42) confirms Isola’s assertion by saying that Soyinka’s conscious target audience is the elitist class of his generation. The view is then put to question, who he is writing for? The masses he intends to defend as a social activist could not access his work because of his style of writing which has been adjudged to be obscured, challenging and complex in the deployment of excessive imagery and signs. Gordimer (2001) cited by Gbadegesin (2017:42) says Soyinka is a sophisticate who is making free usage of the tricks and techniques of European literature. Isola further comments that:
Soyinka’s translation into English of Fagunwa’s first novel *Ogboju Ode Ninu Igbo Irunmole as Forest of a Thousand Daemons* confirmed what was by now ostensibly in his creative works – a solid base in Yoruba culture and an abiding commitment to sharing his rich cultural heritage with the outside world... Soyinka thought the whole world would hear about it in keeping with his practice of generating entrancing drama through the rich resources of the Yoruba culture and the global potentials of English language” (Isola 2010:95)

Therefore, it could be concluded that Ajadi chooses to use simple and direct language in his translation. He is simple and straightforward as a person. Soyinka, on the other hand, chooses to use complex, poetic and imagery in his approach to translation. The personalities of these translators would be considered in their approach to the translation of *Igbó Olódùmarè*.

### Yoruba Translators and Literary Translations

The purpose of translation differs from region to region. To some, it is an avenue to make financial gain; to some, it is a mere aesthetics, but to Africans, it is a serious matter. Isola (2010) sees the literary translation in Africa as a means of achieving the primary purposes of literature. He enumerates the alienation of African literary works in European languages which to Oyel-eye (1995) like Osundare (1995) considers such as a form of translation. Isola (2010:95) however, emphasizes the usefulness of African literary works in European languages thus:

…This is not to suggest that literature in a foreign language by an African writer does not fulfill other useful purposes. It does! First, it exposes aspects of the culture of the writer’s social group to the entire world, leading to a global appreciation and understanding. It also attracts recognition and reward to the author in such a proportion which writers in African languages can never duplicate. Second, the cultures of other languages into which the work has also been translated benefit from the cross-fertilization of cultural ideas...

Isola opines that there are two reasons for African writers who write in European languages: rewards and globalization while the other is cultural fertilization of the benefiting languages. With the global effects of literary translation, Isola (2010:95) also opines that there is a kind of difference between translation for translation purposes and translation as a form of language retrieval. Ìsọlá (2001:v) explains language retrieval thus:
 Nonetheless, there is another category of writers of Yoruba origin, who make use of materials from Yoruba culture for their literary arts but equally made use of English language for their books because they want the whole world to enjoy their works and by so doing exhort Yoruba glory everywhere. It is a pity that the Yorubas do not have access to works of this nature because they are presented in foreign languages. These writers have done great works; many of their books have won several awards all over the world. We thought it wise to bring these works to the reach of the Yorubas by translating them into the Yoruba language. By so doing, we can retrieve the lost items. Our effort here goes beyond mere translation; it is retrieval since the source of the stories is ours before they were narrated in English.

This explanation of Isola demarcates translation and language retrieval. Although, both of them may go through the same process. The explanation also brings to bear, the reasons why some writers write in the foreign language (which is a form of translation (Osundare 1995 and Oyeleye 1995)); why some translate (Ajadi 2005; Soyinka 2010, and Obafemi 2012) and why some embark on language retrieval (Isola 2001). Some translators corroborate Isola’s assertion that the purpose of translation has globalization coloration. For example, Ajadi (2005:30) stipulates that the objective of his translation of *Igbo Olodumare* is to make the novel accessible to literary scholars and students of letters as well as general English readers. Soyinka (2010) says he resolves to translate all Fagunwa’s novels and other writings in order to make them accessible to non-Yoruba readers both within and outside the African continent. Obafemi (2012:7) joins others in their globalization process through translation by saying that: “...I had secretly wished, even in those tender years
of innocence, to let other people who do not belong to Fagunwa’s world, in reality, and in fantasy, into the recesses of his imagination. I of course, never thought that it would end up in translation for a target audience of English speakers…”

The previous perspective implies that there are three different kinds of African literary translation. African writers who write in the European languages (working with experiential text), African literary translators (they work with readily available texts) and language retrieval (though they too work with readily available texts, however, their texts have the same source). All these kinds of literary translation have more or less the same purpose: to retrieve a denied access as well as globalization effects.

**Theoretical Framework**

There are many translation theories; this study adopts natural and directional equivalence because the combination of both, will assist to show the personalities of the translators in view. It will also assist to disprove some of the positions of Gbadegesin (2017) on the authors.

**Natural Equivalence**

The idea that what we say in one language have the same value (the same worth or function) when it is translated into another language is known as natural equivalence (Pym 2010:9). Pym (2010) explains that a translation should have the same value as its corresponding source text. Sometimes the value is at the level of form and some other times at the level of reference. However, equivalence need not say precisely which kind of value is supposed to be the same in each case; it just means that equal value can be attained on one level or another. He also points out some complications of the theory, in that, not everything found in the source texts is always “natural” or “common.” If it were, the texts would be so boring that there would be little reason to translate them. The list of translation procedure is given referencing Vinay and Darbeinet (1958:55) as loan, calque, literal translation, transposition, modulation, correspondence, and adaptation. He explains that loans and calques are only legitimate when there is no more natural equivalence available while literal translation is entirely possible between cognate language but can as well be deceptive since languages abound with what he termed as “false friends.” The import that words may look similar but have varied functions in different languages. He mentions that the procedure of real interest is transposition (where there is a switching of grammatical categories) and Modulation (where modifications are made for different discursive conventions). The
remaining two procedures concern cultural adjustment. The correspondence would use all the corresponding proverbs and referents. Adaptation refers to various things with loosely equivalent cultural functions, for example, cycling is to the French what cricket is to the British.

There is no specific way a translator can do his work. Pym (2010) explains that a simple model is nevertheless possible: the translator might first try the “literal” procedure to see what that gives; if that does not work, the translator can either go closer to the source or closer to the target culture. The other interpretation means that not all the procedures necessarily count as good.

**Directional Equivalence**

Directional equivalence is an asymmetric relation where the creation of an equivalent by translating one way does not imply that the same equivalence will also be created when translating the other way (Pym 2010:26). In other words, if a source text is translated into a target text and a back-translation is done on the translated copy (target text), the result may not necessarily be the same as the source text. The other idea is necessitated based on the directionality of the polarity of many theorists of equivalence. Pym (2010:25-26) provides such theorist and the polar suggestions as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the theorist</th>
<th>The suggested theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cicero</td>
<td>Ur Interpres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schleiermacher</td>
<td>Foreignizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nida</td>
<td>Formal equivalence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newmark</td>
<td>Semantic translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy</td>
<td>Illusory translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>Overt translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nord</td>
<td>Documentary translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touy</td>
<td>Adequate translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venuti</td>
<td>Fluent translation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                               |                                |
| Ut orator                     | Domesticating                  |
| Dynamic equivalence           | Communicative translation      |
| Anti-illusory translation     | Covert translation             |
| Instrumental translation      | Acceptable translation         |
| Resistant translation         |                                |


The above implies that similarity depends on directionality, giving translators general ways of deciding how to translate since they constantly have to select between alternatives. For example, a translator decides on a kind of translation that would look back to the formal values of the source text and embrace them as much as possible; this is what Newmark called semantic
translation. A translator may as well adopt communicative translation which would look forward to the needs of the new addressee, adjusting to those needs as much as necessary (see Pym 2010:32). This kind of polarity goes for the rest of the theories which shall be used in some of our analysis.

The Personality of the Translators

Religious Affiliation in the Translation

As mentioned above, the personality of the translators is the focus of this paper. The personality influences their style and approach to their work(s). From the title of the novel, Ajadi adopts a formal and simple system of communication. Technically, he adopts direct literal translation while Soyinka; who is a complex and complicated person in his style of writing adopts dynamic translation. *Igbo Olodumare* is translated by Ajadi as “The Forest of God” while Soyinka translates it as “In the Forest of Olodumare.” Gbadegesin (2017:44) views Ajadi’s choice of God as the translation for Olodumare was born out of the general interpretation of Yoruba name for God in the Christian circle. He, therefore, opines that such translation gives an interpretation of God dwelling in a forest. He concludes that “The “stories” in the text do not refer to the forest as the dwelling place of God or those of his Angels. It is a woodland full of many unimaginable vicissitudes and weird spirits” (Gbadegesin 2017:45). It seems Gbadegesin prefers Soyinka translation. He explains that “Soyinka’s version *In the forest of Olodumare* leaves the English reader to either take “Olodumare” as the personification of all the elements in the novella or a special creature who acts as a shadow in the forest. The fact is “Igbó Olódùmarè” is one of the existing forests in Oke-Igbo in the Ondo State of Nigeria today. It remains a dreadful forest! It is evident that the spatial setting of Fagunwa’s story is the Earth. The didactic stories address all human persons of all races.

It is doubtful if the inference Gbadegesin deduced from the use of Olodumare in the translation of Soyinka is true. No doubt that *igbo* (the forest) as employed by Fagunwa is conceived both as metaphor and reality. In actual sense, Igbo Olodumare exists in Oke-Igbo, Fagunwa’s hometown. Our take, therefore, it that Fagunwa in his ingenuity and creativity recounts the difficulties of a hunter in the dreaded forest relating the experience with the real-life situation. At the same time, Igbo Olodumare is employed metaphorically as the whole human experience on earth which warrant perseverance, patience, hardwork, teamwork, obedience and several human virtues. Hence, Igbo Olodumare may not necessarily represent the bush in Fagunwa’s hometown but the metaphorical representation of human experience in the Yoruba context. However, Olodumare will never have the connotation Gbadegesin
is trying to force on it. To a Yoruba person, Olorun and Olodumare are of the same value. In fact, Fagunwa used them interchangeably in all his works. Adekoya (2010:16) cited Idowu (1996:37) to have said that Fagunwa’s specific understanding of God in the Yoruba society belongs to the historical background of the question about the true form of God as a creator of the universe, “Olodumare.” The name, indeed, strongly implies “almightiness” and “omnipotence.” It is not just a descriptive title of God; it is the real Yoruba name for God in the Yoruba belief…” Therefore, unlike Gbadegesin (2017) strange interpretation of Olodumare, Yoruba generally whether Christian or Muslim equate Olodumare to God.

It is worthy to note that among the African traditional religious worshipers, there is a difference between Ọlọ́run and Olódùmarè. While Ọlọ́run is the Supreme being, Olódùmarè is the work of His hands, the head of all deities. Lijadu (1895) explains that:

Ọlọ́run nínú Ọrọ fi ara Rẹ han nínú Ọrọ, láti ṣe àkóso àwọn Ààrè (ìyanu) tì Ò dá nípa Ọrọ. Ò si fi Olódùmarè ṣe àlákòóso gbogbo wọn. Olódùmarè já sì Ọrọ kikùn tì ó tìnú Ọrọ Ọlọ́run jáde fún àwọn Ààrè (Olódù-ààrè) ğeni tì ń darí gbogbo isé iyanu Ọlọ́run fún tò jú ayé àti àwọn ọrun márùn-ún tì ó kù. Olódùmarè ń gbé ọrun kefà... (Lijadu 1895:1)

God in the Word reveals Himself in the Word, to control/govern the Aares (Wondrous/Miraculous things) He created through the Word. He puts Olodumare in control of all of them. Olodumare is the complete word that came out of God’s word to the Aares (the head of the odus of Aares) who controls all the miracles of God to take care of the earth and the rest of the five heavens. Olodumare lives in the sixth heaven...

Lijadu’s explanation is like John chapter 1 verse 1-4 of the Bible. Even though, John claims that the Word was God; Lijadu differentiates between Olodumare and Olorun. With this kind of difference, it would be difficult for somebody who has the knowledge to equate Olodumare with God. The above idea must have informed Soyinka retention of Olodumare in his translation. Hence, none of them is right, and at the same time, no one is wrong, their religious affiliation influences their translation.

It is also noteworthy that while Ajadi adopts transposition of Natural language equivalence, Soyinka adopts modulation. Transposition allows switching of grammatical categories which brings about the mandatory insertion of the article the and the preposition of to ensure the structure of English language and the genitive structure of the Noun Phrase as should be understood
from the source text. The submission makes Ajadi’s translation different from mere transliteration (word-for-word translation). Soyinka’s modulations allow for discursive conventions thereby equating a Noun Phrase with a Prepositional Phrase for discourse reasons. The idea behind Igbo Olodumare is never to describe the forest but to give an account of what transpired in the forest.

**Personalities in Translation Strategy**

Our personalities have much to do with our thinking and the way we express our thought (Russell 1953:167). It also shows up in the way we translate. That is why no two people translate the same expression the same way. For example, Ajadi and Soyinka translate the Fagunwa expression below differently.

### Ìwọ ọrẹ́ mi,ọrọ̀ pọ̀, kò yẹ kí n tile máa sọ iyókù ọpọ̀njú ọ̀m-ônìnì fún ọ̀ nísinsiníyì. Mo rò pé, ọ̀ yẹ kí n fi iyókù dí ọ̀là, kò yẹ kí ènìyàn še ju iberi ti Ọlọrun fún un ní ipá mó. Ìṣé ti ôní tó, máa retí mi ní kùtù hàì òwúrọ̀ ọ̀là. Ò̀dígà ọ̀, kí iyàwó rè fún ọ̀lì. (Fagunwa 2005:31)

You, my friend, there is a lot (more) to say. I will not tell you the rest of those adversities now. I think I will have the rest until tomorrow; it does not behoove a man to do more that God has given him the strength to do. Today’s work is enough; expect me very early tomorrow morning. Goodbye. Great your wife for me (Ajadi 2005:68)

My friend, there is yet an abundance of words. It is not fitting that I narrate the trials that followed at this point. I think I should postpone the rest till tomorrow one should not exceed one’s god-given capabilities. Sufficient unto the day. (Soyinka 2010:43)

The two translations seem to reflect the idea of the source text just that the approach differs. Ajadi, being a formal person struggles to present the natural values of the source text in the target text adopting transposition of the natural equivalence procedure. Ìwọ ọrẹ́ mi is not rendered as “*You friend my*” which will be a complete word-for-word translation rather transposition which always switching grammatical categories to reflect the structure of the target language as *You, my friend*. This is regarded as formal equivalence while Soyinka adopts dynamic equivalence. Gutt (1991) calls the kind of Soyinka’s translation “interpretative resemblance” (see Pym 2010:35). He regards language as a very weak representation of meaning, no more than a set of “communicative clues” that receivers have to interpret. This is in
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line with Grice (1975) concept of implicature (see Pym 2010:35). The basic idea of implicature is that we do not communicate by language alone, but by the relation between language and context. Pym (2010) explains that implicature is operating through various maxims and the maxim adopted by Soyinka, in this case, is “Maxim of quantity”. Maxim of quantity gives no more and no less information to the audience than needed for full understanding of the intended message. For example, *máa retí mi ní kùtù hàì ówúrọ ọla*. Ö dìgbà o, kí iyàwó rẹ ń fún mi is missing in the Soyinka’s translation because Soyinka is only providing the needed information making the translation to be what Schleiermacher called foreignizing translation. Foreignizing translation is moving the reader to the author as against domesticating translation which is moving the author to the reader. Hence, the unrepentant cultural salutation of Yoruba is removed emphasizing perhaps the culture of the reader as against the culture of the author.

Their translation styles influence the sense in their translation, and there is no ambiguity whatsoever in both the source and the translations as Gbadegesin (2017) insinuate.

It was on a sweltering afternoon after I had eaten the second meal of the day that I left my house and strolled to the outside of the city wall. I climbed to the top of a huge rock: when I reached the top (of the rock), I sat down under a tree that grew there, hugging my legs to my chest. The sun was scourging hot indeed; human bodies were as hot as heated yam flour, sweat soaked all the children of the world as if they had poured water on themselves. I, who had titled my cap pointedly towards my forehead, took my cap off the crown of my head, and the peaceful air was blowing across my head. I also took off my clothes, except my pants which remained on my buttocks... (Ajadi 2005:41)

One bright afternoon a long while past, after I had launched, I left my home, strolled outside the fence of my compound and climbed on a huge
rock. Arrived at the top, I sat in the shade of a tree that covered the rock, perched like the lord of all he surveyed, even as the sun beat down relentlessly and humanity heated up like the pot of yam flour, sweat oozing from every human pore, so that the only relief could come from dousing oneself in cold water. Even I tossed off my clothing, leaving only my shorts to cover my buttocks. I who had earlier donned a cloth cap cocked its pouch stylishly over the forehead, was forced to toss the covering from my skull. Now the breeze of well-being caressed my occiput (Soyinka 2010: 3)

The bolded parts (emphasis is ours) are queried by Gbadegesin (2010) in his analysis. He opines that lunch is preferred to the second meal which is disambiguated by Fagunwa’s opening remark Lósàn-án gangan. He remarks that Ajadi’s translation would be problematic for a culture of four meals per day. Gbadegesin failed to realise that Ajadi adopts an overt form of translation which allows the reader to have a feeling that what they are reading is a translation of a text as against Soyinka’s style (Covert style of translation). If one has to read Soyinka’s translation without pre-knowledge that it is a translation, one will not have an inclination that it is a translation. It is also noteworthy to state that difference in culture becomes a problem for the translators in translating ehin odi, mo lé góngó and atégün àlàáfìà. Naturally, odi has the value of city wall hence ehin odi will connote after the city wall. Fagunwa in his narration did not specify how close is the narrator’s house to the city wall. This may influence Soyinka’s translation as “Outside the fence of my compound” since he has adopted dynamic equivalence all along as against Ajadi who stay glued to the source text hence his translation as “the outside of the city wall. The breeze of well-being and peaceful air” is another struggle of the translators to translate atégün àlàáfìà. It is judgmental to say one translation is better to others without looking at the personality and style of translation adopted. In fact, Ajadi’s translation would be preferred by some than the alternative Gbadegesin provided as gentle breeze.

Personality in the Preservation of Aesthetics of the Source Language

One of the responsibilities of a translator is to present a translation of a source language with its aesthetics. Both translators tried their best in the preservation linguistic aesthetics in Fagunwa’s writing however, some of them get lost during the translation process (Odoje 2017:4). For example, Àkàrà-oògùn narrates an incidence during his father’s fight with the Igbo Olodumare’s gatekeeper thus: …ni wọn ti tẹ góngọ mọ ojú ilù … (Fagunwa 2005b:38).
In the translations, it was observed that the poetic beauty in the source language is quite lacking in the translated equivalence where Ajadi and Soyinka try to ensure they employ appropriate language to represent the aesthetic features in the Yoruba text: “They began to intensify their praise drumming” (Ajadi 2005:75) / “Drumsticks dug into drumskin, intoning” (Soyinka 2010:53).

*Gọ́ngó/*drumstick is missing in Ajadi’s translation while *ojú ́ilù/*face of the drum is missing in the Soyinka’s translation. Making their translation not to be faithful to the source language if we have to consider natural equivalence theory of translation. Hence, we provide a translation like the below that is faithful to the source text: “They began to intensify drumstick into the face of the drum.” Irrespective of their personalities which inform their approach to translation, it should be stated that both Ajadi and Soyinka can be categorized as an upper zone of Oyeleye (1995:365)’s scale of Bilingualism. Upper zone bilinguals are sophisticated writers who exhibit variation depending on their control of the registers of the language. The previous situation is revealed in their translation of the sentence below:

*Gba eléyìí, jeun dáadáa, má ṣe jé kí inú run ọ́, ọkọ kii ju ọkọ lọ.* (Fagunwa 2005b:27)

Take this, eat very well, and try to avoid stomach ache; one husband does not surpass the other (Ajadi 2005:73-74)

Take this, eat soundly, don’t let anything upset your stomach, no husband is more treasured than another.” (Soyinka 2010:51)

It is observed that their expressions may be different yet both expressed same register in the language. None of them translated *jeun, inú,* and *ọkọ* differently. Even, in a situation where they express different words, such words are synonymous, e.g., *dáadáa* is translated as very well and soundly, and stomach ache and stomach upset connote the same sense. Different expressions, however, is traceable to their personality which largely inform their approaches to translation.

**Conclusion**

There are so many ideas that run through the mind of a translator. Apparently, such translator cannot run away from the purpose and audience of his translation. However, in his translation, his personality highly influence his approach. Ajadi’s translation happened to be his Ph.D. thesis. A Ph.D. work
is a formal document which must be writing formally. Besides that, Ajadi is a gospel minister who might want to employ simple language for the simplicity of his message. Above all, he aimed to translate Fagunwa's work the way Fagunwa presented it which informs is natural equivalence approach. He utilized an open form of translation, domesticating the translation; allowing the reader enjoy the peculiar literary prowess of Fagunwa in the translation edition.

Soyinka, on the other hand, is known for pictorial imagery through complex verbal expressions in his style of writings. Soyinka is motivated to share with the rest of the world verbal pyrotechnics his generation had been weaned and unforgettable characters and musicality in Fagunwa's books. Soyinka admits that Fagunwa is not an easy writer to translate. The idea may have informed the translator’s approach to translation by adopting dynamic equivalence, covert and foreignizing translation. His religious background also informs his approach finding it difficult to translate Olodumare as God.

It is therefore, unfair and judgmental looking at the style and sense of translation without a fair knowledge of the personality of the translator in his translation. More so, translation, itself is an illusion since no two culture and language are the same.

Bibliography


