Shakespeare, Québécois Nationalist
Poet: Perlocutory Translation

...they made up the deficiency by recommending the best productions of the past as patterns, and making them accessible to their scholars. These were chiefly the works of the Christian-Catholic school of the Middle Ages. The translation of Shakespeare, who stands on the border of this art, and smiles with Protestant clearness into our modern time, was intended for controversial purposes...

Heinrich Heine, Germany

Translation as a Perlocutory Operation

As the witches are dancing on the moors, a drum announces Macbeth’s arrival. This is Macbeth’s first appearance in the play:

_Drum within_

_THIRD WITCH: A drum, a drum!
Macbeth doth come._

In Michel Garneau’s Québécois version of the play, Macbeth’s arrival is announced by a different musical instrument, a fiddle:

_Violon_

_TROISIÈME_

_Le violon, le violon, Macbeth s’en vient ! _

By way of metonymy, the fiddle acts as an _actualiser_ in this important scene, as it immediately brings to mind two characteristic features of Québécois folklore – the fiddler and the ebullient rhythm of the jig. The
replacement of the drum is only a minuscule change, but it transforms the setting of the dramatic action and places the tragedy in an unambiguously Québécois framework. This change passes almost unnoticed in print, but, on stage, the powerful evocative, transforming the Scotland of Macbeth, a foreign, imaginary, and distant land, into something immediately familiar.

On another level, this typically Québécois folk music, together with other markers such as the ‘Québécois language,’ functions as a powerful metadiscursive operator. When they hear the sound of the fiddle, the audience realize that the place being referred to (Scotland/fiction) can be superposed on the place from which the lines are being delivered (Québec/reality). The fusion of the content of the play and the place where it is being performed transforms the discourse of Shakespeare’s tragedy into a dual semantic that works upon the consciousness of the audience. Here, translation becomes a perlocutionary operation, to use a term from speech-act theory. The term ‘perlocutory act’ (or, according to J.L. Austin and J. Searle, the perlocutionary act) refers to what is commonly called the ‘effect on the receiver’ in translation theory.

For example, by arguing, I may persuade or convince someone, by warning him I may cause or alarm him, by making a request I may make him do something, by informing him I may convince him (enlighten, inform, etc). The italicized expressions above denote perlocutionary acts.

The term ‘perlocutory’ will thus be used to refer to those transformations that give the target text a persuasive or injunctive function. This function, absent from the source text, is designed to produce specific reactions in the receiver.

Normally, real-actualization transposes the space and time of the original play into a reality familiar to the audience. For example, Robert Lalonde sets the action of Macbeth in 1890s New Brunswick. Michel Garneau’s Macbeth does not re-actualize the entire text of the original play; instead, his translation retains the essential identity of Macbeth. Garneau does, however, introduce changes at certain points that transport Shakespeare’s tragedy to another setting, to a reconstituted past in which the play becomes an allegory of the Conquest, a real-life tragedy from Québécois past that throws light on the life of contemporary Quebec. Thus, Shakespeare’s tragedy is made to fall in line with Québécois reality as is its represented in the social discourse. The fusion of these two realities operates at two levels: space and time.

In Garneau’s spatial re-actualization of the play, the fictitious elsewhere of Macbeth is reactualized in a Québécois context through the explicit use of the target language, a language whose importance, as we have seen, is underlined by the inclusion of the expression ‘translated into Québécois’ on the cover of the published play. Temporal re-actualization is achieved through the use of certain markers, such as the arborescent form of the language of translation. These temporal markers prompt the Québécois audience to perceive the temporal distance of a Quebec that they already recognize through other markers. Although they may seem contradictory, the spatial and temporal dislocations produced by the translation realize a “historic re-actualization of the Shakespearean play, a re-actualization distant in time. This produces much more subtle fusion of the play’s dialogue and the social discourse than could ever be achieved by direct and total transposition of place and characters. By emphasizing the temporal nature of the spatial markers of the dramatic action, Garneau’s translation establishes a distance between the place of reception (Québec) and this same place at a specific time in its history. Dislocated in time, the place referred to in the play (an imaginary Scotland) and the place the translation refers to (historic Quebec) are fused in a contemporary space, that of the prevailing social discourse (present-day Quebec). It is this interaction between the theme of the play, space, and time that produces the perlocutory effect of the translation.

The concept of a ‘chronoporte,’ a term used to refer to the conjunction of a particular space and a particular time, will enable us to schematize the way in which actualizers switch the discourse from one space-time to another. We will demonstrate, in particular, how the actualizers in Garneau’s translation bring about axio-ideological shifts between reality and fiction, that is to say, how they inject into the dialogue of Macbeth values and ideas that represent the Québécois fact in the social discourse.

Michel Garneau’s Macbeth operates within three main space-times—the chronoporte of the original: Scotland/in a mythical time; the chronoporte of the re-actualized original: Quebec/historical time; and the chronoporte of the audience: Quebec/at the time of reception. For each of these chronoportes, there is a discursive configuration: who is speaking, of what, and how? In the first chronoporte, we find Shakespeare’s dialogue. In the second, we find the same dialogue reworked by translation. In the third, the discourse of Québécois society, of which the translator and the audience are part, plays an infinitely greater and much more complex role.
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translation to the chronotope of the source text (in this case, mythical Scotland) – at least, this will be the perception of the audience, who are at the mercy of the translator.

The translator is, however, confronted with certain limitations in this process: *Macbeth* does not lend itself uniformly to axi-ideological semantization in terms of *Québécois* social discourse. Some parts of the play lend themselves better than others to the superposing of chronotopes and, consequently, to the dynamic of discursive exchange. If the entire text of *Macbeth* were translated to correspond perfectly with the discourse of *Québécois* society, the Shakespearian play would be unrecognizable. Thus, it is not surprising that only parts of the play are adjusted – namely, those that are the most compatible with the values and ideas manifested in *Québécois* discourse.

Such adjustments to the original text, which the translator is often not even aware of, can nevertheless reveal the discursive codes of the society into which foreign texts, selected by that society, enter – hence, the interest of these adjustments to translation theorists. A description of the structural underpinnings of these adjustments will enable us to understand better the institutional constraints of the translative operation, as well as the role, little known and very little studied, of the subjects of this operation, translators themselves, in their role as conveyors of the norms of the social discourse and the institution that sets them up and validates them.

A Dynamic Equivalent: *Scotland = N’ou pas* pays

Our examination of a single actualizer in Garneau’s *Macbeth*, the substitution of one musical instrument for another, led us to formulate a number of principles, which we will now apply to the play as a whole. Let us begin with Garneau’s spatio-temporal transformations, comparing settings in the original stage directions with those of the *Québécois* version.

Tables 17 and 18 demonstrate the reductive simplification of the *Québécois* version of the play. In its defence, it might be pointed out that this simplification is dictated by the production constraints of a different theatrical aesthetic, that of an impoverished theatre, the very symbol of the *Québécois* as victims of history. But this only emphasizes all the more that translation and production values are products of the same society and operate within the same ideological framework. They start from the same position, and from the same historical juncture, and arrive at similar interpretations of the source text.¹
Garneau's translation retains fewer than half of the places that appear in the original text, and these are given a vaguer designation; the characters appear, for example, "au bord de la forêt" (A park with a road leading to the palace), "dans la campagne" (The country near Duniniane), "chez Macbeth" (Duniniane. A room in the castle). These neutral settings remove the disquieting nature of the myth. Thus, the cave disappears, while the deserted heath, reminiscent of that in Wuthering Heights, reappears in the more domesticated form of a "brûlé" (slaughtered and burnt, deforested land). The Québécois audience will inevitably associate this "brûlé" with its colonial past of land-clearing settlers, defensive works, forts and castles. In his stage directions, Garneau retains none of the numerous occurrences of the word 'palace.' He does, however, translate "castle," a more modest type of building, although he reduces its value by using it only half as many times as it appears in the original. It is not surprising, either, that he transforms "A room of state" into the more familiar "salle à manger."

One explanation for this systematic shift to the commonplace might be that...
lie in the dialectal nature of the target language, which, it could be argued, limits the possibilities open to the translator. But, surely, the aim of translating a canonical work into 'Québécois' is to achieve a more accurate Québecois and to prove that it is a language in its own right. One characteristic feature of a language is its ability to express any reality and, if necessary, to create the means of doing so. There is, therefore, no reason why there should not be an equivalent for the 'King's palace' in Québecois. Garneau could have used his own graphic and phonetic code to translate 'the King's palace' by 'le palais du roi'. The systematic omission of the word 'palace' indicates that there is a conflict between what the language can say (even in a dialectal form, given that it reproduces characteristics of the French spoken in Quebec during the Ancien Régime) and what the translator makes it say. The omission does not result from a deficiency in the language, but rather from the relationship the translator sets up between the play's content and the 'fait québécois', a reality the language is clearly supposed to express and promote. A castle is a means of defence as well as an aristocratic dwelling. It is a protective enclosure surrounded by ramparts, complete with loopholes, crenels, and watchtowers. As a fortification, the castle is, thus, a real part of the history of Quebec – in contrast with the palace. This explains why the attack on Macbeth's castle has historical resonance for a Québecois audience.

**Macbeth**

_**GARNEAU**_

_Fa’s a recrocher toutes nos banniéres après ‘es crénaux!_ 
_Ca m’a’ti d’iendre cri qu’y s’en venenz, l’echateau
En avez fort pour percre toutes leurs attaquez, ou va ‘es laisser
S’evauter comme des bous jusqu’à temps qu’y crescent ed ‘jam
Pie qu’les feeux ‘es mangent tout crus. R’marqué, ils’éta’tent pas
Renforcé en nombe par estre bande de traitz qui s’a’tent s'postés
D’éte d’not’ bord, on s’ait sorti ‘es défer face à face
Dans l’corps à corps pour les t’culer jusque cheveux!_ (p. 160)

**MACBETH**

_We have to hang our banners out the crenels!_
_It doesn’t face me to hear them yelling that they’re coming,_
_The castle
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is strong enough to withstand their attacks; we are going to let them try like crazy until they starve to death
And wild beasts eat them alive. You know, if they weren’t supported by a bunch of traitors who were supposed to be on our side, we would have gone out and faced them in hand-to-hand combat, to drive them back to where they came from! (our translation)

This passage is reminiscent of cliché descriptions of attacks on forts by Indians or by the English, of the sort found in Québecois popular novels or history books. The similarity is further reinforced by the fact that Garneau omitted many of the proper names that appear in the original _Macbeth_. As the preceding tables indicate, two-thirds of the place-names designating the scene of the action have been removed – a large number. Such omissions are made not only in the stage notes but also in the dialogue of the play itself. Witness, for example, the prophecy around which the play revolves:

_Macbeth shall never vanquish’d be unit_ 
_Great Birnam Wood to high Dunsinane Hill_
_Shall come against him. (p. 861)_

Macbeth s’ra pas vaincu tant qu’la forêt descendra pas d’la colline (p. 106)

Indeed, these place-names do not appear anywhere in the translation:

_PORTIER_
_J’t’en en train d’guetter, comme vous m’aviez dit, si y s’pass’t Quoique chose su’il’s allés pis à coup, m’a semblé, m’a semblé Qu’a la forêt, a commencez’s à bouger, a s’en s’oir vers nous-auts…_
... 
_J’vois jure qu’ia cri vuoi, voi comme j’vois voi, là, Eure mauve d’alors pis d’huissoon d’un gros mille de profund Qui descendent d’la colline!

**MACBETH**

[...] la sardière
_M’a ben dit, cain’s rien tant qu’la forêt descendra pas d’la colline,
A Société critique of Translation

Garneau suppresses not only place-names but also their attributes. ‘Great Birnam Wood’ and ‘high Dunannie Hill,’ larger-than-life places, of mythical proportions, are reduced to normal proportions, and acquire the banality of an everyday rural environment. Similarly, echoes of Holinshed’s chronicles, the source of the play’s plot, are reduced to a whisper. Upstaged from Anglo-Saxon mythology, Macbeth is transplanted to a land resembling New France. The spatio-temporal markers of Shakespeare’s tragedy are displaced, if only intermittently, in favour of a historically recognizable Quebec.

Another example, from Act I, demonstrates even better how the elimination of certain elements facilitates the spatio-temporal displacement of the dialogue and, as a result, the projection of ideologemes of québécois

Shakespeare

KING

Whence cam’st thou, worthy thane?

ROSS

From Fife, great king.

Where the Norwegians banner float the sky. (p. 847)

Garneau

DUNCAN

D’où c’est qu’on s’insouls comme ça?

ROSS

Du plein cœur de la bataille
Ou qu’ils drapeaux des étranges insultent
Nean plus ciel. (p. 16)

In this description of the battle between Scotland and Norway, the translator has removed all references to the original setting and combatants. The latter become ‘les étrangers’ (the foreigner), and later ‘c’y en barbareschi’ (those barbarians). The erasure of the names of people and places that clearly place the text in a Shakespearean universe makes it possible for Québécois readers or audiences to project onto Macbeth their own history and destiny. Conscious or not, the elimination of such references has a very real function. The mêlée may be subliminal, but it nevertheless succeeds in reminding the public of the battle of the Plains of Abraham and the British Conquest, henceforth symbolized by the presence of the federal flag (drapeaux des étranges – the ‘foreign flag’ that replaced the British flag) in the skies of ‘La Belle Province.’

We have seen that, in Garneau’s Macbeth, the discourse through which the Québécois condition is defined meshes with the space-time of the original, by suppressing or adding certain markers. These alterations may well be unconscious, as the translator internalizes the discursive conventions of the society of which they are a part or, to be more precise, of the social group with which they identify. Nevertheless, an audience watching a production of the Québécois Macbeth is under the impression that it is, literally, a contemporary play, and does not realize that it is the translator’s adjustments that have made it so. Garneau did, however, openly admit to eliminating two passages that he considered irrelevant. These omissions are worthy of our attention. Let us examine in detail the two shortened scenes and the differences between the original and the translation.

The King of England in the Trash-Cans of History

‘I omitted lines 36 to 47.’

Garneau justifies his omission of these lines from Act III, Sc. 6, as follows: ‘J’ai sauteur vers 38 au vers 47 par’c’est mêlé mélant’ (I omitted lines 38 to 47 because they are a jumble). What is striking about the scene the translator chose to expurgate is its proliferation of characters and patronyms. In the space of sixty lines, no fewer than ten characters are introduced:

- Duncan, the assassinated King of Scotland;
- Macbeth, the usurper of the throne of Scotland;
- Edward, the pious King of England;
- Banquo, Macbeth’s rival, assassinated on his orders;
- Malcolm and Donalbain, sons of Duncan, refugees at the English court;
- Fleance, Banquo’s son, survivor of an assassination attempt;
- Macduff, leader of the rebellion against Macbeth;
The position of the pronoun ("he"/"Macduff") is reversed ("Macduff/ 
Y") to make the passage clearer. Similarly, Garneau provides the name of 
the tyrant (Macbeth) and he anticipates Ross's response by including 
the name of the organizers of the rebellion in Lennox's question ("Can you 
tell where he bestows himself?" "ou c'est qu'y sont rendus Malcolm pis 
Macduff"). Clearly, Garneau is trying to help his audience make sense of 
this jumble of characters. He replaces the periphrase 'The son of Dun-
can' with the name of the protagonist himself (Malcolm) and repeats 
the name 'Macduff' to guide the reader and, more important, the audience 
in the theatre, through a morass of confusing references. Yet, are these 
substitutions motivated solely by a concern for clarity? Let us look, 
for example, at his treatment of the following references to the King of 
England, all taken from the same scene:

The English court
À cour du roi d'Angleterre

The most pious Edward
not translated

The holy king
(du) roi

The omission of the second reference deprives the King of England of 
his own name and, more important, prevents a Québecois audience from 
hearing the praise for him contained in the original text. In the third ref-
ference, the positive attributes of the King are once again omitted (cen-
sored?), an excess of attention for this otherwise secondary character. 
This suppression is all the more revealing in that it occurs alongside an 
expansion introduced by the translator to praise an even more secondary 
character:

Shakespeare

Thibet Macduff

Is gone to pray the holy king, upon his aid
To wake Northumberland and aar-like Siuard. (p. 86)

Garneau

D’un côté, Macduff en profite pour assayer d’avoir l’appui du roi.
Here, Garneau’s modelling or reshaping of Macbeth operates on two levels. But the reshaping is, above all, ideological, as it removes from the original text attributes which differ from those that Québécois society associates with the British monarch, a central figure in the collective memory of Quebec. Several lines later, we see another example of Garneau’s ideological reshaping, conscious or not, of a passage that was somewhat ambiguous in the original.

Shakespeare

And this report

Hath to exasperate the king that he
Prepares for some attempt at war. (p. 860)

Which king is being referred to here? Is it Edward or Macbeth? A translation by Pierre Leyris, which appeared one year before Garneau’s translation, and which was based on extremely thorough textual analysis, identifies the king of the original text as Macbeth:

Et ces nouvelles

Ont si furieusement exaspéré Macbeth,
Qu’il se prépare à quelque guerre.

Garneau also makes the original text explicit, but he gives this same king, who is preparing for battle, the identity of the King of England, a person held in contempt by the history of Quebec and by Québécois social discourse:

En tout cas, son rapport, à Macduff a si tant touché
Et voilà d’Angleterre, qu’y sont à bas, en train d’être les
Préparatifs de guerre. (p. 96)

These lines are immediately followed by: ‘I omitted lines 38 to 47, because they are a jumble’ (p. 97). Admittedly, the dialogue that follows is somewhat opaque in the original:

LENOX

Sent he to Macduff?
A Sociocritique of Translation

Garneau’s translation of Lennox’s speech retains only the words ‘that a swift blessing,’ which he then expands on:

Ça s’ra une bénédiction pis une saine justice
Si nost pays s’ra libéré la main damnée qui l’opprime. (p. 97)

[It would be a benediction and a blissful justice
If our country were freed from the cursed hand that oppresses it. (our translation)]

The audience’s attention is drawn to this passage, which can now be interpreted at two levels—at one level, the play itself, and at the other, the Québécois context, with discernible echoes of “Vive le Québec libre!” Removed from its original context, whose possible ambiguity could distract the audience’s attention from the plot, the passage now stands out and assumes greater significance—all the more so because it has been expanded to include ‘pis une saine justice,’ an assurance clearly inspired by the prevailing social discourse rather than by the corresponding passage of the original text, in which there is no equivalent. We also note, in particular, the omission of the reference to England, whose liberation would come to a country suffering at the hands of a hated oppressor. Clearly, the narrative of Shakespeare’s tragedy disturbed the order of Québécois sovereignist discourse.

The plot of Macbeth, which revolves around tyranny and usurpation of power, parallels the representation of history in the discourse of Québécois liberation. More than Othello, and many other Shakespeare plays, Macbeth has clear affinities with the values and ideas that define the Québécois condition. Clearly, the choice of Macbeth was not entirely arbitrary. The play was most likely chosen because of its narrative macrostructure; but one of its instant microstructures is problematic—the English monarch appears in the role of liberator, and not in the role of oppressor. A major drawback to this otherwise appropriate vehicle for symbolizing the Québécois condition is, thus, the fact that the English are not portrayed as villains. Indeed, quite the opposite is true: the King of England is ‘the holy King,’ ‘the most pious Edward,’ or ‘gracious England.’ Garneau eliminated these modifiers, minimized the role of the King, and omitted a passage that clearly runs counter to the ideological presuppositions of the sovereignist discourse, a discourse for which Macbeth now becomes an indirect mouthpiece. In his role of social subject, relay of the social discourse, the translator eliminated disruptive passages, invoking a need for clarity to justify this removal of parts of the text: ‘I omitted ... because they are a jumble. The passage referred to above is not one of exemplary clarity, but neither is it incoherent. Indeed, Macbeth contains many, much more obvious examples of incoherence, but Garneau did not remove these. Was he afraid that the audience would confuse fiction with reality and that the benevolence of King Edward might conceal the despising of Quebec by his successors, who continue, in the mind of the audience, to be their oppressors? Therein lies the problem of censorship. It shelters behind an alleged connection between the real and the symbolic to justify its actions.

Intentional or not, the removal of parts of the original text keeps intact the order of a social discourse whose cohesion and presuppositional coherence were threatened. Validating a King of England would introduce a disturbing dialectical element into this otherwise ideologically homogeneous discourse. Garneau minimizes the liberating function of the King, but he does not do so consistently. The modifiers praising the King were most likely omitted at this precise point in the text because the passage contains a phrase of void immediacy, one of exceptional resonance for the Québécois public, a phrase that can be summed up as follows: ‘Oh, that our land were soon freed of foreign domination! The presence of two utterances that are compatible on the stage, but contradictory in the space-time of the receiver, would prevent an audience from making the connection between the real and the fictitious. It would weaken the perlocutory force of the message that the ‘surdestinataire’ of the play, in this case the translator, conveys to the Québécois public. We note in passing that the same passage is also shorn of its Christian references:

Shakespeare

LENNOX

Some holy angel
Fly to the court of England and unfold
His message ere he came, that a swift blessing
May soon return to this our suffering country
Under a hand accurs’d!

LORD

I’ll send up prayers with him. (p. 860)
It would not be appropriate, in the Québécois Macbeth, to send a heaven-
ely angel to the English court to plead for help and liberation. Removal of
the religious elements, despite their limited role in the play, indicates
clearly that in post-Quebec Revolution Quebec, when the influence of
the Church had already been destroyed, religious references could still
obscure a message that the translator obviously wished to express as
clearly and as directly as possible. Freed of context, the utterance leaves
the space-time for the space-time of public opinion. Now pos-
sessing a coherence that makes it possible for the Québécois receiver to
interpret it, the utterance moves from the aesthetic to the political/moral.
The scene is reshaped not only ideologically but also axiologically, as
illustrated by the treatment of the passage immediately preceding the
lines removed by the translator:

Shakespeare

That, by the help of thee – with him above
To ratify the work – we may again,
Give to our tables meat, sleep to our nights,
Free from our breasts and banquets bloody knives,
Do faithful homage and receive few honours,
All which we pine for now. (p. 860)

Garneau

[...] et pis toutes extrémités ensemble
Ae T’aide du bon dieu vont p’t’être ben nous ram’ner le bon temps,
Qu’on dorme tranquille, la nuit, qu’on mange sans méfiance
Qu’les pognard pleins d’ang s’élargissent d’nos banquetz,
Qu’on seye capables d’rende hommage à ceux-là qui l’émènent,
Qu’on seye à même de r’évèver des honneurs véritables, pas des asemblans,
Pour l’amour que tout un chacun s’accoutume terriblement d’Traversé
Ecrive astro. (p. 96)

Garneau’s axiological reshaping of Macbeth is realized not as much
through transposition of reality into fiction, and adaptation to Québécois
reality through suppression or introduction of certain values, as through
extension and repetition of passages praising values identical to those jus-
tifying sovereignist aspirations in the Québécois social discourse. Hence,
one more, we see the exemplary value of Macbeth, a play that depicts the
overthrow of tyranny by collective action. Of all Shakespeare’s plays, Mac-
beth is the most amenable to the expression ofQuébécois demands and
aspirations.

Macbeth, like a fable, contains a moral that the Québécois translation
highlights through adjustments to the text. Combat is a virtue: ‘war-like
Sward’ is neither ‘martial’ (Levis), nor ‘belliqueux’ (Bonfils), but ‘cillant’ and
‘vaillant’ (p. 96), capable of leading the uprising that will re-establish the values suppressed by the usurper – peace and
honesty. It is no longer ‘meat’, as in the original play, or, by etymology,
‘food’ that is demanded in front of an audience that enjoys one of the
highest standards of living in the world, but the right to ‘manger sans
méfiance’ (eat without being on guard). The oft-repeated message is that
one must be on guard against the insidious treachery of the dominant
power and those who are seduced by it; one must be able to disingage
friend from foe: ‘Qu’on soy capables d’rende hommage à ceux-là qui l’émènent / Qu’on seye à même de r’évèver des honneurs véritables, pas des asemblans’ (May we be able to pay homage to those that deserve it / May we be able to accept true honours, not fake ones). The original text
says much more simply: ‘Do faithful homage and receive free honours.’
The insistent aphoristic structure of the Québécois translation gives it
a resonance that subordinates the aesthetic function to the persuasive func-
tion. This is the very process that makes political or advertising slogans
effective, as Jakobson demonstrated with the formulaic I like the.

The perlocutery effectiveness of the Québécois Macbeth is also derived
from its exploitation of a latent interdiscursivity, which involves highlig-
ting those points where the dialogue of the play and the discourse of
the Québécois condition converge. The audience is surreptitiously invited
to take part in this play on double meanings, as we shall see even more
clearly when we examine the other scene expurgated by Garneau.

‘I didn’t translate lines 132 to 161.’

This is how Garneau justifies the omission of these lines from Act IV, Sc.
5: ‘I didn’t translate lines 132–61 (Oxford University Press) because this is
the scene with the doctor, where they speak of the King of England’s tal-
ent as healer – a ‘sèche de ventilation’ (breather), as they say in the cin-
ema; it has nothing to do with the dramatic action and it doesn’t sound
very much like Shakespeare’ (p. 121). The reasons he gives for this sec-
ond omission are similar to those that he gave for the first deletion, but
this time the translator is more explicit. He begins with a brief summary
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of the deleted passage and then indicates its irrelevance to the dramatic action, claiming that he has restored the purity of the original text, which, presumably, was whitewashed by these lines. Macbeth is recognized as one of the most debated texts in the Shakespearean canon, but critics long ago identified which parts of the text were, in fact, additions. However, the authorship of the passage omitted by Garneau has not been clearly established. According to Yves Bonnefoy:

... There is also general agreement on two significant additions, the scenes involving the witches in Acts III and IV, which are attributed to Thomas Middleton. It is less certain that lines 140-153 in Act IV, Scene 5 ("Comes the King forth, I pray you, etc.") were added to Shakespeare's text to please James I: although the Folio was undoubtedly published when the play was being performed before the Court.14

There is nothing in the passage to justify its omission on grounds of sexual purity. Garneau could have omitted any other passage discussed by Bonnefoy; for example, the scene involving Hecate, a character with no relevance to the plot. Clearly, the explanation must lie elsewhere: the omission as glaring as this, to which the translator himself draws attention, must surely arise from a particular discursive logic.

In contrast to the first passage eliminated, this one is not ambiguous and contains nothing irrelevant to what precedes or follows it. Critics question the dramatic relevance of parts of this scene, but their criticism focuses on the meandering dialogue that the doctor interrupts, rather than on its own tirade:

... Act III, Scene 1, in which Macbeth incites the future assassin of Banquo, as well as Act IV, Scene 5, in which Malcolm probes Macduff at length, appear, in their persuasive, dramatically effective, but ornithological rhetoric, to be left over from a more discursive, more loosely constructed first draft. In particular, the long, repugnant exposition of the Malcolm-Macduff scene, however pertinent and important it may be, and whatever choric value it may have, is disconcerting.15

Garneau sacrifices nothing in this long 'repugnant' scene! On the contrary, he emphasizes its dramatic intensity. Let us look, however, at the passage he did choose to omit:

ENTER A DOCTOR

MALCOLM

Well, more anon. Comes the King forth, I pray you?

DOCTOR

Ay, sir; there are a crew of wretched souls
That step his noise; their multiplied numbers
The great assay of art, but at his touch,
Such sanctity hath heaven given his band,
They presently amend.

MALCOLM

I thank you, doctor.  

MACDUFF

What's the disease he means?

MALCOLM

'Tis call'd the exit:
A most miraculous work in this good king,
Which often, since my here-remain in England,
I have seen him do.  How he solicits heaven,
Himself best knows; but strangely visit'd people,
All swooned and o'ercast, pitiful to the eye,
The mere despair of surgery, he cureth;
Hanging a golden stamp about their necks,
Put on with holy prayers; and 'tis spoken
To the succeeding royalty he leaves
The healing benefit: this with strange virtue
He hath a heavenly gift of prophecy,
And sundry blessings hang about his throne
That speak him full of grace.

MACDUFF

See, who comes here?

MALCOLM

My countryman; but yet I know him not. (p. 854)
say that the passage had been added to please the monarch before whom the play was to be performed. Garneau is therefore correct in stating that this passage is not relevant to the plot. Despite his concern for coherence, he does not, however, omit other scenes that could be criticized for the same reason. Why, therefore, did he deem it necessary, indeed vital, to omit this particular scene, whose lack of importance he underlines with the expression 'scène de ventilation.'

Let us take him at his word and accept that he omitted the passage because it functions as an interlude, and is thus disruptive of the plot. But why exactly did he think it so important that there should be no interrup-
tions in the scene? Before addressing this question, let us briefly review the action in the scene.

Malcolm, rightful heir to the throne of Scotland, has taken refuge in England after the assassination of King Duncan. He learns from Macduff, a general who has deserted and come to join him, of the servitude into which Scotland has been plunged by the usurper Macbeth. The two men appraise each other and then decide on the forces they will need to launch an uprising with the support of the King of England. Their discussion is interrupted by the doctor's praise for the supernatural gifts of the King, who is due to arrive. At that moment, General Ross arrives, bearing terrible news of recent atrocities committed by Macbeth, in particular, the massacre of the Macduff family. Macduff is devastated by news of the disaster but quickly recovers and vows that he will lead the rebellion to liberate Scotland.

In this scene, the action moves from a national tragedy experienced by a whole people to an individual tragedy that galvanizes the victim into mobilizing all available forces of resistance. In the middle of the scene, we encounter the pleasant choler of the doctor, who describes the strange talents of a visionary king who has the ability to cure ulcers, swellings, and other scrofula. The interlude clearly has no connection with the dramatic action, and even less with the situation in Quebec. However, one would have to be totally ignorant of the history of New France not to recognize, in the dialogue before and after this interlude, a striking analogy to the Conquest and the Patriote uprising, and not to hear echoes of present-day sovereignist aspirations. This second scene shortened by Garneau is, thus, an even better illustration of how the translator introduces at the discursive level of the play certain assumptions from the discourse of the society of which he is a member.

By definition, 'territoriality' is a focal point, a *lexological node*, of national-
ist discourse. Any reference to territory in the source text is therefore likely to attract the attention of Québécois translators, especially if they are committed to the sovereignist cause. In the scene under discussion, the territory described as Scotch would have no particular resonance for a Québécois audience if it were not accompanied by a series of predications similar to those defining 'Quebec' in the discourse of the target society.

Let us examine how the translator organized the *lexological relevance* of territorial elements in the source text.

In the original text, the word 'Scotland,' a marker of the dramatic action, occurs frequently in Act IV, Scene 3, and is the main theme of the dialogue. The word alternates with substantives such as 'nation,' 'state,' 'country,' which are accompanied by dyphoric qualifiers such as 'poor,' 'miserable,' 'down-fall’n.' Table 19 lists occurrences of all nouns describ-
ing the setting of the dramatic action, and their determiners (articles, possessives, demonstratives, and qualifiers). For each occurrence, Garneau’s translation equivalent is provided. Table 20 compares references to Scotland in the source text and the target text; figures indicate the number of occurrences of each item.

To illustrate further the differences between Garneau’s translation and the original, Table 21 compares references to Scotland in three recent French translations of Macbeth by Pierre Leyris (1977), a year before Michel Garneau’s translation; by Yves Bonnefoy (1983); and by Jean-Michel Déprats, staged at the Comédie Française during the 1985 season.6

These three translations all contain the same degree of lexicosemantic density in relation to the source text. The similarity of lexical choice

---

**TABLE 20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shakespeare</th>
<th>Garneau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scotland 8</td>
<td>Écosse 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>birthdom 1</td>
<td>droit d’exister 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country 5</td>
<td>pays 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state 1</td>
<td>pays 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nation 1</td>
<td>nation 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother 1</td>
<td>mère-pat里me 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grave 1</td>
<td>tombeau 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>down-falln 1</td>
<td>ramièr à rian 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor 5</td>
<td>peuv 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miserable 1</td>
<td>ben misérable 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our 4</td>
<td>not 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thine and my 1</td>
<td>thien piu li mien 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my 1</td>
<td>mon 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General total 31</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**TABLE 21**

| References to Scotland: Layris, Bonnefoy, and Déprats (Macbeth, Act IV, Scene 3) |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Layris | Bonnefoy | Déprats |
| notre mère patrie à bas | Écosse pays natal terrasse | Écosse pays natal terrasse |
| Écosse | Écosse pays | Écosse pays |
| mon pays | notre pays | mon pays |
| ma pays | mon pays | mon pays |
| Écosse pays | notre pays | mon pays |
| mon malheureux pays | mon malheureux pays royaume | mon malheureux pays royaume |
| Écosse | Écosse royaume | Écosse royaume |
| Écosse | Écosse | Écosse |
| Écosse | Écosse | Écosse |
| mon malheureux pays | Écosse | Écosse |
| Écosse | Écosse | Écosse |
| mon malheureux pays | Écosse pays | Écosse pays |
| notre mère | notre mère | notre mère |
| notre tombe | notre tombe | notre tombe |
| Écosse | Écosse | Écosse |
| Écosse | Écosse | Écosse |

shown in Table 21, as well as in table 22, indicates that when there is no word-for-word equivalent, the three French translators all make rigorous use of compensation. Garneau’s translation favours certain terms at the expense of others, and the terms he does retain are used more extensively than are their equivalents in the original. In Shakespeare’s text, the term ‘Scotland’ occurs more frequently than all the common nouns with the same referent. Garneau, however, makes sparing use of the word ‘Scotland,’ employing it only half as often as Shakespeare, and shows a preference for terms which form the syntagm ‘not/pays/pays’ (our poor country), whereas in the original, the syntagm ‘my’ / ‘poor’ / ‘country’ occurs only twice, and there is no occurrence of ‘our poor country,’ in the translation there are altogether six occurrences of the two syntagms. In the Québecois version, the phrase ‘our poor country’ and its variants take on a resonance for the reader or for the audience, a resonance it did not have in the original.

A comparison of (common) nouns referring to Scotland (table 23) reveals other interesting changes made by Garneau to the original. The list of terms from the original play is organized hierarchically. It starts...
with ‘birthdom’ and ends with ‘grave,’ two axiologically marked words, as compared with ‘country,’ which is a neutral designation. In Garneau’s translation, the same list begins and ends with ‘chez-nous’ (homeland), an expression added to the text by the translator and for which there is no equivalent in the original.

Let us seek out some desolate shade, and there
Weep our sad bosoms empty. (p. 86(g))

Quand j’apens à chez-nous, j’ai jusse envie d’me trouver un coin
Tranquille à l’ombre pour m’laiser ferre pis brasser tout mon souil. (p. 118)

In discursive terms, this first occurrence of ‘chez-nous’ is strategic, as the two lines quoted above open the scene. The introduction at this early stage, of the catch phrase ‘Quand j’apens à chez-nous’ immediately captures the attention of the audience and leads it to interpret the ensuing dialogue in terms of Québécois reality. We must bear in mind, and the particular spelling attest to this, that the Québécois phonetics of this introductory clause function as an actualizer. The fact that this was the first time a Shakespearean play had been heard in Franco-Québécois served all the more to reinforce the effect of the language as an actualizer. The language used is, thus, highly effective in what Jakobson terms the ‘plastic function,’ a function that ensures communication is occurring. This spatial and discursive re-actualization through language makes it possible for the Québécois audience to claim ownership of the expression ‘Quand j’apens à chez-nous’ with its follow-up, ‘j’ai jusse envie d’...”
brailer tout mon solû, an expression that falls in line with the social discourse. After the tone is set in these introductory lines, the translation introduces the expression ‘défendre nost’droit d’exister’ (defend our right to exist), a shift that further strengthens the projection of Québécois reality onto the original scene:

Let us rather...

Besstride our down-fell’n birthdom (p. 863).

Moï, j’ pense qu’on fera mieux d’... défendre
Not droit d’exister qui s’tvoue ram’dr quasiment à rien (p. 116).

P. Leyris and Y. Bonnefoy use ‘patrie’ (fatherland) or ‘mère patrie’ (motherland) as equivalents of ‘birthdom.’ We do not know if Garneau avoided these terms because of their ambiguity; today these words would refer (problematically) to Quebec, while, in days gone by, they would have referred only to France. Such terms could thus introduce discursive incompatibility between the audience’s space-time and that of historical Quebec. In the latter chronotope, the words ‘patrie’ and ‘mère patrie’ would conflict with the underlying predicate ‘despoiled nation.’ But one thing is sure, the use of the synonym ‘défendre nost’droit d’exister’ makes it much easier for the audience to recognize the ideologème “Quebec is a despoiled nation.” From this point of view, ‘not’droit d’exister’ is more radical than J.-M. Déplas’ translation: ‘pays natal’ (native land). The expression ‘pays natal’ might almost represent a mistranslation in a discursive space in which the search for identity is explicitly based on the fact that the ‘pays natal’ has never really existed. For, as leitmotifs of Québécois literature, especially poetry, tell us, the Quebecois no more have a ‘native land’ than they have a ‘native language.’

In the original text, ‘birthdom’ is immediately followed by a reference to Scotland, a juxtaposition that makes the passage incompatible with the Québécois social discourse. The term ‘Scotland’ is eliminated by the translator:

... new sorrow
Strike heaven on the face, that it resounds
As if it felt with Scotland and y’d out
Like syllable of disclour. (p. 865)

... des nouveaux malheurs éclatent
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Comme des orages dans l’ciel, si tant qu’ous’not jou jay l’essûr
Si tant qu’on peut quasiment l’entendier crier sa douleur. (p. 116)

Not only does Scotland disappear, but heaven is prosaically reduced to its meteorological reality and given a less metaphysical and less poetic role. The religious symbolism of heaven, a negative value in Québécois society, is de-emphasized. This shift falls in line with the translator’s elimination of the term ‘heavenly angel’ and of the reference to praying in the earlier scene. But the original scene is highly compatible with the discourse on the Quebecois condition. This would explain the high density of axio-ideological shifts the scene undergoes in translation. These changes frequently involve neutralization, or sometimes outright substitution, of determiners:

... I think wthal,
There would be hands uplifted in my riht. (p. 865)

[...] j’ pense que ben des bras sont parés à se fver
Pour défendre nos droits. (p. 117)

In the original text, the rightful heir to the Kingdom of Scotland appraises the support he would personally receive to overthrow the usurper. In the Québecois version, we find a hero of the 1837–8 uprisings, a Patriote who is fighting for the common cause, to free the country ‘d’a main damnée qui l’oppresse’ (from the cursed hand that oppresses it), a slogan that would not have been unappealing to Front de Libération du Québec (FLQ) militants during the October Crisis of 1970. And wouldn’t a Québécois audience be prompted to interpret an extract such as the following against the background of the period between the October Crisis and the 1980 referendum:

Not’cause peut pas être plus jasit! La victoire nous attend
Au boutte d’ta route!

[...]
Bon y qu’ j’ai hâte qu’ les temps changent!
C’te temps-cette sont en train d’ nous voir en étanget. (pp. 120–1)

[Our cause could not be more just! Victory is waiting for us
At the end of the road]...
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Dear God! I can't wait for times to change!
These times are turning us into foreigners (our translation).

With the omission of the interlude with the doctor, the two passages quoted above were conveniently brought together. We note that, this time, the translator considers it relevant to include the religious references: 'J'ais un gros ames à ta prière' (p. 121).

The translation displays a distinct ideological shift when compared with the original:

**ENTER ROSS**

MAGUOFF
My ever gentle cousin, welcome hither.

MALCOLM
I know him now. Good God, how times remove
The means that makes us strangers. (p. 864)

There is no ambiguity in this passage. Malcolms does not immediately recognize General Ross, whom he has not seen since his exile in England. Events in Scotland have kept them apart and they have become strangers.

**MACDUFF**
Voyez qui vient là.

MILCOUM
Un homme de mon pays; pourtant je ne le connais pas.

**MACDUFF**
Mon très noble cousin, voyez le bienvenu ici.

MILCOUM
Je le reconnais maintenant, Grand Dieu, écoutez vite
Ce qui nous rend étrangers l'un à l'autre.18

Leyris and Bonnefoz do not make this scene as explicit as Depress does, but they conclude with the same expression, 'étrangers l'un à l'autre' (strangers to each other).18 However, the anaphoric expansion in Gar-
minier 'their' into a much broader collective noun, 'des falbes' (the weak). This noun, which possesses a referential flexibility, will be readily interpreted by a Québécois audience, who will then see the entire passage as a variant of the Québécois motto, 'je me souviens' (I remember). These words, which appear on Quebec licence plates, are a daily reminder of the British Conquest and of the loss of what was most precious to the Québécois, their freedom, a key word in Québécois social discourse. The presence in the source text of the two words 'I'/remember' no doubt prompted the projection of the motto 'Je me souviens' onto the target text. This appears to be confirmed when we compare the Québécois version with any of the recent French translations. These translations could not permit any reading of québecienf into them, since they do not contain the bundle of relevant changes:

Y. Bonnafy
Je ne puis pas ne pas me souvenir
Qu'il existait, qu'il furent tout mon bien.
Le Ciel regarda-t-il, sans le défendre?

The considerable difference between the semantics of Garneau's translation and those of the original text is a function of the discursive coherence imposed on the translation by the target milieu. In the original, the utterance expresses an emotional state (this deadly grief) that must be overcome (Dispute it like a man). In Garneau's translation, the utterance is realized in a first-person-singular imperative form — I must from now on remember that I have lost that which was most precious to me. This first-person imperative is of the same order as the social injunction 'Je me souviens', in which the 'I' is used to address all Québécois. This type of injunction, which links a word to act, is referred to as a 'performative' in speech-act theory. Here, the effectiveness of the performative flows directly from Garneau's subjectivization of the utterance. Compare, for example, 'Souviens-toi (remember) and 'Je me souviens' (I remember). In the latter case, to say is to do. Subjectivization, or the use of the first-person singular, is a common feature of the discourse of persuasion and of advertising in Quebec. The following examples are taken at random: 'Avez-vous déjà réfléchi à ce que vous allez faire?' 'Oui, j'aimerais bien,' 'La Croix-Rouge, c'est une bonne cause,' 'Je vous écris aujourd'hui.'
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Monsieur!... 'Je me souviens.' It is thus not surprising to finding this cultural trait in Garneau's translation, in passages in which the original text makes no use whatsoever of the first person:

O nation misérable,...
When shit thou see thy wholesome days again. (p. 384)

J'appartiens à une nation misérable
...I ne d'monde ni on va
Jamaîs n'veus les beaux jours d'avant. (p. 339)

The introduction of the first-person singular into the text of Macbeth brings the Shakespearean play clearly in line with Québécois social discourse. The process is reinforced by the elimination of the linguistic difference between the protagonist, or rather, the actor who speaks the lines, and the member of the audience who hears them. The language employed in this translation, which is not the code used in Québécois translations of works from the classical repertoire, abolishes the difference between fiction and reality. Garneau's translation uses a lot that is distinctly rooted in the reality of Quebec and of no other Francophone region. The fact that this is the first time Franco-Québécois has been used to translate Shakespeare has a capitive, cathartic effect on the Québécois audience. The use of the lot in the dialogue fuses fiction and reality, allowing the audience to find in the text their subjective reality, their individual and collective life experience: 'J'appartiens à une nation misérable.'

At the same time, the use of the lot grafts reality onto the symbolic. For the Québécois audience, the language in Garneau's Macbeth is marked as regional French. It would be for an audience in France. Michel Garneau's 'langue québécoise' is archaic, and therefore markedly different from the standard language spoken in Quebec. It is an 'Éclectic language, the language of a pre-Conquest Quebec, of a Quebec that was once free. Thus, this language, which is never actually spoken by a single throatregue, nor by Garneau for that matter, acquires a symbolic value and, in the context of the reception, becomes a kind of plea: omnipresent but none the less concealed, since the audience, whose attention is focused on the dialogue, hears the language without actually listening to it, the 'langue québécoise' becomes a node of persuasion in itself. It constitutes, in other words, the perlocutary basis of the dialogue.
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Not only does Garneau's translation reshape the text ideologically, it also introduces aesthetic transformations; these are, however, difficult to isolate from the ideological. Links between the ideological and the aesthetic are present in any literary text, in so far as literature explores the same paradigm of ideas and values as other discursive formations through which a social group defines itself. Without going so far as to say that 'society and literature share this common function, in that they attempt to realize ideologies', it is clear that, during the period under examination, literature was closely tied to politics, a fact attested to by 'professions of faith' from writers: 'La littérature est un combat' (Literature is a struggle), proclaims the title of an article by André Belleau in the literary magazine with the evocative name L'Esprit. Writer Paul Chamberland is even more explicit: 'The poetic process parallels the political process of national liberation exactly.' The emerging Québécois literature is indeed dominated by the theme of individual and collective dispossession, a theme that is reiterated again and again, with little variation in form, in Québécois poetry:

Jacques Brault
Il n’a pas de nom ce pays que j’aime et renie au long de mes jours. [It has no name this land that I reaffirm and deny throughout all my days.]

Gaston Miron
Je vais mourir vivant dans notre empois de mort. [It will be a living death for me in our pitch of death.]

Gérard Godin
J’ai mal à mon pays. [My country pains me.]

Paul Chamberland
Je souffre d’une terre à nature. [I am suffering from a country waiting to be born.]

These utterances take their meaning partially from the underlying ideologmes: 'Québécois are not masters in their own house.' The use of the words 'J’appartiens à une nation qui est libérée' to translate Macduff’s invocation to the despoiled nation (O nation mi-muélle) is thus not fortuitous. It follows a pre-established model for content as well as for form, a model provided by Québécois poetry.

We could say then, that for the semantic content of the original utterance, there is in the target discourse, a corresponding ideologme, for which there is also, in the receiving literature, a coded expression. It is codified in the sense that the subject of the utterance is represented as belonging to a collective characterized as 'nation mi-muélle.' Hence, the discourse evinced in the space-time under discussion, J'appartiens à une nation qui est libérée.

The characteristic 'je' (I) of lyrical poetry is omnipresent in Québécois poetry, where it is isenously linked to the theme of the lost nation. Thus, the poetic 'I' becomes an engaged 'T,' in what ranging from Gaston Miron’s to those of Denis Vanier, whose first collection of poems was, in fact, entitled Je.

La nuit dont mon peuple est
[...] people futurs criant à l’éclosion d’un verbe dans la langue des 'interdits-de-parole.'

[The night of which my people are part...a foral people calling out for the birth of a verb in the language of the 'forbidden to speak.' (our translation)]

The individual in search of an identity who expresses himself as part of a collective fate (nous) is alienated from himself because he is dispos-essed of a nation:

je refuse un salut personnel et transfiguré je m’identifie depuis ma condition d’humilité je le jure sur l’obscur réveil populaire [...] à tous les gens boute [...]

Paul Chamberland
Je souffre d’une terre à nature. [I am suffering from a country waiting to be born.]

je refuse un salut personnel et transfiguré je m’identifie depuis ma condition d’humilité je le jure sur l’obscur réveil populaire [...] à tous les gens boute [...]

dans la résistance à l’amère décomposition violemment et ethnique de la mort des peuples déchirés [...] je suis sur la place publique avec les miens [...] je vois nos êtres en déchirant dans le siècle je vois notre infériorité et j’ai mal en chacun de nous.!
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[I reject a personal salvation that is treacherous
I derive my identity from my condition of humiliation
I swear to the obscure collective breath

I join with everyone ...
in resistance
to the bitter scoral ethnic decomposition
of the death of drenched peoples
I am on the public square with my own
I see our being in distress in the century
I see our inferiority
And I hurt for each of us. (our translation)]

We need look no further for what lies behind a category of transforma-
tions such as those in the following example, considered earlier:

Let us ...
Weep our sad bosoms emply. (p. 895)

Quand j’empe à cheue nous, j’ai jusse enoi d’[...] brissier tout mon soli.
(p. 116)

Here, translation conforms to the poetic conventions of the target soci-
ety. With the introduction of the first-person singular (‘jeupportens à [...]’/
‘Quand j’empe à cheue-nous’), Shakespeare’s lines fit into the paradigm of
the ‘common places’ of the discourse of québécois and assume significance
in the Québécois field of discourse. As such, they can be ideologically inter-
preted by the receiver in the space-time of reading and listening. This
chronotopic shift in the decoding of signs results from echoes of these
common places, or topoi, in the receiver’s perception of the Shakespearean
text:

Jacques Brault
Ainsi donc encore une fois j’écoute la rumeur du fleuve et
je ne souviens que cette eau saignante d’une très ancienne blessure.34

[And therefore once again I listen to the sound of the river and

Shakespeare

I remember that this water bleeds from a very
ancient wound. (our translation)]

Shakespeare

I cannot but remember such things were,
That were most precious to me. (p. 865)

When Garneau uses the word ‘brûlé’ as the equivalent of ‘heash,’ he
reactivates a line from Gaston Miron’s L’Hommemappillé, a beacon of
Québécois literature. “Homme aux labours des brûlés de l’exil [...] / en
vue de villes et d’une terre qui te soient natales”35 (Man labouring on the
scorched earth of exile ... / for towns and a land that are truly native
to you). The word ‘brûlé’ appears at an important point in the play, at the
very beginning. It places the dramatic action in a specific setting and thus
takes on a number of axi-ideological interpretations. For the translator
and for the receiver immersed in social discourse, the ‘brûlé’ becomes
the metaphor par excellence for the condition of the Québécois people, a
people described by the social discourse as being marginalized, cut off
from the political and economic power exercised by the anglophone
hegemony.

Even though there is no obvious link between Shakespeare and the new
generation of Québécois poets, between Macêth and the emerging
Québécois literature, there is a ‘commonality’ of axiological and ideologi-
cal topoi that revolve around the theme of the despooled nation. Macêth is
an appropriate vehicle for this theme, because the play contains meta-
phonically, and almost mythically, the archetypal expression of the
notion of despooled nation, so central to the emerging Québécois litera-
ture. Do we not hear echoes of the Weird Sisters in the following poem by
Roland Gigère, ‘La grande main finit toujours par pourrir,’ written dur-
ing the authoritarian regime of Maurice Duplessis:

Grande main qui pêse sur nous
grande main qui nous aplati contre terre
grande main [...] 
grands ongles qui nous couvrent les lèvres
grands ongles d’œil couillée
grands ongles d’œil brûlé [...] 
la grande main pourrir,36

Grande main qui pêse sur nous
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[Big hand that weighs on us
big hand that flattens us to the earth
big hand...
big nails that sew up our lips
big rusty pewter nails...
big burnt enamel nails...
the big hand will rot. (our translation)]

Apart from the theme of Macbeth, there is no obvious connection between Hexagon or Paris prizewriters and Shakespeare. However, Macbeth abounds with images identical to the obsessive and almost clichéd images found in Québécois works of these two literary movements. The most frequent image is one of injury, wounds and blood:

Mon Québec ma terre amère [...] avec une large blessure d'espaire au front [...]
Je marche avec un cœur de patience saignante.†

L'entendez-vous sous ses blessures
grêle, ce pays [...] et moi, dans cette souffrance.†

J'étais prisonnier de ses poires
prisonnier de ses blessures
plaie quotidienne
d'un espoir.†

Une plaie au cœur même des blessures
[...]
Québec [...] en cier bas sur la terre de sang.†

[My Québec my bitter land...
with a large wound of space on its forehead
I walk with the heart of my bleeding legs.
Do you hear it groaning underneath its wounds this land...]
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and I, in this suffering
I was prisoner of its poires
prisoner of its wounds
daily wound
of a hope
A wound in the very heart of wounds
Québec...
under a low sky on the land of blood. (our translation)

In the original Macbeth, the same images describe the state of the country oppressed by Macbeth:

Bled, bled poor country!
... our country sinks beneath the yoke;
It weeps, it bleeds, and each day a gash
Is added to her wounds (p. 863)

The metaphors and themes of Macbeth seem to echo Québécois poetry, which in turn echoes Macbeth:

le sang failli s'annelle en tous miroirs seules nos cris
ne peuvent se joindre et tresser l'entrelacs d'une fronde
à tendre contre le roc ourainien du Maître

nommer la terreur du sang
la lourd du sang
qui nous rende aux plages finies d'une terre qui flambe
contre dans nos bras armés.†

[the dishonoured blood disappears in blood mirrors our cries
cannot reach each other and braid the interlacing of a
revel against the Uranian rock of the Master
name the terror of the blood
the thunder of the blood
that takes us to the delimited beaches of a land that burns
ours in our arms raised in revolt. (our translation)]
This particular scene of *Malvolio* (IV, 3) develops a twofold theme of national and individual tragedy, themes very similar to those of Québécois poetry, as seen, for example, in the expression of pain:

Let us seek out some desolate shade, and there
Weep our sad bosoms empty. (p. 863)

[... les larmes...]

je voudrais m'étendre avec tous et comme eux [...]

Notre mémoire pour un sort meilleur.

Or the metaphorical expression of despair:

Adieu poor country;
... it cannot
Be call'd our mother, but our grave. (p. 864)

Ce continent me trahissait ce pays
Je censuré.

Nous vivons encore [...]

Joseph mais drus [...] à l'âge scellera notre aurore ou notre tombée.

Then there is the designation of the innocent:

where nothing.
But who knows nothing, is once seen to smile; (p. 864)

il a toujours le sourire échoué du pauvre avenir à lui.

Or bitterness expressed ironically:

... the dead man's bread
Is there scarce ask'd for who, and good men's lives
Expiry before the flowers in their cap. (p. 854)

Le plaisir sonne perpétuel et jaune à la façon des journées.
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Moins hébéès nous rendons l'âme comme d'autres rendent la monnaie

nos cadavres pasibles et propres font de jolis hommes sur la route de l'histoire. 69

The images in this Shakespearian elegy correspond word for word to images in Québécois poetry of the 1960s and 1970s, as if they were literal translations of each other. There is really nothing more than a simple affinity between them, but they have sufficient mutuality of theme to suggest that the choice of foreign works to be translated in a given society at a given time is by no means fortuitous.

Anaphora, like the lyrical I, is a dominant characteristic of the poetic genre. It is also one of Shakespeare's preferred structures. Garneau's translation overexploits this device, introducing it even when the original in no way justifies it:

Macduff, this noble passion,
Child of integrity, hast from my soul
Why'd the black scruples, reconcile'd my thoughts
To thy good truth and honour. (p. 864)

Ah, mon Macduff, la belle colère, la belle tristesse, qui sont
Les enfants d'ou honnêteté; Ah, mon homme intégré! Ta colère
M'allège de toutes mes grands scrupules, m'éconvoie au 'bouton'
Ton honnête, ta colère m'aille toute ta belle franchise! (p. 120)

This profusion of interwoven anaphoric structures, which is not present in the original text, accentuates a value that (along with that of freedom) is a common theme in Québécois discourse - the theme of integrity, read: 'fidelity' to the Québécois 'nation'. 70 Thus, the aesthetic choice of the translator reinforces an axiological given in Québécois discourse.

If we look at the scene as a whole, we observe that, while there is some degree of anaphora in the original text, the profusion of anaphoric structures in the translation, which accentuate certain passages, is primarily dictated by a pattern within Québécois poetry. We can say then, that anaphora is the surface expression of a specific axiologie or ideologie.

The reader will recall the substitution of the syntagms 'pa'us pays', 'mon pau'us pays', or 'not pau'us pays' for the word 'Scotland.' This substitution produces an anaphoric structure that dominates the whole scene. This particular anaphora is, in fact, fundamental to, or even stereotypical of, Québécois poetry. Consider the following extract from Jacques Brefult's *Mémoire*.
collective fate; the same elegiac tone; the same images of wounds and blood; and the same anaphoric, incantatory structure— in other words, all the conventions of Québécois poetry of the 1960s and 1970s.

P. Chamberland

Je vus d’une désolation sans espoir […]
Je vis et meurs d’un pais pognard dans le plein cœur de ses misères et ses passions […]
J’habite en une terre de crachats de matina hâves et des roumures maudites les poètes s’y assoiffent et les femmes s’y abreuvent les paysages s’y hérisse et la rançonner par la terre de ses habitants […]
la derniere - mon pays […]
- mon pays […]
eatre terre qu’a te lamentos doucement sous mes pieds\nbonnaire terre

étre terre pendue pour ses habitants exporpiés
exporpiés du monde et de la joie
exporpiés de leur propre de leur fureur
exporpiés de leur vivre et de leur mourir
exporpiés de la colère et de l’amour […]

terre cajitale par le sang et par les os

- dans le sang et dans les os […]
eatre terre pendue […]
terre maîtresse

terre matrice […]
eatre terre pendue sous la mélodie des chemins voués à
la folie aiguisée des erreurs de l’œil et de la désolation

petit à petit le monde s’effrite les horizons se bouchent

- dans la déroute les paysages blés et noirs
découverts en songeant à l’ou du malheur et de la désolation

en toujours et de toujours

- l’ordre l’abondance la quête mensonges mensonge

- parce que seule est vraie depuis toujours la haine et les

dépouillons […]

- la mort est la forme de mon cœur de mon désir de mon

histoire de mon pays […]
je souffre d'une terre à maître
d'une terre occupée
nous aurons même pas, l'épitaphe des décapités des
morts de faim des massacres nous nous aurons été qu'une
page blanche de l'histoire. "

[I live with an incurable wound...
I live with a land bewitched through the very heart of its
harvest of its passions...
I live in a land of spate of haggard mornings of
unhealthy blemishes where poets commit suicide and
women go anemic the countryside basks in the sun and
expulsion is purulent on the lips of its people...

pam is my country...
my country...
foreign land that lamines for you softly under my feet
distant land.

foreign land lost for its people expropriated
expropriated from the world and from joy
expropriated from their present, from their future
expropriated from their living and from their dying
expropriated from anger and from love...

a land captive of blood and of bones
in blood and in bones...

foreign land lost...
mistress land
marin land...

foreign land lost, in the melée of roads doomed to
the misdirected wanderings of exile and
madness

little by little the world breaks down horizons justle
in flight the countryside fatally wounded
reveals baring the naked bone of the curse
since forever, since forever

under abundance unoccupied lies lie

because only hatred and dispossession...
are true since forever

death is the form of my body, of my fate of the
history of my country...
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Like storms in the sky, so much
that our whole poor country feels it
So much that you can almost hear it shouting out its pain

... Poor country, my poor country, you are going to bleed
to the last drop of your blood.
The great tyranny really has something to lean on
When the goodness of honesty no longer has anything to say
about anything.
For all the lands the tyrant
Side from people ... our poor country is caught
in a terrible yoke
A country that cries, moans, groans a country
That feels its pain, that bleeds, every day, there is
a new injury
In its sounds ...
I belong to such a miserable nation ...
I wonder if we will
Ever review the beautiful days of yesteryear ...
I don't have the heart to say how dead my hope is.

Our poor country can hardly recognize itself
Our mother-country, we can hardly call it
mother anymore, we will
before long be saying, too common grave. It's
just the innocent
Who don't know anything about anything who have the heart
to smile in our country.
We hear so much sighing, groaning, and crying
that we are
Almost used to it. The only pleasure the tyrant
allows us
is to have all the pain in the world. (our translation.)

Although Garneau's Macbeth and Chamberland's 'L'Afficheur hurle'
use different linguistic codes – a function of the gap separating the two generations of Québécois poets – they display a striking rhetorical and ideological resemblance. Indeed, in some passages, there is a surprising, if not exact, resemblance:

Chamberland

...on je suis foncièrement méchant; caduc perverse je suis ignore me qui je suis ce que vous voudrez je suis le mal je suis le mal que vous m'avez fait je suis ce que vous avez fait de moi. Only Dorchester Colborne Durham je suis la némésis dans la galerie Amérique je suis le buin de Sa Gracieuse Majesté.93

[yes I am basically nasty obstele perverse I am ignorant mean I am what you want I am the evil I am the evil you made me I am what you did to me. Only Dorchester Colborne Durham I am the nigger on the American slave ship I am the boony of Her Gracious Majesty. (our translation)]

Shakespeare / Garneau

[... mon pauv' papa va être encore pogné Avec phrase de méchantes qu'en 'a connus, phrase de souffrance Encore, acte 1 successeur du tyran, [...] C' est moit-même que je pens e, j' connais toutes les vices Qui 'ai dans l'corps, [...] Les mitis, quelles varus, j'en ai aucune. Aucune d' celles Qui font les grands rois, comme la justice, la franchise, la tempérance, El'jag ment, la générosité, la persévérance, la compassion, l'humilité, La dévotion, la patience, l' courage, la grandeur! J' possède aucune D' ces varus à moi j' connais toutes les manières d'être e t'mall (pp. 117-19)
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[... my poor country is going to be trapped again with more cruelty that it ever knew, more suffering Again, with the successor of the tyrant, I'm thinking about myself, I know all the vices That I have in my body Virtues, what virtues, I have none at all. None of these That make great kings, like justice, honesty temperance, And judgement, generosity, perseverance compassion, humility Devotion, patience, courage, greatness I don't have any of them Of those virtues I know all the ways of being evil (our translation)]

Chamberland's poem is a good example of Québecois hostility towards the British monarchy. It underlines why Garneau obviously decided that, in a scene from Medék whose theme is so close to that of Québécois social discourse, praise for the King of England would clearly sound a false note, as out of place as such praise would be in 'L'afficheur hurle'. A comparison of the two texts thus further clarifies the motivation for, or at least the effect of, Garneau's decision to expurgate the original Medék in his translation; nothing should interfere with the projection of the scene onto Québecois reality nor with its ideological intelligibility in the Québecois field of reception.

There are, however, some notable differences between the two excerpts. In Chamberland's poem, the denigration of self is a form of revolt against history. In the scene from Medék, the protagonist uses self-denigration to test the inelegy of his interlocutor. That said, the protagonist is the rightfull heir to the usurped kingdom and, as such, symbolizes the Québécois condition as represented in the social discourse: the Québécois is split, caught between two languages and two cultures, in a divided land. The frequent use of the double as a theme, 'double' being one of the key words in Québécois discourse, leads antithetically to the themes of duplicity and treason. To betray is to reject Quebec and the ideal of autonomy, to ally oneself with anglophone hegemony and risk assimilation or to play the game of double identity, which amounts to the same thing. Even though they are from works as disparate as Medék and
The figural nature of the foreign text as imagined, as the main function of the text in the reader's view, is to project a scene or act that is not so much a mirror of reality as a reflection of the reader's own inner life. The text is a performance of the reader's psyche, and its function is to express the emotions and ideas that are at the core of the reader's being. In this sense, the text is not a passive mirror, but an active agent that shapes the reader's consciousness.

The reader's response to the text is not a static, unchanging process, but a dynamic, interactive one. The reader's emotions and thoughts are influenced by the text in a way that is both direct and indirect, and the text itself is shaped by the reader's interpretation and response. This interaction between text and reader creates a unique and ever-changing experience of the text, one that is intimately connected to the individual's own inner life.

The text is not a mere representation of reality, but a creation of the reader's own mind. It is a mirror that reflects the reader's inner world, and a performance that is shaped by the reader's emotions and thoughts. In this sense, the text is not an external reality, but a reflection of the reader's own psyche, and the reader's response to the text is a reflection of the reader's own inner life.
Québécois vision of the world. This ideology both opens and closes the perspective from which the translation of the Shakespearean play will be read. It filters and normalizes the heterogeneous elements of the original text, that is, elements that are heterogeneous in the discourse produced by the target society. Through manipulation of point of view, a translator can ensure the ideological relevance of the foreign text within the target society. The persuasive function of Garneau's translation is derived from this process; it leads the audience to project an ideologically determined content onto the reshaped source text. Specific passages of Macbeth are reinforced or suppressed to make the representation of a fictitious Scotland coincide with the spatio-temporal entity known as Quebec, or, more specifically, 'Québec libre.' For here, we are dealing with a construct of the social discourse, around which crystallizes a number of ideologies, ideologemes that define and characterize Quebec in terms of its historicity.

The schema introduced at the beginning of our analysis presented three space-times corresponding to levels of reading constructed by Garneau's translation. However, these levels do not always completely overlap. Taken individually, many passages or scenes of Shakespeare's Macbeth do not lend themselves to dual interpretation. They acquire meaning only in the space-time of Shakespearean fiction. But, in the translation, there is intermittent interplay among space-times and it is this that produces its perlocutory effect. The audience would never take Garneau's Macbeth for a doctrinaire work on Quebec; their idealization of literature reinforces their assumption that texts are 'innocent,' especially in the case of a literary classic such as Macbeth. Moreover, the ideological substratum introduced in the translation gains validity from the status of the original text. Literary criticism, a variant of social discourse at its most institutional, also allowed itself to be taken in by Garneau's Macbeth:

Garneau’s translation of Macbeth into Québécois is faithful both to the Shakespearean plot and to its tragic writing. The break with the tone of the original, stemming from the use of decidedly popular speech, whose phonetic, lexical, and syntactical structures are reproduced, does not preclude rigorous respect for sequence of events, development of discourse, and even repetition of ideas... all are changes that are faithful to the meaning of the original, changing only the tone of it; the translation is accurate. It is the work of a poet who substitutes the familiar rhythms of his vernacular language for those of the foreign poet had written in his language.26

This seal of approval conferred on Michel Garneau, the translator, reflects and reinforces the position he occupies as author in the Québécois literary system. Thus, the inventor of what could be a national language for Quebec becomes the Québécois counterpart of Shakespeare. Although critics recognize that all translators are 'part of a given socio-historic system,' they justify Garneau’s translation by stressing the importance of restoring the true ‘Shakespearean speech,’ which, they hasten to add, is a 'popular' speech, a speech that has been ‘tampered with’ by classical or romantic translations.

Garneau translated Shakespeare in reaction to those translations that diminished Shakespeare, and cut him off from his roots... He recognized the text in its own language, omitting or slightly modifying that which had no resonance in Québécois or which could cause confusion. This approach tightened up the text; by being, above all, faithful to the plot and to the poetry, the translator, in fact, stayed close to the essence of the authentic text.27

Given the assumptions in this quotation, we may well ask if Garneau’s aesthetic reshaping of the text, which is based mainly on choice of language of translation (a language that, contrary to what is said, in no way corresponds to the language in Garneau’s other writings) is more respectful of the original text than similar superstructures so criticized in French translations. We have attempted to demonstrate that Garneau’s translation is equally a function of the literary stereotypes of its period and of its place of production. Clearly, we see here evidence of an axio-ideological symbiosis between translation and literary criticism: Québécois criticism implicitly validates works that participate in the search for ‘Québécois’ identity. Translation and translation criticism display what Delsueze would call the same 'coefficient of territorialization.'28