**Jane Koustas**

# FROM "HOMESPUN" TO "AWESOME": TRANSLATED QUEBEC THEATER IN TORONTO

In an article describing the 1986-88 Canadian theater scene, Alan Filewood, noting Toronto's keen interest in Quebec theater, concludes, Montréal seemed closer than it had in years."[1] His comment underlines the importance and extent of exchange between Canada's two largest theater communities and suggests that this was a new development: Toronto audiences had had the opportunity to see Quebec theater in translation for several decades but it was not until the 1980s that Quebec productions in Toronto fostered a greater understanding of the "Other" culture and a feeling of proximity. The present study considers critical response to professional Toronto productions of translated Quebec theater from 1951 to 1988 and concludes that despite its long history, theater transfer did not draw the communities closer until very recently. This article argues that theater exchange failed to bridge the "two solitudes" not because of a shortage of productions, for indeed Quebec theater became "a staple of the Toronto season,"[2] but because of the perspective from which Quebec plays were viewed and reviewed.

Until the arrival of Michel Tremblay on the Toronto English theater circuit in 1972, an average of only one Quebec play in translation was staged a year, Gélinas and Languirand being the most popular playwrights. However, from 1972 to 1980 Toronto audiences had the opportunity to see usually two, if not three, professional productions, at least one of these being a Tremblay play. The 1980s witnessed not only an increase in the number of plays staged but the introduction of many new playwrights representing a wider range of theater practice. This study argues that until the arrival of theater resulting from the Quiet Revolution known as the nouveau théâtre québécois,[3] introduced to Toronto by jean-Claude Germain, Jean Barbeau, and Michel Tremblay, Toronto critics illustrated, though somewhat patronizingly, sensitivity to plays' origins: productions were identified as "Quebec plays." With the introduction of *joual*, which posed more complex translation problems, and of the social and political issues associated with the "nouveau theatre québécois," which demanded a greater understanding of a radically different Quebec, critics were unsympathetic toward

a play's Quebecness or *québécitude;* indeed this seemed to work against the play, rendering it too remote for the Toronto audience. Response to recent and more universal Quebec theater suggests a less defensive, more open attitude which is not centered on specific cultural questions and on the English/French Canada conflict.

In 1972, in his review article of *Forever Yours Marie-Lou,* Herbert Whittaker, the eminent *Globe and Mail* theater critic, urged Toronto audiences to attend French-Canadian plays in translation in order "to learn, to know its [Quebec's] differences, to understand Quebec's backgrounds and motivations."[4] He was, however, idealistic. While the popularity of Quebec theater in Toronto could suggest a genuine curiosity about Quebec culture and an appreciation of its theater, and, indeed, more Quebec literature is translated during periods of tension between French and English Canada (there was for example a marked increased in the early 1970s following the October Crisis,[5] translating the "Other" culture is not necessarily a sign of interest and esteem as Annie Brisset illustrates. It frequently results, instead, in the appropriation of the "Other" and the claiming of its literature as one's own. Brisset accuses Quebec theater translators and companies, for example, of eliminating or downplaying the alterity of non-Quebec theater in their translations, adaptations, parodies, or reappropriations of foreign works. Citing the following definition by Antoine Berman, she concludes that Quebec theater is essentially ethnocentric:

> Ethnocentrique signifera ici: qui ramène tout à sa propre culture, à ses normes et valeurs et considère ce qui est situé en dehors de celle-ci – l'Etranger – comme négatif ou tout juste bon à être annexé, adapté, pour accroître la richesse de cette culture.[6]

Such cultural exploitation is not new in the Canadian literary tradition for, as E. D. Blodgett points out,[7] English Canada too has a long history of claiming the "Other," that is French-Canadian and *québécois* authors, as its own. Similarly, Robert Wallace, although enthusiastic about the popularity of translated Quebec theater,[8] accuses the Toronto theater community of ethnocentrism; it either dismisses or appropriates work that is culturally different. He

states:

> Indeed my general concern with the reception of *québécois* plays in Toronto originates with my discomfort over the attitudes with which they often appear to be approached, not just by the critics who review them but also by the companies that produce them. In a word, I would typify these attitudes as Toronto-centric, adding to the historical complaint... that Toronto's artistic institutions suffer from an arrogance that leads them either to appropriate or dismiss whatever appears to them as genuinely different.[9]

Like Brisset then, Wallace argues that ethnocentrism interferes with genuine exchange. It is in the light of Wallace's and Brisset's studies that this article examines the tradition of translated Quebec theater in Toronto based on the critical response to these plays.[10] Although reviews are, as Wallace states, the "subjective reactions of individuals whose perceptions are often not shared by others,"[11] a study of the criticism, rather than of the translated text, situates the play in a particular social context, treating it as a form of social discourse which is clearly anchored in and greatly influenced by the target culture. Translated drama is, after all, like all translations, a "discourse in the sense that it is a linguistic event produced by a subject within a specific historic context."[12]This article studies the extent to which critics accept, reject, appropriate, or respect Quebec theater and its *québécitude.*

Before their experience with Quebec drama's new voices of the 1980s, whose plays were avowedly less nationalistic, theater critics exhibited ethnocentrism as described by Brisset and Wallace in two ways. First, little attention was paid to the importance of the mediation of translation and to the question of place, thus severing the play from its origins. Wallace suggests that critics, as well as those participating in and/or attending the production avail themselves of a knowledge of place in order to understand the play's "context of time and place."[13] They need also to recognize the importance of the translation process and the "degree to which the translation alters the original and creates, in a sense, a new play."[14]

Critics generally ignored the plays' origins and the importance of the translator, frequently crediting the latter only when he or she rendered the work more familiar.

Those same critics demonstrated in a second way their reluctance to recognize, appreciate or respect the society in and for which the play was written: their interpretations do not reflect what current criticism has identified as the plays' central issues but rather what the critics themselves wished to believe about Quebec. In his article on the English Canadian interpretation of Roch Carrier's novels, Pierre Hébert labels this tendency to extract only the ideas that conform to one's prejudices about Quebecers the "Krieghoff syndrome."[15] A popular nineteenth century painter, Krieghoff produced numerous paintings of French-Canadian life showing the *habitants* as jovial but decidedly unruly, undisciplined, and overly exuberant. This unfavorable portrayal sold tremendously well to English Canadians who preferred to see Quebecers in this light and, indeed, a Krieghoff painting was recently chosen for the cover of *The French Canadian Experience*, published in 1979.[16] Commenting on Krieghoff's success, Barry Lord states: "Isn't that just like them? We can hear the British buyer chuckling."[17] Hébert maintains that Carrier's tremendous success in English Canada, unparalleled in Quebec, is due to his Krieghoff-like portrayal of Quebecers which, intended as caricatures,[18] were interpreted by English Canadians as totally realistic. Hébert states:

> ... Or, ce que j'appellerais le syndrome Krieghoff, c'est iustement cette perpétuation du mythe selon lequel le Canadien-français est jovial, animé, certes mais aussi grossier, anarchique, irrespectueux des conventions, insubordonné.[19]

A similar attitude is prevalent in Toronto's critical response to Quebec theater from the 1950s to the early 1980s, Indeed, in his review of *La Guerre, Yes Sir!*, staged at the Stratford Festival, Herbert Whittaker remarked, "What he [Carrier] set out to show his audience was their [Quebecers] stupidity, ignorance and superstition."[20]

Toronto has always welcomed Quebec theater enthusiastically, albeit often in a "wrong-headed" fashion.[21] It did, for example, "throw out the red carpet"[22] to Gratien Gélinas

and his production of *Tit-Coq* (Royal Alexandra Theatre, 8-13 January, 12-17 March 1951). Gélinas, author/director/star, was honored with a doctorate and the sensational opening night, "a theatrical event about as rare as a blizzard in July"[23] concluded with "one of the most gala events of the winter season."[24] Although this suggests that the Toronto public indicated its appreciation of the significance of this theatrical opening,"[25] reviewers showed little understanding of or appreciation for the social issues addressed in *Tit-Coq,* described as "an unpretentious effort, an earnest, straightforward even naive drama"[26] by a playwright who "understands *his* (emphasis added) country well."[27] No mention was made of the conscription crisis nor, more importantly, of the significance of Tit Coq's bastard origins, recognized by scholars to be "symbolic of Quebec itself, symbolic of a shared alienation."[28] A "down-to-earth piece of homespun" about a "simple trusting little soldier who found his big love before shipping overseas," "a tender and pathetic story of *one* man's (emphasis added) insecurity," "the same tearful source used by soap-opera writers,"[29] *Tit-Coq,* much like Krieghoff's paintings, only confirmed Torontonians' notion of the narrowness of a Catholic society and seemed very much "wrenched out of the soil of Quebec."[30] Some critics were also clearly uncomfortable with the traces of *québécitude* unintentionally present in the performance: the play was performed in English by the original cast, thus producing "crude, picturesque accents"[31] that were "at times very difficult to understand."[32] No mention was made of the translator or of the translation.

In their reviews of Gélinas' subsequent Toronto production, *Bousille and the Just* (Royal Alexandra, 16-20 January 1962), critics demonstrated the same tendency to emphasize that which conformed to their vision of quaint, rural Quebec while dismissing the larger questions addressed by the play. "An awkwardly constructed, ineptly staged and performed melodrama,"[33] which took "a hard look at hypocrisy as it flourishes in [his] native Quebec,"[34] *Bousille* said little to Toronto critics about social injustice in general, or about discontent in Quebec society on the eve of the Quiet Revolution. Only one critic commented on the "stilted and somewhat antiquated translation," but omitted the translator's name. He added that the "things that make the play worthwhile can only be effective in the native tongue and idiom,"[35] but did not specify what these things were nor how the translator failed

to convey them.[36]

While Gélinas, in both the pre- and post- Tremblay years, received considerable attention in Toronto, being at one point "the most honoured man in Canadian theatre,"[37] Marcel Dubé, sometimes identified as the "father" of Quebec theater, was largely ignored. *The Time of the Lilacs* (Royal Alexandra, 28 October-1 November 1958), his only Toronto production, received little critical attention. Described as "gently sentimental,"[38] the play drew only a neutral review. While he noted Ken Johnstone's "questionable translation," Whittaker did not explain why it was problematic nor how this affected the play. More significantly, other Dubé works, *Zone* and *Le Retour des oies blanches* for example, which offer images of a greatly troubled, less Catholic and traditional Quebec were never staged in Toronto.

Given its coolness toward the very popular Dubé, Toronto's interest in the less well-known, more avant-garde Jacques Languirand is all the more surprising. Languirand staged three plays in Toronto, *The Partition* and *Departures* (Central Library Theatre, from 17 February 1966) and *Man Inc.*, produced for the grand opening of the Saint Lawrence Centre (from 16 February 1970). While all plays received mixed reviews, Languirand's theater, and the author himself, generated considerable critical interest. In his review of the first two plays, Whittaker compared Languirand's work to the author describing both as "humorous and unexpected."[39] *The Departures*, "a blithe tragedy without answers"[40] was more successful and "far more satisfying and complex"[41] than *Partition*, a "poorly translated, two finger exercise."[42] The translator's name was not mentioned nor were specific translation problems discussed, but both Nathan Cohen and Whittaker identified Languirand as a "Montreal dramatist" whose approach, according to Cohen, was "partly scornful, partly sympathetic and romantic in a specifically French Canadian intellectual way."[43] Although the critic does not explain what was specifically French Canadian nor how this differed from an English Canadian approach, his comment suggests that Languirand's somewhat avant-garde and experimental work[44] was, indeed, too remote for a Toronto audience that preferred a more "homespun" vision of Quebec. Reviews of *Man Inc.* stressed almost exclusively the play's technical dazzle rather than its content or Languirand's Quebec origins.

Toronto critics were divided over Jean Basile's *The Drummer Boy* (Royal Alexandra Theatre, 17 January-4 February 1968) which presents a disturbing and thus less palatable picture of old Quebec. The story of the rape of an eleven-year-old girl and the abuse of the young, accused soldier, it was both lauded as "a significant debut [for Theatre Toronto]"[45] and condemned as an "insult"[46] and "spluttering jumble, a French Canadian version of Billy Budd."[47] Only Whittaker noted that something may have been "lost in the translation" in this "occasionally jarring version,"[48] but he did not specify the nature of the loss.

Toronto's introduction to *joual* in translation and to a new Quebec theater which spoke of a different, post Quiet Revolution society was with Jean-Claude Germain's *Notes from Quebec* (Théâtre Passe Muraille, from 7 May 1970). Toronto critics were clearly unreceptive to this new experience. The play was condemned as "sophomoric and amateurish"[49] and labelled an "absurdist soap opera."[50] It was primanly its *québécitude* that worked against it. Judged to have lost "some pertinence in the translation"[51] and "impact in its uprooting from Quebec to Toronto,"[52] the play, the understanding of which relies on the audience's appreciation of a modern, nationalistic Quebec, was "over the head"[53] of at least one, if not all, of the critics. Dubarry Campeau was also offended by Germain's, or the translator's, use of four-letter words. The translator's name was not mentioned.

The negative reaction elicited by a play's *québécitude* and political intent, as well as by the use of *joual*, is even more evident in Jean Barbeau's Toronto experience. Critics saw in *Manon Lastcall* and *The Way of Lacross* (W.W. Theatre Productions, Poor Alex, 1-27 May 1972) "one hit, one miss."[54] *Manon Lastcall* was little more than "a tiresome farce"[55] that "misfired."[56] However, *The Way of Lacross*, though "not an entirely successful play,"[57] did illustrate "Barbeau's positive grip on dramatic craftsmanship."[58] More significant is the observation that "the play suffer[ed] from being aimed specifically at a Quebec audience,"[59] thus rendering the social criticism irrelevant. The jokes on Parisian French in *Man on Lastcall*, for example, did not "come across"[60] and critics (and according to them, the audience) were particularly insensitive to the political message of both plays: Lacross' final outburst "fell fiat."[61] Searching for the reasons for Lacross' arrest and apparently unaware that the play was based on the actual arraignment of a political demonstrator, Whittaker

commented that the "play's accusatory drive [was] weakened."[62] Although noting the play's use of "a quality closely identified with

Quebec's separatist pangs," Whittaker, as did most other critics, failed to acknowledge or explain the significance of the October Crisis as the play's political background. Only Urjo Kareda[63] was sensitive to both the linguistic and cultural problems involved in transporting this new type of theater and to the Toronto audience's difficulty in understanding or appreciation. He pointed out the importance of "the sound of language,"[64] stating that "Barbeau uses words with exceptional muscularity and vigour." He noted as well the importance of "words that contain other words much as social structures contain other social structures" and the failure of the "self-deprecating and listless" translation to convey this. Kareda further commented on the difference between the original and English versions, which ran at the same time, arguing that the latter suffered because of the "wilful obliteration of the ceremonial [religious] nature of the play–dropped because it could have proved to be "too remote" for the Toronto audience. Kareda recognized as well the importance of cultural difference or the question of place in Barbeau's work and suggested as well that translating and transposing such plays could be a "troublesome point."

Given this initial negative reaction to the deliberately nationalistic *nouveau théâtre québécois*, and to a Quebec that was no longer quaint and familiar, Michel Tremblay's tremendous success[65] is all the more remarkable. Recognized as "a writer of apparent power and tremendous drive"[66] after his first production *Forever Yours Marie-Lou* (Tarragon Theatre, 14 November-10 December 1972), he was soon "the darling of the critics and the chosen one of the Toronto theatre scene."[67] However, the critical reaction to his work suggests that the Toronto theater community was not responding to Tremblay, the ardent Quebec nationalist, whose "theatre is intimately linked to the world he describes,"[68] the Plateau Mont-Royal, but rather to a "Toronto's favourite *Canadian* (emphasis added) playwright"[69]who was talking more universally about "deceptions and the need for them, and the loss of them and comfort in misery. About *any* (emphasis added) life in fact."[70] Tremblay's success cannot be attributed to his ability to convey in popular language and to a sympathetic and informed audience the sentiments and concerns of post Quiet Revolution

and October Crisis separatist Quebec nor to the fact that "when you're up to your ass in mud, any kind of solid ground is solid joy."[71] His popularity is instead due to the Toronto public's and theater critics' ability and willingness to interpret Tremblay's message as solely universal at the expense of its *québécitude.* Charles Pope stated:

> ...no other Canadian dramatist has succeeded so completely in creating startling, in terms of psychological insights as well as shock tactics and [*sic*] original theatre that is inherently Canadian without being provincial to the point of being incomprehensible to a non-Canadian audience.[72]

Pope's assessment confirms Wallace's observation that Toronto's theater institutions, like their Quebec counterparts studied by Brisset, need either to appropriate or dismiss work that is culturally different. A study of the critical response to Tremblay indicates that the political, Quebec message was ignored or condemned as being "too remote," while the universal elements were appropriated.

*Marie Lou's* return to Toronto (Theatre Plus, St. Lawrence Centre, 4-21 June 1975) was described as a "riveting performance."[73] The almost unanimously positive reaction[74] suggests that the Toronto audience "had more of an opportunity to study his [Tremblay's] style enabling it to spot the surging currents beneath the dazzling movement of the actor stream,"[75] but critics failed to identify the theme of Quebecers' shared degradation and alienation present in all of the Plateau Mont-Royal plays.[76] *Marie-Lou*, like subsequent Tremblay productions, succeeded despite, not because of, its Quebec origins. The product of a "church-ridden state," the play was deemed to have lost some "courage" either through "transplant or translation."[77] It could, however, "reach beyond its point of origin"[78] and "flourish without a political analysis."[79] The *Star* critic further downplayed the play's and Tremblay's Quebec origins by stating: "Tremblay himself would say that he is a Quebec playwright, not Canadian, but never mind."[80]

After Tremblay's sensational return to Toronto with *Les Belles-Sœurs* (St. Lawrence Centre Repertory Theatre Company, 31 March-28 April 1973), a "milestone play, a high

point for the St. Lawrence Centre,"[81] critics commented more directly on Toronto's tolerance of *québécitude*. Kareda urged the crowds lined up at *Move Over Mrs. Markham*, "a shoddy British import" to cross the physical and cultural intersection and to "go next door" to see the "10,000 times more entertaining" Tremblay play, but questioned the Toronto theatergoers' ability to "jump across the [cultural] intersection."[82] Whittaker referred as well to "a kind of mute edged condescension indelibly WASP."[83] Observing that it was not clear whether the audience who stood and cheered at the end of the play did so to show their praise for the production or their respect for the national anthem with which it ends, David McCaughna suggested that the audience's support was indeed ambiguous.[84] Despite their enthusiasm, critics once again failed to comment on the play's political message. For example, stating that there was a risk of losing the political angle in the translation[85] and that "*Les Belles-Sœurs* [was] a play about Quebec, about false promises and political exchange catalogues," Kareda nonetheless identified it as a "Canadian play."[86] He praised its universality, observing that the production "takes that singularly perspective vision of a specific social world and transforms it to take in the rhythms of all our individual fantasies."[87] Only Myron Galloway, the *Montreal Star* critic who described the Toronto production as a "massacre," expressed awareness of the importance of the play's *québécitude* and the failure of the Toronto staging to convey this; he wrote: "the play has nothing to say if the French-Canadian flavour is missing." Thus, in the St. Lawrence Centre production, "which [had] no more to do with Montreal than it [did] with Hong Kong," the play "in no way came across."[88]

It is in its response to Tremblay's greatest Toronto hit, *Hosanna*, that the Toronto theater community most clearly demonstrated its need to dismiss a play's alterity and political, Quebec message and, instead, to appropriate the play and playwright.[89] A resounding success when it first opened at the Tarragon Theatre (15 May-1 June 1974), *Hosanna* continued to draw Toronto crowds in four subsequent productions (Global Village Theatre 6 September-4 October 1974, Toronto Workshop Productions, 13 January-14 February 1977, NDWT Theatre, 11-12 March 1980, Tarragon, 17 May-28 June 1987) and also ran at the Bijou Theatre on Broadway. However, while Toronto enthusiastically

recognized the merits of this "shimmering production,"[90] which was "a heart-pounding tour de force,"[91] and a "landmark"[92] after which "Canadian theatre [was] not quite the same,[93] it was also quick to claim Tremblay as its own at the expense of his theater's political drive and *québécitude*. Like all of Tremblay's plays, *Hosanna* contains a political message. As Tremblay himself stated:

> I do not mean that they [Hosanna and Cuirette] are Quebec symbols or images of Quebec. But their problems with the wider society are political problems. Because they are the fringe group in society, this society in a way hates them. But they want to be happy and they want to be somebody. Hosanna is a man who always wanted to be a woman. This woman always wanted to be Elizabeth Taylor in *Cleopatra*. In other words, this Québécois always wanted to be an English actress in an American movie about an Egyptian myth in a movie shot in Spain. In a way, that is a typically Québécois problem. For the past 300 years we were not taught that we were not people, so we were dreaming about somebody else instead of ourselves. So *Hosanna* is a political play.[94]

Based on the critics' comments, the political aspect was largely missed. The play was, instead, seen as an exploration of the "poetics of love,"[95] a "study of deception and humiliation and the loss of dreams,"[96] a "sensitive delineation of a homosexual relationship,"[97] or a "classic study of homosexual revenge"[98] by "the Canadian theatre's most compassionate poet of *individual* (emphasis added) isolation."[99] Those critics who did recognize an attempt at a political message downplayed it claiming that such an allegory was "far-fetched"[100] or that "there was no inkling of such an idea to be found in the play no matter how hard one looked for signs."[101] More relevant to this study is McCaughna's comment that although Tremblay is "a very political writer and all of his plays have dealt in one way or another with the condition of Quebec society, it does not hit home that this is a play which has a great deal to do with Quebec."[102] Clearly even those critics aware of the political

message refused to acknowledge its importance; they chose instead to ignore the play's philosophical sources.

Tremblay did not always have the same resounding success in Toronto and critical comments suggest that the other plays' *québécitude* did work against them rendering them too remote. Furthermore, translations and translators were acknowledged only when they rendered the work more familiar. *En pièces détachées* (New Theatre, *5* March-15 April 1974), "rather disgustingly re-titled *Montreal Smoked Meat"*[103] was criticized for being merely a repetition of "more Montreal misery."[104] Whittaker questioned the Toronto audience's willingness to accept Montreal's "squalid side" instead of the "quaint, charming, historic vision of Montreal to which [we] have been exposed in the past."[105] *Bonjour là, Bonjour* (Tarragon Theatre, 1 February-16 March 1975) drew mixed reviews but, according to one critic, the translation, "void of the rough joual," was able to "serve the Ontario audience well" since the English version was "in no way a reproduction of the Quebec original."[106] *Saint Carmen of the Main* (Tarragon Theatre, 11 January-26 February 1978) seemed "curiously uprooted," its "spirit" being lost on the Toronto audience.[107] Freeman also accused the translation of not conveying the play's political fable. A *New York Times* critic found the play touching, but dismissed the political vision as "preposterous," while not explaining what the message really was.[108] Critics did not comment on the political message of other Tremblay plays, *Surprise, Surprise* (Toronto Arts Productions, St. Lawrence Centre, 22 October-8 November 1975), which generated a limited but positive response, *La Duchesse de Langeais* (22 May-28 June 1980)[109] a "left-over from the primal scream of gay lib,"[110] and *The Impromptu of Outremont* (Tarragon Theatre, 22 May-28 June 1980) Toronto's first glimpse at Tremblay's interpretation of the life of the upper classes.

Although the success of this distinctly Quebec nationalist playwright might initially suggest an openness to the "Other," reviews thus indicate that he triumphed as a Canadian, not Quebec, playwright due primarily to the universality, not *québécitude*, of his plays. Furthermore, the negative reaction elicited by the distinctive Quebec flavor and subject of the theater of Roland Lepage, Anne Hébert, Michel Garneau. Jovette Marchessault, and Roch Carrier, staged during the same period, suggests a rejection of the unfamiliar and a reluctance

to accept and interpret the importance of place when this ceased to be "homespun." Considered less universal, thus not appropriable, these plays could not compete with Tremblay's "Canadian" theater. Anne H~bert's *Le Temps sauvage* (Firehall Theatre, 23 November-9 December 1972) was described as merely a "symbolic analysis of Quebec's problems."[111] Michel Garneau's *Four to Four* (Tarragon, 30 March-28 April 1974) suffered from dealing solely with "Quebec women"[112] whose background was too "exotic in an Ontario setting."[113] Roland Lepage's *Le Temps d'une vie* (Tarragon, 13 May-25 June 1978), though recognized for its literary merit, also suffered from its regional subject matter. It was merely "a lyrical look at simple habitant life,"[114] an exploration of the "rural roots of French Canada,"[115] which dealt essentially with "the soul of Quebec."[116] Commenting on the play's limited subject matter "my problem and one I suspect I will share with others," Bryan Johnson questioned the Toronto's public's "burning interest in a lyrical epic about one woman's life in rural Quebec."[117] The "magic" of Jovetre Marchessault's *The Saga of the Wet Hens* (Tarragon, 18 February-19 March 1982) was lost due in part to a "poor translation of shameless literary pretention"[118] but primarily due to cultural differences; the numerous allusions to the authors depicted as well as to the Catholic church as the key oppressor were too remote for the Toronto audience.[119] Despite the critic's assessment, the play was a box office success, suggesting that, faced with the larger question of feminism, far more central to the play than nationalism, Torontonians were in fact able to bridge the cultural gap and accept the play's inherent alteriry. The "otherness" of Roch Carrier's *Celestial Bicycle* (Tarragon, 1 April-1 May 1982) clearly worked against it. The play, which illustrates Carrier's fantastical side, was essentially "lost in a smoke screen."[120] Toronto's cool response to this Quebec hit was attributed to the language barrier "which never seemed more inseparable"[121] and once again to the cultural gap; it simply "did nor work with the anglo-phone sensibility."[122] Overshadowed by Tremblay, these authors, whose work relied on an understanding of its *québécitude*, and who spoke of a Quebec radically different from that portrayed by previous more homespun plays, could not flourish in an ethnocentric climate.

The cycle of the *Belles-Sœurs* ended in 1977.[123] Three years later, a lag for which translation time could account, after the Black Cat Cabaret's unsuccessful production of *La*

*Duchesse,* Tremblay's domination of the Toronto theater scene ended. However, while Toronto's "darling" wrote novels, theatergoers sampled a much more diversified, radically different Quebec theater and did so in a somewhat less ethnocentric way. Review articles suggest that in the l980s critics and audiences were more able to "cross the cultural intersection"; critics identified playwrights as *Québécois,* rather than Canadian, no longer appropriating the "Other" and ceased to dismiss or ignore their work on the pretext that it was too remote or culturally different. Furthermore, more attention was paid to the play's origins. As Wallace argues,[124] they continued to confuse the translation with the original commenting, for example, on the translator's style as if it were the playwright's, but the critics also acknowledged the translator and translation more frequently, hence recognizing both the importance of the play's place and language of origin. Thus, although the Toronto theater community continued to produce and review Quebec in a somewhat "wrong-headed" fashion, a change of attitude, insufficient as it may have been, is nonetheless perceptible and can be attributed to changes within both theater communities. First, both Quebec and Toronto theaters exhibited greater openness to and interest in a wide variety of theater from all over Canada and the world; Montreal hosted the Festival des Amériques, Quebec held the Quinzaine Internationale and Toronto staged the du Maurier and Quay Works festivals. Referring to the 1986-88 period, Alan Filewood notes, "This was the period when English Canadians discovered the new wave of imagistic performances in Quebec; at the same time, *québécois* artists discovered the audience beyond their borders."[125] He observes as well that Toronto audiences saw more productions from Quebec than they did from other parts of the country. Diane Pavlovic, commenting on the same period, likewise emphasizes the importance of the theater festivals in Quebec which illustrate "l'ouverture de [notre] pratique théâtrale à celles qui viennent d'ailleurs."[126]

It is not just Toronto's new attitude to Quebec theater that led to increased openness. The introduction of the "new wave of imagistic performances," and of other new theater directions as well as less nationalistic authors greatly facilitated transfer from Montreal to Toronto. Quebec plays survived translation and transportation more easily because they were less Quebec-centred and perhaps would have appealed more than earlier productions even

had the audience remained Toronto-centric. In addition to experimenting with new forms of theater resulting from the integration of various media into performance, such as dance, video, and pyrotechnics, Quebec playwrights steered theater in entirely new directions. As Paviovic states, the nationalist issue, so central to the theater of Barbeau, Germain, and Tremblay, was replaced by a greatly diversified response to broader, universal questions of the human condition:

> Dans les années 1970, le projet théâtral coïncidait avec un projet de société : les artistes semblaient investis d'une mission et servaient volontiers la cause du nationalisme, de l'indépendance... Avec la fin des grandes causes, la fonction proprement politique du théâtre a connu un recul certain... N'étant plus réunies dans un même projet, les démarches artistiques sont éparpillées et proposent, chacune de son côté, des métaphores plus générales sur la condition humaine.[127]

Toronto showed its appreciation of a less folkloric and provincial theater[128] responding to Quebec plays as a total theater experience, rather than as a lesson on the "two solitudes."

One of the greatest successes in the history of Quebec theater, the Théâtre des Voyagments' *Broue* (co-written by Claude Meunier, Michel Côté, Marcel Gauthier, Marc Messier, Jean-Pierre Plante, Francine Ruel, and Louis Saia), translated as *Brew* (Centrestage Company, 29 September-29 October 1983), took English Canada by storm. Although the authors, who claimed to be "not that interested in nationalism any more,"[129]based these series of sketches on a specifically Quebec event, the closing of the men-only *tavernes*, they reached a much wider audience, cutting "across Canada's bilingual blood" in their portrait of "men together of any nation."'[30] Critics and public clearly welcomed the signal that "Quebec theatre [was] beginning to recover the comic sense lost during the 1960s when theatre artists [here] decided it was important for them to express the province's social and political realities."[13]' *Brew's* successful cross-Canada tour indicated to the theater community

that, as Jean-Claude Lesperance, a theater producer, remarked, "There doesn't seem to exist any barrier between English and French now. Where one performs is no longer a political question."'[32]

*Bachelor,* another collective production co-authored as well by Louis Saia and Louise Roy and translated as *Single* by Michel Sinelnikoff (Toronto Free Theatre, November 1983) did not fare as well. However, Toronto critics, while noting that it was from Quebec, blamed the failure on an "insensitive director" and a "grotesque translation"[133] and a "performance as contrived as the monologue"'[34] rather than on any cultural differences. Indeed the story, based on the empty life of a single woman controlled by consumerism and the pursuit of selfish pleasures, was "a script for everyone."[135]

While *Brew* introduced Toronto to more universal, cross-cultural Quebec theater, the play's format remained traditional and it was not until the arrival of Robert Lepage that Toronto experienced the totally new directions in which Lepage, Gilles Maheu, and others were leading Quebec theater. Lepage, later to become the director of the National Arts Centre French Theater, first appeared in Toronto with the Théâtre Repère production of *Circulations* (Canadian Rep Theatre; 11-22 February 1985). One critic was quick to recognize Lepage's talent and the power of the "riveting aural and visual poetry"'[36] used by Lepage as well as by other new playwrights who were "stretching and twisting the language of theater into bizarre and fascinating shapes,"[137] but another saw in this bilingual production, which combined various sound effects with music, theater and mime "a multi-media mish-mash" signifying "very little,"[138] It was not until his latter productions of *The Dragon's Trilogy* (du Maurier World Stage, from 31 May 1986 and Factory Theatre, 18-28 May 1988), *Tectonic Plates* (du Maurier World Stage from 3 June 1988) and *Vinci* (du Maurier Quay Works, from 20 January 1988) that Lepage's "theatrical mastery"[139] was unanimously acknowledged. Sending "shock waves" through the Anglophone community now "forced to recognize the extent of the remarkable theatrical explosion in Quebec,"[140]Lepage introduced Toronto to a new form of theater. Recognized as one of the most "important shows" when it first opened in the World Stage Festival at Harbourfront (1986) and "a must" for anyone wanting to know "the direction of the most exciting theatre in Quebec,"[141] *The Dragon's*

*Trilogy*, a trilingual English, French, Chinese production, was in fact "legendary"'[42] by the time it returned two years later. "A lyrical epic about the meeting of cultures" which illustrated "imagistic theatre at its best,"[143] it electrified both audiences and the international press appealing to "different audiences with different tastes and expectations."[144] Lepage "came and conquered"[145] once again with *Vinci,* and "grabbed the audience hard and never lost [his] grip"[146] with *Tectonic Plates.* While critics readily identified Lepage as Quebec's "enfant terrible,"'[147] the playwright's and the plays' origins clearly did not interfere with the comprehension and appreciation of these imagistic, dream-like, multimedia, multilingual, and multicultural theater pieces which earned Lepage international recognition.

However, as Wallace suggests,[148] Toronto was not entirely ready for Gilles Maheu's totally non-textual theater pieces. *Le Rail* (23 28 October 1986), staged as part of the Brecht festival, recognized as "stunning" but "murky"[149] received little critical attention. *Hamlet-Machine* (du Maurier World Stage, 10 June 1988) was not appreciated by critics who displayed what Paul Leonard and Wallace identify as a typical English-Canadian preoccupation with the text and uneasiness with its absence; they would "still doggedly insist that the performance event is best regarded as primarily an expression of a transcendent meaning–the script."[150] Predisposed against totally imagistic theater, they described *Hamlet-Machine* as "pretention"[151] and "self-indulgent, intellectual bulltwaddel."[152] As Wallace notes, however,[153] their extreme negativity suggests, as did Hebert Whittaker in his review of *Marie-Lou,*[154] that their "response. . .was hedged by an element of curiosity and envy" for critics did recognize Mahen's talent, "his command of stage imagery" and the "awesome" physical discipline of his performers,"[155] which resulted in "breathtaking," "superbly done" productions.[156]

Demonstrating reserved enthusiasm about this innovative theater, Toronto maintained its interest in more traditional plays and its faithfulness to old favorites. Michel Tremblay once again wooed and won the Toronto audience with *Albertine in Five Times* (Tarragon, 9 April-il May 1985).[157] Significantly, it was a new style play, "symptomatic of the Quebec writer's increased introspection"[158] that earned mixed reviews, being described as both "pure theatrical magic,"[159] "soporific,"'[60] and "hard to grasp."[16]' Seeking to "speak of all women

in all times of their lives,"'[62] this play introduced Toronto to a far less political Tremblay who recognized his change of direction, stating, ". . .instead of judging society I was beginning to ask *myself* questions."[163] Similarly, his later production and critical success, *The Real World* (Tarragon, 15 May-26 June 1988), was "a gripping look at parallel realities"[164] by "a master craftsman now exploring an intensely personal phase in his artistic career"[165] and thus "a far cry" from his earlier, more political productions.[166] Critical response to revivals of *Bonjour là, Bonjour* (Toronto Centre Stage, *25* November-20 December 1986) and *Hosanna* (Tarragon, 17 May-28 June 1987), both considered classics, indicated a greater appreciation for and understanding of his earlier work. Controversial and comparatively unsuccessful when if first opened, *Bonjour là, Bonjour* was welcomed as a "highlight,"[167] although the same critic judged the performance to be a "disappointment."'[68] Another praised it as a modest masterpiece."[169] Overcoming their sensitivity to the incest issue, blamed in part for the first production's failure,[170] theatergoers had "realized in spite of their Toronto reserve that they bad been given something unexpectedly fine."[171] *Hosanna's* political message, no longer such a sensitive point in post Referendum Canada, was now readily acknowledged by the theater community: Richard Monette, the star of the previous productions now turned director, noted, "The central metaphor is about being yourself, with the political implication that Quebec should be what she is."[172] Toronto's understanding of Tremblay, who admitted that he felt before that he was being treated "as a nice neighbour,"[173] had clearly evolved.

The Toronto theater community did not limit itself to the sensational new nor to the revival of the old: equally as impressive as the number of Quebec plays staged in Toronto in this period is the diversity of the productions. Feminist, gay and, lesbian companies, Buddies in Bad Times and Nightwood Theatre, responded quickly to the homosexual currents in Quebec theater although their productions were not always critical successes. Jovette Marchessault's *The Edge of the Earth is Too Near, Violette Leduc*[174] (Nightwood Theatre, 14 May-1 June 1986) did not draw good reviews, due in part to a poor translation. One critic clearly recognized the importance of this by commenting on Susanne de Lotbinière Harwood's "overwrought translation,"[175] but another confused it with the original text. He stared that "when it comes to use of language it is difficult to determine where Leduc leaves

off and Marchessault begins,"[176] ignoring de Lotbinière's intermediary role. The Buddies in Bad Times production of Normand Chaurette's *Provincetown Playhouse, July 1919* (3-21 December 1986), was described as a "compelling work,"[177] but once again the critic collapsed the work of the playwright and the translator, William Bouler, commenting on the "evocative" writing without distinguishing between the two versions. Tarragon's production of *Being at Home with Claude* (Tarragon, 29 March-10 May 1987) generated a much greater, more enthusiastic critical response, earning for author René-Daniel Dubois the reputation of "Toronto's playwright of the hour."[178] As in their comments on Marchessault's and Chaurette's work, all Toronto critics identified Dubois as a Quebec playwright, but his origins did not interfere with the reception of his work for like Meunier, Lepage, the new Tremblay, Marchessault, and Chaurette, Dubois was nor writing to a Quebec audience about the Quebec question.[179] As Linda Gaboriau, his translator, stated, "Dubois is one of a new trend of Quebec playwrights who are more North American, more internationalist in their interests than those who came before."[180] Toronto's "first glimpse of the power and the passion of a major new voice from Quebec"[181] was, in fact, a doubleheader including *Pericles Prince of Tyre by William Shakespeare* (Theatre Passe Muraille, 9-26 April 1987) written in English.

Other new Quebec voices did not enjoy Dubois' success but the poor critical response is not necessarily attributable to the public's nor to the critics' ethnocentrism. Like Dubois', these writers' message was more universal than *Québécois* and the plays' Quebec origins, while acknowledged by the critics, were neither central to their interpretation nor responsible for their failure. Rena Gingras' award-winning *Syncope*, translated as *Breaks* by Linda Gaboriau (Toronto Free Theatre, 6-24 January 1988), according to both *Star*[182] and *Globe and Mail*[183] critics, suffered from bad direction, poor acting, and a clumsy translation. Critics illustrated a keen awareness of the importance of language in Gingras' work and of the difficulty in translating "the poetic quality of Quebec theatre, the exuberant use of language."[184] That the critics blamed linguistic, rather than cultural barriers suggests greater openness: the play and its message were not deemed to be too remote; the text was, instead, difficult to translate. In the Toronto Free Theatre's staging of Marie Laberge's *L'Homme*

*Gris*, translated by Rina Fraticelli (Toronto Free Theatre, 2 March-3 April 1988), the poor critical response was not attributable to the translation or to the production: the play itself, a "static yet intense drama"[185] was judged to be repetitious[186] and too much like a "long sermon on how not to be a parent."'[87] Although the reviews were sometimes negative, both Gingras and Laberge drew considerable critical attention, indicating the theater community's awareness of their importance.

In May 1988 the Factory Lab theatre began an exchange program with the Centre d'Essai des Auteurs Dramatiques of Montréal. The initiation of this joint translation project, entitled "Interact," indicated that genuine exchange between Canada's largest theater communities, the absence of which both Wallace and Brisset had lamented, was becoming a reality. The reading of Linda Gaboriau's translation of Michel Marc Bouchard's *Les Feluettes*, retitled *Lilies* (Factory Lab Theatre, 20 May 1988) was, according to Robert Wallace, "an historical occasion"[188] to which the audience responded with an emotional generosity rare in his considerable experience of Toronto theater.[189] Toronto welcomed "the excitement and diversity of the theatre being produced in Quebec" (Factory Lab Press Release) and, as Robert Nunn observes in an article that is somewhat of an update of Brisset's study, Montreal too was showing greater openness to English Canadian and, indeed, to all "foreign" theater. He states:

> ...there is the unprecedented opening of Quebec to the rest of the world, no less evident in the arts than in industry and commerce. That is, there is a two-way communication between Quebec and the rest of the world... In this new atmosphere, the ideologically–driven necessity to ignore this looming other no longer applies: the Montreal press can notice with gratification that *québécois* plays in translation are popular in Toronto; there is no reason not to read, translate and produce English-Canadian scripts.[190]

This article has attempted to trace the evolution of a similar attitude in Toronto. Once viewed somewhat patronizingly, much like Krieghoff's paintings, Quebec theater in

translation, with the arrival of Tremblay, received genuine recognition, but from a perspective that went partially against the spirit of the plays; the central issue of nationalism and Quebec's struggle for identity was ignored. The arrival of new voices such as Claude Meunier, Gilles Maheu, Robert Lepage, René-Daniel Dubois signaled new directions in Quebec drama. Deliberately more universal, this theater was frequently well received in Toronto from a perspective that coincided mote closely with its original intent. Critics acknowledged the translator more frequently, though not always favorably, thus demonstrating a better understanding of the difficulties of theater transfer and increased respect for the play's origins. Theater in translation was finally becoming a reliable "vehicle through which cultures travel"[191] without the misdirection, rerouting, detours, and frequent losses that plagued previous transfers.

---

## Notes

1. Alan Filewood, "Diversity in Deficits: Theatre in Canada 1986-1988." *Canada on Stage* (Toronto: PACTS Communications Centre, 1991), xiv.
2. Robert Wallace, *Producing Marginality: Theatre and Criticism in Canada* (Saskatoon: Fifth House Publishers, 1990), 216.
3. Michel Bélair, *Le Nouveau Théâtre québécois* (Montréal: Leméac, 1973).
4. Herbert Whittaker, *Globe and Mail,* 24 November 1972.
5. David Homel, "Dans les deux sens (la traduction littéraire au Canada)," *Liberté 205. 35.* 1 (1993): 133.
6. Annie Brisset, *Sociocritique de la traduction: Théâtre et altérité au Québec* (Montréal: Éditions Balzac-Le PréambuIe, coll. "L'Univers des discours," 1990), 111.
7. D. Blodgett. "How Do You Say Gabrielle Roy?" *Translation in Canadian Literature* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1983), 13-35.
8. Wallace, *Producing Marginality,* 216.
9. *Ibid.,* 220.

10. This article will discuss only professional productions of translated plays staged in Toronto. See as well: Mariel O'Neil-Karch and Pierre Paul Katch, "Le théâtre québécois *à* Toronto," *Revue d'histoire littéraire du Québec, le Théâtre* (Ottawa: Editions de l'Université d'Ottawa, 1984), 99-107.
11. Wallace, *Producing Marginality*, 217.
12. Paul St. Pierre, "Translation as a Discourse of History," *Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction* 6(1) (1993): 51.
13. Wallace, *Producing Marginality*, 218.
14. *Ibid.*, 221.
15. Pierre Hébert, "La Réception des romans de Roch Carrier au Québec et au Canada anglais ou le syndrome de Krieghoff," *Le Roman Contemporaire au Québec (1960-1985)* (Montréal: Fides, 1992), 211.
16. Gaston Saint Pierre, *The French Canadian Experience* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1979).
17. Barry Lord, *The History of Painting in Canada* (Toronto: NC Press, 1974), 47.
18. Hébert, "La Réception," 201.
19. *Ibid.*, 212.
20. Herbert Whittaker, *Globe and Mail*, 5 August 1972.
21. Wallace, *Producing Marginality*, 217.
22. Karr, *Toronto Star*, 9 January *1951.*
23. *Ibid.*
24. Herbert Whittaker, *Globe and Mail*, 9 January 1951.
25. *Ibid.*, 8 January 1951.
26. *Ibid.*, 10 April 1951.
27. *Ibid.*, 9 January 1951.
28. Jonathan M. Weiss, *French-Canadian Theater* (Boston: Twayne, 1986), 11.
29. Kart, *Toronto Star*, 9 January 1951.
30. Whittaker, *Globe and Mail*, 9 January 1951.
31. *Ibid.*
32. Karr, *Toronto Star*, 9 January 1951.

33. Nathan Cohen, *Toronto Star*, 16 January 1962.
34. Whittaker, *Globe and Mail,* 16 January 1962.
35. Cohen, *Toronto Star,* 16 January 1962.
36. Another Gélinas play, *Mortier* (Factory Lab Theatre, 6-21 December 1972) received little critical attention and, as part of a short play festival that became a "killing marathon," was described as only a "dreary marriage game" (U. Kareda, *Star,* 7 December 1972).
37. Whittaker, *Globe and Mail,* 16 January 1962.
38. *Ibid.*, 28 October 1958.
39. *Ibid.*, 17 February 1966.
40. Ibid,. 18 February 1966.
41. Ronald Evans, *Telegram,* 8 February 1966.
42. *Ibid.*
43. Cohen, *Toronto Star,* 18 February 1966.
44. Weiss, *French-Canadian Theater*, 21-22.
45. Whittaker, *Globe and Mail,* 18 January 1968.
46. McKenzie Porter, *Telegram,* 22 January 1968.
47. Cohen, *Toronto Star,* 18 January 1968.
48. Whittaker, *Globe and Mail,* 18 January 1968.
49. D. Rubin, *Toronto Star,* 8 May 1970.
50. Whittaker, *Globe and Mail,* 8 May 1970.
51. *Ibid.*
52. Rubin, *Toronto Star,* 8 May 1970.
53. Dubary Campeau, *Telegram.* 8 May 1970.
54. Whittaker, *Globe and Mail,* 12 May 1972.
55. U. Kareda, *Toronto Star*, 12 May 1972.
56. Whittaker, *Globe and Mail,* 12 May 1972.
57. *Ibid.*
58. Kareda, *Toronto Star*, 12 May 1972.

59. Grace Richardson, *That's Show Business, 9* June 1972.
60. *Ibid.*
61. *Ibid.*
62. Whittaker, *Globe and Mail,* 12 May 1972.
63. Kareda, *Toronto Star,* 12 May 1972.
64. See Robert Wallace, "Towards an Understanding of Theatrical Difference," *Canadian Theatre Review 55* (Summer 1988): *9.*
65. Tremblay's success has been the subject of numerous studies. See for example: Paula J. Dancy, "Tremblay at Tarragon, 1972-1981: The Plays, the Productions and the Critics," Master's Thesis, University of Guelph, 1985; Renate Usmiani, *Michel Tremblay* (Vancouver: Douglas and MacIntyre, 1982); Renate Usmiani, "Iremblay Opus: Unity in Diversity," *Canadian Theatre Review* 24 (Fall 1979): 12-25; Renate Usmiani, "Where to Begin the Accusation," *Canadian Theatre Review* 24 (Fall 1979): 26-38; Renare Usmiani, "Discovering the Nuance," *Canadian Theatre Review* 24 (Fall 1979): 39-41.
66. Whittaker, *Globe and Mail,* 15 November 1972.
67. Ed Bean, *Varsity,* 29 September 1974.
68. Weiss, *French-Canadian Theater,* 27.
69. Kareda, *Toronto Star, 5* June 1975.
70. Whittaker, *Globe and Mail,* 15 May 1974.
71. Bean, *Varsity,* 20 September 1974.
72. Charles Pope, *Scene Changes,* January 1977.
73. George Anthony, *Toronto Sun,* 6 April 1975.
74. U. Kareda found that Theatre Plus had made "a minus of Tremblay" *(Star, 5* June 1975).
75. Whittaker, *Globe and Mail, 5* June 1975.
76. Weiss, *French-Canadian Theater,* 27-48.
77. Whittaker, *Globe and Mail,* 1975.
78. Whittaker, *Globe and Mail,* 1972.

79. Kareda, *Toronto Star*, 15 May 1972.
80. Ibid, 15 June 1975
81. Whittaker, *Globe and Mail*, 4 March 1973.
82. Kareda, *Toronto Star*, 7 March 1973.
83. Whittaker, *Globe and Mail*, 4 March 1973.
84. David McCaughna, *Toronto Citizen*, 20 April 1973.
85. Kareda, *Toronto Star*, 26 March 1973.
86. *Ibid.*, 4 April 1973.
87. *Ibid.*
88. Myron Gallaway, *Montreal Star*, 4 April 1973.
89. Sections of the discussion of *Hosanna* have appeared previously in J. Koustas, "'*Hosanna* in Toronto' 'Tour de force' or 'Détour de traduction?"'. *Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction* 2 (2) (1989): 129-39.
90. Kareda, *Toronto Star*, 16 May 1974.
91. Whittaker, *Globe and Mail*, 16 May 1974.
92. Gina Mallet, *Toronto Star*, 14 January 1977.
93. David Ossea, *Varsity*, 21 January 1977.
94. Geraldine Anthony, ed., *Stage Voices: Twelve Canadian Playwrights Talk about Their Lives and Work* (Toronto: Doubleday Canada), 283.
95. Agnes Kruchio, *Excalibur*, 19 September 1974.
96. Kareda, *Toronto Star*, 16 May 1974.
97. McCaughna. *Motion*, July/August 1974.
98. Anthony, *Toronto Sun*, 13 September 1974.
99. Kareda, *Toronto Star*, 16 May 1974.
100. Pope, *Scene Changes*, January 1977.
101. John Herbert, *Onion*, 15 February 1977,
102. McCaughna, *Motion*, July/August 1974.
103. Kareda, *Toronto Star*, 8 March 1974.
104. McCaughna, *Toronto Citizen*, 29 March 1974.

105. Whittaker, *Globe and Mail,* 8 March 1974.
106. *Ibid.*, 3 February 1975.
107. B. Freeman, *Toronto Star,* 15 January 1978.
108. Richard Eder, *New York Times,* 2 February 1978.
109. According to M. O'Neil Karch and P.P. Karch the play had been produced previously at the Tarragon Theatre (25-26 January 1976) along with *Johnny Mango and his Astonishing Dogs,* but no reviews could be located.
110. Kaspars Dzeguze, *Sun,* June 1980.
111. Kareda, *Star,* 27 November 1972.
112. McCaughna, *Toronto Citizen,* 12 March 1974.
113. Whittaker, *Globe and Mail.* 7 April 1974.
114. J. Erdelyi. *Ottawa Citizen,* 15 April 1978.
115. Freeman, *Star,* 15 April 1978.
116. Jamie Porter, *Calgary Herald,* 30 April 1978.
117. Bryan Johnson, *Globe and Mail,* 15 May 1978.
118. Mallet, *Toronto Star,* 19 February 1982.
119. N. Harris, *Globe and Mail,* 20 February 1982.
120. Mallet, *Toronto Star,* 2 April 1982.
121. Mallet, *Star,* 2 April 1982.
122. Ray Conlogue, *Globe and Mail,* 2 April 1982.
123. Weiss, *French-Canadian Theater,* 151.
124. Wallace, *Producing Marginality*, 213-43.
125. Filewood. "Diversity in Deficits," xiv.
126. Diane Pavolic and Lorraine Carmelain, "Le Québec des années 1980: éclectisme et exotisme," *Canada on Stage* (Toronto: PACTS Communications Centre, 1991), xxxii.
127. *Ibid.*, xxx.
128. *Ibid.*, xxxii.
129. *Calgary Herald,* 20 October 1982.
130. Lloyd Dykk, *Vancouver Sun,* 31 December 1982.

131. Brian Brennan, Montreal, *Calgary Herald,* 20 October 1982.
132. Marianne Ackerman, *Globe and Mail*, 27 October 1982.
133. Mallet, *Toronto Star,* 14 November 1983.
134. Conlogue, *Globe and Mail,* 15 November 1983.
*135.* Maureen Peterson, *Montreal Gazette,* 2 December 1983.
136. Matthew Fraser, *Globe and Mail,* 1 March 1985.
137. *Ibid.*
138. Crew, *Toronto Star*, 28 February 1985.
139. Filewood, "Diversity in Deficits," xv.
140. *Ibid.*, xiv.
141. Conlogue, *Globe and Mail,* 3 June 1986.
142. Press Release, The Factory Theater, 18 April 1988.
143. Crew, *Toronto Star*, 19 May 1988.
144. Vit Wagner, *Toronto Star,* 13 May 1988.
145. *Crew*, *Toronto Star*, 20 January 1988.
146. Groen, *Globe and Mail,* 7 June 1988.
147. Mallet, *Toronto Magazine,* May 1988.
148. Wallace, *Producing Marginality*, 226.
149. Crew, *Toronto Star*, 24 October 1986.
150. Paul Leonard, "Critical Questioning," *Canadian Theatre Review 57* (Winter 1988): 6.
151. Conlogue, *Globe and Mail,* June 1988.
152. Crew, *Toronto Star*, 12 June 1988.
153. Wallace, *Producing Marginality*, 227.
154. Whittaker, *Globe and Mail, 15* November 1972.
155. Conlogue, *Globe and Mail,* 13 June 1988.
156. Crew, *Toronto Star*, 24 October 1986.
157. An earlier production of *Remember Me* (Canadian Rep Theatre, January 1985) was cancelled.
158. Conlogue, *Globe and Mail,* 10 April 1985.

159. Crew, *Toronto Star*, 10 April 1985.
160. Conlogue, *Globe and Mail*, 10 April 1985.
161. *Ibid.*, 20 May 1985.
162. Margaret Penman, *Toronto Star*, 5 May 1985.
163. Quoted by R. Crew, *Toronto Star*, 31 May 1988.
164. Conlogue, *Globe and Mail*, 26 April 1988.
165. Crew, *Toronto Star*, 25 May 1988.
166. *Ibid.*, 21 May 1988.
167. *Ibid.*, 11 March 1986.
168. *Ibid.*, 28 November 1986.
169. Conlogue, *Globe and Mail*, 28 November 1986.
170. Paula Dancy, "Tremblay at Tarragon 1972-1981: The Plays, the Productions and the Critics" (Master's Thesis, University of Guelph, 1985), 93,
171. Conlogue, *Globe and Mail*, 28 November 1986.
172. Crew, *Toronto Star*, 22 April 1987.
173. *Ibid.*, 21 May 1988.
174. Marchessault's work was staged, as well as part of the Factory Lab Theatre's Brave New Works' series for which there were no reviews. These include *Night Cows* (March-April 1983) and *The Edge of the World is Too Near, Violette Leduc* (April 1985).
175. Conlogue, *Globe and Mail*, 17 May 1986.
176. Henry Mietkiewicz, *Toronto Star*, 20 May 1986.
177. Crew, *Toronto Star*, 7 December 1986.
178. Ackerman, *Montreal Gazette*, 5 May 1987.
179. Robert Wallace points out the critics misconstrued the setting and ignored the importance of the social and historical context (1967) but did not let this interfere with their appreciation of the play (Wallace, *Producing Marginality*, 229).
180. Linda Gaboriau, *Maclean's*, 27 April 1987, 61.
181. Crew, *Toronto Star*, 8 April 1987.

182. *Ibid.*, 18 January 1988.
183. Conlogue, *Globe and Mail*, 9 January 1988.
184. *Ibid.*, 2 January 1988.
185. Wagner, *Toronto Star*, 26 February 1988.
186. Conlogue, *Globe and Mail*, 3 March 1988.
187. Crew, *Toronto Star*. 3 March 1988.
188. Wallace, *Producing Marginality*, 213.
189. *Ibid.*, 216.
190. Robert Nunn, "Cognita: Has Quebec Discovered English Canadian Plays?" *Theatrum* (June/July/August 1991): 17.
191. David Homel and Sherry Simon, *Mapping Literature* (Montreal: Véhicule Press, 1988), 9.

---

Source : Joseph I. Denohoe and Jonathan M. Weiss (eds.) *Essays on Modern Quebec Theater»*, East Lansing, Michigan State University Press, 1995, p. 81-107.