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Translating the Francophone Caribbean: Centering Black Production, Decentering Translation Practices

Abstract

In her article, "A Tree as a Record: On Translating Mahagony by Edouard Glissant," translator Betsy Wing recounts how Martinican writer Edouard Glissant expressed his disinclination to respond to translators’ questions and justified his intention by saying, "I wrote it once, now it’s your turn to write it" (124). According to Glissant, translating and writing are similar in nature. The art of translation therefore does not lie in the process of translating words into another language but in the skill to compose a text anew, that is to say to develop unique ways of ‘writing’ and therefore to deconstruct the idea of translation as a simple act of transferal. As such, this article considers various translators who have ‘written’ Caribbean texts anew. It will specifically look at three works from Black French-speaking Caribbean authors which were all translated into English, namely Patrick Chamoiseau, *L’esclave vieil homme et le molosse* (1997) translated by Linda Coverdale as *Slave Old Man* (2019); Gisèle Pineau’s *La Grande drive des esprits* (1993) translated by J. Michael Dash as *The Drifting of Spirits* (1999); and Yanick Lahens’s *Tante Résia et les Dieux* (1994) translated by Betty Wilson as *Aunt Résia and the Spirits and Other Stories* (2010).

Comparing these translations side by side offers several points of interest: First, it places the race and gender of the author at the core of the translation. Chamoiseau, a Black Martinican man, was translated by Coverdale, a white woman from the United States; Lahens, a Black Haitian woman, by Wilson, a Black Jamaican woman; Pineau, a Black Guadeloupean woman, by Dash, a Trinidadian man. How does the race, gender, or ethnic background of the translator influence the process of translating Black-authored texts? In what ways does it affect the translation of Black experiences? Secondly, we examine various approaches to translating Caribbean creoles into English. For example, Coverdale deliberately keeps the Martinican French in her translation to emphasize the musicality of the text and the voice of the author over transparency and understanding. Similarly to Coverdale, Wilson's translation preserves the Haitian Creole, which bears traces of orality, while also indicating filiations between Haitian Creole and creoles spoken in the Anglophone Caribbean in footnotes. Dash, on the other hand, elects to substitute one creole with another, the Guadeloupean with the Jamaican, allowing the text “to shove the reader around, to make them feel unbalanced” (Dash, 30:09). If the approaches diverge between the translators, each of them views translation as a way to render a foreign text accessible, while simultaneously unsettling the reader's world.

Overall, this comparative analysis of the translations of Black authors from the Francophone Caribbean seeks to highlight a plurality of translation approaches centering Black cultural production while destabilizing the idea of a uniform translation practice.
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In her article “A Tree as a Record: On Translating Mahogany by Edouard Glissant,” translator Betsy Wing recounts how the Martinican writer expressed his reluctance to respond to translators’ questions and justified his intention by saying, “I wrote it once, now it’s your turn to write it” (124). According to Glissant, translating and writing are similar in nature. The art of translation therefore does not lie in the process of translating words into another language but in the skill to compose a text anew, to develop unique ways of writing and therefore to deconstruct the idea of translation as a simple act of transferal. In this way, translations amount to the creation of new, original texts that, as translator Rose-Myriam Réjouis argues, “(re)word [...] what has not been said” in the English language (Vinokur and Réjouis 25).

For Caribbean texts, translation challenges abound, and the cultural contexts of Afro-diasporic religions and Caribbean vernaculars and creoles often resist facile notions of translation as transposition or transferal. Scholars and readers of Caribbean literature, like readers of other literary traditions, tend to fetishize the polyglossia of the source text in Caribbean literature, leading to the belief that the translation can never be as rich as the original.¹ As Charles Forsdick points out, the question of creole languages and their interplay between European languages weighs on the Caribbean text (Forsdick 156). This affects the act of translation itself, such as the translator’s choice to foreignize or domesticate the text for the sake of intelligibility, as well as larger questions regarding which texts are translated and circulate in and outside of the Caribbean. Emphasizing the connection between the translation of languages and the production of Caribbean literature in translation, Forsdick ponders the role of the translator: “What is the flow of translations in the region and also with the rest of the world, and who are the intermediaries in such processes?” (157). As such, this article considers various

¹ For fruitful examination of the (in)stability of originals and translations, see Literary Translation and the Making of Originals by Karen Emmerich (1-3).

As John Keene reminds us, the translation of Black literature is an inherently political act which involves confronting notions of untransibility and impenetrability. To this discussion, Kaima L. Glover also acknowledges that translating Black literatures, especially Haitian authors, means to translate a culture that is often viewed as “pathological” in the Global North (Glover 25-26). The translators we focus on have waded into this terrain, translating texts by Afro-descended writers about Caribbean life from the age of slavery to the present day. We are interested in the ways in which Linda Cloverdale, J. Michael Dash, and Elizabeth Wilson approach the translation of Caribbean texts: what experiences do they have that might inform their translation practice, what strategies do they deploy, and how do they approach Caribbean polyglossia? Each of the translators whose work we explore in this study has a different ethnic background—Cloverdale is from the United States, Dash is from Trinidad, and Wilson is from Jamaica. Yet they share commonalities as well, all of them have doctorates and scholarly backgrounds in literary studies. Cloverdale and Wilson are women. Dash and Wilson both taught at the University of the West Indies in Jamaica and have spent time researching in Haiti. Beyond the translators themselves, we chose the following corpus for a number of reasons. First, we wish to highlight and examine strategies for translating literature from the francophone Caribbean: Martinique (Chamoiseau), Guadeloupe (Pineau), and Haiti (Lahens). To be sure, the three countries are distinct places with their own histories, but by comparing each translator’s approach, we find that there are significant commonalities that will benefit scholars in conducting future studies of francophone Caribbean literature, writ large. In terms of the authors, Patrick Chamoiseau, Gisèle Pineau, and Yanick Lahens are highly recognizable, award-winning writers whose work is of interest to students, scholars, and readers on a global scale. They have also been translated before by translators other than Cloverdale, Dash, and Wilson, so we hope that our choice of texts will draw further attention to other works by Chamoiseau, Pineau, and Lahens as well as an interest in the practices of translators of other Caribbean authors in the process.

For the translators whose practice we examine here, we ask: how does the race, gender, ethnic, or professional background of the translator influence the process of translating texts authored by Afro-Caribbean writers? In what follows, we address how each translator approaches their respective text. In the first section,
we show how Linda Cloverdale draws on intertextual and lexical relationships to place Patrick Chamoiseau’s novel *Slave Old Man* within a francophone Caribbean context in English. In the second part, we discuss J. Michael Dash’s use of translation to challenge the anglophone Caribbean canon by relying on Jamaican and Trinidadian culture and language to translate Gisèle Pineau’s *The Drifting of Spirits*. In the third section, we examine how Elizabeth Wilson negotiates between her role as a literary critic and translator to activate Haitian Creole words in her translations of Yanick Lahens’s short story collection *Aunt Résia and Other Spirits*. While each of the translators we discuss sometimes have divergent or complicated approaches to translation, they all believe in translation as a way to introduce Caribbean literature to new readers and to challenge simplistic portrayals of Black culture and language across the globe.

Cloverdale, Chamoiseau, and the Story of Language

In her translator’s note, Linda Coverdale explains how Patrick Chamoiseau provides instructions to his translators. Chamoiseau writes, “I sacrifice everything to the music of words” (*Slave Old Man* xiv). The musicality of the language is as important as the story in Chamoiseau’s literature, and the English translation must convey not only the author’s narrative but also its melody. To preserve Chamoiseau’s melodic tone throughout her translation, Coverdale chooses, at times, to leave the French words in the English translation, for example: “It was too *magique* to *critique*, he said. *Magnifique sympathique*” (114). Words such as *magique*, *critique*, *magnifique* or *sympathique* are all kept in French, and emphasized as foreign with the use of italics. For an anglophone audience, these French words do not cause a difficulty in comprehension, given that they are all cognates—English words which have roots in the French language and therefore have a similar meaning. Avoiding confusion for the reader, Coverdale retains the melody through the repetitions of “*magique*/magnifique/sympathique,” “*magique*/critique, magnifique/sympathique” or with other words ending in “*ique*.” The translator’s deliberate decision to conserve the French in the English translation is a way to maintain Chamoiseau’s sound and sense.

If some English words find their etymology in the French language, many others do not, or are simply not obvious cognates for an anglophone audience. To preserve Chamoiseau’s voice and simultaneously clarify the text for the readers, Coverdale decides to pair the French and English language together: “The bones were found in the backwoods. *Vieux-nègres* very often come to show me *l’antan*, time gone-by. The *Marqueur de paroles*—Word Scratcher—is for them a guardian of the past” (113). In this one sentence, Coverdale retains three phrases from the French language in the English. The first term, *vieux-nègres*, is not translated into English since it does not hold an equivalent due to its deeper creole reference, a
difference we will explore in detail later in this article. The second and third group of words, the original French of *l’antan* and *Marqueur de paroles*, are included before immediately being glossed into English as “time gone by” and “Word Scratcher,” respectively. Both notions are references to Chamoiseau’s larger oeuvre as well as Cloverdale’s portfolio as a translator. The word *antan* evokes two of Chamoiseau’s other texts: *Antan d’enfance* (Childhood) and *Au temps de l’antan* (Creole Folktales). The *Marqueur de paroles* alludes to Glissant’s preface to Chamoiseau’s *Chronique des sept misères* in which he refers to Chamoiseau as the “Word scratcher.” The *Marqueur de paroles* eventually becomes a character in Chamoiseau’s texts, opening a discussion on the place of oral culture within literature. In leaving these French terms in the English version, Coverdale submerges the reader into Chamoiseau’s literary world and style.

The singularity of Chamoiseau’s writing also reflects the diglossia he experienced growing up in Martinique between Martinican Creole and French, which collide and collapse into one in his texts. In practical terms, Chamoiseau frequently employs creole words and sentence structures, audaciously blending them into the French language. Coverdale explains that “the majority of such Martinican Creole and creolized French words remain intact in the translation, either easily understood by context, or clarified by me with a descriptive word or two, or paired with the English meaning” (xii). On one occasion, when the protagonist, the old man, hits the mastiff, the antagonist chases after him as he escapes from the plantation. Here, Coverdale keeps the creole onomatopoeia intact because the context explains the word’s meaning: “And I struck. *Biwoua*. One-handed. *Biwoua*. With my fears, my hatreds, my rage and my longing to live. The mastiff howled like a Seven-headed Beast” (85). *Biwoua* conveys the sudden, loud noise. In another instance, when the mastiff searches around a tree for the old man to bite him, Coverdale chooses to provide the creole and its English equivalent: “Yes, it’s there on the other side of the trunk. Slinking slowly around it to break my *l’en-bas-butt*” (83). Similarly to Chamoiseau’s text for a French-speaking reader, Coverdale recreates the unsettling experience of reading creole words for an anglophone reader. This translation approach has two effects: first, it echoes Glissant’s claim for opacity, endorsed by Chamoiseau, in refusing the reductive

---

2 Interestingly, the word *antan* ‘the old days’ appears in the French original of these two texts, but both English translations choose to omit it in their titles.

3 Chamoiseau, along with Barnabé and Confiant, explain the difficulties in asserting their writing creolizes French and Frenchifies Creole: “Ce ne sera pas forcément du français créolisé ou réinventé, du créole francisé ou réinventé, mais notre parole retrouvée et finalement décidée. Notre singularité exposée—explodée dans l’Être” (Élodge 46) “it won’t be necessarily a Creolized or reinvented French, nor a Frenchized or reinvented Creole, but our own finally recovered and decisive language. Our singularity exposed-exploded in language until it takes shape into Being” (Taleb-Khyar 109).
transparency of translating each word; second, it positions the text within a place and a culture through language.\(^4\)

Through these translation choices, Coverdale presents the historical duality and subtlety between the French and Creole languages in Martinique. French, the language of the colonial masters, is “a weapon of control” while Creole, born out of the multiplicity of cultures displaced on the plantation, embodied a “weapon against the oppressor” (Slave Old Man xi). To keep Martinican Creole words in the English translation is a way to express that power relations lie in the choice of language. For example, Coverdale decides to keep both the words nègre in French and neg in Creole. Interestingly, and although they share common roots, the word takes a different meaning depending on the language. In French, the word nègre is a colonial and racial insult toward a Black person.\(^5\) When the master says “That dog was a Beast-of-war. And slaughter. It was used to the ways of these nègres,” the term takes on a pejorative meaning dehumanizing the enslaved Black person and reinforcing a racial hierarchy through language (105). In Martinican Creole, as Coverdale clarifies in her translator’s note, the word “neg,” along with designating a Black man, also “both means ‘man’ and ‘people’” (xii). In Creole, the racial slur dissipates and (re-)instills humanity in the enslaved person. In the text, when he fears the mastiff is close on his tracks, the old man internally talks to himself to remain calm: “I had to stay like that. Pas bouger, mon nègre: stock-still, my man.” The French word nègre, in this case, takes on the meaning of the Creole word neg, man. Replicating one of the poetic gestures of the Négritude movement of Aimé Césaire, Léon-Gontran Damas, and Léopold Sédar Senghor, the Creole language reappropriates the French word nègre, turning a derogatory connotation into an empowering one.\(^6\) When the master dehumanizes in French, the enslaved person reclaims and resists in Creole. Coverdale’s choice to keep both words in French, including one word in its creolized form, reveals the power dynamics between the old man and the ‘master.’

Chamoiseau’s original language intentionally acknowledges and pushes these very linguistic boundaries. If Chamoiseau’s French is not considered ‘standard’ due to the insertion of Martinican Creole language and culture, the author also purposely plays with the French language in other ways. Coverdale indicates that “his syntax, lexicon, and punctuation (or lack thereof) can even be technically

\(^4\) Opacity refers to the right to claim difference, or to not be understood. Glissant opposes it to transparency, which reduces and normalizes singularities. See “Transparency et Opacity” (111-120) and “For Opacity” (189-194) in Poetics of Relation.

\(^5\) For more on the translation(s) of the word “nègre” see Laurent Dubois, “Translator’s Introduction” and Grégory Pierrot, “Nègre (Noir, Black, Renoi, Négro).”

\(^6\) Négritude was an aesthetic literary movement of French-speaking Black intellectuals that emerged in the 1930s, valorizing Blackness and rejecting the cultural assimilation enforced by colonization. See Abiola Irele, “Negritude or Black Cultural Nationalism” and “What is Négritude?”
incorrect in French but must be respected—in this disrespect—by the English” (xiv). Chamoiseau’s writing dismantles the French language, and Coverdale replicates this act of subversion in the translation. Such examples include the creation of neologisms such as “un manman-trou” ‘a manman-big hole’ or “He kept his eyelids serrées-clouées: nailed-tight-shut” (Chamoiseau, 85; Coverdale 62, 65).

In addition to the development of a new vocabulary, Chamoiseau grammatically transforms the French language, such as: “L’hors-parole, l’en-deçà de l’écrire du chant et du crié” which becomes ‘The beyond-words and the beyond-reach-of-writing of song and of crying out’ (Chamoiseau 87, Chamoiseau-Coverdale 64). In this sentence, Chamoiseau switches “en-deçà de” from a prepositional phrase to a noun, a grammatical ‘error’ mimicked by Coverdale in her translation. Chamoiseau approaches the French language as though it were malleable; he expresses how language is not fixed and established, but instead how it is constantly changing and moving, which undermines the power and authority of the French language over other languages or dialects. In this way, Chamoiseau’s language mirrors the acts of his slave old man, who runs away from the plantation system to create alternative ways to live. As Coverdale justly puts it, “in this novel, language not only tells the story, it is the story” (our emphasis, xiv).

Chamoiseau’s linguistic subversion displays how his literature is filled with philosophical and historical meditations. His writing considers the Creole experience, tracing the fragments of the plantation system and the remnants of all the cultures that coalesce into the Creole culture of Martinique. The monumental range of his work leaves the reader before an extensive and profuse body of knowledge between poetry and politics. To help the reader grasp Chamoiseau’s broad insight, Coverdale adds an afterword and personal notes to the translation. The afterword contains four small parts offering a general introduction for a wide audience on the history of Martinique and Chamoiseau’s biography. In addition, Coverdale provides a more detailed analysis for a readership acquainted with Chamoiseau’s work regarding the influence of Glissant on Chamoiseau’s writing and the emergence of Chamoiseau’s literary voice. Coverdale also adds a notes section of Creole words and cultural aspects of the text, defining, for example, words such as bêtes-à-diable (a firebug) or bêtes-longues (a snake) or contextualizing the abolition of slavery in the Caribbean, the Trace, the maître-béké (a descendant of the early French white settlers) or marooning, to just name a few examples.

These rich additions detail Coverdale’s approach “to translating [that] has always been based on trying to make the English text reflect not just what the French says, but also what it means to native French-speakers” (Coverdale in P.T. Smith). Coverdale highlights the role of culture within language and asserts that the role of the translator is to supply clues that make the function and value of the text accessible. This rich translation which contains auxiliary information is what
Kwame Anthony Appiah calls “thick translation” (808-19). Appiah encourages the use of annotations or glosses to offer a rich cultural and linguistic context to the reader. Yet, Coverdale’s deliberate choice to enrich the text with supplemental interpretive tools such as explanations or annotations is also in direct contrast with Chamoiseau’s instructions to translators: “Je ne sacrifie pas à la transparence (ni glossaire, ni note de bas de page) qui à mon sens n’apporte rien du point de vue de l’esthétique littéraire” (Arsaye 479) ‘I do not surrender to transparency (no glossary or footnotes) that to me add no value to the viewpoint of literary aesthetics.’ If Coverdale is concerned with misinterpretations of Chamoiseau’s text by the reader, the Martinican author, by contrast, favors the freedom of the reader to interpret his text, regardless of potential (in)accuracy. Chamoiseau’s call for a richness of interpretations directly opposes Coverdale’s thick translation, a deep culturally annotated translation which may restrict the reader’s own interpretation.

The presence of an afterword and notes also displays the thorough research Coverdale undertook to complete the translation of Slave Old Man. As a non-native of the Caribbean, the translator had to find other ways than personal experience to access Chamoiseau’s story and intent. Coverdale’s experience as a reader and translator deeply informs her translations. To translate Slave Old Man, Coverdale relies on French Caribbean Creole Dictionaries, both digital and physical, the intertextual relationship between Chamoiseau and Glissant, and her experience translating other Caribbean writers such as Martinican writer Raphaël Confiant and Haitian authors Lyonel Trouillot and René Philoctète. Aside from textual resources, Coverdale mentions her travels to the French Caribbean to get a sense of place and to establish Martinican contacts, stressing the importance of lived experience as a part of translation. Although she did not contact the author for this particular work, Coverdale reveals she reached out to Chamoiseau while translating some of his other works like School Days (1996) and Chronicle of the Seven Sorrows (1999). The justification for the afterword and notes as well as her translation decisions to keep parts of Chamoiseau’s language may therefore reflect Coverdale’s personal journey in accessing a foreign world as an English reader and translator. Her sensitive translation resides within keeping the text ‘foreign’ while making it accessible to an anglophone reader. These behind-the-scenes strategies expose how the task of the translator is the outcome of critical linguistic and cultural interpretation. Coverdale states that “we mustn’t ‘copy’ the original but give our words a full-bodied life of their own. That life is our art, a re-creation, from melting down the French in our minds and recasting it in English” (Carol Translation). The act of translation is therefore to transmit the writer’s and the translator’s experiences in a new text.
Dash, Pineau, and the Poetics of the Original in *The Drifting of Spirits*

Speaking at a conference on translation in the Caribbean at the University of Miami in 1996, the late Trinidadian scholar and translator J. Michael Dash addresses the potential virtue for a slower process of translation. Dash explains that “[books] that are simultaneously translated,” like Glissant’s 1958 novel *La Lézarde*, “can have problems because usually the motive is commercial” (“Translating the Caribbean Text”). While the translator may work efficiently to produce a new version of the text, Dash argues that commercial translators may lack a deep understanding of the Caribbean literary landscape, and this might filter into the translation. Before becoming a published translator, Dash served as a consultant for the Caribbean Writers Series published by Heinemann (UK) and as an editorial board member for the CARAF (Caribbean and African Literature translated from French) series with the University of Virginia Press. It is not surprising, given his role as an academic and consultant, that Dash would look for translators to play an active role in shaping the canon of Caribbean literature in translation while simultaneously doing the work of translation.

As a translator himself, Dash wanted to push back against “parochial,” Victorian, and colonial British forms of writing that enter the Caribbean literary landscape, which he hoped to shape through translation (“Translating the Caribbean Text”). For Dash, this meant first selecting innovative texts like Glissant’s *La Lézarde* and Gisèle Pineau’s *La Grande drive des esprits* that challenged anglophone Caribbean aesthetic and linguistic boundaries. He also sought to incorporate his own voice as a Trinidadian into the translation so that the English version would have a life of its own and potentially lead to new readings of the text without sending the reader back to the original French to understand the significance of the work. In his afterword to *The Drifting of Spirits*, Dash explains that he aimed to channel Pineau’s “creative code-switching” and the “liveliness or bawdiness of Pineau’s linguistically inventive narrative” by using Caribbean vernacular in English to match its use in French (*The Drifting of Spirits* 240). He explains in “Translating the Caribbean Text” that not only did he use anglophone Caribbean words to convey the mode of storytelling Pineau achieves, but he also blended Jamaican and Trinidadian words and concepts to “translate the mode of signification,” or the poetics of *The Drifting of Spirits*. Dash goes on to refer to Walter Benjamin’s idea of the translator’s task, which “consists in this: to find the

---

7 *La Lézarde* was released in French in 1958 and the following year it was published in English, translated by Frances Frenaye, with the New York publisher G. Braziller. Dash produced a new translation, which appeared in 1985 in the United Kingdom with Heinemann in the Caribbean Writers Series.
intention toward the language into which the work is to be translated, on the basis of which an echo of the original can be awakened in it” (Benjamin 80). Dash also tells his audience that he aims to follow Glissant’s lead, which calls for the translator to “surprendre la poétique de la langue” “to sense the poetics of the original language.” In this way, Dash seeks to imbue the translation with anglophone Caribbean poetics in writing his own version of Pineau’s novel so that it would still be read and understood by English readers as a Caribbean novel. By exploring the lexical and stylistic choices Dash employs throughout his translation of The Drifting of Spirits, we can see how Dash remakes the novel in his own anglophone Caribbean voice.

One of the aspects of The Drifting of Spirits Dash finds most appealing is the way that the language throws the French reader off balance, how the use of neologisms and Guadeloupean Creole phrases and constructions create a sense of disorder for the reader, causing them to question the authority of the French language. Starting with the title in French, La Grande drive des esprits, Dash explains how the word “drive” comes from a Creole word meaning ‘wandering’ or ‘drifting.’ Though the word resembles the French word, “dérive,” “drive” and the adjectival form “drivé” are used throughout the Caribbean to pejoratively describe someone who is ‘wandering about’ or loitering. Even though Dash chooses to translate “drive” with ‘drifting,’ he explains how this translational choice reminded him of his mother, who often called him “too drivé” when he was either up to no good or ‘wandering about’ aimlessly.

Throughout the novel, Dash draws on his experiences growing up in Trinidad and living in Jamaica to destabilize the English reader. Dash plays with Guadeloupean Creole words in the French to create variants for words in English using a creolized poetics. For example, late in the novel as a character named Mona ponders whether to disclose to her son who his father is, she becomes so consumed by anxiety that she turns to the church for healing. In the French, Pineau writes “La fille ne fréquentait ni kakwé ni séancier ni gadèzafè, mais cette rage pérenne qui suintait en elle demandait guérison” (La Grande drive des esprits 197). French readers without any experience reading or studying Caribbean literature and with no knowledge of Guadeloupean Creole would be struck by the words “kakwé” and “gadèzafè,” and they pose challenges when translating the text. In Guadeloupe, “kakwé” refers to a person capable of healing or doling out curses; it can also be used as a noun to evoke spells or curses. In his translation of Maryse Condé’s

---

8 Our translation. The verb ‘surprendre’ also encompasses a wider meaning in French such as to ‘sneak upon’ or to ‘catch by surprise.’ If Dash offers Glissant’s original words, he does not, however, provide a reference in his talk. By the time of the conference, Dash had already translated La Lézarde (The Ripening) and Le Discours antillais (Caribbean Discourse, Essays) by Glissant. Glissant and Dash also exchanged many letters and phone conversations over the years, so it is possible the quotation was something shared between the two but never published.
Traversée de la mangrove, Crossing the Mangrove, Richard Philcox leaves kakwè intact in the text and uses a footnote to define its use as “spells” (Condé 119). However, in translating the passage from The Drifting of Spirits, Dash employs an innovative approach, substituting “kakwè” with “obeahman” in the English: “The girl did not visit obeahman nor sorcerer nor fixer-man, but this persistent fury that she exuded needed to be cured” (The Drifting of Spirits 202). Instead of electing to destabilize the anglophone reader with kakwè followed by a footnote, Dash chooses to translate the concept of the kakwè into an anglophone Caribbean reality.

As a spiritual practice, Obeah traces its roots back to sub-Saharan Africa and generally “consists of ritual practices and knowledge traditions having to do with healing and divination that involve supernatural powers” (Khan 2). At the same time, in a colonial British context, any and every sort of non-European religious practice or knowledge tradition in the Caribbean colonies came to be known under the general appellation of “Obeah.” Aisha Khan writes that enslaved Africans brought with them to the Americas “cosmologies, healing and divination traditions, and existential philosophies, which became congealed as ‘obeah’ under colonial regimes” (Khan 2). From the colonial period until today, Obeah and other Afro-diasporic religions possess an indexical quality brought about and sustained by the continued creolization of the region. Therefore, one way of reading Dash’s use of Obeah is that it embraces the creolizing, indexical function of language in the Caribbean. However, it is also clear that his translation filters a Guadeloupean reality through a Jamaican prism. In this way, Dash, too, runs the risk of over-generalizing spiritual practice in the Caribbean.

On the other hand, in translating “gadèzafè,” another word that refers to a spiritual healer and practitioner, Dash chooses a different strategy. The word in Creole can be seen as a combination of two words “gadè” ‘observer/keeper/watcher’ and “zafè” ‘affairs/business/personal matters,’ or someone who looks after others and their belongings. Rather than attempting to find a word suitable for this Guadeloupean reality in English or the anglophone Caribbean, Dash follows the poetics of Creole and invents his own word, “fixer-man,” that would be intelligible in English and fits within an anglophone tradition of creating neologisms. During his talk “Translating the Caribbean Text,” Dash explains that there are “grades of obeahmen” in Guadeloupe and that each rank performs a different function, just as there are different roles in Trinidadian and Jamaican spiritual practice. Dash is, admittedly, not a part of the spiritual community himself, but he draws on his experience growing up in Trinidad and living in Jamaica to invent the word “fixer-man,” referring to the person in Obeah who looks after other people’s affairs. Although the words are different, and religious practices in Jamaica, Trinidad, and Guadeloupe are not all the same, Dash’s approach to translating The Drifting of Spirits follows a Caribbean poetics of translation. By carefully inventing words and transposing Caribbean concepts
from one island to the next, Dash invites readers to immerse themselves in archipelagic, Pan-Caribbean texts and traditions through translation.

While Dash’s lexical choices certainly allow the reader to notice the translator’s presence in the novel, his use of anglophone Caribbean speech patterns throughout The Drifting of Spirits mirrors the poetics of the original. Some of the more ostentatious characteristics of Pineau’s novel are the oral components of the narration. La Grande drive des esprits shifts between the first and the third person, and often involves a breaking of the fourth wall when the narrator acknowledges the reader or the audience in the second person. In addition to these elements, nursery rhymes, hymns, and dialogue in Guadeloupean Creole interrupt the storytelling and introduce tunes and tones in intimate and (in)formal registers. Any one of these aspects would make for a difficult novel to translate, especially while establishing and maintaining a uniform poetics. In instances where Creole enters the narration, Dash employs a blend of Jamaican and Trinidadian English to translate the intimate, oral nature of speech. For example, when Agatha, Hector’s wife, talks with Ninette about her children, we can see how Dash handles the sudden shift in register between French and Guadeloupean Creole:

Pineau: Sé ti moun ! Yo pa biswen a yen dot ki manjé, kaka, pisé, domi! Ces enfants-là sont bien, Man Nine. Ne casse pas ton cœur pour eux ! (La Grande drive des esprits 105)

Dash: Is little pickney! Them don’t need anything but food, doodoo, weewee, sleepy! These children are OK, Ma Nine. Don’t worry yourself about them! (The Drifting of Spirits 103)

At the same time, in the paragraph that precedes Agatha’s intervention, Pineau uses four different words to mean children: “marmaille,” “bata-zendyen,” “ti moun,” and “enfants.” To translate these four words, Dash employs a combination of two words—“pickney” and “children”—which enable the reader to interpret a difference in the connotations of the words in Pineau’s original. Whenever Pineau uses a Creole term such as “bata-zendyen” (literally, ‘bastard Indian children’), “ti moun” (a neutral/standard term for children) or a French word hinting at condescension, Dash opts for the familiar, occasionally derisive term “pickney.” In the lines above, Dash also uses “them” as the subject and/or object pronoun in Agatha’s speech to mirror the familiarity of her tone in the original while also keeping a spoken Jamaican register. Here, Dash is clear and intentional in his attempt to convey the poetics of the original because, although “yo” in Creole translates to the subject “they,” it can also be the object pronoun “them” or the possessive adjective “their.” By leaning into the polysemic, creolized nature of language in the Caribbean as well as by drawing from his own lived experience,
Dash makes Agatha’s speech resemble that of a woman from Jamaica or Trinidad talking with one of her neighbors. While this mixture of Caribbean vernaculars might imply that the novel is now too far from the original context, it does carry through with Dash’s poetic intention of keeping the novel firmly located within the Caribbean, writ large.

In the closing moments of J. Michael Dash’s talk “Translating the Caribbean Text,” he resists the notion of authenticity, explaining that the translator translates into the voice they possess. This is particularly noteworthy since Dash appears to disagree with Elizabeth Wilson, who we discuss in the following section, who argues that the translator is beholden to the author’s original intent. For Dash, his translation of The Drifting of Spirits channels an anglophone Caribbean lexicon where Guadeloupean Creole speech appears in the novel, and he adapts Pineau’s language according to a Jamaican/Trinidadian process of creating neologisms. Critics of translations of Caribbean texts are sensitive to the type of praxis Dash employs. Marie-José Nzengou-Tayo and Elizabeth Wilson acknowledge the difficulty of translating the “polyphonic nature” of Caribbean texts, writing that “the existence of English-based Creole should be a boon for the translator,” helping them to “accept the opacity of the source text and to convey that opacity in the translation” (Nzengou-Tayo and Wilson 134). As we will see in our discussion of Elizabeth Wilson’s translations of Yanick Lahens, her critical analysis may not always align with her own translation strategies. Still, as Dash suggests, translators cannot translate Caribbean texts into languages to which they do not have access or of which they do not have a reasonable command. At the same time, when translators “seize the poetics of the language (of the original text)” as Glissant puts it, critics must be open to assessing the functions of the translation choices that are made as well as the results of those choices. For instance, when Dash opts to keep Caribbean speech patterns in the Caribbean, in addition to asking how this choice interpellates anglophone Caribbean readers, we must also wonder how these choices keep other readers at bay. Nzengou-Tayo and Wilson explain that the use of Jamaican Creole in the place of Haitian Creole can “help to create a bridge between the French-speaking republic and the (anglophone) CARICOM countries” (135). As Dash points out, this is one way to foster affinities between language traditions and contexts within the Caribbean and its diasporas—not every translator can translate in this way, and we should question whether such a uniform praxis would serve Caribbean literature and its reading publics in translation.

Wilson, Lahens, and the Negotiation of Caribbean Authenticity

The two previous sections on Dash and Coverdale’s approaches demonstrate how translators make use of paratexts—either in the form of afterwords or prefaces or academic talks—to shape the works’ global reception. In
the same vein, Elizabeth Wilson’s translation of Yanick Lahens’s short stories employs similar materials for readers to grasp the significance of Lahens’s collection. The translation features a foreword by Haitian-American writer Edwidge Danticat and an afterword by literary critic Marie-Agnès Sourieau. Danticat’s succinct foreword presents the value of the short story as a genre in the Haitian literary world, a short biography of Lahens, as well as an introduction to her short stories. Danticat also draws on a personal anecdote to recall some of Lahens’s words about how short stories are “like a photograph,” emphasizing the fleeting moments that characterize literature and photography (ii). In her afterword, Sourieau engages with similar themes to Danticat’s but proposes a deeper and lengthier critical analysis. Sourieau provides a detailed biography of Lahens before diving into the aesthetics of disaster in her work, the art of the short story—notably neglected by Haitian male writers—and finally Lahens’s narrative strategies in various short stories in the collection. Interestingly, and despite the critical interventions made by Danticat and Sourieau on Lahens and her work, the book does not carry a translator’s note, leaving the reader to wonder about the behind-the-scenes work undertaken by its translator, Elizabeth Wilson. Even though Wilson’s name appears on the cover of the book before Danticat’s, her reflections on the translation itself are limited to the occasional footnote. Was this a conscious decision by the translator or one made by the press and its editors? As a result, the two critical apparatuses are favored over the translator’s articulation of her translation strategies and choices with respect to Lahens’s language.

This relative invisibility of the translator’s work, besides the translation itself, calls for a discussion regarding the task of the translator. On one hand, Wilson’s absence can be interpreted as part of the lack of consideration given to the translator’s art, which might be simply seen as a job. On the other hand, the translator’s invisibility may be the product of a flawless translation that causes readers to willfully ignore that they have just read a translated text. In other words, as Lawrence Venuti points out, the quality of the translation is so competent and pleasant to read that the reader completely forgets the fact that it is a translation in the first place. However, if the translator’s sole presence cannot be felt in the translation itself, some readers may be curious as to why the translator chose to translate the text and how they managed to recreate it anew. Indeed, as Dash alludes to and Karen Emmerich argues in Literary Translations and the Making of

---

9 In “The Translator’s Invisibility,” Lawrence Venuti states that the translator’s invisibility is the result of the reader responding to “the translation of a foreign text […] as if the text had been originally written in their language, as if it were not in fact a translation” (179). Venuti also discusses how “a translation is judged acceptable (by editors, reviewers and readers) when it reads fluently, when the absence of any awkward phrasings, unidiomatic constructions or confused meanings gives the appearance that the translation reflects the foreign author's personality or intention or the essential meaning of the original text.” (179). On the translator’s visibility, see Heather Cleary.
Originals, all translations are originals and require distinct knowledge, a unique set of skills, and relevant personal experiences to translate a text (Emmerich 1-2). When the translator is not afforded the space to contextualize their translation, readers lose meaningful information that helps to place the translation in relation to the source text. So, without any paratextual space afforded to the translator, how does Elizabeth Wilson create space for herself to explore her translation practice? And how does she (re)present Haiti and Haitian culture in her choices?

While the translator’s commentary in Aunt Résia and Other Stories is limited, Wilson leaves evidence of her translation praxis in her own literary criticism. Most notably, in an article Wilson co-wrote with Marie-José Nzengou-Tayo she leaves clues about her perception of translating Caribbean writers of African descent. In “Translating the Other’s Voice: When Is Too Much Too Much,” the two Caribbean critics ask “how far a translator can/should go in making transparent or authentic the language of the text originally written in a multilingual context, but which, in giving voice to the Other, does not always use his or her native tongue” (Nzengou-Tayo and Wilson 128). To explore their question, they use the example of Carolyn Shread’s translation of Marie Chauvet’s Les Rapaces/The Raptors (1986/2008) where Shread chooses to replace French sentences with Haitian Creole in the English text (128). Nzengou-Tayo and Wilson consider Shread’s decision to interpret the “kreyòl liminal/liminal Haitian Creole” in Les Rapaces as excessive, writing that “[Chauvet’s] literary choices should be respected” before stating that “when the translator re-instates what s/he considers ‘authentic’ language, s/he betrays in fact the authors’ intention” (150). However, Shread has made it clear in various articles that the decision to include Haitian Creole in her unpublished manuscript was the product of revisions and conversations with individual bilingual English/Haitian Creole readers that led her to tap into the French text and reveal the Haitian Creole embedded beneath the surface. For example, one passage reads:


The Raptors: Chef yo pran pouwva: Rulers rise to power, explains toad-man (he’s a true orator who never misses the chance to give a speech), Chef yo pran pouwva: Rulers rise to power, then one fine day, crash! (The Raptors 9)

In the passage above, the French original carries with it repetitive qualities that the English replicates through Haitian Creole, accompanied by an English gloss. At the same time, the insertion of Haitian Creole in this moment and many others is one
specific interpretive layer of Shread’s translation. When speaking with a Haitian-American reader, Shread notes how the reader “m’a expliqué qu’en le lisant, elle entendait les voix kreyòles de son enfance” (“La Traduction métamorphique”) ‘explained to me that, in reading the novel, she heard the Haitian Creole voices of her childhood.’ Shread’s and Wilson and Nzengou-Tayo’s approaches to translation raise important questions about fidelity, authenticity, and the (in)stability of the original French.

The challenges of faithfulness and ethics come into play in Lahens’s Aunt Resia and the Spirits and Other Stories as well. In her afterword, Sourieau indicates how Lahens uses “hybrid stylistic techniques that produce tensions in the fabric of her narratives” (201). The innovative form of her writing gives the reader insight into the tragic dimension of her stories. This original writing style materializes through her “use of the present tense, her abrupt endings, the often elliptical turns of events within an atmosphere of cruelty, and her ‘clear-cut’ narrative technique,” allowing the reader to deeply grasp the tensions embedded within the social, economic, and political reality of Haiti. In “The Survivors,” Wilson replicates the different literary aspects of the French in her translation: “He had finally fallen. There was no longer any way to combat death. Instead of Etienne, all that remained was a parcel of bones, blood and flesh. Form. Nothing but matter right in the heart of the city” (39). The appearance of short sentences in the text denotes its orality as well as its brutality, what Sourieau calls an “aesthetics of disaster.”

Lahens transmits lived experience in Haiti through form in other ways. Her language embodies the multilingual complexity that characterizes the Caribbean by blending the French and Haitian Creole languages in her own writing. Nzengou-Tayo and Wilson point out that, even though her texts are written in standard French, Lahens “uses Haitian Creole words and calques as well as French orthography for creole words” (142). For example, instead of writing “dous” for sweets, the author adapts its spelling into French to become “douces” (Tante Résia 88). The original therefore says “Elle avait prévu pour les collations de l’après-midi toute une variété de ‘douces’: douce à la noix de coco, douce au lait” (Tante Résia 88). Lahens signals the singularity of the word by adding quotation marks around ‘douces,’ indicating that it is borrowed from Haitian Creole and might not be understood in French. In her translation, Wilson gives the Haitian Creole word followed by the English: “She had planned for the afternoon refreshment a whole variety of ‘dous:’ sweets made with coconut, or with milk” (Aunt Résia 58). The translation offers a compromise between foreignness and clarity to her reader by adopting both words.

With respect to ‘fidelity’ as closeness, Wilson creolizes and retains the form of Lahens’s original text. For example, Lahens gallicizes the spelling of Haitian Creole words, and she also transposes Haitian idioms into French. In the short story “Mort en juillet?/”Death in July,” Lahens writes that “Lazarre Chenon arriva tout
Wilson explains that “sa maison à chambre haute” comes from a Haitian expression “Kay chanmòt” (145). This sentence exemplifies how Lahens coalesces the French literary and Haitian oral traditions by combining the French literary passé simple tense with a creole-derived spoken idiom. In Wilson’s translation, “sa maison à chambre haute” is translated into “his one-story house” (Aunt Résia 3). In the article, Nzengou-Tayo and Wilson rectify the translation, stating that “in fact, it should be translated as two-story house” (145). Nzengou-Tago and Wilson also disclose that another possibility arises in Jamaican creolized English with “‘upstairs-house’ but the translator [Wilson] chose to keep it in standard American English” (145). If Wilson does not elaborate on her decision here, the preference for “one-story house” (or two-story house if translated literally) shows how the translator privileges the idea of universal clarity over cultural specificity. Rather than rooting the word within a Caribbean context as Dash did with Trinidadian or Jamaican vernacular and foreignizing the translation for the reader, Wilson may have considered ‘upstairs-house’ to be less meaningful for a general anglophone reader. This decision may be surprising at first, given the fact that Wilson is Jamaican. Therefore, avoiding Jamaican Patwa or a Jamaican spoken register in her translation appears to be a conscious and deliberate choice made by the translator and not due to any linguistic limitations. Wilson appears to favor accessibility, placing Lahens’s stories into a neutral North American English register.

While Wilson opts to avoid an anglophone Caribbean register, her translations still engage with the Caribbean through Haitian religious culture. In French, the title of the book is Tante Résia et les dieux: Nouvelles d’Haiti and the English version proposes Aunt Résia and the Spirits and Other Stories. Here, the main distinction between the two revolves around the word dieux/God in French and spirit in English. In Haiti, God is called Bondye and the lwa are the Vodou spirits that play a role in everyday life. There is only one God but there are hundreds of lwa. Wilson interprets dieux in the French title as divinities, and therefore favors the word “spirits.” Changing the words to spirits also allows Wilson to contextualize the text within the Vodou religion of the Afro-Caribbean diaspora beginning with the title. The lwa are indeed central to the short stories, too. In her co-authored article, Wilson recounts the difficulties in translating this word due to spelling inconsistencies in the original text. Sometimes, Lahens uses the French spelling loa, other times the Haitian Creole spelling, lwa. Wilson also transposes other words, such as pwèn ‘magical power or ability,’ taso kabrit ‘goat jerky,’ mòn ‘mountain or hill,’ tap tap ‘local public transportation in Haiti,’ into Creole in the translation while Lahens had used French orthography. This choice may seem surprising at first given the fact that Wilson criticizes Shread for implementing a
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10 The English translation also includes stories from two other collections by Lahens, La Petite Corruption and La Folie était venue avec la pluie, which explains the latter portion of the title.
similar strategy in her translation of *Les Rapaces*. Yet, a slight distinction between the two translators emerges. On the one hand, Shread chooses to switch languages replacing “key moments in the English text with Haitian Creole,” that is to say French sentences that are translated into English *and* Creole, rather than just English (99). On the other hand, Wilson simply creolizes Haitian words that were originally gallicized by Lahens, the author. In their own way, both translators draw Haitian readers into the texts and create a sense of (af)filiation with the Haitian language, whether this is by Haitianizing Creole words or by interpreting the French original as a “Haitian French” in order to sound the depths of a text that contains particularities germane to Haitian speech.\(^{11}\)

Wilson’s decision to insert some Haitian Creole words also sheds light on how editors shape translations. As she explains in the article, the series editor strongly encouraged Wilson to use standard Haitian Creole orthography in *Aunt Résia* rather than gallicized versions of the words. As a result, Wilson employs linguistic transposition to immerse the reader in a Caribbean literary world by making Lahens’ orthography consistent across the entire collection. Yet, even still, Wilson laments that “reinstating an ‘authentic’ phonetic Haitian Creole spelling where Lahens has chosen to use Standard French may simply serve to further inhibit the reader’s ability to enter into the world of text” (150). In effect, Wilson is deeply concerned with the reader’s perception of the Caribbean, its idioms, and its deities, all of which impact her translation strategies. Although they are not explicitly discussed in a translator’s note, they are nonetheless visible in her translations and her criticism.

Remembering the Past, Looking to the Future of Caribbean Literature in Translation

Translating the cultural and linguistic multiplicity of the Caribbean is a complicated matter. Just as there is no one singular reading sensibility, there is no uniform method for translating Caribbean literature. Instead, translators rely on a matrix of personal, textual, and theoretical influences to translate francophone Caribbean texts that represent and recreate the cultural and linguistic feel of the text anew in English. And, as we have shown, translators of Caribbean literature do not always agree on translation methods with respect to vernaculars, the relationship

\(^{11}\) In an interview with Lauren Cocking on *Leyendo Lat Am*, Kaiama L. Glover discusses her forthcoming translation of Yanick Lahens’s novel *Douces déroutes*, where Lahens writes in what Glover calls “Haitian French.” Glover says: “I would still insist, though, that Haitian French is Haitian French. It has a syntactical, lexical, and melodic particularity to it.”
between the original and the translation, or the use of paratexts in the production of translations.

As a lifelong reader and translator of Patrick Chamoiseau, we can see how Linda Coverdale draws on an intertextual relationship between herself and Chamoiseau (as well as Chamoiseau’s intertextual relationship with Édouard Glissant) to recreate the Martinican author’s poetic gestures in English. For Coverdale, this means treating the interplay between English and Martinican Creole the same way that Chamoiseau does with the interplay between French and Creole. In her translation of *Slave Old Man*, Coverdale crafts neologisms, favors a creolized poetics, and harnesses the onomatopoetic flair of the original. Like Coverdale, Dash endeavors to reproduce the feel of the original while allowing his own anglophone Caribbean voice to emerge in the translation. To achieve these goals, Dash pushes back against the French and Guadeloupean Creole to make space for anglophone Caribbean vernaculars and lexicons. Rather than remove the novel from a Caribbean (linguistic) space and potentially pathologizing the Afro-diasporic religious context of the novel, Dash re-locates Pineau’s spiritual lexicon within Trinidadian and Jamaican contexts. Though this technique makes sense to Dash, Elizabeth Wilson is hesitant to leave such a heavy imprint in her translations of Yanick Lahens. Instead, Wilson attempts to mirror Lahens’s language and syntax as closely as possible, to the point where her voice as a translator might feel imperceptible.

Though the three translators we have examined demonstrate divergent philosophies and approaches to the translation of Caribbean literature, they all share in the work of translating Afro-Caribbean culture and language for an anglophone readership. To the best of their abilities, they find the opportunity to reflect on their practices and approaches, which we believe proves useful for forming the next generation of Caribbean and Caribbeanist translators. We find that it is more important than ever to draw attention to the translators themselves to understand how one’s personal and professional lives impact their work in translation. As we have demonstrated, this work entails not only assembling a critical corpus to analyze the work of translation, but also assembling a body of interviews, paratexts, and presentations that enable the translators to speak for and to their craft.
Works Cited


Lahens, Yanick. *Aunt Rézia and the Spirits and Other Stories*. Translated by Elizabeth Wilson, University of Virginia Press, 2010.


