

The Choice of Processes and Translations of Psalm One

Adeyemi Daramola, Ph.D,

Faculty of Arts, Department of English

University of Lagos, Akoka, Yaba, Lagos, NIGERIA

e-mail- daramolaadeyemi@yahoo.com

+234-08033912012 or +234-08023049541

ABSTRACT

This paper contains an analysis of the processes in Psalm One using the Systemic Function Theory (SFT). *Processes* express the grammar of transitivity in any language. A *Process* consists, potentially, of three components; namely, the *Process* itself, participants and the circumstances associated with it. In English, according to Halliday (1994), there are six *Processes*. Other than all of the *Processes* in English, the Yoruba has the Observational Process (Daramola, 1996). Transitivity system specifies in this analysis, the different types of *Processes* that are used in Psalm One. First of all, the text is analyzed in the English language and; secondly, two translations (old and new) of the text are analyzed in Yoruba. The result demonstrates the meaning potentials inherent in the text vis-à-vis the *Processes* and the dynamic nature of translations, Process shift and, or change.

1.0 Introduction

This paper contains the analysis of Processes in Psalm One using the Systemic Functional Theory (SFT). Processes involve the analysis of the clause of a language and its *Ideational* function because of its role as a means of representing patterns of experience. All normal human beings who use language concretize their *experiential* reality by the construction of *events* involving ‘doing’, ‘happening’, ‘feeling’, and ‘being’, among others. Although these ‘goings on’ are classified in the semantic system of a language, they are, first of all, expressed through the grammar of the clause. Secondly, they form a part of a textual environment in which any piece of language functions.

Halliday (1985:101-157, and in 1994:106-161) defines the three potential components of processes in English as (i) the process itself, (ii) participants in the process and (iii) circumstances associated with the process. On the one hand, all of these tripartite components provide the frame of reference for interpreting the configurations of experience of all users of language. On the other hand, they (i.e. the processes) form veritable sources of the grammatical distinctions of word-classes into nouns, verbs and so on – a pattern that in some form or another is most probably universal in human languages. One of the reasons, as an explanation to this, is that the process represents the verbal group, the participants, the nominal group and the circumstance, the prepositional or adverbial group.

Psalm One, as a form of experience, concerns basically *teaching* although the expression *The Psalms* refers to the Hebrew name “Book of Praises” or “A Song of Praise” or from Greek translation – “The Book of the Song of Worship or the Praise to the Lord” (Batcher and Reyburn 1991:14-22). As a teaching or wisdom psalm, its content contains advice to its readers to dedicate themselves to the study and practice of the Law of God, the *Torah* and Warning them of the consequences if they fail.

As a short but tightly-knit text, linguists, translators and even, of course ordinary readers, are quick to notice the beauty of linguistic evidence of parallelism and opposition or contrasts in it. These attributes contribute to the larger structure of the psalm and provide its shape and meaning. The text is, first of all, analyzed in the English language and; secondly, two translations (old and new) of the text are analyzed in Yoruba. The results demonstrate the meaning potential inherent in it vis-à-vis the *Processes* and the dynamic nature of translation, process shift and, or change.

2.0 Theoretical Framework

Applying the concept of Transitivity in SFT, Halliday identifies three main and three minor types of Processes in English clause (Halliday 1985:101-157; Bloor and Bloor 1995:107 – 134; Daramola 1996:99-112; 2004: 23-31; 2005:65-76, 2008, 2010). The main ones are Material, Mental and Relational. The minor ones are Behavioral, Verbal and Existential. Although Transitivity, which is the process by which the Ideational metafunction is realized, may be universal, there may be other categories, which are yet to be described in language other than English. An example is the Observation Process, which perhaps does not function in English but exists in Yoruba (see Daramola, 1996: 107 – 110).

2.1 The Major Processes

Briefly explained Material Process concerns “doing” by expressing the idea that one “does” something to oneself or to another person or thing. Such a Process, essentially, would have an obligatory participant as Actor while the Goal (or the circumstantial element) may or may not be present. When the Process does not express “doing”, it expresses “happening” or “bringing about”. Examples are clauses containing words such as “catch”, “put” and “resign”.

While Material Process relates mostly to concrete participants because it involves “doing” and “happening”, Mental process relates to abstract meanings of “feeling”,

“thinking”, and “perceiving”, thereby involving potentially, both a “Senser” (always a human being in normal usage) and the “Phenomenon” sensed. What is sensed, thought or perceived again, in normal usage, may not be restricted to any particular semantic category. It may be either a ‘thing’ or a ‘fact’. Like Material Process, however, Mental Process affects the participant who is usually concerned, for example, with the wordings “believe”, “realize” and “see”. The abstract properties of “thought”, “perception” or some kind of consciousness generally require at least one human participant or an animate subject. It is the human being who possesses the attribute of “sensing” and what is commonly ‘sensed’ are facts or phenomena. Facts are abstract things that may be sensed, felt or thought of but nothing can be done to them physically.

The third major Process is the Relational. In semantic terms, it expresses “the state” of being of someone or thing. The main focus of the meaning of this Process is that something is. Every language has, as it were, a way of expressing relationship or the characteristic of some entity. The Relational Process may be divided into two modes – the *attributive* and the *identifying*. In the attributive mode, a particular attribute is ascribed to some entity either as a quality or as a circumstance in relation to time, place and possession. In grammatical terms the two phenomena in the process are described are ATTRIBUTE (Attribute) and CARRIER (the entity carrying the attribute). The main grammatical differences between the attributive and the identifying Relational Process may be given. Firstly, the relational property of these Processes may be expressed thus: a defines the identity of b where a and b are two distinct entities (IDENTIFIED), or where a and b are the same entity (ATTRIBUTIVE). Secondly, an interesting characteristic of some of the Relational process – the participants in the identified relation are reversible (e.g. ‘Tom is the leader’ versus ‘The leader is Tom’).

2.2 The Minor Processes

Behavioural Process in English concerns physiological and ego-centric behaviour such as “breathing”, “coughing”, “snoring” and so on. Grammatically, they operate between Material and Mental Processes. These “Behaviours” are more like “doing” and the “Behaviour” is typically a conscious being whether human or non-human, although some of these behaviours may operate differently in human and non-human entities. Human beings, as an example, may laugh but one is not so sure whether or not goats laugh or giggle.

The functioning of the Verbal Process involves some acts of “saying” or pronouncing whereby “saying” is interpreted in a broad sense to cover a range of phenomena concerning symbolic exchange of meaning. Like Behavioural Process, it functions in an intermediate position between Material and Mental Processes. Like Material Process, it concerns “doing”. Unlike Mental Process, it does not concern directly any phenomenon but the expression of a fact that shows an act of “doing”. Like Mental process which may be associated with a concrete act from one participant to another (human or non-human), a process of “saying” involves human participant or ‘sayer’ except when interpreted in a rather broad sense to include the meanings conveyed by notices on boards, watches and clocks (for time) (see Halliday 1985:129). At that instance, no conscious participant will be required. The “sayer” refers, then, to anything that produces some signal. Other examples are “reports”, “take”, and “complain”.

Existential Process functions to depict that something “exists”, “happens” or “causes”. This Process is therefore closely related to Relational Process especially by considering the word *is* in English. Other words such as “exist” and “there” are Existential Process because the former has spatial meaning, and the latter has Existential rather than representational function.

2.3 Observation Process

As indicated earlier in 2.0 above, the Observational Process is one that is present in Yoruba but not in English language. Briefly described, there are two schools of thought with regard to what is, and what is not a verb in the language (Bamgbose 1972:17-19). These are “wide definition” and the “narrow definition” schools. The former would regard as a verb any non-nominal element in the verbal group which may occur in a clause, and the latter would regard as verbs only those items, which are contained in the verbal group, which may occur in a minimal sentence. The main difference between the two schools of thought is that those auxiliaries which may not function alone in a minimal clause are rejected by the “narrow definition” school. All the practitioners of the “wide definition” school do not hold, nevertheless, the same view regarding the way what they classify as verbs may be classified as adjectives or adjectives or adverbs (Bamgbose 1972 op.cit, 1986; Daramola 1990:29-30).

The categorical status of words such as *ga* (to be tall), *dára* (to be good), *kun* (to be full), *dúdú* (to be black), *pupa* (to be red), and *funfun* (to be white), as examples, presents two conflicting views among scholars of the language (Awobuluyi 1972:74-75). What is usually the problem is the classification of the question of what should take precedence - their attributive meaning or their distributive characteristics. Attributively, these verbs are regarded by some scholars as adjective; distributively, they are regarded as verbs. However, the words *ga* (to be tall), *dára* (to be good), *pé* (late/to be late) and *dúdú* (to be black) are classified as observational process in clauses (i) – (iv) below:

- (i) “Sé Ojo ti *ga* si?”
INT. Ojo PERF. tall plus (INT = interrogative);
Is Ojo taller? (e.g. than when I saw him last)
- (ii) “Ilé náà *dára* púpò.
house ART. beautiful much (ART. = grammatical article)
The house is very beautiful.
- (iii) “Kí ní dé tí o *pé* ní àná?
what is happen that you late PREP. yesterday (PREP = preposition)
Why were you late yesterday?
- (iv) “Okò Adeyemi *dúdú*
vehicle Adeyemi black
Adeyemi’s vehicle (e.g. car) is black.

The systemic meanings of all the italicised words are observational either of a participant or a phenomenon. In this regard, and from the viewpoint of the participant, a probe into the meaning of the classes may be in this form; “What is observable about the participants in clause (i) as an example?” Similarly from the viewpoint of the phenomenon in clause (iii) a probing question may be asked: “What may be observable concerning the participant yesterday?”

Nevertheless, since a full description of transitivity is complex, it would do injustice to condense it thereby running the risk of over simplification. Detailed accounts of its description are found in Halliday (1985:101-137; 197:159-173, 170:11-144, 1994:106-161).

2.4 Translation and Grammar Analyses

According to Nida and Taber (1969:33-58), there are two basic systems for translating. The first consists of rules that are designed to specify the combinatory possibilities of items in the Source Language (SL). These rules involve a selection process

of the SL and the Target Language (TL). The second system of translation comprises three stages. One, it involves the analysis of the message as provided in SL in terms of the grammatical relationships – the meaning of the words and their combination. Two, it involves the transference of analyzed material in the minds of the translator from SL to TL. Three, it involves restructuring whereby the transferred material (i.e. the message) is restructured to make for full acceptability in the TL.

Nevertheless, Gult (1991:23-44) – in his theory of *Translation and Relevance* (TR) - cognition and context – asserts that every thought is a mental representation which has a propositional form. This form, in turn has more relationship with the state of affairs in some world for it to be true. In what appears to be traditional truth – conditional semantics, Gult opines that within relevance theory such representation is description in usage.

The whole essence of such a description in translation theory and practice is the examination of the effectiveness of a translation in the TL. Beginning with Nida (1964), the concept of dynamic equivalence or by its new name, functional equivalence (Hope 1997:7-9; Blois 1997:21-29) centers on the form of the message. A few years later, nevertheless, Nida and Taber drew attention from the form of the message to the response of the receptor. Dynamic or functional equivalence may be achieved therefore if the degree to which the receptors of the messages in the receptor language respond in the same manner as the receptors of the source language.

Context in Relevance Theory is a psychological contrast (Gult *op.cit.* p. 25), which takes into cognizance “the set of premises used in interpreting it”. It does not refer, however, to some part of the external environment – textual or situational circumstances, cultural factors, but rather the part of their assumptions about the world or cognitive environment. Cognitive environment recognizes external factors with emphases on the information which they provide, and their interpretations.

Being both inter-lingual (from English to Yoruba) and intra-lingual (Yoruba to Yoruba) the conceptual frameworks of SFT and TR, as briefly discussed above, provide the bases for the explanation of the meaning potentials inherent in the text - Psalm One.

3.0 Textual Analysis

The following is the datum organized in the clauses in order to ease textual analysis. Although the datum has six verses in English, its clausal presentation appears to be closer to its original Hebrew form in which ancient poems, as this datum is, were not written down in poetic forms (Bratcher and Reyburn *op.cit.* p.3).

- (1) Blessed is the man who walk not in the counsel of the wicked,
- (2) nor stands in the way of sinners,
- (3) nor sits in the seat of scoffers;
- (4) but his delight is in the law of the Lord,
- (5) and on his law he meditates day and night.
- (6) He is like a tree planted by streams of water,
- (7) that yields its fruit in its season,
- (8) and its leaf does not wither,
- (9) in all that he does, he prosper.
- (10) The wicked are not so.
- (11) but are like chaff which the wind drives away.
- (12) Therefore the wicked will not stand in the judgement,
- (13) nor sinners [] in the congregation of the righteous,
- (14) for the Lord knows the way of the righteous
- (15) but the way of the wicked will perish.

The texts' Processes are identified as follow:

- (1) is [Relational] walks [material]
- (2) stands [Material]
- (3) sits [Material]
- (4) is [Existential]
- (5) meditates, [Mental]
- (6) is [Relational] planted [Material]
- (7) yields [Material]
- (8) does [Material] whither [Material]
- (9) does [Material] prospers [Material]
- (10) are [Relational]
- (11) are [Relational] drives [Material]
- (12) will [Relational] stand [Material]
- (13) [] [] (ellipsis)
- (14) knows [Mental]
- (15) will [Relational] perish [Mental]

Being didactic in form, and, or as a wisdom text, the Relational Process *is* in (i) establishes the non-association of a man who wants to be blessed with another man (or, woman, generically) who *walks* [Material] in (i) in the counsel of the wicked. Still established from the negative discourse perspective, such a blessed man neither *stands* [Material] (2) in the way of sinners. Continuing with the negative posture, such a man neither *sits* [Material] (3) in the seat of the scoffers. From a positive perspective, such a blessed man's delight, according to the psalmist, *is* [Existential] (4) in the law of the Lord. On this law, he *meditates* [Mental] (5) day and night. Such a person *is* [Relational] (6) by stream of water for its growth. As a result, he *yields* [Material] (7) its fruit as at when due. Furthermore, its leaf *does* [Material] (8) not *with* [Material] (8). Rather in all that he *does* [Material] (9) he *prosper* [Material] (9).

Contrastively from blessedness, the men that are wicked *are* [Relational] (ii) compared with regard to such a person's spiritual situation. The wicked *will* [Relational] (12) not *stand* [Material] (12) in judgment. There is an elliptical word or words in (13). Ellipsis is described by Halliday and Hasan (1976:89-144) as a cohesive device in texts which operates as "the omission of an item". Quite different from "substitution", mechanically yet, they have some similarities. While an item is replaced by another one is substitution. Ellipsis has nothing to replace the elliptical item. So it is often described as "substitution by zero". If one wishes to fill the ellipsis or "spatial vacuum", a number of possible words or lexical items are "will do so" "will stand", "will []". A significant type of ellipsis has evolved within the elliptical item; again, if one makes an attempt to fill the gaps with the appropriate options that fit them contextually. The two types of sub-ellipsis may be described as ellipses within another ellipses. While the word *stand* and the expression *will do so* and *will stand* may appropriately fill the gap, the words *will* and *do* may be used but a sub-elliptical situation will occur. Furthermore, *knows* [Mental] (14) introduces the movement towards the end of the text by making reference to the ultimate knower – the Lord who is aware of the righteous man. In a final tone, a pronouncement is made concerning the wicked by the psalmist - he *will* [Relational] (15) *perish* [Mental] (15).

Having explained the relevance of the processes in the text in English, two versions of the text in Yoruba are provided below:

Version 1 (Old) (1960)

1. Ìbùkùn ni fún okùnrin na tí kò rìn ní òna àwon ènìà búburú
blessed is PREP.man ART that NEG walk PREP.way PREP.people wicked
blessed is the man who walks not in the way of the wicked
2. tí kò dúrò ní ònà àwon elésè
that NEG stand PREP. way whose sinner
nor stands in the way of sinners
3. àti tí kò si jòkó ní ibùjókò àwon elégàn
and that NEG also sit PREP seat those scoffers
nor sits in the seat of the scoffers
4. sùgbòn dídùn inú rè wà lí òfin Olúwa
but sweet stomach his is PREF law Lord
but his delight is in the law of the Lord
5. àti nínú òfin rè lí ó nse àsàrò
and inside law his does he PROG Do meditate
and on his law he meditates
lí òsán áti lí òru
PREP. day and PREP night
day and night
6. Yío sì dàbí igi tí a gbìn
he Be like a tree that we plant
He is like a tree planted
sí etí ipa odò
PREP edge course river
by streams of water
7. tí nso éso rè jáde lí àkókò rè
that PROG Yield fruit his out PREP season his
that yield its fruit in its season
8. ewé rè kì yío sì rè
leaf his NEG. does not wither
and his leaf does not wither
9. àti ohunkóhun tí ó se ni yío ma se dédé
and whatever that he does is does will do well
in all that he does, he prospers
10. Àwon ènìà búburú kò rí bé
those person wicked NEG is so
The wicked are not so
11. sùgbón nwón dàbí ìyàngbò tí aféfé nfé lo
but those like chaff wind PROG Blow go
but are like chaff which the wind drives away
12. Nítòrína àwon ènì búburú kì
therefore those person wicked NEG
Therefore the wicked will not
yío dide dúrò ní ìdájó
will stand up PREP judgement
stand in the judgment
13. bèli àwon èlèsè kì yío lè
also those sinner NEG will able
nor sinners
dúrò lí àwùjo àwon olódodo
stand PREP. congregation those righteous
in the congregation of the righteous

14. Nítorí Olúwa mo òna àwon olódodo
PREP, Lord know way those righteous
for the Lord knows the way of the righteous
15. sùgbòn òna àwon ènià búburú ni yío sègbé
but why those person wicked is will perish
but the way of the wicked will perish

Version 2 (New) (1994)

1. Ayò n be fún eni náà
Joy PROG, is PREP person ART.
Joyous is the person
2. tí kò gba ìmòrán àwon èniyàn burúkú
that NEG accept counsel those person bad
that does not accept counsel from the wicked
3. tí kò bá àwon elésè rìn
that NEG. PREP. those sinner walk
that does not walk with sinner
4. tí kò sì bá àwon elégàn kégbé
that NEG does PREP those scoffer friend
does not also be in company of scoffers
5. kàkà bèè, ó ní ifé sí òfin OLUWA (sic.)
Instead of that he has love PREP law Lord
Instead, he has love for the law of the Lord
6. a sì máa se àsàrò lórí rẹ̀ tòsán tòru
he does PROG, do meditate PREP law lord
he does meditate on it day and night
7. Yòò dàbí igi tí a gbin`- sí etí odò
he are tree that we plant PREP edge river
he is like a tree planted near the river
8. tí nso ní àkókò tí ó ye
that PROG fruit PREP time that it sit
that produces fruit according to the season
9. tí ewé rẹ̀ kì í ré
that leaf its NEG. wither
its leaf does not wither
10. Gbogbo ohun tí ó bá dǎwólé ni íma yorí sí rere
all what that he does touch PROG become PREP good
in all that he does, he is successful
11. Àwon èniyàn burúkú kò rí bèè
those person bad NEG is so
The wicked people are not so
12. sùgbón wón dàbí fùlùfùlù tí aféfé rí fé lo
but they are chaff that mind PROG below away
but are like the chaff which the wind blows away
13. Nítorí náà àwon èniyàn burúkú kò ní rí ìdàré
Therefore ART person bad NEG is see justification
Therefore the wicked people will not obtain justification
14. bèè ni àwon elésè kò ní lẹ̀ wà ní àwùjo
so is those sinner NEG is able exist PROP congregation
neither the sinner be in the congregation of
àwon olódodo

- those righteousness
of the righteous
15. Nítor í OLUWA (Sic) ní dáábo bo áwon olódodo
Because how PROG protect over those righteous
Because the Lord protects the righteous
16. sùgbún àwon ènìyàn burúkú yóò sègbé
but those person bad will perish
but the evil people will perish.

As a result of the change in translation process of the text, the Processes have also changed in one way or another. The following are the Processes in the second version – Version 1 is a direct translation of the English Version.

1. be (wa) [Existential]
2. gbà (accept) [Material]
3. rìn (walk) [Material]
4. si (does) [Relational] kégbé (became) [Material]
5. ni (has) [Material]
6. si (does) [Material] àsàrò (meditate) [Mental]
7. dabi (are) [Relational] gbin (plant) [Material]
8. so (have fruit) [Material]
9. re (wither) [Material]
10. dǎwòlé (touch) [Material] yori (become) [Material]
11. ri (is) [Relational]
12. dàbí (are) [Relational] fe (blow) [Material]
13. ri (obtain) [Material]
14. ni (is) [Relational] wà (exit) [Existential]
15. dáábobo (protect) [Material]
16. sègbé (perish) [Material]

Although there is an almost one-to-one correspondence between the English and the first version of the Yoruba translation, there are significant differences between the first and the second versions of the Yoruba translations. The differences are discussed with regard to how the processes are affected in the process of their contributions to the meaning potential of the text.

Instead of beginning with the Relational process *ni* (is) [Version 1], version 2 begins with an Existential Process *be* (is) [1]. The Relational Process attribute blessedness with a man, while the Existential Process confirms the existential of *ayo* [joy] [1] not to a man but any person. Before the Material Process of *rin* (walk) as in version 1, what obtain in version 2 is the Material Process *gba* (accept) (2) with regard to the counsel of the evil person. Then the Material Process *rin* (walk) (3) follows with regard to any person association with sinners. The antonymous uses of *duro* (standing) and *joko* (sitting) are non-existent in version 2 although both *si* (does) (4) and *kegbe* (being friendly) (4) dis-associate any joyous person with scoffers. Instead of the Existential Process *wa* (is) in version 1, the Material Process *ni* (has) (5), is indicative of the possession of love for the law of the Lord, is used. In a similar way to version 1, the only Mental process in the text - *asaro* (meditate) (6) in the law of the Lord is maintained in version 2. The uses of the same processes, that is without any change, occur in subsequent clauses such as *dabi* (are) (7) Relational, *gbin* (plant) Material, *so* (yield fruit) (8) Material, *re* (wither) (9) Material).

The Process *dawole* (touch, or what one places hand on) Material (10) in version 2, instead of *se* (does) [Material] as obtainable in version 1 followed by *yorì* (become) to [Relational]. Henceforth from *ri* (is) [Relational], the Processes version 1. instead of *ri* (obtain) 13 [Material], which appears on the surface to be a Mental Process (see its direct translation of the word *se*) – version 1 has *dide* (stand) which is also Material although their participants differ as judgment and justification respectively. Unlike version 1 that has one Existential Process in consonant with the English version, version 2 has the second one *wa* (exist) (14) whereas its equivalent translation in version 1 is *duro* (stand) Material. Instead of a second mental process *mo* (know) in version 1, *daabo* (protect) (15) is replaced with a Material one. Both versions have *segbe* (perish) (16), Material, at the end of the text.

Discussion

Other than the Processes which happen to be my focus of analysis, there are several points of departure in the translation process between the two Yoruba versions of Psalm One. Beginning from single words to phrases and the finally to clauses, the different forms of translations become very clear. The apparent deliberate juxtaposition of antonyms of *duro* (standing) and *joko* (sitting) in the context of *rin* (walking), since both words share some meaning potential, is mission in version 2.

However, while the aesthetics or poetics of such a juxtaposition is missing in the textual environment, there is a simple and logical discourse strategy in version 2. To someone who has native speaker competence in Yoruba, the first process in version 2, be (*wa*) (i) appears dialectical. *Wa* (exist) would have been a better choice because of its neutral, standard and non-dialectical form. The text process *gba* (accept) (2) appears to me to be a strong wording in terms of its discursal import. It seems to have the import that one cannot isolate himself totally from the evil men but that the most important posture to attain is to avoid them or not be unequally yoked with them. *Kegbe* (being friendly) (4) appear to strengthen *gba* (accept) because the joy of a person who loves the law of the Lord is not to do what the evil men do in their utter disrespect for the law of the Lord.

The ellipsis in the English version does not have a place in both versions of Yoruba. The full presence of all processes is indicative of explicitness for all groups of readers – mature or immature in terms of age. The second version is a little bit longer than first one perhaps because the translators and their consultants wanted to be very explicit. Other processes which appear to bring explicitness to the text are *dawole* (touch) (10) and *daabo bo* (protect) (15) because of their simplicity and currency in the use of the language of the text.

Conclusion

The paper contains an analysis of the processes in Psalm One as enunciated by the Hallidayan Systemic Functional Theory. Its translations in English and two versions (i.e. translations of Yoruba) are used. While processes such as Material, Mental, Relational and Existential are found in the text, Behavioural and Verbal are not found in it. These two have been established to be processes in English and Yoruba although they do not exist in this text. The analysis demonstrates the positive effects of a modern translation of text over an old one in terms of simplicity, logical presentation, explicitness and discursively.

NOTES

1. It is possible to see the Hallidayan concept of Process as a new thinking concerning the concept of the verb in English and any language.
2. Most analyses of the Processes in English do not consider the role of the Recipient of an action. Instead, they consider more the role of Actor. The former role is also very important.

3. Much work is very necessary in this area of Yoruba studies in order to throw light on this linguistic situation.
4. One may suggest that although Gutt's Theory of Translation and Relevance is contextual; its basis is also philosophical.
5. SFT practitioners believe in clausal rather than sentential analysis of textual materials.
6. In English, the ellipsis is understood and very grammatical.
7. Didactic here means teaching – the intention to guide the readers or adherents of the Jewish religion (and later Christians aright).
8. *Imo* (knowledge) should not be confused with *oye* (wisdom) as most people do. The two are similar but also different or may be differentiated in their meaning potential.
9. One may see the translation of *Ibukun* (blessing) as *Ayo* (joy). The former is uncommon while the latter is common.
10. There are several other perspectives from which this text may be analyzed. The SFT used is a veritable perspective as I have attempted to do here.

REFERENCES

- Awolubuyi, Oladele (1972), "On the Classification of Yoruba Verbs" in (ed), Ayo Bamgbose, *The Yoruba Verb Phrase*, Ibadan University Press.
- Bamgbose, Ayo (1972), "What is a Verb in Yoruba? In (ed). Ayo Bamgbose, *The Yoruba Verb Phrase*.
- Bibeli Mimo (1960), *The Holy Bible in Yoruba*, Lagos: The Bible Society of Nigeria
- Bloisi, Kees Fide (1997), "Functional Equivalence in the Nineties: Tendencies in the Application of Functional Equivalence Principles in Different Parts of the World" in *Current Trends in Scripture Translation*, United Bible Societies.
- Bloor, Thomas and Bloor, Meriel (1995), *The Functional Analysis of English*, A Hallidayan Approach, Arnold.
- Bratcher, Robert and Reyburn William (1991), *A Translator's Handbook on The Book of Psalms*, New York: United Bible Societies.
- Daramola, Adeyemi (1990), Referential and Cohesion in Yoruba, An Unpublished Macquarie University Doctoral Thesis.
- Daramola, Adeyemi (1996) "Towards a Universal Description of the Processes in Systemic Linguistics in OPANBATA, Number 2. The Department of African Languages and Literature, Lagos State University.
- Daramola, Adeyemi (2004), 'The Nature of Language' in (ed.) A.B.K. Dadzie and Segun Awonusi, *Nigerian English*, Influences and Characteristics, Concepts Publications Limited.
- Daramola, Adeyemi (2005), "Towards an Understanding of Systemic Functional Theory (SFT) for Teachers of English in Nigerian Secondary Schools" in (ed.) Adekunle Adeniran, *Journal of the Nigeria English Studies Association (NESA)*, Vol.11, No. 1. September.
- Daramola, Adeyemi (2008), 'A Child of Necessity: An Analysis of Political Discourse in Nigeria,' in (ed.) Gunter Senft, *Pragmatics*, Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association, (IPrA), Belgium, Vol. 18, No. 3.
- Daramola, Adeyemi (2010), 'Literary or/Linguistic Stylistic Techniques and Discourse Analysis' in (eds.) Makokka, J.K.S., Barasa, Remmy and Daramola,

- Adeyemi, *Tales, Tellers and Tale-Making*, Critical Studies on Literary Stylistics and Narrative Styles in Contemporary African Literature, Germany, VDM Verlag Dr. Muller Publishers.
- Guilt, Ernest – August (1991), *Translation and Relevance* Cognition and Context, Basil Blackwell.
- Hope, Edward R. (1997) “Redefining a Functional Theory of Translation” in *Current Trends in Scripture Translation*, United Bible Societies.
- Iwe Orin Dafidi (1994), *The Book of Psalms in Yoruba*, Lagos, Bible Society of Nigeria.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1970), “Language Structure and Language Function” in John Lyons (ed), John Lyons (ed), *New Horizons in Linguistics*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Book.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1976), Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan (1976), *Cohesion in English*, London Longman.
- Halliday, M.A.K (1994), *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, London: Edward Arnold.
- Nida, Engena A. and Charles R. Taber (1974) *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, United Bible Societies.
- The Holy Bible (1952), Revised Standard Version (RSV) Collins Bible for the Bible Societies.