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ABSTRACT

*L’habit ne fait pas le moine: Antonine Maillet, Translation, and Acadian Identity*
Danielle LeBlanc

As a language essentially transplanted from sixteenth-century France, carrying with it the rich heritage and history of the Acadian people, the *parlure acadienne* [Acadian way of expression] proves central in asserting cultural identity in translation. Using two case studies from Canada’s two primary literary translation practices, French-to-English and English-to-French, this dissertation will argue that Acadian identity, in language and ideology, is expressed through hybridity in translations whose target audiences are non-Acadian. First, two English translations of Antonine Maillet’s works, *The Tale of Don l’Orignal* (1978/2004) translated by Barbara Godard and *Pélagie: The Return to Acadie* (1982/2004) translated by Philip Stratford, will be considered in light of their respective translation strategies to demonstrate that Acadian identity is expressed through respect of the *parlure acadienne*’s linguistic and figurative aspects. Its expression can be interpreted in terms of what Michael Cronin calls a micro-cosmopolitan view of translation that pays attention to singularity and where difference and diversity manifest themselves within the particular. This discussion will set the stage for arguing that Antonine Maillet incorporates the *parlure acadienne* in her translations of Shakespeare’s plays, namely in *La Nuit des Rois* (1993) and *La tempête* (1997). Comparing her translations with Shakespeare’s original and with two contemporaneous Québec translations, this dissertation will argue that the Maillet’s linguistic choices are deliberately reminiscent of the *parlure acadienne* with the purpose of exploring the dynamics of translation on the expression or representation of Acadian identity in an intralingual minority context. Although the Acadian literary tradition is rich and vibrant, little research has been conducted on either the reception of Acadian authors in English Canada or the representation of Acadian identity in Anglo-Canadian translation. Similarly, a few theorists have signalled a sense of Acadian identity in English-to-French literary translation. This dissertation looks to help close those gaps.
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L’HABIT NE FAIT PAS LE MOINE:
ANTONINE MAILLET, TRANSLATION, AND ACADIAN IDENTITY

Introduction

In her monologue titled ‘Le recensement’ [The Census], Antonine Maillet’s La Sagouine mulls over her options for answering the question of nationality on the census. She consecutively rules out American (because Americans work in shops in the United States), Canadian (because Canadians are the English-speaking Dysarts, Carolls, and Joneses), French (because the French are from France), and French Canadian (because French Canadians live in Québec). Exasperated, she concludes:

Pour l’amour de Djeu, où c’est que je vivons, nous autres?
... En Acadie, qu’ils nous avont dit, et je sons des Acadiens. Ça fait que j’avons entrepris de répondre à leu question de naïonalité coume ça : des Acadiens, que je leur avons dit. Ça, je sons sûrs d’une chouse, c’est que je sons les seuls à porter ce nom-là.
(Maillet 1974: 192)

[For the love of God, where is it that we live? ... In Acadie, they told us. And we’re Acadians. So I started to answer their ‘nationality’ question that way: Acadians, I said. If I’m sure of one thing, it’s that we’re the only ones to bear that name.]¹

La Sagouine’s baffled response perfectly captures the ambiguous nature of Acadian ‘nationality’. Acadie is generally understood to represent the French-speaking population on Canada’s East coast, concentrated primarily in the present-day provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island. It does, however, continue to resist clear definition as it corresponds more to ethnic and cultural allegiances than to territorial or judicial delineations (A. Maillet 1971: 2). What makes the Acadian people the only ones to bear that name, as La Sagouine insists, is a rich folkloric tradition and a tragic history, both of which are unique within Canada.

¹ All translations mine unless otherwise referenced.
French presence in the New World began in 1534, though sustained colonial efforts date to 1604-1605 with the establishment of Port Royal in what was then the colony of New France (Delisle 1987: 51). From a scant few hundred settlers in the early seventeenth century, the French population had grown to 15,000 by the 1750s (Gallant and Raymond 2002: 16). Continuous warfare between France and England, which had also established colonies in the region, led to the territory changing hands nine times between 1621 and 1713, when the Treaty of Utrecht placed it definitively under British rule (M. Maillet 1983: 16). The French population nevertheless continued to flourish until the mid-eighteenth century when, amidst concerns about the growing influence of nearby French settlements, the British demanded that the Acadians sign an oath of unconditional allegiance, which the latter had been resisting on the grounds of neutrality since 1713 (Arsenault 2004: 130, 189-90). That decision ultimately led to the Expulsion\(^2\) whereby British forces deported 12,000 Acadians to the American colonies and Europe; hundreds perished in shipwrecks or from starvation or illness, and those who escaped deportation were forced into hiding or exile in French territories such as Québec (M. Maillet 1983: 37). However, many families returned to their homeland over the next hundred years and rebuilding slowly began. The first Conventions nationales acadiennes [Acadian National Conventions] were held in 1881 and 1884 for the purpose of creating a praxis to ensure the survival of the Acadian community, so the corresponding identity discourses were, according to historian and scholar Denis Bourque, based “sur la langue, la religion, l’origine, les traditions et coutumes du peuple acadien et surtout sur son histoire qu’on affirme être unique” [on the Acadian people’s language, religion, origins, traditions, customs, and, especially, on its ostensibly unique history] (quoted in Gallant and Raymond 2002: 18). It would take another century for Acadie to gain a university (1963), to achieve equal French/English language rights in New Brunswick (1969) and establish a publishing house (1972) in a movement of cultural revitalisation (M. Maillet 1983: 179).\(^3\)

Acadie’s history has nonetheless shaped a rich and vibrant collective consciousness that is intimately connected to artistic expression, especially through literature. An Acadian

\(^2\) Also known as the Deportation and the Great Disruption, among others (Bourque 2015b: 48-49).
\(^3\) Marguerite Maillet explains the significance of the establishment of the first Acadian publishing house, Éditions d’Acadie, whose 50 titles in eight years instigated a reversal of fortune in Acadian literary history (1983: 179).
literary tradition slowly grew out of the sociopolitical and cultural renaissance that began in the 1880s (M. Maillet 1983: 57-114). By the early twentieth century, the role of literature was defined in terms of the body politic and was responsible for ensuring the survival of its people (Bourque 2015b: 52). The nationalist ideologies that ran through political discourse and literature appropriated the figure of Evangeline, from Henry Wadsworth Longfellow’s 1847 epic poem of the same name, to reinforce the sense of identity and the myth of a golden age (M. Maillet 1983: 52-53; Gallant and Raymond 2002: 18; Pellerin 2009; Bourque 2015b: 49). *Evangeline* perpetuated the myth of a paradisal Acadie and imbued the nationalist discourse with the imagery and values that the rebuilding elite wanted to propagate (M. Maillet 1983: 50; Bourque 2015b: 51). Although a few novelists, poets, and dramatists had begun diversifying nationalistic narratives in form and ideology (Maillet 1983: 115-76), the mythification of an idyllic Acadie generally persisted in the works of religious and political authorities leading the Acadian cultural renaissance until 1957, when Antonine Maillet stepped onto the literary scene (M. Maillet 1983: 182; Gallant and Raymond 2002: 25).

Born in 1929 in Bouctouche, New Brunswick, Antonine Maillet has had a literary career so prolific that, by her own admission, it is nearly impossible to pinpoint the exact number of novels, essays, stories, children’s books, plays, and translations she has published over the past six decades, though she estimates it to be about 50 stand-alone books (A. Maillet 2016). Maillet’s literary venture is remarkably unambiguous: ‘elle étale glorieusement son lignage’ [she gloriously displays her origins] in an effort to ‘récupérer la petite histoire de son pays et fixer les traditions populaires acadiennes trop longtemps délaissées au profit de l’événement de 1755 et des traditions dites nationales’ [recover her people’s little history and bolster the Acadian folk traditions too often neglected in favour of the event of 1755 and of so-called national traditions] (M. Maillet 1983: 182). As such, she contrasted the romantic myth of Acadie that had heretofore dominated, telling Acadian stories from the perspective of the ‘sagouines’, the every-day folk who lived it. Until then, the nationalist discourse had been imposed from above, by the history books, foreigners, and the political and religious elite who had organised the national conventions (Runte 2000: 171). She rewrote Acadian history from the point of view of common folk – *les gens d’en bas* – rather than from the perspective of the elites – *les gens d’en haut* – or of the foreigner (e.g. Longfellow) (M. Maillet 1983: 182-83; Bourque 2015a: 63). Most importantly,
she told the stories in the language of these people, the first writer to do so (Malaborza 2006: 195; Bourque 2015a: 63). Maillet says of La Sagouine, her first character to embrace fully the vernacular language: ‘[j]e n’ai pas choisi la langue de La Sagouine […], j’ai choisi la Sagouine [I did not choose the language of La Sagouine, I chose the Sagouine] (quoted in Aresu 1986: 230). Language is one of the most distinctive features of Acadian culture, not only because it distinguishes Acadians from other French-Canadian groups, but also because it carries the history and heritage of its people within it.

The Acadian language as Maillet uses it, the parciture acadienne [Acadian way of expression] (Maillet 1973: 107-20), is rooted in, and indeed remains very similar to, sixteenth-century French. It is the spoken language of about 250,000 Francophones in pockets throughout New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Gaspésie (Québec), and the Îles-de-la-Madeleine (A. Maillet 1971: 2). Many of the speakers of this language today are descendants of Acadians deported between 1755 and 1763. In Rabelais et les traditions populaires en Acadie (1971), Maillet traces the origins of the language to the Middle Ages, using François Rabelais’s Gargantua-Pantagruel (1534) as a basis for comparing the late-twentieth-century Acadian oral tradition, its language and folklore, with medieval French (1971: 1). According to Maillet, literary works from the late Middle Ages contain a wealth of popular traditions that, four centuries later, are found remarkably intact in the spoken language of the descendants of seventeenth-century French settlers (1971: 27-8). As Maillet explains in her introduction to the English translation of her play Gapi and Sullivan, French dramatist Jean Racine used 5,000 words in the seventeenth century for Rabelais’s 100,000 a century earlier. ‘Now, where did the other 95,000 go?’ asks Maillet, ‘[t]o Acadia, to the salty sea… cold country, where you can keep things from rotting’ (1987: 12).

For Bernard Aresu, Maillet’s parciture acadienne symbolizes […] a striking phenomenon of cultural resistance, fighting as it does, unlike the joual and chiac dialects, against the encroachments of the language of the conquerors. To the modern reader, it provides a rich insight into the cultural and historical development of an ethnic group. (1986: 232)4

4 ‘Joual’ is the Québécois dialect and ‘chiac’ is another Acadian dialect.
While the plural of Aresu’s ‘conquerors’ may refer to linguistic hegemony in colonial contexts generally, it also suggests the duality of linguistic forces pressuring the Acadian language. The resistance to which Aresu points can occur on two levels, to Anglophone Canada and to Francophone Québec, both of which play majority, linguistically or culturally, to the Acadian minority. This notion of double minority creates a useful framework from which to consider the representation of cultural identity in literary translation, not by subscribing to an entropic view of translation, but by considering translation as exercises in dealing with, if not expressing, otherness.

Canada’s official bilingualism gave rise to two separate Canadian literary translation practices, French-to-English and English-to-French, each spurred by different impetuses. Barbara Godard defines English-to-French translation in terms of the difference in meaning between the French word ‘traduction’ and the English ‘translation’. According to her, “‘traduction’ implies the adaptation and acclimatization of the foreign’ as opposed to “‘translation,’’ which means the circulation of signifieds beyond reference to either the near or the foreign’ (1988: 78). Yet, as will be argued further, both practices, English-to-French and French-to-English, are defined as a function of Québécois assertions of identity where Québécois is both the appropriator and the other to be understood. Where, then, does the translation of Acadian literature into English, or the translation of English literature into a non-Québécois French, fit within the greater literary translation practices geared towards either appropriating or getting to know the other? Literary critic Denis Bourque observed about the Acadian people that ‘ce sont les vicissitudes orageuses de son existence […] qui le font reconnaître comme un peuple distinct au milieu de tous les peuples qui l’entourent’ [the stormy vicissitudes of its existence are what make it recognisable as a distinctive people in the midst of all those surrounding it] (2015b: 50-1). If the identity of a people lies in its ‘stormy vicissitudes’ and in a wholly unique history and language, how is such an identity to be rendered in translation?

This dissertation will look at whether Acadian identity, in language and ideology, is translated, or carried across, in literary translations whose target audiences are non-Acadian, as well as at the implications of expressing cultural identity for a doubly-minoritised literature. More specifically, it will take as case studies two translations of Antonine Maillet’s works into English, _The Tale of Don L’Orignal_ (1978/2004) translated by Barbara Godard and _Pélagie: The Return to Acadie_ (1982/2004) translated by Philip
Stratford, as well as two Shakespearean plays translated by Maillet into French, *La Nuit des Rois* (1993) and *La tempête* (1997) to argue that Acadian identity is threaded through textual and linguistic hybridity. In other words, drawn from two distinct literary translation practices in Canada whose respective motivations diverge from one another, each pair of translations – the French-to-English *Pélagie: The Return to Acadie* and *The Tale of Don l’Orignal*, and the English-to-French *La tempête* and *La Nuit des Rois* – demonstrates a tendency towards, in Maria Tymoczko’s words, a metonymic approach that favours multiplicity and the coexistence of cultural values over absolutist appropriation (1999: 283). First, Godard’s translation of *Don l’Orignal* and Stratford’s translation of *Pélagie-la-Charrette* will be considered in light of their respective translation strategies, expressed in the figures of ventriloquism and smuggling, to demonstrate that Acadian identity is expressed through instantiations of the *parlure acadienne*. Its expression can be interpreted in terms of what Michael Cronin calls a micro-cosmopolitan view of translation that pays attention to singularity and where difference and diversity manifest themselves within the particular (Cronin 2006: 15-6). Furthermore, the representation of a minority identity is relevant insofar as ‘[t]he dominant languages in asymmetrical situations not only determine the specific representations of the minority SL [source language] culture but the translation selections […] can also shape the literary history of a language’ (Cronin 1995: 98).

Secondly, this dissertation will argue that Antonine Maillet incorporates the *parlure acadienne* in her translations of Shakespeare, namely in *La tempête* and *La Nuit des Rois*. Comparing her translations with Shakespeare’s as well as with two Québec translations contemporaneous to her own, it will argue that Maillet’s linguistic choices are deliberately reminiscent of the *parlure acadienne*, culminating in a retelling of the Deportation in *La tempête*. In spite of their different genres, the four works considered share similarities in translation strategies and in form that support a comparative analysis. Maillet’s reliance on the oral tradition in both language and story, for instance, parallels the performative aspect of Shakespeare’s plays. Additionally, *Pélagie: The Return to Acadie* and *The Tempest* lend themselves particularly well to a postcolonial interpretation, while *The Tale of Don l’Orignal* and *La Nuit des Rois* both explore themes of identity in relation to language. The purpose is not to judge the adequacy of these translations, for there are semantic and linguistic problems, some provided for context, but rather to explore the dynamics of translation on the expression or representation of Acadian identity. With a few exceptions (Elder 2005;
Nichols 2009; Hébert 1989), little research has been conducted on either the reception of Acadian authors in English Canada or the representation of Acadian identity in Anglo-Canadian translation. Similarly, a few theorists have signalled a sense of Acadian identity in English-to-French literary translation (Gagnon 2005: 1; Malaborza 2006: 194), but the subject has yet to be investigated thoroughly.

Chapter 1 – Acadian identity in Pélagie: The Return to Acadie and The Tale of Don l’Orignal

1.1 Literary and historical contexts

In trying to come up with an adequate nationality for the census-taker, La Sagouine relates that:

ils avont point voulu écrire ce mot-là [Acadien] dans leu liste, les encenseux. Parce qu’ils avont eu pour leu dire que l’Acadie, c’est point un pays, ça, pis un Acadjen c’est point une nationalité, par rapport que c’est pas écrit dans les livres de Jos Graphie. (A. Maillet 1974: 127)

[they didn’t want to write that word [Acadian] in their census, those incensors. Because they said that Acadie, it’s not a country, and Acadian, it’s not a nationality because it’s not written in Joe Graphy books.]

If geography books prove futile in illuminating La Sagouine’s nationality, written literature provides fertile ground for the development and dissemination of an Acadian identity. The first writings from Acadie date back to Marc Lescarbot’s Histoire de la Nouvelle-France in 1609. Lescarbot and his successors created a myth of Acadie as the promise land to support colonisation efforts (M. Maillet 1983: 17; Gallant and Raymond 2002: 15-16). The narrative persisted up to the mid-nineteenth century through a long period of literary silence, save for personal correspondence, reports, and memoirs, due to the forced exile of the Deportation (M. Maillet 1983: 37-38). Rather paradoxically, the silence was broken by non-Acadians with the publication of American Henry Wadsworth Longfellow’s epic poem Evangeline, A Tale of
Acadie (1847), Frenchman Edmé Rameau de Saint-Père’s La France aux colonies (1859), and Québécois Napoléon Bourassa’s Jacques et Marie : Souvenir d’un peuple dispersé (1865-1866) (ibid.: 50-56). The first traces of Acadian literary tradition followed suit, coinciding approximately with the first Acadian National Conventions in the 1880s whereby cultural, educational, and religious infrastructure was established in Acadie. The discourse that emerged out of this renaissance was decidedly nationalistic and its purpose clear:

Le discours identitaire né des conventions nationales, et notamment le récit commun qui lui sert principalement d’assise, donnera lieu, dans la première moitié du vingtième siècle surtout, à l’émergence d’une littérature acadienne sinon abondante, du moins convaincue du rôle qu’elle doit jouer dans la définition et dans la perpétuation d’une identité acadienne distincte, voire dans la lutte pour la survie de la « nation » acadienne. (Bourque 2015b: 52)

[The discourse on identity born out of the national conventions, namely the common narrative that served as its foundation, gave way, in the first half of the twentieth century, to the emergence of an Acadian literature. This literature, while not particularly abundant, is at least clear on the role it plays in defining and perpetuating a distinct Acadian identity, and even in the fight for survival of the Acadian “nation”.]

The Acadian collective consciousness appropriated the romantic mythos of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow’s Evangeline, which expressly supplied the foundation myths permeating much of pre-1950s Acadian literature (Bourque 2015b: 51). Indeed, the myth of the promise land persisted until Antonine Maillet diversified in scope, language, and themes the patriotic narratives that had hitherto dominated Acadian literary production, creating a counterpoint specifically to the figure of Evangeline (M. Maillet 1983: 183); Godard 1988: 86-87; Gauvin 2004: 297; Pellerin 2009).

Concurrent to Antonine Maillet’s arrival onto the literary scene, momentous changes were taking place on political, social, and cultural spheres across Canada. In New Brunswick, Acadian identity and language formed a ‘national’ consciousness that found recognition in the public sphere from 1966 on (Merkle 2000: 282). Meanwhile, great debates on questions
of language and identity spurred the Quiet Revolution and a growing sense of insular nationalism in the neighbouring province of Québec (Whitfield 2005: 10). Translation practices, literary and otherwise, did not remain immune to such linguistic affirmations. With both English and French as its official languages since 1867, Canada has fostered an environment where institutional translation has become ingrained in the collective consciousness (Delisle 1987: 34; Simon 1994: 43) and a marker of national identity (Lane-Mercier 2014: 519). The trend does not follow through to literary translation, however. In his Bibliography of Canadian Books in translation, French to English and English to French (1977), Philip Stratford compiled a total of 380 titles translated from French to English, and 190 from English to French since the first translations in the New World in 1534. Louise Ladouceur has more recently reasserted Stratford’s statement that literary translation in Canada is not particularly active (2005: 20).

Although theorists hesitate to acknowledge the existence of a literary translation tradition in Canada (Stratford 1977: Foreword [np]; Delisle 1987: 34; Ladouceur 2005: 23-24), Canada’s official bilingualism gave rise to two separate Canadian literary translation practices, French-to-English and English-to-French, each with different motivations. Paraphrasing Sherry Simon, translator and theorist Barbara Godard sums up the difference between the two practices this way: ‘Anglo-Canadians translate in order to know the self through an encounter with the other, while Québécois translate in order to know what the other is saying about them’ (1988: 78). This desire to know what the other is saying in English-to-French translation in Canada stems in part from the fact that ‘Quebec’s minority situation has always been coupled with a certain xenophobia, particularly directed to the rest of the country’ that derives from the linguistic anxieties of the Quiet Revolution (Stratford 1977: preface [np]). Despite Canada’s official bilingualism, there has been a distinctive sense since Confederation in 1867 that, as Jean Delisle puts it, ‘le Canada est d’abord conçu en anglais, puis traduit pour la collectivité francophone [Canada is first conceived of in English, then translated for the Francophone community] (Delisle 1977: 70), his emphasis). This created a large administrative burden for translators to uphold Canadian bilingualism (Shek 1988: 85-6; Ladouceur 2005: 25-6) and partially explains why in Québec, translation from English into French was highly political. In her landmark study of translation on the Québécois stage, Sociocritique de la traduction : Théâtre et altérité au Québec (1968-1988), Annie Brisset explores the ‘relation between translation and social discourse’ (1996:
She looks at, among other things, the role of language in identity formation, arguing that ‘translation can [...] change the relation of linguistic forces, at the institutional and symbolic levels, by making it possible for the vernacular language to take the place of referential language’, borrowing terminology from Henri Gobard (1996: 164-65).

Meanwhile, literary translation practice in English Canada was conceived mainly as a bridge-building endeavour, a metaphor promoted extensively by translator Philip Stratford, one of the foremost figures in the development of French-to-English literary translation in Canada (Ladouceur 2005: 23-24). Stratford argued that ‘[t]he political and cultural duty of the anglophone [sic] translator [...] was both to create an awareness among English-Canadian readers of the nature of the crisis in Québec, and to acquaint them with Québec authors’ (quoted in Lane-Mercier 2006: 76). From the 1960s, sociopolitical unrest in Québec complicated the motivation for translation in English Canada: ‘there was the continued desire to know the other, to break through the two solitudes, but now this was compounded by a sense of urgency, by a need to understand the turmoil in Quebec society’ (Mezei 1985: 214).

1.2 Translated beings

One problem with either of these conceptions of the motivations for literary translation is that not all the French-language literature is Québécois. The Anglo-Canadian translational discourse commonly uses the terms ‘Québec’ and ‘Québécois’ interchangeably, as Stratford does above, to encompass all of French Canada or to designate the works of French-Canadian writers (Stratford 1982: 121; Mezei 1985: 214; Godard 1988: 79; Brisset 1996: 74-79; Lane-Mercier 2014: 523). However, these theorists and critics include in their analyses authors such as Antonine Maillet and Gabrielle Roy, Acadian and Franco-Manitoban writers respectively. As such, “Québec” becomes an essentialist concept that suggests a homogeneous Francophone cultural experience, generally either excluding or failing to distinguish between other minority French-speaking groups such as Acadians. Such insusceptibility, conscious or not, is at least partly a response to the redefinition of the concept of ‘French Canada’ incited by Québec’s increasingly inward gaze in the 1960s: ‘the

---

5 Brisset defines referential language as the language of oral tradition, tying a community to its past, and the vernacular as the shared (communal) language, the mother tongue (1996: 165).
renewal of national consciousness [in Québec] found its voice in the search for identity. Imperceptibly, the Quiet Revolution ushered in the change from *French Canada* to *Québec* (Brisset 1996: 8, her emphasis). Even the examples of Maillet and Roy, comprising a fraction of the French-Canadian literary canon, suggest a plurality of cultural voices and ideologies that warrant different sensibilities in interpretation. Antonine Maillet’s sense of identity, for instance, is fluid, nuanced by her time in Montreal: ‘[c]’est vrai que j’ai des racines profondes, mais mes racines sont des algues qu’on peut promener, vous savez, je traîne mes racines avec moi comme des algues. Alors, je suis acadienne, mais je me suis très bien adaptée à Montréal’ [it is true that my roots strike deep, but my roots are like algae that can be moved, you know, I carry my roots around with me like algae. So, I am Acadian, but I have adapted well to Montreal] (quoted in Pellerin 2009). Maillet’s dual identity – her daily life unfolding in Québec and her creative imagination being grounded in Acadie – effectively gives her migrant status. Although her migration from Acadie to Québec, does not elicit the linguistic anxieties of migrants who are forced to integrate into an unfamiliar and unknown target culture, Maillet does reflect the characterisation of migrants as translated entities. As Michael Cronin observes,

> [t]he condition of the migrant is the condition of the translated being. He or she moves from a source language and culture to a target language and culture so that *translation* takes place both in the physical sense of movement or displacement and in the symbolic sense of the shift from one way of speaking, writing about and interpreting the world to another. (2006: 45, his emphasis)

Both Philip Stratford and Barbara Godard reinforce the notion that Maillet is a ‘translated being’ within French Canada. In his review of the original French *Pélagie-la-Charrette*, Stratford tells his Québécois readers that they likely won’t understand Maillet’s language: ‘not even a good command of the best street *Québécois* will guarantee you a full understanding of this speech’ (1979: 109). He goes on to bemoan the fact that Anglophone readers would have to wait for an ‘inspired, possibly impossible’ translation (ibid.: 109), a challenge he would ultimately answer a few years later. Barbara Godard confirms the necessity for Maillet’s Francophone readers to translate the Acadian language, claiming that
‘[s]topping to ponder over the lexical references of these unfamiliar words, the reader slows his pace. Words come more rapidly than sense and the reader is thus obliged to involve [themselves] actively in the creative process’ (1979: 66). Godard’s ‘creative process’ is clearly a translational one whereby the reader grapples with unfamiliar vocabulary to make sense of the text, but it is a process that only non-Acadians must undertake in reading. In this sense, Maillet embodies the Canadian context of translation wherein the ‘doubly colonized’ context of Canadian politics, represented today by Canada’s official bilingualism, creates a literary industry ‘where both English and French writers have been aware of “translated” language – standard British or American, international French-dominating literature’ (Godard 1979: 53).

For writers like Maillet, then, this misattribution of identity can create situations akin to the experiences of minority-language travellers whose identity is attributed, or misattributed, based on language. As Michael Cronin explains, ‘the challenge for the traveller becomes one of describing this world in the language of the minority-language speaker rather than having it endlessly presented to them in the dominant language’ (2006: 162). The attribution of identity in the case of Maillet or of Gabrielle Roy, in a sense domestic and intralingual travellers within French-Canada, is made on the basis of accent as well as language (or sociolect). The implications are nevertheless the same, for ‘[l]eaving aside nationalist susceptibilities, the difficulty of misattribution is to create a false set of expectations or to conceal histories not normally on view’ (Cronin 2006: 163). The tendency can be to regard what is in this case a domestic minority as foreign or exotic. Glen Nichols, a Canadian comparative literature scholar and translator of plays by Acadian poet and dramatist Herménégilde Chiasson, noticed that Chiasson’s Acadian identity was sometimes acknowledged in English translation, but that ‘the [translated] texts attempt to contain any Acadian particularities as merely interesting side notes, a bit of exotic flavour’ (2009: 80). Nichols’ concerns for what he qualifies as translations that veer towards the sociological rather than the artistic (ibid.: 81) are justified insofar as they may perpetuate the minority’s cultural stereotypes for the majority readership, as both Maria Tymoczko (1999: 62-89) and Michael Cronin (1995: 98) have discussed in the context of Irish literature. Sherry Simon has suggested this occurred in Canada with the representation of Québécois (and presumably French Canadians generally) as ‘non urban, deeply religious’ (quoted in Cronin 1995: 98). The risk, Michael Cronin warns, is to ‘view the minority language [... as] an heirloom, a relic.
from another distant, non-urban age spoken by peasants in picturesque surroundings’ as speakers of majority languages are wont to do (2003: 150).

The epitext surrounding the publication of Pélagie: The Return to Acadie and The Tale of Don l’Orignal certainly seems to relish the quaintness and folksy tone of the works. Bernard Aresu points out the ‘seeming “peculiarity” of numberless stylistic surprises’ (1986: 232, his emphasis). In his review of Pélagie-la-Charrette, Philip Stratford states that Acadian literature now has its Huckleberry Finn (1979: 109). The narrative is recycled in reviews of Stratford’s English translation of the novel. Sherry Simon takes pleasure in the language’s ‘strange music and rough-and-ready tumble’ (1982: B8) while Kathy Mezei praises its ‘folksy tone’ (1983: 387). Similarly, The Tale of Don l’Orignal’s marketing material enthusiastically promises that ‘Barbara Godard’s nimble translation recreates [...] the raucous dialogue in an English that’s colourful, familiar, and just strange enough to capture the magic of the Fleas’ (A. Maillet 2004b: back cover).

1.3 From the universal to the particular

What Glen Nichols identifies above in the translations of Herménégilde Chiasson into English is a general shift from the particular to the universal in translations of Acadian works to prepare the texts for an Anglo-Canadian audience: the ‘cri du cœur of Acadian particularity in the French, [sic] becomes a safe and transcendent universalism, performing the text and author as non-threatening, as something more compatible with a pan-Canadian vision of itself’ (Nichols 2009: 83). It is possible, however, to rephrase Nichols’ notion of a singular particularity to a plural one. In other words, it is not a question of considering the works as the cri du cœur of a particularity, but as cris du cœur of particularities. Or, more accurately, particularities as plural forms of expressions of cultural identity. Indeed, Denis Bourque has argued that Maillet’s corpus ‘se présente comme une vaste fresque de l’Acadie traditionnelle ou historique et comme l’affirmation d’une spécificité qui a bien droit à sa reconnaissance, cette fois sur le plan universel’ [presents itself as a vast fresco of a traditional or historical Acadie and as an affirmation of a specificity that merits acknowledgement, this time at a universal level] (2015b: 59-60).

In Maillet’s works, such particularity is twofold, ideological and linguistic, both of which are encompassed in the parlure acadienne. Ideologically, Antonine Maillet distanced herself from her predecessors not by denying a sense of Acadian identity in her work, but by
refashioning this identity in difference. Maillet’s work is an eloquent manifestation of hybridity, the hybridity of oral and written literature, of past and present, of rural and urban, of rich and poor, of those d’en bas and those d’en haut, to use Maillet’s own characterisation of the dichotomy that constitutes her authorial obsession (Merkle 2000: 271; Mallet 2002: 190; Bourque 2015a: 63). The mythology that Maillet creates in her novels resists not only the ideologies of the elite’s patriotic and nationalistic discourse, but also the cultural characterisation imposed by Evangeline. Maillet constructs a nuanced and complex Acadian identity through hybridity, which Michael Cronin perceives as particularly important in expressing diversity outside urban areas:

To stress hybridity in non-urban settings is not to devalue but to revalue. That is to say, to emphasize the multiple origins of a cultural practice, the intercultural dynamic in a micro-cosmopolitanism of the land, is to refuse to give in to a moralizing condemnation of particularisms on the grounds that traditions are always bogus, that the supposedly authentic is an elaborate historical trick. (Cronin 2006: 18)

According to Cronin, the concept of ‘cosmopolitanism’ provides a useful framework with which to understand connectedness, while ‘micro-cosmopolitanism’ provides the grounds on which the small and particular can be perceived for all its diversity and complexity, but on its own terms (2006: 8-16). Indeed, ‘[t]he micro-cosmopolitan dimension helps thinkers from smaller or less powerful polities to circumvent the terminal paralysis of identity logic not through a programmatic condemnation of elites ruling from above but through a patient undermining of conventional thinking from below’ (Cronin 2006: 16).

Maillet exemplifies perfectly the movement from below rather than from above inherent in Cronin’s concept of ‘micro-cosmopolitanism’. Pélagie-la-Charrette is the story of a family’s (and a few stragglers’) ten-year journey, on foot, from the American colonies back to Acadie 20 years after the Deportation. As such, it is essentially a retelling of history from the point of view of the comic, of the people (Bourque 2015a: 64). In the novel, Maillet shifts the power structures by conceiving an
epic that includes the stories of loss and defeat [and] offers new interpretations of time and the past [...] The losers’ epic shifts narrative power from the centre to the margins, and to the stories of minorities, of women, of the disenfranchised. (Giltrow and Stouck 2002: para. 2)

In Don l’Orignal, a quest for origins that doubles as an allegorical recreation of the tensions between British and French imperial powers leading up to the Deportation, with the Flea Islanders depicting the Acadians and the mainlanders depicting the English, the carnivalesque and tragic conventions create similar power shifts. Denis Bourque reads a Bakhtinian view of the carnivalesque in Don l’Orignal as a ‘conception particulière du monde qui s’est développée chez les couches populaires de la population depuis l’Antiquité jusqu’au Moyen Âge et qui s’est exprimée à travers divers formes, rites et symboles de la fête populaire, dans le langage de la place publique’ [particular world view that developed among the common folk from Antiquity to the Middle Ages and that was expressed in the various forms, rituals and symbols of folk festivals and in the language of public arenas] (1993-1994: 72). Don l’Orignal’s Flea Islanders are descendants of the “gens d’en bas” sur le plan de l’imaginaire qui [...] aiment la fête, la bonne vie, le rire, le manger et le boire, les histoires parodiques, les travestissements’ [“gens d’en bas” in the collective imagination who love celebrations, the good life, laughter, food, drinks, parodies, disguises] (Bourque 2015a: 63).

Apart from casting characters from en bas and subverting her narrative form to support her movement from below rather than above, Maillet also gives voice to these people, in their own language, the parlure acadienne. Along with an innovative approach to narrative, language is what allowed Maillet to shift the emphasis from the past to the present, the collective to the individual, the elite to the popular. Maillet writes

“tout haut” dans un pays sans véritables antécédents littéraires [et] conduit ses personnages [...] où l’imaginaire corrige l’Histoire et où la fable devient vérité de langage. Parfois les mots semblent doués d’une vie propre [...] et leur effervescence se traduit par autant d’archaïsmes voire de néologismes. (Gauvin 2004: 301)
[out loud in a country without true literary antecedents [and] brings her characters where the imagination corrects History and where fable becomes the truth of language. Sometimes, words seem to have a life of their own [...] and their energy translates into as many archaisms, even neologisms.]

For example, Don l’Orignal’s extensive intertextuality (Bourque 1993-1994: 79, Gallant 1986: 289-92; Godard 1979: 62) appropriates the universal word and transforms it into the individual vernacular. Maillet does not stand on the shoulders of giants but translates them. And she mistranslates them at that. Hamlet’s ‘to be or not to be’ becomes, in Citrouille’s words, ‘corver ou point corver, c’est là la grousse affaire’ (A. Maillet 1976: 82), or ‘To croak or not to croak, that’s the big deal’, in Godard’s translation (A. Maillet 2004b: 63).

As Maillet outlined in Rabelais et les traditions populaires en Acadie, the Acadian vernacular acts as both instrument and tradition, signifier and signified: ‘elle [la langue] est à la fois moyen de transmission des traditions et elle-même tradition’ [it [language] is at once the method of transmitting tradition and tradition itself] (1971: 131). According to Maillet, the multitude of songs, superstitions, tales, beliefs, rituals, and legends that are embedded in the words, locutions, metaphors, proverbs, and figures of speech of Acadian language comprise ‘en somme tout un arsenal de pensées et de pratiques populaires qui constituent la manière d’être de ce petit peuple fidèle, sans doute à son insu, à son passé’ [in short a whole collection of thoughts and folk traditions that constitute the way of being of a small people unknowingly loyal to its past] (1971: 131). Moreover, the use of the parlure acadienne ‘proposes a mythology as much in the vocabulary, syntax and rhetoric of her work as in the figuration’ (Godard 1979: 63). Maillet harnesses four centuries’ worth of rich folkloric legacy contained in the oral tradition of the parlure acadienne to create her own language, further reinforcing its particularity. Philip Stratford puts it this way:

Acadien is just her base. To this she adds, instinctively, her own accent, images, rhythms, expressions. The product is an imaginative equivalent of acadien, heavily laced with Rabelais, Perrault, Molière, folk tales, the Catholic missal [...]. What she writes is an amalgam of all these parts, not academic acadien, but a new language. (1986: 328, his emphasis).
Through the *parlure acadienne*, Maillet defines ‘specificity through and not against multiplicity’ (Cronin 2006: 18), a key aspect of micro-cosmopolitanism. In other words, the *parlure acadienne* is the means by which Maillet defines and expresses a micro-cosmopolitan view of Acadian identity. It may therefore be possible to look at the specific in translations of Maillet’s work into English to find instances of expression of Acadian identity beyond the quaint and folksy. The particularisms of the *parlure acadienne* – its puns, intertextuality, misnomers, neologisms, metaphors, imagery, parodies, hyperboles, and malapropisms – will provide the framework through which to explore Acadian identity as expressed in Philip Stratford’s *Pélagie: The Return to Acadie* and Barbara Godard’s *The Tale of Don L’Orignal*.

1.4 Slutty fish, skunky cows, and wooden ropes

Philip Stratford was also accused of not being sufficiently familiar with Acadian culture (Lane-Mercier 2006: 85), which may explain a few minor semantic disruptions in Pélagie: The Return to Acadie. For example, Stratford translates ‘Bélonie premier qui, en 1770, fêtait ses nonante ans’ [Bélonie-the-First who, in 1770, celebrated his ninetieth year] (A. Maillet 1979: 17-8) as ‘Bélonie-the-First who, in 1770, feasted his ninetieth year’ (A. Maillet 2004a: 9, my emphasis). The use of ‘feasted’ is likely a nod to the Catholic tradition of dedicating a day to a particular saint, but in the context of the Expulsion and the novel’s characters struggling across the continent on foot to regain Acadie, the connotation of a sumptuous meal seems slightly misplaced. Similarly, Stratford translates ‘elle [la colonie] continuait allègrement à planter ses choux’ [it [the colony] merrily continued to plant cabbage] (A. Maillet 1979: 21) as ‘had gone on cultivating its garden’ (A. Maillet 2004a: 13) even though the source text alludes to the Acadian nursery rhyme ‘Savez-vous planter des choux’ that Stratford references later in the novel: ‘… et le bec, alouette, savez-vous plantez [sic] les choux …’ (A. Maillet 2004a: 181). For her part, Barbara Godard took significant liberties in The Tale of Don l’Orignal (Patterson 1983: 354), leading to awkward phrasing such as ‘slut of a fish’ (Maillet 2004b: 24) when ‘damn fishery’ may have sufficed for ‘saloppe de pêche’ (Maillet 1969: 93). Reviewer John O’Connor identifies the mistranslation of ‘nuque’ [scalp] as ‘shoulder’ (1979: 392), and the translation of ‘skunks’ (Maillet 2004b: 19) for ‘vaches’ [cows] (Maillet 1969: 89) constitutes another possible mistranslation, even though both of these examples could be the result of aesthetic choices rather than misunderstanding. However, the translation of ‘a man comes home from cod and whores like he’s been to a weddin’ (Maillet 2004b: 23) for ‘un homme s’en revient de la morue comme des noces’ [a man comes home from cod fishing as he does a wedding] (A. Maillet 1969: 92) is more questionable.

Considering these translations from the perspective of what Maria Tymoczko calls the ‘metonymies of translation’ (1999), however, is useful in identifying expressions of Acadian identity without succumbing to an entropic view of linguistic and semantic problems in the translations of Pélagie-la-Charrette and Don l’Orignal. Tymoczko considers

---

6 For examples of translation ‘problems’ in three Maillet novels, including Pélagie-la-Charrette, see Lorin Donald Card’s thesis entiled Antonine Maillet et la traduction littéraire : analyse critique et mise en pratique (1997).
7 John Patterson provides a detailed, though entirely one-sided, overview of mistranslations in Godard’s The Tale of Don l’Orignal (1983: 352-53).
the translation of Irish literature into English in terms of its metonymies – that is, the ‘information load’ of a text, its ‘literary features such as genre, form, performance conventions, and literary allusions; as well as the inevitable questions of linguistic interface’ (1999: 47). She considers the textual information load of marginalised literatures particularly problematic in translation because the ‘translator is in the paradoxical position of “telling a new story” to the receptor audience, even as the translator refracts and rewrites a source text’ (ibid.: 47). Whereas Maillet retells stories for an Acadian readership already familiar with the metonymies of her texts, her English translators are faced with a readership unfamiliar with these same metonymies. The fact that ‘it is in large measure the lack of familiarity with the metonymic aspects of the literary texts of marginalized cultures that make it difficult for the audiences of dominant cultures to integrate marginalized texts in their canons, irrespective of any linguistic or even ideological barrier’ (1999: 48) may explain English-Canada’s rather lukewarm reception of Acadian literature. Indeed, Pierre Hébert gleans from the English-language reviews of Maillet’s work a general discomfort with her narrative style (1989: 272-75), possibly because of the episodic nature of the oral tale that permeates her work. Considering the translation of a text in terms of its metonymies, or in Michael Cronin’s words as a ‘mutable mobile’ (2006: 28), precludes a reading of translation paralysed in the usual dichotomies of faithfulness or treachery. Indeed, ‘[t]he perception of translation as a mutable mobile which operates within a topology of fluidity [...] would usefully put paid to the conventional habit of dismissing translation as synonymous with loss, deformation, poor approximation and entropy’ (Cronin 2006: 28). In other words, ‘translation-as-substitution breeds a discourse about translation that is dualistic, polarized, either/or, right/wrong. A metonymic approach to translation is more flexible, resulting in a discourse of both/and which recognizes varying hierarchies of privilege, [...] coexisting values, and the like’ (Tymoczko 1999: 283). As discussed previously, the parlure acadienne, as both signifier and signified, is in itself metonymic, it is both ‘miracle et musée populaires’ [miracle and museum of the people] because of the four centuries of oral tradition that shaped it (A. Maillet 1971: 133).

Both Philip Stratford and Barbara Godard pay close attention to sound, rhythm, and the orality of the source text (Stratford 1982: 125; Stratford 1986: 326; Card 1997: 62-66; Mezei 1983: 387; Mezei 2006: 208). However, aspects of Acadian identity expressed through the parlure acadienne occur in English translations of Maillet’s works particularly
strongly as polysemy and catachresis in Pélagie: Return to Acadie and as neologisms and malapropisms in The Tale of Don l’Orignal.

1.5 Smuggling and ventriloquism: Expressions of Acadian identity in translation

Philip Stratford conceptualised of translation as an act of smuggling a source text into a target system, of transferring it clandestinely so as to render ‘eux autres’, to show that the ‘other’ is not so distant from the ‘us’ after all (Lane-Mercier 2006: 82). ‘After much reflection, trial and error’, says Stratford, ‘the primary decision that any translator of Antonine Maillet must reach is, what English idiom to imitate or invent to try to capture that droll, earthy, salty, poetic, archaic, innovative language that is the essence of her work’ (Stratford 1986: 326-7). The problem, though, is that any ‘English idiom’ will fall short precisely because the source language is anything but obscure. Maillet’s language is remarkably specific, reinforcing, augmenting, reducing, and repeating to achieve clarity and exactness (A. Maillet 1971: 155). In attempting to compensate for the specificity of Maillet’s language, Stratford considered using an equivalent dialect, his possibilities including Shemogue Irish, Nova Scotia Scotch, or Newfoundland Outport English (Stratford 1982: 125). He ultimately settled on Low Standard North American English but adopted an inventive strategy and developed ‘Stratfordese’, a language to match the source’s ‘Mailletois’ (Stratford 1986: 328). Stratford noted that he preferred to ‘english’ rather than ‘anglicise’ a text (1986: 328), but his critics generally describe a strategy of fluency in his translations of Maillet. For example, Gillian Lane-Mercier states that Stratford ‘downplayed questions of strict equivalence in favour of enhanced fluency and a certain sense of translational latitude’ (Lane-Mercier 2006: 91). Sherry Simon agrees, suggesting that ‘Stratford makes no attempt to reproduce or find equivalents for the specific expressions of Acadian French’ (1982: B8).

Barbara Godard, for her part, is seen as a ventriloquist, likening the art of translation to an act of ventriloquism by which translators insert themselves in the creative process and asserts their visibility in doing so (Mezei 2006: 208-11). Godard opts for an ‘equivalent’ dialect, in this case Ottawa Valley English, in rendering Maillet’s language (Stratford 1986: 327). According to Kathy Mezei, Godard’s style is ‘fluid [and] lively’, the result of ‘developing tactics for difficult texts replete with neologisms, dialect, and semantic and syntactic disruption’ (2006: 207-8). In his review of The Tale of Don l’Orignal, John O’Connor
contradicts John Patterson and lauds Godard for her ‘impressive and near-perfect’ translation, remarking on her having ‘taken great care to find equivalent idioms and to retain Maillot’s puns and verbal tricks’ (1980: 392). Even Patterson, whose scathing review points to multiple linguistic deficiencies, concedes that Godard retains the humour and imaginativeness of the source text (1983: 353).

However, for all the talk of fluency and equivalence, there are multiple occurrences of French vocabulary and syntax in both English translations. Stratford routinely incorporates words with French etymology: ‘charivari’ (Maillet 2004a: 46), ‘sous’ (ibid.: 60), ‘seigneur’ (ibid.: 87), ‘chevalier’ (ibid.: 221), and the list goes on. Though these words have, according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, entered the English lexicon, they have a decidedly French ring to them. Stratford also signals foreignness through untranslated folk songs (ibid.: 40, 181, 222) and by keeping the French terms, in italics, for ‘maçoune’ (ibid.: 7), ‘bien le bonjour’, (ibid.: 12) ‘déshabillés’ (ibid.: 136), and ‘patriotes’ (ibid.: 152), where ‘hearth’, ‘good day’, ‘unclothed’, and ‘patriots’ could have conveyed the message, if not the foreignness, equally effectively. With the exception of ‘patriotes’, the words that Stratford leaves in French all convey a sense of Acadian identity. According to Pascal Poirier’s *Le Glossaire acadien*, ‘maçoune’ is an Acadian diminutive of ‘maçonnerie’ and means ‘âtre, foyer’ [hearth, fireplace] (1995: 288). Poirier also reflects on the simple ‘bonjour’ in his *Glossaire*, linking the slightly altered ‘bonjou’ to a tradition of greeting involving the aboriginal peoples (staunch allies of the Acadians before and during the Expulsion) and to the old world (1995: 72). Finally, ‘déshabillés’ echoes ‘habillage’ and ‘habilleux’, Old French words that refer to the preparation of meat and fish (Poirier 1995: 249), a reference that resonates profoundly in the context of *Pélagie-la-Charrette* and a return to stability and Acadian customs. The word ‘patriotes’, on the other hand, may be a slip from Stratford, as its significance, especially in English, is more closely related to Québécois than Acadian culture, harkening back to the 1837-1838 rebellion in Lower Canada (Arsenault 2004: 385). The word ‘patriotes’ also appears in the source text (A. Maillet 1979: 186) but is qualified by the indefinite article ‘des’ in contrast to Stratford’s personal plural pronoun ‘our’ (A. Maillet 2004a: 152) in English. Godard’s reliance on words with French etymology is less conspicuous, although the repeated ‘reconnoitre’ (A. Maillet 2004b: 26, 40) and ‘pince-nez’ (ibid.: 66) provide two examples. More to the point in Godard’s translation is the title of the epic by *Don l’Orignal’s* resident poet, the ‘Pucéade’ (Gallant 1986: 290), which Godard
renders as ‘Fléiade’ (2004b: 36). The title is a thinly veiled riff on The Iliad that Godard francises by keeping the final ‘e’ to parallel the French translations of Homer’s masterpiece, Iliade.

Philip Stratford’s linguistic decisions point to a deliberate attempt to recreate polysemy, the losses and gains of which are discussed at length by Lorin Donald Card (1997: 60-87). Card looks at Stratford’s orality, regionalisms, register, language play, and semantic equivalences and provides ample examples of gains and losses in all categories (ibid.). His analysis includes the witty ‘resurrextraction’, which he identifies as a ‘mot-valise [...] pour compenser la morphologie populaire dans [le mot] “relevailles”’ [portmanteau word [...] to compensate for the popular morphology of [the word] ‘relevailles’] (1997: 75).

‘Resurrextraction’ (A. Maillet 2004a: 107) is an example of catachresis, a figure of speech that Maillet uses frequently. La Sagouine is especially renowned for her comedic and satirical misuse of words, as evidenced by the Joe Graphy quip mentioned earlier. Antonine Maillet calls these ‘équivoques’ and traces them, similarly to the parlure acadienne, back to Rebelais (1971: 179-80). They allow the characters ‘to disturb the established discourses of church, state, and community through a shift of register frequently expressed in catachresis’ (Reid and Famula 2003: 77). Catachresis, then, is yet another instance of Maillet destabilising the power structures from the bottom-up. Writing about catachresis in La Sagouine, Christine Famula and Gregory J. Reid argue that

as an act of naming that which has not yet been named within a language [it] is the ultimate challenge and accomplishment of translation and causes us to note that Maillet’s La Sagouine is itself very much like a translation, albeit a simulacral translation for which there is no source text. (2003: 78)

It is telling, then, that both Philip Stratford and Barbara Godard imitate Pélagie-la-Charrette’s and Don l’Orignal’s few instances of catachresis. Straford’s Pélagie: The Return to Acadie has two other examples: ‘expectorators’ (A. Maillet 2004a: 152) and ‘Vamoose’ (ibid.: 247). For her part, Godard has, in The Tale of Don l’Orignal, ‘ecumical’ (A. Maillet 2004b: 19), ‘harrycane’ (ibid.: 42), and ‘drownded’ (ibid.: 78). Unlike Stratford, though, she seems to recreate Maillet’s catachresis rather than intersperse them randomly throughout
the text; for example, ‘ecumulical’ is a translation of the source’s ‘concile yeumulumique’ (1969: 89).

More frequent in Don l’Orignal are malapropisms, which Barbara Godard discusses in her article ‘The Tale of a Narrative: Antonine Maillet’s Don l’Orignal’ (1979). Again, these language plays are characteristic of the parlure acadienne and the Rabelaisian legacy (A. Maillet 1971: 179-82). Godard mentions specifically the replacement of ‘aurore’ [dawn] with the figure of a woman named ‘Aurore’, as well as the confounding of ‘helicopter’ and ‘holocaust’ (Godard 1979: 64). She keeps both in her translation: ‘... that a watcher somewhere was hoping for Aurora’ and ‘that a sacrifice would be made of a holocaust or a helicopter’ (A. Maillet 2004b: 77). Citrouille’s mistranslation of Hamlet’s famous soliloquy, ‘to croak or not to croak’ (A. Maillet 2004b: 63), is a case in point as it exemplifies the propensity for parody in the Acadian oral tradition (A. Maillet 1971: 182). In Rabelais et les traditions populaires en Acadie, Maillet discusses specifically parodies of sacred texts, noting that Acadians (and Rabelais) have a penchant for burlesque translations of these texts (ibid.) In this sense, Godard’s ‘I can’t keep him alive vitam aeternatam all by myself’ (A. Maillet 2004b: 40) and ‘[w]e’ll drink a tea deum to celebrate that’ (ibid.: 90) are aptly representative of the playfulness of the parlure acadienne.

The greatest distraction in Godard’s English translation of The Tale of Don l’Orignal, and indeed the one that incensed Paratte and Patterson, is the dialogue rendered in Ottawa Valley English dialect. The dialect produces naturalised expressions such as ‘That’s how she be, then’ (A. Maillet 2004b: 18) for ‘Eh ben, c’est comme ça’ [Well, that’s how it is] (A. Maillet 1969: 89), and ‘but what’s all this finnin and sinning these days!’ (A. Maillet 2004b: 23) for ‘Ah! mais c’est quoi c’est que ces pêches, asteur!’ [What’s all this about fishing, now!] (A. Maillet 1969: 92). Yet, Godard’s linguistic and artistic freedoms should not be judged out of context or with disregard for her translation strategy. She obliquely alludes to this strategy in her critique of two translations by Luis de Cespedes when she argues that

‘[n]one of the experimentation of other Maillet translators, such as phonetic transcription or the retention of words in French to recreate the translation effect that the Acadian dialect has in French, has been attempted in these translations. The result is workmanlike but lacks
The poetic function which, through defamiliarization, the Acadian dialect produced in the original. (1988: 87)

The review was published in 1988, nine years after *The Tale of Don l’Orignal*, which makes it likely that Godard includes herself in those ‘other Maillet translators’. Linguistic misunderstandings notwithstanding, Godard had a solid grasp of Acadian language and culture, or at least of the extent to which Antonine Maillet relied on Rabelais. Her article ‘The Tale of a Narrative’ outlines the ways in which *Don l’Orignal* depends on the results of Maillet’s folklore research as presented in *Rabelais et les traditions populaires en Acadie*, including through language (Godard 1979: 52), narrative form (ibid.: 52), superstitions (ibid.: 60), and proverbs (ibid.: 64). It is through such sensibility to the cultural significance encompassed in the *parlure acadienne* that Godard transmits Acadian identity. Both she and Stratford keep allusions, in French, to Acadian legends referenced in Carmen d’Entremont’s article on Acadian folklore in Maillet’s works (2012: 166), namely the ‘chasse-galerie’ in *The Tale of Don l’Orignal* (A. Maillet 2004b: 34) and the ‘coureurs des bois’ (A. Maillet 2004a: 161, 241).

Another noteworthy example is the allusion to the legend of the ‘bateau fantôme’ [ghost ship] in *The Tale of Don l’Orignal*. An unexplained natural phenomenon in which a giant ship seems to float ablaze on the horizon, the ‘bateau fantôme’ has become legend in the collective consciousness. The story goes that it is a ship of pirates condemned to burn for its crimes and its appearance foretells a storm (d’Entremont 2012: 170-71). The legend appears in *Don l’Orignal* as follows:

Une lueur rouge émergeait de l’eau, comme si les racines mêmes de la mer fussent en feu.

—Le bateau fantôme, s’écria le barbier.

Depuis un siècle et demi déjà, les habitants des côtes de mon pays apercevaient périodiquement cet étrange phénomène.

(Maillet 1969: 95)

[A red glow emerged from the water, as if the roots of the sea were on fire.

—The ghost ship, cried the barber.
For a century and a half already, the inhabitants of the coast of my country witness this strange phenomenon periodically.

In her English translation, however, Godard adds an explanation after the first mention of the ghost ship to situate the Anglo-Canadian reader within Acadian folklore:

A red glow emerged from the water as if the very depths of the sea were on fire.

‘The ghost ship,’ cried the barber.

And all the brave civil servants and members of the mainland parliament shuddered at what these words presaged.

For a century and a half now, the inhabitants of the shores of my country have periodically glimpsed the strange phenomenon of a ship in flames drifting on the horizon with sinister slowness.

(A. Maillet 2004b: 26)

Godard’s addition is a nod to the insistence on superstition and magic, especially omens, in Acadian folklore (A. Maillet 1971: 87-99). She is like Maillet in that what she retains from her source (Maillet’s source being the oral tradition) is ‘le grossissement des faits par l’imagination et la volonté de séduire et d’enthousiasmer le lecteur, comme le ferait un conteur populaire’ [the enlargement of facts through the imagination and a desire to seduce and stir the reader, much like a storyteller would] (Gallant 1986: 288). Indeed, Godard emphasises alliteration in phrases such as ‘the assembly had voted for conscription, coalition, conspiracy, colonization, plus a commanding war budget’ (A. Maillet 2004: 88), a sign of oral literature according to Maillet (1987: 14).

The profound sense of identity that nourishes Antonine Maillet’s novels and plays, which finds expression through the parlure acadienne, is rendered through the lens of micro-cosmopolitanism in English translation. Philip Stratford and Barbara Godard, in their respective translations, recreate the movement from the universal to the particular inherent to Maillet’s works, thereby creating a space wherein to express Acadian identity. Their understanding of their function as translator, either as smuggler or ventriloquist, allows them the necessary platitudes to render the linguistic and textual playfulness, those aspects intrinsic to the parlure acadienne, in English translation. Incidentally, Maillet adapts
these same processes in her translations of Shakespeare for the Québécois stage to incorporate a distinctive tinge of Acadianness.

Chapter 2 – *Traduit en Acadien: Antonine Maillot’s translations of La tempête and La Nuit des Rois*

2.1 Domestic migrants and intralingual translation

Acadie finds itself in the rather unique position of being not only a linguistic minority to English Canada, but also a linguistic and cultural minority to French-speaking Québec. As mentioned previously, Maillot is often regarded as a Québécois author because she lives and writes in Montreal. Given the duality of Maillot’s identity, and indeed her migrant status as discussed previously, it may not be surprising that Maillot’s translations of Shakespeare could bear traces of polyglossia. Commissioned by the Théâtre du Rideau Vert and based in Montreal (Gagnon 2005: 8-9), one of the cities referenced as ‘zones of linguistic dispossession or insecurity’ by Sherry Simon and Michael Cronin (2014: 122), Maillot works in a highly charged and complex sociopolitical environment, one where the city’s polyglot nature exacerbates the expression of identity through language (Cronin and Simon 2014: 122).

Whereas the act of translating from French to English was generally symptomatic of an impulse to bridge the cultural gap between Canada’s two solitudes, its English-to-French counterpart is more profoundly an act of asserting identity in the face of linguistic and cultural anxieties. In his 1977 *Bibliography*, Philip Stratford notes that only a dozen Anglo-Canadian novels had been translated into French in the first hundred years of Canadian Confederation (1977: preface [np]). Louise Ladouceur explains that the administrative burden that fell on translators to enact and ensure Canada’s bilingualism at least partially stunted the development of a vibrant literary translation practice as the appropriation of literary texts was at once a threat and futile endeavour for the minority (2005: 25-6). Annie Brisset’s argument in *A Sociocritique of Translation* (1996) revolves around the representation of the Other and how it materialises in one (or more) of three modes – iconoclastic, perlocutory, and identity-forming. The common thread that runs through Brisset’s translational modes is the elimination of alterity:
Driven by this preoccupation with identity, the translation fulfils, above all, a doxological function. Its objective is no longer to transmit the discourse of the Foreigner; rather, it is to use the Foreigner as a vehicle for its own discourse, the discourse of national liberation.

(1996: 196)

To Brisset, actions such as including the annotation ‘traduit en Québécois’ on a book cover creates an aura of prestige that supports “Québécité” (Québecness) [which] defines itself as the search for absolute distinctness, a distinctness that will counteract the danger of assimilation’ (Brisset 1996: 170-71). As such, the impulse to translate from English to French in Québec is very much an instance of what Michael Cronin calls the ‘symbolic as opposed to the informational function of language’ for a minority, whereby ‘[t]ranslation [...] is not about making communication possible but about establishing identity or enacting a form of resistance to the claims of the hegemonic language’ (2011: 171). It is this outcome that allows Brisset to designate Shakespeare as the ‘Québécois Nationalist Poet’ (1996: 109-59).

The Québécois theatre was the exception to a rather stagnant literary translation practise in French Canada (Simon 1988: 83), although it was representative of a general tendency to translate foreign works rather than Anglo-Canadian works (Ladouceur 2005: 37). According to Sherry Simon, the Québec stage was ideal for translations of William Shakespeare’s works into French because of its long-standing fascination with linguistic issues and its openness to literary translation (1988: 83). Gilbert David counts 47 French-language productions of 22 Shakespearean plays in Montreal and Ottawa alone between 1945 and 1998 (1998: 118). La Nuit des Rois and La tempête lead in terms of number of representations, trailing only behind Macbeth’s seven productions with their six each (ibid.: 119-20). On the one hand, the frequency of these representations can be linked to what Annie Brisset describes as a ‘recyclage culturel des classiques [qui] reflète les tensions qui agitent la société québécoise’ [cultural recycling of classics [that] reflects the tensions unsettling Québécois society] (quoted in Merkle 2000: 269). This is especially true from the 1980s onwards because the translations begin to be done by Québécois, as opposed to French, translators after 1978 (David 1998: 118). (It should be noted that David considers Antonine Maillet as a Québécois translator here). Nevertheless, the frequency of

Almost every one of these productions of both La tempête and La Nuit des Rois merited a new translation commission (ibid.: 122-38), which brings up the notion of ‘retranslation’. According to Antoine Berman, original works remain eternally young but translations age and eventually lose their revelatory and communicatory function, causing the need for a retranslation (1990: 1). Berman goes on to argue that retranslation can be viewed according to two fundamental traits, ‘défaillance’ and ‘kairos’. On the one hand, retranslation is an attempt to redress ‘la défaillance originelle’ [initial deficiency] that necessarily occurs in any translation but that resounds particularly strongly in the earlier translations of a given work (ibid.: 5). On the other, the continuous process of retranslation eventually creates the space in which the ‘grande traduction’ [great translation] can emerge, given the opportune moment, or kairos (ibid.: 6). The retranslation hypothesis proposes that ‘faults’ are more numerous in first translations because of greater deviation from the source text to correspond to target culture norms, until such time as the target culture ‘become[s] familiar with the text (and author) [...] and] allows for and demands new translations – retranslations – that are no longer definitively target oriented, but source text oriented’ (Desmidt 2009: 671).

Although Berman’s theory has been criticized by Isabelle Desmidt, among others, with the argument that retranslations are a product of their sociopolitical and literary contexts and correspond to norms of the target culture (2009: 670, 677), the idea that Québécois translators, and presumably Maillet, were working towards solving the initial deficiencies ties in with affirmations of cultural identity. In the context of the Québécois theatre of the 1970s and 1980s, retranslations of Shakespeare’s plays seem to run counter to Berman’s retranslation hypothesis insofar as they gain distance from their source text to
ascribe to identity-affirming needs of the Québécois target culture. Indeed, the textual liberties taken by translators of Shakespeare for ideological purposes have been extensively documented (Simon 1988; Brisset 1996; Lieblein 1998: 11-14; Merkle 2000: 277-82). Nevertheless, Mallet’s translations in the 1990s mark a return towards Shakespeare’s source texts. It bears repeating that Mallet’s translations correspond to a shift in both the political discourse and the literary tradition, but her translations represent a return to the source text that contrasts starkly with her antecedents.

While Québécois translators worried about using Shakespeare the foreigner as a means of liberation as Annie Brisset puts it above, Mallet celebrated foreignness in yet another manifestation of textual hybridity. Brisset (1996) has argued convincingly that Québécois ideology is weaved through the translations of Shakespeare between 1968 and 1988, an argument taken up, reinforced, and extended by theorists and critics (e.g. Lieblein 1998; Mallet 2002; Gagnon 2003). Mallet’s translations, however, bear little resemblance in language and ideology to her Québécois counterparts, namely, but not only, in her respect of versification, of the decasyllable, and of conventions such as lower-class characters expressing themselves in prose (Gagnon 2005: 9-10). A glance at the character names of Mallet’s *La Nuit des Rois* and *La tempête* in comparison to other translations provides insight into her approach: in both plays she keeps the names as-is from Shakespeare’s version, adding only an acute accent to ‘Sébastien’ and translating ‘Sir’ to ‘sire’. Conversely, Normand Chaurette francises ‘Toby’ to ‘Tobie’ and ‘Adrian’ to ‘Adrien’, Michel Garneau goes one step further, blatantly re-naming ‘Sir Toby Belch’ to ‘Sire Toby le Roteur’, ‘Trinculo’ to ‘Étranglé’, and ‘Alonso’ to ‘Alphonse’, among others.

Moreover, Mallet’s translations stand apart from those that feature in Brisset’s analysis in that they resist the tendency to acculturate and eliminate the Other. For instance, Sonya Malaborza compares Antonine Mallet’s body of translations to Brisset’s translational modes and shows that, with the exception of a few identity-forming archaic or regional linguistic features and some textual interventions that verge on the perlocutory, Mallet’s translations generally contrast with the translations analysed by Brisset (2006: 194-95). Joël Beddows, quoting Pierre Lavoie, sees Mallet as participating in a small counter-movement of ‘traducteurs qui ne cherchent pas à “s’approprier la part de l’autre, le discours de l’Étranger, d’usurper son identité, mais bien plutôt de reconnaître sa différence radicale, inaliénable” [translators who are not looking to appropriate the other, or the discourse of
the foreigner, to usurp their identity, but to acknowledge radical, inalienable difference] (quoted in Beddows 1998: 36, his emphasis). Additionally, Beddows argues that Maillet’s understanding of rhythm creates a Shakespearean poetics in French that acknowledges rather than eliminates foreignness (1998: 36). Denise Merkle similarly talks of Maillet’s approach as one that ‘neutralise rarement’ [rarely neutralises], that produces a ‘traduction textuelle’ [textual translation] and respects the alterity of the source (2000: 282, 284-85). Merkle specifically credits Acadians’ growing awareness of their own identity in the 1960s and 1970s for opening up the space for the Other (ibid.: 268). For her part, Chantal Gagnon attributes the respect of alterity to the fact that Maillet is Acadian and grew up in a bilingual environment, a notion that Maillet confirms when she says: ‘J’ai lu l’anglais dans l’original, alors déjà, je comprends le sens des mots, [...] la langue des mots, le rythme shakespearien’ [I read the English of the original, so already I understand the sense of the words, the language of the words, Shakespearean rhythm] (quoted in Gagnon 2003: para. 22).

2.2 Traduit en Acadien?

In her review of Maillet’s *La Nuit des Rois*, Solange Lévesque writes:

La dramaturge acadienne semble s’être retrouvée chez l’auteur britannique comme dans un univers familier; la multiplicité des tons, la raillerie, la roublardise, les équivoques, le plaisir du jeu (jeu des mots, jeu des rôles), la vivacité et le naturel des dialogue… (1993: 27)

[The Acadian playwright seems to have found herself in the British author’s works, in the multiplicity of voices, the banter, the cleverness, the figures of speech, the pleasure of play (word play, role play), the liveliness, and the naturalness of dialogue…]

Along with Maillet’s understanding of the ‘language of the words’ of Shakespeare, such familiarity is arguably what gives Maillet license to use a different linguistic strategy in her translations compared to those of her Québécois contemporaries. The reality of writing for the Québécois theatre and being published by a Québécois press (Leméac), however, means that Maillet ‘participe au discours social Québécois tout en tenant une position “marginale”’ [participates in the Québécois social discourse but from a ‘marginal’ position] (Gagnon
From this marginal position Maillet contributes to the Québécois literary history through her translations and adaptations of classics and contemporary literature that include *Le bourgeois gentleman* (1972), *Richard III* (1989), *William S.* (1991), *Hamlet* (1999), and *Les fantastiques* (2002). As such, she participates in the identity-forming discourse that dominates literary production and translation in Québec, albeit with a slightly different identity narrative than her Québécois contemporaries. As is especially the case with her translations of *Twelfth Night* and *The Tempest*, Maillet balances the language expected by her Québécois audience while distancing herself from the dominant sociopolitical discourse ongoing in the Québécois literary industry. By foregoing the Québécois vernacular, Maillet distances herself from the sociopolitical discourse that informs translation pursuits in Québec. But at the same time, she also introduces Acadianisms in her translations, words from the *parlure acadienne* that express Acadian identity.

It would seem that, unlike the Québécois translations that are ‘translated into Québécois’ so that the vernacular takes precedence over standard French for sociopolitical purposes (Brisset 1996: 165-69), Antonine Maillet’s translations into French are redolent of a more linguistically neutral approach. Chantal Gagnon argues that Maillet’s translations are generally written in a standard French (2003: 4). She maintains that there is ‘une touche acadienne’ [a hint of Acadian] to *Le Bourgeois gentleman*, an intralingual adaptation of Molière’s *Le Bourgeois gentilhomme* (2005: 5) and mentions that Maillet’s translations of British playwrights generally use a ‘langue presque totalement purgée de son désormais célèbre bouquet acadien’ [a language almost completely devoid of her heretofore famous Acadian flavour], the ‘bouquet acadien’ being the *parlure acadienne* (ibid: 3). Similarly, Malaborza observes that Maillet’s translations of contemporary plays use a French ‘aux couleurs acadiennes’, though it never fully reverts into the *parlure acadienne* of works such as *La Sagouine* (2006: 194), or *Pélagie-la-Charrette* or *Don l’Orignal* for that matter. By contrast, for her translations of classical texts, including Shakespeare’s, Maillet uses what could be considered a standard French, but one that shows traces of an older French (ibid.: 194). Malaborza also identifies Acadian expressions in *Une Lune d’eau salée*, the translation of David French’s *Salt-Water Moon* (2006: 183). Finally, Nicole Mallet recognises a similar strategy in Maillet’s translation of Ben Jonson’s *Bartholomew Fair*, arguing that the target text manifests the local flavour of seventeenth-century French (2002: 194).
Maillet’s translations of *The Tempest* and *Twelfth Night* show tendencies similar to those identified above in their leaning towards the *parlure acadienne*, as both signifier and signified, to express Acadian identity. The translator inserts vocabulary, idiomatic expressions, and references to folkloric material in both *La tempête* and *La Nuit des Rois*. Four works of reference as well as two other (Québécois) translations of each play have been used to support this claim. Pascal Poirier’s *Le Glossaire acadien* (1995), Yves Cormier’s *Dictionnaire du français acadien* (1999), and Éphrem Boudreau’s *Glossaire du vieux parler acadien* (1988) inform the linguistic analysis of these plays, as does Antonine Maillet’s own *Rabelais et les traditions populaires en Acadie*. Maillet drew extensively from Poirier as well as Geneviève Massignon’s 1962 thesis, *Les parlers français d’Acadie*, to compile a glossary of 500 words, locutions, images, and idioms that appear in Rabelais’s (and in some cases his contemporaries’) works and that have also been recorded in contemporary Acadie (1971: 133-84). References to Acadian folklore are likewise elucidated by Maillet’s comprehensive comparison between the oral tradition and Rabelais, as well as by Carmen d’Entremont’s overview of folkloric elements embedded in some of Maillet’s fiction (2012).

The following table presents 13 words drawn from Maillet’s *La tempête* and *La Nuit des Rois* as well as their counterparts in three works of reference to demonstrate their link to the *parlure acadienne*. A more detailed list of vocabulary and proverbs is included in Appendix A for reference.

### Table 1: Acadian vocabulary in Maillet’s *La Nuit des Rois* and *La tempête*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>accoste (NR 17), accoster (NR 79)</td>
<td>accoster (16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attifés (LT 101)</td>
<td>attifailles (45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaviré / chavirée (NR 85, 112)</td>
<td>chaviré (106)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chavire (LT 53)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chaviré(e) (136)</td>
<td></td>
<td>chavirer* (81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connétable (LT 67)</td>
<td>connestable (118)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Page numbers referring to the work listed in the column heading are included in parentheses; Maillet’s translations are abbreviated with ‘NR’ for *La Nuit des Rois* and ‘LT’ for *La tempête*. Asterisks indicate that the word is included in the dictionary but has a different meaning.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>débarrasser</td>
<td>(NR 105)</td>
<td>débarrasser (138)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garce</td>
<td>(NR 52, 66)</td>
<td>garce⁹ (230)</td>
<td>garce (146)</td>
<td>garce (136)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garrocher</td>
<td>(NR 134)</td>
<td>garrocher (229)</td>
<td>garrocher (231)</td>
<td>garrocher (137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garrochées</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hardes</td>
<td>(LT 37)</td>
<td>hardes (252)</td>
<td>hardes (248)</td>
<td>hardes (150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maquereaux</td>
<td>(LT 44)</td>
<td>maquereau* (294)</td>
<td>maquereau (171)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>picoté</td>
<td>(LT 39)</td>
<td>picoté (351)</td>
<td>picoter (150)</td>
<td>picote* (301)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quérir</td>
<td>(NR 105)</td>
<td>quéréir (375)</td>
<td>quéri / quéri (324)</td>
<td>quérir (202)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toises</td>
<td>(LT 14)</td>
<td>toise (420)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tricolant</td>
<td>(LT 102)</td>
<td>tricoler (429)</td>
<td>tricoler (370)</td>
<td>tricoler (235)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these 13 words, two (‘garrocher’ and ‘tricoler’) do not appear in the *Le Petit Robert* (2012) which suggests that they are no longer in use in modern standard French. Of the remainder, only ‘débarrasser’ appears in *Le Petit Robert* without a mention of being either ‘familier’ [informal], a ‘terme didactique d’histoire’ [a pedagogical term of history], ‘ancien’ [antiquated], ‘vieux’ [old], ‘dialectal’ [dialectal], ‘populaire’ [popular], or ‘littéraire’ [literary].

Furthermore, this selection is indicative of linguistic evolution processes proper to Acadie. For example, the Acadian language is known for having appropriated marine terminology and extended meanings to other (terrestrial) contexts (Massignon 1947: 51). The verb ‘chavirer’, listed above, is a case in point. Derivations of this verb appear in both *La tempête* (as a verb) and *La Nuit des Rois* (as an adjective) to mean respectively someone having lost their mind and something that is madness-inducing. The usage in Maillet’s translations is consistent with the Acadian meaning of the word (Poirier 1995: 106; Cormier 1999: 136), which contrasts with the standard French meaning of a boat capsizing (*Le Petit Robert* 2012: 297). Another example of the transfer of marine terminology to everyday actions is ‘accoster’, which appears twice in *La Nuit des Rois*. *Le Petit Robert* (2012: 14) gives a definition that is consistent with the context of its second occurrence in the play (Shakespeare 1993: 79) – that is, ‘to come alongside’. However, the first occurrence of the word in *La Nuit des Rois*, ‘Accoste, Sire Andrew, accoste’ (1993: 17), comes as Toby Belch

---

⁹ Both Poirier (1995: 230) and Maillet (1971: 146) specify that in Acadie the meaning of ‘garce’ is somewhere between its original meaning of ‘girl’ and its modern meaning as an injurious term.
urges Sir Andrew to draw closer, a literal translation of *Twelfth Night’s* ‘Accost, Sir Andrew, accost’ (I.3.48). In this context, the word can also be taken in the figurative sense in which the Acadians use it, as ‘aboutir’ or to wrap up or conclude (Poirier 1995: 16).

Although not exhaustive, this list illustrates Antonine Maillet’s use of the *parlure acadienne*. Moreover, her language contrasts starkly with contemporaneous translations of the same works, as represented here by Normand Chaurette’s *La tempête* (1998) and *La Nuit des Rois ou Ce que vous voudrez* (2002) and by Michel Garneau’s *La tempête* (1973) and *Le soir des rois* (2000).

Table 2: Comparisons of translations by Maillet, Chaurette, and Garneau

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LT1</td>
<td><em>... attifés de leurs vêtements volés</em> (101)</td>
<td>Ariel revient avec [...] l’attirail de tromperies (74)</td>
<td>parés des vêtements volés (99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT2</td>
<td><em>... je suis assez solide pour bousculer un connétable</em> (67)</td>
<td>je me sens d’attaque pour me battre</td>
<td>avec une police comme ça</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT3</td>
<td>Ah! ne t’accroche point à mes <em>hardes</em> (37)</td>
<td>cesse de t’accrocher à mon manteau! (23)</td>
<td>Cesse de te prendre après moi. (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT4</td>
<td><em>Putains, coquins et maquereaux, tous oisifs</em> (44)</td>
<td>l’oisiveté pour tous</td>
<td>juste des bons à rien et des putains (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT5</td>
<td><em>Le sol est</em> picoté de vert. (39)</td>
<td>j’aperçois un soupçon de vert (26)</td>
<td>Avec un peu de chiendent (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT6</td>
<td>Et Trinculo est <em>tricolant</em>. (102)</td>
<td>lui aussi me semble assez plein pour rouler tout seul (75)</td>
<td>Et moi foi, Trinculo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT7</td>
<td>Je troquerai mille <em>toises</em> de mer contre</td>
<td>un acre</td>
<td>de terre ferme (14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NR1</td>
<td><em>Accoste, messire Andrew, accoste!</em> (17)</td>
<td>tu vois que je le suis aussi! (7)</td>
<td>Vous pouvez, Sir Andrew, vous pouvez. (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
... cet homme est sûrement chaviré ... je suis chavirée (85)

... vous êtes en effet chaviré (112)

Débarasse les lieux. (105)

C’est une garce, une pure sang, et elle m’adore. (52)

Certains naissent grands ... et à d’autres enfin les grandeurs sont garrochées. (134)

ma maîtresse ne m’a point envoyé vous quérir pour vous conduire auprès d’elle (105)

In some of these cases, differences between translations are the result of decisions on the part of the translator or the theatre’s production team to abridge or otherwise modify the play’s content. Examples NR1, NR3, and NR4 are indicative of this. Nevertheless, lexical decisions on the part of any of the three translators result from deliberate thought processes and an intention to convey a particular interpretation of Shakespeare’s original text.

Apart from vocabulary, locutions, idioms, and figures of speech, those ‘maîtres de dire’ [ways of saying] (A. Maillet 1971: 169) that are proper to Acadie, also inconspicuously work their way into Maillet’s translations of Shakespeare’s The Tempest and Twelfth Night. For example, grammatical anomalies that characterise the Acadian language, which Pascal Poirier attributes to a reliance on the oral tradition and to ancestors’ ignorance of French grammar and its disconcerting rules (1995: 240-41), also surface in Maillet’s translations. For example, Poirier explains that until the sixteenth century the adjective ‘grand’ remained

---

10 The word 'chavire' also appears in Maillet's La tempête in the context of 'J’entends leur sifflement qui me chavire' (53), which both Garneau (37) and Chaurette (48) more or less ignore.
invariable before a noun (ibid.: 241), which would account for the occurrence of ‘grand-voile’ in *La tempête* (Shakespeare 1997: 12) in spite of the fact that ‘voile’ is a feminine noun that today would call for an ‘e’ at the end of ‘grand’.

Moveover, Geneviève Massignon discusses the multiple irregularities of Acadian verbs, noting, among others, the common use of the ‘imparfait du subjonctif’ [imperfect subjunctive] verb tense in spoken language (1947: 49). This verb tense appears several times in Maillet’s *La Nuit des Rois*: ‘que vous le “voulussiez” ou non’ (1993: 30), ‘fussiez-vous reine’ (ibid.: 34), ‘que nous eussions pu’ (ibid. 41), and ‘que vous fussiez’ (ibid. 77). Finally, by being more adept at visualising than conceptualising, the Acadian people inscribed much imagery in their language, which explains ‘pourquoi nous trouvons encore aujourd’hui chez l’Acadien bien des images ou manières de dire qui lui sont venues du XVIe siècle, comme bien d’autres qu’il a lui-même fabriquées en cours de route pendant trois siècles d’isolement’ [why Acadians today still use several images or ways of saying that come from the sixteenth century, as well as many others that they created along the way over the course of three centuries of isolation] (1971: 169). To this effect, Maillet’s description of land as being ‘picoté de vert’ [pock marked with green] in *La tempête* (1997: 39) flows directly out of Acadian linguistic processes to enhance the visual aspect of language.

The Acadian language is full of locutions, proverbs, and sayings for this same reason. According to Antonine Maillet, locutions in the *parlure acadienne* come from the people’s need, ‘parce qu’il est entier et sans nuance – de renforcer les mots forts, d’augmenter les augmentatifs, de diminuer les diminutifs et de répéter les superlatifs’ [because it is uncompromising and without nuance – forceful words, to augment the augmenters, to reduce the reducers, and to repeat superlatives] (1971: 155). This propensity surfaces in Maillet’s two translations of Shakespeare analysed in this study. For instance, ‘m’est avis que’ [it would seem that] (Poirier 1995: 457), which Maillet locates in Rabelais’s works (1971: 158), appears three times in her *La tempête* (1997: 12, 40, 41) and once in *La Nuit des Rois* (1993: 15). The locution ‘mettons que’ [suppose that], included in Pascal Poirier’s *Le glossaire acadien* (1995: 474), appears in Maillet’s *La Nuit des Rois* (1993: 22) instead of the standard ‘supposons que’. At least four Acadian proverbs and sayings also appear in Maillet’s translation of *Twelfth Night*. The idiomatic expression ‘À saut de chèvre’ [like goats

---

11 The invariable form of ‘grand’ also appears before an adjective, ‘ouverte’ (Shakespeare 1997: 13).
jumping], which also appears in the Acadian oral tradition (A. Maillet 1971: 163), finds its parallel in La Nuit des Rois as ‘Faire sauter le mouton’ [To make the sheep jump] (1993: 20). In addition, the proverbs ‘L’habit de fait pas le moine’ [The dress does not make the monk] (A. Maillet 1971: 162), ‘On ne sait de quel bois il se chauffe’ [We do not know with what wood he wams himself] (ibid. 166), and ‘... la main au feu... le coup à couper’ [hand in the fire... neck in the noose] (1993: 18, 165) appear almost verbatim in Maillet’s French version of La Nuit des Rois (1993: 26, 97, and 113 respectively).

In the translations of the same works by Normand Chaurette and Michel Garneau, the phrasing is significantly less representative of elements that characterise Maillet’s language – imagery, metaphors, and figures of speech. For Maillet’s ‘mettons que’, for example, Chaurette renders in the standard French ‘à supposer que’ [suppose that] (2002: 12) while Garneau avoids rendering it altogether. Moreover, Maillet’s proverb ‘L’habit ne fait pas le moine’ is a translation of Shakespeare’s Latin phrase ‘cucullus non facit monachum’ [the cowl does not make the monk] in Twelfth Night (I.5.53). Neither Garneau nor Chaurette offer an equivalent proverb, the former merely glossing over the dialogue in an effort to abridge the text (2000: 12-3) and the latter keeping some Latin and linguistic playfulness by rendering as ‘Vous êtes confuse. Errare humaine es! L’erreur est un hymen! Et la vôtre est inhumaine’ [You are confused. Errare es human! Error is a hymen! And yours is inhuman] (2002: 14). Furthermore, the Québécois translators maintain little linguistic faithfulness to Shakespeare’s source text in their versions of Twelfth Night’s ‘By this hand, I am’ (IV.2.115), which Garneau renders as ‘tu porteras ma missive à Olivia’ [bring my missive to Olivia] (2000: 79) and Chaurette as ‘tu dois me croire’ [you must believe me] (2002: 71). Again, Maillet’s is the most literal with ‘Ma main au feu que je le suis’ [my hand in the fire that I am] (1993: 113), finding a suitable translation for Shakespeare’s English in Rabelais’s French, thus summoning four centuries of Acadian identity through language.

2.3 Echoes of Acadian folklore in La tempête and La Nuit des Rois

In addition to vocabulary and proverbs that intimate a sense of Acadian identity, Maillet’s translations of Shakespeare include literary processes and allusions that have a direct link with the Acadian oral tradition. While many of these are symptomatic of Maillet’s efforts to remain as close to Shakespeare’s English version as possible, they also create a network of allusions in which anyone with an intimate knowledge of the Acadian oral
tradition and cultural heritage can find ground. In *Rabelais et les traditions populaires en Acadie*, Antonine Maillet gives examples of figures of speech that characterise the Acadian language, including tongue-twisters, puns, repetitions, euphemisms, similes, and truisms (1971: 179-82). Maillet exhibits a propensity for such linguistic sleights of hand in her translations of Shakespeare, including expressions such as ‘Si l’on doit être une proie, mieux vaut cent fois tomber sous la dent du lion que du loup!’ [If one must be preyed upon, it is a hundred times better to come under the tooth of the lion than the wolf!] (1993: 77), ‘des eaux qui vont noyer le poisson’ [waters that would drown a fish] (1993: 52), and ‘Qui est bien pendu en ce monde ne doit craindre aucune couleur’ [He who is well hanged in this world must fear no colour] (1993: 23). There are, in addition, multiple allusions to Acadian folklore, most prominent among them being Maillet’s translation of the Fool’s song lyric ‘Hey, Robin, jolly Robin’ in *Twelfth Night* (IV. 2. 77) as ‘Alouette, gentille alouette’ (Shakespeare 1993: 111). She substitutes a lark for Shakespeare’s robin, thereby including in her translation a popular traditional French-Canadian song, *Alouette* (d’Entremont 2012: 177). Although the song is French Canadian (not solely Acadian), Maillet does include it three times in *Pélagie-la-Charrette* (1979: 43, 221, 267), and neither Garneau (2000: 77) nor Chaurette (2002: 70) use it in their translations.

Surnames and nicknames are also an integral part of the fabric of Acadian folklore as a means of differentiating individuals in a population with few surnames and frequently recycled first names (d’Entremont 2012: 180). Maillet’s novels and plays, including *Pélagie-la-Charrette* and *Don l’Orignal*, are full of these, including, in Stratford’s translation, ‘Pélagie-the-Cart’ (2004a: 88) and ‘Pélagie-the-Grouch’ (ibid.), and in Godard’s, Don ‘Gros-Ventre’ [Don Pot Belly] (2004b: 15). Maillet alludes to this tradition in *La Nuit des Rois* when Toby Belch cheekily refers to Andrew Aguecheek as ‘Andrew Aigreface’ [Andrew Sourface] (1993: 17). Normand Chaurette uses a similar strategy in calling him, in this same passage, ‘signore Agakek’ (2002: 7), whereas Michel Garneau domesticates the name to ‘Sire André Jouesdefièvre’ [Fevercheecks] throughout the play. The result in Maillet’s translation is therefore more reminiscent of the tradition of the ‘heroic noun phrase – traditional epithets – [that] mnemonically recruits the audience to the preservation of the tale’, especially in *Pélagie-la-Charrette* (Giltrow and Stouck 2002: para. 21).

Furthermore, references to Acadian legends in a line such as ‘fis flamber le feu follet’ [set aflame the will-o’-the-wisp] (Shakespeare 1997: 23, my emphasis) or to cultural
traditions ‘la peste de ses harengs fumés’ [strong smell of smoked herring] (Shakespeare 1993: 28, my emphasis) further reinforce the sense of a sustained effort to weave in expressions of Acadian identity. The first of these examples allows Maillet to recreate the assonance in a line from Shakespeare’s The Tempest, ‘I flamed amazement’ (I. 2. 234), and the second is a domesticated equivalent to Twelfth Night’s ‘a plague of pickle herring!’ (1. 5. 119-20), yet both are firmly grounded in the Acadian collective consciousness (d’Entremont 2012: 166 and 175 respectively). Besides, none of the references to Acadian folklore finds its match in either of Chaurette’s or Garneau’s translations.

Finally, and perhaps most poignantly, is Prospero’s story to Miranda of their hurried, involuntary departure from Milan in Maillet’s translation of La tempête as compared to Chaurette’s and Garneau’s, and indeed to the source text (see Appendix B for unabridged excerpts). The passage reads as follows in Shakespeare’s The Tempest:

\begin{quote}
**Prospero**

The gates of Milan, and i’ th’ dead of darkness
The ministers for th’ purpose hurried thence
Me and thy crying self.

(I. 2. 154-156)
\end{quote}

With its allusions to the confiscation (‘extirpate’) and handover (‘confer on’) of land (‘dukedom’), this passage lends itself well to an interpretation that resonates with historical facts of the Expulsion. Under orders from British Governor Charles Lawrence at Halifax, Lieutenant-Colonel John Winslow read on 5 September 1755 a proclamation at the church of Saint-Charles-des-Mines in Grand-Pré, Nova Scotia advising the Acadians that ‘It is Preremptorily [sic] his Majesty’s orders That the French Inhabitants of these Districts, be removed’, and allowing them ‘Liberty to Carry of your money and Household Goods as Many as you Can without Discomemoading [sic] the Vessels you Go in’ (1883: 95). Maillet takes advantage of the uncanniness between historical fact and a fictional narrative that was written 150 years prior, adding in her translation the image of a ship through the use of the verb ‘embarquer’ [to board, embark]:

\begin{quote}
PROSPERO

The gates of Milan, and i’ th’ dead of darkness
The ministers for th’ purpose hurried thence
Me and thy crying self.

(I. 2. 154-156)
\end{quote}
Indeed, her ‘Les mandataires de notre destruction | Nous ont *embarqué* moi et toi en pleurs’ [The agents of our destruction | Made us *embark*, me and you, crying] (Shakespeare 1997: 20, my emphasis) aligns perfectly with accounts and images of the Expulsion, particularly those related to the events at Grand-Pré. Winslow himself reports that the ‘Embarkeation *sic* of the Inhabitants Goes on Slowly’ (1883: 127), and in his letters he consistently refers to Acadians being ‘shipt off’ (ibid.: 133, 134, 139). Bona Arsenault, too, dedicates one chapter to the ‘embarquements’ [embarkations] at various locations during the Deportation (2004: 201-10).

The image of embarking does not appear in the source text (according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the verb ‘to hurry’ does have connotations of transportation, but none that relates to the sea). Neither does it appear in Garneau’s translation of *The Tempest*:

*Prospero*  
Voilà comment, dans la noirceur profonde,  
Les mandataires de notre destruction  
Nous en embarqués moi et toi en pleurs.  

(Shakespeare 1997: 20)

Nor in Chaurette’s:

*Prospero*  
Au plus noir de la nuit ils nous enlèvent  
tu pleurais ma pauvre petite fille  
et moi aussi  
nous enlèvent cette bande de visages à deux faces  
nous entraînent en dehors de ma ville  

(Shakespeare 1973: 9)

Furthermore, the next line, in Miranda’s emotional response to Prospero, Maillet writes ‘De mes pleurs d’alors, je pleure aujourd’hui | Sur un récit qui me fait fondre en larmes’
which further reinforces the allusion as it encapsulates the poignancy of the Expulsion in the Acadian psyche. Again, Chauvette’s and Garneau’s translations differ considerably from Maillet’s: they both close in on the personal (‘*notre histoire*’ [*our* history] (1973: 9, my emphasis), ‘*en vous écoutant*’ [listening to you] (1998: 10, my emphasis)), in contrast to Maillet’s evocation of the collective consciousness in ‘*un récit*’ [*a story*] (my emphasis).

### 2.4 Postcolonialism and intralingual travelling

According to Sherry Simon, a work that inherently highlights a translation poetics, rather than being anchored in the local, ‘par son vocabulaire disparate, sa syntaxe inhabituelle, par un dénouement “déterritorialisant,” mais plus souvent par une circulation intense de références culturelles hétéroclites, [...] se distancie du langage *heimlich* et chaudement sécurisant du terreau communautaire’ [distances itself from the *heimlich*, highly reassuring language of the local community] (1994: 20). While Simon speaks here of poetics created through the inclusion of multiple languages in a literary work (ibid.: 19), her argument applies equally to Antonine Maillet’s translations of Shakespeare, where the interspersing of the *parlure acadienne* and standard French arguably creates a multilingual work that engages a Québécois audience while speaking to an Acadian one. Furthermore, linguistic strangeness is a means by which

\[
\text{de s’insurger en un geste de rupture avec la “nature” et d’arrachement de la langue à toutes les illusions “communautaires,” de servir d’arme contre tout “dispositif de l’enracinement,” contre toute écriture qui revendique le naturalisme de l’appartenance, des valeurs du sang et de la terre. (Simon 1994: 27)}
\]

[to rebel, in one swift motion to rupture with ‘nature’ and snatch from language all its illusions of ‘community’, to serve as a weapon against ‘mechanisms of integration’, against any writing that claims the naturalism of belonging, the values of blood and land.]

It is clear, from this perspective, what Chantal Gagnon meant when she proposed that Maillet’s translations and adaptations of the greatest writers of the French and British
literary canons is not only an act of mediation, but also ‘une sorte de revanche sur le sort pas toujours facile, un brin compliqué, du peuple Acadien’ [a sort of revenge on the not-always-easy, slightly complicated fate of the Acadian people] (2005: 12). Gagnon’s comment implies that Maillet exacts her revenge through translation. In other words, translation, and specifically the use of the *parlure acadienne* in translation, intended for a Québécois audience, is the means by which the slightly complicated fate of the Acadian people can be re-affirmed, superseding anxieties about language or identity. As it continuously refers to the rich folkloric and cultural expression held within the language, the *parlure acadienne* exemplifies Michael Cronin’s understanding of the role of translation in culture as ‘a mode of creative evolution that allows a culture to preserve what is valuable, while leaving itself open to the creative intervention of change’ (1996: 168). Maillet uses language to preserve what is valuable, while language was, paradoxically, the only ‘valuable’ the Acadians were able to bring with them during the Expulsion of 1755: ‘we couldn’t take our tin mugs and our silver spoons with us. We could only carry the essentials – and the essential was a memory in words’ (Maillet 1987: 14).

Five productions of *La tempête* in the 10 years between 1988 and 1998 (David 1998: 120) suggests particular interest in this play. This is symptomatic of manifest interest in Shakespeare on the Québécois stage to be sure, as a total of twelve of his plays were translated and performed in French during this time (ibid.: 130-38). Yet, David’s *Théâtrographie* reveals that *La tempête* is the most frequently translated of these twelve plays with five productions, followed by *Macbeth* with four, and *Songe d’une nuit d’été, Comme il vous plaira*, and *Coriolanus* with two each. Another explanation for such attraction to *The Tempest* in the Québécois theatre may lie in the play’s historicity and colonial topos, as outlined in Eric Cheyfitz’s *The Poetics of Imperialism*. This assumption resounds particularly strongly from the perspective of both Québécois and Acadian affirmations of cultural identity in a postcolonial context. Cheyfitz identifies a translational aspect to the colonising process whereby imperialists transposed their values onto the colonised peoples – that is, imposed European notions of individualism and property that contrasted significantly with the values of kinship-based cultures and economies that conceived of the land as common (1991: 43). For Cheyfitz, this translational process
displaced or attempted to displace [...] Native Americans into the realm of the proper, into that place where the relation between property and identity is inviolable, not so these Americans could possess the proper but so that having been translated into it they could be dispossessed of it [...] and relegated to the territory of the figurative. (1991: 59)

Albeit simplified here, this postcolonial reading of The Tempest is relevant because of the historical context within which expressions of Acadian culture and identity emerged. The Deportation of 1755 is plainly an act of dispossession by the British of the land settled by the Acadians (who had also displaced the indigenous peoples), an act which is eerily similar to the one which Cheyfitz argues is at play in The Tempest (1991: 41-58). And it is in this act that the Acadians are relegated to the territory of the figurative, left quite literally in the possession only of their ‘memory in words’ (Maillet 1987: 14).

Interest in Twelfth Night on the Québec stage was not as strong as in The Tempest, with the play produced every decade or so between 1946 and 1998 (David 1998: 120). It did, however, provide Maillet with the greater canvas on which to exercise her linguistic playfulness as the above analysis of locutions, proverbs, and imagery has shown. One explanation for this interest is the play’s focus on disguise. Dress has long been a figure for translation (Hermans 1985: 115, 120; Cronin 1996: 72, 112-13). Indeed, ‘[i]f translation, like metaphor, carries with it the potential of foreign contamination, it also, if the image of dress is taken into account, has the transgressive possibility of transvestism’ (Cronin 1996: 112). Yet, it may be the notion of travel in Twelfth Night that is the most symbolic in terms of translation, and indeed for Maillet’s migrant status. The play is populated with travelling characters whose characterisation as strangers shifts constantly, Viola being the most obvious example (Lisak 2011: 168). Viola has no trouble understanding or speaking the native language of the country whose shores she graces, even though she is clearly a stranger, asking in her first line ‘What country, friends, is this?’ (1.2.1). Intralingual travel is, according to Michael Cronin in Across the Lines, as fraught with anxieties as its interlingual counterpart. Furthermore, travelling within one’s own language produces situations where the ‘[t]olerance of difference is intimately related to the question of untranslatability’
(Cronin 2000: 13). *Twelfth Night* abounds in cases where linguistic confusion exaggerates misattributed identities, as in the following example:

\begin{verbatim}
Toby Accost, Sir Andrew, accost!
Andrew What’s that?
Toby My niece’s chambermaid.
Andrew Good Mistress Accost, I desire better acquaintance.
Maria My name is Mary, sir.
Andrew Good Mistress Mary Accost.
\end{verbatim}

(Shakespeare [n.d.]: I. 3. 48-54)

And indeed, as discussed previously, Maillet relishes in rendering these in her French translation (Shakespeare 1993: 17), and using puns, highly evocative language, and figures of speech to match Shakespeare’s linguistic verve. Finally, the polyglossic nature of *Twelfth Night* also points, self-referentially, to the translational aspect of the play and, especially, to the polyglossic nature of Maillet’s translation. Maillet responds to Shakespeare’s French and Latin with Spanish and Latin (1993: 44, 74, 80), seamlessly integrating these languages with the translation’s standard French and *parlure acadienne*. Yet, she never calls attention to shifts in language; the show simply goes on and language, translated language, becomes part of the action. In this sense, Maillet exemplifies processes at work in polyglossic settings, particularly those of migrants, where close geographical proximity between language groups complicates the relationship, where ‘[e]xile and diaspora are variants on the ideas of marginality and dissonance implied in the modernist paradigm’ (Cronin and Simon 2014: 122).

Both *The Tempest* and *Twelfth Night*, then, lend themselves particularly well to interpretations that intimate the linguistic anxieties of minority groups in postcolonial or intralingual minority positions. In this light, Maillet’s use of the *parlure acadienne* in her translations of Shakespeare gain in significance in the Canadian literary context. It serves not only as a means of setting herself apart from the dominant Québécois ideological discourse, but also as a strong expression of a cultural identity typically left to the margins. As Cronin observes, ‘[t]he defence of the particular, the promotion of the naturalizing strategy can be derided as the last refuge of the essentialist, but it can be seen equally as
the sine qua non of genuine hybridity’ (2003: 141). In other words, the use of the *parlure acadienne* is both the condition for and manifestation of hybridity in Maillet’s translations. Lise Gauvin, in *La fabrique de la langue*, argues that hybridity is the condition of the Francophone writer, whom she distinguishes as those writing and publishing in Francophone territories outside France:

On peut supposer que l’écrivain francophone ne se contentera pas de mimer/reproduire la hiérarchie à l’origine du clivage social entre les idiomes mais que sa *surconscience* linguistique l’incitera à concevoir diverses figures de l’hybridité, quitte à retrouver par là des pactes plus anciens. (2004: 296)

[We may speculate that the Francophone writer will not be content with imitating/reproducing the hierarchy responsible for the social rift between idioms but that their linguistic overawareness will help form various figures of hybridity, at the risk of finding older associations there.]

The linguistic hybridity inherent to Maillet’s *La Nuit des Rois* and *La tempête*, then, could result from Maillet’s ‘surconscience linguistique’, which Gauvin defines as an awareness of language as a site of reflection (ibid.: 256), especially given Maillet’s understanding of the role of the *parlure acadienne* as both signifier and signified, as she outlined in *Rabelais et les traditions populaires en Acadie*.

**Conclusion**

Acadie has been connected to, and both the object and subject of, translation throughout its history, from communication with the indigenous Mi’kmaq for survival and friendship, to governance and conquest by the British, to the appropriation of American-born Evangeline as a cultural icon (Delisle 1987). The toponym ‘Acadie’ is also the result of translational processes. Exploring the eastern seaboard of North America in 1523-1524, Giovanni Verrazano wrote to King François I of France, of the territory ‘que nous nommâmes Arcadie en raison de la beauté de ses arbres’ [that we named *Arcadie* because
of the beauty of its trees] (Arsenault 2004: 18). Verrazano translated the Arcadia of ancient Greece into ‘Arcadie’, although there were several variant spellings (Arcadia, Larcadia, Accadie, pays de Cadie) before ‘Acadie’ became the norm (Arsenault 2004: 17-19). Alternatively, ‘Acadie’ may be a translation of either the Mi’kmaq word ‘Agatig’ (encampment) or the Maliceet word ‘Quoddy’ (fertile land) (Arsenault 2004: 17). Regardless of its origins, it was born out of a translational process similar to Eric Cheyfitz’s interpretation of the naming of ‘Caliban’ in The Tempest, a translation of a Spanish term that is in turn a translation of a Native American word (1991: 43). For Cheyfitz, the process of translation initiated by Christopher Columbus was perpetuated through colonial domination and stripped the native term of its original signification in a process of dispossession that mirrors the colonisation of the New World (ibid.: 61). In Acadie, the British conquest of French territory further compounds the translational processes and dispossession that Cheyfitz mentions. Indeed, the proclamation made at Grand-Pré, Nova Scotia in September 1755 by Lieutenant-Colonel John Winslow, translated into French for the Acadian population by the Swiss translator Isaac Deschamps (Delisle 1987: 55), conceives of the Expulsion as an act of dispossession of those ‘person[s] of the French Denomination’ of their land and belongings:

Horne Cattle, Sheep, goats, Hoggs and Poultry of Every Kinde. that was this Day Soposed to be Vested in the French Inhabitants of this Province are become Forfitted to his Majesty whose Property they now are (Winslow 1883: 95, my emphasis)

The act of translating, to use Cheyfitz’s terminology, the Acadian people into property not only shifted the cultural relations of the toponym, but also triggered Acadians’ anxieties in relation to their own linguistic identity, thus La Sagouine’s Joe Graphy. The cultural capital of the Acadian people would henceforth reside in the oral tradition – that is, in the ‘only legacy to survive the calamity of 1755: memory’ (Maillet 2001: 32).

For Antonine Maillet, the use of the parlure acadienne, the ‘memory in words’ (Maillet 1987: 14) or verbal incarnation of Acadians’ cultural capital, provides a means by which to set roots and reclaim property:
If, in its modern sense, myth symbolically projects a people’s collective values and attempts to articulate its reality, Maillet’s reliance on the rich legendary traditions of Acadia and her revival of ancient folk traditions attest to her imaginative propensity to mythically transcend historical reality and to strike roots in the rich humus of a pre-industrial consciousness made of “bribes d’images restées dans toutes les mémoires [from Pélagie-la-Charrette]” (Aresu 1986: 234)

If “[l]ittle history” isn’t written in millennia like the other kind, [if] it’s passed on by word of mouth, day by day’ (A. Maillet 2001: 38), it stands to reason that the expression of the cultural identity of the ‘littératures de l’exigüité’ [small literatures], as François Paré calls them (2001), or ‘de l’intranquilité’ [untranquil literatures] in Lise Gauvin’s words (2004: 259), should follow suit. ‘[B]ecause there is always loss and gain in moving between languages and between cultural discourses, because a translator cannot capture everything, [...] because there are limits on the practicable information load of the target text’ (Tymoczko 1999: 55), translators’ decisions create space for marginalised or minority literatures to surface in spite of different target-culture norms in the Anglo-Canadian and Québécois polysystems and sociocultural spheres.

Acadian identity, as expressed through hybridity, straddling the realms of the universal and the specific, infiltrates the four translations analysed above to articulate the vibrancy and resourcefulness of a cultural minority. Maillet enacts a line from the narrator of Pélagie-la-Charrette and writes ‘en langue du pays’ (1979: 284) and this language finds its way into Anglo-Canadian and Québécois literary systems. In Philip Stratford’s Pélagie-la-Charrette and Barbara Godard’s The Tale of Don l’Orignal, Acadian identity surfaces through puns, intertextuality, misnomers, neologisms, metaphors, imagery, parodies, hyperboles, and malapropisms, tools that the ventriloquist- or smuggler-translator borrows from the author of the source text, Antonine Maillet. In Maillet’s Shakespearean translations, La tempête and La Nuit des Rois, similar verbal processes, as well as a reliance on the archaic language of the Acadian vernacular, create a distinctively Acadian narrative that contrasts starkly with contemporaneous translations out of Québec.
Because Acadie has been virtually left out of Canadian translational discourse and practice, save for a handful of critics and scholars and five translators, much more research is needed to assess the implications of the translational comings and goings in and out of Acadie. Namely, it would be useful to look at the reception in Québec of Antonine Maillet’s translations into French, to consider the Acadianness of *La tempête* and *La Nuit des Rois* in the greater context of Maillet’s translation practice, and to explore in greater detail where Acadian identity surfaces in the translations to posit whether Maillet is favouring certain characters or types of narratives over others, and what such favouritism implies. In the Anglo-Canadian context, there are opportunities for comprehensive analysis of the body of translated Acadian literature and to explore the representation of Acadian identity from the perspective of postcolonial and minority translation theories. This dissertation opened the door of enquiry into expressions of cultural identity within the doubly-minoritised context of Acadian literature in Canada.

Nevertheless, a first step of inquiry into such research is the investigation of Acadian identity as expressed in *Pélagie: The Return to Acadie, The Tale of Don l’Orignal, La tempête,* and *La Nuit des Rois* through textual and linguistic hybridity – that is through the dual function of the *parlure acadienne* as language and ideology and its partial transposition in translation. Although the ‘camouflage is not complete in any of the Maillet translations [...] since translators have opted to keep the idiosyncratic French names of the characters’ (Godard 1987: 96), Acadian identity crops up in these works in the particularities that lie beyond the texts’ surface, beyond the folksy packaging. After all, *l’habit ne fait pas le moine.*
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Appendix A – Acadian vocabulary and proverbs in Maillet’s translations of *La Nuit des Rois* and *La tempête*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abordé</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>aborder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accoste</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>accoster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accroire (faire)</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>accroires</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adonne-toi (à des habitudes singulières)</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>adonner (s’)</td>
<td>coincider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amarrer (s’, au tronc d’un mat)</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>amarrer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attifés</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>attifailles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aune</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>aulne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bailli</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>baillir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bouge</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>11, 28</td>
<td>bouger (partir)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bougresse</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>59, 90</td>
<td>bougresse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>braillard</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>12, 13</td>
<td>brailleux</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brin</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>brin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c’ (c’en sera)</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>15, 107</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chamaillerie</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>chamaillé</td>
<td>chamaillé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaviré</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>85, 112</td>
<td>chaviré</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chavire</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>s’est chaviré</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clopant</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td>cloper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connétable</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>connestable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corde (à la)</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coutume (c’est)</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>a de coutume</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de même</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>continuez de même</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>débarasse (les lieux)</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>débarasser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>débauché</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>débaucher</td>
<td>partir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emplie (température empie de clémence)</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>27, 39</td>
<td>emplir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>être toute pleine</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>17???</td>
<td>à plein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>éventer / s'</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>91, 105</td>
<td>éventer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faire sauter le mouton</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>À saut de chèvre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faîte (d’un clocher)</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>faît</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faîte (du mat)</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>faït</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faraud, adj.</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>faraud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fauchers</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>fauchable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fendre (se) par le milieu (la mer)</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>fendre (du bois)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flamber le feu follet</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>flamber (sens figuré)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fouler (le limon des fonds salés)</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>fouler</td>
<td>fouler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fourbisseuse</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>fourbe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garce</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>garce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garrochées</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>garocher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaspiller</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>gaspiller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grand-voile (aussi, grand ouverte LT13)</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(deux genres devant substantif)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guette</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>guetter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>habit (l’) ne fait pas le moine</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>L’habit ne fait pas le moine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hardes</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>hardes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houle</td>
<td>NR / LT</td>
<td>129 / 12, 42</td>
<td>houle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jarretières</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j’monterai ton cheval comme je te montre toi-même</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Montez sur vos grands chevaux</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m’est avis que</td>
<td>LT / NR</td>
<td>12,40,41 / 15</td>
<td>M’est avis que</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>main au feu</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>mettre sa main au feu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maquereaux</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>maquereau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marmonner</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>marmouner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marmouset</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>marmousin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mettons que</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>mettons que</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mouiller</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>mouiller (sens figuré)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passé midi</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>passé (une heure)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>picoté (de vert)</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>picoté</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pisse</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>pisse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>point</td>
<td>NR / LT</td>
<td>17 / 56, 66</td>
<td>point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poitrail</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>poitral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pompe</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>pomper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quérir (aller...du bois)</td>
<td>LT, NR</td>
<td>30, 105</td>
<td>quérir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ravaudeur</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>ravauder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sache de quel bois je me chauffe</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Sache de quel bois il se chauffe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se pavaner de toutes plumes dressées</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>plumer comme un canard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>si</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>several</td>
<td>si (avec contradiction)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somme</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>somme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sot, n.</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>sot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suroît</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>suroi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toises (mille toises de mer contre un acre)</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>toise (de bardeau)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tricolant</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>tricoler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B – Excerpts from *The Tempest* in Shakespeare’s English and three French translations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>William Shakespeare</th>
<th>Antonine Maillet’s translation</th>
<th>Michel Garneau’s translation</th>
<th>Normand Chaurette’s translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROSPERO</strong></td>
<td><em>Now the condition.</em></td>
<td><strong>PROSPÉRO</strong> le duc de napolés mon grand ennemi</td>
<td><strong>PROSPÉRO</strong> Le compromis! Le compromis :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This King of Naples, being an enemy</td>
<td><em>Et maintenant, le résultat du pacte.</em></td>
<td>tout content des promesses de mon frère</td>
<td>Que ce roi de Naples, Mon pire ennemi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To me inveterate, hearkens my brother’s suit,</td>
<td><em>Le roi de Naples, ennemi invétéré, Prête une oreille attentive à mon frère</em></td>
<td>décide de notre bannisement</td>
<td>Accède aux volontés de mon frère</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which was that he, in lieu o’ th’ premises</td>
<td><em>Qui propose, en retour de son hommage</em></td>
<td>belle armée d’hypocrites et de trâtres</td>
<td>Moyennant quoi? Qu’importe!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of homage and I know not how much tribute,</td>
<td><em>Et je ne sais quel tribut en or,</em></td>
<td>un soir aux alentours de la minuit</td>
<td>De nous extirper aussitôt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should presently extirpate me and mine</td>
<td><em>De me destituer, moi et mon enfant,</em></td>
<td>ils ouvrent les portes de ma ville</td>
<td>Moi et les miens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of the dukedom, and confer fair Milan,</td>
<td><em>De mon duché, et conférer Milan,</em></td>
<td>au plus noir de la nuit ils nous enlèrent tu pleurais ma pauvre petite fille et moi aussi</td>
<td>De la cité de Milan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With all the honors, on my brother, whereon,</td>
<td><em>Avec tous ses pouvoirs et privilèges, À mon frère. Ainsi au creux de la nuit</em></td>
<td>nous enlèvent cette bande de visages à deux faces</td>
<td>Afin que celle-ci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A treacherous army levied, one midnight</td>
<td><em>Destinée à cette fin, l’armée traitresse D’Antonio dans Milan s’introduisit ;</em></td>
<td>nous entraînent en dehors de ma ville</td>
<td>Et tous ses honneurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fated to th’ purpose did Antonio open the gates of Milan, and i’ th’ dead of darkness</td>
<td><em>Voilà comment, dans la noirceur profonde,</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deviennent l’unique possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ministers for th’ purpose hurried thence</td>
<td><em>Les mandataires de notre destruction Nous en embarqués moi et toi en pleurs.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>De mon frère.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me and thy crying self.</td>
<td><strong>MIRANDA</strong> Pitié sur moi! Comme je ne me souviens De mes pleurs d’alors, je pleure aujourd’hui</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sur quoi une armée puissante Fut convoquée de nuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sur un récit qui me fait fondre en larmes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Et, sous l’ordre d’Antonio bundle de former les portes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Que défonça les portes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>De la ville, brutalement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Violentée dans les ténèbres,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On m’entraîna hors les murs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIRANDA</strong> Alack, for pity!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avec toi et le cri de tes pleurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, not rememb’ring how I cried out then,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will cry it o’ver again. It is a hint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That wrings mine eyes to ‘t.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1973: 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(1.2.144-160)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1997: 20)