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**Abstract:**

The ethnographic approach to literary translation offers, undoubtedly, many avenues yet to explore. If we can consider translation as a perpetual search for a possibility, dialogic translation consists of waging with other–be he present physically and/or metaphysically–the battle for meaning. The n’zassa approach has no aim but to both reinforce the translator’s visibility and build a trustworthy relationship with (trans)readers. I defend that every translation act is–or should be–based, to some extent, on an n’zassa approach which sees translation practice as a collaborative activity and its product, a collective construct wherein writers, translators and readers are Meaning Weavers. Each text bears the fetus of such encounter, which results in mutual influences and fecundations. With regard to the relation ethnography-translation, Buzelin (2004, 2005), Ferreira (2014, 2017) and Wolf’s (2000) discussions prove fundamental. I conclude that Adiaffi’s n’zassa read through the lens of Latour’s (2008) ANT helps contend information lost and give the translator a sort of immediate collective acceptance. It is only through dialogue between subjects and forms, between divergent or convergent choices in the practice of translation that one may long for a real and inclusive knowledge economy.

**Keywords:** n’zassa, collaborative translation, collective construct, dialogism, ethnographic approach.

***N’zassa*: de l’approche collaborative à la traduction vers une construction collective**

**Résumé**:

L’approche ethnographique à la traduction offre, il n’y a aucun doute, de nombreuses pistes à explorer. Si l’on considère la traduction comme une perpétuelle quête de possibilité, la traduction dialogique alors consiste à engager avec l’autre – puisse celui-ci être présent physiquement et/ou métaphysiquement, la bataille du sens. L’approche n’zassa vise non seulement à renforcer la visibilité du traducteur comme à construire une relation de confiance avec les translecteurs. Je défends que tout acte traductif est – ou devrait être – à certains égards, mené à partir d’une approche n’zassa qui voit en la pratique traductive une activité collaborative et son produit, une construction collective à laquelle les écrivains, les traducteurs et les lecteurs prennent part en tant que tisseurs de sens. Chaque texte porte ainsi le fœtus de cette rencontre qui se somme par des influences et fécondations mutuelles. Pour ce concerne la relation ethnographie-traduction, les travaux de Buzelin (2004, 2005), Ferreira (2014, 2017) et ceux de Wolf (2000) ont été fondamentaux. Je conclus que le n’zassa adiaffien lu à travers le prisme de la TAR permet de réduire la perte d’informations permettant au traducteur de jouir d’une forme d’acceptation collective spontanée. Ce n’est qu’à travers le dialogue entre sujets et formes, entre choix divergents et/ou convergents opérés au cours du processus de traduction que l’on peut espérer une économie de savoir réelle et inclusive.
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1. **Introduction**

Objectivity, Latour (2008) explains, is on the other side of the border and out of reach. If so, one may consider that any reading (interpretation) of a *moving prose* (daily life in a specific society) or, of a *fixed prose* (the written narrative of that same society) produces, undoubtedly, an individual objectivity which builds on that individual subjective vision of the fleeing horizon of the world portrayed. The identification and interpretation of the real in that infinite realm is, for every translator, an actual challenge. In the building of what Bandia (2000) called a “comprehensive history of Translation Studies”, ethnographic considerations play a key role. More specifically, in the attempt of bridging or bringing in one culture into another for the sake of meeting pluralism, the focal point will always be that of fathoming the societies involved and to knowing their customs, structures and functioning, and the elements that participate to their peculiarities. Be these elements inscribed in the language (or in the way it is utilized), in clothing, in names and naming process, or in its oral literature (songs, poetry, proverbs, riddles, philosophy, etc.). All of them partake in the shaping and the conveying of a vision. In literary translation of written works in general, one assumes that a translator investigates these elements at the level of the text. Indeed, Buzelin (2005) is right when she says that both theoretical approaches (descriptive and polysystem studies) contributed a lot to the debate in the field of translation, and yet a “process-oriented kind of research is needed”. It is in this search of a practical stance that the *n’zassa* concept enters the debate about the translation practice. I am attempting here to give the Actor-Network concept another direction, or else, show some analogies with the *n’zassa*. In fact, what I am proposing is a sort of translation culture.

The paper is structured as follows: first, it provides a quick definition of both concepts *n’zassa* and *Actor-Network Theory* (ANT), and an attempt at outlining their convergent and divergent points. Then, it focuses on the contribution of *n’zassa* tracing a parallel with the debate on a dialogic approach to translation. In the last two sections, it deals with knowledge economy and brings in a case study (the translation of *The identity card [1983]* to Brazilian Portuguese) where the idea of a collective construct takes form.

1. **N’zassa / Actor-Network: confluences**

The concept of *n’zassa* germinated among the Anyi women. It is said that, in the past, when a woman acquired a woven fabric for the making of her clothes, she would carefully keep the remaining patch out of it. The more fabric remnants a woman possessed, the more clothes one assumed she had, therefore the more respect and status she would get from society. Her fortune depended on the number of pieces. As time went on, it has become trendy to assemble those fabric remnants to build a patchwork (Bra, 2016) with multiple colors: a fabric *multifabric* named *n’zassa*. The concept was later introduced into literature thanks to the Ivorian writer Jean-Marie Adiaffi. The latter has, in his early literary activities, based his writing on that philosophy. From the very nature of *n’zassa*, Adiaffi would mingle different writing styles (prose, poetry, play, recital, proverbs, etc.) according to his inspiration. In other words, it is a mix of genres or “a genre without genre (Tro Deho, 2009) whose specificity resides in the structure of the utterance, the narrow link between characters’ languages and the vision of the society they live in. The discursive *n’zassa* encompasses at least two linguistic systems, that is, a canorous interpenetration of two languages (Bra, 2017). This system assembling which Adiaffi offered through both a linguistic creation and a combination of grammatical (dis)order may not be familiar to all the members of the interpretative community (or horizon of expectation). Consequently, the nature of such a “source-text” becomes difficult to determine for one can be exposed to the open-ended notion of multiple-text, which might lead to a multiple target text that also requires multiples hands. In a nutshell, a collective work.

But how does the translated text, as a social product viewed from the *n’zassa* perspective, turn to be a collective text? The idea of collective target text is a sound exemplification of the concept of “sauce” as a translation metaphor, in which every ingredient contributes to the edification of the flavor. Note that loans, in this case, become natural and linguistic interferences, a conscious exercise. Is it not to that liberty of its kind that Latour’s (2008) Actor-Network theory referred to? We shall see further.

In the introduction of *The scandals of Translation* (1999), Lawrence Venuti wrote:

The only prestige that a translator can gain comes from practicing translation, not as a form of personal expression, but as a collaboration between divergent groups, motivated by an acknowledgement of the linguistic and cultural differences that translation necessarily rewrites and reorders (Venuti, 1999, p. 4).

It is clear from this quote that translation reaches a dimension that makes it no more an isolated individual work but that of a community (like in Gender Studies) or as a national affair (see among others, Post-colonial literary works in African countries, India, Latin America). From Venuti’s quote, one deduces that translators’ glory resides in the fact of them having the *opportunity* *of collaborating* with peers to the building of a common meaning string of an original (perched on the wall of interpretation). This new “original” to which each member brings his stone conveys specific cultural or social reality(ies) (participants are all aware of) to a public they are *a priori* acquainted with. That idea itself puts the notions of “multiculturalism” and “hybridity” together, say, the former giving birth to the latter. Notwithstanding the ambiguity of the notion of multiculturalism where “the other” is an excepted entity which, in Wolf’s terms, “does not transcend the dialectic of inclusion and exclusion”; still multiculturalism the way it is manifested within the translated text bears, somewhat, some resemblances with hybridity. So am I fully aware that depending on how one approaches them, the distance between the two notions may be abysmal and their connections far narrow, but I suggest we consider hybridity as a fine and condensed articulation of the social and cultural particles expressed in or represented by the term multiculturalism, wherein “the celebrated other” is brought on stage in his exceptional otherness. In a hybrid State (or object), the other’s identity may oscillate between the other-self (the other identity) or a self-other. If a complete merging hardly occurs, there is no doubt that both multiculturalism and hybridity “tend to lionize” an otherness on which their very existence depends. As far as African literature is concerned, any combination of the two notions may not aim at something better than “inclusion”. It is worth stressing that the African writer’s literary works are not always a personal expression, but rather a condensed set of collective expressions performed by an *individual*. Therefore, as we draw on what Venuti just said, it should be no surprise that for its decoding *individuals* be required or involved.

Reflecting upon how Bruno Latour’s (2008) Actor-Network theory could contribute to Translation Studies, Buzelin writes:

In actor-network theory, translation refers to “the methods by which an actor enrolls others”, i.e., the way in which the various actors engaged in production/innovation processes (actors whose primary interests are not necessarily the same) interpret their own objectives into each other’s language so as to ensure everyone’s proper participation (or the dismissal of some actors if necessary), and the continuation of the project until fulfillment. Put differently, translation evokes successive strategies of interpretation and displacement by which an idea gradually moves into becoming a scientific fact or artefact. (Buzelin, 2005, pp. 194-195)

Putting together her reading and Latour’s (2008) definition thereof, Actor-network comprises “human and non-human actors”, or simply, “anything that can induce, whether intentionally or not, an action” (Buzelin, 2005, p. 197). It is when individual subjective-objectivities freely federate around a common object. The comprehension of that convergence can name or be named a theory (method) of its own. In a literary production context (creative or transcreative) it may, internally, refer to any sign or specific word that can induce a different reading/interpretation of another lexeme, paragraph or text. This includes the entire production process starting from the observation/idealization of the object to the textualization and the production stage by the subject. It is circular process like this:



where none of the two actors is stable. They inform (on) each other. I shall from now on call such cycle *n’zassa*. *N’zassa* practice raises awareness on the semantic path a word may externally take as it helps map and provide the diffused meaning/interpretation particles spread all over the community of interpretation (*transreaders[[1]](#footnote-1)*).

Unlike Actor-networks who “can only reveal themselves when *activated*” (Buzelin 2005), *n’zassa* *Meaning Weavers* (MWs) may impose themselves right in the first contact with the material under study. More than focusing on the hybridity of the product, one is appealed by the hybrid nature of the proper subject. I must specify that the MW concept, or transreaders, does not concern only writers (authors), but may include, at different levels, the same parties as those convoked by Actor-Network Theory. As a result, the described scene itself may read, be read and suggest some reading-comprehension lines to the translator. In such context, the limit between a \*hermeneutic approach (that focuses on text and considers translation as a process of meaning transfer[[2]](#footnote-2)), and a \*sociological approach (focused on agents and sees translation as a social process), is hardly definable for a text’s comprehension and apprehension may call upon society which is formed by peoples and their customs. Similarly, transreaders’ understanding may highly depend on their capacity of getting through the text’s code of *deantology[[3]](#footnote-3)* withal. By deantology, it should be understood the set of duties and/or burdens a transreader may benefit from, or be bestowed on, that are controlled by the inherent codes of the text under consideration. In other words, this is a contract between the source text and the transreader.

To affirm that translation has always been present in Africa prior to any contact with Western Explorers and colonization is definitely not an *optical illusion*, nor is it a mere perception. Every group of peoples who have contact of any kind with another group of peoples from a different language, or belonging to an alien culture and space, may somewhat naturally, if not compulsorily, necessitate some sort of mediation. Likewise, linguistic pluralism is an undeniable historical fact in Africa. States internal compositions (like 17th Akan[[4]](#footnote-4)), social interactions, in particular, trade and the spirit of conquer did not start neither from the contact with Europeans, nor did it come from Arabs who preceded them. Such contexts, therefore, exposed those local linguistic communities to some pragmatic issues. According to Bandia, mixing of cultures and languages in itself presupposes translation (2000, p. 360), or intra and inter mediations.

Mediations which, beyond political and economic aspects, also included imaginary(ies), say, literatures. From a pragmalinguistic standpoint, the term “imaginaries” is crucial because speech communities develop, or tend to develop distinct communication strategies fed with culture specific items anchored in the social discourse that surrounds them. In these communication exchanges,

literary translation and reception mutually influence each other. The former makes the book available in the reader’s language and the latter may cause a much more profound interest for a literature and give way to future translations.[[5]](#footnote-5) (Kamgang, 2012, p. 62)

Thus, if decolonization has to take place, one would have to narrow down the yet one-way translation activity. Otherwise, multiculturalism will mean no more than “exclusion”. All it takes is the will to move forward and to have as accurate a perception to anticipate the geopolitics from which the internal politics of contemporary literary texts (deantology) seem not to escape. All literary written or rewritten texts from every geography do not seem, in my opinion, to claim more than a possibility, be it local (the writer having a dialogue with his contemporaries, or with his community of readers) or international (the writer, by means of his translator, exchanging with other writers, readers and with the world).

Indeed, the suffocating label that condemned some “relational and marginal literary” productions (Bernd, 1987) influenced that possibility and jeopardizes the circulation of ideas (those from the South) within our common universal literary heritage. Manuel Rui gives us a beautiful concatenation of that diagnostic:

May the ports of the world

Be the ports of the entire world. (Monteiro, 1987,s/p)[[6]](#footnote-6)

Prior to this undoubtedly crucial utopia, one can observe that there is an attempt in both Actor-Network Theory and *N’zassa.* Although they may have recourse to slightly different elements, their focus includes the production of a comprehensive product (friendly to the parties involved). In next section, I shall try to show how such dialogue and open exchange help face the issue of multitext already mentioned above.

1. **Dialogic approach to translation**

As mentioned above, Post-colonial writers as performers of collective expressions end up concatenating multiples discourses which Bakhtin called “multiplicity of voices” (1978). This is, in Confiant’s (2000) terms, a sort of multiple-texts which might impose for its translation, if not a multiplicity of transreaders, at least, a target text also multiple. By grounding his work on the *n’zassa* philosophy, the Ivorian writer Jean-Marie Adiaffi inscribes and transmits that consciousness where the vision and the structure of the Anyi language and culture erupt in the now Europhone African narrative. According to Kamgang (2012), if the meaning of a book (signification) resides in its literary impact, the form (signifier) produces semantic contents[[7]](#footnote-7) as well, i.e., giving it a sort of transnational belonging. Adiaffi’s writing defies the rules of “the” original as it imposes in the act of reading and, consequently, that of translating, a four hand exercise, in a nutshell, *dialogic*.

More recently, in her *O paradigma da descrição na tradução etnográfica: Lévi-Strauss tradutor em Tristes Tropiques* (2014), Ferreira sorted out four practical strategies in ethnographic approach, which prove useful in the inscription (within the target text) of the outcomes of that dialogic exercise. There are: 1) *Definition*: considered to be a closed description. It designates the attribution of a limit, of an end (de-fine), to an object/subject. 2) *Explication*: it can be defined as the response to questions like *why* which relate to pragmatic, semantic and syntactic aspects. 3) *Hyperonym*: is a meaning relation between the signified and the signifier based on hierarchical classification of the described elements. It intervenes in cases such as names of animal and natural elements (including biomass, specific types of vegetation). And, 4) *Literal translation*: also referred to as an anthropolinguistic description, it builds on a world’s view linguistically framed. Beyond its interlingual feature, literal translation causes estrangement as it seeks to remain the closer to the piece of world represented by the source language/culture letting the translated language erupt within the translating language.

Even though these strategies are not alien to professional ethnographers, Ferreira’s interest was, in fact, in the rupture of the gaze which Lévi-Strauss experienced during his 1930 trip to Brazil (where he visited several Native tribes and communities). Ferreira focused on Lévi-Strauss’s self-questioning crisis, say, his authority, perception and judgment of others’ cosmology. The 1955 publication of *Triste Tropique* impacted ethnography as a whole, at least, the French one. This shift in perception and posture reinforces afresh the challenges any de-scription of someone else’s culture may present. And translation does not differ much from that. If Brazilian Native cultures were not Lévi-Strauss’s research object, but he himself as subject of gaze, Ferreira writes: “how do we learn from an object which keeps shifting as we stare at it? What does the gaze do to the object when it looks, observes, examines, describes and translates it?” In other words, what does the translator do to the other’s discourse while translating it? As a result, it becomes fundamental for the translator, when it comes to literature, to have recourse to these MW (or sparse communities) of the source language/culture in view of reconstructing it in the target language/culture.

If we can consider translation as a perpetual search for a possibility, dialogic translation consists of waging with other, be he present physically or virtually (and/or metaphysically), the battle for meaning. Translation is, therefore, a socialization activity which offers a lot of possibilities. Instead of remaining stuck in the notion of equivalent or text readability, Bandia (2003) points out that Translation Studies would win more if it investigates the impact a translation has on a colonized culture (source or target) and the consequences for the colonizing or homogenizing dominant language/culture (129)[[8]](#footnote-8). That is to try and live the portrayed experience within and outside the text, diving into the text to find out the other text it carries. The meaning of the text is influenced by the quality of that incessant migration flux.

As a migration act and as a quest for possibility(ies), translation may require interactions which imply unpredictable events, where it is assumed that the other be received and recognized with/in his otherness. In Ricard’s words,

The phenomenon of translation is, in the African context, characterized by the exchange, unfair undoubtedly, but at least as a meaning creator; it is what I call dialogic translation. The shift to the written form of the language is prepared during the dialogue between translator and speakers[[9]](#footnote-9). (Ricard, 2011, p. 14)

This exchange is a fundamental act that promotes the possibility of the expected possibility. Beyond the unfairness underscored by Ricard, such dialogue is not exempted of some ambiguity. For Ferreira (2017), the ambiguity caused by the *future* of migration and heterogeneity, as a concrete forthcoming fact, is understandable for it is, at the same time, peculiar in its journey and multiple in its memory (78). Distance, time, space can be overcome, therefore, transposable since the translation project establishes both the translator’s method and his priorities regarding the author’s aesthetics. In this specific process, like Ricard (2011) put it, (trans)readers are, in their role of social forces, given the spot not as the end (like *an unshakable target to hit*) but as the means (as *erratic sentient factors*). They are part of the method. An active translator (see coltrap, fig.1) could undeniably reinforce his control over most of the unthought-of cultural shocks, if s/he is aware of the dynamic force moving from the inside to the outside, and vice-versa. This awareness is likely to help reduce translation flaws and guarantee, as far as Adiaffi is concerned, the phonological power of the Anyi language in the building of his *n’zassa* writing aesthetics, while preserving the text’s *quality or truthfulness* (Grice 1989). As Buzelin puts it,

translation and ethnographic practices, when considered from a reflexive perspective, do not meet only at the writing level. If translators do not do “field work”, they get documented, they inform themselves, refer to sources and do research. In the way that it drives us away from the literary and textual paradigm which […] continues to encumber researches in translation and calls upon us to rather think translation as a production process, and the reflections of anthropologists help approach the notions of “translating subject” from a new perspective.[[10]](#footnote-10) (Buzelin, 2004, p. 732)

The translation activity, in its very nature, has always been marked by either a direct dialogism(the transreader having immediate recourse to a specialist or *informant*), or a distant dialogism (the transreader exchanging with a translation peer, a lexicographer or a researcher whose works help him elucidate muddy points and complex terms met during the translation process) that is interested in the *quantity of information* (Grice, 1989, p. 26). Such dialogue happens quite simultaneously between the *author and the (trans)reader 1*, between the *translator and the author*, between the *translator and the (trans)reader 2* and, finally, between the *author and the (trans)reader 2*. This multiple mediation, in figure 1, is part of cultural translation that takes the public inside a distant mode of living. Such a “cultural” translator may intervene (Wolf, 2000) and even manipulate the translated text, ‘in a friendly way’, in view of reproducing it according to both the context of reception and taking into account the outcomes of the dialogue (in search of *the manner*). I am hinting, here, at the readability, from a linguistic viewpoint, of the cultural marks of the source text. It does not imply therefore that the translator will get to compulsorily adopt any specific standard or structure from the horizon of expectation. In Buzelin’s view, this dialectic epistemology re-allocates in the field of translatology, a slightly different dialogism. She says:

It concerns only the second part of the process: the writing. The interpersonal exchange that undermined it (at least in ethnography) is drained off. It is no more a dialogue between people, rather a dialogue between reader and text, or best, between two texts. (Buzelin, 2004, pp. 737-738)[[11]](#footnote-11)

The dialogue between reader and text, or between texts, opens up to a promising perspective. As dialogism may cause or result in mutual influences and fecundations, each text is likely to bear the fetus of that encounter. The linguistic features of “one” will become visible in the “other”. Language A will speak (or express itself) within language B. Each text, in the reader’s mind becomes, to some point, semi-stranger, semi-native, semi-original and semi-translation.

If the writing, since the suns of independence (1950-1970) in most African countries, cannot be considered a total rupture with former colonizers, it showed undeniable signs of transition (Kourouma, 1968, 1970; Achebe, 1952, 1953, 1958, 1960, 1964, 1966; Adiaffi, 1969, to name but a few). The stylistic tools and cultural artifacts these writers explored became (un-willingly) role-models that serve as powerful ego challengers. Their writing style would delight both the critique and readers of any kind not accustomed to the virulence of the language, for the pleasure it provided them. In Wolf’s terms, “it is through this hybrid construction that one voice is able to unmask the other within a single discourse. It is at this point that authoritative discourse becomes undone. Authoritative discourse is univocal (2000, p. 133).” It is only out of this ego battle (also a mutual transmutation unthinkable in an Authoritative set and mindset) and the ethic of reciprocity[[12]](#footnote-12) it implies that one can pretend to a knowledge economy.

1. **Knowledge economy: from text to dialogue**

The term “economy” should be understood as the efficient use of a resource. This effective use in literature refers to the unveiling of the ideational[[13]](#footnote-13) of a metaphysic universe whose meanings reside in it being always in progress. Such a panorama requires that the translator possesses a shifting profile adjusted to the rhythm of time. As the idealization of the world cannot escape social and subjective influences, the *n’zassa* approach to translation appear to be an initiation *parcours*. It is in this transcendental mind that the translator follows or strives to explore the writing process in order to get to the author and grasp his philosophy. In Souza’s terms,

Thus, hardly transportable linguistic facts like the trace that delineates the borderline between a foreign speech and one’s own may be reported. It includes marking difference which, in an allusive way of saying, presents itself accordingly and hinders the writing fluency that moves from the other’s language to one’s own. (Souza, 2014, p. 23)[[14]](#footnote-14)

When it comes to Adiaffi’s literary and artistic production, the linguistic facts which Souza (2014) referred to become omnipresent. They are almost everywhere in the text, on every page. Those elements in local Ivorian languages (most of the time proper names, onomatopoeias, riddles and/or proverbs) carry, oftentimes, micro-stories which, if carefully analyzed, could reveal unprecedented quirky microsystems. In this type of geography full of microsystems, the reader-citizen would be subject to a set of prerogatives spread all over the text (from metaphysics to physics, from idea to subject matter (text), from author to offer, from specific source to a specified target, from sender to receiver, etc.). This dynamic and each of its inherent protocols constitute translation acts. Thus, to highlight the crucial nature of the transporter, being in this case the translator, is to be aware not only of the vital importance of the text’s deantology but also of its relationships with the outside. The consideration of the latter, as far as African literature is concerned, continuously transforms the well-known binary approach into a multiple (now equal?) mediation process. In other words, the translator’s approach to each side, whatever the culture, should be equanimity-governed. For

literature depends on being read in a certain way in order to be effective and successful. It is written for an audience, and that audience is implied in the text. Reception, response, and interpretation are in a sense preordained by the rhetoric of the literary work, but the audience also plays a role in shaping how the work will be understood and what meanings it will have. Each new generation and each new group of readers in a new setting brings to a work different codes for understanding it. (Rikvin & Ryan, 2004, p. 128)

From that perspective, the text deantology appears to be, direct or indirectly, the condition *sine qua non* to decorticate its structure and enjoy its meaning and flavor. Such conjuncture that the literary text imposed, sometimes as both the means and the end, mostly conditions its reception and interpretation, the two being governed by a dialogistic precept where “the audience also plays a role in shaping how the work will be understood and what meanings it will have”. Figure 1 brings a recap of how many translators operate today and how an n’zassa dialogic method may need them to operate:

Figure 1: **Coltrap developed by the author**

When Kamgang (2012) defends that the translator engagement may equal that of the author from whom he gets his power of agent, it is because an *engagé* post-colonial translator is not only aware of the asymmetrical power relations crystallized by colonial narratives, but most importantly, he sums his efforts to the author’s to deconstruct those forces. His ideological positioning is what provides him with the required apparatus to apply for some change in the receiving target culture. Here, specifically, the notion of ethics might go through some profound turbulences, or, at least, be somewhat relativized. Though it will never be too much insisting that not all post-colonial translation cases are activism-related, there is no doubt, in the case portrayed by the *coltrap*, that ethical values may need to be redefined according to the translation intent (see Aubert, 1993). What one sees in the *coltrap* is far from being a mere curious move of an individual. One rather perceives a translator investing time and effort to grasp his own enchantment (Baiocchi et al., 2013) before the text under consideration. The “expected” does exist in the “Now”, though annihilated by the gradual forces ambushed in the process. Therefore, it is my wish that the “Expected” side be put at the core of the practice. This performativity which should be natural to every translator recalls Ferreira’s (2014) observations on Lévi-Strauss. The latter, with great responsibility, would reflect on the worlds he was enacting. This new approach to knowledge production transforms it in an actor-network insofar as it is itself a compositional entity (Baiocchi et al., 2013, p. 337) that an individual writer/translator/ethnographer builds by means of a methodological gathering of souvenirs. It seems that the core point of all this process is in fact the memory. If so, Derive points that

the closure of the writing world has instilled a set of illusions about the creative writing which determine, in a profound way, the criteria of analysis in that domain. Several slants from contemporary critique led to the re-discussion of some of these *a priori* that had, up-to-now, influenced the textual approach, because of an implicit problematic–stemming directly from the writing practice–according to which the author-writer would be the unique source to the meaning of his discourse. Therefore, awareness has been, in last decades, constantly raised on the limitations and risks of the “intentional” analysis, which consists of seeking within a text, “what the author wanted to say”. This approach was combated by Humanities that proved that the author’s alertness could only constitute a very problematic reference for the study of the meaning of his discourse. The sociological perspective has demonstrated that the author is predetermined in his expressive functions by an ideological bias (ideas from the group to which he belongs: patterns of signified) and by a discursive function (language of the group he belongs to: patterns of signifier). Beyond that, both the psychoanalysis and structural sciences of language and signs insisted on the fact that *the author did not have total control of his discourse*: on the one hand, he might write stuffs he has no awareness of, and on the other hand, *the semantic potentiality of his text goes beyond his own intention*. (Derive, 2015, pp. 66-67; my emphasis in italics)[[15]](#footnote-15)

Paying some attention to the segments in italics starting from the discourse meaning and the author’s ideological kinship to the discursive function (within which post-colonial writers used to weave new discourses based on an idea of “clandestinity” *vis-à-vis* the West), one notes that the author himself is never the centre of attentions. “He did not have total control of his discourse”, he does not have full awareness of it and “his ‘true’ semantic potentiality goes beyond his own intention.” In view of this, one can assume that a text’s meaning(s) is spread over the community of readers and scholars who, consequently, turn to be a community of informants to the translator. I mean the translator must be a memory-hunter. The discourse produced, Wolf says,

should result from a reciprocal, joint, dialogic process. Ideally, the product should be a "polyphonic text", or as Tyler puts it: A post-modern ethnography is a cooperatively evolved text consisting of fragments of discourse intended to evoke in the minds of both reader and writer an emergent fantasy of a possible world of commonsense reality. (Wolf, 2000, p. 131)

It is in these dispersed reading-receptions (the community of transreaders) that reside intertexts (in Riffaterre’s sense, which is “the totality of texts that may be related to the text being considered”)[[16]](#footnote-16) and the author’s possible micro-intentions, which prove useful for the effective exploration of the text under study. Such dialogism is the undeniable principle of a true and effective economy of textual meanings, and it can pave the way for new directions to emerge. Wolf continues:

Translation between two different cultures (e.g., Northern and Southern hemisphere societies) ideally consists in mutual, dialogical production of a discourse. Such discourse can be regarded as the result of the meeting of two cultures, which merge or “hybridize” without giving up or neglecting their own specific cultural features, but which emphasize, rather, the various perspectives that converge in the translation product. (2000, p. 131)

This meeting, in the current state of affairs, is mostly moved by the aroma of capital and inclines to save the reader (and owner of the capital) from remembering his *inability to master the original and to negotiate the untranslatable aspects[[17]](#footnote-17)* of the unfamiliar idiom*.* More than deleting in the target language every single trace of the other, the latter is starred at from far and/or contemplated in a sort of “replay”. For Gikandi (1991), this type of practices strengthens the power of one language over another and, consequently, acquits speakers of the powerful (dominant) language from the duty of learning the less powerful (minorized) language.[[18]](#footnote-18) That is to say,

Based on this compressed survey of colonial inscription, it can be said that colonial projection of African literature was essentially couched in a hegemonic discourse, which failed to account fully for the African subject it was constructing. This agenda of hegemony can inform research in translation studies which seeks to explore the power differential of imperialism. (Bandia, 2000, pp. 356-357).

In other words, it means assimilating foreign literary texts too forcefully to dominant values at home, erasing the sense of foreignness that was likely to have invited translation in the first place[[19]](#footnote-19). Therefore, one should be careful not to fall in “a process in which the single voice of colonial authority undermines the operation of colonial power by inscribing and disclosing the trace of the other so that it reveals itself as double-voiced. (Young, 1995, 23 *in* Wolf, 2000, p. 134)” It means that one should, in apposition to or beside the notion of “fluid text” or text fluency, be able to consider the *non-fluidity of the text* as an unquestionable mark of a “good translation” as well. From all perspectives, the very point is that the authors of those multilingual texts–also multiform to some extent–*,* are aware of both the readers’ openness and their capacity to go after meaning. Let’s have a look:



Figure 2: Object–subject in movement **(developed by the author).**

Is the text the same in phase 2? Is the transreader reading a different text? Or else, can we consider the individual reading to be the same person? Figure2 shows with clarity that one is actually dealing with two grown actors: object (text) and transreader are no more the same. The latter has acquired a new savvy that helps him cast a new light on the former’s renewed form. Then he can discover, on this new dawn, some of the various aspects of the object until then ignored. The influence is bidirectional. Though both actors are in perpetual movement and so difficult to stabilize, the translator is free using his attribution as organizer of the translation to give the product (object-text) a temporary stabilization.

If there is a dire need for the “other” to be properly represented and even urgent to let him represent himself, it became more than relevant to have the way round, where the former “other” represents the erstwhile “self” giving birth to a network of inter-subjective relationships of imageries (Aubert, 1993). For it to be profitable to the Translation Studies, the translator should pay attention to four aspects: 1) how the “other” presents or introduces himself to him; 2) how this “other” let himself be represented; and 3) how in the zenith of this new fraternity wherein the translator, moved by a genuine and laudable intention, may overstate that *other’s* traits; and 4) how the former other (the new self) presents the onetime self (the former self, or the other self). This alertness may help escape “ethno-cultural agendas” or avoid the denial of *“*cultural citizenship” which Wa Thiong’o called a *“*Literary Identity Theft”.[[20]](#footnote-20) It is definitely on the price the post-colonial translator (and any translator overall) pays that cultural inter-comprehension depends. It is only through dialogue between subjects and forms, between divergent or convergent ideas that one may long for a real and inclusive knowledge economy.

**5. Collective Construct: A case study**

Jean-Marie Adiaffi, like many writers of his time whom I consider *ethnographers manqués* (see Clifford, 1998), had a spontaneous recourse to local languages, as they believed French may fail, to some extent, to represent African realities. Published in 1980, *La carte d’identité* (later translated by Brigitte Angays as *The Identity Card* published by the Zimbabwe Publishing House in 1983), is full of Anyi proper names, proverbs, onomatopoeias and interjections. Next to the Anyi language cohabit in this *n’zassa* narrative, other Ivorian languages like Diula and Bete.

An interesting parallel that can be drawn between the practice of translators and ethnographers, as underscored by Wolf (2000), is that both are, in such a textualization process, bound by the burden of decoding the *culture-in-the-text* (Translator)*,* which is highly dependent on the *culture of the text* (its coding, ethnographer/author). During the re-coding process, one may be constrained to establish a textualization tradition which differs from that of the existing (source and target) ones. Inasmuch as “cultural phenomena attached to belief systems could have cosmological, sociological or psychological layers of meaning (Wolf, 2000, p. 139)” and literary texts are powerful platforms for exhibiting those worlds. It turns to be much more complicated to fit in a particular category when one considers the various contributions MWs’ may provide for the elaboration of the construct (translated text).

Beyond their subversive aspects, the writing techniques designed by Post-colonial writers are mechanisms of defense against the threat of oblivion and the experience of dispossession (see Kamgang, 2012). Both Adiaffi’s ethical and political agendas end up converging, and urge the translator’s choices, like those of the writer himself, to becoming politico-ethical. According to Bandia (2012), the ethical dimension is not only essential, but also imperative when it comes to African literatures. He said:

it becomes an ethical requirement, that if a reader is interested in African literature and culture, he or she should make the effort to perceive or understand African thought in its closest ‘natural’ form and not through a ‘sifted’ or watered-down version hewed to dominant domestic values or expectations. (Bandia, cited in Kamgang, 2012, p. 237)

The argument that “if a reader is interested in African literature and culture, he or she should make the effort to perceive or understand African thought in its closest *natural* form” is not very different from Ngugi’s opinion. That is “if the reader wants to have the flavor of the original language, then they should learn the original and read the work in the original (2018, p. 267)”. Ethics should not be the duty of the translator alone, but a shared responsibility, including particularly transreaders.

It is worth mentioning that *The Identity card* (1983) contains about 92 terms (names and expressions) in local languages. But for a matter of space, I chose to discuss the translation of only two proper names: Mélédouman and Floco-Guard Gnamien Pli.

**5.1. Do we translate *Mélédouman*?**

*The identity Card* (1983) is the story of Mélédouman, prince of Bettié, who lived in a time where his city was still a French colonial Circle. One day, Prince Mélédouman is arrested at home and taken to the Circle for no reason by Commandant Kakatika Lapine (official representative of the French colonial Administration in Bettié) and his Floco-Guard Gnamien Pli. When Mélédouman is asked his identity card, then begins between the Commandant and himself a harsh debate on what an identity means. In response to what Commandant Kakatika considered being contemptible and an intolerable questioning to his administration and to his own authority, he reacts: “Guards! Take him to the truth-cell. And bring him to reason. This argumentative idiot, this rebel of a nigger, may have been innocent but he certainly isn’t any longer (1983, p. 32)”. After a seven day torture, Mélédouman lost his eyesight. It is during his judgment that he is finally told of his indictment, since before that time they had nothing against him. In the flow of mistreatments and blows, his identity card had fallen out of his pocket and there was an excellent motive for the administration to justify its ill-treatment of the prince. Two hypotheses were exploitable by the colonial administration: a) ask the prince to provide his identity card. “*If you did, it meant this one wasn’t yours* (1983, p. 108)”; and b) “*But if you didn’t, it meant that our suspicion would be confirmed*.” Mélédouman was given seven days to provide his Identity card. There he was blind, waging a war for his very existence which Kakatika was clearly denying him. By the end of the seven-day-ultimatum, he went back to the Circle where, in a sort of mea culpa, commandant Kakatika attempted:

As soon as you left, we found your identity card. […] Yes, Nanan. The mistake was on the part of one of my guards. He picked up your identity card somewhere and we thought that some words had been scratched off…We thought it was a case of forgery… It’s a serious offence… But the name was slightly faded… That’s why we asked you to produce your identity card (The identity, 1983, p. 108).

Of course, Prince Mélédouman could not provide it because it was in commandant Kakatika’s possession. Absorbed by his project of revisiting not only the writing canon but also the history of Bettié people, –and of Côte d’Ivoire as a whole– Adiaffi played on names to show how the colonial power disregarded the existing African traditions and the mechanisms they use to identify and name one another. What Kakatika and his administration did was to establish their own identification system, which depended on the destruction of the existing one. Adiaffi said:

The name plays on that double reality: the Black who knows he has an identity and the latter being negated by the White. It is all in the intonation. If it is the White speaking, he has a different intonation and the name means something else. If it is Mélédouman himself speaking, it has another meaning. (Adiaffi, cited in Gallimore, 1996, p. 33).[[21]](#footnote-21)

In *The identity card*, Adiaffi already did what Ferreira referred to as explication, i.e., “Are you Mélédouman? (**meaning either** *I have no name* **or more precisely,** *they falsified my name*.)” In fact, by offering this in-gloss translation/explication, Adiaffi provided the transreader with a first element for the meaning weaving. Each part of the explication highlights one of the reading possibilities. During the translation process to Brazilian Portuguese, I had students and participants (in academic meetings) contribute to the re-creation of the linguistic subtlety of the source text in view of maintaining the writer’s agenda. It shall be said that the Portuguese language barely allows two diacritical signs on a single word like French does. In fact, given the significance of intonation, the various debates revolved around the place of the accent on the lexeme. Every intervenient (now transreader) had to substantiate his argument with a reference (be it a dictionary, an article, a *déjà vu*, etc.). Therefore, as participants got to know my translation project and understood the role of intonation, we went from a) *Me****le-d****um****ã****,* b) *M****eledú****man,* to c) *M****êle****dum****ã****.* We finally ended up with *Meleduman* with no diacritical sign. The mediation with MWs happened at two levels. On the one hand, I explored: a) MWs of the SL including native speakers, b) the hints the author himself provides within the text, c) the works available on the Anyi language and on the book under consideration. On the other hand, we have MWs of the TL who helped find, in the horizon of expectation, a place for the text-discourse that was being constructed collectively.

**5.2. What about *Floco-Guard Gnamien Pli?***

Like in most colonial setting, the French Circle of Bettié had its Black military men. These Blacks peoples trained to serve the Administration were (still) selected according to their knowledge of the local geography, languages and traditions. Floco-Guard Gnamien Pli, like it appears in the Zimbabwean translation, was a Black military whose abhorrence of his own Black brothers was astonishing. He wishes he could subject them all to his mercy. So his attempts on many occasions to impress them failed for they found him so funny and ridicule. In this particular case of Floco-Guard, Adiaffi combined three of Ferreira’s concepts: definition, explication and literal translation. In-text glossing is among the many strategies that Adiaffi uses to distribute the useful MWs within the text. Here is a case in point:

Suiting once more the action to the word, our floco-guard (a rather unglorious name given by Blacks, at the time of hard labour, to their most terrible guards, the bloodthirsty ex-conquerors in their red chechias, as cruel and merciless as cangaceiros. They were unconditionally in the district commandant’s pay. Floco means he who is not circumcised, that is an idiot, a thickhead, a vile man, a rapscallion, a son of a bitch, a poor bastard who understands less than nothing. Hence the terrible, vengeful association: floco-guard). (The identity, 1983, p. 4)

One realizes that MWs do not refer only to transreaders, but also include any element that carries or helps reach and formulate the text implications. As implicit ANTs, MWs may perform (or help build) contexts (or be themselves contexts) that are experiential in nature. In so doing, they become a sort of virtual and ambulant labs wherein translator and transreaders carry out thousands and thousands of experiments on the possible lexical combinations. Every single meeting with a new transreader may reorganize the context or, at least, cast a new light on it.

With regard to the implementation of Ferreira’s (2014) strategies, Adiaffi (1980) used artifices like *parenthesis ()*, *comas*, or terms like *means, meaning, more specifically*. Two fundamental aspects of the composition of the name must be noted: 1) the invention of a *portmanteau word,* and 2) an *ironic combination* (see below):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *ironic combination* |
| ***floco*** – guard  |  Gnamien ***Pli*** |
| *portmanteau word* |  |

Though Mélédouman and Floco-Guard are both sarcastic names, the latter presents a very interesting structure where every particle, considered in its individual meaning, does not alter the anatomy of the expected image. Words’ order still corresponds to meaning order. It reveals exactly the various facets of Nhamien Pli. That is:

In the translation process to Brazilian Portuguese, I came (jointly with MWs) to use *guarda* for ‘guard’ which refers, in theory, to a military (wo)man. Though, it is also commonly utilized in Brazil to refer to *vigilante* (janitor), who generally bears no relation with the army. Its association with *Floco (4)* may operate a very quick shift in the reader mind. For one moves from a man who incarnated a national treasure and represented both the law and the State, to a “vile man, a rapscallion, a son of a bitch, a poor bastard who understands less than nothing”. This type of association typical to *n’zassa* contributes a lot to the peculiarity of Adiaffi’s works. He proceeded by defining the term “floco” as *he who is not circumcised,* and then went on providing explications about its possible signification in the traditional district customs of Bettié.

Floco-guard, a Black military man, was part of the colonial army. As he knew that he was under the Administration’s grace, so he wanted to abuse his contemporaries and submit them to his personal caprices. For he considered himself a god, his brothers called him “Gnamien” (God) whose spelling I adapted in the Brazilian Portuguese: *Nhamien*. However, to prove him their total adherence to the idea he has of himself, they added “Pli’ (big or ‘hefty) instead of “Kpli” (grand, mighty) to *Nhamien.* For example:

They gave the floco-guard the much-envied nickname of Gnamien Pli (Big God) but the little devils emphasised Pli (Big) much more than Gnamien (God). (The identity, 1983, p. 7)

One crucial point where MWs proved fundamental was the translation of “floco”. There exists, in Portuguese, the lexeme “floco” and it designates a “flake” and speakers generally relate it to *the cotton flower.* Two options were usable: either a) we re-signify the existing word or; b) we find a stratagem that draws the reader’s attention on that *semantic mobility* (see Bra, 2014). The final solution has been to put a circumflex on the last “o” of the word: *flocô*. Like Adiaffi did in the source text where the Anyi language spoke through French, this diacritical sign (^) also helped come to the same effect: the Anyi speaks in and through Portuguese anew. Thus, I could build a construct that contemplates the traits of the parties involved. The result is *guarda-flocô Nhamien Pli*.

What happened is that, in a n’zassa translation practice, the translator concatenates the four Gricean maxims: 1) *quantity of information* (which the translator gathered from each transreader), 2) *quality or truthfulness* (the confrontation of interpretations helped iron out ambiguities), 3) *relevance or consistence of the context* (Adiaffi’s agenda of revising Bettié history and the political and social conjuncture in which the book was produced imposed some key considerations; and 4) *manner or clarity* (the putting together of cultural issues and the writing style that the author explores–submitted to the confrontation of interpretation–clearly assists the translator in his decision making). Such confrontation gives both the translated text and the process itself the opportunity to surprise us (translators) for it escapes our stigmatizations and our own pre-formed stereotypes. There, the translator may gain a sort of immediate collective acceptance.

**6. Conclusion**

The experience of the text (source and target) begins with its first contact with transreaders. It is where it establishes itself and articulates its movements within the system that will be its new home, if not, at least, as a shelter against oblivion. The left column of the Coltrap (fig.1) above shows where we still are, and one perceives that the right side of the figure is generally not discussed, or simply hidden. When an individual is elected genius, he is genius by consensus and such collective recognition is what forges the future canonized book or author. Literary prizes are a testimony of it. Thus, as an author is canonized not only by editions and re-editions and, above all, by critiques; an *n’zassa* translation approach is to reach that level through the effective exploration of the informants’ network (MWs). Internet and online tools have transformed our relations to one another and to texts, so should it be when it comes to the doing of translation.

In this paper, one could see that both Latour’s Actor theory and the *n’zassa* perspective to translation bear some convergence points. Still, the resources they respectively explore may slightly differ from one another. They do not claim to be applicable theories *per se,* but invest to beating tracks that can instill reflections. It is why the *n’zassa* focuses on factors like: humans (writer, transreaders and translator) and non-humans (editing process, the market and, at least two social realities). A good utilization of Ferreira’s suggestions relies on the sound comprehension of these dynamics (fig. 1 & 2). It remains clear that one of the chief points to which the translator’s attention is drawn is his ability to translate with and without the text, as well as to translate the world in the text and the world of the text. Here is how one can reach a sort of (un)common “objectivity” about the reality, if it does exist in literature, to which the text is calling upon us. The dialogue promoted by the *n’zassa* have no aim but to reinforce both the translator’s visibility and, most importantly, build a trustworthy relationship with (trans)readers.
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15. “o fechamento no mundo da escrita produziu certo número de ilusões sobre a criação literária que determinaram fortemente as modalidades de análise nesse domínio. Várias tendências da crítica contemporânea levaram à rediscussão de alguns desses a priori que tinham até aqui pesado sobre a abordagem textual, em consequência de uma problemática implícita – diretamente resultante da prática de escrita – segundo a qual o autor-escritor seria a única fonte do sentido de seu discurso. Assim é que muito se insistiu, nessas últimas décadas, sobre os limites e os perigos da análise ‘intencional’ que consiste em procurar em um texto ‘o que o autor quis dizer’. Tal ponto de vista foi combatido pelas ciências humanas que colocaram em evidência que a consciência do autor só podia constituir uma referência muito problemática para o estudo do sentido de seu discurso. A abordagem sociológica mostrou que o escritor era previamente determinado em suas funções expressivas por uma formação ideológica (ideias do grupo ao qual ele pertence: modelos de significado) e por uma função discursiva (língua do grupo ao qual ele pertence: modelos de significante). Além disso, tanto a psicanálise, como as ciências estruturais da linguagem e dos signos insistiram sobre o fato de que o autor não dominava a totalidade de seu discurso: de um lado, ele ali inscreve coisas sem ter consciência delas, de outro, a potencialidade semântica de seu texto ultrapassa sua própria intenção.” (Derive, 2015, pp. 66-67). [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. See Wolf, 2000. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Gikandi, 1991, p. 167. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. The concept of *minority* will have to suffer some semantic shifts as its list and features are in constant change. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Kundera, 1988 cited in Venuti, 1998, p. 5. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. It transforms the source-target relationship in what I shall call the dégré zero of the translation process. (see N’gana, 2018) [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Le nom joue sur cette double réalité : le Noir qui sait qu’il a une identité et la négation de celle-ci par le Blanc. C’est dans l’intonation. Si c’est le Blanc qui parle, il a une intonation différente et le nom veut dire autre chose. Si c’est Mélédouman lui-même qui parle, c’est autre chose (Adiaffi, cited in Gallimore, 1996, p. 33). [↑](#footnote-ref-21)