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Abstract

Described as the ‘berceau de la traduction’ in Canada (Gallant 1985), Acadie no longer has legal boundaries but lives on in the language and culture of a Francophone community located primarily in Atlantic Canada. Doubly minoritised in contrast to Anglophone-Canadian and Québécois-Francophone majorities, Acadie experiences translation broadly and in ways that have yet to be thoroughly researched. This thesis investigates the particularities of translation in Acadie, producing Franco-Canadian case studies within the larger frameworks of English-to-French translation in Canada and of minority translation. To accomplish this, it begins by identifying translationality from societal, geographical, and cultural perspectives in three defining periods of Acadian history: sociopolitical neutrality (1713–1755), the Grand Dérangement (1755–1763), and the renaissance (1860s-1880s). It then goes on to analyse literary translation practice in Acadie des Maritimes by considering shifts between translations by Rose Després, Sophie M. Lavoie, Georgette LeBlanc, Antonine Maillet, Sonya Malaborza, and Serge Patrice Thibodeau and their respective source texts. Lastly, the study turns to geocritical, linguistic, and publishing perspectives to outline translational forces within the Acadian diaspora, namely in Québec and Louisiana. Together, these analyses tease out the particularities of translation in Acadie, the results of which are grouped according to, and correlated with, four aspects central to the Acadian imaginary. The ‘aboiteaux’ provide an apt metaphor for the paradoxically porous nature of walls and of regenerative possibilities held within the landscape; ‘défrichetage de parenté’ highlights dual storyteller and genealogist dynamics that enact a search for and an invention of ancestors in an Acadie emptied of its Francophone inhabitants; ‘grands dérangements’ harness mobility to illustrate the Deportation in translation, linguistic disruptions, and geopoetic transpositions; and the ‘mascaret’ facilitates moving through the Acadian diaspora from a decidedly maritime perspective that fosters flow and cyclicality. Ultimately, the study yields a vocabulary of Acadian translation that materialises in an ‘épreuve de la marge’ (Lord 2002). This contributes to establishing translation in Acadian studies, to challenging rigid bridges and monoliths in Canadian translation theory, to engaging minor perspectives in translation studies, and to addressing pressing environmental questions.
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Introduction

‘A little art’, Helen Lowe-Porter called it. The writing of translations: this little art. I accept her little for as long as I can oppose it to trivial, to minor, to young. To the extent that I can hear it — that I can make it — speak of an art of attending to all the small differences.

— Kate Briggs, *This Little Art*

‘Corver ou point corver’, that is the question that, according to Antonine Maillet, Acadie understands intuitively because ‘[t]out ce que nous racontent les livres, nous l’avons connu et vécu chez nous’ (1976: 82). The seeming simplicity of this translation of Hamlet’s oft-quoted line, which comes up again in Maillet’s literary creations (Maillet 1977: 110, 1991: 17), belies complex translational dynamics. The line’s metathesis — the inversion of the vowel and ‘r’ sounds from the French verb ‘crever’ to Maillet’s ‘corver’ — is characteristic of speech in Acadie¹ (Wrenn 1985). Colonised by the French² in the early seventeenth century, Acadie developed as a distinct colony relatively ignored by French and English³ imperial powers vying for the territory in the seventeenth and first half of the eighteenth centuries before being fractured by colonial violence in 1755. It has since reawakened as a vibrant linguistic and cultural minority for thousands of Francophones in Canada’s Maritime provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island and across a vast diaspora. The metathesis within Maillet’s short translation, then, swiftly brings into the semantic fold of Hamlet’s speech the historical and cultural contexts of Acadie. From this perspective, the translation not only spans centuries (from Shakespeare’s seventeenth to Maillet’s twentieth) and linguistic environments (from English to French to Acadian French), but also implicitly questions the unlikeliness of Acadie’s cultural-linguistic survival, let alone flourishing given its historical vicissitudes.

¹ The use of the French ‘Acadie’ rather than ‘Acadia’ throughout this thesis is meant to situate the analysis within its Francophone context. It conveys, moreover, a contemporary view of Acadie that contrasts with the ‘Acadia’ of the past (corresponding to ‘Acadie des origines’) that has largely been portrayed to Anglophone readerships by translators (Elder 2005: 210–11; see, for example, Brisset 1996; Daigle 1995; Grady 2006) and historians (Griffiths 1992, 2005; Plank 2001).

² Throughout this thesis, the term ‘French’ refers either to the language or to France’s imperial administration and projects. Care is taken to differentiate between Francophone communities (e.g. Acadie, Québec, etc.) as needed, or to use ‘Francophone’ or ‘French-speakers’ for more general references.

³ Following Geoffrey Plank (2001: 8) and John Mack Faragher (2005), the term ‘English’ is used to refer to England’s imperial administration and activity prior to 1707 and the Treaty of Union. After this date, ‘British’ is used ‘to refer to persons who spoke English as their first language, regardless of their place of birth’ (Plank 2001: 8), to facilitate differentiation between imperial administration and language.
Expanding on this four-word translation, this thesis is founded on the premise that the richness of meaning captured in the compact and seemingly simple translation of the opening line of Hamlet’s soliloquy points towards multilayered, peculiar, and dynamic translation potential in Acadie. After all, Acadie has been described as the birthplace of translation in what is now known as Canada (Delisle 1987: 54; Gallant 1985). However, as the following pages will illustrate, Acadie’s contribution to translation theory or practice has yet to be comprehensively outlined. Thus, this thesis seeks to fill the gap by identifying ways in which Acadie articulates translation, ultimately producing Franco-Canadian case studies within the larger frameworks of English-to-French translation in Canada and minority translation globally. More specifically, the thesis identifies particularities of Acadian translation and begins to formulate a vocabulary for theorising it on and in its own terms. It challenges monolithic experiences of translation in Francophone Canada underpinned by the discourse of official bilingualism, as well as the ‘fiction’ of dual, imperial translation directions grounded in the homogenising categories of ‘French’ and ‘English’ (Lane-Mercier 2018; Des Rochers 2023).

Translation discourse in Canada has thus far generally been framed around two language categories, English and French, with little space for nuances, accents, or minority languages (Des Rochers 2023). Gillian Lane-Mercier observes, for example, that ‘la traduction littéraire [au Canada] est censée permettre une meilleure connaissance de cet “autre” culturel qu’est, selon le cas, l’anglophone ou le francophone’ (Lane-Mercier 2014: 519, emphasis added). The singulars here suggest one Other: one Francophone experience and one Anglophone experience. Noting specifically the lack of Indigenous languages within institutions, Lane-Mercier warns against blindly accepting translation as a peaceful and

---

4 For the purposes of this thesis, ‘Franco-Canadian’ refers to Francophone communities or populations outside of Québec; ‘French-Canadian’ to elements of French-speaking Canada for the century or so following Canadian Confederation in 1867; and ‘Francophone Canada’ to Francophone communities and populations across the country.


6 ‘La conception à priori pacifique et paritaire des processus de traduction au Canada doit être contestée en raison des angles morts [au sens de ce qui est caché au champ perceptif qu’elle contient’ (2014: 524). The Canada Council for the Arts, the main granting body for literary translation projects since 1972, is open to literary translation projects into or from the more than 70 Indigenous languages and various sign languages spoken or written across Canada (Canada Council for the Arts [n.d.-b]; see also Lane-Mercier 2018). However, it still does not accept the range of other languages spoken within the country (Lane-Mercier 2014: 519). The discrepancy is further entrenched by the Council’s Governor General’s Literary Awards, whose translation categories still only accept translations in English-French pairings (Canada Council for the Arts [n.d.-a]).
equitable endeavour in Canada (2014: 524; see also Des Rochers 2023: 51). Sherry Simon, too, points towards complexification in translation experiences in Canada:

> [a]lthough the ‘English’ (in fact the British) never constituted one unified ethnic group and the ‘French’ (French-Canadians) were themselves divided by relations of class, the overwhelming cultural, religious, and economic differences between the two groups were most often understood in terms of an unequal, dual relationship. (1992: 162)

Furthermore, Arianne Des Rochers (2023) has called for nuancing Canada’s (colonial) language categories, arguing for ‘denaturalizing national cartographies of language’ to deconstruct the very notion of standard(ised) language defined by the arbitrary categories known as ‘French’ and ‘English’ in so-called Canadian bilingualism in favour of heteroglossia, deterritorialisation, and fluidity (2023: 21–64).

This movement towards complexification, outlined broadly in the context of translation in Canada, parallels work in disciplines such as (socio)linguistics and literary theory, in which Acadie has made particularly salient case studies. Thus, the complexification of the discourse on translation in Francophone Canada, along with Acadian particularity as it manifests in other disciplines, provide the starting point of the present research. Before delving further into this idea, however, the study begins with a brief historical and cultural overview of Acadie for the purposes of contextualisation, since historical vicissitudes, as the analysis will go on to demonstrate, have immense bearing on translation practice and phenomena in this region.

**Historical context of Acadie**

French settlers colonised what is known today as eastern Canada from the early seventeenth century. They established the first permanent European settlement in what

---

7 Sociolinguistic studies are too numerous to list comprehensively, but landmark and recent ones include Boudreau (2016, 2022), Gauvin and Violette (2020), Maillet (1971), Martineau and others (2018), Péronnet and others (1998), and Urbain and Arrighi (2021). For Acadian dictionaries, see Boudreau (2009), Cormier (2018), and Poirier (1995).

8 For instance, Lise Gauvin dedicates a section to Acadie in L’écrivain francophone à la croisée des langues : Entretiens (1997) and La Fabrique de la langue (2004). For François Paré, Acadie is an example of ‘littératures de l’exiguïté’ (2001), and its poetry is ‘révélatrice au plus haut point des conditions d’enracinement et d’itinérance qui agitent la culture minoritaire dans son ensemble’ (2003: 198).
became Canada at Port-Royal in 1605, on the western shores of present-day peninsular Nova Scotia (see Figure 1; Arsenault 2018: 25–28; Dunn 2004: 1–8). The territory the Acadians settled, Mi’kma’ki,⁹ had been inhabited since time immemorial by the Mi’kmaq, and remained a battleground for imperial power as the French and the English frequently exchanged colonial rule between 1605 and 1713 (Arsenault 2018: 17–128; Faragher 2005: 35–123). This created a space of overlap and coexistence, a palimpsest that John G. Reid defines as ‘Acadie […] — ou, maladroitement mais plus exactement — […] Mi’kma’ki / Acadie / Nova Scotia’ (2007: 265). While similar to neighbouring colonial regimes in New England and New France,¹⁰ Acadie developed in relative isolation from the control of both Britain and France (Conrad 2020: 81, 86; Plank 2001: 165; Léon Thériault 1993; Joseph Yvon Thériault 2013: 148). This has led some historians to argue that a sense of identity, though perhaps not yet labelled as ‘Acadian’, was discernible before the end of the seventeenth century¹¹ (Griffiths 1992, 2005). The English first conquered Mi’kma’ki/Acadie in 1613, triggering a string of at least seven exchanges of colonial rule between France and England over the course of a century (Arsenault 2018: 17–128; Faragher 2005: 35–123). The final conquest, sealed by victory at Port-Royal in 1710, was ratified by the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713, which definitively placed most of the Acadian territory¹² under British rule and

---

⁹ Mi’kma’ki, the unceded territory of the Mi’kmaq, corresponds roughly to the territory today covered by the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland and Labrador (Francis and Sable 2012: 16). The colonial reach of the French also extended to other Indigenous territories in what is now known as Atlantic Canada, namely those of the Passamaquoddy and Maliseet Peoples. Maliseet territory, named Wolastoqiyik (Wəlastəkəwiyik), covers western New Brunswick. Passamaquoddy lands correspond to the region along the New Brunswick–Maine border. For more on European–Indigenous contact in Mi’kma’ki, see Pastore (1994), Paul (2006), and Plank (2001). The word ‘Mi’kmaq’ is plural and refers to both nation and language (Francis and Sable 2012: 16). It has variant spellings; usage throughout this thesis follows namely that of The Language of this Land, Mi’kma’ki (Francis and Sable 2012) and the Elsipogtog Mi’kmaq Cultural Centre ([n.d.]), except in some quotations, where the author’s original spelling is respected (e.g. pp. 56, 63, 98, and 99). ‘Mi’kmaw’ is the singular version of ‘Mi’kmaq’ as well as the adjectival form of the noun (Francis and Sable 2012: 16).

¹⁰ As the focus of this thesis is Acadie, any reference to New France implicitly excludes Acadie, referring instead roughly to what is now known as the province of Québec. Acadie differed from New France and New England in two main ways, thanks to generally friendly relations with the Mi’kmaq (Faragher 2005: 46–50; Paul 2006: 50–52; Plank 2001: 24) and because of the frequency of imperial regime changes as England and France battled for, and alternately conquered, Mi’kma’ki/Acadie/Nova Scotia in the 100 years or so after European settlement (Arsenault 2018: 29–35, 51–59, 109–20; Faragher 2005: 1–124).

¹¹ Naomi Griffiths’ argument of a distinct Acadian identity prior to the Deportation hinges on the development of social structure, based namely on agriculture supported by the use of a collective dyeing system (2005: 68–69), which will be discussed in Chapter 2. The argument has been contested, namely by Joseph Yvon Thériault, who argues that Acadian identity developed from the 1880s on (1995: 219–44).

¹² i.e. the territory corresponding to present-day peninsular Nova Scotia (see Figure 1). The French maintained control over Île Royale (present-day Cape Breton) and Île Saint-Jean (present-day Prince Edward Island), as well as parts of Newfoundland and the islands off its coast. By contrast, Nouvelle-France remained in the French
renamed Acadie and Port-Royal Nova Scotia and Annapolis Royal, respectively (Arsenault 2018: 119–28; Griffiths 1992: 34–35; Faragher 2005: 136–37). For the next four decades, tensions grew as Acadians refused to swear an oath of unconditional allegiance to the British crown, advocating instead for neutrality and not taking up arms against either colonial power (Arsenault 2018: 129–39; Faragher 2005: 151–277). Then, in the summer of 1755, British officials made the decision to expel the French-speaking population from Nova Scotia (Arsenault 2018: 161–99; Faragher 2005: 313–33). An anonymous letter from a correspondent in Halifax to authorities in Boston\(^\text{13}\) described the project as follows:

> We are now upon a great and noble Scheme of sending the neutral French out of this Province, who have always been secret Enemies [...] If we effect their Expulsion, it will be one of the greatest Things that ever the English did in America; for by all the Accounts, that Part of the Country they possess, is as good Land as any in the World. (qtd. in Faragher 2005: 333)

Between August and December 1755, British officials, under the leadership of Charles Lawrence in Halifax, deported approximately two thirds of the French-speaking population of Nova Scotia\(^\text{14}\) to the Thirteen Colonies, which were generally ill-prepared and unwilling to tolerate deportees (Arsenault 2018: 211–22; Faragher 2005: 365–415). Deportations continued as Britain conquered surrounding territories throughout the Seven Years War (1756–1763), namely Île Saint-Jean and Île Royale.\(^\text{15}\) This event became known as the ‘Déportation’ or the ‘Grand Dérangement’, among a slew of other epithets.\(^\text{16}\) Hundreds of empire until 1763.

\(^\text{13}\) While the seat of British power was in London, local decision-makers were based in Boston, New England.

\(^\text{14}\) Exact figures for the number of Acadians pre-Deportation, the number of deportees, or total deaths are unknown. Estimates of the French-speaking population of Nova Scotia in 1755 range from 10,000 (Arsenault 2018: 176) to 13,000 (Daigle 1993a: 41), 14,000 (White 2005: 56), 16,000 (Leblanc 1967: 526), and 18,500 (Faragher 2005: 424; White 2005: 21), depending on definition and geographical range. Daigle (1993a: 38–39) and Hébert (1994: 35) estimate the number of deportees at around 10,000, and Leblanc at about 12,000 (1967: 528–30). Arsenault (2018: 239–383) provides detailed overviews of numbers by destination and Faragher (2005: 335–415) a thorough overview of expulsions and arrivals at various locations. For precise accounts of numbers at Grand-Pré, see Delaney, who accounts for 3,242 deportees from Grand-Pré and nearby Rivière-aux-Canards and Pigiguit (2020: 55), and Thibodeau (2010).

\(^\text{15}\) Île Saint-Jean (today the province of Prince Edward Island) and Île Royale (present-day Cape Breton, the eastern part of the province of Nova Scotia) were ceded to England as part of the 1763 Treaty of Paris (Faragher 2005: 421).

\(^\text{16}\) Many euphemisms denote and speak to the magnitude of the tragedy: ‘le Grand Drame, le Grand Dérangement, la Tourmente, la Grande Tragédie, le Démembrement, l’Expulsion, la Dispersion, la Déportation, et peut-être d’autres’ (Bourque 2015b: 48–49; Hautecoeur 1975: 77). The thesis uses ‘Deportation’ to refer
Acadians perished in shipwrecks or from illness, at sea or in the inhospitable conditions that awaited at their destination (Arsenault 2018: 211–22; Faragher 2005: 370–92; Leblanc 1967: 528). Those who escaped deportation fled to French-held territory such as New France or, if found in Acadie, were killed or imprisoned (Arsenault 2018: 223–37; Faragher 2005: 364). The century following the Grand Dérangement was marked by a ‘silence’, efforts going into reuniting families and forming new communities17 (Arsenault 2018: 239–385; Marguerite Maillet 1983: 37–49; Thériault 1995: 221–22). Deportees mostly settled outside of Acadie in places such as Louisiana, Québec, France, and the Antilles (Arsenault 2018: 239–344; Hodson 2012). However, after the Treaty of Paris in 1763, Acadians were allowed to return to the region and establish communities, creating what is now known as Acadie des Maritimes18 (Arsenault 2018: 345–83). The second half of the nineteenth century brought about a cultural renaissance19 in Acadie des Maritimes, spurred namely by the foundation of educational institutions and newspapers, as well as the Conventions nationales acadiennes of 1881 and 1884 (Bourque and Richard 2014, 2018; Robidoux 1910). The 1881 Convention coincides with the birth of Acadian ideology and society (Thériault 1995: 225), and the nine other conventions held over the subsequent decades generated significant sociocultural and political gains that reversed the silence, as it were (Bourque and Richard 2014, 2018). Literary creation remained sparse through to the first decades of the twentieth century, and publishing institutions and literary traditions finally began to emerge in the 1970s (Lonergan 2013, 2018; Marguerite Maillet 1983: 177–98).

Acadie as a territory vanished from maps with the 1713 Treaty of Utrecht (Arsenault 2018: 120; Faragher 2005: 136). As a result, Acadie now corresponds to a ‘géographie

---

17 For other interpretations of Acadian silence, see Boudreau (2022), Clarke (2004), and Lord (2009).
18 For comprehensive and multidisciplinary perspectives on Acadie des Maritimes, see Daigle (1980, 1993b) and Landry and others (2021).
19 The term ‘renaissance’ is contested among historians. Some argue that it fosters an illusion of social progress that in reality was limited to the leadership class comprised namely of clergy, politicians, and business leaders (Massicotte 2014: 86). For the purposes of this thesis, the term is devoid of ideological connotations and is used to denote the period from the 1860s onwards, when Acadian culture and society began to undergo organisational change and develop a distinct, collective discourse. In this, the term corresponds to a ‘réveil’, as Éric Forgues calls it (2021: 3). The renaissance was driven institutionally by the founding of Collège Saint-Joseph in 1864 and the first French-language newspaper, Le Moniteur acadien, in 1867, as well as by several Conventions nationales acadiennes between 1881 and 1908.
humaine’ (Lord 2009: 34; Lord and others 2009: 20–21) or a ‘géographie de l’âme’ (Massicotte 2007: 79) more than to a legal boundary.\(^{20}\) The lack of geographical boundaries has generated significant debate around definitions of Acadian identity, broadly understood, following Adrien Bérubé (1987), in territorial (e.g. Acadians live in Acadie) or genealogical (e.g. anyone of Acadian ancestry is Acadian) terms.\(^{21}\) Caroline-Isabelle Caron calls for nuancing these definitions by adopting a diasporic perspective that recognises Acadie comme un ensemble d’aires acadiennes où se concentrent des populations et des communautés acadiennes qui s’inscrivent dans l’historicité de la continuité en tant que communautés acadiennes (pour paraphraser Joseph Yvon Thériault). C’est-à-dire, que ces communautés s’auto-identifient encore comme acadiennes, qu’elles ont conservé et vivent toujours un certain fait acadien jusqu’à ce jour, même si celui-ci a été largement transformé par les contextes politiques, économiques, culturels et historiques depuis leurs fondations. (Caron 2007: 451, see also 2011: 42)

This thesis embraces this perspective, engaging a plural diaspora that goes beyond notions of hereditary logic and geographical location to embrace an Acadian imaginary (Caron 2007, 2011). Nevertheless, Acadie des Maritimes, even if a myth (Arseneault 1999; Trépanier 1996), is at the heart of contemporary Acadian artistic production and political life (Daigle 1980; Landry and others 2021: 7; Thériault 1993). This means that much of the following discussion naturally centres on and references the Francophone population in the Maritime provinces that identifies as Acadian. However, ‘Acadie des Maritimes’ is used throughout this thesis to situate the discussion geographically, not to negate translational experiences outside its (imaginary) borders, as Chapter 5 will illustrate.

---

\(^{20}\) For an overview of the issues surrounding the definition and question of Acadian territory, see Massicotte (2007).

\(^{21}\) The long-standing binary in conceptions of Acadian identity is generally framed around an ‘Acadie généalogique’ versus an ‘Acadie territoriale’. The debate evolved from the four ‘geographies’ defined by Bérubé in the 1980s: ‘Acadie historique’, a historical Acadie dating to the colonial years; ‘Acadie de la diaspora’, a diasporic or genealogical Acadie that corresponds to a ‘patrie sans espace’; ‘Acadie opérationnelle ou fonctionnelle’, a functional or operational Acadie comprised of French-speakers in Canada’s Maritime provinces; and ‘Acadie prospective’, an imagined, self-governed state that oversees collective political projects in a determined territory, e.g. an Acadian province (Bérubé 1987; Bruce 2018: 111). Today, the debate generally revolves around whether Acadie exists for those based in the Acadie des Maritimes who live and experience it daily, or also for those living elsewhere but identifying as Acadian in language or culture (Bruce 2020; Caron 2007; Thériault 1995).
Literary translation in Acadie

As will be discussed in Chapter 1, Acadie’s historical vicissitudes created favourable conditions for translation phenomena and practices to emerge. This is especially true from an institutional perspective: Christel Gallant deems Acadie the ‘berceau de la traduction officielle au Canada’ (1985). It was also in Acadie that the first pay scale for translators was instituted within the present-day borders of Canada and that the first period of official translation took place (Delisle 1987: 54–55). Jean Delisle notes translation activity during the conquest and capitulation of Port-Royal in 1710 (1987: 54) and its instrumental role in social organisation at a time of British rule over a primarily Francophone population between 1710 and 1763 (1987: 54–57; see also Boucher 1984). Translation became crucial during the Grand Dérangement, when Acadians’ knowledge of English, and the negotiation skills they had developed while living under British rule, served them well in their dealings with Anglophone governments that barely tolerated their presence (Faragher 2005: 435). In the third decade of the twenty-first century, New Brunswick is Canada’s only officially bilingual province (its own Official Languages Act was instituted the same year as the federal Act, in 1969), and the province’s largest city, Moncton, remains one of Canada’s few officially bilingual cities (City of Moncton 2002).

The setting of Acadie likewise fostered multilingual literary practices that play with notions of translation from the early years of settlement. Marc Lescarbot and Samuel de Champlain, who were part of the earliest French expeditions, include Indigenous words in their accounts of life in the colony, an approach that Jacques Cartier had also adopted almost a century earlier with Beothuk words (Pastore 1994: 31). In Champlain’s and Lescarbot’s works, Indigenous words are sometimes simply integrated into predominantly French texts, sometimes marked as foreign through marginal annotations, definitions, or typographical markings. Éric Thierry also points out other types of translation in

---

22 For more on pragmatic, institutional translation in Acadie, see Delisle (1987), Dubois (1999), and Gallant (1985).
24 The Beothuk lived in what is today the province of Newfoundland and Labrador.
25 Champlain, for example, writes in Des Sauvages ‘Bonne réception faite aux Français par le grand sagamo des
Champlain’s writing, such as the adaptation of distances from days of travel, in the Indigenous practice, to ‘lieues’ in the French tradition (2019a: 197). Lescarbot’s *Le Théâtre de Neptune*, the first play written and performed in what is now known as Canada, is remarkable for its connection to the environment in which it was written and its similarities to the ‘grand orations’ of the Mi’kmaq oral tradition (Gair 1985: 8–9). The play features a speech in Gascon (Lescarbot 2006: 53) and Indigenous words: ‘matachiaz’ [trinkets or bracelets], ‘Sagamos’ [Chief/Captain], ‘adesquidés’ [friend], and ‘caracona’ [bread] (Lescarbot 2006: 49, 51–52, 54–55; see also Emont 2004: 84; Wasserman 2006: 38). According to Wasserman, the play represents an instance of Lescarbot ‘register[ing] his respect for his Native hosts by incorporating (or appropriating, depending on one’s perspective) indigenous vocabulary from the local language’ (2006: 38). Indisputably colonial in mindset, the play nevertheless attests to the beginnings of a multilingual landscape created through cultural coexistence, fostering a hybridity that interweaves new and classical mythology (Doucette 1984: 8).

Literary translation practice, however, took longer to emerge, for no literary or theatrical tradition developed out of the early texts by Lescarbot and Champlain (Wasserman 2006: 36). Nor did a translation practice in the imperial or Indigenous

---


27 While an annotation in the play specifies the language as being Gascon (Lescarbot 2006: 53), research has shown that it is actually Occitan (Doucette 1984: 5).

28 Wasserman identifies these words as Mi’kmaq, except for ‘matachiaz’, identified as ‘Souriquois’ (2006: 38). Because ‘Souriquois’ is the word the French used to describe Indigenous people generally, and since the Mi’kmaq inhabited the lands Lescarbot visited (Champlain 2019a: 203; Landry 2013: 34–35), it is likely that all the words are indeed Mi’kmaq (Pastore 1994: 32). Mi’kmaq scholars Trudy Sable and Bernie Francis, following Ruth Holmes Whitehead and linguist Peter Bakker, suggest that Champlain would have heard the Basque word ‘zurikuoa’ (‘white man’s place’) used by the Mi’kmaq in their trade with Europeans, and interpreted it as a generic designation of the people (2012: 52). The play also features Indigenous characters, whom Emont suggests were played by Indigenous actors (2002: 111), while Naomi Griffiths remarks that the Mi’kmaq had a hand in the play’s presentation (2005: 16). Wasserman refutes these claims on the grounds that the play’s Indigenous characters ‘spout Parisian verse and cheerlead their own surrender to imperial rule’ (2006: 36–37).

29 The word ‘practice’ is used in the conscious attempt to avoid ‘tradition’, as theorists having argued that one
languages. For approximately a century after the Grand Dérangement, ‘les œuvres du cru firent totalement défaut’ (Marguerite Maillet 1983: 37; see also Faragher 2005: 102). Philip Stratford’s comprehensive Bibliography of Canadian Books in Translation / Bibliographie de livres canadiens-français traduits (1977), which covers the period from European settlement to 1977, includes five listings featuring Acadian names and works (1977: 1–61). All of these are French-to-English translations, and it is only possible to arrive at this number by employing a loose definition of what constitutes an ‘Acadian’ work. Looking specifically at the Acadian context, Mylène White compiled a bibliography titled ‘La traduction littéraire en Acadie : Sources premières et sources secondes’ (2007). It lists four English-to-French translations, plus one French-to-English translation produced by Acadian poet and novelist Gérald Leblanc (White 2007: 10–11, 5). The section dedicated to secondary sources includes a total of eight references (White 2007: 11–12), although additional critical materials are listed under individual translations.

While Stratford’s and White’s bibliographies suggest that literary translation in Acadie is not particularly ‘energetic’, a practice began to germinate in the mid-1970s. The practice quickly evolved to include various approaches to transferring a written source text, canonical or contemporary, interlingually or intralingually to borrow from Roman Jakobson’s either does not exist in the Canadian context or that it hinges on a particular approach (see namely Lane-Mercier 2014, 2018). Lane-Mercier argues that a few studies on the subject published in the 1990s announce ‘l’émergence d’une tradition canadienne de traduction “au féminin”’ (2014: 518). Philip Stratford categorically concluded in 1977 that ‘[i]n short, there is no tradition of literary translation in Canada’ (1977: Foreword [n.p]). Jo-Anne Elder has since made a similar argument (2005: 206), while Gillian Lane-Mercier argues for the need to compensate for the lack of an updated bibliography and of a clear definition of ‘literary translation tradition’ in Canada (2014: 519).

30 The early works by Lescarbot and Champlain also mark the beginning of translation of French-language works produced in Acadie into other languages. Lescarbot’s Les Muses de la Nouvelle-France and Histoire de la Nouvelle-France were translated into English and Histoire into German, and reedited and reprinted five times in Lescarbot’s lifetime (Emont 2004: 7).

31 This estimate is based on general knowledge of the Acadian context and literary field as Stratford does not provide information about authors’ or translators’ cultural identity.

32 Three of the works are by Champlain and Lescarbot, who both returned to France within a few years of their exploring Acadie in the early seventeenth century: Lescarbot’s Le théâtre de Neptune en la Nouvelle France (published in 1609, translated in 1927) and Histoire de la Nouvelle France (published in 1609, partially translated the same year), Samuel de Champlain’s Les Voyages de la Nouvelle France occidentale (published in 1623, translated in 1906). The fourth title is Bona Arsenault’s Histoire et généalogie des Acadiens (published in 1965, translated in 1966). Barbara Godard’s translation of Maillet’s Don l’Original is listed in the section dedicated to forthcoming publications (Stratford 1977: 56).

33 La foire de la Saint-Barthélemy, La nuit des Rois, La tempête, and Richard III, all translated by Antonine Maillet.

34 This term is borrowed from Philip Stratford, who writes that ‘[t]he potential for a lot of vigorous activity in translation is all laid on, right here at home [in Canada]. In actual fact, however, Canadians are not energetic translators’ (1982: 123, emphasis added).
conventional categorisations (2012: 127). Antonine Maillet was the first Acadian translator to establish a sustained practice. Born in Bouctouche, New Brunswick, Maillet moved to Montréal, Québec in 1970 and established long-term professional relationships with the city’s Théâtre du Rideau Vert (Brisset 2017: 135–36) and publisher Leméac Éditeur (Leméac Éditeur [n.d.]). Maillet’s relocation from Acadie to Québec introduces a crucial point about what exactly constitutes ‘Acadian literary translation’. Recalling the plural, nuanced understanding of ‘Acadie’ outlined above, ‘Acadian literary translation’ as it is used in the following pages is meant to represent works created, published, or grounded in an Acadian identity or imaginary rather than solely referring to the cultural identity or geographical location of the translator. In parallel to growing literary fame, Maillet began experimenting with translation in the mid-1970s before engaging in more sustained practice through the 1980s and 1990s (Viau 2008: 213–18). The word ‘experimentation’ is key here, as Maillet’s practice liberally integrates translational approaches and strategies ranging from close adherence to source text to adaptation in the sense that Linda Hutcheon (2013) gives it.

According to this expansive definition, Maillet produced 14 translations for the theatre, mostly from the British and French canons, between 1975 and 1999 (see Table 1). Of these, Richard III, Valentine, La Nuit des Rois, La Tempête, Pygmalion, and Une lune d’eau salée correspond to the Jakobsonian notion of ‘translation proper’, as does La Foire de la Sagouine, first performed in 1972, was garnering tremendous success and Pélagie-la-Charrette would win the Prix Goncourt in 1979.

Hutcheon outlines three characteristics defining adaptation: ‘as a formal entity or product, an adaptation is an announced and extensive transposition of a particular work or works’ (i.e. ‘transcoding’ between mediums); ‘as a process of creation, the act of adaptation always involves both (re-)interpretation and then (re-)creation’; and as a ‘process of reception, adaptation is a form of intertextuality: we experience adaptations (as adaptations) as palimpsests through our memory of other works that resonate through repetition with variation’ (2013: 7–8). Brisset discusses Maillet’s Le Bourgeois gentleman as part of iconoclastic translation in Québec (1990: 140–48), explaining that it ‘prend la forme de l’adaptation, de l’imitation et de la parodie’ (1990: 35). Drouin (2014) and Fischlin (2002) likewise refer to Maillet’s ‘adaptations’.

From the late 1980s and for the next decade, translations generally outpaced ‘original’ works, although the demarcation is difficult to make given Maillet’s artistic approach (Viau 2008: 214).

Judging from Maillet’s other Shakespearean translations, Hamlet likely would also fit the bill, but no manuscript seems to survive to support this.

35 Maillet moved to Montréal in 1970 for practical reasons, in search of a favourable artistic milieu in which to publish, develop a readership, and earn a living as a writer (Viau 2008: 272). There were limited opportunities for writers to make a living in Acadie when she moved, but even as those developed, Maillet elected to remain in Montréal. Nevertheless, she maintained a profound connection with Acadie, not only returning regularly but also harnessing the Acadian cultural fabric to create much of her literary universe (Maillet 2016; ‘Antonine Maillet: mes pensées flottantes’ 2022; Viau 2008).

36 La Sagouine, first performed in 1972, was garnering tremendous success and Pélagie-la-Charrette would win the Prix Goncourt in 1979.

37 Hutcheon outlines three characteristics defining adaptation: ‘as a formal entity or product, an adaptation is an announced and extensive transposition of a particular work or works’ (i.e. ‘transcoding’ between mediums); ‘as a process of creation, the act of adaptation always involves both (re-)interpretation and then (re-)creation’; and as a ‘process of reception, adaptation is a form of intertextuality: we experience adaptations (as adaptations) as palimpsests through our memory of other works that resonate through repetition with variation’ (2013: 7–8). Brisset discusses Maillet’s Le Bourgeois gentleman as part of iconoclastic translation in Québec (1990: 140–48), explaining that it ‘prend la forme de l’adaptation, de l’imitation et de la parodie’ (1990: 35). Drouin (2014) and Fischlin (2002) likewise refer to Maillet’s ‘adaptations’.

38 From the late 1980s and for the next decade, translations generally outpaced ‘original’ works, although the demarcation is difficult to make given Maillet’s artistic approach (Viau 2008: 214).

39 Judging from Maillet’s other Shakespearean translations, Hamlet likely would also fit the bill, but no manuscript seems to survive to support this.
Saint-Barthélemy despite the significant reduction in the length of the play (Nolette 2015: 185).

Conversely, the remainder of the works — Évangéline Deusse; Le Bourgeois gentleman; Les drôlatiques, horrifiques et épouvantables aventures de Panurge, ami de Pantagruel; William S; and La Fontaine ou La Comédie des Animaux — are loose adaptations of canonical works, responding to one or more source texts despite being distinctly Mailletian creations. The cover of Les drôlatiques, horrifiques et épouvantables aventures de Panurge, ami de Pantagruel, for example, presents the play as ‘d’après Rabelais’ (Antonine Maillet 1983), while William S is described as a ‘mash-up or revisionary, hybrid adaptation, and, more importantly, [...] a biographical adaptation’ (Drouin 2014: 62–63). Some of the works listed above are inconsistently understood as translations: William S is, according to Viau, a ‘pièce originale’ (2008: 216), but Drouin calls it an ‘adaptation’ (2014: 62–63) and it contains, as Chapter 3 will show, interlingual and intralingual translations from several Shakespearean plays. Similarly, Évangéline Deusse bears little connection to its source text, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow’s 1847 epic poem Evangeline: A Tale of Acadie (2004), apart from the eponymous heroine’s name and exile from Acadie. Indeed, Viau does not mention Longfellow in the write-up of the play in Antonine Maillet : 50 ans d’écriture (2008: 113–19), but Maria Cristina Greco describes it as ‘réécriture’ (2019) and Jacques Michon as a ‘relecture parodique’ (1994: 334). Such ambiguity, however, plays into Maillet’s profoundly intertextual practice (discussed in Chapter 3), and regardless of whether these plays are recognised as translations, adaptations, or so-called original works, they subscribe to translational dynamics and, for that reason, are included in the following list and considered for analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation title</th>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source text</th>
<th>Source author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Évangéline Deusse</td>
<td>Antonine Maillet</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Evangeline: A Tale of Acadie</td>
<td>Henry Wadsworth Longfellow</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Bourgeois gentleman</td>
<td>Antonine Maillet</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Le bourgeois gentilhomme</td>
<td>Molière</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les drôlatiques, horrifiques et épouvantables aventures de</td>
<td>Antonine Maillet</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Le Quart Livre</td>
<td>François Rabelais</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Translator</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Genre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les fantastiques(^{40})</td>
<td>Antonine Maillet</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td><em>The Fantasticks</em></td>
<td>Tom Jones</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard III</td>
<td>Antonine Maillet</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td><em>The Tragedy of King Richard the Third</em></td>
<td>William Shakespeare(^{41})</td>
<td>1591–1594</td>
<td>Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentine</td>
<td>Antonine Maillet</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td><em>Shirley Valentine</em></td>
<td>Willy Russell</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Nuit des Rois</td>
<td>Antonine Maillet</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td><em>Twelfth Night</em></td>
<td>William Shakespeare</td>
<td>1600–1602</td>
<td>Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Foire de la Saint-Barthélemy</td>
<td>Antonine Maillet</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td><em>Bartholomew Fair</em></td>
<td>Ben Jonson</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Fontaine ou La Comédie des Animaux</td>
<td>Antonine Maillet</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>various fables</td>
<td>La Fontaine</td>
<td>1668–1694</td>
<td>Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aléola</td>
<td>Laval Goupil</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td><em>Aléola</em></td>
<td>Gaétan Charleboix</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Tempête</td>
<td>Antonine Maillet</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td><em>The Tempest</em></td>
<td>William Shakespeare</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>Antonine Maillet</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td><em>Hamlet</em></td>
<td>William Shakespeare</td>
<td>1599–1601</td>
<td>Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pygmalion</td>
<td>Antonine Maillet</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td><em>Pygmalion</em></td>
<td>George Bernard Shaw</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Une lune d'eau salée</td>
<td>Antonine Maillet</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td><em>Saltwater Moon</em></td>
<td>David French</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Batture</td>
<td>Sonya Malaborza</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td><em>Running Far Back</em></td>
<td>Don Hannah</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Journal de John Winslow à Grand-Pré(^{42})</td>
<td>Serge Patrice Thibodeau</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td><em>Journal of Colonel John Winslow of the Provincial Troops, while Engaged in</em></td>
<td>John Winslow</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>Non-fiction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{40}\) Les fantastiques, *Hamlet, Pygmalion, Une lune d'eau salée,* and *Valentine* were performed but not published. Parts of the typescript of *Pygmalion* are available through the Centre d'études acadiennes Anselme-Chiasson, and those of *Une lune d'eau salée, Les fantastiques,* and *Valentine* through the Centre des auteurs dramatiques.

\(^{41}\) All information about Shakespeare's plays is taken from *The Necessary Shakespeare,* edited by David Bevington (2002).

\(^{42}\) Thibodeau declares in the introduction to the translation of the *Journal* being 'ni historien ni traducteur de formation' (2010: 71). The work is nevertheless considered a translation here because of the literary aspect of the project — the 'véritable travail d'archéologie littéraire' promised on the back cover —, which Thibodeau also points to in the introduction (2010: 16–17). Thibodeau's working document, two reproductions of which are included in the following chapters, support this reading. Conversely, *La liste de Winslow expliquée,* edited and translated by Thibodeau, is not included in this list because the work has no published source text and is the result of a collaborative effort to 'présenter au public les résultats d'une recherche essentielle à la compréhension de cette tragédie sans égale dans l'histoire de l'Amérique du nord du 18e siècle' (Thibodeau 2020: 9, 11–12).
Table 1: Book-length Acadian translations published or produced between 1975 and 2020, with source text references

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source Text</th>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La femme du capitaine</td>
<td>Sonya Malaborza</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>The Sea Captain’s Wife</td>
<td>Beth Powning</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Fiction (novel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le pluvier kildir</td>
<td>Rose Després</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Killdeer</td>
<td>Phil Hall</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>femme-rivièr</td>
<td>Rose Després</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>river woman</td>
<td>Katherena Vermette</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nous sommes les rêveurs</td>
<td>Sophie M. Lavoie</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>We are the Dreamers</td>
<td>Rita Joe</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay</td>
<td>Sonya Malaborza</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>The Birth House</td>
<td>Ami McKay</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Fiction (novel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Océan</td>
<td>Georgette LeBlanc</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Ocean</td>
<td>Sue Goyette</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With only one translation produced by an Acadian theatre company\(^{43}\) (Gagnon 2005: 8; Malaborza 2006: 177), Maillet’s translation practice unfolded primarily in Montréal, on the stage of Théâtre du Rideau Vert and within the walls of Leméac Éditeur. Concomitantly, a literary sector began to professionalise in Acadie in the 1970s (Lonergan 2013). The writers leading this development believed that those writing about Acadie from a distance, like Maillet, were witnesses rather than active participants; artists based in Acadie, by contrast, could engage with contemporary realities and lived experiences (Lonergan 2013: 79, 127; Nichols 2001: 242; Runte 1986: 320). These artists and writers\(^{44}\) collectively emitted

---

\(^{43}\) *Valentine* played at Théâtre populaire d’Acadie in 1997, adapted from an earlier version intended for a Québécois audience (Malaborza 2006: 177). The only other translation not created for the Théâtre du Rideau vert is *Une lune d’eau salée*, which played at the Théâtre de l’Île in Gatineau, Québec (Malaborza 2006: 179, note no. 7).

\(^{44}\) These included namely Herménégilde Chiasson, Raymond Guy LeBlanc, Léonard Forest, and Gérald Leblanc. According to Glen Nichols, Chiasson led the charge in denouncing ‘Acadiens domiciliés au Québec’ for ascribing ‘une image folklorique qui fait recette dans les médias […]’, au point où une grande majorité des Acadiens
a *cri de terre*, to borrow from the title of Raymond Guy LeBlanc’s collection that inaugurated Éditions d’Acadie, and sought to ‘repatriate’ Acadian poetry (Lonergan 2013: 124–27). A literary translation practice based in Acadie followed. As Table 1 shows, the Théâtre populaire d’Acadie in New Brunswick was the first to produce Acadian translations: Laval Goupil’s intralingual translation of *Aléola*, by Gaétan Charleboix, and Maillé’s *Valentine* in 1997 (2006: 177). Sonya Malaborza translated Don Hannah’s *La Batture* for the Playwrights Atlantic Resource Centre in 2004. Momentum started to pick up in the next decade, first with Serge Patrice Thibodeau turning to the 1755 diary of a Lieutenant-Colonel overseeing the deportations at Grand-Pré, *Le Journal de John Winslow à Grand-Pré*, followed by Malaborza’s move from theatre to fiction with *La femme du capitaine*. Poetry dominated between 2015 and 2020, with Rose Després and Sophie M. Lavoie each publishing two poetry translations — *Le pluvier kildir* and *femme-rivière* for Després and *Nous sommes les rêveurs* and *Un parcours bispirituel* for Lavoie —, and Georgette LeBlanc publishing *Océan*, which won the Governor General’s Literary Award for Translation for 2020. Malaborza was also nominated for the prize for *L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay*, as was Arianne Des Rochers who relocated to New Brunswick in 2021. Since 2020, Jean-Philippe Raîche has translated a play for Théâtre populaire d’Acadie, publishers Éditions Perce-Neige and Prise de parole are working on projects with Acadian translators, and several translation-forward projects have appeared.\(^45\)

The overview above accounts solely for the translation of literature from English to French, as other translation practices found on the territory are beyond the scope of this study. This includes contemporary heterolingual or bilingual practices, namely in the use of

\(^45\) Théâtre populaire d’Acadie staged Jean-Philippe Raîche’s translation *Les Meilleurs frères* (of a play by Daniel McIvor) in 2022–2023. Éditions Perce-Neige is slated to publish Geneviève Robichaud and Danielle LeBlanc’s translation of *We, Jane*, by Aimee Wall, in 2024. Prise de parole is publishing *Les incroyables aventures de Marie Jeanne Maringouin* by Tompson Highway in a translation by Carl Philippe Gionet, and Sonya Malaborza is working on a French translation of *Blaze Island*, by Catherine Bush. Éditions Perce-Neige is also looking to publish translations of the New Brunswick story *Len & Cub: A Queer History* and of Irish poet Patrick Kavanagh’s *The Great Hunger*.

\(^46\) These include *Cadences. Voix féminines / Female Voices* (Blanchard and Geitzler 2020), projects helmed by the literary review *Ancrages* (e.g., Brown and Malaborza 2023), and Dominique Bernier-Cormier’s *Entre Rive and Shore* (2023a), a bilingual (French-English) poetry collection that charts the experience of living bilingually from a decidedly (self-)translational perspective.
the Acadian dialect that blends English and French, known as *chiac*.\(^{47}\) *Chiac* as a mechanism for translation has already exemplified the playfulness of heterolingual theatre (Nolette 2015), as well as ‘colinguisme’ (Leclerc 2005: 161–2; 2010) and language smuggling (Des Rochers 2023: 84–109). Additionally, the translation of literary works written in *chiac* is the launching point for discussions of ‘untranslatability’ (Cormier 2020) and the ‘ultra-minor’ (Cabajsky 2022). As for the translation of Acadian literature into English, like its English-to-French counterpart, it, too, is ‘something of an exception’ (Cogswell & Elder 1990: xv).

Though French-to-English literary translation has generally outpaced English-to-French translation in Canada (Lane-Mercier 2014; Stratford 1977), ‘little interest has been shown in Acadian literature’ (Godard 2000: 481). Stratford’s *Bibliography* includes, out of 250 titles, four translations of Acadian works into English. In the past decades, Fred Cogswell and Jo-Anne Elder have worked to bring Acadian poetry to an Anglophone readership through anthologies (Cogswell 1970; Cogswell and Elder 1990b) and poetry collections (Chiasson 1999, 2001, 2007; Thibodeau 2009b), while Glen Nichols has focussed primarily on drama (2003). Several of Maillet’s novels have also been translated into English (Maillet 2004a, 2004b, 2006, 2015), as have France Daigle’s.

**Acadia in Canadian literary translation discourse**

As Stratford’s and White’s surveys suggest, and the above overview corroborates, Acadian translations account for a small portion of Canada’s literary translation production. In the introduction to *Traduire depuis les marges / Translating from the Margins*, Sherry Simon names Acadie as one of the research areas that have ‘until now been on [the] margins’ of the ‘picture of translation’ in Canada (2008: 15, see also 20). A few years later, Gillian Lane-Mercier’s plea for an updated and complete inventory of works in translation, and corresponding survey of translation theory, identifies Acadie as one of the jurisdictions whose accelerated development of its own literary institutions is indicative of the need for extended theoretical research into a tradition of translation in Canada (2014: 528). More specifically, Lane-Mercier argues that Acadie is one of the areas for which a comprehensive

---

\(^{47}\) *Chiac* is the Acadian vernacular of southeastern New Brunswick, more specifically around the city of Moncton. For a thorough, critical overview of chiac from a sociolinguistic perspective, see Arrighi (2020).
study might usefully yield trends (2014: 527), even though the results may not always be positive.48

Acadie’s marginality in a translation context is reflected in Jean Delisle’s La traduction au Canada / Translation in Canada. The book’s extensive annotated bibliography includes 2,472 items, only one of which is assigned the code ‘ACAD’, which refers to ‘Traduction en Acadie (1710–1867)’49 (1987: 175). Although other codes arguably overlap with translation events in Acadie,50 the single entry is remarkable, especially since the period covered by the code ‘ACAD’, 1710–1867, covers what Delisle describes as the ‘première période de traduction officielle au Canada’ (1987: 54). It also occurs despite the fact that Christel Gallant, who called Acadie the ‘berceau de la traduction officielle’, is named on the book’s front cover as a contributor and acknowledged in the introduction as having ‘put at [Delisle’s] disposal the results of her research into the history of translation in Acadia and the development of the translation profession in New Brunswick’ (Delisle 1987: 18–19). Furthermore, the scarcity can hardly be attributed to geographical and thematic specificity, as other, equally narrow research areas garner multiple mentions.51

For its part, literary translation discourse in Canada exhibits a tendency to theorise translation from or into French through the lens of Québec. This tendency is aptly captured in the title of the section devoted to Canada in Edwin Gentzler’s Translation and Identity in the Americas (2008): ‘Feminism and Theater in (Quebec) Canada’. There are several likely reasons for this, including Québec’s development of a translation ‘tradition’ in the 1980s, strong institutional support, and a healthy publishing industry. Indeed, cornerstone studies such as those of Annie Brisset (1990), Susanne de Lotbinière-Harwood (1991), Patricia Godbout (2004), Sherry Simon (1996, 2006, 2012), and Luise von Flotow (1997) shine a light, often but not always from a feminist perspective, onto the cultural, social, and literary aspects of translation in Québec. Joining these studies are essay collections with national

---

49 The bibliography is presented as a table. One of the column headers reads ‘T:SPE = Traduction (domaine spécifique)’, and its content designates specific thematic domains. ‘ACAD’ is one of the multiple codes used to designate various fields of production (Delisle 1987: 175).
50 For example, ‘NEWB’, ‘RANG’, and ‘RFRA’, which respectively designate the categories of ‘Traduction au Nouveau-Brunswick’, the ‘Régime anglais (1760–1867)’, and the ‘Régime français (1534–1760)’.
51 e.g. ‘GNOR Traduction dans le Grand Nord canadien’, ‘IPED Traduction à l’Île-du-Prince-Édouard’, ‘SASK Traduction en Saskatchewan’, etc.
and international reach and directed by or featuring Canadian editors: *Culture in Transit: Translating the Literature of Québec* (Simon 1995a, 2018a); *Mapping Literature: The Art and Politics of Translation* (Homel and Simon 1988), and *Changing the Terms: Translation in the Post-Colonial Era* (Simon and St-Pierre 1999). Another contributing factor to the general theorisation of translation in Canada through the lens of Québec is the latter’s strong affinity with the Canadian Francophonie, expressed for instance by Édouard Richard in the introduction to (Québécois) Pamphile Lemay’s translation of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow’s epic poem *Evangeline*, about Acadie (discussed in detail in Chapter 1, pp. 71–78): ‘Puisque ce poème est fait des souffrances de nos pères; puisqu’il est en quelque sorte comme notre chair; puisqu’il est le plus populaire et le mieux connu chez nos voisins, ne convenait-il pas qu’il fût traduit et popularisé chez nous?’ (qtd. in Simon 1989: 38–39) Nevertheless, the Révolution tranquille in Québec focalised ‘Québécois’ nationalist identity in the 1960s and triggered an increasingly inward gaze that excised a reference point for Francophone communities outside Québec, which subsequently turned to the term ‘Franco-Canadian’ for collective definition (Caron 2011: 39; Hotte and Paré 2016: 10–11). The repercussions of this shift in thinking are felt in a collection such as *Culture in Transit: Translating the Literature of Quebec* (Simon 1995a, 2018a). In the introduction to the first edition (reprinted in the second), Simon specifies that ‘following tradition, we will consider [Maillet] an “extension” of Quebec literature’ (1995b: 10, 2018b: 24). Indeed, both editions include a chapter by Philip Stratford titled ‘Translating Antonine Maillet’s Fiction’ (1995, 2018), a piece that had been previously published as an article in the journal *Québec Studies* (1986). However, in recalling Maillet and Stratford performing an excerpt of one of Maillet’s novels in the volume’s introduction, Simon emphasises Maillet’s Acadian identity (1995b: 7, 2018b: 21).

Annie Brisset makes a similar statement in *Sociocritique de la traduction: Théâtre et alterité au Québec, 1968–1988* (Brisset 1990: 74), a work that, rather paradoxically, is one of the first to engage extensively with Acadian translation. Brisset argues that Maillet’s *Le Bourgeois gentleman*, a ‘Québécois version’ of Molière’s *Le bourgeois gentilhomme*, deploys imitation or mockery effectively to replace Molière’s version and adequately describe the

---

52 Whether a unified Franco-Canadian literary identity exists continues to be a point of debate (Nolette 2015: 249).

53 Brisset’s landmark study has been translated into English by Roger Gannon and Rosalind Gill (Brisset 1996).
‘Québécois situation’ (Brisset 1990: 140–48). Like Brisset, Jennifer Drouin appropriates Maillet in *Shakespeare in Québec: Nation, Gender, and Adaptation* to correlate *William S* with key moments in Québec (nationalist) history54 (2014: 62–65). Such appropriation happens repeatedly (Godard 1988: 79; Lane-Mercier 2014: 523; Lieblein 2002; Mallet 2002; Mezei 1985: 214; Stratford 1982: 121, 1995) — not only in literature.55 This may be partly explained by Simon’s clarification in the introduction to the 1995 edition of *Culture in Transit*, quoted above (1995a: 7, 2018b: 24). It is also justifiable in Maillet’s case since her life and practice are based in Montréal.56 Yet, constant appropriation, particularly when unqualified in the context of the work, either in representations of translators’ identity or in translation theory, is problematic because it creates, however inadvertently, the perception of a monolithic translation experience in Francophone Canada.

The specificity of Acadian translation unfolds in minority literary studies more than in translation studies. Lise Gauvin’s *La Fabrique de la langue* not only includes Acadian literature as a ‘littérature de l’intranquillité’ (2004: 259), but also describes Mailletian (and Acadian more generally) literary creation as ‘translation’ (2004: 297–302). Gauvin thereby provides one of the first observations of Maillet’s production through a translational lens. From there, cultural specificity in the work of Acadian translators continues to surface in analyses of Shakespearean translations in both Francophone and Anglophone Canada. Denise Merkle, for example, introduces the idea that Maillet’s motivations may differ from those of Québécois contemporaries due to cultural identity, mentioning twice on one page that it is not only the Québécois who harbour linguistic anxieties towards the English Other (Merkle 2000: 277). Looking at Maillet’s *William S* from a postcolonial perspective and as an example of alterity challenging dominant discourse, Daniel Fischlin includes Acadie as one of the ‘varied contexts’ (2002: 316) distilled from the polyphonic nature of Canadian national identity (2002: 330–33). Fischlin situates Maillet precisely in an ‘Acadian and French Canadian’ context and recognises the tension between Maillet’s role in the Québécois theatre and her importance in the Acadian literary movement (2002: 332). Furthermore, Fischlin’s reading of the play establishes Acadie as able to ‘subver[t] a basic colonial relation

54 e.g. the Quiet Revolution, the two referendums, the Conquest.
55 Des Rochers points out that this also happens in music (2023: 4).
56 Maillet reinforces this (*Les possibles sont infinis* 2009: 4:40–5:30; see also Gauvin 2010: 13). However, Raoul Boudreau notes that ‘il est frappant de voir comment chez [Maillet] le Québec tombe dans l’indifférence et l’oubli’ (2006: 45).
Thus, source culture is shown to be deserving of critique from a perspective that recognizes the interdependence of the particular cultural, social, and national identities that emerge from the colonial enterprise' (2002: 332). Around the same time, Chantal Gagnon alludes to Maillet’s advantageous bilingualism (2003) before situating Maillet outside the Québécois social and literary discourses (2005). Gagnon further argues that Maillet ‘participe au discours social Québécois tout en tenant une position “marginale”’ (2005: 2).

Acknowledging similarities between the Québécois and Acadian sociopolitical contexts after 1990, Gagnon identifies a subtext in Maillet’s Le Bourgeois gentleman that betrays tensions between Acadie and Québec and reads this subtext as an example of the margins talking back (2005: 3–5).

Widening the angle from which to look at Acadian translation, Sonya Malaborza’s article ‘La traduction du théâtre en Acadie — Parcours et tendances actuelles’ (2006) examines the only two plays that, at the time, had been translated and produced in Acadie: Maillet’s translation of David French’s Saltwater Moon and Laval Goupil’s retranslation of Gaétan Charlebois’s Aléola. Malaborza notes that both Goupil and Maillet opt for close adherence to the source text in terms of structure and wording and argues that this strategy not only deliberately offers counterparts to the translations analysed in Brisset’s research but is also symptomatic of a distinctly Acadian translational impulse (2006: 176, 179–83). Malaborza attributes this strategy to the translators’ intimate knowledge of the source language, obtained in a bilingual setting like New Brunswick as opposed to a predominantly unilingual setting like Québec (2006: 196). In a similar vein, Marie-Linda Lord seeks to nuance Brisset’s contention that (Québécois) literature serves (Québécois) linguistic reality to explain the power of Maillet’s use of the vernacular (2010: 24–25). Lord references Brisset from a literary rather than a translation studies perspective, symptomatic perhaps of the relatively little attention paid to Maillet’s translations in otherwise exhaustive studies of her literary production (e.g. Viau 2008, see below).

The heterolingual or bilingual nature of Acadian literature has also warranted attention. As mentioned earlier, Catherine Leclerc’s Des langues en partage? examines the cohabitation of languages and, for the Acadian context specifically, the ‘clignotements acadiens contemporains’ created by the hybrid nature of chiac (2010: 339–378). For its part, Nicole Nolette’s Jouer la traduction : Théâtre et hétérolinguisme au Canada francophone (2015) homes in on the creative potential of heterolingual theatre from the
perspective of ‘traduction ludique’, or playful translation. The section dedicated to Acadie\(^{57}\) (2015: 179–244) revolves around Alain Masson’s notion of *grouillement linguistique*\(^{58}\) and the playful potential of orality and the *chiac* vernacular. Nuancing Brisset’s reading, Nolette argues that *Le Bourgeois gentleman* is Maillet’s best known translation because of its iconoclastic character, but goes on to discern an Acadian subtext through the use of anglicisms in the language of a secondary character (2015: 184–85). Joséphine’s ‘jeu des langues’, which anglicises the play’s French, destabilises the double hegemony of English and (Québec) French (Nolette 2015: 185). Nolette then mentions two other translations by Maillet, Ben Jonson’s *La Foire de la Saint-Barthélemy* and David French’s *Une lune d’eau salée*, aligning readings of these plays with Nicole Mallet’s (2002) and Sonya Malaborza’s (2006) respectively and emphasising Maillet’s Acadian ‘langue de traduction’ (2015: 185). Nevertheless, while it portrays translation in Acadie as a rich and dynamic practice, featuring some 47 works and 17 authors and translators, *Jouer la traduction* focusses mainly on New Brunswick, and the scope of its analysis is limited to heterolingual theatre, thus disregarding much of the corpus listed in Table 1. More recently, Arianne Des Rochers carves out space for Acadie alongside a few other examples of language ‘smuggling’ that transgress the ‘one text, one language’ models of writing [...] that have challenged the structural notions of linguistic autonomy and singularity that underlie not only the formation of the nation-state but also the bulk of Western translation theory and the field of comparative lit. (2023: 12)

Turning specifically to Acadian translation in the Conclusion, Des Rochers outlines a postlingual translation approach deployed in Georgette LeBlanc’s *Océan* (2023: 205–22).

Though not strictly within the scope of the present study, it is worth pointing out that French-to-English translation discourse recognises Acadian specificity from the 1980s. This is particularly noticeable in the numerous reviews and articles published by translators of Acadian literature such as Fred Cogswell and Jo-Anne Elder (1990a), Wayne Grady (2006),

---

\(^{57}\) The book’s two other sections are dedicated to Franco-Ontario and western Canada.

\(^{58}\) According to Masson, *grouillement linguistique* depicts New Brunswick’s linguistic reality. It is the result of ‘la concurrence d’un nombre particulièrement élevé de niveaux de langue’ (1994: 59). Masson goes on to argue that bilingualism in New Brunswick is a euphemism, since ‘les francophones portent en eux-mêmes un véritable grouillement linguistique’ (Masson 1994: 59; qtd. in Nolette 2015: 179). This is discussed in Chapter 4 of this thesis.
Barbara Godard (1979), Ben-Z Shek (1983), and Philip Stratford (1982, 1986, 1995). Louise Ladouceur’s *Making the Scene* mentions Antonine Maillet once in the context of a translation of two plays into English.\(^{59}\) *Traduire depuis les marges / Translating from the Margins* (Merkle and others 2008) includes four chapters (a quarter of the total) on Acadie, none of which discusses translations into French by Acadian translators.\(^{60}\) Moreover, Glen Nichols and Denise Merkle both contribute chapters on Acadie to *Translation Effects: The Shaping of Modern Canadian Culture*. Nichols (2014) correlates (Anglophone) tourism and translation studies in a discussion of the Pays de la Sagouine,\(^{61}\) while Merkle (2014) outlines the inability of English translations of 1970s Acadian poetry to render sociopolitical discontent. More recently, Mathew Cormier has looked at English translations of Acadian novels by Maillet and France Daigle to argue that ‘[u]ntranslatability — at least in terms of Acadian identity and its intrinsic link to language — seems to be at the crux of Acadie’s distinct character and its resistance to the maw of world literature theory’ (2020: 240).

Overall, this focus on translating *out of or from* rather than *within or to* an Acadian context is perhaps not surprising given that Acadian translators are not especially visible within the field. For instance, *Le métier du double : Portraits de traductrices et traducteurs littéraires au Canada* (Whitfield 2005) includes 13 portraits of Francophone translators, none of them Acadian even though Maillet had produced and/or published 14 translations by 1999.\(^{62}\)

---

59 Acadie’s absence here is arguably due to Ladouceur’s scope — discourse and textual analyses of translations of Canadian theatre translation from one official language to the other in the second half of the twentieth century — and the lack of corresponding productions in or out of Acadie, as Maillet translates mostly from the British and French canons. Ladouceur nevertheless acknowledges that the analysis ‘fait en sorte que la dramaturgie francophone du Canada se compose en majorité d’œuvres québécoises qui s’identifient comme telles, alors que la dramaturgie anglophone se définit surtout comme canadienne. On ne saurait donc ici rendre compte de la diversité des communautés francophones et anglophones canadiennes et québécoises et de leurs répertoires dramatiques’ or of languages outside the French-English pairing (2005: 17). Still, at least four of Maillet’s plays had been translated into English in the 1980s by Luis de Cespedes and Ben Z. Shek, and Maillet translated David French’s play *Saltwater Moon* in 1999.

60 The chapters by Marilyn Gaddis Rose (2008) and by Denis Bourque and Denise Merkle (2008) home in on Longfellow’s *Evangeline: A Tale of Acadie* and its translation into French by Pamphile Lemay, while articles by Jean-Guy Mboudjeke (2008) and Catherine Leclerc (2008) respectively address questions of linguistic hybridity in Acadian literature and the challenges of rendering the vernacular in English translation.

61 The Pays de la Sagouine is a historical village / theme park based on the settings, characters, and words of Antonine Maillet.

62 The English version of the work, *Writing between the Lines: Portraits of Canadian Anglophone Translators* (Whitfield 2006), alludes to Acadian literature in translation in the chapters allocated to Philip Stratford (Lane-Mercier 2006: 76) and Barbara Godard (Mezei 2006: 207–8), who both translated Maillet.
Translation in Acadian studies

Though Acadie has increasingly featured in Canadian translation studies over the past few decades, translation continues to hold a marginal position in Acadian studies. The section dedicated to ‘Le cycle des adaptations et traductions théâtrales’ in Antonine Maillet: 50 ans d’écriture (Viau 2008: 213–18), is the shortest of the book’s 11 sections at six pages (the next longest section takes up 11 pages). It lists nearly all of Maillet’s translations (Le Bourgeois gentleman and Évangéline Deussse are included in other chapters) but goes into detail for only three: Les drôlatiques, horrifiques et épouvantables aventures de Panurge, ami de Pantagruel; William S; and La Fontaine ou La Comédie des Animaux. A few others are mentioned in passing throughout the section and in a short paragraph subtitled ‘Autres textes’ that also mentions random texts that did not fit elsewhere in the book (Viau 2008: 215–18). Literary and theatre critic David Lonergan has written at length about Acadian theatre, but pays little attention to translation or its function and place within the Acadian literary institution: Tintamarre: Chroniques de littérature dans l’Acadie d’aujourd’hui (2008) seems to make no mention of translation, either in the relatively long section dedicated to Maillet or in the write-up on Laval Goupil. Even more tellingly, Lonergan mentions, in one of the sections comprising the ‘general texts’ included at the end of the work, Goupil’s long absence from the public space, despite the production of two adaptations during this period, as if those were insufficient in counting as a ‘presence’ (2008: 331). The same section in Tintamarre contains a mention of Maillet’s adaptations and translations, not without a tinge of surprise that three of five publications during the decade were ‘inspirées, traduites ou adaptées de grands classiques’ (Lonergan 2008: 329). Similarly, none of the four volumes of Robert Viau’s Acadie multipiste (2015, 2020, 2022, 2023), collections of essays on Acadian literature, delves into Acadian translations.

In terms of critical and media attention, Maillet’s translations have garnered relatively significant attention (Beddows 1998; Card 1997; Gagnon 2003, 2005; LeBlanc 2018; Lieblein 2002; Malaborza 2006; Mallet 2002; Merkle 2000). Serge Patrice Thibodeau’s Journal de John Winslow à Grand-Pré benefited from a review in the Acadian Studies journal Port Acadie (Nyela 2010). Sophie M. Lavoie’s translations seem mostly to have flown under the radar, and Rose Després earned an article on Radio-Canada for the translation femme-rivière (Radio-Canada 2019b). Malaborza has worked tirelessly to put Acadian translation on the map, especially with the publication of L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay and the promotional
opportunities it afforded (Malaborza [n.d.]), work that has generated results in the form of reviews across a variety of platforms (Éditions Prise de parole 2020). The nomination of three Acadie-based translators for the 2020 Governor General’s Literary Award generated media attention and discussion opportunities (Radio-Canada 2021; La traduction littéraire en Acadie 2021). Finally, both Malaborza and LeBlanc and their translations are featured in a special dossier in Les libraires titled ‘À la découverte de la littérature acadienne’ (‘Dossier: À la découverte de la littérature acadienne’ 2022).

**Theoretical and conceptual grounding**

As outlined above, Acadie’s historical vicissitudes, combined with the emergence of a literary translation practice, create favourable conditions for translation to occur. In addition to addressing what are conventionally understood as literary translations – texts that are transferred from a source context and recreated in a target context interlingually or intralingually –, this thesis investigates translational processes at play on the ground, as it were. This means that it homes in on the potential to effect and undergo translation by looking at elements of Acadian history, culture, language, and identity that exhibit characteristics of translation in several of its etymological and contemporary senses. This approach to theorising translation requires a broad conceptualisation of what translation comprises and how it is deployed not only textually, but also societally, geographically, territorially, and culturally to factor in various phenomena. It requires, in other words, what Maria Tymoczko calls an ‘enlarged’ view of translation (2014). In *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators* (2014), Tymoczko explicitly makes the case for moving beyond narrow and limited definitions of translation typically propounded in Western and English-language traditions. Tymoczko’s enlarged view is meant to ‘remind the reader that the cross-cultural concept at the heart of the international discipline of translation studies is different from the more narrow English-language (and western European) concept of translation that is linked by semiosis to notions of carrying across, the movement of Christian relics, and biblical translation’⁶³ (2014: 59). Kobus Marais further challenges the linguistic, anthropocentric, and cultural biases of translation theory, looking widely at

---

⁶³ Tymoczko adds an asterisk to the term ‘*translation’ throughout *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators* to bring this point to bear. The spirit of that addition echoes in this thesis.
‘translation process-phenomena’ generated by both semiotic and linguistic activity (2019a). Indeed, Marais highlights the translational nature of various disciplines (2023a), but also remarks on the potential for communication and meaning-making across a range of living organisms (2019a). Relevant to the conceptualisation proposed herein is the “translation-ness,” or the translationality of all of the “inter” and “trans” process-phenomena, and even process-phenomena indicated by other terms, thereby expanding the comparative power of translation studies’ (Marais 2019a: 7). Indeed, this conceptualisation recognises ‘the pragmatic, social embeddedness and creative power of translation’ (Marais 2019a: 7). The notion of translationality is further taken up by Piotr Blumczynski who moves beyond the metaphorical to material manifestations of translation to ‘argue that translation as a cultural phenomenon and social practice involves holistic, psychosomatic engagement traceable to corporeal transfer’ (2023: 4). In the Acadian context, the movement of bodies echoes the multiple deportations of the Grand Dérangement and enables a conceptualisation of translation framed around ‘translation at a territorial level’ (Cronin 1996: 49). However, the bodies facilitating or experiencing translation are not always alive, an idea that resonates with the notion of translation that Bella Brodzki unearths in bones and relics (2007). Nor does the translation always occur amongst material things, as Acadian cultural heritage and language are carried mnemonically through historical vicissitudes.

Following this broad conceptualisation of translation, it is possible to view Acadie’s (literary) translation history as rich despite occupying a relatively marginal place in Canadian translation discourse. Furthermore, the far-reaching translational phenomena deployed in Acadie intersect — and, as this thesis aims to show, contribute to — several threads in translation studies. These relate namely to (post)colonialism, minority, geography, ecology, (bio)semiotics, and migration, which provide theoretical and conceptual perspectives that ground the analysis of the chapters that follow.

Minority and (post)colonial perspectives

Before discussing minority and (post)colonial perspectives in terms of translation studies, it is worth outlining ways in which Acadian literature has been defined in these terms generally. French in Canada is in a minority position compared to English (Statistics Canada 2023), and as such, French-language literature within Canada answers to the institutional and linguistic pressures of majority English, pressures that are further
exacerbated by the pull of American influence (Godard 1979: 53). Yet, French-language literature also answers to the centripetal influence of France, positioned as the Francophone literary capital (Boudreau 2006; Casanova 2008). From this perspective, Canadian French-language literature is ‘mineure’ in the sense that Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari understand it — that is, a literature ‘qu’une minorité fait dans la langue majeure’ (1975: 29). Deleuze and Guattari go on to note that the language of minor literature ‘est affectée d’un fort coefficient de déterritorialisation’ (1975: 29), rendering it marginal in contrast to an intralingual centre/majority. In direct reference to Brisset’s work, Andrea Cabajsky points out that, of Deleuze and Guattari’s three features of small/minor literatures, the deterritorialisation of language ‘has arguably had the richest literary history in French Canada for it has hinged on Québec’s institutional emergence and development in the late twentieth century’ (2022: 28).

Québec boasts a thriving literary scene, one that challenges the minority status (Cabajsky 2022: 26–30). As Canada’s only officially French province, and with 82% of its population indicating having French as their first spoken official language (Statistics Canada 2023), Québec is also in a position of majority compared to Francophone communities outside that province. Across Canada, including in the Maritime provinces, Francophones live in official linguistic minority communities (Government of Canada 1985). In New Brunswick, for instance, Francophones represent 30% of the province’s total population, a rate that drops significantly in the other two Maritime provinces, with Francophones representing 2.8% and 2.9% of the population of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, respectively (Statistics Canada 2023). Acadie (along with other Franco-Canadian communities) is thus ‘doubly marginalised’ (Cabajsky 2022: 27) or, in other words, doubly minoritised. This is partly evidenced in the mostly monolithic conception of the Francophone experience pointed out previously. More concretely, it manifests in the double-bind that Raoul Boudreau pinpoints in Acadian literature, for Québec represents
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64 According to Deleuze and Guattari, these features are: ‘the deterritorialization of language, the connection of the individual to a political immediacy, and the collective assemblage of enunciation’ (1975: 18). Casanova notes that the use of ‘minor’ to refer to Kafka, the subject of Deleuze and Guattari’s Kafka: pour une littérature mineure, is a mistranslation of ‘klein’, meaning ‘small’ (Casanova 2008: 287; Tanasescu 2019: 18). According to Andrea Cabajsky, Régine Robin had made a similar argument a decade before Casanova, leading namely Lise Gauvin to question the relevance of the ‘minor’ in the French-Canadian context (2022: 30).
simultaneously the space of consecration (the Acadian readership being too small) and of alienation (because of cultural hegemony) (2006, see also 1998: 8).

While some have argued that the term ‘minor’ no longer adequately represents its situation (Cabajsky 2022: 31–32; Cormier 2020), Acadie experiences layers of minoritisation compared to both Anglophone Maritime/Canadian and Francophone Québécois contexts, particularly in the literary realm. Cabajsky, for one, writes of Acadian literature as ‘ultraminor’ to capture aesthetic and ideological challenges while demonstrating an ability to transcend the fluctuations of cultural and literary emergence65 (2022: 34–41). Lise Gauvin (2004) and François Paré (2015) exemplify Acadie as a ‘littérature de l’intranquillité’ and ‘littérature de l’exiguïté’, respectively. Gauvin identifies Acadian literature as a site in which a ‘surconscience linguistique’ is deployed to ‘irrigate’ the poetics of the text with ludic and transitory elements (2004: 297). Paré, meanwhile, considers Acadian literature as ‘exigüe’, or small, qualifying it specifically as insular66 because of its autarchic yet dependent nature (2001: 31; see also Cormier 2020: 241–42). Both Paré (2001: 139) and Gauvin (2003, 2004: 296) emphasise the productive nature of minority literatures, in explicit or implicit countering of condescending stereotypes of so-called small or dominated literatures, notably the qualifiers of ‘[l]a petitesse, la pauvreté, le “retard”, [et] la marginalité de ces univers littéraires’ (Casanova 2008: 262; see also Cabajsky 2022: 35; Nolette 2015: 47). Nolette, too, emphasises the productive nature of minoritised literatures, but in the context of playful translation of Franco-Canadian heterolingual theatre (2015: 8). Such potential, which hinges on the nuances and particularities of so-called minoritised literatures, is what defines the Acadian context, regardless of whether its literature is defined as ‘exigüe’, ‘intranquille’, ultraminor, or another complementary designation. Thus, for the purposes of this thesis, the terms ‘small’, ‘minor’, and ‘minoritised’ are used interchangeably. They are meant to reinforce the nuances and particularities of a context whose sociopolitical, institutional, and cultural realities do not accrue significant literary capital in the sense that Casanova (2002) understands it, without pitting this context against so-called majorities.

65 For more on ultraminor literatures, see Rønne Bergur and Damrosch (2022).

66 Paré identifies four types of ‘littératures exigües’ — ‘littératures minoritaires’, ‘littératures coloniales’, ‘littératures insulaires’, and ‘petites littératures nationales’ (2001: 26–32, emphasis in original) —, all of which befit the Acadian context to varying degrees (Cormier 2020: 242). Even so, the concept of insularity is particularly relevant to the present research, as will become clear through the analysis that follows.
Acadie’s (post)colonial state is more complex and problematic to define than its statistically confirmed minority status. Rachel Bryant sums up some of the difficulties as follows: ‘in the Atlantic provinces today [...], narratives of nineteenth-, twentieth-, and twenty-first-century economic or “regional” decline have prevailed to such a degree that Settlers have, on the whole, come to imagine and portray themselves as “colonized” subjects within vast national and national imperial orders’ (2017: 142). Recognising settler status, what the thesis aims to emphasise when referring to a (post)colonial context are the forces reminiscent of, and therefore comparable to, other postcolonial contexts, helpful in grasping issues of minoritisation and power in a translation context. As mentioned previously, Acadians are descendants of French settlers and therefore entertain a colonial past and, in many ways, present.67 Yet, history, the Grand Dérangement specifically, but also Canadian Confederation in 1867, gives Acadie postcolonial elements. As a result, ‘Acadian literature is certainly a colonial as well as a postcolonial literature — at its core, it wrestles with unresolved issues stemming from the deportation and beyond, a direct repercussion of both the French and the British colonial enterprises’ (Cormier 2020: 242; see also Slemon 2003: 23–24). More specifically, the Grand Dérangement scattered the Acadian population along the eastern seaboard of the present-day United States, Québec, the Antilles, and Europe (Arsenault 2018: 239–383; Hodson 2012; Leblanc 1967). As a result, Acadie is imbued with what Jean Morency calls a ‘conscience de l’errance continentale acadienne’ (2007: 506), famously epitomised in Acadian literature in the works of Gérald Leblanc (Jacquot 1988; Lonergan 2018: 62–64).

Canadian Confederation not only dispensed with colonial governments on paper, but it also shifted the centre away from the Maritime provinces, long the seat of British colonial enterprises and, paradoxically, the site of Confederation itself. As Tony Tremblay points out in the context of Anglophone literary production, Confederation rendered New Brunswick (and by extension other Maritime provinces) ‘supplicant’68 and, consequently, obscured its

67 Historically, the Mi’kmaq and the Acadians generally maintained friendly alliances (Paul 2006: 173), but this does not negate the colonial violence effected on Indigenous populations by all European settlers. For an overview of contemporary colonial violence, see for example DeMont (2020).

68 Tremblay argues that a group of New Brunswick-based Anglophone writers fought to define Canadian modernism on their terms: the ‘Fiddlehead modernists’ (New Brunswick poets and cultural workers, namely Alfred Baily, Desmond Pacey, and Fred Cogswell) took part in ‘a struggle for self-definition undertaken by smaller parts of the federation as a method of differentiation from centralizing and homogenizing pressures’ (2019: xvii).
literature through dominant narratives that promoted the centre — in this case Toronto/Ontario (Tremblay 2019: xvii, 3–40). Tremblay likewise notes that these circumstances bled into emerging Acadian production (2019: xvii).

Though painted in broad strokes, this context illustrates how Acadie might both represent and contribute to trends in both postcolonial and minority translation studies. Both of these subfields stem from the cultural turn in translation studies heralded by Susan Bassnett and Andre Lefevere (1990, 1998; see also Bassnett 2002), which established cultural background and context as influential factors in the translation process. Following Tejaswini Niranjana’s (1992) landmark investigation into asymmetrical representations and historicity, scholars have homed in on translation’s ability to resist, destabilise, subvert, and counter in postcolonial contexts (Simon and St-Pierre 1999; Tymoczko 1999, 2010; Tymoczko and Gentzler 2002; Venuti 1995). Moreover, postcolonial translation studies have shown ways in which translation can be deployed in the service of cultural identity development. For instance, Brisset’s Sociocritique de la traduction (1990) elucidates Québécois translation practice as it argues for the power of vernacular language to build cultural identity. The translation strategies that Brisset puts forward — iconoclastic, perlocutory, and identity-forming (1990) — exemplify, albeit anachronistically, radical use of domestication strategies like those outlined by Venuti (1995), subverting and occluding the Other.69 Also looking at the Québécois context but expanding geographically, Edwin Gentzler (2008) examines the constitutive function of translation in the Americas, including Québec. Across the Atlantic, Michael Cronin (1996) highlights the role of translation through various periods of Irish history as well as the impact of the contact zone between languages on Irish language, literature, and cultural identity. Maria Tymoczko likewise looks at the Irish context, employing a corpus of early Irish literature in translation to paint the country not only as ‘a locus of imperialism, but [also as] a site of resistance and nation building’ (1999: 21).

The concept of minority in translation studies emerged at the turn of the twenty-first century, generating discussion from the perspectives of languages (Branchadell and West 2005) and cultures/literatures (Cronin 1995, 1998; Venuti 1998). Yet, no clear definition of

69 Brisset observes in Québécois translations that ‘[l]’idéal serait que nulle présence étrangère ne vienne entacher l’identité québécoise. […] Au nom de la différence salvatrice, toute forme d’altérité doit être automatiquement rejetée hors du groupe, confinée à sa propre différence’ (1990: 277–78).
minority translation seems to exist, and Raluca Tanasescu argues that terminology (minor, minority, etc.) is, confusingly and perhaps erroneously, used interchangeably (2019: 18–19). There is, however, consensus that translation in minoritised contexts can generate varied results, both beneficial and detrimental, playing into the idea that minority communities are ‘translation cultures par excellence’ (Cronin 1998: 147, 2003: 139). Building on Deleuze and Guattari’s definition of ‘littérature mineure’ (1975), Venuti correlates the features of minor literatures with translation in a minority context, noting specifically tradition and social affinity, political impulse, and heterogeneity (1998: 136–41). Minority translation generally posits that there are risks associated with translation strategies in or out of a minority context, particularly a postcolonial one, and that ‘foreignizing’ or ‘domesticating’ strategies (Venuti 1995) can foster assimilation or resistance depending on context (Cronin 2020). Cronin sums up these diverging tendencies by differentiating between ‘translation-as-assimilation’ and ‘translation-as-diversification’, by which ‘[l]anguage speakers can either be assimilated through self-translation to a dominant language or they can retain and develop their language through the good offices of translation and thus resist incorporation’ (1998: 148–49). Indeed, this means that it often falls to minoritised communities to ensure the continued need for translation (Cronin 1995: 88, 2000: 95, 2020: 335).

Yet, these features of translation in a minoritised context are generally framed in comparative terms in which minor is compared to major, colonised to coloniser, or vice versa (Tanasescu 2019: 21). This thesis aims to muddle this either/or nature for the Canadian context, which has contributed to defining monolithic experiences defined through two linguistic groups separated by a (single) bridge. In the Acadian context, conventional dichotomies give way to a palimpsest, encapsulated namely in the designation ‘Acadie/Mi’kma’ki/Nova Scotia’ mentioned earlier, which should be expanded to ‘Mi’kma’ki/Acadie/Atlantic Canada’ to reflect present-day realities. While Acadian literature is palimpsestic, too (Ferron 2021: 176; Viau 2008: 141), in translation overlapping circumstances emphasise relationality. Relationality is a quality of minoritised contexts, and indeed of minority literatures more generally (Paré 2003), as the minor is always liable to change to major and vice versa depending on translational forces and contexts (Cronin 1995: 86–88, see also 1998: 151). A more complex approach is required, and this is precisely the perspective for which Gillian Lane-Mercier and Denise Merkle (2018) call in the introduction to their edited volume of TTR : Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction based on
Kobus Marais’ (2013) complexity theory approach. Indeed, as the following chapters will demonstrate, translation in Acadie fluctuates between an activity that undermines and one that resists.

**Hybridity and the fractal dimension**

One of the tenets of the postcolonial perspective (Ashcroft and others 1998: 118) and of postcolonial translation studies more specifically (Maitland 2020), is the notion of hybridity. Grounded in the work of Homi K. Bhabha (1994), hybridity is a conduit for grappling with questions of identity, language, and nation. Like minority perspectives, it can have both positive and negative effects on minoritised communities and cultures (Maitland 2020). Smallness provides one way to highlight hybridity, for as Cronin explains, ‘[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’ (1998: 148, 2003: 141). Cronin argues that even small cultural entities have the potential to showcase infinite diversity. This idea is encompassed in the ‘fractal dimension’, a notion inspired by charting diverse landscapes on the human scale of someone travelling on foot (Cronin 2000: 17–19, 2006: 16, 2012: 59). According to Cronin, the ‘fractal dimension’ provides a perspective by which ‘[t]he small is not simple. The complexity of the open and “densely-textured” space is the roughness or irregularity or complexity that carries across scales’ (Cronin 2000: 17). According to the fractal dimension, paying attention to detail and to the small shifts revealed by close examination and signalling difference through tradition, language, and landscape (the equivalent of travelling on foot) highlights an immanent and rich diversity that can be extrapolated into larger scales (Cronin 2000: 17–19, 2006: 15–18, 2012: 24, 66–68). The fractal dimension thereby feeds into a ‘micro-cosmopolitanism’ capable of revaluing particularity, tradition, and rurality in all their complexity and dynamism (Cronin 2006: 15–18, see also 2000: 16–20). More specifically, ‘[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). This is precisely the stance that this thesis adopts, focussing on a small/minor context through a fractal dimension that aims to highlight diversity and richness. In this, it aligns with the work of Sarah Marilou Brideau
(2012), who draws from Cronin’s concept of micro-cosmopolitanism to shed new light on Acadian poet Gérald Leblanc’s work as it seeks to open itself up to modern, urban perspectives while staying true to its (Acadian) origins. The fractal dimension also underpins the ‘politics of microspection’ that, according to Cronin (2012), promotes engagement with the world from a position indebted to and profoundly cognisant of the local. Indeed, the emphasis on ‘undermining from below’ in Cronin’s definition of micro-cosmopolitanism quoted above is especially relevant to the Acadian context because it plays out on several levels. For one thing, Antonine Maillet famously writes of the ‘gens d’en bas’ instead of those from ‘en haut’ (Bourque 2015a: 63; Marguerite Maillet 1983: 182–83). Still, ‘below’ also encourages the viewer to look underfoot, in this case to the Acadian landscape, which, as the following analysis will demonstrate, contributes significantly to translation practice in Acadie.

Translation sites and zones

The fractal dimension highlights questions of spatiality. Acadie’s smallness, as mentioned previously, is not only complex but also exacerbated by geographical distance. The Maritime provinces became peripheral with Canadian Confederation in the nineteenth century70 (Tremblay 2019: 3–40), but within the region Acadie is further marked by distance. Acadie des Maritimes lies on the edge of Canada, on its Atlantic shores, and Acadian communities are generally located near coastlines across the Maritime provinces (Arseneault 1999; Hodson 2012: 198; Péronnet and others 1998). The Acadian diaspora, including the ‘Petites Cadies’ of Québec and Acadie tropicale in Louisiana discussed in Chapter 5, extend the distance. Yet, the distance is somehow connected or, to use Paré’s term, inhabited. According to Paré, the ‘concept névralgique de diaspora [...] [puisque] [t]outes les cultures minoritaires projettent des comportements et des imaginaires diasporaux’ offers compromise through accommodation (2003: 13). ‘La distance habitée’ counteracts the effects of ‘conscience diasporique’ and ‘errance’ and transforms devastating (and irreversible) losses (death, decline, absence) into potential for gain in literature (2003: 37). Paré turns to strategies that factor in questions of diaspora, wandering, accommodation, and creolisation for so-called marginal communities (2003: 9–

---

70 This state expanded to Atlantic Canada when the province of Newfoundland and Labrador joined Canadian Confederation in 1949.
Nolette, too, addresses questions of distance by adopting an aerial view to map out, through heterolingual theatre, trajectories of circulation from the Francophone peripheries of Western Canada, Franco-Ontario, and Acadie to the centres of (Anglophone) Toronto and (Francophone) Montréal (2015: 8–11). From this perspective, the question of distance in Acadie reframes Simon’s observation that ‘translation across small distances can be more difficult than across continents or oceans’ (2019: 101). In Acadie, translation grapples with both small and vast distances, and complexities on both small (local) and large (across the diaspora) scales are worth considering.

The geographical aspect of translation, and more particularly the impetus to situate translation precisely but not according to national boundaries, has given way to the notion of ‘zone’ (Simon 2013: 182). Mary Louise Pratt outlines ‘contact zones’, those ‘social spaces where disparate cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in highly asymmetrical relations of domination and subordination — like colonialism, slavery, or their aftermaths as they are lived out across the globe today’ (Pratt 2008: 4). Emily Apter proposes the ‘translation zone’, calling for a ‘broad intellectual topography’, a ‘connecting port of translational transnationalism (a term [used] to emphasize translation among small nations or minority language communities), as well as the point of debarkation to a cultural caesura’ (2006: 5). Apter’s conception is largely premised on ‘language wars’ (2006: 5), the implicit violence of which correlates to the Acadian context. Cronin and Simon (2014) bring the concept of translation zone to urban spaces, defining translational cities in which language movements have shaped political and cultural events and the cities’ unique fabric especially strongly. Geographically-oriented studies such as The Caribbean in Translation (Saint-Loubert 2020), Of Peninsulas and Archipelagos (Chittiphalangsri and Rafael 2023), and Translating Home in the Global South (Gómez and Hansen Esplin 2024) have likewise explored translation from the perspective of the interaction between languages and landscape, both rural and urban, telluric and maritime. Saint-Loubert (2020), for instance, uses the figure of the threshold in its paratexual and geographical configurations to remap routes of literary (non)circulation at local and transnational levels, while Chittiphalangsri and Rafael (2023) weave together textual heritage found across varied landscapes in southeast Asia. In the Canadian context, Simon has examined translational Montréal through its various crossings (2006), as well as from the perspective of the city’s hybridity and the translational markers of its ‘third spaces’ (2012: 117–50). The link between
translation and urban spaces is also the subject of Nicole Nolette’s *Traverser Toronto* (2024), which maps out the dynamics of the ‘voisinage linguistique’ of Toronto’s urban zones. Furthermore, built spaces such as churches, gardens, libraries, and bridges, have been deemed sites of translation (Simon 2019). In this context, Simon studies the National Gallery of Canada in Ottawa for the changes that it enacts by displaying Indigenous languages (2019: 144–55).

These cities and sites of translation are for the most part delineated; they are geographically, geopolitically, or architecturally concrete and circumscribed spaces. The city of Montréal and the province of Québec benefit from legally defined boundaries that imbue municipal and provincial governments with rights and responsibilities, namely of upholding the French language (Publications Québec 2023). This enables, for instance, the charting of translation trajectories within the streets of Montréal (Simon 2006) and an ‘endotic travel’ perspective bounded by proximity (Cronin 2012: 11). The Acadian context, by contrast, complicates clear delineations of translation. This does not mean that there are no elements of contact or translation zones; on the contrary, the Maritime provinces are multilingual (Statistics Canada 2023), New Brunswick is Canada’s only bilingual province (OCOLNB - CLONB [n.d.]), Moncton remains one of Canada’s few officially bilingual cities (City of Moncton 2002), and the Acadian ‘chiac’ dialect intertwines French and English. Historically, too, Acadie was a ‘havre sacré’ (LeBlanc 2013: 50) of overlapping languages and cultures (see Chapter 1). From another perspective, though, Acadie has not existed on geographical maps since the Treaty of Utrecht of 1713 that ceded the territory to the British (Arsenault 2018: 120; Faragher 2005: 136). It lives on, as mentioned previously, in the imaginary of the Acadian people and in connection to the landscape. This state is satirically represented in the ‘Le recensement’ monologue of Antonine Maillet’s *La Sagouine*, in which La Sagouine is unable to find a suitable nationality for the census-takers, who contend that ‘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’ (1990: 154). Yet, it is only the census-takers (whom La Sagouine through catachresis calls ‘encenseux’), who problematise Acadian identity; according to La Sagouine’s reasoning, living in Acadie obviously makes her Acadian.71

---

71 ‘Pour l’amour de Djeu, où c’est que je vivons, nous autres? ... En Acadie, qu’ils nous avont dit, et je sons des Acadjens. Ça fait que j’avons entrepris de répondre à leu question de nationalité coume ça : des Acadjens, que je leur avons dit’ (Maillet 1990: 153–54). Incidentally, present-day Canadian censuses recognise Acadie as
Even if ‘[i]t is not the physical structure which defines the site but rather the languages that tell its story’ (Simon 2019: 251), the physical structure, the concreteness of space, contribute to circumscribing or bringing together languages. In Acadie, meanwhile, the Grand Dérangement fractured communities and destroyed lands (Fowler Forthcoming: 10). Some of these were re-established during the Acadian renaissance with communities, institutions, and sites of memory (Rudin 2009) that do constitute sites or zones of translation. Still, these sites, however productive, are scattered as a result of the violence of the Grand Dérangement, which shattered a sense of unified place in Acadie. These sites dot Acadie rather than form neat delineations. As Geneviève Massignon writes in one of the first sociolinguistic studies of Acadie, ‘l’examen de la carte géographique montrant la distribution du peuplement acadien fait voir qu’il est réparti en une série de “noyaux” séparés les uns des autres par des éléments anglo-saxons beaucoup plus nombreux ou par de vastes zones non peuplées’ (1947: 46). Therefore, the zone and its repertory of features that facilitate encounter supply an incomplete framework for considering translation in the Acadian context. As a site of translation, Acadie is not beholden to urban, constructed, structured, or even telluric spaces. Rather, it shifts and fluctuates. As Mélissa Ferron writes to contextualise heterotopias in Acadian literature, ‘[e]n littérature acadienne l’espace acadien reste réticent à tout effort de structure; il est marqué par l’instabilité et la muabilité, et il est appréhendé fondamentalement comme une expérience en soi’ (2021: 172).

Readings of translation: eco-translation and (bio)semiotics

Embracing unconventional sites of translation requires approaches to interpreting translational phenomena beyond text and human languages. In an article titled ‘From Translation Zone to Sacrifice Zone’, Michael Cronin draws from the work of Emily Apter (2006) and Naomi Klein (2014) to propose an ‘eco-minor’ mode as a lens through which to grapple with questions of translation and ecology in the age of the Anthropocene (2021: 4). An ecological perspective of translation for Cronin is intimately connected to the minor and,  

---

an ‘ethnic or cultural origin’ (Statistics Canada 2022).

72 To this effect, see Chapter 2, notably references to Grand-Pré National Historic Site.
more specifically, to an ability to recognise and read (translate) natural environments and landscapes and the languages they contain. More specifically,

[translated into the minor reveals a relationality otherwise obscured. This relationality is not, however, straightforwardly communicative. It is translational. The physical, biological and human-cultural factors present in the coastal meadows do not share a common language. Contact or dialogue means communication across radical forms of difference, a liminal encounter with alternate epistemes and ontologies. (Cronin 2021: 7)

As part of this process, Cronin argues for translating outdoors (2021: 10–14). This does not entail moving human translation practice outdoors, but, rather, ‘developing a sensitivity to the more-than-human world which is rooted in the many languages that have been used to describe that world’ (2021: 11–12). Applying this to the Canadian context, translating outdoors means moving beyond the built, structured, urban notions of translation sites, though these have been shown to involve more-than-human translation, too (Cronin 2021: 14–17; Simon 2019). This approach allows for recognising on the one hand the linguistic palimpsest of Acadie/Mi’kma’ki/Nova Scotia that includes Mi’kmaq, Acadian Frenches, and Gaelic, among other minor languages (Statistics Canada 2023). Minor languages connected to the landscape such as these hold great regenerative power and an ability to counter destruction engendered by (neo)colonialism and capitalism (Cronin 2017: 141–48). On the other hand, an outdoor approach also calls for acknowledging translational phenomena among the more-than-human — that is, among all meaning-making organisms and processes beyond human production and language. From this perspective, Marais’ (bio)semiotic theory of translation (2019a) provides a useful starting point (Cronin 2021: 6; Harding 2021: 363–64).

This expanded view of translation, which in its appreciation of translational phenomena echoes recent studies pushing for an expansion of what translation as product and process entails (Blumczynski 2023; Cronin 2017; Marais 2019a, 2023b; Tymoczko 2014), aptly represents the Acadian context. Here, translation occurs not only between texts and

---

73 The Nova Scotia government has a Department of Gaelic Affairs (Province of Nova Scotia [n.d.]), and Halifax-based Braden Press brings Gaelic language and culture to readers.
languages, but also beyond linguistic systems and human codes, as will be discussed in the following chapters. Before discussing conceptualisations of translation further, however, it is worth noting that calls for paying attention to and indeed translating the various languages of the landscape, human and more-than-human, correspond to the premise of ‘critical place inquiry’ as propounded by Eve Tuck and Marcia McKenzie (2016). According to Tuck and McKenzie and following Tatek Abebe, ‘ethical practices must be place-specific, place-responsive, place resonant’ (2016: 161). As both methodological and theoretical tool, critical place inquiry, like eco- and biosemiotic translation, seeks to acknowledge the devastating effects of (settler) colonialism, globalisation, and environmental degradation (Tuck and McKenzie 2016: xiii–xvii). Furthermore, Tuck and McKenzie argue for a definition of place that recognises that

[p]laces are not always named, and not always justly named. They do not always appear on maps; they do not have agreed-upon boundaries. They are not fixed. Places are not more readily understood by objective accounts. Finally and most importantly, places have practices. In some definitions, places are practices. (2016: 14)

It is precisely such a conception of place as practice — in this case of Acadie as translation practice — that underpins the following thesis. To return to the notion of distance discussed earlier, this idea aligns with Sue-Ann Harding’s interpretation of Tim Ingold’s ‘wayfaring’ in the context of translation studies (2021). Harding emphasises the ‘processual dimension’ of translation and the translator as practitioner/maker (2021: 358–59). Translation actively partakes in the formation of place and practice in Acadie, grounded in a fertile cultural imaginary.

Acts of translation: translatio and other conceptualisations of translation

As the preceding paragraphs suggest, this thesis conceives of translation in a variety of ways. Firstly, it relies, as will be discussed shortly, on a corpus of literary translations in the conventional Jakobsonian sense of ‘interlingual’ and ‘intralingual’ translation (2012: 127), as well as on ‘adaptations’ as understood by Linda Hutcheon (2013). Elsewhere, the concept of translation moves away from textual and in some cases linguistic frameworks
altogether and refers to processes and phenomena that include the translation of people, through physical displacement and linguistic assimilation, of cultures, of landscapes, and of nature. In many ways, it reverts to the etymological sense of *translatio*. Maria Tymoczko explains that ‘[t]he concrete and material aspect of many types of translation is [...] signaled in the connection between textual translation and the earliest meaning of *translation* in English, a meaning reflecting Latin *translatio* — the transfer of power, learning, or the relics of saints from one location to another’ (2014: 118). Now a trope of translation studies, the ‘carrying across’ inherent in the notion of *translatio* parallels phenomena occurring in the Acadian context and for which elements of translationality and translatibility are discussed throughout this thesis. Both Kobus Marais (2019a: 7) and Piotr Blumczynski (2023: 34–36) emphasise the need to acknowledge translationality to grasp the complex translational processes and forces underpinning various phenomena. More specifically, Blumczynski asks the deceptively simple question of what translation does to probe ‘literal, non-metaphorical account[s] of translation’ and explore how medieval and contemporary ‘translational phenomena’ may illuminate ‘textual translation’, instead of the reverse direction conventionally adopted in the field (2023: 26). As for translationality in Acadie, one example comes through the notion of transfer of power that resonates with Eric Cheyfitz’s contention that colonisation and imperialism are themselves translational (1991: xx). According to Cheyfitz, colonisation shifted Indigenous peoples into the ‘realm of the proper’ precisely to dispossess them of it (1991: 59), a situation mirrored in the Acadian context particularly through the violence of the Grand Dérangement that left the Acadian population in possession of very little (LeBlanc 2018: 42–43).

The displacements brought about namely by the Grand Dérangement correspond to the shift from ‘figurative literary meaning of an interlingual transaction’ to the ‘etymological meaning of locational disruption’ that Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi noted a quarter century ago (1999: 13). Indeed, the Grand Dérangement engendered migratory movements, not only through the deportations themselves, but also in numerous subsequent relocations (Arsenault 2018: 239–383; Hodson 2012). Trajectories of migration, and for that matter of travel in a broader sense (Cronin 2000), are inherently intertwined with questions of translation, both linguistic and spatial (Bertacco and Vallorani 2021; Caneda-Cabrera and others 2018; Gómez and Hansen Esplin 2024; Inghilleri 2017; Nergaard 2021). Bertacco and Vallorani, for instance, point out the ‘interwovenness of the physical and intellectual
experience that both translation and migration entail’ (2021: 45). Inghilleri specifies, moreover, that ‘migration’ is not predicated on distance, that all humans migrate merely by ‘moving through life’ 74 (2017: 5, emphasis in original). Meanwhile, Federico Italiano introduces a maritime aspect to the notion of *translatio*, utilising *translatio maris* to describe translation ‘in a broader cultural semiotic sense as a process of transformation and recodification of geographical imaginaries’ (2016: 95).

Finally, *translatio* also harkens back to the transfer of (religious) relics (Bertacco and Vallorani 2021: 28–39; Blumczynski 2023: 83–143; Italiano 2019: 8; Simon 2019: 189; Tymoczko 2014: 59, 118). Blumczynski postulates the material translationality of saintly relics to answer the question posed by Bella Brodzki (2007): ’[t]his is how bones can live: animated by translationality’ (Blumczynski 2023: 143). In the Acadian context the relic is both material and immaterial, and popular or vernacular rather than saintly. The aboiteaux, for example, discussed in Chapter 2, have become buried under centuries of silt deposit: ‘[i]n the archaeological context, the presumed paucity of dyke-wall remnants was not necessarily the result of their rapid erosion, but more often of their rapid burial beneath tidal sediments. By extrapolation, Acadian dykes of the early 1700s would now be covered by 8 to 9 [feet] [2.4 to 2.7 metres] of marshland deposits and thus completely out of sight, but nevertheless present and intact’ (2004: 97; see also Hill Clark 1968: 27). Present and intact, and presumably with stories to tell. As Brodzki writes, ‘excavating or unearthing burial sites or ruins to reconstruct traces of the physical and textual past in a new context is also a mode of translation’ (Brodzki 2007: 4; qtd. in Blumczynski 2023: 141–42). The translationality of the aboiteaux, then, lies not in the movement of relics but in other (translational) movements occurring above, as will be discussed in Chapter 2. Moreover, in the Acadian context some relics are not material but mnemonic. This idea is encompassed in Antonine Maillet’s contention that the only thing to survive the Grand Dérangement intact is a ‘memory in words’ (1987: 14; see also Slemon 2003: 29–30). If loss is a precondition of translation and the acknowledgement of such loss a precursor to meaningfulness (Cronin 2022: 263), then the losses of life and land engendered in the Grand Dérangement presumably carry meaning to be deciphered in the form of ghosts and buried traces, material and immaterial. From this perspective, the Grand Dérangement was bound to be

74 Inghilleri connects this idea with Tim Ingold’s notion of ‘wayfaring’ (Ingold 2007).
impactful translationally. In this context, the strategies devised by Brodzki, compelled by the lingering impact of trauma, to interpret intergenerational transmission in the preservation (survival) of/in memory (2007: 111–46) are particularly useful. Italiano, too, notes ‘the dark side of translation’, which, through the ‘translation of saints’ relics — or in this ritualised translation of ghosts, if you will — we find a process of retrieval and relocation of meaning, of de- and re-contextualisation, which resurfaces in every cultural activity we would call “translation”’ (2019: 8). Both Benjaminian afterlife (Benjamin 2012) and Derridean ‘survival’ (see Apter 2013: 14; Niranjana 1992: 147–48) provide additional frameworks for addressing the ‘memory in words’ that acts as counterpart to death, destruction, and loss of both people and landscapes in the wake of the Grand Dérangement.

**Methodology and materials**

Building on the relatively scant portrait of Acadian translation and on the various threads of translation studies that currently and tangentially relate to it, this study aims to produce focussed case studies of translation within the framework of English-to-French translation in Canada and minority translation globally. The goal is to identify, describe, and interpret the particularities of translation within the Acadian context and to articulate a vocabulary for theorising Acadian literary translation. To accomplish this, the thesis adopts a mixed methodology that includes historiographical investigation, contrastive analysis, and interdisciplinary perspectives. These methods are used variously across each of the five content chapters to address two perspectives from which to articulate the particularities of translation in Acadie: determining how translational phenomena have contributed to sociocultural development and thus outlining translationality, and conversely, how the Acadian imaginary, shaped by history, language, and culture, contributes to translation practice.75

Starting from the premise of translationality within both the material and the immaterial (Blumczynski 2023; Marais 2019a), Chapter 1 starts by finding instances or expressions of translational forces within Acadian history and the cultural imaginary. It thus turns to Acadian historiography to identify features that foster the development of Acadie’s

---

75 This line of enquiry corresponds roughly to Tymoczko’s attempt to reconcile two directions of research in translation studies, the ‘macroscopic’ that looks widely on cultural effects and the ‘microscopic’ that looks at linguistic particularities (2002: 14–17).
translationality — that is, its potential to effect and undergo translation — from societal, geographical, and cultural perspectives. After positioning Acadians at the centre of a multilingual society, the chapter discusses sociopolitical neutrality in the decades after the conquest of Port-Royal (1710–1755), the Grand Dérangement as translation at a territorial level (1755–1763), and the translatability of the Évangéline narrative that drives the Acadian renaissance (1864–1884).

After establishing the translational forces underpinning Acadian history, society, and culture, the focus shifts to determining ways in which the Acadian imaginary in turn informs translation practice. Accordingly, Chapters 2, 3, and 4 turn to a corpus of Acadian literary translations — that is, as described previously, literary translations produced or published in Acadie or grounded in an Acadian imaginary. The translations listed in Table 1 above provided the starting point. Close readings of these translations and comparisons with their source texts revealed key shifts occurring through the translation process. Shifts are understood as additions, omissions, substitutions, or semantic divergences appearing in the translation and therefore engendered in the process of transfer from a source text, regardless of whether a linguistic transfer occurs. In the context of Acadian translation, these often reflect cultural identity, language, folklore, and history. These shifts are especially relevant because most Acadians are bilingual\footnote{This is symptomatic of official linguistic minority settings. According to a breakdown of the most recent census numbers for New Brunswick, for example, 30% of the population indicate having French as a first official language, but 7.9% indicate having knowledge of French only. By contrast, 69.1% indicate having English as a first official language, with 57.9% indicating having knowledge of English only (Statistics Canada 2023).} (Statistics Canada 2023). Unlike predominantly Francophone contexts such as France and even Québec, the Acadian audience is generally familiar and comfortable with the language of the source text. Translators’ decisions, particularly as they relate to Acadian identity, can thus be interpreted according to this ability to access the source text.

The shifts occurring in the translation process from source to target texts were then winnowed and collated into a representative and manageable group. Selection criteria included impact and effect of shift; connection to the elements of Acadian language, culture, and folklore for the purposes of analysis; geographical representation; and diversity in terms of translators, translation strategy, and date of publication. Hence the corpus of 11 works by six translators published between 1975 and 2020, providing a solid overview of the
most prolific period of Acadian translation, from Maillet’s earliest (Évangéline Deusse) to the most recent publications (Océan and L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay). Six of the translations are by Antonine Maillet, the most prolific Acadian translator to date and one whose body of work incorporates interlingual and intralingual translations that range from loose adaptations to close adherence to source text: Évangéline Deusse (Maillet 1975); Le Bourgeois gentleman (Maillet 1978); Les drôlatiques, horrifiques et épouvantables aventures de Panurge, ami de Pantagruel (Antonine Maillet 1983); William S (Maillet 1991); La Fontaine ou La Comédie des Animaux (Maillet 1995); and La Tempête (Shakespeare 1997). The remaining five translations that make up the corpus include fiction, non-fiction, and poetry to counterbalance Maillet’s theatre translations, and likewise represent varied strategies: Journal de John Winslow à Grand-Pré, by Serge Patrice Thibodeau (2010); Nous sommes les rêveurs, by Sophie M. Lavoie (Joe 2016); femme-rivière, by Rose Després (Vermette 2019); L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay, by Sonya Malaborza (McKay 2020); and Océan, by Georgette LeBlanc (Goyette 2020).

Since these 11 literary translations — and indeed the works listed in Table 1 other than Maillet’s — are grounded in Acadie des Maritimes and therefore do not account for the diaspora, Chapter 5 homes in instead on geocritical, publishing, and linguistic strategies. This approach allows for a discussion of translation in the Acadian diaspora representative of translation phenomena beyond a textual frame. The materials for this part of the analysis include Benoit Doyon-Gosselin’s geocritical study of the city of Moncton, Moncton Mentor (2022), as well as the linguistic strategies adopted across Maillet’s translations, and publishing practices in Louisiana, gleaned through Ô Malheureuse: French Writings by Louisiana Women (Wilson Michot 2019) and L’Acadie hier et aujourd’hui and Acadie Then and Now (Perrin and others 2014b, 2014a).

Rather than line-by-line examinations of each text, the analysis centres on the shifts that occur in the process of translation, which are interpreted according to the translators’ own thoughts as gleaned from paratexts and interviews. Research drawn from various fields — such as translation, historiography, ecology, archeology, and literature, mostly but not exclusively as they intersect with Acadian studies — contextualise and inform the findings. From the analysed corpus, groupings emerge according to the types of effect generated by translational shifts and the multidisciplinary perspectives that inform them. Focussing on textual shifts and translational phenomena within this corpus allows not only
for capturing the full range of Acadie’s translation practice, which for practical reasons would be impossible in a line-by-line analysis given the size of the corpus, but also for discerning patterns shared or threaded across nearly a half century of practice. To structure these coherently and uniquely within an Acadian framework, each set of patterns is equated with an aspect central to the Acadian imaginary: aboiteaux, défrichetage de parenté, grands dérangements, and mascaret (defined in the next section). This approach, in turn, allows for elaborating on the particularities of translation, as each aspect also exhibits translational qualities and thereby lends itself well to discussions of translation from several perspectives. While they have been widely discussed from historical, archeological, social, economic, environmental, and political perspectives, none of these aspects has served to correlate sociocultural phenomena in a sustained way yet, and certainly not translation.

Chapter overviews

The point of departure of Chapter 1 is the suggestion implicit in Maillet’s ‘corver ou pas corver’ that translation lies at the heart of Acadian experience. The thesis thus starts by turning to Acadian historiography to find instances in which translational phenomena may have shaped the Acadian imaginary and contributed to ways in which Acadians live and experience translation broadly and variously. Chapter 1 begins by outlining the position of Acadians at the centre of a multilingual society before bringing together three periods of Acadian history: the period of relative peace between the cession of Acadie to Britain with the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713 and the Deportation in 1755; the period of the Grand Dérangement, between 1755 and 1763; and the Acadian renaissance and first Conventions nationales acadiennes, between 1864 and 1884. Acadian historiography and literary history reveal an inherent translationality — a potential to effect and undergo translation — from societal, geographical, and cultural perspectives. This potential is explored through Acadians’ sociopolitical stance, which placed them at the centre of a web of mediation between imperial control and subjection. Ultimately, though, neutrality also fostered translatability, for it allowed the British to devalue Acadian presence and fabulate Acadie/Mi’kma’ki as terra nullius. This leads to the second period examined in this chapter, that of the Grand Dérangement (1755–1762). For, once the territory was perceived as
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77 Tymoczko writes about this impossibility, arguing that texts are ‘overdetermined’ (2002: 15).
empty, the Acadians could justifiably be removed through deportation. In addition to responding to express motivations by the British to ‘translate’ the Francophone community into Anglophone society, the Deportation instantiates what Michael Cronin interprets, following Edmund Spenser’s desire to scatter the Irish among the English in the sixteenth century, as ‘translation at a territorial level’ (1996: 49). Finally, the third feature through which Acadian translationality is explored comes from the narrative of Evangeline that took hold during the Acadian renaissance. Inspired by the story of the Grand Dérangement, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow published in 1847 the epic poem *Evangeline: A Tale of Acadie* (2004). The poem was translated into French by Québécois poet Pamphile Lemay in 1864 (Longfellow 2008) before arriving in Acadie as *Évangéline*, where it quickly and fervently permeated the ideological discourse stemming out of the *Conventions nationales acadiennes* of the 1880s. An instance of cultural translation, *Evangeline* also highlights an inherent translatability from linguistic and intersemiotic perspectives in the Acadian imaginary. The result is the establishment of Acadie as a playground for translation, integral to understanding the practice of literary translation and its peculiar qualities, the focus of the subsequent chapters.

Chapter 2 brings together translations by Serge Patrice Thibodeau, Sonya Malaborza, Sophie M. Lavoie, and Rose Després. It opens with a discussion of walls, and John Winslow’s obsession, as stated in his *Journal*, with building a palisade upon arriving in Grand-Pré to execute deportation orders. Thibodeau’s translation process highlights the vulnerability of the palisade, revealing its porosity. The chapter then moves on to *L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay*, in which Malaborza painstakingly finds substitutes for the novel’s plants and medicinal herbs from Acadian popular medicine, effectively re-planting Acadian flora in a landscape destroyed during the Grand Dérangement. Then, translator Sophie M. Lavoie meets Mi’kmaq poet Rita Joe in the landscape of Cape Breton in *Nous sommes les rêveurs* and minoritises the majority language (English) in a move that reveals the regenerative power of the minor. Finally, *femme-rivière* instigates shifts in translation that mirror fluvial tides and currents. Throughout this chapter, porosity, regeneration, landscape markings, and cyclical flows converge in the figure of the *aboiteau*, the Acadian method of dyking saltmarshes. The
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78 The notion of ‘playground’ invokes the ludic nature of translation in the Franco-Canadian context argued by Nolette (2015), but it also ties into the landscape, or territory, that stimulates and articulates translation, as will be discussed in Chapter 1.
aboiteaux function through dialectical processes, as they are purposely built to let water drain out of the marsh at low tide and prevent water from seeping in at high tide. They are structural, permanent elements of the landscape but are nevertheless porous and generative, altering the landscape by creating arable land out of previously unusable saltmarshes.

Chapter 3 brings together translations by Antonine Maillet, Georgette LeBlanc, and Sonya Malaborza that stage narrative interventions that instigate a search for and an invention of ancestors. Beginning with contextualising Maillet’s literary and translation practices as genealogical and intertextual — and therefore inherently translational —, the chapter proceeds to locating instances of literary hauntings and intertextuality that, when contextualised within the Mailletian universe, converge into a genealogical impulse that makes its way into translations. Maillet’s *Les drôlatiques, horribles et épouvantables aventures de Panurge, ami de Pantagruel, La Fontaine ou la Comédie des Animaux*, and *William S*, along with Georgette LeBlanc’s *Océan*, conjure up ancestors to catalyse Acadian linguistic, cultural, and folkloric legacies. In addition to looking backwards into genealogical ancestry, some translations also diligently invent descendants, effectively repopulating an Acadie emptied of its inhabitants during the Grand Dérangement. This is the case for *Évangéline Deusse* and *L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay*, which both feature midwives (*sages-femmes*) and ‘saga-women’ (Brière 1996a: 13) to assert the presence of an Acadian population despite attempted eradication. These translations are interpreted through the lens of Barry McCrea’s ‘nongenetic genealogies’ (2011), which emphasise the role of the stranger to establish connectivity according to forms of affinity other than genealogy. To frame the discussion about ancestors and descendants, the chapter borrows the notion of *défrichetage de parenté*, an occupation that arose following the ‘éclatement généalogique’ (Brière 1990: 59) of the Grand Dérangement. An Acadian corruption of the French ‘défrichage’, or land clearing, the term ‘défrichetage de parenté’ represents the untangling of frayed, separated family lineages.

Chapter 4 focusses on the Grand Dérangement and its portrayal in translation. The Deportation is at the centre of Serge Patrice Thibodeau’s *Journal de John Winslow à Grand-Pré*, the translation of a British Lieutenant-Colonel’s meticulous account of implementing deportation orders at Grand-Pré, Nova Scotia in the summer and fall of 1755. Thibodeau’s translation strategy, elucidated by the translator’s working documents, generates
centripetal forces aimed at reconfiguring Acadians’ relationship to the past. Then, the chapter turns to an inconspicuous but incontrovertible allusion to the Deportation in Maillet’s *La tempête*, drawing on Canadian Shakespearean translation theory to contextualise its significance. The chapter then turns to other ways in which disruptions recall, at varying levels of explicitness, the Grand Dérangement, and the sense of *mouvance* (mobility) that has come to define Acadian identity. Discussing first Maillet’s translation language, the chapter explores how the *parlure acadienne*, the Acadian language, signals a *grouillement linguistique* (Masson 1994; Nolette 2015: 179–244), an unfixed and dynamic quality in language. It then moves on to Georgette LeBlanc’s *Océan* and outlines, following Federico Italiano’s notion of ‘translation of geographies’ (2016), the transposition of the source text’s geopoetics to LeBlanc’s native (and Acadian) Baie Sainte-Marie. These analyses are joined together under the umbrella of *grands dérangements*, a notion that not only nods to the historical event, but also, in its plural and uncapsulated form, acts as a metaphor for the multiple *mouvances* of the Acadian imaginary.

Chapter 5 begins in Moncton, New Brunswick, the ‘hub’ of contemporary Acadie des Maritimes, and, more specifically, on the river Epetkutogoyek (now known as the Petitcodiac River) that runs through it. It homes in on Benoit Doyon-Gosselin’s geocritical analysis in *Moncton Mentor* (2022) to argue that Acadians’ ‘invention’ of the city (the premise of Doyon-Gosselin’s book) is fundamentally translational and that this translationality is mirrored in the campaign to replace a damaging causeway built across the Petitcodiac. Moving into the Acadian diaspora, the chapter’s next stop is Québec, discussed in the context of Maillet’s linguistic fluidity as it manifests namely in *Le Bourgeois gentleman*. The focus then shifts to Louisiana, where Francophone (Cadien) publishing and cross-border (non)translation practices paradoxically obscure the translational aspects of works that clearly result from translational processes and present translation as a *fait accompli*. By doing so, they provide a counterpart to the notion of textual thresholds outlined by Laëtitia Saint-Loubert in the Caribbean context (2020). These fluid movements are then interpreted in light of Acadie’s ‘maritimeness’, and the chapter concludes by invoking Edward Kamau Brathwaite’s notion of ‘tidalectics’. Theorised by Laëtitia Saint-Loubert (2020) and Elizabeth DeLoughrey (2007), tidalectics facilitates maritime and cyclical trajectories of circulation. Framing this chapter is the natural phenomenon of the mascaret, or tidal bore that occurs on the Petitcodiac River, propelled by the highest tides in the world.
in the Bay of Fundy. The bore is a natural phenomenon that consists of a standing wave travelling against the current at incoming tide, making the Petitcodiac River flow in two alternating directions.

Finally, the concluding chapter of the thesis brings together the analyses of the five main chapters to define paradigms and articulate a cohesive conception of translation in Acadie. Defining translation in Acadie according to rhizomes and ‘amarres’, this section outlines an archipelagic structure that fosters a reconfiguration of the margins. This idea is interpreted alongside Marie-Linda Lord’s ‘épreuve de la marge’, proposed in the context of minority communities in New Brunswick (2002) but also echoing Antoine Berman’s ‘trials of the foreign’ (2012). Then, the Conclusion discusses contributions of the findings of the previous five chapter to the fields of Acadian studies, translation studies (in Canada and internationally), and the environmental humanities. In terms of Acadian studies, the analyses illustrate ways in which Acadie accesses energising notions of regeneration and finds itself at the heart of movements across continents and oceans. From a Canadian translation studies perspective, Acadian translation provides a way of challenging the bridge metaphor that has defined translation in Canada, where dual translation practices fostered by official bilingualism reinforce the seemingly monolithic, homogeneous categories of French and English. Rather than partaking in the linearity and rigidity of the bridge metaphor, translation in Acadie offers an alternative approach and a possible solution to its precarity and propensity for division. This shift in perspective has implications for translation in minority and postcolonial contexts, playing namely into recent research on translationality and matter, framed around medieval *translatio*, as well as translation afterlife. Finally, the research is discussed in light of current environmental concerns, drawing connections between textual, territorial, and biosemiotic translation. Not only does this challenge conventional linguistic and anthropocentric biases of translation, but it also emphasises the potential for meaningful interaction between languages, human and more-than-human in engaging with the climate crisis.
1 The translational foundations of Acadie

Red Coats, Blue Coats, Robes Noires et Plumés
pouvions rentrer et sortir,
notre logis était un havre sacré par le travail, par l’entente
– Georgette LeBlanc, Prudent

The toponym ‘Acadie’ first appears in 1524 in a letter from Giovanni Verrazano advising the king of France that the territory along the coastline of the eastern seaboard of present-day United States and Canada had been named ‘Arcadie, en raison de la beauté de ses arbres’ (qtd. in Arsenault 2018: 18). The name then appears on maps throughout the sixteenth century more precisely to designate the territory now known as Nova Scotia. According to Bona Arsenault, maps from 1548, 1556, and 1570 use ‘Larcadia’ while one dated 1561 opts for ‘Larcadie’ and another, dated 1575, for ‘Arcadia’ (2018: 18). Samuel de Champlain, who was a member of the first expedition to overwinter in what became Acadie, names the territory ‘Arcadie’ in 1603 and ‘Accadie’ a decade later, while the royal commission given to the Sieur de Mons for this expedition cites ‘Cadie’ (2018: 18). These early variations in spelling suggest a sense of adaptability that is heightened by the toponym’s etymologies. Some historians argue that the toponym borrows from a 1502 pastorale that celebrated the sublime beauty of the idyllic wilderness of Ancient Greece’s Arcadia (Arsenault 2018: 18–19; Faragher 2005: 6). Others trace its etymology to local Indigenous languages. Linguist and translator Bernie Francis, for instance, proposes that ‘Acadie’ derives from ‘E’kati’, meaning ‘place of, or land of’ in Mi’kmaq (Paul 2006: 73). Bona Arsenault reports that the term derives from the Mi’kmaw word ‘Agatig’, meaning ‘encampment’, or the Maliseet word ‘Quoddy’, meaning ‘fertile land’ (2018: 17). John Mack Faragher, meanwhile, alludes to similarities between ‘Acadie’ and the suffix ‘-akadie’ in Mi’kmaq, meaning ‘place of abundance’ (2005: 6). Brenda Dunn also points to the suffix, but suggests that it means ‘piece of land’, usually with a positive connotation (2004: 2).

The various spellings and etymologies of the toponym ‘Acadie’ illustrate the geographical plurality that Samuel Arsenault charts in Acadie for the period between 1524 and 1769 (2011). They also hint at the profoundly and fundamentally translational nature of Acadie from its beginnings as a colonial settlement. This is evident, for instance, in the
various uses of the term: ‘the designation of maritime Canada by the early French settlers as
“Acadie” has become the accepted title not only for descendants; it is also the official name
for tidal marsh soils and for the forest formations of the Atlantic region of Canada’
(Bleakney 2004: 10). Historian Andrew Hill Clarks refers to the ‘cartographic ancestry’
(variant spellings across maps) of the term ‘Arcadie’ to explain its acceptance, not to say its
translation, into European colonial discourse (1968: 71). Faragher makes a similar
observation, noting that ‘[t]hese explanations [of the origins of ‘Acadie’] are most
compelling in combination — l’Arcadie mutating into l’Acadie as a result of the intercultural
conversation between Mikmaw hunters and French traders’ (2005: 6).

Initiated decades earlier through contact between the Mi’kmaq and the Europeans at
fishing grounds in what is now known as eastern Nova Scotia, the intercultural conversation
to which Faragher refers created a multilingual society in the territory variously known as
Mi’kma’ki, Acadie, and Nova Scotia from the sixteenth century to present day (Dunn 2004:
13; Griffiths 2005: 31; Landry 2013: 37; Pastore 1994: 33; Reid 2007: 265). Marc Lescarbot, a
member of one of the early French expeditions, notes in a 1609 travel journal that by the
time of his visit, ‘the language of the coast tribes is half Basque’ (Faragher 2005: 7; Pastore
1994: 29). Brian Francis and Trudy Sable corroborate this idea, describing the Mi’kmaq as
Faragher, meanwhile, refers to a ‘trade jargon’ (2005: 7) and Pastore to a ‘lingua franca’
(1994: 29) comprised of a mix of Indigenous and European languages. Another European
language, English, soon followed, as the first British conquest of the territory occurred in
1613 (Arsenault 2018: 33; Faragher 2005: 29–33; Plank 2001: 40–67), setting off a century of
what Maillet describes as Acadie being ‘ballotée d’un maître à l’autre’ (1979: 15, see also
1973: 15). Indeed, this conquest would become the first of a ‘revolving door of regime
changes’ (Johnston 2005: 134) over the next century, as England and France traded imperial
rule at least seven times before 1710 (Arsenault 2018: 17–128; Faragher 2005: 35–123). As
historian Jean Daigle notes, frequent contact between cultures and languages had an impact
on Acadians’ behaviour and language, with hybrid expressions such as ‘vous too’ and ‘pas
yet’ being recorded as early as 163579 (1993a: 9). The Acadians also continued to absorb
Indigenous terminology and develop a toponymy that reflected Indigenous Peoples’

79 The legacy of such transcoding persists to this day with ‘chiac’ (Arrighi 2020; Boudreau 2016).
relationship to the natural environment (Daigle 1993a: 9). The reverse occurred too, the influence of French echoing in Mi’kmaw words such as ‘angeri’ [angel] and ‘hostisin’ [host] (Daigle 1993a: 16). Geoffrey Plank goes further, arguing that the influence of French on the Mi’kmaw language fundamentally changed Indigenous patterns of thinking (2001: 27). Conversely, the French settlers’ ‘Ordre de Bon Temps’, founded to boost morale and stave off scurvy, shows according to Faragher the ‘extensive intercultural exchange taking place at Port-Royal’ (2005: 16). From a societal perspective, such encounters translated into a practice of mixed marriages that became increasingly common over the course of the seventeenth century (Faragher 2005: 46–47; Paul 2006: 24). Plank argues that in Acadie the practice was simply accepted and not considered especially noteworthy; life existed in a multilingual and multicultural context (2001: 72). When the British captured Port-Royal definitively in 1710, renaming it Annapolis Royal in the wake of the conquest, an ‘uneasy occupation’ lasted far beyond the end of the War of the Spanish Succession in 1713 and the Treaty of Utrecht that ceded Acadie to Britain (Dunn 2004: 86–143). As tolerance waned over the subsequent decades, British civilities and cultural and linguistic accommodations towards both the Indigenous and the Acadians deteriorated significantly, as will be discussed in the next section (Daigle 1993a: 9; Plank 2001: 85–86).

Nevertheless, Acadie’s early and ongoing translational aspects have not yet been outlined in detail. This is the gap that this chapter partially seeks to fill by describing Acadie’s translationality — that is, some of the elements that have shaped it as a space for and of translation. It defines Acadie as a ‘translation zone’, one of those ‘designated sites that are “in-translation”’ (Apter 2006: 6). The chapter is descriptive and does not purport to provide an exhaustive view of translation in Acadian society. Rather, it zooms in on three key periods of history: the four decades after the last British conquest (1713 to 1755), the Grand Dérangement (1755 to 1763), and the Acadian renaissance (1864 to 1884). These periods highlight elements conducive to Acadie’s development as a fundamentally translational
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80 e.g. Pigiguit/Pisiguit, Cobequid, Chipoudy, Petitcodiac (Arsenault 2018: 88–89, 98–100). Several Acadian communities today still bear Mi’kmaw names, such as Memramcook (see Figure 1) and Kouchibougouac (see Chapter 5, footnote no. 177 on p. 179).
82 Daniel N. Paul (2006) discusses the differences between the French and English relationships with the Mi’kmaw at length. Plank also lays out these differences in a history of Nova Scotia from 1689 to 1763 from the point of view of the relationships between the various groups inhabiting the region (2001: 68–86, 126–39). See also Dunn (2004: 121–24).
space from three perspectives: societal, geographical, and cultural. These elements are not beholden to textual or linguistic definitions of translation, for Acadie lives and experiences translation variously (see Introduction, pp. 31–47). They are meant to contextualise and complement the literary translation practices that took shape in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries in Acadie, which comprise the next four chapters. Uncovering and understanding the foundations upon which this literary translation practice developed helps to define it on and in its own terms and to interpret production within its specific context. As a result, Acadian translation can be defined not merely as a subset of Canadian translation, but as a practice with its own characteristics, values, and traditions.

Starting from a societal perspective, the chapter opens with the notion of Acadian neutrality. From the Conquest in 1713 to the Grand Dérangement beginning in 1755, the Acadian ‘French Neutrals’ were adamant about not declaring allegiance to either Britain or France, a decision that entrenched them as linguistic and sociocultural intermediaries and characterised them in terms of (un)faithfulness and (dis)loyalty, formulations also found in translation studies. Influencing a collective sense of identity, neutrality also created a perception that the Acadian population was translatable, first linguistically and then territorially. Thus, the chapter then moves to a geographical perspective, describing translation at a territorial level, wherein British colonial administrators expelled the Acadian population between 1755 and 1762. Paradoxically, this translation at a territorial level engendered non-translation, which manifested in the Acadians refusing linguistic assimilation and in the sense of return embedded in the reconstruction of Acadie. A cultural perspective is addressed through the narrative of Évangéline, which underpins identity discourses of the Acadian renaissance and remains ubiquitous across Acadie. Finally, the chapter concludes with interpretations of these elements to lay the groundwork for the analysis of contemporary literary translations in the following chapters.

At the centre of a multilingual society

In their conclusion to The ‘Conquest’ of Acadia, Reid and others write that ‘the conquest of Acadia created a delicate equilibrium. Translated through the European diplomacy that created the Treaty of Utrecht and then through more localized processes of negotiation, it offered a framework within which Mi’kma’ki, Acadia, and Nova Scotia might coexist’ (2004: 204). While alluding to the translation of the Conquest into sociopolitical
reality, the notion of a framework of coexistence also relies on linguistic translation. Following the fall of French-founded Port-Royal in 1710, the Treaty of Utrecht of 1713 placed Acadie definitively under British rule, though neighbouring Île Royale (present-day Cape Breton), Île Saint-Jean (present-day Prince Edward Island), and Nouvelle-France (present-day Québec) remained under French rule. The Treaty specifies that

> [a]ll Nova Scotia or Acadia, comprehended within its ancient boundaries; as also the city of Port Royal now called Annapolis Royal, and all other things in these parts which depend on the said lands and islands, together with the dominion, property and possession of the said islands, lands and places [...] and to the inhabitants of the same, are yielded and made over to the queen [sic] of Great Britain, and to her crown for ever. (qtd. in Griffiths 1992: 34–35)

Furthermore, the Treaty included provisions for the Acadians to remain and be guaranteed equal rights as English-speaking subjects under British administration (Arsenault 2018: 25). Many Acadians did choose to remain, since they generally no longer felt any particular affinity to France, having been relatively isolated from both imperial powers over the previous century except for trade (Conrad 2020: 81, 86; Griffiths 2005: 80–81, 266; Johnston 2005). There was also a sense, because of the ambiguity of the wording of the treaty quoted above, that some of the lands of what now constituted Nova Scotia remained in French hands (Dunn 2004: 134; Griffiths 1992: 44). Whether for pragmatic reasons or a political agenda, few Acadians relocated to French territory (Arsenault 2018: 121–28; Faragher 2005: 151–207; Griffiths 2005: 252–346) and thus became subjects of the British crown.

The first period of official translation in Canada unfolded in the decades following the 1710 Conquest (Delisle 1987: 54; Gallant 1985: 71–76). As Nova Scotia was governed in English for a majority French-speaking population, government deliberations were held in English, with letters and proclamations subsequently translated into French and Mi’kmaq (Gallant 1985: 76; Paul 2006: 84). Policies of systematic translation were instituted at Annapolis Royal in the 1720s, along with the first legal translation pay scale in 1733 (Delisle 1987: 54–55). Processes changed slightly in the 1740s under the governance of Paul
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83 Christel Gallant details the types of documents and processes for translation in a short but informative article (1985).
Mascarene, an Huguenot whose linguistic skills ensured constant contact with the Acadians, including as one of three interpreters during the capitulation negotiations at Port-Royal\(^8^4\) (Delisle 1987: 54; Plank 2001: 102–3). Becoming Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia in 1740, Mascarene favoured writing documents directly in French before translating them into English for reporting purposes in Britain (Gallant 1985: 77). However, due to deteriorating relations between the Acadians and the British and a growing English-speaking population in Nova Scotia in the late 1740s and early 1750s, coinciding with the foundation of Halifax as Nova Scotia’s new capital, systematic translation ceased in favour of *ad hoc* practices by local military personnel (Gallant 1985: 77–78).

Throughout these decades, the translation policies implemented by British officials positioned the Acadians as intermediaries. As historian N.E.S. Griffiths writes, ‘[t]here were several players in the lives of the Acadians between 1713 and [17]55; they themselves; two empires with other colonies in North America, the English and the French; the Amerindians — Mi’kmaq, Malecite, and Abenaki; and New England and New France’ (2005: 255). Indeed, Griffiths notes that the Conquest of 1710 thrust the Acadians from a role of ‘trader’ to one of ‘middleman between Boston merchant and Acadian settlement’ (2005: 266). French-speakers comprised the largest linguistic group at both Annapolis Royal (formerly Port-Royal) and in Nova Scotia (formerly Acadie) (Dunn 2004: 86–143; Plank 2001: 71). Thanks to their linguistic abilities, the Acadians were effectively cast at the centre of three groups with competing needs and political ambitions: the Mi’kmaq, the British, and the French. Proclamations were made in English and translated into French, and the Acadians were often assigned the task of interpreting into Mi’kmaq (Dunn 2004: 126; Plank 2001: 66). The practice proved problematic for both the Acadians and the Mi’kmaq, who had little proficiency in either English or French (Paul 2006: 84). In addition to language barriers, the translation of treaties into Mi’kmaq posed significant translational challenges because of fundamental differences between European and Indigenous mentalities\(^8^5\) (Paul 2006: 84–85).
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\(^8^4\) For an overview of Mascarene’s relationship with the Acadians, see Boucher (1984) and Faragher (2005: 125–31, 141–42, 209–43). According to Faragher, Mascarene was also a literary translator, ‘personal translations of plays by Molière having been found among his papers’ (2005: 213). According to Brenda Dunn, Mascarene’s translation of *Le Misanthrope* may very well have been the first play to have been performed in what became Canada, in April 1744, making Port-Royal / Annapolis Royal the site of the first theatrical performances in French or English (2004: 180–81).

\(^8^5\) For example, wording such as ‘enter into Articles of Pacification with his Majesty’s Governments’ would not only have been practically incoherent when interpreted into Mi’kmaq, but also virtually meaningless in the Mi’kmaw conception of the world (Paul 2006: 84–85). Edwin Gentzler makes a similar argument in the
The repercussions on Mi’kmaq society were disastrous and are felt to this day (Paul 2006: 95). The British, meanwhile, viewed Acadians’ interpreting and mediating roles as a means of strengthening alliances with the Mi’kmaq, which reinforced fears of a potential attack (Faragher 2005: 134–67), particularly because French speakers continued to outnumber English speakers in Nova Scotia until the Deportation in 1755 (Dunn 2004: 86–143; Plank 2001: 66, 74).


**Neutrality and Acadian translatability**

While they engaged in linguistic translation activities on the ground, politically the Acadians embraced an ideology of neutrality. Both in the immediate aftermath of the Conquest and in the decades after the Treaty of Utrecht, the British crown repeatedly asked the Acadian population to swear oaths of unconditional allegiance and was repeatedly met with requests for neutrality (Arsenault 2018: 129–39; Faragher 2005: 151–277). British colonial administrators were loath to refuse these requests because of their reliance on the linguistic and translation abilities, agricultural resources, and labour of their French-speaking subjects. As historian Naomi Griffiths explains,
What is unusual about the Acadian case is that, over a period of some seventeen years, they were able to negotiate the swearing of an oath that expressed their own particular political wishes. There is no doubt that the British authorities demanded an unequivocal oath of loyalty [...]. There is equally no doubt that the Acadians offered, and had accepted by the local officials, a variety of oaths of loyalty between 1719 and 1730, the majority of which contained explicit provisions for neutrality. (1992: 41–42; see also Bartlet Brebner 1927: 360)

The Acadians, therefore, became known as the French Neutrals (Faragher 2005: 179; Johnston 2005: 166; Plank 2001: 104–5), a name that reinforces the group’s linguistic and cultural origins, sometimes detrimentally (Johnston 2005: 166), as will be discussed below in the context of the Grand Dérangement. Some historians have interpreted Acadian neutrality as an awareness of a distinct identity (Clarke 1994: 35; Faragher 2005: 180; Griffiths 1992: 41–42, 69–70, 2005: 169–63; Thériault 1982), while others view it as a means of self-preservation more than coherent ideology (Kennedy 2014: 211; Roy 1981: 96–99, 125; Thériault 1995: 219–44, 2013: 151–58). Regardless of its motivation, Acadian neutrality gained almost mythical proportions in the 1730s and 1740s (Landry 2013: 256–57). Faragher relates the story of the neutrality ‘exception’ being written by hand in the margins of the Acadians’ copy of one agreement in the 1730s, while the version sent to authorities in London did not include it (2005: 169). Distinct sense of identity or not, experiences such as this one shaped a collective memory that influenced neutrality negotiations until 1755 (Faragher 2005: 276; Griffiths 2005: 384–87).

Politically, neutrality entrenched the Acadians as a ‘physical wedge’ between New France and New England, or a ‘continental cornice’, as Griffiths and J. B. Brebner put it respectively (qtd. in Johnston 2005: 132). Yet, neutrality was problematic for both colonial powers. The British perceived it as proof of insincerity and disloyalty to the crown, illustrated by the frequent qualifications ‘as they are improperly called’ or ‘falsely so-called’ accompanying mentions of ‘French Neutrals’ in official correspondence87 (Plank 2001: 104–5). Meanwhile, the French were irritated by a perceived lack of recognition of shared

---

ancestry, language, and religion (Johnston 2005: 165). Both powers realised, furthermore, that British Nova Scotia would suffer greatly should the Acadian population relocate to French territory such as Île Royale or Île Saint-Jean (Faragher 2005: 140–43; Griffiths 2005: 265). By defining their social character in terms of neutrality, the Acadians increasingly positioned themselves between two colonial powers fighting over the territory. As Faragher notes, the Acadians aimed to be ‘both loyal and neutral’ in the face of the ‘competing demands of two sovereigns’ (2005: 323). Reinforcing, perhaps unwittingly, a connection to translational concepts, Faragher adds that ‘[t]he Acadian story [is a] story of frontiers and borderlands at the founding moment of American history, of a people born on the margins of empire who sought a way to live with two masters’ (2005: xviii). Jean Daigle echoes this idea, writing that ‘[h]abitués à vivre sur un territoire contesté, les Acadiens ne voient aucune incohérence à agir de façon à satisfaire des exigences contradictoires’ (1993a: 20). Daigle’s ‘contradictory demands’ and Faragher’s ‘two masters’ and ‘both loyal and neutral’ resonate with the emphasis on (dis)loyalty and (in)fidelity in translation studies.88 Translators navigate competing, sometimes contradictory, demands as they seek to reconcile source text and target culture in a way that is reminiscent of Acadian neutrality:

Neutrality was shorthand for the Acadians’ complex relationship to the colonial world. It stood for their intimate and cooperative connection to the Mikmaq, with whom they shared the land. It stood for their cultural identity, one that retained its French origins in custom, language, and religion, yet was at the same time something new, something American in its attachment to place, local, practice, and newly developed tradition. And it stood for their problematic relationship to empire, their desire to participate wholeheartedly in the opportunities for wider connections, but their insistence on an exemption from the intercolonial struggle for conquest and hegemony. (2005: 179–80, emphasis in original)

88 ‘Translation thus is not simply an act of faithful reproduction but, rather, a deliberate and conscious act of selection, assemblage, structuration, and fabrication — and even, in some cases, of falsification, refusal of information, counterfeiting, and the creation of secret codes. In these ways translators, as much as creative writers and politicians, participate in the powerful acts that create knowledge and shape culture’ (Tymoczko and Gentzler 2002: x).
As Faragher points out, on the one hand neutrality reflects service to two colonial powers, but on the other it entrenches Acadian character with values seemingly incompatible with colonial ambition. Archeologist Jonathan Fowler observes, moreover, that Acadians’ dyking system (aboiteaux\(^{89}\)) and coexistence with the Mi’kmaq were ‘fundamental adaptations’ that effectively enshrined this perception (Forthcoming: 15).

The Acadians’ translation into incompatible values allowed the British to devalue Acadian presence and fabulate Acadie/Mi’kma’ki as \textit{terra nullius},\(^{90}\) which opened the door to further translation, first linguistically and then geographically. The foundation of Halifax in 1749, which replaced Annapolis Royal as Nova Scotia’s capital, came with increased investment from the British crown to settle English-speakers (Plank 2001: 55). As part of these efforts, officials devised a plan to assimilate the Acadians into Anglo-Nova Scotian society (MacNutt 1965: 43–44; Plank 2001: 115–18). In addition to contemporary ideologies about cultural assimilation in other British colonies,\(^{91}\) the idea was inspired by the successes at Annapolis Royal, where government officials witnessed the benefits of a ‘vibrant bilingual community’ in which trade, intermarriage, and multilingual children jointly contributed to a pleasant and relatively peaceful community life (Plank 2001: 89, 100). Able to envision assimilation as a solution to ongoing concerns about refusals to swear oaths of allegiance, William Shirley devised a plan in the late 1740s to ‘acculturate’ and ‘control’ Acadians by sending large numbers of English-speaking settlers to outlying communities (Plank 2001: 115–18). Shirley banked on English-speakers intermarrying and intermingling with Acadians, eventually making the whole colony English-speaking, Protestant, and loyal to the British crown (Plank 2005: 90). In other words, it would ‘turn Acadians into good English-speaking subjects’ (MacNutt 1965: 43–44). To that end, English-speaking immigrants arrived in Halifax in 1749, and the plan to assimilate — or translate — Acadians into Anglo-Nova Scotian society was well underway. The assimilation plan ultimately failed, however, as the

\(^{89}\) The aboiteaux will be discussed in Chapter 2.

\(^{90}\) As Gregory Younging explains of the Indigenous context, ‘Indigenous Peoples’ Territories were interpreted by Western legal regimes as being \textit{terra nullius}, literally meaning “land belonging to no one.” \textit{terra nullius} justified the idea and legal concept that when the first Europeans arrived, the land was owned by no one and therefore open to settlement. In the sixteenth century, when Spanish, British, and French colonial forces began large-scale encroachment upon the thirty million Indigenous people in North America, \textit{terra nullius}, Social Darwinism, and the Doctrine of Discovery were the dominant ideologies that prevailed through colonial institutions to many current, modern, Western institutions’ (2018: 131).

\(^{91}\) Plank explains that decision-makers were placing increased importance on identity and cultural distinction both in Britain and in their colonies at this time (2001: 120–21).
Mi’kmaq, unwilling to welcome English-speaking settlers, thwarted settlement efforts (Griffiths 2005: 390; Plank 2001: 129–30). As a result, officials reverted to calls for unconditional allegiance (MacNutt 1965: 44) and new measures for translating the Acadian population into Anglophone society would have to be put into place.

Before concluding this discussion about translating the Acadian population at a linguistic level, it is worth noting that the idea of mediation remains present in the Acadian psyche after the Grand Dérangement of 1755–1763. The story of Jacques Maurice Vigneau’s deportation and its aftermath provides one example of this. According to Christopher Hodson, ‘[t]he story of Vigneau’s journey is spectacularly — and stereotypically — Acadian’ (2012: 60). Deported to Georgia, Vigneau remained ‘flexible in matters of loyalty’ (Hodson 2012: 60) and ‘thanks to his language skills and position as merchant’ was able to travel across the Thirteen Colonies to bring his strategically enlarged family to safety (Plank 2001: 152, 156–57). As Plank notes, Vigneau exemplified the wavering allegiances of many Acadians since ‘[a]t various times during his lifetime he described himself as a supporter of the British, a stubborn subject of France, and a believer in Acadian independence’ (2001: 157). After 1763 and the end of the Seven Years War, Acadians were allowed to return to Nova Scotia, and to what were soon to become the provinces of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, on condition once again that they swear allegiance to the British crown (Arsenault 2018: 346; Faragher 2005: 417–22; Griffiths 2005: 431–64; Hill Clark 1968: 365). After a century of relative silence, the Conventions nationales acadiennes of 1881 and 1884 launched what is now known as the Acadian renaissance. Despite the majority of its program dedicated to Acadian specificity (Bourque 2015b: 50; Bourque and Richard 2014), the 1881 Convention featured a speech addressed to the Anglophone community emphasising kindness, friendship, and alliance in diversity: ‘we have talked of past hardships […] not to recall unjust treatment and sow seeds of hatred but to refute the erroneous idea prevailing that we are an inferior race’ (Robidoux 1910: 91–96). The Convention was held in Memramcook, New Brunswick, the only area where Acadians had been able to resettle ancestral lands (Roy 1981: 164). Memramcook is also where the Collège Saint-Joseph, the first French-language higher learning institution in New Brunswick, was established. An 1883–84 brochure promoting the Collège promises that ‘French and English are taught with equal care’ and that ‘English-speaking students enjoy exceptional facilities for acquiring a thoroughly practical knowledge of the French language’ (Gair 1985: 13). Nearly a century
later, New Brunswick elected Louis J. Robichaud as its first Acadian Premier (leader of the provincial government), who brought similar contradictions to the fore by ‘embod[ying] [...] the aspirations and contradictions of a historical community — Acadia’ (Ouellette 2001: 18).

The Deportation as translation at a territorial level

According to Andrew Hill Clark, ‘there was no lack of pronouncements, ordinances, warnings, and exhortations, but until the mid-eighteenth century the will or the means or both of the British were of insufficient strength to enforce the political anglicization of the [Acadian] population’ (1968: 187). As it became clear in the early 1750s that Governor Shirley’s project of linguistic assimilation would fail, colonial administrators devised a new plan for the Acadian population. Over the summer of 1755, they summoned Acadian representatives to Halifax and requested once more an oath of unconditional allegiance; again, the representatives argued for neutrality under the terms previously negotiated (Arsenault 2018: 184–85; Griffiths 2005: 431–64). Rather than reluctantly accommodating it, however, British officials finally deemed the Acadians’ refusal sufficient justification for their expulsion from Nova Scotia (Arsenault 2018: 184–85; Faragher 2005: 325–33; Griffiths 2005: 455–62). While the possibility of removing the French-speaking inhabitants had been floated at least twice previously, as early as 1715 and again in 1745 (Arsenault 2018: 133–35; Dunn 2004: 161; Griffiths 2005: 255), the decision was finally made to deport the Acadian population (Arsenault 2018: 185–88). The minutes of the 22 July 1755 meeting of the Council record the decision as follows:

after mature Consideration, it was unanimously Agreed That to prevent as much as possible their Attempting to return and molest the Settlers that may be set down on their lands it would be most proper to send them to be distributed amongst the several Colonies on the Continent, and that a sufficient Number of Vessels should be hired with all possible Expedition for that purpose. (qtd. in Griffiths 2005: 462)

The notion of ‘distribution’ to which the minutes allude recalls the linguistic assimilation planned half a decade earlier, outlined above. Rather than sending English-speaking settlers among the majority Acadian population in Nova Scotia, however, the Acadians would be sent to majority English-speaking communities in the Thirteen Colonies. According to
Griffiths, the decision to deport was the result of ‘short-term decision making’ to address
‘immediate problems that had to be solved’, made without the express authorisation of

Over the summer and fall of 1755, deportations of the Acadian population took place
across Nova Scotia, centred in the regions of Beaubassin, Grand-Pré, Pisiguit, and Port-
Royal/Annapolis Royal93 (see Figure 1; Arsenault 2018: 191–209; Faragher 2005: 335–92).
On 5 September 1755, the men and boys of Grand-Pré were summoned to the church of
Saint-Charles-des-Mines to be read the following orders of deportation:

I [Lieutenant-Colonel John Winslow] have Received from his Excellency Govenor
Lawrance. The Kings Commission which I have in my hand and by whose orders
you are Convened togather to Manifest to you his Majesty's Final resolution to
the French Inhabitants of this his Province of Nova Scotia who for almost half a
Century have had more Indulgence Granted them, then any of his Subjects in any
part of his Dominions. what use you have made of them. you your Self Best Know.
[...] Thus it is Preremtorily his Majesty's orders That the whole French Inhabitants
of these Districts, be removed, and I am Throh his Majesty's Goodness Directed to
allow you Liberty to Carry of your money and Household Goods as Many as you
Can without Discomemoading the Vessels you Go in. [...] I [...] hope that in what
Ever part of the world you may Fall you may be Faithfull Subjects, a Peasable &
happy People. (Winslow 1880a: 94–95)

As Winslow notes, these orders were ‘delivered [...] by Interpretors [sic]’, in French (1880a: 94). They had been rendered into French by Swiss translator Isaac Deschamps (Arsenault
2018: 198; Delisle 1987: 55; Gallant 1985: 78; Faragher 2005: 342), which poignantly
demonstrates that the Acadian population had been moved out of its role as interpreter-
translators. The orders focalise both the neutrality (‘Indulgence Granted’) that the British
crown had accommodated over the previous decades and the hope that assimilation would

92 Boston was so involved in the assimilation and deportation projects that Faragher, after listing the
perpetrators of the plan from conception to execution, concludes that ‘[i]t was a thoroughly Yankee operation’
(2005: 333). To say that the British deported the Acadians, then, is a slight misnomer, though imperial rulers in
London did not vehemently object to it.

93 Arrests and deportations continued as Britain gained access to ships and conquered French territories in
what are now the Maritime provinces throughout the Seven Years War, thereby expanding to all French
communities in Nova Scotia, Île Royale, and Île Saint-Jean by the end of the 1750s.
now be achieved far away, that the Acadians would finally be ‘faithful’, as Winslow writes above. Therefore, while the prospect of assimilating Acadians — of translating them into Anglo-Nova Scotian society — remained, an additional step was required: that of physical displacement into other British-held colonies. The linguistic translation project was thereby effectively replaced with swifter deportation measures. This triggered what is now known as the Grand Dérangement, during which approximately two thirds of the population (see footnote no. 14 above) were deported to nine of the Thirteen Colonies between 1755 and 1762. Subsequent migrations continued well into the final decades of the eighteenth century, reinforcing the euphemistic designation ‘Grand Dérangement’, the nuances of which will be discussed in Chapter 4.

The attempt at linguistic assimilation followed by forced displacement echoes what Michael Cronin interprets as Edmund Spenser’s logic of ‘conquest and control’ in sixteenth-century Ireland. As Cronin explains, ‘Spenser wants to see the Irish scattered among the English, and to achieve this, he again proposes the “translating” of the Irish. Thus, translation at a cultural level — the embrace of English acculturation — is paralleled by translation at a territorial level, the forcible displacement and movement of populations’ (Cronin 1996: 49). The Deportation, then, can be conceived of as one such instance of ‘translation at a territorial level’. The Acadians, in other words, would be translated out of their homeland and be assimilated into Anglo-Nova Scotian society. This interpretation is consistent with the first definition that Samuel Johnson gives of ‘translation’ in the Dictionary of the English Language — ‘removal; act of removing’ (1755) —, coincidentally published the year of the Deportation.

Once again, the plan orchestrated by the British did not yield the expected results — that is, did not fully translate the Acadian population. As French sociologist Edmé Rameau de Saint-Père, who toured Acadie in 1860 and 1861, notes, ‘en broyant la nation, les Anglais, au lieu de l’anéantir, en ont multiplié les rameaux, et il ne serait nullement étonnant que plusieurs de ces groupes acadiens […] ne devinssent l’origine de petites nationalités acadiennes compactes et vigoureuses’ (qtd. in Massicotte 2007: 83). Rameau de Saint-Père’s prediction was right, Acadian communities exist to this day. The translation at a territorial level encompassed in the Deportation, therefore, paradoxically generated manifestations of non-translation. Deported Acadians, as the story of Jacques Maurice Vigneau mentioned earlier illustrates and as will be discussed in Chapter 4, were mobile, engaging in both
involuntary and deliberate migrations and forestalling assimilation. While they occupied a position of cultural and linguistic mediation before the Deportation, Acadians now used their multilingualism as a source of power. For example, in Philadelphia in 1757, a group of Acadians sent a letter, in French, to the Earl of Loudon, commander of the British forces in North America. Loudon returned the letter, stating that he could only receive it in English, to which the Acadians ‘determined that they could only submit it in French, having come to that resolution in considering themselves entirely as French subjects’ (Plank 2005: 102). Ironically, petitions such as the one sent to Loudon were, according to Faragher, examples of negotiation skills Acadians had learned from their years of translating for the English (2005: 435). Nevertheless, the response to Loudon was just as much a simple call for restitution as it was an affirmation of cultural or linguistic identity. Whereas translation had been a means of communication and mediation in Acadie, it became, in the refusal to translate, a way to retain power.

A second instance of a refusal to be translated, this one more closely linked to the notion of translation at a territorial level, is the myth of the return to Acadie after the Treaty of Paris and the end of the Seven Years War in 1763. As mentioned previously, the migrations continued and created a vast diasporic network, which will be discussed in Chapter 5. These migrations included the return of some deportees to Acadie, but only in relatively small numbers (Brun 1982: 34; Leblanc 1967; Thériault 1995: 223, 2013: 155). The communities comprising Acadie des Maritimes today were mainly founded by individuals who had escaped deportation and hid for the duration of the Seven Years War with the help of the Mi’kmaq or who had been imprisoned in Nova Scotia (Arsenault 2018: 345–83). Nevertheless, a powerful myth of the return has been created, and, like the narrative of Évangéline discussed below, it finds root outside of Acadie, namely in the writings of Saint-Père and Lauvrière (Viau 1997: 239). Still, the myth of the return is arguably made most visible in, and indeed significantly reinforced by, Antonine Maillet’s novel Pélagie-la-Charrette (1979). The novel, as the subtitle of Philip Stratford’s English translation — ‘The Return to Acadie’ — makes explicit, charts the 10–year return journey of a motley crew of exiles from Georgia, one of the southern American Colonies, back to their Acadian homeland. Lise Gauvin describes the epic story as an ‘épopée à rebours’ (2010: 14, 2004: 299), echoing a reversal that narrator Pélagie conveys while reflecting that ‘[i]l était grand temps […] que ce Port-Royal du sud remonte au nord et tourne la page de l’exil’ (Maillet
1979: 47). The proportions that the idea of the return has taken in the Acadian collective imagination marks a profound shift in Acadians’ view of themselves in translation.

Both post-Deportation refusals — the linguistic refusal exemplified by the Loudon anecdote and the territorial refusal exemplified by the (mythical) return to Acadie — testify to a non-translatability synonymous with resistance. They provide a stark contrast to the manifestations of translatability — such as the deportations — over which Acadians had no control. In this sense, they epitomise Emily Apter’s call for respecting ‘the right to the Untranslatable’ — that is, to consider translation critically to counter assumptions that translation is in itself ‘a good thing’ (2013: 8). By refusing to let themselves be translated in some post-Deportation circumstances, by maintaining, in other words, some untranslatable elements, Acadians resisted (cultural) translation. This resonates with the stance of neutrality discussed previously, which effectively amounted to a refusal to translate themselves into either imperial power. It also highlights a different engagement with translation. The translations at a territorial level and attempts at linguistic assimilation paradoxically created a state of non-translatability that manifested in a refusal to perform, as the Loudon episode shows, and in cultural preservation. Furthermore, the elements that remained untranslated throughout the British efforts to translate were the pre-Deportation cultural heritage. In Rabelais et les traditions populaires en Acadie, Antonine Maillet explains that

l’Acadie conserve encore vivante toute une tradition de contes, légendes, rites, croyances superstitieuses, chansons et fêtes qui remonte à ses ancêtres européens. […] On a […] découvert un folklore riche, original et fort émouvant, sauvé de quelques naufrages par un mélange d’entêtement, d’isolement et de goût du merveilleux chez un peuple à peu près ignoré du reste du monde.

(1971: 27)

The preservation to which Maillet refers occurs through the ‘memory in words’: ‘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’ (1987: 14, see also 1971: 131–32). The Acadian memory had proven prodigious before the Deportation, as illustrated by the ability to recall the terms of neutrality negotiated a generation earlier (Faragher 2005: 276). Post-
Deportation, it became essential to survival: ‘with their powerful memories of l’Acadie in the years after the Grand Dérangement and their persistent struggle to keep connected to one another, the Acadians managed to survive as a distinct people’ (Faragher 2005: 369, emphasis in original).

Yet, for all the richness and fortitude of Acadian memory, one element remained conspicuously absent until the renaissance of the 1880s: the Deportation. The Deportation was effectively absent from both homegrown historiography and literature, which was steeped in silence until the early twentieth century save for scant memoirs, letters, and reports⁹⁴ (Arsenault 2018: 385–410; Marguerite Maillet 1983: 37–50; Thériault 1993: 45–91). It was also eclipsed from popular memory (Faragher 2005: 345; Thériault 1993: 157).

For sociologist Joseph Yvon Thériault, the memory loss following the Grand Dérangement was post-traumatic, a symptom of the collective amnesia and the psychological result of a need to forget a deeply painful and degrading episode (2013: 160–61). P.D. Clarke puts it slightly differently by proposing that Acadian memory revolves around two temporal realities — the distant past and the present day — with little room left for an ‘entre-deux’, the period that contains expulsion and exile (1994: 13). Clarke also speaks of a ‘mémoire oubliée’ and an ‘Acadie du silence’ (2004), ideas that Tony Tremblay corroborates by noting that ‘self-imposed amnesia’ was one of three strategies of survival without a designated territory, the other two being ‘abject silence’ and ‘hegemonic allegiance’ (2014: 31–32). Either of these (abject silence or hegemonic allegiance) would have been akin to the Acadian translating themselves into the Anglo-American narrative. Amnesia, conversely, opened the door to other processes of translation.

**The translatability of the Evangeline narrative**

While memory loss left a gap to be filled, translation supplied the narratives. The amnesia surrounding the Deportation in the Acadian imaginary meant that, by the Acadian renaissance of the late nineteenth century, a homegrown historiography had yet to emerge.

---

⁹⁴ Léon Thériault questions whether ‘century of silence’ accurately reflects the period between 1763 and 1864, arguing that there is sufficient activity to speak of Acadian society as vibrant even then (1993: 47–48). Naomi Griffiths likewise attests to Acadians’ lively engagement in petition writing in the years following the Deportation (1992: 120). However, Marguerite Maillet makes it clear that ‘[i]l ne se trouve pas un seul Acadien des Maritimes, contemporain des missionnaires canadiens [qui écrivent au sujet de l’Acadie], qui ait laissé, semble-t-il, des écrits offrant quelque intérêt sur le plan littéraire’ (1983: 46–47).
Joseph Yvon Thériault writes that historian and genealogist Placide Gaudet ‘inaugur[a] la tradition d’une historiographie acadienne toute tournée vers la recherche généalogique et l’incessante préoccupation du retour’ (2013: 176). As historian P. D. Clarke writes, ‘en l’absence d’une historiographie indigène, les Acadiens en ont adapté une’ (1994: 37 emphasis added). The idea of adaptation is key here, as it denotes another instantiation of translational forces within Acadian society and brings up the third element of this chapter, the Évangéline narrative.95

According to Léon Thériault, three works ‘jalonent les premiers balbutiements de l’éveil de la conscience collective’ (1993: 55): Henry Wadsworth Longfellow’s epic poem *Evangeline: A Tale of Acadie* (1847), Edmé Rameau de Saint-Père’s sociological study *La France aux colonies* (1859), and Napoléon Bourassa’s novel *Jacques et Marie : Souvenir d’un peuple dispersé* (1865–1866)96 (Marguerite Maillet 1983: 50–56; Thériault 1995: 219–44). These works informed namely the *Conventions nationales acadiennes* of 1881 and 1884, which were instrumental in defining a collective Acadian identity (Bourque 2015b; Bourque and Richard 2014: 2–69; Robidoux 1910: 15). According to Camille-Antoine Richard, Longfellow and Rameau not only put Acadie on the map, but also helped ‘insuffler à l’élite nationale naissante […] le projet d’organiser collectivement l’Acadie nationale’ (qtd. in Bourque 2015b: 49). Recycling the earlier, idyllic descriptions of Samuel de Champlain and Marc Lescarbot, Longfellow, Rameau, and Bourassa created narratives of a paradise lost and positioned Acadians as victims and martyrs (Bourque 2015b; Clarke 1994: 21). While Longfellow and Bourassa focussed on the tragedy of separation, Rameau de Saint-Père wrote a historical treatise that underpinned the sociocultural awakening (Marguerite Maillet 1983: 55). Yet, these works, the sources from which an Acadian imaginary was adapted, are,

---

95 Being both the name of the titular heroine and the title of Longfellow’s poem, the word ‘Evangeline’ comes up frequently. To differentiate as much as possible, the text follows the lead of Aycha Fleury, who translated Joseph Yvon Thériault’s *Évangéline: Contes d’Amérique* into English (2022): ‘Evangeline’ (italicised) refers to Longfellow’s poem, ‘Évangéline’ (italicised and with accents) to the French translation of the poem, ‘Évangéline’ (no italics but with accents) to the figure as embodied in the Acadian imagination, and, finally, ‘Evangeline’ (no italics or accents) to the character as portrayed in Longfellow’s poem.

96 Guillaume Thomas Raynal, Edmund Burke, and others also wrote about Acadie, as Rameau points out (see Marguerite Maillet 1983: 55). Raynal, who draws from William Burck’s *Histoire des colonies européennes dans l’Amérique, en six parties*, along with Nova Scotian historian Thomas Chandler Haliburton are also both acknowledged as sources for Longfellow’s *Evangeline* (Faragher 2005: 448–50; Griffiths 1982: 31–34; Thériault 2013: 111–12). Robert Viau identifies other literary reports of Acadie in New England and deems these precursors to Longfellow’s *Evangeline*, including one story intended for children by Nathaniel Hawthorne and a novel by Catherine Read Williams (1997: 12–28).
significantly, non-Acadian. Longfellow, Rameau, and Bourassa were from New England, France, and Québec respectively. In fact, neither Longfellow nor Bourassa ever stepped foot in Acadie (Marguerite Maillet 1983: 50; Morency 2011: 99; Viau 1998: 37). Therefore, as Marguerite Maillet observes, it was ‘[d]es étrangers [qui] bris[èr]ent le silence’ (1983: 50; see also Clarke 1994: 37, 2012: 226; Cormier 2021: 152; de Finney 2007: 175–76; Thibodeau 2010: 70–71). Or, to put it differently, the narrative and ideological foundations that flowed through and out of the early Conventions nationales were adapted, effectively making them translations.

While Longfellow, Rameau, and Bourassa all contributed to the myths of Acadian identity that began to emerge with the Acadian renaissance, Longfellow’s Evangeline: A Tale of Acadie unquestionably had the most significant and enduring impact (Morency 2011: 107–8; Thériault 2013; Viau 1998). Published in 1847, Evangeline sold 37,000 copies, was translated into seven languages within a decade, and generated 130 translations and 270 editions in the 100 years after its publication (Marguerite Maillet 1983: 50; Thériault 2013: 52; Viau 1998: 62–63). The epic poem tells the story of the titular heroine who, separated from her fiancé Gabriel during the Grand-Pré deportation, dedicates her life to finding him. She wanders across the American Colonies for decades before joining a religious community and finally reuniting with Gabriel on his death bed. Joseph Yvon Thériault is unequivocal about the work’s importance: ‘Évangéline sera littéralement au centre de la construction et du déploiement identitaires de ces groupes : les Acadiens des Maritimes au Canada et les Cadiens de la Louisiane aux États-Unis’ (Thériault 2013: 12). Taking care to avoid the word ‘myth’ in this context because of its structuring implications, Thériault traces how Evangeline supplied foundational tales not only for Acadie but also for Cajun and American communities (2013). While Naomi Griffiths notes that ‘[t]here was a fortuitous coincidence between the needs of a struggling minority and the work of a world-renowned poet’ (1982: 38), seemingly downplaying the hold that the narrative has had on the Acadian imaginary, others reinforce its centrality. Thériault links the ‘épopée malheureuse’ to the construction of national ideology at both popular and historiographical levels (1995: 228). Denis Bourque corroborates this idea when writing that it was Évangéline ‘qui, en 1847, avait doté l’Acadie,

97 For a comprehensive overview of the role that American, Québécois, and French writers played in writing the Grand Dérangement, see Viau (1997: 11–164, 197–223). Morency (2011) questions the place afforded to Évangéline given its nature as a text written by an American and translated by a French-Canadian.
à son insu bien sûr, de son épopée nationale’ (2015b: 49). For, as noted previously, ‘[d]e cette Déportation que Longfellow immortalisera dans son poème, les Acadiens établis dans l’ancienne Acadie française n’en n’avaient [sic] pas conservé mémoire’ (Thériault 2013: 155).

Morency recognises a fundamentally translational nature in Longfellow’s creative practice, namely in *Evangeline* (2011). The Évangéline narrative begins its circuitous journey of translation in an act of cultural translation insofar as it translates Acadian history into an American framework98 (Thériault 2013: 12; see also Brière 1996a: 19). ‘L’histoire de cette légende supposément acadienne’ (Thériault 2013: 53) makes its way to Henry Wadsworth Longfellow felicitously via ‘une Canadienne française’, who passed it on to reverend Horace Lorenzo Connolly who in turn shared it with Longfellow and novelist Nathaniel Hawthorne (Thériault 2013: 53; Viau 1998: 25–28). By the time it had reached Longfellow, the story had already become Americanised despite coming from Acadie (Viau 1998: 56). Longfellow further endowed it with the poetics of the American romantic poetry movement (Thériault 2013: 19–101). According to Pierre Belliveau, Longfellow also drew from ‘family memory and knowledge of French Neutrals’, as his grandfather had helped Acadians deported to Massachusetts (qtd. in Viau 1998: 38). The poem was then translated into French by Québécois poet Pamphile Lemay,99 who published it in the 1864 collection *Essais poétiques* (Thériault 2013: 11). This was the first of three versions published by Lemay, the second following in 1870 (reprinted in 1883) and a third in 1912100 (Demers 1996: 147–48; Michon 1994; Viau 1998: 72). Lemay was part of the ‘École littéraire de Québec’, known as the ‘École patriotique de Québec’, and of a group of writers ‘qui veulent donner une dimension nationale à la littérature “canadienne” émergente’ (Thériault 2013: 121–22). Using the poem as an introduction into the Québécois literary scene, Lemay did not draw attention to the fact that *Évangéline* was a translation of Longfellow’s poem, save for a passing mention

98 Though not named as such, the idea of *Evangeline* as cultural translation comes through comprehensive overviews of the poem and its impact, namely in Thériault (2013) and Viau (1998: 44). Faragher notes that Longfellow was part of an ‘American interpretive tradition’ (2005: 456), while Morency emphasises the poet’s reliance on documentation (2011: 104).
99 There are variant spellings of Lemay, namely Le May (Bourque and Merkle 2008; Gaddis Rose 2008; Greco 2019) and LeMay (Michon 1994; Simon 1988: 66–67); the thesis follows the spelling adopted by Thériault, Viau, and others (Demers 1996; Greco 2019).
100 In an overview of Québécois translations of *Evangeline*, Michon notes that Lemay’s version was temporarily supplanted by others between 1924 and the 1960s, after which time it became once again the reference (1994: 324).


e lle débouche sur l’intégration presque complète d’éléments hétérogènes
dans un corpus défini par des critères relevant de l’esprit national et régi par
des codes littéraires et linguistiques s’avérant suffisamment fixes pour qu’ils
n’en soient pas affectés par le mouvement de traduction et de transposition.
(2011: 105)

Indeed, in addition to nationalist sentiment, Lemay introduces numerous changes to plot and structure.101 Sherry Simon identifies a function of ‘auto-compréhension’ in Lemay’s translation of Evangeline, connected with the desire by which ‘[l]e Québec traduira les images de lui-même que les Autres auront choisi de créer’ (1988: 65–67). For instance, whereas Longfellow’s Evangeline ultimately manages to integrate into American society, Lemay’s Évangéline remains connected to her homeland, ‘trouvait [dans une cité américaine] / Le plus de souvenirs de sa terre natale’ (qtd. in Thériault 2013: 128). Lemay’s translation not only layers a romanticised and idealised view of Acadian history, creating the tragic storyline that would underpin Acadian ideology, but also forestalls both assimilation and the possibility of return. Whereas Longfellow’s Evangeline lives at the end of the poem, Lemay’s Évangéline dies, implicitly opposing Longfellow’s implied acceptance of and integration into New England society. As Marilyn Gaddis Rose puts it, ‘American and British readers did not read the same poem [as Francophone readers]. Acadian historian Geoffrey

Plank notes that when “Read in the spirit of its age, ‘Evangeline’ is an anthem celebrating the transformation of Acadians into archetypal Americans. Not anymore.” (2008: 156) From this perspective, Évangéline can be read as another instance of a refusal to be translated, even if instantiated by a Québécois pen.

Neither Evangeline nor Évangéline returns to Acadie. A return is only enabled by the translation of the text into French and its own journey to Acadie. Évangéline arrived in Acadie in French, her name already bearing the acute accents that Longfellow had removed in translating the story from Acadie to New England. In the hands of those shepherding the renaissance, the exogenous Evangeline became indigenous to Acadie. The poem was added into the curriculum of Collège Saint-Joseph soon after its foundation in 1864 and was published in one of the first issues of the newly founded Acadian newspaper Le Moniteur acadien in 1867 (Clarke 1994: 20; Thériault 2013: 180; Viau 1998: 74). By the time of the Conventions nationales acadiennes of 1881 and 1884, Évangéline had become firmly ensconced in the Acadian imagination, a symbol of the cultural distinctiveness and uniqueness around which renaissance ideologies coalesced (Bourque 2015b: 48–52; Morency 2011: 107–8). Indeed, she became so closely intertwined with the Acadian imaginary that Pamphile Lemay’s second published version, in 1870, was subtitled ‘Traduction du poème acadien de Longfellow’ (Demers 1996: 148, emphasis added). From there, Évangéline only multiplied, as the subtitle of Joseph Yvon Thériault’s Évangéline: Contes d’Amérique (2013) implies through the plural form of ‘contes’ for Longfellow’s singular ‘A Tale of Acadie’. This multiplication is further reinforced in the subtitle of the English translation of Thériault’s work, ‘The Many Identities of a Literary Icon’ (2022, emphasis added). Indeed, the freedom that Lemay allowed in the French translation of Evangeline highlights the fundamentally translatable nature of the narrative (Viau 1997: 37–40, 1998: 166). According to Bourque and Merkle, this translatability lies in the deportation itself, Evangeline ‘cherchait son traducteur au sens benjaminien […] puisque l’original fut en quelque sorte une “interprétation” [...] d’une réalité qui était étrangère à celle de son auteur’ (2008: 122–23).

Évangéline has continued to be swept up by translational forces, the object of linguistic and intersemiotic translations even in the twenty-first century. She is at the heart of novels by some of the most prominent Anglophone Maritime writers of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, such as Thomas Raddall and Charles G.D. Roberts (Viau 1998: 107–
Cafes, garages, shops, railways, and tourism campaigns, among others, have packaged the lore of the figure of Évangéline (Viau 1998: 103–6), with revamped establishments taking their names from Évangéline and Longfellow as recently as 2022 (Spurr 2022). Évangéline also continues to inspire writers and artists, though often from a position of contestation. Maillet’s ‘anti-Evangélinisme’ (Bourque 2015b: 60), for instance, signals ‘a reply to the romanticized character created by Longfellow and traditionally associated with the Acadian people’ (Usmiani 1986: 65), as will be discussed in Chapter 3. Indeed, Éloïse Brière argues that Maillet repatriates Évangéline both from a foreign context and from the patriarchal values of Longfellow’s text (1996a: 9–10). Lastly, Évangéline continues to be the subject of artwork challenging the foundations of the myth it engendered, most notably by visual artists (Belliveau 2017, 2019, 2023) and writers (Godin 2015).

As illustrated earlier, in the eighteenth century the British had recognised the translatability of Acadians, instituting measures for translating them into Anglo-American communities first linguistically and then territorially. Longfellow and Lemay reveal another facet of this translatability. For all the emphasis on the cultural distinctiveness encompassed in the Evangeline narrative, its malleability and potential for universal meaning lie in Évangéline’s very essence as a translation. For instance, Éloïse Brière suggests that the novel Pélagie-la-Charrette, whose eponymous character represents an anti-Évangéline figure, ‘counters the cultural displacement inherent in Longfellow’s powerful narrative, which had so conveniently slipped into the void created by British colonial discourse after the Grand Dérange-ment’ (1996a: 19). Évangéline was not born in the Acadian imagination but was translated into it as the nascent national ideology appropriated the narrative. Longfellow’s Evangeline was fated to remain in the American Colonies, but translation brought her home to Acadie. Source and target cultures became one and the same, Evangeline/Évangéline fully embraced in both contexts. As Robert Viau puts it, the ‘traduction/adaptation de Lemay explique en partie l’interprétation acadienne et canadienne-française que l’on fit du poème’ (1998: 68–69; see also Bourque and Merkle 2008: 122). The paradox of being both outsider and insider, specific and universal, is emblematic of the early Acadian position of ‘living on

102 Robert Viau (1998) explores the manifestations of Evangeline in the Nova Scotian landscape with an emphasis on Grand-Pré for Acadian as well as Anglophone locals and tourists.
the margins of the French and British empires’ and ‘serving two masters’ (Faragher 2005: xviii–xix). On the one hand, Longfellow achieved what the instigators of linguistic assimilation and territorial displacement failed to accomplish, ‘he found a way to celebrate both familial loyalty and cultural assimilation’ (Plank 2001: 166). On the other, as a poem about faithfulness and political and cultural identities, *Evangeline* provides the narrative for the renaissance of a cultural group that should theoretically have been assimilated long ago.

**Conclusion**

It seems ineluctable that Acadie would become fertile ground for translation, the changeability of its toponym in explorations and settlement signalling such potential early on. From the heart of a multilingual society, the Acadians established themselves as cultural intermediaries and linguistic interpreters between French and British colonial powers as well as with the Mi’kmaq. Politically, they became known as the French Neutrals as they steadfastly embraced a position of neutrality over the four decades or so following the Treaty of Utrecht that placed Acadie definitively under British rule in 1713. Neutrality was a precarious position that irritated the French and aroused the ire of the British, leading to policies of linguistic and cultural assimilation and, ultimately, to translation at a territorial level. The Deportation, which triggered the expulsion of about two thirds of Acadians from Nova Scotia, aimed to translate the French-speaking population into faraway English-speaking colonies. Finally, in the absence of a homegrown historiography, the Acadian renaissance adapted symbols and narratives developed by foreigners, most notably the figure and story of Évangéline. A new myth of cultural identity took hold in the collective consciousness, it too emphasising translatability by arriving in, or rather returning to, Acadie through a circuitous journey through New England and Québec.

While the chapter homed in on three specific periods of Acadian history, others are likely to be as equally informative. For instance, New Brunswick’s first Acadian Premier, Louis J. Robichaud, was mentioned above in the context of neutrality. It was under Robichaud’s leadership that New Brunswick became officially bilingual in 1969, some 250 years after the first official translation policies had been instituted on Acadian territory (Delisle 1987: 54; Gallant 1985: 71–76). It was also during Robichaud’s tenure that what is known as the ‘mouvement néo-nationaliste’ (Hautecoeur 1975: 20) and the student revolts of the late 1960s and early 1970s took place (*L’Acadie, l’Acadie?!?* 1971). With a large focus
on linguistic rights and language reclamation, these revolts were, according to Annette Boudreau, closely associated with perceptions of Acadians as compliant and docile people:

*sensibles aux discours qui annoncent l’assimilation des francophones, sensibles aussi au fait qu’on reproche aux Acadiennes et Acadiens leur esprit de consensus, leur mollesse, leur peur, […] les étudiantes et étudiants veulent agir et leur volonté passe par l’action sur le code.* (2022: 176)

These revolts, then, can almost be seen as counter-reactions to the neutrality of two and a half centuries earlier. Roger Ouellette’s description of Robichaud’s election as Premier aligns with this idea, describing it as ‘the refusal of Acadians to remain marginalized and their desire to gain greater institutional autonomy’ (2001: 18). Today, the negotiatory nature of Acadian character manifests in various ways. Charles MacDougall evokes ‘neutrality’ when describing how tour guides present Grand-Pré National Historic Site (see Chapter 2, pp. 86–87) to visitors, whether locals or tourists (MacDougall 2023). In addition to noting that guides at Grand-Pré must be fluent in both English and French, not a requirement of all National Historic Sites, MacDougall conceives of the role as an act of ‘self-translation’ by which the conflict is ‘interpreted’ as a function of the makeup of the audience, which regularly includes descendants of those implicated on either side of the conflict (2023).

Nevertheless, outlining the societal, geographical, and cultural manifestations of translation processes lays the foundations for a practice of literary translation to emerge, and for this practice to be interpreted in ways that adequately reflect the community. As the previous pages have illustrated, Acadie lives and experiences translation in myriad ways, creating a playground of translation. Indeed, Nicole Nolette delineates a ‘terrain de jeu’ constituted by the playful nature of circulating Franco-Canadian heterolingual theatre (2015: 8–11). The preceding chapter, meanwhile, proposed an on-the-ground investigation of translationality as it manifests through geographical, sociocultural, and historical phenomena. The analysis now turns to ways in which this translationality trickles down into Acadian literary translation practice. More specifically, it moves the focus onto analyses of shifts identified by comparing Acadian literary translations and their source texts. To reflect the inherent translationality of Acadie, these shifts – omissions, substitutions, additions, and semantic divergences instituted in the translation process – are grouped according to
Acadian realities and phenomena. Supplemented by information gleaned from paratextual sources, the analysis reinforces the translational nature of Acadie not only by delving into the translationality of Acadian aboiteaux, défrichetage de parenté, grands dérangements, and mascaret, but also by correlating effects generated through literary translation with these phenomena. The works comprising the corpus of analysis have all been published long after the history examined in this chapter, but they are profoundly indebted to the translational forces that have shaped Acadie.
2 The aboiteaux and the Acadian landscape

Mais Pélagie ne choisissait pas ses images, elle les trainait avec elle depuis le pays. Un pays de mâts et de haubans, encadré de baies, balafré de fleuves, et tout emmuré d’aboiteaux.

— Antonine Maillet, Pélagie-la-Charrette

In the excerpt quoted in the epigraph above, the narrator of Antonine Maillet’s novel Pélagie-la-Charrette makes it clear that the protagonist’s memories, which survived deportation to Georgia and are now motivating the return journey, are shaped by the landscape of Acadie. And, more specifically, of an Acadie, in Philip Stratford’s translation, ‘all walled round with aboiteaux’ (Maillet 2004a: 23). Upon settlement in the early seventeenth century, the Acadians established communities and developed practices that contrasted with those of the nomadic Mi’kmaq, whose land (Mi’kma’ki) they and the British colonised. As mentioned in the previous chapter, Acadians developed a sense of identity distinct from both imperial powers vying for the territory. This identity was ‘rooted in the circumstances of their daily life and their network of kin relationships, [...] relative independence from the seigneurial system, [...] contacts with New England, and in the evolution of their own small elite of prosperous farmers and traders’ (Griffiths 2005: 260). Rooted also, as Pélagie fondly remembers, in the aboiteaux that enabled farming and trading.

Aboiteaux are dykes outfitted with a log sluice and hinged valve to allow rainwater to drain out at low tide and prevent saltwater from penetrating at high tide\(^\text{103}\) (see Figure 2). Their basic structure derives from settlers’ experience cultivating saltmarshes in western France (Cormier 1990: 34; Daigle 1993a: 2; Hatvany 2002: 124–27; Kennedy 2013, 2014: 18). Yet, the sluice-and-valve design makes the aboiteaux unique to Acadie (Faragher 2005: 49; Griffiths 1992: 58, note no. 80; see also Hill Clark 1968: 101–3; Kennedy 2013: 54–55). In fact, aboiteaux appear sporadically (Hatvany 2002) but are ubiquitous in neither New England nor New France (Faragher 2005: 49-50; Griffiths 1992: 58, note no. 80). They became symbols of Acadian ingenuity, markers of identity (Cormier 1990; Hatvany 2002: 103 For detailed descriptions of the aboiteaux system, see Cormier (1990, especially pp. 37–57), Province of Nova Scotia (1987: 31–40), and Ross (2002). For an extensive discussion of the importance of aboiteaux in the Maritimes, for the Acadians as well as for Anglophone settlers who oversaw construction and maintenance post-Grand Dérangement, see Bleakney (2004) and Rudin (2021).
and the anchors around which society flourished in terms of geographic expansion, population growth, and economic prosperity (Brun 1982: 42; Faragher 2005: 49–50; Griffiths 2005: 285; Kennedy 2014: 11; Province of Nova Scotia 1987: 23–24). As A.H. Clark points out, ‘no place in Nova Scotia or in the south-eastern parts of New Brunswick settled by the Acadians, [sic] is more than thirty-five miles from tide-water, and 95% of the population and of productive agriculture is within ten or fifteen miles of the coast’ (qtd. in Griffiths 2005: 285). When Acadie definitively came under British rule in 1713, aboiteaux were located around present-day Nova Scotia (Plank 2001), as Figure 3 shows. Indeed, the aboiteaux were so prevalent that Gregory Kennedy describes ‘marshland colonization’ (2013, 2014: 14).

The aboiteaux constitute, according to James Laxer, ‘a unique technological adaptation [that] took on a kind of personality and certainly helped shape the nature of Acadian communities’ (qtd. in Fowler Forthcoming: 7). Their significance — they filled ‘un rôle essentiel dans la survie du peuple acadien et témoignent de ses valeurs les plus fondamentales’ (Cormier 1990: 85) — have made them useful figures for relating Acadian
political and sociocultural phenomena. Aboiteaux have been portrayed as cultural-political shapers (Cormier 1990; Équipe du village historique acadien and others 2003; Faragher 2005: 49–50; Hill Clark 1968: 238–42; Kennedy 2014: 18–24; UNESCO 2012), as historical or archeological artefacts (Bleakney 2004; Fowler Forthcoming; Summersby-Murray 2013), and as agricultural and land-management marvels (Province of Nova Scotia 1987; Ross 2002; Rudin 2021). Christopher Hodson uses them metaphorically to describe the post-Grand Dérangement situation: ‘the Bay of Fundy was caught up in a long run of invasions, treaty making, and power grabbing. In a sense, Acadians were well equipped to ride out the storm. Literally and figuratively, the dikes held’ (2012: 30–46, emphasis added). Jane Slemon, too, connects the aboiteaux to the Grand Dérangement to draw parallels between their hollow centre and the lack of homeland and to metaphorise the return pilgrimage (2003: 26, 29). For Ronald Rudin, the aboiteaux protect: the Acadian landscape ‘had a certain metaphorical power, with the dyke providing protection for Acadians from a hostile world, and the aboiteau with its hinged valve controlling access to Acadian society’ (2021: 9–10, emphasis added). Ariane Brun del Re, meanwhile, correlates aboiteaux with barriers that prevent understanding of Acadian literature, in the same way that aboiteaux prevent saltwater from seeping into fields (2023, see also 2019: 117, footnote no. 365).

Figure 3: Location of dyked saltmarshes around Acadian settlements on the Bay of Fundy, 1636–1755, from Dykes and Aboiteaux, by Sally Ross. Reproduced with permission from Société Grand-Pré.
Despite the uniqueness of the dyking system being challenged in light of marshland and wetland cultivation in other colonies (Hatvany 2002), the mechanism of the aboiteau itself (the sluice and valve control devised to suit the geographical realities of Acadie) is of interest here as it displays translational tendencies. The aboiteaux earned the Acadians the moniker ‘défricheurs d’eau’ (Daigle 1993a: 9; Équipe du village historique acadien and others 2003; Hatvany 2002: 121), a play on the term ‘défricheur’, or land clearer, which will be explored further in the next chapter. Still, the term ‘défricheurs d’eau’ brings into productive coexistence seemingly disparate elements in its paradoxical application of a typically territorial practice (‘défrichage’ means ‘to clear the land’) to a fluid body of water through tidal flux. The aboiteaux therefore exhibit translational aspects, which manifest in three main ways. First, they transform uncultivable saltmarshes into arable lands by fostering desalination, a process that can be likened to transformation from a source to a target. By 1750, about 12,000 acres of dyked marshlands far outpaced the roughly 500 acres of cleared upland across Acadie104 (Hill Clark 1968: 237–38). By 1948, under the stewardship first of the Acadians and then of their Anglophone successors, the Maritime provinces boasted some ‘373 kilometres of dykes and over 400 aboiteaux’ (Rudin 2021: xxvi). The second translational aspect lies in the very design of the aboiteaux, with the sluice and valve mechanism that both allows drainage and prevents inflow, fostering mediation between land and tidal bodies of water, ‘a liminal space between farmland and sea’ (Slemon 2003: 18). The third plays into the notion of Acadian neutrality; both Britain and France considered the aboiteaux a useless endeavour, believing the clearing of highlands a nobler and more rigorous approach (Bleakney 2004: 7; Daigle 1993a: 9; Équipe du village historique acadien and others 2003: 29; Faragher 2005: 49–50; Fowler Forthcoming: 12, 14). This perception perpetuated the myth of Acadie as terra nullius and, consequently, of its people as deportable. Archeologist Jonathan Fowler makes the point explicitly, stating that ‘the Acadians’ most fundamental adaptations to the colonial world — dyking, and peaceful

104 Régis Brun calculates that by the time of Deportation, Acadians in the isthmus of Chignecto (between present-day New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, see Figure 1) had reclaimed about 5,500 acres of meadows after 50 years of labour, compared to 725 acres of cleared uplands (2005: 45). Focussing specifically on the development of the aboiteaux in the Grand-Pré region from the 1686 census to 1755, J. Sherman Bleakney measures more than 27 kilometres of dyke walls (2004: 82–94; see also Faragher 2005: 49–50; Hill Clark 1968: 238–42; Kennedy 2014: 18–24). For an archeological perspective on the dyked marshes and aboiteaux of Tantramar in present-day southeastern New Brunswick, though from political, cultural, and economic dimensions rather than an exclusively Acadian perspective, see Summerby-Murray (2013).
coexistence with Indigenous peoples — were the very features that furnished Anglo-Americans with the symbols necessary to imagine them as primitive and threatening’ (Forthcoming: 15).

Since ‘[t]he marsh muds [...] contain the whole history of the Acadian peoples who dyked the salt marshes, built thriving agricultural communities on these dyke lands’ (Thurston 2004: 142), this chapter seeks to excavate the muds bolstered by aboiteaux. To accomplish this, it heeds Fowler’s call ‘for another archeology’ in Acadie, one that not only aims to unearth the remains of Acadian domestic life, but also to provide a lens through which to read the landscape: ‘a more theoretically informed, interpretive archaeology, and above all one that recognizes materiality as a mediator if not a silent actor in our histories’ (Forthcoming: 11). The connection between such an endeavour and translation is made explicit by Bella Brodzki, who argues that ‘[w]e are most accustomed to thinking of translation as an empirical linguistic maneuver, but excavating or unearthing burial sites of ruins in order to reconstruct traces of the physical and textual past in a new context is also a mode of translation’ (2007: 4; see also Blumczynski 2023). Embracing this mode of translation, the chapter facilitates excavation by connecting the aboiteaux to elements identified in comparing translations by Rose Després, Sophie M. Lavoie, Sonya Malaborza, and Serge Patrice Thibodeau with their source texts. It begins in the marshes of the Grand-Pré region, a significant ‘site of memory’ in the Acadian imaginary (Rudin 2009: 52–53; Viau 2005) and a UNESCO World Heritage Site in part thanks to the legacy of the aboiteaux (UNESCO 2012). The chapter thus begins with a discussion of the built environment that the aboiteaux represent, contrasting their porosity with the perceived impermeability of walls constructed by the British arriving at Grand-Pré to execute deportation orders, as emphasised in Thibodeau’s Journal de John Winslow à Grand-Pré (2010). Malaborza likewise delves into the semantic possibilities of the Grand-Pré landscape, as L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay (McKay 2020) effectively replants a landscape emptied of its Acadian inhabitants. The chapter then turns to the generative function of aboiteaux (land creation) through Lavoie’s Nous sommes les rêveurs (Joe 2016), which highlights the regenerative potential of minority languages, in this case French and Mi’kmaq. Finally, the chapter concludes with a discussion

105 Bleakney makes a similar point, though specifically for the Grand-Pré region, writing that ‘these ghosts [irregular patterns picked up by radar indicating locations of the aboiteaux] from the Acadian farming presence of 300 years ago still haunt the Grand Pré dykelands’ (2004: 80).
of the inherently dialectical nature of aboiteaux. Dependent on the tides for proper functioning, the aboiteaux are constantly engaged in a rhythmic dialectic echoed by that between Rose Desprès’ translation femme-rivière (Vermette 2019) and its source text.

**Porous palisades: Journal de John Winslow à Grand-Pré**

Now a National Historic Site of Canada, Grand-Pré, on the shores of the Minas Basin (see Figure 1), is a ‘monument to Acadian culture and deportation’ as the place of departure for the largest number of deported Acadians (Government of Canada 2023a; see also Rudin 2009: 179–212). This is where Colonel John Winslow was stationed and had his men read Charles Lawrence’s deportation orders in a French translation by the Swiss Isaac Deschamps, marking a shift in the translation and interpretation roles the Acadians had occupied in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries (see Chapter 1, pp. 61–66).

From a literary perspective, Grand-Pré is a

site de terre et de pierre [qui], en vertu d’une sorte d’osmose avec les événements qui s’y ont déroulés, […] a été ‘élu’ comme le centre de l’ancienne Acadie. Entre le pré et la page, Grand-Pré devient une construction de mots qui s’accompagne d’une interprétation, donc d’une recréation du lieu nommé par les écrivains et les œuvres de fiction. (Viau 2021: 139)

The acts of interpretation, construction, and recreation that Viau mentions not only resonate with the translational aspects of aboiteaux outlined previously, but are also effected by the aboiteaux, an indelible part of the Grand-Pré landscape. In 2012, UNESCO named the Landscape of Grand-Pré a World Heritage Site whose ‘marshland and archeological sites constitute a cultural landscape bearing testimony to the development of agricultural farmland using dykes and the aboiteau wooden sluice system’ (UNESCO 2012).

In fact, the aboiteaux are still in use in that region today (Rudin 2021: 220–25).

If, as Pélagie notes in the epigraph introducing this chapter, Acadie is ‘all walled round’ by aboiteaux, Grand-Pré is too, quite literally. Bleakney details the construction of the twelve ‘enclosures’ that make up the Acadian dykes in the Grand-Pré region (2004: 83–91). These were, however, enclosures that paradoxically opened onto, and indeed relied on exchange with, the tides of the Minas Basin. By contrast, John Winslow, tasked with
overseeing the plan to expel the Acadians from Grand-Pré in the summer and fall of 1755, ordered his men to begin constructing a palisade immediately upon arriving on 19 August. The order is recorded, along with meticulous quantitative and descriptive accounts of goings-on and transcriptions of correspondence in the two-volume *Journal of Colonel John Winslow of the Provincial Troops, while Engaged in Removing the Acadian French Inhabitants from Grand-Pre and the Neighbouring Settlements* (Winslow 1880a, 1880b), abbreviated as *Journal* going forward. In reference to the palisade, Winslow writes: ‘arived at Grand Pre and have Veiwed the Scituation [...] Shall to Secure the Party run a Line of Picquets from the Church to the Church yard which I Look upon as a Place of Security in Case of Supprise’ (Winslow 1880b: 245). With repeated references to progress, the *Journal* shows that Winslow remained remarkably concerned with the construction project until at least 28 August (Winslow 1880a: 72, 75, 76, 78, 1880b: 216, 225, 245, 246). In a letter to Boston merchant William Coffin, Winslow justifies ‘picquetting’ (building the palisade) by emphasising its protective function, arguing that it will help stave off a surprise attack by the French-speaking inhabitants (Winslow 1880a: 72; Thibodeau 2010: 40). Winslow notes in another letter that ‘I am but a handful of Men in an open Countrey’ (Winslow 1880a: 75; Thibodeau 2010: 40), his ‘handfull’ comprised in reality of some 300 soldiers with more due to arrive soon after.106

The palisade was built next to the church of Saint-Charles-des-Mines, then the heart of religious life at Grand-Pré and today one of the main features of the National Historic Site in its reconstructed form (Government of Canada 2023a). Rather than enclosing land to protect it from the tides, Winslow’s palisade creates a physical barrier between the Acadians and the British. Fowler observes that in pre-Deportation Nova Scotia, British communities were generally walled, whereas smaller, more isolated (and thus more vulnerable) Acadian and Indigenous communities tended not to be (Forthcoming: 9). By building a wall in an Acadian community, Winslow provides a material signal of the end of the linguistic and cultural coexistence that had reigned, albeit precariously, in Nova Scotia over the previous decades (see Chapter 1, pp. 58–66). On the one hand, it becomes a physical symbol of the shift in British perceptions of Acadians from neutrals to outright

---

106 By comparison, Winslow notes 418 Acadian men and boys imprisoned in the church Saint-Charles-des-Mines on 5 September 1755 (Thibodeau 2010: 151–58), and calculates a total of some 2,242 people from Grand-Pré and the neighbouring settlements to deport (Delaney 2020: 46–55).
threats, a concrete manifestation of the fear of the Other. On the other hand, it serves for Winslow to lay claim to Grand-Pré, foreshadowing the military action of the impending deportations. For, building walls is a colonial endeavour, as ‘[o]wnership rights could be imaginatively and “legally” gained by erecting a fence around a parcel of land. The English were committed, as always, to models of ownership that contained space and resources — or to models that held space and resources effectively captive, well apart from any and all perceived rivals’ (Bryant 2017: 100, emphasis in original). The lack of enclosed spaces in Mi’kma’ki / Acadie, as in other colonies, played into the principles of terra nullius or vaccum domicilium used to justify settlement and dispossession namely of Indigenous peoples by the British (Bryant 2017: 97; Conrad 2020: 140). Despite being permanent, visible ‘signatures’ of the landscape (Cormier 1990: 89; Ross 2022: 14), the aboiteaux did not alter this perception, solidifying in fact the opposite by positioning the Acadians as unsophisticated (Fowler Forthcoming: 15) and, by extension, deportable.

Serge Patrice Thibodeau’s translation of Winslow’s Journal is likewise preoccupied with the palisade. An award-winning poet, publisher, and proponent of Acadian letters, Thibodeau embarked on the translation of Winslow’s Journal at the behest of two ‘historiens anglo-saxons’ who, separately but within one year of one another, asked ‘Acadians have to read this document in French, right?’ (2010: 13–14). As discussed in Chapter 1 (pp. 71–74), Acadian accounts of the Deportation were relatively scarce, and even by the turn of the twenty-first century, no first-hand account was available in French (Marguerite Maillet 1983: 37; Thibodeau 2010: 13–14). Spurred by this idea, Thibodeau embarked on a French translation of the Journal in 2004, amidst commemorations of the 400th anniversary of the founding of Acadie and the 250th anniversary of the Grand Dérangement107 (Thibodeau 2010: 13–15).

The Journal de John Winslow à Grand-Pré (2010) has two parts, a heavily researched, 69-page critical introduction108 and the translation of Winslow’s Journal into French. Thibodeau brings up the question of the palisade in the introductory section of Journal de John Winslow à Grand-Pré, explaining that

---

107 For more on the relation between the Acadian collective memory and the commemorative events of 2004–2005, see Rudin (2009).

108 This section provides historical context for the Journal and insight into the text’s intricacies, meaning, and characters, as well as into Thibodeau’s translation strategy and feelings towards the text as a historical document.
By identifying the construction of the palisade as the turning point from which everything shifted in the lives of those involved, Thibodeau implies that the palisade enables the translation at a territorial level that would soon follow in the form of the Deportation (see Chapter 1, pp. 66–71). In fact, historians have noted that the Grand-Pré palisade did play a strategic role in the overall success of the Grand-Pré deportations in contrast to those in locations where no such fortifications had been built (Thibodeau 2010: 51).

Yet, Thibodeau demonstrates that Winslow’s palisade is in fact porous, like the aboiteaux and their mechanisms for emptying out. While the men and boys of Grand-Pré were imprisoned in the adjacent church, women were overseeing the harvest and feeding both the prisoners and the officers (Thibodeau 2010: 53). Winslow therefore ordered officers to remain within the boundaries of the palisade to help deter transgressions (Thibodeau 2010: 53–59). There were, however, breaches. Indeed, Thibodeau expounds over nine pages the ineffectiveness of the palisade to enclose and the violent consequences of officers’ transgressions (Thibodeau 2010: 51–59). Furthermore, Thibodeau reveals more seepage not mentioned in Winslow’s Journal, this time in an endnote to the introduction to La liste de Winslow expliquée (Delaney 2020). As editor and translator of Delaney’s work, Thibodeau points out that Winslow omits, presumably deliberately given the overall detail included in the Journal, the fact that Acadian prisoners dismantled two stakes from the palisade and escaped (Delaney 2020: 42). While Winslow did not recognise seepage from the palisade, at least not in writing, Thibodeau does and, moreover, notes its relevance twice.

Thibodeau goes on to dedicate a section of the opening section of Journal de John Winslow à Grand-Pré, comprised of a lengthy introduction and critical analysis of Winslow’s diary, to the passages relating the construction of the palisade (2010: 37–47).
If walls ‘negate translation’ in the context of migration (Nergaard 2021: 101), the walls of Grand-Pré, the palisade and the aboiteaux, foster it. In the case of Thibodeau’s translation, this idea is also mirrored in the relationship between text and translator as understood according to Laëtitia Saint-Loubert’s concept of paratextual thresholds. Expanding on a Genettian framework of the threshold, Saint-Loubert ‘invites a reading of paratext as a site of entry into the text, but also as a site of porosity between text and that which is not part of the text’ (2020: 13). This is relevant insofar as the porosity of Winslow’s wall is made manifest in a paratext, an endnote. Thibodeau’s working document for the translation *Journal de John Winslow à Grand-Pré* reveals yet another instance of porosity between text and what lays outside of it (see Figure 4). The reproduction of Thibodeau’s working document shows handwritten marks breaking down the source text into short sections, and notes filling the margins with historical fact, biographical data, translation milestones and events in the translator’s personal life. These markings contrast with the translator’s stated strategy of favouring close adherence to the source text:

> Ma profession étant celle de lecteur, je préfère laisser la Déportation parler d’elle-même, je suis à son écoute, en lisant ou relisant les écrits de ceux qui l’ont faite et commentée, ceux qui nous craignaient et nous haïssaient, qui nous observaient et nous écrivaient, ceux qu’on appelle les autres et qui sont les principaux responsables de ce crime, nos ennemis lointains d’une époque fascinante et décisive pour la destinée de l’Amérique du Nord. (2010: 70, see also 71, emphasis in original)

If there is little conscious interference from the translator in the text of Winslow’s *Journal*, the record of the translation process suggests otherwise. Thibodeau’s working document shows that the Deportation ceases to speak for itself, as it were, and the narrative begins to bear marks of influence in the threshold. Equally noteworthy is a simmering tension between text and translator. The handwritten note at the top of the right-hand page of Figure 4, for instance, records the birth of the translator’s nephew, Jacob Thibodeau, in 2006. This is where Thibodeau’s act of reading (‘[m]a profession étant celle de

---

110 An exception to Thibodeau’s close adherence to source text, the deliberate naming of perpetrators, will be discussed in Chapter 4.
lecteur’) becomes especially intimate, epitomising in a sense Gayatri Spivak’s famous definition of ‘translation as reading’ (2012). The note also implies genealogical continuity akin to that ensured by the déricheteuse de parenté, discussed in the following chapter.

Figure 4: Image of Serge Patrice Thibodeau’s working document for *Journal de John Winslow à Grand-Pré*. Reproduced with permission from Serge Patrice Thibodeau.

Furthermore, the translator’s marks create a sort of visual grid through which to absorb the text. As a document, Winslow’s *Journal* resembles a travel journal, which Federico Italiano, quoting Charles Forsdick and others, describes as ‘a sort of “intermediary form” that enables [...] “mediation between and connection of the text’s two dimensions, external and internal worlds, landscape and mindscape”’ (2016: 88). This idea is exacerbated in Thibodeau’s paratextual interventions. Thibodeau’s name appears on the cover of *Journal de John Winslow à Grand-Pré* where the author’s (Winslow) normally would and there is no
reference to Thibodeau as translator on either the front or back covers. Winslow’s name appears only in the title. This suggests that Thibodeau reclaims the narrative on behalf of Acadians through the act of translation, an idea supported by a line scribbled at the end of the working document: ‘Il aura fallu John Winslow pour me ramener en Acadie’ (Thibodeau 2009a: n.p.). After two decades in Montréal, Thibodeau’s return to Acadie, bolstered by the translation project (Thibodeau 2010: 15), cements the failure of Winslow’s (and by extension British forces’) translation plans, thereby enacting another variation of the refusal to be translated (see Chapter 1, pp. 68–70).

Replanting the Acadian landscape: L’accocheuse de Scots Bay

As mentioned earlier, aboiteaux are designed for the purpose of ‘tidal marsh reclamation’ (Fowler Forthcoming: 7), generating out of saltmarshes arable lands for crops (Cormier 1990: 66; Ross 2002: 2). The aboiteaux therefore fulfill a generative function in constructing, out of saltmarshes unsuitable for agriculture, highly productive fields. The Grand Dérangement, however, had in many ways a reverse effect. Although deportation measures were meant specifically to address the perceived threat posed by the French-speaking inhabitants, then a demographic majority, they also included destroying communities through fire as well as confiscating or killing livestock (Arsenault 2018: 208–9; Fowler Forthcoming: 10). The lands that did survive were given away to English-speaking settlers, known as Planters (Brun 2005: 32; Conrad 2020: 140–44; Faragher 2005: 417–22; Plank 2001: 118), and the responsibility for the maintenance and use of aboiteaux fell to the new landowners (Cormier 1990: 77–81; Rudin 2021: xxv–xxvi). As Faragher explains, ‘[t]he mass surrenders and captures of the previous months had placed nearly two thousand Acadian refugees under British control, and in the summer of 1760, Governor Lawrence devised a scheme to put them to work as laborers on lands previously their own’ (2005: 418). This relegated the Acadians to a subsidiary position of aiding the new landowners, vaguely familiar with the aboiteaux, with maintenance and repairs\textsuperscript{111} (Cormier 1990: 78–79; Faragher 2005: 417–18; Hill Clark 1968: 365; Rudin 2021: 39). Moreover, it triggered a

\begin{footnote}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{111} Rudin specifies that ‘[t]he only marshes available to Acadians as proprietors were at the northern reaches of pre-deportation drainage, in places such as Memramcook (in what would become the province of New Brunswick in 1784) where the Planters had not taken over the land’ (2021: 40). Here, as Rudin notes, the Acadians maintained a ‘connection with the drained landscape’ (2021: 40).
\end{footnote}
process of knowledge transfer by which ‘[s]ome of the former occupants of the land, now prisoners of war, were forced to “train” the new marsh owners’ (Rudin 2021: 39). This knowledge transfer reshaped the landscape and the people’s connection to the aboiteaux. According to Rudin,

relatively few Acadians [...] have tilled the drained marshland of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia since the mid-eighteenth century, but this has not prevented that landscape from serving as a source of inspiration for Acadians who were mindful that Acadie had disappeared from the map [...] Here was an environment that the Acadians had created and that still exists, in the process speaking to something that belonged to them, instead of focusing on their legacy of loss. (2021: 9)

Under the leadership of English-speaking settlers, marshland development led to the establishment of ‘marsh bodies’, local organisations responsible for protecting the dykes and, eventually, to the creation of the Maritime Marshland Rehabilitation Administration (Rudin 2021: xxv–xxvi). The Grand Pre Marsh Body,112 established in 1760 and incorporated in 1949, is still in operation well into the twenty-first century (Rudin 2021: 220–25).

*L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay* (McKay 2020), a translation by Sonya Malaborza of Ami McKay’s novel *The Birth House* (2007), aligns with the idea of landscape (re)generation that the aboiteaux promote. McKay’s novel is set in Scots Bay, Nova Scotia, some 40 kilometres north of Grand-Pré and settled in 1764 by Scottish immigrants forced to overwinter due to a shipwreck (Public Archives of Nova Scotia [n.d.]). The plot of *The Birth House* revolves around midwifery practices (see Chapter 3) reliant on medicinal herbs at the time of the novel’s setting, from 1918 to 1921. Or, to put it differently, reliant on the gardens and natural resources of the Grand-Pré / Scots Bay region. Botanical references are integral to the poetics of *The Birth House*. In the ‘Mot de la traductrice’ included at the end of *L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay*, Malaborza explains having to ensure accuracy while maintaining the religious overtones of the plant selections in McKay’s source text: ‘[u]n travail [...] discret a été fait sur une foule de noms de plantes qui figurent dans ce livre [...]’

112 Spelling, without the accent on ‘Pré’, follows that of historical and incorporation records of the Body (Grand Pre Marsh Body [n.d.]).
[dans les cas] où les noms saints ou poétiques se perdaient dans le transfert linguistique’ (2020: 559). If Malaborza’s toil was discrete, it was not simple. Indeed, the translator notes the challenges of rendering the ‘semantic charge’ of many of the plant references, as in this excerpt from the novel:

Aside from peas, cabbage and other vegetables, there is now a start from every herb in Miss B.’s garden. Blue-eyed Mary, Lady’s keys, Our Lady’s bedstraw, Mary’s slippers, Mary’s gold, Mary’s nettle, Mary’s bouquet, Mary’s bed, Mary’s tears, Mary’s washing plant, Mary’s sword of sorrow, Sweet Mary, Jesus wort, Lady’s modesty. (McKay 2007: 153, italics in original; see also Malaborza 2021)

The religious overtones of the repeated ‘Our Lady’ and ‘Mary’ are not replicated in all of the official French names of these plant: Blue-eyed Mary is ‘omphalodès du printemps’ or ‘collinsie printanière’, Lady’s keys is ‘primevère’, Our Lady’s bedstraw is ‘caille-lait jaune’ or ‘gaillet vrai’, Mary’s slippers is ‘Ancolie du Canada’, and so on (Canadensys [n.d.]; Malaborza 2021). Simply opting for each plant’s French name, then, would have erased the overtones embedded in the English nomenclature (Malaborza 2021). Malaborza therefore translates this excerpt as follows:

À côté des petits pois, des choux et des autres légumes, nous avons planté des boutures de toutes les herbes du jardin de M’ame B. Œillet de Dieu, Herbe sainte, Herbe sacrée, Julienne des dames, Gants-de-Notre-Dame, Menthe de Notre-Dame, Chardon-Marie, Cœur de Marie, Violette de Marie, Manchette de la Vierge, Rose de la Vierge, Sabot de la Vierge, Lys de la Madone. (McKay 2020: 232–33, italics in original)

The translation maintains the source text’s referential environment and religious connotations, but in doing so it enacts a substitution of the novel’s flora. Instead of the plants listed in the excerpt from the English source text, the translation features Mary’s rose or Our Lady’s rose (‘Œillet de Dieu’), vanilla or common sweetgrass (‘Herbe sainte’), hyssop (‘Herbe sacrée’), Dames Rocket (‘Julienne des dames’), wild columbine (‘Gants-de-Notre-Dame’), and so on.
Similar substitutions occur in the *Notes tirées du Livre des saules* (McKay 2020: 535–48), a fictional compendium of knowledge by one of the protagonist midwives included at the end of the novel. In McKay’s English text, the *Willow Book* includes a poetic A-to-Z listing called ‘The Midwife’s Garden’, an excerpt of which is reproduced here along with the corresponding translation:113

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>McKay’s <em>The Birth House</em></th>
<th>Malaborza’s translation <em>L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E is for eggs, one a day cooked ‘till hard</td>
<td>E pour l’églantier qui fait une bonne tite gelée</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fennel brings mother’s milk and a woman’s blood</td>
<td>F c’est le fraisier pour quand-ce t’es constipé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G’s the gooseberry, for pie or for jam</td>
<td>G c’est le goémon qui garde longtemps quand i’ est chessé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyssop, tansy, and mugwort for taking a bath</td>
<td>H pour le houblon qui calme la digestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[..]</td>
<td>[..]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K is for kelp, when it’s dried it will keep</td>
<td>K comme kalmia en cataplasme pour les migraines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labrador tea if you’re needing some sleep</td>
<td>L c’est pour lédon, une bonne plante pour t’endormir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As this excerpt demonstrates (and the complete text in the appendix reinforces), Malaborza sometimes keeps the plant from the English source text and categorises alphabetically according to the first letter of the French equivalent. This is the case, for instance, with ‘kelp’, which is listed under ‘k’ in the English version, and under ‘g’ in the French for ‘goémon’, the equivalent of ‘kelp’. Yet, in other instances Malaborza inserts some substitutions where none is technically required to maintain the abecedarium structure of the text. In other words, the plant is deliberately changed even if the French equivalent of a word starts with the same letter as its English counterpart. In the above excerpt, this happens with both ‘fennel’, which is ‘fenouil’ in French, and with ‘hyssop’, which is ‘hysope’ in French. Instead, Malaborza substitutes respectively with ‘fraisier’ (strawberry bush) and

---

113 See Appendix 1 for complete reproductions of ‘The Midwife’s Garden’ and the ‘Livre des Saules’.
'houblon' (hop). This occurs even though the plants ostensibly do not lose their medicinal properties in the language transfer and could therefore have been kept in the list.

Malaborza explains having consulted several works of reference to complete the translation of *The Birth House*. However, only one botany-related reference is listed among a handful of dictionaries and songbooks in the translator’s note: Marielle Cormier Boudreau’s *Médecine traditionnelle en Acadie* (2020: 560). Although subsequently supplemented by works of reference about plants with religious connotations, phytotherapy, and regional reference guides, the single reference printed in the ‘Mot de la traductrice’ is telling. Described by its author as an ‘inventaire des survivances thérapeutiques anciennes’, *Médecine traditionnelle en Acadie* is an ethnographic study of cultural practices around medicinal herbs and plant-based cures passed down from generation to generation (Cormier Boudreau 2003: 14). The process of knowledge transfer to which Cormier Boudreau refers is deeply embedded in the Acadian imagination; Antonine Maillet traces the practice back to medieval France through the works of Rabelais (1971: 83–86).

The process of substitution is also reflected in *L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay*’s title and cover design. Whereas the English version of McKay’s novel emphasises pregnancy in both the title (‘birth house’) and cover image, the translation centres on the territory (Scots Bay) and flora (see Figure 5). Designed by Acadian artist Carole Deveau, the cover of the translation depicts, at the publisher’s request, some of the plants and flowers listed in *The Willow Book* (Deveau 2021). An herbalist and forager, Deveau explains that the design features plants that not only appear in the ‘Livre des Saules’, but that are also regularly found through her own foraging expeditions (2021). Moreover, Deveau specifies that, on the cover, ‘l’églantier, le plantain, les quatre-temps, les feuilles de framboisier, la tanaisie et le cormier sont celles [les plantes] que je connais grâce à mes grand-parents [sic]’ (2021). In this statement, Deveau correlates the creative contribution to *L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay*

---

114 The novel’s soundscape will be discussed in Chapter 3.
115 Malaborza (2021) lists the following: *A Catholic Gardener’s Spiritual Almanac*, by Margaret Rose Realy; *Mary’s Flowers: Gardens, Legends & Meditations*, by Vincenzina Krymow; *Les plantes pour la femme*, by K. Hostettmann; *Je me soigne avec les plantes sauvages*, by Annny Schneider; *Flore laurentienne*, by Gaëtan Morin; *Plantes de milieux humides et de bord de mer du Québec et des Maritimes*, by Martin Lapointe; and *Flore printanière*, by Gisèle Lamoureux and Roger Larose.
and Acadian roots, just like Malaborza does by integrating Cormier Boudreau’s ancestral knowledge into the translation.

From this perspective, it is possible to view *L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay* not only as transferring plant names into French, but also as replanting gardens with plants and herbs from Acadian traditional medicine. This idea resonates with biologist J. Sherman Bleakney’s description of the aboiteaux: ‘[t]he Acadians became master craftsmen who used tidal marsh meadows, who could carve them and construct with them, and who could farm below sea level’ (2004: 4). In using verbs such as ‘construct’ and ‘carve’, Bleakney indicates intentionality, likening the dyking of marshes to the purposefulness of sowing crops. It also resonates with Michael Cronin’s interpretation, following Tim Ingold’s description of practitioners (2011: 211), of translators as ‘bringing together the materials of language, combin[ing] and redirect[ing] their flow in the anticipation of what might emerge’ (qtd. in Harding 2021: 359; see also Cronin 2017: 46). Malaborza’s substitution can thus be interpreted as a symbolic replacement of the Nova Scotian flora (and popular tradition) of the source text not only with referential equivalents in French, but with specifically Acadian flora (and popular tradition) in translation. Such substitution corresponds to a movement in Acadian literature to reconstruct the pre-Deportation landscape, by which ‘[l]es auteurs tant acadiens qu’étrangers sont parvenus à construire des représentations du paysage de l’ancienne Acadie, en proposant un ensemble de visions qui tiennent autant de l’imaginaire

---

Figure 5: Front covers of Ami McKay’s *The Birth House* and *L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay*
que de la réalité factuelle\textsuperscript{116} (de Finney and others 2011: 5). This idea is further reinforced by the parallels that Ingold identifies between growing plants (or gardens) and raising children (2000: 86–88). Ingold discusses ‘a process in which plants, animals or people are not so much made as grown and in which surrounding human beings play a greater or lesser part in establishing the conditions of nurture’ (2000: 87). Indeed, this idea connects the gesture of replanting occurring in \textit{L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay} to the repopulation of Acadie through the figure of the défricheteuse de parenté outlined in Chapter 3. The gardens of \textit{L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay} ensure a Francophone presence in a region from which the Acadians, had the Deportation gone according to plan, should have been eradicated.

**Meeting in the landscape: Nous sommes les rêveurs**

While the Grand-Pré landscape bears marks of pre-Deportation life, industry, and identity, the larger landscapes of what are now known as the Maritime provinces retain vestiges not only of Acadian life, but also of Mi’kmaq life (Francis and Sable 2012). Prior to the arrival of French settlers in the early seventeenth century, the territory that roughly corresponds to Atlantic Canada today was known as Mi’kmaw’ki (Francis and Sable 2012; Paul 2006). European settlement in Mi’kmaw’ki was disastrous on multiple fronts (Paul 2006), including through the forced translation of Indigenous peoples into European languages and ways of life. One way to accomplish this translation was for white settlers to translate into Mi’kmaq, exemplified for instance in the figure of missionary Silas Tertius Rand. For more than four decades, Rand collected, transcribed, and translated Mi’kmaq stories, 87 of which were published posthumously as \textit{Legends of the Micmac} in 1893 (Sanger 2007: 30–31). Two of Rand’s manuscripts from 1847 and 1884 are reproduced in \textit{The Stone Canoe}, which also includes ‘new English translations, and mi’kmaq transliterations of [the original] transcripts’ (Gaspereau Press 2007). However, Rand’s transcription and translation project was a way to develop his Mi’kmaq vocabulary, seeing ‘his transcription of the legends as instrumental to a translation of the Bible which he intends will replace them’\textsuperscript{117} (Sanger 2007: 28). For Rand, transcribing Mi’kmaq stories phonetically and incorporating interlinear word-for-word translations into the manuscript was a means of supporting language learning and fostering

\textsuperscript{116} These works include Henry Wadsworth Longfellow’s \textit{Evangeline: A Tale of Acadie} (de Finney and others 2011: 5).

\textsuperscript{117} According to Sanger, Rand learned Mi’kmaq because of the ‘Protestant insistence that the Bible had to be accessible to Christians in the vernacular and, by extension, that all Christians should be literate’ (2007: 23).
cultural and religious conversion. It was about control, not only of the cultural narrative —
aiming to have the (written) Bible supplant (oral) storytelling — but also of the historical
record. In the introduction to *The Stone Canoe*, Peter Sanger identifies a paradox within the
approach to translation adopted by white settlers as part of evangelising missions. Found in
university archives in Nova Scotia in 2003, Rand’s surviving manuscripts capture stories that
have become central to Mi’kmaw and Canadian literatures as some of the earliest written
records of Indigenous storytelling in Canada (Sanger 2007: 26–28). Herein lies the paradox:
today ‘we have the manuscripts of 1847 and 1884. They exist as if they had willed and will
their own endurance. Something remains still to be said in a language which too few can
speak and understand. A margin has once again become centre’ (Sanger 2007: 57). *The
Stone Canoe* engages in a tradition of translation in an attempt to ‘loosen’ Silas Rand’s
control over the Mi’kmaw narrative (Sanger 2007: 21) by adding, to Rand’s published
versions, new English translations and a modern Mi’kmaq version (Gaspereau Press 2007).
In other words, *The Stone Canoe* contributes to decolonisation by rectifying settler
overreach through translation.

Colonial trauma informs the poetry of Rita Joe, who has been hailed as the ‘poet
laureate of the Mi’kmaw people’ (Filice 2007). Joe’s poetry is grounded in Unama’kik, the
region now known as Cape Breton in eastern Nova Scotia (see Figure 1) and home to five
Indigenous communities, including Joe’s native We’koqma’q (Whycocomagh) and adopted
Essisoqni (Eskasoni). However, Joe’s poetry has also been described by Sam McKegney as
‘affirmist’, meaning that it reaches out to non-Indigenous readers (qtd. in Bryant 2017: 157).
Rachel Bryant describes Joe’s approach as extending a hand and relates the idea of
neighbourliness specifically to the landscape: ‘this hand is contained within a particular kind
of landscape, one fundamentally premised on kinship and reciprocity’, adding ‘that this is a
landscape that the Mi’gmaq people have never abandoned’ (2017: 157). This landscape of
Unama’kik / Cape Breton is precisely where Sophie M. Lavoie chooses to meet the poet Rita
Joe, to take, as it were, Joe’s hand.

Lavoie has translated Joe’s *We are the Dreamers*, a two-part poetry collection that
includes early and recent poetry. In addition to these two parts, the translation, *Nous
sommes les rêveurs*, includes a translator’s preface titled ‘À la rencontre de Rita Joe’ (2016:
7). It not only establishes the paratext as a place in which author and translator meet, but
also alludes to a meeting in a shared geographical place. Lavoie explains that as a result of
visiting Joe in her home community of Essisoqni as a child, the poet’s environment feels intimately familiar (2016: 7–8). More specifically, Lavoie notes that ‘[q]uand elle [Rita Joe] décrit si élégamment les forêts, l’odeur de l’herbe sacrée, le lac Bras d’Or, les conversations et les bancs d’huîtres, je reconnais bien ces odeurs, ces bruits, ces gens et ces lieux dont j’ai été entourée’ (2016: 8). Regardless of potential cultural differences between poet and translator, the two creators meet through the landscape of Unama’kik. This becomes evident in the text of the translation. Whereas Joe usually employs the English spelling of ‘Eskasoni’, Lavoie, by contrast, opts for spelling ‘Essisoqni’ and other place names in Mi’kmaq throughout the paratext. For example, Lavoie writes that Joe is ‘originaire de la réserve de We’koqma’q’ and of memories ‘d’un pow-wow à Essisoqni’ (2016: 7). The translator nevertheless respects Joe’s spelling choices in the poems themselves, as in the line ‘dans les bois d’Eskasoni’ (Joe 2016: 54). However subtle, the contrast is reconciliatory in nature and acts as a figurative restoration of place and language. For, as Brian Francis and Trudy Sable explain, the Mi’kmaq language ‘grew from within the ancient landscape of Mi’kma’ki’, which in turn is ‘integral to the cultural and spiritual psyche of the people and their language’ (2012: 17–18). Indeed, the gesture resonates with the ‘acts of redress’ represented by the translations of labels into Indigenous languages at the National Gallery of Canada, for example, which Sherry Simon discusses as a site of translation (2019: 152–53).

Joe’s We are the Dreamers is rich with linguistic and translational dynamics, the result of a poetic practice that claims a translational space:

[t]o me, the ultimate expression of any important issue is to voice it in Mi’kmaq —it moves me to hear the words. So, usually, when I hear something voiced in my first language, I listen very carefully then translate it into English.

(1996: 119)

This approach can be observed in We are the Dreamers, in which some poems appear only in Mi’kmaq, while others appear in their original Mi’kmaq with an English translation by

---

118 The translation’s paratext does not specify Lavoie’s cultural identity.
119 See for example ‘A True Story’, which starts with: ‘A Mi’kmaw boy of eleven years / Stood in the woods of Eskasoni’ (Joe 1996: 5).
Joe, and others still integrate Mi’kmaw words and phrases into predominantly English-language text. Subtitled ‘Recent and early poetry’, *We are the Dreamers* is divided into two sections, the first of which corresponds to the ‘recent’ poetry of the subtitle, and the second to ‘early’ poetry. There is a clear formatting difference between the two sections in the presentation of words in Mi’kmaq, with the first section favouring annotations in the margins and the second a glossary at the end. In many cases where Mi’kmaq is integrated into the poetry, translations and definitions are provided in the margins or in the glossary. Still, in *We are the Dreamers*, the mix of English and Mi’kmaq means that a majority language coexists with a minority language: according to the 2021 census, English is the ‘mother tongue’ of 92.8% of the population of Cape Breton County and 82.7% of Inverness County (the counties that respectively include Essiskoqni and We’koqma’q), figures that drop to 2.2% and 1.5% respectively for Mi’kmaq (Statistics Canada 2023).

Thus, the Mi’kmaw experience is the only common dominator between the English and French versions of Joe’s texts. For its part, Lavoie’s *Nous sommes les rêveurs* complexifies the source text’s already multilingual fabric, bringing into it not only a second colonial language but also a second minority language, French. According to a recent census, French is the ‘mother tongue’ of 0.7% and 10.9% of the populations of Cape Breton and Inverness Counties, respectively (Statistics Canada 2023). The dynamics between the three languages of *Nous sommes les rêveurs* recalls that identified by Rachel Bryant in *Message Sticks / Tshissinuatshitakana*, the bilingual (English / Innu-aimun) translation by Phyllis Aronoff of Joséphine Bacon’s bilingual (French / Innu-aimun) *Bâtons à message / Tshissinuatshitakana*. In reference to this translation, Bryant writes that ‘Bacon’s words walk—across time, between destinations, between the scattered Innu and their land, and from the Innu-aimun language into French and then English and back again’ (2017: 138, emphasis in original). The description of Bacon’s words as ‘walking’ through translation echoes the process at work in the translation of Joe’s text. Furthermore, it brings up the ‘traveller on foot’ able to grasp the fractal dimension of the landscape, whom Cronin outlines in the context of the minor, as noted in the Introduction (pp. 38–39; see also Cronin 2000: 16–20, 2006: 15–18).

---

Since only minority languages (Mi’kmaq and French) fill its pages, the translation
Nous sommes les rêveurs can be read as minoritising the Maritime Provinces’ major
language, English, which is also often understood as a major language in literary and
translation spheres more generally (Apter 2006: 3; Venuti 1995). Indeed, the addition of the
line ‘Traduction en français à la page suivante’, which appears twice after poems in Mi’kmaq
(Joe 2016: 29, 55), acts as a sort of wayfinding, a paratextual mitigation that implicitly
signals the absence, or minoritisation, of the major language. Emphasising the minoritised
languages and resituating them in the landscape serves a generative function from an
ecological perspective (Cronin 2017: 143). Furthermore, the ‘regenerative move challenges
through the energies of minority and minoritised major languages the neo-colonial and
predatory emptying out of the landscape and language’ (2017: 143). Faced with Mi’kmaw
and Acadian histories buried by colonisation and forced displacement in the landscape of
Unama’kik / Cape Breton, Nous sommes les rêveurs operates a dual reclamation that leads
to a movement of restoration by creating space for the minor. This type of regenerative
power corresponds to Joe’s conception of literary output as cultural restoration work (Joe
2016: 7–9). It likewise contributes to the sense of neighbourliness, to the hand that Joe
seeks to extend. It mirrors, moreover, the reclamation of toponyms: ‘[i]n the process of
charting, surveying, and mapping, the British assigned new names to the Maritime
landscape [...]. Some names stuck, others did not. Few of the county and parish names [...] applied to Cape Breton were adopted, and even on the mainland Indigenous and Acadian
nomenclature persisted’ (Conrad 2020: 140). These effects converge to reinforce the
presence of the minor languages in the landscape.

‘riverstory’: femme-rivière

The final element of the aboiteaux to be addressed in the context of Acadian literary
translation is the inherently dialectical nature evoked by the flux of the tides. As mentioned
previously, the aboiteaux are specifically designed to work with and harness the high tides
of the Bay of Fundy (Government of Canada 2023b). At high tide, the hinged valve system
prevents saltwater from penetrating (and flooding) fields, while at low tide the sluice lets
rainwater drain, so that the field irrigates (see Figure 2 above). Combined with the constant
in- and outflow in the aboiteaux, the flux produced by the tides’ ebb and flow forms a sort
of dialectic that mirrors a dialectic between Rose Després’ translation femme rivière (2019)
and its source text, Katherena Vermette’s *river woman* (2018). Després is an established voice in Acadian poetry, emerging during and playing a leadership role in the publishing industry from the 1980s (Lonergan 2010b: 191–92, 2018: 64–65, 112). Vermette is an award-winning Métis poet based in the province known today as Manitoba, a Prairie province in western Canada (Vermette [n.d.]). In September 2019, ICI Manitoba, a regional division of French-language public broadcaster Radio-Canada, published a story headlined ‘*Femme-rivière* : une poétesse métisse traduite par une poétesse acadienne’ (Radio-Canada 2019b). The article announced the publication of the translation by Després — the ‘poétesse acadienne’ of the headline — of the collection by Vermette — the ‘poétesse métisse’ of the headline. More of a news story than a review, the short piece provides an overview of Després’ strategy and admiration for the source text, as well as a quick mention of some translation challenges. Nevertheless, the title of the article is notable in its passive phrasing, which not only juxtaposes the cultural identities of the poet and the translator, but also implies the cultural separation that the translation seeks to bridge. However, the distance that the headline suggests the translation bridges is not only cultural but also geographical, as the Métis and Acadian communities are physically separated by the vastness of central Canada, Québec, and Ontario.121

As the title of the collection makes clear, *river woman* is anchored in a fluvial environment. Indeed, one reviewer specifies that the text in translation ‘se lit tel un hommage aux rivières qui irriguent le pays, mais aussi comme un cri du cœur à ne pas les tenir pour acquises dans notre paysage culturel et naturel’ (Lessard 2019). The real and metaphorical rivers that run through Vermette’s collection constitute sites of identity,122 and in this respect they course alongside the rivers and waterways that contour the Acadian imaginary (see Chapter 5). From this perspective, it is possible to reframe the river as a space into which coalesce poet and translator. In other words, if literary translation enables meeting across geography, culture, and language, the figure of the river supplies the force or current to make the meeting happen. The source and target texts engage in a sort of dialectic that sets up the translation as the counterpart rather than the successor or ‘afterlife’ (Benjamin 2012). This initially comes through on the cover of the translation in

---

121 For more on translation in western Canada through the lens of Francophone heterolingual theatre and its circulation to the centres of Toronto and Montréal, see Nolette (2015: 53–116).
122 See, for example, the section titled ‘red river’ (Vermette 2018), as well as Laniel (2019).
comparison to the English version. As Figure 6 illustrates, the representation of the river is twinned on the cover of the translation, implying that this image doubles (as) that of the source text. Moreover, a sense of movement or flow is reinforced by the direction of the fields represented on each cover, with the English-language version suggesting verticality and the translation horizontality. The notion of counterpart supersedes the hierarchy implicit in notions of replacement of the source text as somehow superior to the target text. The cartographic aspect of the collection more generally is encapsulated in the succinct wording of the title of one review, ‘Cartographie’ (Laniel 2019). Nolette describes the trajectory of Franco-Canadian heterolingual theatre as ‘[u]ne trajectoire parabolique, imprévisible’ (2015: 245), and the juxtaposition of the Vermette covers (see Figure 6) suggests a similar trajectory for Acadian poetry translation.

![Figure 6: Covers of river woman and femme-rivière](image)

A sense of flow also surfaces in Després’ femme-rivière through changes in line breaks. The first of these changes occurs on the front covers (see Figure 6). The English source text separates ‘river’ and ‘woman’, while the translation not only positions the words ‘femme’ and ‘rivière’ side by side but also adds a hyphen that typographically links them into a single unit. This pattern continues infrequently but consistently throughout the translation, as the following examples of line rearrangements demonstrate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Vermette’s <em>river woman</em></th>
<th>Després’ translation <em>femme-rivière</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>how they swoop and curve around each other you’d think it was love but their claws are out their cries fierce</td>
<td>leur façon de plonger de se courber autour de l’autre on croirait de l’amour mais leurs griffes sont sorties leurs cris féroces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>slips in slides out as if she was never here</td>
<td>elle entre en se faufilant elle sort furtive comme si elle n’avait jamais été ici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2018: 40)</td>
<td>(2019: 49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>she was here before you and she will be here long after we’ve all gone</td>
<td>elle était ici avant vous et elle sera ici longtemps après que nous serons tous partis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>how to hunt make plant you get to pretend it didn’t happen like this but it did we can’t pretend it doesn’t matter</td>
<td>comment faire fabriquer planter tu te permets de faire semblant que ça ne s’est pas produit comme ça mais c’est bien le cas on ne peut pas faire semblant que ce n’est pas important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>they let us use the names of our dead as if that means we’re allowed to honour them</td>
<td>parce qu’ils nous permettent l’usage des noms de nos morts comme pour signifier qu’il est permis de les honorer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>put them back into the earth come spring with nothing more tangible than hope make them flower</td>
<td>les remettons dans la terre le printemps venu sans rien de plus tangible que l’espoir de les faire fleurir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In examples 1, 3, and 5, the translation has fewer lines than the source text, while examples 2, 4, and 5 show an increase in lines in the translation. These changes were done without significant alteration to the content, even in the case of additions. While for some of the
examples this could be due to the generally lengthier nature of French compared to English, Després explains taking care always to measure the weight of each word, as ‘[l]e sentiment de l’auteur [sic] passe parfois dans trois mots […]. Il faut qu’ils [les mots] gardent toute leur valeur dans la traduction’ (2018: 87).

While the changes in line breaks shift the momentum of the text, the translation also introduces a change in perspective, from singular to plural, from an individual to a collective voice. In the poem ‘parle’, for instance, there is a notable shift in verb tense from the first to the last stanza that does not occur as explicitly in the English source text of ‘speak’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vermette’s river woman</th>
<th>Després’ translation femme-rivière</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>speak</td>
<td>parle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talk</td>
<td>jase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listen</td>
<td>écoute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be</td>
<td>sois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silent</td>
<td>silencieux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as</td>
<td>comme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the lake</td>
<td>le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>lac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>winter</td>
<td>en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>hiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>now speak</td>
<td>parlent maintenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talk</td>
<td>jasent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whisper</td>
<td>chuchotent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sing</td>
<td>chantent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listen</td>
<td>écoute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listen</td>
<td>écoute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don’t forget to listen</td>
<td>n’oublie pas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listen</td>
<td>d’écouter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this excerpt, the verbs ‘parlent’, ‘jasent’, ‘chuchotent’, and ‘chantent’, identified above by bold font, are in the ‘indicatif présent’ tense, contrasting with the imperative tense of ‘parle’, ‘jase’, ‘écoute’, ‘sois’, and ‘oublie’, underlined above for the purposes of illustration. Després uses the ‘indicatif présent’ tense to conjugate the verbs with the subject ‘ces histoires-là’ that ends the preceding stanza. Conversely, English grammar allows for ambiguity, and it is unclear whether the stories are doing the action, or the reader is being told to act. Still, a sense of collectivity resonates in the translation thanks to the plural form,
reinforced through the disconnect created by the white space between stanzas and therefore between the subject ‘histoires’ and the conjugated verbs.

A similar progression occurs in the poem titled ‘une autre histoire’, the French translation of ‘an other story’. Before delving into that poem, it is important to note that the expression ‘an other story’ appears repeatedly in river woman: as the title of the third section of the collection (Vermette 2018: 57), as the title of two poems (2018: 61, 97), and within the lines of these two poems. For its part, ‘another’ appears solely within the poems but does surface in both iterations of the poem ‘an other story’. It is also worth pointing out the semantic shift that the translation of ‘an other story’ into ‘une autre histoire’ causes. The English version emphasises otherness in its use of ‘an’ and ‘other’ as opposed to the determiner ‘another’. This otherness implicitly relates to the poet’s Indigenous identity in the context of the themes of river woman and in lines of the poem that allude to the discourse surrounding the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (2015). In the English source text, the poem moves from ‘an other’ story to ‘another’ story, suggesting some kind of transformation but without specifying whether this transformation is positive (progress) or negative (collective amnesia). The French translation, however, glosses over these shifts in its sustained use of ‘une autre’.

To return to the poem, ‘une autre histoire’ is relevant because it charts a transition from the personal to the collective, particularly in the French translation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘an other story’, from Vermette’s river woman</th>
<th>‘une autre histoire’, from Després’ translation femme-rivièr e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>this country has an other story</td>
<td>ce pays a une autre histoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one that is not his</td>
<td>qui n’appartient ni à lui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or hers</td>
<td>ni à elle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or ours</td>
<td>ni à personne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[…]</td>
<td>[…]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this country has another story</td>
<td>ce pays a une autre histoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and it is not his</td>
<td>elle n’est pas à lui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or hers</td>
<td>ni à elle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or even ours (2018: 61, emphasis added)</td>
<td>ni même à nous (2019: 71–72, emphasis added)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this country has an other story</td>
<td>ce pays a une autre histoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one that is not mine</td>
<td>elle n’est pas à lui</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

123 The use of ‘autre’ may also harken back to Susanne de Lotbinière-Harwood’s exemplification of the term as a feminist ‘re-belle et infidèle’ (1991: 124).
The transition occurs in Després’ choice to break away from the source text and not repeat the line at the end of the two similarly constructed stanzas, marked above in bold type. In this respect, the poem emphasises the individual (‘personne’) before moving to the collective (‘à nous’). This contrasts with the repetition of the collective ‘ours’ in the English source text, underlined in the above excerpt. This sets up the reading of the second poem titled ‘une autre histoire’, which mirrors the collective ‘ours’ of the source text but introduces yet another collective pronoun, ‘la nôtre’. For Vermette’s first instance of ‘us’ at the end of the second excerpt, Després offers a second instance of ‘nous’. In the context of Acadian history and collective trauma, the emphasis on the collective in the translation reinforces a sense of community, as it might for the Indigenous readers of Vermette’s English text. Indeed, the aboiteaux facilitate a similar progression from individual to collective as the elements around which communities and solidarity formed (Bleakney 2004: 58; Cormier 1990: 73–74; Faragher 2005: 182; Griffiths 2005: 95, 177; Ross 2002: 10).

Finally, the weaving in of Acadian identity and shared history is reinforced elsewhere in the collection through Després’ francisation of Francophone proper names (Vermette 2018: 88–89) and topographical references (Vermette 2019: 99–100). In the context of the translation and the meeting between poet and translator, the weaving links the experience of the poem across geographical (Manitoba-Acadie) and cultural (Métis-Acadian) boundaries.

**Conclusion**

Signatures of the landscape, the aboiteaux are not only archeologically rich vestiges of Acadian life, but also productive symbols of translational currents running through Acadie. Serge Patrice Thibodeau’s *Journal de John Winslow à Grand-Pré* emphasises porosity in translation, metaphorically dismantling the palisade that Winslow sought to build in Grand-Pré to facilitate Acadian expulsion. Malaborza’s *L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay*, for its
part, embraces the land-creation function of aboiteaux to replant the flora of Ami McKay’s
csource text with traditional Acadian medicinal herbs in a territory that had effectively been
emptied of its French-speaking inhabitants. Then, Sophie M. Lavoie looks to sights, sounds,
and smells of Unama’kik / Cape Breton to find common ground and create a space in which
minor languages minoritise the major language and enact a regenerative function. Finally,
Rose Després’ femme-rivière highlights the dialectical nature and the ebb and flow rhythms
of the aboiteaux to create a fluid space in which poet and translator coalesce.

Clearly fascinating researchers from historical (Bleakney 2004; Cormier 1990; Ross
2002) and societal (Rudin 2021) perspectives, the aboiteaux serve both pragmatic and
poetic functions. As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, the figure of the aboiteau
has served as a metaphor for the post-Grand Dérangement sociopolitical situation (Hodson
2012: 30–46), for the protection of Acadian society against a hostile environment (Rudin
2021: 9–10), and for barriers to understanding Acadian fiction (Brun del Re 2023). This
chapter went on to frame translation effects that sought to reinvest the Acadian landscape.
In doing so, the figure of the aboiteau contributes to a long tradition of homing in on place
in Acadian literature (Doyon-Gosselin and Desrochers 2021). The tradition began with the
travel journals of early explorers such as Samuel de Champlain and Marc Lescarbot,
surveyed in the Introduction (pp. 15–16), through seminal works such as Cri de terre and
Mourir à Scoudouc and continuing today in such recent works as Les vents de Memramcook
(Brideau 2022), Moncton Mentor (Doyon-Gosselin 2022), and Rivières-aux-Cartouches
(Bérubé 2023).

Insofar as they supposedly create an Acadie ‘all walled round’ but succumb to
porosity, the aboiteaux and their translational nature could be extrapolated to other
instances of (attempted) enclosure. One that readily comes to mind floated just offshore of
the Grand-Pré landscape. Although imprisoning most Acadian men and boys in the church of
Saint-Charles-des-Mines upon arriving in Grand-Pré, Winslow transferred some prisoners to
ships anchored nearby, in the Minas Basin (see Figure 1; Thibodeau 2010: 53, 183–227).
They remained there for weeks, logistical issues delaying the arrival of sufficient vessels for
broader embarkment and deportation to commence (Thibodeau 2010: 183–227). Yet, as
with the palisade, this enclosure proved porous, as some prisoners managed to escape by
donning women’s clothing brought in with food deliveries by their wives and mothers
(Thibodeau 2010: 58). It is noteworthy, moreover, that these escapes were facilitated
through smuggling and disguise, two prominent metaphors in translation studies (Cronin 1996: 72, 112–13; Des Rochers 2023; Hermans 1985: 115, 120; Lane-Mercier 2006).

It would also be worthwhile to investigate the aboiteaux according to Eve Tuck and Marcia McKenzie’s critical place theory (2016). According to them, ‘settler emplacement’, defined following S. L. Morgensen as ‘the desire of settlers to resolve the experience of dislocation implicit in living on stolen land’, precludes decolonisation as it always implies the erasure of Indigenous peoples (2016: 69–70). The Acadian aboiteaux could arguably be considered a manifestation of such emplacement insofar as they are concerned with settler futurity and are embedded (emplaced) in the landscape. Indeed, replanting,\(^{124}\) the reinscribing of language in the landscape, and the very practice of ‘défrichage’ (of land or water) discussed in this chapter, all have colonial undertones. Further research is therefore required to come to grips with the colonial nature of the Acadian enterprise and to determine ways in which translation facilitates this or contributes to decolonising discourse. Looking at the underground network produced by aboiteaux may just provide a productive point of departure because of the complex entanglement of the roots system (Bleakney 2004: 75). For, as Bleakney writes, ‘the root systems of marine marsh grasses […] are the structures that figuratively and literally tie all this cultural and natural history of dykelands firmly together’ (2004: 22).

While the moniker ‘défricheurs d’eau’ that Acadians earned through their dyking practices was meant disparagingly (Faragher 2005: 49; Ross 2002: 8; Thériault 2013: 228), it also suggests translationality. It indicates an ability to adapt to the landscape and signifies transforming the impossible (saltmarshes) into the possible (arable land), which would prove useful post-Deportation. For, after forcible displacement not only cost them their lands and aboiteaux but scattered families and genealogical lineages across the Thirteen Colonies, an entirely new type of ‘défrichage’ would be required.

\(^{124}\) For more on replanting in a colonial context, see DeLoughrey (2007: 256).
3 Défrichetage de parenté and the invention of ancestors and descendants

As Chapter 1 illustrated (pp. 64–71), the plan to deport the Acadian population from Nova Scotia in the mid-eighteenth century aimed at translation at linguistic (assimilation) and territorial (physical displacement) levels. The expulsion scattered the Acadian population across the Thirteen Colonies and, in subsequent migrations, to places across the globe over the span of several decades (Arsenault 2018: 239–383; Hodson 2012). As a result, it created what Éloïse Brière calls an ‘éclatement généalogique’ (1990: 59) and Geneviève Massignon a ‘brassage’ (qtd. in Flikeid 1994: 288). The resulting fragmentation of Acadian society aligns with a pattern in Canadian literature identified by Cynthia Sugars and Eleanor Ty (2014). According to them, Canada’s fragmented historical memory led to ‘a recuperative movement [in Canadian literature] that sought to revive (or invent) symbolic ancestors as a way of establishing a Canadian consciousness grounded in what we might today consider “invented” memories and ancestors’ (2014: 7). In Acadie, where the Grand Dérangement precluded the establishment of a written record for decades and threatened cultural continuity, the ‘invention’ of memories and ancestors became tantamount to cultural survival. Thus, in response to the population dispersal emerged a preoccupation with genealogy that, along with language and history, has underpinned the Acadian collective imagination since at least the cultural renaissance of the second half of the nineteenth century (Thériault 1993: 73; see also Brière 1990; Hautecoeur 1975: 64, 95).

This preoccupation with genealogy is captured in the notion of défrichetage de parenté. Seemingly coined by Antonine Maillet,125 défrichetage de parenté, spelled

---

125 The term appears in Par derrière chez mon père — ‘Si l’on avait confié l’histoire aux conteurs de mon pays, aux chroniqueurs, et colporteurs, et défricheteuses de parenté, je vous assure qu’on ne s’y reconnaîtrait plus’ (Maillet 1972: 20, 29) — and in L’Acadie pour quasiment rien, which warns the reader of what written histories lack: ‘Vous apprendriez bien des choses avec ces conteurs-colporteurs-rabouteux-de-sang-et-défricheteux-de-parenté. Tant pis pour vous si vous avez choisi de vous instruire dans les livres’ (1973: 12). Évangéline Deussé explains that ‘C’en a pris des défricheteuses de parenté pour raccommoder tous ces lignages-là [...] pour nous défricher notre parenté et nous faire regrimer nos racines à rebours jusqu’à la Déportation’ (Maillet 1975: 47).
phonetically to reflect Acadian pronunciation, is inspired by the practice of défrichage (land clearing). Brière highlights the Acadianness of the expression, explaining that ‘[i]n Acadian, “défricher” means not only unearthing, clearing the land, but also examining bloodlines, determining one’s genealogy, one’s ancestry’ (1996a: 6). As Bernard Aresu points out, ‘the metaphorical designation of “défricheteux” or “défricheteux de parenté”’ surfaces widely across [Antonine] Maillet’s body of work, ‘designat[ing] those of the elders who keep track of the complex genealogical ramifications of various clans’ (1986: 231). Yet, défrichetage de parenté is about more than the work of ‘quelques bons généalogistes, qu’en langage acadien on appelle des défricheteux-de-parenté’ (Maillet 1973: 62). Intertwined with the Acadian oral tradition (de Finney and Boucher 1996; de Sousa 2010; Desalvo 2003; Maillet 1973: 12), the practice seeks to (re)trace genealogies, to reappropriate origins, customs, history, and identity (Greco 2019: 170). It therefore performs a cultural survival function through storytelling, combining the preservation of genealogical lineage and ancestral memory (de Finney and Boucher 1996: 136–37). In other words, although they keep lineages untangled, the ‘“défricheteurs de parenté” n’ont pas [pour autant] laissé dans l’oubli les épisodes mémorables de la tragédie [de la Déportation]’ (de Sousa 2010: 136).

Défrichetage de parenté, then, can be seen as keeping Acadian history from getting tangled up, particularly as an Acadie-based written tradition was practically non-existent until at least the middle of the twentieth century (see Chapter 1, pp. 71–73).

The definitions of défrichetage de parenté provided above point to two distinctive yet parallel and complementary functions: genealogical tracing and storytelling (memory-keeping). In its genealogical tracing, défrichetage de parenté probes lineages for connection among scattered individuals and families. In its storytelling, it seeks to establish lineage through narrative, for the practice itself would be unnecessary should there be no population to receive and perpetuate the story. Antonine Maillet summarises the two functions clearly in the novel Pélagie-la-Charrette:

---

126 While efforts were made to keep families together during the deportation embarkments, a considerable degree of separation was inevitable, particularly as adult couples had to choose between families (Conrad 2020: 131–32; Delaney 2020: 30–55; Faragher 2005: 359–60). Viau notes how this separation is reflected in Acadian literature (2022: 186–87). According to Faragher, the first Acadian records post-Deportation were about separated families (2005: 444).
Il n’avait rien oublié, le radoteux-conteux-chroniqueur, de la petite histoire des aïeux. Il pouvait tout raconter, dans un seul souffle, les ancêtres comme les descendants, vous dérouler tout un lignage sans rater une maille, et vous crocheter l’histoire d’un peuple qui allait de France en Acadie, en passant par l’exil, durant une petite génération, une toute petite génération.\(^\text{(1979: 68–69)}\)

In other words, the practice of défrichetage de parenté operates bidirectionally, that is, backwards into history and ancestry through genealogical tracing, and forwards into the line of descendants through storytelling.

This chapter examines ways in which these dual functions of défrichetage de parenté play out in Acadian literary translations. Bella Brodzki’s conception of intergenerational transmission in the context of translation, survival, and cultural memory is helpful in elucidating these functions and their connection to translation. For ‘when “survivorship” itself is at stake, the “task of the translator” is overdetermined, serving as a figure for processes of intergenerational transmission, as well as of intercultural transmission across temporal and spatial boundaries’ (Brodzki 2007: 125). The chapter starts by outlining a fascination with genealogy and intertextuality in Antonine Maillet’s vast body of work to establish a basis for the discussion of défrichetage de parenté in Acadian translation. Then, the chapter highlights the search for and invention of ancestors, manifestations of the dual functions of défrichetage de parenté, in six literary translations. Of these, four are by Maillet: Évangéline Deusse (1975), Les drôlatiques, horribles et épouvantables aventures de Panurge, ami de Pantagruel (1983), William S (1991), and La Fontaine ou la Comédie des Animaux (1995). The remaining two are Georgette LeBlanc’s Océan (Goyette 2020) and Sonya Malaborza’s L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay (McKay 2020). Two observations arise from the analysis. The first is that défrichetage in Acadian translations is performed by women, and the second, that it occurs through narrative or textual interventions made possible by the process of translation. Together, these observations are interpreted through the framework of Barry McCrea’s nongenetic genealogical narrative model (2011). This model

---

\(^{127}\) Stratford translates ‘conteux et défricheteux’, which describes the line of sequential narrators named Bélonie who recount over the two centuries the story of Pélagie-la-Charrette, ‘storytellers and root delvers’ (Maillet 2004a: 9).
hinges on queerness and a reliance on the figure of the stranger, both of which are encompassed in the figure of the défricheteuse de parenté who fosters generation and appears only in translation. Ultimately, this approach legitimises reconfigured Acadian communities, as it does Acadian translation within literary production.

**Genealogies, intertextuality, and literary hauntings**

If a ‘lyrisme généalogique et philologique’ underpins the first works produced on Acadian soil in the seventeenth century (de Finney and Duclos 2011: 33), a preoccupation with kinship becomes particularly evident in Antonine Maillet’s writings. This is acknowledged by Maillet (2010, 2022b), as well as scholars. Jeanne Demers, for example, observes in Maillet a ‘filiation [avec le] XVIe [siècle], Rabelais’ (1988: 307), while Denis Bourque discusses the foundational nature of some works (in this case Les Crasseux) ‘sur le plan génétique’ (2015a: 63). Literary historian Marguerite Maillet, meanwhile, writes that Antonine Maillet’s artistic approach consists of ‘étale[r] glorieusement son lignage’ (1983: 182). Lineage in Maillet’s works is both genealogical and intertextual, and sometimes both at once. Mon testament, for example, is a (fictional) will that outlines what Maillet bequeaths some of her most famous characters (2022b). It opens with ‘C’est embêtant, je n’ai pas de descendance directe, pas d’héritiers naturels ou légitimes en droit d’accéder un jour à ma succession’ (2022b: 7), implying a genealogical relationship with characters. This idea is reinforced in a recent interview (‘Antonine Maillet: mes pensées flottantes’ 2022), which will be discussed below. Janis Pallister expands the intertextual filiation, noting that Maillet is Rabelais’ ‘remote descendant, his spiritual granddaughter’ (1986). Maillet, too, writes of the ‘parenté étrange qui lie l’œuvre littéraire de Rabelais à la tradition orale acadienne’ (Maillet 1971: 1; see also Gauvin 1997: 102–3). Moreover, Rabelais is not the only writer to inspire Maillet’s works: ‘some foreign genes from Shakespeare, Molière, Swift, Giono, Faulkner, and others—in particular her Acadian forebears and her Québec cousins—have entered the bloodline’ of her works (Pallister 1986: 279; see also Gagnon 2003: 8,

128 In the novel Le chemin Saint-Jacques, for example, the character Radegonde (Radi), Maillet’s literary alter ego, traces lineage to the Maillets who helped build Notre-Dame-de-Paris (Boudreau 2000: 175). Maillet bequeathes ‘[s]on legs le plus précieux, l’histoire de ta vie’ to Radi in Mon testament (Maillet 2022b: 95; Viau 2023: 267, see also 2020: 138).

129 For the numerous ways in which Acadian language and popular tradition, and consequently Maillet’s literary production, are indebted to Rabelais, see Maillet (1971, 2010: 76–81) and Pallister (1986).

Intertextuality is also widespread within Maillet’s own literary universe. Viau identifies an ‘air de parenté’ (2008: 323, 2020: 141–43) within the body of work and specifies that ‘[l]a généalogie, présente dans la filiation des personnages [...], intervient également sur le plan intratextuel’, referring to both the filial representation of characters130 and the interconnectedness of stories wherein one work generates another (2008: 141). Indeed, Viau calls Maillet’s individual works ‘chapters’ in a great œuvre that collectively contribute to the creation of a complex literary universe in which each story and character feeds into a cohesive and ever-expanding whole131 (2008: 9–10, 323, 2011: 89). This description, moreover, echoes Maillet’s own contention that individual works are ‘drafts’ for upcoming work (2010: 108–9).

From this perspective, Maillet’s creative output can be seen as translational insofar as the works are effectively rewritings in the sense that Andre Lefevere understands them (Lefevere 1992). This is particularly the case since Maillet draws extensively from the oral tradition (Bourque 2010: 78; Maillet 1974: 13, 2010: 12–13; Paget 1988: 284; Viau 2008: 325), itself underpinned by an inheritance that makes ‘[e]very creation [...] a re-creation’ (Tymoczko 1999: 41). The translational nature of Maillet’s creative production is thus threaded through the entire body of work, surfacing without prejudice in so-called original works and literary translations. Indeed, the line demarcating each creative practice is blurred to begin with (see Introduction, p. 18), making it possible to trace filiation between works. For instance, Denis Bourque suggests that Don l’Orignal is a precursor to Le

130 Throughout Maillet’s works appears an emphasis on filiation, evident in the name of characters, such as Pierre-à-Polyte, Marie à Gélas à Gélas, etc.
131 Les Crasseux is a good example of this: while the play itself underwent several iterations between 1965 and 1976, it is also the foundation of the novel Don l’Original (Bourque 2010: 75). The Les Crasseux-Don l’Original pair, in turn, is the basis for a larger cycle of works comprising six novels and six plays that concluded in 1984 (Bourque 2010: 89). For more on Don l’Original’s intertextuality, see Gallant (1986) and Godard (1979). Another example is the novel Mariaagélas, which leads to the play of the same title that in turn engenders another play, La contrebardière, which finally brings about the novel Crache à Pic (Viau 2008: 141).

In addition to these allusions, ghosts of Maïlet’s literary universe haunt several translations whose source texts are far from the Acadian imaginary. In Les drôlatiques, horribles et épouvantables aventure de Panurge, ami de Pantagreul (abbreviated as Panurge going forward), Maïlet’s adaptation of Rabelais’ Quart Livre, a disembodied La Sagouine, anachronistically interjects the Rabelaisian saga with one of her most famous lines: ‘C’est point d’aouère de quoi qui rend une parsoune bénaisse, c’est de saouère qu’a va l’aouère’ (Antonine Maïlet 1983: 133; Maïlet 1990: 132). Yet, in chronological time La Sagouine arrives four centuries after Rabelais’ Pantagreul and Panurge (Rabelais 1997). Similarly, in Le Bourgeois gentleman, Joséphine’s line ‘je retourne à mon ssss… siau’ (1978: 95) echoes La Sagouine’s ‘J’ai les mains blanches parce que j’ai eu les mains dans l’eau [du siau] toute ma vie’ (Maïlet 1990: 13; see also Viau 2008: 161). Kinship between Joséphine and La Sagouine is further reinforced by the fact that they were both played on stage by Viola Léger (Maïlet 1978: distribution).

While heavily emphasised in the Mailletian universe, questions of genealogy also infiltrate the works of the other two translators discussed in this chapter, Georgette LeBlanc and Sonya Malaborza. LeBlanc’s Prudent (2013) fictionalises the real-life mutiny of deported Acadians aboard the Pembroke in 1755 through the eyes of Prudent Robichaud, who was in real life chained by the British for the ‘heinous misdemeanour’ of entertaining the Mi’kmaq at Annapolis Royal (see Chapter 1, p. 61). Robichaud is LeBlanc’s ancestor, and his story has

132 ‘Jarnigoine’ is an Acadian noun meaning resourcefulness and good sense.
133 La Sagouine, published in 1972 (1990) and available in an English translation by Wayne Grady (Maïlet 2015), propelled Maïlet onto the literary scene. The book is a series of monologues by the titular character, a washerwoman of humble roots with opinions on the world.
134 Léger portrayed La Sagouine for five decades, performing the role more than 2,000 times (Nolette 2015: 180).
been passed down to the author-translator through generations of storytelling (LeBlanc 2015). Furthermore, Prudent makes explicit the genealogical ramifications of the Deportation. In the text, the protagonist translates the success of the mutiny into a sense of relief that the genealogical line will continue: ‘C’était point rinque qu’ils aviont le Capitaine d’amarré. / C’était plus fort que ça encore. / Prudent avait rebraqué le feu de sa lignée. / Prudent avait repris la main de son fils. / En prenant le bote, ils aviont repris boussole. / Il retrouverait son petit-fils’ (LeBlanc 2013: 113; see also Viau 2022: 195–97). Similarly, the inspiration for LeBlanc’s Alma (2006) is also grounded in the author’s family tree (Saada 2010: 51). Meanwhile, Malaborza’s incorporation of genealogy is slightly more inconspicuous, couched in the translation strategy to render the botanical references in L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay using Acadian popular medicine. As was discussed in Chapter 2 (p. 96), Malaborza’s approach relies heavily on Marielle Cormier Boudreau’s ethnographic study of cultural practices around medicinal herbs and plant-based cures passed down from generation to generation and well embedded in Acadian popular medicine (Cormier Boudreau 2003: 14).

Défrichetage and the search for ancestors

As explained in the introduction to this chapter, défrichage de parenté serves two functions, genealogical (re)tracing and storytelling. This section addresses the first of these, which in translation corresponds to a search for ancestors scattered during the Grand Dérangement. It personifies, in other words, what Hugh Kenner describes as Ezra Pound’s understanding ‘of translation as a model for the poetic art: blood brought to ghosts’ (qtd. in Gentzler 2001: 16). According to Bella Brodzki, ‘[o]f the myriad cultural forms available to transmit the losses of the past, all involve the act of translation’ (2007: 185). Along similar lines but writing specifically about Acadie, historian Patrick D. Clarke quotes Jean-Claude Dupont and Jacques Mathieu to argue that ‘dans la mémoire longue [des sociétés à transmission orale…] “la parole ancestrale n’est pas figée dans un passé immémorial” […], l’ancêtre est son interlocutoire qui assiste au point de rencontre des générations’ (2004: 44). Clarke’s intergenerational meeting implies coexistence, active exchange, or transmission between past and present, which aligns with a practice of défrichetage de parenté that goes backwards to retrace ancestry from a departure point in the present.
From this perspective, it is possible to argue that the practice of défrichetage de parenté effectively makes past and present coincide.

Maillet’s play *Panurge* is a good case in point. It stages Rabelais’ legendary characters Panurge and Pantagruel, bringing them to the New World as Panurge runs away from marriage. In a review of the play, Pierre Nepveu is disappointed that in it ‘on ne s’encombre pas de scrupules, pour des raisons commerciales évidentes, alors qu’il s’agit très majoritairement du texte de Rabelais, modifié ici et là, additionné de quelques assaisonnements et d’un épilogue maison’ (Maillet 1983a: 148). With the mentions ‘d’après Rabelais’ on the cover and ‘librement inspiré de Rabelais’ in its marketing materials (Antonine Maillet 1983), *Panurge* does not attempt to hide its literary antecedents (or kinship). The ‘assaisonnements’ to which Nepveu refers are to be expected. Nevertheless, Nepveu’s comment hints at a breakdown in the verticality inherent in the chronological relationship between source and target texts, the target text necessarily coming after the source text. Geneviève Chovrelat takes up the idea of collapsed chronological time and argues that ‘Maillet déplie les replis du temps pour mettre en correspondance les Acadiens du 20e siècle et les personnages rabelaisiens’ (2005: 19). Maillet had previously acknowledged such a possibility, albeit obliquely, in *Rabelais et les traditions populaires en Acadie*, suggesting that Rabelais ‘envoyait si allégrement son Pantagruel en tournée de reconnaissance par les contrées lointaines, au-delà de l’Atlantique, atteignant ce qui pourrait fort bien aujourd’hui s’identifier à l’Acadie’ (1971: 1). Maillet goes on to specify that

par souci d’exactitude historique, disons tout de suite que l’équipage de Pantagruel prend ici [dans *Rabelais et les traditions populaires en Acadie*] la figure symbolique de cette poignée de colons venus du ‘jardin de France’ — comme se plaît à l’appeler Rabelais — et que cet héritage qu’ils apportent avec eux en terre acadienne n’est pas les *Cinq Livres*, mais une part de leur contenu. (1971: 1)

From this perspective, the translation *Panurge* seems to fulfill what is merely a possibility in Maillet’s earlier work. This idea becomes fully realised in the play *Panurge* when Pantagruel is told ‘Vous êtes en terre de Neuve France où Poitevins et Tourangeaux, nos pères, sont venus planter leurs raves et leurs choux’ (Antonine Maillet 1983: 133–34). Rabelais had not
had the means to send Pantagruel and the crew to Acadie in the mid-sixteenth century, before the French colonised Acadie. But Maillet does, and does so precisely through the process of translation. The translation effectively enables a staging of the first Acadian migration, situating the transfer of Acadian cultural and linguistic heritage from France to Acadie. *Panurge*, in other words, ensures that the foundations of Acadian identity are established for subsequent generations. In this respect, it exemplifies the impulse that Tejaswini Niranjana identifies in postcolonial contexts for ‘historiography […] [to] provide ways of recovering occluded images from the past to deconstruct colonial and neocolonial histories’ (1992: 41–42).

A similar collapse of linear time and of the distance between source and target texts occurs in another translation by Maillet, *La Fontaine ou la Comédie des Animaux*. An adaptation of fables by Jean de La Fontaine, which date back to the last decades of the seventeenth century, the translation references the imperial wars between France and Britain that ultimately led to the Grand Dérangement in the eighteenth century. This is evident, for example, in an impassioned speech by the Lion: ‘pour vous, une nouvelle ère commence […] Après tant de misère et d’isolement au fond des bois, le Lion votre rrroi… grrrr… vous fait sortir au grand jour et vous ouvre les portes d’un avenir prospère et glorieux’ (Maillet 1995: 20). Accentuating the ‘r’ sounds in this line echoes the Acadian accent in the mouths of those who ‘crawl[ed] out of the woods and laugh[ed] with their eyes and roll[ed] their rrr’s’ (Maillet 2004a: 257). However, the fact that it is the Lion who pronounces this line in the Acadian accent introduces a reversal. Long a symbol of the British crown (Bryant 2017: 80), the lion has symbolically been translated into an Acadian accent and into the assurance of a prosperous and glorious future that counters the effects of the Grand Dérangement. Furthermore, the parallels between this sentence and the sociopolitical discourse of the Acadian renaissance, which likewise emphasised emerging from a period of darkness (Bourque 2015b: 49; Maillet 1971; Viau 2008: 74–75), helps entrench the translation into an Acadian imaginary, echoing calls for taking control of a collective destiny (Roy 1981; Thériault 1993: 58). Finally, *La Fontaine ou la Comédie des Animaux* concludes with a speech extolling the virtues, and ultimately the triumph, of ‘les petits’ over ‘les grands’:
C'est à leur dernier jour que les grands sont à plaindre;
Car ils n'ont pas appris, tels les petits, à feindre,
À finasser,
Se débrouiller,
Ou lutter contre le plus fort,
Car nul n’est plus grand que le roi... hormis la Mort. (1995: 132)

Maillet’s works generally evince a partiality for the ‘petite histoire’, more precisely the Acadian one,¹³⁵ which contextualises the processes at work in the translation. Anchored in the world of La Fontaine’s fables, the translation seems to prepare the minority (Acadian) group for events that, chronologically speaking, have yet to happen.

A final example comes from Maillet’s William S, a compilation — what Maillet calls, in French, a ‘transposition’ (2010: 198) — of excerpts from several plays by William Shakespeare, namely Hamlet, Henry IV, Henry V, King Lear, Macbeth, The Merchant of Venice, Romeo & Juliet, and The Taming of the Shrew. Some of the excerpts are replicated verbatim in Shakespeare’s English, while others are translated into French.¹³⁶ Maillet’s creative additions then flesh out the play. As part of these additions, Maillet stages Shakespeare alongside some of his characters. Yet, as Jennifer Drouin explains,

[the] characters literally speak to Shakespeare himself, charging him with the crimes that were their fate in his texts – silence, domestic violence, and death. In attempting to justify the misogyny of his plots, the character of Shakespeare [...] cannot help but acknowledge the violence to which he has subjected his women characters and the futility of attempting to fix textual meaning transhistorically. (Drouin 2014: 145)

¹³⁵ Pierre L’Hérault argues that the play Les Crasseux establishes the ‘antinomie fondamentale’ between a hierarchical above and below, the haves and have nots, underpinning most of Maillet’s works (qtd. in Bourque 2015a: 63).
¹³⁶ Hamlet, for example, says ‘Fragilité, ton nom est femme’ (1991: 19) and recites a version of the ‘to be or not to be’ soliloquy (1991: 17), while Lady Macbeth repeats ad nauseam ‘Out, out damned spot!’ (1991: 17, 18, 32, 34, 57). The Fou, meanwhile, borrows and misquotes famous lines by other characters, exclaiming, for example, a line from a gravedigger in Hamlet — ‘Alas, poor Yorick’ (1991: 30) — and mockingly repeating Juliette’s ‘Roméo, oh! Oh! Méo-méo, oh! Oh!’ (1991: 28).
The transhistoric fixes that Drouin mentions occur in *William S* – that is, in the translation. Daniel Fischlin draws a similar conclusion, ‘suggesting that alternative modes of their [the characters] being given life in adaptations is one way of instituting the renewal they seek’ (2002: 333). Fischlin nevertheless adds a clarification regarding Shylock’s attack on British identity, represented by the character of Shakespeare. The passage reads as follows: ‘Rien du tout, c’est un Anglais mesquin, médiocre et antisémite, comme la plupart des chrétiens de son espèce’ (Maillet 1991: 39). According to Fischlin, this attack cannot be dissociated from the trauma of ‘massive deportation and diaspora of Acadians effected from 1755 to 1762 by the English’ (2002: 332). *William S* therefore allows for blame to be cast and history reversed, as Fischlin also notes (2002: 332).

This reversal becomes even clearer when several characters put Shakespeare in chains and La Mégère exclaims ‘À ton tour, misérable, de goûter à la douceur des chaînes et de l’asservissement’ (Maillet 1991: 75). While Maillet could be taking issue with Shakespeare’s treatment of his female characters, there is a clear statement about imperial behaviour during the Grand Dérangement in the allusion to chains and subjugation. Maillet’s additions, which link Shakespearean texts to Acadian deportees, gives voice to the Acadian experience within a British perspective. If works such as *Pélagie-la-Charrette* seek to set the historical record straight (Aresu 1986: 229; Desalvo 2003), translations such as *William S* go further. The play institutes a reversal by shifting what Éloïse Brière has identified as genealogical anxieties in French-speaking colonial societies of the New World, namely Acadie and the Caribbean (1990). The character of Shakespeare worries about the life of his creations, whom he recognises will outlive him. Shakespeare imagines these characters boasting ‘Nous allons continuer à être longtemps après la mort de notre auteur parce que nous sommes plus grands que lui, plus durables, plus intemporels, plus universels, plus… éternellement vivants’ (Maillet 1991: 23). Insofar as Shakespeare represents the British, *William S* shifts preoccupations about genealogical continuity, threatened on the Acadian side by the Deportation, into a force for regeneration and, implicitly, retribution. Whereas the Acadians have had to shoulder worries of genealogical continuity for centuries, *William S* symbolically transfers these anxieties to the British. Maillet famously declared

---

137 Though Maillet has been described as a feminist writer (Lord 2010), few of the analyses of Maillet’s works include more than a passing reference to this translational perspective (Drouin 2014).
having avenged her ancestors upon winning the Prix Goncourt in 1979 for her novel Pélagie-la-Charrette (Sherbrooke 1988), and William S interweaves this idea. For, as Chantal Gagnon argues, Maillet’s translations not only constitute acts of mediation, but also ‘une sorte de revanche sur le sort pas toujours facile, un brin compliqué, du peuple Acadien’ (2005: 12).

While Maillet conjures up ancestors to ensure the arrival of Acadian linguistic and cultural heritage in Panurge and facilitate genealogical continuity in William S, Georgette LeBlanc comes closer to the interlocution proposed by P. D. Clarke and quoted at the beginning of this section. Océan is LeBlanc’s translation of the poetry collection titled Ocean by Nova Scotian poet Sue Goyette. The collection promises the reader that ‘[t]he ocean has never had a biographer quite like Sue Goyette’ (Gaspereau Press [n.d.]). Yet, it unequivocally tells the life of the Atlantic from the port city of Halifax, Nova Scotia, where Goyette lives (Gaspereau Press [n.d.]). LeBlanc, meanwhile, grew up in Baie Sainte-Marie, on the west coast of Nova Scotia (see Figure 1). Founded after the Deportation when the British granted Acadians permission to settle anew in Nova Scotia, Baie Sainte-Marie is located near the former Acadian fortress of Port-Royal. Port-Royal / Annapolis Royal is an important site of memory in Acadie (Rudin 2009: 47–54), an administrative centre for both the French and the British during their imperial rules. It was also one of the primary sites of deportation. As Abraham Adams confirms in a letter to John Winslow dated 8 December 1755, British forces had ‘Ernbarked 1664 [souls from the area surrounding Annapolis Royal] on board of 2 Ships 3 Snows, & one Brigantine who Sailed from Goat Island and the Baltimore Sloop of War was their Convoy’ (Winslow 1880a: 186). Adams goes on to specify that an additional 300 fled ‘and the Remainder is Sent off to the great Mortification of Some of our Friends’ (Winslow 1880a: 186).

LeBlanc translates Océan into a French tinged with the geographically-specific Baie Sainte-Marie accent, Acadjonne138 (LeBlanc 2021), as well as other Acadian accents. In doing so, LeBlanc’s translation enacts a geographical transposition of the collection’s setting from Halifax in Goyette’s source text to Baie Sainte-Marie. This transposition will be discussed in

---

138 The use of ‘accent’ to refer to Acadjonne comes from sociolinguist Mélanie LeBlanc (2021). ‘Acadjonne’ both refers to the local vernacular and serves as an adjective to qualify things or persons from the Baie Sainte-Marie region (LeBlanc 2021: 97). Georgette LeBlanc shies away from explicitly confirming the use of Acadjonne in Océan, noting instead the use of a range of accents so that a greater number of Acadians can find themselves represented in the text (La traduction littéraire en Acadie 2021: 44:51–46:27). This will be discussed further in Chapter 4.
greater detail in Chapter 4, but for the purposes of this analysis it is possible to extrapolate that the waters along the shores of LeBlanc’s transposed *Océan* are essentially the same as those on which Adams shipped Acadian deportees. Reading LeBlanc’s transposed *Océan* through this historical lens therefore imbues the translation with connotations missing from Goyette’s source text, as poem ‘Eighteen’ shows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goyette’s <em>Ocean</em></th>
<th>LeBlanc’s translation <em>Océan</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At first we floated on our ancestors’ sadness, the waters rife with the salt of their tears, but then <em>vivre</em> [sic] <em>l’évolution</em>, those tears sprouted gills and tails and small, watchful eyes. It isn’t entirely accurate to say we ate those fish but more like accepted that which we’d inherited. What we hadn’t anticipated was how the eyes of those original tears would persist, how they’d keep watching. (Goyette 2013: n.p.)</td>
<td>Au commencement, j’flottions sur la tristesse de nos ancêtres, l’eau salée de leurs <em>pleurs</em>, mais là thank God pour l’évolution, leurs <em>pleurs</em> germirent des branchies, des tcheues pis des petits yeux réveillés. C’est point tout à fait vrai que j’mangions ctes poissons-là, mais j’avions accepté ça que j’avions hérité. Ça que j’aurions point pu imaginé [sic], c’est comment ce que les yeux de ctes <em>pleurs</em>-là, de ctes premières <em>pleurs</em>-là, arrêteriont point de nous <em>regarder</em>, de nous <em>watcher</em>. (Goyette 2020: n.p., emphasis (bold) added)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While Goyette’s source text alludes to the tragedies generally experienced by coastal communities and seafarers, LeBlanc’s translation seems to recall Acadian ancestors. First, the repeated mentions of ‘pleurs’ evokes the imagery of tears, prevalent in written and visual depictions of the Deportation (Chovrelat 2005: 24–25; Viau 2008: 76). Furthermore, to render Goyette’s ‘those original tears’, LeBlanc resorts to repetition: ‘ctes pleurs-là, de ctes premières pleurs-là’. Grammatically unnecessary, the repetition emphasises the tragic element of the narrative and links back to ancestors through both the Évangéline narrative and the collective memory. LeBlanc’s repetition shifts the power imbalance by bringing the narrative back to an Acadian voice and experience. For Goyette’s one occurrence of ‘tears’,
LeBlanc reinforces with two ‘pleurs’, creating an echo not without resonance to waves crashing against the shore. Then, the addition of the second ‘pleurs’ implies continuation, an interpretation that the subsequent lines corroborate as the tears ‘arrêtent point / de nous regarder, de nous watcher’. In the source text, the eyes ‘persist’, whereas in LeBlanc’s translation persistence disappears in favour of another repetition, this time bilingual: ‘regarder’ and ‘watcher’. Code switching between French and English occurs throughout Océan, but the sense of observation, of watching, creates space for intergenerational exchange. The eyes that keep watching are those of the ancestors who survived, symbolically in the collective memory if not physically.

**Repopulating Acadie: midwives and saga women**

If the genealogical tracing function of défrichetage de parenté translates the dispersal occasioned by the Grand Dérangement into tangible lineage, the storytelling function facilitates the reverse. Maria Tymoczko points to elements of inheritance in oral literatures, as ‘derivation] from established patterns that the teller or singer inherits and in turn passes on to those who succeed [them]’ (1999: 41). Yet, the storytelling function of défrichetage de parenté can only be operational with an express expectation of descendants, since ensuring cultural survival becomes obsolete if there is no population for whom to save this memory. Éloïse Brière highlights a connection between verbal creativity and cultural survival in an analysis of Maillet’s novel Pélagie-la-Charrette, in which “[t]he theme of the interplay between verbal creativity and cultural survival is emphasized as the midwife—‘sage-femme’—becomes the saga woman, a “défricheteuse” or teller of tales’ (Brière 1996a: 13). The *sage-femme* (midwife) and saga woman (storyteller) can thus be said to be one and the same. Indeed, Brière observes a need in the works of Maillet to ‘maîtriser [sa] généalogie afin de déboucher sur la possibilité d’enfanter le verbe, de s’approprier les moyens de produire un discours’ (1990: 61). Furthermore, to borrow from Bella Brodzki’s connection between intergenerational transmission and imperiled narratives (2007: 111–46), the midwife-storyteller operates according to translational principles. She interrogates ‘processes of intergenerational and intercultural transmission conceived as acts of translation […]’ to determine ‘[w]hat, if not communicable content, what Benjamin calls “information,” gets passed on, passed down, or passed across’ (Brodzki 2007: 111–12). This connection between translation, cultural survival, and birth is especially relevant
considering Acadie’s historical vicissitudes, which forced the reestablishment of populations and communities. As Jean-Luc Desalvo remarks again in the context of Pélagie-la-Charrette, ‘with the aid of the “conteurs” and “conteuses,” the male and female storytellers, and, likewise, the “défricheteurs ou défricheteuses de parenté,” the unofficial Acadian genealogists, the Acadians are able to take their revenge on what Maillet’s narrator calls “l’histoire juridique”’ (2003: 247).

Antonine Maillet’s 1975 play Évangéline Deusse participates in the phenomenon of translatability surrounding the Évangéline narrative discussed in Chapter 1 (pp. 71–78). Indeed, Longfellow’s Evangeline remains, along with the Bible, one of the most frequent sources of intertextuality in Maillet’s works (Malaborza 2006: 190). Évangéline Deusse features four characters, all exiles settled in Montréal, and their discussions revolve around the theme of deportation. The play has not generally been considered a translation *per se* in research and criticism (see Introduction, p. 19), but its translational aspects are both prominent and strategic. On the one hand, the play features multiple crossings, evident namely in the various acts of ‘travorser’ that Henri-Paul Jacques identifies. On the other, the title Évangéline Deusse clearly positions the play opposite a text firmly grounded in the Acadian collective imagination, Longfellow’s Evangeline: A Tale of Acadie (see Chapter 1, pp. 71–78). Longfellow’s name appears nowhere on the covers of Évangéline Deusse, but the word ‘Deusse’ [the second] leaves little doubt as to the play’s antecedents, leading at least one scholar to describe it as a ‘rewriting’ (Greco 2019). Michon, too, implies a translational aspect by suggesting that the character of Évangéline Deusse is ‘[a]ffranchie de son traducteur [Lemay] et maintenant de son créateur [Longfellow]’ (1994: 335).

As Jonathan Weiss points out, though, Maillet’s choices are ‘surprising and significant’, having ‘always eschewed the Évangéline story as belonging to the elite rather than to the people’ (1977: 178). Narratively consonant perhaps (Rinne 2003: 141), Maillet’s play and Longfellow’s epic poem nonetheless have little in common apart from each featuring a cast of exiles and a heroine named Évangéline. There clearly are echoes between the two works, but the differences are noticeable (Weiss 1977: 183). The distance between

139 In a preface to the play, Jacques writes that ‘Chez Évangéline [Deusse], la parole est le ‘travorsier’ par excellence’ (1975: xx). The word ‘travorsier’, and the verb ‘travorser’ are versions, in Acadian phonetic spelling, of the French words ‘traversier’ and ‘traverser’, meaning ‘ferry’ and ‘to go across’ respectively. They also provide another example of metathesis, as in the word ‘corver’ that opened the Introduction.
Evangeline and Évangéline Deusse is, moreover, made manifest as Évangéline Deusse remarks being unfamiliar with Longfellow’s work (Rinne 2003: 140; Weiss 1977: 180). As Rinne points out, Évangéline Deusse ‘n’a pas [...] de valeur itérative, mais fonctionne plutôt comme un affixe marquant l’opposition, la négation du premier élément [c’est-à-dire l’Évangeline de Longfellow]’ (2003: 140). Robert Viau agrees, noting that under Maillet’s pen ‘[l]a vieille dame [Évangéline Deusse] fait preuve de bagout, de sagacité, de finesse et de pétulance’, the implication being that she does not in Longfellow’s version (Viau 2008: 113). Thus, Maillet’s Évangéline Deusse is far from a carbon copy of Longfellow’s Evangeline, and even farther from Québécois translator Pamphile Lemay’s more conservative version (see Chapter 1, pp. 74–76). She is, rather, an ‘anti-Evangeline’ figure140 (Usmiani 1986; Weiss 1977: 178). As Pénélope Cormier puts it, ‘Maillet se distingue par un acharnement sur l’héritage du poète américain en remplaçant la figure d’Évangéline par des contre-modèles’ (2021: 155). The transformation, then, establishes a new genealogy for Évangéline Deusse, confirming her predecessors to be ‘La Sagouine, Maria à Gélas, etc.’ (Weiss 1977: 179), not Longfellow’s Evangeline.

The creation of a counter-model and the establishment of Évangéline Deusse’s descendancy from other Mailletian creations gives the Evangelinian myth an Acadian genealogy in translation. Viau in fact argues that the principal difference between the two Éangélines can be explained by the fact that the “dénricheteuses de parenté” ont rétabli les généalogies’ (2008: 171). Moreover, défrichetage de parenté ensures that this genealogy is reflective of Acadian society, thereby reversing the values with which Evangeline is typically associated, namely her virginity (Clarke 2004: 31; Rinne 2003: 141). Longfellow modelled Evangeline on a perceived feminine ideal, specifying that inspiration came in a story that conveyed ‘the best illustration of faithfulness and the constancy of woman that I have ever heard of or read’ (qtd. in Viau 1998: 26–27). Lemay accentuates the emphasis on virginity by referring to Évangéline as the ‘vierge d’Acadie’ (qtd. in Thériault 2013: 127). However, pre-Deportation Acadian society was renowned for the size of its families and for its low infant mortality rates (Brun 1982: 109; Griffiths 2005: 173–74; Hodson 2012: 152). For that reason, ‘si Longfellow avait vécu en Acadie, Évangéline n’aurait pas été une vierge

héroïque mais mère de 12 enfants qui aurait essayé de mettre de l’ordre dans les déportés au lieu de pleurer sur un rocher en regardant la mer’ (Maillet qtd. in Gallant 1987: 79). This explains Évangéline Deusu’s many sons (Maillet 1975: 35) and, consequently, the translation’s restitution of an Acadian population and the creation of a healthy line of descendants.141 In other words, Évangéline Deusse exemplifies the invention of ancestors that Sugars and Ty (2014: 7) map out for Canadian literature more generally, as outlined in the introduction to this chapter.

Évangéline Deusse would have been well served by the midwives of another Acadian literary translation, Sonya Malaborza’s L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay. Ami McKay’s The Birth House, the translation’s source text, is a novel about two midwives in the village of Scots Bay, Nova Scotia in the years following World War I. While midwifery forms the crux of McKay’s source text, it also lends itself to the idea of Acadian repopulation. Scots Bay lies about 40 kilometres north of Grand-Pré (see Figure 1), arguably the most significant site of memory in Acadie (Forgues and Atran-Fresco 2021: 22; Rudin 2009: 50; Viau 2005). McKay establishes a connection to Grand-Pré through the character of Marie Babineau (nicknamed Miss B., M’ame B. in the translation), the granddaughter of the last baby to be born there before the Deportation (2007: 26). Miss B. grew up in Louisiana, where her ancestors settled after the Grand Dérangement, and returns to Grand-Pré in the novel’s opening pages, compelled by the spirit of her grandfather (McKay 2007: 26). Miss B. does not, however, settle in Grand-Pré, and according to the narrator ‘[n]o one is quite certain of how she ended up in Scots Bay instead of the fertile valley of her ancestors’ (McKay 2007: 27). The translation reinforces the connection to formerly French-speaking Grand-Pré in two ways. The first is through the choice of language for M’ame B.’s French, which Malaborza explains as follows:

La décision d’employer un français aux couleurs acadjonnes et cadiennes dans les dialogues de ce roman ne s’est pas fait à la légère; il s’agissait d’un moyen de faire entendre les français qui circulaient en Nouvelle-Écosse vers 1916–

141 Quoting Barry Jean Ancelet, Joseph Yvon Thériault notes a similar link between ‘verbal creativity’ and ‘cultural survival’ in Louisiana: ‘Évangéline n’émane pas de la culture populaire acadienne, elle est une Américaine dont le récit a dévié la conscience cadienne des vrais enjeux, des vrais [sic] héroïnes, de la vraie langue : “Ce ne sont pas des vierges qui donnent naissance. Si toutes les Acadiennes avaient été comme Évangéline, on ne serait plus là”’ (2013: 254).
1919 et de donner corps au français plus métissé de M’ame B., celui qui l’aurait suivie depuis sa Louisiane natale et qui se serait transformé au gré d’une trentaine d’années à vivre tout près de Grand-Pré, dans la vallée d’Annapolis. (2020: 557–58)

Malaborza accentuates M’ame B.’s French, from the tinge of Louisiana French that McKay had given her to a ‘français plus métissé’ specifically influenced by Grand-Pré. In other words, L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay digs into the source text’s setting and characters to find existing Frenches and bring them to light in the translation. The colours to which Malaborza refers are made manifest from the beginning of the translation and appear in most of the dialogue.¹⁴²

The second element that ties back to a French-speaking community is the translation’s soundscape. Malaborza confirms in the ‘Mot de la traductrice’ having been absorbed in ‘une longue réflexion quant au meilleur moyen de transmettre au lecteur francophone l’univers référentiel [musical] de l’autrice’ (2020: 558). A trained musicologist, McKay peppers The Birth House with songs, which Malaborza renders with songs from the ‘répertoire franco-canadien’ to reflect the spirit of their English counterparts (Malaborza 2020: 558–59). Not all the songs that Malaborza chooses are Acadian, as is made clear in the use of the qualification ‘franco-canadien’ as opposed to ‘acadien’ or even ‘canadien français’. Still, it is striking that Malaborza opts for this strategy instead of translating the lyrics or keeping the songs in their original English. Both strategies would have been plausible given the novel’s setting in a predominantly Anglophone region of Nova Scotia.

There was but a small population to hear ‘les français qui circulaient’ or the songs in French that Malaborza highlights in the translation in the place and around the time at which the novel is set. The 1921 Canadian census shows that 86.4% of the population of Nova Scotia spoke English only, compared to 1.4% who spoke only French (Department of Trade and Commerce 1925). Acadian lands had, after all, been reallocated to English-speaking Planters post-Deportation, and new communities, including Scots Bay, had been founded by English-speaking immigrants in the ensuing decades (Public Archives of Nova Scotia [n.d.]).

¹⁴² e.g. ‘A voulit point que je vous bâdre avec ça. A m’a dit que ça allait passer, mais je l’ai jamais vue pâtir de même. Quand j’avons vu mon père bâsir chez mon oncle, j’ai filé ici aussi vite comme j’ai pu’ (McKay 2020: 22–23).
Malaborza’s decision to substitute, then, deliberately transforms the novel’s ‘univers référentiel’ into a Franco-Canadian one and effectively creates a Francophone population in a region emptied of it a century and a half earlier. The creation of a Francophone universe in *L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay* through the multiple Frenches and the musical soundscape present in the translation would be obsolete in the absence of interlocutors. The translation thus effectively invents descendants for the Acadians deported from the Grand-Pré region in the mid-eighteenth century. To put it differently, translation, along with Évangéline Deusse’s many children in replacement of Evangeline’s childlessness, symbolically repopulates an Acadie emptied of its population.

**Female generation and nongenetic genealogies**

Two observations stem from the instances of défrichetage de parenté outlined above. The first is that the acts of défrichetage are performed by women. The accusations in *William S* arise from Maillet’s additions to transposed and translated Shakespearean text, and the play’s female characters lead the reversal of history, particularly as La Mégère calls for shackling Shakespeare and, symbolically, British rulers. The gesture is especially meaningful in light of the active role Acadian women played during the Grand-Pré deportation, gathering the harvest, feeding imprisoned men and boys as well as British officials, and devising escape plans (Thibodeau 2010: 49–66). In *Évangéline Deusse* and *L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay*, repopulation efforts are guided by women as Évangéline Deusse produces descendants, and midwives symbolically create space for the Acadian experience in the soundscapes of formerly Acadian regions. By building a community of French-speakers and giving birth to multiple children, Évangéline Deusse and the midwives of *L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay* effect what Éloïse Brière points out in the context of Maillet’s novel *Pélagie-la-Charrette*:

> [a]fin de reprendre le cours de l’histoire entre leurs mains, les personnages féminins ont décidé d’enfanter sans l’aide de leurs hommes. [...] [Elles] s’unissent dans une complicité féroce pour effectuer la renaissance de l’Acadie, effort auquel les hommes ne participeront pas. (Brière 1996b: 101)
Even in *Panurge*, whose narrative arc is carried by the male characters of Panurge and Pantagruel, it is La Sagouine’s anachronistic presence that unfolds the folds of time, to borrow Chevrolat’s formulation again. It is also the unnamed ‘Femme’ who welcomes and confirms the crew’s arrival ‘en Terre de Neuve France’ (Antonine Maillet 1983: 134). In these translations, women ensure production, of history, culture, and genealogical continuity, an echo of what happens elsewhere in Maillet’s body of works. Viau, for instance, argues that ‘dans l’œuvre de Maillet, c’est par la “voie des femmes” que l’Acadie se refait’, adding that ‘[c]ette “voie” des femmes est aussi la “voie” des femmes, car presque tous les narrateurs de ces récits sont des narratrices’ (Viau 2008: 193). Marie-Linda Lord agrees, arguing that Maillet’s (female) protagonists represent a renewed, feminist vision of Acadian society as women finally have a chance to speak (Lord 2010: 21).

It is perhaps not surprising that acts of défrichetage in translation are led by women, since the genealogist-storyteller is usually presented in the feminine form of ‘défricheteuse’ as opposed to the masculine ‘défricheteux’. One of the earliest mentions of the term appears in *Par derrière chez mon père*, in which Maillet refers to the ‘conteurs de mon pays, aux chroniqueurs, et colporteurs, et défricheteuses de parenté [...]’ (1972: 20). The spelling of ‘défricheteuse’ here is particularly remarkable as it is the only term listed in the feminine form, with ‘conteurs’, ‘chroniqueurs’, and ‘colporteurs’ all taking the masculine form.143 The idea of female-led défrichetage also corresponds to the production of ethnicity in Acadian society. The power dynamics that Greg Allain, Isabelle McKee-Allain, and Joseph Yvon Thériault identify as underpinning traditional discourse144 reveal a duality within domestic production units:

une partie des activités économiques des familles (l’unité de production domestique) est liée à l’échange marchand alors qu’une autre, lieu d’activités

---

143 Maillet writes ‘défricheteux’ in *L’Acadie pour quasiment rien* (1973: 12, see also p. 62). Here, as with occurrences in works by Aresu (1986: 231) and de Sousa (2010: 136), the use of the masculine is likely symptomatic of the generalised use of the masculine in French grammar at the time to designate both forms.

144 The study by Allain and others is part of a sociological account of Acadie that attempts to clarify what the authors deem to be a neo-nationalist crisis in late twentieth-century Acadian society (1993: 341–42). The authors refer to four types of discourse: ‘discours traditionnel’ (prevalent until the late 1950s, projecting a traditional vision of Acadie; ‘discours modernisateur’ (1960s), characterised by a desire for greater integration into the social environment; ‘discours critique’ (1970s), critical of the two previous periods, and characterised by a renewed desire to reconfigure Acadian social space; and ‘discours organisationnel’, emerging in the 1980s and reflecting the fragmented nature of Acadian society at the time (1993: 343–44).
McKee-Allain expands on this notion elsewhere, concluding that ‘dans un moment historique qualifié par J.-Y. Thériault de premier mouvement protestataire en Acadie [...] [c]e sont les communautés religieuses de femmes enseignantes, inscrites dans ce vaste mouvement se réclamant l’acadianité, qui sont privilégiées en tant que productrices d’ethnicité’ (1989: 68). The idea of female generation also applies to the storytelling function of défrichetage de parenté when considered in terms of Maillet’s understanding of giving birth, as it were, to characters. This ‘besoin de mettre au monde’, Maillet explains, ‘c’est une création [...] je le sortais de mon ventre, mes enfants sortaient de mon ventre, [ne] sortaient pas de ma tête’ (‘Antonine Maillet: mes pensées flottantes’ 2022: 30:25–30:41).

The second observation relating to the preceding analyses revolves around défrichetage de parenté occurring through narrative or textual interventions through the process of translation. There are no instances of Acadian défrichetage de parenté in the source texts. The défricheteuse de parenté weaves herself into the narrative of the translation from an initial position of being outside the source text. The défricheteuse is thus foreign to the source texts. In this sense, she resembles the genealogist or storyteller who maintains a familiarity with lineages, though this familiarity is not necessarily expressed in genealogical or, in this context, intertextual terms. To frame this idea according to Tim Ingold’s genealogical line, it ‘gives us a way of describing ancestry and descent [...] in terms of the narrative interweaving of present and past lives rather than the plotting of connections between unique and self-contained individuals’ (2007: 117–18). In other words, the défricheteuse de parenté travels to and dwells in — to borrow another concept by Ingold¹⁴⁵ — various points along family histories, across generations and time periods through the process of translation.

¹⁴⁵ According to Ingold, the ‘dwelling perspective [...] treats the immersion of the organism-person in an environment or lifeworld as an inescapable condition of existence’, which contrasts with ‘the building perspective’ by which people ‘must perforce “construct” the world, in consciousness, before they can act in it’ (2000: 153). Ingold considers narrative and storytelling acts of dwelling that ‘amount not to a metaphorical representation of the world, but to a form of poetic involvement’ (2000: 57).
This idea of the stranger manifesting through textual interventions connects the preceding analyses to the nongenetic genealogical narrative model espoused by Barry McCrea in *In the Company of Strangers* (2011). Based on the Victorian novel, McCrea’s study proposes an alternative, ‘queer’, ‘non-genealogical’ narrative model to the conventional family model (2011: 4). The randomness of encounters is crucial to McCrea’s model (2011: 18), and in défrichetage de parenté it manifests in the random scattering of families during the Grand Dépangement and in the unpredictability of the défricheteuse’s appearances in translation. Moreover, McCrea’s model relies on the figure of the stranger, a neighbour or other person outside the family unit who infiltrates the narrative: ‘the family needs the stranger, but it also neutralizes him, brings him in from the wilderness and assimilates him to the syntax of genealogy and kinship, rerouting his energies back into family life and, by extension, civilized society’ (McCrea 2011: 14). This is precisely the role of the défricheteuse de parenté, who is intimately connected to, and embedded within, the lineages she keeps untangled while remaining unrelated to at least some of the ancestors and descendants traced by her practice. From a textual perspective, she is *étrangère*, foreign to or removed from the source text. She comes to life only in translation. Returning to McCrea’s description of the stranger quoted above, it is possible to see that the stranger-défricheteuse in Acadian translations operates first from outside the text, from its ‘wilderness’, before being assimilated into the syntax of genealogy and ‘kinship’ in translation. The essence of the défricheteuse as a weaver of collective memory allows her to integrate the story in translation to continue weaving, and in the process, reconfiguring genealogies and (hi)stories. For, as Doireann Ní Ghriofa points out, ‘the etymology of the word “text” lies in the Latin verb “texere”: to weave, to fuse, to braid’ (2020: 74; see also Ingold 2007: 61).

If the immediacy of the present makes the défricheteuse de parenté a stranger with intimate knowledge of the genealogical lines she (re)traces, strangerhood in this context is reminiscent of Siri Nergaard’s conception of the translated stranger. Drawing on the work of Georg Simmel, Nergaard argues for a conception of translation that takes into account the stranger (the transmigrant) and that embraces ‘ambivalence’ and ‘incommensurabilities’ to defy ‘binary oppositions’ (2021: 45–47). More specifically, Nergaard posits that the
[n]onbinary stranger living next door is the “transmigrant”: she is a person in transition, with plural and heterogenous allegiances in a continuous transformative and precarious tension. The transmigrant lives in an ambivalent condition of translation, belonging and not belonging, being imbedded in strangerhood. (2021: 53–54)

Like the ambivalence of the transmigrant, the défricheteuse de parenté is both in her (translational) present and in the lineages of past and future generations.

The nongenetic model ‘offers as much formal consonance and cohesion’ as the conventional family model (McCrea 2011: 4), meaning that the défricheteuse de parenté’s interventions can be interpreted in terms of legitimising (reconfigured) lineages and intertextuality. Closure is brought about by the full-circle nature of the défricheteuse’s textual interventions, by the restoration of ancestry and descendance threatened during the Grand Dérangement. Nevertheless, the process of restoration paradoxically leads to an opening since it occurs in translation. On the one hand, the concept of nongenetic genealogies contributes to the legitimisation of Acadian genealogies reconfigured during and after the Grand Dérangement. On the other, whereas pre-Deportation Acadian communities were often founded based on family connections (Basque 1996: 41, 82; Cormier 1990: 74; Daigle 1993a: 12), post-Deportation efforts focussed on family reunification but in many cases communities were also reconstituted according to shared experiences, language, culture, and religion (Hodson 2012: 182). Both the legitimising and reconstituting processes exemplify François Noudelmann’s notion of ‘disruptive kinship’, by which ‘elective as opposed to genetically ordained affinities are the rule’ (qtd. in Apter 2013: 14). Moreover, they strongly echo the result of nongenetic genealogies that McCrea outlines:

> nongenetic genealogies usurp paternity and marriage by offering a grid on which to plot the protagonists’ positions and changing but consistent identities across time (the sum of their sums, but not from a copy-book). Again, these alternative genealogies do not exclude the reality and function of biological family. (2011: 142, emphasis in original)
Paternity and marriage are usurped in the Acadian context by the disturbances of the Grand Dérangement, and Acadie recreated not a copy of its pre-Deportation self but a renewed version from remnants, the sum of its sums.

A final point to make about McCrea’s model is that it is male driven at the levels of both author and character: Charles Dickens and his Fagin, Arthur Conan Doyle and his Sherlock Holmes, James Joyce and his Leopold Bloom, and Marcel Proust and his Charles Swann. The défricheteuse de parenté, then, provides a sort of female counterpart. Within the larger context of literary translation in Canada, the female agency of the défricheteuse de parenté in Acadian translations aligns with the feminist approach to translation (de Lotbinière-Harwood 1991; Simon 1996 (see p. 29 for a retrospective); von Flotow 1997). The interpretative or interventionist aspect of LeBlanc’s, MAILLET’S, and Malaborza’s translations corresponds generally to Sherry Simon’s argument that Canadian feminist translations are ‘essential to this transaction [of engaging with the values of a text]; it activates the implicit cultural meanings which are brought to bear’ (Simon 1996: 140). The défricheteuse weaves in important detail from the Acadian collective imagination, thereby inscribing the feminine and making clear the ‘esthetic [she] imprint[s] upon the work’ (Simon 1996: 162). This is precisely what Pallister seeks to transmit by qualifying MAILLET AS RABELAIS’ ‘remote descendant, his spiritual granddaughter’ rather than her being ‘under the influence of Rabelais, for both are literary masters’ (1986: 262). As Pallister explains,

Maillet’s transposition [...] to the world of women is not [...] a mere manifestation of the recent trend toward a Canadian matriarchy [...] More accurately, it reflects Maillet’s recognition of early Acadian realities, in which woman has historically emerged as the incarnation of tenacity and fortitude. [...] Maillet herself underscores the historical need of the woman to replace the male head of the family lost in the grand dérangement.146 (1986: 262–63)

This idea is further reinforced by the role of women during the Deportation (see Thibodeau 2010: 49–66). The défricheteuse de parenté, by generating nongenetic genealogies and legitimising reconfigured communities, takes over from the (male) narratives not being written in the years of silence following the Grand Dérangement (see Chapter 1, pp. 71–73).

146 In this excerpt Pallister is challenging Bruno Drolet’s (1975) reading of Maillet’s ‘libération de la femme’.
Though she searches for ancestors and invents descendants on her own, by being a stranger she also brings to bear Susanne de Lotbinière-Harwood’s contention that translation is not ‘une œuvre de conception immaculée indépendante du travail de médiation textuel et culturel qui l’a fait exister. Une traduction est une œuvre de cocréation’ (1991: 44).

**Conclusion**

The process of défrichetage de parenté, put in place to address the genealogical ramifications of the Grand Dérrangement, manifests variously in Acadian translations. Firstly, an ‘inquiétude généalogique’ (Brière 1990) finds expression in an emphasis on ancestors and intertextuality in the works of Antonine Maillet, as well as in translations by Georgette LeBlanc and Sonya Malaborza. Maillet, especially, weaves bonds of kinship between translations and so-called original creations in a corpus that already blurs the boundaries between these two practices. For their part, the dual functions of défrichetage de parenté, genealogical retracing and storytelling, manifest through narrative interventions identified in translations by LeBlanc, Maillet, and Malaborza. In *Les drôlatriques, horrifiques et épouvantables aventures de Panurge, ami de Pantagruel, La Fontaine ou la Comédie des Animaux, William S, and Océan*, these interventions stage historical reversals to search for Acadian ancestors. Conversely, *Évangéline Deusse* and *L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay* both invent descendants and effectively repopulate an Acadie emptied of its inhabitants during the Grand Dérrangement. Led by women and occurring through narrative interventions present in the translations but not in their source texts, défrichetage de parenté produces a (female) counterpart to Barry McCrea’s (male) nongenetic genealogies. This nongenetic view, in turn, legitimises the reconstruction of Acadian communities along shared experiences, language, culture, and religion more than genealogical connection.

The notion of weaving that défrichetage de parenté instigates in Acadian translation practice differs from the approaches outlined by Annie Brisset (1996) and Jennifer Drouin (2014) for the Québécois context. Brisset’s iconoclastic, perlocutory, and identity-forming modes of translation provide the framework for an analysis of the relationship between the discursive act of translation and Québécois ideologies between 1968 and 1988 (1990: 23–24). Focussing on Shakespeare, Drouin (2014) connects Québécois adaptations to key moments in Québec nationalist history (Quiet Revolution, referendums, the Conquest, etc.) and outlines differences between Québécois and Canadian Shakespeares on the grounds of
nationalist and feminist discourses articulated around modern expressions of gender norms. Both Brisset and Drouin draw on the Other in their analyses, emphasising nationalist motivations behind the translations they examine. Drouin links these motivations to Québec’s status as one of the few ‘nations’ without sovereignty (2014: 4). Yet, Québec benefits from self-governance, particularly in relation to language policy, as a legally-defined province within Canadian confederation (Publications Québec 2023). Acadie, by contrast has no legally-defined territory and remains a minority group within the Maritime provinces. Such difference between the contained and the fluid brings up an interesting perspective from which to consider nationalist motivations. To be sure, the invention of ancestors and assertion of genealogical lines can both be interpreted as political acts. Yet, the translations analysed by Brisset and Drouin highlight replacement or appropriation — Brisset uses the word ‘absorption’ (1990: 195) — of the Other, whereas the Acadian translations’ narrative or textual interventions create space for source and target texts to intermingle. Indeed, the preceding analysis has alluded to reversal and continuation more than to substitution, particularly in the context of inventing ancestors and descendants. From this perspective, it would be fruitful to pursue further research within the framework of défrichetage de parenté considering (at least) two concepts in translation studies. The first is Maria Tymoczko’s notion of metonymic translation. The translations outlined in this chapter enact Tymoczko’s metonymic translation by shifting the understanding of ‘translation-as-substitution [which] 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’ (1999: 283). Rather than the conventional separation between source and target texts, interventions of défrichetage in Acadian translations create opportunities for source and target texts to coincide. A second research avenue that may inform défrichetage de parenté and vice versa is Emily Apter’s notion of untranslatability, more specifically in terms of François Noudelmann’s ‘disruptive kinship’ and Jacques Derrida’s ‘metaphoric catastrophe’ (Apter 2013: 14). On the one hand, Apter points out that Noudelmann’s disruptive kinship ‘refers to blood ties that have been broken, thwarted orders of nature, queer families, subcultures, soul mates, monsters, the progeny of Virgin birth, [or] spirits born of metempsychosis’ (2013: 14). This description provides grounds for considering the nature of the défrichetuse de parenté in
more specific terms than ‘étrangère’. For instance, the ‘thwarted orders of nature’ harken back to the discussion of aboiteaux in Chapter 2, while the carnivalesque quality of Maillet’s works (Bourque 1993, 1994) may elucidate the défricheteuse as ‘monster’. On the other hand, Apter also expands on Derrida’s questioning of ‘life’ and ‘family’ in linguistics to describe the ‘[s]undered filiation’ of ‘untranslatables’ — that is, language that does not belong to language families (2013: 14–15). Rather than from a perspective of the untranslatable, an impossibility of moving from source to target, défrichetage de parenté highlights the potential of the translatable. For, défrichetage de parenté occurs only in translation, not in the source texts.

Défrichetage de parenté, like défrichage in the sense of land-clearing, grounds translation in a territory, the place back to which genealogical connections are threaded. According to Bernard Aresu, défrichetage de parenté ‘figuratively and earthily comingles the function of oral tradition and that of attachment to the land, sine qua non conditions of Acadian survival’ (1986: 231). From this perspective, défrichetage de parenté reconciles what Herménégilde Chiasson bewails as the two versions of Acadie, one created locally and the other by ‘exiled’ artists: ‘pour s’approprier la réalité il faut la raconter soi-même, créer sur place’ (qtd. in Boudreau 2016: 249–51). Imbuing translations with Acadian lineage grounds them. From this perspective, the works analysed in this chapter reconfigure Acadie’s peripherality, created by the Grand Dérangement and maintained since through Acadie’s double minority status compared to both Anglophone Canada and Francophone Québec. Indeed, McCrea’s model ‘takes up this question of queer temporality from a narratological point of view [and] addresses the question of how nongenealogical experiences of kinship and time can be taken from the periphery and “centred” as an alternative underlying model for narrative itself’ (McCrea 2011: 14). Focalising nongenetic genealogies and intertextual palimpsests not only highlights a legitimising function, but also a territorial one. By adopting a practice of défrichetage de parenté that favours nongenetic genealogies, Acadian literary translation imbues itself with a particularity that goes beyond the choice of translation language (or accent) and that roots it in a poetics specific to its terroir, a process especially relevant in a consciousness shaped by disruption.

147 Alberto Manguel considers La Sagouine as one of the great ‘monstres fabuleux’ of fiction who reveal and elucidate the world (2020: 112–14).
4  \textit{Grands dérangements} and the dynamics of Acadian translation

A person who dislocates — whatever the reason behind her movement — enters a complex process of translation.
— Siri Nergaard, Translation and Transmigration

The census-takers asking for La Sagouine’s nationality (see Introduction, pp. 41), refuse to accept ‘Acadian’ because ‘c’est pas écrit dans les livres de Jos Graphie’ (1990: 154). Acadie’s lack of legal boundaries, its absence from geography books, complicates the definition of Acadian identity in geographical terms, a complication further exacerbated by the displacements of the Grand Dérangement. If the aboiteaux grounded the Acadian population, the deportations of 1755 to 1762 and the ensuing migrations over the subsequent decades — both voluntary and forced (Arsenault 2018: 211–383; Hodson 2012; Leblanc 1967) — caused profound dislocation. Maillet’s Jos Graphie, then, can be read as the personification of the oral tradition captured through the practice of défrichetage de parenté, as story compensating for defined (written) territory. Acadie’s oral history is indeed underpinned by movement, Maillet positing for instance that it has been ‘sauvé[e] de quelques naufrages’ (Maillet 1971: 27). The dislocations of the Grand Dérangement and ensuing migrations ingrained a sense of mobility — or, more precisely for the Acadian context, of mouvance — in the collective consciousness. The Deportation has already been correlated to translation at a territorial level (Chapter 1, pp. 66–71), but other instances of migration and movement likewise contribute to defining Acadie’s mouvances. Even if a sense of mobility can be found in everyday instances of moving through life (Inghilleri 2017: 5), in Acadie history has been nothing short of mouvementée on a larger scale, the dynamics of which harken back to the notion of \textit{translatio} outlined in the Introduction (pp. 44–47).

Acadie’s very foundation as a colonial society is redolent of \textit{translatio} insofar as colonisation and imperialism ‘articulat[e] the historical relationship in the New World between translation, \textit{translatio}, and the \textit{translatio imperii et studii}, between, that is, a theory of communication, a theory of figurative language, and a theory of the transmission of power’ (Cheyfitz 1991: xx). Indeed, ‘[t]he Acadians saw themselves as having been displaced first into, then out of, Acadie’ (Slemon 2003: 25). In the mid-to-late seventeenth century, Acadie also welcomed, in the words of Leslie Choquette, a ‘contingent of
particularly mobile Frenchmen’ (qtd. in Griffiths 2005: 47–48). The Acadian territory itself shifted dynamically throughout the seventeenth century, changing according to transfers in imperial control between France and Britain (Arsenault 2018: 17–128; Faragher 2005: 35–123). After the conquest of Port-Royal in 1710, Acadians became ‘geographically mobile individuals’ as they relocated and created a ‘third Acadia’, comprised of Acadians whose ties to both colonial powers remained circumstantially fluid (Basque 2004: 174). The Grand Dérangement then accelerated Acadian mobility and expanded displacements across a vast geographical range:

In the thirty years after 1755, refugees from the Bay of Fundy turned up in a stunning range of far-flung places. These included port cities of both British North America and the British Isles, France’s colonies in the Caribbean and on the South American coast, the Falkland Islands, the uncultivated plains, windswept islands, and urban tenements of western France, the river valleys of eastern Canada, and Spanish Louisiana, where their descendants would eventually be known as Cajuns. Had more radical plans come to fruition, this list of destinations might have included farms in the bone-dry Sierra Morena of Andalusia, the climatically mismatched islands of Corsica and Jersey, a French forest owned by the nonagenarian ex-king of Poland, Ile-de-France (now Mauritius in the Indian Ocean), and the ‘central mass of the Antarctic continent’, allegedly discovered by a French seafarer in 1773. (Hodson 2012: 4–5)

Following these dynamics, Stéphane Pâquet and Martin Savard suggest that ‘l’expérience de l’histoire acadienne [depuis la commémoration du 250e anniversaire de la Déportation] s’inscrit sous le mode d’une triple mouvance : la mouvance traumatique avec la Déportation, la mouvance régénérative avec le retour des exilés et la mouvance diasporique avec l’instauration

148 For a complementary set of maps, see Leblanc (1967).
subséquente de tout un réseau migratoire’ (Pâquet and Savard 2007: 1). This state is perceptible in visual representations of the displacements of the Deportation and of the waves of Acadian migrations that ensued. The maps in Figure 7 highlight the breadth of movement of migrations triggered by the Grand Dérangement in terms of both frequency and geographical range. The thick blue arrows in the 1755–1757 and 1758–1762 maps correspond to the outflow of Acadians, while the green arrows in the 1763–1767 and 1768–1785 maps designate post-Deportation migrations towards more welcoming territories or as part of family reunification schemes. As geographer Robert A. Leblanc puts it, ‘[f]or many years thereafter [after 1755] […] [the Acadians] moved across the map always seeking but seldom finding a permanent home’ (1967: 523).

The multiple mouvances of Acadie are captured in the idea of grands dérangements, or great disruptions. As one of many euphemisms used to denote Acadian deportations (Bourque 2015b: 48–49; Hautecoeur 1975: 77), the term ‘Grand Dérangement’ encapsulates the trauma of Deportation and the far-reaching repercussions of the expulsion. Tracing the term’s history, Ronnie-Gilles LeBlanc specifies that ‘dérangement’ was used as early as 1773 by deported Acadians and the adjective ‘grand’ as early as 1836 (2005: 12–14). The term was enshrined on a national scale in 2005 through the official proclamation of the ‘Journée de commémoration du Grand Dérangement’, or ‘Day of Commemoration of the Great Upheaval’ (Government of Canada 2003). The centrality of the Grand Dérangement in the Acadian psyche can hardly be overstated: as Naomi E.S. Griffiths writes, ‘the events of these years [between 1755 and 1764], whether labelled as “the deportation,” “the time of exile,” “le grand dérangement,” have become so central to self-definition of later generations of Acadians that the reality of what actually happened has often been overlooked’ (1992: 95; see also Roy 1978; Thériault 1982). Its importance comes through numerous book-length studies in both French and English, and from Acadian, Canadian and international historians. Elsewhere, it serves as a hinge for general historical accounts of Acadie and inspiration for literary production, most famously Longfellow’s Evangeline: A Tale of Acadie (2004).

149 For detailed accounts of post-Grand Dérangement migrations and (re)settlements, see Arsenault (2018: 211–383), Hodson (2012), and Leblanc (1967).
150 e.g. Bernard (1936), Faragher (2005), Gaudet (1922), Hodson (2012), Lauvrière (1922), LeBlanc (2005), Plank (2001), and Thibodeau (2010).
Harnessing the centrality of the Grand Dérangement in the Acadian consciousness, this chapter adapts it into the plural, lower-case form ‘grands désarrangements’. For, as Faragher notes, the term ‘implie[s] something more personal, le grand désarrangement d’esprit, the derangement of mind and spirit that drove their [the post-Deportation generation of Acadians’] parents and grandparents to the edge of madness’ (2005: 445). The multiplicity and mobility embedded in this expanded notion of grands désarrangements mirrors Robert Viau’s in Les Grands Dérangements (1997), but in that work the plural form indicates the recurrence of the Deportation in Acadian, Québécois, and French literatures rather than echoes of multiple mouvances. Hans R. Runte, too, makes a passing reference to ‘les traumas des grands désarrangements’ in reference to Maillet’s ability to treat tragedy through a carnivalesque lens (1987: 88). Thus, the plural, lower-case form alludes not only to the event, but also to the multiple deportations effected across territories and to the various mouvances embedded in the collective consciousness.

The chapter examines translations by Georgette LeBlanc, Antonine Maillet, and Serge Patrice Thibodeau. It begins with two discussions of the Deportation in translation, addressing first Serge Patrice Thibodeau’s Journal de John Winslow à Grand-Pré (2010). Due to the nature of the source text, Thibodeau’s work is effectively a translation of the Deportation, but the translator ensures that the whole of the Deportation story is told, including naming the perpetrators. Then, the chapter moves to a rather inconspicuous allusion to the Grand Dérangement in La tempête (Shakespeare 1997), Maillet’s translation of Shakespeare’s The Tempest, interpreted in the context of Canadian Shakespearean translation. Next, the chapter turns to linguistic and geographical manifestations of grands désarrangements. It delves into Maillet’s corpus of translations for signs of linguistic disruptions, which manifest through in the inclusion of the ‘parlure acadienne’ (Acadian language) in translation. Maillet’s ethnolinguistic study Rabelais et les traditions populaires en Acadie (1971) provides the backdrop for identifying remnants of Rabelaisian speech that survived two major migrations – colonial settlement and deportation – and that finds its way into translations. Finally, the chapter moves towards a textual manifestation of Acadian migrations, identifying a transposition of geopoetics (Italiano 2016) in Georgette LeBlanc’s Océan (2020).
Translating the Deportation

In an overview of representations of the Grand Dérangement in Acadian, Québécois, and French literatures, Viau observes that ‘la Déportation, après avoir fait couler beaucoup de sang et de larmes, [a] fait couler beaucoup d’encre’ (1997: 7). As Viau goes on to note, the spilled ink belongs mostly, at least in the early years of an Acadian literary tradition, to the pens of non-Acadian writers, first the Americans (Longfellow), then the French (Rameau de Saint-Père), and then the French-Canadians (1997: 8; see also Chapter 1, pp. 72–73). The important production happening outside of Acadie is mirrored by a marked silence from Acadian writers before the second half of the twentieth century, after which time the Grand Dérangement becomes a central theme in Acadian literature (Viau 1997: 173–90, 224–78, 2023: 94–96, 123–31). Sociopolitical discourse stemming out of the Conventions nationales acadiennes, for its part, recognises the ‘vicissitudes orageuses’ of the past, but focusses on uniqueness and peculiarity rather than rehashing the events of the Grand Dérangement (Bourque 2015b: 50–51; Thériault 1995: 221–22). Yet, the relative scarcity of Deportation narratives partly explains Serge Patrice Thibodeau’s motivation to translate Winslow’s Journal (1880a, 1880b) into French.

The nature of Winslow’s Journal, as an artefact recording the atrocities committed against the Acadians written by one of the most reviled figures in Acadian history, makes it a noteworthy choice of translation project for an Acadian translator. Thibodeau acknowledges the curiosity (2010: 13) but also remarks that the text is one of those ‘qui nous en disent beaucoup plus que les mythes, les clichés et autres images de nous-mêmes, bricolés à tour de bras par le premier survenant sympathique passé par chez nous’ (2010: 70). Thibodeau alludes here to some of the narratives by non-Acadians mentioned earlier, which tend to romanticise the Deportation and perpetuate an ideologised, somewhat passé view of Acadie (Bourque and Richard 2014: 11–21, 68–69). As a result, Thibodeau opts to ‘let the Deportation speak for itself’ and to translate as literally as possible (2010: 71; see also Chapter 2 of this thesis, p. 90). As reviewer Désiré Nyela points out, the source text, which includes plain and straightforward accounts of the proceedings related to the removal of the Acadians, makes the strategy possible: ‘[à] écriture littérale, traduction littérale’ (2010: 212). Thibodeau justifies this approach by stating that he is neither a historian nor a translator by training (2010: 71), which reinforces the goal of interfering as little as possible with the text while rendering it into French. Furthermore, Thibodeau recognises the intrinsic value of the
Journal’s text and narrative, presumably in contrast to the romanticisation and biases of earlier, fictionalised Grand Dérangement narratives. The strategy of close adherence to source text thus deploys on two levels: character and narrative. Indeed, Thibodeau explicitly outlines an attempt at recovering the character of Winslow within the text:

C’était le point de vue d’un autre — un point de vue qui n’était pas forcément celui des canons officiels de l’histoire acadienne du début du 20e siècle — loin du discours officiel d’auteurs aussi édifiants que partisans, qui ont par ailleurs caricaturé à outrance le personnage de John Winslow. (Thibodeau 2010: 13–14)

The sense of duty to let Winslow come through honestly is not, however, an act of exoneration. On the contrary, the translation, as Nyela observes, lays the blame squarely on the shoulders of the perpetrators: ‘[d]onner la parole à John Winslow, c’est le rétablir, par le fait même, dans son humanité — dans tout criminel, quel qu’il soit, il reste toujours cette part irréductible d’humanité — et montrer la complexité d’un personnage enfermé, jusque-là, dans sa figure détestable de bourreau’ (2010: 212). Thibodeau, too, explicitly attributes blame, but as with the identification of breaches within the Grand-Pré palisade discussed in Chapter 2 (pp. 86–92), does so obliquely. The attribution of blame occurs in a paratext belonging to another work: La liste de Winslow expliquée (Delaney 2020), which Thibodeau translated and edited (to this effect, see note no. 42 in the Introduction of this thesis, p. 20). According to Thibodeau’s ‘Mot de l’éditeur-traducteur’, ‘Winslow n’a pas fait qu’obéir aux ordres de ses supérieurs, une obéissance qu’il qualifie mensongèrement de “très désagréable à [s]on caractère”’ (Delaney 2020 : 9–12, emphasis in original). In Journal de John Winslow à Grand-Pré, meanwhile, Thibodeau attempts to restore versions of Winslow and the Deportation unencumbered by the weight of history. An example of such recovery is given in the first part of the book, in which Thibodeau explains that over the years, the line ‘This Day Finished the Picquetting & began the owen to Clear our Selves of one of the Egiptian Plagues’ (Winslow 1880a: 78) has succumbed to ‘toutes sortes d’interprétations ou de traductions farfelues’ (Thibodeau 2010: 44). It has been interpreted too literally, ‘pris personnel’ as it were, as a metaphor for the Acadian people and, therefore, as proof of Winslow’s hatred towards the Acadians (Thibodeau 2010: 44). Thibodeau, conversely, argues that the lack of literary flair throughout the Journal means that the reference is
meant to be literal, not metaphorical: Winslow is commenting on the camp’s unsanitary conditions, not on the Acadians as has generally been assumed (2010: 44–46). The French translation in *Journal de John Winslow à Grand-Pré* therefore reads ‘Aujourd’hui, nous avons terminé la construction de la palissade et formé le vœu de nous débarrasser de l’une des plaies d’Égypte’ (Thibodeau 2010: 98).

Despite the declared strategy of close adherence to the text, Thibodeau does allow one telling freedom that speaks directly to attributing blame: naming the perpetrators. Thibodeau’s working manuscript is filled with notes in the margins that include detailed information about the people giving or executing deportation orders (see Figure 8). Biographical data about ‘Robert D’, named ‘Govr Dunwiddie’ in Winslow’s text (1880a: 131), handwritten in the top-right corner of Figure 8 dates Dunwiddie’s governorship from 1751 to 1758 and highlights the appointment of ‘S. Washington’. Moreover, the names ‘George 1<sup>er</sup>’, ‘William’, ‘Jotham’, ‘James’, ‘Jeremiah’, ‘Samuel’, ‘Charles’, ‘John’, ‘Thomas’, and ‘Joseph’ are sprinkled throughout the two pages of the working document shown here. The names also find their way into the final translation, without any indication that they are translatorial additions. The following excerpt, which corresponds to the second section on the left-hand side of the reproduced image, provides an example of this: ‘[…] pour avoir répliqué avec impertinence à son officier pendant la garde. Présenter rapport. Capitaine Humphrey Hobbs, président; lieutenant Gamaliel Bradford, lieutenant Jonas Fitch, enseigne James Carr, enseigne Jeremiah Bancroft. John Winslow’ (Thibodeau 2010: 169). In the introductory material to the translation, Thibodeau explains that ‘chaque responsable est nommé par son grade, son prénom et son nom au complet, du simple soldat à l’officier le plus haut gradé’, a decision attributed to the translator’s human rights background (2010: 71). However, the gesture is especially meaningful in the context of the *Journal*, which lists the 2,242 Acadians ‘shipt’ out to sea by Winslow (Thibodeau 2010: 151–58; Winslow 1880a: 114–22). Adding the full names and titles of the perpetrators, neglected in the source text, the translation demands accountability. The *Journal de John Winslow à Grand-Pré* then becomes, as Clarke puts it, a mechanism ‘[p]our tous ces Acadiens qui cherchent à se faire face, mais à partir de ce code qui leur est “familier” — le français, parce que moins
belliqueux’ (2012: 221). In this context, ‘[t]raduire, c’est [...] recoder le livre comptable des morts pour mieux le banaliser’ (2012: 221).

The translation thus allows Acadians to grapple with their own history from a familiar space and in their native language, in a spirit of openness if not of outright reconciliation.153 Thus, ‘Thibodeau n’obéit point à la consigne du silence’ (Clarke 2012: 217, 221). Clarke describes Thibodeau as a ‘passeur’ operating in a continuous back-and-forth between past and present and assuming roles other than those of the translator in the

153 In the lead up to the commemorative events of 2004–2005, a group of people led a campaign to obtain a formal apology from Queen Elizabeth II for the Grand Dérangement. Though the apology never materialised, a Royal Proclamation was signed in 2003 acknowledging the wrongs and establishing 28 July as a Day of commemoration of the Great Upheaval. For more on the Proclamation, see Appendix 4 of the Journal de John Winslow à Grand-Pré (Thibodeau 2010: 189–90), as well as Faragher (2005: 473–80) and Perrin (2004).
narrow sense of rendering text into another language (2012: 221). The implication is that Thibodeau’s project goes beyond the language of the text, and, in this sense, contributes to centripetal forces of return or reappropriation through translation (see Chapter 1, pp. 68–70). As Clarke goes on to explain, ‘[e]n rapprochant ce qui était distant, en rendant familier ce qui était étranger, et en mettant au jour les lieux communs, en lumière les origines cachées et ses ramifications pas encore réalisées — l’auteur [Thibodeau] refigure notre rapport à l’Histoire et au monde’ (2012: 221). As a translator, Thibodeau had come ready for a ‘face à face avec Winslow’ (2010: 17), an experience that the translation replicates for its readers. It is through the translational act of the Journal that Acadie gets to read its history, presumably unembellished. This is how it can begin, finally, to ‘tourner la page’ (Thibodeau 2010: 69), the literal page of the Journal and the figurative page of a renewed sense of Acadian identity in the first decade of the twenty-first century.

The Grand Dérangement in translation

As mentioned previously, a contradiction reigns over the Grand Dérangement in literature in that it has been shrouded in silence, the result of collective trauma (Thériault 2013: 161), but also paradoxically belaboured (Viau 1997). Antonine Maillet mostly steers away from the Deportation in plays and novels, focusing instead on ‘les traditions populaires acadiennes trop longtemps délaissées au profit de l’événement de 1755 et des traditions dites nationales’ (Marguerite Maillet 1983: 182). However, the embeddedness of the Deportation in the Acadian psyche, and indeed its translational nature (see Chapter 1, pp. 66–71), create the conditions for it to surface in literary translation. The previous chapter alluded to this idea in its discussion of references to the events surrounding the Grand Dérangement in William S and La Fontaine ou la Comédie des Animaux. Both plays are adaptations, loosely based on source texts but altogether new literary creations, and in these Maillet’s translation strategy differs markedly from that adopted in translations of Shakespearean plays. As Malaborza observes:

154 Clarke’s use of the word ‘auteur’ instead of ‘traducteur’ in this sentence goes back to the fact that Thibodeau’s name appears on the front cover of Journal de John Winslow à Grand-Pré while Winslow is mentioned in the title but not as an author.
de tous [les] travaux [de traduction de Maillet] ressort un souci de tout rendre
du texte anglais, à la lettre; on a d’ailleurs dit des traductions shakespeareennes
de Maillet que si elles tendent parfois à s’éloigner sur le plan métrique des
textes source, elles reflètent une pratique littérale de la traduction. (2006: 180;

The translations, therefore, supposedly leave little room to weave in the Grand
Dérangement, unlike the freer approaches of the adaptations discussed in Chapter 3 (pp.
118–122). However, one of Maillet’s translations stands out for a relatively inconspicuous
but incontrovertible allusion to the Grand Dérangement: *La tempête*, a translation of
Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* (Shakespeare 1997). The allusion occurs in Act I, Scene III, in the
scene recounting Prospero and Miranda’s exile, which reads as follows in English:

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

MIRANDA       Alack, for pity!
I, not remembering how I cried out then,
Will cry o’er again. It is a hint
That wrings mine eyes to ‘t. (Shakespeare 2002a: 130–134, emphasis added)

Maillet translates this excerpt as:

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

MIRANDA      Pitié sur moi! Comme je ne me souviens
de mes pleurs d’alors, je pleure aujourd’hui
Sur un récit qui me fait fondre en larmes (Shakespeare 1997: 20, emphasis added)

There are two observations to make about this excerpt. The first is that the vocabulary in
*The Tempest* echoes the wording in John Winslow’s *Journal*. For instance, Winslow’s journal
entry for 28 September 1755 reads: ‘began to Embark the Inhabitants who went of Very
Solentarily and unwillingly, the women in Great Distress Carrying off Their Children In their
arms’ (1880b: 166). In The Tempest, a few lines down from the excerpt quoted above, Shakespeare writes ‘In few, they hurried us aboard a bark, / Bore us some leagues to sea, where they prepared / A rotten carcass of a butt, not rigged, / Nor tackle, sail, nor mast; the very rats / Instinctively have quit it’ (2002a: 146–148). This description recalls the harrowing conditions aboard deportation ships, riddled with disease and prone to shipwreck (Thériault 1993: 39).

The second observation relates specifically to Maillet’s translation and its use of the verb ‘embarquer’. The verb alludes to one of the most recognised euphemisms of the Deportation, ‘L’embarquement’ (Arsenault 2018: 201–9; Griffiths 1992: 120). It also emphasises the mode of transportation, the ship, resonating with the multiple references to Acadians being ‘embarked’ and ‘shipt off’ in the letters recorded in Winslow’s Journal (1880b: 114–22). The Oxford English Dictionary specifies that ‘hurried’ connotes transportation, but none of the definitions invokes the sea (‘Hurried’ 2023). An overt reference to embarkment comes only later in the English text: ‘they hurried us aboard a bark, / Bore us some leagues to sea’ (Shakespeare 2002a: 144–145). Other French translations of The Tempest produced for Montréal stages around the same time as Maillet’s likewise forego mentions of the mode of transportation in the line in which Maillet alludes to the ‘embarquement’. Michel Garneau, for instance, translates the line as ‘nous entraînaient en dehors de ma ville’ (Shakespeare 1973: 9). Alice Ronfard and Marie Cardinal present a prose version that reads ‘Antonio ouvre les portes de la ville, nous chassant dans les ténèbres, moi le Duc de Milan, et toi ma fille en larmes’ (Shakespeare 1988: 7). Finally, the year just after Maillet’s translation, Normand Chaurette translates the line as ‘On m’entraîna hors les murs’ (Chaurette 1998: 10). Maillet thus seems to take advantage of the uncanny parallel between historical fact and Shakespearean story to anchor La tempête in imagery of the Deportation. This idea is further reinforced in Miranda’s tearful response, which points to the recurrent imagery of tears and crying in visual and written depictions of the Grand Dérangement (Chovrelat 2005: 24–25; Viau 2008: 76).

---

155 Garneau’s translation was also staged in 1982, 1991, and 1993, but the 1973 version seems to be the definitive text (David 1998).

156 The translations by Ronfard, Chaurette, Maillet, and Garneau account for all of the productions of La tempête listed by Gilbert David as produced in the second half of the twentieth century in Montréal (David 1998).
Maillet’s *La tempête* and other translations of Shakespeare for the Montréal stage (see Table 1 in the Introduction) are part of a long tradition of Shakespearean translation in Canada\(^{157}\) and in Québec.\(^{158}\) Diana Brydon and Irena Makaryk explicitly connect this tradition to Canada’s colonial consciousness, for ‘[a]s a settler/invader colony founded on displacements, Canada has been well positioned to deal with revisions and rewritings of canonical works’ (2002: 35). Displacement is exacerbated in Acadie because of the Grand Dérangement, arguably adding a further level of significance to Shakespearean translation. Michael Cronin argues that the ‘translatability’ of Britain — that is, its recreation around the world through imperial conquest and colonisation — is ‘both articulated and foreshadowed’ in the works of Shakespeare (2006: 94–97). Maillet’s *La tempête* can thus be seen as bringing to bear another example of Shakespeare foreshadowing and articulating the ‘way in which the “unique” island of Britain […] translate[s] itself around the globe’ (Cronin 2006: 94). Indeed, from this perspective the Deportation in *La tempête* can be read as a version, a recreation as it were, of the translation at a territorial level that Edmund Spenser suggests in the Irish context (Cronin 1996: 48–49), as discussed in Chapter 1 (p. 68). Parallel to this idea is the notion of colonies as translations (inferior versions) of ‘the great Original of Europe’ (Bassnett and Trivedi 1999: 4; see also Bertacco and Vallorani 2021: 48). There is no consensus among historians in the Acadian context as to whether ‘Atlantic migrants primarily recreated old worlds in the colonies […] or created new ones’ (Choquette qtd. in Kennedy 2014: 210). Maillet’s *La tempête* thus plays into these dynamics, complexifying imperial processes of translation. Moreover, it also exemplifies the acts of dispossession that colonisation and imperialism enact through what Eric Cheyfitz identifies as their fundamentally translational nature (1991). Cheyfitz refers specifically to Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* to argue that colonisation

\[
\text{displaced or attempted to displace […] Native Americans into the realm of the proper […]}, \text{ not so these Americans could possess the proper but so that having been translated into it they could be dispossessed of it […] and relegated to the territory of the figurative. (1991: 59)}
\]


The Deportation relegated Acadians to the territory of the figurative, leaving them in possession only of their ‘memory in words’ (Maillet 1987: 14), of ‘embarqués’ figuratively encapsulating the Acadian experience in Shakespearean text. More specifically, if The Tempest foreshadows or exemplifies British imperialist acts of translation, Maillet’s La tempête ensures that these are read through an Acadian narrative lens.

Discussing Michel Garneau’s translation of The Tempest (Shakespeare 1973), Jennifer Drouin notes that it ‘emphasizes Prospero’s deportation from Milan, a form of colonial violence that could evoke empathy in Québécois since many are descendants of deported Acadians’ (2014: 102). What then, of Acadian readers or of the significance of this ‘embarquement’ in translation? One clue to the significance comes in François Dumont’s study of the literary and historical underpinnings of Michel Roy’s L’Acadie perdue (2011).159 Dumont discusses the book’s epigraph, a collage of excerpts from Arthur Rimbaud, and suggests that ‘en raison du montage réalisé, [l’inscription] semble commenter directement le Grand Dérangement’ (2011: 125). Dumont goes on to note the strategic functions of the collaged epigraph in terms of broadening Roy’s voice and reach (2011: 124–26). Similarly, Maillet’s inclusion of ‘embarqués’ broadens La tempête’s reach. However, because it does so intralingually, that is with a French verb that holds meaning for a particular Francophone community, the broadening happens exclusively for the attuned eye reading the text or ear listening to the on-stage performance. Drouin’s comment focusses on the trauma of exile generally, not on the semantic richness of ‘embarquer’. If Maillet’s La tempête evokes empathy in the Québécois audience member, it engages a spectator or reader familiar with Acadian history more closely. In other words, it engages them in an active process of translation. It is a similar effect to the one Sherry Simon pinpoints in an art exhibit by Montréal-based Carl Trahan (2023: xii). The project presents a series of word equivalences dovetailing from one another in the form of an ‘arborescence’ (2023: xii). Coincidentally, Trahan’s piece is based on the word ‘dérangement’, which Simon connects to Trahan’s Acadian origins:

The historical exile is here dramatized as an exile from meaning though it also shows how words create new connections through their wanderings. Trahan,

159 A cornerstone of Acadian historiography, L’Acadie perdue (Roy 1978) challenges Acadian history and its discourses of traditionalism and victimisation (see Paré 2009).
who is of Acadian origin, builds on this episode of dispossession to show how 
meaning is caught up in an endless play of recommencement, each word 
rippling out into always enlarging nodes of interlocked meanings. (Simon 
2023: xii)

Barbara Godard, too, has observed the translational processes required to grasp Maillet’s 
work: ‘[s]topping to ponder over the lexical references of these unfamiliar [Acadian] words, 
the reader slows [their] pace. Words come more rapidly than sense and the reader is thus 
obliged to involve himself actively in the creative process’ (1987: 66). The use of 
‘embarqués’ in Maillet’s La tempête reverses the process; instead of unfamiliarity and 
interruptions, the attuned reader or spectator translates familiar words into familiar story 
seamlessly. The essence of the Shakespearean play is left unaltered while some of the 
translation’s cultural meaning is reserved for those with the baggage needed to decipher 
the clues. This creates a sense of complicity without altogether excluding non-Acadians from 
the experience.

Maillet’s translations of Shakespeare in the 1990s helped usher in a 
countermovement that sought not to reappropriate (as Brisset (1990) had argued) but to 
recognise and respect alterity (Beddows 1998: 36; Merkle 2000: 289). For Maillet, 
recognition of Shakespearean genius is due to growing up in bilingual New Brunswick:

Je n’ai pas tous les avantages d’avoir été dans un pays bilingue, dans une 
province bilingue, mais j’en ai des petits […]. J’ai étudié Shakespeare presque 
comme j’ai bu le lait de ma mère et […] je n’ai pas passé par une traduction. 
J’ai lu l’anglais dans l’original, alors déjà, je comprends le sens des mots, […] la 
langue des mots, le rythme shakespearien. (qtd. in Gagnon 2003: 8, 2005: 9)

Chantal Gagnon takes this to mean that Maillet’s Acadian identity fosters respect for alterity 
(2003: 8). Moreover, Denise Merkle identifies a sort of hold (‘emprise’) that Shakespeare 
exerts on Maillet (2000: 289), which Maillet acknowledges, too (qtd. in Merkle 2000: 289; 
Maillet 2022a). Still, for all the confinement or stasis that a hold could potentially have on a 
translation strategy, Maillet’s paradoxically opens the translation rather than constrain it.
The liveliness of the parlure acadienne

Continuing with this idea of openness as it manifests in Maillet’s translation strategy, the chapter now turns to disruptions redolent of grands dérangements in the plural, lowercase sense defined in the introduction to this chapter. Maillet’s William S is a collage of excerpts from various Shakespearean plays. In the play, the Fou calls out Juliette for using the word ‘gésir’, arguing that ‘jamais Shakespeare, notre auteur, n’eût mis un verbe aussi désuet dans la bouche d’une de ses créatures’ (1991: 28). Juliette replies as follows: ‘S’il en avait eu besoin, il l’eût fait. Ce n’est pas à cet auteur-là qu’on eût enseigné les scrupules de la langue’ (Maillet 1991: 28). The exchange pokes fun at Acadian French, the parlure acadienne, still filled with vocabulary now deemed archaic, as well as expressions, turns of phrase, and literary processes that have changed remarkably little since Rabelais’ time (Maillet 1971). Imagining that Pantagruel’s crew travelled to Acadie with linguistic heritage stashed in ships’ holds, Maillet writes that ‘[n]i Rabelais ni l’Acadie ne pouvaient soupçonner l’importance du legs enfoui dans les cales de la flotte pantagruélique’ (1971: 1). According to Maillet, the vocabulary and processes that make up the parlure acadienne have survived in Acadie because of displacements. On the one hand, ‘[t]he reason why Acadia has kept the old French is that we were the first in America and the last in Europe to get hold of that language and we couldn’t afford to lose it (Maillet 1987: 14). On the other, language, Maillet’s ‘memory in words’, was the only essential to bring during the Deportation (1987: 14).

languages in translation and fiction, comparing the speech in *Pygmalion* to La Sagouine’s\(^{160}\) (2017: 146).

A closer look at this flavour or colour reveals that processes and vocabulary redolent of the *parlure acadienne* appear throughout Maillet’s translations in senses that often diverge from the standards defined in *Le Robert* or *Usito*,\(^{161}\) or that are marked variously as ‘familier’, ‘ancien’, ‘vieux’, ‘dialectal’, ‘populaire’, etc. in these dictionaries (see Table 2). These processes and vocabulary render language ranging from sixteenth-century English to Eliza Doolittle’s cockney accent. Table 2 identifies such vocabulary, marked in bold font in the left-hand column within the context of the translation, along with corresponding entries in Acadian dictionaries and works of reference: Maillet’s *Rabelais et les traditions populaires en Acadie* (1971), a comparative analysis of Rabelaisian and Acadian popular language; *Le Glossaire Acadien* (Poirier 1995); the *Glossaire du vieux parler acadien* (Boudreau 2009); and the *Dictionnaire du français acadien* (Cormier 2018). For comparative purposes, Table 2 also details entries (or notes the lack thereof) in the French *Le Robert* (Le Robert [n.d.]) and *Usito* (Université de Sherbrooke 2024).

---

\(^{160}\) However, a closer look at the language reveals that it is not as close as it may seem and that Brisset’s conclusions sometimes counter Maillet’s stated motivations.

\(^{161}\) *Usito* is a French-language dictionary aimed at providing a ‘description du français en usage au Québec et plus particulièrement de son registre standard, — à la description du contexte québécois et de l’environnement nord-américain’ and highlighting ‘la culture francophone québécoise et nord-américaine’ (Université de Sherbrooke [n.d.]).
The definitions provided are those listed as ‘sens principal’, with one exception of a ‘sens secondaire’, specified as such in the table. Cormier qualifies definitions with or mentions ‘vieux’, ‘vieilli’, or ‘disparu’ when necessary (2018: 50–51); none of these qualifiers is included in the definitions of the words highlighted here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary in Maillet’s translations</th>
<th>Rabelais et les traditions populaires en Acadie</th>
<th>Le Glossaire Acadien</th>
<th>Glossaire du vieux parler acadien</th>
<th>Dictionnaire du français acadien(^2)</th>
<th>Le Robert</th>
<th>Usito</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\(^2\) The definitions provided are those listed as ‘sens principal’, with one exception of a ‘sens secondaire’, specified as such in the table. Cormier qualifies definitions with or mentions ‘vieux’, ‘vieilli’, or ‘disparu’ when necessary (2018: 50–51); none of these qualifiers is included in the definitions of the words highlighted here.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary in Maillet’s translations</th>
<th>Rabelais et les traditions populaires en Acadie</th>
<th>Le Glossaire Acadien</th>
<th>Glossaire du vieux parler acadien</th>
<th>Dictionnaire du français acadien</th>
<th>Le Robert</th>
<th>Usito</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary in Maillet’s translations</td>
<td>Rabelais et les traditions populaires en Acadie</td>
<td>Le Glossaire Acadien</td>
<td>Glossaire du vieux parler acadien</td>
<td>Dictionnaire du français acadien</td>
<td>Le Robert</td>
<td>Usito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ‘... les grandeurs sont garrochées’. (Shakespeare 1993: 134)  
‘... deux ramées de viaulettes garrochées da-ans gadoue’ (Shaw n.d.: 3) | Not included | Garrocher: ‘Se garocher, c’est se jeter mutuellement des pierres. Par extension, on garoche n’importe quoi à la tête de quelqu’un’ (231) | Garrocher: ‘Lancer des petites pierres’ (137) | ‘régional (Ouest; Canada, Louisiane), familier Lancer. [..] 2. Se précipiter’ | Garrocher: ‘Lancer’; ‘S’élancer, se précipiter’ |
| ‘... qui c’est qui t’a gréé...’ (Maillet 1978: 48) | Not included | Grément: ‘Habillement, parure’ (243) | Greyer: ‘Gréer; préparer. [...] Se préparer, s’habiller pour aller quelque part’ (145) | ‘Garnir (un navire, un mât) de gréement’ | Greyer: ‘Garnir de son gréement, surtout un voilier, un mât’; ‘Équiper; habiller’ |
| ‘... ne t’accroches point à mes hardes!’ (Shakespeare 1997: 35)  
<p>| ‘Putins, coquins et maquereaux, tous oisifs’. (Shakespeare 1997: 44) | maquereau (under the category of) | No definition corresponding to Maillet’s use | Not included | ‘familier et vulgaire Personne qui vit de la pêche’ | Maquereau: ‘Poisson des mers tempérées’; ‘(fam) Homme qui vit de la pêche’ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary in Maillet’s translations</th>
<th><em>Rabelais et les traditions populaires en Acadie</em></th>
<th><em>Le Glossaire Acadien</em></th>
<th><em>Glossaire du vieux parler acadien</em></th>
<th><em>Dictionnaire du français acadien</em></th>
<th><em>Le Robert</em></th>
<th><em>Usito</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>erotica verba imagery</em> (171)</td>
<td>Picoté: ‘Grêlé, marqué de petite variole [...] Se dit aussi des choses, mais avec le sens de moucheté’ (351)</td>
<td>Not included</td>
<td>Not included</td>
<td>‘1. Piquer légèrement et à petits coups répétés. 2. Irriter comme par de légères piqûres répétées’</td>
<td>Picoté: ‘Marqué de petits points, de petites taches’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘[Le sol est] / Picoté de vert’. (Shakespeare 1997: 39)</td>
<td>The verb ‘picoter’ is listed but under its usual definition of ‘peck’ or ‘prick’ (1971: 150). However, it is included in Maillet’s category of colourful imagery (155)</td>
<td>‘Chercher’ (202)</td>
<td>Qu’ri, Quéri: ‘Chercher’ (441)</td>
<td>‘vieux Chercher’</td>
<td>Quérir: ‘Chercher pour amener, apporter’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary in Maillet’s translations</td>
<td>Rabelais et les traditions populaires en Acadie</td>
<td>Le Glossaire Acadien</td>
<td>Glossaire du vieux parler acadien</td>
<td>Dictionnaire du français acadien</td>
<td>Le Robert</td>
<td>Usito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Vocabulary in Maillet’s translations with corresponding entries in Acadian, French, and Québécois dictionaries

In suggesting that Shakespeare would have used so-called archaic language had he needed to, Juliette implies that Maillet uses it out of necessity. Solange Levesque notes an affinity between Maillet and Shakespeare in this context:

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 dialogues. (1993: 27)

Indeed, Maillet notes in an interview that the ‘façon acadienne de le dire’ simply ‘fit[s]’ better than standard French (2022a). One particularly fruitful example of Acadian French fitting perfectly with Shakespearean English arises in Maillet’s La Nuit des Rois (Shakespeare 1993):
### Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night* vs. Maillet’s translation *La Nuit des Rois*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sir Andrew to Maria</th>
<th>Bless you, fair shrew.</th>
<th>Sir Toby</th>
<th>Accost, Sir Andrew, accost!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>And you too, sir.</td>
<td>Sir Toby</td>
<td>What’s that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Andrew</td>
<td>Good Mistress Accost, I desire better acquaintance.</td>
<td>My niece’s chambermaid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>My name is Mary, sir.</td>
<td>Sir Andrew</td>
<td>Good Mistress Mary Accost— (Shakespeare 2002b: I.III.44–54, emphasis added)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this excerpt, Maillet benefits from the coincidence of ‘accost’ having similar meanings in English and French but manages to keep the linguistic confusion of the source text through the Acadian use of the verb ‘accoster’. In its figurative sense of ‘venir au fait, aboutir, conclure’ (Poirier 1995: 16), the Acadian version captures the meaning of Shakespeare’s ‘accost’ (i.e. to wrap up), which eludes the contemporary meaning of coming alongside, or broaching (‘Accost’ 2023). Similar uses of the *parlure acadienne* to render linguistic playfulness occurs in *Panurge*. The play comes full circle by including two of the three examples of ‘équivoques’ listed in Maillet’s *Rabelais et les traditions populaires en Acadie* as borrowed verbatim from Rabelais (1971: 179–80):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prieur</th>
<th>Que fait cet ivrogne ici? Troubler ainsi le service divin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frère Jean</td>
<td>Mais le service du vin, vous les laissez troubler sans vous en soucier? (Antonine Maillet 1983: 29, emphasis added)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frère Jean</th>
<th>J’ai la parole de Dieu en bouche: Sitio!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panurge</td>
<td>Vous l’entendez, l’ivrogne? Il en veut encore six siaux.163 (Antonine Maillet 1983: 37, emphasis added)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

163 ‘Siaux’ is the phonetic spelling of ‘seaux’ [buckets].

---

161
The inclusion of such language in Maillet’s translations, which will be discussed further in Chapter 5, exemplifies Alain Masson’s notion of *grouillement linguistique*, to which Nicole Nolette turns in the section dedicated to Acadie in *Jouer la traduction* (2015: 179–244). Masson defines *grouillement linguistique* as the ‘situation linguistique en Acadie [qui] peut être décrite comme la concurrence d’un nombre particulièrement élevé de niveaux de langue’ (1994: 59). It thereby encapsulates the linguistic particularities of the heterolingual plays that Nolette examines, including Maillet’s *Le Bourgeois gentleman* and its ‘anglicisms’ (2015: 184–85). From this perspective, it is possible to interpret Maillet’s sprinkling of the *parlure acadienne* as the convergence of varieties of language, creating translations that ‘grouillent’. There is an inherent liveliness in the notion of *grouillement linguistique*, so that Maillet’s translations seem to be teeming with movement, seem linguistically astir. The *parlure acadienne* is, after all, a linguistic system that, as mentioned previously, not only survived a few shipwrecks, but also extensive movement through migrations. The *parlure acadienne* travelled stashed in the holds of the ships transporting Pantagruel and his crew (Maillet 1971: 1), symbolising the transatlantic journey of Acadian migrants, before journeying along deportation routes and through the ensuing migrations.

**The translation of geopoetics in *Océan***

The final manifestation of a grand dérangement that this chapter addresses relates to the translation of geopoetics in Georgette LeBlanc’s *Océan* (Goyette 2020). The book’s promotional material explains that, ‘[[living in the port city of Halifax, Goyette’s days are bounded by the substantial fact of the North Atlantic, both by its physical presence and by its metaphoric connotations’ (Gaspereau Press [n.d.]). The text of *Ocean* is therefore deeply embedded in an Atlantic imaginary as experienced in the city of Halifax. In the translation, titled *Océan*, LeBlanc keeps the collection’s allusions to Halifax’s iconic bridges, hills, smokestacks, and fog, staying true to an express motivation not to ‘rewrite’, ‘transform’, or ‘comment’ on Goyette’s source text (LeBlanc 2020). LeBlanc’s own upbringing facilitates this strategy, having grown up in Baie Sainte-Marie, on the shores of the Atlantic some 265 kilometres west of Halifax towards the Bay of Fundy164 (see Figure 1). The Baie Sainte-Marie

---

164 Though often depicted as its own body of water, the Bay of Fundy flows into the Atlantic (Winchester 2010: 145).
region has a particular Acadian-French accent and cultural reference system known as Acadjonne,\textsuperscript{165} present in the four works LeBlanc published prior to \textit{Océan}.\textsuperscript{166} It surfaces in \textit{Océan} as well. As LeBlanc explains, ‘La langue de la traduction devait m’habiter. Ayant grandi en Nouvelle-Écosse, tout près du littoral atlantique […], il est normal qu’\textit{Océan} parle dans le français du territoire, s’exprime dans le français acadien toujours parlé et que j’écris’ (2020). Characteristics of Acadjonne are recognisable throughout the translation, as in this sentence from the epigraph: ‘J’veux point être le plus vieux \textit{performer} dans le zoo… J’veux point regarder comme un p’tit vieux en train de danser là devant tout le monde’ (Goyette 2020). Here, the English word ‘performer’ provides an example of code switching, ‘point’ of archaic vocabulary, and ‘j’veux’ and ‘p’tit’ of phonetic spelling, all characteristics of Acadjonne (LeBlanc 2021: 80–96). This is the language that led the peer assessment committee that awarded \textit{Océan} the 2020 Governor General’s Literary Award for Translation to state: ‘The poems in this collection resonate with the waves that crash against the Acadian coast at Baie Sainte-Marie. […] Upon reading this luminous epic […]}, each and every person will hear the foghorn in the distance and will taste the brine on the breeze’ (Canada Council for the Arts 2020). LeBlanc later nuanced the choice of translation language, expanding to a representation of multiple Acadian accents: ‘je ne voulais pas écrire en Acadjonne […] j’ai comme négocié, avec moi-même […] c’était [une question] d’essayer de coller, de créer […] une langue acadienne, “passeport”, normative’ (\textit{La traduction littéraire en Acadie} 2021: 42:54–46:04). From this perspective, the translation’s persistent use of the collective ‘je’\textsuperscript{167} is reminiscent of both Acadjonne (LeBlanc 2021: 89–91) and of Maillet’s \textit{parlure acadienne} (Maillet 1971: 136–37). Nevertheless, what is clear from LeBlanc’s approach is that it anchors the translation language in an Acadian imaginary, both locally in Baie Sainte-Marie and regionally across Acadie.


\textsuperscript{166} This includes the aforementioned \textit{Prudent} (LeBlanc 2013). For more on Georgette LeBlanc’s writings, see Langevin (2016), Papillon (2016), and Viau (2022: 181–216).

\textsuperscript{167} As in this example from the ‘Prologue’: ‘J’avions échangé un accordéon d’heures contre du bois’ (Goyette 2020).
In its Acadian French accents, the translation develops a new relationship with the collection’s geographical setting, as evidenced, for example, in poem ‘Thirty-Nine’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goyette’s Ocean</th>
<th>LeBlanc’s translation Océan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We scavenged the silence looking / for the berries of our original names (Goyette 2013: Thirty-Nine, emphasis added)</td>
<td>J’reprenions le silence en regardant / pour les baies de nos premiers noms (Goyette 2020: Trente-neuf, emphasis added)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The word ‘baie’ in French denotes both berry and body of water. Under LeBlanc’s pen, ‘baie’ hints at the region of Acadie where the geographical imagination wanders, not only Baie Sainte-Marie but also the nearby Baie Française (present-day Bay of Fundy), the location of the first Acadian settlement (Arsenault 2018: 25–28; Dunn 2004). The meaning of ‘berries’ of the source text arrives belatedly, if at all, in the translation.

By emphasising accents grounded in the place of Acadie, the language of Océan effectively engenders a geographical translation from the British-established, predominantly Anglophone Halifax to Acadie. This translation is facilitated by the fact that the two regions share a geographical proximity, a maritime space bounded by the Atlantic (see Figure 1).

Thus, the fog that Goyette captures in the third poem of Ocean — ‘Halifax, once the capital of the medieval fog trade, / still has its ancient fog-making bellows’ — could be shrouding the Acadian coastlines of Océan, a region also known for its fog ‘of [the] “pea soup” variety’ (Thurston 2011: 7). Moreover, this translation is symptomatic of the translatability of geographies as Federico Italiano has outlined it:

> [g]eopoetic features are coded representations of the earth that cannot be hived off from the mediality and aesthetic conventions (and ruptures) that make their emergence possible [...]. It is on the basis of this premise that we should understand geopoetics as the result of a negotiation between a certain geographical imagination and territorial, geographical discourse of a certain epoch. [...] Thus, considered in its textuality, in its poietical/poetical tension, geography is not only the translandum but is translation per se [sic], the process of translation in which the imagined (and imaginative) earth — the prefix ‘geo’ [...], with all its complexities and possible affixes — becomes
textual, the process by which we fix our ‘imaginative’ constructions on the world we live in. (2016: 9)

Italiano’s reference to ruptures is particularly relevant in the context of Acadie and this chapter’s discussion, predicated on migration and dislocation. Baie Sainte-Marie today is home to a vibrant Acadian community that remains strongly connected to its past. According to Mélanie LeBlanc, it positions itself as authentically Acadian because of its geographical proximity to Port-Royal, the first Acadian settlement, and because it was founded by families dispersed during the Grand Dérangement (2021: 61; see also Leblanc 1967: 533). LeBlanc goes on to specify that families can therefore ‘se présenter aux touristes comme les descendants du premier peuple fondateur, offrant aux touristes une touche d’authenticité toute particulière, légitimant du même coup l’usage de la langue régionale pour ajouter à l’impression d’authenticité’ (2021: 61).

In the context of Océan, the geographical transposition enacted in translation has particularly vast implications when considered in the historical context of Nova Scotia. Port-Royal fell to the British in 1710 and, along with the rest of peninsular Nova Scotia, officially became British territory under the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713 (see Introduction, pp. 11–12). Port-Royal was promptly renamed Annapolis Royal, but a strong Acadian contingent remained and by the 1730s coexisted relatively peacefully with English-speaking settlers (Plank 2001: 89, 100–105; see also Dunn 2004: 203). Halifax, meanwhile, supplanted Annapolis Royal as capital of Nova Scotia when it was founded in 1749 (Conrad 2020: 121–25; Faragher 2005: 249–56). As Chapter 1 illustrated (p. 60), the foundation of Halifax marked a shift in British officials’ policies towards the Acadians, a position reflected in the translation practices implemented in the new capital (Delisle 1987: 55). Halifax played a direct role in the orchestration of deportations, not only because it became the Nova Scotian seat of decision-making, but also because it is where the Acadians refused, one final

---

168 The regional municipality of Clare, in which Baie Sainte-Marie is located, is co-hosting the 2024 Congrès mondial acadien. The promotional website boasts that ‘l’Acadie du Sud-Ouest de la Nouvelle-Écosse ouvre la porte sur plus de 400 ans d’histoire. C’est ici que tout a commencé!’ (Congrès mondial acadien [n.d.-a]).

169 Plank points out elsewhere (2005: 87) that Halifax was also a setting for daily interaction between Acadians and English-speakers (see also Conrad 2020: 144–48). The difference, though, lies in the deep ties that were formed over a century and a half of coexistence in Port-Royal / Annapolis Royal. These were made manifest, as Ronald Rudin notes, during the 400th anniversary celebrations of the foundation of Port-Royal and the Acadian settlement in 2004, which the Anglophone community elected to celebrate even though Annapolis Royal only came into being as a town in 1713 (2009: 137).
time in the summer of 1755, to sign an oath of unconditional allegiance to the British crown, an act that was used to justify the decision to deport (Arsenault 2018: 181–82; Faragher 2005: 318–21). Halifax, then, was the centre from which deportation orders were issued, as the correspondence recorded in Winslow’s Journal illustrates (1880a).

Against this backdrop, passages of LeBlanc’s Océan gain in significance, as with Poem ‘Dix-huit’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goyette’s Ocean</th>
<th>LeBlanc’s translation Océan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some believed that the ocean wasn’t always salty but that our ancestors had been very sad. They’d been promised a great many things only to have the fruit drop and their breasts sag. They cried a lot. [...]</td>
<td>Y en a qui croyiont que l’océan avait point toujours été salé; que c’était nos ancêtres qu’étiont tristes. Nos ancêtres auriont été promis plusieurs affaires avant de voir le fruit tomber pis leurs seins pendre. Ils brailliont beaucoup. [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Goyette 2013: Eighteen)</td>
<td>(Goyette 2020: Dix-huit)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LeBlanc’s introduction of a semi-colon after ‘salé’ in this excerpt forces the reader to pause and to consider both the ocean’s salinity and the sadness of ancestors. This is further reinforced by the frequent allusions to salt in Antonine Maillet’s understanding of how Acadian traditions and language were preserved. Moreover, LeBlanc’s use of the verb ‘brailler’ instead of the standard ‘pleurer’ is also noteworthy. Firstly, it anchors the translation in an Acadian cultural space, since ‘brailler’ is almost always used instead of the standard ‘pleurer’ in Acadian speech (Poirier 1995: 78). Secondly, ‘brailler’, and more specifically its conjugation in the above excerpt, evokes a sense of continuity. The imperfect tense ‘brailliard’, used here, is pronounced the same as ‘braillant’, the Acadian conjugation of the present tense. The dissonance between past and present therefore collapses in the translation, implicitly perpetuating the memory of the Grand Dérangement. The

---

170 Attempting to account for the 95,000-word difference between Rabelais’ sixteenth-century and Racine’s seventeenth-century French, Maillet suggests the words went ‘[t]o Acadia by the salty sea … cold country, where you can keep things from rotting’ (1987: 12). See also Desalvo (2003: 245).
geographical transposition that LeBlanc engenders through language, then, allows the translation to carve out the Acadian experience from within the confines of the source text, in ways similar to those outlined for Maillet’s La tempête. In LeBlanc’s language, the text implies that the promises to ancestors (‘Nos ancêtres auriont été promis / Plusieurs affaires’) remain unfulfilled, just as British officials broke their promises to the Acadians in the years leading up to the Grand Déранgement. The subtle shift towards continuity in Georgette LeBlanc’s translation ushers in a proverbial turning of the tides and intimates regeneration. Évangéline’s tears are generally associated with immutability (Chovrelat 2005: 24–25; Viau 2008: 76), and, apart from those shed during the embarkment, remain on foreign soil as Longfellow’s heroine never does make her way back to Acadie. The tears in LeBlanc’s translation, by contrast, are put back into flux in the Atlantic.

The last point to mention about the translation of geopoetics in Océan, one that introduces the analysis of the next chapter, is that it moves Acadian translation into a maritime space. While Ocean, as mentioned previously, emphasises an Atlantic environment, the inherently maritime nature of Acadian French (Massignon 1947: 51; Péronnet and others 1998; see, for example, Poirier 1995: 28) ties the translation to a way of life and psyche shaped by the sea. The editors of the Atlas linguistique du vocabulaire maritime acadien explain that their ‘choix du domaine maritime comme objet d’étude a été motivé par le fait que la mer représente un métier et un cadre de vie de toute première importance pour les Acadiens, à la fois historiquement et actuellement’ (Péronnet and others 1998: 1). Italiano outlines a maritime perspective in the translation of geographies, encompassed namely in the notion of translatio maris (2016: 95–96). A maritime version of the medieval concepts of translatio imperii et studii, translatio maris maintains imperial connotations (Italiano 2016: 95–104) and facilitates the translation of geopoetics between underwater and telluric environments (Italiano 2016: 104–10). The translation trajectories that Italiano charts generally go from maritime to telluric, meaning that Goyette’s Ocean, as a biography of the Atlantic Ocean, could be interpreted as an occurrence of translatio maris. Océan, meanwhile, engenders a (re)translation into a maritime space. This mirrors, though

171 British colonial officials had been accommodating Acadian neutrality reluctantly since the Treaty of Utrecht of 1713. The Acadians relied on the promises made by Governor Phillips in 1730 and lived in a relatively stable arrangement. Deportation orders announced in 1755 therefore took the Acadians by surprise (Arsenault 2018: 181–82; Conrad 2020: 130; Faragher 2005: 318–21).
through Acadian rather than Anglo-Nova Scotian agency, the translation at a territorial level that the Grand Dérangement effected via maritime routes, as Maillet’s ‘embarqués’ makes clear.

Conclusion

Under the umbrella of grands dérangements, this chapter homed in on the centrality of the Deportation and the mouvances that have shaped the Acadian imaginary. It opened with a discussion of the Grand Dérangement in translation by way of Serge Patrice Thibodeau’s *Journal de John Winslow à Grand-Pré*. Adopting a strategy of close adherence to the source text, Thibodeau seeks to let the Deportation speak for itself through text, but, importantly, rounds out the story by naming the perpetrators. The chapter then moved to a more inconspicuous expression of the Deportation, embedded in Maillet’s translation *La tempête*. Maillet’s use of the word ‘embarqués’ to render Prospero and Miranda’s exile creates a sense of complicity among readers or spectators able to grasp its connotations and contributes to studies on Shakespeare and colonialism. Moving away from explicit expressions of the Grand Dérangement, the chapter continued with a discussion of grouillements linguistiques occasioned by Maillet’s inclusion of the parlure acadienne in translations. Not only did the parlure survive two migrations to find its way into contemporary works, but it also establishes an inherent dynamism within Maillet’s translation language. Finally, the chapter closed with a discussion of Federico Italiano’s concept of translation of geopoetics as it manifests in *Océan*: by grounding the translation language regionally, LeBlanc effectively transposes the text’s geopoetics from Halifax in the source text to Acadie in the translation.

The geographical aspect of parts of the discussion in the previous chapter introduces the possibility of developing a cartography of translation in Acadie. While this is partly addressed in a diasporic context in the next chapter, the transposition of geopoetics such as the one at work in *Océan* points to a potential for outlining routes or trajectories of translation within Acadie des Maritimes. Some of these may very well follow the contours of the aboiteaux, hug Atlantic shores, or veer inland towards ‘Acadie des terres et des forêts’. 172 By charting such routes, further research could expand, for example, on the

172 While most Acadian communities are located along the coast, the region known as ‘Acadie des terres et
trajectories of circulation from peripheries to centres that Nolette draws (2015). Or, it could provide points of comparison or contrast to the routes that Laëtitia Saint-Loubert maps out for the circulation of translation in the Caribbean (2020). Establishing such routes may contribute to outlining a geography not exclusively defined in terms of fragility or fragmentation, thereby countering trends in Acadian literature: ‘[p]lus que d’autres littératures, la littérature acadienne exacerbe la géographie […] en raison de la sempiternelle fragilité du territoire acadien et de la fluctuation de ses frontières, de la perte de ce territoire et de la Déportation et l’éparpillement de ses habitants’ (Lord and others 2009: 20–21).

This brings up the notion of travel, which is particularly pertinent in the context of minoritised communities (Heller 2006: 3–4). Questions of travel have of course intersected with translation studies, ranging from Michael Cronin’s intertwining of travel, language, and translation (2000) to Piotr Blumczynski’s ‘relics on the move today’ (2023: 127–33). As Cheyfitz points out, the ‘voyager and the translator are two figures of transportation’ (1991: 101). Additionally, timely concerns about migration (Bertacco and Vallorani 2021; Gómez and Hansen Esplin 2024; Inghilleri 2017; Nergaard 2021) and a growing emphasis on translation as network (Chittiphalangsri and Rafael 2023; Feinauer and others 2023; Saint-Loubert 2020) open up avenues for comparing and expanding on the dynamics of Acadian translation outlined here. From this perspective, a literary translation like the forthcoming Nous, Jane (Wall 2024) could lend itself particularly well to such an exercise, as it tells the story of a journey from Montréal to rural Newfoundland and thus offers a counterpart to the works grounded in Acadie des Maritimes presented heretofore. In the Acadian context, it would also be worthwhile to explore further the connection between traveller and deportee, particularly considering Tim Ingold’s differentiation between wayfaring and transport (2007).

Finally, as the works by Ferdinand and DeLoughrey quoted above suggest, the notion of grands dérangements also brings up ecological questions. This connection is aptly captured in Amitav Ghosh’s The Great Derangement: Climate Change and the Unthinkable, the French translation of which is titled Le Grand Dérangement (2021). The meanings of forêts’ groups parts of northwestern New Brunswick, eastern Québec, and Maine (Congrès mondial acadien [n.d.-b]); see Figure 1.
‘dérangement’ for Ghosh and in the Acadian context are dissimilar. For Ghosh, ‘derangement’ refers to a collective failure to imagine and render the scope of the climate crisis in literature and politics. Interestingly, though, Ghosh poses the question undergirding the book in maritime terms: ‘Les courants du réchauffement climatique sont-ils trop sauvages pour que les barques coutumières de la narration ne naviguent dessus?’ (2021: 18). Where the ‘dérangements’ of Acadie and as Ghosh understands it do intersect, however, is in their joint connecting of social and natural environments. Ghosh questions the lack of portentous gravity in literature, while Acadian translation seeks to reverse extractivist activity through biosemiotic translation processes involving the more-than-human. This will be discussed further in the Conclusion, but for now the thesis turns to a conception of translation as fluid, buoyed by Acadie’s tides.
5 The *mascaret*, tidal flows, and translation within the Acadian diaspora

The power to translate successfully is not to be found in dictionaries but rather in routes and connections.
– Sherry Simon, *Translation Sites*

The dynamics of translation discussed in the previous chapter embrace a certain fluidity. Indeed, this fluidity has been present since Chapter 2, perceptible not only in the notion of grands dérangements, but also in aboiteaux reliant on tidal flows and défrichetage de parenté based on travel within lineages. Still, the maritime quality of Acadie, whose communities are — and have historically been — predominantly located in coastal areas (Basque 1996: 46–47; Griffiths 2005: 285; Péronnet and others 1998), is undeniable. For,

[i]l est malaisé de comprendre quelque chose du tempérament acadien si l'on n’a pas d’abord compris la mer. Pour raconter l’Acadie il faudrait réécrire la genèse et dire : ‘à l’origine Dieu créa le sable et l’eau; puis il fit les poissons, les coquillages; et le sixième jour il prit du sel, souffla... et en fit le pêcheur et sa femme’. (Maillet qtd. in Vernex 2007: 171)

J. Sherman Bleakney traces this connection back to the aboiteaux, the establishment of which marked the start of ‘a partnership of sea and settler like no other’ (2004: 6). Writing about a ‘continental paradigm’ in Acadian literature, François Paré points to an inherent risk associated with territorial connections in the diaspora: ‘diagonal fracture across the continent [...] could only lead Acadian identity [...] to its historical birth in silence and oppression. [...] Only from its liminal position along the seashore could post-deportation Acadie gain symbolic ascendance over its disastrous history’ (2009: 144). Indeed, a turn towards the sea was perhaps inevitable given that the diaspora was created through the maritime routes of deportations by ship. The chapter takes these maritime routes, exploring first translation processes occurring figuratively and literally on the tidal river flowing through the city of Moncton, at the heart of modern Acadie des Maritimes, before heading out into the Acadian diaspora, represented here by Québec and Louisiana.
As noted in Chapter 2, the Grand Dérangement triggered forced and voluntary migrations that continued throughout the second half of the eighteenth century (Faragher 2005: 365–441; Hodson 2012; Leblanc 1967). These resulted in a diaspora scattered across a vast geographical area. In the 1970s, in conjunction with the emergence of a ‘poésie de l’errance’ mentioned in the previous chapter, increased recognition of the Acadian diaspora reconfigured the notion of territoriality in Acadian literature. A ‘conscience diasporale’ is characteristic of small literatures according to Paré (2003: 15), and the expansion of territorial delimitations specifically imbued Acadian literature with a continental quality:

a new Acadian territoriality would soon be crafted both within and outside its traditional boundaries by writers, singers, film makers, and other artists. A diagonal line would eventually link Moncton [New Brunswick] with its various diasporic polarities, including France, Québec, and Louisiana. (Paré 2009: 143)

The growing sense of a ‘continent-wide Acadia’ was spurred by what seemed to be ‘crucial connections’ between ‘splintered French Canadian [sic] communities’ and ‘the notion of amériscanité, as both real and symbolic sense of belonging to American popular and literate cultures’ (Paré 2009: 143). Paré aligns this amériscanité with the open road, reinforced by an affinity between certain Acadian poets, namely Gérald Leblanc, and the American literary scene (Lonergan 2010b: 204; Morency 2006: 65). The affinity is, moreover, representative ‘of the continental dimension of the Acadian deportation’ (Paré 2009: 145).

Although sometimes contentious (Bruce 2020; Caron 2011), the use of the term ‘diaspora’ is meant here to frame connections between Acadie des Maritimes, the ground of the analysis of the four previous chapters, and other Acadies, namely those of Louisiana (Acadie tropicale/du Sud) and Québec (Petites Cadies). Acadian identity is celebrated in both these regions, and it is the trajectories of translation rather than questions of legitimacy that the chapter seeks to address. This is the basis, moreover, of calls for renewed, inclusive understandings of Acadian identity that extend beyond the narrower conceptions of ‘Acadie généalogique’ and ‘Acadie territoriale’ (Bruce 2018, 2020; Caron 2007, 2011). Jean Morency (2007) adapts this perspective to literature, identifying an ‘inconscient diasporal’ in the works of four writers, two Acadians (France Daigle and Jean Babineau) and two non-Acadians (Nicolas Dickner and Daniel Poliquin). Morency writes that the works of Poliquin
and Dickner ‘vien[nent] ainsi bouleverser les conceptions figées de l’identité acadienne en
cassant l’un des deux pôles de la dialectique du territoire et de la diaspora. Sans se réclamer
d’une quelconque identité acadienne, Poliquin et Dickner investissent cette identité en
vertu d’une logique qui ne relève pas de l’appartenance, mais plutôt de l’inconscient’ (2007:
507). The diasporic consciousness explored in this chapter is embedded with a distinct sense
of Acadian identity but still fractures one of the two poles identified by Morency.

To bring together diaspora and fluidity, the chapter is framed by the phenomenon of
‘mascaret’, known in English as the tidal bore. A rare natural phenomenon that consists of a
standing wave travelling against the current at flood tide, a tidal bore occurs along the river
Epetkutogoyek, now known as the Petitcodiac River, in southeastern New Brunswick
(Sentinelles Petitcodiac Riverkeepers [n.d.-c]). It is propelled by the tides of the Bay of
Fundy, the highest in the world (Government of Canada 2023b). The Petitcodiac River runs
through the city of Moncton, New Brunswick, home to a significant — but, at 17% (Statistics
Canada 2023), still minoritised — Acadian community. Since the late 1960s, Monctonians’
relationship with the tidal bore has been magnified due to the construction of a causeway
whose underwater gates remained closed for decades, significantly reducing the bore and
causing extensive environmental and ecosystem destruction on the river (Rudin 2021: 148–
62, 182–89; Sentinelles Petitcodiac Riverkeepers [n.d.-a]). The Acadians have a cultural and
historical connection to the Petitcodiac and its mascaret (Bleakney 2004: 12; Doyon-
used the mascaret as a metaphor for Acadian perseverance through historical vicissitudes
(qtd. in Rudin 2009: 193). In addition to its close connection to the Acadian imaginary, the
Petitcodiac River’s tidal bore flows alternately in opposite directions, creating a state of flux
that aptly captures translation processes.

Because of the lack of literary translations beyond Acadie des Maritimes until now
(Maillet excepted), the chapter moves away from textual analyses of literary translations.
It focusses instead on geocritical, linguistic, and publishing strategies identified through
patterns of translation across the diaspora. To reflect the mascaret, the chapter begins in
Moncton, for which the analysis is based on Benoit Doyon-Gosselin’s geocritical

173 The forthcoming translation of We, Jane, a novel by Newfoundland and Labrador-born Aimee Wall (2024)
could soon broaden the perspective to Atlantic Canada.
Inventing Moncton and its mascaret

Moncton, New Brunswick is this chapter’s first stop, approached from a geocritical perspective. In Moncton Mentor, géocritique d’une ville (2022), Benoit Doyon-Gosselin posits that the city was effectively invented by its Francophone population:

Si cette ville possède un magnétisme certain, à la croisée des langues, c’est en grande partie parce que depuis un demi-siècle, les poètes et les chanteuses, les
peintres et les romancières, acadiens et francophones, se la sont appropriée. Par un renversement de l’histoire aussi incroyable qu’improbable, cette ville s’est inventée en français. Comme pour pallier à [sic] une réalité difficile à accepter, le Moncton imaginaire, imaginé, imaginable est francophone. (2022: 9)

It is worth noting the irony that tinges this excerpt given that Moncton’s name comes from Colonel Robert Monckton, who in 1755 orchestrated the deportation of Acadians at Fort Beauséjour, 60 kilometres or so south of Moncton today\(^{174}\) (see Figure 1; Faragher 2005: 296–384). In any case, the invention of the city in literature, song, and visual arts, as Doyon-Gosselin conceives of it, requires the translation of the cityscape into a coherent corpus of multidisciplinary artistic works. From this perspective, the invention of the city of Moncton parallels the invention of Grand-Pré outlined in Chapter 2 (pp. 86–87). Yet, the process of invention in Moncton also involves linguistic exchange and is thus further symptomatic of translational processes. Michael Cronin and Sherry Simon argue that ‘[a]ll cities are translational, but there are historical moments when language movements are key to political or cultural reversals’ (2014: 119). This is the case for Moncton, which became an officially bilingual city — Canada’s first — in 2002 (City of Moncton 2002) but has, over the course of its history, been the setting of language movements that have generated reversals. In the late 1960s, for example, Université de Moncton students delivered a severed pig’s head on the doorstep of then-Mayor Leonard Jones to denounce City Council’s anti-Francophone stance,\(^{175}\) an event that Merkle argues arose from the ‘discontents of translation’ (2014). Or, the ‘radical action’ that was the ‘tintamarre’ (see footnote no. 187 below) of the 1955 gathering in front of the (Acadian) Notre-Dame-d’Acadie cathedral to commemorate the 200\(^{th}\) anniversary of the Deportation. ‘There was something not very “Acadian” about such a blatant takeover of public space’, writes Rudin (2009: 211).

Doyon-Gosselin speaks of Moncton’s linguistic dynamism and exchange in terms akin to Nicole Nolette’s understanding of *grouillement linguistique* and the ludic elements identified in Acadian heterolingual theatre (2015: 179–244). This is perhaps not surprising

\(^{174}\) The ‘k’ in the city’s name disappeared due to a clerical error (Faragher 2005: 475). Still, the city’s connection to Colonel Monckton has recently triggered a campaign from some members of the Acadian community to change the name of the Université de Moncton (Cammarano and Gaudreau 2023).

\(^{175}\) For a thorough overview of the linguistic tensions in Moncton in the late 1960s and early 1970s, see the documentary *L’Acadie, l’Acadie?!?* (1971).
given that Moncton figures prominently in *Jouer la traduction* (Nolette 2015: 192–225).

According to Nolette, language relations (playful or not) never stray too far from questions of identity, but the concept of playful translation allows for two registers — preoccupation about assimilation and linguistic playfulness — to coexist regardless of whether they are functions of identity (2015: 246). Furthermore, Doyon-Gosselin describes Moncton’s invention as stemming from a gap, further reinforcing the translational aspect of the process:

> [q]ue la littérature acadienne se soit en grande partie imposée à Moncton, que les créations de tout acabit aient fait exister cette ville en français tiennent aussi de l’écart. Si l’on considère l’anglais comme code de la langue, le fait de créer en français, de créer un Moncton francophone constitue une infraction au code, un écart. (2022: 59)

The implication of infringing the code is that French-speaking Monctonians are required to translate themselves daily because they live in a primarily Anglophone environment. This, again, resonates with the translational city as Cronin and Simon conceive of it: ‘[w]hen translations take place among communities that share the same territory, the same geographical and cultural references, the social effects of translation are enhanced’ (2014: 122). In the context of *Moncton Mentor*, French calls attention to itself through artistic production and creative invention taking place in that language. Inventing the city in French can therefore be understood as another instance of challenging translation, not unlike deported Acadians’ refusal to be translated, linguistically and socially, into New England society in the aftermath of the Deportation (see Chapter 1, pp. 69–70). More recently, it mirrors the fight for official bilingualism in the province of New Brunswick, led primarily by the Acadian community as bilingualism was deemed ‘l’affaire des francophones’ (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism qtd. in Boudreau 2022: 151, 145–54). From this perspective, the invention of Moncton through Francophone artistic production is not only powerful resistance but also affirmation. As Cronin explains,

> [i]t is resistance to translation, not acceptance, that generates translation. If a group of individuals or a people agree to translate themselves into another
language, that is if they accept translation unreservedly, then the need for translation soon disappears. For the translated there is no more translation. On the other hand, if they refuse to translate themselves and insist on speaking and writing in their own language, then the need for translation becomes imperative if communication of any kind is to be established. (2000: 95, emphasis in original)

The Acadian community ensures continued translation by assuming control over and managing the narrative. Like the refusals to be translated discussed in the post-Deportation context (p. 70), Acadians in Moncton refuse to be translated into the majority group, embracing a ‘right to the Untranslatable’ (Apter 2013: 8) by insisting not only on speaking and writing in their own language but on creating the city in that language through artistic pursuits.

Without explicitly defining it as such, Moncton Mentor identifies an instance of Acadian control over the narrative of translation in the invention of the city in French. To this effect, Doyon-Gosselin brings up a song by Acadian singer-songwriter Fayo titled ‘Le mythe du masque à Ray’. The song was written for and performed as part of a show presented during the 1999 Sommet de la Francophonie held in Moncton (Doyon-Gosselin 2022: 126). A supernatural tale, the lyrics tell the story of a (fictional) man named Raymond (Ray) Saunier who hears a message from the Petitcodiac River compelling him to find a mask that will purportedly save the Acadians from deportation (see Appendix 2 for lyrics). The song and the show in which it featured highlight tensions between traditional and modern Acadie and symbolise the dangers of remaining blind (behind a mask) to present-day realities and the pressures that Acadians face in a linguistic minority setting (Doyon-Gosselin 2022: 125–27). The translational nature of the song lies in the pronunciation of the title, ‘Le mythe du masque à Ray’, as ‘masque à Ray’ phonetically mimics the word ‘mascaret’. The play on words blurs the distinction between ‘mascaret’ (natural phenomenon) and ‘masque à Ray’ (supernatural force interpreted through human agency). Doyon-Gosselin recognises the generative function in this translation process, which contributes to the invention of the city of Moncton through the Francophone imaginary:
[c’est ici que le rôle transformateur de la création prend tout son sens. Que ce soit une force naturelle comme le mascaret ou une force surnaturelle comme le masque à Ray, rien dans le passé n’est garant de l’avenir. Les artistes l’ont compris en inventant Moncton en français, en transformant le mascaret en masque à Ray. (2022: 127)

The appropriation of the mascaret in the creative act is especially pertinent considering the mascaret’s recent history, and the Acadian connection to it.

As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, the mascaret is an important feature in both Moncton’s geographical landscape and Monctonians’ collective imaginary (City of Moncton 2022; Rudin 2021: 192–98). When a causeway was built across the Petitcodiac River between Moncton and the town of Riverview in 1968, closed underwater gates halted the river’s current, and the height of the tidal bore reduced from two metres at its peak to a mere few centimetres (Sentinelles Petitcodiac Riverkeepers [n.d.–c]). A lengthy campaign to open the gates and restore the river, its ecosystems, and the tidal bore began soon after the causeway was installed, culminating in the gates opening in 2010 and in the construction of a replacement bridge (without underwater obstruction) in 2021 (Rudin 2021: 179–209). Historian Ronald Rudin, however, points out that the campaign was led primarily by Acadian activists (2021: 192–93, 198). Moreover, Rudin ties the motivations of this campaign to Acadians’ long-standing connection to tidal marshes: ‘[w]hile individual Acadians […] had been involved with the opposition to the causeway since the early 1980s, there was now an effort to connect Acadians more broadly with a landscape that had originally been transformed by their ancestors’ (2021: 192–93). Rudin refers here to the aboiteaux that had not only transformed the landscape but that also became representative of Acadian identity, as outlined in Chapter 2.176 Rudin continues:

the fight to save the river became part of a larger narrative of Acadian resistance to the challenges they had faced throughout their history, but particularly over the previous thirty years, starting with the battles for bilingualism and control over their own institutions in the 1960s and

---

176 It is perhaps just a happy coincidence that Ray’s patronym in the Fayo song (Saunier) is the same as the profession from which Acadians developed their aboiteaux-making skills (saunier).
Acadian resistance did yield results; since the gates were opened in 2010, the mascaret has been regaining in height, and the Petitcodiac River’s ecosystems are slowly recovering (Rudin 2021: 206–8; Sentinelles Petitcodiac Riverkeepers [n.d.-b]). Moreover, the silt deposits that had narrowed the Petitcodiac River from a width of one kilometre to 80 metres quickly began to wash away, widening the river by 25% within only two years of the gates opening (Rudin 2021: 207). In other words, because of Acadian efforts and resistance, the mascaret has effectively been reinvented, thereby echoing the premise of *Moncton Mentor* and the invention of the city through Francophone artistic production.

Thanks to its tidal nature, the mascaret itself can be read as a body that translates. Unlike land, a surface upon which things or beings can be carried, the mascaret, along with other bodies of water, carries. More precisely, the mascaret carries water at a rate of 100 billion tons with every tide towards the city from the Bay of Fundy at a speed of roughly 13 kilometres per hour (City of Moncton 2022; Rudin 2021: 172). It also carries a plethora of organisms and sediment and, perhaps less obviously, human beings. Indeed, the notion of carrying across manifests physically on the Petitcodiac River: within a few years of the gates opening, the bore had regained sufficient height to carry keen surfers from around the world for about 30 kilometres (see Figure 9) (Calnan 2014; CBC News 2013; Sentinelles Petitcodiac Riverkeepers [n.d.-a]). Doyon-Gosselin fictionalises the surfer story in *Moncton Mentor*, imagining the surfers as descendants of Acadians settled in Louisiana, Martinique, and Québec (2022: 9). In both the real and the fictionalised versions, the Petitcodiac becomes a space of convergence. *Moncton Mentor* emphasises, following Bertrand Westphal, the multiple perspectives inventing the city: ‘endogène’ (local), ‘exogène’ (the visitor’s exotising perspective), and ‘allogène’ (the unfamiliar but unexotic perspective) (2022: 13–15). Working in tandem to create a comprehensive geocritical view of the city,


178 Surfers also rode the tidal bore before the construction of the causeway (Rudin 2021: 152). As part of a larger argument about the translation semiosis inherent in the figure of the wave, Stecconi equates the emphasis in translation studies on ‘transfer’ and ‘carrying’ with the interest in the surfer rather than the wave (2010: 55–56).
these perspectives resonate with the various ways in which Acadie developed as a translational space. The discussion in Chapter 1 highlighted ways in which Acadie was conceived translationally, first through exogenous points of view (Longfellow and Lemay), then allogenous (Rameau de Saint-Père), and finally endogenous perspectives (from the leaders of the Acadian Renaissance to the translators discussed in the present study). The Évangéline / Evangeline narrative follows a similar route, embarking on a circuitous journey from Longfellow’s New England (exogenous) to Lemay’s Québec (allogenous) before flowing into Acadie (endogenous) where it expands through intersemiotic translation channels.

![Surfer riding a tidal bore](image)

**Figure 9:** A surfer rides the tidal bore on the Petitcodiac River in Moncton, New Brunswick. Photo by Serge Patrice Thibodeau. Reproduced with permission.

**Linguistic confluence in Antonine Maillet’s translations**

Twice daily, the mascaret reverses the direction of the Petitcodiac River, flowing inland against the ebb of the tide. Thus, for every tidal bore that flows into Moncton is a counter process of emptying back out into the Bay of Fundy. As much as the Petitcodiac River carries in with the mascaret, it also carries out at ebb tide. The Bay of Fundy, meanwhile, connects to the ‘common roadway’ (Bailyn 2005: 83) of the Atlantic Ocean. Indeed, it is through such a conception of the Atlantic as enabling rather than hindering
connection amongst peoples and nations bordering its shores (Steele 1986; Winchester 2010) that this chapter now flows towards parts of the Acadian diaspora.

Several Acadian families emigrated to Québec, fleeing deportation during the Grand Dérangement, in the waves of migration that followed throughout the second half of the eighteenth century, or in search of greater opportunities (Arsenault 2018: 239–307; Bujold 2007; Hébert 1994; Musée acadien du Québec [n.d.]). They established ‘Petites Cadies’ that comprise an ‘Acadie du Québec’ (Bujold 2007: 470–73; Hébert 1994). Surveys estimate the population of Acadian descent in Québec in the millions (Hébert 1994: 427; Musée acadien du Québec [n.d.]). ‘Petites Cadies’ were mostly established in small communities predominantly along the Baie des Chaleurs and the Saint Lawrence River (see Figure 1; Arsenault 2018: 239–307). However, Montréal also welcomed emigrating and deported Acadians throughout the second half of the eighteenth century179 (Hébert 1994: 71–73, 359–84), as well as Acadians in search of work since the nineteenth century (Bujold 2007: 472, 475). Antonine Maillet is one of those who relocated to Montréal, becoming ‘montréalaise d’adoption’ after having moved from her native Bouctouche, New Brunswick (Gauvin 2010; see also Viau 2008: 272). Maillet elected to remain in Montréal even as an Acadian literary scene developed in the 1970s (Lonergan 2013), establishing long-term professional relationships with the city’s Théâtre du Rideau Vert (Brisset 2017: 135–36) and publisher Leméac Éditeur (Leméac Éditeur [n.d.]; Lord 2010: 13). However, Maillet maintained a profound connection with Acadie, returning regularly and creating a vast literary universe predominantly out of the Acadian cultural fabric (Maillet 2010, 2022b; Viau 2008). Maillet thus produced literature over five decades while straddling two worlds: the geographical, physical space of the Montréal literary and theatre sectors, and the imaginative, cultural space of Acadie.180 These two worlds play out variously throughout Maillet’s corpus (Lord 2009), and they present a fruitful perspective from which to consider translational fluidity.

Montréal is a city of and in translation, as its linguistic crossings and intersections (Simon 2006, 2012: 117–50) and the translational mechanisms at work on its theatre stages

179 According to Pierre-Maurice Hébert, Acadians made up approximately 10% of the population of Montréal island in the 1781 census (1994: 363–64).
180 For an overview of the differences between the Acadian and Québécois collective imaginations, see de Finney and Boucher (1996).
(Brisset 1990) illustrate. Having lived in Montréal for decades, Maillet would have experienced versions of the translational city depicted in Brisset’s and Simon’s works. Indeed, Brisset explicitly includes Maillet’s *Le Bourgeois gentleman* (1978), set in Montréal, as an example of iconoclastic translation in *Sociocritique de la traduction* (1990: 140–48). The play, an adaptation of Molière’s *Le bourgeois gentilhomme*, stages linguistic and cultural conflicts within a Francophone but Anglophile household, comically pitting the two languages against one another. Brisset argues that *Le Bourgeois gentleman* aims to ‘offrir une représentation de l’Anglais, l’Autre, le fantasme par excellence’ as the protagonist, Bourgeois, ‘refuse la condition du Québécois que l’expression populaire définit comme […] victime des Anglais qui ont le pouvoir et la véritable richesse’ (1990: 140–41). Brisset also emphasises the intrinsic ridiculousness of the English Other in the context of Québécois separatist politics in the aftermath of the *Révolution tranquille* of the 1960s (1990: 141).

The subtitle of Brisset’s *Sociocritique*, ‘Théâtre et altérité au Québec’, sets up the expectation that the study will focus on Québec. Contextualising the study, however, Brisset addresses the inclusion of non-Québécois translators and writers such as Maillet in the selected corpus:

> la notion de dramaturgie québécoise recouvre, ici encore, la dramaturgie canadienne d’expression française, même lorsque son auteur n’est pas identifié comme Québécois. C’est le cas d’Antonine Maillet, qui est étroitement associée à l’Acadie et au Nouveau-Brunswick mais dont les pièces ont néanmoins été créées au Québec. (Brisset 1990: 74)

Other critics have also read *Le Bourgeois gentleman* through a Québécois lens. Robert Viau considers the play to be Maillet’s most political and notes that it has ‘une autre signification, proprement québécoise’ (2008: 161). Denise Merkle, meanwhile, recognises that the play expresses not only Québécois but also Acadian anxieties towards the Other (2000: 277). Marie-Linda Lord makes the point explicitly by remarking that Brisset should add ‘acadienne’ to the qualifier ‘québécoise’ in the following sentence from *Sociocritique de la traduction*: ‘Au rejet de l’altérité anglophone, hégémonique, s’ajoute donc le désir de refouler la langue française dans la sphère de l’étranger pour qu’advienne ou que soit créée la langue québécoise [acadienne]’ (Lord 2010: 24).
Nicole Nolette brings the analysis of *Le Bourgeois gentleman* into a decidedly Acadian context, building upon and explicitly nuancing Brisset’s reading. Focussing on ‘anglicisms’, Nolette notes that English (the language) is used by secondary characters to undermine an overly academic French: ‘[d]ans ces conditions, l’anglicisme devient la source d’un rire qui fait dégringoler l’anglais et le français de leur piédestal pour que la servante Joséphine puisse revendiquer les deux langues comme les siennes’ (2015 : 184). In other words, Nolette argues that the heterolingualism of the play — that is, the confluence of languages — expressed through the character of Joséphine, positions itself opposite not only English, but also French. Yet, Joséphine’s key particularity is that she is the play’s sole Acadian amongst a cast of Québécois characters (Viau 2008: 163). In a pun on her role as maid, Joséphine is said to have been ‘[m]ade in New Brunswick’ (Maillet 1978: 71). This not only associates the play’s heterolingualism with Acadie, but also alludes to New Brunswick’s status as ‘malaisément bilingue’ (Malaborza 2006: 189). The linguistic landscape of Joséphine’s native province is thus a creative force for Maillet, who, sharing her character’s Acadian roots, understands the advantages of having grown up in a bilingual community reading Molière alongside Shakespeare (Gagnon 2003: 8, 2005: 9; Maillet 2022a).

As discussed in Chapter 4 (pp. 153–162), the use of the *parlure acadienne* throughout Maillet’s corpus of translations shows an integration of the cultural and historical fabric of Acadie, even if it is only used sparingly. ‘On ne peut plus écrire une langue de façon monolingue’, writes Édouard Glissant, ‘[o]n est obligé de tenir compte des imaginaires des langues’ (1994c: 84). Although Maillet’s linguistic choices in translation are underplayed, the fact remains that these choices convey a sense of Acadianness in translations produced primarily for a Québécois audience at the Théâtre du Rideau Vert in Montréal. There are two exceptions to Maillet’s nearly exclusive relationship with this theatre: *Une lune d’eau salée*, which was staged by Théâtre de l’Île de Hull (now part of the municipality of Gatineau), and *Valentine*, produced by Théâtre populaire d’Acadie (Malaborza 2006: 179). The fact that only one of Maillet’s translations had been staged in Acadie leads Malaborza to conclude that ‘il peut être difficile d’imaginer que Maillet traduit “par et pour l’Acadie”’ (2006: 184). Still, Malaborza uses a close reading of the first of these translations, David French’s *Salt-Water Moon*, to illustrate ‘à quel point certains d’entre eux [les textes de Maillet], les traductions de textes plus contemporains surtout, sont porteurs

The tinge, colour, or flavour of Acadian language identified in Maillet’s translation implicitly suggest that it does not hinder understanding by readers or spectators unfamiliar with the Acadian context. That the Théâtre du Rideau Vert was used to ‘une langue différente’ facilitated audience reception (Gauvin 2004: 303). By contrast, Philip Stratford, one of Maillet’s English translators, notes of the novel Pélagie-la-Charrette that ‘not even a good command of the best street Québécois will guarantee you a full understanding of this speech’ (Stratford 1979: 109, emphasis in original). Perhaps translation allowed Maillet the freedom to veer away from the Acadian imaginary that informs other works. Yet, the linguistic ambivalence that underpins these translations, whether by design or due to the uncanny ability of Acadian language to render Shakespeare (see Chapter 4, pp. 160–162), provides a means through which to occupy both the geographical and cultural space of Montréal’s theatres and the cultural and linguistic space of Acadie. It is as though Maillet is travelling intralingually, slipping between varieties of French that are not all that different from one another. Travel occurs, namely, between the parlure acadienne of Maillet’s literary universe and the various French registers of Québec, Franco-Canadian, and international readerships and audiences. As Michael Cronin explains, the intralingual traveller, by the very nature of travelling among spaces that share a language, gains a heightened experience of translation (2000: 10). Indeed, ‘the encounter with dialect, jargon, sublanguages, and register support[s] a Bakhtinian, heteroglossic view of language that makes translation a recurrent presence in the field of same-language travel’ (Cronin 2000: 11). The tension created in these encounters and experienced by the intralingual traveller who is both Same and Other, indigenous and exotic from a linguistic perspective, plays out in Maillet’s translations.

In an analysis of ways in which the motif of translation occurs in Shakespeare, Cronin points to the translational weight of punning in an intralingual context. Inspired by the work of Dirk Delabastita, Cronin argues that punning can be viewed ‘as a form of double language
so that the double language of interlingual translation [...] is mirrored by the double language of intralingual translation in the form of punning’ (2006: 99). From this perspective, Joséphine’s ‘[m]ade in New Brunswick’, mentioned earlier, or the use of ‘accoste’ to render Shakespearean puns discussed in Chapter 4 (p. 161) add another level of translation to Maillet’s practice. Furthermore, the idea of doubling can be expanded to the rest of Maillet’s corpus of translations thanks to the inherently colourful nature of the Acadian vernacular and popular traditions, rooted in a Rabelaisian carnivalesque. As Maillet explains, the Acadian vernacular is inherently playful because ‘[l]e peuple éprouve [...] ce besoin — parce qu’il est entier et sans nuance — de renforcer les mots forts, d’augmenter les augmentatifs, de diminuer les diminutifs et de répeter les superlatifs jusqu’à trois ou cinq fois’ (Maillet 1971: 155). This leads, for instance, to several ‘procédés dans la langue populaire — tels les jurons, l’onomastique et la toponymie burlesques, les répétitions et les superlatifs, les parodies ou jeux d’esprit sous toutes ses formes — dont Rabelais a fait un tel usage et qui se retrouvent si abondamment en Acadie’ (Maillet 1971: 170).

According to Nolette, playfulness in translation can be tremendously creative. Quoting Paré (2001: 189), Nolette argues that

D’un côté, il est bien possible que, pour atteindre la légitimation par les institutions dominantes grâce à la traduction, ‘les cultures de l’exiguïté sacrifient ce qu’elles possèdent de plus radicalement créateur’ [...], c’est-à-dire l’inscription du traduisible et l’hétérolinguisme ludique. De l’autre, parmi les traductions additionnelles qui découlent de ces processus de diffusion et de légitimation, la réinscription supplémentaire ou ludique du traduisible pourrait être tout aussi radicalement créatrice que son inscription première. (2015: 8, emphasis in original)

It is possible to view Maillet’s linguistic playfulness through the same lens. The metonymic inscription of multilayered meaning in translation promotes a complex and multilayered approach to identity, one that is embedded in playful configurations of language and imagery and that inherently complicates monolithic myths of identity. This creates a system in which translation drives the possibility of bypassing teleological interpretations and the restrictiveness of minority identity logic. Playfulness in Nolette’s terms allows for
multiplicity, for ‘jeu’ (play) and ‘enjeu’ (issue) to become intertwined in translation and for identity and post-identity to coexist (2015: 245). The framework of intersection that Nolette creates enables reading between the lines of these translations, as it were, to identify complex, plural, and diverse forms of identity expression. In other words, translation supports a modern and plural conception of Acadian identity, which, in turn allows for considering minority translation in Francophone Canada beyond doxological functions and monolithic conceptions.

Furthermore, the straddling perceivable in Maillet’s translations challenges the centre/margin binary. Chantal Gagnon notices the foundations of such dynamics, as the translations subscribe to an Acadian tradition despite being commissioned and produced for a primarily Québécois public: Maillet ‘participe au discours social Québécois tout en prenant une position “marginale”’ (Gagnon 2005: 2). If instances of Acadian flavour or hints expose the translators’ marginality, could they also, reposition the marginal? Caroline-Isabelle Caron’s definition of a diasporic identity discussed in the Introduction (p. 14) homes in on ‘cultural continuity’ and speaks of how ‘these manifestations give a certain Acadian “colour” to very different places’ (2007: 452; 2011: 43). From this perspective, Maillet’s translations, with their Acadian ‘colour’, could be contributing to Caron’s notion of ‘cultural continuity’. This idea is further reinforced by the fact that Caron’s argument focuses largely on identity being formed and passed down through genealogy, tying back to the défricheteuse de parenté who, as Chapter 3 outlined, figures prominently in Maillet’s translations.

Nevertheless, considering Maillet’s translations in terms of Caron’s renewed Acadian diaspora highlights their fluidity, their oscillation between two spaces, just like Maillet herself: ‘[c]’est vrai que j’ai des racines profondes, mais mes racines sont des algues qu’on peut promener, vous savez, je traine mes racines avec moi comme des algues. Alors, je suis acadienne, mais je me suis très bien adaptée à Montréal’ (Les possibles sont infinis 2009). The idea of identifying as both québécoise and acadienne is consistent with the arguments put forward by Marie Lefebvre (2007) and Stéphan Bujold (2007) in their discussions about ‘chevauchement’ and ‘enchevêtrement’ in definitions of Acadian-Québécois identity from the perspective of diaspora. This is precisely what seems to be occurring in Maillet’s translations, and the implication of roots as seaweeds is that these are carried across, or perhaps more pointedly and respecting the maritime metaphor, floated across. Maillet’s
translations, anchored in both the physical space of Québécois theatre and in an Acadian imaginary, absorb the quality of the seaweeds that are mobile, fluid.

Carrying\textsuperscript{181} the language in Acadie tropicale

This chapter’s next stop is Louisiana, where Acadian families deported during the Grand Dérangement arrived between 1764 and 1785, settling primarily in a region now known as Acadiana (Atran-Fresco 2016: 31). Of the Acadians who arrived in Louisiana, some had been imprisoned in Halifax during the Seven Years War, and others had migrated from the Thirteen Colonies, where they had been deported a few years earlier (Atran-Fresco 2016: 17). However, the majority of Acadian settlers in Louisiana came from Belle-Île-en-Mer, off the northwestern coast of France, where they had been relocated as part of French attempts to recolonise the island (Hodson 2012: 146–72, 181–95). Settlers of Acadian ancestry in Louisiana became known as ‘Cadiens’ and ‘Cadiennes’, a term still generally used by Louisiana’s French-speaking population to reclaim identity (Atran-Fresco 2016). While the predominant term in English seems to be ‘Cajun’, this term glosses over the demographic and historical nuances of a complex identity in Francophone Louisiana (Klinger 2009; c.f. Rabalais 2016: 14). Thus, for the purposes of this study, the term ‘Cadien’ will be used to refer to the Louisianaian context. While not altogether unproblematic (see Bruce 2020), it seeks to acknowledge Acadian culture, heritage, and history while accounting for Louisiana’s unique context and its Francophone legacy (Atran-Fresco 2016: 8–9). The nickname ‘Acadie tropicale’, for its part, has been used by the poet and folklorist Barry Jean Ancelet in Louisiana and by Gérald Leblanc in New Brunswick (Paré 2009: 145–46). It suggests both genealogical and historical ties, as well as a diasporic element.

Institutionally, the ties between Acadie tropicale and Acadie des Maritimes have led to the creation of programs such as the Observatoire Nord/Sud and its Chaire de recherche du Canada en études acadiennes et transnationales (CRÉAcT),\textsuperscript{182} the cooperation agreement between the state of Louisiana and the government of New Brunswick,\textsuperscript{183} and the

\textsuperscript{181} The idea of ‘carrying’ is borrowed from Ashlee Wilson Michot, who acknowledges in the Introduction and Acknowledgements of Ô Malheureuse those who ‘carry’ the language (2019: 2, 150).
\textsuperscript{182} Based at Nova Scotia’s Université Sainte-Anne, the Observatoire Nord/Sud fosters the study and understanding of Acacie in its international dimension (Université Sainte-Anne [n.d.]).
\textsuperscript{183} Signed as part of the Congrès mondial acadien in 2019, this ‘Plan d’action 2019–2023’ renews previous agreements and memoranda dating as far back as 1977 (État de la Louisiane and Gouvernement du Nouveau-Brunswick 2019).
Memorandum of Understanding signed between Nova Scotia and Louisiana. The Acadian and Cadien publishing industries have benefited from these institutional crossovers, likewise creating a space for collaboration and exchange. For instance, the enthusiasm of Acadian poet and publisher Gérald Leblanc for Acadie tropicale led to the creation in the 1980s of a dedicated collection of the same name at Éditions Perce-Neige, based in Moncton (Paré 2009: 145–46). Éditions Perce-Neige maintained its ‘Acadie tropicale’ collection until 2023, and while it disappeared to avoid unnecessarily putting writers into identity silos, the publisher still has an editor responsible for soliciting writings from Louisiana (Éditions Perce-Neige [n.d.-b]). In addition, Louisianian publisher Éditions Tintamarre and New Brunswick-based children’s publisher Bouton d’or Acadie signed a co-publishing agreement in 2014 (Hart Macneill 2014).

Within these frameworks of exchange, there is a marked and sustained emphasis on language in the published books’ promotion materials, which regularly mention a ‘Cadien’ connection. For example, the description of each of the five titles in print in Éditions Perce-Neige’s ‘Acadie tropicale’ collection includes a reference to Cajun or Cadien French (Éditions Perce-Neige [n.d.-a]). Some of the descriptions note its use, as in the poems of David Cheramie’s L’allée du souvenir, ‘[é]crits dans un français universel émaillé d’acadianismes propres à la Louisiane’ (Éditions Perce-Neige 2017). Others position the work as contributing to social engagement issues, as in Le trou dans le mur, by Jean Arceneaux (Barry Jean Aucelet’s pseudonym), whose writings are apparently ‘tous engagés et motivés par le fait français’ (Éditions Perce-Neige 2012). For its part, B pour bayou (Guidry 2019), a co-publication between Éditions Tintamarre and Bouton d’or Acadie, is subtitled ‘Un abécédaire cadien’ and promises ‘une délectation de mots aux senteurs de Gombo’.

According to Clint Bruce, Tintamarre emphasises the patrimonial value of conserving and sharing (Cadien) culture, and their authors both contribute to preserving French in Louisiana and are able to reach Francophone readerships (2011: 230, 235).

Another characteristic emerges from glancing at the catalogues of Francophone (or bilingual) publishers based in Louisiana, namely the interweaving of French and English in
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184 Formal agreements between Louisiana and Nova Scotia date back 30 years, and this renewal set the stage for Nova Scotia hosting the Congrès mondial acadien in 2024 (Congrès mondial acadien [n.d.-a]; Government of Nova Scotia 2022).

185 Gumbo is Louisiana’s official state dish (Louisiana Office of Tourism 2024).
texts and/or paratexts. Recent bilingual French-English works published in Louisiana include Œ Malheureuse: French Writings from Louisiana Women (University of Louisiana at Lafayette Press, 2019) and Jolie Blonde et Aimable Brune: Love Songs of Cajun and Creole Louisiana (Éditions Tintamarre, 2019). Meanwhile, B pour bayou provides a good example of an English-language paratext accompanying a French-language text. Although the book is written in French and its summary appears in French in Bouton d’or Acadie’s catalogue (Éditions Bouton d’or Acadie 2019), the distributor — University of Louisiana at Lafayette Press, also a bilingual publisher — includes only English in its materials (University of Louisiana at Lafayette Press 2019). There are also examples of books published in separate English and French versions but by the same contributors and publisher. These include Warren Perrin, Mary Broussard Perrin, and Phil Comeau’s L’Acadie hier et aujourd’hui (2014b) and Acadie Then and Now (2014a), as well as Warren Perrin’s Acadian Redemption: From Beausoleil Broussard to the Queen’s Royal Proclamation (2004) and Une Saga Acadienne, 1755–2003 (2009). To a certain extent, this trend likewise spills into works published by otherwise Francophone publishers, such as Éditions Perce-Neige whose catalogue includes Bayou des Acadiens Blind River, by Beverly Matherne, a bilingual French-English collection from Acadie tropicale (Éditions Perce-Neige 2015).

One striking commonality amongst these works is the absence of translator names and of almost any reference to translation. There is no indication, for instance, on the front or back covers of Œ Malheureuse that the collection includes English translations of the ‘French Writings by Louisiana Women’. Only the book’s Table of Contents mentions them, despite the subtitle appearing exclusively in English on the cover. Nor is there any acknowledgement of who may have done the translation. Furthermore, the translations are tucked away at the end of the book, in a smaller font and condensed on the page, taking up half as much space at 47 pages (2019: 102–48) as the French poems’ 94 pages (2019: 7–100). Acadie Then and Now shines a slightly brighter light on translation processes. Editor Warren A. Perrin writes about Phil Comeau, the book’s General Editor, in the Director’s Note:

Since he is fully bilingual, I knew Phil would be best suited to coordinate the translation of the 21 original French language articles to English, and the 43 original English language articles to French. (Perrin 2014a: x)
Perrin goes on to note Comeau’s ‘workaholic’ professionalism without further mentioning translation (Perrin and others 2014a: x). The French version of the book, *L’Acadie hier et aujourd’hui*, uses the same wording, although it specifies 22 original French-language articles\(^{186}\) (Perrin and others 2014b: xii). A browse through each version of the book provides little additional information, as a translator is acknowledged in only one of the 64 articles or paratextual components of the English-language work, the ‘Letter by Jean-Baptiste Semer to his Father in France’ (Mouhot 2014: 266). None stands out in *L’Acadie hier et aujourd’hui*, since the Mouhot letter was originally written in French and republished as such.

In these examples, bilingual texts are presented as a *fait accompli*, without fanfare. This contrasts with works such as *The Road to Louisiana: The Saint-Domingue Refugees, 1792–1809*, which does not deal specifically with Acadian culture or language and names the translator along with the editors on the cover (Brasseaux and Conrad 1992). A marker of the linguistic fluidity mentioned above, the tendency towards in-house or self-translation could also be symptomatic of the linguistic context of Louisiana, whose complexity reflects the cultural landscape of Acadian, Cadien, Cajun, and/or Creole identities. The pressures of assimilation into Anglo-American language and culture in Louisiana differ from those in Acadie des Maritimes (Atran-Fresco 2016). From this perspective, bilingual editions become a reflection of the linguistic landscape in which they are published. Nevertheless, the impulse to write and publish in French, especially by authors who identify as Cadien, is profoundly connected to revitalisation efforts and reclamation movements that have resonated especially strongly over the last decades (Atran-Fresco 2016: 2; Bruce 2011). In this sense, bilingual editions published in Louisiana could be considered in the context of different instances of linguistic insecurity.

Yet, the lack of markers signalling translation within the works or their paratextual and promotional materials is interesting insofar as it provides a counterpoint to Laëtitia Saint-Loubert’s notion of thresholds of dislocation traced in *The Caribbean in Translation*

---

\(^{186}\) An anomaly arose while reviewing the contents of *L’Acadie hier et aujourd’hui* and *Acadie Then and Now*. While the English version notes the translation of 21 articles from French into English, one fewer than the 22 mentioned in the French version, *Acadie Then and Now* actually contains 65 articles and paratexts for the French version’s 64. The discrepancy is an article titled ‘Acadians in the Magdalen Islands, Quebec’, presumably written in French due to the nature of its content but (mistakenly?) left out of *L’Acadie hier et aujourd’hui*. 
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Saint-Loubert articulates the ‘transformative potential’ of thresholds, positioning ‘translation as a dynamic process of correspondences and dialogues, whose full creative potential entails [...] a poetics of differentiation, a poetics of translation that archipelizes loci of cultural representations, a poetics performed by a denizen of the threshold’ (2020: 47). In addition to their (para)textual manifestations, Saint-Loubert also notes the various shapes that thresholds can take, including as ‘lines of demarcation as manifested [...] in physiological boundaries separating bodies of water and landmasses’ (Saint-Loubert 2020).

If translation in the Cadien context in the form of bilingual texts generally foregoes textual thresholds, and therefore textual demarcations, is it possible to look at the region’s physiological or geographical thresholds for paths instead?

If so, the bayous may provide an interesting place from which to investigate. Upon arriving in Louisiana, seeking isolation and opportunities to make a living, the Acadian newcomers congregated around bayous, which fostered both the preservation of cultural and linguistic heritage and the emergence of a distinct, southern culture (National Geographic [n.d.]). According to the Wetlands Acadian Cultural Center, the newly arrived Acadians took particularly well to the fluvial aspect of the bayous: ‘The Acadian exiles who settled along Louisiana’s bayous created a distinctive Cajun culture based on life in a watery realm’ (National Park Service 2022). The bayous are fluid, if slow-moving (National Geographic [n.d.]), and like the Petitcodiac River they flow in both directions (Waggoner 2014: 74). They can thus be seen to act in precisely the same way as Moncton’s Petitcodiac River, an Acadie tropicale counterpart to Acadie des Maritimes’ mascaret. Insofar as ‘the threshold functions as an ambiguous space of uprooting (being away from home) and belonging (to a diaspora, for example)’ (Saint-Loubert 2020: 33), the bayous become a threshold that connects Acadie tropicale to Acadie des Maritimes. Indeed, according to François Paré, bayous contribute to ‘structure[r] les représentations de la diversité “insulaire” de l’Acadie actuelle’ (Paré 2003: 185–86). Paré’s insularity is archipelagic (Paré 2003: 185–86), connected through bodies of water. The archipelagic formation will be discussed further in the Conclusion, but the image is pertinent here as it reinforces the marine element, the fluidity of translation within the diaspora.
The tidalectics of Acadian translation

The tidal cycle of in- and out-flow that governs the mascaret resonates in Acadie with the latent potential for, if not the actual manifestation of, return. As Chapter 1 outlined (pp. 72–73), discourse flowing out of the Conventions nationales acadiennes and the Acadian renaissance revolves around notions of recovery and reinforcement (Bourque and Richard 2014: 11–22; Robidoux 1910). The mascaret and the translation flows that it propels within the Acadian diaspora correspond to a model used in Caribbean and Pacific contexts to relate the circulation of literature, including literary translations. Translation in Acadie as it is framed by the mascaret reflects a model of tidalectics developed by scholar, historian, and writer Edward Kamau Brathwaite as an alternative to dialectical models (DeLoughrey 2007: 2, 2018: 94; Mackey 1995: 14). Steeped in a maritime paradigm and accounting for tidal movements, Brathwaite’s notion of tidalectics has been used as a methodology to analyse the circulation of texts and to ‘navigate’ (to use Elizabeth DeLoughrey’s term) literatures in postcolonial or decolonising contexts (DeLoughrey 2007: 1–48, 2018; Saint-Loubert 2020: 186–87). DeLoughrey describes what gives tidalectics a navigable quality as follows:

Challenging the binarism of Western thought, the ocean and land are seen in continuous relation — as shifting points of contact, arrival, departure, and transformation. Tidalectics engage what Brathwaite calls an ‘alter/native’ historiography to linear models of colonial progress. This ‘tidal dialectic’ resists the synthesizing telos of Hegel’s dialectic by drawing from a cyclical model, invoking the continual movement and rhythm of the ocean. Tidalectics foreground ‘alter/native’ epistemologies to colonialism and capitalism, with their linear and materialist biases. In contradistinction to Western models of passive and empty space, such as terra (and aqua) nullius, which were used to justify territorial expansion, tidalectics reckons a space and time that requires an active and participatory engagement with the island seascape. (2018: 94)

There are many elements of DeLoughrey’s explanation to unpack in the context of translation in Acadie. Most obvious is the fact that the mascaret is a natural phenomenon

---

regulated by tides. While it follows the same path or trajectory with every tide, outflow into the Bay of Fundy fosters the possibility of dissemination beyond Acadie des Maritimes. Indeed, DeLoughrey’s description reverberates in Caron’s call, following Jana Evans and Annita Mannur, for a positive definition of diaspora (2007: 448–49). Caron writes: ‘le terme [diaspora] suggère la fertilité de la dispersion, de la dissémination et le dynamisme interculturel. Il implique aussi une critique des oppositions binaires simplistes, en embrassant les expériences vécues des sujets diasporiques, dans toutes ses ambivalences, contradictions et chemins de traverse’ (2007: 449).

DeLoughrey also emphasises the non-linearity of tidalectics, as does Saint-Loubert in a specifically translational framework: in ‘Brathwaite’s “tidalectics” another approach to translation emerges, based on a cross-cultural poetics that allows us to reconsider translation from a non-linear, non-teleological perspective’ (2020: 37). Such non-linearity is visible in the multidirectional flows of Acadian translation networks mapped out in the examples of Québec (westward) and Louisiana (southward), and even in the diverse origins of the real and fictionalised surfers coming into Moncton on the Petitcodiac River. Tidalectics, furthermore, ‘highlight[s] oceanic trajectories of diaspora […]’, underlining their shared similarities in geo-pelagic relation rather than the limiting model of national framework’ (DeLoughrey 2007: 23). From this perspective, approaching translation in Acadie through a tidalectical framework allows escape from the inherent binarism of conceptions of identity elaborated exclusively in territorial terms. It imbues the mascaret, the Bay of Fundy, the bayous, and other bodies of water into which Acadie spills with legitimacy and substance. For example, Corina Crainic points out that comparative analyses of Acadian, Louisianian, and Caribbean literatures ‘permettent d’ausculter un ensemble de différences tout en réfléchissant à des legs dont les connivences sont tout aussi importantes, dont une sensibilité où le déracinement et la spoliation ne peuvent être oubliés’ (2020: 17). From Crainic’s perspective, these literatures interact through a shared language and minority consciousness. Reframing this within the lens of tidalectics provides the means for going beyond the commonality of shared language, in this case French, and to consider geo-pelagic relations as acts of translation geographically (translatio) and linguistically.

A further connection between the mascaret and the notion of tidalectics as DeLoughrey defines it above arises in the mascaret’s ability to counter narratives of
emptiness and passivity. As mentioned in the section devoted to *Moncton Mentor* earlier in this chapter, the building of the causeway across the Petitcodiac River halted the flow of water, significantly reduced the height of the mascaret, and narrowed the river to less than a tenth of its former width. To put it differently, the causeway emptied the Petitcodiac River of its stories and life, it created space for passivity. The opening of the gates and the construction of a bridge to replace the causeway, conversely, reinvigorated the Petitcodiac River. While the (Acadian) environmental activism campaign inherently precluded passivity, the reopening of the gates also had an almost immediate impact on the biodiversity of the Petitcodiac River underwater (fish, organisms), at surface level (surfers), and on the riverbanks (widening of the river) (Rudin 2021: 206–8; Sentinelles Petitcodiac Riverkeepers [n.d.-b]). In other words, the process of (re)invention of the mascaret created space for the Petitcodiac River to generate story and narrative once again, to transform from myth (masque à Ray) to reality (mascaret), to fill once again.

**Conclusion**

The preceding analysis suggests that the ‘liminal position along the seashore’ from which ‘post-deportation Acadie [could] gain symbolic ascendance over its disastrous history’ (Paré 2009: 144) is perhaps not so liminal after all. The shore, and more specifically the embrace of a maritime perspective buoyed by the mascaret and the bodies of water to which it connects physically and symbolically, are integral to a conception of translation in Acadie. Three perspectives contributed to defining the fluidity of translation in Acadie in the previous chapter: geocritical, linguistic, and in publishing practices. The geocritical perspective was discussed through the lens of Benoît Doyon-Gosselin’s *Moncton Mentor*, which posits that the city of Moncton was invented through the artistic creation of its Francophone (Acadian) population. Identifying the fundamentally translational nature of the process of invention, the analysis interpreted along similar lines the reinvention of the mascaret on the Petitcodiac River, achieved following a lengthy environmental battle to remove the causeway led primarily by the Acadian community. The chapter then embraced the fluidity of the mascaret to travel westward into Québec. Focussing on Maillet’s translation language, this section investigated the confluence of the geographical space of Montréal’s theatres and the imaginative space of Maillet’s native Acadie in translation.
From Montréal, the chapter travelled to the bayous of Louisiana to investigate Cadien publishing practices that highlight translational and bilingual approaches. These were interpreted according to Laëtitia Saint-Loubert’s paratextual thresholds to emphasise the archipelagic structure of Acadian translation. Finally, the fluvial nature of these analyses was interpreted according to Edward Kamau Brathwaite’s tidalectics to emphasise geo-pelagic relations, openness, and connection through maritime routes.

The maritime quality of the mascaret as a framework for translation in Acadie rounds out an evolution from primarily territorial (aboiteaux, défrichetage de parenté) to increasingly fluvial paradigms (grands dérangements, mascaret). The shift in perspective allows for exploring a complex and integral element of Acadian identity, one not only marked by fluidity and flux but also instrumental to a pluralistic society (Clarke 2000: 330).

While the mascaret on the Petitcodiac River carries in and replenishes, the subsequent ebb tide empties out. From this perspective, whatever the ebb tide carries out with it is at risk of flowing out and being diluted in the vast Atlantic. Stéphan Bujold identifies a similar risk of dilution in a diasporic conception of Acadian identity, affirming having

> aucune volonté de diluer l’identité des Acadiens occupant toujours l’Acadie dans une sorte de fluide nommé mondialisation et dont les conséquences pourraient être une marginalisation et une diminution de leur pouvoir politique au sein même du peuple acadien et de ses organisations. (2007: 279)

Yet, Bujold goes on to argue that the ‘champ national acadien est vaste justement parce qu’il n’est pas limité dans l’espace et dans le temps’ and outlines the positive outcomes of widening scope in terms of sociopolitical advancement and reversing folkloric perceptions (2007: 479–80). These principles can be applied to translation. If the mascaret fosters (bio)diverse perspectives, as the chapter has illustrated, the ebb tide technically runs the risk of diluting and uniformising them once again. This is of course the direction of flow that the chapter followed, as it flowed out from Moncton to Québec to Louisiana, and that French-to-English translation of Acadian works would follow as well. However, the cyclical nature of the tidalectical model ensures some sort of return. This idea warrants further study to home in on the specifics of what may be gained or lost in translations that reflect a fluvial perspective. Such research could be conducted, for example, in light of the
negentropic dimension of translation identified by both Michael Cronin (2017: 34, see also 2006: 130–35) and Kobus Marais (2019a: 126). Or, to enhance or complicate conceptions of translation formulated around waves. Ubaldo Steconni, for instance, zooms in on the continuity and underlying energy of the wave to metaphorise translation (2010), a physicality that Marais finds restrictive from a biosemiotics perspective (2019a: 128). Marais turns elsewhere to eddies, as both process and pattern (2019b: 58), but ultimately rejects this conceptualisation, as well as an alternative model based on ‘the model of a tidal river mouth’, because they foster repetitiveness, not system change through feedback (2019a: 127–28). Investigating translation through the lens of a mascaret along a tidal river may yield the missing ‘feedback’ loop.

Finally, while this chapter mapped some marine routes through the Acadian diaspora, many more remain to be charted for a comprehensive view of translation in Acadie to emerge. The Acadian diaspora is vast (Hodson 2012), thereby offering several directions towards which to draw connections. Some of these already have foundations in other disciplines. Both Eloïse Brière (1990) and François Paré (2003: 185–98), for instance, have argued that Acadian literature has roots in the Antilles. Corina Crainic’s research (2020) focusses on the intersection of Acadie, the Caribbean, and Louisiana from a postcolonial perspective. The ‘ligne acadienne’ and the Marais Poitevin in France present opportunities across the Atlantic, as would the research conducted by Paul Delaney to retrace Acadians deported to Falmouth, England (2005). Other ports of call could include Îles-de-la-Madeleine, Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon, Newfoundland and Labrador, and New England.

---

188 The ‘ligne acadienne’ represents the location of nearly 60 farms established by Acadians in the Poitou region of France in the 1770s as a consequence of the 1763 Treaty of Paris (Agator and Bernier [n.d.]; Perrin 2014b: 351).
6 Conclusion: Acadian translation and the trials of the margin

Les courants qui façonnent les méandres de ce réseau fluvial
bousculent les galets qui roulent sous nos pieds.
Rien n’est permanence ici, tout est dialogue.
– Sonya Malaborza, Prendre racine

The preceding chapters sought to articulate the particularities of Acadian translation. After laying out the visibility of Acadian translation in the past, the thesis began, in Chapter 1, by homing in on ways in which translation has shaped Acadian experiences and life. It examined three defining periods of Acadian history to identify societal, geographical, and cultural impacts generating translationality in Acadie. Then, the study turned to literary translation practice and how various aspects of the translational imaginary manifest in these. Chapters 2, 3, and 4 highlighted textual shifts identified through comparisons between source and target texts in a corpus of translations by Rose Després, Sophie M. Lavoie, Georgette LeBlanc, Antonine Maillet, Sonya Malaborza, and Serge Patrice Thibodeau published between 1975 and 2020. The shifts were grouped according to characteristics to present an overarching view of translation practices and trends. In Chapter 2, the aboîteaux provided an apt metaphor for the paradoxically porous nature of (British) walls and for regenerative possibilities held within the landscape, both of which were revealed through translations by Després, Lavoie, Malaborza, and Thibodeau. Then, in Chapter 3 défrichetage de parenté highlighted dual storyteller and genealogist dynamics that enacted a search for and an invention of ancestors motivated by the population dispersals of the Grand Dérangement. Translations by LeBlanc, Maillet, and Malaborza emphasised ancestors and descendants, engendering a figurative repopulation of an Acadie essentially emptied of its Francophone inhabitants. Then, Chapter 4 harnessed the dynamic movement and mobility of grands dérangements to illustrate instances of the Deportation in translation, linguistic disruptions, and geopoetic transpositions. Moving the analysis beyond both the setting of Acadie des Maritimes and the comparative frames of the previous three chapters, Chapter 5 addressed geocritical, linguistic, and publishing perspectives. A geocritical approach underpinned the discussion of the ‘invention’ of the city of Moncton through the translational forces of the mascaret that runs along the Petitcodiac River. The chapter then
moved towards Québec, charting Maillet’s translation language as it straddles a Montréal-based geographical space and an Acadian imaginary, before heading to the bayous of Louisiana to outline co-publishing and bilingual publishing practices. From a decidedly maritime perspective, the analysis was framed by Edward Kamau Brathwaite’s notion of tidallectics to emphasise flow and cyclicality.

The purpose of outlining the particularities of Acadian translation, both in terms of translationality on the ground and through the patterns that emerge within a diverse corpus of literary translations, is to explicate and theorise translation in a minority English-to-French context within Canada. From this perspective, the thesis has generated a vocabulary of translation grounded in, and representative of, the particularities of Acadie. Aboiteaux, défrichetage de parenté, grands dérangements, and the mascaret articulate the intricacies of a vibrant but minoritised, plural but marginalised setting and practice of translation. These paradigms frame a practice that deploys on multiple levels, namely through text, sociocultural production, and biosemiotics. The analysis has identified patterns — or, more appropriately given the context, currents — that form a recognisable framework for comparison with English-to-French translation practices within Canada and minority translation more generally. Indeed, the analysis presented in the previous chapters conveys an approach that replenishes and reinvests, that displays strong engagement with source material and points of departure.

Acadian translations are playful in the sense that Nolette describes in the context of Franco-Canadian heterolinguial theatre (2015). Nolette homes in on the translational processes added to facilitate the circulation of Franco-Canadian theatre and argues that the ‘réinscription supplémentaire ou ludique du traduisible pourrait être tout aussi radicalement créatrice que son inscription première’ (2015: 8). The preceding analysis shows that Acadian translations, regardless of genre, engage in a similar process. Shifts – additions, omissions, substitutions, and semantic divergences – playfully integrate Acadian history, culture, language, and folklore to create currents for an audience largely able to read the source text. This idea also exemplifies Tong King Lee’s notion of ludic translation, which approaches the source text ‘obliquely’ and fosters open-endedness and dialogic interplay (2022: 20–21). The ludic nature of Acadian literary translations reinforces the notion of Acadie as a playground of translation alluded to in the Introduction (p. 51) and in Chapter 1 (pp. 79–80).
It connects literary translation with what is happening on the ground, bringing it into the realm of the whims of nature and human volition. In other words, these translations take and give back, displace and reinstate, ebb and flow.

To be sure, the manifestations and corpus analysed herein produce a partial, though representative, overview of translationality and literary translation in Acadie. The works included in Table 1 (p. 19–21) but not analysed in depth here, along with other sociopolitical, cultural, and historical activity, would provide new angles from which to complement or complexify the research presented herein. Indeed, as a place that lives and experiences translation broadly, Acadie offers myriad sociocultural and natural phenomena that would lend themselves well to further research and contribute to a more detailed articulation of translation and translationality. These include, namely, the ‘barachois’,189 ‘tintamarre’,190 ‘mi-carême’,191 and ‘mocauque’.192 Only then will it be truly possible to map the hills, valleys, shorelines, and currents of translation in Acadie to provide, from a fractal dimension, a fuller picture of the intricacies of translation in Acadie.

Nevertheless, one way to encapsulate and envision the results presented in this thesis is through an ‘épreuve de la marge’, a notion that Marie-Linda Lord employs to describe minoritised experiences in the fiction of Antonine Maillet and David Adams Richards. Lord concludes that ‘l’épreuve de la marge stimule des conflits entre le communautaire et l’individuel, la subjectivité et l’américanité, la confrontation et l’accommodation qui sont intenses’ (2002: 77). In a translation context, the notion of ‘épreuve de la marge’ has obvious connotations to Antoine Berman’s ‘l’épreuve de l’étranger’, or trials of the foreign (Berman 2012). Borrowing the term from Heidegger’s assessment of Hölderlin’s poetic experience, Berman emphasises the work (labour) involved and identifies two ways in which the trial manifests: in the experience of the foreign from

189 Meaning a ‘shallow lagoon of water separated from the sea by a sand bar’, the Acadian term (Boudreau 2009: 55–56; Cormier 2018: 111; Poirier 1995: 57) has been appropriated by Anglophone Atlantic Canada (‘Barachois’ 2023).

190 From the word meaning ‘racket’, in the sense of noise (Cormier 2018: 494–95), the ‘tintamarre’ is a parade organised in Acadian communities on August 15 (the Acadian national holiday) in which people decked out in red, white, blue, and yellow (the colours of the Acadian flag) make as much noise as possible (Labelle n.d.).

191 A traditional, carnivalesque masquerade — the metaphor of translation as disguise (Cronin 1996: 72, 112–13; Hermans 1985: 115, 120) would lend itself well here — still celebrated in Cape Breton (Centre d’interprétation Mi-Carême [n.d.]).

192 ‘Mocauque’ refers to marshland or wetland, brush-filled terrain on the edge of wooded areas (Poirier 1995: 306).
the position of the ‘Self-Same (Propre)’ and in the process of being ‘uprooted from its own language-ground (sol-de-langue)’ (Berman 2012: 240, emphasis in original). Applying this dual experience to Lord’s notion of the trial of the margins, it is possible to consider both the experience of the margins — the factors that regulate circulation as in Nolette (2015), for example — and a trial for the margins — the inherent dynamism and driving force that can arise from the margins. Indeed, the currents detected in the literary translations analysed in the previous chapters flow in and out of the text, creating occasional expressions of linguistic and cultural identity. The translations replace and regenerate part of the landscape (Chapter 2), intervene intermittently in the narrative (Chapter 3), brim with energy but do not spill over (Chapter 4), and open up, rather than close themselves off, to the diaspora (Chapter 5). They engage the source texts while creating a network that connects and projects outward. In other words, the currents are identifiable and felt but they do not supersede.

Another way to frame this idea is through Simon Brown and Sonya Malaborza’s description of translation in the Maritime provinces / Mi’kma’ki / Acadie as a ‘pratique du bord’. By ‘pratique du bord’, Brown and Malaborza mean ‘Contexte bord. Contexte bout. Contexte à-bout, contexte bout-du-monde. Contexte loin, en tout cas. Loin du centre, ou loin de ce qu’on croit être le centre’ (2023). It is a practice that utilises ‘[l]es moyens du bord’ (2023). A practice that, in other words, embraces the edge and relies on the tools and materials available in a particular context — on board, as it were. This perspective implies that the tools of Acadian translation are at the ready as long as one knows where to find them and how to use them. This holds, again as the analysis has shown, tremendous potential, which can be revealed by way of a trial of the margins. This process is what prompts the défricheteuse de parenté to travel among the lineages (see Chapter 3). What prompts the adaptation of the aboiteaux to the landscape (Chapter 2), the mascaret regaining momentum once the causeway gates reopened (Chapter 5), and the forces driving translation (Chapter 4). These translational currents, in other words, are propelled by the tools available to the translators — the Acadian language, culture, history, and landscape — and immanent to a practice that spans decades and genres.

To return to Berman’s trials of the foreign, in the Acadian context the so-called foreign work is not so much ‘uprooted from its language-ground’ as it is replanted in
another language ground. From this perspective, the trials of the margin in Acadian translation reconfigure the margin — the minoritised, the one meant to have disappeared — into a vibrant affirmation that neither eclipses nor dispels with the Other(s). After all, the source texts, namely those of Sue Goyette, and Rita Joe, Ami McKay, and John Winslow are grounded in Acadie / Mi’kma’ki / Atlantic Canada, too. Translations not analysed in this thesis follow a similar pattern, for instance those of New Brunswick-based Beth Powning or Nova Scotia-born Daniel MacIvor. Those that are not, such as the classics (Shakespeare, Molière, Rabelais), are made to be, as the arrival of Pantagruel’s crew onto Acadian shores (Antonine Maillet 1983; see also Chapter 3 of this thesis, pp. 118–19) aptly demonstrates. Translation in Acadie thus comes across predominantly as an act of symbolically countering the effects of dispersal and affirming presence.

Again, the figure of the aboiteau serves to illustrate this idea. Sherman J. Bleakney explains the rich intricacies of the ‘matrix’ of roots under the dyke:

> Finally, we must acknowledge the root systems of marine marsh grasses. They are the structures that figuratively and literally tie all this cultural and natural history of dykelands firmly together. Roots spread through this nutritious soil in every direction, forming a tightly tangled root matrix that resists being pulled apart. When all the clay is washed from a marsh sod […], a very firm replica of the original sod, consisting entirely of roots, remains. (2004: 22)

This image can be transposed to translation in Acadie through two figures. The first is that of the ‘rhizome’, a notion developed by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari (1987: 3–25) and further developed by Édouard Glissant (1994a). For Deleuze and Guattari, a rhizomic structure breaks down binary and monolithic (centre-margin) perspectives perpetuated by colonial discourse (1987: 3–25; see also Ashcroft and others 1998: 207), pertinent in the Acadian context for reasons outlined in the Introduction (pp. 23–31). Two aspects of the rhizome as Deleuze and Guattari define it are relevant to this discussion. The first is the potential for connection to any other point within the network (1987: 21), a feature that facilitates, for instance, the diasporic flux of Chapter 5. The second is the ability to connect disparate elements (1987: 21), important namely in the context of the discussions pertaining to aboiteaux, défrichetage de parenté, and mascaret (Chapters 2, 3, and 5). For
these paradigms connect seemingly incommensurable elements, land and sea, past and present, proximity and distance. As Deleuze and Guattari explain, the rhizome ‘is composed not of units but of dimensions, or rather directions in motion. It has neither beginning nor end, but always a middle (milieu) from which it grows and overspills’ (1987: 21). This clearly echoes the discussion of the preceding chapters and presents an alternate framework that enables the trials of the margins by reconfiguring binarism and multiplying centres, implicitly destabilising what constitutes the centre and the periphery or margins. Indeed, Glissant takes up the concept of the rhizome to challenge tensions between centre and margins (1994b: 100–101) and to foster relation (2000: 11). Within the framework of the rhizome,

les centres et les périphéries sont des notions caduques. [...] Cette existence de régions qui archipélistent les continents fait que la pensée des continents est de moins en moins dense, épaisse et pesante et la pensée des archipels de plus en plus écumante et proliférante. [...] [D]es réalités culturelles régionales ne seront plus considérées comme des périphéries ni comme des centres, mais seront considérées comme des multiplicités écumantes — il n’y a pas d’autre mot — de la réalité de la totalité-monde’. (Glissant 1994b: 101)

Archipelagic formation is integral to Glissant’s poetics (2000: 33–34), and both Clint Bruce (2020: 141) and François Paré (2003: 185–86) bring this idea explicitly into the Acadian literary context. Lastly, the rhizome has been transferred into a maritime paradigm, as Elizabeth M. DeLoughrey builds on Edward Kamau Brathwaite’s claim that ‘the unity is submarine’ to develop the idea of ‘archipelagoes as a submarine rhizome’ and connect geography and history (2007: 25, see also 17).

The second figure comes from Laëtitia Saint-Loubert and moves into a translational paradigm. Mapping out ‘literary trajectories’ between islands and continents (2020: 169–87), Saint-Loubert borrows from the work of Françoise Vergès and Calpanin Marimoutou to describe amarres as moorings that ‘reveal sub-liminal connections between marginalized literary spheres that resist assimilation into mainstream cultures’ (2020: 169). Yet, the term ‘amarres’, as it is used in one of the texts cited by Saint-Loubert, offers an example of untranslatability as it respects the specificity inherent in processes of creolisation, the
‘inherent instability of meaning of a term depending on its insular context’ (2020: 180). As moorings, *amarres* bring together distinctive but complementary archipelagic loci through maritime networks while respecting specificity. In the Acadian context, meanwhile, the word ‘amarrer’ also has multiple meanings (Péronnet and others 1998: 484, 488). Moreover, it is a practical example of the maritime quality of Acadian language and of the tendency to attribute general meanings and usage to primarily maritime vocabulary (Massignon 1947: 51). Thus, Acadians ‘amarrent’ their shoes as they do their boats (Poirier 1995: 28); the word means both ‘to moor’ and ‘to tie’. *Le glossaire acadien* gives ‘amarrer’ ‘un emploi universel’ (1995: 28), but this universal quality is achieved paradoxically yet precisely thanks to the verb’s specificity. The specificity of the word compels its translation into wider usage, including to discuss the connections within translation in Acadie.

The images of the rhizome and *amarre* foster an archipelagic view. When describing its type of ‘exiguïté’, François Paré specifies that Acadian literature belongs to the category of ‘littératures insulaires’, remarking on its ‘caractéristiques de dépendance et d’autarcie des îles’ (2001: 31). Paré goes on: ‘cette insularité fait sa force stratégique tout en constituant ses limites les plus tangibles’ (2001: 31). Acadian translation, insofar as it is rhizomic, as it establishes *amarres*, contributes to breaking down the tangible limits observed above. Indeed, Paré nuances the insular quality of Acadie in a subsequent work:

> la figure instable de l’archipel et celle, rhizomique, du bayou structurent les représentations de la diversité ‘insulaire’ de l’Acadie actuelle. Elles permettent de penser la culture acadienne comme une culture du Détour, pour emprunter une analyse d’Édouard Glissant, une culture où se manifeste une certaine ‘antillanité’ des formes discursives et de l’imaginaire. (Paré 2003: 185–86)

Chapter 5 illustrated that the bayous are markers of translation phenomena in the context of the Acadian diaspora (p. 191), thereby reinforcing the correlation being made here. The archipelago, for its part, has been used to describe the North American Francophonie more generally (Louder and others 2007), often representing Francophone communities as fragmented and fragile (Thériault 1995: 85–86). Mathieu Wade, conversely, uses the metaphor to compensate for Acadie’s lack of legally defined territory: ‘Peuple sans État, l’Acadie n’est pas pour autant sans territoire. Seulement, ce territoire prend la forme d’un

Emphasising the archipelagic form in translation not only connects it with conceptions of Acadian literature but also brings a certain cohesion and connection to cope with — to inhabit, to use Paré’s word (2003) — the distance that marks the Acadian context (see Introduction, pp. 39–42). As mentioned previously, the distance that Acadian translation overcomes is not so much with the so-called foreign work as with itself to compensate for historical vicissitudes. Thanks to connections enabled by rhizomes or amarres inherent in Acadian translation, the trials — both in the sense of experiencing and of driving the labour — reinvest the Acadian margin. In other words, translation in Acadie experiences (and indeed embraces) its marginality to reposition itself as a viable and flourishing player. Thus, the vocabulary of translation proposed creates a similar effect as the use of aquatic metaphors that Elizabeth M. DeLoughrey offers up in contradistinction to territorial belonging in diaspora theory:

[t]he use of aquatic metaphors, a maritime grammar of the ‘peoples of the sea’, helps us to recognize the importance of the ocean in the transnational imaginary and in diaspora theory in general. Moreover, historicizing the grammar of diaspora demonstrates how the sea is historically and imaginatively territorialized and cannot function as a facile aqua nullius or a blank template for transoceanic migration. (2007: 30)

DeLoughrey develops this idea in light of tidalectics (see Chapter 5, pp. 192–194), mapping out the routes necessary to achieve the navigation of Caribbean and Pacific island literatures promised in the subtitle of Routes and Roots (2007). Adapting this idea to the Acadian context, the vocabulary of translation proposed here is transformed into a grammar through the textual examples of literary translations provided. In other words, the process of hybridisation that Acadian translation generates ‘creolises’ and ‘re-vernacularises’ (Rafael 2023: xii), as it were (this will come up again below), the discourse of translation in Canada. As with DeLoughrey’s shift from a territorial to an oceanic framework, the vocabulary and
grammar of Acadian translation counters facile *aqua or terra nullius*. It substantiates Acadie as a space for and of translation and translationality so that it is recognised not as an emptiness inviting takeover by a dominant force but as a legitimately productive and (re)creative space. Moreover, the trials of the margins and the rhizomic structure that it generates combine to form a view of translation that contributes to and indeed broadens research in various fields, namely Acadian studies, Canadian translation theory, translation studies, and the environmental humanities. These contributions are outlined below.

**Acadian studies: Turning the page**

Drawing from several disciplines intersecting with Acadian studies at various points and in varying degrees, the thesis has proposed a translational lens through which to look not only at Acadie’s historical vicissitudes but also at Acadian society more generally. The *Proclamation Designating July 28 of Every Year as ‘A Day of Commemoration of the Great Upheaval’*, drawn up in lieu of an official apology for the Deportation from the British crown (Perrin 2004, 2009), expresses the ‘hope that the Acadian people can turn the page on this dark chapter of their history’ (Government of Canada 2003; Thibodeau 2010: 69). ‘Ce vœu pieux’, writes Serge Patrice Thibodeau in the introductory section of the *Journal de John Winslow à Grand-Pré*, ‘est étonnant. Comment les Acadiens [et Acadiennes] pourraient-ils tourner la page d’un livre qu’ils n’ont jamais lu?’ (2010: 69) The question was literal for Thibodeau, who for this reason went on to translate the book Acadians had supposedly never read, a first-hand, unfictionalised account of the Deportation (2010). The question is also rhetorical, though, for even if not existing textually, the ‘book’ to which Thibodeau refers has been told, passed on, inscribed, and translated variously as the heavy emphasis on the Grand Dérangement throughout the preceding chapters demonstrates. The acts of memorialisation like the one in which Thibodeau and the other translators discussed herein engage stem from traumatic loss, which Bella Brodzki explicitly links to translation:

---

193 Acadian studies has been a field of study since at least the 1960s (Daigle 1980, 1993a; Landry and others 2021, see especially pp. 477–488), intersecting a range of disciplines such as linguistics (Boudreau 2016; LeBlanc 2021; Urbain and Arrighi 2021), geography (Arseneault 1999; Bérubé 1987), history and historiography (Faragher 2005; Griffiths 1992, 2005; Hautecoeur 1975; Thériault 1993), sociology (Thériault 1995), politics (Thériault 1982), genealogy (White 1999), archeology (Erickson and Fowler 2013; Fowler Forthcoming), and literature (Lonergan 2008, 2013, 2018; Marguerite Maillet 1983).
[i]n their broadest embrace, textual acts of mourning and memorialization are dialogues with death, in which relief, rage, guilt, and shame are enmeshed with grief, both collective and personal. More pointedly, they speak on behalf of the dead, the missing, and sometimes even in their name — for the dead, by definition, can no longer speak for themselves and are often consigned to anonymity and oblivion, as well as to silence. [...] Translation is an impetus to forestall loss, it is a response to impending loss, and it is a sign itself of the consequence, as well as the consciousness, of loss. (2007: 185–86)

Insofar as loss is a ‘precondition’ of translation (Cronin 2022: 253), and in light of the creative potential afforded by what is lost (Cronin 2022: 263), the Grand Dérangement was likely to have significant impact from a translation perspective. Yet, as Cronin goes on to point out, ‘we need to move loss in translation into a different register — [...] into a different kind of ontological space that frees it up to dialogue with other issues and practices’ (2022: 260). The violence of the Grand Dérangement brought about tremendous loss — of life, community, property, land —, and only relatively recently has the discourse begun to shift from a narrative of loss and victimisation to one of complexity and dynamism.194 ‘L’Acadie, c’est un détail’, bemoaned Irène Doiron at the end of L’Acadie, l’Acadie?!?, a documentary on the Acadian student movements of the early 1970s (L’Acadie, l’Acadie?!? 1971). Today, this ‘detail’ is at the centre of reinvigorated sociocultural movements that embrace ‘parler mal’ (Richard and Robichaud [n.d.]; see also Boudreau 2016) as an affirmation of linguistic security, sociopolitical complexity (Landry and others 2021), and challenging the traditional (e.g. Évangéline) through artistic practices to grapple with contemporary social issues (Belliveau 2023; Godin 2020). Translation in Acadie contributes to this movement, focussing on translationality to tease out some ways particularities translate into complex dynamics.

Since relatively limited attention has been paid to literary translation in Acadian studies thus far (see Introduction, pp. 30–31), bringing forward a translational perspective also contributes to elucidating linguistic particularities in Acadian literature not necessarily recognised as ‘literary translation’. Nicole Nolette highlights some of these within

---

194 For an overview of this shift, see namely Bourque and Richard (2014) and Rudin (2009).
heterolingual theatre in the Franco-Canadian context (2015: 186–244). But if, as the preceding analysis has shown, translationality is a fundamental characteristic of Acadie, the practice of (textual) translation is likely not beholden to conventional transfer, or even to language categories (Des Rochers 2023). Indeed, Des Rochers challenges the fixity of Canada’s colonial language categories, recognising the beginnings of a postlingual approach in Georgette LeBlanc’s translation Océan (2023: 205–22). Des Rochers identifies writers and translators who, like LeBlanc,

refuse to play the game of [settler monolingual] language according to the settler nation’s rules. Writing this way in present-day Canada [...] is a way for marginalized speakers — be they Indigenous, queer, immigrants, Acadian, or Québécois — to escape the fixed linguistic identity they are supposed to perform and, by the same token, to counter the colonial and heteronormative linguistic narratives that characterize present-day Canada. (2023: 205)

A work like Dominique Bernier-Cormier’s Entre Rive and Shore (2023a) aligns with this idea. In this poetry collection, Bernier-Cormier explores the intricacies of bilingualism in Acadian identity, opening with a story of family lore that recounts the escape by Pierrot, a Cormier ancestor, from Fort Beauséjour on the eve of Deportation by wearing a smuggled dress (2023a: 9–10). The author then questions ‘does any of it matter? Was Pierrot’s escape in vain if, 266 years later, I am writing this in English anyway, and not in French? Does translation catch up to us all, inevitably?’ (2023a: 10) A partial answer comes later in the collection:

Regardless of whether I write in French or English, I am writing in a language of displacement, of erasure. To insist too heavily on the borders between these languages is to recognize their claims to the land. The conflicts between French and British powers here were immoral and violent, their claims illegitimate. I refuse to re-enact those conflicts within myself, de signer un serment d’allégeance. I refuse to believe qu’une frontière armée découpe each bilingual self, je refuse d’être un garde at the borders of language. (Bernier-Cormier 2023a: 55)
Bernier-Cormier describes translation practice as engaging in a bilingual writing practice, not as the conventional practice of interlingual translation with separate source and target texts (Bernier-Cormier 2023b). This, too, is translation in Acadie. Bernier-Cormier is one of many writers, including those analysed by Nolette (2015: 179–244), who play with language and contribute to redefining who identifies as a translator and what constitutes a translation in Acadie. How do these translators approach the practice differently than those translating from a source text not their own? Are they partaking in self-translation practices or carving out a different path for themselves?

Moving beyond a textual and linguistic frame, it would also be fruitful to examine the semiotic translational forces in projects such as Akadi Lumina. Launched in the summer of 2023, Akadi Lumina presents (translates) the ‘essence of Acadie’ via a nighttime forest walk that creates an ‘artistic experience [...] through light, poetry, video projection and original music’ (Moment Factory [n.d.]). It conveys a decidedly romantic vision of Acadie, the marketing inviting participants to ‘[s]tep into the home of a cheerful people, shaped by more than 400 years of maritime stories, social struggles, colourful banter, and unforgettable kitchen parties’ (Moment Factory [n.d.]). ‘Le Kitchen Party: An Acadian Celebration of Food and Music’ is another project that harnesses Acadie’s translational forces, this time through food and music. Created by Acadian conductor Juliane Gallant and slated for Toronto’s Théâtre Passe Muraille in May 2024, the project invites the discovery of ‘Acadian traditions’ warm, infectious music’ to ‘fill your hearts with nostalgia’ (Tapestry Opera [n.d.]). It blends the traditional and the urban and Acadianises classical music, destabilising again the margin and the centre. Moreover, the work of visual artist Rémi Belliveau also presents opportunities for further research. Belliveau wonders about the ‘use of Evangeline for an Acadian like me today’ (Belliveau 2017). ‘I don’t really know what is useful about it’, they confess, ‘except if I try to work with what has been left behind, and make new meaning out of it’ (Belliveau 2017). In the summer of 2023, Belliveau presented an exhibition titled Evangelinia, exploring the elitist nature of the tourist route The Land of Evangeline created by the Dominion Atlantic Railway. According to Belliveau, the Route’s

195 It goes on: ‘Like a migrating swallow, you will soar over a land of infinite shores, follow a star that shines like an invincible beacon, and immerse yourself in melodies inspired by the courage and resilience of a people known for their joie de vivre, authenticity, and legendary hospitality’ (Moment Factory [n.d.]). Akadi Lumina is installed at the Pays de la Sagouine, a historical-village-cum-theme-park based on the settings, characters, and words of Antonine Maillet.
‘thématique [...] résolument évangélinienne [...] instrumentalisait, voir fétichisait, plusieurs aspects de la culture acadienne — notamment son histoire et ses anciennes coutumes — au bénéfice d’une classe sociale à laquelle peu d’acadien-ne-s appartenaient’ (2023). The comment highlights the multiplicity of intersemiotic translations of Évangéline even today, her appropriation by both the conqueror, symbolised by the Dominion Atlantic Railway, and by Acadians, Belliveau ‘[é]tant [iel]-même acadien-ne, descendant-e de ces paysan-ne-s modestes’ (Belliveau 2023). Évangéline’s retranslatability remains relevant, but now challenges narratives of identity, culture, and narrative.

Two other upcoming projects should likewise contribute to expanding the view on translation in Acadie from the perspective of French-to-English practice, also relatively scant though slightly more active than its English-to-French counterpart, examined throughout this thesis. The first is Geneviève Robichaud’s post-doctoral project titled Our Inhabitable Mornings, a bilingual research-creation project that includes a translation into English of Gérald Leblanc’s Les matins habitables and the composition of a long poem-essay in the form of a poetic reply and meta-commentary on the translation (Robichaud 2024). The second project is the self-translation into English of Alma, by Georgette LeBlanc. Both projects will likely complexify the picture that has so far heavily focussed on language. If Jo-Anne Elder is correct in stating that English translations create ‘une impression pas toujours juste’ of Acadie (2005), there remains ample opportunity to investigate further. Of particular interest, and a direction that would mirror the research presented in the previous chapters, might be the charting of these translations’ trajectories, since they take place both within and outside of Atlantic Canada.

Lastly, while the research presented herein portrays an objectively small context, approaches that disentangle translation from exclusively textual boundaries allow for extrapolation into other contexts for comparative purposes. In this, Acadian translation

---

196 A thorough study of Acadian works in translation has not yet been completed, but a cursory overview can be gleaned from other studies (Elder 2005; Paratte 1985; Stratford 1977; White 2007). Additional research and general knowledge of the field cover the gap to present-day. Based on these, more than 50 books by 15 Acadian authors (a loose definition here to include Samuel de Champlain’s writings even though calling him Acadian is anachronistic) have been translated by roughly 20 translators since 1609.

197 For example, Antonine Maillet’s fiction and plays have been translated by Ontario- or Québec-based Wayne Grady, Barbara Godard, Philip Stratford, and Ben-Z Shek, and France Daigle has been translated by Robert Majzels. New Brunswick-based Fred Cogswell and Jo-Anne Elder have taken significant interest in Acadian poetry (Cogswell and Elder 1990b; Elder 2005, 2007), and Glen Nichols, also based in New Brunswick, has taken on Acadian drama, namely the plays of Herménégilde Chiasson.
provides one of several potential counterpoints for comparative work with other (post)colonial contexts, Louisiana, the Caribbean, and Ireland coming readily to mind. While some comparative research between Acadie and these places has been done, none of it seems to be through the lens of translation. Corina Crainic has argued that Acadie, Louisiana, and the Caribbean share states of strangeness and minoritisation (Crainic 2020). François Paré discusses Acadie’s ‘antillanité’ in the context of inhabited distance (2003: 185–98), while Éloïse Brière maps out genealogical preoccupations in the New World, focussing specifically on Acadie and the Caribbean (1990). These connections and others would benefit from further research, the beginnings of which were presented in the previous chapters, to compare namely with the work of Laëtitia Saint-Loubert (2020). As for Ireland, Marie-Linda Lord compares the minoritised Acadian and Miramichi-Irish contexts in New Brunswick (2002), Marie-Noëlle Rinne compares Maillet’s Évangéline Deusse with James Joyce’s Maria (2003), and Robert Viau points out affinities between the two regions (Viau 2023: 141, footnote no. 9). All of these form the beginnings of an analysis exportable into comparative research between Acadie and Ireland from a translation perspective through the work of Maria Tymoczko (1999) and Michael Cronin (1996, 2000, 2006, 2021). In this regard, a closer look at Serge Patrice Thibodeau’s forthcoming translation of Patrick Kavanagh’s poem The Great Hunger would likely prove insightful, as it brings together Kavanagh’s Irish famine context with the region of Madawaska in northwestern New Brunswick ravaged by famine in the late eighteenth century (Thibodeau 2014).

Translation in Canada: Challenging the bridge metaphor

While a dominant image in translation studies (Cronin 2006: 121; Simon 2019: 105–6), the figure of the bridge is especially prominent in Canadian translation. The metaphor conveys primarily the goal of bridging what Hugh MacLennan famously called the ‘two solitudes’ (2018), represented by the two main settler colonies and their languages of English and French (Lane-Mercier 2018: 282; Mezei 1985, 2008). Supported by the ‘unrealistic vision of Canada as a dynamic nation committed to cultural bridge-building, translational justice, participatory citizenship and outdated notions of linguistic parity and intercultural exchange’ (Woodsworth and Lane-Mercier 2018: 11–12), the bridge metaphor is especially strong in the discourse pertaining to French-to-English translation (Lane-
Nevertheless, English-to-French translation also responds to bridging a gap, if more from the perspective of cultural appropriation and reaffirmation than from that of seeking understanding of the other (Brisset 1990). Still, the bridge in Canadian translation is precarious, as Kathy Mezei observes: ‘literary translation [in Canada] has been a “bridge of sorts”, a fragile, weakly supported, predominantly one-way bridge linking the two solitudes over which a few enterprising souls have ventured’ (1985: 204–5). It remains precarious to this day: three decades after Mezei, Lane-Mercier bemoans the fact that the Canada Council for the Arts ‘reconduit explicitement la métaphore de la traduction comme pont entre “deux solitudes” largement ignorantes l’une de l’autre’ (2014: 520–21).

In addition to such precarity, one problem with the bridge is that it perpetuates monolithic understandings of Canada’s two official language groups, glossing over multiple linguistic minority, Indigenous, and cultural communities across the country. To illustrate this, another transportation infrastructure metaphor, this one advanced by Philip Stratford, is useful. Stratford writes that ‘I would like to see the word translation become as household and as vital a word as Trans-Canada’ (qtd. in Mezei 1985: 205). The TransCanada highway runs through Canada’s ten provinces, but it connects only relatively few and select communities — tellingly missing the country’s three territories — and excludes several others found along backroads in every which direction. The relative narrowness of the TransCanada Highway parallels the elements that the bridge metaphor implicitly connects, ‘French’ Canada in Montréal/Québec and ‘English’ Canada in Toronto/Ontario. With the bridge metaphor as with the TransCanada, the countless communities that constitute these two solitudes, let alone all those that fit in neither of these neat categories, are left out.

Like debates about official bilingualism in Canada that tend to gloss over divisions between the two major linguistic groups (Lane-Mercier 2014: 520–21; Woodsworth and Lane-Mercier 2018: 11–12), the bridge connects but also separates and divides. Both Mezei198 (1985: 204, 2008) and Simon (2012: 13, 2019: 105–6) have observed this phenomenon. Even if the bridge fosters bidirectionality, traffic flows heavier in one direction than the other in practice (Mezei 2008: 30) and there is little room for nuance. Hence Nolette’s need to step outside the well-trodden — paved, as it were — bridge

---

198 Mezei writes: ‘the metaphors or “emblems”, to use Stratford’s expression, which characterize discussions of the two literatures, reflect our separation: Hugh MacLennan’s “two solitudes”, Jean Falardeau’s horizontal and vertical axis, [...] Philip Stratford’s “double helix”’ (1985: 204).
between the two solitudes to chart regionally specific heterolingual theatre and metonymically map out ‘un circuit géographique pour le théâtre franco-canadien qui commence à Montréal’ (2015: 1).

Translation in Acadie, both in terms of its spatial conception and its literary deployment, offers an alternative approach to the bridge and, consequently, a possible solution to its precarity and propensity for division. Translation in Acadie proposes to look at what flows under the bridge, not at or from the bridge but at what the bridge theoretically bypasses. It homes in on fluidity rather than on the relatively narrow, structurally rigid bridge. Translation in Acadie lends itself well to this exercise because of its fluid nature. As Chapter 2 has shown, aboiteaux are mechanisms designed specifically to work with and harness tidal flows, connecting the saltmarshes into which they were built with the surrounding body of water. Their unique sluice-and-valve system is in constant flux, performing one of two functions: stopping water from penetrating and thus flooding fields at high tide or allowing salt water to drain out at low tide. The notions of grands dérangements and mascaret, discussed in Chapters 4 and 5, both occur on or through maritime routes. Though not framed in a maritime paradigm, défrichetage de parenté, presented in Chapter 3, also engages in a poetics of fluidity, particularly insofar as the défricheteuse is conceived as able to travel seamlessly within lineages.

Homing in on the body of water flowing under the bridge introduces the possibility of intersection and cross-connection. If the bridge connects Canada’s two solitudes, respectively represented as homogeneous groups under the designations of ‘French’ and ‘English’ Canada, what flows under the bridge can be the space of nuance, of diversity, of minority. It can be a space in which to collect emplaced and embodied data (Tuck and McKenzie 2016: 105–10). This calls for the fractal dimension (Cronin 2000: 16–20, 2006: 14–22), where diversity on the micro level parallels diversity on the macro level — that is, where diversity in representations of translation practices parallels diversity at the societal level, not that hidden by the binarism of official bilingualism or the illusory homogeneity of the ‘two solitudes’. Quoting Mezei, Simon observes that this is precisely the purview of the ‘margins’ of Canadian translation:

"In bringing the margins to the centre of attention, in highlighting the expanding and intersecting margins of literary life, these papers [the collection
of essays in *Traduire depuis les marges / Translating from the Margins*] show the relevance of translation to the study of the contemporary complexities of Canadian culture. [...] The stereotypical bridge of translation has given way to ‘flexible, multilayered, and mobile spaces and textures, repeating and doubling on themselves and skillfully confusing target and source texts and spaces’.
(2008: 23–24)

The alternative metaphor proposed here shifts the conventional loci of translation discourse in Canada. Looking at what flows under the bridge provides an angular perspective reminiscent of currents and tributaries. In other words, it is a rhizomic perspective rather than a linear one. While bridges are generally rigid, what they straddle is often fluid, flowing. Such fluidity, and the biosemiotic communication that it enables, is, according to Cronin, part of the future of translation studies. Cronin notes a shift in the film *Gorgo* whereby the ‘bridge-builder (*pontifex*)’ turns into the sea dweller who wants to be in the water, negotiating the currents, interacting continuously with different life systems. *[Gorgo]* wants to be immersed, not detached. As societies the world over face into the climate crisis [...], translation studies needs less of the pontifical certainties of human (language) exceptionalism and more of the supple, shifting openness of the fluvial. (2021: 17)

The dismantling of the causeway bridging the Petitcodiac River, discussed in Chapter 5 (pp. 174–180), represents an apt depiction of this idea. In addition to providing an example of actual bridge dismantling in a translational context, the causeway corroborates the results that looking at what flows under the bridge can yield and what can happen from a (bio)diversity perspective when flow and fluidity are embraced.

This perspective creates space for the range of communities living in Mi’kma’ki / Acadie / Atlantic Canada and engaging with the land. More specifically, delving deeper into Mi’kmaq-Acadian translation practices would offer stimulating avenues of research, particularly in light of Des Rochers’ language smuggling (2023) or, from a broader perspective, of Vicente L. Rafael’s notion of ‘the debts of settler translation’ (2024). *Nous sommes les rêveurs* and its translator’s note provide some insight into this idea, some of
which was discussed in Chapter 2 (pp. 98–102). However, the ongoing working relationship between Mi’kmaq poet and playwright shalan joudry and translator Sonya Malaborza, a collaborative effort rendering texts from Mi’kmaq and English into French, may create fruitful material for future research. Sophie M. Lavoie has also translated the memoir of Ojibwa-Cree Elder Ma-Nee Chacaby, *Un parcours bispirituel: Récit d’une aînée objibwé-crie lesbienne* (Chacaby and Plummer 2019), while Acadie-based literary translator Arianne Des Rochers is translating Indigenous literatures, though not yet Mi’kmaq.

**Translation Studies: Contributions from the minor**

Exemplifying how minoritised cultures are ‘translation cultures par excellence’ (Cronin 1998: 147, 2003: 139), the thesis adopted a dual approach to explore both translation and translationality within the Acadian context. As promised in the Introduction (pp. 38–39), it investigated from a fractal dimension the particularities of the terrain of translation in Acadie. Neutrality, the Deportation, and the Évangéline narrative, along with the vocabulary of translation drawn from textual analyses and publishing activity, provided a wide-ranging view of translation that contributes to ongoing and current trends in translation studies.

Quoting Naomi E.S. Griffiths, historians Stéphane Savard and Martin Pâquet point to the inherent contradictions of an Acadie complicated by its historical vicissitudes: ‘[l]a frontière dans le cas de l’Acadie, qui fut dès les origines une “border colony,” c’est donc ce lieu à la fois matériel et immatériel où il est possible d’assumer sa déportation et où l’on décide d’ouvrir grand les portes’ (2007: 7). In addition to hinting at the causeway gates discussed in Chapter 5, this resonates with the stance of neutrality outlined in Chapter 1 (pp. 61–66), which was not a position of power in sociopolitical terms but an assertion of connection to the land and to community. It was a way of going forward with those priorities while respecting the limitations imposed by the imperial regimes. In other words, it was a way towards a ‘both/and’ rather than an ‘either/or’ framework, a hybrid, ambiguous state that engages in often complementary, sometimes contradictory, patterns. The currents that emerged throughout the analysis represent instances of Acadian cultural expression that ebb and flow in each of the translations, instead of consuming or appropriating the source texts into Acadian poetics, ideology, or discourse. As with the
mascaret that constitutes one of the paradigms outlined, translation in Acadie is fluid. For example, despite the pull of geographical transposition through translation, *Océan* anchors the reader in Halifax, the setting of Goyette’s source text (see Chapter 4, pp. 162–168). Explicitly promising to translate John Winslow’s *Journal* as literally as possible (2010: 71), Thibodeau makes the translation ‘Acadian’ through the motivation to make the text accessible to a Francophone (read Acadian) readership. Similarly, the translations of Rose Després and Sophie M. Lavoie do not bear any significant marks of Acadian French but flow into the currents of Acadian translation through the metaphors they elicit. Grounded in the territory but also targeting readerships that spill beyond its borders, rendering cultural specificity while recognising the shared landscape between source and target text, Acadian literary translations embrace hybridity. This is precisely what prompts Arianne Des Rochers to posit a postlingual approach, one that surfaces specifically in LeBlanc’s translation *Océan*:

> By drawing on what she *hears* around her and wherever she goes, LeBlanc creates an assemblage of ‘sounds that link us together’. This ‘us’ is not some imagined national or supranational community (e.g. the francophone world) but an actual neighborhood, an actual network of relationships. What links this ‘us’ together, what resonates here and now is not some abstracted, delocalized, standardized, faraway language but a heterogeneous, fluid, changing, live, very real, and immediate linguistic landscape from which translators can draw. (2023: 218, emphasis in original)

Echoing on the one hand the metonymic impulse in translation outlined by Maria Tymoczko (1999), this emphasis on hybridity aligns with recent research on minoritised and marginalised contexts that breaks away from binary models of exchange. For instance, translation in Acadie corresponds to a perspective recently outlined by Vicente Rafael to outline the ‘translationscape’ of Southeast Asia (2023). Connecting the etymologies of the word ‘translation’ and the suffix ‘scape’, Rafael explains that in the combination ‘[t]here is then the unending and contingent combination of play and repression, of violence and generosity, of decision and indeterminacy that is woven into the notion of “translationscapes”’ (2023: x). Rafael’s contention is premised on an archipelagic formation and on the interplay of land- and seascapes (2023: x). Sea level becomes a vantage from
which translation can be ‘[s]een from below and across, [...] thus reveal[ing] what [Rafael has]
elsewhere referred to as the enduring insurgency of language whereby attempts at
standardization meet up with processes of creolization that seek to re-vernarcaulize official
discourse’ (2023: xii). As noted above, translation in Acadie operates at sea or ground level
rather than pontificating from above. Its rhizomic structure, moreover, supports a position
of horizontality, not of hierarchical verticality. This horizontality is liable to spill out of
imagined boundaries, like the translation-based artwork centred on the word
‘dérangement’ that Sherry Simon discusses in the context of thinking translationally (2023;
see also Chapter 4 of this thesis, pp. 151–52). The multifarious nature of this approach,
furthermore, aligns with Phrae Chittiphlangsri’s argument, following Angela Kershaw and
Gabriela Saldanha, that the conception of translation as linear transfer

excludes the arbitrariness of borderline propounded by scholars such as
Arjun Appadurai who sees modern cultural forms as primarily ‘fractal’, that
is overlapping and irregular; and Maeve Olohan who proposes the term
‘faultlines’ to account for the ever-shifting, overlapping, impactful, and
virtual rather than actual configuration of boundary in translation. (2023: 3)

Insofar as ‘rhizomic dynamics’ foster a ‘poetics of “unpredictability” (Saint-Loubert 2020:
44), Acadie opens onto a perspective broader than the limits of its insularity or (imaginary)
boundaries through the archipelago formed by literary translation practice and
translationality.

Piotr Blumczynski ties translationality back to its medieval sense to argue that
‘translation as a cultural phenomenon and social practice involves a holistic, psychosomatic
engagement traceable to corporeal transfer’ (2023: 4). Focussing specifically on the
translation of bodies (dead and alive), Blumczynski challenges the textual biases of
translation studies. The Évangéline narrative provides one such example. Though also the
result of textual translation (Longfellow 2008), Évangéline has long been the subject of what
Jakobson calls ‘intersemiotic’ translation (2012: 127). She has recently undergone various
transformations as part of Rémi Belliveau’s visual arts practice (2017, 2019, 2023). On the
printed artist statement accompanying the 2023 exhibition titled Evangelinia, Belliveau
includes an excerpt from the brochure produced by the Dominion Atlantic Railway to
promote its *Land of Evangeline Route* at the turn of the twentieth century. According to the brochure, tourists are promised ‘a collection of [...] Acadian relics [...] and other articles of historic interest that help the mind fancy a life that has passed away’ (qtd. in Belliveau 2023). The *Land of Evangeline Route* cuts across the Grand-Pré landscape, where John Winslow’s walls were porous, where the aboiteaux constitute a UNESCO World Heritage Site, and where Acadian gardens were replanted and Acadian communities repopulated in *L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay* (see Chapter 2). Thus, whether the ‘life passed away’ mentioned in the brochure refers to Évangéline’s or to the Acadian community’s, the comment, paralleling Évangéline’s never-ending translatability, resonates with the translation of relics that Blumczynski outlines (2023: 83–143; see also Bertacco and Vallorani 2021: 28–39; Brodzki 2007; Italiano 2016: 8; Simon 2019: 189; Tymoczko 2014: 59). Material relics are intimately connected to the mnemonic, as Jane Slemon’s discussion of the two cedar chests central to *Pélagie-la-Charrette* and the myth of the return to Acadie shows: one chest is real, carrying Deportation relics, the other imagined, representing the heaviness of the past that threatens survival through exile (2003: 29–30). Material or mnemonic, the relics exemplify the definition of translation Brodzki offers as ‘the mode through which what is dead, disappeared, forgotten, buried, or suppressed overcomes its determined fate by being borne (and thus born anew) to other contexts across time and space’ (2007: 6). It comes back to Patrick D. Clarke’s idea that ancestors become the interlocutor at the crossroads of generations (2004: 44; see also Chapter 3 of this thesis, p. 117–18). It comes back, also, to Georgette LeBlanc resurrecting Acadian ancestors in *Océan* in the same waters in which struggled Prudent Robichaud and his fellow deportees aboard the *Pembroke* (see Chapter 3, p. 116–117).

Another way to consider this phenomenon is through Walter Benjamin’s notion of translation as ‘afterlife’ (2012: 76). The violence effected during the ‘great and noble scheme’ (qtd. in Faragher 2005: 333) that was the Deportation was, after all, meant to lead to the death of Acadie. From there, it is a short leap to consider what has survived — what Benjamin calls ‘continuing life’ (2012: 77) — as afterlife. This is the process at work in Georgette LeBlanc’s *Prudent*, whose titular character is a ‘traducteur de métier’ who in real

199 The idea of connecting Acadian relics to Brodzki comes from Ariane Brun del Re, who argues that a transcription of Franco-Ontarian stories and heritage in an English-language novel by Lola Lemire Tostevin titled *Frog Moon* illustrates Brodzki’s argument (2019: 247, footnote 645).
life served as interpreter in French, Mi’kmaq, and English (Basque 1996), and in fiction translates Acadians’ doomed fate into hope (LeBlanc 2013). In LeBlanc’s text, Prudent reprises a translatively role aboard the Pembroke, the ship carrying 232 Acadians to North Carolina, but not a linguistic one. Rather, Prudent translates the story from one of deportation to one of return and the narrative from a British to an Acadian perspective (LeBlanc 2013: 13; see also Viau 2022: 181–216). The translator-storyteller forges new identities, not unlike the défricheteuse de parenté and her narrative interventions that effectively rewrite history (Chapter 3). A similar process occurs with the aboiteaux encouraging silt deposits and changing the landscapes around them (Chapter 2). Or the mascaret changing the narrative of dwindling biodiversity through Acadians’ transnational agency (Chapter 5). Benjamin points to the meaning held within a text’s translatability, and indeed draws the translation’s connection to its original through its own translatability (2012: 76). It would be worthwhile to expand on this idea to accommodate a broader definition of what an ‘original’ might constitute in the context of translation in Acadie, moving beyond exclusively textual sources to include geographic, biosemiotic, literary, cultural, historical, and genealogical antecedents.

**Environmental humanities: Translating outdoors**

On 7 September 2019, hurricane Dorian ravaged the Bahamas, the Caribbean, the eastern seaboard of the United States, and Atlantic Canada, making landfall as a Category 2 post-tropical storm in southwestern Nova Scotia. Dorian left extensive damage in its wake, including an uprooted tree named Georges. Folklore has it that Georges had stood on the grounds of Grand-Pré National Historic Site since the Deportation, contributing to it becoming a beloved favourite of staff and visitors (Radio-Canada 2019a). If Georges stood as a romantic, nostalgic testament to the (Acadian) past of Grand-Pré and the linguistic (see Chapter 2) and population (see Chapter 4) losses sustained there, its demise also underscores an environment drastically changing due to climate change.

The role of translation in interspecies communication is contributing to recognising anthropocentric biases and moving towards perspectives that engage the more-than-human (Cronin 2017, 2021, 2023; Marais 2019a). As eco-translation thinking surmises, translation is a conduit for considering ‘interconnectedness’ between human and more-than-human, as
well as the ‘vulnerability’ experienced by both (Cronin 2017: 1; see also Marais 2019a: 3). Although a drop in the proverbial bucket of the catastrophic damage caused by Dorian, Georges highlights an urgent need for developing tools for grasping, engaging with, and relating to the environment. In other words, for acknowledging the ‘tradosphere’ (Cronin 2017: 71, 2021) in which Georges’ demise is forged, along with Dorian’s other casualties and the threats and damaging effects of storms increasing in both ferocity and frequency, of rising sea levels, of eroding coastlines, and more. Cronin explains the ‘tradosphere’ as ‘the sum of all translation systems on the planet, all the ways in which information circulates between living and non-living organisms and is translated into a language code that can be processed or understood by the receiving entity’ (2017: 71, 2021: 6). Such recognition becomes crucial in a minoritised context, where forms of the minor in translation can account for the particulars of place and counter extractivist practices of both text and ecology (Cronin 2021: 9, 14).

As the preceding analysis has shown, literary translation practices in Acadie contribute to (re)establishing the particulars of the landscape and engaging in recuperative efforts from colonial violence and environmental degradation. Acadie’s translationality unfolds in great part outdoors, the aboiteaux, grands dérangements, and mascaret bringing this idea to bear. The practices engage intimately with the landscape and exemplify what Cronin identifies as characteristic of an ‘outdoor praxis of translation’, a heightened sensitivity to the more-than-human world (Cronin 2021: 10–14). This idea was discussed briefly in the context of Sophie M. Lavoie’s translation Nous sommes les rêveurs, in which translator meets poet in the landscape of Unama’kik / Cape Breton (Chapter 2, pp. 98–102). The replanting efforts of L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay provide another concrete example, this time of reinvesting the landscape with traditions and nomenclature lost during the emptying out and destruction of natural and human-built environments (Faragher 2005: 364; Fowler Forthcoming: 10). The impoverishment of the landscape, for example, is perceptible in Colonel John Winslow’s detailed list of persons, cattle, sheep, pigs, and horses taken and buildings burnt during the deportation at Grand-Pré (Thibodeau 2010: 58; Winslow 1880a: 122). Conversely, the Herbe sainte, Julienne des dames, Violette de Marie,

---

200 For example, Prince Edward Island National Park lost an estimated 80% of trees in the Cavendish area during the storm, and coastlines across the region suffered erosion of up to two metres (CBC News 2019).
Lys de la Madone, and other herbs and plants from *Médecine traditionnelle en Acadie* (Cormier Boudreau 2003) planted in the Acadian-accented midwives’ gardens in Scots Bay (McKay 2020: 232–33; see also Chapter 2 of this thesis, pp. 92–98) contribute to the minor language ‘restor[ing] a sense of history, particularity, complexity and (common) ownership to place’ (Cronin 2017: 143). The geopoetics of *Océan* (see Chapter 4, pp. 162–168) engage in a similar process, weaving the particularities of the fog, berries, and bays of the (minor) Acadian experience within the (major) discourse of Anglophone Nova Scotia. Or, the tidal bore as a place of convergence in Moncton, the city invented by its Acadian minority (Chapter 5, pp. 174–180), resulting in a reconfigured relationship between language, translation, and territory.

The aboiteaux provide a productive frame for thinking about eco-translation. They have continued to effect change on the landscape, both as functional dyking systems (Rudin 2021) and in their disuse (Bleakney 2004). Many aboiteaux fell into disuse following the Grand Dérangement (Cormier 1990: 78–80; Province of Nova Scotia 1987: 30, 43; Thurston 2004: 142) and now constitute visible remnants of a distant past. Yet, if ‘translation beyond translation’ entails addressing ‘growing communication across boundaries of all kinds, not only lingual’ (Marais 2023a: 2), the aboiteaux facilitate such communication. Engaging with the aboiteaux as translations into or from the minor allows for them to be perceived as being suffused with information relevant today rather than solely as vestiges of a lost past. Remnants of aboiteaux are visible to this day on the banks of the Petitcodiac River (see Figure 10). Incidentally, they would be visible to organisms (including surfers) flowing upstream with the mascaret or flowing out at ebb tide. Remnants of the aboiteaux were also found underground during construction of the bridge replacing the causeway (Rudin 2021: 205) — that is, during the process of (re)invention of the mascaret led by the Acadian community as outlined in Chapter 5.

![Figure 10: Remnants of the aboiteaux along the banks of the Petitcodiac River, with a western view to Moncton in the background. Photo by the author.](image-url)
This idea ties back to Brodzki’s call for ‘excavating or unearthing burial sites or ruins to reconstruct traces of the physical and textual past’ (2007: 4). Excavations in Moncton and at other sites of functioning and nonoperational aboiteaux are required to decipher buried human and more-than-human communications. This is what being attuned to Jonathan Fowler’s idea of ‘another archeology’ (see Chapter 2, p. 85) entails, as it promotes ‘a liminal encounter with alternate epistemes and ontologies’ (Cronin 2021: 7). Or attuned to Tuck and McKenzie’s critical place inquiry, recognising place as practice (2016: 14). Through these processes, the vocabulary and perspective of minority translation becomes increasingly diverse, creating a sophisticated tapestry of minor languages in the region. In addition to the Acadian sites explored herein, such as Grand-Pré, Port-Royal / Baie Sainte-Marie, and Moncton, further field work is required to grasp Acadie’s translation potential fully. In the vein of Sherry Simon’s *Sites of Translation* (2019), this research would not only create a fuller picture of rural-urban dynamics but also lead to a more thorough understanding of Acadie as a translational space through its multiple communications, human and (bio)semiotic. Moreover, it would create space for Mi’kmaq, Wolastoqey, French, Scottish Gaelic, and other minor languages known or spoken in Atlantic Canada (Statistics Canada 2023) to be explored from the perspective of translation.

Furthermore, an ability not only to excavate but also to interpret and read the aboiteaux for contemporary meaning from an environmental perspective is crucial, namely for helping to adapt to rising sea levels. Indeed, aboiteaux have increasingly been measures of the cumulative effects of rising sea levels because of the silt levels and sedimentation they attract (Bleakney 2004: 21; Cormier 1990: 37). Their study is thus beneficial to various disciplines, such as oceanography, archaeology, biology, and environmental studies (Bleakney 2004: 96–98). They also remain at the centre of present-day concerns on the Chignecto Isthmus (a land corridor connecting the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, see Figure 1), where rising sea levels are especially threatening. As a 2022 government-sponsored study notes:

Presently, the historic earthen dykes along with their re-habilitation conducted in the 1950s protect the coastline: without the current protection provided by the existing earthen dykes, much of the Isthmus would be inundated by today’s sea levels resulting in significant negative socio-economic impacts
The aboiteaux are therefore the ongoing focus of upgrade efforts led jointly by the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia (Government of New Brunswick [n.d.]) to adapt to climate change. Yet, although prey to erosion, the aboiteaux also replenish, they achieve cyclical balance between sedimentation and tidal erosion (Cormier 1990: 37). This ability makes them particularly relevant in an eco-translation framework. Since translation is required to ensure ethical ecological democracy and representation (Cronin 2023), the findings of the present research may contribute perspectives to a project like Alain Deneault’s ‘laboratoire biorégional’. Spearheaded out of the Péninsule acadienne region of northeastern New Brunswick, the project aims to redefine ways to address the ‘dérèglements écologiques, intellectuels et psychiques propres à notre siècle’ from a bioregional angle (Deneault 2023). The ‘laboratoire’ already acknowledges the crucial role of writers, and would benefit from including translators, too.

While the aboiteaux are being threatened on the Chignecto Isthmus, the Acadian minor is at risk of erosion from linguistic, political, and environmental perspectives. A pan-Canadian phenomenon, the decline of French is focalised in Acadie because of the proximity of Anglocentric influences (Pépin-Filion 2018). Recent decisions by the provincial government with regard to the Official Languages Act (MacLean 2023), as well as federal government appointments are exacerbating the threat. Such erosion, meanwhile, is mirrored at the environmental level. As mentioned previously, Acadian communities are located primarily in coastal areas of the Maritime provinces (Arseneault 1999; Hodson 2012: 198; Péronnet and others 1998), regions that are currently experiencing severe erosion and flooding. Predictions for five Acadian municipalities in southeastern New Brunswick hazard that up to 9.6% of buildings and 7.6% of roads will be lost to erosion by 2100, and that 4,721

---

201 Playwright Emma Haché and poet Jean-Philippe Raîche were among the guest presenters at the summit in the summer of 2023. See also an interview with Deneault on the challenges of the twenty-first century (‘Les défis du 21e siècle, selon le philosophe Alain Deneault’ 2023).

202 In 2019, the federal government appointed a unilingual Lieutenant-Governor for New Brunswick. The Société de l’Acadie du Nouveau-Brunswick launched a court case, arguing that the appointment infringes constitutional rights (Silberman 2023; Société de l’Acadie du Nouveau-Brunswick 2023).
buildings and 80.3 kilometres of roads will be vulnerable to flooding by 2030 should a weather event with a return period of 100 years occur (Chelbi and others 2023: 109–10).

These projections do not include damage to landscapes and natural environments carrying the Acadian language, such as the aboiteaux and mascaret explored throughout this thesis, or the barachois and mocauques mentioned above. The Louisiana bayous are hardly expected to fare better, threatened, too, by rising sea levels (Chavez 2021). The parallels with linguistic erosion enacted through neocolonial and minority-threatening policies are striking. Sociolinguist Mélanie LeBlanc equates the survival of the Acadian accent in the Baie Sainte-Marie region of Nova Scotia (see Chapter 3, p. 122, and Chapter 4, p. 163) specifically to the landscape and the settlement it enabled:

 Après le Grand Dérangement, […] la Baie Sainte-Marie a connu une reconstitution très différente de celles des autres communautés acadiennes. D’une part, l’expansion de la Baie Sainte-Marie à partir de 1785 s’est faite le long de la côte. Ce détail est particulièrement important pour comprendre l’évolution de la langue française et le maintien de certaines formes linguistiques dans la région. La communauté acadienne a de cette façon été isolée et les contacts avec les anglais ont été limités pendant une longue période ; l’intérieur des terres étant inhabité, l’érosion de la langue — donc l’anglicisation de la population francophone — ne s’est faite qu’à partir des extrémités est et ouest de la région, laissant la plus grande partie de la côte à peu près intacte. (2021: 47)

Eco-linguistics having established the link between language diversity and biodiversity (Abrams 1996), the loss of Acadian coasts may have a direct impact on the (further) loss of Acadian language, wearing away as it would at the safety that Baie Sainte-Marie’s shoreline has so far proffered. For, linguistic impoverishment creates an effect similar to — and indeed is exacerbated by — environmental destruction (Cronin 2017: 141; Macfarlane 2016: 23). Conversely, the loss of Acadian language may directly contribute to environmental degradation. In this context, linguistic insecurity becomes a type of manufactured insecurity in the sense that Astra Taylor denounces in The Age of Insecurity, as a deliberate violence motivated by capitalism and politics to keep the marginal marginalised (2023).
In this context, the ideological shift from linguistic insecurity to linguistic security (Boudreau 2022; Richard and Robichaud [n.d.]) takes on increased significance. There is a related economic argument to make, too. In New Brunswick, Acadians punch above their (minority) weight class in terms of cultural production (Doyon-Gosselin 2022; see also Chapter 5, pp. 174–80) and drive an economy reliant on bilingualism and on tourism centred around cultural experiences (Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages for New Brunswick 2019: 20–39). In the Maritimes provinces, the three most-visited tourist destinations are literary in nature, and two of these — the Pays de la Sagouine based on Maillet’s universe, and Grand-Pré, based on Évangéline — are profoundly Acadian (Viau 2020: 154). It is therefore crucial not to let these stories, written in the landscape, vanish, and to foster the means by which society can read, translate, and understand them.

***

The vast and multifarious contributions to Acadian studies, Canadian translation theory, translation studies, and the environmental humanities outlined in the preceding sections highlight the dynamism of translation in Acadie. As hypothesised at the beginning of the Introduction, the playfulness and peculiarity of Maillet’s translation of the opening line of Hamlet’s famous soliloquy indeed clearly capture the potential of a literary translation practice burgeoning in the 1970s. Subsequent translations, despite giving rise to a relatively modest practice in the past four decades, have likewise induced rich material with which to reconfigure Acadie’s exigüité. The rhizome, to which Acadian translation was likened earlier, implies continuity, a multitude of dimensions to explore. Some of these dimensions were charted in the preceding pages, thereby articulating a vocabulary of translation in Acadie. Still, Acadian translation and translationality will undoubtedly continue to yield more. Will continue, in other words, to negotiate the currents.

---

203 The third is Prince Edward Island’s Green Gables National Historic Site, based on the novels of Lucy Maud Montgomery.
Appendices


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'The Midwife’s Garden', from The Birth House</th>
<th>‘Le jardin de l’accoucheuse’, de L’accoucheuse de Scots Bay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A is for anise, sweet relief for the bowels</td>
<td>A c’est pour l’ânis qui débloque les boyaux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B is the butcher’s broom to shrink the womb</td>
<td>B : bourse de pasteur qui ralentit ton sang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>down</td>
<td>C comme dans cormier qui soulagera tes maux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C is for cayenne; its heat stays the blood</td>
<td>D c’est dent-de-lion et ses feuilles qu’on bouille longtemps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dandelion greens should be boiled some good</td>
<td>E pour l’églantier qui fait une bonne tite gelée</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E is for eggs, one a day cooked ’til hard</td>
<td>F c’est le fraisier pour quand-ce t’es constipé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fennel brings mother’s milk and a woman’s</td>
<td>G c’est le goémon qui garde longtemps quand i’ est chessé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blood</td>
<td>H pour le houblon qui calme la digestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G’s the gooseberry, for pie or for jam</td>
<td>I c’est comme if, son noyau c’est du poison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyssop, tansy, and mugwort for taking a bath</td>
<td>J pour le jaune qui annonce le tusillage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’s the Irish Moss for blanc mange and stew</td>
<td>K comme kalmia en cataplasme pour les migraines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniper without berries is for making tea too</td>
<td>L c’est pour lédon, une bonne plante pour t’endormir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K is for kelp, when it’s dried it will keep</td>
<td>M c’est la moutarde pour faire sûr que tes règles viennent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labrador tea if you’re needing some sleep</td>
<td>N pour noisetier qui soulage les jambes de lait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M is for mustard, on her belly makes her bleed</td>
<td>O comme dans ortie, tu prends les feuilles, jamais les graines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N’s for the nettle, just the leaves, not the seed</td>
<td>P pour le plantain en onguent sur les gerçures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onions to the feet will bring down a fever</td>
<td>Q : les quatre-temps qui guérissent le choléra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennyroyal’s tincture makes a tiny baby leave her</td>
<td>R comme rosemarine qui viendra baisser ta fièvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne’s lace is poison, it’s not caraway</td>
<td>S c’est sang-dragon pour faire quitter un avorton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red raspberry tea should be drunk every day</td>
<td>T comme dans tanesé dans ton bain quand t’as des crampes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S is for sage, which makes the milk go</td>
<td>U pour l’uvulaire, un bon traitement pour les ulcères</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thistle, that’s blessed, makes the milk flow</td>
<td>V comme dans verveine qui viendra calmer les nerfs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unicorn, false, with bed and capsicum</td>
<td>W c’est wapato, au tubercule très nourrissant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good at keeping the babe inside his mum</td>
<td>X-actement comme la patate finalement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wintergreen tea is best made in the spring</td>
<td>Y c’est pour les yams que tu mettras dans ton potage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-cept for making jam, for the berries you must bring</td>
<td>Z c’est pour le zeste — de citron pis d’humour qu’on partage! (McKay 2020: 536–37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y is for yew, its stone will bring strife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zest comes from lemons, oranges and life! (McKay 2007: 371–72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(McKay 2020: 536–37)
Appendix B: Lyrics to ‘Le masque à Ray’, by Fayo

J'ai jamais vu, j'ai jamais su, j'ai jamais cru, j'ai jamais pu
Comprendre le mythe du masque à Raymond Saunier
C'est une joke, c'est une hoke, pis tant qu'à moi, c'est du folk'
Voici l'histoire du masque à Raymond Saunier

Raymond Saunier, c'était l'bedeau de l'église
C'était l'freak du village, il disait tout l'temps "please"
Au curé, qu'était tanné de l'entendre
Il dit "Raymond, il faut que t'arrête de boire
Il faut que t'arrête de hanger out dans la rivière le soir
T'es pas mal brûlé pis t'as la tête dans la brume
Arrête de célébrer tes trips nocturnes
C'est des sentiments qui vient d'Satan
Please, Raymond, j'ai pas vraiment l'temps"

[refrain]
Il dit « ça m’s'tress vraiment de m’occuper d’ton cas
De régler tes abus, tes hallucinations
T’es fou, t’es saoul, pis tes images sont floues
Si tu continues d’même, tu vas tomber dans l’trou
C’est toute une histoire que t’essayes de m’faire croire
J’ai d’la misère à ’oir qu’y a une voix dans la rivière
S’il-vous-plaît, Raymond, arrête d’boire"

Ah, ben monsieur l’curé, j’ai pas vraiment bu
Au contraire, j’ai tout entendu
Y a une voix dans la rivière qui m’a parlé
Dans mes culottes, ben ça a manqué d’puer
La rivière me dit d’vous apporter cette boîte

J't'assure, abbé, j'ai toute dans ma tête
J'ai vu, j'ai cru, j'ai tout entendu, cette boîte carrée, c'est moi qui l'a conçue
La rivière me dit d'pas la rouvrir, c'est la seule façon qu'on pourra survivre

[refrain]
Il dit "c'est toute un histoire que tu m'as raconté
Non, j'suis pas si fou que j'suis mal habillé
J'ai d'la misère à prêcher ma confiance
À tout ceux qui s'prêtent au serment d'allégeance

Y a des bateaux qui viennent nous déporter
Ma grande foi d’Dieu, je sais pus quoi penser
J'commence à croire dans ton masque sacré
Allons voir les Indiens pour se protéger

Ah ben, allô Mic-mac, as-tu une place pour moi dans ton tipi?
Ça m'tente pas d'm'en aller, ça m'tente pas d’décoller
Mais ça de l’air c’est fini, y a pu d'Acadie "Ah non, les maudits

La seule chose qui nous reste
C'est cette boîte fermée avec un masque dedans
Qu'est censé d'nous sauver
Si qu'on croit dans ces esprits, ben ça va sauver notre vie"

Ah oui?
Crois-tu que j'pourrais m'cacher dans ton tipi?

[refrain]
Croyez-vous dans l’mythe du masque à Ray?
Avez-vous vu le masque à Raymond Saunier?
Croyez-vous dans l’mythe du masque à Ray?
Avez-vous vu le masque à Raymond Saunier?
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