"To Be or Not To Be Free": Nation and Gender in Québécois Adaptations of Shakespeare

Jennifer Drouin
Department of English,
McGill University, Montréal

August 2005

A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-21641-5
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-21641-5

Abstract

At first glance, the long tradition of Québécois adaptations of Shakespeare might seem paradoxical, since Québec is a francophone nation seeking political independence and has little direct connection to the British literary canon. However, it is precisely this cultural distance that allows Québécois playwrights to play irreverently with Shakespeare and use his texts to explore issues of nation and gender which are closely connected to each other. Soon after the Quiet Revolution, adaptations such as Robert Gurik's *Hamlet, prince du Québec* and Jean-Claude Germain's *Rodéo et Juliette* raised the question "To be or not to be free" in order to interrogate how Québec could take action to achieve independence. In *Macbeth* and *La tempête*, Michel Garneau "tradapts" Shakespeare and situates his texts in the context of the Conquest. Jean-Pierre Ronfard's *Lear* and *Vie et mort du Roi Boiteux* carnivalize the nation and permit women to rise to power. Adaptations since 1990 reveal awareness of the need for cultural and gender diversity so that women, queers, and immigrants may contribute more to the nation's development. Since Québec is simultaneously colonial, neo-colonial, and postcolonial, Québécois playwrights negotiate differently than English Canadians the fine line between the enrichment of their local culture and its possible contamination, assimilation, or effacement by Shakespeare's overwhelming influence, which thus allows them to appropriate his texts in service of gender issues and the decolonization of the Québec nation.

Résumé

À première vue, la longue tradition des adaptations québécoises de Shakespeare pourrait sembler paradoxale, surtout par rapport à une nation francophone qui cherche son indépendance politique et qui a peu de liens directs au canon littéraire britannique. Or, c'est précisément cette distance culturelle qui permet aux auteurs québécois de jouer de façon irrévérente avec Shakespeare et de se servir de ses textes afin d'explorer des questions de nation et de genre qui sont intimement liées l'une à l'autre. Peu après la Révolution tranquille, des adaptations telles que *Hamlet, prince du Québec* de Robert Gurik et *Rodéo et Juliette* de Jean-Claude Germain ont soulevé la question d'« Être ou ne pas être libre » afin d'interroger comment le Québec pourrait passer à l'action et réaliser la souveraineté. Dans *Macbeth* et *La tempête*, Michel Garneau « tradapte » Shakespeare afin de situer ses textes dans le contexte de la Conquête. *Lear* et *Vie et mort du Roi Boiteux* de Jean-Pierre Ronfard carnivalisent la nation et permettent aux femmes d'accéder au pouvoir. Dans des adaptations depuis les années 1990, il y a eu chez les auteurs une reconnaissance de la nécessité de plus de diversité culturelle et genrée pour que les femmes, les gais, et les immigrants puissent contribuer davantage au développement de la nation. Puisque le Québec est colonial, neo-colonial, et postcolonial tout à la fois, les auteurs québécois négocient autrement que les canadiens anglais la ligne mince entre l'enrichissement de leur culture locale et sa contamination, son assimilation, ou son effacement potentiels par l'influence importante de Shakespeare, ce qui leur permet donc d'approprier ses textes au service du genre et surtout de la décolonisation de la nation québécoise.

Acknowledgements

Many people have been instrumental in my intellectual growth and the development of my academic career. First and foremost, my dissertation supervisor Leanore Lieblein has always been available to provide helpful advice and critical comments which have vastly improved the final version of this dissertation. Even from overseas, she has always quickly responded to my many late-night e-mails, and most importantly she has gone above and beyond the call of duty on many occasions, especially during one particular summer, for which I'm truly grateful. During my time at McGill, I have also been very lucky to receive guidance and advice from Mike Bristol and Paul Yachnin and to be able to call them my supervisors as well. Mike's suggestions significantly improved my compulsory research project, parts of which have found their way into this dissertation, and I'm excited about expanding this research in new directions and working with Paul on my postdoctoral project. I couldn't have asked for a more generous trio of scholars with whom to work. I have also had the opportunity to benefit from the knowledge and camaraderie of the McGill Shakespeare and Performance Research Team and professors at McGill and in Montréal, especially Wes Folkerth, Joyce Boro, Ken Borris, and Erin Hurley.

I received much-needed funding for my three years of study at McGill and my first year at the Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), the Québec Fonds pour la Formation des chercheurs et d'aide à la recherche (FCAR), McGill, and UQTR. I received travel funding from the McGill Department of English to attend various academic conferences which was greatly appreciated as well. Portions of this dissertation were presented at several conferences: the Canadian Association for Commonwealth Literature and Language Studies (CACLALS) in May 2002, the Shakespeare Association of America (SAA) in April 2003, the North East Conference on British Studies (NECBS) in October 2004, the SAA in March 2005, and the Association of Canadian College and University Teachers of English (ACCUTE) conference in May 2005. I would like to thank my fellow participants for their critical feedback on my work.

Several scholars have generously provided me with copies of some of the unpublished manuscripts that I have studied here. Many thanks to Leanore Lieblein, Mark Fortier, Caroline Garand, and Laurie Maguire, as well as Daniel Gauthier at the Centre des auteurs dramatiques (CEAD).

Many friends and colleagues at McGill and other institutions have provided help and support over the years. Susan Knutson at Université Sainte-Anne and Jessica Slights at Acadia were my mentors during my undergraduate and master's degrees and remain so today. Sharon O'Dair at the University of Alabama offered a keen critical eye and a willing ear at crucial moments down the stretch. I would also like to acknowledge Guy Drouin, Nicole Prévost, Manon Bussières, Chris Fox, Sarah Waisvisz, fellow RenJens Shea and McDermott, and in particular Deb Hoffmann.

Table of Contents

Introduction

It is common practice in Québec to compare "la langue de Molière" and "la langue de Shakespeare".[1] Yet, in a Québec which prides itself on still speaking Molière's tongue, it is especially puzzling to find a remarkably rich history of adaptations of Shakespeare. Through a close textual analysis focusing on the themes of nation and gender in over thirty French-language adaptations of Shakespeare from the Quiet Revolution until the present day, this dissertation seeks to explain why contemporary Québécois playwrights appear so obsessed with rewriting Shakespeare, what changes they make to the original Shakespearean text, and how the discursive differences between Shakespeare and the adaptations reflect the nationalist, feminist, and queer concerns of contemporary Québec society. These adaptations embrace hybridity by uniting Québécois language and Shakespeare's texts and, in this sense, are the products of two distinct cultural traditions. By appropriating the cultural capital and canonical authority of Shakespeare's texts, Québécois adapters legitimize their local struggle for the freedom of their nation as well as that of women and queers.

The use of Shakespeare by Québécois playwrights to highlight issues of nation and gender is effective for two reasons. First, the indeterminacy of his texts makes them easily malleable to their political purposes, just as his plays have often been manipulated in service of various political agendas transhistorically and transculturally. Second, in the popular imagination, Shakespeare has made what Michael Bristol calls the "big time"; that is, Shakespeare's name carries what Pierre Bourdieu describes as cultural capital. The appropriation of Shakespeare's canonical authority therefore lends weight to the political agenda of

authors who cite or rewrite his texts. While this appropriation would normally require that the adapters negotiate a fine line between the enrichment of their local culture and its possible contamination, assimilation, or effacement by Shakespeare's often overwhelming influence, as is the case in English Canadian and other anglophone postcolonial adaptations,[2] in Québec the adapters' cultural distance and indifference to British hegemony, which adds a playful irreverence to their texts, diminishes this risk.

This irreverent, and hence liberating, attitude of Québécois towards Shakespeare can be summed up in their nickname for him: "le grand Will". In Québec, Shakespeare is a great author to revere, yet Québécois playwrights are not afraid to bring him down to size, to make him their own, and to develop an affectionate relationship with him on a first-name basis (Lieblein, "Re-making" 178-9). In Québec, the colonial relationship to Shakespeare is two-fold and unique. As a former settler colony of France, and as a nation which was then conquered by the British only to be subsumed shortly thereafter into the Canadian confederation which many Québécois consider to be a form of neo-colonial tutelage, Québec has been both a colonizer of the Native peoples and has been colonized itself. Québec's ambivalent and overlapping identities as a colonial, neo-colonial, and postcolonial nation inform its Shakespearean adaptations. Québécois playwrights reinscribe the Bard's canonical authority when they appropriate it in order to highlight Québec's distinct cultural identity and to legitimize the nation's struggle for political independence; however, they are also able to play with his texts more freely (as we shall see in Ronfard's *Lear*, for example), since Shakespeare's texts do not belong to the Québécois "canon".

Canonical difference thus provides one possible answer to the question frequently invoked by the paradoxical existence of "Québécois Shakespeare": "Why adapt Shakespeare and why not Molière?" The lack of investment in, and indoctrination by, the British literary canon, coupled nonetheless with Shakespeare's "big time" status, makes his texts both worthy of adaptation and sufficiently culturally distant to become objects of play. The adaptation of Shakespeare in Québec also has the added bonus of constituting a subversive attack on English Canada, where bardolotry reigns more strongly and the British canon carries more cultural authority, by transgressing the norms of the "proper" representation of an important cultural icon.[3]

The distinction between Québec and other postcolonial contexts, such as English Canada, raises the question of who or what is "Québécois". The legal definition of Québécois according to most ministerial departments, such as education or health insurance, is any person born in Québec or any resident living permanently on the territory of Québec. For the purposes of this dissertation, I define a Québécois playwright as any person born in Québec or living in Québec at the time of the composition of his/her play. I define a Québécois adaptation as any adaptation (according to the definition that I propose in chapter one) written by a Québécois playwright whether or not it was first published or produced in Québec. This broad definition permits the inclusion, therefore, of the English version of *Hamlet, prince du Québec* discussed in chapter one, of *Willliam S* by Antonine Maillet, as we shall see in chapter five, and of René-Daniel Dubois' *Pericles, Prince of Tyre, by William Shakespeare* which was written and produced in English in Toronto, as noted in the appendix.

This dissertation has two main research objectives. First, it will show how the application of various nationalist discourses illuminates the relevance of Shakespeare's plays for a postcolonial Québécois readership/audience, and, reciprocally, how Shakespeare illuminates nationalist debates in Québec. Second, because gender issues in Québec are closely tied to nationalism, my dissertation will analyze the tensions between neo-colonial and queer identities which are frequently at odds in contemporary Québec due to the perceived strategic need to subordinate the long-term political goals of either the nationalist or the queer movement in order to accomplish the immediate goals of the other. Independent of each other, the themes of nation and gender are helpful in illuminating the immense social change which started in Québec from the Quiet Revolution onward. There are, however, several points at which nation and gender intersect theoretically, and these contact zones are particularly pertinent in the Québécois context. For instance, as I argue in chapter one, in Québec nation and gender overlap through metaphors of conquest and rape, and the psychological condition created through these traumas subsequently creates a second socio-political parallel through the strategic employment of separatism as a solution to oppression. Ironically, the socio-political process of separatism mirrors the literary process of adaptation since both are concerned with the transformation of otherness into selfhood. In chapters two through five, which constitute a chronological survey of the key Shakespearean adaptations from the Quiet Revolution until 2002, we shall see the development of a progression in the various texts, albeit a reticent and inadequate progression, towards a greater recognition of the interdependence of nation and gender.[4]

The second chapter of this dissertation examines the founding texts of the adaptation tradition following the Quiet Revolution, *Hamlet, prince du Québec* (1968) by Robert Gurik and *Rodéo et Juliette* (1970) by Jean-Claude Germain. These plays can be read as a call to arms, demanding that Québécois stop turning in philosophical circles and take their national fate into their own hands. For instance, Hamlet's dilemma, that of one torn between action and ceaseless contemplation, is also the dilemma of Québec which cannot resolve its internal conflicts in order to take the action of self-affirmation necessary to claim its birthright. Gurik is the first to make the comparison between Hamlet's existential crisis, "To be, or not to be" (3.1.57), and Québec's national question which he sums up similarly as, "Être ou ne pas être libre!" (51). While Germain's *Rodeo et Juliette* barely employs the Shakespearean source text from which it derives its title, it is equally concerned with Québec's need to resolve its Hamlet complex and *passer à l'action* or to take action. In both adaptations, however, women are largely absent from the texts and are problematically excluded from the affairs of the nation.

The third chapter examines Michel Garneau's "tradaptations" of the Conquest, that is, *Macbeth* (1978) and *La tempête* (1989). Written at the same time as the *Loi 101* and Michèle Lalonde's manifesto,"La deffence et illustration de la langue quebecquoyse", Garneau's tradaptation, to use his own neologism, of *Macbeth* into a rural 17th century New France dialect that resembles contemporary urban *joual* engages with one of the crucial political questions in Québec at that time: the valorization of the French language in relation to English, and, equally, the valorization of spoken Québécois in relation to so-called "international" or

"standard" French. In his tradaptations, Garneau simulataneously situates the plays' action in three spatio-temporal registers; in addition to the original Shakespearean context, he locates the action in New France, thereby evoking the Conquest of Québec in 1759, and he also alludes to the contemporary political situation of the 1970's and the neo-colonialism that has since resulted from the Conquest and Confederation. Based on plays with almost no women characters, however, these tradaptations continue to marginalize women and prevent them from contributing to the development of the nation to their full potential.

The fourth chapter is dedicated to works of Jean-Pierre Ronfard, that is, *Lear* (1977), and *Vie et mort du Roi Boiteux* (1981). Ronfard's adaptations, which straddle the 1980 referendum, carnivalize the nation, rendering it grotesque though still an object of interrogation. Ronfard's critique of legitimacy and focus on the theme of bastardy are particularly pertinent for a Québec nation still considered illegitimate as a full political entity, at best Canada's limping, bastard cousin. In both *Lear* and *Vie et mort du Roi Boiteux*, this critique of hierarchy extends to gender roles, for Ronfard rewrites the characters of Lear's daughters as well as the queens of the *Henry VI-Richard III* history plays. These women eventually become the true rulers of the nation, but only after it has been almost destroyed by their male predecessors. However, while women do come to rule the nation, issues of nation and gender are also linked in both plays more problematically by the rape of women's bodies as part of civilizing missions of colonization, thereby also exposing the potentially dangerous consequences of the interdependence of nation and gender.

Finally, the fifth chapter explores a selection of plays from the recent

explosion of at least twenty-two Shakespearean adaptations since 1990, in particular, Normand Chaurette's *Les Reines* (1991), Antonine Maillet's *William S* (1991), and Madd Harold's and Anthony Kokx's *Henry.Octobre.1970.* (2002).[5] The 1990's mark an emergence of a pluralist approach to Québécois adaptations in which various playwrights explore the concerns of their own particular subject positions rather than those of the collectivity, and this slightly diminished focus on the nation allows for cultural and gender diversity to occupy a larger space within plays of this period. However, as *Les Reines* shows and as Maillet's Shrew character protests, the social space available for women to occupy remains insufficient, which has a debilitating effect on the nation. The inadequate attention accorded to cultural and gender diversity is most evident in *Henry. Octobre. 1970.* in which queers are still subject to homophobia despite the historical distance between the play's composition in 2002 and its setting in 1970, and in which immigrants are present onstage but problematically absent from the text. In the 1990's, we see Québécois adapters engage in a dialogue with Shakespearean gender norms, but we also see the emergence of women and immigrant adapters whose texts address their predecessors as well precisely because the voices of women, queers, and immigrants are lacking in Québécois adaptations by earlier playwrights, and this exclusion of alterity is detrimental to the nation. This new generation of adaptations, written by several women, queer, and immigrant playwrights, begins to imagine a less monolithic vision of the nation that is more inclusive of cultural and gender diversity;[6] however, this utopia remains to be actualized fully and women, queers, and immigrants either remain constrained by early modern norms or completely marginalized within

these texts. Since nation and gender are indivisible battlefields, the struggle for the liberation of oppressed groups still requires greater social recognition of their interdependence, as the analysis of nation and gender in the plays examined in chapters two through five reveals.

Notes to Introduction

[1] The use of French accents on Québec and Québécois, although not always the standard procedure of translators in English usage, is a deliberate choice on my part in order to recognize and highlight the cultural specificity of Québec. Leanore Lieblein, Ric Knowles, Daniel Fischlin, and Robert Schwartzwald all adopt the same practice.

[2] Is Canada postcolonial? Is Québec? The postcoloniality of settler colonies has long been contested and continues to be debated by critics today. In the collection *Is Canada Postcolonial?* (2003) edited by Laura Moss, several critics, notably Moss, George Elliot Clarke, Neil Besner, Diana Brydon, Terry Goldie, and Stephen Slemon, theorize all sides of the question without arriving at a consensus, or, as Moss sums it up, they arrive at a "typical Canadian response": "an unequivocal 'yes... and no... and maybe'" or "'it depends'" (7). In Québec, and in French literary studies in general, the debate has lagged significantly behind for reasons explored seriously for the first time in a special issue of the journal *Québec Studies* in 2003 in which the response is much more categorical. Critics such as Robert Schwartzwald, Marvin Richards, Vincent Desroches, Amaryll Chanady, and Obed Nkunzimana, among others, all argue convincingly that Québec is postcolonial and that Québécois literary studies would be greatly enhanced by the application of postcolonial theory to Québécois texts. More specifically in terms of Québécois adaptations of Shakespeare, all the critical work on the subject by Denis Salter is heavily inflected by postcolonial theory.

[3] This is not to imply that English Canadian adaptations do not also constitute a subversive attack on the British canon, but English Canada does not have the double relationship to both Britain and another nation that Québec has with both English Canada and Britain.

[4] The data on which my theories of nation and gender are based are limited by the number of close textual readings that it is possible to perform in this dissertation. I have chosen the most important plays in Québec's theatre history and attempted to cover a broad range of authors over a significant period of time.

[5] See the Appendix for a listing of each of these plays.

A notable exclusion from chapter five and from the corpus of plays discussed in this dissertation is the work of Robert Lepage, perhaps the most famous director in Québec and certainly the most successful on the international stage. As a director, however, he does not adapt Shakespeare's text so much as he stages the source text innovatively in performance. His two most original Shakespeare performances *Romeo & Juliette* (1989), a bilingual production in collaboration with Gordon McCall, and *Elseneur* (1996), a one-man show, do not adapt the Shakespearean source text. *Romeo & Juliette* is a combination of the Signet edition in English and a literal translation in French by Governor General award-winning playwright Jean-Marc Dalpé. *Elseneur* is a literal translation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* that is innovative insomuch as Lepage performed all the roles himself with the aid of elaborate technology.

[6] Erin Hurley makes this argument in a forthcoming article on Micone in *Theatre Research in Canada.*

Chapter 1

Nation, Gender, and Adaptation

Nation and gender are the two issues which have most marked the history of Québec since the Quiet Revolution (which began in 1960 with the election of Jean Lesage who instituted a series of social reforms completely transforming the Québec nation and the identity of Québécois). Nation and gender are inextricably linked as common political battlefields in Québec, as is best exemplified in the 1970's popular feminist slogan "Pas de Québec libre sans libération des femmes! Pas de femmes libres sans libération du Québec!" (M. Dumont et al. 483).[1] Nation and gender are inseparable issues in Québec, and, as Québécois radical feminists of the 1970's pointed out, the nation cannot achieve freedom without women also achieving greater freedom and a greater place in the political affairs of the nation than they had previously occupied. To debate Robert Gurik's question in *Hamlet, prince du Québec*, "To be or not to be free", to be discussed in the next chapter, it is necessary to ask who shall achieve this freedom, for the freedom on one social group is contingent upon that of another.

In this chapter I argue, then, that nationalists, women, and queers all seek freedom and recognition of their distinct cultural identities, and separatism is a strategic means to independence, self-determination, or political recognition which are common goals of all these groups. Although there are important differences in how each of these groups conceives of these goals and its own cultural identity, the underlying principle of freedom (however generalized) and the need to cast off otherness to achieve selfhood tie together issues of nation and gender. In Québec, nation and gender overlap through metaphors of conquest and

rape, and the psychological condition created through these traumas subsequently creates a second socio-political parallel through the strategic employment of separatism. Separatism ironically mirrors the literary process of adaptation, thereby making adaptation a useful tool for the assertion of self identity by groups who believe themselves to be oppressed.

Conquest and Rape

The most notable imprint on the collective consciousness of Québec is without a doubt the "Conquête," that is, the Conquest of the French by the British in 1759 on the Plains of Abraham. Within the pre-existing French-English binary which dominated the socio-cultural landscape of New France at the time, the French were immediately jolted from a dominant to a dominated, and hence disempowered, collective subject position. Due to its minority status, the conquered nation could arguably be likened both socio-culturally and politically to a woman, since, like the French, despite its superior demographic power the disempowered gender remains minoritized. As a nation, Québec has been gendered female since the Conquest. Moreover, the very terms used to express the conquest of a nation are always gendered and sexualized so as to mimic the conquest of a woman; the conquered nation is raped and plundered. From a psychoanalytic perspective I would argue that Québec, as a national collective consciousness, has acted, and continues to act, like a raped woman. It/She can never fully heal or recover from its/her wounds; instead, it must adapt, accept, learn to live with, or, to employ a Québécois colloquialism which ironically highlights the linguistic colonialism implicit in anglicisms, "dealer avec" its/her violation.[2] The process of dealing with both the Conquest and rape follows a

similar psychological pattern: first, the submission of defeat; then anger (the Patriots' uprising in 1837-38); diversion, distraction, and the channelling of pent-up, repressed energy elsewhere (the religious fervour of Ultramontanism following the crushed rebellions); resignation and a loss of the will to fight back ("la Grande noirceur" of the reign of Maurice Duplessis); and finally self-affirmation (the Quiet Revolution, which was a collective mental make-over and drastic turn in self-perception worthy of pop psychology). Even when this self-affirmation translates into complete independence, the wound remains, perhaps scarred over but present nonetheless as a memory of past trauma in the (collective) consciousness.

My theory of the parallel between the Conquest and rape would explain why the Conquest remains such a critical part of the Québécois identity even today; like a woman's rape, it is never truly resolved over the course of her lifetime. Even when it no longer has any influence on her daily life, it still forms part of her identity and is responsible for shaping her current personality, whether or not she accepts to acknowledge its impact upon her. This theory would also explain why what Robert Schwartzwald terms "federasty" has been such a potent motif in Québécois literature since the Quiet Revolution. "Fédéraste" is a common Québécois pun that associates federalists with pederasts. The pun is a means by which an oppressed nationalist minority gets one over, linguistically at least, on their federalist colonizers through a displacement of the abject. This tradition (which is paradoxical since the nationalist Parti québécois government has been responsible for Québec's progressive stance on gay rights ["Fear" 180]) can be explained psychoanalytically, as Schwartzwald does in intricate detail

("Fear" 179-81), as a reactionary response to political oppression which attempts to turn the tables on the colonizer by figuring him as effeminate and penetrable, hence weak. When Québécois authors resort to "federasty", it is a manifestation of the rape violence suffered by the national collectivity during the Conquest that continues to pervade their collective unconsciousness. It is a transformation from the passivity of the common sentiment that "on s'est fait fourrer" into active agency inflicting the equivalent of ritualized sexualized violence, an attempt to escape from the feminized victim position and to effeminize the abuser.[3] For all survivors of conquest/rape, the potential to inflict the same sexualized violence on someone else in order to heal one's own submission through the domination of others is a constant lurking presence, one which sometimes manifests itself indirectly despite conscious efforts to keep it in check. Just as many male rape victims risk in turn becoming abusers themselves, the need to re-enact the violence from the position of active subject rather than passive object is so strongly engrained in the unconscious self that it is difficult to acknowledge or to suppress. Finally, the Conquest/rape parallel also helps to develop the connection between nation and gender though the association of the nation and the Mother, as in the common expression of "Mother country" and the ambivalence of "mère patrie".[4] The Conquest then becomes the psychological equivalent of the rape and loss of the Mother, of which the resulting melancholia and drive for autonomy have been described by Julia Kristeva in *Black Sun* (*Portable Kristeva* 195-99).

The trauma of conquest/rape/loss calls for the creation of a "safe space", that is, a space free from oppression. Gender-based "safe spaces" are frequently created in feminist and queer movements through separatism, such as through the

creation of women-only spaces or gay villages. Taken to its logical conclusion, the concept of "safe space" finds its equivalent in national liberation movements in the drive for independence, the creation of a new country being the ultimate "safe space" for those whose oppression has been colonial or neo-colonial. Thus, common to both nation and gender, separatism is a strategy by which minorities achieve freedom from oppression through the creation of safe spaces. In the following sections, I elaborate on this theory of the creation of separatist safe spaces by and for national and gendered minorities.

Strategic Separatism

In contemporary Québec, separatism is a dirty word, often used but rarely defined. When employed in reference to cultural or ethnic identity, the word separatism generally connotes what is more accurately described by postcolonial theorists as a national liberation movement, a cultural community's search for political independence. In relation to feminism, separatism generally refers to a radical lesbian-feminist movement particularly strong in the 1970's which favoured the formation of women-only communities. Critics of these political discourses have used the word "separatism" pejoratively in order to dismiss the movements' aims as tribalist, xenophobic, static, or absolutist.[5] Common to all these criticisms is the implication, and sometimes the direct accusation, of "essentialism". Martha Nussbaum observes that often "the opponents of essentialism use the word polemically as a term of abuse and with a certain air of superiority" (205). The charge of "essentialism" as it is commonly employed, however, is often a vulgarization of a complex philosophical position within debates about metaphysical realism or internalist conceptions of the human being.

Independent of its negative associations though, Nussbaum argues that essentialism can promote social justice through an identification of basic human functions; for instance, it is usually better to be alive than dead, to have food than to starve, to feel emotionally fulfilled than dissatisfied, and to be free from violence than to be violated. Forms of cultural relativism which ignore these essential human needs under the guise of respect for the rights of foreign cultures are not synonymous with respect for the rights of individuals, especially when the moral high-ground of non-interference is taken by those in positions of privilege as a justification for ignoring their duty to attend to the basic needs of others (216-221, 203-205). Essentialism, then, can be a rallying cry to insure that basic human needs are met, especially the needs of socially marginalized others, and as such separatism can be employed tactically as an appropriation of the power necessary to secure the fulfillment of those needs when they are not already met.

Separatism, then, is strategic action. It aims at the full political independence of a marginalized community and the full psychological selfhood of that community's members. It is "essentialist" in the sense that it views its program as necessary—and thus essential—for the cultural survival and for the physical and psychological well being of its members. Separatism is also "essentialist" in adopting the view that all of its members share a common identity, common needs, values, and aspirations. These commonalities are essential to the cohesion of the community and are the foundation for the separatists' imagination of a new community. While the defining characteristic of a separatist collectivity may be nation, gender, class, ability, or any other trait which differentiates 'us' from 'them', the overall goal is always the formation of a

distinct community with established criteria for inclusion and exclusion of its members. In this sense, separatism imagines new communities through a collective recognition of the differences between self and other. This recognition of certain criteria for inclusion and exclusion does not necessarily imply biological determinism though; that is, membership based on nation or gender need not be limited by race or sex. A national separatist movement may welcome the contributions of immigrants, and a lesbian separatist community may include transsexual women who were born as biological men. In this sense, separatism is not "essentialist" in the vulgarized sense of the word. Separatism does not fit neatly on one side or the other of the essentialism versus constructivism dichotomy. Separatists may both recognize and valorize, for example, the social constructedness of nations as what Benedict Anderson calls "imagined communities" or the social constructedness of gender within what Judith Butler calls the "heterosexual matrix of sex/gender/desire". Rather than invalidating separatist desires for a new community based on certain "essential" characteristics, social constructivism can actually legitimate a separatist movement's aims to build a new socio-political community, since all communities are only constructions anyway, none more or less valid than its neighbour.[6]

Extant scholarship on various separatist movements, including nationalist and lesbian feminist separatism, is copious; however, scholarship to date has usually focused on narrow historical accounts of a particular group.[7] A cross-theoretical paradigm of what separatism is and how it works in terms of both nation and gender has never been developed. I propose an overarching model of separatism as a psychological process rooted in the self/other dialectic. I will first

discuss communal identity formation through the self/other dialectic strictly in terms of nation, and then in terms of gender, before finally proposing a broad theory of separatism that can include both.

National Separatisms

In theories of nationalism, separatism passes under the guise of the more politically accurate term of secession. Ernest Gellner explains the emergence of secessionist movements as a combination of two phenomena, cultural difference and socio-economic inequality. In *Nations and Nationalism*, he writes that "men will to be politically united with all those, and only those, who share their culture. Polities then will to extend their boundaries to the limits of their cultures, and to protect and impose their culture within the boundaries of their power" (55). Gellner thus conceives of the nation as a cultural construct for which the political boundaries should, whenever possible, correspond territorially to the cultural map of peoples.

Building on the early work of Gellner, in his influential work *Imagined Communities* Benedict Anderson proposes a definition of nation as "an imagined political community—and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign" (6). Anderson argues that "the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship", that is, a "fraternity" (7), or as "large cultural systems ... out of which—as well as against which—it came into being" (12). Anderson's notion of imagined communities is thus significant for its elaboration of a theory of cultural nationalism, as opposed to several other forms of nationalism.

Québécois political scientist Denis Monière divides the various forms of nationalism into two typological groups. Monière's first typology opposes ethnic

versus civic nationalism. Ethnic nationalism, often associated with a German tradition, is rooted in bloodlines and genealogical admission criteria. Conversely, civic, or political, nationalism, often associated with a French tradition, is rooted in minimum residency requirements, knowledge of the national language and history, and a voluntary conformity to social norms, values, and institutions. The second typology, more nuanced than the traditional ethnic versus civic dichotomy, is comprised of four kinds of nationalisms: nationalisms of domination, liberation, conservation, and recognition. Nationalism of domination, whose most extreme forms are associated with Nazism and fascism, is rooted in the specific characteristics of one group whose hegemonic belief in its biological or cultural superiority justifies its conquest of other groups or territories. Nationalism of domination can also include imperialism, colonialism, and a "civilizing" mission rooted in discourses of supposed progress and democracy. Nationalism of liberation, associated with the decolonisation movement after WWII and based on the liberal principle of equality, rejects domination by foreign powers and seeks to establish political sovereignty through the creation of a nation-state. Nationalism of conservation, or official nationalism, describes the patriotism of existing nation-states, and manifests itself through the glorification of national symbols in order to preserve and maintain national identity and collective unity. Nationalism of recognition, such as French-Canadian nationalism or some versions of Québécois renewed federalism, refers to the political claims made by minority ethnic groups for particular rights without questioning membership within a multiethnic or multinational state.[8] In any society, there may be various combinations of these four types of nationalism, as is the case in Québec where

tensions between groups identifying as Québécois, French-Canadian, or Canadian are responsible for the conflicting nationalist discourses of liberation, recognition, and conservation currently in circulation (*Pour* 11-14). Anderson's imagined communities do not correspond precisely to any one of these categories, but they do share certain characteristics, such as a common language and history which qualify civic nationalism, and collective symbols which sustain nationalisms of conservation. Monière sums up Anderson's argument in the claim that "le moteur de la conscience nationale, ce sont les producteurs de sens, c'est-à-dire les intellectuels, qui sont les spécialistes de la langue, les producteurs de culture et les diffuseurs d'idées" (55).[9]

Picking up the theory of cultural nationalism where Anderson's study leaves off, in "A Nation is a Nation, is a State, is an Ethnic Group, is a ..." Walker Connor argues that "a nation is a self-aware ethnic group" (45). Connor claims that "an ethnic group may be readily discerned by an anthropologist or other outside observer, but until the members are themselves aware of the group's uniqueness, it is merely an ethnic group and not a nation. While an ethnic group *may*, therefore, be other-defined, the nation *must* be self-defined" (45-46). [10] Connor adds that "[e]mploying ethnic group or ethnicity in relationship to several types of identities therefore beclouds the relationship between the *ethnic group* and the *nation* and also deprives scholarship of an excellent term for referring to both nations and potential nations" (46). One could argue by extension that since recognition of cultural distinctness and self-definition are essential to the ascension to full nationhood, other forms of separatism replicate this necessary process whereby cultural groups form nations (with or without political states)

through the recognition and acceptance of their shared collective identity.

Equally, in "The Maladies of Development", Tom Nairn discusses the "double inwardness attach[ed] to nationalism" (71). Nairn explains that nationalism's double inwardness "corresponds to certain internal needs of the society in question, *and* to certain individual, psychological needs as well. It supplies peoples and persons with an important commodity, 'identity'" (71). He adds that there is "a distinctive, easily recognizable subjectivity linked to all this. Whenever we talk about nationalism, we normally find ourselves talking before too long about 'feelings', 'instincts', supposed desires and hankerings to 'belong', and so on" (71). Thus, the collective construction of nations is intimately linked to the individual selfhood of the community's members. Culture provides this link as a transcendent means of communication by which the common elements of the identities of individual members are recognized as essential traits to the nation as a whole. Individuals come to feel intuitively that they belong to the community as a whole despite the geographical inability for every member of a nation to know personally all the other members.

Gendered Separatisms

This psychology, that is, this emphasis on the inherent subjectivity and collective identity of nations, characterizes gender-based separatism as well. In *L'amère patrie: Féminisme et nationalisme dans le Québec contemporain*, Diane Lamoureux describes the three points of convergence between Québécois feminism and nationalism, the third being "une convergence dans la politisation de l'identité, même si les deux mouvements privilégient des formes différentes d'affiliation identitaire" (178-9).[11] A concrete example of the connections

between nationalist and feminist discourses of separatism rooted in self-affirming identity politics is the merger of Québec's nationalist and feminist movements in the 1970's through the popular slogan "Pas de Québec libre sans libération des femmes! Pas de femmes libres sans libération du Québec!". The slogan conflates not only nation and gender but also collective and individual identity, demanding not only the collective freedom of the nation but also the individual freedom of every woman who comprises it.

The discursive convergence of nation and gender in recent Québécois studies of identity politics can be traced back to Ti-Grace Atkinson's preliminary association of nation and gender in her 1984 generalist historical account of the women's movement in the 1970's. Atkinson claims that "le séparatisme lesbien, en tant que nationalisme féminin, a inventé l'idée d'une nouvelle sorte d'État-nation" (43), adding that this version of separatism "avait été acceptée comme étant stratégiquement indispensable" (45).[12] Atkinson employs here a serious misnomer, since lesbian separatism did not invent a new sort of nation-state, but rather adopted the practice of applying cultural nationalism to identity-based collectivities without political states. While Atkinson proposes a rather unconvincing argument for lesbian separatism as a nation-state by defining it territorially in terms of the bodies of other women, the true value of her reflection lies in positing lesbian separatist communities as any type of nation at all and in calling attention to the need to theorize lesbian separatism through the discourses of nationalism.

Sonya Andermahr, in "The Politics of Separatism and Lesbian Utopian Fiction", comes closer than other critics to formulating a theory of lesbian

separatism. Grounding her argument first in practice, she qualifies that separatism "takes various forms and can be absolute or strategic; most feminisms have recognized the desirability of women-only spaces such as refuges, retreats, bars and conferences" (134). She then points out that the group Radicalesbians speak of lesbian separatism "in liberal individualist terms as a journey towards 'the liberation of self, inner peace, real love of self and of all women'" (137). This suggests that "the achievement of individual 'selfhood' is as important as the overthrow of male supremacy. Far more common in utopian separatist discourse, however, is the construction of the lesbian subject as a member of the collective rather than as an individual seeking self-identity" (137-8). Coherent self-identity is thus as essential to the proper functioning of any group as it is to the individual. The conception of various collectivities through the cultural nationalist paradigm, itself modeled on individual subjectivity, allows us to consider the achievement of selfhood as a principal goal of separatism.

Andermahr takes her argument a step further by specifying that lesbian separatism "is not a homogeneous discourse; separatists differ in their conceptions of sexual identity and sexual politics, and draw on different, sometimes conflicting, epistemological and ontological frameworks" (134). She then identifies two distinct positions which she calls the 'political' model and the 'utopian' model:

> The 'political' model, characteristic of political lesbianism and revolutionary feminism, sees separatism primarily as a means of undermining male power. It argues that if women cease to co-operate with men on a daily basis, the system of male power which oppresses women

> will no longer be able to sustain itself. Separatism is therefore primarily a tactical weapon, a means to an end. The emphasis is on political struggle in the here and now. (134)

The political model of separatism is intended to be provisional, necessary only until its goal is accomplished, and its temporary nature implies therefore a potential return to a renewed society transformed in the separatists' absence. The political model of lesbian separatism is thus strategic action for specific political ends, not biological or cultural determinism.

Building on the first model, the second form of separatism which Andermahr terms "the 'utopian' model, characteristic of cultural feminism and the radical feminism of the 1970's, sees separatism not only as a strategy but [also] as a ... solution to the problem of women's oppression in male-dominated society. The emphasis is not so much on overthrowing the male system as on withdrawing from it for good" (134). As a goal in and of itself, utopian lesbian separatism is not temporally limited and does not foresee a return to patriarchal society. The political model of separatism is commonly found in the "real world" while the utopian model tends to characterize lesbian feminist literature. As a temporary, real world solution, the political model describes most accurately the most common example of gender-based separatism, the gay village.

The Queer Nation

Separatist safe spaces assure, to return to Nussbaum's terms, social justice. The contemporary gay village illustrates the same tensions between dominant and oppressed groups which are always inherent in the dynamics of separatism. While the foundation of gay villages is established through

oppression and ghettoization by a dominant heterosexual majority, those villages that survive and flourish become safe spaces (which are often economically viable and self-sustaining as well) through the collective solidarity of members whose individual identities link them to what has come to be known as the Queer Nation. While membership to this community is based on a common identity and shared cultural codes, it is worth noting that queer nationhood is not essentialist in the vulgarized sense. Gay villages rarely have clearly delineated borders, and sexual identities of visitors are not verified at the door or on street corners. This fluidity characterizes all cultural nations, since membership in these communities is voluntary, dependent only on the adoption of learned signifiers such as codes, languages, and ideas.

The fluidity of the borders of cultural nations is a result of their self-determination. Once separatist groups perceive their safe space to be sufficiently secure and the tensions with the dominant group have dissipated, there is no longer a need to police the borders. The establishment of safe space by a separatist community occurs in parallel with the establishment of a communal identity of full-fledged selfhood. The shedding of the collectivity's stigma of otherness and its development of a coherent self identity which valorizes its difference from the formerly dominant group makes them others in turn. The separatists' othering of the dominant group effectively disempowers them and defuses any future threat they may present to the separatists' newly formed community.

This dynamic also characterizes Québécois nationalism. The sovereignist Parti Québécois and the Bloc Québécois have both frequently proclaimed as part

of their official discourse that, contrary to the popular opinion that Québec's independence will signal a retreat from the rest of the world, in reality it will actually permit a greater openness toward the international community and even potentially result in a loosening of language laws which currently restrict the use of English in order to promote the use of French. Since political independence ensures the safe space of the cultural nation, the need for protectionist policies that police the national borders becomes irrelevant and obsolete.

Separatism, therefore, is not a process whereby the marginalized risk assimilation or an effacement of difference in a futile search for equality within existing socio-cultural and political communities; rather, it is the process of creating new ones whose collective self-determination trickles down to strengthen and valorize the individual identities of its members. While Benedict Anderson argues that nationalism is "an anticipatory struggle adopted by dominant groups which are threatened with marginalization or exclusion from an emerging nationally-imagined community" (101), I propose that separatism is a latent struggle adopted by minority groups firmly entrenched in their marginalization that appropriate the power of exclusion in order to imagine their own national or gendered community. Separatism permits socio-cultural others to achieve full collective selfhood.

Adaptation as Independence Movement

Adaptation is a literary mirror of the socio-political process of separatism. Both are rooted in the psychological transformation of otherness into selfhood. As Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier point out in the introduction to their anthology *Adaptations of Shakespeare*, the "notion of adaptation (from the Latin

adaptare, to fit, to make suitable) implies a way of making Shakespeare fit a particular historical moment or social requirement" (17)—hence the witty title of Sandra Clark's anthology of Restoration adaptations, *Shakespeare Made Fit*. But adaptation is also a way of making Shakespeare fit a particular subjectivity. In this sense, adaptation resembles separatism through the drive of making otherness correspond to selfhood—in this case Québec's concept of its collective identity. Adaptation involves making a Shakespeare which is foreign, alien, and other fit a particular conception of the self. This definition of adaptation shares some of the properties of "appropriation", a term which Fischlin and Fortier reject because they claim that it "suggests a hostile takeover, a seizure of authority over the original in a way that appeals to contemporary sensibilities steeped in a politicized understanding of culture. It is not certain that this label does justice to other, more respectful, aspects of the practice ..." (3). However, I would suggest on the contrary that "appropriation" can also imply a more holistic practice, a process of making oneness or creating wholeness through the merging of self and other. Certainly appropriation may involve hostility, but it need not be limited to this singular sentiment; appropriation can also be a way of making love to Shakespeare, of integrating his foreignness into one's own self identity.[13] This possibility is especially true in a postcolonial context in which Shakespeare is always already foreign, if not linguistically then at least culturally and historically, so appropriation becomes a means of reducing the gap between a contemporary postcolonial context and the early modern England which informs Shakespeare's texts. Appropriation need not, therefore, connote solely the negative aspects of adaptation; rather, appropriation can be seen as a motivation always already

implicit in the practice of theatrical adaptation.

As the adjective "theatrical" implies, adaptation can take many forms and therefore interpolates questions of genre. The term adaptation is often applied to cinematic productions of Shakespeare as well as to some innovative stage productions. Adaptation can also work across literary genres, such as from dramatic play text to novel or to poetry. Some critics, such as Linda Hutcheon, apply the term even more broadly to include video games, publicity, and various forms of parody and intertextuality.[14] I would argue, however, that the term quickly loses its usefulness as a categorical tool when it is allowed to signify this broadly. If the term becomes a catch-all, it becomes impossible to compare or to analyze adaptations at all. Just as film studies has evolved within academia into its own discipline, video games cannot be analyzed in the same terms as literary play texts because their signifying processes are so radically different on a structural level. Rather than conflating these new commercial products of the Shakespeare industry with adaptation, developing a new typological framework in which to study them would be a more fruitful enterprise.

My definition of "adaptation" for the purposes of this project is thus rooted in textuality since the adaptations which I consider here are all dramatic play texts, just as Shakespeare's plays were also dramatic texts, a term which points to their dual destination for both the page and the stage. The intended trajectory of these Québécois adaptations from author's pen to stage to, in some cases, commercialized text, follows the same production pattern as the Shakespearean sources on which they are based, and none of them participates in generic cross-over, as is the case with narrative or cinematic adaptations. I have chosen to

exclude film from my definition of adaptation because the transposition of a dramatic play text designed for the theatre to another medium necessarily implies a process of adaptation anyway, but adaptation imposed by the medium itself is quite distinct from a process of adaptation rooted in a playwright's deliberate literary choices. Dramatic play texts and cinematic works cannot be compared accurately because some elements of the cinematic adaptation will always result from the cross-over from one medium to another. With dramatic play texts, the differences between the source text and the adapted text can more accurately be assigned to authorial intention (however problematically, as we shall see) on the part of the adapter rather than to the constraints of a particular medium or genre. Nevertheless, genre seems to me less problematic than medium in the definition of adaptation. Jane Smiley's novel *A Thousand Acres*, a feminist adaptation of *King Lear*, is less far removed from the Shakespearean source text than, for example, Gus Van Sant's film *My Own Private Idaho*, an adaptation of both parts of *Henry IV*, because the cinematic adaptation must first be written as a film script and then produced through that medium, engendering a double process of adaptation that obscures the point of origin of changes to the Shakespearean source. The exclusion of cinematic adaptations from this study reduces the corpus which would otherwise include, for example, *Une histoire inventée*, a cinematic adaptation of *Othello*, and other Shakespeare-derived Québécois films.

Dramatic play texts do not, however, remain entirely untouched by the problem of medium. As Fischlin and Fortier put it, "every drama text is an incomplete entity that must be 'translated' by being put on stage. Adaptation is, therefore, only an extreme version of the reworking that takes place in any

theatrical production" (7). In effect, all theatrical productions involve an element of adaptation; therefore, to include theatrical productions in the category of "adaptations" also renders it useless as a classifying system since it becomes all inclusive. Like film, theatrical productions which do not adapt the text itself can be more accurately described as remakings through a medium which has its own particular advantages and conventions that are not directly translatable in a text on a page, even if they can be transcribed. Thus, I define "adaptation" in textual terms because it permits the delineation of limits which "production" precludes. Methodologically, it follows, therefore, that since my definition of adaptation is text-based and excludes production, this dissertation is a literary analysis of the playtexts. Reviews of the plays' reception in performance, however important and legitimate in their own right, are thus outside the scope of this study since performance can fix in time and space the meaning of the text, and I have chosen to privilege the plurality of signification afforded by textual readings (including extant literary criticism of the adaptations, although few detailed readings of the texts considered here exist to date, despite numerous accounts of the plays in performance and in the larger scope of theatre history, most notably by Leanore Lieblein and Denis Salter).

Eliminating medium and genre as factors which ultimately render some remakings of Shakespeare incomparable to others, I define adaptations as additions (although not reductions for the purpose of playing time), transpositions, or translations which alter significantly the content or meaning of the source text and thus produce a new reading of the play. For example, I classify Robert Gurik's *Hamlet, prince du Québec* as well as Michel Garneau's 17th century New

France nationalist 'tradaptation' of *Macbeth* as adaptations, but I exclude Alice Ronfard's very literal translation of *La Tempête* since its originality lies in its performance (e.g. Prospero acted by a woman) rather than in changes to the text. While any attempt at defining "adaptation" too precisely is likely to encounter exceptions to its own rules, a balance between breadth (any change to the source text) and limits (excluding cross-genre or cross-medium) can at the very least produce a workable category. My definition accommodates, for example, Charles Marowitz's *Measure for Measure* (which only adds one line to the Shakespearean source text and merely transposes speech prefixes and line order to produce a new reading), a play which is often cited as defying standard categories of adaptation, such as the subcategories of "reduction/emendation," "adaptation," and "transformation" proposed by Ruby Cohn in her work *Modern Shakespeare Offshoots* (3).

Unlike Fischlin and Fortier, however, I do not simply settle for "adaptation" "for lack of a better term" (3), but choose it actively as the most appropriate word for the particular Québécois texts under discussion here. Fischlin and Fortier "fall back on adaptation ... to take advantage of its general currency" because the term's common usage renders it "capable of minimizing confusion" (3). This ambivalent adoption of "adaptation" does the term a disservice by under-appreciating its most common signification rooted in the notion of change, a concept to which no value judgements can be easily attached. Fischlin and Fortier come to define adaptations as works which "radically alter the shape and significance of another work so as to invoke that work and yet be different from it—so that any adaptation is, and is not, Shakespeare" (3-4). It is

precisely in its common definition as a radical alteration which creates something which is both new and not new that adaptation finds its most powerful signification, one to which no pre-determined judgement is attached independent of the evaluation of the new work itself. As a signifier, "adaptation" carries neither positive nor negative connotations but rather it leaves the question of value in the hands of the reader or the critic. As Fischlin and Fortier subsequently argue to justify their choice of this "fall back" term, "adaptation" has been misrepresented in the past due to false notions of "originality in creation and fidelity in interpretation" (4), but if "we think outside the distortion caused by the high regard in which our culture has held Shakespeare's plays, it becomes clear there is no necessary relation of value between original and adaptation" (3). Thus, provided that we accept Fischlin and Fortier's arguments that 1) "cultural reworking [is] taken to be basic to cultural production in general" (4), and 2) "Shakespeare in his own work was not original in the way these judgements [about original and fidelity] seem to presume" (4), then their concerns about value judgements attached to the term "adaptation" become unjustified. Since their underlying arguments about the nature of cultural production, especially Shakespeare's, are not contentious, the term "adaptation" becomes the most appropriate and value neutral signifier for texts that rewrite the Shakespearean source text, just as Shakespeare adapted the cultural material provided by his own sources, no matter what value we subsequently attach to the rewritten text itself, be it Shakespeare's or that of a contemporary Québécois playwright.

To argue that the signifier "adaptation" is free from value judgements does not necessarily imply, however, that contemporary adaptations do not try to

manipulate the value attached to Shakespeare's text for their own purposes. Indeed, they do, and it is here that appropriation re-enters the equation. Terminologically, adaptation is not value-laden, but contemporary adaptations, especially those written in postcolonial contexts such as Québec, all engage in a dialogue with Shakespeare's canonicity. Adapters choose the amount of weight which they want to allot to, and attempt to appropriate from, that canon. Whereas adaptation asks us to examine how Shakespeare is rewritten, appropriation forces us to examine what parts of Shakespeare are rewritten and why, or, in other words, for what agenda is Shakespeare rewritten and whose interests does his appropriation serve.

In the introduction to her co-edited volume *Shakespeare and Appropriation*, Christy Desmet builds upon Marianne Novy's and Adrienne Rich's work on "re-visions" of Shakespeare as well as Michael Bristol's concept of "big-time" Shakespeare. In response to these two notions, she coins the term "'small-time Shakespeare,' individual acts of 're-vision' that arise from love or rage, or simply a desire to play with Shakespeare" (2). As opposed to big-time Shakespeare which "serves corporate goals, entrenched power structures, and conservative cultural ideologies", small-time Shakespeare, on the other hand, "emerges from local, more pointed responses to the Bard, [and] satisfies motives ranging from play, to political commitment, to agnostic gamesmanship" (2-3). The origin of small-time Shakespeare can be attributed to "the cultural prestige he confers on [a] devalued genre", "the sheer fun of playing 'identify that quotation'", or even out of a "personal urgency for their creators" to produce "acts of survival" (2). Desmet rightly points out that big-time and small-time

Shakespeare cannot always be easily distinguished from each other, as in the case of some Walt Disney productions, and recognition of their interconnection helpfully encourages us to "at once challenge the idea that Shakespeare must always already be co-opted by the dominant culture and caution against the easy assumption that Shakespeare can set us free" (3). I would nonetheless claim that all of the Québécois adaptations considered here are small-time Shakespeare because of the minority status of Québécois culture both internationally and within the rest of Canada. These local adaptations at times play with and at times attack the Bard, and they always testify to a political commitment by their authors to achieve a social power within Canada and internationally which is denied to them.

The agency, or lack thereof, of authors is central to discussions of adaptation and appropriation. Fischlin and Fortier and Desmet all refer to Roland Barthes' theory of the "death of the author" and Michel Foucault's article "What is an Author?" in which the author becomes no more than a mere "author-function". Foucault challenges the notion of authorial intent; consequently, since authors no longer possess the meaning of their works, all discourses are "objects of appropriation" (453). Fischlin and Fortier take issue with the death of the author and argue that "if the author function were completely dead it would likely mean the end of" adaptations and rewritings (6). Instead, they claim that "as in translation, parody, and citation, rather than the rejection of the author function, there is ambivalent support for it, or an attempt to reinscribe it otherwise" (6). Desmet, on the other hand, seems to embrace the death of the author because Foucault's author-function is "simply a proper name by which we describe a piece

of discourse. Shakespeare therefore becomes the author-function 'Shakespeare.' If Shakespeare is really 'Shakespeare,' then his name can be pried loose from the discourses he names and circulated through culture and time" (4-5). Although she passes through a different logic, she seems to arrive at a similar conclusion to Fischlin and Fortier; that is, the death of the author ultimately encourages adaptation and appropriation because it liberates the text from the author, reducing it to pure discourse which can be subsequently reinscribed by other author-functions.

In the case of Québécois adaptations, however, the relationship of adapters to Shakespeare as author and to "Shakespeare" as mere author-function is complicated by the desire of the adapter to both profit from and repudiate Shakespeare's authority and cultural capital. It is also complicated by the notion of adapter-as-author, for these adapters seem to see themselves as creators of an original work of art, so it is impossible for them to subscribe fully to the notion of Shakespeare as a mere author-function without also participating in their own erasure as author and creative voice, relegating themselves to a mere function which reproduces or modifies Shakespearean discourse. In other words, although the death of the author may encourage adaptation, it also comports risks for the adapters themselves since reducing Shakespeare's works to mere words on a page and participating in the reinscription of his discourse ultimately signals the potential futility of their own creative process as writers whose works may also be disregarded or reinterpreted just as easily.

The death of the author implies, then, the devaluation of cultural capital. Why should authors write or adapters adapt if their own texts are subject to the

same processes of reinscription, transformation, and reinterpretation which far exceed their intentions? In the case of Québécois adapters, I would argue that the payoff is the conversion of Shakespeare's cultural capital into their own socio-political capital. Fischlin and Fortier point out that contemporary adaptations "often attempt to recontextualize Shakespeare politically" (5), and this assertion appears to be particularly true in postcolonial contexts where ideological struggles are already at work.

When the author is considered dead, then his cultural capital is free for the taking by authors seeking to legitimize social and political struggles. As Desmet states, the signifier "'Shakespeare' is circulated through different ages and social strata, in turn accruing and conferring symbolic value on cultural projects from both highbrow and lowbrow culture" (5), and also, therefore, the political agenda of those who choose to appropriate it. The weight of Shakespeare's canonical authority, coupled with the free circulation of his cultural capital, makes Shakespearean adaptation what I call a "power play", that is, a text that unabashedly profits from the cultural strength of Shakespeare's text while simultaneously struggling with it in an aggressive *rapport des forces*, always fighting against its own erasure by the so-called original text whence it is born. This is the paradox of Shakespearean appropriation to which Desmet refers when she speaks of Shakespeare as neither fully capable of dominating nor setting free. The assumptions of Shakespeare-as-colonizer or Shakespeare-as-liberator are each equally binding upon the adapter, for even as postcolonial writers may feel trapped under the weight of Shakespeare's canonical presence, the act of adaptation (using the master's tools to deconstruct the master's house in Audrey

Lorde's terms) carries with it the risk of contamination, assimilation, or effacement of their own cultural distinctiveness, but this risk need not be actualized to the same extent in all postcolonial contexts, as the case of Québec will show. In Québec, Shakespearean adaptation is complicated by the ambivalent power relations between a dead author and authors who refuse to be dead without a fight; it is a precarious tight-rope walk for adapters who simultaneously profit from and repudiate Shakespeare's canonicity, risking cultural assimilation in the hope of gaining individual cultural capital that can be translated into collective political capital.

Notes to Chapter 1

[1] "No free Québec without the freedom of women! No free women without the freedom of Québec!"

All translations in this dissertation are my own, unless otherwise noted, such as when another translation of a playtext already exists as it does for *Hamlet, prince du Québec* and *Les Reines*. In all cases, I have chosen to translate as literally as possible (even idioms for which I subsequently provide an English equivalent) in order to highlight the differences between the word choice of adapters in Québécois texts and the Shakespearean source text.

[2] "To deal with," an explicit anglicization of the English expression which thus testifies to the linguistic colonization of Québécois.

[3] "We got fucked", a common expression in Québec, equivalent to "getting screwed", used particularly in regard to politcs.

[4] "Mother nation / homeland."

[5] For associations between nationalist separatism and "tribalism", "xenophobia", and "essentialism", see Stephen May's *Language and Minority Rights* (9, 20-23), Michel Seymour's "Québec and Canada at the Crossroads" (2), and Seymour's "Questioning the Ethnic/Civic Dichotomy" (29n36). William Johnson, a Québec journalist and former leader of Alliance Québec, associates the Québec sovereignist movement with "tribalism" and "anglophobia". Daniel Salée, Vice-Principal and Associate Professor, School of Community and Public Affairs, Concordia University, expresses shock at popular associations between nationalism and "tribalism" and "xenophobia". In *Line Drawings*, Cressida Heyes documents several articles by Nancy Fraser, Joan Scott, bell hooks, and Linda Nicholson in which the charge "essentialist" implicitly characterizes certain feminist political identities as "'static,' 'absolutist,' 'overdetermined,' and 'universalist'" (17-18, 190n1-4).

Historically, whenever the term separatism has not been used pejoratively, it has nonetheless been used ambivalently. In 1961, Marcel Chaput published the essay *Pourquoi je suis séparatiste.* In an introduction to a subsequent edition he recounts being forced by the editor to adopt this title despite claiming adamantly that he was a "nationalist", not a "separatist". Thus, I use the term separatism for the sole purpose of tracing points of convergence between nation and gender. Whenever it is possible to refer only to nation, I prefer to use more appropriate political terms such as nationalism, sovereignty, succession and their cognates.

[6] This was recently the discourse of the Bloc Québécois in their 2004 election campaign entitled "Parce qu'on est différents". Leader Gilles Duceppe repeatedly claimed that Québec is a "pays pas meilleur et pas pire que les autres, juste différent", that is, no better and no worse than any other sovereign country, simply different. (Duceppe has given speeches on this theme, for instance, at the PQ *Conseil national* on February 7, 2004 in Laval, and at the BQ pre-electoral formation camp on March 20, 2004 in Montréal.)

[7] For historical accounts of nationalist separatist movements, see, for example, *National Separatism*, ed. Colin H. Williams, *Separatism: Democracy and Disintegration*, ed. Metta Spenser, and *Separatism and Integration: A Study in Analytical History* by Bertrand Roehner with Leonard J. Rahilly. For historical accounts of lesbian feminist separatism, see *Separatism and Women's Community* by Dana Shugar and *For Lesbians Only: A Separatist Anthology* eds. Sarah Lucia Hoagland and Julia Penelope.

[8] In *Multiculturalism and 'the Politics of Recognition'*, Charles Taylor examines the tensions between Canadian and Québécois nationalisms. He sympathizes with Québécois nationalists in his claim that modern "identity politics" is a search for recognition of one's difference or

otherness, yet he fails to take his argument to its logical conclusion. Stopping short of advocating Québec sovereignty as a solution to the non-recognition of Québec's difference, he ultimately relegates Québécois difference to its pre-Quiet Revolution status as merely a French-Canadian identity through his conclusion that Québec should continue to try to function with the federal political structure.

[9] "The motor of national consciousness are the producers of meaning, that is, intellectuals who are specialists of language, producers of culture, and disseminators of ideas."

[10] Throughout this dissertation, italics in either English or French quotations are reproduced as indicated in the original text unless otherwise noted as my own.

[11] "A convergence in the politicization of identity, even if the two movements privilege different forms of identity affiliation."

[12] "Lesbian separatism, as a feminine nationalism, invented the idea of a new sort of nation-state." "Had been accepted as strategically indispensable."

[13] Jean Marsden comes close to this conception of "appropriation" when she cites the OED definition, 'to take to one's self' and extrapolates the idea of "making this [desired] object one's own"; however, she ultimately associates the term with its negative connotations of "theft", "possession", "usurpation", and "seizure" (1), failing to conceive the term beyond its traditional usage.

[14] Linda Hutcheon delivered a talk on this subject entitled "Familiarity and Contempt: Adaptation(s) Run Amok", which is part of her forthcoming book, at McGill University in January 2004.

Chapter 2

The Quiet Revolution: *Passer à l'(in)action*

Thought versus action: the dilemma of Shakespeare's Hamlet is also that of the Québec nation. Both Robert Gurik's *Hamlet, prince du Québec* (1968) and Jean-Claude Germain's *Rodéo et Juliette* (1970-1) situate Québec's quest for sovereignty in terms of Hamlet's problem of ceaseless thought versus the need to take immediate action. Gurik's text is allegorical while Germain's associations with the political context of the time are metaphorical, but both adaptations are focused thematically on the need for Québécois to throw off their Hamlet complex, a theme that is in keeping with larger social discourses about nationalism at the time. In Québec in the late 1960's and early 1970's, nationalism was expressed largely in terms of taking action, *passer à l'action*,[1] and throwing off the defeatism of a *né-pour-un-petit-pain* attitude of self-deprecation.[2] This type of nationalism was manifested through anti-ecclesiasticism, neo-marxism, and parallels with African decolonization, and these discourses, in dialogue with Canadian federalism, are the major concerns of Shakespearean adaptation during this period, particularly *Hamlet, prince du Québec*. However, Québécois nationalism does not overlap significantly with feminism in these early adaptations in which women are largely absent, despite the potential of women's contributions to the nationalist movement being briefly suggested at the end of *Rodéo et Juliette*.

From a broad socio-historical perspective, Gurik's choice of *Hamlet* as the first adaptation of Shakespeare after the Quiet Revolution is uncanny since the trajectory of the independence movement in Québec shows remarkable parallels

to many basic plot elements of Shakespeare's play. Various groups composing the sovereignist movement have traditionally positioned their different strategies in the struggle for national independence along an axis of thought versus action. On one end of the spectrum, radical groups such as the *Front de Libération du Québec* (FLQ) have embodied the philosophy of direct action as the only means to liberate a nation considered occupied by a foreign power. Inspired by Frantz Fanon and the decolonization movement which was changing the political map of Africa, the direct action elements of the Québec sovereignist movement had resolved the hamletian impasse of ceaseless contemplation of the morality of their actions, and they were already decided, from the moment of their inception in the early 1960's, to free their nation from those whom they considered to be Claudius-like tyrannical usurpers. On the other end of the spectrum, however, the majority of Québécois sovereignists valued the democratic process above their own freedom, and, like Hamlet, chose a route which delayed the accomplishment of their goals until the proposed action could be legitimated by moral introspection, or at least the democratic process. Since its foundation in 1968, the *Parti Québécois* (PQ), which represents the largest majority of sovereignists, has defined itself as a "party of ideas", and, since the adoption of the governing strategy of *étapisme* in November 1974,[3] it has proceeded like Hamlet who refuses to kill Claudius while he is praying, refusing to martyr the enemy and to damn his own soul as the price of victory, and delaying and sacrificing its ultimate goal in its attempts to do so above moral or democratic reproach.

Retrospectively, then, the history of the sovereignist movement, and the PQ in particular, parallels the plot of Hamlet, but even without the luxury of

nearly forty years of hindsight, Robert Gurik's *Hamlet, prince du Québec* teased out the Québec nation's Hamlet complex as early as 1968. Composed in November 1967, *Hamlet, prince du Québec* was first performed in Montréal on January 17, 1968 on the boat theatre L'Escale and then (re)translated into English by Marc Gélinas for performance at the London Little Theatre in Ontario in November of the same year. The English version of *Hamlet, Prince of Quebec* presents so many significant changes from the French version that it is more properly identified as an adaptation of the adaptation rather than a mere literal translation, and, accordingly, it is treated here as such, since its destination for an English Canadian stage provides the translator with the opportunity to address directly an audience who could be considered the colonizer. The shift in audience would have necessitated changes to some cultural references that would be "too Québécois" for a "foreign" audience to understand. It also allows the English version of the text to drive home there where its satire would bite the most the political messages aimed at the perceived colonizer and Canadian federalism in general, messages that would be redundant for a Québécois audience who would already be more sympathetic to the cause. In both the French and English versions though, the process of adaptation lies in the reorientation of the meaning of the source text through its recontextualization within the Québec political scene of 1967-68, the association of Shakespeare's characters with Québécois politicians, the addition of a second gravedigger, two extra scenes of dialogue between the working-class gravediggers, five short radio broadcasts of current events, the elimination of Fortibras and his invading army, and numerous references to Québécois history and current affairs. Nearly every line of the

adaptation functions simultaneously on two levels—that of Shakespeare's narrative and that of the Québécois political situation—making the text incredibly rich. On the surface, the adaptation is a remarkably accurate political satire, but, it also signifies more profoundly as an allegory of the hesitation that marks the collective consciousness of the Québec nation. Gurik's play is a thinly-veiled national allegory in Frederic Jameson's sense of the term; that is, for Gurik's protagonist the "story of the private individual destiny is always an allegory of the embattled structure of the public ... culture and society" (Jameson 67). Gurik's Hamlet represents the Québec nation and is identified explicitly as such both in the text in parenthesis after the speech prefix and on stage by his cape covered in fleur-de-lys, and most explicitly by the play's title itself.

Each character in Gurik's *Hamlet* is similarly identified with a symbolic collectivity or an individual, well-recognized politician. All of the characters (except Hamlet) wear white masks that visually mark them as their political counterpart, and all of them are also identified as such in speech prefixes of the text. *Le Roi*, King Claudius, is "*L'anglophonie*", at once the English-speaking world in the broadest sense, the British army of General Wolfe during the Conquest, the English-dominated Canadian federal government, and encroaching American capitalism. *La Reine*, Queen Gertrude, is "*L'église*", the Roman Catholic Church which controlled nearly every aspect of Québec society from the failure of the *Patriote* rebellion in 1837-38 until the Quiet Revolution began in 1960, and which was particularly strong during the period dominated by the ideology of Ultramontanism that began in 1840 and peaked between 1867 and 1896.[4] Polonius is Lester B. Pearson, Prime Minister of Canada from June 18,

1962 until April 20, 1968 (when Trudeau was sworn in following his victory of the Liberal party leadership on April 6, 1968), responsible notably for endowing the country with the Canadian flag in February 1965 in service of unifying Canada *a mari usque ad mare*. Laerte is Pierre Elliot Trudeau who, in January 1968, though well-positioned for the role of Prime Minister, was still the federal Minister of Justice and well-known as an intellectual for his writings in *Cité libre*. Laerte's sister, Ophélie, is Jean Lesage, leader of the provincial *Parti Libéral du Québec* (PLQ) and father of the Quiet Revolution in his role of Premier of Québec from June 1960 until June 1966 when he lost the provincial election to Daniel Johnson of the *Union nationale*. Hamlet's loyal companion, Horatio, is René Lévesque, well-known as a journalist and host of the television program *Point de mire*, as the instigator of the nationalization of Québec's various electricity companies under the banner of Hydro-Québec (whose insignia appears on his costume), and as the deputy who sparked a series of resignations from the PLQ on October 14, 1967. His impromptu departure from the PLQ resulted in the foundation of the *Mouvement Souveraineté-Association* (MSA) in November 1967, a party that eventually became the *Parti Québécois* when it merged with the *Ralliment national* and with the *Rassemblement pour l'indépendance nationale* (RIN) in October 1968. *L'Officier du Rhin*, the leader of the watch, is Pierre Bourgault, the leader of the RIN (founded in September 1960), an intellectual and a politician considered more radical and leftist than Lévesque. Rosencrantz and Guildernstern are Gérard Pelletier and Jean Marchand, a federal deputy and the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration respectively, co-founders and contributors with Trudeau to *Cité libre* magazine for which they were known

collectively as "les trois colombes" (doves) in French and the "Three Wise Men" in English. Finally, *Le Spectre*, the ghost, of Hamlet's father is General Charles De Gaulle, the French President whose famous cry of "Vive le Québec libre" from the balcony of Montréal's city hall on July 24, 1967 caused considerable controversy in Québec and especially in English Canada.

Hamlet, prince du Québec is thus an allegory in the primary sense that the characters represent more than their individual identity, particularly in the case of Hamlet-Québec, *Le Roi-L'anglophonie*, and *La Reine-L'église*. More importantly, it is also a national allegory because the main plot exposes the collective consciousness of the nation, ending with a moral imperative which directs the people to resolve the nation's principal character flaw, its inaction. The opening line of the play's introduction firmly situates its message in the realm of moral imperatives: "Hamlet c'est le Québec avec toutes ses hésitations, avec sa soif d'action et de liberté, corseté par cents ans d'inaction" (5).[5] Hamlet-Québec's problem is its hesitation, and only by throwing off the corset of inaction can it finally quench its thirst for freedom. The necessity for Québec to resolve its Hamlet complex is not merely a neat parallel; it is a matter of life and death, as the play's opening scene of two "fossoyeurs" digging a "tombe [qui] peut très bien être celle d'Hamlet" makes clear (5).[6] Throwing off the restraints of hesitation and ceaseless contemplation is an imperative whose failure will have mortal consequences. What's worse, given that the two gravediggers represent the older generation and the younger generation of poor, francophone workers respectively, the nation is literally digging its own grave and burying itself alive. Philosophical debate, in the context of both Gurik's and Germain's plays, is more than just a

caprice; it creates stagnancy and a slow self-inflicted death. As Hamlet-Québec realizes with his dying breath at the end of the play, the people are trapped in "la fange des compromis, de l'esclavage" by "les chaînes qu'hypocritement [ils ont eux]-mêmes forgées" (95).[7] The moral imperative of the allegory could not be clearer: the nation must break free from the chains which it has placed on its own freedom, and the only way to do so is to renounce its Hamlet complex, turning ceaselessly in philosophical circles and self-introspection until it is too late, and immediately "take arms against a sea of troubles" (3.1.59), or *passer à l'action.*

While the national allegory, that is, the overarching portrait of the hesitation that has marked Québec's collective consciousness since the Conquest, constitutes the driving force of Gurik's play, just as Hamlet's hesitation paradoxically drives Shakepseare's play, the political satire derived from the association of each character with a political figure creates the narrative base which substantiates the allegory. Although critics such as Laurent Mailhot and Melanie Stevenson have applauded the neat parallels between Shakespeare's characters and the political personalities with whom Gurik associates them, and they have quite rightly attributed the source of the play's satire to this transposition, the political satire pierces both the French and the English versions of Gurik's adaptation much more profoundly than previous commentators have acknowledged. A full appreciation of the adaptation requires a more extensive deconstruction of the text's intricate web of allegory and of the multiple allusions to socio-historical realities embedded in the association of the literary characters with their corresponding political stand-ins. Many of the play's subtle social critiques, which are conveyed through anti-ecclesiastic and neo-marxist

discourses, have been eclipsed by earlier commentaries, yet these analyses are essential to understanding the adaptation's use of the Shakespearean text to advance a nationalist discourse.

Of all the radical social changes that took place during the Quiet Revolution, secularisation was the most far-reaching and abrupt, for most Catholics in Québec broke free from the control of the Church over the course of only a few years, particularly in the urban centers. In fact, the play opens with a discussion between gravediggers from two generations who typify the changing attitudes towards the Church's stranglehold over everyday life. The *1er Fossoyeur*, a representative of the older, obedient generation, tells his work companion, the *2ième Fossoyeur*, that he has six children, and his family size places an economic strain on daily domestic life (although six children is far from abnormal during this period when families with fifteen to twenty children were relatively common). The *2ième Fossoyeur*, from the more liberated generation that participated actively in the changes instituted during the Quiet Revolution, sardonically deplores, "Et y en a qui disent que c'est fini la revanche des berceaux... pourquoi tu essaies pas la pilule ?", to which the first replies, "Avec le salaire que je fais, j'ai pas les moyens de m'acheter des bonbons. Et puis ma femme voudrait pas... à cause du curé" (10).[8] Critical of the "revenge of the cradle", that is, the Church's insistence that the survival of the French language and Catholicism in North America, and hence the fate of the nation, rested on a mere numbers game of producing as many children as possible (regardless of the burden of this practice on individual families), the younger generation adopted a counter-discursive position to the effect that the Church has no place in the

bedrooms of the nation (long before Trudeau made his famous declaration to the same effect about the role of the state). The discussion on birth control by the two gravediggers portrays the slippage of the Church's social and moral authority over its parishioners, its rule destined to die out with the older generation as Québécois youth categorically refute its dominance over their daily life.

Similarly, later in the play, *La Reine-L'église*, upset with Hamlet-Québec's rejection of her, asks, "Avez-vous oublié qui je suis ? J'ai guidé vos premiers pas", to which Hamlet-Québec defiantly replies, "Et vous m'avez brouillé la vue" (67).[9] Hamlet-Québec's retort here marks a heightened sense of self-awareness compared to his earlier response to *La Reine-L'église* about her guidance of his steps which ends in reluctant submission: "Vous avez guidé sagement mes pas alors que mes jambes étaient trop frêles pour me porter. Aujourd'hui, encore, je vous écoute et vous obéis" (13).[10] In both statements though, Hamlet-Québec successfully exposes the trap of the colonizing paradigm, a trap that equally describes the position in which Québec finds itself within Canadian federalism. Under the pretence of lending a helping hand to guide timid first steps, colonization creates a dependence that prevents the colonized from walking alone by blurring the vision of the final destination or even the path along which to travel. The helping hand creates a disability where one did not previously exist, and this metaphor of stunted growth describes both the Church's overwhelming, controlling influence in the daily life of Québécois until the Quiet Revolution as well Canadian federalism which, while supposedly helpfully guiding Québec's socio-economic development, also hinders it with more obscured tactics that many nationalists of the period, influenced by African decolonization, would

arguably describe as neo-colonial domination.

Several minor yet significant changes to the English version of the adaptation highlight further this critique of the Church's long-standing but quickly diminishing surveillance of Québec's francophone majority. When criticizing *Le Roi-L'anglophonie*'s hasty marriage to *La Reine-L'église*, Hamlet-Québec comments that he built her "des résidences à travers le pays, toutes plus somptueuses les unes que les autres" (14).[11] To the end of this claim, the English text tags on the observation, "and now empty..." (4), a mocking jab at the desolation of Québec's churches. The people's rapid abandonment of the Church is further reinforced by the addition in the English of the qualifier "and yet within not even a day, but one poor hour in history" (4), a comment which is completely absent from the French text and represents a marked change from Shakespeare both in time (a month) and the object which it modifies (Gertrude's affections rather than the empty palaces). Moreover, the famous condemnation of Gertrude by Shakespeare's Hamlet—"frailty, thy name is woman"(1.2.146)—becomes "Fragilité, ton nom est robe" (14) in French but "frailty thy name is cassock" (4) in Gélinas's English translation.[12] While the French version is ambiguous, "robe" potentially signifying both the priest's robes as well as a woman's dress, in the English adaptation this pun is eliminated in order to transform the criticism of women's sexual infidelity into an outright accusation against the Roman Catholic Church.

In two other instances the English version adds criticisms of the Church that are absent from the French text but that allow Hamlet/Quebec to assert him/itself in the face of Canadian federalism with which the Queen/The Church

is associated by virtue of her/its marriage/complicity with the King/The English.[13] More than insults mocking the Church's sudden loss of power, these insertions testify to an underlying resentment towards the Church for its manipulation of the people. When questioning whether or not Rosencrantz and Guilderstern attempted to assay Hamlet with a pastime, the Queen/The Church confesses, "'Tis a proven way to occupy the mind, bind and bend it. I myself held Hamlet chained to his ignorance, by games of 'beads', 'rhythm', 'follow the cross', 'suffer, suffer', and 'do it now or you'll burn forever'. But he plays no more... How children go!" (25). Later, in the bedchamber scene, Hamlet/Quebec rhetorically asks the Queen/The Church, "Have you consented to barter away your freedom in this land to which you have given love and mountainous labour against security, status and the trinkets of power but without this power, really" (38). Through these two additions to its English version, the adaptation accuses the Church of manipulating Québec's francophone, Roman Catholic majority with games of guilt and punishment, stunting Québec's development by keeping it ignorantly unaware of its full adult potential, and privileging the Church's self-interested desire for a control that was only illusionary anyway. The pun on "mountainous" and "Ultramontanism" takes aim in particular at the period in the late 19th century when the Church appealed to the people's patriotism with a defensive nationalist discourse oriented towards a solidification of the Church's political influence rather than the betterment of the nation since it privileged immobility over social advancement. In all of these examples though, the bitterness of the accusation fades into the stark reality that the Church's power exists no more. The repeated use of ellipses at the end of these anti-ecclesiastical reminiscences points past the

fall of the Queen/The Church to the fall of the King/The English as well. Not only do the unfinished sentences signal other unfinished tasks left to be accomplished, but Québec's liberation from the Church serves as a model of liberation from English Canadian domination. The realization that the Queen/The Church has blurred his/its sight endows Hamlet/Quebec with the awareness to avoid in future the games and dangling beads of his/its other adversaries and regain the vision required to achieve his/its other goals such as economic wealth and political sovereignty.

Similar to the anti-ecclesiasticism underlying the play's nationalism, the play's neo-marxist discourse is also rooted in a nationalist agenda. This neo-marxism is crucial to the play by virtue of the fact that it is disseminated by one of Gurik's major additions to the Shakespearean text, the impoverished francophone worker symbolized by the two gravediggers. Neo-marxism was becoming increasingly popular in Québec in the late 1960's, largely due to a collective recognition by francophones of their economic disenfranchisement compared to the wealth of their anglophone bosses and overseers. Neo-marxist consciousness-raising, which occurred in conjunction with African discourses of decolonization rooted in a similar disentitlement, reached its peak in Québec in 1970 with the October Crisis (as we shall see in chapter five with *Henry.Octobre.1970.*) before authorities and the workers' own disillusionment quickly wiped it out. The discursive connection between neo-marxism, African decolonization, and Québécois nationalism manifests itself in the play through a radio broadcast announcing anniversaries of historic events: "Il y a cinq ans jour pour jour éclatait la première bombe séparatiste dans une boîte à letters. Ce même jour en 1959 le

Congo se rebellait pour accéder à son indépen..." (24-5).[14] The English version adds the specific target of the FLQ bombs, "the English Montreal suburb of Westmount", as well as the origin of the Congo rebellion "in Leopoldville, Africa" (9-10). Not only do these details further situate the struggle for Congo's and Québec's independence within a discourse of decolonization by evoking King Leopold of Belgium's conquest and exploitation of the African colony, but these insertions also reinforce the neo-marxist discourse by evoking Westmount, a symbolic synonym for the socio-economic disparity between wealthy anglophone bosses and poor francophone workers. The reference to the anglophone city of Westmount is a particularly biting addition to the English version of the play because it directly implicates the Ontarian audience in the colonizing mission of Canadian federalism and it also antagonizes the audience by making them experience indirectly the fear of attack with which their fellow English Canadians must now live. The precision of Westmount interpolates the audience as vicarious (and even potential) victims of terrorism by exposing their complicity in the English Canadian exploitation of Québec.

The play's comparison of Québec to Africa, and hence of Westmount to imperial Europe, is by no means reductive, nor does it easily lend itself to the common accusation that Québécois nationalism is motivated by a *repli sur soi* or xenophobic inward turn. On the contrary, the play testifies to an underlying passionate concern about global affairs and solidarity towards so-called "Third World" countries. The radio announcement in the French version refers to the United States' "rôle de pacification" in Vietnam (19),[15] but implicitly critiques this pacification as really being colonization, if not war-mongering. The radio's

subsequent anniversary date describes the imprisonment of Montréal mayor Camillien Houde in 1941 for protesting conscription, with the trailing reminder that a year later the battle of Dieppe took place in which many Québécois soldiers conscripted by the Canadian government were killed. The valorization of the Québécois pacifist who accurately predicted the slaughter of his people on the front lines in World War II establishes the play's solidarity with the Vietnamese people whose colonization is disguised as pacification. The English version also aligns Hamlet-Québec in solidarity with the Gabonese (4), and, through the satiric addition of a black slave vocative, "boy come" (13), figures Horatio/Lévesque as an associate member of the African negritude movement as a "nègre blanc d'Amérique".[16] Far from being obsessed with the inward navel-gazing of Shakespeare's Hamlet, Gurik's Hamlet-Québec, who even greets Horatio-Lévesque in Spanish with "Holà" (30), is very much in tune to world affairs. The play's implied parallels between African decolonization and Québécois nationalism thus strengthen the neo-marxist argument in favour of independence because the exploitation of workers across continental divides by former imperial conquerors turned global capitalists creates a bond of solidarity between all those who feel enslaved, thereby encouraging those who have not yet broken free from their masters, new or old, to emulate those who already have.

The neo-marxist link between poverty and colonization is rendered most explicit though in the scenes with the two gravediggers. In the opening scene, the *1er Fossoyeur* explains why he is poor and dissatisfied with his job but unable to change his lot in life: "j'ai pas d'instruction et puis j'parle pas anglais..." (10).[17] As a result of the Conquest and the colonization of New France by England

(particularly Lord Durham's recommendation in February 1839 that the French majority be assimilated), the francophone majority of Québec has become trapped in a cycle whereby linguistic difference prevents access to education and well-paying jobs, and the poverty caused by low-level employment prevents workers' children from furthering their education through which they could erase their linguistic, and hence economic, difference. Without education and a mastery of the English language, poor francophone workers cannot even rise up socially and economically to the class of *contre-maîtres*, that is, foremen who were typically seen as colonial "mimic men" because they lorded power over their own people in an unsuccessful attempt to join the ranks of their anglophone bosses (as we shall see the text's construction of Laerte-Trudeau). In the play's English version, the criticism of this situation is accentuated by the First Digger's accent, broken English syntax, and a pun on a common nickname for anglophones derived from their swearing habits, "des goddamns": "I never go to dhe school and me goddamn I no spick Ingliss..." (2). The Second Digger also evokes indirectly the linguistic colonization of Québec when he consoles the First by telling him to listen to the radio because "de hit parade is good" (2), a comment which does not appear in the French version but which points to the encroaching assimilation of francophones through (mostly American) anglophone mass culture since CRTC rules establishing a minimum level of French content (set at 65% by the *Broadcasting Act* of 1991) did not yet exist in order to protect Québécois culture.[18]

The discursive overlap between neo-marxism and nationalism in Québec is further developed in the Patriots scene which Gurik adds after the equivalent of

3.4 and before the equivalent of 4.5 in Shakespeare's play. Mid-way through Gurik's 2.7, the gravediggers experience a transition in time and come out of their grave wearing clothes from the time of the *Patriote* rebellion of 1837-38.[19] The *2ième Fossoyeur* complains that "la dîme a été augmentée et tout cet argent s'en va vers d'autres contrées, celles-là même qui ont aidé le nouveau roi à monter sur le trône" (72).[20] His Patriot-era recognition of the people's colonization, that is, their taxation (by their own religious authorities functioning as compradors) which is being used to reinforce the wealth and power of their foreign conquerors, mixes neo-marxism and nationalism as factors encouraging decolonization. The gravedigger's complaint also rejoins his earlier, contemporary-era frustration at exploitation and desire for liberation: "Tant qu'à manger de la scrap j'aime autant la manger à ma table et pas à celle d'un autre" (70).[21] Here as well the *2ième Fossoyeur* combines a neo-marxist discourse on poverty (eating scraps) with the nationalist discourse of "maîtres chez nous" (masters in our own homes) which was the slogan of Lesage's *PLQ* in the 1960 election that launched the Quiet Revolution (eating at my own table). The entire Patriot scene is instigated by a conversation between the two gravediggers about René Lévesque's resignation from the paradoxical Québec-nationalist-Canadian-federalist *PLQ* and his plans to found a new "parti pour l'indépendance", the *MSA* (70).[22] In effect, the second gravedigger links Lévesque to the Patriots, wishing for him to lead a new rebellion (democratic this time) to finish the task which the Patriots failed to complete the first time: "Moi avec un gars comme ça, je marche. ... Si on avait tenu notre bout en ce temps-là [des patriotes de '37]... on n'en serait pas là. Je suis sûr qu'on aurait pu" (70).[23] Thus, Gurik's addition of the Patriots scene

functions not only as a warning against repeating the mistakes of the past (failing to finish the revolution for independence), but also as an exposition of how little the socio-economic condition of francophone workers has changed in 130 years, thereby suggesting the necessity of independence as the only solution to poverty.

While the play's nationalist discourse depends on neo-marxism, the opposing discourse of Canadian federalism propagated by *Le Roi-L'anglophonie*, Polonius-Pearson, and Laerte-Trudeau completely ignores the presence, let alone the plight, of Québec's working class. Instead, the federalist discourse is rooted in a Foucauldian paradigm of power relations focused on discipline and punishment. *Le Roi-L'anglophonie*, for instance, describes Hamlet-Québec as "une plaie brûlante dans mon flanc" and writes to England requesting "une aide armée pour raffermir notre autorité dans ce pays" (64).[24] Taken in conjunction with Rosencrantz-Pelletier's subsequent observation that "il suffit d'une étincelle pour faire exploser la poudre" (64),[25] Gurik not only alludes to FLQ bombs which had already exploded but also predicts the federal government's response to the October Crisis two years later, that is, sending the army to occupy the streets of Montréal in order to re-establish its authority over the territory of Québec and its local law enforcement. *Le Roi-L'anglophonie* then warns *La Reine-L'église*, "Il faut que votre fils se soumette totalement" (65), an absolutist position consistent with the King's decision to "mettre des gants de fer" as related by the Patriot-era *2ième Fossoyeur*: "'À partir d'aujourd'hui, la seule langue tolérée sera celle en usage à la cour. Tout contrevenant sera puni sévèrement'" (71).[26] This sinister portrait of Canadian federalism's sadistic obsession with severely punishing Québec at every possible opportunity is, of course, to be expected in a

sovereignist play.[27] Domination is in fact *Le Roi-L'anglophonie*'s position from the play's outset when he tells Hamlet-Québec, "Il faut faire face aux réalités… ce qui était n'est plus" (13),[28] reminding him of the Conquest of Old Hamlet-New France and encouraging him to accept his defeat with obedient submission.

As Hamlet-Québec becomes more and more conscious of his domination by *Le Roi-L'anglophonie* and the complicity of *La Reine-L'église*, *Le Roi-L'anglophonie* becomes more preoccupied with his project to "les mâter, et lui et le peuple" (78),[29] particularly in the discussion of vengeance with Laerte-Trudeau. This desire to quell the uprising of Hamlet-Québec and the people who are profoundly attached to him betrays not only *Le Roi-L'anglophonie*'s obsession with suppressing Hamlet-Québec's quest to understand the murder-Conquest of Old Hamlet-New France but also the common myth in English Canada that all nationalists who identify with Québec are necessarily radicals, and hence terrorists, who must be stomped out by force.[30] *Le Roi-L'anglophonie*'s fixation on suppressing all the people aligned with Hamlet-Québec, regardless of ideological differences within the collectivity labelled "le peuple", belies his bad faith and incomprehension of the underlying causes of the uprising that he is determined to wipe out. *Le Roi-L'anglophonie*'s totalitarian discourse derives from his desire to secure his dominance through the enactment of the ritualistic violence characteristic of an early modern revenge tragedy rather than a rational assessment of the social conditions, such as poverty, that motivate the allegiance of the various factions of the population to Hamlet-Québec.

Laerte-Trudeau fully supports *Le Roi-L'anglophonie*'s strategy of punishment and ritualistic violence in his dealings with Hamlet-Québec.

Following Hamlet-Québec's accidental stabbing of Polonius-Pearson behind the arras, Laerte-Trudeau completely ignores his father's earlier advice that "la patience fait souvent triompher les causes, mêmes les plus faibles" (23).[31] Polonius-Pearson advocates the slow assimilation of Québec into English-Canada while simultaneously admitting the moral and democratic illegitimacy of such a strategy, a bitterly ironic diversion from Shakespeare's Polonius's imperative "to thine own self be true" (1.3.78). Laerte-Trudeau, on the other hand, wants to be *Le Roi-L'anglophonie*'s instrument in Hamlet-Québec's murder and says that he "l'égorger[ait] au pied de l'autel que sa mort serve d'exemple aux têtes brûlées du pays" (80),[32] reorienting the motivations of Shakespeare's Laertes by situating the murder in terms of the repression of Québec's radicals, that is, its sovereignists and neo-marxists, rather than in terms of Laertes' grief over the deaths of his sister and father. The adaptation's conclusion exposes, however, the moral that Laerte-Trudeau has equally been caught in *Le Roi-L'anglophonie*'s trap. With his dying breath Laerte-Trudeau confesses to Hamlet-Québec, "Je t'aimais, maintenant, je le sais, mais le miroitement des honneurs, les malheurs qui se sont abattus sur moi, la langue perfide du grand responsable de notre tragédie ont obscurci ma raison..." (94).[33] Gurik could have easily omitted Laerte-Trudeau's attempted reconciliation with Hamlet-Québec, just as he cuts Fortinbras' invasion and many other lines from Shakespeare's text; however, the inclusion of these lines enriches the adaptation by figuring Laerte-Trudeau as himself a colonized subject who recognizes too late his role as comprador. Gurik's adaptation constructs Laerte-Trudeau, like the bourgeois in V.S. Naipaul's novel, as a "mimic man", that is, a subject who is oblivious to his own colonization because

of his desire to identify with the colonizer and who enacts his self-hatred on his own people in order to earn the colonizer's praise.

Interestingly, the Laertes/Trudeau character changes drastically in the English version of the play, as does consequently the political strategy of the King/The English since the English version affords the opportunity to address directly an audience representative of the Canadian federalism which it mocks and attacks more subversively than the French version. Most notable is the English version's translation of *Le Roi-L'anglophonie*'s phrase "Mais j'ai su les mâter, et lui et le peuple" (78) as "But I have him bewildered, both he and the people also, and thou, dearest Laertes, art part of the show" (44). The semiotic gap between "mâter" (meaning to quell or suppress a rebellion or terrorists) and "bewildered" signals a shift in the English version's representation of the King/The English's tactics in dealing with Hamlet/Quebec. Instead of forcefully inflicted punishments, the King/The English approaches the problem of Québécois nationalism more strategically, in keeping with the policy of assimilation, and he consciously employs his mimic man in order to create the illusion that the Québécois population may voice its positions through its democratic representative, although in reality its representative speaks in service of its colonizer. Laertes/Trudeau is no more than a talking head, full of sound and fury but signifying nothing, and, what's worse, he doesn't know that he is just a puppet in the King/The English's "show" until he is explicitly told so (44). While the English version tones down the physical violence of colonization by omitting the reference to suppressing rebellion, it highlights the more insidious, and more effective, colonial strategy of using artifice to confuse the people so that they fail

to recognize their own colonized state.

The English version of the adaptation further undercuts the Laertes/Trudeau character by the addition of several references to flowers. When Laertes/Trudeau returns from his voyage to Ottawa to study law, he enters "clenching raggedly-looking flowers which he swings like a club" (43), and when the King/The English recounts the plan of the poisoned sword, he charges with his flowers crying, "I will do it! Ha! Ha!" (45). While, as Stevenson suggests (76), the heightened parody of Trudeau for an English Canadian audience may be attributed to his increased public profile following his swearing in as Prime Minister, I would argue, on the contrary, that the added mockery of Trudeau in the English version has less to do with public familiarity with his real-life antics and can instead be attributed to a Québécois fear of federasty, as described in chapter one. Laertes/Trudeau's use of flowers in place of a sword not only makes him a laughing stock by parodying the characteristic red rose in Trudeau's lapel but it also constructs the fictional character as weak and effeminate by replacing the penetrating virility of Laertes/Trudeau's pointed rapier with a traditionally feminine symbol. The English version of the adaptation essentially disarms Trudeau on his home turf. The mockery of Laertes/Trudeau in an English Canadian context is thus more subversive than it would be in the original French version since the audience would generally tend to be more sympathetic to the real life political figure, who, like Shakespeare, was practically considered a cultural icon at the time and revered as a hero and a "wise man". Undercutting the character on his home turf thus constitutes a direct attack by the play on the ideals of the unified Canadian nation that Trudeau defended and represented.

The English version of the adaptation also mocks Trudeau's crusade for bilingualism coast to coast across Canada. The messenger who announces Laertes/Trudeau's return recounts how he "rambles on and on going without pause or warning from well hewn words to senseless jargon; a foreign language ... unknown to most, and he rambles on and on, then back to sense, till this folly strikes again and then flowers again" (43). While the messenger's description further feminizes Trudeau by attributing to him Ophelia's behaviour in Shakespeare's play, more importantly it renders bilingualism nothing more than a fit of folly which strikes its victim at random. Laertes/Trudeau's ability to switch effortlessly between well hewn words in English and French, which is experienced as a foreign language unknown to many in English Canada, does not garner respect within the context of the play; instead, Laertes/Trudeau's perfect bilingualism characterizes him as schizophrenic since French is described as a nonsense language to English Canadian ears. Trudeau's political argument for bilingualism on the grounds of civil liberties is further undercut when Laertes/Trudeau threatens his father's killer with his "bilingual wrath, one of snarl, the other of spit", claiming, "For 'tis my right, I will use it, no one can take this from me. I have the 'right to free spit...oh...'" (43). By transforming the right of free speech into "free spit", the adaptation's English version posits that the bilingual speaker doesn't really speak effectively in two languages. Rather than eloquent words, nothing more than hot air and spit leave his mouth. Bilingualism is therefore transformed from a right to a caprice with which the speaker attempts to impress his interlocutor but produces nothing of substance except a projection of his own internal processes, bodily or otherwise. Again, this

attack on the concept of bilingualism, which was supposed to heal the divide between English and French and unify the Canadian nation, is more effective when addressed to an English Canadian audience who, while probably reticent about the idea, might possibly also see bilingualism as a source of hope to avert the threat of "separatism". While this argument would be redundant to a Québécois audience, in the English version it satirically undercuts the audience's ambivalent belief in this magic solution to national unity.

The federal government's use of bilingualism to colonize Québec is made even more explicit in the English version of the play through the Rosencrantz and Guilderstern characters who are transformed from Pelletier and Marchand to the "B & B Commission", that is, the commission on bilingualism and biculturalism led by André Laurendeau and Davidson Dunton whose preliminary report was submitted in 1965.[34] Contrary to the play's French version in which no English is spoken, the English version contains occasional incursions of French, such as the repetitions of the B & B Commission who speak every line twice, one member saying the line in English while the other simultaneously says the same thing in French. While Stevenson points out this difference between the two versions of the play (81), she fails to propose its significance. I would argue that the double-speak of the B & B Commission alludes to several sovereignist arguments. First, the repetition of Rosencrantz's and Guildenstern's sentences in both languages underscores the redundancy of bilingualism, especially in a unilingual anglophone context in which the audience is unlikely to understand the French sentences anyway. The fact that the bilingual sentences are spoken simultaneously further obscures the French, drowning it out with the English which would enter first, and

more easily, the ears of anglophone audience members. Second, the redundant double-speak stands in metaphorically for the sovereignist argument based on the administrative efficiency which Québec independence will achieve through the reduction of two levels of government to just one. In additional, the increased administrative cost of bilingualism to tax payers has traditionally been a strong argument against its institution in English Canada, so by highlighting the redundancy of double-speak, the English version implicitly evokes the anglophone audience's unspoken disavowal of bilingualism. Finally, Gélinas's English version of Gurik's play stages the redundancy of bilingualism because bilingualism in the Canadian context generally means francophones who speak English, rather than vice-versa, and Hamlet/Quebec's anxious yet relatively effortless switch from French to English under the policing gaze of the anglophone audience.[35] By staging the redundancy of a policy to which an anglophone audience in southern Ontario in 1968 would generally be unsympathetically predisposed,[36] the English version of the play creates favourable conditions for another sovereignist argument: the refusal of English Canada to acquiesce to Québec's demands for the respect of French language and culture.

The duplicity of double-speak and the refusal of English Canada to respect French culture are explicitly verbalized by the King/The English when he praises Rosencrantz and Guildenstern/B & B Commission for their bilingualism. As Stevenson describes, the King/The English "note que ceux-là sont très chanceux d'être bilingues, cars ils peuvent profiter des avantages des deux cultures ; puis il se livre à une courte autocritique ayant trait à sa propre incapacité d'apprendre le

français" (82),[37] but the King/The English's discourse surpasses mere self-criticism and actually reveals his duplicitous response that Québec's political situation demands. He tells the Commission, "I know some words: 'Je vous aime', but have no feeling for them" (16). The King/The English reveals to the Commission the real strategy behind the development of a policy on bilingualism: to appease Québec superficially without actually changing English Canada's underlying disinterest in its concerns. English Canada's profession of love for Québec is false, a double discourse in which the words articulated mask the underlying true feelings (an insightful observation by Gurik in 1968, and one which takes on added poignancy following the federal government's adoption of the hard line "Plan B" immediately after the 1995 referendum "love-in"). In light of the King/The English's double discourse towards Québec, the extravagant praise for bilingualism which he heaps on the B & B Commission appears insincere. His semblance of valorization of the Commission's two cultures is actually motivated by a self-interested envy and resigned acceptance of his own inadequacies: "You have two cultures; I wish I had even one" (16). Here, the play provides a motivation for its own translation from French to English: Gurik's play must be translated and presented to an anglophone audience, even at the risk of its own assimilation to English Canada's political hegemony, because Québec is the heart of Canada's cultural production. The English version of the adaptation argues that English Canada, being devoid of any distinct culture of its own, depends on Québec artists to provide meaning, even if English Canada's identity must be formed counter-discursively to Québécois culture.

The dangers of assimilation are raised several times by the B & B

Commission. As Stevenson notes (82), the Rosencrantz and Guildenstern characters state their mission explicitly twice, first when they confess "with time we assimilate" (21), and again when they explain their "golden rule": "Homogenize, unify, bleach the brains so that all will come to the same pot, and melt within" (24). The assimilation of francophones by English Canada's linguistic hegemony takes place on-stage much more subtly however. When Hamlet/Quebec first greets Rosencrantz and Guildenstern/ B & B Commission, he begins in French, stops, looks at the audience, makes Rosencrantz/B anxious by his silence, and then re-begins his welcome again in English. Stevenson explains Hamlet/Quebec's awkward switch in terms of a reminder that the play takes place in London rather than Montréal (81). More than a mere nod to the relocation of the play, Hamlet/Quebec's switch from French to English re-enacts, and implicitly criticizes, the quotidian practice in Québec, common in 1968 but still present today, of a group of francophones who are speaking in French to switch immediately to English as soon as an anglophone becomes a part of the conversation. The play dramatizes the anglophone audience's complicity in English Canada's assimilation of Québec; as such, it appropriates their silent, policing gaze and refigures it as a critique both of anglophone linguistic hegemony and of francophones' own colonized mentality. Although linguistic assimilation stems from English Canada's demographic and political weight over Québec, the play recognizes nonetheless the complicity of francophones in their own assimilation because of their neo-colonial inferiority complex and capitulation to the presence of English in their daily lives. This attitude is also dramatized by the Queen/The Church's reply to Rosencrantz/B of "Thank you,

'merci'" followed by a laugh (16). Her pitiful attempt at bilingualism highlights it as a joke in the English Canadian context, and the nervous discomfort of her laughter betrays her own assimilation and complicity with the King/The English's and the B & B Commission's political agenda. The B & B Commission reveals its own assimilation to the King/The English's agenda when it reports back on its conversation with Hamlet/Quebec: "Words, torrents from a drunken babbling babe, come forth but I know not, hear not, what he wants" (25). In effect, bilingualism acknowledges here its own pitfalls; that is, bilingualism does not increase linguistic or cultural comprehension but incapacitates it. Linguistically, the B & B Commission cannot make sense of Hamlet/Quebec's words, and, culturally, it has been assimilated by the King/The English's agenda.

The various nationalist discourses based in anti-ecclesiasticism, neo-marxism, and linguistic and cultural imperialism that permeate both versions of *Hamlet, prince du Québec* through the political analogies of the secondary characters, especially, the federalists such as the King, the Queen, Rosencrantz and Guildernstern, and Laertes, effectively provide a catalogue of reasons for Québec's sovereignty during this time period without necessarily having recourse to the adaptation's primary national allegory rooted in Hamlet-Québec's hesitation. These other nationalist discourses, rooted in concrete socio-political arguments, thus underlie and reinforce the national allegory which is more abstractly situated in a psychological assessment of Québec's collective consciousness whose principal dilemma, its hesitation, is voiced through Hamlet-Québec's own harsh self criticism.

Hamlet-Québec's self assessment, a necessary component of his *prise de*

conscience, sets the tone of the adaptation from the outset, thereby establishing Gurik's Hamlet as more timid initially than Shakespeare's. Whereas Shakespeare's Hamlet begins the play with sufficient self-assurance to attack Claudius wittily through the well-known pun that he is "too much in the sun" (1.2.67), Gurik's Hamlet-Québec turns the same critique inward on himself. Claiming, "je vois peu la lumière" (12),[38] Hamlet-Québec criticizes the nation's lack of vision and its blindness to its own colonization. His lack of assertion in his relationship with *Le Roi-L'anglophonie*'s neo-colonial power also surfaces in his hesitation to speak up against the injustices which he observes around him. He recognizes that he is "forcé d'enchaîner [s]a langue" (14),[39] but cannot offer any answer to the question of whether or not he will find it again. Hamlet-Québec begins to recognize in theory that the only course of escape from his colonized state is direct, concrete action, but he is unable to put this strategy into practice: "De nos jours, Horatio, l'homme qui veut survivre ne rend pas les armes, il se bat. Mais je suis bien mal placé pour te dicter ta conduite" (16).[40]

Despite knowing that his mission must be to take action, Hamlet-Québec's challenge over the course of the play is to nuance his thesis; that is, *passer à l'action* does not suffice without also formulating the response to the questions of what action and why: "Que faire ? Pourquoi faire ?" (14).[41] Thus, the driving force of the adaptation becomes an intellectual exercise in the development of a multi-faceted argumentation to justify action which will precipitate the decolonization of Québec from *Le Roi-L'anglophonie*'s rule, as well as to determine what form that action should take, either revolutionary or democratic. The secondary characters, as we have seen, expose the sovereignist arguments for

the audience's benefit, while the *Spectre-De Gaulle* reveals the primary reason for sovereignty, the murder/Conquest of Old Hamlet-New France, to Hamlet-Québec. When Hamlet-Québec states that *Le Roi-L'anglophonie* "foule cette terre où il est un étranger" (30),[42] he articulates the rape of the nation through the image of the violation of the land. "La terre", an image associated with the mother, recurs frequently in Québécois poetry (Nelligan, Garneau, Chamberland, Miron, etc.), as we shall see in Chapter 3, as a metonymy for the nation as a whole, and its violation here by a foreigner evokes the psychological trauma associated with the rape of the mother. As mentioned in chapter one, the Conquest of New France is explicitly linked here to violation and rape. Hamlet-Québec is thus figured as rape victim, and this victimization then explains another reason why the play also effeminizes Laertes/Trudeau. Hamlet-Québec, through the bias of a Québécois adaptation of the British canon, must transfer the fear of federastic penetration back onto the perceived servant of *Le Roi-L'anglophonie* (i.e., the British and their canon as well as English Canada) who initially enacted the violence on Hamlet-Québec by way of his father New-France and the symbolic Mother, his land.

The trauma of the realization of the rape of the nation/mother precipitates Hamlet-Québec's awakening, that is, his *prise de conscience* of that which instinctively he already knew but could not articulate, allowing him to rise up from his state of being *à genoux*.[43] The knowledge of this event "vient confirmer toutes [ses] présomptions, tout ce [qu'il sentait] sans oser [se] l'avouer ouvertement"and breaks him free from his denial so that he can finally experience the repressed feelings associated with the psychological trauma of rape, "toute

cette angoisse, ce ressentiment d'oppression, d'esclavage, d'abaissement", buried inside him (30).[44] The rape of the nation/mother thus becomes the foundation on which the argument for decolonization is based, without actually being the sole, or even the principally advocated, reason. Rather than a passionate, reactionary motivation for decolonization (as one would expect as the result of an emotional trauma), the rape of the nation/mother acts as a catalyst towards the acquisition of higher rational arguments, such as the lack of democratic representation and the poverty of the workers which Hamlet-Québec discovers in his conversation with the *2ième Fossoyeur* (84). Hamlet-Québec's feelings of anxiety and oppression do not justify his plan to overthrow the usurper of his national homeland; they merely endow him with the self-confidence to trust that which he already suspected to be true and to decide finally to defend openly those convictions which he had repressed. The new-found knowledge of the rape of the nation/mother puts an end to Hamlet-Québec's defeatism ("Je n'attache pas grand prix à ma vie" [27]), and forces him to open his eyes fully to the duplicity of *Le Roi-L'anglophonie* whom the *Spectre-De Gaulle* describes as a "profiteur qui pourrait [le] laisser croire qu'il [le] comprend et qu'il [l]'aime" but whose Conquest of the land and literal rape of Hamlet-Québec's mother (since her consent to *Le Roi-L'anglophonie* is obtained through deception) betrays his sinister character (30).[45]

Yet, even after learning about the Conquest/rape of his homeland/mother, Hamlet-Québec still hesitates to take action. In this, Gurik's Hamlet-Québec resembles Shakespeare's character, but the hesitation of Hamlet-Québec is also marked by significant differences. Like Shakespeare's Hamlet, Gurik's ponders

the very nature of hesitation itself, telling Horatio, philosophically, "Ceux qui disent demain, pensent jamais..." *qu'il ne viendra pas* (27).[46] Despite recognizing that the high price of hesitation is to never achieve one's goals at all, Hamlet-Québec still struggles to throw off the habit that has laced him in a "corset d'immobilité pour engourdir en [lui] le sentiment de la vengeance et de la libération", and like Shakespeare's rogue and peasant slave privileges "encore demain..." over immediate action (47).[47]

However, the hesitation of Gurik's Hamlet-Québec takes a significant detour from that of Shakespeare's in the famous "To be or not to be speech" (3.1.56-88) which Gurik rewrites as "Être ou ne pas être libre !" (51). The word "libre" (free) transforms Hamlet-Québec's soliloquy from a potential deliberation of suicide to a plan of action for national independence. A series of cuts and additions to the speech shift the focus from death to liberty, from a hopeless present to a hopeful future, notably the concentration of life's hardships in the political sphere to the exclusion of other forms of oppression, and the transformation of the "undiscover'd country" of death (3.1.79) into "l'espoir de quelque avenir" (51).[48] Most importantly, Gurik's Hamlet-Québec ends the soliloquy on a decidedly more resolute tone than Shakespeare's with the refusal of sleep in favour of a decision to "se battre !" for "[des] projets enfantés avec le plus d'énergie et d'audace" (51).[49] The exclamation mark after "fight" with which the soliloquy ends signals Hamlet-Québec's conquest of his own hesitation.

Thus, the recipe for overcoming his own hesitation is a complex psychological process for Hamlet-Québec involving a *prise de conscience* based on (re)learning his own personal history, the confrontation of denial, the surfacing

of repressed reactions, and finally the self-affirmation which underlies his resolution to fight to defend his convictions. The course of the evolution of Hamlet-Québec's hesitation significantly differs from the trajectory of Shakespeare's Hamlet's introspection. The divergence in the two characters is especially evident in the graveyard scene. Whereas Shakespeare's Hamlet gives latitude to his previous melancholy through his nostalgic reminiscence of his youth with poor Yorick, Gurik's Hamlet-Québec negates this dialogue with death by focusing instead on the necessity to avoid the grave in order to ensure the future well-being of the nation. He points out the obvious to the *2ième Fossoyeur*: "Si tu te couches dans la fosse, cela n'aidera pas tes fils" (86).[50]

Hamlet-Québec's discourse is clearly situated in the realm of concrete action by the graveyard scene, but the question of what kind of action remains unanswered, explicitly at least. His conversation with the *2ième Fossoyeur* reveals the answer indirectly: a direct dialogue with the people in which they are educated and awakened from their colonized state by those who have already done so is an essential pre-condition to any popular revolution. The *2ième Fossoyeur* confesses that a large segment of the population is ready to take this step, but their resolve is complicated by their inaction. The *2ième Fossoyeur* explains that are still waiting for a new leader like those such as Papineau and De Lorimier who led the Patriot rebellion: "un crâne... un chef..." (86).[51] This waiting, emphasized by the multiple ellipses, is inherently problematic, for, despite Hamlet-Québec's assurance that a leader will come, it hides two dangers. First, waiting for a leader can easily become waiting for a messiah to deliver the people magically from their oppression, and no political leader can live up to the

expectations of a messiah and single-handedly save the nation without the contribution of the people themselves, not even Horatio-Lévesque to whom the bald skull refers. Second, waiting is an act which is not one, and this inaction does not hold the people to the responsibility to take charge and confront their colonized state themselves; rather, it creates a dependence on their leader that subsequently leaves them open to manipulation and neo-colonial exploitation equal to, if not worse than, that of the previous colonial regime.

This tension between the people's psychological need for a leader/saviour to mobilize their energy and the practical necessity that they rise up and lead themselves independently to their own independence in order for it to survive is at the heart of Hamlet-Québec's dying speech:

> Je meurs... qui viendra nous conduire vers la lumière, car il ne suffit pas de tuer le serpent mais il faut aussi détruire son nid pour que sur cette terre pousse librement ce qui doit s'épanouir. Vous sentirez-vous assez fort pour le faire, assez courageux pour le vouloir ? Il est tellement plus facile de pourrir dans l'habitude. Manger... dormir... mourir... et ne jamais rêver... ne jamais rire. Qui... qui... nous sortira de la fange des compromis, de l'esclavage, qui brisera les chaînes qu'hypocritement nous avons nous-mêmes forgées. Il faut que ma mort serve aux autres. Il faut... que vive... un... Qué...bec... libre. (95)[52]

Although Hamlet-Québec addresses Lévesque (and in some stage performances *L'Officier du Rhin-Bourgault* as well),[53] his words also interpolate the audience, the entire population of Québec, through the direct question posed in "vous" form which can be read in both its singular, polite meaning and its plural usage. The

speech further addresses the collective nation through its evocation of the people's daily life—eating, sleeping, dying—and the encouragement to improve it by dreaming and laughing. The adaptation suggests that the population of Québec is currently in a state of sleep, waiting for their leader/saviour, but they need to wake up and to open their eyes like Hamlet-Québec did at the price of his life. If they use his sacrifice to open their eyes while avoiding the cost themselves, then his death will let live a free Québec. Hamlet-Québec will resolve the paradox of the *2ième Fossoyeur* and help his sons from beyond the grave.

Gurik's Hamlet-Québec functions as a national allegory, then, because, as Jameson explains, the "telling of the individual story and the individual experience cannot but ultimately involve the whole laborious telling of the experience of the collectivity itself" (85-6). In telling the story of Hamlet in a Québécois context, surrounding him by the political figures who work with and against the development of the nation, Gurik's Hamlet cannot help but reveal the feelings and concerns with which the entire national collectivity is preoccupied. What Jameson calls the "radical split between the private and the public, between the poetic and the political" is, if not overcome, brought significantly closer together (69). In a Québécois context, Hamlet's "private individual destiny" comes inevitably to represent the "embattled situation of the public ... culture and society" of Québec during the Quiet Revolution (69). The distinction between Hamlet's hesitation to overthrow his usurping uncle within Shakespeare's text becomes blurred with Québec's hesitation to achieve its decolonization from English Canada within the adaptation; that is, the adaptation forbids the reader/audience from ever determining with certainty to what degree the driving

force of the narrative's events is dictated by Shakespeare's text or by the reality of the political situation on which Gurik draws.

***

Jean-Claude Germain's play *Rodéo et Juliette*, first written and performed in 1970 and revised in 1971, also focuses thematically on Québec's inaction and its failure to achieve decolonization by separating from English Canada. *Rodéo et Juliette* relies on the same neo-marxism as *Hamlet, prince du Québec* to make its point; however, the associations between the text and the political situation of the time are more loosely metaphorical in Germain's text than allegorical. In effect, Germain, who saw and even published a review of Gurik's play in *Le Petit Journal*, explores the same theme, but while Gurik points to the potential of sovereignty through Hamlet-Québec's dying words ("Il faut que vivre un Québec libre"), Germain, on the other hand, points to the stagnant living death in which Québec will find itself (or in which it is already trapped?) if the nation does not resolve Hamlet's dilemma of sterile discussions that occult real action. Gurik asks the questions of (and suggests answers to) "what makes Québec different from Canada" and "why sovereignty"; whereas, Germain explores "how do we achieve it" through the negative example of the consequences of failing to take action. Germain's play is not as closely based on a Shakespearean source text as Gurik's; in fact, the only elements adapted from Shakespeare are the title characters' names and Juliette's brief love scene in which she mediates on men's treatment of women at the end of the play. Germain's play, which is not nearly as rich in puns, allusions, and direct satirical critiques as Gurik's, treats the question of Québécois hesitation from a broader, less literal perspective, but in both cases

inaction and pointless thought have the same consequences: poverty and a stagnant living death. Germain, however, takes Gurik's idea a step further and identifies the cause of Québécois inaction: a fear of the unknown, or, in Hamlet's terms, the human fallibility to "bear those ills we have / Than fly to others we know not of" (3.1.81-2).

Germain's *Rodéo et Juliette*, which remains an unpublished manuscript, is a western comedy which takes place in the fictional, rural village of Saint Lin, modeled after the real village of Saint-Tite situated in the north of Québec's Mauricie region.[54] The play's action is centered around three old men who sit on the veranda of a hotel and comment occasionally on events in the village, particularly the tourists who arrive for a few days each year for the village's country and western festival. The major events which precipitate the discussions of the play are the construction by Rodéo Cadieux of a giant wooden horse at the entrance to the village and the presence of Juliette who doesn't leave town with all the other tourists when the festival ends. The dominant point of view of the villagers, summed up by the refrain of the three old men's opening song, praises the absence of action: "À Saint Lin y s'passe rien / C'est donc signe que toute va bien / L'bon dieu veille sur toué chrétiens" (4).[55] Not only does nothing happen, but the villagers bear no responsibility for their actions, or lack thereof, because their belief in god absolves them from the burden of free will to change their social environment. The three old men represent the generation prior to the Quiet Revolution through their subscription to Roman Catholicism despite the abandonment of it by the youth, their strongly pronounced habitant accent which Germain transcribes phonetically, their xenophobic mistrust of visitors to the

village, and their valorization of the comfort of inaction. Their criticism of Rodéo for having built the giant horse that attracts more tourists than the competing village of Saint Joachim down the road stems from their outrage that a youth has the audacity to introduce the potential for change into the daily life of the collectivity. St-Lin functions, then, as a microcosm for the nation, and the three old men epitomize the resistance to change which led in 1970 to the election of Robert Bourassa's somewhat socially conservative PLQ despite the overwhelming rise in support among Québécois youth for the more socially progressive PQ (23.1% of the popular vote but only 7 seats).

The villagers' resistance to change permeates so thoroughly their world-view that they discourage thought itself, since thought could potentially lead to new ideas that would instigate action. The *2e vieux* and *3e vieux* condemn the *1er vieux* for his tendency to think too much, and they taunt him frequently with the nickname of *le jeune*, thereby associating free thought with disruptive youth. The *1er vieux* retorts, "On dirait qu'vous pensez rien qu'à ça, vous autes...PAS PENSER! Tell'ment qu'vous seriez morts, pis qu'vous l'sauriez même pas!" (9).[56] The *1er vieux*'s observation constitutes precisely the case: they are all living-dead already and do not know it (or if, like the *1er vieux*, they suspect it, they prefer things to remain the same anyway). The primary occupation of the second and third old men is to engage in sterile discussions which deny both thought and action. Worse than Hamlet whose thought eventually leads to action if only too late, the old men prefer the sterility of non-thought, not so much the existential void, but the void of civil irresponsibility justified by the relinquishment of responsibility to a higher power, hence a complicity with hierarchy.

The discouragement of thought and free will in this microcosm of the Québec nation also stems from its potential to lead to "la folie des grandeurs...S'QUI EST PAS NORMAL POUR ICITE" according to the *3e vieux* (9).[57] The abnormality of having aspirations originates in the Church's teachings that Québécois were "né pour un petit pain", which was precisely the slogan against which Québécois youth rebelled during the Quiet Revolution. The somniferous anti-action teachings of the Church (be good, don't cause trouble, better yet don't do anything at all) that is mocked in both Gurik and Germain's plays originally found its roots in the fear of uprising brought to New France by Ultramontane priests fleeing the guillotine and subsequently the 1848 rebellions in Europe, but it eventually expanded to the "né pour un petit pain" self-deprecating and defeatist attitude which underlies survivalist nationalism in Québec (don't complain about poverty because it is your destiny and god will ultimately reward you for ensuring the survival of French and Roman Catholicism in North America).[58] Inaction thus breeds contentment with poverty which in turn justifies inaction through the discursive linkages which tie Ultramontanism to old-style Québécois nationalism of the mid 1800's emanating from the association of the survival of Catholicism and the survival of the French language and nation in North America. Germain's play criticizes this inaction and encourages Québécois to strive for the greatness of something more, that is, a country, by exposing that the contentment of their defeatism is really a living death and not contentment at all.

This metaphorical denunciation of defeatism manifests itself in the second and third old men's mockery of the first as "le jeune" who comes to represent the

Québec nation itself over the course of the play. *Le vieux des provarbes* who morphs into the *2e vieux* tells his son, "Tu voué mon petit garçon...c'est ça l'monde... parsonne est jamais content de c'qu'y est...les bons voudraient ête méchants...les pauvres voudraient ête riches... pis... [...] Les jeunes voudraient ête vieux!" (30).[59] The second and third old men thus provoke the ire of the first who replies "CHUS D'TROP...Pis chus assez vieux... [...] Ouais...assez vieux pour m'en rende compte par moi-même sans que vous soyez obligés de me l'répéter par deux fois..." (30).[60] The *1er vieux*'s desire to be treated with the respect that his age merits evokes the Québec nation that seeks independence—often articulated metaphorically as seeking to be treated like an adult—in the face of pessimistic self-deprecation that holds back its development with the argument that it should be content with what it has already. The play compares the Québec nation to the *1er vieux* whose peers crush his dreams for grandeur, respect, and self-betterment as mere folly. The *1er vieux*'s insistence on the recognition of his maturity rejoins the common nationalist discourse that Québec is no longer a child but an adult who has grown up and must now leave the nest of Canadian confederation; whereas the *2e vieux*'s complaint about youth who want to be old before they are ready parallels the discourse of fear which prevents the nation from growing up and reaching its full potential. This metaphor is particularly strong in French since Québécois nationalism is often phrased in terms of a *pays qui cherche à se naître*, a country which seeks to give birth to itself,[61] drawing implicitly on images of the child growing to adulthood.

At the same time, the proverbial old man/second old man's observation that nobody is happy with what he is, especially poor men who want to be rich,

functions as a satiric criticism of the discourse of the hopelessness of poverty that affords no possibility of escape. By illustrating the ridiculousness of the notion of the poor being content with poverty, the play also exposes the ridiculousness of not wanting to change one's social position for the better, including the collective betterment of the nation that must also break free of its misery. This same consternation of the misery of poor francophone workers compared to their anglophone bosses provoked the violent (re)actions of the FLQ during the October Crisis in 1970 at approximately the same time as the play's composition, a social reality also voiced by the janitors in *Henry. Octobre. 1970.* as we shall see in chapter 5. The play's positing of poverty and exploitation as a reason for social change thus links discursively neo-marxism and nationalism in a manner similar to their interdependence in Gurik's play and in the social reality of Québec as a whole during the late 1960's and early 1970's.

Like Gurik's adaptation, Germain's play also advocates decolonization, as the term derived from revolutionary movements in Africa, as a solution to social and national inequality. Juliette sings a song justifying the necessity of action:

> La liberté n'est qu'une illusion
> Quand tous les rêves sont d'évasion
> L'jour où l'pouvoir s'ra sans fusils
> Les jeux d'la peur s'ront interdits
> La seule réponse à l'oppression
> C'est encore là révolution. (24)[62]

Juliette's disruptive presence as a tourist in the village who dictates to the locals how to solve their problems leads the *2e vieux* to reveal to the villagers their

repressed awareness of their status as colonial other. Shortly after Juliette's song, the *2e vieux* comments, "Ouais...s'plutôt comme une mode ça la misère... une mode qu'on aurait inventé sans l'savoir si y avaient [*sic*] pas eu les tourisses pour nous l'dire" (24).[63] Through the *2e vieux*'s lament on poverty, the play satirizes the colonial discourse by which the colonized other is unaware of his so-called "primitive" or "uncivilized" life before the arrival of the foreign colonizer who arrives and teaches him the error of and solution to his current traditional practices. Here, the *2e vieux* simultaneously praises and condemns primitivism, nostalgically evoking pre-colonial bliss of poverty as not being poverty at all, yet undercutting his own condemnation of the ignorant foreigner since the tourist Juliette's advice advocates liberation rather than colonization. On the one hand, Juliette is the foreign tourist who arrogantly tells the "natives" how to live their own life, but on the other hand she is right about the necessity for them to adopt a revolutionary action-oriented strategy for liberation.

The old men's distrust of Juliette extends beyond a fear of the unknown other and is more profoundly just one more manifestation of their denial of action-provoking thought, their refusal of a *prise de conscience* among their peers. In reaction to the *1er vieux*'s repeated attempts to introduce thought into their conversations about their own poverty, the second and third old men threaten him that he will end up "avec pus parsonne pour parler... ... en exil dans [son] propre pays" (25).[64] The ostracization and social exile of the *1er vieux* due to his critique of the nation's poverty testifies to the predominant will of the collectivity to keep its eyes closed to reality in order to maintain the myth that all is well. The conscious and deliberate refusal of a *prise de conscience* trumps the social reality

with which the nation's citizens are confronted on a daily basis, and those individuals who do not acquiesce to the *idée reçue* of the collectivity quickly risk becoming subject to the sanctions of its policing gaze.

Despite the threat of reprisals, Rodéo Cadieux succeeds in breaking free from received ideas and becomes aware of his potential to achieve something bigger than himself through the construction of his giant horse which throughout the play represents the *pays à se naître*.[65] Rodéo's *prise de conscience*, which he recounts in his opening monologue, has taken place before the play begins, but his challenge is to transmit his strange new idea to the rest of the village. Rodéo complains at the beginning of the play that he would like to be the bad guy for once because he's "tanné d'avoir à attende la fin du film pour gagner", but as hard as he tries he remains the good guy because non-violence is part of his nature (11).[66] Rodéo's desire for violence but inability to carry it out, as well as his self-realization that he must wait for victory, reflect the two driving forces of Québécois nationalism in 1970, that is, the FLQ's recent failed attempts at violent revolution, and the more patient route to independence chosen by the PQ that expects democracy to win out over the long term. Since Rodéo is not a bad guy, he is forced to explain the logic of his project to build a giant horse/country to the rest of the collectivity: "Ch'construis quêque chose là monsieur dont l'père de mon père avait eu l'idée... Quêque chose de tell'ment solide qu'ça va ête encore là pour les enfants d'mes p'titz-enfants" (13-4).[67] The problem, as Rodéo describes it, is that people are afraid to get on a real horse, and they're even afraid to get one made of wood, which leaves him all alone with his horse, although he thinks that having had the idea should have been enough. Rodéo's dilemma of

having built a horse that nobody wants to ride parallels the political situation of 1970, or, more precisely that of René Lévesque who built a political party which a large portion of the population supported in principle but were too afraid to embark with when came the time to vote, leaving the PQ all alone in the National Assembly.[68] On another level, Rodéo's dilemma raises the larger question of the *projet de pays*: what is the point of dreaming of a large project if the population does not want it, or is not ready to accept it, and therefore does not join in with its collective construction? It is precisely this resistance against his project that Rodéo must conquer by convincing the rest of the village/nation of the value of his project, despite the fact that the village itself, through its western festival, desires a "retour au passé" which implies a *rempli sur soi* antithetical to revolutionary emancipation (18).[69] The old men even argue, replicating the 19th century teachings of survivalist nationalism of Ultramontane priests, that liberty is a temptation that must be resisted, and that "des fois s'sarvir d'une libarté, c'est l'meilleur moyen d'la parde... Ou de s'la faire enl'ver" (22).[70] Conquering the popular resistance to his project is essential, however, to Rodéo because the project will fail without their input, as exemplified by the popular French expression that the "peuple doit se donner un pays", the people must give themselves a country, which is translated in the play through the doctrine that charity begins at home: "charité ben ordonnée commence par soi-même" (27).[71] Rodéo's problem with trying to explain his project is that the people wake up and listen only after it is too late: "ça s'réveille parce qu'il leur arrive des affaires... Quand y a d'la violence... Ça vient s'plaindre" (29).[72] This was the case in 1970 with the FLQ bombings and the October Crisis; citizens complained about the

violence inherent in the arrests without warrants and the police presence in the streets, but by then their realization of the power of the Canadian government to suspend their civil liberties was too late to change the situation.

Juliette's meeting with Rodéo, whom she seeks out precisely because of his great project, disrupts the stasis of the village and sets in motion the acts which will lead to national self-affirmation. While Rodéo wallows self-pityingly that he built a twenty-five foot tall horse that is too big for him as an ordinary man to do anything with, Juliette forces him to confront a crucial question: "Pis après?" (48).[73] Juliette spurs Rodéo to his second *prise de conscience*: his dreams of his large project are meaningless unless he continues to fight for something even bigger, and as long as he hasn't accomplished everything there is to be done, there still remain new acts to accomplish. Rodéo's second *prise de conscience* propels his decision to build a second, female, horse at the other end of the village because "ça permattrait d'vouère plus loin... pis là, a s'rait vue de Saint Joachim" (49).[74] This awakening allows him to acquire self-assurance and to continue his project alone, even if the rest of the village still does not join in, because he comes to accept that they will one day as long as he continues to promote his dream in the meantime. He asserts confidently, "ch'sens qu'ça va arriver [...] ch'sais qu'ça va arriver [...] rien peut l'empêcher [...] Tou'é ch'vaux y sont sortis d'leu cour [...] rien peut l'arrêter" (49).[75] Nothing can stop Rodéo's grand project for a horse/country because this time his project has even higher objectives; it extends beyond convincing his own people of its necessity, and he has taken on the even more difficult task of recognition by the other. The horses which have left the yard cannot help but venture out beyond their borders into a larger world. The

second female horse which will be seen from the neighbouring village represents international recognition; instead of limiting his project to his own people, who do not appreciate it yet, Rodéo has decided to present his project to others because their approval will help convince his own people of the validity of his project. The gender of the second horse, "une jument" (49),[76] and Juliette's pivotal role in Rodéo's second *prise de conscience* indicates that this new project will be both by and for women as well, a significant change from his first project which was entirely male-oriented since no other women appeared in the village in the play prior to Juliette's arrival. The play ends on a note of hope that Rodéo's new bigger-than-himself project, which includes women and geographical others this time, will be a success. The three old men recognize "ça fait jusse commencer..." (49),[77] and they acquiesce that nothing will stop Rodéo from constructing his new project/country for the benefit of the entire village/nation.

The absence of women from the village/nation, until Juliette's arrival and meeting with Rodéo at the end of the play, points to a notable change just beginning to take place in Québécois society in the early 1970's, the integration of women into the nationalist movement. Women are remarkably absent from Gurik's 1968 adaptation in which all the roles, even *La Reine-L'église* and Ophélie-Lesage, were acted by men. In Germain's 1971 play, the sole woman character begins to achieve social recognition and acceptance only in the very last lines of the play. Just a few lines previously, she continues to be treated by the men of the village according to the same gender stereotypes found in Shakespeare, that is, that women should be beautiful but silent, as Lynda E. Boose has convincingly argued in relation to *The Taming of the Shrew*. Juliette's parody

of gender norms in literature from Shakespeare through to contemporary western films marks the first acknowledgement in the two Shakespearean adaptations considered here of the potential contribution of women to the nationalist movement:

> Nous autes, d'habitude les z-héroines, on ouve la bouche juste pour dire... Oui mon héros...non mon héro...Marci mon héros...Encore mon héro... Ch't'aime mon héros... Adieu mon héros...pauvre héros...Y est mort en héros...comme toué héros...Pis quand on vous r'garde, on fait comme si on vous voyait pas, d'ailleurs même si on vous voulait on pourrait pas, tell'ment on est occupées à batte des cils d'admiration...Y faut toujours ête comme éblouies...parde le souffe pis s'pâmer d'avance, jusse à l'idée que le héros va nous prende dans ses bras...pis on fait tout ça: pourquoi? Pour y sauver de l'ouvrage...pour pas qu'les héros s'voyent comme y sont: habitants comme des habitants. (47)[78]

Juliette's satiric exposition of gender norms makes clear that women recognize that the game they are forced to play derives from men's failure to acknowledge their own inadequacies. The play constructs women as the rescuers of heroes who do not know that they are really nothing more than *habitants*, which is a pejorative term for rural farmworkers generally lacking in education. Women's knowledge of the true condition of men who lack sufficient self-awareness of their colonial status posits them as more capable of being the heroines who will liberate the nation; however, their relegation to sexual objects that are forced to bat their eyelashes to build up male egos prevents them from making a more valuable contribution to the construction of the nation. Only in the 1980's and the 1990's,

after feminist vindications have firmly entrenched themselves in Québec's social fabric, do women begin to appear as nation-builders alongside, and even ahead of, men. In the following two chapters on the Shakespearean adaptations of Michel Garneau and Jean-Pierre Ronfard, we shall see the beginnings of a slow progression in which, women move from a marginalized to a central role in the construction of the Québec nation. In Garneau's work, especially *Macbeth* written in the late 1970's, women remain largely marginalized, as they do here in the adaptations of Gurik and Germain, but in Ronfard's work, especially *Vie et mort du Roi Boiteux* written after the 1980 referendum and the nation's failure to achieve sovereignty, women begin finally to take a role in its leadership, if only to reconstruct it after it falls apart. The early Shakespearean adaptations seen in this chapter though, are in tune with the social reality of the period in that the nationalist discourses do not overlap significantly with Québécois feminism; they draw instead on discourses of anti-ecclesiasticism, neo-marxism and African decolonizationin order to develop a more internationalist perspective in counter-balance to traditional nationalist discourses derived from Ultramontanism which are updated in the context of the Quiet Revolution's drive for Québécois to take action and which come to be articulated in terms of Québec's socio-political, linguistic and economic inequality within the framework of Canadian federalism.

Notes to Chapter 2

[1] "Passer à l'action", literally "to move to action", could be translated as "to take action", but it is a notably Québécois expression which loses in translation its underlying emotional force and its double insistence on action with the verb "passer", "to move," which indicates a progress forward that is absent from the English expression "to take".

[2] In "Entre deux joints" (1973), co-written with RIN leader Pierre Bourgault, Robert Charlebois sings, "Ta sœur est aux États, ton frère est au Mexique / Y font d'l'argent là-bas pendant qu'tu chômes icitte / T'es né pour un petit pain, c'est ce que ton père t'a dit / Chez les Américains, c'pas ça qu't'aurais appris". (Your sister's in the States, your brother's in Mexico / They make money there while you're unemployed here / You were born for a [little] roll [of bread, as opposed to a loaf], that's what your father said / With the Americans that's not what you'd have learned.) The rejection of the *né pour un petit pain* attitude thus embodies the generational divide between youth of the Quiet Revolution and their parents (who grew up accepting that they should settle for less (a roll being less than a loaf of bread), as well as the new generation's growing internationalism.

[3] *Étapisme*, meaning "by stages", was adopted by members of the PQ at their Congress, the highest deciding body within the party, which was held November 15-17, 1974 (Fraser 392). There is a well-known anecdote about how Jacques Parizeau, who disagreed with the idea but rallied to Lévesque's idea, "s'est trompé de micro", "mistook" the Against microphone for the For microphone, in order to show his disapproval and momentarily raise the tension in the room. *Étapisme*—to achieve independence through a referendum rather than an *élection référendaire*, that is, through the outcome of a general election—was proposed to René Lévesque by Claude Morin who was later revealed to be a spy working for the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. For the full story, see Normand Lester's *Enquêtes sur les services secrets*.

[4] From Latin, meaning "beyond the mountains", that is, the Alps, Ultramontanism, equally known as *Ultramontanisme* in French, was the point of view of Roman Catholics who supported the pope as supreme head of the church, as opposed to Gallicanism and other tendencies that opposed papal jurisdiction. Ultramontane priests were strong advocates of the *né pour un petit pain* attitude. For an in-depth analysis, see Denis Monière's *Le Développement des idéologies au Québec des origines à nos jours*, especially chapters four and five.

[5] "Hamlet is Québec with all its hesitations, with its thirst for freedom, corseted by one hundred years of inaction."

[6] "Gravediggers." "A grave [that] can very well be that of Hamlet."

[7] "The mire of compromises, of slavery". "The chains that hypocritically [they them]selves forged."

[8] "And there are some who say that the revenge of the cradle is over… why don't you try the pill?" "With the salary I make, I don't have the means to buy candies. And plus my wife wouldn't want to… because of the priest."

[9] "Have you forgotten who I am? I guided your first steps." "And you blurred my vision."

[10] "You guided my steps wisely when my legs were too frail to carry me. Today, still, I listen to you and obey you."

[11] "Residences across the country, all more sumptuous one after the other."

[12] "Frailty, thy name is priest / dress."

[13] In the French version of the text, the compound names are joined by a hyphen and Québec has an accent (Hamlet-Québec). In the English version, the names are joined by a slash and Quebec has no accent (Hamlet/Quebec). I reproduce the character names as they appear in order to help distinguish more clearly between characters in each version of the text.

[14] "Five years ago, day for day, the first separatist bomb exploded in a mail box. That same day in 1959 Congo rebelled to accede to its indepen...."

[15] "Peace-keeping role."

[16] "White nigger of America", the title of a famous book written by FLQ member Pierre Vallières while in prison in New York in 1966-67 and published in 1968.

[17] "I've no education and plus I don't speak English."

[18] For the complete chronology of Canadian and francophone content rules established by the CRTC, see http://www.parl.gc.ca/InfoComDoc/37/2/HERI/Studies/Reports/herirp02/01d-toc-e.htm

[19] The Patriots rebellion of 1837-38 was principally a demand for responsible government, including the adoption of the 92 Resolutions. Although sometimes believed to be a war between francophones and anglophones, many anglophones also rebelled against the British empire in Lower Canada alongside the francophones, as they also did in Upper Canada. Gilles Laporte (UQÀM) lists on his website (http://cgi2.cvm.qc.ca/glaporte/index.shtml) a total of 37 624 people who participated in the rebellions in Lower Canada.

[20] The tithe was raised and all that money goes to other regions, the same ones that helped the new king get on the throne."

[21] "As long as I'm eating scraps, I prefer to eat them at my own table and not someone else's."

[22] "Party in favour of independence."

[23] "Me, with a guy like that, I'm in. ... If we had held our own back then [at the time of the Patriots of '37]... we wouldn't be there now. I'm sure that we could have."

[24] "A burning wound in my side." "Armed aid to firm up our authority in this country."

[25] "It only takes a spark to make the powder explode."

[26] "It is necessary for your son to submit totally." "Put on iron gloves." "As of today, the only tolerated language will be that of used by the court. Any offender will be severely punished."

[27] The play's bitter examples of English Canada's domination of Québec are not far removed from reality. Gurik's portrayal of English Canada's hard-line rule of Québec with an iron fist accurately describes, long before Stéphane Dion invented the term, the "Plan B" tactics employed by the federal government following the close results of the 1995 referendum: punish Québec severely (Bill C-20 also know as the "Clarity Law", fiscal inequality, funds funnelled to federalist organizations in order to challenge Bill 101 and as part of the Sponsorship scandal, etc.) until it accepts its "proper" place within a dialectic of dominance and submission. For a comprehensive, historical account, see Normand Lester's *Le livre noir du Canada anglais*.

[28] "One has to face reality... what was is no more."

[29] "Quell (or suppress [of a rebellion or terrorists]) him and the people."

[30] This stereotype effaces the complex myriad of political positions espoused by the population of Québec and conflates together conservative federalist-nationalists (such as Duplessis), progressive federalist-nationalists (such as Lesage and the PLQ), conditional sovereignists (Johnson and the *Union nationale* with "*Égalité ou Indépendance*"), partnership-oriented sovereignists (Lévesque and the MSA), left-wing sovereignists (Bourgault and the RIN), and radical, action-oriented sovereignists (the FLQ).

[31] "Patience often makes causes triumph, even the weakest ones."

[32] "[Would] choke him at the foot of the altar so that his death would serve as an example to the other hotheads of the country."

[33] "I loved you, now I know that, but the sparkle of honours, the misfortunes that fell upon me, the treacherous tongue of the person largely responsible for our tragedy obscured my reason...."

[34] Laurendeau, a Québécois nationalist, noted in the report (which recommended an increase in bilingualism in federal institutions) that the source of tension between anglophones and francophones in Canada resided in the particular status of Québec. In 1971, Trudeau rejected the recommendations of the commission and instituted instead a policy of "multiculturalism", which some Québécois nationalists considered to be a strategy to drown out the notion of "two founding nations" (problematically forgetting the First Nations) in a sea of multiple ethnic identities which constitute Canada.

[35] Hamlet/Quebec greets the B & B in French. The stage directions read: "(stops as if he had just remembered. Looks at the audience)" (20). Rosencrantz/B corrects him: "My honoured lord... (casting an anxious glance at the audience)", and then Hamlet/Québec "(... starts the reply anew)" in a particularly British English, saying "Good lads, how do ye both?" (21).

[36] In her review of the 1968 London performance, Helen Wallace writes: "You don't have to understand French, or even be particularly sympathetic to the French cause to enjoy *Hamlet*. Far from being a propagandist piece of French subtlety fired through with separatist sentiment, it offers, instead a good insight into French-Canadian needs. And it is doubtful anything has been lost in the English translation by Marc Gélinas, since the play adheres so closely to the original Shakespearean text" (142). As Stevenson points out (79), the critic protests too much and seems more concerned with calming the audience's fears that they will be exposed to "separatist" discourses which would ruin their aesthetic enjoyment of the play. In fact, the play is fired with separatist sentiment, and Gélinas's English translation does not adhere closely to the Shakespearean source text at all from the perspective of translation practices. Wallace appears to be reassuring potential playgoers that "it's okay" not to know French or to care about Québec politics at all; they can still "enjoy" the play without having to engage with its underlying nationalist discourses.

[37] "Notes that those people are lucky to be bilingual because they can profit from the advantages of both cultures, then he gives a short self-criticism about his own incapacity to learn French."

[38] "I don't see the light much."

[39] "Forced to chain his tongue."

[40] "These days, Horatio, the man who wants to survive doesn't lay down his weapons; he fights. But I'm really misplaced to dictate your behaviour."

[41] "What to do? Why do it?"

[42] "Tramples this land where he is a stranger."

[43] Awakening. On one's knees. Both *prise de conscience* and *à genoux* are notable Québécois expressions, especially in a political context, to indicate one's servitude and rejection of it, the underlying emotion of which is lost in translation.

[44] "Comes to confirm all of his presumptions, all [he felt] without daring to confess it [to himself] openly." "All this anguish, this feeling of oppression, of slavery, of abasement."

[45] "I don't put much worth on my life." "Profiteer who could let [him] believe that he understands [him] and loves [him]."

[46] "Those who say tomorrow never think" that it won't come.

[47] "Corset of immobility to numb in him the feeling of vengeance and freedom." "Still tomorrow."

[48] "The hope of some future."

[49] "Fight!" "Projects born with the most energy and boldness."

[50] "If you lie down in the grave, that won't help your sons."

[51] "A skull... a leader...."

[52] "I'm dying... who will come guide us towards the light, for it is not enough to kill the snake but it is also necessary to kill its nest so that on this land can growly freely what must bloom. Will you feel strong enough to do it, courageous enough to want it? It's so much easier to rot in habit. Eat... sleep... die... and never dream... never laugh. Who... who... will get us out of the mire of compromises, of slavery, who will break the chains that hypocritically we ourselves forged. It is necessary that my death serve for others. It is necessary that lives... a... free... Qué...bec."

[53] According to Stevenson, in both editions of the French text Hamlet-Québec seems to address Horatio-Lévesque only; however, in the 1977 Leméac edition (as opposed to the 1968 *Éditions de l'homme* text), Gurik asserts that on-stage Hamlet-Québec dies in the arms of both Horatio-Lévesque and *L'Officier du Rhin*-Bourgault (72n4).

I would add that this fact is significant since it points to the dependence of the nation's future on the mutual collaboration of the two men, Lévesque and Bourgault, who would have to work together when Bourgault's RIN merged with Lévesque's MSA to form the PQ. In fact, the PQ's long-standing internal disputes, according to some analysts, originate from tensions between its more radical left-wing members issued from the RIN and its more moderate members coming from Lévesque's center-left position.

[54] In the original 1970 version of the text, the village is in fact Saint-Tite, but in the 1971 version it becomes Saint Lin (Lieblein "Tradaptation" 262). References here are to the 1971 version archived at the *Centre des auteurs dramatiques* (CEAD) in Montréal. Thanks to Daniel Gauthier and Jean-Claude Germain for permission to consult the text.

[55] "In Saint-Lin nothing happens / It's thus sign that everything's going well / The good god watches over all Christians."

As this first citation makes clear, Germain's phonetic transcription of rural Québécois by old men born in the early 1900's results in most words being misspelled in contemporary French. Since a large percentage of words are misspelled purposely in his text for phonetic effect, I have chosen not to mark all of these words with "[*sic*]" in this chapter, except in the case of blatant grammatical errors which have no phonetic purpose.

The text also uses an inordinate amount of ellipses; therefore, to distinguish between those already in the text and my own, my use of ellipses is enclosed in square brackets.

[56] "One would say that you only think about that, you guys... NOT THINK! So much so that you'd be dead and you wouldn't even know it!"

[57] "The foolishness of big aspirations, WHICH ISN'T NORMAL FOR HERE."

[58] As Louis Balthazar explains in *Bilan du nationalisme au Québec*, Québec nationalism was strongly rooted in Catholicism during the high period of Ultramontanism. This religious-based nationalism was marked by a rejection of modernism, and hence socio-economic growth: "Cet encadrement religieux en viendra à influer tellement sur la vie des Canadiens français que l'idée de nation canadienne-française apparaîtra comme indissociable de la foi catholique. D'ailleurs ce sont les clercs eux-mêmes qui entreprendront de définir la nation et de promouvoir le nationalisme. Ils le feront dans des termes nettement traditionnels en fonction d'une doctrine réactionnaire braquée contre toutes les idées modernes" (72). ("This religious supervision came to influence the life of French-Canadians so much that the idea of a French-Canadian nation would appear inseparable from the Catholic faith. In fact, it is the clerics themselves who would undertake to define the nation and to promote nationalism. They would do it in clearly traditional terms through a reactionary doctrine set against all modern ideas.") Balthazar adds, "Selon Mgr Laflèche (évêque de Trois-Rivières de 1870 à 1898), par exemple, la nation est constituée par l'unité de langue, l'unité de foi, l'uniformité des mœurs, des coutumes et des institutions, et la mission du Canada français est de constituer un foyer de catholicisme dans le Nouveau Monde" (72-3), which was often summed up by the trilogy of "nos lois, notre langue, notre religion" (57). ("According to Bishop Laflèche [bishop of Trois-Rivières from 1870 to 1898], for example, the nation was constituted by the unity of language, the unity of faith, the uniformity of morals, customs and institutions, and the mission of French Canadians was to constitute the cradle of Catholicism in the New World." "Our laws, our language, our religion.") Since the primary mission of the Québécois nation was to create and protect a cradle of Catholicism in the New World, it followed in Church teachings that the reward for carrying out this mission would come from god in the afterlife and was not to be found materially on earth.

[59] "The old man of proverbs." "You see, my little boy, the good guys would like to be bad guys... the poor would like to be rich... and... [...] The young would like to be old!"

[60] "I'M TOO MUCH... And I'm old enough... [...] Yeah... old enough to understand by myself without you having to repeat it to me twice...."

[61] In French, *se naître* is always a reflexive verb, to give birth to oneself, the only exception being the use of the passive voice to express the time of birth, *il est né à telle heure ou à tel jour.*

[62] "Liberty is only an illusion / When all the dreams are of escape / The day when power will be without guns / The games of fear will be forbidden / The only answer to oppression / Is still revolution."

[63] "Yeah... it's almost like a fashion, misery... a fashion that we would have invented without knowing it if the tourists weren't there to tell us."

[64] "With nobody left to speak to... in exile in [one's] own country."

[65] As Lieblein points out, the horse, or *cheval*, is also significant because it "is of course associated with the repudiated (by some) urban linguistic form of *joual*", and, as "both a return to the past and an attempt to break out of the past" it functions as "a literal and figurative move toward independence in a context of material and linguistic disempowerment" ("Tradaptation" 262).

[66] "Tired of having to wait until the end of the film to win."

[67] "I'm building something there, mister, for which the father of my father had the idea... Something so solid that it's going to still be there for my grandchildren's children."

[68] From 1867 to 1968, the National Assembly was called the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Québec, but by the time the PQ was first elected to a seat in 1970, it had already been "nationalized" so to speak. See http://www.assnat.qc.ca/fra/patrimoine/lexique/a/index.html#asnat

[69] "Return to the past."

[70] "Sometimes, making use of a freedom is the best way to lose it... Or to have it taken away."

[71] "Well-ordered charity starts with oneself."

[72] "They wake up because things happen to them... When there's violence... They come complaining."

[73] Literally, "Then after?", meaning "What next?".

[74] "That would allow to see further... and then she'll be seen from Saint Joachim."

[75] "I feel that it's going to happen [...] I know that it's going to happen [...] nothing can stop it [...] All the horses are going to leave their backyard [...] nothing can stop it."

[76] "A mare."

[77] "It is just getting started..."

[78] "Us, normally the heroines, we open our mouths just to say... Yes my hero... No my hero... Thanks my hero... Again my hero... I love you my hero... Goodbye my hero... poor hero... He's dead my hero... like all heroes. And when we look at you, we make like we don't see you, in fact even if we wanted to we couldn't, we're so busy batting our eyelashes in admiration... It's always necessary to be dazzled, lose our breath and to swoon in advance, just at the thought the hero is going to take us in his arms... and we do all that: why? To save them work...so that the heroes don't see themselves as they are: locals like country bumpkins."

Chapter 3

Tyrants and Usurpers: Michel Garneau's Tradaptations of the Conquest

The use, quality, and even the existence of the Québécois language was a key debate in Québec during the 1970's, a debate to which Michel Garneau contributed significantly with his "tradaptations" (to employ his own neologism) of Shakespeare. In *Macbeth* and *La tempête*, without changing Shakespeare's plot or characters, Garneau exposes the semiotic richness of the Québécois language by translating the text into an approximation of a 17th century dialect spoken prior to the Conquest of New France by England in 1759. At the same time, he subtly adapts several geographical and historical details in order to conflate the action within the world of plays with the Conquest as well as contemporary neo-colonialism. The overlapping spatio-temporal markers produce a triple layer of signification, simultaneously locating the play in either medieval Scotland or on Caliban's island, in 17th century New France, and in contemporary Québec. Distinctions between the layers of this palimpsest are blurred since the three spatio-temporal contexts are all linked by a single nationalist discourse centered on the country's usurpation by a tyrant and its desperate need for liberation.[1] For the most part, however, this nation excludes the contributions of women as anything more than a means to ensure the continuation of patriarchal kinship. While the plays cross the space between Macbeth's Scotland or Caliban's island and Shakespeare's England in terms of Québécois nationalism, they fail to situate themselves contemporarily in terms of the early modern gender norms of the source texts that they continue to perpetuate. The reasons for this lack of attention to gender are twofold: first, the primary spatio-temporal setting of the three in the

palimpsest is New France where historically women were marginalized except as nuns, nurses, and *filles de joie*; and, second, as in most of these adaptations until the 1990's, gender is not the primary motivating factor for adaptation by Québécois male authors.

In 1973, Michèle Lalonde wrote "La deffence et illustration de la langue quebecquoyse",[2] a manifesto for the defence and promotion of the Québécois language closely modelled after Joachim Du Bellay's 1549 *Deffence et illustration de la langue françoyse* in which du Bellay pleads for the aesthetic beauty of vernacular French and the use of French, rather than Greek or Latin, in the composition of poetry.[3] Du Bellay begins his argument with the concept of language as a living tree whose branches are in constant growth, and he then moves to discredit the idea of vernacular French as "barbarous", qualifying French instead as "as rich as" its classical predecessors. His defence, then, is inflected with a certain degree of unacknowledged nationalism in his pride in the aesthetics of the local language, and, more prominently, a popularism underlying his high-culture defence of the *vox populi*. Lalonde picks up these key elements of du Bellay's text and expands the argument, first by situating the notion of the living tree in the specific historical context of Québec's linguistic isolation from France in the aftermath of the Conquest, and then by explaining how Québécois is not only as rich as *français de France* but also how it is less corrupted by anglicisms. Lalonde adapts du Bellay in that she imitates several of his main arguments, follows the structure of his text, and even adopts his 16th century orthography, but she adds two new key arguments, one psychoanalytic and the other postcolonial, which are both closely related.

Throughout her text, Lalonde identifies the two most common discursive positions in regard to the Québécois language: the first ensconces the virtues of *français de France* while maligning *joual*; the other, vice-versa, extols *joual* to the detriment of all grammar. In terms of the former, and more problematic, discourse, Lalonde frames her psychoanalytic reading as the "difficulté de s'exprimer dans la langue à-sa-mére" (12) which she characterizes as an inferiority complex for certain people still tied by the umbilical cord to France and whose "langue maternelle ... les humilie personnellement si fort" (13).[4] The unstated implication of her observation of this "aliénation" is that the renunciation of the Mother (tongue) is also a rejection of the nation itself since those who practice this linguistic snobbery "insultent [sa] famille et qu'à trop admirer le Bon Parler, ils en viennent à mépriser inconsciemment les bonnes gens qui parlent..." (13, 12).[5] Lalonde's psychoanalytic reading of the inferiority complex underlying this high-culture versus low-culture linguistic dichotomy thus quickly translates into a postcolonial approach as she exposes ironically the quotidian symptoms of this *complexe de colonisé*. She claims that both the pro-French and the pro-*joual* groups have adopted "sous le coup de l'angoisse la conduite de l'autruche" (17) and thus bury their heads in the sand rather than recognizing their own colonization.[6] Advocates in the first group, "refusant d'admettre la présence d'un Conquérant & Occupant étranger, qui les dépossède chaque jour un peu plus de la richesse de leur culture & leur langue", prefer to take themselves for "l'agresseur à abattre" and no longer see anything except the Québécois' own blindness, crass ignorance, and supposed collective impotence to dust off their vocabulary and to correct their grammar (17).[7] They are happy to "prendre leur trou" (a particularly

Québécois idiom expressing the colonial mindset) where they find their enemy "au fond de leur propre humiliation" (17).[8] In contrast, members of the second group, in their "fierté de parler Kébecway", falsely believe that by speaking less and less French they are "moins en moins colonisés" and that they see clearly in the bottom of their hole that "anyway l'ennemi c'est la France!" (17).[9] By mocking equally both discourses, Lalonde succinctly illustrates the position of double colonization in which Québec finds itself relative to imperialist France and neo-colonial cultural and capital imperialism of anglophone nations.

These psychological responses to Québec's colonization, rooted in a recognizable daily reality for the reader of the period, lend credibility to Lalonde's political claims about Québec sovereignty that she inserts a page earlier into the same chapter. She explains the contextual difference between du Bellay's text and her own, namely that 16th century France was already independent from the ancient Roman Empire against whose Latin du Bellay was writing. Lalonde, on the other hand, does not see herself, or the "vulgaire Québécois" she is defending, as "réunis sous un sceptre audacieux capable de les mener très très loin" (15).[10] Unlike du Bellay's French compatriots, the Québécois are not united under a bold sceptre that will lead them into the future because they are not a sovereign nation. Rather, the Québécois are colonized because they are "cernés de toutes parts par des puissances estrangières tantôt Anglaise, tantôt Américaine, voire, récemment, Italienne, qui ... les soumettent à leurs lois, privilèges ou droits acquis de plus ou moins longue date sur ce territoire" (15).[11] While recognizing that some Québécois already feel "independent" in their interiority, she ironizes that she doesn't know yet that "cette excellente disposition psychologique soit bel et bien

reconnue par aucune disposition de nos lois ou proclamation d'Indépendance très réelle et claire, entendue des Nations-Unies" (16).[12] Lalonde buckles the loop in the logic of language and the psychology of colonization when the irony of her previous claims deflates into the stark realization that celebrating the autonomy of the Québécois language is pre-emptive when "la nation qui veut la parler ne parvient mesme pas au jour d'huy à conjuguer ses forces au premier temps de l'indicatif..." (16).[13] Like Gurik and Germain, Lalonde decries the inability of Québécois to take action, situating the lacuna within a linguistic metaphor.

Lalonde is not unique in linking language and nationalism in order to construct a strategic discourse of literary, and potentially even political, decolonization in the face of (neo)colonialism. In 1977, after ten years of reflection on the subject, the famous Kenyan writer Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, whose novel *A Grain of Wheat* chronicles his country's struggle for independence, decided despite the success of his novels in English to write exclusively in his mother tongue of Gĩkũyũ, thereby making his texts available to international readers in translation only. In his essay *Moving the Center*, Ngũgĩ describes the critical moment of consciousness that provoked his decision:

> I came to realise only too painfully that the novel in which I had so carefully painted the struggle of the Kenya peasantry against colonial oppression would never be read by them. In an interview shortly afterwards in the *Union News* ... in 1967, I said I did not think that I would continue writing in English: that I knew *about* whom I was writing, but *for* whom was I writing? (9-10, italics in original)

Ngũgĩ's realization of the inutility of exposing the injustices of colonial rule and

of recounting the sacrifices of those involved in independence movement in a language inaccessible to the very people for whom he was writing highlights the cultural imperialism that often underlies the theory and the practice of literature and translation in neocolonial and postcolonial political contexts. Rather than perpetuating the cultural preponderance of the language of the colonizer, Ngũgĩ's decision to privilege exclusively his maternal and national language constructs Kenyan readers as a dominant cultural force and disempowers the colonizer through the production of meaning which does not signify within the colonizer's system of cultural codes. Michel Garneau also employs the power of language to turn the tables on the colonizer by privileging a sign system inaccessible to him, but Garneau's strategy is more subversive since he appropriates the colonizer's own texts and signifies through them an inaccessible cultural reality.

Just four years after Lalonde's "Deffence" and in the same year as Ngũgĩ's exclusive adoption of Gĩkũyũ, Michel Garneau undertook the task of translating and adapting *Macbeth* at the request of the Montréal-based *École nationale de théâtre du Canada*. *Macbeth* was performed professionally by the Théâtre de la Manufacture at the Cinéma Parallèle in Montreal from October 31 to December 2, 1978, at which time the text was also published. Prior to *Macbeth*, Garneau had also tradapted *La tempête* in 1973 for the *École nationale de théâtre*, but, as Denis Salter points out, "Garneau came to *re*write *Garneau's Tempest* in the early 1980's" ("Between" 63); therefore, the play which he later published in 1989 (and with which I am concerned here) is a different text than his 1973 ur-*Tempête*. In 1989, Garneau also published *Coriolan*; however, of his three Shakespearean tradaptations, *Coriolan* is written in the most standardized French, diverges the

least from the source text (especially in terms of early modern representations of gender), and is the least inflected with Québécois nationalism, hence it is excluded from this study.[14] All three plays were later re-staged by Robert Lepage in 1993 for the *Festival de théâtre des Amériques*.

Garneau's Shakespearean tradaptations are neither literal translations of Shakespeare nor adaptations that largely modify the content of the source text. Tradaptation, as the word implies, involves both translation and adaptation in such a way that it defies distinctions between the two practices. As Lieblein observes, the resistance of "standard" French translations and the appropriation of Shakespeare's cultural authority involved in adaptation results in tradaptation exemplifying Québec's double colonization by both French language purists and British hegemony ("Cette" 255). According to Maria Tymoczko, almost all translation in a postcolonial context involves a form of cultural adaptation of the text, and translation "reflects the literary system of the post-colonial or minority culture itself" which may involve introducing "various forms of indigenous formalism to the dominant culture" (34). For this reason, Salter asserts that tradaptation "is close to being oxymoronic, as it discloses the kind of prodigious doubling to which the translator's identity ... is necessarily subjected" as he seeks to preserve the linguistic heritage of the past and assert cultural autonomy in the present ("Between" 63). Garneau thus uses the methods of both the translator and the adapter to create hybrid plays which articulate a carefully constructed discourse very different from Shakespeare's: the need for Québec's decolonisation. He employs several different techniques to integrate subtly this nationalist discourse into the Shakespearean text. Like Gurik and Germain,

Garneau encourages the reader to draw parallels between specific situations within the world of the play and the political and socio-historical context of Québec, and, more specifically, he employs metonymy, intertextuality, and archaism.

Garneau's infusion of Québécois nationalism into the Shakespearean text is most apparent in his tradaptation of *Macbeth*.[15] In *Sociocritique de la traduction*, Annie Brisset, who has painstakingly documented Garneau's use of metonymy in this play, concludes that the foremost means by which he appropriates the text is by continually replacing the word "Scotland" with either the term "chez-nous" or the word "pays".[16] While this substitution is relatively simple for any translator and does not make the play an adaptation in and of itself, its repeated use throughout the play ultimately creates the desired effect. Although technically the Québécois *Macbeth* still takes place in Great Britain at the center of the Shakespearean canon, it simultaneously takes place on the margins of the British Empire in Quebec with, as we shall see, its characteristic geographical and natural traits. This shift in context, which situates the play closer to home for a Québécois reader, then allows for a shift in theme and the introduction of a nationalist discourse.

In the published text of his tradaptation, Garneau both draws attention to and attempts to disguise the most nationalist speeches in the play.[17] For example, in Act 3, scene 6, he intervenes in the text and writes, "J'saute du vers 38 au vers 47 parc'c'est melé, mêlant" (3.6.97).[18] For readers of the tradaptation, this scene immediately stands out since it is one of only two instances of acknowledged authorial intervention in the play, and there are no such cases at all in the other

two plays of the trilogy. In this first case, the textual result is that Ross's account of all that is wrong in the country is directly followed by Lennox's longing plea, "Ça s'ra't eune bénidiction pis eune sainte justice / Si not'pays s'ra't libéré d'la main damnée qui l'opprime" (3.6.97).[19] While, as Oxford editor Nicolas Brooke explains in his introduction (1989), 3.6 is "perfectly coherent until l.37, and thereafter it becomes confusing" (52), Arden 2 editor Kenneth Muir explains in his introduction to the 1984 reissue of the play that the passage could be made more logical by simply transposing the line order (xxxiv n.2).[20] While Garneau's authorial intervention is correct in noting the confusion associated with the passage, the Shakespearean text is not so incoherent that an adapter could not include a logical version of it. The authorial intervention thus seems more motivated by a desire to draw attention to the nationalism of Lennox's two concluding lines, as well as to prepare the reader for Garneau's second textual incursion in 4.3 by implicitly invoking here the argument of textual interpolation which scholars of *Macbeth* familiar with the argument would be likely to accept at face value.

The second authorial intervention occurs in Act 4, scene 3 when Garneau writes, "J'traduis pas du vers 139 au vers 161 (Édition Oxford University Press) parc'c'est la scène avec le docteur où on parle du don de guérisseur du roi d'Angleterre, une scène de ventilation comme on dit au cinéma, qui n'a rien à faire avec l'action dramatique pis qui sonne même pas très Shakespeare" (4.3.120-1).[21] This textual incursion stands out even more than the first considering that Garneau's reason is unjustified. As in the first case in which the omitted lines are not as confusing as Garneau claims, in this case there is no

indication that these lines are not from Shakespeare's pen, or that they are simply filler space without meaning. While the authorship of several scenes of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* has been contested, and this particular passage has been included in that debate, both Muir and Brooke have judged it consistent with Shakespeare's pen. Muir contends that 4.3.140-6 "contains examples of Shakespeare's characteristic imagery and is certainly his" (xxxii). He also argues that even if the passage on the King's Evil is an interpolation that Shakespeare may have inserted during a process of revision for the stage, "it can still be justified on dramatic grounds" (n.4.3.140-59). Brooke concurs with Muir that the passage's "dramatic function is evident—and the text we have is itself coherent" (51). The lines cut by Garneau recount how the King of England, who is preparing to help MacDuff defeat Macbeth, has special healing powers. As Muir points out, the passage relates thematically to many aspects of the play: the opposition between the King's good supernatural powers and the evil powers of the witches; the contrast between the holy Edward the Confessor of England and the unholy Macbeth of Scotland; and the disease imagery in Act 5 (n.4.3.140-59). In addition, Ross' entrance with tragic news is heightened dramatically by its placement after this factual passage. From a socio-historical perspective, the passage may have functioned as either flattery of or persuasion for King James I who occasionally "touched" to heal the sick and had a well-known interest in the supernatural (Brooke 72).

Rather than eliminating confusion in the text, Garneau is weakly attempting to disguise the fact that, as Brisset has convincingly argued (220-2), these lines, if not omitted, would interrupt the most nationalist speech of the play.

By omitting these lines, the scene becomes a poignant discussion on the imperative need for national liberation before it is too late. Malcolm laments how Macbeth is destroying his country, and then encourages MacDuff to join them in overthrowing the tyrant: "Ensemble, on va y aller! / Not'cause peut pas ête plus jusse! La victoére nous attend / Au boutte d'la route!" (4.3.120).[22] This speech resounds with double meaning for Québécois readers, for not only is Malcolm's cause just, but so too is the cause of all Québécois to imitate him and throw off the reins of oppression by usurping the usurper. Readers are interpellated by Malcolm's battle cry; the word "notre" conscripts them into the army that at the end of the play will defeat tyranny. Without the interruption about the wonders of the King of England, Malcolm's rally is followed by Ross's eulogy for the country:

> Not'pauv'pays a quaisiment d'la misére à se r'connaîte lui-même.
> Not'mére-patrie, on peut quaisiment pus la nommer mére, faudra't
> Ben proche dire tombeau, fosse commune. Y'a ben jusse les innocents
> Qui savent arien su rien qu'y'ont l'coeur d'sourire cheuz-nous.
> .....
> La seule extase que l'rêgne nous parmet
> C'est d'avoér toute la peine du monde. (4.3.121)[23]

This mournful account of the pitiful state of the country convinces MacDuff of the urgency to act immediately, just as it is designed to encourage the audience to fight for national liberation as well. The play's suggestion for Québécois to emulate MacDuff and acquire agency (*passer à l'action*) thus inscribes its nationalist discourse in the same current of thought as that of Gurik's *Hamlet*.

Garneau also highlights the history of the Conquest and Québec's alterity from Britain through subtle geographical differences between Shakespeare's source text and his tradaptation. In *La tempête*, Garneau marks Caliban's island as Québec by the substitution of foreign wildlife by "oies blanches" (also known as "oies de neige") whose regional specificity and twice annual migration along the St. Lawrence River (particularly at Cap-Tourmente, Baie-du-Febrve, and Montmagny) are well known to a Québécois reader (4.1.108).[24] In *Macbeth*, the metonymic substitution of "Birnam wood" by "la forêt" and "Dunsinan" by "la colline",[25] as well as a reversal in the direction in which the forest moves, is even more notable because it locates the final battle of the play on the equivalent of the Plains of Abraham.[26] In Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, the movement of Birnam wood is mentioned seven times, and in each case Garneau consistently translates this movement with the verb "descendre", to descend, contrary to the movement implied by the source text. The first indication of the relational situation of the Birnam to Dunsinan makes clear that the wood is below the hill on which sits the castle. The Third Apparition predicts, "Macbeth shall never vanquished be, until / Great Birnam Wood to high Dunsinan Hill / Shall come against him" (4.1.107-9).[27] Yet, in the tradaptation, the apparition prophesizes, "Macbeth s'ra pas vaincu tant qu'la forêt descendra pas d'la colline" (4.1.106).[28] To follow Shakespeare, the correct verb should be "monter", to go up or to climb, since the castle is "high" atop the hill. The tradaptation insists on the verb "descendre" in each instance the forest is evoked, even when the Shakespearean text varies the expression, from "remove" (5.2.2) to "come" (5.3.59, 5.5.45-6, 5.7.60). In Garneau's version, in order for the forest to descend the hill, it must be situated on

top of it or on the side of it. I would argue that this relocation of the forest serves to evoke the Battle of the Plains of Abraham on September 13, 1759 and the Conquest of New France by the British.

This reference to this historical event is strengthened by two other changes to the source text, the generalization of proper names and the addition of a notion of surprise attack. In Garneau, Birnam wood is consistently referred to as an unnamed forest, removing its geographical situatedness from Scotland, and specific mention of it in the source text is cut completely on two occasions (5.2.5, 5.2.31), thereby reducing the potential disjuncture experienced by the reader between the narrative location of Scotland and the symbolic location of New France. Similarly, Dunsinan is consistently translated vaguely as "la colline" which evokes the fortified city of Québec on its hilltop as well as the "colline parlementaire" that is now located in the upper city near both the fort and the Plains of Abraham which dominate remarkably the hilltop. The surprise attack on Québec City in the night of September 12-13, 1759 is evoked by an addition to Malcolm's explanation of why they should they should adopt the tree branches as a disguise. Shakespeare's Malcolm orders, "Let every soldier hew him down a bough / And bear't before him, thereby shall we shadow / The numbers of our host, and make discovery / Err in report of us" (5.4.4-7), using the tree branches solely to hide the number of soldiers as they approach and make reconnaissance. He does not evoke the notion of a surprise attack since such a plan would be pointless given that Macbeth has already received report from a servant of the approach of ten thousand soldiers and begun to make battle preparations (5.2.13). While these facts remain unchanged in the tradaptation, the notion of a surprise

attack is nonetheless added contrary to plot's logic: "Tu vas dire à chaque soldat d's'arracher un buisson, un arbuste, / Ou ben un p'tit âbre pour s'cacher aveuc, comme çâ, y'a'ront pas / Idée du nombre qu'on est pis c't'eune erreur qui va nous parmette / D'es surprende" (5.4.139).[29] The surprise arrival of English soldiers up the hill to the Plains of Abraham is precisely the error that changed the face of New France, and this surprise is largely due to the belief that the hill was not climbable due to the trees which covered it. Access to the Plains of Abraham was believed to be impossible as long as the trees remained on the hill, barring any path to the top, and the French army falsely believed itself invincible as long as the tree-covered hill remained a source of protection. The Plains would only be accessible were the trees to fall or to be cut down, *d'être descendus*. In actual fact, just as it is possible for Birnam wood to move, it is possible for the trees ironically to provide the traction necessary for the English to climb the hill as well as the cover to do so unnoticed. The metonymy that dislocates Birnam from Scotland and the re-creation of the Battle of the Plains of Abraham both serve to align temporarily the reader's sympathy with Macbeth whose conquest, and that of Scotland as a whole, arrives at the hands of the English army, thus associating the colonization of Scotland by Edward the Conqueror and the Conquest of New France.

The second means by which Garneau appropriates Shakespeare's text is intertextuality. Just as his use of metonymy serves to Québécize the text, so too does Garneau's insertion of typically Québécois motifs frequently found in the poetry of his contemporaries. Again, Brisset has led the way, having shown how Garneau reproduces motifs and themes common to the poetry of Paul

Chamberland, Gérald Godin, and Gaston Miron, among others (236-51). For example, in Garneau's *Macbeth* one finds the same characteristics as in Chamberland's *L'afficheur hurle*: the same apocalyptic vision of society, the same resistance to dominant power, the same discourse of despair, of exile, of dispossession, the same subjectivity of a collective destiny, the same tone of eulogy, the same images of wounds and blood, the same incantic structure, in other words, all the traits of Québécois poetry in the 1960's and 1970's (246).

Garneau's third technique for textual appropriation is the use of archaisms.[30] The language of the play, which to some extent in its written form resembles the *joual* of Michel Tremblay's Plateau Mont-Royal, is best described as an approximation of the language used in 17th century New France under the *ancien régime*. Regional and historical variations aside, there is no doubt that the language is Québécois in a *pure laine* form. Linguistically, *Macbeth* is the most Québécois of Garneau's Shakespearean tradaptations. While *La tempête* and *Coriolan* use Québécois words and expressions, *Macbeth* also transcribes the accent and the rhythm with which the words are pronounced. The reproduction of the Québécois accent in the text is particularly significant given the political and literary context in which the plays are written. Not only does *Macbeth* arrive close on the heels of Lalonde's manifesto, but Garneau was also writing in the midst of the political debate surrounding the implementation of the *Loi 101* which passed in 1977 under the first PQ government. As an answer to Lalonde's challenge, Garneau's plays defend and illustrate the Québécois language, valorizing it not only over Shakespearean English, but also in regard to "standard" French, that is, *français de France*, which dominated most French-language

productions, and hence literal translations, of Shakespeare in Québec until this time. Garneau's *Macbeth* dispels the myth that only French in the style of François-Victor Hugo (whose prose translations of the complete works had a major impact on French and Québécois stage productons and are still used today) can represent Shakespeare. The Québécois text valorizes the poetry and beauty of the Québécois language, and, by extension, the Québécois culture. The work's title clearly states "traduit en québécois", translated into Québécois, so there can be no doubt in the reader's mind that the text doesn't compromise the Québécois language by attempting to adhere to the rules of the *Académie française* in Paris and the restrictions of standard French. One could compare Garneau's use of archaic Québécois to represent Shakespeare to Ngũgĩ's decision to write exclusively in Gĩkũyũ. Garneau endows his language and his culture with a textual representation of their equality with those of colonialist Britain and France, and thus destabilizes the hierarchy that separates "proper" metropolitan speech from the center from "degenerate" colonial dialects spoken on the margins of those former empires.

More important than the linguistic techniques of metonymy, intertextuality, and archaism, however, the principal strategy by which Garneau's trilogy conveys a variety of nationalist discourses is through resonances to the political context of his time, which, similarly to the adaptations of Gurik and Germain, focuses on the themes of inaction and anti-ecclesiasticism. In keeping with Gurik's emphasis on the need for Québécois to take action, or *passer à l'action*, Garneau eliminates, for example, a crucial occurrence in the text of characters failing to take action, that is, Malcolm and Donalbain's inability to stay

and claim the throne which is rightfully theirs upon the murder of their father. Like Hamlet, Malcolm allows his birthright to be usurped by his father's conqueror, and seeks refuge in exile, as Hamlet does in feigned madness, privileging hesitant thought over his own agency. Shakespeare's Donalbain urges Malcolm, "Let's away, our tears are not yet brewed", while Malcolm completes his thought, "Nor our strong sorrow upon the foot of motion" (2.3.125-6). Contrary to Germain's strategy of criticizing inaction through parody, Garneau simply eliminates it from his text, redirecting attention from Malcolm and Donalbain's flight to the suffering of the loss of the Father and their birthright. In the adaptation, Donalbain laments "On s'rait mieux d'déguarpir nous-autes; d'autant plusse / Qu'on sait pas 'xact'ment sur quoé pleurer", and Malcolm adds, "Chu comme engourdi d'vant l'malheur, la douleur m'vient lent'ment" (2.3.66).[31] The adaptation shifts the focus from the lack of action provoked by sorrow to the emotional experience of sorrow itself through its repeated translation as both "malheur" and "douleur" and the addition of Malcolm's feeling of "numbness". Rather than sorrow slowing his charge to action, Malcolm experiences his sorrow slowly, as if it must be savoured and fully appreciated in the moment, in opposition to Shakespeare's metaphor of brewing sorrow, of quickening or fermenting it for a specific purpose as the witches brew trouble. This transformation of Malcolm's sorrow in Garneau's text thus complements Donalbain's leading remark that they are so upset that they are incapable of understanding rationally the cause of their sorrow, another textual addition that could be interpreted as much in terms of the emotional excess of the situation as it could in terms of the lack of reliable knowledge about the reason for their father's

murder. The adaptation's increased emphasis on sorrow, and the removal of reference to the yet unbrewed "foot of motion", situates Malcolm and Donalbain as post-Conquest mourners, more concerned with their own (navel-gazing) emotional response to their loss rather than the rational course of action required to reclaim it. In this passage, Malcolm and Donalbain embody the collective consciousness of the Québécois people. The loss of the Father (symbolized by the loss of language to describe the reason for their tears) and the birthright of Duncan's sons correspond to the rape of the Mother/nation of all Québécois.

The tradapted text also evokes the anti-ecclesiastical discourse promulgated so strongly in Gurik's *Hamlet*, but in Garneau's *Macbeth* the relationship between nation and religion is introduced more subtly into the text and is more politically progressive. Like its predecessor, Garneau's adaptation is concerned with freeing Québécois from the reign of the Church, but this anti-ecclesiasticism goes a step further and incorporates an attention to the secularization of Québec society at large through the elimination of religious prejudice. In the porter scene, Garneau systematically replaces every occurrence of the noun "equivocator" and the verb "equivocate" (2.3.8-33) with "jésuite" as both a noun and a verb (2.3.56-7). While the equivocator in Shakespeare's *Macbeth* is considered an allusion to the Jesuit Superior Father Henry Garnet found guilty of perjury about his role in the gunpowder plot (Brooke 59), there is no semantic impediment in French to Garneau employing the same term in one of its many derivative forms (the verb "équivoquer", the noun "équivocation", or the adjective "équivoque") which all share the same Latin etymological origin of *aequivocus* as the English term. His metonymic substitution must therefore serve

a larger discursive purpose, and I would argue that the emphatic association of liars with Jesuits functions as a critique, especially in the play's *ancien régime* context, of the role played by Jesuit priests in the colonial development of New France, a development that depended largely on the near genocide of the Native Peoples. Recounted most famously by Jean de Brébeuf in *Les relations jésuites*, the establishment of New France involved the religious conversion of Native Peoples, especially the Hurons, by whom the missionaries were necessarily viewed as distrustful equivocators due to the devastating diseases they imported with their civilizing mission that threatened to eradicate the entire Huron people. By metonymically replacing "equivocator" with "jésuite", Garneau's *Macbeth* accepts responsibility for the duality of the Jesuit mission as both cultural and biological imperialism, which itself stands metaphorically for the duplicity of all colonialism, thus encouraging Québécois readers to perceive themselves not only as the victims of colonialism but also as its perpetrators.

This subtle mixture of national affirmation with religious and ethnocultural tolerance is made more apparent later in the adaptation by Garneau's deletion of the anti-Semitism of the Shakespearean source text. Whereas Shakespeare's third witch throws into the cauldron "[l]iver of blaspheming Jew" (4.1.26), explicitly associating Judaism with blasphemy of a supposedly higher and implicitly Christian religion, in the adaptation she speaks merely of "foé d'blasphémateur" (4.1.102) without qualifying blasphemy with a specific religious practice.[32] The textual elimination of anti-Semitism, and the resulting egalitarianism by which anyone may be considered a blasphemer regardless of his or her religious affiliation or lack thereof, points to a concern about social inclusivity present

throughout the text. This sensitivity to the need for greater religious and ethnocultural tolerance marks a shift within nationalist discourse away from a binary French-English model to one of greater plurality, anticipating the inclusion and valorization of the diversity of immigrants and native peoples that we will see in Ronfard's *Vie et mort du Roi boiteux* in Chapter 4 and in the adaptations since 1990 in Chapter 5.

This discursive move towards a greater respect for and inclusion of groups from other religious and ethnic origins is rooted within a greater movement of secularization stemming from the same anti-ecclesiasticism found in Gurik's *Hamlet*. The hypocrisy of religious discourse is established early in the adaptation when Garneau's Macbeth and Macduff refer to the late Duncan with the collective possessive pronoun "our" as opposed to "your" which is employed in the Shakespearean source text solely in reference to Malcolm and Donalbain's father. Macbeth, immediately following his murder of Duncan and the servants, tells the sons, "la source, la riviére d'not'sang, / La vra'e r'source de nos vies, toute s'assèche" (2.3.63).[33] Macduff innocently picks up on Macbeth's "notre" and adds, "Not'pére le roé a subi l'meurte" (2.3.63).[34] The words "notre père" resonate with the beginning of a religious prayer easily completed by a Québécois reader, "notre père qui êtes aux cieux...".[35] Macbeth's appropriation of Duncan as the symbolic holy father with the words "our blood" and "our life" reveals the duplicity or equivocation of religious discourse. The ease with which he mixes his blood and his life with that which he has just taken exposes Macbeth, and all others who pretend to lay claim to the life and blood of the holy father while spilling blood on their hands, as a fraud. Yet, by killing the pure, white father

figure of Duncan, Macbeth not only exposes the hypocrisy of religious discourse but he also eradicates, symbolically, the church itself. He functions temporarily therefore as a model of the secularization that took place in Québec in the 1960's and 1970's in which the priest-ridden province was liberated from the holy fathers who had heretofore dominated its cultural and political life.

The urgent need for Québécois to free themselves from the grasp of Catholicism in order to devote energy to national liberation is later voiced explicitly by Macbeth in his conversation with the hired murderers. While Shakespeare's Macbeth asks the first murderer, "Are you so gospelled to pray for this good man" (3.1.88), Garneau's Macbeth transforms the metaphor: "J'voudra's savoér si les prêtes / Vous ont assez endormis qu'vous allez continuer d'prier / Pour l'âme de c'te brave homme" (3.1.76-7).[36] The significant difference between being gospelled and being asleep signals two opposing views of the influence of religion on the free will of the subject. Gospelled implies that the first murderer has been indoctrinated, but he still theoretically possesses the potential for independent, conscious thought; whereas, a sleeping subject lacks consciousness and free will over his thoughts and actions. The substitution of "endormi" for "gospelled" thus signals the gravity of the situation in which Québécois may find themselves, for they lack the capacity to question the religious discourse imposed by the Catholic Church. The first murderer should, of course, challenge Macbeth's orders on moral grounds, but he should also do so for the sake of national liberation because Macbeth, as the dictatorial priest that he himself condemns, is responsible for the sleepy destruction of the nation through his attempted murder of Banquo and Fleance, the first of a long line of sovereign

kings. The first murderer, whose lack of consciousness is highlighted ironically by the person who symbolically enables it, is complicit, through his inaction, that is, through his sleepy unwillingness to interrogate the situation before him, an attack on sovereignty. By extension, the tradaptation implies, all Québécois who are lulled asleep by priests and who fail to question the status quo before them are participating in the murder of the nation.

* * *

Garneau's tradaptation of *The Tempest* is especially interesting in that it diverges from the formula adopted by most other postcolonial playwrights. Rather than focusing on the Prospero-Caliban relationship and attempting to subvert the Hegelian master-slave dialectic that characterizes it, as Aimé Césaire does in *Une tempête* for example, Garneau's *La tempête* preserves the structure of colonial power relations on the island; however, it situates the adaptation in terms of Prospero's deportation from Milan, another form of colonial violence that could evoke empathy in Québécois readers given that many present-day Québécois, especially those living on the south shore of the St-Laurent, are descendants of deported Acadians. In *Macbeth*, the term "chez-nous" replaces Scotland and its presence in the text often indicates the infiltration of a nationalist discourse. In *La tempête*, the term "chez-nous" is never used in reference to Caliban's island; instead, "chez nous" is limited exclusively to Prospero's lost dukedom of Milan, replacing metonymically the word "thence" whence they came (1.2.62). Like its association with "pays" in *Macbeth*, in *La tempête* "chez nous" is synonymous in French with Prospero's "seigneurie" (1.2.18), a term which evokes the lands of New France prior to the Conquest and also the lands of

Acadie whence the Acadians, like Prospero, were forcefully deported.

Garneau's *La tempête* inverts the classic postcolonial Prospero-Caliban paradigm and encourages the reader in two ways to identify with Prospero whose rightful dukedom has been usurped, first, by exaggerating Prospero's suffering in comparison to the Shakespearean version, and, second, by softening the character in his interactions with the other characters on the island. In describing his exile from Milan (which is never mentioned by name but rather identified by the possessive "ma ville", my city [1.2.20]), the Québécois Prospero repeatedly focuses on the theme of betrayal. The words "foul play" (1.2.60, 62) are translated as "trahis" and "viliane trahaison" (1.2.17), while "treacherous army" (1.2.128) becomes "belle armée d'hypocrites et de traîtres" (1.2.20) modified by three adjectives rather than just one, and Shakespeare's rather vague "ministers for th' purpose" (1.2.131) becomes a very concrete "bande de visages à deux faces" (1.2.20).[37] This last reference not only reiterates the notion that the usurpers are traitors, but also links the play to both versions of Gurik's *Hamlet, prince du Québec* in which the Rosencrantz and Guilderstern characters illustrate their two-faced treachery by their reversible capes that have red, federalist maple leaves on one side and blue, nationalist *fleur de lys* on the other.

Just as in *Macbeth* and in the poetry of the period the "je" recurs frequently to express an emerging selfhood, so too in *La tempête* does the first person take an inordinate place in the text to reinforce the reader's position within a collective national identity. In telling the story of his and Miranda's exile, Prospero employs repeatedly the collective pronoun "our". Garneau translates "Under my burden groaned" (1.2.156) as "grandement écrasé par nos misères"

(1.2.21) and transforms "wrings mine eyes to't" (1.2.135) into "notre histoire me crève le coeur" (1.2.20), a phrase which has the double meaning of not only "our story" but also "our history", and which thus evokes a series of powerful images:[38] the Conquest, the crushed Patriot rebellions and the subsequent executions, the conscription crisis, the October crisis, and countless other incidents in Québec's history which are understood to pierce the reader's heart as they do Miranda's.

Prospero's relationship with Miranda is much more tender and less authoritarian in the Québécois version, and their treatment of Caliban and Ariel is also less deplorable. Rather than addressing Caliban as "Abhorred slave" (1.2.352), Garneau's Prospero simply says "toi" (1.2.33). Rather than accusing, "Thou liest malignant thing" (1.2.257), he more jokingly says "tu mens comme un notaire" (1.2.28).[39] Prospero does not unnecessarily taunt the others on the island with his magic either. The banquet scene in which Shakespeare's Prospero tortures the starving shipwreck survivors with disappearing food is omitted from Garneau's tradaptation (3.3.18-51), as is his sadistic pledge towards Caliban, Stephano, and Triculo to "plague them all, / Even to roaring" (4.1.192-3). No longer undercut by his moments of sadism as he is in Shakesepare's text, this kinder, gentler Prospero therefore becomes in the reader's eyes more worthy of the restoration of his kingdom at the end of the play.

Garneau's Prospero contrasts most sharply with Shakespeare's in the final act. Garneau omits Prospero's gratitude to Gonzalo for helping him during the coup d'état as well as most other references to this help. As a result, Prospero's forced exile appears more violent and unanimous. In effect, Garneau essentializes

this plot incident in order to increase readers' sympathy for Prospero and their conviction that he was indeed betrayed. While in Shakespeare's text Antonio's coup d'état is referred to unjudgementally as an "act" (5.1.73), in Garneau's text it is a "saloperie" (5.1.114).[40] Most significantly, Garneau cuts Prospero's declaration of forgiveness of Antonio: "I do forgive / Thy rankest fault" (5.1.131-2). The Québécois Prospero also rejects the romantic notion that fate separated him from his crown so that Miranda would ultimately be reunited with it by marrying Ferdinand. In Garneau's *La tempête*, no excuse justifies the violent territorial dispossession by which Prospero's *seigneurie* was stolen from him, and he commits no wrongs that merit forgiveness or justify the usurper's treachery. Unlike Shakespeare's Prospero who tells Alonso, "Let us not burden our remembrances with / A heaviness that's gone" (5.1.199-200), for the Québécois Prospero the past is neither forgiven nor forgotten. There is no statute of limitations for rectifying past wrongs, that is, for reclaiming the rule which was usurped long ago in the Conquest.

In addition to evoking the Conquest, *La tempête* also severely critiques Canada's neo-colonial rule over Québec through the representation of Antonio's insidious take-over of Prospero's power. Prospero's description of his usurpation by Antonio alludes to the Union of Upper and Lower Canada in 1840:

> et mon propre frère s'est laissé tenter
> par le diable et ma confiance en lui
> a rencontré une grande malhonnêteté
> et il est devenu maître
> non seulement de mes revenus

mais de ma puissance même

à force de mentir

il a fini par croire à ses accraires

les voir légitimes (1.2.19)[41]

First, Prospero's brother, that is, one who shares a similar developmental growth as him yet is a distinct entity, succumbs to the devil; that is, he does not follow the same religious leader. The opposing religious beliefs of Prospero and his brother echoes that between English Canadian Protestants and francophone Catholics who were the majority in Québec. Second, Alonso confiscates not only Prospero's political power but also his finances. For a Québécois reader this accusation evokes the financial losses accrued by Union. Lower Canada was significantly wealthier than Upper Canada, but Union allowed Upper Canada to pay its debts with the revenues of Lower Canada and eventually become the more affluent of the two. Third, Antonio's growing belief in the legitimacy of his own lies corresponds to the increased power over Québec that English Canada gained in Union and then the Confederation of 1867, reinforcing the legitimacy of its neo-colonial economic and political rule by sheer force of numbers, the strategy for assimilation advocated by Lord Durham in his *Report on the Affairs of British North America* published in London in February 1839. Antonio's/English Canada's belief in his own lies corresponds to the rewriting of history by the victors that usually occurs in the context of colonization. Antonio's/English Canada's rewriting of history applies not only to the Conquest but also to the Union/Confederation, which, although considered democratic by English Canada, has arguably been considered undemocratic in Québec since it was not decided by

the people's voice in a referendum but rather by the voices of a few Members of Parliament at a time when even the election of MP's was democratically questionable given the presence of *bras de fer* strongmen outside polls who intimidated voters in favour of particular candidates. Prospero's/Québec's bitterness in retelling his tale thus derives not only from his political and financial losses but from the arrogance of his brother/English Canada who should have been an equal partner but whose usurpation appropriates a false legitimacy to which he/it is not entitled. The play as a whole thus advocates for Québec sovereignty since the restoration of Prospero's kingdom corresponds to rectification of both the Conquest and Union leading to Confederation.

Although thus far I have attempted to describe the incursion of nationalism in the texts as a consistent, logical imposition onto the Shakespearean plot structure, the constraints of working with a predetermined source text do not always make this possible within the subtle genre of tradaptation. While it is possible to impose a nationalist discourse onto the plot structure of the Shakespearean text, this is not the only means by which Garneau Québécizes the text. Since it would be impossible for the Shakespearean text to correspond completely to Québec's historical or contemporary political situation, rather than try to make the entire text fit his agenda, Garneau exploits those points in the source text that are most vulnerable, regardless of plot or character constraints, unifying the nationalism discursively rather than structurally. At times, a Québécois nationalist discourse is voiced by characters from the other side of the plot-imposed hero/enemy binary, by Macbeth or the shipwrecked sailors, because the elimination of proper nouns blurs the self/other dichotomy and allows the

nationalist discourse to enter the text wherever it can best be articulated. For example, when asked at the beginning of the play whence he comes, Ross replies, "Du plein coeur d'la bataille / Ousqu' les drapeaux des étranges insultent / Not' beau ciel" (1.2.16),[42] a phrase that clearly evokes the battle of the Plains of Abraham, and still resonates today 25 years after the play's composition at a time when Québec-Canada flag wars rage as strong as ever (i.e. the sponsorship scandal as a Canadian flag war). This early scene casts Macbeth as the hero, yet later he becomes the "main damnée qui opprime" from whom Lennox reclaims liberation. In the final battle, Macbeth shifts once again into the role of hero, fighting single-handedly to hold off the invading English army: "Vous pouvez sacrer vot'camp, mes p'tits seigneurs manqués, allez-vous en / Gloutonner ac'les Angla's" (5.3.136).[43] That Garneau does not limit the insertion of nationalist discourses based on character restraints testifies to the plurivocality of the text. This plurivocality refutes the common charge that Québécois nationalism is exclusionist since all characters within the narrative may freely join the battle for the liberation of their nation. Their political allegiances within the world of the play do not limit their participation in and contribution to the nationalism. In this respect, Garneau's writing is more progressive than that of Lalonde, who figures Italian immigrants as a source of anxiety and as potential agents of the linguistic assimilation of *pure laine* Québécois, since *Macbeth* does not belie any fears about the recuperation or evacuation of nationalist discourse by outsiders but rather actively encourages their adoption of it.

Obviously, nationalist discourses in Québec in the late 1970's were far from homogenous; in fact, not all nationalist discourses of the period were also

sovereignist discourses; however, even those nationalists who didn't reclaim total political independence still agreed that Québec formed a distinct nation with a distinct culture. Garneau's valorization of the Québécois language, particularly in *Macbeth*, renders the play nationalist even in those instances when the text does not directly call for independence. The use of a *langue québécoise* implies the existence of a *peuple québécois*. The translation of Shakespeare into Québécois proves that Québécois is a language in its own right distinct from *français de France*. Since the first ontological criteria of a language is to express any reality it encounters, the capacity to translate the foreign reality of Shakespeare demonstrates that Québécois is a true language. At the same time, refusing to qualify Québécois as simply a subsidiary dialect of *français de France* eradicates what Brisset calls an "internal bilingualism" in which local orality is subconsciously "policed" by an overseas empire whose language cannot properly convey that local experience (269-70). Since, however, *Macbeth* is in 17th century Québécois, Brisset proposes that Garneau's tradaptation does not seek to endow readers with a new contemporary orality, but rather with a sense of their history and ancestral attachments (240).

Brisset also argues that readers of Garneau's *Macbeth* will have the impression that the Shakespearean tragedy admirably symbolizes the Québécois condition, and as such Québec's destiny takes on a universality which legitimizes the Québécois problem mythically beyond spatio-temporal borders (253). As easy as it is to problematize the very notion of universality, we must nonetheless recognize how the concept of universality does in fact legitimize nationalist discourses in Québec. The current sovereignist discourse in Québec relies on the

notion of universality when it reminds us that all over the world, from the Czech Republic to East Timor, more and more nations are acquiring full political statehood through democratic referenda. Since the composition of Garneau's plays, the context of globalization has made the concept of universality even more important as an answer to the false accusation that nationalists cannot see beyond Québec's own borders, transforming the notion of separatism as a *repli sur soi* into the political argument that a nation requires political independence in order to sit at the table of international organizations (such as the United Nations, World Trade Organization, World Health Organization, etc.) and interact with other nations from around the world in a fruitful and open dialogue. Thus, as problematic as the term may be theoretically for postcolonialists, Brisset is still correct to assert that Garneau's tradaptations attempt to appropriate not only the Shakespearean text but more importantly Shakespeare's so-called "universality". By minimizing the alterity of the British Shakespearean text, that is, by telling the same narrative with distinctly Québécois geographical and linguistic markers, the tradaptations attempt to ascend to the same level on the ladder of so-called "universality" and carve out a niche for themselves in the elite space of the Western canon. By association with Shakespeare, the Québécois tradaptations acquire canonical authority and the nation of Québec, as represented by the *langue québécoise*, passes from the status of marginal other to the canonical center where its selfhood is finally recognized. Unlike more radical Québécois adaptations of Shakespeare, such as *Henry.Octobre.1970*, Garneau's tradaptations do not necessarily subvert the eurocentrism which lends authority to the Shakespearean canon and they do not deconstruct the center/margin dichotomy,

but they do displace the center and appropriate its authority within that system in order to legimitize Québec's nationalist aspirations.

The project of national liberation in these tradaptations brings with it the emancipation of Shakespeare's women characters, particularly Lady Macbeth and Miranda, from the narrow, socially constructed roles to which they are confined by the source text; however, the adaptation of Miranda's character is both more progressive and more closely tied to the national project than that of Lady Macbeth. The decade of social reforms between publication of the tradaptation of *Macbeth* in 1978 and *La tempête* in 1989 is no doubt partly responsible for this discrepancy. In some cases, Garneau's *Macbeth* propagates the misogyny of Shakespeare's text towards Lady Macbeth by circumscribing her within the gender roles of 17th century New France rather than 20th century Québec, such as Macbeth's back-handed compliment that evokes the image of the dutiful, domestic wife. Rather than being his "dearest partner of greatness" (1.5.10), occupying an equal role in their enterprises, Lady Macbeth is transformed into Macbeth's moral support system and relieved of agency of her own; she becomes "eune femme comme y s'en fa't pus comme / Eune compagne encourageante à plein",[44] a traditional symbol of "Woman" that was in danger of no longer existing in the context of rising militant feminism in the Québec of the 1970's (1.5.33). The text's ambivalent characterization of women is most apparent in Lady Macbeth's famous "unsex me here" speech (1.5.39-53) in which the performativity of gender exposed in the Shakespearean source is further highlighted by the ambiguity of "sexe" to mean both "sex" and "gender".[45] Lady Macbeth's determined plea to be unsexed by spirits is transformed in the

tradaptation into a wistfully paradoxical rejection of what may be either her sex or her gender: "J'veux pus rien savoér d'mon beau sexe doux, j'veux pus rien savoér / D'mon beau sexe tendre" (1.5.34).[46] Garneau's Lady Macbeth praises her sex/gender as soft, tender, and beautiful even as she renounces it, thereby undermining the performative gesture of unsexing that Shakespeare's Lady Macbeth successfully accomplishes. In contrast, Garneau's Lady Macbeth performs most forcefully her femininity even at the very moment when she reneges on it. The tradapted text also introduces the possibility of homoeroticism, or at least autoeroticism, for Lady Macbeth's description of her own sex/gender as beautiful, soft, and tender praises these qualities in all members of the female sex. In addition, "sexe" in French also refers to genitals, so Lady Macbeth's homoerotic appreciation of the female sex / feminine gender in the broad sense can also be read as an autoerotic infatuation with her own body.

The effect of this ambivalent adaptation of Lady Macbeth's plea to be unsexed is that the potential allusion to radical feminism and the deconstruction of gender norms that was occurring in Québec in the late 1970's, as it did throughout the Western world, is severely undercut. Lady Macbeth's desire to be unsexed has the potential to be read as a renunciation of what Judith Butler would call the heterosexual matrix of sex/gender/desire and a celebration of the potential for an awareness and strategic manipulation of gender performativity to effect socio-political change. As I have argued elsewhere, Shakespeare's Lady Macbeth's gender identity may be read as "stone butch" by contemporary definitions of the term;[47] however, Garneau's Lady Macbeth evacuates her own potential to disrupt the matrix of sex/gender/desire. On one hand, her homoerotic desire for the

female body signals her potential to remove herself from the masculinist warrior culture of medieval Scotland, or even the Seven Years War between France and England, because her longing for the softness, beauty, and tenderness of her own sex/gender implies lesbian, and perhaps even separatist, tendencies. On the other hand, her hyper-feminization of the female body as soft and tender completely undercuts the potential for her material body to possess fully the masculinized strength that she seeks to help accomplish her goals.

While the hyper-feminization of Lady Macbeth fails to disrupt traditional gender binaries, the play's presentation of men does upset the dichotomy by eliminating sexual difference from key passages in the source text that reinforce the virility of the male characters. In order to prepare for the crowning of the new king after Duncan's murder, Macbeth tells Banquo, Macduff, Malcolm, and Donalbain that they should "put on manly readiness" (2.3.135), that is, full clothes and armour as well as a masculine temperament appropriate for the occasion. Garneau's Macbeth, however, says that they should "s'habiller comme du monde" (2.3.66),[48] a gender-neutral phrase that degenders the clothes, removes the implication that those clothes would in fact be armour, and disassociates the war-like temperament of those who wear the armour from a virile strength only accessible to men. This elimination of a gendered discourse of virility is repeated later in the play when Garneau translates Lady Macbeth's taunting question to Macbeth "What, quite unmanned in folly?"(3.4.74) as "T'es-tu en train de toute t'laisser envahir par la folie?" (3.4.88).[49] The tradaptation disrupts the gender relations of the Shakespearean text in two ways, first by disassociating Macbeth's madness with an ephemeral loss of manliness, and, second, by introducing an

even more disturbing image for the male character, his penetrability. Garneau's Macbeth does not simply lose his manhood, to have it disappear mysteriously into an unknown void as does the courage of Shakespeare's Macbeth. Rather, Garneau's Macbeth is invaded; that is, he is figured as raped by madness. The Québécois *Macbeth* thus betrays a fear of federasty. Rather than adapting Lady Macbeth to correspond more closely to the values of radical feminism popular in Québec in the late 1970's, it participates instead in the propagation of a *complexe de colonisé* in which the masculine is posited as always potentially penetrable, vulnerable, and conquerable.

La tempête, published eleven years later, focuses significantly more than *Macbeth* on the role of women in the nation that is soon to be reclaimed by Prospero, the omniscient father. From the outset, the tradaptation eliminates Shakespeare's most sexist language, cutting, for example, Gonzalo's comparison of the sinking ship "as leaky as an unstanched wench" (1.1.46-7) and thus the figuring of women as what Gail Kern Paster calls "leaky vessels" (25). The exorcism from the Shakespearean source text of the early modern anxiety surrounding women's lack of containment also applies to Prospero's relationship with Miranda which is less domineering in the tradaptation and therefore less focussed on controlling her speech. The tradaptation cuts Prospero's order for Miranda to "[o]bey and be attentive" (1.2.38). Instead, the text retains only the idea of "ope thine ear" (1.2.37), translated as a softer and more familiar "sois toutes oreilles" (1.2.16).[50] The increased mutuality of the father-daughter relationship in Garneau's tradaptation carries over to two key scenes regarding Miranda's marriage to Ferdinand, and, subsequently, the relationship between

gender and nation.

Prospero does not have the same dynastic project of regaining his kingdom through Miranda's marriage to Ferdinand in Garneau's adaptation of the play. Shakespeare's Prospero stages an elaborate court masque in celebration of Miranda's betrothal to Ferdinand (4.1.60-142), and repeatedly insists on the sexual abstinence of the couple until their marriage rites have been properly performed, that is, until the marriage has been sanctioned by Alonso, thereby assuring that his grandchildren will inherit both Milan and Naples. Garneau's tradaptation omits the entire masque with the goddesses of light, marriage, and the harvest—Iris, Juno, and Ceres—because the restoration of the Québécois Prospero's usurped kingdom does not pass through the reproductive capacity of his daughter's body as it does in Shakespeare's play. To suggest that national liberation is dependent on marriage and the bodies of women could offend the sensibilities of Québécois men and women in 1989 for whom the *revanche des berceaux* ended with the advent of the *Révolution tranquille*.

This elimination of the exploitation of women's bodies from the discourse of national liberation reoccurs in the final scene which cuts Gonzalo's romantic notion that "Milan [was] thrust from Milan that his issue / Should become kings of Naples" (5.1.205-6). This omission is crucial to the play's nationalism because Gonzalo's sentimentalist reliance on Fate would deprive Prospero of any agency in the reclamation of his usurped kingdom. The presence of Gonzalo's naïve trust in a higher power overseeing the many happy endings that he goes on to enumerate in Shakespeare's text would compromise the nationalist discourse underlying the tradaptation. The wait-and-see-what-happens-in-the-end attitude

of Gonzalo's claim might lessen the responsibility of the Québécois reader to acquire agency and reclaim the usurped nation. Equally, it would be problematic to include this speech in the tradaptation since it also implies that this new utopian nation will not be ruled by those who seek it in the present (such as Prospero) but rather by their children (such as Miranda and her own issue). In addition, this reclamation would be conditional on women collectively dedicating their bodies to biological reproduction, thereby tying the success of national liberation to their compulsory heterosexuality and domesticity. Like many Québécois women after the Quiet Revolution (for whom liberation from the Church also meant access to birth control for the first time, as the second gravedigger tells the first in Gurik's *Hamlet*), Garneau's Miranda fortunately escapes the fate suggested by Shakespeare's Gonzalo, and by extension the play rejects the notion of the *revanche des berceaux* and the nation's dependence on the bodies of women.

Garneau's Miranda also escapes the sacrifice of her individual independence as well. When Shakespeare's Ferdinand and Miranda are discovered playing chess, and Miranda accuses him of playing false, she also agrees to withdraw her accusation, and in so doing to deny her perception of reality, in order to remain an object of his heterosexual desire: "Yes, for a score of kingdoms you should wrangle, / And I would call it fair play" (5.1.174-5). While the game of chess and Miranda's accusation of Ferdinand's cheating remain in the tradaptation, this final line in which Miranda sanctions Ferdinand's future cheating is omitted. For Garneau's Miranda to accept Ferdinand's cheating would entail a sacrifice of her autonomy and individual free thought thereby creating a gender-based hierarchy within their relationship contrary to the beliefs of a

feminist readership in the late 1980's. Equally if not more problematic within the Québécois context, were Miranda to accept Ferdinand's falsehoods she would be complicit in the perpetuation of the colonization of the nation. To excuse acts which are not fair is to participate actively in the reinscription of one's own colonization. As the youthful heir to the soon to be restored nation, Miranda represents a new generation of Québécois who must be diligently conscious of false moves made against its best interests and liberate itself from the colonialist mindset of accepting the treachery of others. Miranda and Ferdinand's game of chess thus writes back to the game of chess of provincial-federal negotiations on a host of political matters, such as *la nuit des longues couteaux*. While writing back cannot undo false moves, that is, omitting Miranda's complicity does not negate Ferdinand's cheating, Miranda's refusal to excuse or to sanction those false moves does function as a model of steadfastness for the younger generation of Québécois to adopt in their future negotiations with those who refuse to play by the rules of the game.

Michel Garneau's tradaptations of Shakespeare thus subtly manipulate the Québécois language in their translation of the source text in order to advocate for the liberation of the usurped nation from the rule of tyrants. Unlike some other Québécois adaptations, Garneau's plays do not change the plot structure of Shakespeare's texts, or even the attribution of lines to different characters, in order to situate the plays' action simultaneously within the historical context of the Conquest as well as within the 1970's political context of neo-colonialism believed to have resulted from it. Minor cuts, the use of words that both convey the same message as the source and radically change it, and the valorization of a

distinctly Québécois language, history, geography, and hence culture all combine to manipulate the existing plot structure thereby giving new layers of signification to Malcolm's disposition of the tyrant who usurps his throne or to Prospero's reclamation of his usurped kingdom from his treacherous and deceptive brother. Garneau then supplements the nationalism already inherent in the plot structure with discursive incursions that enhance further the message of national liberation by pervading the text even when the structure does not allow it. The tradaptations are thus successful in defending the Québécois language because they not only reproduce with little change the "story" told by Shakespeare, thus illustrating the capacity of the Québécois language to reproduce his so-called "genius" and gain access to his so-called "universality", but they also dispel the need for Québécois readers to lapse into the internal bilingualism characteristic of colonized peoples whose language is policed by themselves and by the linguistic majority.

The plays that Garneau chooses to tradapt, however, a tragedy and a late romance, are profoundly patriarchal and almost devoid of women characters, thus leaving little potential for women to contribute or to figure prominently in the process of national reclamation. While Miranda's role in Garneau's text is certainly more promising in terms of the role of women in the reclamation of the usurped nation than in the Shakespearean source, or even than Lady Macbeth's role in Garneau's *Macbeth*, her contribution remains far less significant than that of the women characters who reconstruct the nation after its destruction by men in the adaptations of Jean-Pierre Ronfard, as we shall see in the next chapter, or the increased prominence of women and gender issues in Québécois adaptations after 1990, as we shall see in chapter five.

Notes to Chapter 3

[1] This is, of course, a reductive reading of Shakespeare's text; however, like most adaptations, summary readings of the source text are precisely the interpretation against which the adaptation works, and this broad reading of the plot does, in fact, qualify well the adaptation's use of the text.

[2] As is evident from the title of the manifesto, Lalonde's adoption of an exaggerated 16th century orthography which both imitates and mocks du Bellay's results in most words being misspelled in contemporary French. Since almost every word is misspelled purposely in the text to create temporal distance, I have chosen not to mark all of these words with "[*sic*]" in this chapter.

[3] "The Defense and Illustration of the Québécois Language. The Defense and Illustration of the French Language."

[4] "Difficulty to express oneself in the language of-one's-mother." "Mother tongue humiliates them personally so strongly."

[5] "Alienation." "Insult [her] family and by admiring too much Good Language finish by disrespecting the good people who speak [it]..."

[6] "Under the influence of anxiety the behaviour of the ostrich."

[7] "Refusing to admit the presence of a Conqueror & foreign Occupier, who dispossesses them a little more each day of the richness of their language and their culture." "Aggressor to cut down."

[8] "Occupy their hole." "At the bottom of their own humiliation."

[9] "Less and less colonized." "Anyway, the enemy is France."

[10] "Reunited under a bold sceptre capable of leading them very, very far."

[11] "Surrounded on all sides by powerful foreigners, sometimes English, sometimes American, even, recently, Italian, who ... subject them to their laws, privileges, and rights acquired [from living] on this territory for a more or less long time."

[12] "This excellent psychological disposition is truly and surely recognized by any disposition of our laws or proclamation of Independence very real and clear, heard by the United Nations."

[13] "The nation that wants to speak doesn't even manage today to conjugate its strengths in the first person indicative."

[14] Garneau's three tradaptations present remarkable differences in terms of the degree to which they are adapted. *Macbeth*, the first text that was actually published (although not the first which he translated), is by far the most radical both in terms of the language employed, which constitutes an entire semantic system in its own right, and the discursive differences produced by this new vocabulary. At the other extreme, *Coriolan* rarely diverges from the Shakespearean source text at all, and the language is the most standardized of the three texts, employing no *joual* to distinguish it from international French. *La tempête* lies in the middle between the two. The French spelling and syntax is mostly regularized, but it does employ distinctly Québécois terms, such as Caliban's insult to Stéphano as "ce niasieux" (5.1.125), and the nationalism is readily apparent. I limit this discussion to *Macbeth* and *La tempête* since they adapt the Shakespearean source text much more significantly than *Coriolan*. This distinction between *Coriolan* and the other two tradaptations holds true not only in terms of nation but also in terms of gender, since the tradaptation does not

alter the representation of Shakespeare's women characters, Volumnia, Virgilia, and Valeria, or the representation of masculinity performed by Caius Martius and Tullus Aufidius.

[15] As the most notable Québécois adaptation of Shakespeare of the 1970's, and unique in its use of archaic Québécois, Garneau's *Macbeth* has received a great deal of critical attention from scholars; however, this criticism is entirely performance-oriented. See Andrès and Lefèbvre, Hodgdon, Lieblein, ("Cette", "Remaking") and Salter ("Between", "Borderlines"). While all of these scholars discuss briefly the exceptional Québécois language of the text, their discussions of the play focus on the play in performance rather than the context of the text itself. Hodgdon and Salter focus in particular on Robert Lepage's 1993 staging with little interest in Garneau's text which is "difficult to understand" for actors and audiences ("Borderlines" 72).

[16] "At home." "Country."

[17] See Brisset, chapter 3, esp. pp. 207-22, for a comprehensive discussion of the two passages that Garneau omits.

[18] "I'm skipping from line 38 to line 47 because it's confused and confusing."
Since Garneau's texts do not provide line numbers, but they do follow Shakespeare's act and scene divisions, references to Garneau's two tradaptations indicate act, scene, and page numbers as they appear in Garneau's texts.

[19] "It would be a blessing and a heavenly justice if our country were liberated from the cursed hand that oppresses it."
As this first citation of a complete sentence of dialogue makes clear, Garneau's phonetic transcription of an 17th century dialect results in most words being misspelled in contemporary French. Since a large percentage of words are misspelled purposely in his text for phonetic effect, I have chosen not to mark all of these words with "[*sic*]" in this chapter.

[20] Following H.L. Rogers in *'Double Profit' in Macbeth* (1964), Muir suggests transposing the lines as follows (xxxiv n.2):
Lord: That, by the help of these (with Him above / To ratify the work), we may again / Give to our tables meat, sleep to our nights, / Free from our feasts and banquets bloody knives, / Do faithful homage, and receive free honours, / All which we pine for now. (32-37)
Lennox: Sent he to Macduff? (39)
Lord: He did: and with an absolute 'Sir, not I,' / The cloudy messenger turns me his back, / And hums, as who should say, 'You'll rue the time / That clogs me with this answer.' (40-43) / And this report / Hath so exasperate the King, that he / Prepares for some attempt of war. (37-39)
Lennox: And that well might / Advise him to a caution, t'hold what distance / His wisdom can provide. (43-45)

[21] "I am not translating from lines 139 to 161 (Oxford University Press edition) because it's the scene with the doctor in which they talk about the gift of healing of the king of England, a filler scene as we say in film, that has nothing to do with the dramatic action and doesn't even sound very Shakespearean."
The line numbers of Garneau's Oxford edition correspond to the Oxford edition I use here.

[22] "Together, we'll make it! / Our cause cannot be any more just! Victory is waiting for us / At the end of the road."

[23] "Our poor country almost has trouble recognizing itself. / Our mother country, we can almost no longer call it mother, have to / More closely say grave, mass ditch. It's only naïve people / Who know nothing about anything who have the heart to smile in our home. / ... / The only ecstasy that is allowed to reign / Is to have all the pain of the world."

[24] "White geese" also known as "snow geese."

[25] "The forest." "The hill."

[26] Although Annie Brisset notes the deletion of the proper names of Birnam wood and Dunsinan hill (205), she overlooks the discrepancy in the translation of the direction in which the forest moves. While she claims that the play is localized in Québec by the omission of these proper names (205), and while she also claims in relation to another passage in the text that the action is associated with the battle of the Plains of Abraham (206), she fails to connect the two claims or to associate either one with the anomalous translation of the forest's movement which, surprisingly, she does not discuss at all.

[27] All citations from Shakespeare's *Macbeth* refer to the 1998 Oxford edition. Citations from *The Tempest* are taken from the Arden 3rd series edition.

[28] "Macbeth won't be beaten until the forest goes down the hill."

[29] "You'll tell every soldier to rip off a bush, a shrub, / Or else a little tree to hide himself with, like that they won't have / Any idea of the number we are and besides it's an error that will allow us / To surprise them."

[30] Garneau is said to have based his approximation of a 17th century dialect on the language still spoken in the mid-1970's in rural Gaspé. Although this dialect was still spoken contemporarily with a heavily-inflected accent, it is still archaic compared to Québécois spoken in the urban centers. A parallel can be drawn between Acadian French spoken in southwest Nova Scotia which is a mix of 16th century French, Micmac, and English. This Acadian dialect is archaic (from a standard-French perspective), despite being still spoken, since it remains much the same as that spoken at the time of Rabelais due to the region's geographic isolation that prevented the language from developing the same way French developed in France or Québec. The same can also be said for some elements of contemporary Québécois *joual*, such as words similar to *moi* and *roi* whose pronunciation in *joual* as *moé* and *roé* corresponds to how the words were pronounced in France when settlers first immigrated to New France.

[31] "We'd be better to scram out of here; even more so / That we don't know exactly what to cry about. I'm like numb in front of this sadness, the pain is coming over me slowly."

[32] "Liver of blasphemer."

[33] "The source, the river of our blood, / The true resource of our lives, it's all drying up."

[34] "Our father has suffered murder."

[35] "Our father who art in heaven..."

[36]" I would like to know if the priests have / Put you to sleep enough that you're going to continue to pray / For the soul of this worthy man."

[37]" Betrayed." "Vile betrayal." "Good army of hypocrites and traitors." "Bunch of two-sided faces."

[38] "Largely crushed by our miseries." "Our story/history breaks my heart."

[39] "You lie like a lawyer."

[40] "Dirty trick," from "salope" meaning slut.

[41] "And my own brother let himself be tempted / by the devil and my trust in him / met a great lie / and he became master / not only of my revenues / but also of my power itself / from the habit of lying / he ended up believing his falsehoods / to see them as legitimate."
In contrast, Shakespeare's Prospero says, "I thus neglecting worldly ends /... / in my false brother / Awaked an evil nature, and my trust, / Like a good parent, did beget of him / A falsehood in its contrary as great / As my trust was, which had indeed no limit, / A confidence sans bound. He being thus lorded, / Not only with what my revenue yielded / But what my power might else exact, like one / Who, having into truth by telling of it, / Made such a sinner of his memory / To credit his lie, he did believe / He was indeed the duke, out o'th' substitution / And executing th'outward face of royalty / With all prerogative" (1.2.89-105).

[42] "From the very heart of the battle / Where the flags of foreigners insult / Our beautiful sky."
In contrast, Shakespeare's Ross says, "From Fife, great King, / Where the Norweyan banners flout the sky, / And fan our people cold" (1.2.49-51).

[43] "You can run away, you little failed lords, go / Be gluttonous with the English."
In contrast, Shakespeare's Macbeth says, "Then fly, false Thanes, / And mingle with the English epicures" (5.3.7-8).

[44] "A woman like they don't make 'em anymore like / A fully encouraging companion."

[45] In fact, recent scholarship in French is beginning to translate "gender" as "genre", but this practice has only begun in the last five years, the word "genre" has not yet reached the general public so as to be easily comprehensible in French, and the most certainly was not commonly employed in 1978 when Garneau published *Macbeth*.

[46] "I want nothing more to do with my beautiful, soft sex/gender, I want nothing more to do with / My beautiful, tender sex/gender."

[47] "Ungender Hir Here: Lady Macbeth's Stone Butch Blues". Unpublished conference paper. Canadian Lesbian and Gay Studies Association, Congress of the Social Sciences and Humanities, Dalhousie University, June 2003.

[48] Literally, "to get dressed like many people," but, metaphorically, "to get dressed appropriately as befits people of good standing."

[49] "Are you in the process of letting yourself be completely invaded by madness?"

[50] "Be all ears."

Chapter 4

Daughters of the Carnivalized Nation in Jean-Pierre Ronfard's *Lear* and *Vie et mort du Roi Boiteux*

Jean-Pierre Ronfard's plays *Lear* (1977) and *Vie et mort du Roi Boiteux* (1981), adaptations of Shakespeare's *King Lear* and of *Richard III* respectively, employ carnival and magic realism to parody the bastardized state of the nation whose corruption and decay can be eliminated only by the rise to power of strong willed women.[1] Rabelaisian carnival dominates every aspect of these two adaptations; food, drinking, rampant sexuality, and the grotesque lower body abound in every scene, but, since it is temporary the result of carnival must ultimately be the reinstatement and solidification of social order. Thus, when the decrepitude of the nation precipitated by absentee male rulers finally reaches its apogee at the close of both plays, that is, when there is no old order left for the carnivalesque to reverse, only the daughters of the former rulers remain to assume the responsibility of taking the fate of the nation into their own hands and leading it to a brighter future. Ronfard's plays, especially *Vie et mort*, mark the beginning of a true recognition of the interdependence of nation and gender in the Québécois tradition of adaptations of Shakespeare. In addition, Ronfard's carnivalesque approach to Shakespearean adaptation illustrates, quite literally in the case of *Lear*, the artificiality of the signifier 'Shakespeare' as the embodiment of high culture, simultaneously appropriating and undercutting *le grand Will*'s claim to cultural authority.

The composition and production of Ronfard's two adaptations straddle a crucial turning point in Québec's history, the 1980 referendum on sovereignty-

association in which the No side won 60% to 40% over the Yes side. The Québécois population's struggle for political independence, and their subsequent rejection of it, marks both of these plays. Whereas in the pre-referendum *Lear* the declining state of nation, and the need to rescue it, figures prominently throughout the play, in the post-referendum *Vie et mort du Roi Boiteux* the obvious degeneration of the nation is relegated to the background of the play in favour of a focus on gender relations and sexuality until the nation finally acquires a new ruler at the play's end. The later play's inquiry into women's independence in marriage and political role in society corresponds to the historical rise of the feminist movement in Québec in the 1970's and its increased social presence following the temporary decline in focus on the national question after the 1980 referendum.

Lear was performed at the *Théâtre expérimental de Montréal* in January 1977 and published in the TEM's own journal, *TRAC*, in April of the same year. The play's truncated title immediately informs the audience/reader that it is an adaptation, devoid of the regal decorum of Shakespeare's *King Lear*. The adaptation conserves the basics of Shakespeare's main plot but very little of the text. The cast of characters is also trimmed to the bare minimum, but the parallels to Shakespeare are obvious: *Le Roi* (who, unnamed, is only addressed as king or father) is King Lear; Josette is Goneril; Violette is Regan; Laurette/*Le Fou* is Cordelia/The Fool; Corneille, a woman, assumes the parts of Kent and Gloucester while her son, Hector, is the adaptation's Edmund figure. Ronfard adds two new characters, two "Shakespeares" who work the stage lighting while drinking half-pints of beer in the play's tavern/technical booth. The drunken Shakespeares

signal from the outset the adaptation's parodic undercutting of the Bard's authority and set the tone for the carnivalesque debauchery that ensues.

The play opens with the first Shakespeare's consternation, "Notre pays est malade, profondément malade" (6).[2] The accuracy of his assessment is immediately confirmed when the king emerges from behind crumpled newspapers to divide up the nation he wishes to bestow on his daughters and the reasons for the nation's sickness are revealed: the king lacks agency; therefore, the nation is in a survivalist mode and consuming itself in order to remain barely alive. The nation is represented, rather than by a map, by a pizza that the first two daughters begin to eat, literally acting out their self-interested consummation of the nation's resources in disregard of the needs of its people. The nation's decline is also signalled poignantly by the king's unwitting revelation that his regal power is nothing more than an empty signifier devoid of any real authority. He pitifully requests that his daughters profess their love for him "dans cette belle langue qui nous reste encore, signe et symbole de notre pouvoir ancestral" (7).[3] Language is one of the only remnants of the nation's historical strength, but since it is never used performatively by the king even the national language is nothing more than a symbol; the former power of the nation's ancestors now lacks agency. While language is frequently the ultimate signifier of cultural difference, culture itself has been reduced to nothing more than an ineffective life support system for the nation's heritage. In the king's own metaphor, "La culture [...] nous relie au souffle et au sang des ancêtres comme les tuyaux de toutes les couleurs entretiennent à l'hôpital l'existence du moribond momifié dans ses bandelettes" (28).[4] As little more than artificial respiration for a terminally ill nation, culture

can only prolong survival, but it cannot heal the nation's sickness or endow it with agency. In a brief moment of clarity, the king recognizes that survival is not progress.

The king's symbolic, self-inflicted disempowerment, which signals a loss of agency by the nation, and hence by the individual subjects composing the collectivity, results in a national lack of direction since the king's approach is survivalist, focusing on barely keeping the past alive rather than building a future. The striking image of culture on life support as a futile prolongation of its death works in the play as a criticism of the common survivalist approach to Québécois nationalism prevalent in the late 1970's. First performed just two months after the historic election of the PQ to power on November 15, 1976, and shortly before the instauration of Bill 101, the *Charte de la langue française*, on August 26, 1977, the adaptation denounces here what is forcibly a colonized attitude towards independence, that is, that the priority of nationalism is to preserve the dying remains of the past rather than to build collectively a better future. When Corneille seeks reassurance about the ability of the king's daughters to run the country (one of whom is writing to a nuclear power plant while the other masturbates loudly in the corner), the king replies, "Les charges de pouvoir, je connais ça. Bien content d'en être débarassé [*sic*]" (16).[5] By throwing away his responsibility as national leader to maintain and exercise authority, the king also strips his subjects of the agency necessary to heal the wounded nation. The king's lack of direction (in the sense of leadership) of the nation causes the collectivity to lack direction (in the sense of goals); thus, the play criticizes the colonized attitude of Québécois survivalist nationalism. The nation needs goals; that is, it

needs a *projet de pays* (a horse in Rodéo's terms) oriented towards the future rather than desperate attempts to preserve a dying past. Even more importantly, it needs to reclaim agency to achieve those goals; that is, it must stop conceiving of political power, and by extension the concept of sovereignty, as a responsibility which is too heavy to carry, a burden to be happily surrendered. Rather, the nation must see kingship/sovereignty as a privileged opportunity to create something enduring for the future, something that goes beyond individualist, masturbatory, fleeting pleasures, such as those which Josette and Violette seek.

In justification of his abdication of sovereignty, the king claims that the new order inaugurated by his daughters is completely "normal" (16), but what is really normalized by his abdication is disorder. The nation has entered into a permanent state of carnival-like topsy-turvyness. Carnival, in Bakhtin's terms, normally celebrates a "temporary liberation from the prevailing truth and from the established order", marking "the suspension of all hierarchical rank, privileges, norms, and prohibitions" (10), and it creates a parallel "second-world" (11). However, at the beginning of *Lear* the established order has been completely replaced by carnivalized disorder since the daughters already belonged to the world of carnival before they were consecrated the new rulers of the nation; therefore, this "second world" shows no signs of being "temporary". Michael Bristol argues that carnival has "*both* a social and an antisocial tendency" (*Carnival* 25), and in Ronfard's *Lear* Josette and Violette embody its antisocial elements since their self-interested gratification (as symbolized by their voracious appetites for food and sex) is antithetical to the reification of the community that ought to emerge from carnivalesque disorder. Carnival does not serve its intended

purpose of creating a free-for-all zone alongside order; rather, it replaces it entirely for the duration of the play.

Josette finally recognizes near the end of the play that disorder reigns completely in the nation, but by then it is too late for her to reinstate the former order that existed prior to her carnivalesque take-over. Although she derived personal pleasure from specific carnivalesque elements such as food and sex, carnival is "not an individual reaction" but for "all the people" (Bakhtin 11). When Josette realizes that carnival is in fact a collective event that must forcibly encompass the entire nation, she suddenly becomes highly critical of it because she understands that it endows the people with the liberty to subvert her authority:

> Il faut que ça change! Rien ne marche dans cette maison. [...] Des folles excitées, seins au vent, bourrent le crâne de leur [sic] leurs congénères et commencent à nous casser les oreilles avec leurs slogans démagogiques : 'le vieux pouvoir est mort!', 'vive le droit des peuples à disposer de tout!', 'le jour se lève...la couleur du ciel change...saluons la naissance d'un nouvel ordre!'. Et c'est moi, (*gémissements de Violette dans son lit.*) enfin moi et ma sœur, c'est nous qu'on attend pour le réaliser ce fameux nouvel ordre. Imbéciles! L'ordre est l'ordre. Il n'a pas à être nouveau ou ancien. L'ordre n'a pas de couleur. (54)[6]

The half-naked women demand that carnivalized nation embody the true spirit of carnival which is in fact democracy since one of the principal features of carnival is the equality of everyone through the temporary abolition of socially constructed rank, class, age, and gender norms. The people's slogans, which, ironically, Josette qualifies as demagogic, sum up the democratic principles that underlie

carnival, that is, the rule of the people by the people rather than social superiors, and the new, second-world, order that is born out of the death of the established order. Josette's futile protest that order is order lacks credibility due to the hypocrisy of the sudden rejection of her own carnivalesque nature and due to her reluctant acknowledgement that her sister, who is fully engaged in carnivalesque sexuality at that precise moment, shares her social authority. Everything around her confirms that there is a distinct difference between carnivalesque democracy and the authoritarian control that she seeks to impose to wipe it out. Moreover, her claim that order has no colour resonates particularly strongly in a Québécois context where order is often symbolized by "flag wars" and where the differences between red, federalist order and blue, nationalist order affect nearly every aspect of the population's democratic life. In the context of the recent 1976 election of the PQ and a pending 1980 referendum on independence, Josette's reactionary response to a new order becomes a parodic criticism of those who fail to see the differences, and the advantages, of a new order in the which people have the right to dispose of their own affairs.

The carnivalization of the nation and the creation of a new order is embodied in the character of Hector. A bastard, and thus the personification of illegitimacy's triumph over order, Hector is significantly "baser" than his Shakespearean counterpart Edmund. Edmund questions the socially constructed nature of an order that categorizes humans as either base or legitimate, but he nonetheless strives to ascend within that order through the acquisition of his father's lands and titles. He criticizes the system but does not seek to topple it. Hector, on the other hand, relishes the baseness of bastardy and strives to reverse

the former social order so that baseness may leave its mark on all elements of the nation. Hector literalizes onstage his valorization of baseness when, after entering pulling a "seau de merde" (19), "il se met à lancer des boules de marde partout, particulièrement sur le trône, sur la cages des shakespeares-techniciens et au plafond" (20).[7] This scatological scattering of the abject incites Hector to invoke the "temps dénaturé" in a soliloquy reminiscent of Edmund's plea to Nature (1.2.1-22), but rather than attempting to elevate the base to an equal status with the legitimate, Hector praises the ability of the base to soil and to overthrow social order entirely: "Vive la bâtardise / Qui bouleverse les lois / Qui souille les églises / Et détrône les rois" (20-21).[8] His concluding cry of "Les bâtards au pouvoir !", which he howls "avec la force convaincante du contestataire du choc", provokes the uprising of a horde of protesters who take up his slogan (21).[9] The facility with which Hector creates a popular uprising reaffirms that the reversal of the social order for which he advocates has already begun to take place since the king's abdication. Bastards can be in power because the former order has crumbled and been replaced by a new one in which the people, his horde of protesters, have instated the democracy of carnival.

This state of carnival also extends from the nation to the gender relations found in Ronfard's *Lear*. Carnival typically subverts gender hierarchies and permits a fluid exchange whereby sexed bodies may temporarily occupy their opposite gender role, most notably by adopting drag, which as Judith Butler notes in *Gender Trouble*, parodies heterosexuality by exposing the social constructedness of gender itself (174, 187). Ronfard's adaptation uses carnival both to reverse gender roles and to accentuate the performativity of gender. The

reversal of gender roles already occurs in Shakespeare's *King Lear*; Lear is emasculated by Goneril and Regan's appropriation of the phallus when they begin to exercise his regal authority. In this sense, Ronfard's adaptation does not innovate; it merely literalizes the theme, with a crudeness typical of carnivalesque sexuality, when the king soliloquizes upon his downtrodden state: "je suis fourré, jusqu'à l'os. [...] Violette, par dérision, a fait rajouter aux armoiries royales un pénis de sinople sur fond de gueules qu'elle prétend m'avoir dérobé à jamais. C'est dur" (24).[10] The term "dérision" occurs frequently in Ronfard's Shakespearean adaptations, especially in *Vie et mort*, and it captures the carnivalesque spirit found in the tone of the texts themselves, as evidenced here by the pun on "dur" that can refer both to the king's difficulty in accepting his emasculation and to the firmness of Violette's appropriated phallic symbol.

The performativity of gender is highlighted frequently in Shakespearean comedy by the many characters who don drag and pass successfully, most notably Viola/Cesario in *Twelfth Night* and Rosalind/Ganymede in *As You Like It.* In Ronfard's *Lear*, though, the carnivalization of gender, marked by a playful exposure of its performativity, takes a sinister twist in the course of a long dialogue between the king and Corneille. As in Shakespeare when Lear doesn't recognize Kent, the king asks who Corneille is, to which she replies that she is a woman, which the king then surmises "n'est pas grand chose", that is, not much of anything (32), or, in a throw-back to Shakespeare, "nothing" more than a vagina (1.1.90). When Corneille adds that she is the king's old accomplice, he ignores her gender in order to fulfill his desire to reminisce:

LE ROI : Raconte-moi, Corneille. Raconte notre dernier exploit.

CORNEILLE : Je suis gênée.

LE ROI : Entre hommes.

CORNEILLE : Si tu veux. (*D'un seul coup elle prend une voix avinée, une attitude de corps de garde, une face de salaud. Elle replace des couilles imaginaires.*) [...] On s'est dit: '[...] on en a dans la culotte, oui ou non? Bien sûr qu'on en a. Deux belles grosses comme grand-père'. (32-33)[11]

On one hand, the king's assertion that a woman is nothing makes the category of "woman" an empty signifier, thereby reaffirming "man" as the only gender which can lay claim to meaning in the nation's clearly patriarchal culture. On the other hand, Corneille's effortless transition from the materiality of her female sexed body to the performance of a male one, that is, her adoption of a transgendered identity through the growth of imaginary balls (in both the literal and metaphorical sense), demonstrates the fluidity and social constructedness of all signs of gender. Corneille's immaterial gesture of grabbing them like a man confirms both her masculine gender identity and her entrance into the boy's club of male homosociality of which the king is the guardian, and it also highlights that all gender is a mere simulacrum of social norms without origin.

The sinister twist to the adaptation's carnvalization of gender comes at the climax of Corneille's story about their conquest of a village and arson of abandoned warehouses in which local women were hiding from them:

> Elles arrachaient leurs vêtements qui les brûlaient la peau. Nues, elles sautaient sur place comme des sauterelles estropiées. Elles se sont groupées en un tas au milieu des nôtres qui rigolaient de leur bon coup.

'Heïe! C'est moi le roi!' Tu as crié. 'À moi la fleur!' Tu as tombé culotte et toute l'armée a vu. Toute l'armée t'a vu dans toute ta puissance. Elles y ont passé l'une après l'autre. Écartelées par quatre soldats qui se relayaient. Tu étais infatiguable [*sic*]. Tu riais de plaisir. Tu hurlais de rage et de fureur. Et ça y allait. Et ça y allait. Tu as enfourché la dernière en bâillant à te décrocher la mâchoire. Et tu t'es écrasé au sol, endormi tout d'un coup. Je t'ai recouvert de mon manteau. Quand tu t'es réveillé, au petit matin de la victoire, la fille sous toi était morte.

(*Pendant tout le récit, Corneille et le roi se taponnent, se frottent, s'excitent l'un l'autre. Corneille chevauche le roi et l'épuise. Ils finissent écrasés à terre.*) (35)[12]

Corneille's fluid transition from biological woman to performative man leaves her in a problematic position (much like that experienced by contemporary FTM's [female to male transsexuals]) because her gender identity is unfixed, floating in a liminal space between the material body that the audience sees before them and the "almost but not quite" mimicry of masculinity (to adapt Bhabha) which fails to mask it (*Location* 86).[13] The audience is thus forced to question where her gender allegiances lie in this brutal, mass rape with which she was complicit. The text (and its accompanying photographs of the original performance in which she is smiling) implies that she has fully adopted the identity of a male soldier and that she derives great pleasure from the king's and, by association, her own show of virility. She shows no sympathy for the four raped women or even for the one who dies under the weight of the king. Her transition across gender lines and initiation into male homosociality, with the potential privileges (or peer pressure?)

of rape which it confers, appears to be complete.

Yet, Corneille's entry into the world of male homosocial bonding is complicated and undercut by the image of her female body sexually straddling the king in a re-enactment of heterosexuality. The mutuality of the sexual exchange in which they excite each other throughout the course of the story indicates that Corneille's masculine identity does not interfere with her female body's ability to derive pleasure from heterosexual interaction. However, her re-enactment of heterosexual intercourse further complicates any interpretation of the story. On the one hand, she occupies the role of the women in the story, making the story itself a rape fantasy from which she derives excitement. On the other hand, her physical position astride the king that ends with them lying together exhausted on the ground (presumably with her still on top) re-enacts the king's crushing of the girl underneath him at the same moment that she recounts that part of the story. This reading constitutes another gender role reversal by which Corneille becomes the king and the king becomes the dead girl that he had raped. Alternatively, if the king continues to ignore Corneille's female body during the story and interacts solely with the masculine gender identity that she performs, then their mutual sexual excitement is no longer heterosexual at all; instead it is homoerotic, a slippage into the realm of physicality of the homosocial bond of soldiers. I would argue that all of these multiple and contradictory levels of interpretation are in fact at work in the scene simultaneously. The scene thus performs the performativity of gender itself by highlighting the impossibility of fixity in a scene whose disturbing textual content is undercut and disjointed by the pervasiveness of reversals.

The treatment of gender in Ronfard's *Lear* also diverges notably from Shakespeare in the play's conclusion. Whereas in Shakespeare the responsibility of rebuilding the nation falls to Albany who offers it to Edgar,[14] in Ronfard's adaptation no counterparts exist for these two characters, and the only character still alive at the end is Laurette, the Cordelia figure:

> *Tout le monde est donc mort sauf Laurette. Elle arrive revêtue d'une grande chemise blanche, pieds nus, cheveux dénoués; elle n'a plus son maquillage de fou. Elle passe au milieu du charnier et se dirige vers le trône, au bout du tapis rouge. Elle y monte, s'y installe et d'un beau geste tranquille, elle tire la langue et la tient entre le pouce et l'index. Elle s'immobilise.* (70)[15]

The only rebuilder of the destroyed nation is a pure, angelic woman (as symbolized by her large white shirt), but she has been silenced and rendered static by the men as well as her own sisters. The nation lacks solidarity, as do the gender relations typified by her sisters; therefore, she is unable to speak or to act on behalf of a community (either national or sororal) which does not recognize her participation in it. In their own self-destruction, the rest of the characters also unwittingly destroy the possibility of the rebirth and regeneration which is normally the outcome of carnival. Within the confines of the play, there is no return from the death of the carnivalesque second-world to another new social order. Yet, despite her silence, as the lone survivor and an angelic figure, Laurette still represents hope since she escapes the fate of both of her Shakespearean counterparts, Cordelia who dies, and the Fool who inexplicably disappears. Although the final scene is one of desolation, the image of Laurette's purity stands

out remarkably in contrast to the death/absence of her Shakespearean counterparts. She still symbolizes the potential for rebirth even though it is not actualized.

The audience/reader can still find hope for change and regeneration in Laurette's character at the end of the play because it is located in her from the very beginning through her steadfast surveillance of the affairs of the nation and refusal to accept an unjustified exile (contrary to what the audience knows for certain of Shakespeare's Cordelia). When the king banishes her for failing to speak during the love test, Laurette tells herself that it is out of the question to "faire du tourisme africain quand c'est ici que ça se passe" (13).[16] In opposition to the references to African decolonization in Gurik's *Hamlet*, Laurette's statement marks a turn in nationalist discourse in the nine years between the two adaptations. Whereas Gurik's adaptation valorizes African decolonization, and thus encourages Québécois nationalists to study and learn from it, Ronfard's adaptation emphasizes that it is here, that is, in Québec, that things are happening. It is no longer the time to quietly observe international events from the outside like a tourist; it is now the time to be in the center of the action, and Laurette implicitly accepts the challenge by refusing exile.

Laurette's adoption of this progressive, action-oriented attitude thus brands her as a source of regeneration from the play's outset. Even the silence and immobility with which she ends the play cannot entirely diminish the potential that she embodies since she held her tongue in the exact same manner during the love test, that is, at a moment of resistance to the king's capriciousness when silence may represent internal strength. Now that the king and her sisters are dead

at her feet, the closing image of her in her self-imposed silence is imbued with uncertainty, and the audience/reader may envision that her liberation from the conditions leading up to her silence will allow her to liberate herself from it. Her potential to rebuild the nation, that is *passer à l'action*, remains unconstrained, like her flowing, white shirt. While Lieblein, on the other hand, claims that the king's dying words, "Le reste est silence" (68) from *Hamlet* (5.2.363), indicate that "the father (Lear? Shakespeare?) proves unable to empower his child's speech" ("Nation" 274), I would argue that Lear's dying words may strengthen the reading of Laurette as a pillar of strength. Like Hamlet when he speaks to Horatio, Lear's death does not indicate that everything is silent or that the dramatic action has come to a close; rather, Hamlet and Lear emphasize only their own silence in order to encourage that their tale be told by someone close to them whom they trust and on whom they can count to oversee the rebirth of the state after their death. Liberated from the king's patriarchal rule that was responsible for her initial silence, at the end of the adaptation Laurette has leave, like Horatio, to "speak to th'yet unknowing world / … / Of carnal, bloody, and unnatural acts, / Of accidental judgments, [and] casual slaughters" and thus instate a new order in the aftermath of the carnivalesque chaos which has just ensued (5.2.384-7).

In fact, the play's conclusion is marked by an unexpected, if not parodic, regeneration of another sort. After all the other characters have died (except Laurette who is still offstage), the two Shakespeares mysteriously decide to engage in a sword fight that resonates with the polite decorum of Hamlet and Laertes' duel. They stab each other and both fall down dead, but after Laurette returns onstage the adaptation ends on a note of magic realism with Shakespeare's

return from the dead:

> *Coup de théâtre: l'un des Shakespeares, en gémissant se redresse, arrache l'épée qui le perforait, se traîne, agonisant, vers la cabine d'éclairage et dans un dernier élan de vie, éteint les lumières, en disant*:
>
> 2 : Calvaire! (70)[17]

The death of Shakespeare by himself, and his surprising spontaneous regeneration, functions as a metaphor for the ambivalent status of Shakespeare in Québécois adaptations of his works. On one level, this scene reinscribes and reinforces the bard's canonical authority through the implication that nobody can kill off Shakespeare entirely, not even Shakespeare himself; he will continue to pop up when we least expect it, if not in one incarnation then in another. On another level though, this scene undercuts that same authority by highlighting how easily and successfully Shakespeare can be manipulated and appropriated by Québécois playwrights. Shakespeare's pronunciation of a typically Québécois blasphemy with his dying breath, in contrast to the Elizabethan English spoken during the preceding duel and the "standard" French of the opening scene, confers on Shakespeare an "authentic" Québécois identity, that of the *pure laine*, francophone, beer-drinking working class. Rather than being crushed by the weight of Shakespeare's canonical authority, Québécois popular culture has turned the tables on him and forced Shakespeare to adopt its discourse. The final word of the play is a blasphemous baptism of Shakespeare that marks him as Québécois.

The tenuous balance between so-called "authentic" Shakespeare and his appropriation within the Québécois context is the subject of several other

intertextual moments in the adaptation. During the equivalent of Shakespeare's storm scene, the fool hides in the rafters and pours down water onto the two Shakespeares who, huddled together under "*un parapluie typiquement 'british'*", "*se lancent, avec verve et conscience historique [...] dans la grande narration du rêve de Clarence (authentiquement tirée de RICHARD III du grand William)*" (46-48).[18] The excerpt from Shakespeare's *Richard III* is in fact "authentic" insofar as it is a literal translation with no additions or cuts that alter in any way the meaning of the source text (1.4.1-33). Nonetheless, the authority of this "authentic" text is undercut both in the published text of the adaptation by the familiarity of the reference to Shakespeare by his first name, and the mocking jab at the stereotype of the British weather, and the two Shakespeares' ironic obliviousness to the fact that they are being drowned like Clarence by the Fool's "pipi de chat" (cat pee) (50). This carnivalesque association of Shakespeare with the grotesque lower body also takes place at the end of the horde's protest when "*le roi contemple une boule de merde qu'il tient dans sa main, dans une posture qui rappelle Michel-Ange, Rodin, l'Hamlet traditionnel*" (21).[19] In both cases, the reduction of Shakespeare from cerebral philosopher to a target of the products of the grotesque lower body serves to undercut seriously the popular conception of his "greatness" within a false high culture / low culture hierarchy.

The grotesque body is, of course, a dominant feature in Shakespeare's works, as Bakhtin points out (11), but in the popular imaginary Shakespeare's name tends to be associated with high culture to the convenient exclusion of the bawdy and carnivalesque elements of his plays. In fact, Ronfard's adaptation plays upon, even as it subverts, the popularity of this false high culture / low

culture binary of "Shakespeare" as signifier of "universal human greatness" (and other implied hyperboles of the like) versus the carnivalesque and the grotesque. The protest by the horde of pro-bastard supporters culminates in the opposition collapsing in on itself:

> *Sur leur trajet, ils rencontrent les deux shakespeares sorties de leur cage par curiosité. Deux mondes sont confrontés. Silence. Immobilité. Question : Qu'est que nous faisons tous ici ? Chacun s'abîme dans ce vide théâtral plein d'angoisse métaphysique.* (21)[20]

The confrontation of Shakespeare and carnival as two diametrically opposed worlds which collapse when they come into contact with each reifies the high culture / low culture binary. Yet, it is precisely this event that provokes the king to adopt the persona of Hamlet in his contemplation of the ball of shit. Thus, the onstage confrontation of Shakespeare and carnival can actually be interpreted as an invitation for the audience/reader to examine more closely the carnivalesque that is already part of Shakespeare and the grotesque that lurks behind the high culture image of "*Hamlet*" as signifier of literary greatness.

Following in the long tradition of folk culture in French literature best exemplifed by Rabelais, Ronfard's *Lear* employs carnival to parody the decrepitude of the nation and the rigidity of traditional gender roles. His adaptation valorizes the democracy and social equality which inherently underlie the notion of carnival, and in this way the play can be read as an encouragement of a popular uprising, like that of the horde, that would create a new order in which bastards, that is, oppressed peoples such as working-class Québécois,[21] could rule themselves according to their own will and desires. Yet, having been

written and performed only six years after the October Crisis, the play also cautions against such a popular uprising getting out of control, turning to violence, and destroying the nation even as it seeks to heal it. Through its invocation of carnival, and thus a theory of cyclical death and rebirth, by way of the closing image of devastation the adaptation calls for a necessary order and rebirth following such a popular revolution. Significantly, it locates the as yet unrealized potential for this regeneration in the figure of a pure woman. In this way, the conclusion of Ronfard's *Lear* follows a pattern similar to Germain's *Rodéo et Juliette* and Garneau's *La tempête*, but the major difference is that in her role as the omniscient Fool perched above "toute la scène aggrippé au haut d'une colonne" (38), Laurette, who is the sole survivor of the carnage, demonstrates her talents and wisdom throughout the entire course of the play; in contrast, Juliette's and Miranda's potential contributions to the nation's progress are only suggested at the very ends of their respective plays. No doubt the advancements gained for Québécois women by the feminist movement in the span of the early to mid 1970's between the two plays influenced, consciously or not, the greater place occupied by women in the later play and the increased emphasis on women as the potential healers of a sick nation in need of rebirth. Ronfard's *Lear* thus makes a significant contribution to the corpus of early Québécois adaptations of Shakespeare because it is the first to figure women as the site of a new national order, and, contrary to the Roman Catholic doctrine of *la revanche des berceaux*, Laurette's contribution is not located in her womb. Rather, by stealthily adopting a disguise (like Viola and Rosalind) and overseeing the affairs of the nation from her safe space in the rafters, she demonstrates her wit, her strategic intelligence to

survive dire situations, and her recognition of the need to be implicated in the action of rebuilding the nation once the horde has passed.

* * *

Ronfard's *Vie et mort du Roi Boiteux*, subtitled as "une épopée sanglant et grotesque en six pièces et un épilogue", was first published in two volumes in 1981.[22] The epic's six plays were gradually performed between July 1981 and June 1982, and the entire 15 hour epic was performed from morning to night at the *Expo-Théâtre* at Montréal's *Cité du Havre* on June 24 and June 26 as well as at Bishop's University in Lennoxville on July 3 and in Ottawa on July 11, 1982. The adaptation sprang from a collective initiative by the *Nouveau Théâtre Expérimental* to create a play entitled *Shakespeare Follies* following a study of Shakespeare's complete works with the four other permanent group members (Robert Claing, Robert Gravel, Pol Pelletier, and Pierre Pesant); they conferred the writing of this project to Ronfard who created *Vie et mort* instead. The epic is a feminist adaptation of Shakespeare's War of the Roses tetralogy (*1-3 Henry VI*, *Richard III*) in which the male characters from the York and Lancaster families are replaced by warring women of the Ragone and Roberge families respectively. Like the absent King Edward III underlying Shakespeare's history plays, the warring families actually have a common ancestor, *Le vieux père Roberge, Roi de l'Abitibi*, but a split occurred prior to the play when his oldest daughter, Angela Roberge (married to the supposedly insane Filippo Ragone) committed suicide by driving into a brick wall, for which the other Roberge sisters blame their Ragone in-laws. The adaptation's dramatic action takes place in a fictional working-class neighbourhood of Montréal named l'Arsenal that the characters also take to be a

royal kingdom over which they struggle for power.

The parallels between the plots of Shakespeare's four plays and Ronfard's six plays are too exhaustive to enumerate,[23] and the associations between Ronfard's characters and their Shakespearean counterparts are frequently in flux; however, several correspondences stand out between the characters of both authors' works. Richard Premier (Premier being his surname, not a regal designation) who limps in an orthopaedic shoe is Richard III. Marie-Jeanne Larose, who is seduced by Richard over the body of her dead husband, Alcide Premier, corresponds to Lady Anne, while Richard's older brother Alcide evokes both Edward IV and Clarence, Alcide's death from thirst on a mountain-top ironically parodying Clarence's dream of drowning. Shakespeare's Queen Margaret resembles most closely Madame Emma Roberge, a widow with a biting tongue, but Margaret also manifests herself in Filippo Ragone *dit le Débile*, whose crippled body and crazy persona mask his wisdom and perceptiveness, as well as in Lou Birkanian, a witch with magical powers who eventually dies when nobody listens to her fanciful tales anymore. Peter Williams, a pastor who dies at the hands of cannibals, evokes Henry VI, the religious king who is metaphorically eaten alive by the blood-thirsty nobles surrounding him. His wife Judith drowns her madness with mud and flowers in a nod to Ophelia. Their son, Roy Williams, a businessman who prostitutes his own sister to Richard and then leads a mafia that controls the butchery industry and the local police, embodies the most violent traits of Richard III and functions in the plays as Richard Premier's doppelganger. Their mutual friend Freddy Dubois, who follows Richard loyally at first, resembles Buckingham. Finally, Moïse, whose far removed, bastard lineage

makes him an unlikely candidate to be king, who is largely absent throughout the play, and who leads his horde across the sea and kills Richard with an arrow, resembles Richmond, later Henry VII.

For the fifth and sixth plays of the epic, Ronfard creates a new character though with no Shakespearean counterpart, Claire Premier, Richard's daughter. As heir to the nation (which shifts fluidly throughout the play between a royal court and the neighbourhood's backyard playground), issues of nation and gender unite seamlessly in this character. Like Laurette, Claire, and her cousin *la fille de Leïla*,[24] inherits a decaying nation threatened by perpetual carnivalesque disorder, and, as we shall see, only a woman can lead it into the future. However, unlike Laurette, Claire rarely appears onstage and the reader/audience knows very little about her by the epic's conclusion. Rather, the reader/audience is left to surmise what kind of national leader she will be based on the women who raise her and her differences from them. Having been written and performed on the heels of a losing referendum on sovereignty, the epic gives greater attention to gender issues than the national question and focuses principally on the matriarchs. The attention accorded to the matriarchs anticipates Normand Chaurette's later adaptation, *Les Reines*, as we shall see in chapter five.

The epic's matriarchs—Lou Birkanian, Catherine Ragone, Judith Williams *née* Roberge, and Madame Emma Roberge—are in fact referred to as "les quatre reines" (2.6.125); moreover, all are, or become, widows, but the respect, or lack thereof, associated with this marital status colours differently each one's perspective on gender relations and her role in society. Their diverse reactions to their similar situations echoes the plurality found in Shakespeare's representation

of a what is typically a stock, archetypal figure, and an object of mockery or scorn, in the early modern context.[25] In *Vie et mort*, the range of the women's responses to their widowhood thus speaks to the overall complexity of gender relations and possible roles for women within the world of the play, as well as the different competing constructions of the category of "woman" in circulation in Québec at the time of the adaptation's composition, ranging from the bitter, radical separatist to the emotionally detached, power-hungry businesswoman to the traditionally passive Yvette who resurged during the 1980 referendum campaign.

These competing constructions of "woman" manifest themselves most poignantly in the widows' different reactions to the carnivalesque sexuality which runs rampant throughout the play. Emma Roberge, for instance, describes sexual reproduction as a rising tide of rats and orders women to "[b]oucher [leurs] trous", plug their holes, because all that comes out of them are cockroaches (2.2.107). She takes pride in her infertility because she claims that her childlessness allows her to see more clearly than the other women whom she defiantly compares to egg-laying chickens in a cage. Yet, even as she protests that she has no regrets at having escaped becoming a tool for the reproduction of male heirs, as her niece Catherine has become, underneath her gynocentric, separatist discourse lies a hint of remorse: "J'ai eu deux hommes aussi. Ils sont morts tous les deux. Je veux plus m'en souvenir. Je veux plus rien savoir. Fini les hommes. Ils ont passé dans ma vie comme une tempête du mois d'avril. Ça met de la boue partout, mais ça dure pas longtemps" (2.2.107).[26] Her desire to remember "no longer" implies that she has indeed been consumed at some point in the past by memories of her

conjugal life, but she has consciously decided to reject the liberty of the carnivalesque sexuality experienced by most of the other characters because it is muddy, fleeting, and only women suffer the consequences of pregnancy. As she lectures her sister Judith, rejecting the liberty of carnivalesque sexuality procures another kind of liberty for women, the social liberty of upright strength enjoyed by men: "Tu aurais pu te tenir debout toute seule, toute droite sur ton fil à plomb, mais non ! Y a fallu que tu te mettes à l'horizontale ! et de l'horizontale à la grosse balloune, y a tout juste l'intervalle d'un demi-lune. Misère" (2.2.108-9)[27]. In her view, carnivalesque sexuality leads to physical deformity and vulnerability while its rejection gives women lead-like strength and independence. Like Shakespeare's Queen Margaret, Emma's anti-male rants are as much born out of a necessity for protection due to the vulnerability of her social position as they are from her bitterness of having been wronged. The protectionist, gender-based separatism for which she advocates is in fact warranted; her social vulnerability is later confirmed by the fact that she is the first of the four "queens" to die from masculine violence. Her attempts to appropriate masculine strength and economic self-sufficiency rebound tragically when she tries to hire her hit-man nephew Roy.

The target of Emma's violent yearnings for independence, Catherine Ragone, also strives for access to patriarchal power, but her manipulation of sexuality is complicit with an androcentric view of the female body. While Emma warns her of the pain of childbirth, Catherine ignores her advice and chooses instead to offer up both her body and her sexual pleasure for the sake of patriarchal primogeniture, telling her husband François Premier that her "plaisir est pour le fils [qu'elle fera] germer de [son] plaisir éjaculé" (1.2.47)[28]. At the

beginning of the play, Catherine embodies the traditional image of female self-sacrifice, deluding herself that her pleasure is her own even as she confesses that she is merely the vessel who transmits it from her husband to her son. Later in the epic, she learns to manipulate sexuality to her own advantage, both in her emotionally-detached affair with Robert Houle and her Gertrude-Hamlet Oedipal relationship with her son Richard, but her shift from a self-sacrificing sexuality to a self-serving strategy designed to consolidate her political power happens only after she is widowed and confronted by Judith with the social reality of her status: "Tu peux te rengorger de toute ton arrogance. Mais tu es veuve, Catherine. Une veuve n'a pas de pouvoir, c'est une coque vide, un nom sans répondant. Une veuve comme toi n'a que ses yeux pour pleurer, sa bouche pour maudire. Apprends à courber la tête et pleure. C'est le destin des veuves" (2.6.128)[29]. The shocking realization that socially she is nothing more than an empty shell allows Catherine to adopt consciously this metaphor as her sexual identity. Whereas previously, as wife, she was an empty shell, a mere vessel for the transmission of pleasure and power from father to son, but unaware of her condition, her recognition of and confrontation with this reality in her newfound widowhood allows her to manipulate strategically her sexual body as empty shell and use it to gain social and political power from the men around her and consolidate that power until the end of the epic. She is an empty shell emotionally, but she is not, as Judith claims, an empty signifier. On the contrary, her sexual and emotional emptiness endows her with precisely the agency sought by Emma which permits Catherine to signify by leaving her mark on all the other characters within the court over which she becomes supreme ruler. This reversal in Catherine's agency

and ability to signify is typified in her relationship with Richard; instead of being an empty vessel for the transmission of agency from father to son, after her widowhood, Catherine becomes the sole source of agency and Richard cannot signify without her.

Ironically, Judith, who marks Catherine as empty shell, becomes one herself when her husband is killed and eaten by cannibals. Upon learning the news, she immediately breaks down and goes crazy, nothing more than an empty shell of her former self for the rest of the epic. Yet, even before this incident Judith is a shell of an even prior self, the dutiful wife who sacrificed her career for her first lover, only to be abandoned during her pregnancy and forced to abandon her son Moïse. Judith's complacency and self-sacrifice to a domesticity that serves patriarchal interests but leaves her disempowered figures her as an "Yvette", that is, one of the women, named after a dutiful, family-serving young girl from Québécois schoolbooks, who protested against sovereignty and in favour of their own domesticity on the eve of the 1980 referendum after Lise Payette made the blunder of calling all Québécois women "Yvettes" because their education made them docile and afraid of change. Sacrificing the dream that made her happy, being a singer and queen of the local music scene, as well as her independence, Judith is an Yvette vulnerably preconditioned to become an empty shell in her widowhood. This vulnerability also locates her as a site for colonial desire, that is, the desire of a colonial man for the white woman that has been denied him and upon which he can enact symbolic violence against his colonizer through miscegenation. After Peter's death, the reactionary violence of liberation to which he is subject as an evangelist colonizer of aboriginal cultures is

transferred symbolically to Judith who begins to dream of being tied naked to a pole, her legs spread open sexually leaving her vulnerable to potential rape, and then being hacked up and burned alive. She becomes the site of the ritualized violence of decolonization, and as such she signifies only insofar as she is a symbol of her husband and his role in a colonizing mission. Nevertheless, she remains, as she prophetically told Catherine, an empty signifier herself, devoid of agency and reason because she has already subscribed to the belief that women's meaning is located solely in her sexuality and within the confines of a patriarchal economy. In this way, Judith is the most ironically prophetic of these three widows because each eventually takes on her social role according to her own definition of women's sexuality, but Judith actually names the condition of empty signifier that she will adopt in her widowhood before it is thrust upon her.

Lou Birkanian, the last of the four "queens", extols the advantages of a separatist, homosocial community of women, but the form of female solidarity that she praises is much less adversarial than Emma's. Rather than seeking to overthrow patriarchal rule, the women of Lou's homosocial community subvert it with carnivalesque heterosexuality and achieve mutually satisfying results for both sexes. The epic's storyteller and a source of wisdom and magic realism (most notably with Circe during the adaptation of Homer's *Odyssey* in the fifth play), Lou is the queen most closely associated with carnival. The story of her childhood exposure to sexuality and the adventure of her wedding night are both marked by carnivalesque laughter which she locates as the source of her liberty, a liberty that is absent in the nation around which the epic is centered:

Dans ce temps-là, dans mon pays, les filles étaient bien différentes de ce

que vous êtes vous autres aujourd'hui. On ne connaissait pas l'homme avant les noces, mais on savait tout. Les femmes bavardent, tu sais, dans les cours des maisons et les filles écoutent en écossant des petits pois. [...] Elles ne font pas que parler. Elles se montrent leurs corps, elles se détaillent, elles se comparent. Elles expliquent où ça se passe, comment ça se fait, combien de temps ça dure. Elles s'indiquent des positions, elles se lancent des défis, elles se donnent des conseils de plaisir, elles échangent leurs expériences des nuits passées et elles rient, elles rient à n'en plus finir. Le rire des femmes de chez nous ! Veux-tu que je te dise : ici, j'ai jamais entendu un rire de même, le rire de la liberté. Pourtant, les femmes d'ici disent qu'elles sont plus libres que chez nous ! (3.6.174)[30]

Not only does the liberty of carnivalesque laughter afford occasions for homosocial bonds between women to extend into homoeroticism, but it also allows women to subvert the marital order imposed by heteronormativity. Lou concludes her long narrative with the adventure of her wedding night during which she consummated her marriage with the best man, who slipped in through the window, because her husband was impotent and asleep from drinking. This carnivalesque trick not only cuckolds her husband but it also gives Lou the liberty to run out and display the blood-stained sheet to the waiting crowd, a ritual normally performed by the husband, thus twice inverting gender roles and usurping her husband's power to control her sexuality. She retains this liberty even in her widowhood, most notably when she literally makes love to the character Time in the fourth play.

Of the four matriarchal, widowed queens, then, Lou's embrace of

carnivalesque sexuality affords her the most personal liberty to operate outside the bounds of socially constructed order. Catherine's manipulation of sexuality, particularly Richard's in their Oedipal re-enactment of the bedroom scene between Gertrude and Hamlet, affords her the greatest political power; whereas, Emma and Judith are both destroyed, Emma by attempting to politically manipulate men without Catherine's recourse to sexuality, and Judith, in stark contrast to Lou, by surrendering her desires and personal liberty. The adaptation thus valorizes free sexuality, be it for the purpose of carnivalesque laughter and pleasure or be it for the purpose of personal power and strength. This dual valorization of unfettered sexuality for both pleasure and power manifests itself in the incestuous homosexuality of both the Nelson twins and Claire Premier in whom the adaptation situates hope, rebirth, and liberty.

Sandy Sparks and Nelson Trapp, fraternal twins in Lou's care, resemble the double beings described by Aristophanes in Plato's *Symposium* who were split asunder by the gods and constantly seek their other half because they are incomplete without it. During their childhood, they compose a hermaphroditic being on the playground (2.3.118), and in their youth they have an incestuous sexual relationship that neither can live without (3.4.165). In the fifth play, the twins are trapped on a raft with their friend Freddy Dubois in the middle of the Pacific Ocean for eighteen days in an adaptation of the biblical story of Noah's ark. Freddy tells them that he would like to marry them and for the three of them to all make love together. Both Sandy and Nelson accept willingly, express their love for him, and, as the three unite to form "une figure à trois", a dove approaches and drops an olive branch (5.11.172). Freddy claims that the olive

branch is a sign of the end of the flood and the beginning of a new world, and, indeed, when they open their eyes they discover land. In rewriting biblical myth, the adaptation figures unrestrained sexuality, including the homosexuality between Nelson and Freddy and the incest between Sandy and Nelson, as a source of salvation rather than destruction. In fact, the love between Sandy, Nelson, and Freddy is the most enduring relationship of the entire epic, for, even after Nelson is killed by natives in a futile attempt to use his blood to heal a man dying from syphilis (who turns out to be the father who abandoned the twins), Sandy and Freddy carry Nelson's body with them everywhere they go for the rest of the epic. The tragedy of Nelson's pointless death to save a father whose own unrestrained sexuality was fickle and loveless serves to heighten the reader's/audience's sympathy for this trio whose incestuous and homosexual desire belies a love that endures beyond the grave, the only such love of the entire epic. Moreover, as Freddy points out, the trio's love, blessed by the heavens, embodies the potential for a new world order; as such, it is also a source of salvation for the nation. The breakdown of the socially constructed order of traditional sexuality through its greatest taboos creates a free space for the construction of a new national order. In fact, their new world is a paradise until confronted by an old world order dominated by taboos and superstition that falsely locates the trio's potential for regeneration in their material bodies instead of in their transcendent love.

Sexual liberty, including incestuous homosexuality, is also the source of national regeneration embodied by Claire Premier, one of two women who survive the destruction of the nation as its rightful heir at the end of the epic. The power to rule the nation is transmitted sexually to Claire by her grandmother,

Catherine, thus bypassing completely the male heir Richard who has been ruled by his mother throughout the epic but unable to exercise political agency himself. This matrilineal transfer of power takes place in a photography session in which every click of the shutter of Claire's camera intensifies the sexual exchange of power from her grandmother to herself. Claire symbolically captures Catherine who willingly surrenders, emotionally and sexually, for the only time in the epic:

> *D'un seul coup, Catherine se lève et joue avec un abattage extraordinaire le rôle de mannequin photographique. Elle prend toutes les poses possibles, depuis celle de la grande dame contemplant l'univers jusqu'à celle de la putain de bas étage. Elle et Claire font un numéro éblouissant. Elles s'amusent, rirent, courent, tournent sur elles-mêmes, se pressent l'une contre l'autre. Claire fait vraiment l'amour avec son appareil-photo. En poussant des gémissements de chattes en chaleur, elles finissent par rouler à terre. Claire, sexe contre sexe, les jambes de Catherine nouées dans son dos, prend un dernier cliché de la tête de Catherine extasiée. Entre Richard Premier qui voit le tableau. [...] Catherine pousse un immense gémissement d'orgasme.* (6.10.294)[31]

Thus, when Claire exits and Richard finally kills his mother in a futile attempt to appropriate from her the power necessary to rule the nation, it is too late because Catherine has already abdicated it to Claire. Richard is powerless to hold off the barbarous horde that is led by the bastard Moïse but is really under the control of Leïla's snake-charming daughter.

The epic's conclusion revels in an ambiguity that presents the reader/audience with two legitimate daughters of the nation surviving to claim the

throne, depending, oddly enough, on the epic's performance schedule. According to authorial, prefatory instructions in the published text, the epic's epilogue is only supposed to be performed when the epic as a whole has been played in one day, but the epilogue should be omitted when each play is performed on a different day. Thus, performed as "théâtre-feuilleton" or leaflet theatre (1.36), Claire Premier emerges as the new leader of the nation following Catherine's and Richard's deaths because, despite Leïla's daughter holding the dying Richard in the second last snapshot of the play, Leïla's daughter mysteriously disappears from the final shot. The final snapshot of Richard's dead body with the blind monk who represents Fortune behind him indicates that nobody else remains to lead the nation except for Claire who took the picture. Her omniscient position above the carnage of the horde signals her objective perspective and ability to rule rationally over the collectivity, in contrast to the self-interested narcissism that drove Richard to seek his mother's power. Claire emerges as the rightful ruler of the nation both through matrilineal descent and through a concerned interest in the needs and suffering of others (her grandmother's need for release and Richard's painful death) that inspires collective empathy (the photographs are transmitted to the audience). Since concern for others is precisely what has been lacking in the largely narcissistic and capitalist world of the play, Claire represents hope for a better future of the nation. She has received the right to rule from Catherine and Richard, but unlike them she has remained innocent and uncorrupted by the knowledge that she is heir to power.

If, however, the epilogue is included in the performance of the epic, then Leïla's daughter emerges as the new, legitimate, ruler of the devastated nation.

As the daughter of Leïla and Alcide Premier, Richard's older half-brother and first son of François Premier, Leïla's daughter's claim to the throne takes precedence over Claire's (in a situation that echoes the disputing genealogical claims traced back to Edward III in Shakespeare's War of the Roses tetraology). The reader/audience has no prior knowledge of Leïla's daughter, or even of her existence, before she appears in the closing scene as a snake-charmer leading Moïse's horde against Richard, but in the epilogue, she magically destroys the entire neighbourhood, including Claire's pictures and Moïse's business, the café where his mother Judith used to sing. Moïse's destruction by Leïla's daughter aligns with the carnivalesque spirit that permeates the play. As the bastard and thus underdog hero of the epic (in echo of Hector in *Lear*, Lou sings the praises of bastards [4.5.107]), Moïse can lead a popular revolution that topples the despotic old order of Richard, but he cannot lead the nation because he cannot create the new order to which carnival is supposed to return. Leïla's daughter, on the other hand, symbolizes new order because she is descended through Alcide from François Premier and his first wife, Augustine Labelle, who died in childbirth, both of whom are outsiders to the genealogical feud between the Ragone and Roberge families that is at the heart of the characters' animosity throughout the epic. Thus, she descends from a line of immigrants external to the epic's power struggle over the rule of the neighbourhood/kingdom. Leïla's daughter is further marked as immigrant other by the fact that her birth would have occurred when Alcide and Leïla were in Azerbaïdjan and by her exoticism as snake charmer. Like Claire, Leïla's daughter embodies hope for a new social order through the contribution of her exotic otherness and through her obliteration of a stale

patriarchal power struggle by wiping out the male heads of each family, Richard for the Ragones and Moïse for the Roberges.

Situated in terms of a Québécois context, Leïla's conquest speaks interestingly to a greater social acceptance of otherness in light of the losing referendum that pitted francophone sovereignists against francophone federalists (such as Claude Ryan, Robert Bourrassa, and Pierre Elliot Trudeau), both of whom descended from the same *pure laine* roots. In this way, the referendum parallels the family feud around which *Vie et mort* is based with the Roberge family, represented by Moïse, the abandoned son who leads a horde of bastards, as the sovereignists, and the Ragone family, represented by Catherine, in denial of her roots, as the Québécois federalists. Catherine's denial of her lineage epitomizes the colonial mimicry. She describes the Roberge family as a "sale race", a dirty race, despite the fact that her own mother was a Roberge which makes her a Roberge by blood if not by name (2.3.119). The denial of her maternal roots through her virulent assertions that she is purely Ragone, which she considers superior, belies her colonial mimicry; she is "almost but not quite" Ragone, in Bhabha's terms, and her frequent outbursts against the Roberge family expose her own self-hatred. Her rule over the court is merely that of a comprador, a derivative stand-in for the outside colonizing force of the Ragone family that acquired the Roberge gold mines by conquest of her mother Angela. In this, Catherine Roberge-Ragone evokes the ruling Québécois federalist elite that holds its own people in tutelage in the interests of the exploitation of its resources by an outside colonial force. Catherine Roberge-Ragone denies her Roberge heritage in the name of Ragone, thus resembling *pure laine* Québécois federalists who deny

the heritage of their birth in order to extol the ideal of a federal Canadian identity.

However, as neither Roberge nor Ragone, Leïla's daughter transcends entirely this petty feud and illuminates the question of ethnic origin as a ridiculous debate. The unexpected arrival and conquest of Leïla's daughter represents, then, the arrival of immigrants and international culture and the explosion of the Roberge-Ragone / sovereignist-federalist binary that predominates the genealogical table prefacing both volumes of the epic. The literal explosion of the neighbourhood/kingdom provoked by Leïla's daughter in the epilogue creates a third space and opens possibilities for a new social order based on the contributions of a plurality of ethnic identities that transcend the former binaries. This emphasis on an open, internationalist perspective through the character of Leïla's daughter is in keeping with the entire fifth play of the epic with its intertextual nods to Homer's *Odyssey* and Captain James Cook's exploration of the South Pacific. *Vie et mort* explores international cultural exchange as a contribution that may enrich national identity without threatening or destroying it. The explosion caused by Leïla's daughter does not destroy the national community (as the continuing radio broadcast proves), only the rigid identity paradigms that were perpetuating rancour. In this respect, this conclusion to the play does not discount national identity or sovereignty, but speaks to the need for exterior influences to renew the debate from a different perspective.

The ambiguous conclusion thus produces two very different readings of the adaptation, but, whether the epic ends with Claire or with Leïla's daughter in power, one constant remains: both are daughters of the nation's legitimate rulers. The inheritance of the nation by women explains why Richard is never able to

govern without his mother's help the nation to which he thinks he is entitled: his attempts at rule are both profoundly colonialist and misogynist. These two approaches to governance are parodied when Richard arrives on Circé's island:

> Salut poupée ! Je suis Richard Premier, fils de François Premier et de Catherine Ragone ici présente. Au nom de mes ancêtres, en vertu des pouvoirs, que l'histoire et ma vertu me donnent, je plante mon drapeau sur cette île. Dès cet instant, elle est et restera jusqu'à la fin des temps ma possession pleine et entière. Cette île et tout ce qu'il y a dessus. Donc tu es mon esclave. Comment t'appelles-tu ? (5.9.156)[32]

The adaptation's parody of the colonization of the New World (and of Prospero's colonization of Sycorax's island in *The Tempest*) exposes the inherent misogyny underlying colonial discourse through Richard's opening address of Circe as "doll", an object of his sexual conquest, and his failure to ask her name until after his failed attempt to interpellate her into a master-slave dialectic. Moreover, colonial discourse itself is undercut since Richard bases his claim on history and his own virtue, neither of which he possesses since he has no past conquests or historical claim on the island he has just "discovered" and no virtue given that he intended to sacrifice his own daughter in order to gain favourable winds for his colonial exploration.

In addition to the attempted murder of his daughter as the most obvious example of his total misappraisal of women's social contribution, Richard's prayer of thanks to Nature for her birth also betrays his tendency to discount women's strength: "Une fille ! Oui, c'est cela que je voulais et que tu me donnes, Nature, tenancière du grand bordel ! Pas de garçons ! Aux poubelles les garçons

! Ils arrivent toujours trop tôt avec des dents trop longues. Les filles, elles, mettent plus longtemps à s'émanciper" (5.1.117).[33] Although his misogynist assessment of women's weakness ironically transmits a sentiment highlighting the need for more widespread feminist emancipation, a condition still unfulfilled in Québec in the early 1980's, Richard's praise of feminine weakness actually reinforces his own effeminacy (even his mother calls him a "tapette" [fag] [4.13.99]) by revealing his fear of other men. Despite his desire for a daughter who cannot threaten his authority, Richard remains oblivious to his mother's continuing control of him. He is not fit to rule because he fails to recognize the potential strength of all women in his infant daughter and the actualized strength of his dominating mother. His disregard and fear of women is further repeated throughout the text by his consuming fear of heterosexual intercourse, most notably in his very Freudian comparison of women's genitals to a shark's mouth ("Jaws!") that bites and cuts him (4.13.99).

Thus, in one of the epic's two conclusions, the women carry the potential for national renewal through liberal homosexuality, and, in the other conclusion, women bring the potential for national renewal through increased internationalism and cultural openness; in either case men cannot rule without recognition of women's strength and contribution to national development. The 6-play conclusion favouring Claire's rule carries greater weight, however, for several reasons. The Claire-ending connects strongly to the Sandy-Nelson-Freddy relationship through the valorization of homosexual desire in loving relationships. In fact, the Catherine-Claire and the Sandy-Nelson-Freddy relationships also directly contradict Jean-Cléo Godin and Pierre Lavoie's assertion, in the epic's

introductory essay, of "l'absence, dans l'œuvre de Ronfard, de l'homosexualité, très présente dans la littérature québécoise contemporaine" (20n12).[34] There are actually several additional episodes of homoeroticism in the epic, such as Annie's desire for Swedish women with honey breasts, Amazons, and Marie-Jeanne Larose (2.3.111-3), Annie's desire for Circe reminiscent of Helena and Hermia in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (5.9.159), and Richard's boast that no man could help being seduced by a picture of his naked body (4.3.36). Godin and Lavoie's claim may stem from knowledge of authorial intention (nine years later, Ronfard published a critical article denying the existence of a specific homosexual identity and its relevance to theatre),[35] but homoeroticism pervades the text of *Vie et mort* nonetheless. Moreover, within the context of the epic as a whole, the adaptation's predominant emphasis on carnivalesque sexuality throughout, rather than the more limited treatment of international exploration, favours the 6-play conclusion and Claire's succession. As François Premier observes, "Partout Éros triomphe, le sexe, le cul" (3.10.188).[36] Internationalism, although an important theme, is primarily contained within the fifth play and relegated elsewhere to subplot characters. While sexuality is a function of carnival, internationalism is a function of magic realism within the play, and the entire Odyssey of the fifth play is undercut when, upon the characters' return from their global voyages, the reader/audience learns that their journeys were merely an illusion created by the woman of the Andes (5.21.216).

Vie et mort du Roi Boiteux, then, like Ronfard's *Lear*, figures daughters as the survivors, inheritors, and sources of regeneration for fictional, bastard nations that pass through the disorder of carnival and then hover on the precipice of a new

social order which will be more inclusive of women, and to some extent immigrants, that is, of the "others" to whom carnival gives lease to rule. In Ronfard's Shakespearean adaptations, national development is dependent on the instauration of gender equity, an issue which begins to receive increased attention in the wake of the 1980 referendum. In the next chapter on adaptations since 1990, gender and cultural diversity occupy a more prominent space in Québécois adaptations of Shakespeare written by a new generation of women and immigrant playwrights who engage in a dialogue not only with Shakespeare but also with the adapters we have seen thus far in order to highlight the need for a far greater recognition of the interdependence of these issues.

Notes to Chapter 4

[1] "*Life and Death of the Limping King.*"
I have excluded from this study of Jean-Pierre Ronfard's Shakespearean adaptations his play *Falstaff* (1990) because the text does not contain enough original content to make it relevant here as an adaptation. *Falstaff* abridges and combines the plots of Shakespeare's *1-2 Henry IV* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor* in an almost literal translation. The play contains only one original speech, Falstaff's closing monologue on *la joie de vivre.* In this sense, *Falstaff* is also carnivalesque, but it does not deal with issues of nation and gender.

[2] "Our country is sick, profoundly sick."

[3]" In this beautiful language that we have left, sign and symbol of our ancestral power."

[4] "Culture [...] ties us to the breath and the blood of ancestors like the many-coloured hospital tubes maintain the existence of the dying man who is mummified in his bandages."

[5] "I know about the weight (responsibility) of power. Very happy to be rid of it."

[6] "It has to change! Nothing works in this house. [...] Excited, crazy women, breasts to the wind, are filling the skulls of their fellow creatures and are starting to bust our ears with their demagogic slogans: 'the old power is dead!', 'long live the right of peoples to order everything!', 'day is breaking...the colour of the sky is changing...welcome the birth of a new order!'. And it's I, (*moans from Violette in her bed*) well I and my sister, it's we that they expect to bring about this new order. Imbeciles! Order is order. It doesn't have to be new or old. Order has no colour."

[7] "Bucket of shit." "He starts throwing balls of shit everywhere, particularly on the throne, on the cage of the Shakespeare-Technicians and on the ceiling."

[8] "Unnatural time." "Long live bastardy / that knocks down laws / that dirties churches / and dethrones kings."

[9] " Power to bastards." "With the convincing force of a shock-inducing protester."

[10] "I'm fucked to the bone. [...] Violette, by mocking disregard, has had added to the royal coat of arms against a heraldic red background a green-blazoned penis that she claims to have stolen from me for forever. It's hard."

[11] "The King: Tell me about it, Corneille. Tell me about our last exploit.
Corneille: I'm embarrassed.
The King: Between men.
Corneille: If you want. (*All at once, she takes on an inebriated voice, a guardsman's attitude, and a shithead's look. She adjusts her imaginary balls.*) [...] We told each other: '[...] we've got 'em in our pants, don't we? Of course we've got 'em. Two beautiful big ones like grandfather'."

[12] "They were ripping off their clothes that were burning their skin. Naked, they jumped in place like crippled grasshoppers. They huddled together in the middle of our guys who were laughing at their good luck. 'Hey! I'm the king!' You yelled. 'The flower's mine!' You dropped your pants and the whole army saw it. The whole army saw you in all your force. The women went by you one after the other. Spread eagle by four soldiers who took turns holding them down. You were tireless. You laughed with pleasure. You screamed with rage and fury. And it went on. And it went on. You mounted the last one yawning wide enough to dislocate your jaw. And you crashed on the ground, instantly fast asleep. I covered you over with my coat. When you woke up, in the early morning of victory, the girl under you was dead.

(*During the whole story, Corneille and the king touch, rub, and excite each other. Corneille straddles the king and wears him out. They end up exhausted on the ground.*)"

[13] I develop much more fully the potentially useful theoretical cross-over between Bhabha's idea of colonial mimicry and current approaches to gender imitation that do not adequately distinguish between cross-dressing, drag, and passing in an unpublished conference paper: "Cross-Dressing, Drag, and Passing: Slip/pages in *Twelfth Night* and *As You Like It*." Shakespeare Association of America. New Orleans, Louisiana. (April 2004)

[14] Or not. Albany may either "restore Edgar and Kent to their titles and power as nobles so that they can *sustain* order in the realm" or he may be "inviting them to govern jointly with him" (5.3.319n), an offer which is further complicated by the change between the Quarto and the Folio of the final speech prefix from Albany to Edgar.

[15] "*Everyone is thus dead except Laurette. She arrives wearing a large, white shirt, barefoot, hair loose; she no longer has her fool's make-up. She goes through the center of the mass grave and finds her way to the throne at the end of the red carpet. She climbs up, settles heselfr on it, and in a beautiful, quiet gesture, she pulls out her tongue and holds it between her thumb and index finger. She freezes.*"

[16] "Go on a tour of Africa when it's here where things are happening."

[17] "Coup de théâtre*: one of the Shakespeares gets up groaningly, pulls out the sword that was penetrating him, drags himself, dying, towards the lighting booth and in a last burst of life turns off the lights while saying*: Damn!"

[18] "*A typically British umbrella.*" "*Jump into, with eloquence and historical attention, [...] the long narration of Clarence's dream (authentically excerpted from the great William's RICHARD III).*"

[19] "*The king contemplates a ball of shit that he holds in his hand in a posture that invokes Michelangelo, Rodin, the traditional Hamlet.*"

[20] "*On their path, they meet the two Shakespeares having come out of their booth out of curiosity. Two worlds confront each other. Silence. Immobility. Question: What are we all doing here? Everyone is engulfed in this theatrical emptiness full of metaphysical angst.*"

[21] The association between carnival and Québec's (neo-)colonial status occurs in other nationalist works, the most notable example being Pierre Falardeau's film *Le temps des bouffons* (1993) about the annual Beaver Club supper at the Queen Elizabeth hotel in Montréal. Falardeau invokes carnival when he implicitly compares Québec and Ghana, but he mocks the notion of carnival since it is temporary and has no lasting political effect: "On est au Ghana en 1957, avant l'indépendance. [...] Chaque année, les membres de la secte [des Haoukas] se réunissent pour fêter. [...] En 1957, le Ghana, c'est une colonie britannique... quelques rois nègres pour faire semblant, mais les vrais maîtres sont anglais. [...] La religion des Haoukas reproduit le système colonial en plus petit, mais à l'envers. Les colonisés se déguisent en colonisateurs, les exploités jouent le rôle des exploiteurs, les esclaves deviennent les maîtres. Une fois par année, les pauvres mangent du chien. Une fois par année, les fous sont maîtres. Le reste du temps, les maîtres sont fous" (73). ("We are in Ghana in 1957, before independence. [...] Each year, the members of the [Haoukas] sect gather to celebrate. [...] In 1957, Ghaha is a British colony... a few nigger kings to pretend, but the real masters are English. [...] The Haoukas religion reproduces the colonial system smaller but backwards. The colonized disguise themselves as colonizers, the exploited play the role of exploiters, the slaves become masters. Once a year, the poor eat dog. Once a year, the fools are masters. The rest of the time, the masters are crazy.") See "*Le Temps des bouffons*, Prise 2" in *La liberté n'est pas une marque de yogourt* for the complete text of the film's voice-over commentary

(73-76). Falardeau also made a film version in 1980 of Michèle Lalonde's poem "Speak White" mentioned in chapters three and five.

[22] "A bloody and grotesque epic in six plays and an epilogue."

[23] See Le Blanc (131-132) for a list of plot parallels, some of which I reproduce here in the list of characters, but some of which oversimply the two plays and overlook other important similarities.

[24] The reading of who actually inherits the nation, Claire or *la fille de Leïla*, depends on whether or not one considers the epilogue which is only supposed to close the play when the epic is performed in its entirety in one day.

[25] Shakespeare's Queen Margaret represents the archetypal figure of the widow most closely with her dried up, non-reproductive body and her witch-like curses. She contrasts drastically with the equally spirited yet ultimately non-threatening rich widow whom Grumio marries in *The Taming of the Shrew* or Gertrude's naïve vulnerability in *Hamlet.*

[26] "I had two men too. They are both dead. I don't want to remember them any more. I don't want anything to do with them anymore. Done with men. They came through my life like April showers. They leave mud everywhere, but they don't last long."

[27] "You could have stood on your own two feet, straight and vertical, but no! You had to put yourself on the horizontal! and from horizontal to a fat balloon, there's just the interval of a half moon. Misery."

[28] "Pleasure is for the son that [she'll] make germinate from [his] ejaculated pleasure."

[29] "You can stick up your nose in arrogance. But you are a widow, Catherine. A widow doesn't have power, she's an empty shell, a name with no guarantor. A widow like you only has eyes for crying and mouth for cursing. Learn to bow your head and cry. It's the destiny of widows."

[30] "At that time, in my country, the girls were quite different from what you girls are like today. We didn't know men before the wedding, but we knew everything. Women gossip, you know, in the courtyard and the girls listen while shelling peas. [...] They don't just talk. They show each other their bodies, they examine each other in detail, they compare themselves to each other. They explain where it happens, how it's done, how long it lasts. They show each other positions, they give each other challenges, they give each other advice for pleasure, they share their experiences from past nights and they laugh, they laugh unendingly. The laugh of women back home! Let me tell you: here, I've never heard a laugh like that, the laugh of liberty. And yet, women here say that they are more free than we are!"

[31] "*All at once, Catherine gets up and acts with extraordinary brio the role of a photographer's model. She strikes every possible pose, from the magnanimous lady contemplating the universe to the second-rate whore. She and Claire do a dazzling number. They enjoy themselves, laugh, run, spin around, press their bodies against each other. Claire truly makes love to her camera. While heaving moans of cats in heat, they end up rolling around the ground. Claire, genitals against genitals, with Catherine's legs wrapped together around her back, takes one last headshot of Catherine in ecstasy. Enter Richard Premier who sees the scene. [...] Catherine heaves out an immense orgasmic moan.*"

[32] "Hey doll! I'm Richard Premier, son of François Premier and Catherine Ragone present here. In the name of my ancestors, in virtue of powers that history and my virtue give me, I plant my flag on this island. From this moment on, it is and will remain until the end of time my full and entire possession. This island and all that is on it. Therefore you are my slave. What's your name?"

[33] "A girl! Yes, that's what I wanted and that you are giving me, Nature, you manager of the great brothel! No boys! Into the garbage with boys! They always arrive too early with too long teeth. Girls, they take longer to emancipate themselves."

[34] "The absence, in Ronfard's work, of homosexuality, very present in contemporary Québécois literature."

[35] In "En contrepoint" ("In counterpoint") (1990), Ronfard writes: "Du coup, marchant dans les rues, j'ai commencé à m'interroger : est-ce que l'homosexualité au théâtre, dans la pratique du théâtre est intéressante? À quels niveaux? Est-ce que moi, ça m'intéresse? / Commençons par moi. Peut-être parce que je suis hétérosexuel, donc enfoncé dans ce plan dans ce ce qu'on appelle la norme, l'homosexualité m'intéresse, privément, au même titre que la cuisine végétarienne, le zen, le vélocipédisme et l'idéologie des non-fumeurs, c'est-à-dire assez peu. [...] Bref, je ne sais jamais qu'un tel est homosexuel, juif ou philatéliste" (Ronfard 123 cited in Brault and Garand 51). While such statements by playwrights may be insightful into their personal views, I would argue, in keeping with theories of the death of the author, that they should not influence how critics interpret their texts. Ronfard's *Vie et mort* clearly does valorize homosexuality through the relationships of Sandy, Nelson and Freddy and of Catherine and Claire. Although they are not reflected in the text, Ronfard's personal views do point, however, to a broader social disregard or disdain for queers, which, if not homophobic is at least clearly heterosexist, and which manifests itself, as we shall see in chapter five, in other Québécois adaptations such as *Henry. Octobre. 1970.*

[36] "Everywhere Eros triumphs, sex, ass."

Chapter 5

Cultural and Gender Diversity Since 1990

Since 1990, Québec has seen an explosion of adaptations of Shakespeare by a wide range of playwrights from various socio-cultural backgrounds. The 1990's saw, for instance, the first Québécois adaptations of Shakespeare written by women, queers, and immigrants. No fewer than twenty-two adaptations have been written and produced since then, and the number continues to grow (See Appendix). With such a wide range of texts, one would not expect to find much commonality among them, but, in fact, these plays all share one important trait: an exposure of the need to redefine the nation more inclusively in terms of cultural and gender diversity. In this respect, each of the diverse adaptations from this period, whether its focus is on the social roles of women, queers, or immigrants, falls in line with the Western postmodernist tendency to recognize the existence of fragmented subject positions and to embrace pluralistic identities more openly, even when such multiple subject positions may be in conflict with one another. This new generation of Shakespearean adaptors, including Normand Chaurette, Antonine Maillet, and Madd Harold and Anthony Kokx, among others, thus engage in a dialogue with Shakespeare on the issue of diversity, but these playwrights also implicitly critique their predecessors whose focus on nation lacked the diversity to which this generation of adaptations calls attention with varying degrees of success.

A brief glance at the theatre history of Québécois adaptations since 1990 reveals this potential for increased cultural and gender diversity and for multiple and competing subject positions in the redefinition of the nation less

monolithically. No production exemplifies this better than the *38* event (1996), a series of thirty-eight monologues about each of Shakespeare's plays written and performed individually by thirty-eight different playwrights or actors. Each monologue is a personal, even intimate, interpretation of a play by a particular individual with little to no intertextual or thematic exchange among the thirty-eight texts.[1] The monologues reflect larger social debates of the period, but only to the extent that the individual playwright/actor feels personally interpolated by them. For instance, "38 métiers 38 mégères" by Yvan Bienvenue, inspired by *The Taming of the Shrew*, quite unexpectedly disregards the character of Katherine completely; instead, his monologue is an apology for patriarchy through the lens of new masculinity as the character of a washed-up actor laments having to choose between playing the role of Petruchio against his conscience or losing his girlfriend because of his chronic "loserdom" (to employ a term coined by Richard Burt). Martin Doyon's "Richard III, pauvre chou",[2] based on *Richard III*, also neglects the opportunity to explore the play's women characters (as Normand Chaurette does in *Les Reines* as we shall see), and chooses instead to parody the "psycho-pop" discourse emerging at the time by analyzing Richard's character in terms of his childhood development—complete with all the technobabble of educators, psychologists, and juvenile rehabilitators—thereby re-creating another 90's emblem of individualism gone awry, the phenomenon of *l'enfant-roi* (the spoiled child-king). Although not technically a textual adaptation of Shakespeare as I have been discussing here but rather an innovative stage production, Robert Lepage's *Elseneur*,[3] a one-man show in which, with the help of complex technical apparatuses, he plays all the characters, including the women, also represents this

desire to interact with Shakespeare one-on-one and to emphasize the competing subject positions within the world of the play (since playing all the characters and talking to himself constructs the actor as schizophrenic).

To a certain extent, this pluralist approach to Shakespeare in Québec in the 1990's could be seen as a temporary turn away from the use of Shakespeare as a medium for nationalist discourses. Instead, Shakespeare is appropriated in service of different socio-political agendas, especially by women, queers, and immigrants. Since the national question is often so all-consuming in Québec, only when it is temporarily occulted, for whatever social or political reason, can other minority groups assert their voices. As concerns about the collective nation ceded the way to a more pluralist approach to Shakespeare that privileged alterity, the 1990's saw the emergence of several Québécois adaptations for the first time by women, queer, and immigrant playwrights. Of note among these are *À propos de Roméo et Juliette* (1989) by Pierre-Yves Lemieux in which a gay Mercutio blatantly asserts his homoerotic desire for Roméo, *Le Marchand de Venise de Shakespeare à Auschwitz* (1977, 1993, 1998) by Tibor Egervari which takes place in a Nazi concentration camp, *La mégère de Padova* (1995) by Marco Micone, a neo-Québécois playwright of Italian descent, *Le making of de Macbeth* (1996) by Paula de Vaconcelos who represents the emergence of a new generation of women neo-Québécois writers,[4] *Sauvée des eaux: Texte dramatique sur Ophélie* (2000) by Daphné Thompson who takes a postmodern approach to the death of Ophelia, *Dave veut jouer Richard III* (2001) by Alexis Martin in which an actor with cerebral palsy plays Richard III,[5] *Sous l'empire de Iago* (2002) by Kadar Mansour in which the ghosts of Othello and Desdemona return for revenge on

Iago whom they qualify as "imperialist", and *Hamlet-le-Malécite* (2004) by Yves Sioui Durand and Jean-Frédéric Messier in which an aboriginal man seeks to play Hamlet while living the plot in his own life.[6] These adaptations all highlight, with varying degrees of success, the need for a better social recognition of women, queers, aboriginals, and immigrants within Québec. Marco Micone, who is also well-known for his poem "Speak What?" which adapts Michèle Lalonde's famous "Speak White", explicitly claims, for instance, that giving voice to women and Italians was the underlying motivation for his adaptation of *The Taming of the Shrew*: "En tant qu'immigrant, j'ai voulu insister sur l'hétérogenéité de cette culture" (qtd. in Lieblein, "Re-making" 187).[7]

Of particular interest during this period are the three plays that are the focus of this chapter, Normand Chaurette's *Les Reines* (1991), Antonine Maillet's *William S* (1991),[8] and Madd Harold and Anthony Kokx's *Henry. Octobre. 1970.* (2002). These three plays all diverge more radically from the Shakespearean source text than other adaptations of the period, and together they touch on each of these diverse cultural or gendered subject positions, although the first and the last play also both continue to grapple with the inescapable national question. Written by a gay man, by an "immigrant" woman, and in a bilingual collaboration, these adaptations are also representative of cultural and gender diversity in their authorship. This diversity in authorship extends to the approaches to Shakespearean adaptation employed by the playwrights, and each of these three plays therefore engages in a dialogue with Shakespeare in regards to either nation, gender, or the nature of adaptation itself for a very different purpose: *Les Reines* confronts but ultimately reinscribes early modern gender

norms; *William S* attempts to liberate Shakespeare's women characters from those same norms by confronting the fictionalized author with them directly, and hence questions also Shakespeare's canonical authority ; and *Henry. Octobre. 1970.* reasserts early nationalist discourses from the 1970's, and hence returns to a conception of the nation in which cultural and gender diversity continue to be excluded.

***

Normand Chaurette's *Les Reines* challenges the representation of women in Shakespeare's first tetralogy and the patriarchal norms within which they were confined. *Les Reines*, which was translated a year after its publication as *The Queens*,[9] showcases the offstage lives of four of Shakespeare's matriarchs from *1-3 Henry VI* and *Richard III*, creating a parallel world in which we see what they were doing while Shakespeare's "main" characters were engaged in the plot with which the reader is already familiar—much like Tom Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guilderstern Are Dead* constructs a parallel world set against the plot of *Hamlet*. To the four past or aspiring queens found in Shakespeare's text—Queen Margaret (wife of Henry VI and former mother-in-law of Lady Anne Warwick), Queen Elizabeth (wife of Edward IV), the Duchess of York (Edward's mother), and Lady Anne Warwick (wife of Richard III)—Chaurette adds two other characters of his own creation, Isabelle Warwick (wife of George, Duke of Clarence) and Anne Dexter (sister to Edward, George, and Richard). The play, which is limited to these six women, centers around the pettiness and manipulation as each one, except for Anne Dexter, reminisces and revels in the glory of past power or dreams about and plots to achieve future rule of England on the eve of Edward's

death and George's murder. Rather than sugar-coating, and thus denying, the harshness of early modern gender norms and their influence on Shakespeare's women characters, Chaurette's adaptation exposes those norms at their ugliest, thereby crediting his adapted characters with a strength that is obscured, or when not obscured denigrated by the male characters, in the source text. However, while Chaurette's adaptation gives voice to women characters who are marginalized in Shakespeare's text, the notion of giving voice then begs the question of what kind of voice are they given. I would argue that the play implicitly criticizes the early modern gender norms which circumscribe the existence of these queens, and implicitly the remnants of those norms which persist in contemporary stereotypes about women and political power; however, the adaptation ultimately reinscribes these norms since the voices with which the queens are endowed are ineffectual and the characters never transcend the limits imposed on them by the early modern discourses that dominate the source text.

The play's title signals from the outset the complex questioning of early modern gender norms since, as Lois Sherlow observes, the word "reine" in French, like its English counterpart "queen", has a double meaning that alludes not only to female royalty but also to gay men (358), in particular, I would add, to those who exhibit excessive femininity and whose gender performance thus parodies heteronormativity. The queens of Chaurette's play are early modern women, but they could equally be contemporary drag queens or simply flaming fags. The viciousness with which they lie to, spy on, and manipulate each other in their jostle for power plays into contemporary gender stereotypes about both straight women and queer men. Sherlow relies on biographical information to

support a queer reading of the play's title when she claims that the play is "cryptically signed as the work of a homosexual playwright" by the date of the play's action, January 20th, which is the feast of Saint Sebastian,[10] adding that such a "a use of significant dates is characteristic of Chaurette's writing" (369-70n3). While, in theory, any reading of the play should interpret the queens' performance of gender simultaneously in terms of early modern women, contemporary women, and contemporary gay men, in actual fact the queens never succeed in escaping the early modern context, so the wordplay and the potential multiple levels of meaning implied by the title are never actualized. The play writes back to early modern gender norms, but it does not liberate the queens from them.

Les Reines attempts to challenge these early modern gender norms through images of the nation's frozen immobility and grotesque decay which are symptomatic of the marginalization of these queens from real political power. Sherlow claims that like the work of Jean-Pierre Ronfard, Chaurette's play is "post-nationalist" theatre (358), a work that foregrounds poetry over politics. While it is certainly true that *Les Reines* is not *théâtre engagé* in the political sense, this supposedly "post-nationalist" play does in fact say a lot about the nation, and Québec in particular. Like Macbeth's Scotland or Caliban's island in Garneau's tradaptations, the nation in Chaurette's adaptation is marked geographically as Québéc, thereby turning the world of the play into a palimpsest of both England in 1483 and Québec in 1991.

Rather than alluding to the Plains of Abraham or local wildlife as Garneau does, *Les Reines* marks the nation as Québec by invoking another well-known

feature, its climate. As the queens observe, on this particular day during which the play takes place it is snowing; in fact, it is snowing so hard that they describe the snow as a flood which is causing the city of London to disappear (46). As Sherlow points out (356), the snow refers to the "winter of discontent" which opens *Richard III* (1.1.1). However, Sherlow fails to pursue the significance of this snow or the direction to which a full reading of the source text points. I would posit that this mysterious snow which pervades the backdrop of the play marks the nation as Québec firstly because it rarely snows in London, and secondly because snow and frost are frequent themes in Québécois poetry, especially in poetry of the 1920's-1950's. The most famous example of the image of winter in popular, nationalist discourse is Gilles Vigneault's song "Mon pays, ce n'est pas un pays, c'est l'hiver" (1964) in which the nation which must awaken from the cold so that it can, in the equally famous words of nationalist songwriter Paul Piché, be "Heureux d'un printemps" (1977) when it gives birth to itself.[11] The snow which overshadows the play is both a poignant spatial marker and a preliminary indication of the current distress of the yet unborn nation. In Québécois poetry, such as that of Hector de Saint-Denys Garneau, Paul Chamberland, and Pierre Châtillon, winter is associated with immobility and sleep while fire signals the awakening of the nation and the energy needed to accomplish sovereignty. In *Les Reines*, winter can also be read as a sign of frozen immobility, but in this case that immobility can be symptomatic of the nation's inability to accept change, such as the contributions of women to its political life.

As a reference to Shakespeare's "winter of our discontent", the adaptation's snowy backdrop is equally problematic because, as all readers

familiar with Shakespeare know, in *Richard III* "now" is not at all the winter of discontent but winter "[m]ade glorious summer by this son of York" (1.1.2). The snow thus begs the question of why *Les Reines* is set in a winter of discontent when it ought to be set in a glorious summer. In Shakespeare's text, the winter of discontent refers, for Richard on the one hand, to the rule of the Lancasters that ends with Edward IV's ascension to the throne, and, for the audience on the other hand, to the War of the Roses that has reached a ceasefire at the beginning of the play and will, ironically for Richard, reach its final conclusion by the end. In the adaptation, the winter of discontent is not made glorious summer because the nation is in a state of decay. Civil war opens the first scene of the play in the form of the queens' babble and continues as they bicker amongst themselves for the entire course of the play's action. In Québec in 1991, the nation was also in a state of discontent, caught between the failed Meech Lake Accord of 1990 and the looming Charlottetown Accord of 1992, civil debates that were dividing not only Québécois between sovereignists and federalists, but also dividing the rest of English Canada as a babble of marginalized voices—women, Native Peoples, francophones outside of Québec—was heard emanating from the hallways of power for the first time.

The decaying state of the nation is symbolized most powerfully in the play though through the grotesque death of its foremost embodiment, the monarch. In *Les Reines*, Edward IV is dying; in fact, he has been in a constant state of dying since his birth according to Anne Dexter (63). The long, grotesque description of his death by Queen Margaret constitutes an entire scene of the play in which the reader learns how first he lost one of his hands which rolled to the foot of his bed,

then his left eye fell out and rolled down his cheek, his mouth died and sealed his lips forever only to open again and spit out foamy potions from his esophagus and stomach, his blood poisoned his veins one by one, his forehead blackened, and his hair fell out of his head (25-27). The grotesque decay of Edward's body is a powerful description of the pitiful state of the nation which is not only England but also Québec. Edward's grotesque body also ties Chaurette's adaptation to those of Jean-Pierre Ronfard; the dying Edward is even more grotesque than Ronfard's Lear or his limping King Richard, thus signalling an even greater decline of the Québécois nation.

Why is the nation decaying so grotesquely? Compared to the worlds of Ronfard's *Lear* and *Vie et mort*, women are even more marginalized from positions of power and their voices are significantly less effective in influencing the decisions made by men in power. The queens attempt to engage in malicious forms of behind-the-scenes manipulation of men of power, since they can't participate directly in the affairs of the state, but this covert manipulation is not only unsuccessful in influencing the actions of men but merely serves to corrupt the queens even further. Politically, they have no voices; they produce only a senseless cacophony, like the babble that opens the play, in which none of their individual voices can be identified or heard properly. *Les Reines* takes place within a masculinist, violent culture characterized by backstabbing in the hallways of power, and the women, except Anne Dexter, are complicit in perpetuating this violence. Without a feminine element to counterbalance it, this masculinist violence is responsible for the slow decay of the nation. Moreover, the characters are constantly going downstairs to the furnace in the basement, a furnace so large

that one can walk around inside it; however, according to Queen Margaret, Richard has jurisdiction over it (35). These trips to the hot furnace could be read as attempts by the women to make "glorious summer" for themselves, and, indeed, like the plans of Shakespeare's Richard to make summer for himself, each trip is associated with a murder plot; however, this violent plotting in the furnace room does little to alleviate the winter storm outside. The nation continues to suffer under the snow and to decay so long as the women's feminine attributes, such as their maternal love for their own children, are co-opted into a masculinist civil war against each other rather than being used to create sororal solidarity.

Les Reines, then, is a play about women who do not meet the traditional definition of "Woman" and the impact this has on their society. The queens are all bad mothers; in fact, Queen Elizabeth is constantly searching for her children who are always being tended by someone else, and her lack of personal care for them is responsible for their murder when the Duchess of York gives them, at the end of the play, to Anne Warwick (who will deliver them to Richard) in exchange for wearing her crown for ten seconds. Queen Elizabeth is obsessed with patriarchal lineage, with the fact that the "Woodville, [elle] la première / Sont en train d'hériter / Le trésor d'Angleterre" (33),[12] rather than her maternal duty. Thus, the play either reinscribes that women ought to be childrearers in the home, or it highlights that early modern society obliged them to be, but in either case the adaptation does not change their lot in society or offer an alternative for them. While the play could be read as a critique of these norms, Queen Elizabeth is still punished by the death of her children as a result of her attempted incursion into the world of patriarchal affairs of wealth and lineage, and, in fact, the punishment

carries a heightened irony since it is enacted through the law of primogeniture, her only claim to wealth and power being through her children and the reproduction of her husband's lineage.

The Duchess of York's motherhood is more troubling than Queen Elizabeth's and reveals even more poignantly that the women's quest for power, rather than devotion to nurturing and loving their children, is highly problematic. The conversation between the Duchess and her supposedly mute daughter Anne Dexter, which is the longest scene in the play, articulates the conflict between the Duchess's masculinity and the femininity of her children Anne and George, a femininity that is encoded in early modern notions of women's silence. Anne and George have both been silent since childhood, speaking only when alone with their mother, who commanded their silence in reaction to discovering their incestuous love for each other, a crime for which she also ordered Richard to cut off Anne's hands. Anne reminds her mother, "George était un sphère d'amour / Mais je régnais dans son coeur / Ah ce devait être souffrant / De t'incliner devant sa reine!" (61),[13] and she charges that her hands were cut off because her mother was jealous and consumed with knowing that her hands had touched George. Anne Dexter, then, is, or at least was, a queen too, the queen of George's heart, and because she challenged her mother, whose one dream in life is to be a queen as well, if only for ten seconds, her punishment for usurping her mother's place in her brother's heart must exceed mere silence; she must cease to exist in her mother's eyes. The Duchess may be heartless, but Anne, according to her mother, is nothing at all (66).

The gendering of both George and Anne's punishments illuminates the

gender trouble experienced by the other five women in the play, George in terms of his effeminization and Anne in terms of women's non-presence. When confronting the Duchess, Anne confirms that George speaks only at the Duchess's command but qualifies his speech as not being language at all: "Des râlements, des cris / Des sons mis bout à bout / Des mots qui n'ont de place / En aucun dictionnaire." (60).[14] As a language controlled by his mother, the "langue-à-sa-mère" to which Lalonde refers perhaps, George's "speech" is feminine. As a character, he has been feminized by his mother both in terms of the feminine language he speaks which the Duchess claims only she can understand and, since silence is the principal characteristic of good early modern women, in terms of his silence towards everyone else. Yet, George's feminization is not only a result of the Duchess's manipulation of him but something to which he was already in tune through his incestuous love for Anne. As Anne says, their love for each other was "avant le temps / Tu as compris que nous avions été là d'abord / Et que le monde était venu ensuite / Tu n'étais que notre mère / Mais engendrée après nous—" (61).[15] Existing before time and before the world, George and Anne's love not only transcends the social norms of the masculinist world of the play but preceded the construction of all social conventions and taboos. Their incestuous love is embedded with a purity experienced temporarily by the other characters as a peace that, because they are indoctrinated by masculinist social norms, such as the violence exemplified by Richard, they are unable to understand or endure. Before silencing them both, the Duchess was moved by their happiness and taught Richard by their example: "Qui mieux que nous pouvait illustrer / La paix dans notre maison? / Et pourtant au bout de six mois / Cette paix avait trop duré"

(62).[16] As Anne concludes, their feminine love and peace could not survive in this violent masculinist realm. Their love was simply incomprehensible to everyone else, including the Duchess who subscribes to the laws of the realm.

Anne's non-existence in her mother's eyes signifies a similar rejection of the feminine maternal love that cannot survive in this masculinist society, resulting in the Duchess's living death. Anne confronts her mother about her attempts to erase her existence because she is the wrong gender: "On m'a parlé aussi / D'une fille parmi ces frères. / ... / Il te faut des heures / Pour expliquer que cette enfant-là / N'est jamais née" (58).[17] The Duchess has tried to write Anne out of history because she was born a daughter rather than a son, but this erasure is a long and arduous process. The Duchess is successful in transforming Anne in "nothing", but she pays the price for her rejection of the feminine with her own living death. Unable to die despite her age because she has prevented her children from living, the Duchess's hundred years will soon be forgotten because she has subscribed to a purely patriarchal approach to kinship: "À défaut d'avoir mis au monde / Une sœur pour tes fils / Une fille qui aurait peut-être pu / Regretter sa mère" nobody will remember or mourn her (65).[18] The Duchess's condemnation to a living death results, then, not only from forbidding her children to live their own lives but also from her rejection of her own femininity, and the rejection of her daughter, in favour of the laws of a masculinist society which privileges sons. She retorts that she would have liked to have given birth to a daughter, but she couldn't give birth to a daughter because she could not give birth to the feminine element inside her: "Pour qu'elle naisse / Je lui promettais tout ce qu'elle désirerait / Pourvu qu'elle arrive en moi / Rien n'y faisait / Elle n'était pas en

moi" (65).[19] The Duchess has not actively subscribed to this masculinist culture, therefore, but she too is a product of it against her will. She desired to produce the feminine within her and set it free in the world, but the social constraints working against her were too strong. Since the feminine cannot exist within the masculinist world of the play, Anne is "nothing". The Duchess tells her that "elle est à notre langue / Ce que zéro est à nos nombres", and then adds even more paradoxically, confirming her existence in the same breath that denies it, "Aussi vrai que toi tu existes / Aussi vrai que tu es devant mes yeux / Elle n'est rien. / Rien. Nothing" (66).[20]

Anne's status as "nothing", as that which does not signify, is in fact full of signification. First, although her mother equates her with the number zero, as any mathematician knows, the number zero is in fact a key placeholder without which most equations could not be solved, and Anne too is the key to the puzzling world of *Les Reines*. Anne both is and is not a queen; she is George's queen, but she is also an inversion of a queen, since the word "rien" is an anagram of "reine" (minus the silent, feminizing final "e"). Yet she is not a queen in the royalist sense, so within the kinship-based world of the play, she is nothing. Second, she is silent because she is a daughter rather than a son, and early modern women must be silent, thus her silent invisibility also makes her nothing. Anne embodies the silence of all the queens, since everything they say is like their opening babble a meaningless cacophony which goes unheard and does not signify within the masculinist world of the play. Third, since she is called "Nothing" in English in the original French text, she is tied intertextually to Shakespeare's most famous representation of nothingness, Cordelia, and Lear's warning that "Nothing will

come of nothing" (1.1.90). Like Cordelia, or Mariana in *Measure for Measure* who is "neither maid, widow, nor wife" (5.1.177-8), Anne thus becomes a vagina or a punk; she represents the transgressive, and hence uninhibited, female sexuality which cannot be expressed in the world of the play, just as her love for George was a nothing that defied signification to the other characters as was her mother's own attempt to give birth of her that also could not be actualized. Fourth, Anne is nothing because she does not exist in Shakespeare's *Richard III*; therefore, she is outside of history as the audience knows it since the cultural weight of Shakespeare's history plays has allowed them to replace History itself (especially in the case of *Richard III*). Queen Margaret, Queen Elizabeth, the Duchess of York, and Lady Anne all appear onstage in Shakespeare's play, and although Clarence's wife Isabel Warwick does not, she is presumed to exist by virtue of her reproductive capacity as the mother of Clarence's children who do appear. Only Anne Dexter, sister to two kings but mother to none, does not exist in Shakespeare's history and thus not at all. She is nothing because she has not fulfilled a reproductive capacity, through the use of her vaginal "nothing", to perpetuate patriarchal kinship and the violent competition that endlessly feeds it.

As nothing, then, Anne Dexter literalizes the condition of the other women in the play. They do not think that they are nothing, but in fact they are as well, since their only real power, despite their backroom manipulations, is their use of their nothings to produce male heirs. They do not exist, except by virtue of their husbands and their sons. In this respect, the queens echo the widows in the other Québécois adaptation of *Richard III*, Ronfard's *Vie et mort*. Much like Judith Roberge who tells Catherine Ragone that she is nothing once she becomes a

widow, a name with no guarantor, so too are these queens nothing more than reproductive vessels for a patriarchal system that despite all their cunning they are unable to control. Their non-presence in the affairs of the nation, and the lack of the feminine element represented by George, whom Anne calls purity, causes its decay: "la pureté va bientôt mourir / Noyée dans un tonneau / Cette maison n'est plus qu'un entonnoir / Où tout se mélange et s'écoule / Dans la bouche pourrie de la mort" (63).[21] The nation is rotten because it lacks the purity of George and Anne's unconventional love and feminine influence to counterbalance Richard's violence. While the play challenges these early modern gender norms and implicitly critiques both them and contemporary gender stereotypes about the masculinity and lack of maternal tenderness of women who seek political power, ultimately these early modern norms win out since there is no return to the feminine at the end and no indication that nation will cure itself of its decay.

Finally, Anne's nothingness also ties her intertextually to Antonine's Maillet play *William S.* As an analogue to Cordelia, Anne is also an analogue to Lear's Fool given Shakespeare's association of the two characters in his version of *King Lear* as well as the Fool's frequent references to Lear's state of nothingness following the loss of his kingdom. Sherlow also ties Anne to the Fool, although she does so in relation to the Tarot (361). I would argue that Anne functions as the Fool in a more Shakespearean sense, as the one character who observes everything and understands the most. She is also the only character who always appears to speak the truth amidst the lies of the five other women. Similar to Lear's Fool, Anne Dexter does not speak for the last three scenes of the play. She may be onstage or she may not; the stage directions do not indicate whether

she is still present observing the others or whether she has mysteriously disappeared entirely. In reaction to the last words she does speak, Queen Elizabeth replies, "Voyez comme tout me rend folle" (70),[22] accusing her of creating folly. If, by virtue of her similarities to Shakespeare's other fools, particularly Lear's Fool, Anne is the fool of *Les Reines*, then she is, to some extent, also the most Shakespearean character, at least as suggested by Antonine Maillet whose Fool in *William S*, as we shall see, is Shakespeare himself. Since Maillet's *William S* was first produced in April 1991, only fourth months after *Les Reines*, this tie between the two plays may be more than coincidental.

***

Antonine Maillet's *William S* takes issue with early modern gender norms much more literally than *Les Reines*. The play adapts some of Shakespeare's most famous women characters—Lady Macbeth, the Shrew, Juliet and her nurse—and gives voices to those on whom early modern dramatic conventions of gender impose silence. However, not only does Maillet engage in a dialogue with the Shakespearean canon, but her characters literally speak to Shakespeare himself, charging him with the crimes which were their fate in his texts—silence, domestic violence, and death. In attempting to justify the misogyny of his plots, the character of Shakespeare, personified as his own Fool, cannot help but acknowledge the violence to which he has subjected his women characters and the futility of his own attempt as author to fix transhistorically the meaning of his texts.

By staging the author interacting with characters who attempt to restructure his gender and racial paradigms, the adaptation engages in a debate

about authorial intention, and it intertwines questions of race and gender with canonical authority. Shakespeare, feeling god-like, descends from the sky into the theatre to spy on how his characters are doing after 400 years, but he rudely discovers that they are not pleased with the roles written for them and they do not regard their author as the benevolent creator that he thinks himself to be. The fictional Shakespeare's descent from the sky, balancing on a cable, immediately posits the author as god, a comparison which is evoked textually several times in the play and also intertextually by the historical Shakespeare's use of this theatrical device for the god Jupiter in *Cymbeline* and the spirit Ariel in *The Tempest*.

The fictional Shakespeare's opening monologue to the audience establishes his disinterested god-like possession of his characters which he says "[Qu'il] a créés, sorties de rien, pour [le] distraire" (23).[23] Shakespeare then explains his reason for writing his plays: "J'ai voulu, comme tant d'autres, avoir le dernier mot dans mon dialogue avec [... le Temps]" (23).[24] Shakespeare's confessions to the audience raise two important questions about author/ity. First, are characters "real" people, and, second, can the author fix transhistorically the meaning of his work? The fictional Shakespeare's attitude towards his characters, that they are mere playthings to amuse him, indicates that they are objects rather than thinking subjects; however, his encounters with them throughout the course of the play force him to re-evaluate his position because they are clearly self-aware and conscious of their role as characters. Shakespeare's characters are indeed endowed with agency and are able to rebel against and exceed their prescribed roles. The characters' independence from their author confirms that the

author cannot have the last word on his work after all, that Time will indeed give new life to his characters and allow them to develop in unexpected directions beyond his original intentions for them.

The adaptation appears, then, to extol Barthes' theory of the death of the author since the subversion of authorial intention by the characters themselves prevents any fixity of the text's meaning. In fact, a dialogue between Shakespeare-as-Fool and Hamlet explicitly connects Nietzche's death of god with Barthes' death of the author, a problematic association for the fictional Shakespeare as author-god:

> SHYLOCK: Nous réclamons l'auteur.
>
> FOU: L'auteur est introuvable.
>
> HAMLET: Le créateur est introuvable. Dieu est introuvable!
>
> FALSTAFF: Dieu est mort et enterré. (59)[25]

Here, absurdist, Beckett-esque, existential exasperation with the absence of god becomes a Barthes-esque assertion of the death of the author through an implied syllogism that if both the author and god are absent, and god is dead and buried, then the author must also be dead and buried. Shakespeare-as-Fool is confronted with his own characters' claim that he does not exist, that is, that he has no author/ity; whereas, their agency to debate the subject proves that they have "lives of their own", that is, that they are not only subject to other interpretations beyond his intentions but also that they are active subjects. Of course, this debate on the nature of authorship is forcibly paradoxical since it depends on the play's staging of the author and his interaction with his characters who must expose his intentions and motivations, thereby endowing those intentions with a certain

authority as if the author's intentions were indeed the word of god—intentions which nonetheless *define* the characters despite failing to *circumscribe* them. Ironically, Maillet's experiment of staging the death of the author depends on his presence (it is in fact Shakespeare-as-Fool who claims the author is absent) and the explicit confession of his intentions as an authority which the characters must resist.

This deconstructive absent-presence of the author does nothing, however, to resolve the real concerns of the characters—their gendered or racial oppression based on the roles to which they have been assigned and from which they are struggling to break free. Juliet's Nurse, for example, categorically rejects any debate about an author-god, asserting, "Personne ne m'a faite, moi, hormis mon père et ma mère. Pour les autres... auteurs, créateurs, Dieu... bouillie pour les chats. Parlons de choses sérieuses" (73).[26] The Nurse, in her blissful disdain for existential angst, exposes the debate as, if not false, then at least irrelevant because she cannot change the nature of an author-god, only her own condition. For her, the concrete nature of her existence is the only serious topic of discussion, and for the women characters who compose the majority of the play's dramatis personae their existence is defined by a misogyny which limits the "life" of their character. The Shrew, for instance, wears heavy chains throughout the play even though there is no stage direction to this effect in the original Shakespearean text. As she points out, she is in a constant struggle between the destiny which her essential nature demands of her and the circumstances which prevent her from achieving it: "Conçue mégère, puis mise au monde apprivoisée. [...] Je suis mon propre contraire. Un paradoxe ambulant" (44).[27] In a throw-back

to postcolonial criticisms of Caliban's relationship to Prospero, the Shrew claims "nous sommes tous ses esclaves" (45),[28] implicitly evoking a discourse of decolonization from the authorial gender norms which are responsible for her heavy chains.

The Shrew's interaction with other women, notably Juliet, furthers her exposé of the harsh reality of early modern gender paradigms, particularly the rules of primogeniture. The Shrew asks Juliet: "Depuis quatre siècles, ma fille, depuis le début du monde que nous nous trouvons, femmes, en position de faiblesse. Et qu'a-t-on fait de nous?" (64).[29] Juliet responds, "On nous a aimées", provoking the Shrew to retort sarcastically, "Oh! oh!! Entendez roucouler le gentil pigeon! Aimées, dit-elle, aimées dans les chaînes, aimées esclaves, courtisanes, machines à leur fabriquer une progéniture, progéniture de mâles pour hériter de leurs biens et titres, et de quelques femelles pour assurer la lignée. Et vous appelez ça aimer, Juliette?" (64).[30] Katherine's exasperation at the law of primogeniture is certainly nothing new for Shakespeareans—Edmund in *King Lear* eloquently, if self-contradictingly, makes a similar complaint—but despite its lack of subtlety Katherine's frustration prepares Shakespeare-as-Fool to receive the more nuanced complaints of other women characters who claim to have suffered more at his hand than their male counterparts.

Maillet's Lady Macbeth, for instance, plays on the gender fluidity which characterizes Shakespeare's Lady Macbeth and even expresses a hint of a transgendered identity. She asks the fictional Shakespeare why he made her a woman when she was better equipped than her husband to be king: "Moi seule de nous deux possédais la tête, l'âme, le coeur d'un roi... mais dans un corps de

femme. Pourquoi?" (78).[31] Lady Macbeth claims that Shakespeare's complicity with early modern gender norms is solely responsible for her downfall, and that had her character been free to act unconstrained she would have proven a better ruler than her husband:

> Mais moi dans tout ça, moi votre créature, aiguillonnée par l'ambition, tentée par le pouvoir, que vous avez doté d'une âme d'acier pour venir ensuite l'enfermer dans une enveloppe de conventions et de lois à l'usage des mâles, qu'avez-vous fait de moi, la femme? Vous m'avez faite femme, justement, avec tout ce que cette condition entraîne de misères et de limitations. La femme qui ne saurait porter l'épée, ni commander à son homme, ni transgresser les lois de son sexe. (79)[32]

Her demand for rectification—"Que le roi mâle remette aux femmes la pouvoir usurpé" (67)[33]—interpolates not only her husband the male king but also Shakespeare, the male author-god who is king of her fictional universe. Moreover, she specifically blames Shakespeare for attributing a female body to her masculine gender identity. Yet, rather than negating that body, she rejects instead the early modern gender norms which circumscribe it, calling for a social paradigm shift, rather than an author-god to issue magically a new male body. As such, Maillet's Lady Macbeth works to posit the disruption of gender norms—what Judith Butler calls working the variation in the norm (*GT* 185)—as a potential reordering of social hierarchy that exploits the social constructedness of early modern paradigms whose principal vulnerability is their lack of transhistoricity.

This disruption of social hierarchy is, according to Maillet's Shrew, the

reason why Shakespeare refused to let her character live out its natural life:

> "Quand il s'est rendu compte qu'il avait créé une femme si forte, si libre, si indépendante, l'homme en lui a tremblé pour sa suprématie. Je risquais de bouleverser l'ordre des choses. Et pour me couler dans sa vision misogyne du monde, il m'a pliée en quatre et m'a rompu l'échine. Puis il m'a mis en bouche, à moi qui fus douée d'un si splendide franc-parler, le discours le plus plat, insipide et moralisateur de la littérature universelle" (100-101).[34]

The Shakespearean Katherine's final speech is problematic for contemporary audiences precisely because the gender norms it espouses have not passed the test of time, such as the wife placing her hand under her husband's foot, a ritual removed from the Book of Common Prayer in 1549 that was already forty years outdated at the time of the play (Boose 182-3). As Maillet's Shrew points out though, this discursive shift between dramatic action and religious ordinance is quite possibly the most awkward theatrical moment in the Shakespearean canon because the socially constructed moral norms do not correspond to what the audience expects based on past knowledge of the "natural life of the character". The jolt in the dramatic action signals a potential point of disruption of the early modern social hierarchy which Shakespeare fails to smooth over sufficiently, thus highlighting the precise point in his play at which the introduction of a variation in early modern norms could potentially wreak the most social havoc. Maillet's Shrew describes Shakespeare's portrait of character following this unexpected turn of events as "pas un très bel exemple de son prétendu génie. S'il avait fait avec elle comme avec vous, Falstaff, Hamlet, ou Lear, s'il avait donné à la

Mégère ses coudées franches et l'avait laissée vivre jusqu'au bout son personnage, vous pensez qu'elle se serait laissé apprivoiser, domestiquer, réduire à l'état de paillasson de son homme?" (99)[35]

In analyzing not just her own lot in life as a dramatic character but also the dramatic and aesthetic qualities of the Shakespearean text as well as its narrative continuity, Maillet's Shrew becomes a literary critic of her own author-god, thus employing the same critical techniques required of postcolonial authors in order to write back to the canon. She compares the well-roundedness of Shakespeare's Shylock and the two-sided balance of *The Merchant of Venice* to the sudden break in the action of *The Taming of the Shrew*: "au Juif au moins il a fourni l'occasion de se defender. Pas à la Mégère" (97); "avec moi, il s'est révélé un piètre auteur. Car en apprivoisant la Mégère, il a raté sa pièce" (99).[36] The fictional Shakespeare agrees with this assessment of his early comedy compared to Shylock's later "Hath not a Jew eyes" speech: "Hé oui! brave Juif. Vous venez de prononcer le plus beau discours de toute mon oeuvre. Dans la bouche d'aucun autre n'ai-je mis paroles plus sublimes. C'est à vous que j'ai confié l'éloquent plaidoyer à la défense de tout un peuple, et vous vous plaignez de moi?" (97).[37] However, as with much of the rest of the play, Maillet's fictional Shakespeare takes the easy route and provides a pat answer that does not get to the heart of the issue. Yes, Shylock's character can defend himself while the Shrew cannot, but this superficial distinction between the two situations fails to account for the social construction of anti-Semitism and racism. Rather than uniting the causes of gender and racial oppression by bringing the Shrew and Shylock together as allies, the play's conclusion is a cop-out which represents early modern gender

norms as inherently "worse" than early modern religious and racial stereotypes, thereby failing to acknowledge the constructedness of all norms, gender, religious, racial or otherwise. By failing to recognize the social constructedness of all norms, regardless of what type, and by privileging a recognition of the social impact of one over the other, the adaptation also fails to acknowledge the potential for disruption of the transhistoricity of all socially constructed norms through similar strategic actions, such as Butler's suggestion of introducing a variation into the norm, and the potential alliances that can be forged by social activists of different minority groups.

This easy dismissal of Shylock's cause that results in a division between gendered and religious or racial oppression rather than their unification in a common cause is just one of many examples in which Maillet's *William S* misses its target and smoothes over opportunities for a more in-depth criticism of early modern gender, religious, and racial paradigms. In two other instances, Maillet's adapted characters perpetuate rather than challenge gendered stereotypes found in the Shakespearean text. When a confused and slightly senile King Lear meets Juliet, for example, he states, "Je n'ai engendré nulle Juliette. Un ange, deux démons, mais aucune Juliette" (60).[38] Here Maillet's Lear maintains the same misogynist, demonized representation of Goneril and Regan that can be found in traditional Shakespearean criticism. The adaptation completely fails to engage with more contemporary feminist interpretations of the last 40 years, such as Peter Brook's production which shows Goneril and Regan as victims rather than villains, or such as Jane Smiley's adapted novel *A Thousand Acres* which was published in 1992 just a year later than *William S* and thus written in the same

historical context of Western feminism.

In addition, despite its defence of the Shrew as the adaptation's heroine, *William S* also perpetuates early modern norms about female loquacity. Falstaff introduces the Shrew to Lear as "la Mégère, Sire, la Commère, le Tonnerre..." (61).[39] While the description of Katherine as a "commère" links her to *The Merry Wives of Windsor* whose standard French title is *Les Joyeuses commères de Windsor*, this noun completely misrepresents the character of Shakespeare's Shrew. According to *Le Petit Robert*, "commère" designates a "femme qui sait et colporte toutes les nouvelles", that is, a "bavard", and "commérage" signifies "bavardage indiscret" or "ragot" or "médisance".[40] Yet Shakespeare's Katherine cannot be classified as a gossip in the same sense as the women in Thomas Middleton's *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside*. As Maillet's Shrew herself explains, her character used her frank speech to defend herself, and her loquacity posed a threat to social order thus prompting the need to put in her mouth the most boring and moralizing speech on gender roles in the history of literature. Maillet's Shrew attributes her verbosity to self-defence, not idle gossip. As the rest of the adaptation makes clear, the character is not a gossip or merry wife but one who protests her victimization and the domestic violence to which she is subjected. This discursive inconsistency between Falstaff's characterization of the Shrew as a merry gossip making thunderous noise for no reason and her own self-definition undermines the Shrew's plea to be free from her chains, positing her loquacity as trivial and immoral rather than legitimate and necessary.

Despite these inconsistencies, the adaptation's overall attempt to challenge early modern gender paradigms and Shakespeare's transhistorical canonical

author/ity achieves a certain success, however limited. By staging characters who literally talk back to an absent yet present author-god, and who give voice to their racial, religious, and gender diversity, the adaptation endorses the Shrew's loquacity and proposes that a wide range of clamorous voices may be a strategy for challenging an always already dead author and thereby subverting his author/ity.

***

Henry. Octobre. 1970., Madd Harold and Anthony Kokx's bilingual adaptation of *Henry V* transposed into the context of Québec's October Crisis is also invested in subverting authority; however, the play is not concerned so much with Shakespeare's authority but rather with that of another man who has acquired a god-like socio-cultural status: Pierre Elliot Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada from 1968 to 1979 and from 1980 to 1984. The adaptation appropriates Shakespeare's version of the 15th century British invasion of France in order to highlight the anti-democratic nature of the Canadian government's 1970 military occupation of Québec and Pierre Trudeau's invocation of the War Measures Act in peacetime. By setting Shakespeare's play during the only 20th century military operation to take place on Canadian soil, Harold and Kokx draw attention to the persistence of the linguistic and socio-cultural cleavage imported to Canada by both French and English European colonialism. Further, this setting subverts traditional readings of Shakespeare's text as a supposedly rousing elegy to English imperialism,[41] highlighting the moral uncertainty underlying Henry/Trudeau's actions and illustrating instead the legitimacy of the FLQ's socio-political concerns and Québec's aspirations for independence.[42] In this

return to a 1970 context and the nationalist discourses of the period though, including traditional French-English cleavages, the adaptation largely forecloses an examination of the contributions of immigrants, queers, and women in the nation, except in the case of the latter two as victims of symbolic violence.

While the play was directed largely in English by Harold with additional French text by Kokx, it employs Shakespeare's text so deftly that the adaptation initially appears to be composed largely from original material. Upon closer textual examination, however, it becomes clear that, except for Kokx's FLQ scenes, most of the text does indeed derive from Shakespeare. Rather than rewriting the source text, the adaptation achieves its originality principally through the redistribution of roles. It often attributes the speeches of the English forces to the FLQ and its supporters, or speeches of the French army to the federalists, and thereby distributes more evenly than Shakespeare the violence and aggression of the play to both sides of the conflict. Following the precedent set by Gurik's *Hamlet, prince du Québec*, the play contemporizes its characters within the political context of 1970. The character of René Lévesque corresponds variously to Shakespeare's French King or the Dauphin. The French army is the FLQ, anonymously identified as P'tit Jeune, P'tit Grand, and P'tit Gros rather than the real names of Francis Simard, Bernard Lortie, Jacques Rose, and Paul Rose who made up the Chénier cell that kidnapped Pierre Laporte. The English army is composed of Québec Premier Robert Bourassa, a Minister from Ontario, and a Minister from Alberta. The central character of Henry V, however, simply named "Prime Minister" in the performance program and "Henry" in the play script, is never directly referred to as Pierre Trudeau despite being undeniably

portrayed onstage as such, complete with a red rose in his lapel and his famous dancing twirl.

In addition to these changes to roles, five other significant additions contextualize the play geographically and historically: the FLQ manifesto; Michèle Lalonde's poem "Speak White" first read at the *Nuit de la poésie* in Montréal in 1970; scenes recreating the hostage situation, including an English translation of the letter from Laporte to Bourassa; video projections on the theatre's upstage wall of black and white newsreel footage of the October Crisis; and real-time video recreations of Pierre Trudeau's address to the nation in which he announced his invocation of the War Measures Act, as well as his famous "Just watch me" television interview on the steps of Parliament after the army stationed itself in the streets of Montréal.

The issue at the heart of the FLQ manifesto, class equality across linguistic lines, opens the play, clearly situating this adaptation in socio-political terms, and connecting it intertextually, once again, to the neo-marxism underlying Gurik's *Hamlet*. The audience is introduced to Mafoie and Majoie (who later corresponds to Shakespeare's Montjoy as the French messenger to Henry), two francophone janitors who are completely disillusioned with the current political state of affairs. Alone together, they employ homophobic insults to describe Trudeau and Bourassa as loud-mouthed but ultimately weak, effeminate politicians who, unlike the FLQ, do nothing to enable social change. As the francophone janitors sweep silently the corridors of power, off to the margins of the stage, the audience watches important political decisions being made center stage by Henry/Trudeau and his cabinet, decisions which ignore Bourassa's protests uttered in a

disempowered English highlighted by his clumsy accent. By the time a messenger arrives to read in English the FLQ manifesto to Henry/Trudeau, the audience has had the opportunity to witness firsthand that the manifesto's frequent references to the impoverished, lower-class, francophone workers of Québec are not simply rhetorical flourishes or unreasonable pleas for sympathy; rather, the FLQ demands are poignantly juxtaposed to and validated by the image of the slow, steady sweeping of the janitors whose blue working-class overalls contrast sharply with Henry/Trudeau's elegant business suit. Although the play reduces considerably the length of the FLQ manifesto for reasons of time, its central argument nonetheless pervades the rest of the play: the FLQ does not consider itself to be a terrorist group; its principal concern is to incite the government to instill social reforms which would efface the inequality instilled by privileged anglophones from Westmount who profit on the backs of francophone workers.

This neo-marxist discourse is reiterated later in the play in the student protest scene. The protest ties together the neo-marxism of the FLQ manifesto, the language issues which provoked the McGill Français protests (and eventually led to equal rights for both francophone and anglophone students), and the explosion of arrests without warrants which followed the proclamation of the War Measures Act and its suspension of the Canadian Bill of Rights. The scene begins with Lévesque proclaiming to a crowd of students, "Thus come the English with full power upon us, / And more than carefully it us concerns / To answer honourably in our defenses" (17, 2.4.1-3)[43]. This initial uprising is followed by the arrival of a messenger with Pierre Laporte's letter to Robert Bourassa pleading for Bourassa to negotiate with the FLQ, then an onstage recreation of Trudeau's

declaration of the War Measures Act using a live video feed projected in real time onto the upstage wall of the theatre. Immediately following this speech, Henry/Trudeau begins to recite Henry's famous "Once more unto the breach, dear friends" speech (21, 3.1.1-34); however, Henry/Trudeau speaks aloud only the first and last lines of the monologue, mouthing the rest silently, while Lévesque stands in front of the video projection and simultaneously delivers aloud the same speech in French. The effect of Lévesque's speech is rousing on both the students and the audience, but it is overshadowed by the wide-eyed, obsessed look of Henry/Trudeau's giant head behind him, an image with chilling Big Brother overtones. This rapid sequence of events sparks the student protest which concludes the scene and which consists principally of Katherine, Shakespeare's French princess who is here a student, waving a Québec flag and passionately reciting Lalonde's "Speak White" to a crowd of enthusiastic students.

Lalonde's "Speak White" integrates seamlessly into the text of *Henry. Octobre. 1970.* not only because it evokes Shakespeare but also because the poem articulates the same socio-political and economic concerns as the FLQ manifesto. Twice the poem evokes Shakespeare as the epitome of "proper" English. First, the image of Shakespeare's English opens the poem ironically, slightly tongue in cheek, as a critique of linguistic and cultural imperialism:

> Speak white
> il est si beau de vous entendre
> parler de Paradise Lost
> ou du profil gracieux et anonyme qui tremble dans les sonnets de Shakespeare. (1-4)[44]

However, it is later associated in the poem with the atrocities of war:

dans la langue douce de Shakespeare

avec l'accent de Longfellow

parlez un français pur et atrocement blanc

comme au Viêt-Nam au Congo (73-6).[45]

While, as a text with a strong emphasis on linguistic and cultural imperialism, "Speak White" articulates a protectionist discourse about the Québécois language, the protest scene as a whole foregrounds among the student protestors the presence of an Italian immigrant who does not speak white but who speaks the language of the francophone majority and who embraces the nationalist and neo-marxist struggles of his *pure laine* friends. The unnamed Italian immigrant may be interpreted as a wink to the audience indicating that although the scene is set in the context of 1970 when the poem "Speak White" was a legitimate response to the widespread use of English, especially in the workplace, a more relevant question in 2002 would be that raised by Italian author Marco Micone in his poem "Speak What" about the need for *pure laine* nationalists to be more welcoming of immigrants, especially *enfants de la loi 101* who have assimilated to the francophone majority and who are willing to join the sovereignist movement provided their own cultural difference is respected. However, although the Italian immigrant appears onstage, and his ethnic origin is clearly identified by his heavy accent which makes him stand out among the other students taking part in the protest, his presence is not mentioned at all in the playtext and he is not assigned any specific lines in the text except for his onstage shouts of encouragement of *pure laine* companions in the original stage

performance. The problematic exclusion of the only immigrant character in the performance from the text of the play highlights the adaptation's overall lack of engagement with issues of cultural and gender diversity, and this absence is doubly problematic given that Micone's "Speak What" (with which the playwrights should be familiar given that the scene includes "Speak White") ends with a plea for immigrants to be included in the sovereignist project ("nous sommes cent peuples venus de loin / pour vous dire que vous n'êtes pas seuls") and even validates Québec's protectionist approach to language in the face of assimilation ("nous dirons notre trépas avec vos mots / pour que vous ne mouriez pas").[46]

In addition to the strong focus on the linguistic assimilation of the Québécois people in the 1970 context to the exclusion of immigrant voices, the "Speak White" also places a strong emphasis on the need to "raconter / une vie de peuple-concierge" (58-9),[47] an image which ties the poem to Mafoie and Majoie's janitorial duties which open the play. Like the FLQ manifesto, "Speak White" is first and foremost a rallying cry to the effect of "workers of Québec unite!":

> mais quand vous really speak white
> quand vous get down to brass tacks
> pour parler du gracious living
> et parler du standard de vie
> et de la Grande Société
> un peu plus fort alors speak white
> haussez vos voix de contremaîtres
> nous sommes un peu durs d'oreille

nous vivons trop près des machines

et n'entendons que notre souffle au-dessus des outils (23-32)[48]

By linking the neo-marxist discourse of the FLQ manifesto to Lalonde's famous poem, the play de-terrorizes the FLQ. No longer are they portrayed as radical terrorists, as is often the case in English Canadian historical accounts; rather, they appear as just one more facet of a much larger social movement comprised of well-educated students and highly respected poets, a movement representing the views of a large portion of the francophone population of Québec.

The intertextuality of the protest scene is not strictly limited, however, to discourse or motifs; it also connects *Henry. Octobre. 1970.* to actual events which took place preceding and following the suspension of civil liberties in Québec by the federal government. By staging "Speak White" as a protest, the play recalls the McGill Français demonstration of March 28, 1969, as well as the protest in Quebec City on October 31, 1969 against the government's Bill 63 linguistic policy. Katherine's onstage arrest at the end of the next scene evokes Montréal Mayor Drapeau's anti-demonstration legislation of November 12, 1969 which resulted in a series of violent arrests. Even more troubling, the subsequent scene in which Katherine and all the students are shown in jail must be read as a direct reference to the more than 500 arrests without warrants which took place in the days and weeks following Trudeau's invocation of the War Measures Act, the first 450 persons being taken in a mass operation during the night of October 16, 1970. The armed soldier standing watch over the prisoners from the corner of the stage appears as a perfect copy of those seen patrolling the streets of Montréal in documentary footage of the period, news clips which later appear along with

images of tanks and helicopters in the funeral scene video projections.

The professionalism of the well-trained soldier who refuses to flinch in response to Katherine's aggressive assertion that he is a "con" is contrasted in the play with the bumbling confusion which pervades the FLQ hostage scenes. In most respects, *Henry. Octobre. 1970.* follows closely the details provided by Francis Simard in *Pour en finer avec Octobre*, his personal account of events leading up to, during, and after the October Crisis. This is the only public account by someone who was actually present during these events since there was no need for testimony at trial, the Chenier cell having pleaded "responsible" in court (rather than "guilty"). Simard's narrative, published in 1982 about the same time he was released from prison, was adapted into Pierre Falardeau's 1994 film *Octobre*. *Henry. Octobre. 1970.* follows in Simard and Falardeau's approach of demystifying the actual events by giving the audience a privileged peek into the *huis clos*. The audience witnesses a relatively accurate dramatization of Simard's account of the tense waiting period after the kidnapping up until the moment of Laporte's death. Through the characters of P'tit Gros, P'tit Grand, and P'tit Jeune, the play emphasizes that the FLQ were young men who were holed up in a house with little food for Laporte or for themselves and who had no real plan of action of what to do with Laporte once they had actually kidnapped him.

The youth and ineptitude of the FLQ is comically portrayed by their writing of a ransom note as a difficult challenge that requires a group effort to complete. This task echoes the collective, impromptu writing of the FLQ manifesto; however, the play diverges from real life accounts in order to heighten the comic effect. Whereas the FLQ manifesto testifies to the education of the four

youths who wrote it, both through its proper use of grammar and its skillful use of rhetorical convention in order to appeal directly to the emotions of the entire working-class population of Québec who would hear it broadcast on radio and television in the FLQ's attempt to garner support for its cause, the ransom note of the play falls far short of this eloquence. The two attempts made at writing the communiqué become comic releases of the tension onstage. P'tit Gros's attempt ironically gives voice to the "langue à jurons/...pas très propre" (64-5) mocked by Lalonde:[49]

> Communiqué.
>
> À Robert Bourassa.
>
> Ont [*sic*] a Pierre Laporte.
>
> Va te faire foutre par une vielle [*sic*] marmotte.
>
> Va chier.
>
> On t'aime pas.
>
> Tu sent [*sic*] la crotte.
>
> De chaval.
>
> Dans une grotte.
>
> De vielle [*sic*] marmotte? [...]
>
> Merci beaucoup, P'tit Gros, P'tit Grand et P'tit Jeune.
>
> Et Pierre Laporte.
>
> Front de Libération du Québec.
>
> Nous vaincrons! Nous vaincrons! (12)[50]

P'tit Grand's subsequent attempt is even less articulate and borders on the absurd:

> Communiqué.

Robert,

C'est nous autres.

Devine qui?

Pas capable?

Essaye don't [*sic*]?

Peur?

Peureux?

Va chier, salté [*sic*].

Nous vaincrons! Nous vaincrons! (15)[51]

Both manifesto-writing episodes are important not only for their comedic element which makes the hostage situation more palatable for the audience, but also as yet another point of contrast between the FLQ and the figures of powerful, political authority. While Henry/Trudeau and even, although to a lesser extent, the assimilated neo-colonial Bourassa both master Shakespeare's English throughout the play and articulate some of the most eloquent monologues in the entire English canon, the FLQ scenes are written almost exclusively in a *joual* which emphasizes the working-class background of the FLQ's members. The politicians are estranged not only from their own Québécois roots and the reality of their own people, but also from the very discourses which express that reality.

In all the FLQ scenes in *Henry. Octobre. 1970.*, there is, however, one exception to this *joual*-only rule. For the final speech of their final scene, P'tit Jeune appropriates Shakespeare's language and Henry V's famous St. Crispian Day speech (40, 4.3.18-67). As a postcolonial appropriation though, the speech, which is delivered in French, is transformed into a strange case of cultural

hybridity, neither Shakespeare's discourse nor entirely that of the FLQ but a mutation of both. No longer are fair cousin Westmorland and the entire English army encouraged to fight for the honour of being remembered each year at the feast of St. Crispian; instead, P'tit Jeune spurs on his two lone companions "to make a stand" (the only English words inserted into the speech) so that tomorrow may finally be declared "la Journée de la Liberté". *Henry. Octobre. 1970.* thus constitutes a definitive discursive shift from Gurik's *Hamlet, prince du Québec.* Rather than emphasizing Québec's perpetual inability to choose its destiny and *passer à l'action*, as Gurik's adaptation implies, *Henry. Octobre. 1970.* revolves around the FLQ's choice to move from deliberation to action. By associating that decisive action with a speech which in Shakespeare's version is pronounced on the eve of victory, the play constructs the FLQ's stand as an important moment necessary to win the struggle for independence since Henry V's battle at Agincourt is also the final battle in the source text at which the war is won. To the end of Shakespeare's rousing testimony to the strength and courage of the English army, the adaptation adds two passionate cries of "Vive le Québec libre!". At this very moment, all the emotion of the speech culminates in P'tit Jeune's strangulation of Laporte using a Québec flag. Dramatically, this is the strongest moment of the play, but it is not achieved without compromising an important detail from the historical account. In the historical version of events, Laporte attempted to escape by jumping through a window, but he was unsuccessful because, despite being free from his handcuffs, in his panic he did not remove his blindfold and got stuck in the broken window. He severely cut his wrists and chest on the broken glass, and the ensuing panic and confusion caused by this

unexpected turn of events is what eventually precipitated his unpremeditated murder. Unable to stop his bleeding but unwilling to risk leaving the house and being apprehended while taking him to a hospital, the FLQ members strangled Laporte with the chain he was wearing around his neck; it was a perverse, spontaneous *coup de grace*, and even the governmental inquest ruled his death accidental. In omitting this sequence of events, the play posits the death of Laporte as a well-planned act of liberation rather than a confused act of desperation.

The victorious moment towards national liberation suggested by the association of the death of Laporte with Henry V's St. Crispian's day speech is undercut by the FLQ's problematic treatment of gender issues. Not only are women excluded from this wing of the sovereignist movement, but the FLQ scenes are pervaded with homophobia that excludes queers as well. In Shakespeare's play, there is a subtext of homoerotic desire between Henry V and his former bedfellow turned traitor Lord Scroop (2.2.8-11).[52] The homoeroticism of the source text, coupled with a slur calling Trudeau a "tapette" in the original FLQ manifesto, can partly explain the adaptation's frequent descriptions of Henry/Trudeau as a "tapette" (2), a "pansy" (16), and a "queer" (17), and of Bourassa as a "momoune" (2) who "fait yainque tèté [*sic*] la queue du Boss" (16).[53] While these homophobic incursions certainly contextualize the play more convincingly in 1970, a period in which such insults and homophobia in general went largely unchallenged, their repetition is problematic for a contemporary audience and indicates that respect for gender diversity remains insufficient in Québécois adaptations of Shakespeare even as recently as 2002.[54]

However, the recurring undercurrent of homophobia which runs throughout the play, from Henry/Trudeau's gay pornography magazine to the gay sauna staging of Shakespeare's camp scene and the frequent insults, could also arguably be interpreted as picking up in a subtle manner on a paradoxical trend found in nationalist discourses of colonized peoples, a phenomenon which Robert Schwartzwald terms the "false feminine". Since all of the play's homophobic epithets are focused on the federalists as a means of conveying scorn, this discourse reproduces what Schwartzwald also labels the "fear of federasty", as described in chapter one. Given that the popular discourse of impoverished francophone workers often reflected the sentiment of "on s'est fait fourrer",[55] it is not surprising that they would want to redirect that demeaning, sexualized violence towards the privileged francophone politicians whom they considered to be traitors, or compradors, as Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffins would define the term for sold-out mimic men. In the play's 1970 context, this use of homophobic violence to fight back against perceived political traitors makes sense since the disempowered workers who utter the epithets have no other means of striking back against those who wield power over the conditions that govern their daily lives. However in its 2002 context, this manifestation of the fear of federasty remains problematic for the nationalism conveyed by the adaptation since the play's homophobic insults do not advance further the perception of Henry/Trudeau and Bourassa as traitors; rather, that claim is undercut by the workers' disrespect of the human rights of queers and their estrangement from social norms which no longer sanction such overt intolerance.

Henry/Trudeau's guilt as a traitor is perhaps *Henry. Octobre. 1970.*'s most

innovative reworking of Shakespeare's text. The scene entitled "Dream" reverses Henry V's charges against the traitors Cambridge, Scroop, and Grey in order to implicate Henry/Trudeau as guilty, subconsciously at least, for betraying his nation and for the impending death of Laporte which becomes inevitable once Henry/Trudeau declares War Measures and states his refusal to negotiate with the FLQ. Throughout the play, speeches attributed to one side or another of the English-French conflict are employed by the other party, but nowhere in the play is this switch so effective as it is here. In Shakespeare's text, Henry is the accuser of three traitors, but his own reputation remains relatively untarnished by their actions against him as victim. Conversely, in the adaptation, Henry/Trudeau is far from being, as King Lear claims to be, "a man / More sinned against than sinning" (3.2.59-60), and he becomes the accused rather than the accuser. Lévesque usurps the role of Shakespeare's Henry V, telling Henry/Trudeau:

> You must not dare, for shame, to talk of reason,
> For your own reasons turn in your bosom,
> As dogs upon their masters, worrying you. -
> See you, my princes and my noble peers,
> This English monster! (13-14, 2.2.81-5)

Lévesque's appropriation of these lines is especially effective because Henry/Trudeau's subsequent announcement of War Measures and his refusal to negotiate with the FLQ (a speech quoted from fact, not derived from fiction) hinges rhetorically on the notion of "reason" when he preemptively absolves himself from any criticism by arguing that to blame the federal government as even remotely responsible for the outcome of events would be a "most twisted

form of logic" (20). At the end of the dream scene, however, the audience witnesses that despite his brave public persona, Henry/Trudeau's inner demons still haunt him. After Lévesque's final accusatory speech, "You have conspired against our sovereign state" (14, 2.2.167), Henry/Trudeau becomes like a sacrificial lamb himself, only to discover that he has lost his tongue, which he pulls from his pocket in a small glass bottle.

Lévesque's appropriation of Henry V's words is not, however, always accusatory. At the end of the gay sauna/camp scene, after Henry/Trudeau has reflected on the burden borne by leaders, Lévesque returns onstage alone to pray:

> O God of battles! steel my people's hearts;
> Possess them not with fear; take from them now
> The sense of reckoning, if the opposed numbers
> Pluck their hearts from them. Not to-day, O Lord,
> O, not to-day, think not upon the fault. (39, 4.1.286-90)

In Shakespeare's play, the "fault" is not that of Henry V but that of his father, Henry IV, whose usurpation of the throne led to the murder of Richard II. Here, when Lévesque usurps Henry's role, he seeks penitence, bearing like a true leader the "fault" of his subjects, a burden which Henry/Trudeau has just explicitly rejected as his responsibility. The soliloquy thus figures Lévesque as a more populist and honest leader who is in tune with the concerns of his people and who exhibits a genuine care for their emotional and moral well-being.

A final role reversal which contributes to the adaptation's overall sympathetic treatment of the French over the English is the transfer of arrogant self-obsession from the French King and his forces to the anglophone Ministers

from Ontario and Alberta. While in Shakespeare's play the Constable of France, Orleans, and the Dauphin boast about their superior armour and horses, in the adaptation Minister Ontario brags to Minister Alberta about his suit and chauffeured car while sitting on a toilet flipping through Henry/Trudeau's gay pornography magazine (31, 3.7.1-68). This image of excess and indulgence not only serves to ridicule the anglophone politicians but also lends weight once again to the FLQ claim that many anglophones, and some colonized Québécois mimic men, are living in luxury while the majority of francophone workers suffer in poverty.

Minister Alberta also returns problematically in the final and most chilling scene of the play. In *Henry. Octobre. 1970.*, Shakespeare's heteronormative promise of rebirth and renewal symbolized by Katherine's marriage to Henry V is perverted in order to expose the hard reality of prison, the violent undertones of heterosexual courtship, and Canada's unceasing domination of Québec. The last prison scene between Minister Alberta and Katherine evokes Michel Brault's 1974 film *Les Ordres*, a black and white documentary style dramatic recreation of the October Crisis from the perspective of a few of the 500 ordinary Montréalais who were arrested and imprisoned for months without trial, over 90% of whom were eventually released without explanation and without being charged (Fournier 487). The most moving scene in the film captures one such man who is dragged by guards from his jail cell in the middle of the night without reason, taken to an empty room, put on his knees facing the wall, and shot execution style—his terror is no less when, hearing the click of the trigger, he discovers that the guard's gun was never actually loaded, and he is returned to his cell a broken man. Brault's

harsh portrayal of prison life for those arrested during the October Crisis is mirrored in *Henry. Octobre. 1970.* when what begins as a courting scene ends with the violent rape of Katherine. Although it takes place offstage, it is no less horrific as the audience is forced to endure her wailing screams, and it then sees her return onstage in a torn shirt, fall down onstage writhing and convulsing her hips sexually to simulate the rape, and then curl up pitifully in a fetal position.

The intertextuality of this scene is multi-layered. Beyond Brault's film, the scene also recalls Henry's threats in both versions of the play to subject the French's "pure maidens" to "hot and forcing violation" and to "[d]efile the locks of [their] shrill-shrieking daughters" (26, 3.3.20-1, 3.3.35). Although in Shakespeare's play these threats are empty, in the adaptation they become reality and the symbolic equivalent of the rape of Québec by Ottawa.[56] Minister Alberta's ravishing of her body metaphorically recreates the penetration of the city of Montréal by the tanks and helicopters of the federal Armed Forces, an army sent by Trudeau (officially at the request of Bourassa and Drapeau, although many Québécois have questioned who unofficially imposed the decision on whom). Finally, this prison rape scene is also connected to the sense of futility and the ongoing domination of Québec by Canada which marks the end of Michel Tremblay's revolutionary *Les belles soeurs*, a play which forever changed Québec theatre with its use of *joual*, and which also concludes with "O Canada" as an indication of the protagonist's defeat and the destruction of her dreams of grandeur. Similarly, with Katherine still crying on the floor, *Henry. Octobre. 1970.* ends with the video projection of a test pattern—like that aired nightly by CBC, the bastion of English Canadian culture, at the end of its programming—

and the playing of "O Canada" (which was originally composed as the national anthem of French Canadians for Saint-Jean-Baptiste day before being appropriated). The music is without lyrics, and without a precise point of emanation it is impossible to determine whether it is performed by or intended for anglophones or francophones; however, taken in conjunction with Katherine's rape, the audience is led to suspect that the music signals, once again, Canada's victory over Québec.

Henry. Octobre. 1970., then, must be interpreted as a postcolonial appropriation of Shakespeare's text which subverts the nationalism inherent in his work in order to legitimize, ironically, the nationalist struggle of a people descended from the antagonists of the source text. The play's Machiavellian portrayal of Henry/Trudeau, in addition to its sympathetic treatment of the FLQ's dilemma of weighing individual human life against collective national freedom, and the exposure of their socio-political concerns, all combine to undermine the rousing elegy to English imperialism upheld by traditional readings of Shakespeare's play and to illustrate the ethical problems inherent in Canadian federal government's invocation of the War Measures Act without proof of a "real or apprehended danger" to the general populace.[57] However, the adaptation also replicates early nationalist discourses that problematically construct the nation monolithically to the exclusion of others such as women, queers, and immigrants.

As the most recent Québécois adaptation examined here, and the only one since the turn of the new century, any conclusion about trends in the broader theatrical history of Québécois adaptations can only be tentative and contingent on future adaptations that continue to be written every year; however, in its own

right *Henry. Octobre. 1970.* does constitute a return to a much more politicized approach to Shakespearean adaptation in Québec in which the national debate continues to neglect issues of cultural and gender diversity. Although *Les Reines*, *William S*, and *Henry. Octobre. 1970.* all engage in a dialogue with early modern norms or traditional readings of the Shakespearean source text, these plays from the new generation of adaptations since 1990 could still push further for a greater recognition of the plurality of identities whose presence in the contemporary Québec nation is signalled but whose inclusion is not yet fully actualized. Adaptations since 1990 constitute a small step in this direction but they have not yet transformed the babble of the queens, the Shrew's cries, or the silent voices of immigrants into a nationalist discourse that integrates cultural and gender diversity.

Notes to Chapter 5

[1] The event took place over the course of five nights during which, each night, seven or eight monologues were performed. Each of the thirty-eight authors was under the age of thirty-eight years, and the Shakespearean play which they were assigned to adapt was determined by a random draw from a hat of one of the titles of his thirty-eight plays. They were completely free to do as they pleased in writing their ten-minute monologue and directing an actor of their choice. For a complete list of the playwrights and the titles of their monologues, see the Appendix.

[2] Literally, "Richard III, poor cabbage", but idiomatically "Richard III, poor, little one".

[3] See Knowles "From Dream to Machine" and "Reading *Elsinore*" for accounts of this play.

[4] See Salter's "Blood ... Sex ... Death ... Birth" for an interview with the author/director and an account of this play in performance.

[5] See Lieblein's "Dave veut jouer *Richard III*:" for an account of this play in performance.

[6] I have a short article on this adaptation forthcoming on the *CASP* site.

[7] "As an immigrant I wanted to insist on the heterogeneity of this culture."

[8] Antonine Maillet might, at first, appear somewhat out of place in the category of Québécois authors. In "Nation and/as Adaptation", Daniel Fischlin consistently situates *William S* in an "Acadian cultural context" because of Maillet's famous origins in Acadie (333). Yet, this claim overlooks the fact that the play was written and first performed in Montréal, and, in fact, the play is not nearly as "Acadian" as her other plays since it is written in so-called "standard" French rather than the Acadian language employed in many of her other texts such as her novel *Pélagie-la-Charette*. In addition, despite her ethnic origins, Maillet is not only a descendent of deported Acadians but an example of the necessity for most Acadians and French-Canadian artists to "immigrate" to Québec. Québec remains the only francophone region of Canada to receive adequate funding for literature and the arts, in large part because it has the demographic base to be self-sustaining and has thus developed many funding agencies in parallel to the "Canadian" organisms which are supposed to promote bilingualism and multiculturalism but which inevitably fall far short of the demand necessary to sustain and promote French culture outside of Québec. It is precisely because of this cultural and economic reality that I have included Maillet's work among "Québécois" adaptations. She represents an important part of the Québécois population: French-Canadian immigrants from other provinces. (The music industry best illustrates this cultural and economic reality; we need only think of Edith Butler from Acadie, Zachary Richard from Louisiana, and, more recently, Wilfred Le Bouthillier, the winner of Star Académie, also from Acadie.) Finally, the argument that Québec is the only francophone region of Canada with adequate cultural and economic resources for francophones outside of Québec to follow a career in the arts also extends to academia. Notably, Maillet completed her doctoral dissertation on *Rabelais et les traditions populaires en Acadie* at Université Laval in Québec City in 1970 and was a professor at the Université de Montréal in 1975-6.

[9] The English translation of *The Queens* by Linda Gaboriau is a literal translation that does not adapt the original text in content or meaning. Unlike the English version of *Hamlet, prince du Québec* which does change significantly in the English text, it is not an adaptation of an adaptation; therefore, I discuss only the original French text. All English translations in this chapter are Linda Gaboriau's rather than my own.

[10] Saint Sebastian has come to be popularly referred to as the "gay saint". He was a Christian

martyr who infiltrated the Roman military (a decidedly homoerotic space) in order to comfort persecuted Christians held prisoner. He was discovered, shot with arrows as punishment, survived, and returned to confront the Roman Emperor Diocletian for which he was beaten to death. A cult of Saint Sebastian emerged in the 19th century, possibly in reaction to the homoerotic depictions of him in Renaissance art in which he is pierced with phallic arrows and wears an expression of both pleasure and pain. Oscar Wilde adopted the pseudonym "Sebastian Melmoth" upon his release from prison. When the AIDS crisis emerged, Sebastian took on new meaning as a gay icon since he is also a saint with the power to ward off the plague. The two Sebastians in Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night* and *The Merchant of Venice* also exhibit homoerotic desire.

[11] "My country is not a country, it's winter." "Happy about a spring [that does something]."

[12] "The Woodvilles, [she] first amongst them / Are in the process of inheriting. / The treasure of England"

[13] "George was a sphere of love / But I reigned in his heart / Ah it must have been painful / To give way to his queen!"

[14] "Gasps and groans / Sounds strung together / Words that cannot be found / In any lexicon."

[15] "Before time immemorial / You understood that we had been there first / And the world arrived afterwards / You were only our mother / But born after us—"

[16] "Who could better illustrate / The peace in our household? / Yet only months later / This peace had lasted too long."

[17] "I have heard tell as well / Of a daughter among these brothers. / ... / It takes you hours / To explain that that girlchild / Was never born."

[18] "For lack of giving birth / To a sister for your sons / A daughter who might have been able / To mourn her mother."

[19] "To conjure her birth / I promised her everything she could desire / Provided that she arrive inside me / To no avail / She was not inside me"

[20] "She is to language / What zero is to numbers." "As sure as you exist / As sure as you stand before my eyes / She is nothing. / Nothing. *Rien.*"

[21] "Your purity is soon to die / Drowned in a cask / This house is no more than a funnel / Where everything mingles and flows / Into the rotten mouth of death." According to Holinshed, George, Duke of Clarence, died from drowning in a butt of malmsey wine (See Oxford edition 1.4n).

[22] "See how everything drives me mad!"

[23] "[That he] created, out of nothing, to distract [himself]."

[24] "I wanted, like so many others, to have the last word in my dialogue with [Time]."

[25] "Shylock: We demand the author. / Fool: The author cannot be found. / Hamlet: The creator cannot be found. God cannot be found! / Falstaff: God is dead and buried."

[26] "Nobody made me, except my father and my mother. As for everyone else... authors, creators, God... gruel for cats. Let's talk about serious things."

[27] "Conceived a shrew, and put on earth tamed. [...] I am my own opposite. A walking paradox."

[28] "We are all his slaves."

[29] "For four centuries, my girl, since the beginning of the world, we women have found ourselves in a position of weakness. And what has been done with us?"

[30] "We have been loved." "Oh! Oh!! Listen to the gentle pigeon coo. Loved, she says, loved in chains, loved slaves, courtesans, progeny-making machines, male progeny to inherit their goods and titles, and a few females to continue the line. And you call that love, Juliet?"

[31] "I was the only one of the two of us who possessed the head, the soul, the heart of a king... but in a woman's body. Why?"

[32] "But me in all that, me, your creature, sharpened by ambition, tempted by power, that you endowed with a soul of steel and then to come close it up in an envelope of conventions and laws for men's use, what have you done to me, the woman? You made me precisely that, woman, with all that this condition carries with it of misery and limitations. The woman who won't carry a sword, nor order her man, nor transgress the laws of her sex/gender."

[33] "That the male king returns to women the usurped power."

[34] "When he realized that he created a woman so strong, so free, so independent, the man in him shook for his supremacy. I risked knocking over the order of things. So to cement me in his misogynist view of the world, he folded me in four and broke my backbone. Then he put in my mouth, in me who was gifted with such a splendid frankness, the most boring, insipid, and moralizing speech in world literature."

[35] "Not a very good example of his so-called genius. If he had done with me like with you, Falstaff, Hamlet, or Lear, if he had given the Shrew free scope and had let her live to the end of her character, do you think that she would have let herself be tamed, domesticated, reduced to a doormat by her man?"

[36] "To the Jew at least he gave the chance to defend himself. Not to the Shrew." "With me, he revealed himself to be a paltry excuse for an author. For by taming the Shrew, he spoiled his play."

[37] Why, yes, brave Jew! You've just spoken the most beautiful speech of my whole work. In the mouth of no other did I place more sublime words. To you I confided the eloquent plea in the defence of a whole people, and you're complaining about me?"

[38] "I engendered no Juliet. An angel, two demons, but no Juliet."

[39] "The Shrew, sire, the Merry Wife, the Thunder..."

[40] "Woman who knows and spreads news." "Gossip." "Indiscrete gossiping." "Piece of gossip." "Slander."

[41] As Oxford editor Gary Taylor points out, critics of the play "almost all divide into two camps: partisans of Henry and partisans of pacificism", with the former group interpreting the play as "a blunt straightforward Englishman's paean to English glory" while the latter group "believe Shakespeare (Subtle rather than Blunt, and never straightforward) himself intensely disliked Henry, and tried hard to communicate this moral distaste to the more discerning members of the audience" (1). *Henry. Octobre. 1970.* clearly falls into the anti-Henry camp.

[42] Although I speak here of a Québec with a unified dream of independence, this is clearly not the

current socio-political reality, nor has it ever been so historically. *Henry. Octobre. 1970.*, however, operates within a Canadian federalist versus Québec sovereignist binary, and this discussion therefore reflects that point of view. The length of this chapter prevents a detailed treatment of the nuances of the competing political positions operating within Québec, and such distinctions would only obscure the play's construction of the political and linguistic divide. For example, the play's positioning of René Lévesque as indirect leader of the FLQ in his role as leader of the French army obviously derives not from historical fact but rather from the process of mapping the October Crisis onto the pre-existing structure of Shakespeare's play. In addition, the English versus French cleavage not only reflects Shakespeare's text but is also precisely one of the ways that the adaptation recreates the popular discourse of 1970 in which political positions were much more strongly divided along linguistic lines than is now the case over thirty years later.

[43] All quotations from *Henry. Octobre. 1970.* are documented in the body of this essay. The references are to the page numbers of the director's unpublished manuscript, and are followed, where applicable, by references to the corresponding passages of Shakespeare's *Henry V*, Arden third series, edited by T. W. Craik. Thanks to Madd Harold for generously providing a copy of his manuscript.

[44] "Speak white / it is so beautiful to hear you / speak of Paradise Lost / or of the gracious, anonymous profile that shakes in the sonnets of Shakspeare." Lalonde's poem, first read at the *Nuit de la poésie* rather than published, was initially distributed as a *poème d'affiche*, the spirit of which remains today in its prolific distribution on sovereignist websites. References are to the line numbers of the poem.

[45] "In the soft language of Shakespeare / with Longfellow's accent / speak a pure and atrociously white French / like in Vietnam and the Congo"

[46] "We are one hundred peoples come from afar / to tell you that you are not alone." "We will speak our death with your words / so that you will not die."

[47] "Tell the life story of a people of janitors."

[48] "But when you really *parlez blanc* / when you *en viens au faits* / to speak of *la vie gracieuse* / and speak of quality of life / and of the Great Society / a little louder then *parlez blanc* / raise your foreman's voices / we're a bit hard of hearing / we live too close to the machines / and only hear our puffing over the tools."

[49] "Language of curses, not very clean/proper."

[50] "Press release. / To Robert Bourassa. / We have Pierre Laporte. / Go fuck yourself with an old groundhog. / Piss off. / We don't like you. / You smell like shit. / Horseshit. / In a cave. / Of an old groundhog? / [...] / Thanks so much, Little Fatty, Little Tall, and Little Young'un / And Pierre Laporte. / Front de Libération du Québec. / We will triumph! We will triumph!"

[51] "Press release. Robert, / It's us. / Guess who? / Can't? / Come on, try / Scared? / Wimp? / Fuck off, filth. / We will triumph! We will triumph!"

[52] See Richard Burt's "New Shakesqueer Cinema" in *Shakespeare, the Movie: Popularizing the Plays on Film, TV, and Video* for a discussion of homoeroticism in Kenneth Branagh's film version of *Henry V*.

[53] "Fag." "Cocksucker." "Does nothing but suck the Boss's dick."

[54] Performed August 21-31, 2002, the play was thus staged a mere week before the Québec Superior Court released its decision on the constitutionality of gay marriage on September 6, 2002,

in which it struck down the opposite-sex restriction on marriage as an unconstitutional violation of s.15 of the *Charter*. The general social climate in Québec at the time was favorable of this decision and of queer rights in general, often more so than in English Canada, according to informal opinion polls such as those conducted by newspapers and television news programs.

[55] "We got fucked."

[56] In addition to the significance of the act of rape itself, it is also pertinent to question why the rapist is Minister Alberta instead of the man who uttered the threats, Henry/Trudeau. The answer, of course, is that the limits of poetic license are quickly reached should one attempt to portray the country's most revered Prime Minister as a rapist. The outpouring of emotion which marked Trudeau's funeral in 2000, less than two years before the play, clearly placed a social injunction on tarnishing his image so soon after his death. Nonetheless, the rape of Katherine by an English Canadian politician, whether from Alberta or from Ottawa, makes a similar point equating the intrusion of English Canadian politicians in Québécois politics with rape.

[57] This is the condition required to proclaim the War Measures Act legitimately.

Conclusion

Canada v. Québec: Postcolonial and Neo-colonial Appropriation

In *Shakespeare and Canada: Essays on Production, Translation, and Adaptation*, Ric Knowles presents an "autobiographical narrative" in which he reveals his subject position as critic of Shakespeare and Canada from his youth to the present day (16). He describes his current autobiographical position as a "white, male, settler/invader [who] stands *as* postcolonial subject" and who participated in the "1970s Canadian nationalist movement" in which Canadian drama was "coming of age" and supposedly "breaking *free* of what it consider[ed] to be the pernicious influence of the mother country, her Bard, and his theatrical outpost in Southwestern Ontario" and spawned instead "nationalist, alternative theatres" (13, 12). Knowles recounts his subjective experience of feeling like Miranda when she expresses amazement at this "brave new world / That has such people in't" (5.1.183-4). He claims that she is an "(almost) second-generation settler/invader [speaking], not about the new world, but the old one—or, more accurately, speaking about debased representatives of old world culture on a temporary sojourn in the colonies" (17), and as a teenager he too was awestruck by the old world colonial project, by the costumes, language and accents of the actors in a production of Shakespeare in Stratford, Ontario.[1] He argues that Miranda, as both settler and invader, as "inheritor, and perhaps reluctant agent of colonization, who is both implicated in and subjected to the inequities and injustices of the imperial project", embodies a third position that breaks down the Prospero/Caliban binary of colonizer/colonized first suggested in 1956 by Octave Mannoni which still haunts postcolonial theory today (16).

I have approached this project from a very different perspective, despite being very much a settler/invader subject myself, one who is in addition white, female, queer, and working class, but, most importantly, an anglophone Nova Scotian immigrant to Québec.[2] The difference between myself and Knowles in our approaches to Shakespeare and/in Canada/Québec is not our mutual occupation of an ambivalent settler/invader subject position, but where hierarchically we are situated as colonizer/colonized in relation to the texts/authors we analyse. While Knowles is, as he explains, a Prospero figure towards minority groups within Canada's complex cultural make-up—women, Native peoples, immigrants—he has also experienced what it *feels* like to be Caliban in relation to the imperial texts about which he writes. He derives his Caliban-like feelings of subjection from his frustration with the domination of the Stratford Festival by British directors; thus, his critical project, from the 1970's onward has been the liberation of Canadian theatre from its colonial status.

As a Nova Scotian—as marginalized from Stratford, Ontario and the "Canadian" cultural "center" as from Stratford, England—I have, like Knowles, experienced subjectively the colonial position of Caliban in relation to Shakespeare in all of its theatrical manifestations, both old world and new; however, I cannot claim the same position as Caliban in relation to the texts of my study since as an anglo-Canadian in Québec I am, like it or not, *de facto* a Prospero figure, no longer the ambivalent settler/invader awestruck by the Shakespeare of both Stratfords, but purely the anglophone colonizer. This claim is not a romantization of the French/English binary of pre-*Loi 101* Québec but a daily reality reinforced each time my attempts to divest myself of my subject

position as colonizer by addressing Québécois individuals in French with a heavy anglophone accent is thrown back at me and reinscribed by a colonial inferiority complex, uttered in English with French accents far worse than mine. I cannot divest myself of my subject position as colonizer as long as the society in which I circulate does not first divest itself of its own *complexe de colonisé* through decolonization or sovereignty. Unlike Prospero, I am not allowed to cast off my robes or throw down my books. Even as a sovereignist advocating for the political liberty of the nation (a subject position which should hardly come as a surprise revelation at this point in the text, and is no less objective than Knowles's critical project of nationalizing Canadian theatre), I remain an anglophone colonizer, an invader from the English Canadian neo-colonial project coming to say with the paternalism of the imperial project what is best for the future of the nation conquered by my ancestors. This observation is by no means a sympathy ploy or excuse for the Prosperos of the world but merely a caveat to the reading of any French-language Québécois adaptation of Shakespeare by an angophone critic. One can attempt to become more *pure laine* than the *pure laines*, and even do so with some success, but the privilege of Prospero's robes will always remain around one's shoulders in reading any text derived from Shakespeare-as-signifier and inform that reading in a way not necessarily accessible to the *pure laine* Québécois author/reader/critic. The bardoloatry acquired by anglophone subjects pervades the culture of English Canada, and hence any critic's, unconscious so thoroughly that even conscious attempts to valorize "alternative" readings of the sources cannot help but situate the Shakespearean source text as the primary point of reference to which all else must measure up, even when awareness that not

"measuring up" is the strategic goal of the adapted text. The Canadian adaptation *Harlem Duet*, for example, writes back to Shakespeare's *Othello*, not Cinthio's source text, because even when the text proposes an alternative reading so radically different as to be incomparable to the source text, the source text which stands as the point of reference for the adaptation is Shakespeare's rather than the sources that he adapted.

Knowles's proposal that the figure of Miranda can helpfully break down the Prospero/Caliban binary is thus exciting *theoretically*, but it remains largely on that side of the theory/practice divide which continues to dominate postcolonial studies today, a discipline in which social activism has little place and any social change derived from radical literary studies remains largely abstract or merely envisioned. Theoretically, Québécois are all Mirandas, as Garneau strikingly points out in his reference to the colonization of Québec's Native Peoples by Jesuit settler/invaders. In practice, however, the French/Caliban versus English/Prospero binary remains firmly entrenched both in daily real life (with the notable exception of immigrant *enfants de la loi 101*) and in the theatre history of Québécois adaptations (with the notable exception of *Henry.Octobre.1970.* in which the anglophone/francophone binary breaks down in production even as it is reinscribed more firmly by the content of the text).

Miranda is an interesting metaphor because she was so largely neglected by Shakespearean scholars until the late 1980's or early 1990's, and feminist interest in her character has largely coincided with postcolonial interest in her as a third subject position (with the work of Diana Brydon exemplifying this integral perspective most succinctly).[3] Miranda's gender only becomes an issue of critical

interest as an addendum to her relationship to the Prospero/Caliban colonial binary, and gender does not become fully integrated into postcolonial theory in general until, interestingly, approximately the same moment when it begins to occupy a more important role in the history of Québécois adaptations of Shakespeare as writers employ adaptation as a tool in the movement for women's liberation. As many radical feminists in Québec, such as Nicole Brossard, complained in the 1970's, the national question occults for the most part issues of gender, as it continues to do today. For example, while both the nationalist Parti québécois and Bloc Québécois support gay marriage and other gender-related equality rights issues in principle and in parliamentary votes, any mention of these questions is absent from their party platforms and their public websites. The difference between interest levels for nation or gender is thus one of degree, and in the political sphere the liberation of the nation remains the first priority since it is perceived as a prerequisite to greater social justice, including gender issues; the nation is a means to greater ends which then become eclipsed in the course of the struggle to acquire those means.

This privileging of nation over gender in Québécois adaptations becomes more apparent in comparison with the thematic emphasis of Canadian adaptations of Shakespeare.[4] Knowles claims that Shakespeare-as-signifier "haunts different collectivities within Canada differently, and has frequently been used, not only in the service of shoring up but also of destabilizing unitary concepts of Canadian nationhood, even as 'Canada' has been used both to reinforce and destabilize unitary concepts of Shakespeare as universal (English) bard" (22). While it is true that different collectivities use Shakespeare to destabilize various unitary concepts

within Canadian public discourse, such as race (as in Djanet Sears's *Harlem Duet*) or gender (Ann-Marie MacDonald's *Good Night Desdemona, Good Morning Juliet*), no other regions or provinces of Canada do so in order to destabilize *national* identity itself. Unlike Québec, there is no theatrical history, let alone long-standing tradition, of adaptations of Shakespeare in Nova Scotia, for instance, much less for the purpose of nationalist identitary affirmation—and the Maritimes are not a region lacking in self-affirmation in other cultural forms; one has only to look at their folk music or the Highland Games—because, unlike Québec, other regions of Canada are not seeking liberation from neo-colonial tutelage.[5] Canadian nationhood is only destabilized by collectivities within Canada who consider themselves to be distinct nations separate from the Canadian national identity, that is, Québec and the First Nations. Daniel Fischlin cites, for example, Warren Graves's 1974 play *Chief Shaking Spear Rides Again (or the Taming of the Sioux)*, but even as the play criticizes Canada's neo-colonial domination of its Native Peoples, it does so within the framework of a clash of nations within the coast-to-coast Canadian political structure without positing separatism as the solution to neo-colonialism ("Nation and/as Adaptation" 328-30). Only Québécois adaptations employ Shakespeare primarily (above class, race, or gender) not only to reconstruct or to reformulate Canadian national identity but also to destabilize and to expose it as a false construct.

Fischlin confirms that Canadian national identity may be nothing more than a false construct when he writes, "[n]ational identity is an imaginary entity, an ideality based on the simultaneous production and eradication of difference through the filter of communal values, in this case, putatively embedded in

Shakespeare and the Shakespeare effect" (327). For Fischlin, Canadians have no essential national identity other than that which they socially construct through cultural production, of which Shakespearean adaptation is an important part. This adaptation tradition "links the iconicity of Shakespeare with the symbolic destiny, however illusory, of nation" (321). However, I would argue that national identity is not imaginary even if the community constituting the nation is imagined. Fischlin agrees with Benedict Anderson that nations are imagined communities, but I would contend that the imaginary composition of that community does not invalidate or render illusory the subjective experience of a national identity by the community's individual citizens. While, as Fischlin observes, the very definition of "communal" values obviously depends on the eradication of difference within the imagined community, in Québec these communal values are not embedded in Shakespeare as they are for many in English Canada because Québec does not have the same colonial relationship to the Bard, and its citizens possess a very different collective, subjective, settler/invader experience than that of English Canadians. Not being as closely entangled with Shakespeare as English Canadian settler/invaders, Québécois playwrights are freer to manipulate the effect produced by Shakespeare's authority in their call for national freedom.

Fischlin pursues this notion of the nation as a false construct in his claim that "[n]ation assumes assimilation into the authentic bosom of an originary identity, however spurious or illusory such an idea may be" (326). This assertion holds true in that Québécois nationalism claims an originary identity (be it derived from France, l'Île d'Orléans, or the Conquest), but I would claim that the rest of his argument does not apply to Québec when he adds:

> The authentic, because it is always predicated on a belatedly assimilative effect, signifies an identity crisis by way of a dialectic that presumes and requires the inauthentic (that which is assimilated) in order to give it meaning. Shakespeare's assimilation by state (read 'authentic') culture is used as a bulwark against incursions in state culture by its 'inauthentic,' nomadic margins. (326)

In Québec, the "inauthentic" is precisely what characterizes Shakespearean adaptation. Québécois adaptations are "inauthentic" in terms of the nation that is not yet a state, and in terms of gender, queerness, and especially class (since the use of *joual* inscribes the adapted Shakespearean characters as "working class"), rendering them the marginal incursions into "authentic" Shakespearean culture.

Unlike Canada, whose history of "Shakespearean adaptation is coincident with its emergence as a nation-state" (Fischlin 321), Québec is a state-less nation whose history of Shakespearean adaptation precedes this political emergence. Shakespearean adaptation in Québec does not coincide with the ascension to full political statehood, although it does coincide with the emergence of renewed and more fervent nationalism in the wake of the Quiet Revolution, because nationalist playwrights may find in Shakespeare's authority validation for their cause, provided that they negotiate carefully the power relations inherent in their "collaboration" with him and avoid drowning out their own voices by the clamour with which Shakespeare-as-signifier resounds. Garneau's *Macbeth* typifies this search for balance between manipulating the power of Shakespeare-as-signifier and succumbing to it—as the long title of his play suggests, beginning with "*de William Shakespeare*" but ending pointedly and forcefully with "*traduit en*

québécois". In this case, Fischlin's claims about the nature of adaptation hold true: "Adaptations work both sides of this coin, whether confirming a myth of authenticity and origin or interrogating such a position through alternative and revisionary definitions of authenticity" (326). Québécois adaptations confirm Shakespeare's authority by relying on his cultural power, but they interrogate the English colonialism that he also represents. For the most part, they skate aptly around both sides of the power play, that is, the play for power over who holds authority over the play.

Fischlin sums up his argument with the assertion that "adaptation questions the essentialist qualities associated with Shakespearean authority, canonicity, and cultural value. In short, adaptations serve multiple positionings with regard to national self-identity as mediated by a cultural icon like Shakespeare" (328). While it is true that Québécois adaptations question authority and canonicity (to the extent that a national group can question a literary canon which is not its own and in which it does not have the invested stakes of those who helped form it—a significant difference between English Canada and Québec), Québécois adaptations do not serve multiple positions within Québécois national self-identity. There are no federalist adaptations of Shakespeare in Québec to construct a unified Canadian identity by anglo-Québécois, and certainly not by franco-Québécois. Instead, Québécois adaptations are all oriented in same direction towards the creation and solidification of one national identity, of a sovereign people, which includes women and aboriginals and immigrants, but who are expected to assimilate to a mostly monolithic identity in these plays as part of one large multiethnic, sovereign nation. Gender and ethnoreligious

difference are acknowledged and respected, but are not foregrounded because Québécois adapters are almost all men (with the exception of Maillet, de Vasconcelos, Thompson, and Thomas) and their approach to nationalism is inherently masculinist. Women play crucial roles in the formation of the nation, but the collective survival of the nation takes precedence over the concerns of individual women characters, of which these plays have very few, Maillet's Shrew being the notable exception of a resolutely feminist character. While gender begins to appear in adaptations of the 1980's and 1990's, the recognition of the nation's interdependence with gender is largely inadequate, thereby confirming the truth underlying the feminist slogan/demand "Pas de Québec libre sans libération des femmes! Pas de femmes libres sans libération du Québec!" since neither the nation nor women have become free in these adaptations independently of each other. As in *Les Reines*, the marginalization of women is both a cause and an effect of an unhealthy nation.

In respect to this monolithic nation constructed both textually and socially, Marc Fortier's astute observation about Canadian identity can also be said not to apply to Québec. Fortier argues:

> there is always something un-Canadian about being Canadian, that the from-elsewhere is part of being here. Shakespeare, therefore, is one manifestation of from elsewhere at work in Canada. As such, Canadians confront Shakespeare as the cultural undead, neither dead nor living, not a person but an other forming part of living personalities, if only as part of the sublime personality..., the otherness of the past the remains of which reside here. Canadians too, in their specific ways, are the undead,

although as *noir* subjects they may not always realize this. (342)

Fortier's underlying premise does not hold true in Québec where the notion of "from-elsewhere" did not appear until after the 1995 referendum campaign, at which point it entered nationalist discourse as damage control after Jacques Parizeau's famous statement on "l'argent et le vote ethnique" that was based on a definition of "nous" as *pure laine*. After the referendum, the notion that Québec was *le pays de tous les Québécois* (to borrow the title of a collection by Michel Sarra-Bournet) began to enter academic discourse, but a general mistrust of sovereignists' claims of openness to the inclusion of people of multiple ethnic origin within the national project remained. Only very recently has the concept of "from-elsewhere" entered public discourse with great popularity (notably thanks to artists rather than politicians; for example, the most popular male artist at the 2004 Gala de l'ADISQ was Rwandan-born Corneille well-known for his song about immigration "Parce qu'on vient de loin"), but the celebration of foreign origins was not in circulation at the time these adaptations were written to the same extent as it was in the rest of Canada. The reason that "from-elsewhere" is not current in Québec is nationalism. Canadian nationalism (federalism) is disguised by the celebration of "multiculturalism" as a replacement of the discourse of "bilingualism and biculturalism", based on the notion of "two founding nations". This belief in "two founding nations (which ignores of course all the First Nations) was in circulation until the reign of Trudeau when it became apparent after the 1980 referendum that one way to diminish Québec's claim as a founding nation, on which its claims for greater political autonomy were based, would be to multiply the number of national identities which compose Canada

(and indeed they do outside of Québec, in Toronto for instance, although the phenomenon is hardly as widespread as official discourse would have one believe and tends to be confined to the immigration of specific ethnic groups to specific geopolitical locations—Asians in British Columbia, Quakers in Manitoba, Mennonites in Southern Ontario, and hardly anyone to the Maritimes since Confederation).[6] Despite attempts to divert the idea of "two founding nations" to "multiculturalism", the binary approach pervades popular thought in Québec and until recently has overshadowed references to "from-elsewhere".

Québec's relationship to Shakespeare as "undead" is different from that of Canada's, then, because the lack of "from elsewhere" testifies to a lack of alterity or cultural otherness in Québec to the same degree, as seen in Québécois adaptations of Shakespeare. The "national question" has a totalizing effect that so thoroughly permeates the collective consciousness that forms of alterity, such as ethnicity, but also, and more importantly, gender, are eclipsed, without being erased. Racial, gendered, and class otherness is not given its full place in society in comparison to other Western societies in which national independence has long been settled, such as the United States, because the national question remains to be settled first; however, the preponderance of the national question and the failure to recognize the interdependence of gender and to create more space for women and queers in the nationalist movement proves to be precisely one of the handicaps towards resolving the national question and the mutual desire of nationalists and gendered minorities to acquire freedom.

In "Féminisme et nationalisme au Québec, une alliance inattendue", Micheline de Sève describes, for instance, how in Québec in the early 1970's the

origin of a movement of radical feminist, Québécois nationalists came down to "quelques étudiantes anglophones de McGill, adeptes du *Women's Lib* et converties à la légitimité de la lutte de libération sociale et nationale du Québec" (161).[7] According to de Sève, "ces radicales nationalistes ne réclamaient rien moins que le renversement du patriarcat et de l'impérialisme anglo-américain" (161).[8] Their battle clearly ties together feminism and nationalism, as does the *Front de libération des femmes* when it argues that "[l]e Québec étant un pays colonisé, la Québécoise est donc doublement exploitée" (FLF in de Sève 161).[9] As de Sève points out, the English language gave these anglophone students more access to the writings of American radical feminists, but eventually the francophone feminists felt oppressed by their anglophone sisters. De Sève fails to mention, however, the reason why anglophone American women would adopt this political position in the first place. I would posit that already having firmly and securely in hand their own national identity, these anglo-American women were free to take up gender issues as their cause; whereas, Québec feminists were too caught up in the birthing of a national identity and the decolonization of their nation—as the eventual feelings of double oppression on this front testify—to take on a feminist agenda to a full, radical extent, their energies being divided. As the feminist slogan demands, the freedom of Québec and the freedom of women must necessarily happen conjointly in order for Québécois women not to feel doubly oppressed, but fighting both battles at once, without the collaboration of male nationalists, would make it difficult for either nationalists or gendered minorities to achieve their goals. The anglo-American women, on the other hand, would not consider the linking of the two causes as dividing their energies since

they would be less implicated subjectively in the case of Québécois nationalism, and certainly not colonized doubly by their subject position as nationalists since they were eventually perceived as the colonizer themselves.

This theory of a simple lack of attention to gender issues due to the preponderance of the national question also plays out in terms of queerness within the context of Québécois adaptations of Shakespeare. While queerness is certainly well accepted in Québécois theatre in general during this time (Michel Tremblay's *Hosanna* and Michel Marc Bouchard's *Les Feluettes* both pushed the envelope of staging queerness), its diminished presence here in nationalist plays that attempt to affront British canonicity is striking. For instance, while homoeroticism is in fact present in several key scenes of Ronfard's *Vie et mort*, critics either insist that it is absent or fail to mention it at all. Even when queerness is to be found in the text, the critical discourse does not recognize its importance until the appearance of the Shakespearean adaptations of the 1990's (such as Pierre-Yves Lemieux's *À propos de Roméo et Juliette* in which an openly gay Mercutio desires Romeo). When queerness finally emerges in its own light as part of a greater social attention in general to gender issues following the 1985 defeat of the *Parti québécois* and the bottoming out of nationalist fervour, it is recuperated by the new nationalist fervour in the 1990's when the rebirth of nationalism was provoked by the failed Meech Lake and Charlottetown accords in which the key term of the debate was alterity or otherness in all its forms, not just Québécois but also First Nations and women (and queers to the extent that gay issues were making the national spotlight in parallel through the beginning AIDS awareness). Nonetheless, as late as 2002, in *Henry. Octobre. 1970.*, Québécois

adaptations continue to propagate homophobia as the fear of federasty privileges nationalism over queerness rather than attempting to acknowledge the contributions of queers in the construction of the nation, especially artistically by such famous authors as Michel Tremblay whose literary use of *joual* advanced the nation's claim to a distinct language, culture, and identity.

While the connection between nation and gender does not begin to appear clearly until the later adaptations of this tradition, once the association does happen it does so poignantly and consistently in terms of the theme of rape—the rape of women's bodies symbolizing the rape of the nation. Corneille's story in Ronfard's *Lear* illustrates clearly how rape is a tool of conquest by soldiers in war, and Judith's dream in his *Vie et mort* figures rape as part of a civilizing mission as she imagines the rape of her body as a fit revenge for her husband's colonial rape of aboriginal culture. In *Henry.Octobre.1970.* though, the symbolic substitution of the rape of women's bodies for the rape of the nation is most clearly literalized by the play itself; Katherine's rape stands in not only for the military conquest of the Québécois nation taken hostage by soldiers but also by neo-colonial domination and Canadian cultural imperialism. This literalized awareness within the adaptations of the nation's status as raped woman, a recognition and acceptance of the victimized *complexe de colonisé* that it has borne since the Conquest, seems to be, I would argue, a necessary pre-requisite towards shedding that collective psychological complex in order to create, through separatism, a collective safe space for the nation and the others who inhabit it.

Québécois adaptations of Shakespeare, then, highlight Québec's cultural

difference as mere productions of Shakespeare in Québec cannot. The moment of departure from the Shakespearean source text by the adapter imposes a cultural specificity onto the text that is not to be found in Stratford, Ontario or England. While Canadian adaptations of Shakespeare struggle to wrest authority from an undead author, Québécois adaptations, because they do not run the same risks of contamination by that authority, and have a neo-colonial relationship to Canada in addition to a postcolonial relationship to Europe, appropriate it much more freely, especially in service of the decolonization of the nation.

Notes to Conclusion

[1] Knowles also writes—with what strikes me a profound irony of how little the subjectivity of young, colonial, Canadian Shakespeare students has changed in thirty years—of his "first pilgrimage to England" "while working on [his] PhD" "in search of authenticity, authority, cultural identity" on his "purchased-in-Canada Brit-Rail pass through train stations named after characters in Shakespeare's history plays" (19). The difference between his pilgrimage and my own comes down to no more than the timing of two crucial moments of recognition—his upon his return and mine prior to departure—of our status as colonial subjects seeking authenticity, authority, and identity in a foreign yet mother country and the Disneyfication of both Stratfords as theme parks in which that authenticity and authority have been neatly commodified to give literal meaning to the term "cultural capital".

[2] I use the word "immigrant" to mark the otherness of Québec as a distinct nation from the rest of English Canada to which I belong, even if it is not yet a sovereign political entity for the legal purposes of immigration. Notable differences in civil law and the residency requirements of the Ministère de l'Éducation and the Régie d'assurance maladie for out-of-province new arrivals may often create, however, the subjective experience of immigration for some English Canadians.

[3] See "Re-writing *The Tempest*" and esp. "Sister Letters: Miranda's *Tempest* in Canada" (1993).

[4] From a statistical perspective, by counting the adaptations which privilege thematically nation over gender (and excluding those that deal primarily with neither), the ratio is approximately seventeen to eight, and of those eight in which gender is a central concern the earliest text is Pierre Yves Lemieux's *À propos de Roméo et Juliette*, written in 1989, which features an openly gay Mercutio in love with Roméo.

[5] There are successionist movements in British Columbia, Alberta, and even Ontario, of course, but their proponents remain a minority which is incomparable statistically to the popularity of the Québécois sovereignist movement, and "national unity" remains strong in popular, public and political discourse in these regions as a whole.

[6] On an anecdotal side note, and to acknowledge fully the reinscription in this dissertation of the binary of English Canada and Québec as two founding nations, I couldn't help but be struck by the irony that I was completing this conclusion on the eve of what I used to call, when I lived in English Canada, Victoria Day, but which has been officially decreed by the Québec government "La journée des Patriotes" in recognition and celebration of the rebels who took up arms against the rule of Queen Victoria; therefore, I don't think that analysis of Canadian and Québécois adaptations within a binary framework is wholly unjustified even today.

[7] "A few anglophone students from McGill, enthusiasts of *Women's Lib* and converted to the legitimacy of the struggle for the social and national liberation of Québec."

[8] "These radical nationalists were demanding no less than the toppling of patriarchy and anglo-American imperialism."

[9] "Québec being a colonized country, the Québécois woman is thus doubly exploited."

Appendix

A Chronology of Québécois Adaptations of Shakespeare, 1960-2005

This appendix lists chronologically all adaptations of Shakespeare in Québec since 1960 whose publication and/or publication details have been confirmed. Some texts listed in the *Canadian Adaptations of Shakespeare Project* (*CASP*) database for which manuscripts are not currently available have been excluded since I have not been able to confirm whether or not the text meets the definition of adaptation used here.[1]

This chronology lists the year, title, author, the Shakespearean source text(s) from which it is adapted, publication details, production details of the earliest performance if known, and any translations if applicable. Since the definition of "adaptation" employed here is text-based, the year is determined 1) by date of publication or, 2) if the text has not been published, by the date of composition on the author's manuscript or, 3) failing that, first production. In keeping with a text-based definition of adaptation, the publication history is privileged over the production history.

Where relevant, manuscripts available at the *Centre des auteurs dramatiques* (CEAD) in Montréal have been marked as such in order to distinguish them from unpublished manuscripts that are not in their repertory and have been obtained by other means, such as from playwrights and other scholars. In those cases in which neither a published nor an unpublished manuscript is indicated, publication details have been omitted entirely since it has not been possible to obtain and confirm the existence of a manuscript. In these cases, production reviews and criticism have been used to confirm that the play is indeed an adaptation. In some cases, the production details are not listed or are not complete either because they are not available, or, as is also common, the manuscript is/was a work in progress and has not been produced for the stage.[2]

Year:	1968
Title:	*Hamlet, prince du Québec*
Author:	Robert Gurik
Adaptation:	*Hamlet*
Publication:	Montréal: Éditions de l'homme, 1968
Production:	Théâtre de l'Escale, Montréal, 17 January 1968
Translation:	*Hamlet, Prince of Quebec*. Trans. Marc F. Gélinas. Toronto: Playwrights Guild of Canada, 1968. (London Little Theatre, November 1968)
Year:	1970-71
Title:	*Rodéo et Juliette*
Author:	Jean-Claude Germain
Adaptation:	*Romeo and Juliet*
Publication:	Unpublished manuscript (CEAD 1971 revised)
Production:	Théâtre du Même Nom
Year:	1977

Title:	*Lear*
Author:	Jean-Pierre Ronfard
Adaptation:	*King Lear*
Publication:	Montréal: Trac, 1977
Production:	Théâtre expérimental de Montréal, January 1977
Year:	1978
Title:	*Macbeth de William Shakespeare: Traduit en québécois*
Author:	Michel Garneau
Adaptation:	*Macbeth*
Publication:	Montréal: VLB éditeur, 1978
Production:	Théâtre de la Manufacture, Cinéma Parallèle, Montréal, 31 October 1978
Year:	1981
Title:	*Vie et mort du Roi Boiteux*
Author:	Jean-Pierre Ronfard
Adaptation:	*King Richard III*
Publication:	Montréal: Leméac, 1981
Production:	Théâtre expérimental de Montréal, École nationale de théâtre, Montréal, 20, 21, 22 July 1981
Year:	1982
Title:	*Roméo et Julien*
Author:	Jacques Girard and Reynald Robinson
Adaptation:	*Romeo and Juliet*
Publication:	Québec: Éditions du Théâtre de la Bordée, 1982
Production:	Théâtre de la Bordée, February 1980
Year:	1986
Title:	*Pericles, Prince of Tyre, by William Shakespeare*
Author:	René-Daniel Dubois
Adaptation:	*Pericles*
Publication:	Unpublished manuscript (in English) (December 1986)
Production:	Théâtre Passe Muraille, Toronto, 9-19 April 1987
Year:	1989
Title:	*À propos de Roméo et Juliette*
Author:	Pierre-Yves Lemieux
Adaptation:	*Romeo and Juliet*
Publication:	Unpublished manuscript (CEAD 1989)
Year:	1989
Title:	*La tempête*
Author:	Michel Garneau
Adaptation:	*The Tempest*
Publication:	Montréal: VLB, 1989.
Production:	Groupe d'animation urbaine de Montréal et École nationale de théâtre, Vieux-Port de Montréal, 25 July 1982
Year:	1989
Title:	*Coriolan*
Author:	Michel Garneau

Adaptation:	*Coriolanus*
Publication:	Montréal: VLB, 1989.
Production:	Centre national des Arts, L'Atelier, Ottawa, 3-7 December 1991
Year:	1990
Title:	*Falstaff*
Author:	Jean-Pierre Ronfard
Adaptation:	*1 Henry IV*, *2 Henry IV*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*
Publication:	Unpublished manuscript (1990)
Production:	Théâtre du Trident, Québec, 1990
Year:	1991
Title:	*Shakespeare: un monde qu'on peut apprendre par coeur*
Author:	Michel Garneau
Adaptation:	*The Tempest*, *Richard III*, *1Henry IV*, *Hamlet*, *Sonnets*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *King Lear*, *Henry V*, *Macbeth*
Publication:	Unpublished manuscript (CEAD January 1991)
Production:	Nouvelle Compagnie Théâtrale, salle Denise-Pelletier, Montréal, 15 April 1991
Year:	1991
Title:	*Les Reines*
Author:	Normand Chaurette
Adaptation:	*1-3 Henry VI*, *Richard III*
Publication:	Montréal: Leméac, 1991.
Production:	Théâtre d'Aujourd'hui, Montréal, 18 January 1991
Translation:	*The Queens*. Trans. Linda Gaboriau. Toronto: Coach House P, 1992. (Canadian Stage Company, Toronto, 6 November 1992)
Year:	1991
Title:	*William S*
Author:	Antonine Maillet
Adaptation:	Shakespeare as a character, *Macbeth*, *1-2 Henry IV*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, *King Lear*, *Hamlet*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *The Merchant of Venice*
Publication:	Montréal: Leméac, 1991.
Production:	Théâtre du Rideau Vert, Montréal, 16 April 1991
Year:	1993
Title:	*Le Marchand de Venise de Shakespeare à Auschwitz*
Author:	Tibor Egervari
Adaptation:	*The Merchant of Venice*
Publication:	Unpublished manuscript (1993, revised 1998)
Production:	Université d'Ottawa, 1977. Théâtre Distinct, Gésu, Montréal, 7-8, 14-15 October 1993
Year:	1994
Title:	*Touchez pas à ma paroisse*
Author:	Reynald Bouchard
Adaptation:	*Hamlet*
Publication:	Unpublished manuscript (CEAD May 1994)
Year:	1995

Title:	*La mégère de Padova*
Author:	Marco Micone
Adaptation:	*The Taming of the Shrew*
Publication:	Unpublished manuscript (CEAD 1995)
Production:	As *La mégère apprivoisée*, Théâtre du Nouveau Monde, Montréal, 14 March - 8 April 1995
Year:	1995
Title:	*Songe d'une nuit*
Author:	Michel Ouellette
Adaptation:	*A Midsummer Night's Dream*
Publication:	Unpublished manuscript (CEAD April 1995, revised July 1999)
Year:	1996
Title:	*Le* Making of *de Macbeth*
Author:	Pigeons International [Jean-Frédéric Messier] d'après une idée originale de Paula de Vasconcelos
Adaptation:	*Macbeth*
Publication:	Unpublished manuscript (04/03/1996)
Production:	Musée d'Art Contemporain de Montréal
Year:	1996
Title:	*38 (A, E, I, O, U)*
Author:	Thirty-eight individual authors of the following monologues: *38 métiers 38 mégères* by Yvan Bienvenue; *Lady Percy's Grande Traîtrise* by Olivier Choinière; *Henry IV deuxième partie* by Jean Gaudreau; *Macbeth* by Jean Pelletier; *Timon d'Athènes* by Emmanuelle Amoni; *La Mort de Falstaff* by Dominic Champagne; *Martine versus Richard II* by Chantal Cadieux; *Sur deux colonnes* by Emmanuelle Roy; *Le Songe* by Wajdi Mouawad; *Hamlette* by Dominick Parenteau-Lebeuf; *Titus Andronicus* by François Boulay; *Henry V* by Anne Legault; *Erreur* by Isabelle Thivierge; *Taxi Actor* by Michel Monty; *Le Juif* by Jean-Rock Gaudreault; *Les aut' mots* by Claude Champagne; *Souvenirs d'une auteure malade* by Hélène Boissinot; *Le rêve d'Albert Levert* by Pascale Rafie; *Roméo et Juliette tel que (...)* by Michel Duchesne; *Comme Henri* by Raymond Villeneuve; *Milford Haven* by Patrick Leroux; *Richard III, pauvre chou* by Martin Doyon; *La vie inimitable de Cléopâtre* by François Archambault; *Les deux nobles cousins* by Nathalie Boisvert; *Othello* by Jérôme Labbé; *Périclès* by Alexis Martin; *Polyxéna* by Benoit Pelletier; *La nuit d'un roi* by Francis Monty; *Le fils amère* by Hélène Ducharme; *Comment vous plairait-il?* by Pascal Brullemans; *Tempête* by François Paré; *Jules César* by Johanna Murphy; *La comédie des méprises* by Isabelle Hubert; *La Vierge* by Christine Germain; *Measure for measure* by Erik Charpentier; *Anne Boleyn* by Pierre-Yves Lemieux; *Le beau jardin secret de Jean-Stéphane* by Stéphane Laporte; *Peines d'amour perdues* by Josée Plourde.
Adaptation:	All 38 of Shakespeare's plays

Publication:	5 Vols. Montréal, Dramaturges Éditeurs, 1996
Production:	Théâtre Urbi et Orbi, Théâtre d'Aujourd'hui, Montréal, 17-21 September 1996
Year:	1997-1998
Title:	*Richard moins III*
Author:	Lük Fleury
Adaptation:	*Richard III*
Publication:	Unpublished manuscript (CEAD 1997-98)
Production:	Théâtre Kafala, Théâtre Du Maurier au Monument-National, Montréal, 27 October 1998
Year:	1998
Title:	*Le Songe d'une nuit d'été*
Author:	Oleg Kisseliov
Adaptation:	*A Midsummer Night's Dream*
Publication:	Unpublished manuscript
Production:	Le Groupe de la Veillée, Théâtre Espace la Veillée, 29 September - 18 October 1998
Year:	1999
Title:	*Mon royaume pour un cheval*
Adaptation:	*Richard III*
Production:	Société Richard III (Daniel Paquette), 1999
Year:	2000
Title:	*Sauvée des eaux : Texte dramatique sur Ophélie*
Author:	Daphné Thompson
Adaptation:	*Hamlet*
Publication:	Unpublished manuscript
Production:	Théâtre de l'Esquisse, 12-14 May 2000
Year:	2001
Title:	*Dave veut jouer Richard III*
Author:	Alexis Martin
Adaptation:	*Richard III*
Publication:	Unpublished manuscript
Production:	Nouveau Théâtre expérimental, L'Auditorium Justine Lacoste-Beaubien de l'Hôpital Ste-Justine, Montréal, 15-27 October 2001
Year:	2002
Title:	*Henry. Octobre. 1970.*
Author:	Madd Harold (Tippen) and Anthony Kokx
Adaptation:	*Henry V*
Publication:	Unpublished manuscript
Production:	Gravy Bath, Théâtre Calixa-Lavallée, Montréal, 21-31 August 2002
Year:	2002
Title:	*Sous l'empire de Iago*
Author:	Kadar Mansour
Adaptation:	*Othello*
Publication:	Unpublished manuscript (CEAD 2002)
Year:	2002

Title:	*Richard III ou la chute du corbeau*
Author:	Nancy Thomas
Adaptation:	*Richard III*
Publication:	Unpublished manuscript (11 December 2002)
Production:	Théâtre du Cloître, Festival Fringe, Salle Jean-Claude Germain au Théâtre d'Aujourd'hui, Montréal, June 2003
Year:	2003
Title:	*Le Capitaine Horribifabulo*
Author:	Simon Boudrault and Geneviève Simard
Adaptation:	*Romeo and Juliet*
Production:	Théâtre des Ventrebleus, La Maison Théâtre, February 2003
Year:	2004
Title:	*Hamlet-le-Malécite*
Author:	Yves Sioui Durand and Jean-Frédéric Messier
Adaptation:	*Hamlet*
Publication:	Unpublished manuscript (9 September 2004)
Production:	Ondinnok, American Can, 1-19 June 2004
Year:	2004
Title:	*Guitare Tatou*
Author:	Larry Tremblay
Adaptation:	*Romeo and Juliet, A Midsummer Night's Dream*
Production:	Théâtre PàP, Théâtre Espace GO, (Reading), 1 November 2004

Notes to Appendix

[1] See http://www.canadianshakespeares.ca/Production_Shakespeare/SearchPublicKeywordAction.cfm?keyword=franco&Boolean=OR&RequestTimeout=500 for the list generated by the CASP database. The 174 entries listed in these search results may be inflated since it lists all thirty-eight monologues from the *38* event as separate entries, it does not always makes a distinction between translation and adaptation, and it includes some stage productions as adaptations.

[2] Omissions will continue to be remedied as I acquire more rare texts in the course of my postdoctoral project at McGill with the MCRI *Making Publics* research team, in which I will be creating a Québécois adaptations of Shakespeare online anthology and database entitled *Shakespeare au/in Québec*. Sometimes, even playwrights themselves no longer possess these texts, as is the case of the bilingual *Romeo & Juliette* translated by Dalpé and produced by Lepage and McCall, which, after a four-year search for the text, I was able to obtain but determined was not a textual adaptation. Therefore, I am choosing here to err on the side of caution and omit texts which I have not been able to verify.

Works Cited and Consulted

Primary Sources

Bienvenue, Yvan et. al. *38: A. E. I. O. U.* 5 vols. Montréal: Dramaturges Éditeurs, 1996.

Chaurette, Normand. *The Queens*. Trans. Linda Gaboriau. Toronto: Coach House P, 1992.

---. *Les Reines*. Montréal: Leméac, 1991.

Garneau, Michel. *Macbeth de William Shakespeare*. Montréal: VLB, 1978.

---. *La tempête*. Montréal: VLB, 1989.

Germain, Jean-Claude. *Rodéo et Juliette*. ms. 1970.

Gurik, Robert. *Hamlet, prince du Québec*. Montréal: Éditions de l'homme, 1968.

---. *Hamlet, Prince of Quebec*. Trans. Marc F. Gélinas. Toronto: Playwrights Guild of Canada, 1968.

Harold, Madd and Anthony Kokx. *Henry.Octobre.1970.* ms. 2002.

Maillet, Antonine. *William S.* Montréal: Leméac, 1991.

Ronfard, Jean-Pierre. *Falstaff.* ms. 1990.

--. *Lear*. Montréal: TRAC, 1977.

--. *Vie et mort du Roi Boiteux*. 2 vols. Montréal: Leméac, 1981.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. Ed. Harold Jenkins. Arden Ser. 2. London: Thomson Learning, 1982.

--. *King Henry V*. Ed. Gary Taylor. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1982.

--. *King Henry V*. Ed. T.W. Craik. Arden Ser. 3. London & New York: Routledge, 1995.

--. *King Lear*. Ed. R.A. Foakes. Arden Ser. 3. Walton-on-Thames: Thomas Nelson. 997.

--. *King Richard III*. Ed. Antony Hammond. Arden Ser. 2. Walton-on-Thames: Thomas Nelson, 1981.

--. *Macbeth*. Ed. Nicholas Brooke. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990.

---. *Macbeth*. Ed. Kenneth Muir. Arden Ser. 2. Walton-on-Thames: Thomas Nelson, 1984.

---. *Measure for Measure*. Ed. N.W. Bawcutt. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991.

---. *The Tempest*. Eds. Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan. Arden Ser. 3. Walton-on-Thames: Thomas Nelson, 1999.

Secondary Sources

Ahmad, Aijaz. "Jameson's Rhetoric of Otherness and the 'National Allegory.'" *Social Text* 17 (Fall 1986):

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies*. London & New York: Routledge, 1998.

--, eds. *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. London & New York: Routledge, 1999.

Andrès, Bernard and Paul Lefèbvre. "Macbeth: Theatre de la Manufacture." *Jeu* 11 1979): 80-88.

Atkinson, Ti-Grace. "Le nationalisme feminin." *Nouvelles questions féministes* 6-7 printemps 1984): 35-54.

Balthazar, Louis. *Bilan du nationalisme au Québec*. Montréal: Hexagone, 1986.

Barratt, Amy. "Separatists and Shakespeare: The Bard meets the FLQ in *Henry.Octobre.1970*." *Montréal Mirror*. 22 Aug. 2002.

Barthes, Roland. "The Death of the Author." *Modern Criticism and Theory*. Ed. David Lodge. London: Longman, 1988. 167-72.

--. "From Work to Text." *Textual Strategies*. Ed. Josué Havari. London: Methuen, 1980. 73-81.

Beauchamp-Rank, Hélène. "Pour un réel théâtral objectif: Le théâtre de Robert Gurik." *Voix et Images du Pays* 8 (1974): 173-91.

Beddows, Joel. "Le Texte shakespearien et son image au Canada francophone." *ALFA: Actes de langue française et de linguistique* 10-11 (1997-1998): 61-73.

Bélair, Michel. *Le nouveau théâtre québécois*. Ottawa: Leméac, 1973.

Bélanger, Claude. "Pierre Elliott Trudeau's Televised Statement on the War Measures Act: October 16, 1970." <http://www2.marianopolis.edu/quebechistory/docs/october/trudeau.htm> (1 Feb. 2003).

---. "Quebec History: Documents on the October Crisis." <http://www2.marianopolis.edu/quebechistory/docs/october/> (1 Feb. 2003).

---. "Trudeau's "Just watch me" Interview: Impromptu interview of Pierre Elliott Trudeau with Tim Ralfe of the CBC and Peter Reilly of CJON-TV on October 13, 1970." <http://www2.marianopolis.edu/quebechistory/docs/october/watchme.htm> (1 Feb. 2003).

---, trans. "Letter of Pierre Laporte to Robert Bourassa." <http://www2.marianopolis.edu/quebechistory/docs/october/laporte1.htm> (1 Feb. 2003).

Bennett, Susan. *Performing Nostalgia: Shifting Shakespeare and the Contemporary Past.* London & New York: Routledge, 1996.

Berlant, Lauren and Elizabeth Freeman. "Queer Nationality." *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory.* Ed. Michael Warner. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1993. 193-229.

Bérubé, Renald. "*Le Cid* et *Hamlet*: Corneille et Shakespeare lus par Ducharme et Gurik." *Voix et images: littérature québécoise* 1.1 (1975): 35-56.

Bhabha, Homi. *The Location of Culture.* London & New York: Routledge, 1994.

Birnbaum, Pierre. "From Multiculturalism to Nationalism." *Political Theory* 24.1 (Feb. 1996): 33-45.

Boose, Lynda E. "Scolding Brides and Bridling Scolds: Taming the Women's Unruly Member." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42.2 (1991): 179-213.

Bouchard, Louise. "Lear." *Jeu* (Spring 1977): 107-110.

Bouchard, Michel-Marc. *Les Feluettes ou la Répétition d'un drame romantique.* Montréal: Leméac, 1987.

Bouchard, Reynald. *Touchez pas à ma paroisse.* ms. 1994.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *La distinction: Critique sociale du jugement.* Paris: Minuit, 1979.

Brault, Marie-Andrée and Caroline Garand. "L'expérimental : entre invention et provocation."*Jean-Pierre Ronfard : L'Expérience du théâtre.* Spec. issue of *L'Annuaire théâtral* 35 (Spring 2004): 43-54.

Brault, Michel, dir. *Les Ordres*. Videocassette. 1974.

Brisset, Annie. *Sociocritique de la traduction: Théâtre et altérité au Québec (1968-1988)*. Longueuil: Éditions du Préambule, 1990.

--. "Translation and Social Discourse: Shakespeare, a Playwright after Quebec's Heart." *Translation: Theory and Practice, Tension and Interdependence*. Ed. Mildred L. Larson. Binghamton: State U of New York, 1991.

Bristol, Michael. *Big-time Shakespeare*. London & New York: Routledge, 1996.

--. *Carnival and Theatre: Plebeian Culture and the Structure of Authority in Renaissance England*. London: Methuen, 1986.

Brown, John Russell. "Foreign Shakespeare and English-speaking audiences." *Foreign Shakespeare: Contemporary Performance*. Ed. Dennis Kennedy. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. 21-35.

--. *New Sites for Shakespeare: Theatre, the Audience and Asia*. London & New York, Routledge, 1999.

Brydon, Diana. "Canada and Postcolonialism: Questions, Inventories, and Futures." *Is Canada Postcolonial ? Unsettling Canadian Literature*. Ed. Laura Moss. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier UP, 2003. 49-77.

--. "Re-writing *The Tempest*." *World Literature Written in English* 23.1 (1984): 75-88.

--. "Sister Letters: Miranda's *Tempest* in Canada." *Cross-Cultural Performances: Differences in Women's Re-Visions of Shakspeare*. Ed. Marianne Novy. Urbana and Chicago: U of Illinois P, 1993. 165-84.

-- and Irena R. Makaryk, eds. *Shakespeare in Canada: A World Elsewhere?* Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2002.

Burt, Richard. "New Shakesqueer Cinema." *Shakespeare, the Movie: Popularizing the Plays on Film, TV, and Video*. Eds. Richard Burt and Lynda E. Boose. New York: Routledge, 1997. Rpt. in "The Love That Dare Not Speak Shakespeare's Name: New Shakesqueer Cinema." *Unspeakable ShaXXXspeares: Queer Theory and American Kiddie Culture*. New York: St. Martin's, 1998. 29-75.

Butler, Judith. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"*. New York & London: Routledge, 1993.

--. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and Subversion of Identity*. (1990.) New York & London: Routledge, 1999.

Camerlain, Lorraine, ed. *Échos shakespeariens*. Spec. issue of *Cahiers de théâtre Jeu* 48 (1988): 5-90.

---. *Traduction théâtrale*. Spec. issue of *Cahiers de théâtre Jeu* 56 (1990): 7-125.

Cartelli, Thomas, ed. *Repositioning Shakespeare: National Formations, Postcolonial Appropriations*. London & New York: Routledge, 1999.

Carson, Christie. "Collaboration, Translation, Interpretation." *New Theatre Quarterly* 33 (February 1993): 31-36.

Chanady, Amaryll. "Rereading Québécois Literature in a Postcolonial Context." *Quebec and Postcolonialism*. Spec. issue of *Quebec Studies* 35 (Spring-Summer 2003): 12pp.

Chaput, Marcel. *Pourquoi je suis séparatiste*. Montréal: Éditions du jour, 1961.

Charest, Rémy. *Robert Lepage: Connecting Flights*. Tr. Wanda Romer Taylor. London: Methuen, 1997.

Charlebois, Gaetan. "Henry V meets the FLQ: Madd Harold puts 1970 October Crisis into the hands of the Bard." *Gazette* [Montréal]. 21 Aug. 2002: F6.

Clark, Sandra, ed. *Shakespeare Made Fit: Restoration Adaptations of Shakespeare*. London: Everyman, 1997.

Cohn, Ruby. *Modern Shakespeare Offshoots*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1976

Comeau, Robert, Daniel Cooper, and Pierre Vallières, eds. *FLQ: un projet révolutionnaire: Lettres et écrits felquistes (1963-1988)*. Outremont: VLB, 1990.

Connor, Walker. "A Nation is a Nation, is a State, is an Ethnic Group, is a ...". *Nationalism*. Eds. John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1994. 36-46.

Davies, Miranda, ed. *Third World - Second Sex: Women's Struggles and National Liberation: Third World Women Speak Out*. London: Zed, 1983.

Day, Moira. "Shakespeare on the Saskatchewan 1985-1990: 'The Stratford of the West' (NOT)." *Essays in Theatre* 15.1 (November 1996): 69-90.

De Sève, Micheline. "Féminisme et nationalisme au Québec, une alliance inattendue." *Revue internationale d'études canadiennes* 17 (1998): 157-175.

---. "Gendered Feelings About Our National Issue(s)." *Atlantis* 21.2 (Spring/Summer 1997): 111-7.

Desmet, Christy. "Introduction." *Shakespeare and Appropriation*. Eds. Christy Desmet and Robert Sawyer. London & New York: Routledge, 1999. 1-12.

Donohoe, Joseph and and Jane Koustas, eds. *Theater sans frontiers: Essays on the Dramatic Universe of Robert Lepage*. East Lansing: Michigan State UP, 2000.

Desroches, Vincent, ed. "Présentation : en quoi la littérature québécoise est-elle postcoloniale?" *Quebec and Postcolonialism*. Spec. issue of *Quebec Studies* 35 (Spring-Summer 2003): 9pp.

de Vasconcelos, Paula. *Le* Making of *de Macbeth*. ms. 1996.

Dubois, René-Daniel. *Pericles, Prince of Tyre, by William Shakespeare*. ms. 1986.

Dumont, Fernand. *Genèse de la société québécoise*. Montréal: Boréal, 1993.

---. *La vigile du Québec: Octobre 1970: l'impasse?* Montréal: Hurtubise, 1971.

Dumont, Micheline. *Découvrir la mémoire des femmes: Une historienne face à l'histoire des femmes*. Montréal: Remue-ménage, 2001.

--- et al. (Collectif Clio). *L'Histoire des femmes au Québec depuis quatre siècles*. Montréal: Quinze, 1982.

Du Bellay, Joachim. *La deffence et illustration de la langue françoyse*. (1549). Ed. Jean-Charles Monferran. Genève: Droz, 2001.

Dvorak, Marta. "L'altérité et les modes de non-traduction: Un regard sur Robert Lepage." *Études canadiennes* 22.41 (1996): 57-70.

---. "Représentations récentes des *Sept branches de la rivière Ota* et d'*Elseneur* de Robert Lepage." *Dalhousie French Studies* 41 (1997): 139-50.

Egervari, Tibor. *Le Marchand de Venise de Shakespeare à Auschwitz*. ms. 1998.

Falardeau, Pierre. *La liberté n'est pas une marque de yogourt*. Montréal: Stanké, 1995.

---. *Octobre*. Montréal: Stanké, 1994.

---, dir. *Le temps des bouffons*. 1993. DVD. Vidéographe, 2004.

---. *Speak White*. ONF. 1980. DVD. Vidéographe, 2004.

---. *Octobre*. Videocassette. ACPAV/ONF, 1994.

Féral, Josette. "Langage et appropriation, ou comment réinterpréter Shakespeare au

Québec." *The French Review* 71.6 (1998): 930-939.

Ferretti, Andrée and Gaston Miron. *Les grands textes indépendantistes: écrits, discours et manifestes québécois 1774-1992*. Montréal: Hexagone, 1992.

Fischlin, Daniel. "Nation and/as Adaptation: Shakespeare, Canada, and Authenticity." *Shakespeare in Canada: A World Elsewhere?* Eds. Diana Brydon and Irena R. Makaryk. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2002. 313-38.

---. "Theatrical Adaptations of Shakespeare in Canada: A Working Bibliography." *Canadian Theatre Review* 111 (2002): 67-73.

---, ed. *Canadian Adaptations of Shakespeare Project* (*CASP*). http://www.canadianshakespeares.ca

--- and Mark Fortier, eds. *Adaptations of Shakespeare: A Critical Anthology of Plays from the Seventeenth Century to the Present*. London & New York: Routledge, 2000.

--- and Ric Knowles, eds. *Canadian Theatre Review: Adapting Shakespeare in Canada* 111 (2002).

Fleury, Lük. *Richard moins III*. ms. 1998.

Fraser, Graham. *Le Parti Québécois*. Tr. Dominique Clift. Montréal: Libre Expression, 1984.

Frye, Marilyn. "On Separatism and Power." *The Politics of Reality: Essays in Feminist Theory*. Freedom CA: Crossing Press, 1983.

Fortier, Mark. "Undead and Unsafe: Adapting Shakespeare (in Canada)". *Shakespeare in Canada: A World Elsewhere?* Eds. Diana Brydon and Irena R. Makaryk. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2002. 339-52.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*. (1978) New York: Vintage, 1990.

---. "What is an Author?" *Modern Criticism and Theory*. Ed. David Lodge. London: Longman, 1988. 446-64.

Fournier, Louis. *FLQ: Histoire d'un mouvement clandestin*. Outremont: Lanctôt, 1998.

Fuss, Diana. *Essentially Speaking: Feminism, Nature & Difference*. New York & London: Routledge, 1989.

Garneau, Michel. *Coriolan*. Montréal: VLB, 1989.

---. *Shakespeare: un monde qu'on peut apprendre par coeur*. ms. 1991.

Gauvin, Lise. "De *Speak White* à *Speak What?*: À propos de quelques manifestes québécois." *Quebec Studies* 20 (Spring-Summer 1995): 19-26.

---. "Manifester la différance: Place et fonctions des manifestes dans les littératures francophones." *Globe: Revue Internationale d'Études Québécoises* 6.1 (2003): 23-42.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca : Cornell UP, 1983.

Gentzler, Edwin. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. London & New York: Routledge, 1993.

Gilbert, Helen and Joanne Tompkins. *Post-colonial Drama: Theory, Practice, Politics*. London & New York: Routledge, 1996.

Godard, Barbara, Sherry Simon, and Patricia Smart. "Symposium: Feminism and Postmodernism in Quebec: The Politics of Alliance." *Quebec Studies* 9 (1989/90): 131-50.

Godin, Diane, ed. *Ronfard : les legs*. Spec. issue of *Cahiers de théâtre Jeu* 110 (2004.1): 7-133.

Godin, Jean Cléo and Dominique Lafon. *Dramaturgies québécoises des années quatre-vingt*. Montréal: Leméac, 1999.

Graham, Catherine. "Speaking as Part of Canada: An Interview with Gordon McCall about Centaur Theatre." *Canadian Theatre Review* (Winter 1997): 23-26.

Graham, Joseph F., ed. *Difference in Translation*. Ithaca & London: Cornell U P, 1985.

Un Groupe de femmes de Montréal. *Manifeste des femmes québécoises*. Montréal: L'Étincelle, 1971.

Halio, Jay L. "A New Watershed? Robert Lepage's 'Mudsummer' Night's Dream." *Shakespeare's Sweet Thunder: Essays on the Early Comedies*. Ed. Michael J. Collins. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1997. 217-227.

Harvie, Jennifer and Erin Hurley. "States of Play: Locating Quebec in the Performances of Robert Lepage, Ex Machina and the Cirque du Soleil." *Theatre Journal* 51.3 (1999): 299-315.

Hedrick, Donald and Bryan Reynolds. "Shakespace and Transversal Power." *Shakespeare Without Class: Misappropriations of Cultural Capital*. Eds. Donald Hedrick and Bryan Reynolds. New York: Palgrave, 2000. 3-47.

Heyes, Cressida J. *Line Drawings: Defining Women through Feminist Practice*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2000.

Hoagland, Sarah Lucia and Julia Penelope, eds. *For Lesbians Only: A Separatist Anthology*. London: Onlywomen Press, 1988.

Hobbs, Sandra. "De l'opposition à l'ambivalence: la théorie postcolonial et l'écriture de la résistance." *Quebec and Postcolonialism*. Spec. issue of *Quebec Studies* 35 (Spring-Summer 2003): 9pp.

Hodgdon, Barbara. "Splish Splash and The Other: Lepage's Intercultural Dream Machine." *Essays in Theatre* 12.1 (1993): 29-40. Rpt. in "Looking For Mr. Shakespeare after 'The Revolution': Robert Lepage's Intercultural Dream Machine." *Shakespeare, Theory and Performance*. Ed. James C. Bulman. London : Routledge, 1996. 68-91.

---. "Macbeth at the Turn of the Millenium." *Shakespearean Illuminations: Essays in Honor of Marvin Rosenberg*. Eds. Jay L. Halio and Hugh Richmond. Newark & London: U of Delaware P & Associated UP, 1998. 147-63.

Huffman, Shawn. "Amputation, Phantom Limbs, and Spectral Agency in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* and Normand Chaurette's *Les Reines*." *Modern Drama* 47.1 (Spring 2004): 66-81.

Hunt, Nigel. "The Global Voyage of Robert Lepage." *The Drama Review* 33.2 (Summer 1989): 104-118.

Hutchinson, John. "Cultural Nationalism and Moral Regeneration". *Nationalism*. Eds. John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1994. 122-131.

Jameson, Frederic. "Third World literature in the era of multinational capitalism." *Social Text* 15 (Fall 1986): 65-88.

Jayawardena, Kumari. *Feminism and Nationalism in the Third World*. London: Zed Books, 1986.

Kantorowicz, Ernst. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1957.

Kennedy, Dennis. "Shakespeare Without His Language." *Shakespeare, Theory and Performance*. Ed. James C. Bulman. London & New York : Routledge, 1996. 133-148.

---, ed. *Foreign Shakespeare: Contemporary Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993

Kristeva, Julia. *The Portable Kristeva*. Ed. Kelly Oliver. New York: Columbia UP, 2002.

Knowles, Richard Paul [Ric]. "From Dream to Machine: Peter Brook, Robert Lepage, and the Contemporary Shakespearean Director as (Post)Modernist." *Theatre Journal* 50.2 (1998): 189.

---. "Reading *Elsinore*: The Ghost and the Machine." *Canadian Theatre Review: Adapting Shakespeare in Canada.* 111 (Summer 2002). 87-88.

---. Rev. of *The Queens*, by Normand Chaurette, translated by Linda Gaboriau. *Canadian Theatre Review* 78 (Spring 1994). 61.

---. *Shakespeare and Canada: Essays on Production, Translation, and Adaptation.* Brussels: Peter Lang, 2004.

Koustas, Jane. "Translation(s), Origin(s) and Identity in the Theatre of Robert Lepage." *Origins and Identities in French Literature.* Ed. Buford Norman. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1999.

Krysinski, Wladimir. Rev. of *Les Reines. Jeu* 60 (1991) : 121-4.

Lafon, Dominique. "Shakespeare à l'Arsenal ou Comment une filiale rompt avec la société mère." *L'Annuaire théâtrale* 24 (1998): 85-99.

---, ed. *Jean-Pierre Ronfard : L'Expérience du théâtre.* Spec. issue of *L'Annuaire théâtral* 35 (Spring 2004): 5-150.

Lalonde, Michèle. "La deffence et illustration de la langue quebecquoyse". *Défense et illustration de la langue québécoise suive de prose et poèmes.* Paris: Change / L'Hexagone/ Laffont, 1980. 9-34.

---. "Speak White." *Défense et illustration de la langue québécoise suive de prose et poèmes.* Paris: Change / L'Hexagone/ Laffont, 1980. 37-40.

Lamoureux, Diane. *L'amère patrie: Féminisme et nationalisme dans le Québec contemporain.* Montréal: Remue-ménage, 2001.

--- et al., eds. *Malaises identitaires: échanges féministes autour d'un Québec incertain.* Montréal: Remue-ménage, 1999.

Lanier, Douglas. *Shakespeare and Modern Popular Culture.* Oxford : Oxford UP, 2002.

Lapointe, Gilles. "*Vie et mort du Roi Boiteux* de Jean-Ronfard." *Canadian Drama.* 9.2 (1983): 220-25.

LaVoie, Pierre, ed. 'Vie et mort du roi Boiteux': *nouveau théâtre expérimental.* Spec. issue of *Jeu* 27 (1983): 62-138.

Le Blanc, Alonzo. "Ronfard: Dérive organisée et conflit des cultures." *Études Littéraires* 18.3 (Winter 1985): 123-141.

LeClerc, Patrice and Lois A. West. "Feminist Nationalist Movements in Québec: Resolving Contradictions?" *Feminist Nationalism*. Ed. Lois A. West. New York & London: Routledge, 1997. 220-46.

Lemieux, Pierre-Yves. *À propos de Roméo et Juliette*. ms. 1989.

Lepage, Robert. *Elseneur*. Montréal. ms. 1996.

Lepage, Robert and Gordon McCall. *Romeo & Juliette*. ms. 1989.

Lester, Normand. *Enquêtes sur les services secrets*. Montréal: Éditions de l'homme, 1998.

---. *Le livre noir du Canada anglais*. Montréal: Éditions des Intouchables, 2001.

Letourneur, Micheline. Rev. of *William S. Jeu* 60 (1991): 124-8.

Lever, Yves. "Les Ordres de Michel Brault: Un volet de l'opération «Taire des hommes»." <http://www.cam.org/~lever/Articles/Ordres.html> (1 Feb. 2003).

Lévesque, Robert. "Des farces de reines." *Le Devoir* [Montréal]. 24 Jan. 1991. B3.

Lieblein, Leanore. "Cette Belle Langue: The 'Tradaptation' of Shakespeare in Quebec." *Shakespeare and the Language of Translation*. Ed. A.J. Hoenselaars. London: Arden, 2004. 255-69.

---. "Dave veut jouer *Richard III*: Interrogating the Shakespearean Body in Québec." *Canadian Theatre Review* 111 (2002): 15-21.

---. "'Le Re-making' of le Grand Will: Shakespeare in Francophone Quebec." *Shakespeare in Canada: A World Elsewhere?* Eds. Diana Brydon and Irena R. Makaryk. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2002. 174-191.

---. "Shakespeare and the Quebec Nation." *The Elizabethan Theatre XV*. Eds. C.E. McGee and A.L. Magnussan. Toronto: P.D. Meany, 2002. 261-77.

---. "Shakespeare in Francophone Québec." <http://web.uvic.ca/shakespeare/Library/Criticism/shakespearein/quebec1.html> (1 Feb. 2003).

---. "Taming Shrews in Quebec." *ALFA: Actes de langue française et de linguistique* 10-11 (1997-98): 19-32.

---. "Theatre Archives at the Intersection of Production and Reception: The Example of

Quebecois Shakespeare." *Textual and Theatrical Shakespeare: Questions of Evidence.* Ed. Edward Pechter. Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 1996. 164-80. Rpt. "D'une époque ou de tous les temps? Le « printemps Shakepeare » de 1988." in *L'Annuaire théâtrale* 24 (1998): 100-113.

---. "Translation and mise en scène: the example of contemporary French Shakespeare." *Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism* 5.1 (1990): 81-94. Rpt. in *Foreign Shakespeare: Contemporary Performance*. Ed. Dennis Kennedy. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. 76-92.

---, ed. "Présentation." *Traversées de Shakespeare*. Spec. issue of *L'Annuaire théâtrale*. 24 (1998): 11-16.

Loomba, Ania and Martin Orkin eds. *Postcolonial Shakespeares*. London & New York: Routledge, 1998.

Mac Dougall, Jill. *Performing Identities on the Stages of Quebec*. New York: Peter Lang, 1997.

Maguire, Laurie E. "'Oh Be Some Other Name': Translating Romeo and Juliet." *Shakespeare, Text and Theater: Essays in Honor of Jay L. Halio*. Eds. Lois Potter et Arthur F. Kinney. Newark & London : U of Delaware P & Associated UP, 1999. 266-84.

Maier, Carol. "Toward a Theoretical Practice for Cross-Cultural Translation." *Between Languages and Cultures: Translation and Cross-Cultural Texts*. Eds. Anuradha Dingwaney and Carol Maier. Pittsburgh & London: U of Pittsburgh P, 1995.

Mannoni, Octave. *Prospero and Caliban: The Psychology of Colonization.* (1956) Trans. Pamela Powesland. New York: Praeger, 1964.

Mansour, Kadar. *Sous l'empire de Iago*. ms. 2002.

Marsden, Jean, ed. *The Appropriation of Shakespeare: Post-Renaissance Reconstructions of the Works and the Myth.* New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991.

May, Stephen. *Language and Minority Rights: Ethnicity, Nationalism, and the Politics of Language*. Harlow U.K.: Pearson, 2001.

McCall, Gordon. "Two Solitudes: A Bilingual Romeo & Juliette in Saskatoon." *Canadian Theatre Review* 62 (Spring 1990): 35-41.

McIlwain, C.H., ed. *The Political Works of James I.* Volume 1. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1918.

Mealing, S.R., ed. *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents: A Selection.* Ottawa: Carleton, Library Series, 1990.

Micone, Marco. *La mégère de Padova.* ms. 1995.

---. "Speak What." *Jeu* 50 (1989): 84-5.

Minh-ha, Trinh T. "Not You/Like You: Postcolonial Women and the Interlocking Questions of Identity and Difference." *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation, and Postcolonial Perspectives.* Ed. Anne McClintock et al. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1997.

---. *Woman, Native, Other.* Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana UP, 1989.

Monière, Denis. *Le Développement des ideologies au Québec des origins à nos jours.* Montréal: Québec/Amérique, 1977.

---. *Pour comprendre le nationalisme au Québec et ailleurs.* Montréal: Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 2001.

Moss, Laura, ed. *Is Canada Postcolonial ? Unsettling Canadian Literature.* Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier UP, 2003.

Naipaul, V.S. *The Mimic Men.* Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969.

Nairn, Tom. "The Maladies of Development". *Nationalism.* Eds. John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1994. 70-76.

Neilsen, Kai. "Cultural Nationalism, Neither Ethnic nor Civic". *Theorizing Nationalism.* Ed. Ronald Beiner. Albany: State U of New York P, 1999. 119-30.

Nestruck, J. Kelly. "War Measures Act: A Montreal play mixes Shakespeare's Henry V and the October Crisis." *National Post* [Don Mills, ON]. 26 Aug. 2002, natl. ed.: AL.3.

Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language.* London: James Currey, 1981.

---. *Moving the Center: The Struggle for Cultural Freedoms.* London: James Currey, 1993.

Nkunzimana, Obed. "Le débat postcolonial et le Québec?" *Quebec and Postcolonialism.* Spec. issue of *Quebec Studies* 35 (Spring-Summer 2003): 21pp.

Norbu, Dawa. *Culture and the Politics of Third World Nationalism.* London & New York: Routledge, 1992.

Novy, Marianne. "Introduction." *Transforming Shakespeare: Contemporary Women's Re-Visions in Literature and Performance.* Ed. Marianne Novy. New York: St. Martin's

P, 1999. 1-12.

Nussbaum, Martha. "Human Functioning and Social Justice: In Defense of Aristotelian Essentialism." *Political Theory* 20.2 (May 1992): 202-46.

Oksenburg Rorty, Amelie. "The Hidden Politics of Cultural Identification." *Political Theory* 22.1 (Feb. 1994): 152-66.

O'Leary, Véronique and Louise Toupin, eds. *Québécoises Deboutte!: Une anthologie de texts du Front de liberation de femmes (1969-1971) et du Centre des femmes (1972-1975)*. 2 vols. Montréal: Remue-ménage, 1982.

Ouellette, Michel. *Songe d'une nuit*. ms. 1995.

Parker, Andrew et al. eds *Nationalisms & Sexualities*. New York & London: Routledge, 1992.

Paster, Gail Kern. *The Body Embarrassed: Drama and the Disciplines of Shame in Early Modern England*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993.

Pivato, Joseph. "Five-fold translation in the theatre of Marco Micone." *Canadian Theatre Review* 104 (Fall 2000): 11-15.

Radz, Matt. "Untying art's tongue: Guts, imagination and pinch of genius went into Henry. Octobre. 1970." *Gazette* [Montréal]. 23 Aug. 2002: D1.

Ranchod-Nilsson, Sita and Mary Ann Tétrault eds. *Women, States, and Nationalism: At Home in the Nation?* London: Routledge, 2000.

Richards, Marvin. "Corralling the Wild Ponies: Correspondences Between Québec and the Postcolonial." *Quebec and Postcolonialism*. Spec. issue of *Quebec Studies* 35 (Spring-Summer 2003): 17pp.

Riendeau, Pascal. "Normand Chaurette face à Shakespeare ou Traduisez *Comme il vous plaira....*" *L'Annuaire théâtrale* 24 (1998): 17-34.

Roehner, Bertrand M. with Leonard J. Rahilly. *Separatism and Integration: A Study in Analytical History*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002.

Ronfard, Jean-Pierre. "En contrepoint." *Cahiers de théâtre Jeu* 54 (1990): 123-5.

---. *Falstaff*. ms. 1990.

Roy, Irene. *Le Théâtre Repère: du ludique au poétique dans le théâtre de recherche*. Québec: Nuit blanche, 1993.

Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage, 1994.

Salter, Denis. "Acting Shakespeare in Postcolonial Space." *Shakespeare, Theory and Performance*. Ed. James C. Bulman. London : Routledge, 1996. 113-131.

---. "Between Wor(l)ds: Lepage's Shakespeare Cycle." *Theater* 24.3 (1993): 61-70.

---. "Blood ... Sex ... Death ... Birth: Paula de Vasconcelos's *Le Making of de Macbeth*: an interview." *Australasian Drama Studies* 29 (October 1996): 67-83.

---. "Borderlines: An Interview with Robert Lepage and Le Théâtre Repère." *Theater*. 24.3 (1993): 71-79.

---. "Introduction: The End(s) of Shakespeare?" *Essays in Theatre: Shakespeare and Postcolonial Conditions*. 15.1 (November 1996): 3-14.

Sarra-Bournet, Michel, ed. *Le pays de tous les Québécois: Diversité culturelle et souveraineté*. Montréal: VLB, 1998.

Schulte, Rainer and John Biguenet, eds. *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*. Chicago & London: U of Chicago P, 1992.

Schwartzwald, Robert. "Fear of Federasty: Québec's Inverted Fictions." *Comparative American Identities: Race, Sex and Nationality in the Modern Text*. Ed. Hortense J. Spillers. London & New York: Routledge, 1991. 175-195.

---. "Rush to Judgment? Postcolonial Criticism and Québec." *Quebec and Postcolonialism*. Spec. issue of *Quebec Studies* 35 (Spring-Summer 2003): 17pp.

---. "'Symbolic' Homosexuality, 'False Feminine,' and the Problematics of Identity in Québec." *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory*. Ed. Michael Warner. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1993. 264-299.

Sears, Dianne. "Défense de parler: Language on Trial in Michèle Lalonde's 'La Deffence et illustration de la langue québecquoyse' and 'Outrage au tribunal'." *The French Review: Journal of the American Association of Teachers of French* 68.6 (May 1995): 1015-21.

Seymour, Michel. "Quebec and Canada at the Crossroads: A Nation within a Nation." *Nations and Nationalism* 6.2 (2000): 227-55. Rpt. in (http://www.philo.umontreal.ca/textes/Seymour_Crossroads.pdf) 22 March 2004.

--- with Jocelyne Couture and Kai Neilsen. "Questioning the Ethnic/Civic Dichotomy". *Rethinking Nationalism*. Eds. Jocelyne Couture, Kai Nielsen, and Michel Seymour. Calgary: U of Calgary P. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 22 (supplementary 1996): 1-61.

Sherlow, Lois. "Normand Chaurette's *Les Reines*: Shakespeare and the Modern in the Alchemical Oven." *Shakespeare in Canada: A World Elsewhere?* Eds. Diana Brydon and Irena R. Makaryk. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2002. 353-70.

---. "Shakespearean Dramaturgies in Québec." *Ilha do Desterro* 36 (Jan/Jun 1999): 185-218.

Shugar, Dana. *Separatism and Women's Community*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1995.

Signorini, Ines. "Quête d'un discours fondateur chez Jean-Claude Germain." *Voix et images: littérature québécoise* 13.2 (1988): 304-316.

Simard, Francis. *Pour en finir avec Octobre*. Montréal: Stanké, 1982.

Simon, Sherry. *Gender in Translation*. London & New York: Routledge, 1996.

---. "The Language of Cultural Difference: Figures of Alterity in Canadian Translation." *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London & New York: Routledge, 1992. 159-76.

---. "Shakespeare en traduction." *Jeu* 48 (1988): 82-7.

---. "Speaking with Authority: The Theatre of Marco Micone." *Canadian Literature* 106 (Fall 1985): 57-64.

---. "Translating and interlingual creation in the contact zone: Border writing in Quebec." *Post-colonial Translation: Theory and Practice*. Eds. Susan Bassnett et Harish Trivedi. London & New York: Routledge, 1999.

Sioui Durand, Yves and Jean-Frédéric Messier. *Hamlet-le-Malécite*. ms. 2004.

Slemon, Stephen. "Unsettling the Empire: Resistance Theory for the Second World." *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. Eds. Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin. London & New York: Routledge, 1999.

Smith, Anthony D. *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History*. Malden MA: Blackwell, 2001.

Spenser, Metta, ed. *Separatism: Democracy and Disintegration*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998.

Spivak, Gayatri. "Criticism, feminism, and the institution, interview with Elizabeth Gross." *Thesis Eleven* 10/11 (November/March 1984/1985): 175-87.

Steen, Shannon and Werry, Margaret. "Bodies, Technologies, and Subjectivities: The

Production of Authority in Robert Lepage's *Elsinore*." *Essays in Theatre* 16.2 (1998): 139-51.

Stevenson, Melanie. "À qui appartient Shakespeare? Les tiraillements au sujet du *Hamlet, prince du Québec* de Robert Gurik." *L'Annuaire théâtrale* 24 (1998): 69-84.

Taylor, Charles. *Multiculturalism and 'the Politics of Recognition'*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1992.

---. *Rapprocher les solitudes: Écrits sur le fédéralisme et le nationalisme au Canada.* Sainte-Foy: Presses de l'Université Laval, 1992.

Thomas, Nancy. *Richard III ou la chute du corbeau.* ms. 2002.

Thompson, Daphné. *Sauvée des eaux : Texte dramatique sur Ophélie*. ms. 2000.

Tompkins, Joanne. "Re-Citing Shakespeare in Post-Colonial Drama." *Essays in Theatre* 15.1 (November 1996): 15-22.

Tremblay, Michel. *Les belles soeurs*. Montréal: Lémeac, 1972.

---. *Hosanna suivi de La Duchesse de Langeais*. Montréal: Leméac, 1973.

Tymoczko, Maria. "Post-colonial writing and literary translation." *Post-colonial Translation: Theory and Practice*. Eds. Susan Bassnett et Harish Trivedi. London & New York: Routledge, 1999.

Vallières, Pierre. *Nègres blancs d'Amérique*. Montréal: Parti pris, 1969.

Vigeant, Louise. "Aventure du côté du carnaval: *Vie et mort du Roi Boiteux*." *Theatre Research International* 17.3 (Fall 1992): 203-216.

---. "(Im)Pure Theatre." *Canadian Theatre Review* 50 (Spring 1987): 14-19.

Wallace, Helen. "French-Canadian political satire resounding success for LLT." 1968. Rpt. in Gurik. *Hamlet, prince du Québec*. Ottawa: Leméac, 1977. 141-43.

Walker, Brian. "Social Movements as Nationalisms or, On the Very Idea of a Queer Nation." *Rethinking Nationalism*. Eds. Jocelyne Couture, Kai Nielsen, and Michel Seymour. Calgary: U of Calgary P. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*. 22 (supplementary 1996): 505-547.

Ward, Ian. "Shakespeare and the Politics of Community". *Early Modern Literary Studies* 4.3 (January 1999): 2.1-45.

Weiss, Jonathan M. "The Contemporary Theatre and Its Public in Quebec." *Quebec*

Studies 1.1 (1983): 166-77.

Weber, Max. "The Nation". *Nationalism*. Eds. John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1994. 21-25.

Wheale, Nigel. "Culture Clustering, Gender Crossing: *Hamlet* Meets Globalization in Robert Lepage's *Elsinore*." *Shakespeare and his Contemporaries in Performance*. Ed. Edward J. Esche. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2000. 121-135.

Wickham, Philip. "Une nourriture de l'esprit." *Jeu* 111 (2004.2): 24-6.

Williams, Colin H. "Introduction". *National Separatism*. Ed. Colin H. Williams. Cardiff: U of Wales P, 1982. 1-16.

Yuval-Davis, Nira. *Gender & Nation*. London: Sage, 1997.

Zemon Davis, Natalie. "Women on Top." *Society and Culture in Early Modern France*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1975. 124-151.