The Missionary Translator:

Expanding notions of translation through the colonial mission practices of the SMEP Basutoland and Barotseland missions (1857-1904)

Thesis presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

By Esther Ruth Liu

December 2016
Declaration

DECLARATION
This work has not been submitted in substance for any other degree or award at this or any other university or place of learning, nor is being submitted concurrently in candidature for any degree or other award.

Signed ………………………………………(candidate)     Date …………………………………

STATEMENT 1
This thesis is being submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of PhD

Signed ………………………………………(candidate)     Date …………………………………

STATEMENT 2
This thesis is the result of my own independent work/investigation, except where otherwise stated, and the thesis has not been edited by a third party beyond what is permitted by Cardiff University’s Policy on the Use of Third Party Editors by Research Degree Students. Other sources are acknowledged by explicit references. The views expressed are my own.

Signed ………………………………………(candidate)     Date …………………………………

STATEMENT 3
I hereby give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available online in the University’s Open Access repository and for inter-library loan, and for the title and summary to be made available to outside organisations.

Signed…………………………………………(candidate)     Date …………………………………

STATEMENT 4: PREVIOUSLY APPROVED BAR ON ACCESS
I hereby give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available online in the University’s Open Access repository and for inter-library loans after expiry of a bar on access previously approved by the Academic Standards & Quality Committee.

Signed…………………………………………(candidate)     Date …………………………………
Acknowledgements

I am so very grateful for my supervisors, for their time and energy over the last three years. Prof Loredana Polezzi came onto the project relatively late, but was a great help and a fresh perspective at just the right time. Dr Kate Griffiths was such an encouragement at the start, and continues to be a precious pastoral support when my brain feels like it might explode. Prof Rachael Langford has given me so much of herself, even during my undergrad, and I am so very thankful for her guidance – academic and otherwise. Dr Cristina Marinetti also played an important role in this whole thing, since it was her idea that I should do a PhD. I appreciate her proofreading my proposal(s) and just for that initial, unexpected suggestion. I count it a great privilege to have been able to spend time with and glean insights from these four women.

Thanks must go to the President’s Research Scholarship who part-funded this project. I wasn’t required to submit reports or updates, but please know that I valued the funding and tried to take full advantage of this overwhelming opportunity.

I am also thankful to Claire-Lise Lombard, archivist at Défap who opened the archive for me on at least one occasion, and whose help in deciphering François Coillard’s beautiful but sometimes illegible handwriting was invaluable. Through this connection too, I was able to obtain Emilie Gangnat’s doctoral thesis from the generous author herself, a piece of work inexpressibly foundational to chapter 4’s thoughts.

My gratitude spills over when I think of all the friends who have been there asking me ‘so what is it that you’re doing again?’ Office friends at MLANG have been such support and have let me bounce ideas around: Estella, Lea, Nada, Simon, Kristine. Mirona, every minute we spend together is good for me. Ayshka, I know I tell you too often, but how very grateful I am for you arriving in my office one day.

My family. Dad, I love that you’ve become obsessed by the Coillards and the photographs in particular. Mum, thank you for encouraging me to look after myself amongst the craziness. Pete and Rach, you ground me and make me laugh. Thank you wonderful Locks. And thank you too, to my in-laws, for so much love and copious amounts of orange polenta cake. Keep it coming.

My Sam. This is all your doing. You know how much I love you for it.

Above all, thank you to the ultimate Translator who made me and loves me.

‘May I never boast except in the cross of my Lord Jesus Christ, through which the world has been crucified to me, and I to the world’.
Summary

In this thesis the figure of the colonial Christian missionary is put forward as a translator - in terms of both interlingual translation (translation proper) and a more metaphorical and intercultural translation process (mission-translation). It takes the example of SMEP (Société des Missions Évangéliques de Paris) missionary, François Coillard (1834-1904), his wife, Christina, and indigenous missionaries such as Asser Sehahabane and Aaron Mayoro, and posits these historical individuals and their translation practices as sources which shed new light on current understandings of the nature of translation and the ontology of the translator. Through the discussion of the famous French protestant missionary, it deconstructs the (in)visibility binary in translation studies as well as the singularity of the translator, and puts forward a spectral collaborative translator-presence. From this point on, the thesis demonstrates that translation proper is an incarnational, bodily act which goes far beyond ink on a page. As it considers François’ wife, Christina Coillard née Mackintosh, and other female missionaries, it re-evaluates the site of the domestic as vital in translation, posits hospitality as a multidirectional facet of translation, and completion as the goal of translation. Indigenous missionary involvement then reveals translation to be made up of relationships of trust and of multiple movements. And Coillard’s photographs, seen as and in translation, demonstrate the many layers of context and significance at work in translation. Whilst colonial missionaries are overlooked translator-figures in studies of missiology, colonial history, and translation, in this thesis, a closer look at mission-translation reveals that these individuals are significant sources for the expansion of notions of both mission and translation.
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Glossary of Terms and People

List of Common Terms

Banyai The name of the people inhabiting a region of Mashonaland

Barotse The name of the people inhabiting the region of the Upper Zambezi in southern Africa, and of the language spoken by them. Barotse represents the Basuto pronunciation of the name, now replaced in local official usage by Balozi, the language being called Silozi

Barotseland Now a western region of Zambia, also spelt Barotsiland

Basuto Someone from Basutoland (now Lesotho), or adjective relating to this people, also spelt Basotho and Basouto

Basutoland Made a British Protectorate in 1868, now known as Lesotho

Bechuanaland Now Botswana

BSAC British South Africa Company

JME Journal des Missions Evangéliques, Mission journal of SMEP (also JDME elsewhere)

LMS The London Missionary Society

Mashonaland Now a north-eastern region of Zimbabwe

Sesuto The name given to the language spoken in Basutoland by the Basuto people, also spelt Sesotho and Sesutu

SMEP La Société des Missions Evangéliques de Paris (Paris Evangelical Mission Society)

---


2 ‘A member of a Bantu people of central southern Africa; (subsequently) a citizen or inhabitant of Lesotho (formerly Basutoland), ‘of, relating to, or designating this people; (also) native to Lesotho’, ‘Basotho, N. and Adj.’, Oxford English Dictionary Online (Oxford University Press, 2016) <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/207005#eid17393769> [accessed 22 August 2016].

3 Called, ba-Souto by François Coillard, Haut-Zambèze (1899), p. viii.

List of People

Aaron Mayoro  Member of the Barotseland mission
Akufuna (Tatira)  King of Barotseland (ruled 1884-1885)
Asser Sehahabane  Member of the Barotseland mission
Boegner, Alfred  Director of SMEP (served 1882-1912)
Coillard, Christina  Née Mackintosh, wife of François, member of the Barotseland mission
Coillard, Elise  Niece of François and Christina, member of the Barotseland mission, married Dorwald Jeanmairet 1885
Coillard, François  SMEP missionary (served 1857-1904), husband of Christina, member of the Barotseland mission
Christol, Frédéric  SMEP missionary (served 1882-1908), signed up to Barotseland mission but remained in Bethesda, Basutoland
Jalla, Adolphe  SMEP missionary (served 1889-1946), stationed at Sefula, Barotseland
Jacottet, Edouard  SMEP missionary (served 1884-1920), stationed at Thaba Bossiou, Basutoland
Jeanmairet, Dorwald  SMEP missionary (served 1883-1924), member of the Barotseland mission, married Elise Coillard 1885, later stationed at Bérée, Basutoland
Khama III (Khama)  Ruler of Bechuanaland (ruled 1872-1873, 1975-1923), baptised 1860
Lewanika, Lubosi  Ruler of Barotseland (ruled 1878-1884, 1885-1916)
Litia (Yeta III)  Son of Lewanika, ruler of Barotseland (ruled 1916-1945)
Lobengula  King of Matabeleland and Mashonaland (ruled 1869-1894)
Masonda  Vassal of Lobengula
Molapo  Son of Moshesh, and ruler of the Leribe district of Basutoland
Moshesh  (also, Moshoeshoe) Ruler of Basutoland (ruled 1822-1870, succeeded by his son, Letsie)
Villéger, François  SMEP missionary (1869-1895), stationed in Senegal, then Tahiti
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Introduction

We embark on this thesis with a small group of foreign and indigenous missionaries journeying north through Africa at the end of the nineteenth century. In 1877, the Frenchman François Coillard, his Scottish wife Christina Coillard, Basuto evangelists Asser Sehahabane, Aaron Mayoro and others, loaded up wagons and cattle, and travelled from Basutoland (what is now Lesotho) to Barotseland (now a western region of Zambia), in order to establish a protestant mission station amongst the unevangelised Barotse people.¹ This thesis will discuss these European and African colonial missionaries as translators, not only interlingual translators of the Bible text, but intercultural translators of Christianity.² It will examine what I will define and call their mission-translations alongside theories of translation proper, and consider the insights that they provide for a greater understanding of the colonial moment and the history of mission, and for the conceptualisation of the ontology of the translator and the nature of translation. We will see that there is more to missionary-translation than Bible translation.

This introduction will firstly define the terms which will be vital in the analysis of the missionary work and its application to translation theory: mission-translation and translation proper. Following this, I will situate the project and its research questions within the current academic discussions of mission and translation. I will subsequently provide a brief methodology regarding how this thesis seeks to answer these questions, and, before concluding with a chapter overview, I will focus on the specific aspects of the missionary case study - why colonial mission? Why French colonial mission? Why protestant French colonial mission? Why the particular case study of the Société des Missions Évangéliques de Paris (SMEP) and François Coillard?

¹ As will be explained in the methodology section of this chapter, this thesis will refer to these places as Basutoland and Barotseland respectively, because the majority of the thesis is in English, and because the historical context of the content is mainly 1857-1904.
² When I refer to colonial missionaries and colonial missions, I use ‘colonial’ to mean those missionaries and missions working during the colonial period, rather than acting as agents with the national agenda of colonial state expansion.
Defining Translation

We cannot go any further without defining two terms which will be used repeatedly throughout the thesis to describe two interrelated translation processes: ‘translation proper’ and ‘mission-translation’.

‘Translation proper’ (and ‘translator proper’ to describe the one doing this work) will be used to signify practices of interlingual and intertextual translation, as Roman Jakobson employed the expression. For example, translation proper denotes the translation of the Bible from Hebrew and Greek into Sesuto. It is not an unproblematic term, as Theo Hermans (amongst others) has pointed out, due to its implication that other forms of translation are not ‘proper’, and not ‘“properly” translation’. However, it is a helpful term - and a recognisable one in Translation Studies - when attempting to define the commonly perceived action of translating a written text from one language to another. Furthermore, it is a useful term in contrast to the more metaphorical concept of ‘mission-translation’.

Secondly then, ‘mission-translation’ (and ‘missionary-translator’ to refer to the one doing this work) will be used to denote the multiple forms of translation occurring in the missionary context with the aim of communicating and transferring Christianity and its effects over geographical, linguistic, and spiritual boundaries. When previously used, similar phrases have signified the translation proper of the Bible occurring in mission contexts. Lamin Sanneh repeatedly uses the phrase, ‘mission as translation’, in his publications to demonstrate the centrality of translation proper in mission practice, and Hephzibah Israel uses similar language to discuss the ‘language choices

---


made to translate Protestant Christianity in colonial South India’, again referring to translation proper. However, this thesis uses ‘mission-translation’ with a much broader scope, binding mission and translation with a hyphen, bringing them closer together. I use the term to refer to a wider activity taking place within the goal of translating Christianity than just the translation proper of the Bible or of written Christian texts. Mission itself has been described as ‘the effort to effect passage over the boundary between faith in Jesus Christ and its absence’, and a process wherein ‘a religion is translated from one cultural context to another’. Mission’s aim is conversion, and thus the translation of faith into lives. It is a textual transfer, but also a cultural transfer of ‘religious codes’, values, beliefs, and the translation of a worldview. Therefore, as well as Bible translation, this thesis considers mission-translation as, amongst other things, teaching, preaching, communication of Christian values and beliefs, hospitality, and even photography. More than this, just as Hephzibah Israel discusses what she calls ‘lived Christianity’ in Religious Transactions; mission-translation involves the life and body of the missionary. Therefore, whilst mission-translation does include translation proper, its scope is far broader than only intertextual and interlingual transfer.

I am aware of the danger of the metaphorical use of translation ‘justify[ing] a non-arbitrary use of the word for processes and instances of understanding and interpretation; for cultural, textual, psychological, bodily and artistic communication or language in general’. However, like Dilek Dizdar, I would like to keep ‘the tension between translation proper and other translations’, precisely in order to analyse the

---

10 William Frawley writes of ‘translation as recodification’, and states, ‘We can talk of the translation of one culture’s religious codes into those of another, as say, missionaries are forced to do’, William Frawley, ‘Prolegomenon to a Theory of Translation’, in The Translation Studies Reader, ed. by Lawrence Venuti (London; New York: Routledge, 2000), pp. 250–63 (p. 251).
‘interrelations’ between them.\textsuperscript{13} Translation proper has been used as a reaction against the over use of translation as a metaphor in the humanities,\textsuperscript{14} but the intertextual action of translation and its metaphorical scope are not so distinguishable. This thesis will demonstrate that these two terms, mission-translation and translation proper, relate to each other and therefore can be used to re-evaluate each other, and that both can be identified within an overarching understanding of ‘translation’.

\textit{Mission and Translation}

Translation is an important feature of mission. Ever since ‘the Word became flesh and made his dwelling among us’, the spread of Christianity has necessarily implied, and thus become entangled with, translation practice and theory.\textsuperscript{15} As Andrew Walls writes in his chapter on ‘The Translation Principle in Christian History’, the incarnation of Christ is an act of divine translation that legitimises and commissions further Christian acts of translation: ‘There is a history of translation of the Bible because there was a translation of the Word into flesh’.\textsuperscript{16} The inspiration for the translation conducted in mission thus comes from the divine translation at the heart of its message. The connection between the fervour for translation and Christian mission has been seen through history. In the introduction to \textit{Translating Religion: What is Lost and Gained?}, Michael P. Dejonge and Christiane Tietz claim, ‘Historically, the strongest impetus for translation has been explicitly religious, stemming from the Christian missionary imperative’.\textsuperscript{17} Mission has often therefore been the motivation for translation proper. Indeed, Dejonge and Tietz write, ‘Christians have generally adopted the strategy of “mission by translation”’,\textsuperscript{18} and, similarly, in \textit{Translating the Message: Missionary Impact on Culture}, a book described as ‘one of the most illuminating treatises on the

\textsuperscript{13} Dizdar, p. 90.
\textsuperscript{14} See Dizdar.
\textsuperscript{15} John 1.14, New International Version. All further references are to this version unless stated.
significance of missionary translation’, Lamin Sanneh asserts ‘mission has come pre-
eminently to mean translation’. The spread of Christianity has therefore been
equated to translation practice, and missionaries have been identified as agents of
translation proper. Even now, the missionary task of Bible translation remains the
‘largest translation project in history’, with the goal of a translation in every language.
Translation is a key element of Christian mission, and this dependency is mutual as
missionary practices of translation proper have had a significant role in the history of
translation.

The ‘missionary imperative’ to translate the Bible has formed an important part
of the construction of translation theory. In After Babel, George Steiner writes, ‘In
the history and theory of literature [,] translation […] has figured marginally, if at all.
The exception is the study of the transmission and interpretation of the Biblical
canon.’ He argues that the translation of the text of the Bible drew attention to
translation theory and practice. Furthermore, Hephzibah Israel asserts that ‘[s]ince the
Bible has almost always been read in translation, Bible translation has contributed
substantially to Western theories of translation from the beginning’. Indeed, core
texts in Translation Studies list Bible translators and theologians such as Augustine, St.
Jerome, Martin Luther, and Friedrich Schleiermacher, as foundational figures with
foundational principles, and theorists such as Eugene Nida, Jacobus Naudé, and
Christiane Nord use the text and translation of the Bible in the construction of their
theories. Moreover, in Contemporary Translation Theories, Edwin Gentzler writes:

---

20 Sanneh, Translating the Message, p. 8.
23 Steiner, p. 284.
24 Israel, Religious Transactions, p. 5.
Bible translating has generated more data in more languages than any other translation practice: it enjoys a longer history, has reached more people in more diverse cultures, and has involved more translators from different backgrounds than any other translation practice. In generic terms as well, Bible translating has touched all fields for within the text one finds passages of poetry and prose, narrative and dialogue, parables and laws. The sheer quantity of examples and breadth of scope have made Bible translation a necessary part of any study on the theory of translation.27

Even in a book about ‘contemporary’ theories, Gentzler recognises that the missionary task of the translation of the Bible through history offers much diversity to Translation Studies. So then, translation and the propagation of Christianity are closely linked, each resting on the other. This thesis will build on this interrelation, but will argue for the application of translation theory to missionary work where it has been neglected, and the usefulness of missionaries in developing notions of translation where they have been marginalised.

Although it is intimately linked to translation, the study of mission is lacking in theoretical approaches to translation. Translation theory makes some appearances in Mission Studies publications. William Smalley, in Translation as Mission: Bible Translation in the Modern Missionary Movement, includes theories of equivalence, discusses Nida, and posits that translation is essential to the very nature of Christianity.28 Furthermore, the work of Lamin Sanneh, one of the most prolific scholars on this subject, promotes Christianity as being a ‘translatable’ religion.29 However, despite these authors positing the significance of translation and theories of translatability in Mission Studies, according to Alan Williams, in New Approaches to the Study of Religion, ‘Little has been written by religionists [...] on the theoretical issues in the translation of texts’.30 As he points out, ‘religionists [...] do not speak about “translation” as an abstract subject, but rather as referring to their actual pieces of

29 ‘Translatability’, in Sanneh, Translating the Message, pp. 7, 8, 11, 56, 244, 247.
Even in the regular publication of *Missionary Linguistics* conference papers, which promotes the interdisciplinary dialogue between studies of mission and language (with topics ranging from phonology to syntax to lexicography), the missionary remains a figure of translation proper. In the 2014 volume, entitled ‘Translation Theories and Practices’, Otto Zwartjes discusses ‘the missionaries’ contribution to translation studies’ in regards to ‘the mise en page of translated texts’, Victoria Ríos Castaño considers ‘translation purposes’ and ‘target audiences’, and Cristina Muru explores ‘the impact of missionary translations in Southern India’. And yet, as Mission Studies and Translation Studies overlap in scholarship, the metaphorical scope of translation is left well alone by missiologists.

Likewise, although Bible translation plays a significant part in the study of translation history and the construction of translation theory, missionaries are noticeably absent in much of Translation Studies. As Zwartjes writes, ‘The contribution of missionaries in the colonial period to translation studies has been generally neglected in handbooks on Western translation theory’. There are some exceptions to this generalisation: Derek Peterson studies missionary dictionaries in twentieth-century Gikuyuland, and proposes mission texts as ‘fundamentally dialogical’; Vicente Rafael’s *Contracting Colonialism* considers the case of colonial Spanish priests in the Philippines from the late sixteenth century to the early eighteenth century, and asserts that translation is ‘yoked’ to both evangelisation and colonisation; and the research of Hephzibah Israel (for example, *Religious Transactions*) focusses on the translation proper of Protestant missionaries in Colonial South India, exploring the choices of

---

31 Williams, II, p. 32.
33 Zwartjes, p. 2.
terminology, negotiation of scriptural traditions, and indigenous counter-translation strategies. However, other than this, missionaries are only found in brief mentions of negotiations of translating ‘God’, and fleeting references to colonialism and Bible translation in Translation Studies readers. When the missionary-translator does appear in Translation Studies, he is a figure of translation proper, a translator of the Bible, and a negotiator of language alone. One partial exception to this is the work of Probal Dasgupta which employs missionaries as metaphors for those translation theorists who ‘expect their theories to cover the entire planet’. Dasgupta writes that ‘[t]he missionaries of a translation model or translation theory show you how to redo your first drafts along the lines they regard as perfect’, so for Dasgupta, many theorists would be missionaries of their theories. Furthermore, in her work, Israel highlights how the translation of the Bible is not only a textual transfer, but a cultural one. However, although Israel does discuss the ‘missionary translator’, her focus is, again, on the translation proper of the text of the Bible.

In contrast to the focus on the missionary as undertaking translation proper in both Translation Studies and Mission Studies, through mission-translation, this thesis defines the translation of Christianity undertaken by Christian missionaries as reaching

36 Israel, Religious Transactions; Israel, ‘Translating the Sacred’.
40 Dasgupta, p. 59.
41 Israel, ‘Translating the Sacred’, p. 566.
further than ink on a page and further than an interlingual process. Of course, colonial mission was a thoroughly multilingual environment and the case study in this thesis was no exception. In the marriage at the heart of this project, French and English was spoken, and the missionaries learnt the Sesuto language of their new home and the Zulu language of their exile. However, whilst acknowledging the translation proper as that which motivated Protestant colonial mission, this thesis seeks to purposefully move away from the reductive view that missionaries only engaged in interlingual and intertextual translations of the Bible and instead proposes that the missionary is far more useful for academic study than only as a negotiator of non-equivalent linguistic signs. It aims to do this by placing the work and lives of colonial missionary-translators alongside current theories and common perceptions of translation. Hephzibah Israel writes *Religious Transactions* with the purpose of ‘Rescuing the study of Bible translation from its present confines within theology and mission studies’. This thesis strives to do the same but with missionary work, demonstrating that the study of missionaries can inform more than only Mission Studies, and the exploration of mission-translation can provide more than an additional notch on a chronology of Bible translation. Therefore, it will ask, and seek to answer, the following research questions.

The overall aim of the thesis is to find out: 1) *How are colonial missionaries significant figures in the expansion of notions of translation?* In order to do this it must consider what mission-translation looks like in reality; 2) *How does the missionary translate the message of Christianity and its effects into the receiving cultures of Africa and Europe?* In light of current understandings of translation, it will then ask: 3) *What assumptions in Translation Studies regarding the ontology of the translator and the nature of translation do these missionary-translators challenge/ reinforce?* But different missionaries and different practices will have different implications for the study of mission-translation and translation proper, so to unpack this further I will ask: 4) *How do gender, race and formal characteristics affect the missionary’s translation strategies and how does this enable us to question understandings of translation?*

---

Methodology

To open up the above questions I am using the case study of the colonial French Protestant missionary, François Coillard (1834 – 1904), his Scottish wife Christina Coillard née Mackintosh, indigenous missionaries from Basutoland such as Asser Sehahabane and Aaron Mayoro, and the mission society sending them, La Société des Missions Évangéliques de Paris (SMEP) (the value of this specific case study will be detailed below). Each chapter uses historical sources regarding these missionaries as a starting point, considering their mission-work in terms of translation, and then compares these notions of translation with current theory. Where the sources allowed, I include references to and information on the interlingual and intertextual translation practices which underpinned the mission-translation work, however, my focus when reading was the broader definition of mission-translation as the cultural process of the translation of Christianity.

In order to recover the work and experiences of these missionary-translators, I employ a range of historical sources – biographical and autobiographical, religious and secular, nineteenth century and modern day.44 A good deal of the nineteenth-century sources found in all four chapters such as newspapers (such as Le Monde) and mission journals (such as JME) have been accessed through two websites: Gallica (Gallica.bnf.fr), and Internet Archive (Archive.org), where many of the hundred-year-old sources used have been digitised. In contrast, some of the sources used are unpublished archived letters, taken from the SMEP archives at the Bibliothèque du Défap in Paris. This variety of sources provides the thesis with a broad picture of the mission work, detailing the efforts of SMEP, Coillard, his wife, the indigenous missionaries, and the reactions to them. I want to consider the mission as a whole rather than only certain aspects or representations of it. Moreover, as well as sources which directly address the SMEP mission discussed in the thesis, my research also employs sources which examine missions that are not French, Protestant or nineteenth-century. These sites of mission are heterogeneous, located in other times and geo-political contexts, and their juxtaposition with research on the SMEP mission

44 I am particularly grateful for Edouard Favre’s many biographies of François Coillard, in which he compiled letters, journal entries, and general information by and about Coillard. See Edouard Favre, François Coillard, Enfance et Jeunesse (1834-1861) (Paris: Société des missions évangéliques, 1908); Favre, François Coillard: Missionnaire Au Lessouto (1861-1882) (Paris: Société des Missions Evangéliques, 1912); Favre, Zambèze.
might risk being reductive. However, by using the SMEP mission as the thread through the thesis, the research maintains its focus. Furthermore, the inclusion of other experiences and practices in different denominations, times, and places positions the SMEP mission within its wider context.

Furthermore, the photographs considered in chapter 4 are found in an album presented to the Geographical Society of Paris by SMEP in 1887.\(^{45}\) There exist many more photographs in the SMEP archives, however, 22 photographs from the album (available online and on site at the Bibliothèque National de France) have been selected for the chapter’s discussion to exemplify the overall themes of the album. For this chapter, too, I was able to obtain Emilie Gangnat’s doctoral thesis from the author herself, through a contact in the SMEP archives. This thesis was very useful in the foundational stages of forming ideas and writing the chapter.

These diverse historical sources will be used, not only to reflect on past practices and experiences, but as ‘a means of understanding and criticising the present’, something which Lawrence Venuti states ‘has been less and less pursued’.\(^{46}\) Indeed, this thesis attempts to fulfil that which Christopher Rundle asserts in his article, ‘Translation as an Approach to History’:

> we should question the widespread assumption that translation history must, almost automatically, mean a contribution to an overall history of translation couched with the frames of reference of TS.\(^{47}\)

In terms of translation, the analysis of historical sources has often been confined to chronological overviews of past theories, past practices, and past versions of certain texts. This thesis seeks instead to apply historical mission-translations to present practice and theory.

---


Much of the historical details that are contained in this thesis take place in two geographical areas to be identified as Basutoland and Barotseland. However, because the above sources are a mixture of English and French, and span over 150 years, the names of these places alter depending on the context. This matter is further complicated by the fact that borders and boundaries were, according to Bina Fernandez, ‘an inheritance of the 1885 Berlin conference’, and ‘prior to the colonial era, hard geographical borders did not characterize states in Africa, with rulers having only loose control over territory and movements of people’, as Stephen Golub writes. Therefore, in a 2016 English-language thesis which discusses a French colonial context, there are inevitably going to be gaps between the terms I use and how they are understood by different readers and in different contexts. However, for consistency and to identify the geographical areas accurately, because the thesis is in English (apart from some French quotations), I have chosen to use the English-language names. Furthermore, because the historical context of the content is mainly 1857-1904, I will use the English-language place names from that period. Therefore, rather than Lessouto, used by Coillard in his French texts, and Lesotho, currently used, I will refer to the first area of southern Africa as Basutoland. Similarly, rather than Zambèze, or Haut-Zambèze, used by Coillard, and Western Zambia, where the region

---


50 For example, François Coillard, *Haut-Zambèze (1899)*, pp. viii, iv, xvi, xvii, xviii, xxii.


53 François Coillard, *Haut-Zambèze (1899)*; Favre, *Zambèze*. 
is now located, 54 I will refer to the second area as Barotseland. 55 Following this logic, other places such as Banyailand (a region of Mashonaland) and Mashonaland (now a north-eastern region of Zimbabwe) will be referred to using the British colonial titles. These terms are not neutral. Basutoland is a British construct, 56 and many in Barotseland are seeking autonomy from Zambia, following the 1964 Barotseland agreement. 57 However, the clarity of the content of the thesis would be compromised, were I to continually refer to the many names and definitions of the places herein discussed.

Finally, as well as historical sources, this thesis also includes translation theory, applying the experiences of the missionary-translators to the claims of translation theory in order to challenge, reinforce or expand accepted notions of translation. In this respect, the thesis does not only focus on one theoretical approach explored in Translation Studies but includes a broad range of theories and theorists, from Lawrence Venuti to Christiane Nord, from Andrew Chesterman to Sherry Simon.

Hephzibah Israel, in the introduction to Religious Transactions, writes of her attitude towards colonial mission:

Like [Lamin Sanneh and William Smalley] I do not subscribe to the notion that all aspects of Christian mission were always “destructive of indigenous

---


56 Basutoland is a colonial construct, the ‘official name used by British [sic] for Lesotho during the period of Cape and British rule’. Rosenberg, Weisfelder, and Frisbie-Fulton, p. 58. See also, Elizabeth Eldredge, Power in Colonial Africa: Conflict and Discourse in Lesotho, 1870–1960 (Madison; London: University of Wisconsin Press, 2007), p. xi.

57 ‘At independence it was agreed that Barotseland would have a special status within Zambia. This arrangement was soon abrogated by the Zambian government’, Donald Horowitz, Ethnic Groups in Conflict (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), p. 245. ‘Barotseland: Zambian Court Acquits Five Youths Arrested in 2015 for Carrying UNPO Flag’, 1 July 2016 <http://unpo.org/article/19292> [accessed 12 September 2016].
cultures” but neither do I agree with their celebratory conclusion that the mission of translation was entirely positive and advantageous to target cultures or that the missionary enterprise can be entirely disassociated from the history of colonialism.\(^{58}\)

Similarly, in this thesis I do not wish to posit that colonial Christian mission was necessarily ‘entirely positive’ or unequivocally ‘destructive’. Although I am not without my own biases, my aim is not to pass judgement on the actions of the figures discussed. Rather, I want to consider them and their representations in order to propose new paradigms in Translation Studies, reflecting on past assumptions and common conventions in translation theory precisely through these missionary-translators and their mission-translations.

**Colonial Mission**

The colonial period, and specifically the mid-nineteenth to the early twentieth century, is a context which provides significant insights for the study of the relationship between mission and translation due to the particular intensity of Christian mission in the period in Europe; according to Eugene Nida, the ‘nineteenth and twentieth centuries [...] are often spoken of as “the missionary centuries”’.\(^{59}\) Although, as Giuliana Chamedes and Elizabeth Foster write, ‘for a long time, many historians [...] working on the colonies overlooked the important presence (and the rich archives) of Catholic and Protestant missionaries, who outnumbered colonial administrators on the ground throughout much of the empire’,\(^{60}\) missionaries were not only numerous but important vanguards of empire and of colonial encounter. Discussing the French context in *Civilizing Habits*, Sarah Curtis asserts that missionaries were the ‘forerunners [...] of empire’,\(^{61}\) and J.P. Daughton writes in *An Empire Divided: Religion, Republicanism and the Making of French Colonialism, 1880-1914*, ‘Whether loved and respected or detested and targeted, French missionaries were at the forefront of their nation’s encounter with the world’.\(^{62}\) Indeed, of this encounter, Daughton and Owen

---

\(^{58}\) Israel, *Religious Transactions*, p. 11.


White argue in *In God’s Empire: French Missionaries in the Modern World* that missionaries ‘were often the first French men and women to work and live among indigenous societies’ and ‘[v]ery few French men and women had as close interactions with indigenous populations, for as sustained periods of time, as religious workers’.63 So then, missionaries often initiated and maintained contact with indigenous communities; as Emily Manktelow writes in *Missionary Families*, ‘for thousands of people around the world, missionaries were the point of contact between the local and the global’.64 Therefore, as they were significant in encounter, contact and subsequent communication with difference and otherness, they were significant in relationships of translation. Missionaries were those Europeans who were in the centre of the intercultural and interlingual translation processes between the colonized and the colonizer: ‘European encounters with cultures outside the borders of Europe have inscribed colonised cultures through acts of translation, often carried out by travelers and missionaries’, according to Israel.65

Colonialism has already played an important role in the development of translation theory due to its insight into processes of cultural contact and its emphasis on encounters occurring within power structures. Colonialism has been used as a metaphor for Translation Studies, whereby scholars such as Vicente Rafael, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, and Tejaswini Niranjana discuss imperial values and attitudes of superiority and inferiority that affect the choice of text, the choice of language, and the value ascribed to the original and the translation.66 Furthermore, as well as the ‘the metaphor of the colony as a translation, a copy of an original located elsewhere on the map’,67 Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi’s foundational book on the topic, *Postcolonial Translation: Theory and Practice* explores ‘the role played by translation in facilitating colonization’,68 whereby ‘translation was for centuries a one-way process,
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68 Bassnett and Trivedi, p. 5.
with texts being translated into European languages for European consumption, rather than as part of a reciprocal process of exchange’. Indeed, as Jeremy Munday writes, in colonialism translation had the role of ‘disseminating an ideologically motivated image of colonized peoples’. Translation was a tool of empire as well as a metaphor for wider processes of power occurring within the colonial moment. As we can see, a postcolonial approach ‘reengage[s] with the ethical dimensions of translation praxis’, and exposes notions of hierarchy in the process and perception of translation. And yet, Lamin Sanneh asserts that a study of colonialism and translation does not only provide condemnation, but also that translation was precisely the process that ‘muddied the water’ in the relationship between colonial mission and the colonial state. As Sanneh writes,

by adopting local idioms in bible translation in place of Western forms and ideas [...] Bible translation acknowledged the priority of local usage over Western usage, thereby causing the colonial system and its missionary allies to become schizoid about Christianity.

Indeed, he claims that translation into the vernacular gave agency and dignity to indigenous cultures. Although the relationship between translation and colonialism has been often equated to ‘translation as empire’, translation was at work in the more complex situations and encounters occurring at the time.

Furthermore, this period is a particularly interesting context for the study of translation practices given the changes in technology that occurred and thus the changing modes of encountering and representing otherness that emerged. The introduction of photography in the nineteenth century, in the metropole and the colonies, and the enthusiasm that Coillard specifically had for the activity, means that photographs are another important source for the exploration of colonial mission-translation work in this thesis. Indeed, in contrast to the neglect of images in

---

69 Bassnett and Trivedi, p. 5.
73 Sanneh, Disciples, p. 135.
Translation Studies, a study of the construction and circulation of colonial photographs provides significant contributions to chapter 4’s consideration of translation.

**French Colonial Mission**

The French context provides a particularly valuable setting because of its relationship with religion. As has already been seen in references to works by Curtis and Daughton, the neglect of colonial missionaries as essential sources in scholarship is particularly acute in the French context. There has been relatively ‘extensive research conducted on missionaries in the British empire’, but, as Daughton writes, ‘missionaries remain either ignored or greatly misunderstood in most histories of French colonialism’, and Chamedes and Foster’s assertion that ‘many historians […] working on the colonies overlooked […] missionaries’, specifically refers to French historiography. According to White and Daughton, this ‘marginalisation’ is due to ‘anticlerical suspicion of missionaries among scholars’ and ‘a preoccupation with state actors’. Therefore, they claim that ‘missionaries have regularly been relegated to, at most, a few pages in studies of modern French colonialism and have often been portrayed as little more than handmaids of empire’. Indeed, in *Black Christians and White Missionaries*, Richard Gray writes of this ‘inattention’, pointing out that ‘the only entries under “missionaries” in […] Henri Brunschwig’s *French Colonialism 1871-1941* […] refer to British Protestant missionaries’. This tension between the French State and the religions present within its geographical borders remains a relevant issue; Daughton and White write that ‘struggles between nation and religion [do not] show any sign of abating in contemporary France’.

The work of J.P. Daughton and Owen White seeks to fill this void, exploring ‘the variety of ways missionaries and other religious workers complemented and
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77 Daughton, p. 12.
78 Chamedes and Foster, p. 2.
79 White and Daughton, ‘Introduction’, p. 5.
80 White and Daughton, ‘Introduction’, p. 5.
82 White and Daughton, ‘Introduction’, p. 3.
complicated French engagement with non-European societies around the globe’. However, their publications contribute to histories and historiographies of colonialism and mission. My aim in this thesis is to apply French colonial mission outside of itself, to explore the usefulness of historical figures in the present understanding of translation, and, as such, in further interdisciplinary study.

This thesis uses French sources and employs French colonial mission as its point of departure. But, as Hilde Nielsen, Inger Marie Okkenhaug and Karina Hestad Skeie have asserted, mission is transnational. So although François Coillard, the man with whom this thesis begins, is French, the history found within this study does not only belong to France. Coillard’s wife was Scottish, and his colleagues were English, Swiss, and Basuto. Furthermore, although Coillard’s training took place in France, his first mission was in Basutoland, and he journeyed to Barotseland to establish a second. This thesis will use, as a starting point, this period of French colonial history, seeking not only to recover French colonial mission from academic inattention, but to demonstrate its worth in interdisciplinary study, and specifically in the re-evaluation of translation.

**French Protestant Colonial Mission**

On those occasions when French colonial mission is discussed in scholarship, the majority of the attention is paid to Catholic contexts. For example, in White and Daughton’s *In God’s Empire*, 11 out of the 12 chapters have as their subject Catholic missions – only Jean-François Zorn’s chapter discusses Protestant mission at some length. Furthermore, in Daughton’s *An Empire Divided*, there are 33 page references to the ‘Catholic Church’ and ‘Catholicism’ and only 14 to ‘Protestantism’ and ‘Protestants, French’. And yet, protestant French missions are important for the study of missionary-translation for two reasons: their relationship with the State, and their relationship with the Word.

87 Daughton, pp. 319, 327.
Firstly, the relationship between French Protestants and the French State was much weaker than that between Catholic missionaries and la Patrie, and so a study of French Protestant missionaries allows this study, though rooted in the colonial moment, not to be entrenched in the colonial agenda. At the start of the nineteenth century, when SMEP was formed, ‘protestants were still legally prevented from missionary work in French colonies’.88 Due to this separation between the missionaries and the State, French Protestants often had what Jean-François Zorn calls a ‘noncolonial posture within the colonial framework’.89 Talking specifically about SMEP, he writes that this Protestant mission society ‘defended a missionary internationalism against a colonial nationalism’,90 ‘demonstrat[ing] that it was not unthinkingly committed to colonization […] defying national and even ecclesiastical borders’.91 A study of French Protestant missions therefore implies a more complex connection between the colonial power and these Christian ministers than Amanda Barry’s title for colonial missionaries, *Evangelists of Empire*.92 In the Protestant French colonial mission context we watch a ‘decoupling’ of ‘state nationalism and church confessionalism’,93 so that the claim that ‘Qui dit Français dit catholique’ is not always necessarily correct.94

Secondly, the Protestant focus on the text of the Bible and the necessity of indigenous people being able to read the Christian scriptures in their own language means that Protestant missionaries will be most useful for this thesis in light of its - and their - focus on translation.95 In *The Blackwell Companion to Protestantism* we find that ‘Protestant missions […] tended to use the vernacular for the transmission of the

---

90 Zorn, ‘Replacing’, p. 216.
94 Zorn, ‘Replacing’, p. 216; Daughton, pp. 167–204.
faith’, their emphasis being on the access of indigenous people to Christianity via their own language. Furthermore, Hephzibah Israel states that ‘From its beginnings in the early eighteenth century, the evangelical project of Protestant missions focussed on the translation of the Bible into different languages’, and that, ‘[f]or Western Protestant missionaries, translating the Bible was translating Christianity’. So then, by studying protestant French colonial missionaries we will be studying figures who prize translation proper and who are also undertaking the wider translation project of what Israel calls ‘translating Christianity’. This will allow the research to gain particular insights into the interrelation of the two.

**SMEP and François Coillard**

Established in 1822, and later succeeded by DEFAP and CEVAA in 1971, the Société des Missions Evangéliques de Paris (Paris Society of Evangelical Missions) was set up with the purpose of ‘spread[ing] the Gospel among heathens and other non-Christian peoples’, in Paris and across the world. As ‘the largest Protestant missionary organisation in France’ in the late nineteenth century, the analysis of SMEP sources is an essential foundation for a study on colonial French protestant mission. It has its own archive in Paris, as well as an online library, and historians such as Jean-François Zorn have begun to collect and disseminate invaluable information regarding SMEP practices and experiences. This thesis therefore has resources to use, but also contributes to this work by employing SMEP history in interdisciplinary study.

---


97 Israel, ‘Translating the Bible’, p. 441.

98 Israel, ‘Translating the Bible’, p. 441. See also, ‘the writing of the vernacular, the translation of the Bible, and teaching converts to read it (which for Protestant missionaries was fundamental to their mission’, Monica Wilson, in Sanneh, *Translating the Message*, p. 212.


100 Zorn, ‘Replaced’, pp. 216, 218. Société des Missions Evangéliques de Paris henceforth to be referred to as SMEP.

101 Daughton, p. 167.


François Coillard is one of the most famous missionaries from SMEP, and was, while he was alive, a key figure of French mission, Protestant mission, and colonial mission. *The Geographical Journal* in 1908 describes him in the following terms:

In the ranks of the great missionary pioneers in Africa, François Coillard occupied a position midway between that of Robert Moffat and David Livingstone. Unlike Moffat, his life-work was not confined to one region, and, unlike Livingstone, he never merged the missionary in the explorer.\(^{104}\)

His association with these well-known figures was not rare. Indeed, before and after his death he was called ‘le Livingstone français’ by *Le Figaro*, amongst others.\(^{105}\) He was a celebrity in both secular and religious spheres. This fame has meant that data and resources relating to him are easy to find and easy to access. Coillard is particularly interesting because he participated in both a pre-existing mission (Basutoland) and established a new mission station (Barotseland), and therefore in his one case study, we find multiple contexts.

He was a translator proper of the Bible and Christian texts, continuing on the interlingual translation work started by SMEP over ten years before his arrival in Basutoland. The New Testament had already been translated (the gospels of Mark and John in 1839 and the rest was printed in 1845), and the translation of the whole Bible text was well underway (finished in 1879).\(^{106}\) Coillard himself added Psalms and Proverbs to the project,\(^{107}\) and undertook the task of editing and polishing other translation contributions.\(^{108}\) But more than this, as this thesis demonstrates, Coillard was a translator of Christianity and its impact to African and European contexts.

Furthermore, Coillard is particularly significant for the analysis of images as translations in chapter 4 given his zeal for photography. As he embraced the new technology of photography, taking his own camera with him on his missionary

---


journeys, seeing them as an important element of the SMEP missionary expedition to Barotseland, his photographs acted as mission-translations.

However, Coillard is not the sole focus of the thesis. For through his relationships, and through the mission as a whole, we will see other translators at work. We will reflect on the role of women and wives in mission-translation, in particular considering Christina Coillard. Furthermore, we will focus on the indigenous men and women who travelled with the Coillards, remembering that colonial mission was not only an activity of white Europeans, and rethinking the complex relationships not only between the European missionary and Europe, but also within the missionary team itself.

Chapter Outline

This thesis considers the multidirectional nature of both mission and translation, and follows the translation of Christianity from Europe to Africa, around Africa, and back ‘home’ to Europe.

In chapter one, ‘François Coillard and the Missionary-Translator: Incarnation, Spectres, and Teams’, we study François Coillard and the translation of Christianity from Europe to Africa. We observe his mission-translation practices and the myth constructed around him and re-examine questions of the in/visibility, the singularity, and the space of the translator, seeking alternative paradigms for the ontology of the translator. The chapter argues that the missionary-translator and thus the translator proper is thoroughly involved in his own translation, using his body and mind to construct and compose, translation entering the translator’s very life. Furthermore, we see through Coillard’s simultaneous prominence and humility that the translator is a spectral presence, both visible and invisible in his metaphorical and physical texts. Finally, the vastly collaborative work of the missionary-translator reveals translation proper to be a collective task too.

In the second chapter, ‘The Space and Status of Female Missionary-Translators: Domestication, Hospitality and Completion’, we consider the role of women in the mission-translation occurring in the direction of Europe to Africa. The chapter explores the undervalued and underrepresented status (a double invisibility) of female missionaries in historical and modern missionary discourse, and in translation theory, positing them as vital components of the missionary endeavour, and valuable in the re-
assessment of notions of translation. In particular, through this study of Christina Coillard and her mission-translations, we reconsider the notion of the domestic in Translation Studies as female-missionaries were often found in the domestic sphere, the domestic facilitating, acting as the method for, and providing the context for, mission-translation and translation proper. Furthermore, the female missionary allows us to bring the concept of hospitality to the discussion on these multiple forms of translation, the missionary-translator and the intertextual translator taking on both the role of guest and host. Finally, the work of the female missionary with the male, enables us to discuss completion and supplementation in translation. The notion of the ‘female’ in translation, is thus not only useful in feminist theory, but enables a different perspective on notions of the domestic, hospitality, and completion.

In the third chapter, ‘Indigenous Missionary-Translators: Bodies, Trust and Movement’, we see the movement and translation of Christianity around Africa largely performed by indigenous missionaries. Using the examples of Asser Sehahabane and Aaron Mayoro, amongst others, this chapter demonstrates the ‘rich history of interlingual and intercultural exchanges in the Horn and the whole of Africa’ and thus ‘African agency in translation processes, before but also during and after colonization.’ It examines the interbodily nature of missionary-translation in contrast to Nord’s ‘interpersonal’ theory of translation proper, thus making a similar contribution to Hephzibah Israel’s work which ‘challeng[es] the customary binaries of European missionary versus Protestant convert and, more importantly, that of acquiescent “victim” versus proactive “resistor”’. Indeed, the chapter explores how the relationships between the bodies involved in mission-translation and translation proper require trust in tension with Nord’s notion of loyalty. Furthermore, the interbodily nature of both processes reveals translation proper and mission itself as processes of movement whereby roles are not static or fixed, and whereby physical movement occurs across geographical and domestic borders. However, although movement is present and necessary in both translation proper and mission-translation,
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110 Israel, Religious Transactions, p. 10.
this chapter will close with the claim that each has the ultimate goal of stasis, a stasis that is precisely the motivation for both mission and translation.

In the fourth and final chapter, ‘Missionary Photography and/as Translation: Layers and Contexts’, we observe the continued translation of Christianity around Africa as well as the translation of this work back to Europe through photographs taken by François Coillard. This chapter considers Coillard’s use of photography as facilitating and accompanying mission-translation. It suggests that photographs were used as a means of presenting the Christian message and its effects to Africans and Europeans, rendering the missionary-translator more credible, and thus it posits that images reinforce other translation processes. It also discusses photographs as mission-translations, translations which convey the missionary experience, the progress of Christianity, indigenous culture, relationships, landscape, and collaboration to European audiences. It therefore explores images as being intersemiotic translations. Finally, by considering the use of Coillard’s photography in multiple publications, it looks at photographs in translation, demonstrating that mission-translation and translation proper are always processes made up of layers – interacting layers of framing, of context, of reading, and of significance that enable a fuller access to the source text.
Chapter 1. François Coillard and the Missionary-Translator: Incarnation, Spectres, and Teams

In this first chapter, I will explore the work and life of François Coillard and will demonstrate that he is a missionary-translator, one who undertook translation proper as well as a wider translation of Christianity through songs, preaching, and even through his life. Then, considering his international fame and concurrent personal promotion of humility, we will see that this well-known but private missionary-translator, rather than seeking visibility or invisibility, demonstrates a translation process in which he is a spectral absence and presence. Finally, rather than working alone, as popular representations of missionaries and translators would suggest, Coillard prioritises collaboration in his mission-translation and thus reveals a translation proper process always completed in teams.

Incarnational Translation

French protestant, François Coillard, was a missionary to Basutoland and Barotseland from 1857 until his death in 1904.\(^1\) Sent by SMEP to an already-existing mission in Basutoland, he was stationed in Leribe,\(^2\) where Christina Mackintosh, the daughter of a Scottish minister, joined him to be his wife in 1861.\(^3\) After witnessing conversions and rebellions, they were entangled in issues of interethnic war and were subsequently exiled to neighbouring Natal in 1866.\(^4\) They returned to Leribe in 1869, and continued the mission work. In 1876 SMEP asked the Coillards to postpone a proposed furlough and respond to requests from Basuto converts to pioneer a mission to the unevangelised Banyai people.\(^5\) Setting off in 1877, the expedition included European artisan missionaries, George Middleton and William Waddell, indigenous evangelists and their families, the Coillards, and their teenage niece, Elise Coillard.\(^6\) The group faced persecution, capture, and murder attempts by the Matabele ruler, Lobengula,
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\(^1\) As stated in the introduction, this thesis will be using these English-language colonial place names.

\(^2\) Now known as Hlotse, see James Bainbridge, *South Africa Lesotho and Swaziland* (Footscray: London: Lonely Planet, 2009), p. 561; Willie Olivier and Sandra Olivier, *Touring in South Africa* (Cape Town: Struik, 2005), p. 115. For more detail regarding the mission, see the timeline found in Appendix A.

\(^3\) Mackintosh, *Zambesi*, p. 100.


\(^5\) This region is now a southwestern area of Zimbabwe.

\(^6\) Azael, Aaron, Andreas and Asser and their families as well as four ‘leaders and drivers’, Fono, Bushman, Eleazar, Khosana, see Mackintosh, *Zambesi*, p. 228.
and they were not welcome in many of the places they attempted to enter. Because of this consistent opposition, and after advice from Khama, ruler of Bechuanaland, the mission party looked instead to begin a mission in Barotseland. After a furlough to Europe (1880-1882) and the return of the Basuto evangelists to Basutoland, the group set out again for Barotseland, arriving in 1884, and continued the work, building relationships, buildings, and starting a school. In 1890 Coillard had gained the trust of the Barotse leader, Lewanika, and was part of the negotiations of the Lochner Concession with Lewanika (also called the Barotse concession). It transpired that this was not an agreement with the British monarch or government, as believed by Lewanika, who wanted British protectorate status in Barotseland, but a contract with the British South Africa Company (BSAC).

In 1891, after prolonged illness, Christina Coillard died and François lost not only a wife, but a fellow worker: ‘Ainsi se terminèrent en pleine paix ses trente années de vie conjugale et de mission, trente années de travail, de voyages, de souffrances, trente années de bonheur et de bénédictions’. After another furlough to Europe (1896-1898), Coillard returned to Basutoland and Barotseland. He baptised Litia, Lewanika’s son, who had professed to be a Christian, and witnessed the departure of some of the Barotse Christians from the SMEP congregation to the Ethiopian movement.

In 1904, at the age of 69, Coillard died and was buried alongside the grave of his wife at Sefula, in Barotseland.

During his life, Coillard was a prolific intertextual translator. He grew up in poverty, but even at a young age, he prized the text of the Bible: ‘I read to myself in the fields [...] I read and re-read the only book I possessed – one of the Gospels’.
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7 See Mackintosh, Zambesi, pp. 227–65.
8 This time, the group was made up of the Coillards, another SMEP missionary, Jeanmairet, artisan missionaries, Waddell and Middleton, indigenous evangelists, Isaiah and Levi, joined by Aaron and Andreas from the previous expedition. See Mackintosh, Zambesi, p. 312.
10 For the first seven years of this agreement, the BSAC failed to make any of its promised payments or to provide the assistance it had pledged to Lewanika. Coillard was accused of trickery regarding his help in the negotiations and lost trust with the Barotse people. Coillard’s name remains implicated in the colonial enterprise because of this involvement. See Caplan; John S. Galbraith, Crown and Charter: The Early Years of the British South Africa Company (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974); Gwyn Prins, The Hidden Hippopotamus. Reappraisal in African History: The Early Colonial Experience in Western Zambia (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).
11 Favre, Zambèze, p. 242.
12 Mackintosh, Zambesi, p. 438.
13 Mackintosh, Zambesi, p. 376. For more detail regarding the mission, see the timeline found in Appendix A.
14 Mackintosh, Zambesi, p. 8.
Indeed, he pursued words, ‘rear[ing] rabbits in order to pay for his Latin books and school stationary’,\(^\text{15}\) and later studied biblical languages at SMEP.\(^\text{16}\) Then, when he went to Basutoland and Barotseland, translation was a part of his daily activity: ‘Jusqu’au déjeuner, je reste à la maison à lire, à écrire, à faire des traductions’.\(^\text{17}\) He translated for Europeans who could not speak Sesuto and Africans that could not speak English: for example, he translated for Major Malan;\(^\text{18}\) between British missionary and explorer, Dr James Johnston, and his congregation;\(^\text{19}\) and between British statesman, Theophilus Shepstone, and Basuto chief, Molapo.\(^\text{20}\) Furthermore, his translations were significant in the Lochner Concession, where according to John Galbraith, Coillard’s translation choices misled Lewanika to believe that he was signing an agreement with Queen Victoria.\(^\text{21}\)

Coillard also had experience in literary translation. He translated La Fontaine’s fables, as well as J.H. Kurtz’s ‘Bible History’.\(^\text{22}\) He translated parts of the Bible, rendering some of the Psalms in Sesuto, as well as the book of Proverbs.\(^\text{23}\) Furthermore, as much of the Bible translation work was already in progress in Basutoland, we read in Coillard’s journal, ‘14\(^\text{th}\) October 1860. I have been busy with translation and with the correction of the MS by M. Dyke upon Joshua’,\(^\text{24}\) and Catharine Mackintosh writes that ‘his share in [the work] lay […] in revising what others had done and giving it literary finish’.\(^\text{25}\) Coillard acted as translator and an

\(^{15}\) Mackintosh, Zambesi, p. 13.
\(^{16}\) He ‘devoted himself’ to language learning, and in particular, Hebrew, see Mackintosh, Zambesi, p. 27.
\(^{17}\) Favre, Lessouto, p. 65. See also, ‘songs to be written, and translations made’, Shillito, p. 101.
\(^{18}\) Mackintosh, Zambesi, p. 214.
\(^{20}\) Favre, Lessouto, p. 92.
\(^{21}\) ‘Coillard translated “chartered company” to the Lozi as lekhotla (king’s council) and “grant” in the English version became “borrow” in the Lozi translation. Linguistic misunderstandings however were not the primary cause for subsequent controversy.’ Galbraith, pp. 217–18. See also, ‘Coillard went as a translator; Molapo had expected him to be more than that, and in point of fact his influence must have told for more than a translator’s’, Shillito, p. 86. See also, Caplan, p. 52.
\(^{23}\) ‘Je me suis adonné à versifier des psaumes en sessouto et j’en suis au trente-septième’, Favre, Lessouto, p. 438. ‘He devoted special attention to the Book of Proverbs’, Mackintosh, Zambesi, p. 103. ‘To the work already begun by others he added a translation of the Book of Proverbs, giving the ancient maxims a new setting with such skill that they found a place in popular speech’, Addison, pp. 12–13.
\(^{24}\) Shillito, p. 67.
\(^{25}\) Mackintosh, Zambesi, p. 103.
editor. In pointing out the ‘literary finish’, Mackintosh highlights Coillard’s ‘instinct for style in language’.26 When he witnessed other people undertaking translation, he commented, for example, ‘M Creux impressionna vivement l’assemblée par un discours qui perdit pourtant de son parfum par la traduction’;27 and ‘This simple story [...] in translation loses so much of its warmth and colour’.28 Coillard acknowledged that translation is not a simple transference from one language to another, but in both examples, he mourned the loss of the more stylistic features of translation – the fragrance, the sense of invitation, and the hues and shades of language.

Coillard’s mission-translations consisted of more than the text of the Bible, although the Bible was important to him - when Coillard lost his Bible on his expedition to the upper Zambesi, he called it, ‘le compagnon de ma vie journalière et de tous mes voyages’, sending someone back to retrieve it.29 When exiled in Natal, he longed to speak Zulu and was relieved, not when he was able to translate the Bible’s entirety, but when he was able to communicate to the indigenous people one element of it: ‘J’aurais pleuré d’émotion et de reconnaissance la première fois que j’ai pu parler à ces pauvres Zoulous d’un Dieu Sauveur qui les aime’.30 That which Coillard sought to translate, or to render understandable in another language, was not the Bible, but what he perceived to be its message.

Furthermore, Coillard’s main anxiety and thus his priority, beyond Bible translation, according to Catharine Mackintosh, was ‘to give the Basutos a treasury of hymns’, therefore ‘to the very end he was constantly translating and adapting the most suitable [hymns] from French and English sources’,31 ‘set[ting] himself to translate the hymns of his childhood into Sesuto’,32 and putting psalms ‘en vers de sorte qu’on puisse les chanter’.33 These hymns, many of which are found in a collection called, Lifela tsa Sione (The Hymns of Zion), are ‘still in use today’.34 Coillard did not see
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30 Favre, Lessouto, p. 137.
31 Mackintosh, Zambesi, p. 103.
32 Addison, p. 12.
33 Favre, Lessouto, pp. 360, 183.
34 ‘[...] he translated into Sesotho most of Lifela tsa Sione (The Hymns of Zion), a popular hymnal still in use today’, in Rosenberg, Weisfelder, and Frisbie-Fulton, p. 61. Elsewhere we read that it is ‘probably the most widely used of any hymnbook across the whole of southern Africa’, Morija Museum and Archives, ‘Lifela Tsa Sione’, Morija Museum and Archives, 2012 <http://www.morija.co.ls/museum/objects/lifela-tsa-sione/> [accessed 2 September 2014]. See also ‘un
this work as being separate from his formal missionary work, neither did he view it as separate from his translation work. Mackintosh points out that he translated hymns in order ‘to spread the Gospel’, 35 and another biographer writes that ‘poetry and song were for Coillard two rungs in the ladder by which he drew nearer to God’. 36 Coillard’s mission-translation went beyond formal Bible translation practices. For him, the translation of hymns was bound up in the translation of the gospel over Africa. The missionary wrote, ‘C’est ainsi que les vérités religieuses, portées sur les ailes de la musique, font leur chemin parmi nos Bassoutos, et se répandent au loin’. 37 Indeed, elsewhere, Coillard stated, ‘Je crois à la puissance du chant pour propager et populariser l’Evangile’. 38 For Coillard, as Favre comments, song was certainly ‘un puissant moyen d’évangélisation’, 39 a means by which he translated the message of the Christian gospel to the Basuto people. The fact that Coillard’s missionary work included the translation of songs demonstrates some of the breadth of mission-translation as a concept, and shows the blurring between his translation proper and his mission-translation.

More than this, Coillard’s mission-translation went beyond pages and ink, even beyond words. When he talked of his missionary work, and thus his translation strategy, it was not an activity which had a beginning and an end, instead it was ‘l’oeuvre à laquelle nous avions joyeusement donné nos vies’. 40 For Coillard, ‘vivre c’est Christ’, 41 and so in the translation of the message of Christ, his whole life was implicated. In one conversation with Molapo, Coillard says, ‘le chrétien fait plus que de parler de sa foi, il vit de sa foi’, 42 and of Major Malan he writes, ‘Sa vie est pour moi une illustration frappante de Phil. III, 14’. 43 For Coillard, the spread of the Christian
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gospel occurred through more than only the formal translation of the Bible; it occurred through his very life. Indeed, this incarnational translation of Christianity was what the Coillards sought in their mission: ‘they wanted real not nominal Christians – men and women whose lives attested their faith’.\footnote{Catharine Winkworth Mackintosh, ‘Some Pioneer Missions of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland’, in The Occasional Papers of the Rhodes-Livingstone Museum Nos 1-16 in One Volume, ed. by Rhodes-Livingstone Museum (Manchester: Reprinted on behalf of the Institute for African Studies, University of Zambia by Manchester University Press, 1974), pp. 249–96 (p. 264).} The Christian faith can seemingly be translated not only by one’s [written or spoken] words, but also by one’s life. Indeed, Coillard did not only translate the Christian message in the times set aside in his daily routine. Rather, as we have seen, translation filtered into every aspect of his life - his actions, his body, himself - and occurred alongside translation proper. Coillard, as a missionary-translator, was therefore not only one who translated the Bible, and even hymns. Here, as in other missionary accounts, the missionary was one who ‘live[d] the doctrine’;\footnote{William Davies, Extracts from the Journal of the Rev. William Davies, 1st: When a Missionary at Sierra Leone, Western Africa: Containing Some Account of the Country, Its Inhabitants, the Progress of Religion among the Negroes, Manner of Governments, State of the Weather, &c. (Llanidloes: Printed at the Wesleyan Printing Office, 1835), p. 27.} he was a walking, physical, incarnational translation of the word of God.

If we look for these notions of incarnation in Translation Studies, in terms of translation proper, it is often stated that translators inhabit an in-between space,\footnote{For example, ‘Successful translators often inhabit a middle space between cultures and languages. They are often interlingual border dwellers, liminal figures who reside literally or metaphorically between ethnic identities’, Martha Cutter, Lost and Found in Translation: Contemporary Ethnic American Writing and the Politics of Language Diversity (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), p. 245.} and indeed, Coillard did inhabit a physical space between the settlements of European colonisers and the residences of the indigenous people. He was not integrated within the community, but neither was he found within the European settlements. However, through Coillard’s attitude to his mission-translation which moved from the text of the Bible to song lyrics, to his very life, we can see that the translator proper does not only inhabit a liminal space but is himself this space in-between. Theo Hermans commenting on one translation model, writes:

Oversimplification is inevitable [...] but the scheme’s very ease runs the risk of perpetuating simplicities, for example the assumption that the translator belongs to the target culture. If we think of [...] the contemporary United Nations interpreters in New York and elsewhere, or the multiple code-switching and translating practiced by Caribbean writers [...] it become [sic] clear that neat divisions into source and target poles are not enough. What matters in such cases is the co-existence of different personal and collective agendas in those fluid zones where cultures tangle and overlap, and the translator or
interpreter may belong wholly or in part, permanently or temporarily, to one side or the other, or to both, or to neither in particular.\textsuperscript{47}

Hermans points out that translation occurs at a point of entanglement, but this space of overlapping cultures; these fluid zones are shown in Coillard’s mission-translation practices to be the translator himself. As he observed, as he listened, as he communicated, as he translated, the missionary-translator embodied – and thus the translator proper embodies - the space where cultures, languages and traditions meet. For, just as mission-translation goes beyond words, translation proper implicates the translator’s body and life too. This is most evident in theatre, where ‘text is manifested through action’,\textsuperscript{48} and where, as Tanya Gerstle writes, ‘a kinaesthetic translation’ takes place, whereby ‘[t]he body becomes content, image and witness’.\textsuperscript{49} And yet, away from the theatre, in translation proper the translator’s body and life is caught up in his activity. Jean Boase-Beier writes, ‘the mind [...] is constrained by what the body allows or encourages it to do’.\textsuperscript{50} Therefore, as translation proper is performed, seemingly a cognitive process, it can only be accomplished via the physical body of the translator: eyes that read, ears that take in knowledge, a body that needs water and sustenance to concentrate, and fingers that write. Martin Fuchs asserts, ‘translation is made in everyday life by everyone; translation happens in each person’s mind – one lives in translation’.\textsuperscript{51} The body and life of the missionary-translator and the translator proper are vital as the spaces for his work. François Coillard therefore shows that, just as the translation of Christianity communicates the message of ‘the Word became flesh’, translation proper involves incarnational translation.

\textit{Spectres in translation}

The life and mission-translation work of François Coillard also offers insights into debates on visibility in translation. As a missionary-translator, and one whose life
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received a great deal of attention, Coillard confronted the tension in translation between visibility and invisibility, first discussed in such terms by Lawrence Venuti, and often debated in Translation Studies. However, as he was subject to visibility, as he pursued it, and as he rejected it in his mission-translations, Coillard demonstrates that, as opposed to Venuti’s binary, the translator is a spectral presence and absence in the translated text, simultaneously visible and invisible.

François Coillard was undeniably a visible missionary-translator. Although to some degree an ordinary Frenchman, working for an obscure protestant missionary society, Coillard was visible in the French colonial context, made visible in national and international narratives as an explorer, hero (secular and religious), and a legendary figure. Furthermore, more recently, he has been visible in the history of the Churches of Lesotho and Zambia, in accounts of colonialism in those places, and in histories of mission.

Firstly, Coillard was represented - and thus made visible – primarily in relation to famous explorers. Jean-François Zorn writes, ‘thrust onto the public scene by the press, [Coillard was] likened to the greatest explorers of the time’. Indeed, in one of the first sources that introduced Coillard to a national audience, an 1879 issue of the weekly journal, Le Tour Du Monde, Coillard was mentioned in the ‘Revue Géographique’, in the context of explorers Savorgnan de Brazza, Morton Stanley, and Serpa Pinto. Similarly, in an 1884 bulletin of the Geographical Society of Rochefort, he was described as ‘le digne continuateur des Levallant, Delegorgne, Verreau, Arbousset, Dumas, Casalis et de tant d’autres Français qui avaient fait de l’Afrique australe, le théâtre de leurs explorations’. He was therefore introduced within the setting of exploration and discovery, a very visible, theatrical setting. Moreover, in Le Tour du Monde we read that he embarked on a journey, ‘la même où Livingstone

53 Zorn then goes on to specify, ‘Livingstone in whose footsteps they had trod and Serpa Pinto who owed them his life’, Zorn, Transforming, p. 14.
rencontrait le peuple des Makololo’. These allusions to Coillard as being within the same frame of reference as internationally famous explorers were not rare. He was frequently described in some way as a successor of Livingstone, the LMS figure of ‘mission and empire’, and explicitly called ‘le Livingstone français’ in multiple publications. Coillard himself documented his own reception in Barotseland in the same way: ‘Whether I will, or not, I am Nyaka (doctor), Livingstone’s successor’. Moreover, he was also associated with Portuguese explorer, Serpa Pinto, who Coillard ‘saved’ from ‘imminent peril’ when he had been accused of not paying his ‘carriers’ for their work. Pinto dedicated half of his book to ‘The Coillard Family’, and thus Coillard was consumed as ‘the man who saved me’, in Portuguese, French, English, German, Swedish, Spanish, and Italian contexts. In the Revue de Géographie, we read that Coillard was ‘un missionnaire protestant, dont Serpa Pinto révéla le nom’. His visibility was therefore due in large part to Pinto’s own publicity, and Coillard’s name
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was read alongside Pinto’s in many publications as a result.\textsuperscript{66} Coillard was therefore included in the colonial discourse of discovery and implied superiority of European explorers, as he was compared to others.

But as well as being visible as an explorer connected to other famous ‘pioneers’, Coillard was recognised and consumed by societies and congregations himself ‘en explorateur et non en missionnaire’.\textsuperscript{67} According to Edouard Favre, at the time of his 1880-1882 furlough ‘Coillard était précédé, en Europe, [...] d’une renommée d’explorateur. [...] ses auditeurs désiraient entendre parler d’aventures plutôt que de mission’.\textsuperscript{68} Coillard himself says, ‘the explorer was more popular than the missionary’, in an almost schizophrenic description of his vocation and requirements when touring.\textsuperscript{69} Perhaps considering his contexts, the emphasis on the socio-political aspect of his work is not surprising. With the nineteenth-century obsession with the spectacular, and as Zorn writes, ‘the public taste for exotic adventure, even in church circles’, the same was demanded from missionaries as from entertainers.\textsuperscript{70} Furthermore, historically Christianity in France, and in particular Protestantism, had been pushed into the private sphere and thus limited in the public. Regardless of the dechristianisation of his work, Coillard’s geographical accomplishments were celebrated in France: he received scientific distinctions,\textsuperscript{71} was named ‘membre
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correspondant’ of numerous geographical societies, and was described as a significant explorer of l’Afrique australe. In Britain too, Coillard was recognised for his exploration, and in particular, for his narratives of discovery. Zorn writes,

The British press was full of praise for Coillard’s book, saying it was one of the best travel narratives in the United Kingdom, and that its author should take his place alongside national heroes such as Moffat and Livingstone which, for a Frenchman, was quite an honour.

Coillard was primarily visible in this context as a travel writer, not a missionary; a contributor to geographical progress, not religious advancement. He was visible in the national and international press as an explorer.

Moreover, taking a closer look at the rhetoric in the above citation as well as that of Serpa Pinto’s narrative, Coillard was visible not only as an explorer-figure, but as a hero. Engulfed by the heroic, soldierly language of the Third Republic whereby ‘the military [w]as a source of masculine authority and a privileged arena of male activity’, Coillard was repeatedly described as brave and heroic in his work. Adjectives that were assigned to him included ‘vaillant’, ‘indomitable’, indestructible, and heroic/hero. His autobiography, one of the ‘great epics of
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humanity’, and his missionary journey was likened to the Iliad and the Odyssey.\textsuperscript{80} Furthermore, one writer claimed, ’on ne lira guère de récit plus grandiose que cette épopée vécue’,\textsuperscript{81} rendering Coillard’s work a heroic adventure. He was an exaggerated figure, often represented in superlative descriptions of ‘kindest’, ‘best’, ‘extraordinary’, ‘remarkable’.\textsuperscript{82} One writer asserted that he possessed ‘une intelligence supérieure, l’indomptable volonté et l’insondable mansuétude’,\textsuperscript{83} and described ‘la tranquilité surhumaine de son courage’, calling the missionary ‘un type d’espèce humaine complètement nouveau’.\textsuperscript{84} Coillard was presented as an exceptional figure; even a ‘completely new breed of human’.\textsuperscript{85} These hyperbolic representations could in part be seen to justify the violence of the colonial encounter in which he was implicated. Indeed, more than one publication hailed Coillard as the redeemer of Barotseland: ‘through him the country began to be saved’;\textsuperscript{86} ‘c’est par l’œuvre de cet admirable pionnier de l’Évangile que le pays retrouva sa tranquillité. [...] c’est l’œuvre régénératrice de Coillard qui empêcha le royaume de courir à sa ruine’.\textsuperscript{87} Coillard was visible as a heroic figure.

For Christian audiences, Coillard was visible as a hero too, a hero of the faith, found in ‘la légende missionnaire’.\textsuperscript{88} He was represented as an ‘ambassadeur du Christ’,\textsuperscript{89} ‘fighting on tenaciously to evolve Christianity and moral order out of the Barotsi chaos’,\textsuperscript{90} and he was affirmed as a ‘grand exemple’ of ‘foi inébranlable’, who
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was able to ‘comprendre les hommes, [and] les pénétrer dans l’intimité de leur être’. In language similar to that which describes the very word of God - ‘it penetrates even to dividing soul and spirit, joints and marrow; it judges the thoughts and attitudes of the heart’ – Coillard was accorded almost divine qualities. He was likened to fifteenth-century reformer and martyr, Savonarola, he was elevated to status of an ‘apôtre’, compared to a ‘prophet’, Elijah, and ‘courageux’ John the Baptist, and described as ‘Christlike’. At his death, he was quasi-canonised as one writer traced his name ‘dans le livre d’or des grandes âmes’, referring to the ‘Lamb’s book of life’ in the book of Revelation, but adding gold detail as though to make the pages worthy of Coillard’s ‘grand[e] âm[e]’ and great name. He was portrayed as a ‘Chrétien d’élite’, one of the ‘héroïques pionniers de l’Evangile’, and his work was depicted as a ‘mission héroïque’, and ‘une des œuvres de conquête missionnaire les plus remarquables du XIXe siècle’. This representation had the two-fold effect of inspiring the Church, and also gaining support for the mission itself. Jean-François Zorn writes, in his history of SMEP, C’est autant […] pour démontrer la capacité des Eglises de France à fonder de nouvelles Eglises, que la Mission de Paris doit accomplir un effort financier et de propagande considérable pour faire du Zambèze un second Lesotho. Nous verrons quels moyens sont mis en œuvre pour héroïser, en quelque sorte, l’œuvre de Coillard et de ses compagnons, afin d’insuffler aux Eglises de France, prisonnières de leurs conflits ecclésiastiques, une grande vision de l’évangélisation du monde. Therefore, the ‘heroisation’ of Coillard served a financial purpose, according to Zorn, and inspired and infused the French Church with the zeal and desire to follow in his
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evangelising footsteps. Although the missionary worked abroad, his visibility at home encouraged religious faith and reinforced colonial assumptions.

Long after his death, Coillard remains visible, present in French and British literature of two principle genres: religious and historical. In terms of the religious narrative, Coillard is held up as one of the ‘outstanding Protestant pioneers of the Gospel’, and as such, an authoritative voice on religious issues such as prayer: ‘Francois [sic] Coillard explains, “Our prayers for the evangelisation of the world are but a bitter irony as long as we give only of our superfluity, and draw back before the sacrifice of ourselves.”’ Furthermore, the Coillards are an example of marriage, found at Christianity.com: ‘never before or since was there quite a love match in a missionary team’, ‘the two were a loving couple who flew to each other’s side when the other was in danger or sick’. Coillard is an example of Christian life and faith.

Then, in terms of historical visibility, Coillard is regarded as instrumental in the establishment of Christianity in Zambia and its continuation in Lesotho. But he is also visible in the colonial history of these places. One 1984 account of the relationship between the United States and Africa cites Coillard as ‘a veteran missionary statesman’ who took ‘an important role during the 1890s in persuading the Lozi (Barotse) king to place himself under British protection’. This account depicts Coillard as a political figure, and shows him as active in the Lochner concession. Indeed, Coillard is visible in a number of publications in this context. In some accounts, he is neutral, even innocent, reluctant to enter colonial discussions about land: ‘Coillard’s reputation for neutrality’; ‘Shippard’s message deceived both Lewanika and Coillard’, ‘Coillard was
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almost as much an innocent as Lewanika in dealing with Rhodes and his agent’;\textsuperscript{111} ‘Coillard was not eager to comply […] Finally the missionary gave way’.\textsuperscript{112} But in other accounts, Coillard ‘played an active role in bringing Barotseland toward the end of the last century’:\textsuperscript{113} ‘François Coillard, the Paris Society leader, had achieved a measure of influence with the chief’, ‘the pro-British Coillard, who feared Portuguese or German interference from the west and consequently desired British protection in order to further his missionary endeavour’, ‘Coillard […] induced Lewanika […] to request British protection’, ‘with Coillard’s active assistance [Lochner] finally persuaded Lewanika’.\textsuperscript{114} Coillard is visible as an influential and manipulative colonial agent. Moreover, in pockets of France and southern Africa, Coillard’s name is still present. In France, in Asnières-les-Bourges (Coillard’s birthplace), a road was named Rue François Coillard in 1950, the town paying ‘homage à son grand homme’;\textsuperscript{115} and ‘Coillard Street’ and ‘Coillard Memorial Church’ can be found in Livingstone, Southern Zambia.\textsuperscript{116} François Coillard even has a Facebook page.\textsuperscript{117}

Coillard’s visibility in his mission-translation work is undeniable, described specifically as ‘[m]issionnaire-explorateur français bien connu’,\textsuperscript{118} and ‘le célèbre François Coillard’,\textsuperscript{119} and ‘le digne missionnaire protestant que tant d’entre nous
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connaissent, au moins de nom’. Indeed, two years after his death, we read of ‘le nom de M. Coillard, si populaire en France, en Grand-Bretagne et en Suisse’. Seven years later, in 1913, a literary journal asks, ‘Qui n’a entendu le nom de François Coillard?’ And then ten years later, Edward Shillito’s biography states, ‘François Coillard is not one of the missionaries who needs to be rescued from the neglect of his own generation’. In his political history of Zambia, Gerald Caplan writes that Coillard was ‘one of the two most important white men in Barotseland’, and in Karen Milbourne’s overview of craft and creativity in Barotseland, she acknowledges that ‘Lewanika is a household name, but so are the names of Coillard and his successors [...] recognised as part of the special history of this region’.

In some ways this visibility was imposed on Coillard malgré lui as nineteenth-century journalism and post-colonial historians exposed and examined his work. However, in other ways, François Coillard pursued visibility. As well as featuring in other people’s publications, Coillard published his own work. Encouraged by SMEP, by editing and collating letters which had already been published in the Journal des Missions Evangéliques, and with the help and translations of his niece, Catharine W. Mackintosh, Coillard published On the Threshold of Central Africa (1897) in London, and Sur le Haut Zambèze (1898) in Paris, ‘a de-luxe edition on glossy paper and with forty printed plates’. According to Jean-François Zorn, ‘It was an immediate best-seller in both countries’. Although Coillard did not write much about the book in his correspondence and diary entries, other than the anticipation of writing it – ‘cinq semaines pour écrire un livre’ - and the acknowledgement of its publication - ‘Quel accueil lui fera-t-on? Quel bien, surtout, fera-t-il?’ - in the production of an autobiography Coillard created visibility for himself.
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This visibility accomplished three things: it achieved an awareness of the mission process, it legitimised the mission work, and it provided an example for others. Zorn documents that Coillard’s publication meant that ‘at last people could now get an overall picture of the missionary work in Zambezi [sic] over the last twelve years previously only available to the few readers of the JDME’.\(^{131}\) Coillard’s visibility, according to Zorn, promoted the awareness of the missionary work to a wider readership. Coillard seems to have felt this too, as in one publication we read,

\[\text{M. Coillard termine sa conférence en exprimant la joie profonde qu’il ressentit à son retour en Europe après vingt-trois ans d’absence, en apprenant combien les travaux des missionnaires y étaient appréciés, alors qu’il les croyait complètement ignorés dans le silence des déserts africains.}\(^{132}\)

Coillard’s visibility and recognition reassured him as to his support and the general awareness of the seemingly ignored mission work. Visibility was Coillard’s antidote to public ignorance. Furthermore, in the author’s preface to \textit{On the Threshold}, we read that the book was written specifically ‘for the rising generation’\(^{133}\), to incite and invite them to take on the work after him. Visibility is a method of recruitment. This seems to have been effective as James Clifford writes,

\[\text{The vigor of his propaganda and personal charisma had brought him rapid success – measured in donations, stations, and staff, if not in the creation of independent African churches. He embodied an evangelical “imago” that never failed to move the faithful: the lone man in white, paddled by blacks up an infested African river, bringing the Gospel to lost souls.}\(^{134}\)

Coillard’s very visible public image and confident personality, here, are seen to have been great driving forces of promotion. But more than propaganda, Jean-François Zorn writes that through the publication of \textit{Sur le Haut-Zambèze}:

\[\text{Coillard testified to a work begun which, with the support of churches and the sympathy of wider circles, he would carry forward in the eyes of the world, and in the name of France. Was this not precisely the legitimacy that Coillard had come in search of in Europe?}\(^{135}\)

Coillard’s autobiography generated support and sympathy, but Zorn suggests that Coillard also seeks this visibility to \textit{legitimise} his work.

\[\text{As well as in Europe, Coillard also sought visibility as he undertook mission-translation in the communities of southern Africa. Although he attempted to assimilate}\]
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into the indigenous community to an extent, for example through language acquisition and habitation, he still continued to wear European clothes. Although living a significant proportion of his missionary life in a wagon or a tent, he erected a church and a house in the image of those back home. And although not often in one place for very long before being moved by his own mission society or by the local political situation, Coillard planted fields and gardens, ‘soigné à l’européenne’. He integrated, but preserved visible difference. Coillard kept a structure and order to his life as in Europe, seeking to ‘mener une vie plus régulière’. One biographer of Christina Coillard writes,

To both of them scrupulous attention to cleanliness and neatness in their dress and surroundings, to courtesy and grace in daily living, were everyday requirements [...] If the missionary were not himself an example of the graciousness of Christian life, from whom would his converts learn it? The missionary’s visible difference and order was to act as ‘an example’ of ‘Christian life’, the missionary-translator’s very life being seen again as a significant part of his work. The missionary’s differences were visible, therefore, in order to instruct, and to support the foreign ideas he preached.

The three goals of the missionary-translator’s visibility can be seen in the promotion of visibility in translation proper. Coillard’s visibility served as propaganda whereby visibility made known the processes and practices occurring in mission: Coillard wrote, ‘All this [...] did not add to our importance for ourselves. It is not us, but
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136 He is said to ‘parle leur langue comme l’un d’eux’, Glardon, p. 549. See also: ‘C’est pour moi un sujet de reconnaissance envers le Seigneur que je puisse maintenant prêcher assez librement en zoulou [...]’. Ma femme s’en tire aussi très bien’, ‘J’aurais pleuré d’émotion et de reconnaissance la première fois que j’ai pu parler à ces pauvres Zoulous d’un Dieu Sauveur qui les aime’, ‘Prêché en sessouto et en zoulou sur Heb II, 3’; ‘nous couchons parmi eux, dans une tente qui se boutonne par dehors, avec autant de sécurité que vous avec vos portes fermées à clef’, in Favre, Lessouto, pp. 67, 135, 137, 147.
137 For example, ‘une jaquette en serge blanche, que lui avait faite Mme Coillard’, in Favre, Zambèze, p. 292.
139 ‘Les Coillard ont un beau jardin, soigné à l’européenne’, in Favre, Lessouto, p. 223. See also, ‘le champ [...] est ensemencé d’un peu de blé européen’, in Favre, Lessouto, p. 64.
140 Favre, Lessouto, p. 65.
Africa, our Mission Society and our Protestantism that are honoured’,\textsuperscript{142} and claimed that his visibility served to raise awareness for the larger missionary work. Similarly, visibility in translation proper seeks to encourage the awareness in the contemporary consciousness that the translation process is occurring. The active foreignisation techniques that Lawrence Venuti advocates as opposed to the supposedly passive and subservient domestication strategies, ‘highlight the foreignness of the texts […] to ensure that readers recognise that they are reading a work that originated somewhere else’\textsuperscript{143} In a foreignised translation, the ‘foreignness’ of the text is preserved as much as possible by the translator; the reader is made aware that they are \textit{not} reading the original. According to Venuti, such visible translation strategies promote the translation process itself.\textsuperscript{144} Visibility thus enables the reader’s awareness of translation.

Furthermore, Coillard’s visibility, according to Zorn, legitimised and validated his work. Likewise in translation proper, where Venuti claims that invisibility ‘devalues translation’,\textsuperscript{145} the translator’s visibility allegedly gives worth to the translator and recognises his efforts. Venuti writes that in common pro-invisibility practice, ‘translation is required to efface its second-order status with the effect of transparency, producing the illusion of authorial presence whereby the translated text can be taken as the original’.\textsuperscript{146} Therefore, invisibility conceals the translation’s very status as a translation and thus a visible translator validates the very process and status of translation.

Finally, Coillard’s visibility enabled him to demonstrate that which he wanted to see reciprocated; his visible difference in the indigenous communities had an agenda. In the same way, a visible translation proper is a deliberate ‘locus of difference’.\textsuperscript{147} Whether a feminist or post-colonial approach, translations in which the translator’s efforts are visible seek to subvert and resist a dominant assumption.\textsuperscript{148} Visibility is

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{142} Zorn, \textit{Transforming}, p. 12.  \\
\textsuperscript{143} Bassnett, \textit{Reflections on Translation}, p. 17.  \\
\textsuperscript{144} ‘The effect of [invisibility and] transparency conceals the numerous conditions under which the translation is made, starting with the translators crucial intervention’, Lawrence Venuti, \textit{The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation}, 2nd edn (Abingdon; New York: Routledge, 2008), p. 1.  \\
\textsuperscript{145} Venuti, \textit{Invisibility}, p. 7.  \\
\textsuperscript{146} Venuti, \textit{Invisibility}, p. 6.  \\
\textsuperscript{147} Venuti, \textit{Invisibility}, p. 34.  \\
\textsuperscript{148} Translations should be ‘intervention[s] according to Venuti, ‘translators must also force a revision of the codes – cultural, economic, legal, - that marginalise and exploit them’, Venuti, \textit{Invisibility}, pp. 276, 273.
\end{flushright}
didactic in translation, possessing an ‘interventionist power’, according to Rosemary Arrojo.\(^{149}\) Therefore, just as Coillard pursued visibility for awareness, recognition, legitimacy, and ultimately, to promote an agenda, so too is visibility promoted in Translation Studies. Indeed, it seems that Coillard was in favour of the (missionary-) translator’s visibility and used his visibility for the advantage of Christianity and of his mission.

However, as well as pursuing visibility, Coillard was also an invisible missionary-translator. Coillard was hailed as ‘le plus grand missionnaire qu’ait connu la Société des Missions Évangéliques de Paris’,\(^ {150}\) however, considering that SMEP was a Protestant French mission society, with 193 missionaries sent out in the nineteenth century in contrast to the \textit{London Missionary Society} which sent out 1,300 in that time,\(^ {151}\) this apparent visibility is perhaps not so significant after all. Furthermore, although popular in France, Great Britain and Switzerland, we read that he was ‘presque ignoré en Allemagne’.\(^ {152}\) His visibility was therefore not ubiquitous. Similarly, although Coillard’s mission-translation may have been to some extent visible in the past, he is largely invisible now; where in the past he was found in national newspapers and geographical journals, now he can only be found in those few contexts as discussed – in obscure religious devotionals and historical accounts of colonialism in Lesotho and Zambia.

Furthermore, as well as becoming invisible in different parts of the world and over time, Coillard did also desire invisibility. In one of his letters to the director of SMEP, he stated, ‘C’est à vous que j’écris et je n’aime pas que mes lettres, mes pauvres lettres, soient lues par tout le monde’.\(^ {153}\) He did not wish for his letters to be read or published (it is worth pointing out that, contrary to Coillard’s protestation, we read his letter, published in Edouard Favre’s biography). In another of his letters to Alfred Bertrand, president of the \textit{Société de Géographie de Genève}, in 1901, Coillard wrote,

\textit{Glorifier Dieu, non pas l’homme, c’est là, après tout, le but unique de la vie. [...] C’est ce que pensait Jean-Baptiste quand il disait : « Il faut qu’Il croisse et que je diminue. » Voilà ce que je me répète chaque jour à moi-même.}\(^ {154}\)

\(^{149}\) Arrojo, p. 121.  
\(^{150}\) \textit{Revue international des Missions} in Zorn, \textit{Grand}, p. 499.  
\(^{151}\) ‘Around 10,000 missionaries were dispatched from Britain in those first hundred years [nineteenth century]; over 1,300 by the LMS alone’, Manktelow, p. 2.  
\(^{152}\) ‘Lettre D’Allemagne’, p. 3.  
\(^{153}\) Favre, \textit{Lessouto}, p. 69.  
\(^{154}\) Favre, \textit{Zambèze}, p. 483.
By this logic, a mission-translation which seeks self-promotion is therefore taking the glory from God himself. Coillard instead asserted that missionary-translators ought to diminish themselves, for the sake of the visibility of God. Coillard repeated this verse, cited from John’s gospel, throughout his writing, emphasising his desire to be less visible in his work, and his desire that God, the one whose message he proclaims, would be more visible.155

Where in translation theory, invisibility is, as Lawrence Venuti writes, a ‘weird self-annihilation’, negatively critiquing translators who domesticate, Coillard saw this ‘self-annihilation’ as the profoundly positive goal of his work.156 Indeed, many times in his letters and diaries, Coillard claimed that the life of a missionary was ‘une vie de foi et de renoncement’,157 a life of active trust and self-denial.158 Mission, according to Coillard, was a self-effacement. Just as Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak claims that ‘the translator must surrender to the text’,159 Coillard surrendered himself to the work and to the visibility of the ‘text’, or message of his mission-translation. He wrote of the danger of visibility whereby the missionary-translator is recognised rather than the message, the gospel: ‘Nous sommes tous portés […] à identifier l’Evangile avec l’homme qui le prêche, et à oublier que c’est bien cet Evangile et non le prédicateur qui est la puissance de Dieu’.160 Indeed, when Coillard described the preaching of the controversial Anglican bishop, John Colenso, residing in neighbouring Natal, he condemned precisely the visibility of the heretical leader:

Sa prédication est des plus captivantes. […] je dois dire que j’eusse été émerveillé de son discours, si j’avais pu sympathiser avec ce qu’il nous enseignait. Ce fameux discours était une confession de foi, ou plutôt une dénégation de foi. […] C’était un discours parfaitement blasphématoire.161

Colenso was certainly visible – ‘captivant’ – and yet his content was unrecognisable for Coillard. Indeed, Coillard continued, ‘je m’étonne pas que plusieurs de ses adhérents s’attachent plus à sa personne qu’à ses doctrines’.162 By his visibility,
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156 Venuti, Invisibility, p. 8.
157 Favre, Lessouto, p. 477.
158 See also, when writing to a young boy who wanted to be a missionary, Coillard stated that the ‘première condition’ for the vocation is ‘qu’il renonce à lui-même, qu’il se charge de sa croix et qu’il le suive’, words which echo Matthew 6.24, Mark 8.24, Luke 9.23. Favre, Lessouto, p. 508.
160 Favre, Lessouto, p. 147.
161 Favre, Lessouto, p. 133.
162 Favre, Lessouto, p. 133.
Colenso, the aggressive translator edified himself rather than his text, and this Coillard did not condone. Coillard would have perhaps approved then, of this description of him:

Il est étrange [...] de constater combien ces grands explorateurs sont modestes. Coillard nous a rappelé Cambier. On s’irrite presque d’un pareil effacement de soi-même, que nous ne comprenons pas dans notre milieu bruyant et personnel [...].

Coillard, even as he spoke publically and visibly, was presented as self-effacing, and modest. He renounced himself and, ironically, this self-sacrifice is emphasised (we will return to this paradox in a moment).

Ralph Ellison claims that in Translation Studies, ‘to be considered “invisible” [...] is a gross insult’, and that the only presented response to this status is to exploit it as it ‘provides the greatest margin for movement, especially of the subversive kind’. Ellison would have us believe that the only reaction to invisibility is subversion and rebellion. However, Coillard pursued invisibility; the invisibility sought by the missionary, reflecting the humility of the ‘Word become flesh’, is one which gives of itself to reconcile God and man. Therefore, although Coillard pursued visibility in Europe and Africa, through tours and publications, for support and validation, he also desired a translation where the translator is invisible, humble, and self-sacrificial for the sake of the text. Norman Shapiro asserts that ‘A good translation [...] should never call attention to itself’, and writes, ‘certainly my ego and personality are involved in translating, and yet I have to try to [translate] in such a way that my own personality doesn’t show’. Similarly, Coillard saw visible translations, as self-promotional, and therefore only mounds of rubble reminiscent of the unfinished tower of Babel: ‘Il ne faut pas que la mission [...] soit une question personnelle, la mission de M. Coillard : ce serait sa ruine’.

So then, Coillard advocated visibility and invisibility for the missionary. Indeed, he did not employ the binary with which Venuti supplies us in Translation Studies where the translator is one or the other. Instead, Coillard was somehow both. He was
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165 Brodzki, p. 8.
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the example, the charisma, the visible persona. And yet he was also the mouthpiece of
God, a passive, invisible instrument of the message of salvation. Furthermore, this
(in)visibility becomes more complex as we see that each conjures the other. Even as
his modesty was described, his invisibility had attention and was being made visible.170
On the other hand too, as he was rendered visible in multiple publications, he was
invisible within these representations; Coillard’s visibility, past and present, as secular
explorer and hero, and religious hero of the faith, as colonial victim and colonial
perpetrator, is not and cannot be a full visibility, but rather this visibility is a partial
one. For these representations of Coillard are themselves only partial, myths which
‘empty reality’,171 are ‘almost transparent’,172 and present ‘half-amputated’
distortion[s].173 Indeed, to follow this description of partial physicality, Coillard’s
physical appearance was often not represented. In one instance, we read that his
beard added to his explorer profile: ‘A la grand barbe blanche, est le type du pionnier;
il fait songer à Livingstone’.174 And on another occasion we see that his renowned
personality did not match up to his physical stature: ‘Mais je vous croyais plus
grand!’175 But apart from these instances there are very few references to Coillard’s
physical appearance. The suppression of the physical in favour of the elevation of the
spiritual and emotional can be seen in this 1896 description of the missionary:

Au physique, M. Coillard est d’une taille au-dessous de la moyenne et le regard
n’est frappé que par une grande barbe blanche descendant au milieu de la
poitrine. Mais bientôt le charme opère. Sous cette enveloppe assez frêle, veille
une âme méditative que l’on croit entrevoir à travers ces yeux profonds et
lumineux. La bouche est mince et serrée, laissant entendre qu’il n’en sortira
rien qui n’ait été longuement mûri à l’intérieur. Sur l’ensemble de la
physionomie, un voile de douceur résignée et un peu triste, l’air d’un homme,
traversant ce monde, ses joies, ses misères, ses beautés, en voyageur qui
regarde toujours au-delà.176

Coillard’s physical body is barely discussed elsewhere, but even here where he is
described ‘au physique’, the writer employs the physical only to move quickly on to his
character and his work. As Coillard is frequently described amid a plethora of

170 ‘On s’irrite presque d’un pareil effacement de soi-même, que nous ne comprenons pas dans notre
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172 Barthes, Mythologies, pp. 142, 158.
173 Barthes, Mythologies, p. 146.
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175 Rey, p. 34.
176 August Sabatier, In Zorn, Grand, p. 478.
superlatives and barely depicted as a physical man with physical attributes other than in the cited examples, he is only partially visible. Indeed, many retellings of Coillard’s story are partial even in their spelling: ‘Francisco Coillard, one of the first missionaries in Africa’, 177 ‘Francios Coillard, a French Calvinist missionary’, 178 ‘Rev Francis Coillard’. 179 Additionally, more than in spellings, Coillard’s character was distorted, misrepresented. For example, Coillard, the one heralded as a valiant, military hero (see above) is the one who says to Serpa Pinto, ‘Je n’y serais parvenu qu’au prix du sang versé, et jamais je ne tuerai un homme pour sauver ma vie ni même celle des miens’. 180 The real, passive Coillard is invisible in the heroic representations of him. When completing her biography of Coillard, Catharine Winkworth Mackintosh acknowledged, ‘In looking over this biography, I am deeply conscious of its inadequacy to give a living portrait. All the letters and journals quoted have been condensed, and in the process much of their parfum has fled.’ 181 Mackintosh knew that her writing could not re-create the person of Coillard and would only be a distant scent, a fragment. But the lack of the ‘living portrait’ is not only evident in Mackintosh’s work, but in all of the publications which perpetuate the Coillard myth.

So then, the missionary-translator François Coillard shows us that the translator proper can be both visible and invisible simultaneously as he works. As Albrecht Neubrecht and Gregory Shreve write, ‘Linguistic expressions at the textual surface are the [...] remnants of the translator’s presence’. 182 The ‘translator’s presence’ is visible as the reader engages with a visible text, one chosen and crafted by the translator. The translator will always be inevitably present and visible in the translation work to some extent, as his choices, words and sentences, are visible. But at the same time, the

180 Pinto, Comment, p. 254.
181 Mackintosh, Zambesi, p. vii. Emphasis added. It is interesting that Mackintosh should use the word ‘aroma’ in regards to her inadequate presentation of Coillard, when Coillard himself uses a similar notion to describe the loss in translation: ‘M Creux impressionna vivement l’assemblée par un discours qui perdit pourtant de son parfum par la traduction’, Favre, Lessouto, p. 278.
translator will also be unavoidably invisible in the text as ‘the writer of the original story remains in the reader’s consciousness as a haunting presence in the text’, as Jenni Ramone writes, demonstrating the partial visibility of the translator alongside the partial presence of the ‘original’ author, and the ‘original story’.183 Furthermore, as Bella Brodzki asserts, ‘[r]arely is the name of the translator on the [book] cover’, going on to expose the invisibility of the translator on title pages and ‘other essential bibliographical information’.184 The translator, although visible in the text, in the very act and product of translation, is also invisible.

In the simultaneous presence and absence, visibility and invisibility of the missionary-translator, we see then that the translator proper is a spectre in translation. In contrast to the common image of translator as bridge, Michael Emmerich discusses the translator as ‘something like a ghost’, whereby, ‘Rather than imagine the translator as someone who stands between languages, cultures, and nations, [...] he is] a ghost who haunts languages, cultures, and nations, existing in two worlds at once but belonging fully to neither.’185 Emmerich posits translation as a ghostly act, one in which the translator is ‘neither entirely visible nor entirely invisible to those who stand in one world or the other, even in the finished form of her product, because she is in their world but not of it.’186 Just as Coillard, therefore, was invisibly visible in the representations built up around him, and was also visibly invisible, perceptibly modest about his own efforts for the sake of the glory of God’s work, the translator proper is this ghostly translator too – both visible and invisible, partial, spectral.

François Coillard, the missionary-translator, was visible in many representations of him as explorer, hero, and colonial agent, and in his self-representation as an example of difference, but his mission-translation was also invisible as he sought the fame of his religion and his God. Furthermore, his visibility was itself only partial, a myth of ‘essences’,187 and his invisibility was also partial as he was seen and recognised to be self-effacing. He therefore demonstrates in his being both a visible and invisible
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missionary-translator, that Venuti’s binary in translation proper must acknowledge a third way, a spectral translucence where the translator is both visible and invisible, present and absent.

**Teams in Translation**

When considering the pervasive representations of François Coillard, above, we can see at a glance that the construction of this explorer-missionary is that of one man, a singular legend, a solo hero. However, much of Coillard’s mission-translation work was done in collaboration with others, as part of a team. Similarly, the translator proper is also often presented as a singular being, rarely found in collective contexts such as ‘team of translators’. Even in Lawrence Venuti’s text arguing against invisibility, *The Translator’s Invisibility*, the collective in translation is invisible. And yet many of the translator’s processes are aided by external agents and resources, translation being a collaborative enterprise. In Translation Studies we see a few collaborative examples of translation. Bible translation, which ‘exceeds the capacity of individuals’, ‘has a long history of institutional translation practice’, and employs ‘translation teams’. The fansubbing genre, an increasingly popular activity where translations are performed by ‘networks of fans’, involves ‘communities of activists [...] engaged in networking and exploiting their collective intelligence’. And Burton Raffel discusses ‘collaborative translation’ as a subgenre of translation whereby partners in translation work together, ‘Each possess[ing] knowledge and abilities that the other does not have’. Elsewhere, if the collective nature of translation is acknowledged, it is usually tucked away deep ‘under the singular term “translator”’, for ‘convenience’ of argument, as
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Andrew Chesterman admits. However, rather than confining collaboration to subsections of Translation Studies, or to a footnote or brief mention, by considering the collective work behind the representations of Coillard - work accomplished with his wife, other missionaries, indigenous converts, and with the support of the French mission society – this section re-examines the translator’s process, often made visible as a singular work in Translation Studies, proposing it instead as a collective enterprise and thus the translator as a collective concept. By considering Coillard’s mission-translation community, we can therefore redefine translation as a collective endeavour.

François Coillard’s work is largely presented as a singular work. Observing some of the titles of the many books depicting the mission (compared to one title for Christina), we can see the singularity of his fame: François Coillard, François Coillard: A Wayfaring Man, François Coillard: Pathfinder on the Upper Zambezi, Franz Coillard’s Sambesi-mission. The mission is portrayed as belonging to Coillard, this lone traveller and pioneer. Similarly, in the titles of Edouard Favre’s biographies, which contain letters and writings of Christina as well as her husband, only François Coillard’s name is found, the singular ‘missionnaire’. In some instances, other workers are acknowledged, such as in Jean-François Zorn’s The Mission of François Coillard and Basuto Evangelists, and the title of Catharine Winkworth Mackintosh’s biography features the notion that Coillard’s work was not done in isolation: Coillard of the Zambesi: the lives of François and Christina Coillard, of the Paris Missionary Society, in South and Central Africa (1858-1904). Christina Coillard is acknowledged in this title, as well as the mission society, however, they only appear as a subtitle to François’ work. In contrast, as the remainder of this chapter will demonstrate, other agents were integral to the mission-translation work.

First and foremost, his wife worked with him. Her role in the mission-translation will be explored in more depth in chapter 2 of this thesis, but here we will see that she was a significant partner in the mission, validating and sharing Coillard’s
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own work. Christina’s letters feature in Edouard Favre’s works, and her voice can be heard in the accounts of Majors Pinto and Malan, though all to a lesser extent than those of François Coillard. But although Christina Coillard was often represented only as a subtext to Coillard’s missionary work, she was vital for his mission.

Firstly, she enabled him. Coillard needed a wife so that he could undertake his work on two counts. The first was that he was remarkably lonely, and this especially due to his spiritual isolation in a non-Christian context.202 The second was that the indigenous community would not take him seriously without one. In James Addison’s biography we read,

Many [...] were not satisfied that the missionary should have a mother. They refused to regard him as sufficiently mature to teach until he had a beard and a wife. The beard he was able to produce with reasonable promptness, but for the wife, in these first years, he could only hope.203

The indigenous people did not trust Coillard without a wife, as he was still thought to be dependent; therefore, he was a figure without authority, unable to teach. When Coillard managed to secure a ‘yes’ from Christina Mackintosh after his second proposal to her, he wrote, ‘I cannot believe my own happiness [...] Molapo [the local ruler], now he knows I am going to be married, considers me a man, acquaints me with his affairs, and asks my advice!’204 Christina’s acceptance, and later her presence, granted François personal happiness, but also authenticated his work among the indigenous people. The counterpart, the wife of the missionary, validated him in his context.

Furthermore, as well as legitimising his mission-translation work, Christina contributed to it. At the beginning of his autobiography Coillard’s dedication reads,

\[\text{A LA MÉMOIRE BÉNIE}\\ \text{DE CELLE}\\ \text{QUI PENDANT TREnte ANNÉES}\\ \text{A EMBELLI MON PÉLERINAGE ET PARTAGÉ MES LABEURS}\\ \text{SUPPORTÉ NOBLEMENT LES VOYAGES, AVENTURES, PÉRILS ET PRIVATIONS}\\ \text{D’UNE VIE DE PIONNIER}\\ \text{A CONSOMMÉ LE SACRIFICE DE SA VIE AU SERVICE DE SON MAITRE}\\ \text{AU PAYS DES BA-ROTSI, SUR LE HAUT-ZAMBÈZE}\\ \text{ET MAINTENANT DORT EN PAIX A SÉFOULA}\\ \text{« ATTENDANT LE MATIN »}205\]

202 Addison, p. 9.
203 Addison, p. 9.
204 Addison, p. 9.
205 François Coillard, Haut-Zambèze (1898), p. v.
We read here that Christina had ‘embelli’ and ‘partagé’ the work of Coillard, and bore, herself, ‘une vie de pionnier’. She enhanced his work, and worked with him, undergoing similar trials, and undertaking similar journeys and tasks. In the Christian journal, *Foi et Vie*, Daniel Couve wrote of Christina as ‘celle qui, à partir de 1861, fait véritablement un avec lui, partageant ses joies et ses peines, fidèle, avec lui et comme lui, dans les bons et dans les mauvais jours’.\(^{206}\) Again we are told that Christina went through the same things as François – joys and sorrows – becoming, as J. H. Morrison writes, ‘the never failing helper and solace of her husband, and the companion of all his wanderings’.\(^{207}\) But she was not only a helper who merely followed her husband; on one occasion Coillard wrote to Christina of their equality in the work: ‘Ma bien-aimée, tu es une servante de Jésus-Christ, comme je suis son serviteur [...] Ta part dans cette entreprise [...] est tout aussi grande que la mienne’.\(^{208}\) Together they were a ‘match’, a ‘team’,\(^{209}\) ‘les grands Coillard’.\(^{210}\) Coillard replied to those who asked if she would go with him on his expedition, ‘Of course ! Elle est mon monde et je suis le sien!’\(^{211}\) Coillard’s assumption was that they would go together, and work together.

And yet, although she *shared* her husband’s labours, they did not carry out the same role (we will see more of this in chapter 2). As well as teaching children at the mission,\(^{212}\) we often read of Christina nursing an invalid,\(^{213}\) being an ‘hôtesse’ to numerous guests,\(^{214}\) cleaning and sewing,\(^{215}\) and generally maintaining the home.\(^{216}\) Regarding her examples of missionary wives, Winifred Mathews asserts, ‘without them
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\(^{207}\) Morrison, p. 223.  
\(^{209}\) Graves.  
\(^{210}\) Couve, p. 100.  
\(^{211}\) Favre, *Lessouto*, p. 278.  
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\(^{215}\) ‘In addition to superintending all house and garden work, feeding the animals, [...] teaching in the school daily, visiting in the village, and in the distant excursions for evangelising, she had to do all the sewing; make candles; make as well as mend all the house linen, her own clothes, her husband’s, and those of their servants’, in Mackintosh, *Zambesi*, pp. 109–10.  
\(^{216}\) See chapter 2 for further explanation.
their respective husbands would have been like birds trying to fly with one wing’. 217 Mathews recognises the complementarity of husband and wife in mission. She goes on to say, ‘If they [missionary wives] had not worked among the women while their husbands taught the men, the churches established as a result of the men’s work would have lacked depth and permanence’. 218 Mathews claims that, not only does the presence of wives enable their husbands to work, but that the partnership itself gives greater depth and thus duration to the mission-translations. So then, as Christina and François embarked on mission as a unit, they were effective and reflective missionary-translators. Christina’s work enabled François to undertake his own, but she was also active in the mission. As both wife and woman, Christina was a vital agent in their mission-translation endeavour.

Furthermore, François Coillard’s work was collective as he worked with other European and American missionaries. In the bulletin for the Société de Géographie de Marseille, the account of Coillard’s journey to the ‘haut-Zambèze’ includes many contributors:

M. Coillard est accompagné de sa vaillante compagne Mme Coillard, de sa nièce Mlle Coillard, de M. le missionnaire Jeanmairet, de deux aides missionnaires indigènes et de leurs familles, de MM. Waddell et Middleton, qui seront chargés spécialement des travaux de construction de la station, enfin de deux jeunes indigènes originaire du haut Zambèze, qui ont passé plusieurs années à l’école des missionnaires française de Morija. C’est donc toute une petite colonie qui va s’établir sous l’égide de la France, au cœur même de l’Afrique. […] M. Coillard et ses collaborateurs […] 219

In this ‘colonie’ of travellers, the mission-translation work is signalled as an act of collaboration of parties, and not the feat of a single figure. As well as his wife and niece, Coillard was accompanied by Dorwald Jeanmairet, a fellow SMEP missionary, as well as MM. Waddell (Scottish) and Middleton (English) who were, though not identified as such by the writer of the article, listed as missionaries in the Liste des Missionnaires de la SMEP (1822-1971), and recognised as ‘aide missionnaires’. 220 As the bulletin states, they were included in the party in order to build the mission station on arrival. These fellow missionaries provided a very physical help to the mission-translation work, erecting shelter where needed. They - very practically - provided the
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space in which the work was conducted and lived out. On other occasions, European (and American) missionaries were mentioned alongside Coillard as partners for the same cause. In *Le Figaro*, we read of ‘MM. les missionnaires Coillard et Christol’, and ‘missionnaires Coillard et Escande’. Additionally, in Coillard’s own autobiography he mentioned countless other missionaries who were in Africa with him. He heard them preach, benefited from their hospitality, contributed to regional synods and conferences, and was offered a home by them when exiled from Léribé due to civil war. Furthermore, he did not only coexist with them; he learnt about and from their different methods of mission, for example, the German emphasis on ‘adoration’, and the Wesleyan work ethic. Coillard wrote of a German mission at Hermannsberg, ‘Rien de plus intéressant et de plus instructif que de voir comment diverses nationalités et différentes dénominations comprennent l’œuvre des missions, et de comparer les résultats de leurs systèmes’. Other missions and missionaries inspired him.

Moreover, as well as collaborating with other European missionaries where he was, Coillard’s mission-translations were collaborations with past missionaries too. He interacted with indigenous individuals who had been educated by missionaries and who had attended ‘l’école biblique’ at Morija. Coillard carried on a work already begun. This idea of continuation and collaboration is evident in the account of the house given to SMEP missionary, Frédéric Christol, in Basutoland: built by Hamilton Dyke (‘aide-missionnaire puis pasteur’ 1839-1878); inhabited by Eugène Casalis (pastor 1832 - 1855) and Frédéric Ellenberger (pastor 1860 -1905); and the place of Samuel Jean de Paris, ‘Nouvelles Diverses’, *Le Figaro* (Paris, 19 April 1882), p. 56.
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Rolland’s (pastor 1829-1873) death. Many other past missionaries contributed to the work. Similarly, in his translation proper, another SMEP missionary, François Villéger, working in Senegal, benefitted from past mission-work, using the previous work of Catholic missionaries in the translation of ‘l’Evangile selon Saint Matthieu’ into Wolof. He wrote to SMEP, ‘l’orthographe qu’ait adoptée les missionnaires catholiques pour leur catéchismes parce que leurs élèves lisent le Wolof en général’. Recognising the established orthography begun by past Catholic missionaries, Villéger continued the work, building on from the orthography, and creating a text. Therefore, other missionaries, past and present, were key in mission-translation work.

Furthermore, indigenous missionaries were a part of the mission group. These indigenous counterparts will be discussed in greater depth in chapter 3, but here we will see that they were crucial in the conceptualisation of the mission and in its execution. Indeed, although, above and elsewhere they were described patronisingly as ‘jeunes’, it was the Basuto evangelists who had the idea and who initiated the mission amongst the Banyaï people: according to Jean-François Zorn, the mission was a joint effort of François Coillard and Basuto Evangelists. Furthermore, the indigenous missionaries aided the mission-translation in their knowledge of local languages. Coillard wrote, ‘sessouto est compris par tout le monde. Seulement le fait que les évangélistes sont des Bassoutos [...] sera-ce une recommandation?’ The answer to this rhetorical questions was a clear yes, for later he wrote,

Toutes ces tribus échelonnées sur le Zambèze parlent différents dialectes, mais communiquent entre elles par le sessouto, la langue que nous parlons au pays des Bassoutos. [...] La nationalité de nos évangélistes leur donne droit de cité parmi ces tribus et leur assure une influence spéciale. [...] nos écoles du lessouto, que nos livres et que tout ce qui sort de notre presse, pourraient servir à l’œuvre des Barotsis, [...] le premier évangéliste mossouto venu pourrait, le jour même de son arrivée au Zambèze, se mettre à enseigner.

The mother tongue of the Basuto missionaries gave them an advantage in both the initial and longer-term work, as they were able to preach in their own language and be
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understood. Furthermore, Coillard had help from the indigenous converts regarding his translation proper. Catharine Mackintosh states, ‘He used to do that [hymn writing] with the aid of his friend Nathanael Makotoko [...] that man used to come to M. Coillard’s study early in the morning, they had a prayer meeting, and then worked at those translations’. And Coillard was not the only missionary to work with indigenous people. François Villéger wrote to SMEP of the help received from the indigenous community in his translation proper of Matthew’s gospel:

Je l’ai lue à des noirs qui m’ont assuré que le wolof en est bon. Je l’ai revue toute entière avec un noir très intelligent, connaissant parfaitement sa propre langue et la nôtre. Il m’a fort aidé [...]. Je m’adressais alors aux indigènes et à des Européens qui habitent le Sénégal depuis longtemps.

For Villéger, translation was a task to be completed by a community. It is this series of consultations that then allowed him to be confident in the quality of his own work; similarly to Coillard, the indigenous people in his translation process validated his translation work and reassured him.

Furthermore, as well as those doing the work alongside Coillard, there were many others involved in his mission, such as the financial supporters of the mission - ‘all has been raised personally by M. Coillard or by his supporters’ and the committee of SMEP, the missionary society acknowledged only in the title of Catharine Mackintosh’s biography. The Société were heavily involved in the work of Coillard. They provided some of his funding, authorised his voyages, edited his letters for publishing, and publicised his work. Indeed, the board of the mission society was the encouragement behind the publication of Coillard’s book. According to Zorn, after the initial success of *Sur le Haut-Zambèze*, SMEP ‘decided to publish a cheaper edition
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at a more accessible price and to present it to the Académie Française hoping to win one of its annual prizes’.  

As we can see, although built up as a singular missionary-translator, Coillard’s person and the apparent success of his work was not the product of a man in isolation, but of a wife, fellow European and indigenous missionaries, and a sending mission society and its supporters. The mission-translation was a collective enterprise. Similarly, although translation proper is often presented as a singular process done by a singular translator where ‘When a translator sits down at her computer to translate, she is alone’, behind these representations there is much collaboration involved in translation proper.

Firstly, all textual production, and thus all translation proper occurs in a cultural context whereby the translator consciously and subconsciously is influenced by texts previously read or the current socio-political discourses surrounding that particular translation process. Julia Kristeva writes that a text is ‘a permutation of texts, an intertextuality in the space of a given text’. To expand this, Graham Allen explains, Texts are made up of what is at times styled ‘the cultural (or social) text’, all the different discourses, ways of speaking and saying, institutionally sanctioned structures and systems which make up what we call culture. In this sense, the text is not an individual, isolated object but, rather a compilation of cultural textuality.

Every text is an etymological ‘weave’, made up of many parts, and many people. Indeed, translation participates in and perpetrates what Michael Cronin calls ‘networks of intertextual influence’. Therefore collaborators in translation proper include past authors and translators (for more on this see chapter 4’s discussion on layers and/of contexts).

Furthermore, the seemingly singular translator uses tools such as, ‘other texts, previous translations or the technical infrastructure of chirographic culture and print

244 Zorn, Transforming, p. 41.
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literacy, [...] dictionaries and their precursors’, as Michael Cronin lists. Translation proper requires and employs many sources and therefore the efforts of many other people. Sándor Hervey and Ian Higgins point to this collaboration as something which occurs specifically in times of need: ‘problems can only be solved by consulting [...] experts, databases, or, if possible, the author of the ST’. Translation occurs here with the help of other people, their knowledge, and their past work. With changes in technology, and the increasing ubiquitousness of digital practices as mediating relationships with the world, the availability of these resources is also growing, and thus, as Tony Hartley asserts in his discussion of technology and translation, ‘Translation is increasingly a collaborative activity’. Indeed, as Anthony Pym writes, Free online data-based machine translation now enables almost everyone to produce a translation of some kind; electronic social networking is enabling a wide range of volunteers to engage in collective translation projects (‘collaborative translation’, ‘community translation’, ‘crowdsourcing,’ and other names).

Pym claims that whether enabling more translations, or enabling more collaboration in translation, technology in translation increases the agents involved in translation. Therefore, by combining the work of past translators, linguists, lexographers, and present experts and language-speakers, translation is a collaborative act.

Finally, in the process from translated text to published text, as Sergey Tyulenev asserts, the ‘translation process [...] involves external activities, such as editing and approving printing or other types of social circulation’. Just as Coillard’s mission-translation work had input from the mission society who commissioned him, edited and published him, a translation project is also commissioned, edited, published by other figures than the singular translator. This involvement of other people in the translation process can even lead to conflict in the production of the translation; Karen Emmerich asserts, ‘the highly collaborative nature of textual production and the ways
in which a translator’s approach can be influenced or even overwritten by other agents’. The translator is certainly not alone in his translation.

Therefore, the involvement of Christina Coillard, indigenous and European missionaries, the mission society and many others in François Coillard’s mission-translations demonstrates that translation is a vastly collaborative and collective work whereby the translator is influenced by his context, and uses multiple tools and people to complete the work.

Conclusion

In this first chapter, we have seen François Coillard as a missionary-translator who took Christianity from Europe to Basutoland and Barotseland, translating the Christian message to a non-Christian people. We have observed his interactions and his representations, and an examination of his priorities and activities has revealed a mission-translation work that extends beyond ink and paper, beyond the realm of written words.

He was an interlingual translator of the Bible and of Christian songs, but, more than this, mission-translation permeates all that he does, even his physical sphere: ‘il vit de sa foi’. Likewise, we have seen that the translator proper is an in-between space and that his body and life are involved in translation. Furthermore, we have seen through Coillard that visibility in translation is not a binary where the translator chooses one or the other. This famous and frequently represented missionary-translator figure experienced visibility as an explorer, hero and historical figure in colonial and post-colonial context. Simultaneously, he pursued invisibility in his mission translations, seeking the glory of God, not himself. Coillard therefore, secondly, demonstrates that the missionary-translator and translator proper are spectral presences in the text, both visible and invisible. Finally, Coillard’s frequent collaboration with Europeans – his wife, other missionaries, the mission society and supporters - and indigenous evangelists and Christians demonstrates that mission-translation and translation proper are collective enterprises, performed as a result of interactions with culture, with experts, other translators, and with textual producers.
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In chapters 2 and 3 we will consider this collaboration in more detail, discussing the mission-translations of Coillard’s wife, Christina, and the indigenous missionaries with them, and in chapter 4 we will return to the ideas of interrelating layers of selection in translation.
Chapter 2. The Space and Status of Female Missionary-Translators: Domestication, Hospitality and Completion

As we have already established, although he was a famous singular figure in secular and sacred spheres, much of François Coillard’s mission-translation work was performed in collaboration with others, and in particular, his wife. Christina Coillard née Mackintosh was a vital part of the Basutoland and Barotseland missions, enabling François and working with him. Following on from the short exploration of her role in chapter 1’s discussion of collaboration, this chapter will consider the mission-translations of Christina Coillard and, through her example, colonial female missionaries more generally, and use their experiences and practices to reflect on translation proper. In particular, we will study them as figures of domesticity, hospitality, and completion.

Women and (Mission-)Translation

Coillard observed and acknowledged that women were undervalued in the French missionary endeavour. In her biography of Christina, C. Rey documents François’ reaction to the lack of recognition of female missionaries:

Un point qui m’a toujours frappé [...] c’est la petite place que la dame missionnaire occupe parmi nous. [...] On parle beaucoup des missionnaires hommes, de leur courage, de leur activité, de leur œuvre, mais on ignore que [...] le missionnaire n’est missionnaire que dans la proportion où sa femme l’est elle-même et le seconde.¹

Coillard claims that female missionaries occupied too small a place in the discourse surrounding mission. Therefore, as well as the Christian missionary being largely invisible in discussions of French colonial history (see introduction and chapter 1), the female missionary was doubly invisible: invisible due to the ‘marginality of mission life’,² and due to her gender. This is perhaps because there were relatively few of them. When examining SMEP’s Liste des Missionnaires, only 33% of the missionaries recorded pre-1945 were female, and 62% of those women began their work after the

¹ Rey, pp. 20, 21.
First World War. What is more, 82% of the men listed as missionaries had wives, but only 8% of these wives also appear in the list as missionaries in their own right. Indeed, Christina Mackintosh is found in the list of missionaries, and is located in the column of ‘époux’. However, Christina Coillard is absent from the list. Once married, then, the female missionary became the missionary wife, and her mission work was espoused to that of her husband.

Moreover, the relative invisibility of female missionaries is evident when glancing at a bibliography of the literature available on the Coillard couple. Two autobiographies, at least twenty-four biographies, and at least twelve chapters exist recounting François’ work, in English, French, Danish, Dutch, German, Swedish,
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Swahili and Afrikaans. However, only one short (125 pages) French biography and 6 English-language chapters are dedicated solely to Christina. Of course, ‘the activities of husband and wife were so closely intertwined’, that each spouse’s biographical material includes the other, and two biographical accounts are explicitly about them both. However, literature and publicity regarding Christian missionaries, was primarily devoted to the work of the men, and the missionary wife was ‘incorporated’ in her husband’s work. As J.P. Daughton observes of the Catholic context, ‘reading missionary publications from the nineteenth century can leave the overwhelming impression that Catholic missionaries, by definition, were men’. He adds that ‘[o]n the infrequent occasion that a letter from a sister’ was published, ‘the editors often chose not to print the woman’s name, instead labelling it […] “letter from a sœur missionnaire” - a practice never used with men’s correspondence’. Symbolically in the lack of published material, and lexically within the few documents appertaining to the work of female missionaries, the names and identities of women in mission have historically been erased. Indeed, many post-colonial critics have pointed out that the French noun, missionnaire, was and is a ‘distinctly masculine noun’. Women often remain invisible in representations of mission. Indeed, Catharine Mackintosh tells of how Christina Coillard’s figure frequently ‘fills the background’, a characteristic
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seemingly very common in female mission work. In missiology, their work was disconnected from the wider Christian mission and was assigned the name, ‘Woman’s work for Woman’, whereby the female missionary effectiveness was limited semantically to the sphere of other women, as opposed to the universal influence of the male missionary.¹³

And yet, as Stephen Bevans and Roger Schroeder write, women were ‘an integral part of the mission history of the nineteenth century’.¹⁴ Indeed, as seen in the quotation at the start of this chapter, François Coillard valued ‘la collaboration féminine’⁵. In his own life, four particular women impacted his missionary vocation: ‘Tante X’, an ailing female servant, was instrumental in his conversion;¹⁶ Marie Bost, the daughter of a Protestant French pastor, was significant in his missionary calling;¹⁷ his mother was vital to his going to Basutoland;¹⁸ and his wife was essential for his work - Coillard praised her as ‘[l]e meilleur missionnaire en Afrique’.¹⁹ Thus, women were important in raising, inspiring, and supporting Coillard, even though seemingly underappreciated in the wider discourse. Furthermore, other than only supporting the men, female missionaries also undertook mission work of their own. Christina taught,²⁰ nursed,²¹ played the harmonium in church services,²² translated,²³ and helped her husband in his tasks, as we will see.

In Translation Studies, it can be argued that the female perspective has also been underrepresented. In Gender in Translation, Sherry Simon points out that both “Woman” and “translator” have been relegated to the same position of discursive
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inferiority.\textsuperscript{24} And yet, whilst emphasising the neglect of the feminine in translation, in her own discourse Simon does just that. She only discusses the juxtaposition of female identity and translation theory in terms of the female translator who is a ‘translatress’ who must employ ‘womanhandling’ when approaching the text,\textsuperscript{25} and the female text who is a ‘wea[k] and derivative’ ‘mistress’, seduced into unfaithfulness by the translator.\textsuperscript{26} Simon has limited the role of the female in translation to that of a victim and that of an aggressor, and has reduced the insights of a female perspective to female contexts. Indeed, in the same way that female missionary work was relegated to ‘women’s work for women’, the relationship between women and translation has only been explored in the context of feminist translation theory. In both contexts then – of Mission Studies and Translation Studies, the representation of women and their value has been restricted to work on gender and feminism. And yet, just as a closer look at the experiences of female missionaries reveals that their underrepresentation does not equate to their lack of agency or efficiency in the reality of mission, the study of female missionaries also offers important reflections as we expand notions of translation. The mission-translation work of Christina Coillard and other female missionaries enables us to reassess ideas of the domestic, hospitality, and completion as opposed to competition in translation.

In the first section of this chapter, we will consider the recurring motif of the domestic, whereby the role of the female missionary revolved around the home, the family, and the body. It will explore the domestic space of the female missionary as enabling and facilitating the mission-translation going on around her. Furthermore, it will demonstrate that the domestic, seen in housework, sewing, and family, was the method for the female missionary’s own mission-translations. And it will reveal the domestic as the setting for the female missionary-translator’s explicit sharing of the Christian message. In Lawrence Venuti’s translation theory, the domestic, which he uses in opposition to the foreign, is a site of violence and abuse, where the text is forced to forego its foreignness and assimilate into the ‘domestic’ of the target audience. However, this is a reduction of the notion of the domestic in translation


\textsuperscript{25} Simon, pp. 2, 13.

proper, and an exploration of the term in mission-translation reveals the domestic, homely, familiar space to be an important site for the process and product of translation.

In the second section of this chapter, after considering the domestic, we will then also reflect on a fluid notion of hospitality in mission and translation. Within hospitality, we observe the interaction of hosts and guests, where Christina Coillard had both the role ‘à recevoir et à représenter’, and female missionary-translators acted as both visitor and visited. Considering ideas put forward in Translation Studies and Mission Studies by Paul Ricoeur, and Tobias Brandner respectively, this section explores both sides of hospitality as being mutually vulnerable and as having mutual gain. It is almost impossible to discuss the relationship between host and guest in this colonial context without considering the implications in regards to ideas of power and control. And yet, it is the mutual nature of the encounter required in hospitality which causes us to rethink these notions of power in mission-translation and translation proper.

Finally, while taking into account power dynamics in the mission-translation of female missionaries, the chapter will conclude by discussing the status of women in mission. In particular, the repeated notions of the humble submissiveness and passivity of the female missionary have implications for translation proper as Sherry Simon has called it ‘an unequal struggle for authority over the text’. Female missionaries were often overshadowed by their husbands, they were submissive, and remain in the background of mission history. And yet, they were radical too, subversive within their submissiveness: Christina and Elise Coillard were among the first Europeans to see Victoria Falls, for example; and female missionaries had much mobility in their vocation. Moreover, whether subversive or submissive, female missionary-translators complemented and supplemented the work of male missionaries. The women were not in competition with their husbands, or their male counterparts, but their mission-translations acted as completions.
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The representation of female missionaries in modern discourse has often been restricted to women as wives, and their ministry as exclusively for women. Likewise, the value of female translators/translations has only been explored in the limited context of feminist translation theory. However, starting with Christina Coillard, and taking the examples of experiences of married and single, Catholic and Protestant women, this chapter demonstrates that female mission-translators are useful figures in the consideration of mission-translation and translation proper. They reveal how much of translation occurs through and in the domestic space, they demonstrate the mutual loss and gain in hospitality, and they help us to see translation not as submissive or necessarily subversive, but as working with the source text for completion.

Translation and the Domestic

In 1879, the first issue of the bi-monthly French protestant Christian magazine, *La Femme*, appeared. In this first publication, which would later include letters from Christina Coillard and other missionaries, a Christian woman comes to terms with the position of women in French society. She writes, ‘je me souviens d’avoir versé des larmes amères à l’idée d’en être réduite à porter des cheveux longs et des robes ma vie durant’. She is resistant to the conventions which reduce her gender to the fragmentary images of hair and dresses. And yet, she goes on to write about the ‘belle’ ‘mission’ of female Christians:

Les Romains avaient leurs vestales chargées d’entretenir le feu sacré, les Germains leurs prêtresses redoutées et souveraines ; nous avons, nous, la femme chrétienne, dépositaire du trésor du foyer, arbitre des destinées de la famille, et par la même, de celles de la patrie.

The author claims that the mission of the 1879 woman was undertaken, not in the ancient religious sanctuaries of the Romans or the Germans, but specifically within the ‘foyer’, and the ‘famille’: ‘cercle du foyer domestique. C’est là qu’est notre vrai centre d’action’. The domestic space is presented as being central to the actions of women in society, and thus the locus of their spiritual activity. Not only female Christians, but this focus on the domestic is also seen in the representation of women in formal
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missionary work. J. P. Daughton observes that ‘men were mobile preachers, women stayed and took care of the children, sick and elderly’.35 Indeed, Christina Coillard, although a traveller like her husband, is often described in terms of her home: François Coillard writes that she ‘avait le culte passionné de la vie domestique’, and ‘[s]i elle avait une passion, c’était celle de la vie intime et sédentaire du foyer domestique’,36 and Winifred Mathews’ chapter on Christina is entitled, ‘Home-making in the Wagon’, whereby the attention is on Christina’s ability to create a home in a constantly moving house.37

In one sense, this emphasis on the domestic is projected onto female missionaries. We read in chapters by Winifred Mathews and E.C. Dawson that as Christina Coillard was forcibly removed from her home at the time of civil war in Basutoland, ‘she had not even time to take her new-baked bread out of the oven!’38 The detail given identifies Christina, not as a missionary under persecution, but primarily as a woman unable to complete her domestic duties. Furthermore, in Constance Padwick’s White Heroines of Africa, Christina is for the most part identified in terms of the domestic setting: ‘Christina Coillard was called to forego any settle home’,39 ‘Christina the houseless’,40 ‘How Christina gave up her home’,41 and ‘How would you furnish a wagon if you were going to live in it for two years?’42 Christina’s relationship with her home is relentlessly brought to the foreground of the narrative. But more than only an imposition and a common feature of the depiction of female missionaries, although the women were mobile, able to travel and move relatively freely, the domestic was a vital and central notion of the fixed space of their mission, one which they utilised for the benefit of the wider mission and their own evangelism. Indeed, the domestic was part of their enabling function, as they facilitated the wider work of the mission; the domestic was the means and the method of their own part in the mission-translation work, as they conveyed the message of the gospel through

35 Daughton, p. 123.
36 François Coillard, Haut-Zambèze (1898), p. xxviii, 457. See also François Coillard, Threshold, p. 431.
37 Mathews, p. 55.
38 Dawson, p. 205; Mathews, p. 61.
39 Padwick, p. 40.
40 Padwick, p. 43.
41 Padwick, p. 61.
42 Padwick, p. 44. See also, ‘how would you furnish it?’, Padwick, p. 61.
their domestic activities; and it was the setting and the context for their more explicit evangelism.

In terms of translation proper, the domestic has only been explored in regards to Lawrence Venuti’s theories on domestication, a translation practice which communicates what Venuti would posit as a false ‘at-homeness’ to the reader,\(^{43}\) in contrast to foreignisation, which conveys the ‘strangeness and marginality’ of the source text to the reader.\(^{44}\) According to Venuti, ‘domestication [...] is appropriative and potentially imperialistic’,\(^{45}\) and therefore the domestic space has negative and violent connotations in translation theory. However, by reflecting on the domestic in relation to the mission-translation performed by female missionaries, this section will reveal the notion of the domestic to be much more useful in Translation Studies. Just as we will see that the domestic enabled mission-translation, we will also observe that it facilitates translation proper too, being the site in which the translator’s needs are met. Moreover, as much of the female mission-translation occurred through domestic means, translation can be seen again as being more than a written act, and the intimacy found in this domestic method is also a crucial element of translation proper. Finally, just as the domestic is the setting for mission-translation, the domestic is the ultimate context for the product of translation and for its effect.

It must be acknowledged, before proceeding, that the domestic is an ambiguous term. Firstly, it is ambiguous in regards to geographical and colonial contexts. Although the female missionary makes a home, this home, this domestic space is on foreign soil, foreign to them. Christina’s home is in Basutoland and Barotseland. She is therefore simultaneously at home and abroad. Moreover, the domestic is an ambiguous term due to the moving nature of mission (for more of this see chapter 3). As we read Mathews’ description of the Coillards’ home, ‘the wagon was church and mission station as well as home’,\(^{46}\) we realise that the missionary’s home is not a place where mission stops. Rather, the mission spills into the supposedly private space. Thus the domestic is not entirely domestic, and as such, it is not always


\(^{44}\) Steiner, George, p. 158.


\(^{46}\) Mathews, p. 67.
‘home’. Finally, the domestic is ambiguous for the missionary as the Christian notion of ‘home’ is not rooted on earth but in heaven. Christina Coillard’s final words before she died were, ‘je suis enfin arrivée’. The word ‘arrivée’ suggests that until that moment, she had been journeying towards a destination not reached at Basutoland or Barotseland, but only attainable through death. The focus on the ‘home ici-bas’, shifted to the focus on ‘notre « chez nous » du ciel où Jesus nous attend’. This chapter will use the term, domestic, to refer to the house of the missionary, and the duties and activities associated with that dwelling.

The domestic is, firstly, the way in which female missionaries facilitated the mission-translation work of the men, collaborating with them (see more in chapter 1) and enabling them in their mission. Christina Coillard’s life was often described in terms of her home and her domestic busyness and this domesticity was very often specifically in the context of the needs of others. In Catharine Mackintosh’s account Christina was charged with:

superintending all house and garden work, feeding the animals, “which [...] are [...] necessary for food,” teaching in the school daily, visiting in the village, [...] she had to do all the sewing; make candles; make as well as mend all the house linen, her own clothes, her husband’s, and those of their servants (and clothes wear out very fast in such a life as theirs).

Christina’s tasks, done out of necessity it seems, provided food, light, and clothes. Similarly, in C. Rey’s description of her ‘occupations ménagères’, we read, ‘on la vit longtemps fabriquer son pain, sa chandelle, et son savon’. She had the responsibility of providing – even creating - the very essentials of life for the mission. Indeed, adding to these tasks those of drawing water and collecting firewood, Winifred Mathews writes, ‘to keep her husband and herself alive and well took up much of Christina’s time’. Christina’s domestic work enabled the mission work of her husband precisely because she was keeping him alive! More than only him, her attention to domestic details supported the whole missionary team:

Mme Coillard was the house-mother to the whole party. She always took care to have a good stock of bottles filled with cold tea, so that the axe-men and
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team-drivers should quench their thirst, and continue their dry work undistressed.\textsuperscript{53}

This female missionary’s domestic activities enabled the continuation and advancement of the mission-translation work as a whole. She cared for the team and provided for their physical (‘thirst’) and therefore emotional (‘distress’) needs. She worked for their survival.

The domestic is also an important enabling site for translation proper. If we carry forward the notion from the first chapter of the thesis, that mission-translation and thus translation proper are bodily acts, then the domestic enables the translator proper as she undertakes her work. The domestic is the space of rest and sustenance for the translator. More than only being a metaphorical space into which the source text is assimilated, it is a physical space vital to translation. If, as Jean Boase-Beier writes, ‘the mind […] is constrained by what the body allows or encourages it to do’ in translation,\textsuperscript{54} then we must say that the body is constrained by itself in terms of its nutrition, its rest, its health. In contrast to computer-aided translations, human translators need food, they need leisure time, they need sleep. These things are sourced in the domestic setting, therefore the domestic plays an important role in enabling translation proper as it sustains and enables the translator.

Secondly, as well as facilitating mission-translation, the domestic is the very method of the mission-translation performed by female missionaries themselves. By ordering her home, sewing, and prioritising family, the female missionary translated the Christian gospel with her actions. Firstly, Christina maintained her home, translating domestic and moral order. Winifred Mathews discusses ‘the Christian hom[e]’ as the place ‘where God was confessed in “the beauty of their ordered lives”.’\textsuperscript{55} Similarly to chapter 1 wherein we saw that François Coillard’s life was a translation of the Christian message, for Mathews, domestic details and orderly homes were a ‘confession’, a declaration of faith, a translation of Christianity. The description of the Coillards’ promotion of and attention to ‘purity of mind, manners and morals, but also to clean clothing’,\textsuperscript{56} shows that the purity and moral order found in the
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Christian gospel is translated alongside and through the purity and order of the home. Indeed, François Coillard writes of his wife,

Les soins qu’elle prend de son ménage excitent la curiosité des négresses ; elles apprennent le bien-être qui en résulte pour nous ; elles cherchent à l’imiter et comprennent l’idée de famille. Ce n’est qu’après ce résultat obtenu que je puis songer à enseigner avec succès des idées de morale.57

Again, we see that Christina’s ‘ménage’ enabled Coillard’s own mission work. It is after her example that he was able to teach. Christina therefore worked alongside François. But here too Christina’s domestic work was itself instructive – the indigenous women ‘apprennent le bien-être’ and ‘comprennent l’idée de famillle’. Although private, the domestic was on this occasion a visible, public example to be observed and imitated.

As we have already read in chapter 1, Winifred Mathews writes of the Coillard couple’s attention to domestic ‘cleanliness and neatness’: ‘If the missionary were not himself an example of the graciousness of Christian life, from whom would his converts learn it?’58

Again, Christina’s domestic activities were didactic. They either supported or undermined Coillard’s mission-translations, themselves forming a translation of the gospel through which to measure the other analogous translations, those performed by other missionary-translators or found in other forms. The domestic activity of the female missionary is itself a form of mission-translation.

Moreover, sewing was an important domestic activity for female mission-translation, and another method of translating the Christian message. Christina Coillard led a ‘classe de couture’,59 and sewed in the courts of Lewanika.60 Similarly, Elise Coillard ran a sewing class,61 and other SMEP missionary wives ‘enseign[é] aux femmes à coudre et à confectionner des vêtements’.62 The fact that sewing ‘was a practice that insisted on neatness, orderliness, concentration, patience, and precision’,63 meant that it was another way of introducing the order exemplified by the Coillards’ domestic neatness. Furthermore, not only was domestic order observed, but it was experienced and assumed here too. This particular activity has been seen by

58 Mathews, p. 57.
59 Rey, p. 62.
60 ‘Mme Coillard was welcomed as a dressmaker and a milliner!’ Morrison, p. 235.
61 Elise Coillard, letter to Miss Scott, 2 Aug 1883, Défap.
62 See Villéger, p. 288.
some as an expansion and an enforcement of the colonial influence over the indigenous body and over indigenous clothes-making practices. The teaching of sewing ‘domesticat[e]d’ the indigenous body and distracted the indigenous women from non-Christian pursuits. And yet, Catharine Mackintosh points out to her readers in 1907 that, in regard to the Barotse people,

They are […] passionately fond of clothing, which they adopted quite independently of European influence. During the revolution of 1883-5 their garments had been lost or destroyed, and the first thing all the royal ladies wanted Mme. Coillard to do was to take them new ones.

According to Mackintosh, then, sewing was not a colonial imposition but met an explicit need. Furthermore, it has been argued that sewing was to some extent, empowering and sometimes ‘enabled […] women to make money’. Indeed, the skills acquired were not without their use. According to J.P. Daughton, sewing was employed by female missionaries in order to introduce an activity ‘that would be useful in their lives as mothers’, and Eliza Kent writes that in India, mission’s goal was to make ‘better wives and mothers through the training for both their minds and their hands. The two main components […] were instruction in reading and training in needlework.’ So then, sewing translated the moral order, mission’s goal, and trained women for their roles in family life.

This emphasis on wives and mothers reflects the importance and the priority of family, another aspect of the domestic, in female mission-translation work. Christina Coillard’s identity was often wrapped up with the domestic familial sphere; she was called ‘the white mother’, ‘the mother of all’, by biographers, and was often called ‘mère’ by the indigenous people among whom they lived. She had no biological children, although one publication incorrectly identified her niece, Elise Coillard, as
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'leur fille', but Christina and François did adopt Basuto and Barotse children, and looked after many others. She wrote to *La Femme* in 1889:

> Depuis que je vous ai écrit à la fin de 1888 ma famille de jeunes filles s’est encore augmentée par l’arrivée de la pette fiancée du fils de Lewanika et celle de son neveu Sepopa. Il y a deux mois notre domestique Kamburu m’a amené sa jeune femme pour que je la garde chez nous pendant son absence. C’est ainsi que je me trouve la mère de 8 jeunes filles, qui me donnent beaucoup d’occupation en dehors de l’école mais qui sont aussi en même temps pour moi des aides précieuses [...]

Christina welcomed children into her home, and took on the responsibility of their care and education. This focus on family was widespread among female missionaries. Women in mission became ‘mamans’ to orphans, and Catholic women became ‘sœurs’ and ‘mères’, giving up their names to become symbolic family members of the church. Furthermore, it was in the indigenous family unit that Christianity was believed to be able to develop: ‘missionaries were convinced that their efforts would come to nought if they could not produce African women who would create a family environment in which African Christianity could grow’. Modupe Labode asserts that the family was an important aspect not only of the European mission context, but also of the indigenous reception of Christianity. The domestic element of the family was a crucial part of female mission.

> But as well as the symbolic family, the ‘western style family’ of the European missionaries was also ‘an instrument of conversion’. The emphasis on family could therefore be seen as a further translation of the Christian message. As Catherine Hall writes of the LMS,

> Family was indeed a many-layered concept in this context: there was the [...] family of marriage, the family of the chapel, the mission family, the family of Baptists at home and the family-to-be in the sky – this last providing the key to the overarching spiritual nature of the Christian family.
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The family unit in the mission therefore was a sign of the Christian doctrine of adoption into the family of God. Winifred Mathews writes in 1947 that ‘no form of witness is more fruitful than that of the Christian home in the non-Christian world as a centre of sacrificial service to the community around’. She calls the Christian home, the family unit as well as the brick and mortar, a ‘witness’, a communication and an authentication of the Christian faith. Furthermore, nineteenth-century philosopher and theologian, Freidrich Schleiermacher, known to Translation Studies as an advocate of foreignization, focussed his mission theories on this ‘home-based (domestic) type of mission’ and concentrated on the family as the ‘primary agent’ of mission, ‘the original model of the church’, and ‘the core of all social communities’. He saw it as important and effective in mission due to the fact that the family, the household, the domestic, is itself ‘a basic community’, and ‘mission is based on personal interaction’. The domestic is the space in which ‘the private and the public domain’ come together, the space in which ‘the family discloses itself to others’. The domestic is the setting for the mediation of the encounter of private and public, and, as the domestic and the family are the units through which relationship and community occur, mission-translation therefore can occur. For as James M. Brandt writes of Schleiermacher’s theories, ‘[the kingdom of God] grows by the most ordinary and natural of means – people sharing common life together’. Therefore, by drawing attention to the home and the family as important for mission, Schleiermacher gives female missionaries, and in fact, all female Christians, agency in evangelism as their home life can lead to the growth of Christianity. Indeed, Heleen Zorgdrager writes,

By highlighting the role of the family as an open and productive community of spiritual formation, Schleiermacher shifts the competence to ordinary women and women, making them participatory agents in defining and transmitting the Christian faith. This is a revolutionary move [...] far from “banning the spirituality of women to hearth and home”.
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The female Christian, and therefore the female missionary, ‘transmit[s] the Christian faith’ through her family and through her home. She undertakes mission-translation through the domestic setting of her family. Therefore as we see the female missionary’s primarily domestic roles, she is not reduced in worth by this; her role is not marginal. Rather, she is exalted, and the normality of daily life is exalted with her as key to her mission-translation work.

The female missionaries’ ‘domestic’ translations – their homes, their sewing and their families - show again that the mission-translations carried out by François and Christina were not only performed with words and with text, but with their sewing hands, their lives and their homes. But more than this, the intimacy found in each of these spaces and activities reveals the intimacy required for translation proper. On the whole, the work of the female missionary-translators was at a closer proximity than the work of the men. Aside from that which we have seen within the intimate setting of the home and the family, much of women’s work was nursing (30% of the SMEP women were nurses/ doctors), and connecting with people physically or emotionally (see the section on hospitality). According to Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, ‘translation is the most intimate act of reading’, 87 and Lori Saint-Martin writes that it is ‘a way of being close’, an ‘embrace’. 88 Therefore intimacy is found in the encounter between translator and source text. Moreover, Kathryn Batchelor describes the intimacy between the ‘author and her text’ - and thus also between the translator and the target text as she is a sort of author of the translation. 89 And, as both author and translator interact with the source text, she claims that there is an closeness between the source text producer and the translator, ‘an indirect one, taking place through the text itself’. 90 The intimacy seen in the domestic setting and domestic activities of the female missionaries is therefore a prerequisite in female mission-translation and in translation proper.

Furthermore, as well as being the means of an implicit mission-translation, the domestic is also the setting for the explicit mission-translation of female missionaries.

90 Batchelor.
As Dana Robert writes, ‘hospitality in one’s own home, and visiting non-Christian women in their homes, remained the chief means by which missionary women could find opportunities for verbal witness to the Christian message.’\textsuperscript{91} It is the home that is the important context for the ‘verbal witness’ of the female missionary. Indeed, In Major Malan’s account of his stay with the Coillards, he recalled a story of one of these ‘opportunities’:

M. Coillard [...] aperçut un païen qui se tenait immobile à l’entrée du jardin ; [...] Mme Coillard, [...] s’approcha du noir et, ouvrant son Nouveau-Testament, elle lui lut ces paroles : « Que servirait-il un homme de gagner tout le monde s’il perdait son âme ? » Le païen s’assit, très ému et ne pouvant proférer une parole. Mme Coillard lui demanda ce qui l’avait touché à ce point, et il lui apprit alors qu’il avait été pendant quelque temps au service d’un Boer, lequel avait essayé de convertir ses domestiques indigènes et leur lisait continuellement ce verset. [...] voilà que, de retour dans sa tribu, il se trouva à la prédication d’un missionnaire de passage qui avait pris pour texte ces mêmes paroles. « Aujourd’hui ajouta-t-il, j’arrive ici pour chercher du travail afin de pouvoir m’acheter des vêtements, et ce sont les mêmes paroles qui frappent encore mon oreille. Je comprends maintenant que ce sont les paroles de Dieu [...] Il resta pendant deux ou trois ans avec M. et Mme Coillard, fut instruit, baptisé sous le nom de Jérémie et, depuis lors, il est devenu un fidèle missionnaire.\textsuperscript{92}

Whilst François’ mission-translations were often undertaken outside of the home, in the church or the village, or on journeys, we must note here how Christina’s evangelism occurs ‘à l’entrée du jardin’. It is on the threshold of her domestic space that she reads and discusses the Bible with non-Christians.

Moreover, returning to the importance of sewing, Christina Coillard was ‘welcomed’ into the courts of Lewanika’s sister, Queen Mokwae, ‘as a dressmaker and milliner’.\textsuperscript{93} However, we read that whilst she was received in this capacity she was ‘looking for opportunities of speaking to them of Christ, in the intervals of cutting out and trying on dresses for them’.\textsuperscript{94} In Mackintosh’s account, Christina tried to ‘turn their poor frivolous minds to higher thoughts while cutting out dresses for them and fitting them on’.\textsuperscript{95} And Rey writes that she was ‘employ[ée] à tailler et à coudre des robes, tout en causant amicalement des choses de Dieu’.\textsuperscript{96} In the context of her sewing,
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Christina broached spiritual conversations with the women, undertaking explicit mission-translation activity, combining the domestic activity and the foreign Christian concepts.\footnote{See also, sewing and talking ‘in friendly fashion about the things of God’, François Coillard, \textit{Threshold}, p. 428.} The same is true of the wife of François Villéger as she ‘enseigne aux femmes à coudre’ and with this ends up ‘répondant à toutes sortes de questions’.\footnote{Villéger, p. 288.} The domestic context of sewing is therefore the setting for the conversational evangelism of the female missionaries. Here in the domestic setting, the female missionary worked at a close proximity to her ‘target audience’; again she had intimacy with her ‘readers’ as she translated the gospel to them in conversation. Furthermore, just as her clothes entered their domestic space, her message then also entered the domestic of the indigenous women as, for example, Nolianga, one of Lewanika’s wives, became a Christian.\footnote{Mutumba Mainga, \textit{Bulozi Under the Luyana Kings: Political Evolution and State Formation in Pre-Colonial Zambia} (Lusaka: Bookworld Publishers, 2010), p. 177.} For the translation of the Christian message is the translation of something which impacts and changes lives: as Jenny Williams writes, ‘it is a message that does not only aim to provide information; it is also a call to action’.\footnote{Jenny Williams, \textit{Theories of Translation} (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), p. 34.} The domestic therefore, not only facilitates mission-translation, it is the context for its product, too.

In the same way, in translation proper, translation enters into the domestic space. Physical books are put in homes, on shelves, read by families. More than this, translation proper affects even the domestic of the body. Jean Boase-Beier writes:

\begin{quote}
when we read a text [...] what the reader experiences are also not just textual effects, but poetic effects, which are cognitive, that is, they are effects on the mind and imagination, and even [...] on the body.\footnote{Boase-Beier, p. 86.}
\end{quote}

Boase-Beier recognises that the process and the effects of translation overflow into the physical space of the reader and the domestic intimacy of one’s own body. The domestic is therefore the context for the process and the product of translation. Just as the sewing, conversation, the orderliness of home became part of the domestic sphere of the indigenous, entering into their home and their lives, and just as the message took root in their lives, so too does translation proper enter domestic spaces and belong to the home-space of the reader.
The involvement of the female missionaries in the domestic aspects of mission-translation permits us to reconsider the domestic in translation proper. In contrast to Venuti’s violent and national act of domestication, the domestic in mission-translation demonstrates a more local act of intimacy and care. The domestic firstly facilitated mission-translation, supplying physical needs for the work. Similarly, the translator proper’s body needs sustenance and rest, those things found in the domestic. Furthermore, the female mission-translations found in the domestic were visible, physical, instructive, and the intimacy required for their undertaking reveals the intimacy needed in translation proper. Finally, in considering the domestic space as the context for the mission-translations of female missionaries, we have acknowledged that the domestic is also the setting for the process and product of translation proper. The domestic therefore has more scope for the notion of translation than only Venuti’s choice between domestication and foreignization of the source text.

Translation and Hospitality

As we have begun to observe, the mission-translation work of female missionaries, in employing the domestic, the site of interaction, involves the encounter of public and private and necessitates hospitality, a relatively underused term in both Translation Studies and Mission Studies. The encounter of public and private thus is also the encounter of host and guest. In a 2013 article in the International Review of Mission, Tobias Brandner has posited hospitality as an ‘emerging paradigm in mission’, \(^\text{102}\) and an historically ‘central element of Old Testament ethics’ and New Testament narrative. \(^\text{103}\) Brander claims that missionaries are both hosts and guests in their work, where mission, ‘a ministry of visiting and as a ministry of hosting’, \(^\text{104}\) involves the missionary as host, showing ‘a readiness for disruption and openness to the sacramental quality of a guest’, \(^\text{105}\) and the missionary as guest emphasises her ‘vulnerability and voluntary submission to the cultural and contextual rules.’ \(^\text{106}\) In this section, we will observe

\(^{102}\) Brandner, p. 94.
\(^{103}\) ‘The ultimate ground for the dialectic of host and guest is revealed in Christ, in whom alien transcendence became flesh to live as a guest among us [...] , and who invites us as the host to his festive banquets, [...] the present ones around the Eucharistic table, and the future eschatological banquet.’ Brandner, pp. 95–96.
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Christina Coillard as performing both roles in this dialectic, and we will see both the host and the guest as important elements of mission-translation and translation proper. Furthermore as this section goes on to explore the power dynamic of mission hospitality, it will demonstrate that translation, also often associated with a struggle for power, involves both loss and gain.

Currently, hospitality is an underused term in Translation Studies. It is found in regards to migration, for example, in *Postcolonial Hospitality: The Immigrant as Guest*, Mireille Rosello recognises that language involves power, and that translation therefore plays a vital and practical role in ‘dynamics of hospitality and inhospitality between cultures’. Furthermore, hospitality is found in Paul Ricoeur’s *On Translation*, which discusses ‘linguistic hospitality’, whereby translation is the ‘act of inhabiting the word of the Other paralleled by the act of receiving the word of the Other into one’s own home, one’s own dwelling’. For Ricoeur, translation is both an inhabiting act and a receiving act; translation involves both roles in hospitality. Furthermore, for Ricoeur as for Brandner, the host and guest actions in this encounter are ‘parallel’. As Richard Kearney writes of Ricoeur’s theory, ‘We are called to make our language put on the stranger’s clothes at the same time as we invite the stranger to step into the fabric of our own speech’. This mutual relationship in translation, where sacrifice and gain occurs ‘at the same time’, will be important to our understanding of hospitality in translation, especially in regards to the assumed hierarchies in both mission and translation. Ricoeur writes, ‘the pleasure of dwelling in the other’s language is balanced by the pleasure of receiving the foreign word […] in one’s own welcoming home’, and therefore we will see translation as this ‘balance’.

Firstly, Christina Coillard undertook mission-translation as a host. She accommodated the English Major Malan, offered a ‘chaleureux accueil’ to arriving missionaries, hosted Lochner when he was in the Barotse valley for the
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concession,\textsuperscript{114} adopted children,\textsuperscript{115} and even near the end of her life, in her illness, her hospitality is the context for her ministry: ‘She was too weak to visit people in their homes; but the women […] besieged her in her hut, and she gave herself entirely up to them’.\textsuperscript{116} Furthermore, she hosted and nursed the Portuguese explorer, Serpa Pinto, hospitality described at length by the explorer. Pinto wrote of the provision of ‘mon hôtesse’,\textsuperscript{117} as that of ‘every possible comfort’; ‘infinite care and kindness’; ‘a good bed’; and tea.\textsuperscript{118} Christina supplied for his thirst and comfort. Indeed, Pinto talked a lot about Madame Coillard’s tea making: ‘the first thing she did when the caravan halted was to make me some tea, a beverage which she knew me to be inordinately fond’;\textsuperscript{119} and ‘Madame Coillard too had laid [on] a fresh supply of tea’.\textsuperscript{120} Christina seems to have agreed with the anonymous female author of the quotation, ‘One must never underestimate the importance of a cup of tea in the evangelization of the world’,\textsuperscript{121} and sought to provide hospitality for her guests in much tea-making! This hospitality was, according to Brandner, ‘missional in a very direct, practical and concrete sense. Evangelism is often understood as inviting others to experience the redemptive hospitality of God’.\textsuperscript{122} Therefore, Christina’s hosting hospitality is a mission-translation in itself which translated the message of the ultimate host, Christ ‘who invites us as the host to his festive banquets, the past ones during his lifetime, the present ones around the Eucharistic table, and the future eschatological banquet’.\textsuperscript{123} Where elsewhere mission is a spoken or written translation of the Christian message, here as in chapter 1, within hospitality, it is a lived out translation where the gospel is experienced by the guest.

Furthermore, as Pinto made note of Christina’s small acts of hosting, he indicated that her hospitality had a profound impact on him, her actions even having a moralising effect on the guest:
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...the last of Madame Coillard’s tea! I was so struck and touched at the expression on the face of this good Scotch lady as she surveyed the few remaining leaves that my ill-humour fled as if by magic, and, strange to relate, it seemed like some foul spirit to be exercised for good and all.124

Therefore, not only did Christina model her Christian faith as she hosted, translating the welcome of God to sinners, but also her hospitality directly influenced its receivers, improving Pinto ‘for good and all’. And Pinto also identified François as taking part in this hosting hospitality: ‘In their eyes all men are indeed brethren; their hand is open to the native as to the European, to the poor as to the rich’.125 Pinto saw that the Coillards’ hosting-hospitality was available to many people, and François Coillard is rightly included in the hospitality of the mission. Coillard was explicitly in favour of hosting-hospitality as a method of evangelism. In one of his journal entries, we read,

The missionary must be hospitable. Hospitality is one of the charms of African life. [...] We have received strange characters in our own house [...] We endeavoured to make all our guests feel, whether they were governors or adventurers, that they were welcome, and that for a reasonable time our home was their home, and never have we had cause to regret it.126

Hosting-hospitality is part of the missionary responsibility, according to François Coillard. It is clear that his desire was for an indiscriminate hospitality that bade the guest benefit from the domestic space. However, although François wrote these words, and the hospitality of the couple is sometimes accorded to the male missionary,127 Christina undertook much of the practical implications of that which he asserted. Indeed, in 1893, two years after Christina’s death, François admitted, ‘Je n’ai pu offrir à mes amis qu’une hospitalité bien maigre. Je remplis mal dans le ménage la place qui est vide’.128 Although he attempted hospitality, he recognised Christina as the true host. Christina functioned in an acutely domestic setting, as we have already seen, but the effectiveness of this environment as a context for mission-translation was due to the accompanying act of her hosting-hospitality.
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However, secondly, Christina Coillard was also a guest in her mission-translation work. She visited others, ‘she visited the village women’,¹²⁹ and Europeans,¹³⁰ becoming a guest in many homes. She and François were ‘strangers in Natal’ when expelled from Basutoland, and guests of an American missionary who gave them his station at Ifumi in which to live.¹³¹ Reading the Catholic missionary journal, *Les Missions Catholiques*, visiting was also a routine activity for the missionary sœurs; they were called ‘visitatrices’, identified in their title as guests.¹³² Moreover, the Coillards were constantly guests as they travelled around southern Africa seeking permission to enter Banyailand and Barotseland; they were guests in the courts of Lobengula and Lewanika and other rulers.¹³³ Furthermore, Christina was a guest in Europe, writing ‘nous étions étrangères dans notre patrie’,¹³⁴ the lines between the definitions of home and abroad, guest and host blurring again. More than this, as we have already seen in the introduction to this chapter, as a Christian, Christina believed that she was a perpetual guest, a wanderer and journeyer,¹³⁵ not only among countries, but a ‘strange[r] on earth […] longing for a better country – a heavenly one’,¹³⁶ an ‘exile from home’,¹³⁷ on a ‘pèlerinage terrestre’.¹³⁸ The missionary, by definition, was a guest and stranger wherever she went, only truly at home in heaven.

Being a guest enabled the female missionaries to nurse the sick effectively:

Christina ‘prescribed medicines and nursed the sick’,¹³⁹ and Catholic missionaries were seen to ‘visitent à domicile les infirmes qui n’ont pas pu venir au dispensaire’;¹⁴⁰ ‘Tous
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les jours, où à peu près, elles visitent l’hôpital de la ville, consolent les malades et
tachent de leur parler du salut’. 141 But also, being a guest meant that the female
missionary had access to people to whom they (and in particular, the men) would not
otherwise have access: ‘[t]rois fois par semaine […] une Sœur va visiter à domicile […]
les femmes que les maris empêchent de sortir’. 142 In one publication we read that,
’dans la ville et les environs, elles vont chez les malades, petits et grands, qui aiment
voir les sœurs et recevoir de leurs remèdes. Ainsi s’exerce une charitable influence
pour la propagation de notre sainte religion’. 143 Therefore, as the physical presence of
the female missionary entered the domestic space of the indigenous person, the
’influence’ of the message also crossed the threshold. Indeed, again, as Brandner
points out, the missionary as guest enabled the translation of the gospel of the
ultimate guest, ‘Christ, in whom alien transcendence became flesh to live as a guest
among us (John 1:14)’. 144

Therefore, as we have seen female missionaries as both hosts and guests, we
observe mission-translation as occurring within both components of the hospitality
paradigm. However, when discussing the colonial mission, translation, and this concept
of hospitality, we cannot ignore the power dynamics within these encounters. Vicente
Rafael asserts that ‘Translation […] leads to the emergence of hierarchy, however,
conceived’, 145 and Brandner and others admit that ‘hospitality is always inseparable
from power because it is an ability, capacity or strength to receive and give shelter’; 146
‘hospitality is […] only possible on the basis of having power to host and exert control
over the people hosted’. 147 Therefore, with the introduction of hospitality into notions
of mission and translation, we must consider issues surrounding hierarchy, where the
host is powerful and the guest is therefore vulnerable.

---
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The power of the host is evident as Serpa Pinto writes that Christina Coillard’s kindness renders him helpless: ‘Biscuits were being made and baked with a lavishness that made me quite ashamed of the appetite I was supposed to possess. How could I ever return the favors that were showered upon me?’ 148 Pinto, the guest, feels indebted; he is dependent and Christina, the host, has some sort of power over him. The host has the comfort of ‘receiv[ing] the foreign word and linguistic world at home’. 149 But the host is not without sacrifice and weakness. Although the host may have more power, and more control, with this she also has more responsibility. Rey writes of the ‘exigences de l’hospitalité’, 150 that Christina felt, and François Coillard writes, ‘we endeavoured to make all our guests feel […] welcome’, 151 demonstrating that hosting is a burden to the host, and therefore comes at a cost. Indeed, Coillard wrote of illness as an unwanted guest: ‘the great heats of summer have passed away, and, with them, the fever, that importunate guest of whom we have not been able to rid ourselves for the last six months’. 152 The guest in this metaphor is a burden, and one who overstays their welcome. Moreover, we read that Christina Coillard, at the age of fifty five, was ‘weary […] of never having any privacy’. 153 As Brandner writes, ‘a hospitable-missionary […] accepts interruption’. 154 Therefore, the host, although possessing some level of authority in relation to the guest, is disrupted and disturbed by the presence of difference. 155 So then, although the host has potentially more power in the relationship, she must undergo disruption and must take on the responsibility of hosting.

Likewise, although the guest is typified as a victim and a dependent, passive receiver of the host’s hospitality, the guest gains in hospitality too. As a guest of Masonda, Christina Coillard was certainly vulnerable; she was guided towards a ‘round, slippery rock overhanging a precipice’ and ‘down the face of the cliff’ by a group of the
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Banyai people as they took her to the ruler. The Coillards were not in control as guests and had to receive permission from rulers like Lewanika to establish their mission and even preach. Furthermore as a guest, Christina was away from the comfort of her own home and, according to her niece, was not able to express herself completely: ‘those who never saw her in her own home did not know her as she really was, overflowing with kindness and hospitality’. Being a guest, according to Brandner, requires ‘

humility and readiness to submit themselves [...] They will not come with a crusading mind but with a crucified mind, not to establish their own kingdom, but ready to decrease (John 3:30)’. Citing that favourite verse of François Coillard, the guest here is seen as voluntarily taking on weakness, subjecting herself to the will of the host. Indeed, the missionary as guest ‘implies humility that stands in contrast to any spirit of conquest’. However, although vulnerable, the missionary as guest receives access and welcome. Christina and François gained a base for their exile in Natal, and Major Malan described his being a guest as ‘heureux jours’, ‘jouissant d’une veritable communion fraternelle’. Furthermore, the guest, in having the very status of guest is ‘allow[ed] – or even expect[ed] – [...] to remain different’; though coming together, ‘it is essential to remain two’. Schleiermacher writes that mission ‘does not aim to annihilate diversity’, and as the guest and host meet, in hospitality this diversity is preserved. So then, although the guest is vulnerable, she gains a welcome, is invited to remain different, and is free from the burden of responsibility.

In hospitality, both guest and host benefits from the encounter with the other, the encounter with difference. From hosting Serpa Pinto, the Coillards gained more recognition in Europe and a welcome in Portugal, and from being a guest at Ifumi they were able to stay in southern Africa, return to Basutoland and continue their mission
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work. They benefitted from being hosts and guests. Likewise, there is loss and gain on both sides of the translation proper process as it enacts this hospitality.

Firstly, the source text loses in translation, something reemphasised countless times; loss is inevitable in translation: ‘A short Google search produced approximately 17,700 pages elaborating on “loss in translation” and only 92 mentioning “gain”’.165 The source text loses autonomy as another language and culture claim its content. Furthermore, the source text loses something of its effect or meaning or source features; translation is only partial. However, we cannot forget that the source text also gains and grows in translation, as Christiane Nord asserts. This growth is quantitative, where ‘the source text is made available to more readers’,166 qualitative, where ‘people learn about other cultures’ forms of behaviour through translations’, as ‘translations refer to source-culture realities’,167 and functional, where ‘diverse interpretations and insights into the foreign language and culture’ expand the scope of the text.168 In other words, just as the ‘hospitable-missionary […] accepts interruption and grows through it’,169 the source text gains continued life, further existence, translation being, a ‘transfusion. Of blood’,170 as we will see in the final section of this chapter. Furthermore, the source text, in translation, in being found ‘worthy’ of translation, gains the status of being the source text. As Brandner writes of missionaries, ‘Guest/stranger-missionaries have an empowering effect by turning their recipients into hosts’,171 the same is true in translation. The translation process and target text renders the source a source text, giving it status.

Moreover, the target text undergoes loss and gain too. Just as the source text is not autonomous, neither is the target text, forfeiting independence, forever bound to the source. As Richard Kearney writes of Paul Ricoeur’s linguistic hospitality, ‘good
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translations involve some element of openness to the other. Indeed [...] we [must] be prepared to forfeit our native language’s claim to self-sufficiency [...] in order to ‘host’ (qua *hospes*) the ‘foreign’ (*hostis*)’.\(^{172}\) So then, the target text ‘forfeit[s]’ self-sufficiency. Similarly, Kearney asserts:

Linguistic hospitality calls us to forgo the lure of omnipotence: the illusion of a total translation which would provide a perfect replica of the original. Instead it asks us to respect the fact that the semantic and syntactic fields of two languages are not the same, or exactly reducible the one to the other.\(^{173}\) Therefore, the target text also loses ‘omnipotence’, and the claim that it is a ‘perfect replica’. Hospitality in translation involves the abdication of power and the acknowledgement of weakness. However, although sacrificing self-sufficiency, the target text gains existence in translation; it is birthed by the source text’s inability to communicate and thus gains life in its own necessity.

So then, the missionary performed both roles in the hospitality dialectic: she visited the sick, and invited strangers and guests into her home. She was both host and guest and undertook mission-translation in both settings. Furthermore, in contrast to the problematic questions of power in mission, translation and hospitality, the missionary, in both of these roles experienced both loss and gain, and both host and guest were transformed by their respective experience of difference: ‘Hospitality to the stranger affects, as every missional encounter should, both host and guest’, ‘The missionary encounter thus *transforms both sides, host and guest*’.\(^{174}\) Hospitality in mission-translation thus demonstrates that the role of host and guest and the power dynamic found within this dialectic is not as clear cut as source text and target text, and that translation involves the loss and gain of both the host and the guest. As Lori Chamberlain writes, ‘each [is] the debtor of the other’.\(^{175}\)

**Translation and Completion**

Following on from this pertinent idea that translation involves mutual debt and interdependency, we will finally move on to explore the relationship between the mission-translation work of female missionaries and male missionaries together. In the
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discussion of the domestic and hospitality in colonial mission-translation issues of power and authority have recurred, ideas not unfamiliar when considering the female figure in translation. Sherry Simon asserts that ‘Translators and women have historically been the weaker figures in their respective hierarchies: translators are handmaidens to authors, women inferior to men’. 176 As we have already established, missionary women have often been undervalued in religious and secular discourse; wives submissive to husbands, and Sœurs obedient to Pères. Indeed, whilst the male missionaries take up pages in journals, history books and biographies, the women are more often, and sometimes explicitly, in the ‘background’. 177 In their representations then, female missionaries become passive victims, unseen, uninviting faithful servants. And yet, although female missionaries were submissive to patriarchal authority, they were also subversive to a great extent, useful, resourceful, and possessing agency in their contexts and communities. They were subversive within their submission, revealing a mission-translation strategy that need not choose between sacrifice and resistance. Furthermore, the female missionaries were vital as fellow-missionaries to the men. They were, in themselves, translations of the male missionary-type, but they did not seek to replicate the ministry of the men exactly. Instead, supplementing the work of their husbands and superiors, they reveal translation that works towards the completion of the source text, not its replacement.

It cannot be denied that female missionaries were expected to be submissive to the patriarchal system of the missionary endeavour. When Christina Coillard was described in one geographical society’s journal, she was ‘Ecossaise par naissance, Française par mariage’. 178 Her submission to her husband is signalled as even her national identity merges with his. Indeed, several biographical accounts repeat Christina’s own words to her husband as she promised to follow him: ‘Je suis venue en Afrique faire avec toi l’œuvre de Dieu, quelle qu’elle soit, où que ce soit, et, souvient-t’en, où que Dieu t’appelle, jamais tu ne me trouveras en travers du chemin du devoir’. 179 Christina is seen to work ‘avec’ Coillard, but the assumption is made here that God, who ‘t’appelle’, calls the male first, and the female will then follow. Similarly,
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in writing about the couple, biographical information about Coillard comes first, then his wife: ‘in most cases the story of the wife has had to be built up from a biography written primarily about the husband’.180 Fiona Bowie writes that women were ‘seen as adjuncts to men, rather than as protagonists in their own right’, 181 and this submission was an expected status of the time, not only for the religious, but in general society. However, the sacrifice required for mission was even more demanding than only submission to men. One writer claims that Christina Coillard had ‘échang[e] la vie brillante des villes d’Europe contre la vie souvent pénible des forêts d’Afrique’, 182 and Christina’s family lament that to go on mission was ‘to bury herself and her talents in Africa’.183 Typifying this attitude, Charlotte Brontë’s Jane Eyre exclaims in response to an invitation to be a missionary wife, ‘if I go to India, I go to premature death’, 184 indicating that mission was a perilous undertaking for the nineteenth-century woman. Mission was considered as a loss for the female missionary, submission to a missionary husband, submission to a painful life, and ultimately submission to death.

And yet, whilst being ‘relegated to a role […] subsidiary to that of their male counterparts’, 185 female missionaries were radical even in this position of submission. They were firstly represented as radical, Christina, and others, described in terms of ‘courage’, 186 and bravery, 187 as ‘vaillantes’, 188 ‘dauntless’, 189 ‘heroines’. 190 Similarly to their adventurous male colleagues, they were found in a context of intrepid exploration and were seen to risk their lives heroically for the work of the mission.

Indeed, just as we saw in chapter 1 in relation to François, Christina was described as having an ‘indomitable will’, 191 and she was depicted as an extremely capable woman,
‘si forte, si active, si pleine d’énergie!’192 with as ‘un esprit vaillant [...] partageant l’enthousiasme de son mari’.193 She was described as having a ‘caractère indépendant’ and was ‘ambitieuse’.194 In all of these depictions Christina was not built up merely as a passive wife. Indeed, she was respected by her husband who himself described her as ‘the heroine [...] she never knew fear’.195 Filling most of the descriptions of the Bible’s ‘wife of noble character’, found in Proverbs 31,196 caring for those in need, and being entrepreneurial, and hardworking, Christina was an ideal Christian woman, a superlative, much the same as her husband, though in ‘the background’ in comparison to his public recognition.197 Christina was more than only the meal-maker or nurse; she was a leader, who François called ‘la diaconesse’,198 and who C. Rey positioned ‘à la tête d’une [...] maisonnée’ in which ‘il faillait aussi savoir administrer, prévoir, et pourvoir à temps’.199 Though submissive, she was an active contributor to the community and the mission.

Indeed, more than only in representation, the female missionary was radical in her actions. Even going on mission was subversive, Christina pushing against the disapproval of her family, knowing that the engagement could mean ‘exile for life’.200 In Africa, Christina engaged with politics, taking ‘part in the consultations’ with kings; possessing ‘a power of judgement worth ten men’;201 and ‘une habilité diplomatique’ that was useful many times.202 Furthermore, even the domestic activity of her sewing was subversive. Firstly, given that it was a ‘masculine prerogative’ among the Barotsis,203 Christina’s constant employment of the needle and thread was subversive to the culture. Moreover, she used it as a tool of resistance against attackers. At one point during the Coillard’s journey towards the upper-Zambesi, they were surrounded and intimidated by a group of the Banyai people, whose leader, Lobengula, did not
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want them on his territory unless they gave him gunpowder. In numerous accounts we read that Christina’s defiant response to the threat was to sew:

> The whole tribe was out. The wagons were surrounded [...] Mme Coillard’s wagon sank [...] She and her niece were determined to show no fear, so, while the wagon was being lightened, they got out and sat beneath the shade of a tree to sew.  

Sewing was thus an empowering activity, and although a mundane, domestic action, was in this case a method of Christina’s radical resistance. And Christina was not alone in her subversive actions; Catholic female missionaries were called courageous for risking their health for the nursing of the sick, and they were given saving agency as ‘nos braves baptiseuses’, ‘ces chères Sœurs baptiseuses’, were the ones to baptise, ‘pour sauver le plus possible de ces innocents victimes’. Furthermore, nuns who would otherwise be cloistered, were mobilised, able ‘d’aller de montagne en montagne et de village en village’, free within the structure of their mission. As Sarah Curtis writes of female missionaries who were seen, ‘travelling widely, exercising authority, speaking out – while seeking simultaneously to subjugate themselves’, she reveals that these female missionaries were simultaneously subversive and submissive. The female missionaries were submissive to their male superiors, but they were subversive within this submission and radically active in their mission-translations. They possessed, as Rey writes of Christina, a ‘mélange d’initiative et de soumission’.  

Interrogating these findings regarding female missionary-translation through the lens of translation theory, we also see translation proper as involving submission
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alongside agency. Firstly, translation implies submission: Sherry Simon states, ‘to engage with the text means a certain loss of rhetorical control’. Translation proper can only occur within certain boundaries fixed by the source text. There is much discomfort at the idea of submission in translation, that which the female missionaries unavoidably perform, and this is no wonder when it appears in such contexts as Venuti’s notion of ‘cultural narcissism’, and Chamberlain’s ugly allusions to rape. Similarly to the nineteenth century notions of the female missionaries burying their futures, submission in translation is characterised as the complete loss of the self, this seen clearly in Albert Bensoussan’s exaggerated image of the ill-treated translator:


In this description, submission is suffering, victimisation, and a negative, forced state. And yet, this submission – of the translator and the female missionary – is, as we have seen, not without agency. Bensoussan misses an essential element of translation, and of the missionary’s submission: their voluntary nature. In translation proper, and in mission-translation, the ‘parole de l’autre’ is willingly taken on: ‘Any translation is obviously intended action’. There is undeniably some restriction in this submission: the female missionary is under the authority of her male superiors, a translation is to some extent limited by, as Octavio Paz writes, ‘the fixed language of the [source text]’, and a source text is subject to the constraints of the target language. But the submission to these boundaries is a choice made by the translator proper, these boundaries are vital for the construction of the target text (it would not be a translation without the source), and the translator can still introduce imagination and interpretation within her limitations.
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Moreover, moving back into the mission context, whether submissive or
subversive, the women in mission were vital for the Christian work. Firstly, they had
access to work where it was inaccessible and/ or inappropriate for the men. E.C.
Dawson describes missionary wives as receiving particular attention from local people:
‘They were especially delighted to see the white teacher’s wife. She was so friendly
they all felt at home with her at once. One of her great charms was her complete
fearlessness and confidence’.217 The missionary wife is something different to her
husband, she is special, and makes others feel at ease, and ‘at home’. Indeed, as the
Coillards met Lobengula on their way to plant a mission in Barotseland, it was
Christina, and notFrançois, who gained an audience and who impressed the king:
At Bulawayo the mission-party was treated with scant courtesy, though
Lobengula offered no violence. He would not allow M. Coillard to explain his
mission till Mme Coillard was introduced to him. She at once impressed his
savage majesty. When he motioned her to sit on the ground at his feet, her
husband explained that it was not customary in Europe to ask ladies to sit
without offering them a seat. A stool was then brought, and very soon Mme
Coillard gained the king’s ear, talking quietly and fearlessly till she had
thoroughly interested him.218
Christina had access where François did not. This access given specifically to female
missionaries was not rare. In Catholic missions in India, the ‘système des « zenanas »,
c’est-à-dire de l’habitation de la femme dans une chambre dont elle ne doit pas sortir,
où elle ne doit voir aucun homme, ni en être vue, sauf de son mari’, meant that ‘aucun
missionnaire ne peut entrer dans ces maisons pour trouver ces femmes et leur donner
les connaissances nécessaires’.219 Thus, we read, ‘Pour résoudre ce grand problème, ce
sont les Sœurs qui seraient les meilleurs intermédiaires’.220 Although the extent of the
work of the female missionaries reached much further than ‘women’s work’, that
‘separate province of the mission enterprise’,221 the women on mission were able to
minister to indigenous women much more effectively than the men, especially in those
cultures where the sexes were societally separate. Therefore, the women’s work
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contributed to a more rounded evangelistic strategy whereby both husbands and wives were included in the goals of the mission.

But more than this, as well as filling in the gaps where the male missionaries were ineffective, female missionaries complemented and helped the men with their work. Christina was vital for François in his mission-translation. François himself wrote of Christina, ‘Je pouvais toujours compter sur son jugement, sur la sagesse de ses conseils’, we see that she was not only a companion to him, but a counsellor and an advisor.222 Furthermore, as his attempts at haggling with locals failed, she stepped in, coming ‘to the rescue’, saying, ‘Here are some beads [...] Every man who has not made a fuss shall have a few’.223 She did not compete with him, but rather she complemented and supplemented him. In his theology of mission, Schleiermacher argues that mission ‘could never be properly conducted without the intertwined and complementary participation of both sexes’, and thus he ‘insists that missionaries be married before moving abroad, so that mission will be an activity of husband and wife together’.224 Indeed, according to Coillard, ‘le missionnaire n’est missionnaire que dans la proportion où sa femme l’est elle-même et le seconde’,225 and Christina Coillard, described by Dawson as ‘her husband’s right hand’,226 is depicted by C. Rey as ‘l’aide semblable à [François] qui a doublé, peut-être décuplé les forces de son mari’.227 The wife in this portrayal, augments and amplifies the work of the husband, she renders his efforts more efficient, more effective, more productive. The role of the female is thus vital to the missionary work because they supplemented the men.

Finally, female missionaries were significant because they enabled the men to embark on mission in the first place, and vice versa. We saw in chapter 1 how Christina, by marrying François, added to his status, giving him respect with the Basuto people by gaining a wife and a beard;228 Christina enabled François to do his mission, just by being his wife. This authentication by marriage was common in SMEP: 70% of the married missionary men were married within three years either side of starting their missionary activity (see figure 1), and 33% of the dates of marriage actually
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coincide with the start of their mission. Perhaps this was because, ‘In Africa celibacy has no virtue in any native’s eyes’, ²²⁹ but regardless of why, certainly, for the men, having a wife was important for their missionary work. Women as wives were therefore very significant.

The same figures regarding the married women are more confusing. 49% of the married missionary women were married within three years either side of the start of their missionary work. It could therefore be claimed that marriage allowed women to do mission too. However, 55% of the dates of marriage occur within 3 years either side of the end of the mission of the women (in comparison with 10% of the men), and 39% of the dates of marriage actually coincide with the end of their missionary work (in comparison with 0.7%). Therefore, it seems as though women were more likely to end mission when getting married, and men were more likely to begin mission when getting married. However, as has already been stated, the SMEP records are incomplete and only 8% of the women listed as female missionaries are also recorded as wives.

Using other sources, Mathews writes in 1947, ‘the wife was often attracted to the missionary before she married the man’, ²³⁰ exposing the idea that women did get married in order to be a part of his missionary work. Indeed, Deborah Kirkwood writes that, as opposed to being ‘married to the job, […] they were often married for the job’. ²³¹ And so perhaps the SMEP figures do not show the full extent of the outworking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date of marriage (DOM) within 3 yrs either side of start of mission</th>
<th>DOM within 2 yrs either side of start of mission</th>
<th>DOM coincides with start of mission</th>
<th>DOM coincides with end of mission</th>
<th>DOM within 2 yrs either side of end of mission</th>
<th>DOM within 3 yrs either side of end of mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male missionaries</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female missionaries</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 - Dates of marriage compared with start and end dates of mission

Source of data: Liste des missionnaires, see Appendix B

²²⁹ Dawson, p. 236.
²³⁰ Mathews, p. 6.
²³¹ Kirkwood, p. 27.
of the roles of those wives not listed as missionaries. Indeed, Mathews writes that there was a mutual need for marriage:

[M]any a woman who ardently desired to serve God in some remote part of His world was grateful for the opportunity of married to a missionary who, on his side, had been advised by his mission board to marry before he was sent to some lonely outpost.  

Therefore, women as wives were useful to male missionaries, but, in the same way, male missionaries as husbands were useful to women desiring the missionary life. The complementing union of male and female missionaries thus enabled both men and women to embark upon mission. Thus, as seen in their ability to access otherwise inaccessible sites/people, their helping the men to do mission work, and their enabling the men to begin mission (and themselves arguably being enabled), female missionaries, as both translations of the men and producers of mission-translations alongside those of the men, reveal translation, not as a competition, but as completion.

Applying these notions regarding mission-translation to ideas of translation proper, we can view the female missionary as a translation of the male missionary, as Sherry Simon does. However, rather than necessarily perpetuating ‘the discursive inferiority’ of women and translations, the female missionary, as she enabled the work of the men and was enabled and empowered by the men, shows that in translation proper the translation and the source text are bound up in each other. This is seen in Harry Zohn’s translation of Walter Benjamin: ‘[translation is] charged with the special mission of watching over the maturing process of the original language and the birth pangs of its own’. Translation does not threaten a source text but defends it and fortifies it; just as female missionary work was a ‘grand secours’ for the work of the men, translation assists and benefits the source text, giving it existence for a target reader. Just as female missionaries undertook the biblical mandate to be ‘helper[s]’ to their husbands and male colleagues, that word so often associated
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232 Mathews, p. 6.
236 Genesis 2.18.
with subjection, but actually associated in the Bible with the rescue of God, the translation is also a ‘helper’, a deliverer of the source text. It ‘enrich[es] or clarify[ies] the SL text’. Translation according to Bella Brodzki is ‘a life-sustaining act, a life-empowering moment’, a ‘redemptive work’, thus through translation the original breathes, speaks, lives. Indeed, not only does the target text provide life for the source text; each text fulfils a role that the other cannot. Joseph Graham states, ‘the two need each other [...] and they complement each other’. Without the source text, the translation would have no existence as it would not be a translation, and without the target text, the source is without the aforementioned ‘helper’. Furthermore, translation ‘offer[s] readers the opportunity to enter deeper into the essence of a given [...] piece’, and so translation is also a light-shedding activity that shows more of the source text than only the source text could reveal alone. Therefore, there is a coming-together involved in translation, where the translation ‘does not reproduce the original, [...] [but] completes it’. The translation is a supplement of the source text. Each is part of the other’s growth and life, and more of the ‘whole’ is revealed in translation (also see chapter 4).

Of course, we know that this fullness, this wholeness, this ultimate completion, is not possible. In translation there will always be a gap, a movement ‘never fully achieved’. However, it is the desire, the pursuit of this wholeness, and therefore the failure of attaining it, that motivates translation itself. George Steiner states that, ‘Human consciousness recognizes in the existent a constant margin of incompletion, of
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237 See ‘H5828 עֵזֶר ezer from H5826, aid: - help’, in James Strong, Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance to the Bible (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2009), p. 1550. Examples include: Exodus 18.4, ‘My father’s God was my helper; he saved me from the sword of Pharaoh’; Deuteronomy 33.7, ‘Oh, be his help against his foes’; Deuteronomy 33.29 ‘the Lord [...] is your shield and helper and your glorious sword’; Psalm 70.5, ‘I am poor and needy; come quickly to me, O God. You are my help and my deliverer’. Also see ‘Help’, in Strong, p. 503.


239 Brodzki, pp. 4, 129.


242 Brodzki, p. 4.
arrested potentiality which challenges fulfilment. [...] This Utopian instinct is the mainspring of his politics.\textsuperscript{244} It is thus ‘incompletion’ which drives ‘politics’, missionary practice, and the task of the translator. For translation endeavours to supply that which fills the lack of understanding, and struggles with semiotic gaps in order to pursue the notion of a complete meaning, and the epitomic, ‘Utopian’ picture of the Edenic ‘one flesh’ wholeness.\textsuperscript{245}

So then, although these female missionary-translators and the extent of their work has been underrepresented, they were vital for the mission work. They were not merely passive and neither were they only subversive. Rather, they were active agents within their submission to the patriarchy, simultaneously radical and humble. Therefore, although it has been suggested that the translation is the weaker, submissive, obedient female to the dominant, dictatorial male of the original, within the relationship of the female and male missionaries, we see translation as the same ‘sainte union’ of Christina and François Coillard.\textsuperscript{246} As she is seen ‘mêlant sa vie avec la mienne’,\textsuperscript{247} so too, do the translation and the original intermingle, their lives dependent on each other, the notion of completion only possible in their coexistence.

\textit{Conclusion}

In this chapter we have seen how female missionaries have been largely invisible in historical and modern missionary discourse. And yet, we have also explored how they were vital components of the missionary enterprise, and how their experience and representations can be beneficial to Translation Studies, where the idea of the female in translation has also been restricted.

Their role in the domestic sphere firstly enables a re-evaluation of the domestic in translation. That which, before now, has been confined to Venuti’s violent notion of domestication, and previously understood in a national context as an antonym to foreignness, can be seen as a more useful and complex term signifying the home. It is a necessary part of mission and translation as its intimacy facilitates both. Furthermore, the domestic is a method of mission revealing again that translation moves beyond

\textsuperscript{244} Steiner, p. 227.
\textsuperscript{245} Genesis 2:24.
\textsuperscript{246} Rey, p. 18.
\textsuperscript{247} François Coillard, \textit{Haut-Zambèze (1898)}, p. 459. See also, François Coillard, \textit{Threshold}, p. 433.
words and physical texts into homes and interactions. And the domestic is the context for mission-translation and translation proper as it provides a space for the process and product of each. Moreover, with the introduction of encounter within the domestic, hospitality is a useful term in regards to female missionaries and their translation activities. We have seen that the missionary takes on both roles of host and guest, the dynamic of hospitality being a fluid one in both processes of translation. We have observed, therefore, that hospitality in translation causes both parties to experience mutual loss and gain. Finally, we have seen how the simultaneous submission and subversion of female missionaries reflects a coming-together of loss and gain in a union, not competition. The female and male missionaries supplemented each other, able to speak into different contexts and circumstances, and in translation proper the source and target texts also work to this end. Indeed, this union or completion is translation’s ultimate goal. As the female missionaries complement and supplement their male counterparts, they work towards a more well-rounded mission-translation, and as such they reveal the intermingling of texts in translation proper.

The notion of the ‘female’ in translation, is thus not only useful in feminist theory, but reveals how much of mission and translation occurs in the domestic space, how issues of missionary hospitality are interwoven with translation theory, how power relations play out in this ambiguous space for mutual loss, mutual gain, and mutual growth.
Chapter 3. Indigenous Missionary-Translators: Bodies, Trust and Movement

So far in this thesis, we have observed the mission-translations of François and Christina Coillard, translations of Christianity from Europe to Africa, and translations undertaken through their written texts, spoken words, homes, and lives. In this chapter we will consider the indigenous missionaries that were part of the SMEP missions to Banyailand and Barotseland and we will continue to expand notions of translation through their mission-translations which occurred around Africa. We have already seen indigenous Christians and non-Christians in chapters 1 and 2 within discussions of collaboration, domesticity and hospitality, but the mission-translations of indigenous missionaries merit more attention as they highlight African agency and offer further insights in the re-evaluation of translation theory. This chapter will demonstrate that these co-translators of the Christian message reveal a translation method in which the concept of trust is vital due to the interpersonal and interbodily interactions implicated in both mission-translation and translation proper, in contrast to contemporary theories of loyalty. Furthermore, as figures of spatial and metaphorical movement, indigenous missionaries show the multiple movements and the tension between movement and the pursuit of stasis integral to mission-translation and the practice of translation proper.

Indigenous Mission

According to Joseph Mujere, ‘a key feature of Coillard’s expedition [to Mashonaland] was that several of its members were Sotho evangelists and the venture had come from African Christians’.¹ The missionary work that is at the centre of this thesis is thus set apart from many other colonial missions because of its initiation by and involvement of indigenous Christians. The 1877 expedition to the Banyai people included: Asser Sehahabane, Aaron Mayoro, Azaël, and Andreas, along with their

families, and Eleazar Marathane, Khosana, Fono, and Bushman, were named as ‘drivers and leaders for the wagons’. Moreover, the 1884 Barotseland mission included, depending on the source: Levi and Isaiah, Andreas (before leaving for a Swiss mission), Aaron Mayoro, Jonathan, a convert of Coillard and an indigenous pioneer, ‘Philippe, Joël, Jacob, Mapoto, Joseph, Ezéchiel, Pampanyané, Mokopané, etc. étaient chargés de conduire les wagons’, and two ‘Zambéziens, Séajika et Karoumba’ also accompanied the mission. There was much indigenous involvement in both mission expeditions and mission stations; they were vital in their help and in their own mission-translations. They were translators, and helped with translations. They were essential members of the mission.

Their significance can be seen in the analogous representations of the indigenous and European missionaries. In both missionary journeys the African individuals and their families left their homes and their churches, just like the Coillards, and they travelled with the Europeans, united in the purpose of mission. They were
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2 See Addison, p. 28; Mackintosh, Zambesi, p. 228; Shillito, p. 120; François Coillard, Haut-Zambèze (1898), p. 8; Catharine Winkworth Mackintosh, ‘The Banyai Expedition’, in On the Threshold of Central Africa: A Record of 20 Years’ Pioneering among the Barotsi of the Upper Zambesi, ed. by Catharine Winkworth Mackintosh (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1897), pp. 3–5 (p. 3); Zorn, Grand, p. 448. Andreas also called André in French-language sources.

3 See Mackintosh, Zambesi, p. 228; Zorn, Grand, p. 448.


5 Also called Lévi and Esaïe. Favre, Zambèze, p. 38; Shillito, p. 144; Mackintosh, Zambesi, p. 312; François Coillard, Threshold, pp. 116, 137.

6 Also called André. Mackintosh, Zambesi, p. 312; François Coillard, Threshold, p. 122.

7 Favre, Zambèze, p. 62; François Coillard, Threshold, pp. 122, 137.

8 Favre, Zambèze, p. 38.

9 Favre, Zambèze, p. 38.


12 Mujere, p. 140.


14 Aaron is an ‘instructor in reading’, in Addison, p. 43. Also, ‘the Basuto catechists were trained teachers’, Mackintosh, ‘Some Pioneer Missions of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland’, p. 267.

15 Coillard discusses ‘la prédication de Silas, l’évangéliste de Cana’, in Favre, Lessouto, p. 182.

16 Morrison, p. 230; Mackintosh, ‘Some Pioneer Missions of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland’, p. 252.
‘co-workers’,\(^{17}\) and ‘collaborateurs’ with the Coillards,\(^{18}\) the repeated prefix, ‘co’, indicating the potential for equal status in the work. D.N. Beach even calls the mission to Barotseland a ‘Franco-Sotho’ mission, highlighting the equality of those present.\(^{19}\) Indeed, the indigenous members of the mission were often described in similar terms to the European missionaries. Eleazar and Asser were described as ‘gallant’ ‘adventurer[s]’ and ‘explorers’.\(^{20}\) Furthermore, Asser was presented as ‘l’intrépide évangéliste missionnaire’,\(^{21}\) ‘l’intrépide pionnier de la mission’, Coillard’s ‘ancien compagnon de voyage’,\(^{22}\) who had ‘a true pioneering spirit’,\(^{23}\) and was ‘the leader, a born explorer and a most able man’.\(^{24}\) The repeated use of the language of courage and determination mirrors the countless secular depictions of Coillard and other European missionaries as ‘vaillant’ pioneers and heroes (see chapter 1).\(^{25}\) Moreover, similarly to the European missionaries, the Basuto evangelists were also portrayed in terms of superlative spiritual strength: Coillard described Lévi as ‘un digne évangéliste’,\(^{26}\) Eleazar Marathane as ‘un de nos meilleur évangélistes’;\(^{27}\) and Azaël as ‘one of the most pious men I have ever met in Africa’.\(^{28}\) Andreas received ‘a call from our Swiss brethren in Valdezia’, echoing the calls to ministry experienced by European missionaries,\(^{29}\) and Coillard used the phrase, ‘homme de prière’, to describe both Azaël and Adolphe Mabille, a key European SMEP missionary.\(^{30}\) Semantically, the indigenous involvement in the mission was as significant as the European involvement.
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\(^{20}\) Shillito, pp. 118, 133.


\(^{22}\) Favre, Zambèze, p. 401.

\(^{23}\) François Coillard, Threshold, p. xxv.

\(^{24}\) Mackintosh, Zambesi, p. 212.


\(^{26}\) François Coillard, Haut-Zambèze (1898), p. 122.

\(^{27}\) Favre, Lessouto, p. 288.

\(^{28}\) François Coillard, Threshold, p. 91.

\(^{29}\) François Coillard, Threshold, p. 122.

\(^{30}\) Favre, Lessouto, p. 287; François Coillard, Haut-Zambèze (1898), p. 590.
This case study reflects a wider trend. Beyond the perimeters of the SMEP mission, on a global scale too, we can see the effectiveness and importance of the work of indigenous converts in colonial Christian missions across the whole of Africa in both Protestant and Catholic contexts. African converts were ‘porters, guides, and aides’, but they were also regularly agents of translation; authors such as David Maxwell write of the creative involvement of Africans in the vernacular translation of scriptures and their subsequent ownership of the faith. Furthermore, indigenous converts became evangelists and preachers too, and were therefore involved in the oral mission-translation of Christianity across their continent. Beach writes that ‘[a] great deal of work was carried out by devoted and determined African evangelists’, stating, ‘the establishment of Christianity was as much an African achievement as a European one’. This can be seen during European absences, where church growth was not inhibited, but where mission continued because of the labour of indigenous workers. Elizabeth Isichei writes that ‘in nineteenth-century Madagascar, some missions [...] acquired more adherents in the absence of foreign missionaries than when they were present’, and A.D. Roberts, in considering the Catholic context writes,

In Buganda, when the White Fathers temporarily withdrew in 1882, the young Catholic converts immediately displayed that zeal and conviction which in less than a decade was to carry them [...] through persecution to a position of power and dominance.

In some cases therefore, mission ran independently of foreign missionary influence, and effectively so; not only did the indigenous Christians continue the work, they thrived in it. The European missionaries were not necessary for the work of the mission. François Coillard experienced this redundancy himself on returning to Basutoland after the failed mission to the Banyai people. He wrote, ‘Tous paraissent pleins d’activité [...] Plusieurs personnes se sont données au Seigneur depuis notre

31 Mujere, pp. 133, 140.
32 ‘[T]he extent to which Africans were creatively involved in the translation process, placing their own ideas and images into the final texts [...] demonstrated how Africans came to possess the Christian faith through participating in the citation of their own vernacular scriptures’, David Maxwell, ‘Writing the History of African Christianity: Reflections of an Editor’, Journal of Religion in Africa, 36 (2006), 379–99 (p. 384).
33 Beach, p. 27.
34 Isichei, p. 217.
départ’.

As Edouard Favre states, ‘L’œuvre s’y poursuit en l’absence du missionnaire’.

However, although the indigenous missionaries were significant for Coillard and for the spread of Christianity across Africa, the somewhat cloudy condition of the information regarding the individuals in the SMEP missions reflects the wider lack of recognition of indigenous mission in history and in scholarship – in some sources the indigenous involvement in the Coillards’ mission was anonymous. Indeed, in past and contemporary accounts of colonial history, the indigenous missionary is largely nameless, forgotten, invisible. Edward Andrews writes that ‘[b]ecause most […] missionary history had often sought to elevate or vilify white missionaries, the role of indigenous peoples has usually been relegated to the background’. We have already discussed the notion of invisibility in relation to religion and gender; Coillard’s Christianity is censored out of the secular explorer-narratives, and Christina is often only in the background of these representations. Here, this invisibility covers the indigenous missionary too; he is unseen due to his religion and due to his race. As a result, finding written material about such individuals is difficult, something increasingly apparent when reading Elizabeth Isichei’s 1995 publication, *A History of Christianity in Africa*. Throughout her book, Isichei makes such acknowledgements as, ‘David Kaunda […] is not mentioned in contemporary mission publication, and is remembered now because he was […] father of a more famous son’; and, ‘We know of [Alfred Diban] only because one of his children became a distinguished historian, and wrote his father’s biography’. Isichei asserts that these names are only known due to the arbitrary success of their children. In contrast, the implication is that many names whose circumstances obscure them have been lost. Of Diban, and thus of those few indigenous evangelists who are named in narratives of colonial history, Isichei claims, ‘He may stand for hundreds of obscure catechists, whose very names are now forgotten’. Indeed, although Mujere asserts that ‘there has been a recent upsurge in
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40 Isichei, p. 141.
41 Isichei, p. 225.
42 Isichei, p. 225.
works analysing the roles played by African evangelists in evangelising their fellow
Africans’, the material available on indigenous missionaries remains much harder to
find than material on European missionaries.

However, any study on the colonial missionary movement is severely lacking if
the consideration of indigenous missionaries is neglected. Justin Bradford, writing
about ‘the importance of indigenous agency in shaping the mission encounter’,
specifically in relation to Tiyo Soga and Henry Budd, asserts that ‘indigenous
missionaries were individuals making decisions’ and to ignore their work ‘reduce[s]
their history to an account of the imposition of Christianity by [European]
missionaries’. Furthermore, in A History of Christianity, Elizabeth Isichei writes, ‘It is a
paradox that the most famous missionary names belong to the nineteenth century (…)
whereas the expansion of Christianity took place in the twentieth, and then largely
through the work of African evangelists’. There has been a history of, and there
continues to be disparity between the representation and the reality of mission. In
only considering François Coillard and his wife in this thesis, I would thus be
perpetuating the false notion that the European missionaries were the only - or even
the most important - figures in the spread of Christianity. This chapter seeks to recover
these important indigenous missionaries from the anonymity to which history has
consigned them. As missionary-translators, they offer insights for expanding notions of
translation and mission. In contrast to the dichotomy often presented (now and in the
past) of the colonizer/propagator and the colonized/recipient, what Philip Sampson
sees as ‘vulnerable native and exploiting priest’, the European and indigenous
missionaries can be seen instead as working together, interacting. It is in this
interpersonal and, more specifically, interbodily interaction that the indigenous
missionary-translator can broaden notions of translation as the interactions in mission-
translation and translation proper involve issues of trust – more than only loyalty – and
movement, both in terms of geography and status.

43 Mujere, p. 133.
Translation and Bodies

As has already been established in chapter 1’s discussion of collaboration, mission-translation involves the interaction of many people: ‘at home’ there are mission society committees, families, churches, financial supporters, producers and readers of mission journals, local/national government agents; ‘in the field’ there are missionaries (indigenous and European), families, indigenous non-Christians, indigenous church members, indigenous rulers, European government agents. The interaction between all of these people is foundational in this chapter, for as David Maxwell writes:

There is [...] a danger of simplistically putting missionaries against Africans as if they were polar opposites. It is important to weigh up missionary hegemony against African agency, but [...] it is equally important to study how missionaries and Africans interacted to create new cultural forms and new types of knowledge. 47

Where colonial and post-colonial history have pitted African and European missionaries against each other as ‘opposites’, this chapter will consider their interrelation. Through the indigenous missionaries we see an alternative to Aimé Césaire’s argument that ‘Entre colonisateur et colonisé, il n’y a de place que pour la corvée, l’intimidation, la pression [...] Aucun contact humain, mais des rapports de domination et de soumission’. 48 In stark contrast, to use Mary Louise Pratt’s term, which ‘foreground[s] the interactive, improvisational dimensions of colonial encounters so easily ignored’, the SMEP mission created a ‘contact zone’ in the colonial context, a ‘space in which peoples geographically and historically separated come into contact with each other’. 49 Instead of their being ‘aucun contact humain’, Pratt claims that colonial encounters create contact and communication between people. This was the case in the Basutoland and Barotseland missions. Indeed, using similar language Emily Manktelow writes, ‘missionaries were the point of contact between the local and the global’. 50 Mission involved contact – in terms of relationship and communication. What is more, to take the term literally, colonial encounters, such as mission, created physical contact between bodies. In mission-translation, European

50 Manktelow, p. 2.
and indigenous bodies meet and interact with each other, and this interbodily interaction is important for our exploration of translation.

Mission-translation was firstly carried out via bodies, through feet that walk, lips that speak, hands that touch, pray and heal.\(^\text{51}\) Vanessa Grotti, Oiara Bonilla, and Aparecida Vilaça discuss ‘conversion as bodily change’ in regards to converts in the Americas.\(^\text{52}\) Indeed, secondly, the results of mission were measured by bodies: the proof of conversion amongst Protestant missions and the means of conversion by Catholic missionaries was often baptism, a process which symbolises a spiritual experience but done to the body nonetheless;\(^\text{53}\) the physical taking of communion, a ritual invoking the body of Christ, was an outward sign of a believed inner transformation; and the rejection of polygamy was a bodily manifestation of a spiritual change.\(^\text{54}\) But also, the responses to mission and mission relationships were bodily: when Asser Sehahabane left his original mission station, Morija, he wrote to one of the European missionary-wives, Madame Mabille, ‘Il y a déjà longtemps que nous sommes séparés [...] En nous séparant, vous pleuriez et nous pleurions aussi’.\(^\text{55}\) Asser’s tears from his eyes and on his face were a bodily reaction to the separation. Similarly, on their way back to Europe from the partially successful pioneering mission to Barotseland in 1879, Coillard writes of his sadness at leaving the indigenous members of the team:

Le moment de notre séparation d’avec nos évangélistes fut solennel. Nous avions pendant deux années vécu ensemble dans un contact de chaque instant, nous avions partagé les mêmes fatigues, les mêmes épreuves, les mêmes bénédictions [...] Nous n’étions qu’une famille [...]\(^\text{56}\)

In this lament we can see much interaction between the African and the European missionaries. They lived together for two years (three wagons and three tents for 27
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\(^\text{51}\) Also see chapters 1 and 2.


\(^\text{53}\) Adrian Carton discusses baptism among Catholic French missions, citing Saliha Belmessaous who claims that ‘through writing baptism, indigenous peoples would then return to life as both Christian and French’; Carton writes, ‘the goal was not only to create new religious subjects, but to also produce new reconstituted French bodies’, see Adrian Carton, Mixed-Race and Modernity in Colonial India: Changing Concepts of Hybridity across Empires (Abingdon; New York: Routledge, 2012), p. 66.

\(^\text{54}\) Polygamy is said to be ‘incompatible with Christianity’ by Christina Coillard’s niece, Mackintosh, ZamBesi, p. 66.


\(^\text{56}\) François Coillard, Haut-Zambèze (1898), pp. 85–86.
people). They were in constant ‘contact’, their bodies interacting daily as they ate, slept, walked and talked. They shared every experience, undergoing the same challenges and blessings. Therefore, colonial mission-translation was carried out by, measured by, and responded to by bodies.

Furthermore, not only is the mission-translation process one of bodies, but these bodies interrelate. For example, as in the case of François Coillard, the European missionary often lived among or near the indigenous people for whom the message of the Christian gospel was being translated. More than this, we read that Coillard slept ‘parmi eux, dans une tente qui se boutonne par dehors, avec autant de sécurité que vous avec vos portes fermées à clef’, ‘parmi’ indicating the intimacy of this arrangement. Alongside this physical proximity and contact, the Coillards also grew closer to the indigenous population in terms of relationship too. At the beginning of the mission in Basutoland, ‘les missionnaires […] s’intègrent à la vie sotho […] Ils sont devenus partie intégrante de la tribu et ont fait corps avec elle’. The SMEP missionary Jacottet described the relationship between the European missionaries and the indigenous people in bodily terms (‘faire corps’). Furthermore, when on expeditions, the indigenous missionaries talked with Coillard, ate with him, travelled with him, and took communion with him. Their bodies interacted regularly. Mission-translation therefore was an interbodily process, where bodies encounter, touch, give, and receive.

Translation proper must be considered as an interbodily interaction too. According to Karin Littau, ‘contemporary literary theories of reading have systematically [...] ignored: the body of the reader’, and likewise the physical bodies of translators are absent in Translation Studies; the corporal aspect to the translation of corpora has been forgotten. But, as discussed in chapters 1 and 2, translation proper is performed through and received by multiple bodies. The source text producer constructs the source text in the mind, a mind ‘constrained by what the body allows […] it to do’, and writes it with hands and eyes, writing being a ‘physical, corporeal

57 François Coillard, Haut-Zambèze (1898), p. 8; Mackintosh, Zambesi, p. 228.
58 Favre, Lessouto, p. 67.
59 Jacottet, p. 196.
60 For example, François Coillard, Haut-Zambèze (1898), p. 15.
62 Boase-Beier, p. 98.
The translator then also engages with this physical act of writing as well as the bodily act of reading, whereby ‘what the reader experiences are also not just textual effects, but poetic effects, which are cognitive, that is, they are effects on the mind and [...] the body’. Indeed, even cognition cannot be ‘pure cognition’, for, as Anna Gibbs writes, ‘there can be no [...] cognition uncontaminated by the richness of sensate experience, including affective experience’. The manuscripts of both texts are handled and read by editors and proofreaders. The products of translation are then also touched and processed by target text receivers and users, and, as previously explored, the text then enters the physical space of the reader who is ‘a sensuous figure and not solely [...] a sense-maker’, and whereby translation affects ‘the body’. Therefore, the people involved in the translation process are not only metaphorical figures but also physical bodies.

But more than this, like mission-translation, translation proper is an interbodily process, where these bodies interact. Christiane Nord writes against the common reduction of translation to an intertextual process, instead stating that translation is a ‘communicative interaction between individuals’, and is thus an ‘interpersonal interaction’. Nord’s theory will provide the foundational framework for much of this chapter, however, this emphasis on people is not enough; just as we have acknowledged translation as involving bodies it necessarily involves the interrelation of these bodies. In the process of translation, although potentially never meeting face-to-face, bodies interact in the production and consumption of the target text. This chapter presents translation proper therefore as an interbodily process similar to that of mission-translation, where there are bodies at every stage of the production of the translation
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64 Boase-Beier, p. 86.
66 Littau, p. 154.
67 Boase-Beier, p. 86.
69 Nord, Purposeful Activity, pp. 19, 20. She lists the people involved as the “initiator” who needs a particular text for a particular purpose; ‘the commissioner [...] who asks the translator to produce a target text for a particular purpose and addressee’; the ‘source text producer’ who ‘only participates indirectly’; the translator who ‘carr[ies] out the commissioned task’; the ‘target-text receiver’ who is the ‘addressee of the translation’; and the ‘target-text user’ who ‘the one who finally puts it to use’, Nord, Purposeful Activity, pp. 20–22.
text and bodies that interrelate. Moving forwards, we will focus on two of the implications of this body-focussed approach for mission and translation: trust in the interbodily encounter, and the movement of translator- and translation-bodies.

Translation and Trust

When Christiane Nord explores translation as an ‘interpersonal interaction’, her claims carry her from this concept to the subsequent need for ‘loyalty’ between these interacting individuals. Nord writes that loyalty is the ‘responsibility translators have toward their partners in translational interaction [...] It is an interpersonal category referring to a social relationship between people’. However, we must ask, if instead we are stating that mission-translation and thus translation proper are interbodily processes, then is Nord’s loyalty ethically enough in their encounter? In its discussion of indigenous missionary involvement, this section will argue that loyalty is not sufficient, and that it is limited in terms of hierarchy, and direction. Instead, it will put forward trust as a complementary concept in the interbodily interactions of mission-translation and translation proper, for as Andrew Chesterman writes, ‘trust is [...] the value which motivates loyal behaviour’. Loyalty is inspired by trust; trust comes first.

Trust has only really been discussed in Translation Studies by George Steiner in regards to the translator’s trust at the start of the translation act. The translator trusts that the text is translatable: ‘we grant ab initio that there is “something there” to be understood, that the transfer will not be void’. Steiner states that this ‘act of trust’ often goes unnoticed: ‘This confiding will, ordinarily, be instantaneous and unexamined’. However, although overlooked in translation processes and Translation Studies, this section will posit that, as Chesterman has explored in ‘Ethics of Translation’, trust offers much more to notions of translation than only Steiner’s initial act, especially when used to supplement Nord’s loyalty, and especially when considering translation as an interbodily process. Exploring the relationships between the indigenous and European mission-translators, I will present trust as an equal,

71 Nord, Purposeful Activity, p. 125.
72 Chesterman, p. 153.
73 Steiner, p. 312.
74 Steiner, p. 312.
multidirectional component, vital alongside loyalty in all of the interbodily relationships and interactions that mission-translation and translation proper entail.

Firstly, where loyalty is limited in hierarchy, trust allows for equality and complementarity. Chesterman, discussing loyalty in regards to translation ethics, deconstructs the ‘relative status of the people involved’. 75 He writes:

To be loyal to [...] someone is to maintain firm support, friendship or service. Yet this [...] someone is often understood to be “higher” than whoever is being loyal [...] Loyalty is commonly thought of as allegiance, as duty to a liege or master. Its prevalence in translation studies perhaps goes back to the days when the source text and/or its writer were raised on a pedestal above all the other factors involved in translating, with the translator in a servant’s role. 76

This connotation of servitude, of inferiority, of duty, that loyalty carries is an undesirable subtext in relation to colonial missions and to translation proper, and it does not tell the whole story. Nord’s concept of loyalty, an attribute which the translator must possess, suggests that the translator is subject to all other parties in the interpersonal process and is, as a result, without agency. However, the indigenous missionary-initiative shows this hierarchical loyalty to be only a partial representation of their mission-translation work. For although notions of hierarchy were prevalent in contemporary representations and treatment of indigenous evangelists, described by Edouard Favre for example as ‘auxiliaires’, 77 we have already seen that the work of these indigenous bodies in the missions was vital: they were important collaborators and fellow-workers. When the mission to the Banyai people was conceptualised, Asser Sehahabane, one of the first Basuto evangelists, played a significant part, sent by SMEP as leader of the team. 78 Although the group was denied passage and arrested twice, as Joseph Mujere describes, ‘upon their release [...] Sehahabane and other evangelists and their PEMS missionaries organised another expedition to go into Chivi and Zimuto areas’. 79 In contrast to many colonial representations, the African missionaries took the lead in the organisation of expeditions, persevering in the work, with ‘their PEMS

75 Chesterman, p. 153.
76 Chesterman, p. 153.
77 Favre, Lessouto, p. 469.
79 Mujere, p. 138.
missionaries’ in tow.\textsuperscript{80} This initiative was remarkably significant: according to D.N. Beach, ‘for the Shona their experience of Christianity at first hand often began when an African evangelist arrived to preach and to lay the foundations for a later mission’.\textsuperscript{81} So then, the indigenous missionaries were often the first contact with Christianity, the mediators for the European arrival. Indeed, the African converts ‘spearhead[ed] missionary penetration among the Shona’.\textsuperscript{82} Therefore it was through the efforts of the indigenous missionaries, that the European missionaries were able to establish mission stations and spread Christianity. This missionary-translator was not inferior to his European counterpart. Rather, in this instance, he took the lead. The disparity located in the word, loyalty, thus neglects the crucial – potentially pioneering - work of the indigenous missionaries and the equality of their work with that of the European missionaries.

Furthermore, the representations of many of these indigenous missionary-translators in similar ways to the European missionaries – courageous, pioneers, spiritual heroes, as briefly discussed in the introduction to this chapter – also demonstrate that they were not less valuable than the European missionaries. One of the indigenous members of the church in Basutoland, Nathanael Makotoko, was described as ‘l’ami intime de M. Coillard’,\textsuperscript{83} and Coillard himself wrote of him, ‘Nathanael Makotoko, to whom I am closely bound by a friendship of more than twenty years’.\textsuperscript{84} The relationship was not one of servitude but friendship, where Coillard himself is ‘bound’ to Makotoko. Furthermore, Catharine Winkworth Mackintosh wrote of one journey where ‘[t]he party consisted of himself [François Coillard] and Nathanael Makotoko, with their respective followers’.\textsuperscript{85} Coillard and Makotoko are equal in this representation, they are similar figures each with ‘respective followers’. In another instance, we read of a group ‘includ[ing] the well-known Christian, Nathanael Makotoko, and the PEMS missionary’.\textsuperscript{86} In this example, it

\textsuperscript{80} Mujere, p. 138.
\textsuperscript{81} Beach, p. 25.
\textsuperscript{82} Mujere, p. 136.
\textsuperscript{83} Blanquis, p. 575. See also, ‘M. Coillard’s devoted friend’, Mackintosh, \textit{Zambesi}, p. 127.
\textsuperscript{84} François Coillard, \textit{Threshold}, p. 12.
\textsuperscript{85} Mackintosh, \textit{Zambesi}, p. 127.
is François Coillard who remains nameless, and the indigenous church leader’s reputation precedes him. The hierarchy at the heart of the concept of loyalty therefore ignores the complexity of the relationships in mission-translation whereby the dichotomy of ‘colonizer’ and ‘colonized’ is destabilised in the figure of the indigenous missionary-translator. For, as Marion Grau writes in reference to Lamin Sanneh’s work, ‘The relationship between missionaries and Africans [...] constitute[s] a form of “reciprocity” that goes beyond the assumptions that “Africans” are merely “victims of missionary oppression”’.87

In translation proper, too, the relationship between the bodies involved is much more complex than Nord’s hierarchical loyalty implies. The traditional hierarchy of ‘superior original and an inferior copy’,88 implies a similar hierarchy of the people involved in the work: superior source text producer (author) and inferior target text producer (translator). Indeed, we have already come across Sherry Simon’s assertion that ‘translators are handmaidens to authors’.89 To some extent this is true: just as the indigenous missionary-translator is dependent on the European missionary to give him the gospel before being able to then translate it, the translator proper is dependent on the source text producer, for without this work, the translator would have no material to translate. However, regardless of this perceived superiority, source text producers are also reliant on translators; as Maurice Blanchot writes, ‘classical masterpieces [...] live only in translation’.90 Just as the indigenous missionary-translators ‘spearheaded’ missionary activity, first receiving the gospel and then carrying it onwards, intertextual translators give source texts (and thus source text producers) access to the cultural and linguistic context into which they are being translated. Without translators, source text producers cannot reach these new audiences and new contexts. Therefore, just as the indigenous and European missionaries in mission-translation depend on each other, the texts and agents in translation proper depend on each other, they are symbiotic and equal in importance. So then, Nord’s loyalty evokes sentiments of hierarchy, but the relationships found in mission-translation and translation proper reveal to us that there is complexity within the different roles and relationships.

89 Simon, p. 1. See chapter 2.
90 In Venuti, Invisibility, p. 308.
Instead of this hierarchical loyalty, I propose trust as a more appropriate term, as according to Chesterman, it ‘describes something more like a relation between equals, and specifically between people’. 91 This mutual trust, therefore reflects the reality of the interbodily mission- and translation-relationships.

The second limitation of Nord’s loyalty, as well as hierarchy, is its direction; instead, trust allows for the multidirectional relationships in translation. Chesterman writes that, ‘loyalty is […] a requirement of translators alone’, 92 and indeed, we must notice that as Nord discusses loyalty, it is only the translator who is loyal ‘to the source and target sides’. 93 She states, ‘Loyalty always refers to the attitude or behaviour of the translator […] It is the translator’s behaviour that is or is not loyal’, emphasising the translator’s obligations in the process. 94 However, an examination of the indigenous missionary work reveals the many relationships in mission-translation, and thus translation proper, which necessitate multi-directional dependence (see figure 2 for overview).

Firstly, the European missionary trusted the indigenous missionary, entrusting the message of the gospel to the African convert. The European missionary trusted that the indigenous evangelist had understood the Christian message and the task of its translation and communication; that he would treat the Christian message in a similar way to the European missionary; and that he would be a Christian example, a translation of the message by his actions. The Basuto evangelists were trusted in this way, as Edouard Favre writes of the mission station at Séléka, ‘qu’à son retour du Zambèze il [Coillard] avait confié aux évangélistes bassoutos Asser, Aaron et André’. 95

---
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93 Nord, Purposeful Activity, p. 125.
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Here the European missionary confié, and entrusted the running of the mission station, as well as the missionary ministry itself to the indigenous evangelists. Indeed, Stephen Volz writes of indigenous mission to the Batsana, where much of the indigenous evangelism ‘took place in villages and homes beyond the direct oversight of Europeans, and missionaries had little control over how early Tswana preachers propagated and interpreted’.96 The European missionary was forced to trust his indigenous counterpart as he undertook the work at a distance. Historically, this meant a trust that the indigenous missionaries would continue with the same purpose, if not the exact same method; A.D. Roberts writes of the late nineteenth century, ‘Already Christianity in Africa was by no means identical with the missionary’s understanding of the faith; already it had a vitality independent of its contacts with the West’.97 So then, firstly, the European missionary trusted the indigenous missionary.

We cannot move on without acknowledging that this trust, or at the very least its representation, was tainted by a quasi-supervision of the indigenous missionaries. One of Coillard’s biographers writes in 1929 of the Zambesi mission, ‘[t]he three Basuto catechists of course brought aid, but needed watching’,98 suggesting that the indigenous evangelists were not trusted fully. Furthermore, Edouard Favre wrote of ‘la mission du Zambèze’ that it was ‘une œuvre nouvelle dont la fondation devait être confiée non pas à des évangélistes indigènes seuls, mais à des missionnaires européens, ayant des évangélistes indigènes pour auxiliaires’.99 Favre indicated that the indigenous missionaries were trusted to a certain degree, as ‘auxiliaires’, but not enough to be left completely alone, independent of the Europeans. It could be argued that the European missionaries were acting on the notion, communicated by George Steiner, that trust in translation ‘anticipates proof’;100 the indigenous missionaries were entrusted in part, but had to wait to be fully trusted. And yet, it could also be a case of representation. In a later source, D.N. Beach writes, ‘it was decided that the four evangelists chosen to convert the Shona would be escorted by the French missionary

97 A.D. Roberts, p. 141.
98 Addison, p. 42.
99 Favre, *Lessouto*, pp. 468, 469.
100 Steiner, p. 313.
François Coillard’. Coillard was therefore only an ‘escort’, accompanying the indigenous evangelists, and supplementing them. Indeed, this ‘Coillard of the Zambesi’ that we have already scrutinised (see chapter 1), was only present on the mission to appease local authorities. As the indigenous ‘passeports […] furent refusés […] Il ne restait plus qu’une alternative : celle de les faire accompagner par un missionnaire qui leur servirait de protecteur et les couvrirait de sa responsabilité devant les colons du Transvaal’. Coillard himself was a passport for the indigenous mission, the means by which the Basuto evangelists could do their work. In Coillard’s autobiography, we read,

Nous pensions d’abord envoyer seuls nos missionnaires indigènes. Mais ayant appris que le gouvernement du Transvaal […] s’opposait à leur passage, « craignant qu’ils ne suscitassent des troubles à ses frontières », il fut décidé qu’un de nous les conduirait’. Coillard’s supervision was required for the mission to go ahead. So then, as we continue to discuss multidirectional trust, we must remember that the issue remains complex.

Secondly, the indigenous missionary trusted the European missionary. He trusted that the information ‘translated’, the Christian message that had been communicated, had been done so faithfully, and trusted that the replication of the methods of the European missionary were possible and beneficial. Before leaving for Mashonaland, Aaron Mayoro took the floor and addressed the Basuto congregation:

Vous vous étonnez que nous quittions pays et parenté, et les églises qui nous ont vus naître, pour aller comme Abraham dans un pays inconnu ? […] Détournez vos regards de nous, […] Regardez à nos pères (les missionnaires) ; nous ne faisais que ce qu’eux-mêmes ont fait, rien de plus.

Aaron was keen to align the work of the Basuto evangelists with that of the European missionaries, stating that their method was the same as the Coillards’. Furthermore, after having set off, a conversation between Eleazar Marathane and a local Boer expressed a similar parallel. When asked by the nameless Boer, ‘penses-tu que les Banyaïs se convertissent et deviennent des chrétiens ?’, Eleazar responded, ‘Eh ! sans
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doute, tout aussi bien que je me suis converti moi-même’. Just as Aaron believed that the European method of evangelism could be replicated, here Eleazar was confident and trusted that his own experience of conversion could also be imitated. Moreover, the trust of the European missionary and of his mission can be seen in the sacrifices made for its success. According to E.K. Mashingaidze, ‘not only did the Basotho give whatever they could, but many also volunteered to go and work among the people in Zimbabwe. Some […] offered their young sons for missionary work’. The European missionary was trusted with the sons of the community. And Coillard was aware of this trust: as he faced opposition in the move northwards, we read in Catharine Winkworth Mackintosh’s account that he was determined

not to return to Basutoland without finding a field for the catechists to evangelise […] Firstly – He had not originated the expedition, nor had he offered to undertake it till he was asked. It was a trust, and he must fulfil it.

Not only did the European missionaries trust the indigenous missionaries, but they were trusted too. Trust, therefore, is found in both directions of the indigenous-European-missionary relationship.

Thirdly, the new recipient of the message, the indigenous receiver, trusted both the indigenous and European missionaries. The European missionary was often trusted in more formal, political settings. As already discussed, a European missionary was required by the local government as a quasi-passport to accompany the indigenous evangelists wanting to travel north; François Coillard’s presence was an assurance to the local authority of the trustworthy nature of the excursion. However, although the European missionaries were trusted by official parties, it was arguably the African evangelists who gained more trust in the informal contexts of the indigenous communities. In a letter to Alfred Boegner, Coillard wrote, ‘La présence d’Aarone à la capitale fit sensation […] on venait de loin pour le voir. C’est une popularité qui a ses dangers mais le fait est là!’ People went to see Aaron Mayoro, the indigenous

---
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evangelist, not Coillard; he was popular and liked. Furthermore, Catharine Winkworth Mackintosh wrote of Aaron and Andreas, ‘These were of the greatest value, and M. Coillard several times expressed the opinion that it was their presence more than anything else which inspired the Barotsi confidence in the mission’. The indigenous missionaries were the source of the ‘confidence’ and the trust that the receivers possessed. Coillard even stated, ‘one could quite feel these men [...] were regarded by the natives much as the Basuto regarded us’, claiming that the indigenous missionaries had gained the status in Barotseland that the European missionaries had in Basutoland. Elsewhere, Coillard wrote, ‘La nationalité de nos évangélistes leur donne droit de cité parmi ces tribus et leur assure une influence spéciale’. The Basuto evangelists had ‘droit de cité’; they were trusted by the local communities automatically because of their ethnicity. Furthermore, in regards to the mission to the Banyai people we learn that, ‘a number of them had gone into Mashonaland before the missionaries had been to the area’ and so ‘had a better understanding of the geography of Mashonaland and some of them were proficient in the Shona language’. The indigenous evangelists in Mashonaland gained trust having established knowledge of the location and language. This trust of the indigenous missionaries can be seen as the recipients of the message argued back. Discussing indigenous mission to the Batswana people, Joseph Mujere writes, ‘Christians under African evangelists were more independent and engaged in robust debate’, and Stephen Volz claims that there was ‘more independent thought’ under indigenous instruction. Although this could be interpreted as distrust, as the message is refuted rather than merely accepted, I suggest, however, that the confidence to debate and engage with what was being received indicates a higher level of trust in the indigenous evangelists than in the Europeans. It seems, therefore, that as Linden and Weller assert, ‘the Sotho origins of most of the missionary party proved to be an asset’.
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Furthermore the European missionary-translators often trusted the indigenous receivers of the Christian message. Stephen Volz writes that ‘although European missionaries introduced Christianity to Batswana, they had little control over the different ways that early Tswana converts perceived, adapted and proclaimed the new teaching’. The European missionary, although able to supervise the indigenous missionaries to some extent, as already discussed, was unable to control the reception of the message. There was trust, as the translator-missionary gave the translation to the receiver/ ‘reader’, that the receiver would recognise it as a translated text, a passed-on message, and that the receiver would understand it as the translator had meant it to be understood.

Finally, the mission society and its supporters were involved in this multidirectional trust. They trusted the European missionaries. In *Sur le Haut-Zambèze* we read a letter from Coillard to ‘MM. les membres du Comité des missions’ where he writes, ‘l’expédition missionnaire que vous m’avez fait l’honneur de me confier a maintenan remplit sa mission’. We see the notion of trust in the word ‘confier’ again, whereby the mission society entrusted the work to Coillard and trusted him to fulfil it. Indeed, the committee and the supporters trusted that the missionary would do the work expected and would keep in contact. Moreover, the mission society trusted the indigenous missionary as the work was passed on and began to reach beyond their control. And in the other direction, the families of the missionaries, and indeed the missionaries themselves, trusted that the mission societies understood the situations to which they were sending missionaries. The financial supporters of the mission trusted that their donated funds would be used by the missionary for needs, and not wants. The missionary endeavour was thus bound up by multiple relationships of trust.

---
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Trust, then, can be seen in many of the relationships involved in mission-translation, multidirectional as opposed to the unidirectional loyalty put forward by Christiane Nord. Applying this beyond mission-translation, we continue to see trust, ‘a value that must be subscribed to by all parties concerned’,\textsuperscript{122} in translation proper relationships (see figure 3 for overview). It supplements Nord’s loyalty which only relates to the translator. Of course, in order for the work to be embarked upon, the translator trusts that translation is possible;\textsuperscript{123} the translator trusts the text, the original author and the client of the translation, and trusts the translation process itself. But it is not only the translator who trusts. Daniel Gouadac writes of the professional context, ‘a good business relationship between the translator and any one client is based on [...] mutual trust’.\textsuperscript{124} It is evident, therefore, that the translator must trust, but that s/he is also trusted. Indeed, Chesterman writes, ‘The client must trust the translator, and so must the original writer [...] ; so must the readers’.\textsuperscript{125} So then, the translator must be trusted by multiple parties: as well as the client, the source text producer trusts the translator with the source text, and the reader trusts the translator’s work and interpretation. The reader’s trust is a significant element of translation proper: Douadac writes that ‘in translation you have to ensure the reader’s trust, to a greater extent than in original writing. The moment artificiality becomes excessive, the reader will stop trusting the translator’.\textsuperscript{126} The trust in translation proper, is therefore multidirectional, necessary between the interacting people and bodies. Chesterman asserts that it is this very attribute that enables translation and transfer: ‘Without such mutual multidirectional trust, communication fails’.\textsuperscript{127}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Agents of translation trusting (below)/Agents being trusted (right) & Source Text & Source text producer & Translator & Client of translation \\
\hline
Translator & ✓ & ✓ &  & ✓ \\
Client of translation &  &  & ✓ &  \\
Source text producer &  &  &  & ✓ \\
Reader &  &  &  &  \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Trust in translation proper relationships}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{122} Chesterman, p. 153.
\textsuperscript{123} Steiner, p. 312.
\textsuperscript{125} Chesterman, p. 153.
\textsuperscript{126} Gouadac, p. 202.
\textsuperscript{127} Chesterman, p. 153.
Therefore, just as in mission-translation, in translation proper, in contrast to Nord’s loyalty that only the translator must possess, trust is multidirectional, required of all parties towards all parties.

To conclude this section, trust is vital in the interbodily relationships of mission-translation and translation proper. Where Christiane Nord’s interpersonal notion of ‘loyalty’ is limited in hierarchy and direction, the involvement of the indigenous missionaries in the Banyailand and Barotseland missions shows that Andrew Chesterman’s ‘trust’ is required beneath each process due to the proximity and intimacy of these interbodily interactions. Where loyalty suggests the lordship and superiority of the source text producer and commissioner/client over the translator, trust implies the mutual dependency found in this relationship. And where loyalty’s focus on the obligations of the translator alone ignore the complexities of the relationships present in the translation process, trust can be seen to be required of all agents and all bodies.

Translation and Movement

Finally, the exploration of the work and representation of indigenous missionary-translators enables us to reassess ideas of movement in translation. Instead of only the movement from source text to target text, the application of mission-translation patterns demonstrates that translation involves multiple movements in tension with the pursuit of stasis.

Movement is a reoccurring image when examining indigenous missionary work; similar to global trends, the indigenous bodies in the mission-translation processes moved socially and physically. As Elizabeth Isichei writes, ‘The missionary movement was an expression of a far wider development – the social emancipation of the underprivileged classes’, 128 and indeed, in this section we will see the social mobility of the indigenous missionaries as they changed roles from receivers to commissioners to translators of the Christian gospel. They reveal that the roles in translation proper - Nord’s roles of ‘source-text producer’, ‘receiver’, ‘commissioner’, and ‘translator’, 129 as well as my own additions of ‘editor’ and ‘benefactor’ - are not fixed or static, but are

---
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fluid and changeable. Indeed, this section will apply the roles in translation proper directly to the mission-translation roles for this fluidity to be seen most clearly. Furthermore, physically too, the colonial period saw ‘greater geographic mobility’, and the indigenous missionaries, themselves translations of the European missionary-translator as they sought to do the same work, demonstrate a mission-translation which involved physical movement, sometimes multiple movements to and from respective ‘homes’ as well as a desire to stop, settle, and build. These movements reveal that translation is necessary because of movement, translation occurring across geographic and domestic boundaries. Moreover, we will observe that mission-translation and translation proper involve multiple movements, in contrast to the notion that translation is a unidirectional process from source text to target text. Finally, this section will demonstrate that mission-translation and translation proper are simultaneously pursuits of motion and stasis, where there is movement through time and space, constantly incomplete in translation, but mission stations are established, churches are built, and texts are titled, bound and shelved.

Firstly, movement occurs regarding the roles of mission-translation (see figure 4 for overview). This is seen most clearly in the changing status of the indigenous missionary from receiver of the Christian message to translator. Indigenous figures such as Asser Sehahabane, Aaron Mayoro and Eleazar Marathane received the Christian message, professed to be Christians themselves, and then went on to undertake the work of evangelism, communicating the received message to others. Asser Sehahabane was a receiver of the translated message of Christianity in Basutoland, an indigenous convert. He was then one of the first Basuto Christians to communicate the message elsewhere, part of the group who set out ‘à explorer le pays des Banyais’, and prepare the ground for Christian mission work for the first time.131

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role (below)/ Becomes (right)</th>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th>Benefactor</th>
<th>Editor</th>
<th>Receiver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous ‘receiver’</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European ‘translator’</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 - Changes in mission-translation roles
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Asser was not a passive recipient of the gospel, but an active translator of the message. He preached, possessing ‘le talent de parler des choses les plus extraordinaires avec une simplicité qui vous tenait sous le charme de sa parole. C’était un conférencier d’une grand valeur’. And, more than this, he was a leader, ‘le chef de l’expédition’, who took charge, and who added credibility to the group: when accused of crime, ‘les Makupas [...] affirmant [...] qu’Asser étant leur missionnaire et voyageant avec des gens du « Livre », ne pouvait avoir commis ce crime’. Asser was one of those ‘individuals making decisions’ too often forgotten in colonial and missionary history, he was not only a receiver of Christianity, but a propagator, a translator like Coillard. Indeed, descriptions of Asser as ‘l’un des pionniers de la mission’, ‘un homme remarquable [...] un homme d’action, d’initiative et de parole’; ‘célebre dans tout le Lessouto’, ‘the hero of the original Banyai exploration’, ‘orateur de premier ordre’, and the praise for ‘son zèle, et son grand savoir-faire’, echo superlative descriptions of François Coillard himself, the shift in language highlighting the shift in mission-translation roles.

Asser was not alone in this movement. Aaron Mayoro also transformed from receiver to translator of the Christian message. After one of Coillard’s sermons, Ngouana-Ngombé, a new convert in Sefula, talked to the congregation of ‘les conseils d’Aaron et de mon père [Coillard]’ as both significant in his having ‘trouvé le pardon de mes pêchés’. The indigenous missionary, Aaron, was acknowledged as an influence in conversion. Ngouana-Ngombé went on to talk about ‘des ba-Souto chrétiens comme Aaron’, saying, ‘Ce sont les ba-Souto chrétiens qui nous apportent l’Evangile qu’ils ont
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eux-mêmes reçu des chrétiens de France’.145 We can see clearly in this assertion the transition that Aaron and others have experienced from having a receiving role (‘eux-mêmes reçu’) to a propagating role (‘qui nous apportent’). Furthermore, Eleazar Marathane was acknowledged as a missionary-translator by Coillard, who wrote that Azaël, another of the indigenous evangelists, was ‘converti [...] par le ministère d’Eleazar Marathane’.146 Even within the group of indigenous missionaries, the traditional roles of receivers of Christianity as ‘colonized’ and translators/perpetrators as ‘colonizers’ were destabilised as some of the indigenous evangelists were converted by other indigenous workers. Therefore, we see indigenous receivers as translators too, passing on the message of Christianity.

Moreover, the indigenous converts also transformed from being receivers to commissioners of mission-translation, where Christiane Nord defines the commissioner as the individual ‘who asks the translator to produce a target text for a particular purpose and addressee’.147 We read in many accounts that the Basuto Christians took the initiative in the mission-translation work, ‘pénétres de leur responsabilité individuelle’,148 sending their own members to undertake evangelism among the Banyai people. The mission was described as ‘l’initiative’ of ‘[l]es Eglises du Lessouto’,149 ‘ce fut l’œuvre des églises du Lessouto’,150 and more recently Isichei has written that ‘[a] more lasting missionary presence was created by outreach from the Church in Lesotho’.151 The indigenous receivers did far more than only receive the message. One account states:

The Basuto Christians [...] wished to carry the Gospel to the Banyai tribe of Mashonaland. Asser [...] visited this tribe with several companions and his report to the Basuto churches was that three great chiefs would gladly welcome the coming of missionaries and had even chosen sites for the stations.152

Here we see the desire of the Basuto churches, the action of the indigenous missionaries, and then, the accountability of the missionary to the churches. This latter
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152 Mackintosh, ‘Some Pioneer Missions of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland’, pp. 252–53.
detail demonstrates that the churches took on the authoritative role of commissioner, for the missionary’s report was carried back to them. Although it could be claimed that the indigenous missionaries followed the lead of their European counterparts seen in references such as ‘nos missionnaires indigènes’,\(^{153}\) and in the fact that a conference of French missionaries in the region ‘determin[ed] that the young Church of Basutoland should prove its mettle and save its soul by launching forth upon a missionary venture of its own’,\(^{154}\) the European missionary can also be seen as following the wishes of the indigenous missionary-translators. Edouard Favre wrote, ‘il fallait soutenir les chrétiens du Lessouto dans leur désir « de ne pas garder pour eux seuls le trésor de l’Evangile »’.\(^{155}\) The use of the word ‘soutenir’ suggests that the emphasis was on the indigenous desire, and that the Europeans were therefore the auxiliaries. Moreover, Weller and Linden claim that ‘the mission owed its origin to Sotho Christians, and only acquired European members as an afterthought to facilitate progress through the Transvaal’.\(^{156}\) The European missionaries were quite clearly, in this account, an addendum, a bonus. Therefore, in the case of the SMEP mission, the indigenous receivers became commissioners, reflecting a global and historical development whereby ‘Africa is no longer only on the receiving end of the missionary relationship, but has become a sending continent’.\(^{157}\) Indeed, the commissioning role of the indigenous church can be seen in the institution of independent African churches which ‘not only enriched the African expression of Christianity [...] but also contributed to an ongoing process of emancipating Christian thought and praxis from the domination of European concepts and values’.\(^{158}\)

The role of the indigenous churches changed in a second way: as well as the development from readers to commissioners, the Basuto church became the financial support for the mission-translation too; the receiver became the benefactor, a term missing from Nord’s translation roles. Following Asser’s report in 1875, we read that ‘within a few months the Basuto churches had themselves raised enough money to fit

\(^{153}\) Mgr Favier, ‘Lettre de Mgr Favier’, Annales de La Propagation de La Foi, 73.434 (1901), 17–22 (p. 20); Favre, Lessouto, p. 268. Emphasis added.

\(^{154}\) Addison, p. 27. Also see section on the European missionary as commissioner.

\(^{155}\) Favre, Lessouto, p. 490.

\(^{156}\) Weller and Linden, p. 30.


\(^{158}\) Isichei, p. 95.
The Basuto Christians took it upon themselves to raise the funds needed for the mission, replacing the mission society’s supporters back home. Indeed, one missionary wrote to SMEP in Paris, ‘Dieu soit loué, nous avons à notre tour une Société des Missions’. This substitution seems timely given the declining support from European Christians: in 1882, Coillard wrote, ‘chez nous, l’œuvre des missions est encore peu connue, [...] peu comprise. Il est maints pasteurs évangéliques qui ne s’en occupant pas, qui ne reçoivent ou ne lisent jamais un journal des missions’. As Coillard saw the benefactors in Europe neglecting the responsibilities of their role, the church in Basutoland proved a valuable replacement. The readers and receivers of the translated Christian message became commissioners and financial supporters of its spread.

Not only did the indigenous role change, but the role of the European missionary was fluid too. Firstly, as well as being a translator of the message, he was another commissioner of mission-translation. In the Barotseland mission, Coillard delegated mission tasks to Europeans and indigenous alike: ‘he used Waddell to teach [...] carpentry and the Basuto Aaron as instructor in reading’. Furthermore, the European missionary was in accord with the indigenous desire to evangelise: Coillard wrote to the ‘amis de missions’, ‘l’église de Léribé devrait être [...] une société de missions.’ He was in favour of the indigenous involvement in mission, and did not keep the work for himself. Indeed, he believed that ‘l’Afrique, si elle doit être évangélisée, doit l’être par ses propres enfants’, and declared, ‘Woe to us who conduct them, woe to the missions themselves, if we hold them too long in leading-strings, and if, kept thus in an abnormal childhood, they lose the power of independent action and of responsibility’. Coillard saw the importance of indigenous mission, but also revealed the commissioning role of the European missionary-translators as he suggested that it was their charge to ‘hold’ the ‘leading-strings’ for
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the appropriate time. So then, the European missionary-translator becomes a commissioner of indigenous mission-translation.

Moreover, to use another term absent from Nord’s interpersonal framework, the European missionary’s role changed from a translator to an editor, where an editor allows the translator to do the work, but then manages and oversees the translation.  

This can be seen in Coillard’s mission-translation process as we read of ‘la prédication de Silas’, an evangelist from Cana in Basutoland: François Coillard wrote, ‘Il parlait sur la nouvelle naissance; [...] j’ajoutai peu de chose’.  

Although Coillard pointed out that his interference was minimal, it must be noted that this interference seemed expected, for we are specifically told that he added little. Indeed, as previously stated, the indigenous missionaries were often placed under European ‘supervision’, to use the words of Catholic missionary Diaz, ‘Les missionnaires indigènes’, were ‘placés sous [l]a présidence’ of a European missionary.  

The European missionary was not only a translator of the Christian message, but watched over its translation.

Finally, the European missionary-translator became a recipient of the gospel. As John MacKenzie writes, it was generally impossible for missionaries to be entirely unaffected by the people among whom they had settled. Such people were not passive recipients of the message of the mission. Through their own agency, they also created reciprocal influences upon the white inhabitants of the mission.

Indeed, as Coillard listened to the preaching of Silas, we read, ‘je fus très édifié’.  

Coillard was encouraged by the ministry of the indigenous preacher, and he responded as a receiver of the message. Similarly, when Ngouana-Ngombé spoke to the Basuto congregation, we read from Coillard’s autobiography, ‘nous, il nous a touchés’.

Although a missionary-translator, when listening and witnessing the mission-translations of indigenous evangelists, Coillard became a reader, affected by the messages being received. In Elizabeth Isichei’s *A History*, she writes, ‘When they
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[indigenous preachers] came to express their own understanding of the Bible in their own language, they gave a missionary new insights’. Similarly to Coillard’s experience above, indigenous missionaries in general enlightened, taught, affected European missionaries just as they did their indigenous receivers. Examples of this include the Luba translation of ‘the Lord’s table [as] the “Feast of Memories”, or the “Table of Tears”’ which is described by D. Crawford as ‘fresh fluidity’. Indeed, Stephen Volz writes, ‘missionaries themselves were moved by Tswana expressions of faith and adapted their evangelism to achieve such success, welcoming each convert as a “letter from Christ”’. Missionary-translators were not only propagators but receivers of the translations of the gospel, and some considered these ‘helpful “new lights” that illuminated [...] the gospel’. 

In fact, the European missionary was a ‘reader’ long before he was a ‘translator’. Individually, European missionaries, such as François Coillard, were recipients of the gospel, hearing the Christian message for the first time. We read that at one point, ‘I felt myself in contact with that something which I had already recognised in the lives which commanded my deepest homage, and I felt I had it not’. Coillard identified that he had not accepted the Christian gospel, that it was something he did not have. Then, shortly after this, we read, ‘At last I understood that it was to accept salvation on God’s conditions; that is to say, without any conditions whatever. I can truly say the scales fell from my eyes [...] “Once I was blind, and now I see”’. Coillard himself experienced receiving the gospel, ‘accept[ing]’ the message, and this before being sent to share it. Indeed, mission is a continual process of receiving, communicating, and sending. The Oxford English Dictionary’s etymology of mission even includes the ‘sending of Christ into the world’ and the ‘sending of the Holy Spirit into the world’. Therefore, mission is a motion of passing on. As Jesus Christ was sent by God the Father, he sent the Holy Spirit and his disciples, then as the...
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disciples were sent, they sent others.\textsuperscript{180} Centuries later, the European colonial missionary, hearing and accepting the Christian message, became a translator to others, sending them, passing on the message to others, so that they too would pass it on. Indeed, when Aaron Mayoro spoke to the Basuto congregation before leaving he said,

Regardez à nos pères (les missionnaires) ; nous ne faisons que ce qu’eux-mêmes ont fait, rien de plus. [...] Détournez vos regards d’eux comme de nous [...] Jésus, lui, n’a-t-il pas tout quitté pour nous sauver ? ...Il a tout quitté, oui, tout !\textsuperscript{181}

Mayoro acknowledged that mission has movement at its heart as its very message is of the Jesus who was sent ‘into the world [...] to save the world through him’ (John 3.17). The roles of Christian mission have therefore always been changing, from readers to translators to commissioners. Mission has long been a process of trans-mission.

These changes in roles were not always comfortable, and not always smooth transitions. As Elizabeth Isichei points out, ‘Religious orders were often reluctant to admit African members [...] and expatriate nuns tended to form separate orders for African sisters’.\textsuperscript{182} The movement of roles challenged institutional structures and, as shown here, this movement was sometimes resisted. In our own case study, resistance was found on the part of some of the indigenous evangelists as they moved from receiver to translator; they did so in rebellion of the European missionary’s translation methods. In 1900, one of SMEP’s Basuto evangelists, Willie Mokalapa, ‘turned against the mission’, joined the Ethiopian movement, and attempted to establish the Ethiopian mission in Barotseland.\textsuperscript{183} The schism was because ‘the new elite wanted far more teaching of English and other ‘practical’ subjects’,\textsuperscript{184} and because they wanted to have ‘independent African leadership’.\textsuperscript{185} Coillard was sad that his own disciples had deserted him, but he wrote, ‘Bien que ces Ethiopiens se soient mis [...] sur un pied d’hostilité, ce sont des chrétiens et des hommes capables. Ils prêcheront le Christ dans un esprit de contradiction, mais ils le prêcheront’.\textsuperscript{186} Even at this time of
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discord, Coillard recognised that the role of the indigenous missionaries had changed, that they were preaching, and that they were doing the translation work which he also was undertaking. He saw that the roles in mission were not fixed, and these indigenous missionaries, who had at one point been receivers of the Christian message, took on the role of translators, establishing their own missions.

So then, in the missionary work of Asser, Aaron and Willie, we can see how the indigenous receiver was also translator, commissioner, benefactor, and, in the work of François Coillard, how the European missionary-translator also fulfilled the role of commissioner, editor, and receiver (also reader). Roles in mission-translation were therefore not static, and these reflections apply to translation proper too. Theo Hermans defines translation in terms of this mutability, describing ‘fluid zones where cultures tangle and overlap’ at the heart of translation activities.\(^\text{187}\) So then, translation involves fluidity and transgression of boundaries, but relating this fluidity specifically to the translator’s status and relationship to other bodies in the process, Hermans states that ‘the translator […] may belong wholly or in part, permanently or temporarily, to one side or the other, or to both, or to neither in particular’.\(^\text{188}\) In contrast to much translation theory wherein the translator has a fixed role, Hermans constructs the translator’s role as ambiguous, just as we have seen it to be in mission-translation. Where Hermans fails to unpack the fullness of this ambiguity we will now explore the changing roles within translation proper (see figure 5 for overview).

Firstly, the translator is also a reader. The translator begins the translation process as a reader. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak writes that ‘translation is the most intimate act of reading’,\(^\text{189}\) and Francis R. Jones has identified that ‘Just before translating, the reading purpose may be to familiarize oneself with a source [text], or identify its key features and problems’.\(^\text{190}\) In both instances, the translator is firstly a

\[\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{Role (below)/Becomes (right)} & \text{Receiver} & \text{Commissioner} & \text{Translator} \\
\hline
\text{Translator} & \checkmark & \checkmark & \checkmark \\
\text{Receiver} & \checkmark & \checkmark & \checkmark \\
\text{Editor} & \checkmark & \checkmark & \checkmark \\
\text{Source text producer} & \checkmark & \checkmark & \checkmark \\
\hline
\end{array} \]

**Figure 5 - Changes in translation proper roles**
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\(^{190}\) Francis R. Jones, *Poetry Translating as Expert Action: Processes, Priorities and Networks* (Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2011), p. 35. See also, ‘Prior to writing the target text, translators are
reader, a text-receiver. Indeed, the translator must read the text before s/he translates it, and the translator’s reading of the text is precisely what s/he translates. As Meta Grosman writes, ‘translators are readers who translate their reading experience to other readers’. Moreover, the translator’s role, during the process of translation, regularly returns to that of reader. Jones continues, ‘As translating goes on, translators also read in order to check rough target-language output, often in parallel with reading the source [text]’. So then, throughout the act of translation, the role of the translator oscillates between translator and reader. The role of the translator is therefore not fixed.

Furthermore, in translation proper the readers become translators as they translate the text for themselves in the very act of reading. Indeed, in their publication on Readers and Writers, David Booth and Larry Swartz posit that the cognitive process of reading is a form of translation: ‘Readers translate written symbols that are grouped into words into their oral representation, hearing them inside the head during silent reading’. Reading is a translation of written signifiers into words and meanings. Moreover, Spivak asserts that ‘all reading is translation’, and employs the acronym ‘RAT’ repeatedly in her work to mean ‘reader-as-translator’ and George Steiner claims that ‘when we read [...] we translate’. In engaging with and interpreting the text, readers embark on new translations, thus as the target text is produced. So then, translators are readers, and readers are also translators.

Moreover, the translator, in constructing the target text, implicitly commissions reading and therefore a further translation. The translator is also a commissioner. Furthermore, editors are readers as they engage with the translated text before
editing it. And even the source text producer’s role is not fixed as the source text is already a sort of translation because as Octavio Paz writes, ‘language itself, in its essence, is already a translation’ of the nonverbal;\(^{198}\) the source text producer is also a translator. Therefore, between translator, reader, editor and source text producer, as we have seen, translation involves much movement between roles.

However, as well as the movement between roles in mission-translation and translation proper, the pursuit of both movement and stasis in mission-translation by indigenous missionaries reveals that translation proper is bound by notions of unfinished movement and the hope of a final destination. Firstly, indigenous missionaries reveal mission-translation as involving much movement across boundaries. As we have already seen, etymologically, Christian ‘mission’ is a ‘sending’ motion;\(^{199}\) it involves going, a physical movement of bodies over geographical space and over borders. Indeed, Christian mission has always been a travelling ministry – its biblical mandate including ‘the ends of the earth’ and ‘all nations’,\(^{200}\) and Coillard himself is identified on numerous occasions as a ‘voyageur’,\(^{201}\) or traveller.\(^{202}\) The indigenous missionaries of the SMEP expeditions were not exempt from this emphasis on movement. In contrast to the static historical representation of indigenous involvement in mission as ‘Missionaries to Yourselves’,\(^{203}\) whereby movement and boundaries are seemingly erased, we can see instead in the journeys of Asser, Aaron, Azael, Andreas, Eleazar and others, around Africa, to the Banyai people, to Bechuanaland, to Barotseland, that indigenous missionaries were only ‘indigenous’ to the location from which they were sent. Physical movement was as much a part of their mission as of European mission. Asser Sehahabane, for example, was seen to go to the Banyai people three times, once with only indigenous accompaniment, once with the missionary, Dieterlen, and another time with Coillard. Sehahabane was therefore often found moving, and, indeed, when he arrived back from the first expedition, he walked for 29 days to Basutoland.\(^{204}\) These examples were not exceptional. This movement can also be seen as some of the ‘indigenous’ missionaries
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across Africa in the late nineteenth century were those whose ancestors had been taken to America. African-Americans retraced the journey of their ancestors over the Pacific. They are not considered ‘indigenous’ in the same way as evangelists such as Sehahabane because, as Isichei highlights, ‘Some of the Settlers were fourth- or fifth-generation Americans. They no longer spoke an African language, and clung to American culture (and Christianity) as ways of defining their identity’. And yet, these missionaries were figures in motion. Furthermore, Adrian Hastings writes that other indigenous missionaries were physically in transit even when they began their mission: ‘The men who really carried the Christian faith along the West Coast [of Africa] in the mid-nineteenth century were nearly all Africans, many of them men and women rescued from slave ships on the Atlantic’. Christianity was spread by those already travelling. Mission-translation necessarily implied movement.

More than this, as the discussion of African-Americans begins to demonstrate, the movements in mission are multiple (see figure 6 for overview). The missionary – indigenous or European – does not stop after one movement, but continues onwards. Coillard moved from Europe to Africa (a journey of ‘ten weeks at sea’), but then moved elsewhere within Africa. Although stationed in Léribé in Basutoland, he visited other villages, and regularly conducted, ‘une tournée d’évangélisation’, a trip which involved over 4 weeks of travelling. Furthermore, Coillard and the indigenous evangelists travelled from the mission station in Basutoland to found another in Barotseland. Similarly, over a sixth of all the SMEP missionaries listed pre-WWII were stationed at multiple missions, either in different

![Figure 6 - Physical movement in mission](image)
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countries (as diverse as Madagascar, Tahiti, China, Palestine and the Antilles), or within the same country. Movement was expected of the missionary-translator in the first place, but it was also often required after the initial posting too. Furthermore, as we have already seen, there was a historical movement from Africa to America, and a movement back to Africa as the descendent was involved in mission. But even within the continent, the indigenous missionary made multiple movements from homes to other parts of Africa. Asser, for example, travelled from Basutoland to the Banyai people back to Basutoland multiple times, then journeyed to Barotseland with the Coillards. J.P. Daughton describes the colonial missionary as a ‘traveler for Christ’, defining the figure as nomadic, in transit. Although he wrote about the white European missionary, this brief consideration of indigenous mission reveals that the African evangelists and missionaries were also these traveling translator figures, travellers who, to use Edward Said’s language ‘cros[s] over, travers[e] territory, and abando[n] fixed positions, all the time.’ The indigenous missionary therefore reveals that mission-translation involved regular, and often multiple movements. Rather than the more recent increase of African missionaries to Europe being what David Maxwell calls, ‘reverse missionisation’, mission itself does not have one fixed motion which can be reversed; mission, and therefore mission-translation, is constant movement.

However, although there is much movement in this context, we continually see in missionary writings and in the indigenous mission movements a pattern of settlement, a pursuit of stasis. In mission, bricks are laid, buildings are built, gardens are planted. We see the Coillards ‘settle’ in multiple places, calling Basutoland ‘une seconde patrie, une autre France’. In the same way, Joseph Mujere writes about the Basuto evangelists in Mashonaland, ‘Most of these Basotho and other African evangelists and their families settled permanently in Zimbabwe’, going on to discuss...
their continued evangelisation efforts.\textsuperscript{215} Therefore, although mission-translation necessarily denotes movement, we must note that stasis was desired and pursued: mission ‘stations’ (etymologically stationary) and established churches were the goal. Benoît Truffet, a Catholic missionary in what is now Senegal, wrote in 1847, ‘je tacherai de suivre cette marche [...], afin que peu à peu la mission devienne une église gouvernée par le droit commun et vivant de ses ressources locales sous la paternelle suprématie du Saint-Siège’.\textsuperscript{216} Truffet’s desire was to see the evolution of the moving mission to an established church. Indeed, this distinction is evident in SMEP’s history of Christianity in Lessouto, as the Livre D’Or lists both ‘missionnaires français’/‘missionnaires européens’, and ‘pasteurs indigènes’.\textsuperscript{217} The titles themselves indicate the European missionary as mobile as opposed to the indigenous pastors who are tied to their congregations. There is a distinction between static and moving workers; at some point, mission was expected to be still.

And yet, there is a tension. Truffet wrote, ‘Le but des missionnaires devait être de fonder une église, ayant des écoles et tirant de son sein des catéchistes, des prêtres, etc. pour évangéliser leurs propres compatriotes’.\textsuperscript{218} The goal of stasis is present here - the goal of mission-translation is to ‘fonder’, found and ground a church. However, this is so that indigenous Christians could be sent to ‘évangéliser’.

Therefore, the goal of the moving mission-translation was the foundation of a static church in order that moving mission-translation could be continued elsewhere. Indeed, as briefly explored in chapter 2, the ultimate settlement or ‘home’ of the indigenous and European missionaries is the spiritual stasis of heaven, the supreme destination. As Kirsteen Kim notes, ‘being in mission, all Christians are migrants and in some sense aliens and exiles from their true homes’.\textsuperscript{219} Until the arrival at their ‘true homes’, the movement of colonial missionaries was never complete. When Eleazar Marathane
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died, Coillard wrote that ‘son dernière soupir n’avait été que la dernière exhalation [...] de l’âme d’un voyageur épuisé qui arrive enfin à la maison paternelle’.\footnote{Favre, Lessouto, p. 444.} This traveller’s destination was not the new mission, it was not a new church, but a heavenly home. Indeed, it is this goal of stasis, the final arrival, that motivates the very movement of mission, in order to fulfil Revelation’s vision of ‘a great multitude [...] from every nation, tribe, people and language, standing before the throne and before the Lamb [...] And they cried out in a loud voice: “Salvation belongs to our God”’.\footnote{Revelation 7.9-10} Mission thus is a process of continual movement, but its aim is stasis on earth and, ultimately, a home in heaven where every people group is represented and sings a united song.

Just as in mission-translation movement is pursued alongside stasis, in translation proper this same tension is present. Translation has been identified as a metaphorical movement. Jan Parker writes that the translator moves ‘a text over time, space, language, and culture’,\footnote{Jan Parker, ‘Introduction: Images of Tradition, Translation, Trauma...’, in Tradition, Translation, Trauma: The Classic and the Modern, ed. by Jan Parker and Timothy Mathews (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 11–25 (p. 12).} and Bella Brodzki states that translation involves ‘the transporting of texts from one historical context to another, and the tracking of the migration of meanings from one cultural space to another’.\footnote{Brodzki, p. 4.} In both cases translation proper is the movement of a text across abstract and concrete boundaries; a text is somehow carried across history, across geographical borders, and across cultural modes of understanding. Indeed, Susan Bassnett writes that ‘[t]ranslation can be seen as a kind of journey, from one point in time and space to another, a textual journey that a traveller may undertake in reality.’\footnote{Mary Snell-Hornby, The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms Or Shifting Viewpoints?, Benjamins Translation Library, 66 (Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2006), p. 90.} Physically too, the tangible text is passed between bodies, and moved from shop shelf to book shelf.

However, in contrast to the common reduction of translation’s only movement as the ‘directional movement from source to target’ called the ‘conduit metaphor’, or ‘transference metaphor’,\footnote{Rainer Guldin, Translation as Metaphor (London; New York: Routledge, 2016), p. 52. See also, Maria Tymoczko, Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators (Manchester: St. Jerome Pub., 2007), p. 35.} the movements occurring in translation proper are multiple and multidirectional. Jeremy Munday describes translation as a constant ‘to-
ing and fro-ing’, 226 and Maria Sanchez writes that ‘translators find themselves in a Janus-like position, constantly looking backwards and forwards’. 227 There is repeated movement occurring between the texts. Indeed, translation has been described by Susan Bassnett as ‘a movement between and across, not simply [...] a transaction between a source and a target text’, 228 and Bella Brodzki writes that ‘[b]ecause translation is a movement never fully achieved, both trans, meaning “across”, and inter, meaning “between”, are crucial to an understanding of the breadth of the workings of translation’. 229 Translation is therefore not only a movement from source text to target text, but a continued motion, a process caught in the in-betweenness of itself, and its product is ‘a text in transit, “never stationary”’. 230 Similarly, Bassnett writes,

> translation is always troué, there are gaps across time and space that can never be fully bridged, and translation is [...] destined to be incomplete, always in the making, always in motion, never reaching a final point of stillness. 231

Both Brodzki and Bassnett (and others, as we have already seen) assert that translation is defined by motion, it is defined by its inability to attain stasis.

Yet, just as we have seen the mission-translation to be both a movement and a pursuit of stasis, so too is translation proper also a pursuit of the completion of the translation movement. We have already seen the physical nature of the translator and the translation (see chapters 1 and 2), but here again the product of the movement of translation is a static, fixed, printed text. Although translation’s process includes fluid movement of meaning across time and space, translation’s goal is a tangible, readable, finished product. More than this, translation’s very aim is wholeness, completion, the cessation of movement, and indeed, the end of translation. George Steiner writes that ‘Translation exists because men speak different languages’, 232 and that ‘each act of translation is an endeavour to abolish multiplicity and to bring different world-pictures
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back into perfect congruence’. The very purpose of translation – not just the task but the concept - is therefore the oneness of difference, and thus the redundancy of itself. As Douglas Robinson writes, translation is ‘the striving for perfect identity between SL and TL, often called the supreme ideal of all translation’. Translation, this ‘teleological imperative’, pursues perfection, completion. So then, in both mission-translation and translation proper, as missionaries settle, as church buildings are built, as texts are bound and placed on shelves, there is a tension found in the simultaneous pursuit of both movement and stasis.

**Conclusion**

In many representations of colonial history there is a vast disparity between the emphasis on the work of European missionaries and that of narratives of indigenous evangelists. Past scholarship has often presented the European missionary as the ‘coloniser’, the beneficiary and active agent, and the African as the ‘colonised’, the passive, ‘recipient’ and observer. However, the presence of both African and European missionaries in the Mashonaland mission-attempt and in the Barotseland mission, as well as in mission endeavours across the continent and the world, reveals the relationship between foreign and indigenous bodies as much more complex. Indeed, this chapter has shown, just as Justin Bradford writes, that ‘indigenous missionaries must be seen as more than people “in-between”’. Rather, the indigenous missionaries who worked with Coillard - Asser, Aaron, Azael, Eleazar and others - ‘worked effectively, and shared the sacrifice; seven of the first 15 graves of missionaries and their families were those of Sotho members of the party’. Their individual contributions and their interactive assistance were vital for the colonial mission work.

The work of both indigenous and European missionaries together reveals mission-translation and translation proper as processes involving bodies. These bodies, interacting at close proximity, call into question the concept of loyalty found in
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Christiane Nord’s translation theory, and necessitate Andrew Chesterman’s notion of trust as supplementary. Where loyalty conveys notions of disparity and unidirectional commitment, indigenous mission highlights trust in translation as equal and as required of each role involved in the process. Furthermore, in the context of social and geographic movement, the interaction of indigenous and European bodies reveal that there is movement and fluidity in the dynamics of mission-translation and translation proper. The roles in these relationships are not fixed: the European missionaries were at one point receivers of a translated message, and the indigenous receivers become propagators of this message. Likewise, in translation proper, the translator is a reader, and indeed the reader is a translator. Furthermore, just as trust shows the multidirectionality of translation, the physical movement of the missionary bodies across countries and continents is multiple. Similarly, translation proper is made up of multiple metaphorical and physical movements across time and space. And yet, finally, there is a tension between the movement of these processes and the desired stasis found within them. Mission-translation’s short-term goal is a ‘station’, and a church, but its ultimate aim is a heavenly home wherein a united song can be heard from the lips of people from every tribe and tongue and nation. Indeed, it is this aim which motivates the missionary movement and mission-translation. In the same way, the movement of translation proper is inspired by the pursuit of stasis; its product is a physical, fixed text, and its ideological aim is the very stasis of meaning and its understanding.
Chapter 4. Missionary Photography and/as Translation: Layers and Contexts

In this thesis, we have explored mission-translations of European and African colonial missionaries. We have followed the intercultural and interlingual translations of the Christian message from Europe to Africa as well as the forgotten circulation and translation of that message around Africa. This final chapter, by considering François Coillard’s use of photography and photographs in/for mission, will focus on the continued translation of Christianity around Africa and, ultimately, the translation of this work back to Europe. It will firstly detail the importance of photographs to the mission-translation work, enabling the mission-translation relationships and concurrently demonstrating the transfer of Christianity. Then it will employ a selection of Coillard’s photographs to posit that photographs, as they communicate ideas and images across boundaries, recode an event and an experience as an object, and are thus forms of mission-translation and forms of translation. Finally, it will consider the circulation and consumption of Coillard’s photographs, revealing the multiple layers and contexts involved in the construction of the photograph. Therefore, as well as a heightened awareness of the translator in the consciousness of the reader, called for in the last decade by Venuti amongst others, this chapter will echo the previous chapter’s discussions of collaboration, completion and complementing roles to conclude with the significance of the multiplicity of agents, processes, contexts and layers at work in translation.

Photography and Translation

Although photographic processes had been in use since 1839 to produce ‘two dimensional replica[s] of at least one moment of reality’, it was not until ‘the introduction of the dry plate in the 1880s’, when photography became an accessible activity for the masses in the metropoles as well as the colonies. In particular, as Christraud M. Geary writes, when considering Europeans ‘[i]n the African context, we

1 Venuti, *Invisibility*.
observe an increase of photographic activity in the last two decades of the nineteenth century’ due to ‘the growing popularity of photography and the technological changes’, and the fact that this was a ‘crucial phase of the exploration of the new territories in Africa’. Photography played an important role in the documentation of ‘discovery’, it was not only increasing in popularity as an activity or hobby, but as a product, a piece of propaganda to circulate and to consume.

François Coillard is an example of this increased interest, particularly in the African context. In 1882, Coillard was the first SMEP missionary to take a camera onto the mission field. Learning about the practice from ‘deux professionnels, à Londres et à Paris’, and able to purchase a camera because of ‘le don d’un comité de dames suisse’, he became a skilled and ‘enthusiastic photographer’, one of those ‘amateurs who had familiarized themselves with a rather complicated technology’. Photography then became part of his daily routine: ‘La vie, dans ces voyages sur le fleuve, est toujours la même : Coillard évangélise, observe, note, il admire le paysage, il photographie’. But more than a pastime, for Coillard, photography was a subject of prayer, and was something that concerned the glory of God. He wrote, ‘j’ai la conviction intime que cet appareil travaillera pour la gloire de mon Dieu et pour le faire connaître et aimer’, therefore Coillard’s photography was bound to his Christian mission. Indeed, as we will explore, his photographs were an important and integral element of the mission-translation work, found alongside his mission translations in

---

4 Geary, ‘Photographs as Materials’, p. 94.
6 Gangnat, ‘Photographies Diffusées’, p. 244. See also, ‘cela pourrait intéresser les dames qui m’ont donné l’appareil photographique’, in François Coillard, letter to ‘bien chère madame et sœur’, 27 Oct 1882, found in found in the Société des Missions Évangéliques de Paris archives, in La Bibliothèque du Défap, 102, Boulevard Arago, Paris. All other references to letters are from these archives which will henceforth be referred to as ‘Défap’.
8 Jenkins and Geary, p. 56.
9 Favre, Zambèze, p. 135.
10 ‘J’ai pris quelques vues que je demande à Dieu de faire réussir dans l’intérêt de son œuvre. Si nous devons tout faire [...] pour sa gloire, sûrement je puis faire de la photographie pour le même but. Et je le fais’, and ‘J’ai envoyé des instructions pour une commande d’appareil photographique [...] J’ai beaucoup prié à ce sujet’, in Favre, Zambèze, pp. 135, 291.
11 Favre, Zambèze, p. 291.
Barotseland, and informing and linking the supporters in Europe visually to the mission activities going on abroad. As we will explore, they were a means of presenting the gospel, a way of enhancing his own credibility, an indication of the state of the wider mission-translation work, a method of fundraising, and photography was an activity that he enjoyed.

Firstly, photographs were useful for Coillard’s mission as they were a means of presenting the gospel, a means by which he could then verbally translate the message of Christianity. Photographs caught people’s attention: Coillard regularly wrote of the power of the ‘la lanterne magique’, and of photographs to arouse curiosity. He wrote that in ‘chaque village où nous passons, il faut voir tout le monde accourir et me demander d’exhiber “les chefs que j’ai dans ma poche”’, and ‘[d]ans tous les villages on venait en foule. Il faillait dix fois le jour recommencer l’exhibition des photographies’. As Coillard travelled, he gained curiosity and interest because of his photographs. He was able to converse with non-Christians through his photographs; they were a point of initial contact. Moreover, this attention, once attracted by the photographs, was then concentrated on the gospel message. Coillard asserted that ‘la lanterne magique est un excellent moyen d’attirer et d’instruire’. The exhibition of photographs drew the crowd that Coillard needed precisely for preaching, for his mission-translation work. Photographs were therefore the means by which the missionary introduced the gospel message. In his books, Coillard explicitly related this exhibition of photographs with the presentation of Christianity:

Au coucher du soleil, je tombai sur un autre plan. Je me rendis au lékhothla et je commençai à exhiber mes photographies. Il y eut bientôt foule. […] Et il fallait entendre les remarques piquantes, les explosions d’enthousiasme à la vue de Léwanika et de Makouaé! — A la brune, les photographies pliées, je fis asseoir tout ce monde, et je leur parlai du Sauveur.

Here we watch as Coillard’s ‘plan’ unfolded: people came to look at his photographs, and he then took the opportunity to preach to the group assembled. Photography enabled him to gather a large group of people in one place and to get their attention

---

12 François Coillard, letter to ‘bien chère sœur’, 14 Sept 1882, Défap; François Coillard, letter to A. Boegner, 7 Sept 1896, Défap ; François Coillard, letter to Bianqui, 14 Oct 1898, Défap. Favre, Zambèze, pp. 25, 285.
14 François Coillard, Haut-Zambèze (1899), p. 184.
15 Coillard, letter to ‘bien chère sœur’, 14 Sept 1882.
16 François Coillard, Haut-Zambèze (1898), p. 371. See also, François Coillard, Threshold, p. 353.
before presenting the Christian message to them. The photographs were significant in the mission therefore as they preceded and enabled the mission-translation. And Coillard did not only use projections of photographs to get the attention of African people. He used the ‘magic lantern […] both to instruct and influence potential converts in Africa and to educate and enthuse supporters of mission at home’. 17 As well as wanting to ‘faire voyager nos Basoutos’ through photos of Swiss mountains,18 he showed slides of the Zambesi mission during his tours to Europe, ‘façant voyager les Européens avec ses photographies’. 19 Coillard exploited the interest in the still relatively new technology and the photographs themselves to gather people – whether European or African - and to present to them both his message and his mission.

Secondly, as well as enabling the gathering and interest of people, photographs rendered Coillard’s message and Coillard himself more credible. In one particular instance, when Coillard showed a photograph to Matauka, Lewanika’s sister, the reaction was documented as follows:

> il fallait voir sa figure et son excitation quand je lui montrais mes photographies. À la vue de celle de Mathaha, elle recula d’effroi : « Sénano ! Sénano ! criait-elle, l’infâme ! l’infâme! Ces gens-là (parlant de moi) sont redoutables ; ils ont dans leurs poches les vivants et les morts ! » Puis, se ravisant et riant de son rire cynique, elle répétait : « Mais nous l’avons exterminé, ce Sénano ! »

When Coillard showed her pictures of dead rebels, Matauka assigned a supernatural power to Coillard as he seemed to transcend time by bringing the dead into the temporal moment of the living. Gwyn Prins uses this example as evidence for Coillard’s exploitation of his indigenous audience’s ignorance of photographic technology, asserting that Coillard uses photography to demonstrate colonial power and influence.21 Similarly, Heike Behrend writes that Coillard ‘took photographs on site to prove to the Lozi that he possessed a supernatural power’, and that he and other missionaries,
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19 Gangnat, ‘Photographies Diffusées’, p. 246. See also, ‘Pouvait-on pr la fin de cette semaine m’envoyer les vues de Z [sic] pr projections ?’ Coillard, letter to A. Boegner, 7 Sept 1896.
20 François Coillard, *Haut-Zambeze (1898)*, p. 230. See also, François Coillard, *Threshold*, p. 216.
calculatingly employed technical media [...] to spread Christian doctrine and its accompanying way of life as effectively as possible, but at the same time also to demonstrate their own and their God’s extraordinary power. 22

Both post-colonial accounts reveal that the photographs that Coillard presented had an impact on how he was viewed. They made him seem more powerful. So then, as in texts where the photograph is believed to ‘elevat[e] the credibility of the narrative’, 23 in Coillard’s context too photographs elevated the photographer and thus gave Coillard a reputation of authority.

Furthermore, the act of photographing gave Coillard more credibility as it gave him favour. In contrast to the above notion of exerted power on the part of the photographer, the ruler, Litia (Lewanika’s son) asked Coillard to photograph his own son, who was being ‘gardé’ by Lewanika. 24 This task was culturally significant as personne, en dehors de sa parenté immédiate et des esclaves attachés à son service, n’a encore vu son visage. Personne n’est censé connaître son nom ou savoir si c’est une fille ou un garçon. Personne que les gens de service n’est, depuis deux ans, entré dans la cour où il grandit, et si lui-même a dû en sortir, ce n’est que couvert de fourrures au point d’étouffer. [...] C’est le sort de tous les enfants de sang royal. 25

Photography enabled Coillard to enter into a very intimate and culturally significant setting, and thus build trust and build relationship with the figure of authority. Regardless of whether this is a reflection of the relationship that Coillard already had with Litia, or whether this episode strengthened their connection, we see through photography that Coillard’s mission-translation was enabled as the relationship was affirmed. In both cases, photography gave Coillard authority and credibility, and aided the reception of the wider mission-translation occurring. In terms of Europeans, too, after spending time with James Johnston, he wrote, ‘Nous avons donc fait ensemble de la photographie’. 26 Therefore, the act of photography was not only a means by which

---

24 François Coillard, Haut-Zambahé (1898), p. 610. See also François Coillard, Threshold, p. 575.
25 François Coillard, Haut-Zambahé (1898), p. 610. See also François Coillard, Threshold, p. 575.
26 François Coillard, Haut-Zambahé (1898), p. 471. ‘He is a clever and passionate photographer; consequently, we did a good deal of photography together’, François Coillard, Threshold, p. 445.
he obtained the favour of African people, but Europeans too, using it to gain access and relationship.

Thirdly, as well as drawing the crowd for the mission-translation and giving authority to the mission-translation, photography and the transfer of the practice to indigenous users were indicators of the wider mission-translation occurring. Just as the indigenous converts took on the verbal translation of the Christian message (see chapter 3), photography and its appropriation mirrored this transfer. Rulers of Barotseland, Lewanika and Litia were of great concern to the missionary. Coillard recounted in much detail the reception of the Christian message by both: Lewanika attended services, sang Christian songs and spoke of the Bible. Coillard saw him as ‘pas loin du royaume de Dieu. Il connait la vérité, il aime les choses de Dieu […] mais son cœur n’est pas encore touché’. And Litia, his son, joined the Coillard’s school, devoting himself to the Coillards before professing faith and personal conversion, becoming ‘the Christian King of the Barotsi’. Similarly, to their conversion processes, the transfer of the practice of photography mirrored the spiritual and cultural transfer occurring in the mission-translation. Both Lewanika and Litia took and used photographs for their own advantage. Karen Milbourne claims that Lewanika exploited ‘visual processes to further his power’, posing and staging his appearance ‘to respond to the demands of the day’ and ‘to gain multinational recognition of Barotseland’. Furthermore, Litia himself went on to pursue photography, ‘formé à la photographie par Coillard’, having ‘his own dark room’ and ‘developing his own photographs when Percy Clark, a professional photographer, visited Sesheke in 1903’. Thus, as Gwyn Prins writes, ‘control of photography was perceived by both sides to be a valuable asset’. Just as Coillard’s message of Christianity was being translated and received,

30 Addison, p. 45.
33 Macmillan, p. 36. At least 2 of Litia’s photographs can be found in the DEFAP archive.
34 Prins, ‘Battle for Control’, p. 98.
this acceptance and appropriation of photography shows us an analogous translation movement.

Fourthly, Coillard used photographs to raise financial support and enable the general translation (metaphorical and translation proper) work of the mission. Coillard saw the value of photographs as objects to be consumed by the public, and encouraged the sale of his own pictures. In multiple issues of the *Journal des Missions Evangéliques* (JME), SMEP advertised Coillard’s photographs as for sale. As well as this, Coillard sent them to Geneva for Swiss consumption:

> J’envoie mes clichés à Genève aux dames qui m’ont donné mon appareil. Je leur demanderai de les faire imprimer pour la vente des missions – en faveur du Zambèze – on pourrait les envoyer ensuite à Paris, […] vous feriez la même chose.

He sent his photographs specifically for their development and subsequent sale, specifying exactly where the money was to be spent. He was aware that photographs generated income for the mission. His pursuit of the activity – in spite of the immobility of the apparatus and the economic strain of materials and resources – therefore shows his knowledge of the financial merit of photography. Indeed, he subscribed to many geographical journals and Emilie Gangnat claims that, ‘Il est donc conscient que l’image est un bon moyen pour communiquer à propos de son travail’. Furthermore, she asserts, ‘il a bien compris l’importance de ce nouveau medium pour le développement de la propagande missionnaire en Europe’. Coillard saw the potential that his own photographs had for mission funds.

And yet, finally, although, as Paul Jenkins writes, ‘sceptical voices […] argue that photographs were primarily taken to support missionary fund-raising activities at home’, many missionaries, such as Coillard, took photographs because of a genuine

---


36 François Coillard, letter to Boegner, 13 Nov 1883, Défap. See also, ‘Pourriez vs [sic] les faire imprimer p. [sic] la vente et les faire ensuite passer à Genève ?’ François Coillard, letter to Boegner, 11 Feb 1884, Défap. See also, ‘M. Bosman, le pasteur hollandais, [de?] Pretoria demande qu’on lui envoie un certain nombre d [sic] photos qu’il vendra au profit de la mission.’ François Coillard, letter to Boegner, 7 July 1886, Défap.

37 Gangnat, ‘Photographies Diffusées’, p. 245.

38 Gangnat, ‘Photographies Diffusées’, p. 244.
interest in the activity.\textsuperscript{39} Photography required mastering, something which Coillard did while on furlough in Europe, and often required sacrifice of time and money: ‘photographs were mostly taken during the missionaries’ leisure time, at their own initiative and cost’.\textsuperscript{40} More than this, Coillard took serious physical risks for the sake of a photograph,\textsuperscript{41} and spent ‘a good deal of money on photography’.\textsuperscript{42} Moreover, in contrast to the profit-making use of photography seen above, he often sent one or two photographs to friends for their enjoyment rather than for revenue.\textsuperscript{43} Indeed, Coillard was not always confident of the commercial value of his images. He writes to SMEP of their giving the Geographical Society of Paris the album of photographs, ‘C’était une heureuse idée [...] Mais a-t-elle de la valeur cette collection? Je me sens bien coupable envers la S. [sic] de Géographie’.\textsuperscript{44} It seems that, although the photographs functioned as mission propaganda, Coillard was not always aware of and not always motivated by this function and the ‘valeur’ of his photographs in this capacity.

So then, photography was an integral part of Coillard’s mission-translation work. He often used it as a means of presenting the Christian message, as a means of presenting himself as more credible, and the transfer of photographs and photography between himself and the indigenous rulers indicates the wider mission-translation. Moreover, he used photography for the profit of the mission, and also seemed to enjoy the activity. Therefore we can see that photographs were significant for Coillard as they facilitated and accompanied mission-translation. Images have historically been neglected in the study of colonial history, missionary history, and Africa’s social history,\textsuperscript{45} where the use of photographs as ‘a primary source’ is ‘relatively rare’,\textsuperscript{46} and

\textsuperscript{41} ‘[…] courant de roches en roches, cherchant un point de vue à photographe, je glissai, tombai et roulai jusqu’au bord du torrent’ François Coillard, \textit{Haut-Zambèze (1898)}, p. 181. See also François Coillard, \textit{Threshold}, p. 169. And see François Coillard, letter to Boegner, 5 March 1885, Défap.
\textsuperscript{42} See also, Prins, ‘Battle for Control’, p. 98.
\textsuperscript{43} Coillard, letter to Boegner, 13 Nov 1883; Coillard, letter to ‘bien chère madame et sœur’, 27 Oct 1882. See also, ‘Je vous ai envoyé un lever de soleil voici un coucher’, François Coillard, letter to Boegner, 17 Feb 1903, Défap.
\textsuperscript{44} François Coillard, letter to Boegner, 1 June 1887, Défap.
\textsuperscript{46} Geary, ‘Photographs as Materials’, p. 91.
where they are employed instead as ‘illustrations’ for books.\textsuperscript{47} Indeed, regarding the specific photographic archives of SMEP, the collections are ‘fonds alors peu connu et non inventorié’, and apart from Emilie Gangnat’s foundational work, to which this chapter owes much, ‘aucune étude n’existait sur les fonds photographiques’.\textsuperscript{48} Furthermore, similarly, translation theory’s past ‘neglect of images, as opposed to verbal language’ has also been recognised,\textsuperscript{49} whereby ‘as the centre of translation studies is language, the role and the importance of non-verbal text elements is reduced to general statements’,\textsuperscript{50} with a few exceptions now apparent.\textsuperscript{51} And yet, this chapter will proceed to demonstrate that, more than only accompanying mission-translation, Coillard’s photographs are useful artefacts for historical enquiry, and in the re-evaluation of notions of translation, for they are examples to us of another form of mission-translation and indeed another form of translation.

The album of photographs to be considered in more depth in the remainder of this chapter is entitled \textit{Vues du Zambèze: Album de 103 photographies} and will henceforth to be referred to as \textit{Vues}.\textsuperscript{52} The album contains 107 photographs taken by Coillard,\textsuperscript{53} selected by SMEP, and given to the Paris Geographical Society in 1888. In particular, I will be discussing 22 photographs (found in the appendix) which I have selected from the album to exemplify and demonstrate the overall themes of

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Gangnat, ‘Une Histoire de La Photographie Missionnaire’, p. 160.}
\footnote{François Coillard, \textit{Vues}.}
\footnote{The ‘Album de 103 Photographies’ is actually an album of 107 photographs. The numbers on the photographs range from 1 – 98, however, with the addition of multiple ‘bis’ (for example, 18 bis) the total number of photographs in the album amounts to 107.}
\end{footnotes}
translation occurring and the many layers of context which construct the text’s whole.\textsuperscript{54}

\textit{Photographs as Translations}

As has been stated, photography has been largely ignored in studies of translation. Even when discussed, images/photographs are marginalised. Gabriela Saldanha and Sharon O’Brien’s \textit{Research Methodologies} suggests that photographs should be more common in Translation Studies research, but not as forms of translation, rather as ways to keep the interest of the reader: ‘photographs and other pictorial elements [...] can also bring our report to life by providing a break from the narrative’.\textsuperscript{55} In contrast, Yves Gambier and Henrik Gottlieb’s volume on multimedia and translation begins to examine ‘relations between the linguistic part and the rest of the MM [multimedia] message’;\textsuperscript{56} and as a result, suggests the need to ‘redefine certain concepts’ such as “text” and “meaning”.\textsuperscript{57} However, in regards to images, the volume only considers the challenges of translating a source text in which images are found; it does not consider them as translations themselves. Translation Studies has not been without some insight into the subject. More consistent with the claims of this thesis, a recent publication entitled \textit{Framing the Interpreter} has examined photographic representations of the translator/interpreter figure. The editors, Anxo Fernández-Ocampo and Michaela Wolf, write that ‘photographs themselves may be seen as acts of translation – a form of cultural translation that moves a set of experiences from one space of understanding to another’.\textsuperscript{58} They claim that photographs can be identified as

\textsuperscript{54} Photographs chosen can be found in Appendix C and are photographs 1, 5, 10, 12, 13, 19, 20, 23, 31b, 35, 46, 47, 49, 55, 59, 62, 66, 67, 77, 86, 94, 98 from Vues. Hardcopies of the album are available for viewing at the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, and photographs from the album are available for viewing at the DEFAP archive.


a ‘form of translation in their own right’. But after these enlightening and intriguing claims, they retreat: ‘The major focus of this book, however, will be the ways that interpreting emerged through photography’. In contrast, in an edition of *Recherches Sémiotiques*, Maurizio Gagliano boldly communicates the link between photography and translation. He ‘examine[s] the issue of photographic representation through the filter of translation theory’ and ‘consider[s] it among those transformations which set-up an equivalence between the source sign and the target one’. He therefore claims that photography is a form of translation, and as a result declares that ‘a wider focus on translation ought to include non-verbal languages’. Indeed, Gagliano – a semiotics scholar – asserts to the Translation Studies community, ‘the comparison herein developed may end up proving even more valuable to the very idea of translation itself’.

Contrary to this neglect, outside the field of Translation Studies, photography and translation have historically been described as analogous activities. In 1850, one writer in the *Revue de Deux Mondes* called the daguerreotype (the first commercially successful photographic process) ‘un traducteur chargé de nous initier plus avant dans les secrets de la nature’. From its appearance in the modern world, the camera was assigned the task of translating. It was a mediator between the human world and the natural world. More recently, others such as Elizabeth Edwards, Sigrid Lien, and Abigail Solomon-Godeau have communicated the same comparison between photography and translation. Edwards and Lien claim that photography is a ‘conveyor of meaning’, using similar language to that of translation scholars. Furthermore, Solomon-Godeau writes that ‘the camera produces representations – iconic signs – translating the actual into the pictorial’. She argues that within the process of photography there is a

59 Fernández-Ocampo and Wolf, ‘Framing the Interpreter’, p. 4.
60 Fernández-Ocampo and Wolf, ‘Framing the Interpreter’, p. 4.
61 Gagliano, p. 29.
62 Gagliano, p. 29.
63 Gagliano, p. 40.
translation process at work, a translation of a moment from one medium (reality) to another (image), the translation of ‘events [...] into scenes’, as Vilém Flusser writes.\textsuperscript{68} Photography is the communication of a vision across a boundary, and, as such, a translation of an experience into an ‘object’.

Indeed, it seems that individual missionaries and missionary societies used photographs as translations. They were employed in the ‘depiction of constant progress’,\textsuperscript{69} and used to translate Africa to Europe, rendering ‘the foreign’ context of mission accessible to ‘home’ audiences. Missionary photographs became part of what V.Y. Mudimbe describes as the ‘colonial library’ which had ‘the specific purpose of faithfully translating and deciphering the African object’.\textsuperscript{70} Similarly, in Emilie Gangnat’s doctoral thesis, on the SMEP photography of François Coillard and Élie Allegret, although translation is not a focus, or even an element, of her work, she frequently resorts to the language and metaphor of translation to describe the function of the mission-photograph.\textsuperscript{71} According to Gangnat, the photographs of François Coillard translate changes in relationships in mission,\textsuperscript{72} otherness and ‘l’africanité’,\textsuperscript{73} subjective feeling and ‘émotion’,\textsuperscript{74} the motivations and attitudes of the photographer,\textsuperscript{75} and the attitudes of the mission society itself.\textsuperscript{76} For Gangnat, photographs are ‘des témoins visuels’, witnessing and indicating what was going on.\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{72} For example, ‘traduisent les changements subis par les populations au contact des missionnaires’, and ‘traduit le changement des relations’, Gangnat, ‘À Travers Les Archives’, pp. 20, 73.
\textsuperscript{74} ‘Il cherche à traduire par l’image une émotion plus qu’un fait’, Gangnat, ‘À Travers Les Archives’, p. 60.
\textsuperscript{77} Gangnat, ‘À Travers Les Archives’, p. 350.
In the study of an album of Coillard’s photographs, building on Gangnat’s findings, we will see evidence of the translational capacity of photographs. Through a selection of Coillard’s photographs, we will see that Coillard was using his photographs to translate the work of the mission back to Europe, translating progress, otherness, relationship, and the mission experience, and that thus photographs are forms of translation. Photographs as mission-translations therefore do not only translate the message of Christianity, but its propagation, its success, and its results.

Firstly, as Gangnat suggests, Coillard’s photographs translate the progress of Christianity and ‘civilisation’, and thus the effect of the mission, acting as propaganda for its success. François Coillard’s photographs correspond with Christraud Geary’s assertion that ‘the depiction of constant progress […] was at the heart of missionary writing and image production’. In image 1, we are presented with a busy mission station. In the background, William Waddell is standing at his carpentry work, building up the mission materially (explored in chapter 1). Next to him are Christina and Elise Coillard, sitting on chairs reading, or perhaps sewing. In the foreground of the picture and, according to the caption, the focal point of the photograph, sitting on a stool, is the missionary Jeanmairet teaching four ‘Zambéziens’, who are sitting on the floor, to read. The Europeans shown are active, doing, applying knowledge, and the Africans, seen lower down physically, are receiving this knowledge. The photograph translates the progress possible in missionary work, seen in the ‘civilised’ activities of the Europeans, and translates the process itself, depicting the activity of learning. Geary asserts that, ‘[missionary-]Photographs of schools and the teaching of particular crafts denote the instilling of proper skills’, thus, although Coillard’s photographs do not depict a classroom, we are asked to observe as skills (seen in the background and the foreground) are passed from the Europeans to the Africans. Considering this translation of progress, a few pages on in the album, in image 2, we are presented with a similar picture of the teacher sitting higher than his students – many more students – and showing them a text. However, this teacher is Aaron Mayoro and the caption tells us that we are looking at ‘l’école d’Aaron’. Aaron is wearing European clothes.

---

(indigenous figures are seen in European clothes in 30% of the album), ‘a much photographed theme in colonial photography’.

We are therefore shown throughout the album, that not only Christianity (as seen in chapter 3), but the ability to teach and reform, and dress, have been passed on to the African converts. In its inclusion of this progression, the album demonstrates the success of the civilising – and Christian – mission(s). Coillard’s photographs translate progress.

However, whilst certain images might carry the connotation of progress and civilisation, when we consider the album as a whole, there is not an obvious ‘before’ and ‘after’ progression which begins with supposed degeneration and ends with Europeanisation. Instead, the first images of the album are of the mission group (British, French and Basuto men and women (see image 3)), and the final images of the album are of the mission group (as above, but with children (see image 4)) and of two indigenous Zambéziens ‘faisant un parquet de boue et de bouse de vache’ (see image 5). Therefore, although we can see that photographs act to translate mission practices such as teaching, the album does not seem to be showing a stereotypical ‘before and after’ progression over all.

Furthermore, as well as schools, missionary photographs often also depicted ‘missionary stations and churches [...] baptisms, weddings, and preaching’, however, Vues, only ticks mission stations off this list. To some extent, Coillard’s photos thus firstly translate the successful effect of the mission to audiences and supporters in Europe, but this progression is not a clear ‘avant/après’ representation of the mission.

Secondly, image 5 is also part of a pattern in the album whereby Coillard’s photographs translate indigenous culture, and thus difference and otherness, to European audiences, making them visually accessible. Many of the album’s

---

80 Jenkins, ‘Missionary Photographs in Modern Discussion’, p. 74. Photographs in which indigenous figures are wearing European clothes are 1, 2, 3 bis, 3, 4, 9, 13, 16, 18 bis, 18, 19, 20, 23, 26, 29, 35, 38, 46, 49, 55, 56, 57, 60, 61, 62, 85, 86, 87, 88, 92, 94, 95 in François Coillard, Vues.


Photographs show indigenous methods and practices, such as the making of a floor of image 5, and the ‘trituration du blé’ in image 6. Fifteen other images in the album show people playing indigenous musical instruments, cooking, dancing, making things, and selling things.  

British Explorer Frederick Selous describes Coillard’s ‘many most interesting photographs representing different phases of native life and customs’, and its focus on difference, Coillard’s photography is located in that nineteenth century obsession with ‘catalogu[ing]’ and ‘picturing the other’, a trend which was a result of the simultaneous birth of ethnography and photography, and in which ‘commercial and amateur photographers, scientists and explorers all were engaged’, including Coillard. Indeed Coillard’s pictures do reflect this contemporary emphasis on ethnography whereby ‘[i]t is impossible to image [sic] ethnography without photography, but it is also hard to imagine 19th century photography without its ethnological uses, where art and science were very hard to tell apart’. Photographs such as image 7 present an ethnographic view of the indigenous individual, showing a stark background with the focal point of each photograph being the respective side and front profiles of the local ruler, Ratau. This was a common composition in depictions of Africans:

there is a type of missionary photography which we may define as anthropological. On the surface such photography is apparently scientific or factual. It often shows examples of particular ‘types’ of Africans. Sometimes such photos come in pairs, showing full face and profile of the same person.

Vues contains seven such photos, where an indigenous figure (three chefs, Esaie, a ‘prefet des Matokas’, and ‘Ben, notre conducteur’ (image 20), ‘un makuengo’) is photographed twice showing the shoulders and the head, once from the side, and once from the front. According to Emilie Gangnat, ‘Lecteur attentif de nombreuses publications scientifiques et soucieux de contribuer à l’étude du monde, Coillard
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83 Photographs 35, 36, 36 bis, 37, 45, 46, 41, 65, 63, 78, 80, 89, 90, 96 bis, 98 in François Coillard, Vues.
84 Frederick Courteney Selous, Travel and Adventure in South-East Africa; Being the Narrative of the Last Eleven Years Spent by the Author on the Zambesi and Its Tributaries; with an Account of the Colonisation of Mashunaland and the Progress of the Gold Industry in That Country (London: R. Ward and Co., 1893), p. 252.
86 Pinheiro, p. 499.
88 Photographs 3, 43, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61 in François Coillard, Vues.
reprend certains éléments de la photographie anthropologique’, therefore perhaps these photographs were taken with the intention of imitating his reading, of cataloguing indigenous behaviour and features, indigenous ‘types’.⁸⁹ Indeed, out of the 85 photographs showing people in the album, 79 display indigenous people,⁹⁰ and only 21 show Europeans.⁹¹ It could be suggested therefore that Coillard’s emphasis was on ‘picturing the other’.⁹² Coillard’s photographs translate the indigenous culture to the European gaze by making indigenous people, indigenous customs, and indigenous difference the focus of the photographs.

And yet, although Coillard’s photographs were influenced by the ethnographic trends of his contemporary moment, his Christianity also influenced his approach to the activity and as a result, his photographs sometimes resisted common ethnographical trends. For instance, image 8 is the only photograph in the album to focus on indigenous women. It depicts four women and a baby sitting on the ground outside a house. Although the two young figures behind seem to be staring at the photographer, the four women are looking to their right, avoiding our gaze. Unlike many colonial photographs of indigenous women, they are not exposed, instead they are sitting and covered. Indeed, women in general are scarce in Coillard’s photographs. This is perhaps because their domestic setting (see chapter 2) was difficult to photograph due to the lack of light, however, Coillard’s photography challenged photographic and ethnographic norms in more ways than its refusal to present and expose women. As Gangnat points out Coillard’s mirroring of anthropological techniques, she goes on to write,

[...] mais il ne se montre pas toujours scrupuleux avec les méthodes de normalisation prônées à l’époque. Il fait poser la plupart des chefs zambéziens de face et de profil. Mais si les arrières plans sont flous et mal définis, ils restent naturels. Aucun drap ou décor n’est pose derrière les sujets. Le missionnaire ne place pas non plus de règle à côté des visages. Enfin, il ne fait jamais poser ses modèles nus.⁹³

⁹⁰ Photographs 1, 2, 3 bis, 3, 4, 9, 13, 16, 18 bis, 18, 19, 20, 23, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31 bis, 31, 35, 36, 36 bis, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96 bis, 97, 98 in François Coillard, Vues.
⁹¹ Photographs 1, 5, 7, 9, 10, 13, 21, 22, 23, 24, 30, 36 bis, 47, 48, 50, 81, 85, 94, 95, 96, 97 in François Coillard, Vues.
⁹² Pinheiro, p. 499.
Coillard does not follow all anthropological trends then. He does not create scenery or backdrops, and he does not photograph nudity. Indeed, in contrast to the emphasis of chapter 3 and much colonial photography, there is not much focus on the indigenous body.\textsuperscript{94} Instead, shots are often wide and distant. Furthermore, although it has be said that the photographs act as indicators of European superiority, ‘the hierarchical arrangement of the photograph’ an element which is ‘totally under Coillard’s control’,\textsuperscript{95} the layout of many of the photographs undermines this assertion. In image 4, for example, although the Europeans take up the centre of the photograph and the Africans take up the periphery,\textsuperscript{96} in terms of levels, it is not only the indigenous members of the party that are placed lower down than Coillard, but Waddell and Middleton too. Indeed, in image 3, we find Middleton and Waddell on the edge of the photograph and so the interpreted hierarchy is not always the same.

Moreover, Coillard’s photographs translate a more complex relationship between Europe and Africa than merely the colonised and colonisers, as we have discussed in chapter 3. Of course, it can be asserted that Coillard’s photographs reveal ‘the battle for control’,\textsuperscript{97} going on in his contemporary context. According to Gwyn Prins, Coillard ‘used photography as a weapon’;\textsuperscript{98} he continues, ‘Coillard was in control of his camera. All the subjects are passively posed, like specimens’.\textsuperscript{99} Indeed, in regards to the album’s many photographs of local rulers (eight seen over thirteen photographs),\textsuperscript{100} Gangnat writes, ‘Coillard montre qu’il est capable de garder avec lui, sous son contrôle, l’image de chefs respectés’.\textsuperscript{101} As he photographed indigenous rulers, and as he possessed the resulting objects, Coillard used the act of photography and the photographs themselves to present himself as powerful and influential. And yet, as we have already seen in chapter 3, there were relationships of mutual trust.

\textsuperscript{94} The representation of women in colonial photography is underscored with practices inscribing indigenous bodies that are commodified to make possible their seizure by the “observers”, in Michael Hayes, ‘Photography and the Emergence of the Pacific Cruise: Rethinking the Representational Crisis in Colonial Photography’, in Colonialist Photography: Imag(in)ing Race and Place, ed. by Eleanor M. Hight and Gary D. Sampson (New York; Abingdon: Routledge, 2002), pp. 172–87 (p. 178).
\textsuperscript{95} Prins, ‘Battle for Control’, p. 99.
\textsuperscript{96} Gangnat, ‘À Travers Les Archives’, p. 186.
\textsuperscript{97} Prins, ‘Battle for Control’.
\textsuperscript{98} Prins, ‘Battle for Control’, p. 99.
\textsuperscript{100} Photographs 18, 18 bis, 19, 20, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 65, 74, 79 from the album depict ‘chefs’, ‘rois’ and a ‘1er ministre’, see François Coillard, Vues.
\textsuperscript{101} Gangnat, ‘À Travers Les Archives’, p. 58.
between the agents involved in mission-translation. Four of the photographs of the rulers were taken in an ethnographic fashion similar to image 7, but others such as images 9, 10 and 11 show less clinical poses. They are taken from further away, showing more than only the ruler’s head and shoulders, and include his family and/or subjects, therefore depicting him in his environment and showing his influence.

Gangnat discusses Coillard’s photographs of the ruler Lewanika and notices that,

le photographe s’est positionné à la même hauteur que Lewanika et suggère ainsi une relation fondée sur un rapport d’égalité. La mission n’a pas pour objectif de contrôler la royauté, mais de collaborer avec elle.¹⁰²

Therefore, the photographs of the indigenous rulers translate a collaborative relationship, demonstrating that ‘rare intimacy’ occasionally found in missionary photographs.¹⁰³ Furthermore, although complex power dynamics cannot be denied, there was dialogue between the photographed and the photographer. As David Maxwell writes:

Although missionary and anthropological photographs were created in a power relationship within a colonial situation, there is a need to consider “the ‘photographic event’ – the dialogic period during which the subject and the photographer come together” [...].¹⁰⁴

We cannot forget the negotiation between Coillard and whoever he was photographing: the requests, the questions, the information. Indeed, Gangnat states that ‘Coillard […] montre qu’il est accepté par les chefs parce qu’ils ont posé pour lui, parce qu’ils ont accepté de donner leur image au missionnaire’.¹⁰⁵ The fact that the rulers agreed to sit for Coillard’s photographs shows a certain level of trust. Similarly, Christian Forlacroix writes of the photographer as being ‘très dépendant de la bonne volonté des personnes qu’il voulait photographier’, describing the ‘confiance et sympathie’ that the subject being photographed had for the photographer in order to pose/ be photographed.¹⁰⁶ It is not only the photographer who has power. These photographs thus translate a relationship between photographed and photographer. Furthermore, in contrast to Lionel Decle’s photograph of Khama,¹⁰⁷ Coillard’s
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¹⁰² Gangnat, ‘Une Histoire de La Photographie Missionnaire’, p. 66.
¹⁰³ Jenkins, ‘Missionary Photographs in Modern Discussion’, p. 73.
¹⁰⁶ Forlacroix, p. 129.
photographs of the ruler (images 10, 11) serve to ‘souligner son status de chef’ and to portray Khama’s authority. Khama is sitting on a leopard skin on a chair, with one leg crossed over the other and his arms loosely folded, looking relaxed and composed. Furthermore, as in image 9, these photographs of Khama show the ruler’s status as he is the only one in the whole group of people on a chair. Coillard’s photographs therefore translate indigenous dignity; hierarchy and influence is not reserved for Europeans. Moreover, although we could posit that the visually superior agents are those who have been ‘Europeanised’ in clothing and/or custom (see images 2, 10, 11), image 9’s ruler has not been identifiably Europeanised and so Coillard translates indigenous stature, and indeed a more complex relationship between Europe and Africa than a reductive coloniser/colonised binary.

Indeed, Coillard’s photographs translate the collective experience of mission, the collaboration discussed in the previous three chapters of this thesis. In contrast to John Kirk’s photographic documentation of the Zambesi whereby ‘places were photographed as if they were empty of people’, Coillard’s photo album contains over 500 people. More specifically, 21% of the album’s photographs show the mission team. The album begins with image 3, which shows some of the European and African personnel of the mission. The album frequently contains group shots, and often presents family portraits such as that in image 12. Rarely do we see a singular figure from the mission group; the mission is a collective endeavour. Indeed, we are presented with a picture of the whole expedition near the end of the album (image 4) with the caption ‘une famille unie et heureuse’, and so this pattern of families does not only present a Christianised, monogamous culture, but also an intimate relationship between European and African missionaries.

Furthermore, moving away from the human interactions in the mission-translation work, Coillard’s photographs also translate the experience of the exotic
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108 See Gangnat, ‘À Travers Les Archives’, p. 64.
109 Pinheiro, p. 500.
110 Photographs 1, 2, 3 bis, 4, 5, 7, 9, 13, 23, 26, 47, 48, 55, 62, 68, 81, 85, 86, 87, 88, 94, 97 in the album, François Coillard, Vues.
111 Photographs 3, 3 bis, 26, 29 in the album, François Coillard, Vues.
natural world through many views of land- and river-scapes. As well as ‘other’ customs and cultures, we are shown ‘other’ places. As Gangnat writes,

Les images d’un « ailleurs » rencontrent donc un grand succès auprès du public européen qui développe un goût pour le lointain et l’exotisme. [...] Coillard [...] encourage les dons et les soutiens envers la mission en faisant voyager les Européens avec ses photographies.\(^{113}\)

Coillard’s photography transports its viewers to an ‘elsewhere’, an ‘otherworld’. In photographs such as image 13, almost half of the frame is taken up by the sky, and a further third (at least) is the river. We are shown the vastness of the river, as well as its tranquillity - there are few, if any, disturbances to the surface. Coillard therefore translates the awesome beauty of his surroundings. Indeed, the river can be found in 15% of the album.\(^{114}\) This is hardly surprising given that the album’s title, *Vues du Zambèze*, draws attention to the Zambesi river. However, Coillard prioritises this genre of photograph in the mutual exchange of images between Europe and Africa. Not only does he translate Africa to Europe, but also he translates Europe to Africa by showing the indigenous onlookers views of ‘notre belle suisse, nos montagnes, nos glaciers’, in order to ‘faire voyager nos Basoutos’.\(^{115}\) So then, Coillard’s photographs translate nature and scenery to African as well as European audiences.

Finally, Coillard’s photography translates the missionary journey; as Gangnat writes, ‘Ses photographies abordent des sujets chers aux voyageurs de l’époque : moyens de transport utilisés, paysages traversés, hommes et femmes rencontrés’.\(^{116}\) The frequent focus on the river presents a journey-narrative, the movement of the river being unmistakable in such photographs as image 14. Furthermore, many of Coillard’s photographs include modes of transport. Fourteen of the photographs in the album show wagons (such as images 15, 16, 17), six show cattle (such as image 16), and eight show other modes of transport, such as walking and boating.\(^{117}\) 22% of the photographs in the album therefore, portray the movement of the missionary, as well as the continuous trajectory being reinforced by the moving river’s presence in the album. In the edition of JME in 1904 (the year of Coillard’s death), George Appia writes

\(^{113}\) Gangnat, ‘Photographies Diffusées’, p. 246.

\(^{114}\) Pictures 5 bis, 6, 10, 14, 25, 31 bis, 31, 32, 51, 52, 53, 67, 68, 71, 71 bis, 72 from François Coillard, *Vues*.

\(^{115}\) Coillard, letter to ‘bien chère sœur’, 14 Sept 1882.

\(^{116}\) Gangnat, ‘Photographies Diffusées’, p. 245.

\(^{117}\) Photographs 10, 27, 49, 56, 68, 81, 93, 97 in the album, François Coillard, *Vues*.
of ‘cette odyssée, si souvent représentée par la photographie’, and so Coillard’s photographs translate the journey.118 And yet, as we have seen in chapter 3, this movement is in tension with the stasis of the missionary. Indeed, image 15 shows stationary wagons, and image 17 shows one of the camps of the travellers. 40% of the album’s photographs show a camp of some sort, a European mission station, or African settlement.119 Therefore, Coillard’s photographs act as a record of the missionary experience, and ‘cherchent à documenter la vie quotidienne’,120 representing their ‘petit monde’ of movement and rest.121

So then, we can see that Coillard’s photographs were integral to his mission-translations and acted as mission-translations themselves. They translated the mission work and all it entailed – progress, otherness, relationships, and journey - to Europe and to Africa. George Steiner has claimed that translation is ‘implicit in every act of communication’,122 and Roda Roberts states, ‘Translation is an act of communication – with the accent on communication rather than on language, which only serves as an intermediary’.123 Therefore, as this colonial photography communicated an idea, a feeling, or a moment, over the boundaries of time, space, and medium, it also translated; as Coillard’s images communicated (and continue to communicate) to European and African, public and private viewers, notions of Africa, of mission, of travel, he translated. Therefore, Coillard’s photography is another part of his mission-translation work and, enables, to some extent, the fulfilment of Gagliano’s call for a wider focus on ‘translation [...] to include non-verbal languages’.124

Layers and/of Context

As well as being translations in their communication, Coillard’s photographs are translations in the sense that they transform ‘the visible, light-soaked world into a

119 Photographs 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 18 bis, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 29, 34, 35, 36, 36 bis, 37, 38, 40, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 53, 54, 55, 56, 65, 69, 70, 73 in the album, François Coillard, Vues.
120 Gangnat, ‘À Travers Les Archives’, p. 25.
121 François Coillard, letter to Boegner, 15 July 1892, Défap.
122 Steiner, p. xii.
124 Gagliano, p. 29.
commodity, a manufactured or industrialized object that will enter the complex circuit of representation’, as Fernández-Ocampo and Wolf state. In the remainder of this chapter, we will consider photographs and translations as these objects/products of multiple layers, layers of construction, production and consumption. We will see that, although layers of selection and meaning are often ignored, and photographs and translations are perceived to be direct, unmediated points of access with their sources, recognition is needed of the significance, not only of the mediation by a translator/photographer, as advocated by Venuti, but of the many multiple layers and contexts in both processes.

Historically, translation and photography have been assigned similar expectations of their being truthful, unmediated, faithful reproductions of a source text/reality respectively. Discussing pictures taken in Crimea, Jennifer Green-Lewis writes of the value of photographs in the Victorian era as being in ‘their presentation of reality’. She claims that there was a ‘belief that [...] the best photography is that which is most invisible, which somehow allows a more direct relationship with the subject’, and that as such there existed a view that ‘[b]eing invisible, photography is also [...] more accurate than other forms of representation’. Green-Lewis argues that at the time of Coillard’s images, ‘a photograph, like a pane of glass between the viewer and the world, set up only a magically independent doorway, never a perspective or a point of view’, putting forward ‘the conflation in many nineteenth-century minds of photography and documentary’. And this applied to missionaries: according to T. Jack Thompson, ‘both earlier and later missionary photographers [...] believed they were documenting reality’. Indeed, when discussing biographies, Coillard, writes, ‘non pas [...] que toutes les biographies et autobiographies nous donnent une photographie fidèle de l’homme. L’histoire intérieure d’une vie ne s’écrit pas’. By pointing out the hidden secrets behind written biographies, their partial revelations,

125 Fernández-Ocampo and Wolf, ‘Framing the Interpreter’, p. 2.
126 Venuti, *Invisibility*.
130 Thompson, *Light on Darkness?: Missionary Photography of Africa in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries*, p. 251.
Coillard implies that the photograph as a document is in contrast a ‘fidèle’ and full revelation of reality. But this is not an idea confined to nineteenth-century minds. Even now, ‘[p]hotographs are [...] used to create a sense of the real and the immediacy of context’,\textsuperscript{132} still thought to be ‘closer to reality than most other documents’\textsuperscript{133} According to Susan Sontag, in her crucial work, \textit{On Photography}, ‘a photograph passes for incontrovertible proof that a given thing happened’,\textsuperscript{134} a notion founded in ‘a common view that the meaning of photographs is transparent’,\textsuperscript{135} and that they ‘portra[...y] reality without the intermediary of human subjectivity’.\textsuperscript{136} Similarly, Solomon-Godeau also argues, ‘the photograph registers as pure image, and it is by virtue of this effect that we commonly ascribe to the photograph the mythic value of transparency’.\textsuperscript{137} Again, in the same way, Helen Gilbert expands on this, explaining,

Photography’s claim to truthful representation rests on its combination of two semiotic codes [...] the photographic image is first an indexical sign: it points to something’s prior existence, implying a temporal link to that object. At the same time, a photograph is also an iconic sign: [...] a visual likeness of the thing to which the index refers. [...] photography creates the illusion of such exact correspondence between the signifier and the signified.\textsuperscript{138}

Precisely because a photograph links the viewer temporally to the original moment, “that which was”, its referent,\textsuperscript{139} and visually to a likeness of that moment, the viewer supposes that those two elements of the photograph correspond and that they are looking at reality. So then, although some have claimed that ‘it is no longer an accepted canon that a photograph is merely [...] a simple and uncomplicated translation between reality and its mechanical representation’,\textsuperscript{140} it is clear that photography, from its ‘advent [...] as an apparently objective science’,\textsuperscript{141} to its

\textsuperscript{132} Edwards and Lien, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{133} Polezzi, p. 339.
\textsuperscript{135} Gullestad, p. 53.
\textsuperscript{136} Gagliano, p. 37.
\textsuperscript{137} Solomon-Godeau, p. 180.
\textsuperscript{141} Gilbert, p. 17.
continued status as ‘reality’s twin’, has been charged with the responsibility of replicating reality, and of transparently connecting the viewer and the object.

Similarly to photography, historically, translations have been given the task of transparency. In the same language as that used by Green-Lewis above, translation has been likened to ‘a pane of glass. The better it is, the less it will be noticed. It’s only the bubbles and flaws that make it visible, and that consequently attract the observer’s intention.’ Moreover, it has been ‘seen as the reproduction or transfer or an invariant contained in or caused by the source text, whether its form, its meaning, or its effect’, a means of unmediated, direct access to ‘an invariant’ of the source text. Just as a photograph is expected to be transparent, so too is a translation required to be unmediated, connecting the reader to the source text. Elizabeth Edwards juxtaposes translation and photography in this way: ‘like translation […], photographs carry a transparency, an apparent access to an unmediated world’. So then in both processes there has been a historical expectation of what I will call ‘layerlessness’, whereby the reader/viewer has direct access to the text/world without layers impeding reading.

However, although there has been an ignorance of the layers at work in photography and translation processes and products, an exploration of the construction and use of Coillard’s photographs will demonstrate that there are many ‘layers of selection’, and layers of significance at work. For it is not only the photographer who frames the photograph. By considering the circulation and consumption of Coillard’s photographs, we will see that photography and translation are not layerless, unmediated activities producing objects which function in only a binary of original moment/source text and viewer/reader respectively. Instead, I will
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142 Gagliano, p. 40.
144 Venuti, Everything, p. 3.
146 Hayes, Silvester, and Hartmann, p. 5. This expression will continue to be used in the rest of this chapter and refers to that phrase written by Hayes, Silvester and Hartmann. Furthermore, Elizabeth Edwards writes of ‘layer[s] of interpretative significance woven around the image’, Edwards, ‘Interpreting Photographs’, p. 23. I will therefore be using the phrase ‘layer of significance’ in this chapter with reference to this text.
demonstrate they are subject to multiple layers of selection, multiple layers of reading, and that these individual partial layers come together in the pursuit of the whole.

Firstly, Coillard himself is a ‘layer of selection’, as photographs are products of a photographer’s choices, and ‘processes of intention’. Chrestraud Geary writes that ‘the photographer subjectively chooses the frame and the vantage point’, and Maurizio Gagliano states that images are products of the ‘camera operator’s [...] subjectivity’ and his ‘own visual intentionality’. Coillard is aware of his own part in the construction of the photograph, and writes to Boegner on one occasion introducing the idea of copyright:

"A propos de mes photos voudriez-vous prendre les mesures nécessaires [...] m’en "réserver les droits" – C’est de grande importance. Dr Holub s’en eut procuré quelques unes, les a envoyées en Autriche pr [sic] les reproduire, et en orner son ouvrage. Je lui ai dit qu’elles [sic] étaient miennes, et que je n’avais pas d’objection à ce qu’il les reproduisit pourvu qu’il mentionnât leur provenance. Il m’a dit, "certainement" mais comme s’il ne me reconnaissait aucun droit. Un jour nous pouvons avoir besoin d’illustrer des publications donc, réservons nos droits, et que ce soit clairement imprimé sur chaque carte : Défense."

Coillard knows that his photographs are being used in other contexts and he does not want to stop this circulation, but he sees value in preserving their ‘provenance’, and the recognition of that provenance. Indeed, in Robert Brown’s The Story of Africa, Coillard’s images are stated as being ‘from a photograph taken for the Paris Society for Evangelical Missions’. Although Coillard is not mentioned individually, his desire for the recognition of provenance is met to some extent here as his request for the protection of ‘nos droits’ is fulfilled in the acknowledgment of the mission society as source. On another occasion, he writes regarding the request of a Dutch pastor:

"M. Bosman, le pasteur hollandais, [de ?] Pretoria demande qu’on lui envoie un certain nombre d [sic] photos qu’il vendra au profit de la mission. Considérez ce
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150 Gagliano, p. 37.
151 Coillard, letter to Boegner, 7 July 1886.
Again, Coillard conveys a strong opposition to the use of his photographs without their being correctly referenced, wanting to distance himself from plagiarism. So then François Coillard views his photographs as originating with himself and with SMEP, and sees origin as an important layer in the consumption of his images.

However, Coillard is also aware of the other people involved in the process of constructing the object of the photograph. As he writes to Boegner in 1883 we see multiple people, and multiple parts of the process of the development and distribution of his photographs:

J’envoie mes clichés à Genève aux dames qui m’ont donné mon appareil. Je leur demanderai de les faire imprimer [sic] pour la vente des missions – en faveur du Zambeze – on pourrait les envoyer ensuite à Paris, [où ?] vous feriez la même chose. On pourrait en faire des albums [...] Je renonce à imprimer, décidément je n’ai assez de temps ni assez de patience. En Europe on fera de bons clichés des mauvais que j’envoie.  

Here we see that Coillard requires someone to print his photographs; he acknowledges that what he sends are ‘clichés’, negatives, not developed photographs. Then he asks for them to be sent elsewhere, inviting others into the circulation of his photo-translations. Finally, he suggests that someone could make them into an album. But the phrase at the end of this citation is fascinating in regards to the previously discussed attitudes towards provenance. He suggests, when he writes, ‘on fera de bons clichés des mauvais que j’envoie’, that others can alter - even improve - his photographs. Similarly, in another instance he writes, ‘Plusieurs clichés sont durs et difficiles à imprimer [...] Je les envoie espérant q [sic] M. Pénabert pourra les adoucir’. Not only does he desire for his photographs to be developed, but to be softened, ameliorated by someone else. Therefore, although claiming to be the
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153 Coillard, letter to Boegner, 7 July 1886.
155 See also, ‘J’emballerai mes clichés aussi soigneusement q. possible et vs les enverrai’, François Coillard, letter to Boegner, 16 Dec 1885, Défap.
156 François Coillard, letter, unknown sender, no date (1885?), Défap.
origin of the photograph, Coillard is aware that there are other layers in the construction of the image as object.

Indeed, considering the source of much of this chapter’s evidence so far, the photographic album in which 107 of Coillard’s photographs are found is an example of many layers of intention and selection. Photographs have been selected to be included, they have been chosen in an order, to appear on opposing pages or on the same page as other photographs, captions have been considered and written, contributing to what Edwards and Hart call, ‘performative qualities’ of albums, which ‘narrativise photographs’. Furthermore, the photographs have been attached to paper pages, the album has been bound, given by SMEP, received by the Geographical Society in Paris, read, and finally archived. Therefore, many more layers of significance affect the reception of the photographs, even ‘their materiality dictates the embodied conditions of viewing, literally performing the images in certain ways’. The very album in which these photographs are found, then, contains many layers of selection, and affects the reading of the texts themselves.

However, although this chapter has so far concentrated in large part on the album, Vues du Zambèze, Coillard’s photographs can be found in diverse contexts beyond the binding of the album, these contexts illuminating the content of the photographs. As Joanna Sassoon points out, ‘[t]hrough its life, the photograph, as both image and object, can potentially move across several spaces, including the sites of production, use, reproduction and preservation’. We will therefore now consider these changing sites and spaces, for Coillard’s photographs can be found as illustrations in his own publications (1898), he used them in his own magic lantern shows/ projections, and they were used in SMEP publications such as the Journal des Missions Evangéliques. During Coillard’s life, they were used to illustrate the
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158 In Edwards and Hart, p. 11.
159 Edwards and Hart, p. 11.
160 Sassoon, p. 191.
161 François Coillard, Threshold; François Coillard, Haut-Zambèze (1898).
162 ‘Pourrait-on pr la fin de cette semaine m’envoyer les vues de Z. pr projections ?’, Coillard, letter to Boegner, 7 Sept 1896; ‘J’ai les vues pr projections je les apporteraï’, Coillard, letter to Bianqui, 14 Oct 1898. See also, Frédéric Christol, lettre to Boegner, 11 Aug 1896, Défap.

explorer narratives of other travellers to the region, such as that of Emil Holub;\textsuperscript{164} they were used as images in history books, such as Robert Brown’s \textit{The Story of Africa and Its Explorers} (1894-5);\textsuperscript{165} and they can be seen in other geographical publications such as Hachette’s \textit{Au Pays Des Ba-Rotsi} (1898) and an issue of \textit{Le Monde Illustré} (1898).\textsuperscript{166} After his death, too, Coillard’s photographs were given to books such as Catharine Mackintosh’s biography of her uncle (1907) and John Charles Harris’ \textit{Khama: The Great African Chief} (1922).\textsuperscript{167} Furthermore, they can also be found in post-colonial texts which deal with the social and economic history of the land in which he photographed.\textsuperscript{168} Now his images can even be found on websites, those which regard the region’s monarchy and the area’s natural beauty.\textsuperscript{169} In addition to the access to Coillard’s photographs in books, journals, and online, in English-language contexts as well as French-language contexts, many of his images are in archives (online and material).\textsuperscript{170} The layers of selection can be seen at a glance on a macro level – photographs are chosen for certain contexts, or simply put boxes in the basement of a library. But the layers of selection are still more complex as we will see considering the multiple micro-level contexts, where “‘context’ is [...] itself an act of [...] framing used to contain and direct meaning’;\textsuperscript{171} ‘constitut[ing] another layer of interpretative significance woven around the image’.\textsuperscript{172}

\textsuperscript{164} See François Coillard, letter to Boegner, 7 July 1886, Défap.

\textsuperscript{165} For example, Brown, iii, pp. 4, 5, 8, 12, 13, 16, 193, 204, 205, 216, 220, 227, 229; Robert Brown, \textit{The Story of Africa and Its Explorers}, 4 vols (London: Cassell and Co., 1895), iv, p. 285.


\textsuperscript{170} See DEFAP (on site and online), BNF (on site and online).


\textsuperscript{172} Edwards, ‘Interpreting Photographs’, p. 23.
Firstly, the surrounding text affects the reading of the image (and vice versa). For example, an image of Coillard’s, of £1,200 worth of ivory (image 19), is found in a section of Robert Brown’s *The Story of Africa* (1894) in which Brown discusses the expeditions of Gordon Cumming.\(^{173}\) The text in which the photograph is found recounts, ‘it was in the Bamangwato Mountains that his [Cumming’s] first elephant was killed’, ‘in March, 1845 […] he soon bagged his fifteenth elephant’, and ‘by the 2\(^{nd}\) of February, 1847, Cumming was […] laden with hunting trophies, and with ivory and ostrich feathers which he sold for “somewhere about £1,000”’.\(^{174}\) Readers are given information about Gordon Cumming’s poaching of elephants alongside Coillard’s missionary photographs. Ignorant of the original context of the photographs (Brown’s caption reads ‘£1,200 worth of ivory at a trader’s store at Pandamatenka: from a photograph taken for the Paris Society for Evangelical Missions’), readers are instead led to believe – even through the juxtaposition of the £1200 in the photograph’s caption and the ‘somewhere about £1000’ in the text - that the photograph depicts Cumming’s ivory store. Elsewhere in Brown’s *Africa*, Coillard’s pictures are found within accounts about the British missionary Moffat, British explorer Selous, Serpa Pinto and David Livingstone (and others).\(^{175}\) Coillard’s missionary photographs are decontextualised, taken from the specific context of his mission, and recontextualised into the narratives of other famous travellers.

Similarly, in Harris’ *Khama*, Coillard’s photograph (image 11) of Khama with his lekhotla is found next to a page of writing which mentions missionary-explorers Livingstone and Moffat, indigenous teacher Sehunelwe, and English and German missionaries, but not Coillard, not SMEP, not France.\(^{176}\) Perhaps Coillard’s photographs were used in this way due to the lack of photographs that these men had associated with their own journeys. Indeed, of the photographs taken by Livingstone’s brother, ‘only the photograph of a baobab tree survived’.\(^{177}\) However, without any mention of Coillard in the text or the caption, someone reading the text would most probably link one of these other parties with Khama, and with the photograph, rather than understanding the actual context and the relationship behind the image. Where the

\(^{173}\) Brown, III, pp. 204, 205.

\(^{174}\) Brown, III, pp. 204, 205.

\(^{175}\) Brown, III, pp. 4, 5, 6, 8, 193, 220.

\(^{176}\) John Charles Harris, p. 24.

\(^{177}\) Pinheiro, p. 500.
same photograph is found on Jacob Knight’s website (and book), the context is the history of Shoshong, and in particular Khama’s reign. Therefore, the contexts of Coillard’s photographs affect their readings. Even in the album itself, image 11 is preceded by image 10, and both are preceded by two similar images of Khama (still sat on the leopard skin) and his son. Together, the images build up a sense of Khama’s influence and his subjects. Indeed, Paul Jenkins writes, ‘new information changes the way we perceive the photograph’, 178 and ‘the way answering fundamental questions about the moment the photograph was taken transforms our reading of its contents and significance’. 179 He discusses a missionary photograph from Ghana where we see that the missionary is standing and the Ghanaian chief is sitting. Although it could seem as though the photograph depicts the missionary’s superiority, with the information on the context and the culture, Jenkins points out that ‘the missionary is not dominating and structuring the situation. He is bowing to traditional etiquette’. 180 This link between text and image is performed in both directions: the photographs, whilst being altered by the surrounding text, alter the reading of the text too. One review of the photographs in Coillard of the Zambesi states, ‘They illuminate the text’. 181 So then, the text surrounding the translated images is a layer of significance.

As well as these different textual contexts, captions are another layer through which the photographs are read. Occasionally, the details given for the photographs are incorrect. One photograph in Mackintosh’s Coillard of the Zambesi, has the caption, ‘photograph by F. Coillard Sept 2 1904’. 182 Given that Coillard died over three months before the date given, this caption’s claim is impossible. Furthermore, multiple captions offer multiple readings. For example, image 7 is given the caption, ‘Ratau, un des chefs principaux’ in Vues du Zambèze, but where this image is found in Coillard’s autobiography, Sur le Haut, information has been added: ‘rataou ou "le père du lion" un des principaux chefs de secheke, un guerrier de renom’. 183 There is more specificity in Coillard’s publication; we are given a second title, and information regarding the reputation of the warrior. In contrast to this increased precision, image 12’s caption of
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182 Mackintosh, Zambesi, p. 440.
‘L’évangéliste Aarone et sa famille’ in the album, becomes ‘Un evangeliste mo-souto et sa famille’ in *Sur le Haut*. Crucially, the specificity of the indigenous missionary’s *name* is lost. In the same way, a photograph of Coillard’s, captioned ‘Un Motoka affranchi par Khama. Ben, notre conducteur’ in *Vues* (image 20), can be found as ‘Batoka type’ in Robert Brown’s *The Story of Africa*. The sense of relationship is lost; the photograph that showed an individual member of the mission team now only serves as an ethnographical example of a ‘type’ or category of African, and therefore as an example of what Jack Thompson calls, ‘Anonymous African Syndrome’ whereby nineteenth century missionary photographs ‘stripped [Africans] of their identity’. Indeed, where in *Vues* we are given a side and front profile of ‘Ben’, in Brown’s publication we only see the side of this ‘batoka’s’ head. We are not given a chance to look into his eyes but rather we are forced to examine his features. The change in caption seems to subtract from the meaning of the photograph. Similarly, image 1, ‘Leshoma, la station, M. Jeanmairet enseignant aux Zambéziens à lire’, becomes ‘travaux préliminaires à lechoma’ in Coillard’s *Sur le Haut*, where we are also given the following names: ‘M. Jeanmairet, Ngouana-Ngombé, Kambourou, M. Waddell’.

Although more information is given regarding some of the agents in the photograph, the women are not named, and two of the Africans are not named. Choices have been made as to who should be recognised in the text given, therefore the layer of selection that the caption represents, affects the reading and understanding of the photographs. Thompson writes of the importance of the photograph’s textual context: ‘Photographs can be equally seriously distorted […] by the text which accompanies them […] When it [the photograph] is accompanied by a caption […] the viewer is led along a particular path’, and Fernández-Ocampo and Wolf write of the ‘centrality of captions in the production of meaning’. So then, the differing captions take us along particular paths of interpretation, the caption being another layer through which the photograph is read.

185 Brown, III, p. 229.
Furthermore, as well as affecting the individual reading of the image, the multiple captions found in multiple contexts together form a broader ‘picture’ of the photographic event. Image 21 can be found in *Vues du Zambèze* with the caption, ‘Mangwato, le chef Khama et quelques-uns de ses conseillers’. The same image in John Harris’ *Khama* uses the caption, ‘Khama and his headmen (about the year 1882)’. And Jacob Knight’s website captions the same image with, ‘Khama with his son Sekgoma on his left hand side, Ratshosa is wearing the top hat – photo probably by Francois [sic] Coillard’. Depending on the context we are able to identify some of the individuals in the photograph and their statuses. In one context we are given a possible date of the photographic event, in another we are given a potential photographer. We know different details regarding the content of the image in different contexts but we can form a larger idea of the context of the photographic event by considering them all. We can see, through the three different captions, some of the relationships in the photograph, its date, its photographer, the place, and all three give Khama himself as the focal point. Similarly, in *Bulozi under the Luyana Kings* (2010), the caption on image 3 gives different information to the caption of the same photograph in the SMEP album. It is the first photograph of *Vues*, and is captioned ‘Leshoma – le personnel de l’expédition’, displaying the names,

M. François Coillard; Mlle Coillard; Mme Coillard; Mr D. Jeanmairet; Mr Middleton, aide missionnaire; Léfi, catéchiste; Ma-Ruthi, femme de Léfi; femme d’Aaron; Aarone, catéchiste; Esaïe, gardien des attelages; Mr Waddell, aide missionnaire.

Each member of the mission party is identified, all but one is named, and around half are acknowledged with their mission role. The caption of the same image in *Bulozi Kings* reads:

The mission party on its way to the Zambesi, probably taken at Lusuma in 1884. Standing, left to right: Rev. F. Coillard, and Rev. D. Jeanmairet (Swiss); sitting: Mr. Middleton, Miss E. Coillard, Mrs Coillard, Mr William Waddell, Sotho Evangelists and their wives.

Here we are given sporadically specific details which supplement the caption from *Vues*: Jeanmairet’s nationality, some initials, Waddell’s first name. However, the Basuto missionaries are anonymous figures ‘and their wives’ are nameless add-ons.
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And so Mutumba Mainga’s publication gives both more and less information in comparison with *Vues*. By considering these captions together, which provide different details on the content of the same image, again, we are able to form a better idea of the people in the photograph, but also of the context in which the photograph appears. However, in Gwyn Prins’ ‘Battle for Control’, he simply captions the photograph with ‘Mission Party’.\(^{193}\) We are told nothing about the people in the photograph, just that together they form a group of missionaries. Furthermore, even within the same album, one photograph has two different captions: image 17 (photo 23) is found with the legend, ‘Le camp avant le lever du soleil, Mangwato’, and image 18 (photo 13) - the same image - has the caption, ‘Campement à Mangwato. M. Jeanmairet vaccinant’. In the first instance, we are informed as to the time of day, whereas in the second we are told of the activity being done. Each caption provides different information about the same image. Therefore, with both photographs we potentially gain a more ideas of the what the photograph’s content is, and yet, at the same time, the information being provided is undermined by the photograph’s duplication.

Not only does the text alter the reading of the photographs, but the images are sometimes modified themselves, a layer of selection being imposed on the size, focus, and quality of the photograph. For example, image 3 has been cropped in its inclusion in *Bulozi Kings*, cutting off Coillard and Jeanmairet’s foreheads.\(^{194}\) Furthermore, more radically, Coillard’s photographs are translated into different material forms, we see them in the forms of gravures (engravings),\(^{195}\) lithographs, illustrations, produced ‘d’après une phot. de M. Coillard’.\(^{196}\) Some of these engravings are remarkably similar to Coillard’s photographs, such as that found in Favre’s *Zambèze*,\(^{197}\) however, others have details added or taken away. In the image based on Coillard’s photograph of a river crossing (image 16), found in Brown’s *Africa*, the onlooker’s hat has been taken off and placed on the grass beside him, a man on a boat has been added onto the
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river, and the blur seen across the photograph in the album has been omitted from the engraving. The image has been altered, with details added and clarity imposed. Some of these changes are subtle. In an engraving of Coillard’s photograph (image 21), ‘Mangwato, vue panoramique prise de l’Est’, seen in Brown’s Africa (image 22), as ‘Bamangwato, Khama’s town, looking West’ (note the change in perspective in the caption), most of the photograph has been replicated, but people have been added to the foreground, and a sunset has been added to the background, perhaps to romanticise the image. In other instances, the translation of Coillard’s photograph is radical: Brown’s version of image 23 from Vues (see image 24), shows ‘native hunters returning from the chase’ (named in the album as ‘Africa et Yantje revenant de la chasse’). The engraving shows the content from another angle, close-up, and cropped. Where the photograph shows children sitting and looking on, a house and a fence, and around 10 hunters in the right third, and the back of the image, Brown’s engraving shows three indigenous hunters as the focal point in the foreground, and the background has been almost entirely omitted. Brown’s translation of the image involves cropping, rotating, and zooming, it is a dramatic alteration of the ‘original’ image. Sometimes, the image’s nature as a gravure is evident in both style and context (we are told). Some of these translations have been signed by the engraver or artist, either with their own signature or the mark of the publisher, or have a mark, ‘sc’ to demonstrate that the picture is ‘sculpst’, engraved, in each case the ‘translator’ literally putting his/her mark on the translation of the photograph. However, at others times we are not given information about the production of the image. This draws us into questions of originality and creativity, questions not unrelated to translation (and questions which can be added to those future studies suggested by Gagliano), but in terms of layers, certainly, the alterations of the images themselves are more layers of selection, intention, and significance.
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Therefore, in the translation of Coillard’s photographs we can see that photographs as translations are read through many layers: the photographer’s choices, the development of the photographs, editing into albums, diverse textual contexts, differing captions, and changes in media. Furthermore, as Edwards writes,

> Whether a photograph is seen and used in an archive, a newspaper or an art gallery, whether it is held in the hands or viewed on a screen – all these embodied relations with the photograph shape the viewer’s response and give meaning to that image.\(^{204}\)

Finally then, another layer is evident through which the original moment is viewed – the layer of the viewer’s context and interpretation. As Tanya Rodrigue writes, ‘Just like the creator, the viewer [...] will hold power in the construction of meaning’.\(^{205}\) Not only first or past viewers of the photograph, but current, modern ‘readers’ form a layer in the photographic process too.

In contrast to the historical and pervasive belief that photographs are ‘pane[s] of glass between the viewer and the world’, therefore, we can see from Coillard’s photographs as translations and his photographs in translation, that photography is a mediated process, whereby bias, framing, and subjectivity influence the construction and consumption of the photograph.\(^{206}\) Whether captions, other textual context, media, chosen content, or the context and interpretation of the viewers themselves, Coillard’s photographs – their production and their reception - are products of ‘layers of selection’ and therefore interrelated layers of meaning.\(^{207}\) According to Jean Pirotte, even ‘les techniques et les supports matériels utilisés pour la création des images ont un impact sur le message qu’elles véhiculent’.\(^{208}\) In their book, *Colonising the Camera*, Patricia Hayes, Jeremy Silvester and Wolfram Hartmann write about these layers:

> it is not only the observer who brings reference systems, subjectivity and knowledge to looking at colonial photographs. There have been many previous sets of filters which have mediated the photographs [...] it is crucial to identify the layers of selection – the inclusions and exclusions – through which the photographs have passed, and the paths along which they have travelled. From
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the photographers background, to the photographic occasion in which the picture was taken, to the way photographic subjects presented themselves to the camera, to the technical production of the print, to the private or public circuits into which the image was inserted, to the ultimate fate of the picture as [...] a book illustration, part of a forgotten collection that is destroyed or an item in the photographic files of an archive, it is important to contextualise, historicise and theorise the processes by which the photograph has come before the public gaze (or not).209

Hayes, Silvester and Hartmann describe the journey of the photographic process and identify the myriad ‘layers of selection’ in photography as important in their reading and analysing. As we have seen, these many layers are often partial in and of themselves, captions only giving certain context, and images being cropped and altered. Indeed, the photograph as an object is only, what Coillard calls ‘instantanée’,210 and the world being photographed is ‘trop vaste pour la photographie’; photography is not sufficient for reality.211 Birgit Mersmann, writing about the picturing of interpreters in colonial photography, writes, ‘photography presents the moment, not the process of interpreting’.212 Like Hayes, Silvester and Hartmann, she draws attention to the process going on behind the image, and like Coillard, she identifies that photography is limited to a moment, to a frame. Indeed, as Geary writes, a photograph is ‘a two-dimensional rendition of only a tiny fraction of the three-dimensional worked around us. [...] a photograph represents a time segment.’213 Both temporally and materially, photographs and their interpretations are partial.

However, when we consider the partial captions, contexts, and images together, we understand more of the content of the photograph and the context of its reproduction. For example, in the photographs above we gain a wider sense of who is in the picture as we consider captions together. Furthermore, the changes in caption

209 Hayes, Silvester, and Hartmann, pp. 5, 6.
210 ‘une photographie instantanée de notre petit monde zambésien’, François Coillard, letter to Boegner, 15 July 1892, Défap. See also, ‘je ne considère que comme une photographie plus ou moins instantanée de ce qui se passe dans notre petit monde du Zambèze’, François Coillard, Haut-Zambèze (1898), p. 536. See also, François Coillard, Threshold, p. 510; François Coillard, ‘Author’s Preface to the English Reader’, in On the Threshold of Central Africa: A Record of 20 Years’ Pioneering among the Barotsi of the Upper Zambesi, ed. & trans. by Catharine Winkworth Mackintosh (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1897), pp. v–vi.
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provide us – now - with evidence of the colonial mind-set, where ‘these images have now an increased significance’.214 Indeed, we see in post-colonial publications that ‘[o]riginal captions and locations are crucial in piecing together the dynamics of colonial representation, and the latter’s circuits of dissemination and reproduction’.215 Therefore, although ‘[t]hose historians who discuss the complex nature of the photographic image and its formal qualities seem to be separated from those who discuss the content’,216 we can see that context and content are closely related, and reveal more of each other.

In the same way, translation proper, too, although historically thought of as a layerless, transparent process by which the reader accesses the source text, is a process in which many ‘layers of selection’, and layers of interpretation function. Some translation theorists have argued against this layerlessness. Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter, in their introduction to A Companion to Translation Studies, problematize the idea of a ‘single language’ with ‘historical and cultural layerings within each text’,217 and write that during the ‘cultural turn’, ‘it was clear that the performance of translation entailed more than the translator alone. [...] primary actors include publishers, editors, illustrators, copyeditors, readers, and other agents in the world’s making, marketing, and transmission of texts’.218 However, in the study of translation proper the main attempt to disrupt the binary of author and reader has been Lawrence Venuti’s appeal to call attention to the work and influence of the translator.219 The many layers in photography reveal that this recognition does not reach far enough, and that, rather, translation should be acknowledged as a many-layered process.

Firstly, the source text is a layer in the translation. Although Venuti writes that translation is ‘an interpretive act’,220 placing the creative responsibility on the translator, he asserts that this ‘interpretation [is] inscribed in a source text’.221 Indeed,
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to translate, George Steiner writes, ‘One must master the temporal and local setting of one’s text, the moorings which attach even the most idiosyncratic of poetic expressions to the surrounding idiom’. Just as the photograph has an ‘insistent relationship with “that which has been”’, the translation too is bound to the source text’s content, and its context.

Secondly, the target text reader’s context and reception is also a layer in the translation. Where past perceptions of translation have supposed that ‘the translator provides [...] unmediated access to [the] text’, Lawrence Venuti argues instead that it is ‘a construction that is always mediated by intelligibilities and interests in the receiving situation’. The translation is read through the lens of the reader’s own context.

Thirdly, the translator’s context is a layer. The task of the translator, as well as the author, is one of intention, whereby he/she negotiates ‘the myriad choices’ in order to ‘imitat[e] its [the source text’s] specificity’. As Venuti writes, ‘the fact remains that the translator has chosen every single word in the translation, whether or not a source-language word lies behind it’. The translator chooses the words, ‘determin[ing] and organiz[ing]’ what s/he ‘consider[s] to be the source text’s relevant matter’, as Gagliano states. The translator’s deeming ‘relevant’ is an individual decision, however, the translator’s temporal and spatial contexts are also significant as ‘[t]ranslations are profoundly linked to their historical moment’, ‘[t]he cultural formation mediat[ing] every stage of the translation process’.

And yet, this layer is, as Venuti states, ‘always already collective’. The layer of the translator’s own decisions is already multiple, whereby the ‘translator’s agency, the ensemble of motivations, conditions, and consequences that decisively inform the work of translating’ are:

- determined most decisively by linguistic usage, literary canons, translation traditions, and the institution where a translation is produced and where various other agents have a hand in such procedures as negotiating translation
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rights and commissioning the translator, editing and printing the translated text, promoting and marketing the printed book.\textsuperscript{231}

Here we see that translations are negotiated in light of the interactions in the process (see chapter 3). The translator’s collaboration affects his/her translation, reflecting the ‘concerns of those requesting and paying for a translation’,\textsuperscript{232} and ‘the cultural and financial interests’ of parties involved.\textsuperscript{233} Furthermore, Venuti states that ‘the translation process [is] determined not only by source text and culture but also by values, beliefs, and representations in the receiving culture’.\textsuperscript{234} The reader’s context influences the translator in his/her work. Venuti asserts, ‘The translator is [...] a resourceful imitator who rewrites [the source text] to appeal to another audience in a different language and culture, often in a different period. This audience ultimately takes priority’.\textsuperscript{235} Therefore, the reader is a layer of interpretation him/herself, but is also a factor, a layer of consideration in the translation process along with the many other influences in the translator’s context.

Furthermore, the layer of source text is also multiple in itself. The source text is made up of many layers, consisting of multiple writings, issuing from several cultures and entering into dialogue with each other’.\textsuperscript{236} Eugene Nida lists a few of the ‘structural levels of a text’ as, ‘phonological, lexical, grammatical, and historical, including events leading up to the production of a text, [and] the ways in which it has been interpreted in the past’.\textsuperscript{237} Therefore, the source text itself is a complex weave of layers.\textsuperscript{238} It is ‘a network of inevitable and even unconscious references to and quotations from other texts’.\textsuperscript{239} Indeed, as Edith Grossman asserts, ‘no written or spoken text is “original” at all, since language, whatever else it may be, is a translation of the non-verbal world,
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and each linguistic sign and phrase translates another sign and phrase’. The source text, therefore, is made up of multiple layers, before it has been translated, ‘always already interpreted, traced with a cultural discourse’. Moreover, the translated text contributes to this intertextual web, ‘the source text […] undergoing a further, perhaps divergent inscription when translated’. Just as Tanya Rodrigue writes that ‘a photograph is a complex site of intertextuality, a text that has engaged with multiple texts in and across time’, the translated text is, by its nature, ‘polyphonic’ and intertextual, a privileged exploratory space in which many voices converge and reshape each other’. Venuti asserts that translation ‘involve[s] the creation of an intertextual dimension for the translated text, a network of relations, not only to the source text, but also to other texts written in the translating language’. Translation adds to the layers of reading, in its conscious and unconscious references to other texts.

As a result, as Roland Barthes declares, ‘the reader is the very space in which are inscribed, without any being lost, all the citations a writing consists of; the unity of a text is not in its origin, it is in its destination’. The layer of the reader’s reading is therefore also multiple as the reader engages with the translated text as well as all the other texts inscribed therein and creates another layer as he/she considers other texts in light of the translation. Indeed, Luis Pérez González writes that translation allows for ‘multiple individual reading experiences through intertextual resonance and the interplay between verbal and non-verbal signifiers’. Readings of both source and target text are multiple too.
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Therefore, translation is made up of many interrelating layers: the source text references, choices and contexts, the translator’s context and interactions, and the reader’s context. Even the text’s physical construction, its status as a material object, contains paratextual layers of significance: as Justine Peters writes of Nida’s *Contexts*, ‘How the word is presented determines the way it is perceived’. A font, a margin, an image, a cover, all these things affect the reading of the text itself, ‘the text as [having] a complex relationship between its physical and signifying structures’. The text – symbolic and physical - is made of and made by ‘layers of selection’, and ‘layer[s] of significance’. As Geary writes of colonial missionary photography as ‘a process of construction that only began with the photographer’, the translator’s act of translation is therefore only one layer of the translated text. But in contrast to Barthes’ damming proclamation that at the point of a text’s production, the author dies, instead we see through François Coillard’s photography and the many layers that make up a photograph, and indeed, a translation, that no agent involved becomes obsolete. Rather, their voice is joined by others, for ‘translation is primarily a process of putting together.’

Just as the multiple layers of framing revealed photography to be limited, partial, Venuti writes that in translation, ‘communication will always be partial, both incomplete and inevitably slanted’, and ‘every translation […] is […] at once fragmentary and biased’. Each of these layers is partial, each is incomplete, but each layer is related to each other and to the source text, ‘throw[ing] searching light on the fundamental propositions in the original’, and pointing towards it. Indeed, Venuti asserts that ‘[a] translation ought to be read differently from an original composition precisely because it is not an original’. Translations exist in relation to the source

---

251 Hayes, Silvester, and Hartmann, p. 5.
252 Venuti, *Everything*, p. 112.
255 Venuti, *Everything*, p. 16.
257 Steiner, p. xi.
text. Rather than only considering one translation, therefore, layers of construction and consumption inform each other and interact to provide a more complete sense of the whole. The full reading of the source text is never possible, but multiple translations work together. Venuti pleads with his readers, ‘Don’t take one translation as representative of an entire foreign literature; compare it to translations of other works from the same language’, but what if, on a micro level we were to apply this to the reading of a source text through a translation? John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte state, ‘various perspectives created by different translators [...] offer readers the opportunity to enter deeper into the essence of a given [...] piece’, and Bible translator, William Thompson writes: ‘variety of expression [...] serve[s], both to excite, and gratify, desires of a fuller knowledge of the Common Version [and ] promote[s] a fuller knowledge of the Scriptures’. Therefore, as with the photographs, whereby multiple translations, different contexts and captions could be examined together to enable a fuller reading of the image and therefore the original moment photographed, in translation multiple layers form a collection of voices pointing to the source text, to the past, to what was, and also to the present, and, through the gaps, to the future potential. Paul Jenkins writes that ‘it is important to help viewers of [...] photographs to develop their own inner discussion about [...] what is on show’. Perhaps in Translation Studies, this same idea is needed, the encouragement of this same ‘inner discussion’. I do not only refer to a consciousness of only the translator’s involvement, as promoted by Venuti, but of the volume of layers at work in the reading of a single text.

Therefore, where Translation Studies calls for a greater recognition of the translator in the translation process, here instead, through the circulation of Coillard’s photographs we see a web of layers of construction and consumption, where multiple contexts, multiple translations, multiple layers come together to give access to a text. As well as the invisibility of the translator, then, we must also expose the invisibility of
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the reader, the publisher, the editor, and all of the agents, contexts and layers at work in the translation process.

Conclusion

In this chapter we have studied François Coillard’s photography, that activity so integral to his mission-translation work, useful as a means of presenting the gospel, important as it rendered Coillard and his message credible, beneficial as an indicator of the wider mission-translation occurring, and valuable as a means of raising financial support. We have seen that, in contrast to the neglect of images in translation theory, photography can be identified as a form of translation and as significant for expanding notions of translation, and as such, requires much more attention in the field.

We have observed that Coillard’s photographs translated Europe to Africa and, more prevalently, Africa to Europe, communicating progress, otherness, relationship, and the collective and journeying experience of the mission-translation work, though not always in expected ways, rejecting some ethnographic trends. Furthermore, in the circulation and further translation of these photographs we have seen that translations are subject to multiple layers of framing, layers of context, layers of significance. The photographic mission-translations were subject to Coillard’s choices, the photographer himself a ‘layer of selection’, as well as other people involved in the process of refining and printing the images. Furthermore, the creation of an album and the employment of Coillard’s photographs in multiple publications with differing contexts and captions also signify other layers, with even the viewer him/herself acting as a ‘layer of significance’. Likewise, in translation proper the source text, the reader’s context, the translator’s context are all interrelating layers and contribute to the intertextual web of textual production.

And yet, as has been demonstrated, all of these layers – in mission-translation and in translation proper - are partial, incomplete. They come together as a whole, enlightening not only the source text, but its production, its translation, and its reception. The singular text, is never mono-tonous, but is made up of multiple voices, multiple layers, and multiple contexts.
Conclusion

This thesis has focussed on the concept of mission-translation, defined as the multiple forms of translation occurring within the missionary work with the ultimate goal of translating Christianity,¹ applying it to discussions of translation proper,² in order to interrogate and expand notions of the ontology of the translator and the nature of translation. To do so, it has examined the mission-translation work of colonial Christian missionaries, François and Christina Coillard, and indigenous missionaries, such as Aaron Mayoro and Asser Sehahabane, of the Société des Missions Évangéliques de Paris (SMEP). By analysing archived letters, photograph collections, and secondary sources, it has followed the translation of Christianity from Europe to Africa, around Africa, and back to Europe and has witnessed the crossing of geographical, bodily, domestic, racial, and formal boundaries.

The research began with the aim of answering the following questions:

1- How are colonial missionaries significant figures in the expansion of notions of translation?

2- How does the missionary translate the message of Christianity and its effects into the receiving cultures of Africa and Europe?

3- What assumptions in Translation Studies regarding the ontology of the translator and the nature of translation do these missionary-translators challenge/reinforce?

4- How do gender, race and formal characteristics affect the missionary’s translation strategies and how does this enable us to question accepted translation theory?

Through the study of the Coillards, and the indigenous missionaries working with them, it has become evident that colonial missionaries are essential in the re-evaluation of notions of translation because of their importance as ‘forerunners [...] of

---

¹ Hephzibah Israel has used similar language, discussing ‘language choices made to translate Protestant Christianity in colonial South India’, Israel, ‘Contesting the Sacred’, p. 178. Furthermore, Lamin Sanneh uses the phrase, ‘mission as translation’, in his publications to discuss the translation proper performed by missionaries for the purpose of the respective missions. Sanneh, ‘Bible Translation, Culture, and Religion’, p. 275; Sanneh, Translating the Message, pp. 34, 36, 37, 92, 124, 128, 132, 146, 214, 216.

² Used by Jakobson to refer to practices of interlingual and intertextual translation, see Munday, Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications, p. 9.
empire’, and their being ‘at the forefront of their nation’s encounter with the world’. In this missionary encounter, and the constant contact with racial and spiritual otherness, we have seen continuous efforts to translate Christianity in various forms and different ways. Missionaries translated the gospel and its effects to Africa and Europe through the translation proper of the Bible. But more than this, through songs, domestic activities and spaces, interactions and relationships of mutual hospitality and mutual trust, photographs, and through their own lives they translated the message of Christ.

The study of these missionary-translators has therefore challenged and built on many assumptions in Translation Studies regarding the translator and the translation process. The study of the public male missionary challenged negative notions of invisibility in translation, positing that the translator is a ghostly presence in the text, both visible and invisible in his work (chapter 1). Furthermore, it contested the pervasive idea of the singular translator, revealing that translation is rather a collaborative and reciprocal process between many agents (chapter 1). In addition, the investigation of female missionary-translators enabled the development of the concept of the domestic in translation from a harmful space of appropriation to a vital site and method for the translator (chapter 2), a space where translation is enabled and where its product is often located. Furthermore, the female missionary-translator challenged ideas of power in translation, revealing instead a reciprocal gesture of hospitality where the source text and target text both undergo loss and gain. The analysis of indigenous mission-translation challenged the idea of loyalty in translation, and supplemented it with trust in interpersonal and interbodily interactions (chapter 3). Moreover, it destabilised fixed notions of roles in translation, revealing translators as readers and readers as translators (chapter 3), and demonstrating mission-translation and translation proper as interconnected practices which complicate the centre-periphery model. Finally, the study of photographs (chapter 4), a relatively unexplored form in Translation Studies, allowed for the recognition of the process as

---

4 Daughton, p. 12.
5 Venuti, Invisibility.
6 Venuti, Invisibility.
translation that communicates experiences or moments of reality across temporal and spatial thresholds, and posited that, as such, it warrants more attention in the field.

Furthermore, considering the thesis as a whole, the study of François Coillard’s incarnational translations, Christina’s domestic space, the indigenous movement, and the photograph as object has reinforced notions of the physical nature of translation – of the process as involving physical bodies, physical spaces, and tangible texts. Moreover, we have seen the fluidity of roles, layers, sites and spaces, and the seemingly fixed notions of visibility and hospitality have been complicated. Fixed states have been revealed as moving and changeable. Finally, the study of these different missionary-translator figures and different forms allowed these research questions to be answered in a way that reflects precisely that which we have witnessed translation to be – made up of layers and contexts which interact and interrelate. Indeed, in all of the chapters, we have seen the multiple people, multiple directions, and multiple processes which come together within translation.

This thesis has provided useful insights for colonial history and mission studies, demonstrating that female missionaries and African individuals were equal agents of mission and fellow-translators of Christianity. But this thesis has also demonstrated that missionaries are ‘a legitimate site for historical analysis’ in interdisciplinary study. Indeed the analysis in this project reveals the value of colonial missionaries in Translation Studies and demonstrates their value for further enquiry in other fields, even when ‘divorced from their effect on public processes of ‘modernisation’, ‘civilisation’ and colonial engagement’, which ‘remains scholastically taboo’, according to Emily Manktelow. The study of colonial missionaries need not only be consigned to colonial history and mission studies therefore, or to timelines of Bible translation. They are translators – metaphorical and proper – of the Christian message – and are intercultural figures rich in insight.

This research is not without its limitations. The primary potential weakness in this thesis lies in the decision not to develop an interlingual framework within discussions of the Christian mission. Although it has been acknowledged that translation proper was integral to mission-translation, the focus of this thesis was the

---

8 Manktelow, p. 4.
9 Manktelow, p. 4.
more metaphorical aspect of mission-translation in contrast to most scholarship on this subject which only considers the translation occurring in mission as Bible translation. A future project could consider the extent to which interlingual translation practices contribute to the overall mission-translation efforts that I have explored, examining the overlap between the two terms. Moreover, whilst referring to other missionaries and employing sources related to other missions (including Catholic missions, British missions, other SMEP stations), it has focussed on a select group from SMEP, not exploring the experiences of other missionaries in much depth.

Furthermore, although the research has considered a French missionary and his Scottish missionary-wife, the thesis has not examined the interaction of European contexts or of these different missions; it has not compared the mission-translations of different European nations. Similarly, it has focussed on a period of 50 years, and has not been able to interrogate present-day Christian missionaries as to their contrasting/analogous activities. There is much scope for further research on the subject of missionary-translators therefore, to see whether the experiences of the Coillards represent their historical moment, and/or Christian mission-work in general.

To some extent, I believe these missionaries are representative of the colonial missionary context: the human encounters, African agency and teamwork are common elements of much colonial mission. However, the focus on indigenous involvement, the lack of biological children for the Coillards, and the strong reciprocal relationships evident in the mission work are, if not unique, rare features of their contemporary context. And yet, regardless of whether they are representative or not, the Coillards and the indigenous missionaries who supplemented them, are significant as they reveal new ways to approach translation. Indeed, the originality of this research lies in its methodology, the metaphorical reading of historical sources and the use of a moment of social history, with its human experiences and interactions, as a lens through which to test key tenets of translation theory. The study of the mission-translations in the SMEP Basutoland and Barotseland missions and the exploration of the figure of the missionary translator has therefore revealed the value of historical missionaries, not only in chronologies of Bible translation, but in constructing and re-evaluating wider notions of a multi-layered, multi-directional translation.
Of course, this thesis is only another partial picture which contributes to the understanding of mission and translation. It is made up of ‘scattered leaves’, as Coillard wrote of his own publication,\(^{10}\) fragmented information, and is itself my own reading of events and theory. It is another layer through which we can view colonial mission practice and the processes at work in translation, another translation itself of the Coillards, the indigenous missionaries, and their translated Christianity.

\(^{10}\) François Coillard, ‘Author’s Preface’, p. v.
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Appendices

Appendix A – Timeline of Events

1822  *Société des Missions Evangéliques, Paris* (SMEP) founded ‘with the help of the London Missionary Society’\(^1\)

1829  Christina Mackintosh (CM) born, daughter of a Scottish preacher

1833  First SMEP missionaries arrive in Basutoland

1834  François Coillard (FC) born, Asnières-lès-Bourges, central France, to Huguenot peasants

c. 1851  FC trained to be a schoolmaster at 17 and soon after made a personal profession of the [Protestant] Christian faith

1854  After an appeal for protestant missionaries, and with the consent of his mother, he became a missionary of SMEP, being trained at ‘L’École Préparatoire de Théologie’, in Lille

1857  FC and CM meet in Paris.

1857  FC leaves France for Basutoland

1857  FC proposes to CM. CM says no.

1858  FC arrives in Basutoland, ‘a country then unoccupied by any European Power’\(^2\)

1859  FC proposes to CM. CM says yes.

1860  CM meets FC’s mother and leaves for South Africa.

1861  FC marries CM (CC), they are missionaries together in Leribe, Basutoland

1864  Basuto church founded in Leribe, construction begins

1866  Expelled from Basutoland due to war between Boers and Basutos, exiled in Natal

1868  Basutoland becomes a British Protectorate

---

\(^1\) Zorn, *Transforming*, p. vii. Unless otherwise stated, sources for this timeline are Mackintosh, *Zambesi*; Zorn, *Transforming*.

\(^2\) Mackintosh, *Zambesi*, pp. 31, 32.
1869 Return to Leribe, Basutoland

1870-1871 Franco-Prussian war

1871 Construction of church at Leribe completed

1874 FC and CC host Major Charles H. Malan

1875 Basuto Christians express the desire to evangelise the Banyai people, raising money and volunteering men

1876 The attempt to evangelise the Banyai people fails. Basuto evangelists are imprisoned and the SMEP missionary Dieterlen is let off with bail

1877 SMEP asks FC and CC to postpone proposed furlough and pioneer mission to the unevangelised Banyai people

1877 The missionaries to the Banyai people leave Basutoland. The expedition includes indigenous evangelists and their families, William Waddell, George Middleton, the Coillards, and their niece, Elise Coillard

1878 Taken captive for three months and expelled

1878 The mission party go to Mangwato, to the converted Christian ruler Khama, who advises them to go to Barotseland

1878 Journey to Barotseland

1878 FC and CC take care of Serpa Pinto who subsequently wrote about the Coillards in his book, How I Crossed Africa, and thus made François Coillard’s name known in geographical and scientific contexts where before his work was only discussed in mission meetings.

1879 Return to Basutoland

1880-1882 FC and CC furlough in Europe, Basuto evangelists return to Basutoland. FC purchases a camera whilst in Europe

1882 FC and CC return to Leribe, Basutoland

---


4 Pinto, How.
1884 FC and CC travel to Barotseland after SMEP perceive a ‘closed door’ in regards to the Banyai people. Mission party consists of the Coillards, Elise Coillard, Dorwald Jeanairet (SMEP missionary), Waddell and Middleton (artisan missionaries), Isaiah and Levi (indigenous evangelists) and their families. Rejoined by Aaron and Andreas

1884 Lewanika usurped by Akufuna

1885 Lewanika returned to power

1885 Marriage of Dorwald Jeanmairet and Elise Coillard

1887 George Middleton leaves the mission

1887 Maison des Missions built (SMEP headquarters), 102, Boulevard Arago, Paris

1888 SMEP gives a selection of FC’s photographs to the Paris Geographical Society

1890 FC translates and is part of the negotiations of the Lochner Concession

1891 After prolonged illness, CC dies. CC buried at Sefula

1891 Visit of Dr James Johnston

1896-1898 FC furlough to Europe

1897 FC publishes his biography in English, On the Threshold of Central Africa: A Record of 20 Years’ Pioneering among the Barotsi of the Upper Zambesi, translated by Catharine Winkworth Mackintosh, Coillard’s niece

1898 FC publishes his biography in French, Sur Le Haut-Zambèze, Voyage et Travaux de Missions

1898 FC travels for South Africa again, this time with Alfred Bertrand

1899 Reprint of Sur Le Haut-Zambèze, Voyage et Travaux de Missions

---

5 François Coillard, Vues.
6 For the first seven years of this agreement, the BSAC failed to make any of its promised payments or to provide the assistance it had pledged to Lewanika. Coillard was accused of trickery regarding his help in the negotiations and lost trust with the Barotse people. Coillard remains implicated in the colonial enterprise because of this involvement. See Caplan; Galbraith; Prins, Hidden Hippopotamus.
7 François Coillard, Threshold.
8 François Coillard, Haut-Zambèze (1898).
9 See also Bertrand, Au Pays Des Ba-Rotsi, Haut-Zambèze, Voyage d’Exploration.
10 François Coillard, Haut-Zambèze (1899).
1903 FC witnesses the rejection of his leadership by some indigenous Christians and the rise of the Ethiopian movement

1904 FC dies at Léalui, Barotseland, buried at Sefula alongside the grave of CC, with the inscription, ‘To live is Christ’
Appendix B – Liste des Missionnaires de la SMEP (1822-1971)\textsuperscript{1}

(19 pages)

\textsuperscript{1} Found at ‘Les Fonds D’Archives’. Since first accessed, this document was updated. However, because the updated version (Sept 2016) does not contain information on marriages of missionaries (needed in chapter 2), I continued to use the 2014 version.
Appendix C – Selected Photographs
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