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ABSTRACT

In the 1960s, American plays presented in Montreal were translated in France; the following decade saw the first of American plays translated or adapted in Quebec. In the 1980s, the translative practices employed in the seventies proved the dominant mode. In the 1990s, only exceptionally has an American play been presented in a translation originating outside of Quebec. It is now the rule that all foreign plays produced in Quebec are translated in the Quebecois idiom. This translative situation has stabilized, and the translation of American plays into Quebecois reflects an established practice. The tracing and analysis of this translative practice and its evolution serve as the guiding focus of the dissertation.

While the political impulse of national identification has played a great role in the legitimation of the translation of foreign plays in Quebecois, it is not the principal consideration that has led the artists of the Quebecois stage to shun foreign (i.e., French) translations and to produce local translations. Rather, it has been the secular concern of verisimilitude, of identification, and of theatrical efficiency that has made the Quebecois directors demand local and not European translations of American plays.

We begin with the assumption that a theatrical translation exists only through its scenic realization. It exists only in the production project to which it is attached. The theatrical translation is thus part of the creative process of stage-representation, which includes the aspects of acting and scenography. Therefore, to analyze any particular theatrical translation, the project of the creators involved in the process has to be taken into account and assessed. By examining all of Arthur Miller's plays presented in
Montreal, complemented with the interviews of those artists involved in the Miller productions, this dissertation attempts to identify and explain how the translative and the appropriation practices of American plays have evolved and developed in Quebec from the 1960s to the 1990s. It is a challenge to traditional scholarship which puts Quebecois politics at the forefront of Quebecois translation.
INTRODUCTION

Between 1968 and 1988, twenty-four per cent of the foreign plays presented by the mainstream theatres of Montreal and Quebec City were composed by American dramatists (Brisset, Codes 52). If we exclude from this list works of French origin, which theoretically require no translation, sixty-nine per cent of the plays presented in Montreal and Quebec City during this period were originally written in English. A little more than fifty per cent of these plays were American (Brisset, Codes 59). These statistics lead us to the fact that, of the three-hundred and ninety-two foreign plays presented by mainstream theatres in Quebec\(^1\) between 1968 and 1988, ninety-five were American (Brisset, Codes 60). If we look at all the plays produced during the period (both Quebecois and foreign), American drama claims a significant position, comprising thirteen percent of the total production offerings (Codes 82). These numbers indicate the undeniable importance of American drama in the Quebecois theatre scene. It should also be noted that this era witnessed a major shift in translation practice. In 1968, seventy-five per cent of the foreign plays presented in Montreal were translated in France; in 1988, ninety-three per cent of such plays were produced in a Quebecois version (Brisset, Codes 84). These trends reveal much about the state of theatre in Quebec during this period and invite analysis concerning both the political and aesthetic aims of Quebecois artists. While traditional scholarship assumes that political factors are responsible for the changes, the

\[^1\] Throughout the dissertation the term Quebec will identify the province of Quebec. The term Quebecois will indicate the population of the province of Quebec.
dissertation will show that theatrical and artistic considerations primarily influenced the scope and trajectory of Quebecois translation.

The production of American plays in Quebec well illustrates the recent history of Quebecois translation. In the 1960s, American plays presented in Montreal were translated in France; the following decade saw the first of American plays translated or adapted in Quebec. In the 1980s, the translative practices employed in the seventies proved the dominant mode. In the 1990s, only exceptionally has an American play been presented in a translation originating outside of Quebec. It is now the rule that all foreign plays produced in Quebec are translated in Quebecois idiom. This translative situation has stabilized, and the translation of American plays into Quebecois reflects an established practice. The tracing and analysis of this translative practice and its evolution serve as the guiding focus of this dissertation.

Because the transition to Quebecois translation occurred during a period of political turmoil, the research on foreign plays presented on the Quebecois stage has been dominated by a socio-political approach. Translation practice has consequently been viewed chiefly through the lens of a nationalistic politics.

---

2. For some obscure reasons, most of the German plays (works of Buchner or Heiner Müller, for example) are presented in their European French translation. But plays of Anglo-Saxon origin are more often than not presented in Quebecois.

3. Although the notions of translation and adaptation in the Quebecois context are sketchy, a definition of both is needed here:
   A play translation is a transfer of the source text from one language to another without any change in geography, social context or time frame.
   A play adaptation is a transfer of the source text from one language to another with changes in geography, social context or time frame.
Since the early sixties (and the dawn of the Quiet Revolution), Quebecois culture has been involved in a self-defining process that has led artists to attack foreign cultural material, so as to nurture the development of a strong French North American culture. The 1976 election of the Parti Québécois, with its nationalistic program calling for the creation of a new Quebec nation, spurred this Quebecois-at-all-cost artistic attitude. However, after the loss of two referendums on the issue of Quebec’s separation, and with the success of artists like Robert Lepage and Denis Marleau and companies like Le Cirque du Soleil and Carbone 14, Quebecois culture has emerged from its nationalistic period and has opened itself to the world in a new way. The fervor and tension born of the separatism issue has nevertheless served to color any discussion concerning the evolution of the translative practice of American plays in Montreal. The issue has deflected attention away from the aesthetic concerns of Quebecois artists as well as the new internationalism that has come to the fore in recent Quebec history.

The works of Annie Brisset and more recently Gilbert David’s article “L’Autre et le même: Théâtre de France et théâtre québécois contemporain” typify the conventional understanding of Quebecois translation. Such scholars champion the assumption that the nationalistic views of the Quebecois artists have proven the base (often exclusive) factor in understanding the cultural transference practices of the last thirty years. While respecting the work and contribution of these scholars, this dissertation develops a different point of view.

Although the socio-political context of recent Quebecois history cannot be ignored, to make it the main or single analytical key concerning the translation of American plays...
in Quebec is a mistake. It is commonly agreed that theatre should speak to its audience, but the way theatre was presented prior to the Quiet Revolution made the experience foreign to most Montreal audience members. Even without the affirmation movement in Quebec, theatre artists would have been compelled to bring translations closer to the language of the Quebecois audience. This was necessary for a number of reasons, including the demand of viable and effective acting. Contingencies of verisimilitude and plausibility made it increasingly difficult for audiences to abide North American characters speaking with a typically French vocabulary. Frequent geographical and contextual mistakes in French translations further distanced and alienated texts from the Quebecois audience. Moreover, the existence of a specific North American French vocabulary, ignored by French translators, created counter-meanings in the translated texts that proved problematic for local production. The “genuineness” of the translated plays was at risk. Consequently, Quebecois translation was a necessity for successful staging in the Quebecois environment. It should thus be acknowledged that the drive to translate in Quebecois, even if fostered by a socio-political context, was chiefly informed by a desire—in both artists and audiences—for verisimilitude and plausibility. The Quebecois translators reappropriated the territoriality of the plays. They also actualized the vocabulary of North American French, something French translators had been unable to achieve. Examples of discrepancies in French translations are numerous: professional baseball teams’ names translated contrary to Quebecois practice (the Boston Red Sox becoming “Les Bas rouges de Boston”); or culinary terms given their proper French name when the English term was currently used in Quebecois (coulis de tomate instead of ketchup). More specifically in
Arthur Miller’s *La Mort d’un commis voyageur*, we find Willy Loman stating that he has driven his car eighty or eighty-two thousand miles. In the French translation, we find:

Willy: Oui, monsieur, cent trente mille au compteur... cent trente-trois mille pour être exact! (Kahane’s translation 14)

In the Quebecois translation, we read:

Willy: Oui, monsieur, quatre-vingt mille milles... quatre-vingt-DEUX mille milles! (Michel Dumont, Marc Grégoire’s translation 7)

While the translations seem equivalent, in these dozen words many differences appear. The most obvious is the transformation of miles into kilometers in the French translation. For the Quebecois audience, Willy Loman in the French translation has not driven his car eighty-two thousand miles but a hundred and thirty-three miles, a point that totally changes the context of his physical and spiritual exhaustion in the play. Also, to add emphasis, the French translator added a “pour être exact” at the end of the line. The Quebecois translators achieved the same effect with fewer words by capitalizing the “DEUX” of eighty-two thousand miles.

Although minute, these differences show that cultural differences transform play translations. Though perhaps slight, these discrepancies show how the French translation became distant from the Quebecois perception of the original play. Early on, it became obvious to the Quebecois artists that it was necessary to repatriate translation if only for clarity sake. This dissertation will attempt to document this feature of Quebecois translation practice by following a historical examination of American plays in Montreal over the last thirty years. It will argue that aesthetic, in conjunction with nationalistic, factors influenced the scope and trajectory of Quebecois translation.
Attempting to analyze all of the translated American plays produced by the professional theatres in Montreal would prove too onerous a task; the dissertation therefore concentrates on the work of Arthur Miller. Miller's work will serve as a test-case for Quebecois translation practices, as the productions of his plays illuminate key features of Quebecois translation history.

The reasons for my choice of Miller are as follows:

1- I have a personal interest in Miller and consider him the best American playwright of the twentieth century. I am fascinated by the way he writes, the way he structures his plays, and the themes he develops in his work as a whole.

2- Miller is the American playwright (Neil Simon excepted) who has been presented and translated the most often in Montreal; this provided me a wide body of material to analyze.

3- Miller's social and political concerns led me to suppose that, in the context of Quebecois political conflict, Miller more than Williams, O'Neill, Simon, Shepard, or Mamet, might be the best playwright to study vis-à-vis an assumed nationalistic agenda of Quebecois theatre artists.

Although the literary aspect of translation is very important, one must bear in mind that translation for the theatre is not merely a linguistic act. Because of its pragmatic and material nature, theatre filters the translated text through various levels of codification that add layers of meaning to the original text. One always has to remember "that translation for the stage borrows means other than those of a purely linguistic translation and that a
real translation takes place on the level of the mise en scène as a whole” (Pavis, Problems 41). This mise en scène is not autonomous and needs to find its roots in the translated text; however, the translated text will also be materialized according to the director’s vision of the play.

Translation at root is a matter of decision-making. The collaborative work between the director and the playwright is replaced by the interplay between the translator and the director. Yet even before the director brings his reading and interpretation to the translated text, “a translation imposes choices—both restrictions and openings—that the translator undertakes necessarily and that are dramaturgical analysis and options of mise en scène” (Pavis, Croisement 145). To be sure, in order to best embrace the aims of the translation and to bring it into stage realization, the director needs to be aware of the choices made by the translator. In the ideal scenario, the translator would be in conversation with the director and aware of the director’s approach so that the production would not work at cross purposes.

Ortrun Zuber addresses these issues and proposes a typology of the translation process. Her work focuses on: “(1) the process of translating the text into the target language and (2) the process of transposing the translated text onto the stage” (Towards a Typology 487). These two axes are at the core of my present research. Priority is not given to the translated text for its literary and linguistic values, although both are

4. To ease the reading flow of the dissertation, short quotes from French texts will be translated directly into English. Longer quotes will be presented in their complete French version followed by their English translation.
important, but to the intentions of the artists (translators, directors, actors) involved in the various productions of Miller's plays in Montreal. This study concentrates on the aims of the creators and what these artists hoped to achieve while presenting Miller's plays to Montreal audiences.

Like Ortrun Zuber, Patrice Pavis outlines some problems specific to theatre translation. He argues that one should get as close as possible to theatre practice when studying the mechanism of cultural transference. He identifies two elements as key when assessing the *mise en scène* in the translation act:

1- In the theatre, the translation reaches the audience by way of the actors' bodies.
2- We cannot simply translate a text linguistically; rather we confront and communicate heterogenous cultures and situations of enunciation that are separated in space and time.

(Pavis, Problems 25)

Strongly anchored in theatre practice, this approach gives a more complete account of what is happening when a translated script is presented to an audience. It considers all the creative agents involved in staging a representation. It also makes clear how translating a foreign play is as much a matter of interpretation and appropriation as that of transmitting the work's dramatic essence. These notions of appropriation and interpretation cannot be ignored. In this model, "the problem of the transference of plays from culture to culture is seen not just as a question of translating the text but of conveying its meaning and adapting it to its new cultural environment so as to create new meanings" (Scolnicov 1). Such newly created meanings are inevitable. Even if the artists involved in the presentation of a translated script claim to respect the original work, the
cultural differences between the original script (and its initial target culture) and its host culture will necessarily bring changes to the meaning of the play when presented before its new audience. These observations indicate how “a specialist in drama translation, like a theatre critic, has to consider the final production of the play” (Zuber-Skerritt, Translation Science 3). This is the path my study follows; it assesses the recent history of Quebecois translation with an eye to the actual mountings of the translated theatrical work.

Ortrun Zuber-Skerritt, in a 1988 article titled “Towards a Typology of Literary Translation: Drama Translation Science,” suggests

Five areas of research for future development in drama translation science. First, there is the study and schematization of production process itself. This process constitutes the transposition from written (translated) drama to the performed work of art. A second area of research might be the influence which certain productions of translated plays have on the playwrights, critics and producers in the target country and on their work. Third, future research might usefully concentrate on translated drama as acted and produced, i.e. as a performing art. To date drama translation scientists have focused their attention mainly on translated drama as the text basis for the stage production, rather than the final performances. A fourth area of research might be the study of a performance of a play in the original language and culture in comparison with that of the same play in the target language and culture. Finally, future research might investigate the complex area of possibilities and determinants of interpretation of a performance. In the past this interpretation was mainly determined by the director/producer and carried out by the actors and designers under his/her supervision. In more recent times, with the permeation of democracy in the theatre, everyone involved in the performance may participate in the action and interpretation of the play, including the audience. (489-490)

Of these five avenues of research three are combined in various degrees in the present study. The first and third are concerned mainly with the stage representation, while the fifth points to an analysis of the mise en scène and all the creators involved in the
collaborative process. The second and fourth avenues are not considered in the present study for the following reasons:

1- In the research process, it was impossible to determine a link between the translation practice and its influence on the evolution of the national theatre in Quebec.

2- To compare original productions with productions of the translated texts would require research more extensive than that suitable for the scope of this study.

Even though Zuber favors the use of video tapes as a source for analyzing theatrical performances, this means of documentation has been dismissed. The plays studied were presented between the early sixties and the early nineties; videotapes were not available for each production. In my study of the stage representations, printed sources have been privileged. For all the productions examined, it was possible to retrieve significant materials such as programs, reviews, and articles published in various newspapers, etc. These documents have provided the basis for an effective analysis of how Miller was appraised and utilized by Montreal theatre companies through this time.

To augment this accumulation of data, eighteen artists involved with the various productions of Miller’s plays were interviewed. We discussed the plays they worked on; they related their opinions on the evolution of American theatre translation in Montreal. These interviews appear toward the end of the dissertation and have been divided according to three categories: the directors of the plays; actors involved in more than one Miller production; and the translators of the plays. Although many of the facts discovered
in the written evidences were corroborated, these interviews provided special insight and contributed to my understanding of the state of translation today. These interviews also gave me a sense of lived-history.

Combining the oral and the written materials, this study offers a picture of how Miller's plays have been produced in Montreal. It is as much a historical picture as a contemporary one. And we can assume with Zuber that "the study and schematization of the production process appears to be not only a worthwhile, but essential research area in drama translation" (Translation Science 10).

My dissertation is concerned with cultural transference. It concentrates on how theater practitioners in Montreal, from the early sixties to the early nineties, worked on and transformed the plays of Arthur Miller. It favors a pragmatic approach based on the archival "traces" left by the various productions of Miller's plays. My assessment of Miller's translations is drawn from newspapers and journals, theatre review sections, the programs printed for each production, the translated texts used for the various productions, and interviews with several theatre artists involved in presenting Miller's plays for the Montreal audience. Miller is discussed as an example that illuminates general changes in translation practices and allows us to theorize about the recent course of Quebecois theatre.

Through the analysis, it will become clear that the socio-political factors of decolonization, nationalism, and cultural identity, although important, did not provide the only motivation for the appropriation of American texts by Quebecois theatre artists. It will be argued that considerations of verisimilitude, plausibility, and audience identification
were at the core of the Quebecois translative approaches. This historical approach will show that pragmatic theatrical decisions (and objectives) by and large informed the appropriation of American plays in Montreal.
PART I
QUEBECOIS TRANSLATION IN CONTEXT

Before examining how Miller's plays were staged for the Montreal audience during the period from the early sixties to the mid-nineties, it is helpful to survey the scholarship on the history of translation in Quebec during that time. It is also useful to consider recent linguistic debates that have taken place (and are still taking place) concerning the use of the Quebeccois language in lieu of a conventional (universal?) French when translating plays for the Montreal audience. These two topics (history and linguistics) will be treated separately in order to show how scholars and commentators have understood the state of translative practice and its evolution in Montreal during the last thirty years. With a general view on how translation evolved in Quebec in mind, it will be easier to put into perspective how the plays of Arthur Miller have been translated during the period under study.
CHAPTER 1
LINGUISTIC AND GEOGRAPHICAL IDENTITY

Although not the main concern of this dissertation, it is impossible to avoid discussing language and its importance in the formation of culture. The field is immense, and it is important to avoid the traps set by the linguists, the anthropologists, the philosophers, the sociologists, and the whole array of scholars who study the influence language has upon culture. It is also important to establish a few principles that will guide my analysis of why French has been abandoned in translations of foreign plays (specifically Arthur Miller's plays) in favor of Quebecois translations.

Using an ethnolinguistic approach to culture, this study holds that "language (understood as unit language-thought) is genetically a social product, it constitutes the reflection of a social and physical milieu historically constituted" (Shaff 126). Two elements of this assumption are useful for the present dissertation: the notion of language-thought and the notion of social and physical milieu historically constituted.

THE NOTION OF LANGUAGE-THOUGHT

A link exists between a spoken tongue and thoughts. This assertion much more than any political factor grounds my discussion on why Montreal theatre artists have used a North American French instead of a European French when translating plays. Without oversimplifying, it can be assumed that a specific way of speaking indicates a specific way of thinking. Since the Quebecois people do not speak like their French European cousins, they do not think in the same manner either. Thus, on the stage, where the sharpness and
clarity of expression are so intimately linked to the accurate portrayal of characters and their inner lives, the need for indigenous translations is especially keen.

This assumption is of capital importance to this study. It is an important indication of the anti-colonialist struggle which has occurred in Quebec. Let us remember that Quebec was “abandoned” by France in 1789. Nevertheless, France and its culture have remained a model for the North American French intelligentsia. So, even as the Quebecois culture and language evolved independently, continental French continued as a referential standard for cultural expression. The tension created by this evolution of a language/culture independent from its French origin (while retaining its attachment to the source culture) has led to a schizophrenia in the language-thought process. This schizophrenia for many years colored the production of translated foreign theatrical works on Montreal stages. Although the French translations in no way sounded like the language heard in the streets of Quebec, the French language was familiar enough to the attending educated public, who believed the translations adequately transmitted the meaning of the play. With the rise of a new intellectual class that questioned the hegemony of French culture, along with the democratization of theatre attendance, the irrelevancies and contradictions in the French translations presented before the Montreal audience were noted and disputed. It rapidly became obvious to the Quebecois artists that French translators, although quite competent at rendering the reality of American life to their fellow European French spectators, were not adept at conveying North American, everyday-life details to the Quebecois audience. Oftentimes misunderstandings in the translations created blatant counter-meanings. In some cases, it became literally
impossible for the Quebecois actors and directors to work from the French translations of foreign and American plays. Confronted with meaningless (or inaccurate) translations from abroad, the Quebecois artists were brought face-to-face with their own Americanity. It soon became clear that they could understand American plays better than the Europeans, because they were North Americans themselves.

THE NOTION OF SOCIAL MILIEU HISTORICALLY CONSTITUTED

Despite their shared history, Quebec is not France. In fact, most of Quebec’s societal organization is structured after either British (political) or American (social) cultural models. Even though Quebec (like Louisiana) has kept the Napoleonic code instead of adopting British common law, the life habits of its citizens are closer to those of its English-speaking neighbors than those of its French ancestors. Although language still keeps France and Quebec close, 200 years of separation have driven the two cultures apart. Thus, given the nature of the theatrical event and its demand for immediacy, French translations have not spoken to the American situation, which seems so familiar to the Quebecois audience, and have been consequently considered inadequate. For Quebecois theatre artists, such translations were seen as inappropriate; they desired Quebecois versions, ones more in touch with the realities of the target audience.

Because the language spoken in France and Quebec is different, inhabitants of the two locales experience different realities, different worlds. Therefore, a French translation, even a very good one, cannot wholly speak to a Quebecois audience because it is describing a reality different from that of its target audience (which has developed a different vision of the world).
In recent years, some scholars have exhibited a tendency to belittle the linguistic differences between French and Quebecois language. They have dismissed the importance of the geographical distance between the two cultures, linking the rise of the Quebecois voice and identity to a political cause. In their view, the use of the Quebecois language has been made to serve the political agenda of the independentist elite and has thus emerged as an "artificial" point of debate. Annie Brisset and Jean-Louis Roux, both quoted in this dissertation, support this interpretation, which according to my argument does not sufficiently address the political and aesthetic realities of Quebecois culture. Language is too deeply rooted in the geography and social habits of a people to be ignored and considered in such a superficial way. Quebecois language is more than a peripheral dialect that takes its source from a predominant tongue, and as a prominent linguist reminds us, "We see, we hear and we experiment as we do, because linguistic habits of our community predispose us to interpretative choices" (Schaff 99).

Stunning discoveries made by researchers like Alfred Tomatis have given physical evidence to support the notion that spoken language differences are rooted in the discrete geographical environments of various cultures. Tomatis, a medical doctor (an ear specialist) uses a compelling metaphor to describe how a language evolves from its geographical setting. For Tomatis, "language is as sensitive as vegetables. It blossoms and evolves according to its own parameters and the milieu in which it grows" (Nous Sommes tous nés 33).

Scholars opposing the use of the Quebecois language argue that it is a regional peculiarity (and thus is flawed). They choose to forget that particularisms and
Regionalisms occur all over the globe, in various contexts. They defend, in the case of the theatre presented in translation in Montreal, the rhythmic and linguistic patterns deeply rooted in the Parisian usage of the French language (and its own particular geographical setting). They ignore that textual meanings might be blurred when such translations are put before a Quebecois audience.

Starting in the late sixties and early seventies, Quebecois translators came to the fore, viewing their task as an exercise in clarification. This work was not an ethnocentric shutting-off of the rest of the world, as assumed by the adversaries of Quebecois translation. Rather, it represented the natural reflex of an emerging nation legitimating its cultural practices in its relationships with the international community.

According to Tomatis:

Il faut savoir désormais que chaque coin du monde a ses propres résonances acoustiques qui induisent des parlers différents et qui animent les mécanismes de créativité. À partir de là, le sens de la liberté de chacun s'exprimant dans sa réalité linguistique permet d'établir une véritable communication entre les gens d'une même région. (Nous Sommes tous nés 43)

One needs to know henceforth that each corner of the world has its own acoustic resonances that induce different speech patterns and that animate the creative mechanisms. From there, the sense of the liberty of every one expressing oneself in its linguistic reality allows the establishment of a real communication between the peoples of a same region. (Nous Sommes tous nés 43)

Accepting this theory evacuates the discussion about the relevance or the necessity of translating plays in Quebecois for the Montreal audience. The translative process, in this light, demands a necessary connection between emotion and identification. In short, for an audience to receive the affective impact of a play, the translation needs to resonate
with the sonorities of the audience's language, rooted in the audience’s geography and culture.

Theatre relies on the immediacy of the communication process. It relies also on identification. The relevance of the language used in a stage production is essential for the creation of this identification and immediacy. From the effective blending of these two elements emerges a sense of verisimilitude that permits the communication between actors and audience. The texture of the words and the accent in which they are spoken work at the core of the theatre event to evoke and convey expected emotive and communicative qualities. As Tomatis reminds us,

Un mot nous fait réagir de différentes manières en fonction de la manière dont il est prononcé, de la nature de celui qui l'exprime, de sa latéralité, du lieu de son émission. Certains mots nous passent au dessus de la tête et nous laissent de marbre, d'autres nous arrivent en plein visage, d'autres encore nous touchent au cœur ou nous coupent les jambes. (Nous Sommes tous nés 65)

A word makes us react in different manners according to the way in which it is pronounced, the nature of who expresses it, its orientation, its source. Some words pass over our head and leave us indifferent, others hit us in the face, others again touch our heart or cut off our legs. (Nous sommes tous nés 65)

Such a recognition and understanding are exactly what resulted when Quebecois theatre artists started translating plays for their audience in a familiar language. Before this practice, the public was able to comprehend the story line and the meaning of a play conveyed by a French translation, but the general reception of the play was cold and distant. With the Quebecois translation, passion was brought into the theatrical staging of the foreign play due to the familiarity of the language used. To concur with this
assessment, which is the cornerstone of my study, one has to accept the view that the Quebecois language, although still loosely structured, is a valuable tongue, one strong enough to carry a culture. It is within this dynamic dissension and debate concerning the appropriation of foreign theatrical texts that my discussion is situated (and must be understood).

In this context, two options, with multiple variations, are open to the Quebecois translator. He can translate a play into standardized French (literary or normative) following all the rules of French usage, or he can use the Quebecois dialect. Since this dialect is not as yet well defined, a plethora of choices is available. Depending on the effect the translator wants to achieve, he can emphasize popular language or regionalism. Although the use of Quebecois language has become the norm in theatre practice, standard French translations still find their way on the local scene, and while many people object to the practice, it still gathers significant support.

A recent letter titled “L’ Accent québécois au théâtre” from a reader of Le Devoir defends the use of standard French on stage and typifies the persisting support of French translation practice. In diatribe fashion, this reader virulently attacks the use of the Quebecois language on stage. He perceives such practice as suspect since, in his estimation, “France fixes the norms of French” (Joly A8). In the imaginary world created by the theater, the spectator, according to this reader, loses contact with the imaginary situation when any local dialect is used:

Le spectateur d’un drame de Tchekhov, à Paris ou à Montréal, se transporte mentalement en Russie, en se pliant à la convention de la traduction: il faut bien que les acteurs disent leur rôle en français pour se
faire comprendre. Mais, si les personnages adoptent l'accent picard, marseillais, martiniquais ou québécois, il naît de là un contresens: ces dictions sont marquées géographiquement, et l'action déménage bizarrement dans une région déterminée de la francophonie. (Joly A 8)

The spectator of a Chekhov play, in Paris or in Montreal, is transported mentally to Russia, by accepting the convention of the translation: it is obviously necessary for the actors to speak their role in French to be understood. But, if the characters adopt the "Picard", "Marseillais", "Martiniquais" or Quebecois accent, a misinterpretation arises: these speeches are geographically tainted, and the action moves peculiarly in a determined region of the "francophonie". (Joly A 8)

This theatregoer develops three arguments against the use of Quebecois language. First, exhibiting a neo-colonialist attitude, he claims the predominance of French culture (from France) over any other culture originating from the French tradition, as if bigger meant better. Joly seems to believe in a language that could exist without any location, connotation, or geographical roots: a French tongue that is universal and neutral.

Second, Joly links Quebec with French regions such as la Martinique, Marseille, and la Picardie. Joly does not offer models like Belgium, Morocco, or l’Île Maurice, which are independent francophone countries. These omissions are not naive; the purpose of the comparison is to diminish Quebec’s stature as the most important enclave of French culture in North America. Comparing it to any region in France deprives Quebec of its political and social importance and belittles its aspirations to cultural independence.

Third, Joly assumes that a jargon (or dialect) is too closely identified with a location. Dialect, therefore, creates too strong a localization-effect, generating counter-meanings when used to appropriate a foreign work (as if a Russian or an American character speaking standardized French would be more plausible than the same character
using a dialect). This attitude, still shared by many in Quebec, tends to create a theatre of high culture, where “proper” means universal and French and “improper” means regional and Quebecois.

The questions and problems of translative process lead to the risk of creating schizophrenic audience members and artists. One justifiably asks where, on the one hand, is the living language of the people, and where, on the other, is the universal (proper?) language of the stage. The danger of an overly formal stage language issues from its consequent distancing from lived daily realities, neutralizing the potential social effect of the theatre on its audience.

This schizophrenia was well described by Jean-Louis Roux in a speech delivered at a dinner of Cité Libre (an important political journal) on April 8, 1993 (Roux, Une charge A-3). On that occasion, Roux exposed how the theatre lacked a rigorous approach to language. He described precisely, although negatively, the realities of Quebecois theatre. According to Roux, when Quebecois audiences are confronted with a French text, a feeling of alienation arises. This is more deeply felt because French words—perceived as an expression of foreignness—are employed in an already alien play. Where Roux sees this as an incapacity to manage the international French language, others see it as an opportunity to free Quebec from linguistic oppression, promising a freedom that affirms the population’s sense of self, and creating a sense of recognition between the spectator and the translated foreign work (Régime A7).

Linguistic choices are still perceived as political choices. In the 1990s, one still finds it impossible to avoid the two dangers of assimilation facing Quebec: (1) Quebec can
stay culturally close to France and be condemned to be a carbon copy of European French culture; (2) on the other hand, having such a small population (a little over six million French speaking people), Quebec is always threatened by Anglo-American assimilation. This is why Roux’s detractors see the affirmation of the Quebecois language as coincident with the social and political affirmation of Quebec itself.

Roux himself notes the forces that have led to the need for Quebecois language in the theatre. Not without contempt, he admits:

Le phénomène a été jusqu’à un point essentiel . . . Il a agi comme une sorte d’exorcisme dans ce sens que les mal parlants osaient mal parler, s’afficher avec la fierté d’une langue qui portait les cicatrices des coups et blessures de deux siècles de colonialisme et de discrimination. (Charge A-3)

The phenomenon has been essential up to a point . . . It has acted as a sort of exorcism in the way the ill spoken dared speak badly, showing themselves with pride when using that scarred language, knocked and injured by two centuries of colonialism and discrimination. (Charge A-3)

Instead of seeing the positive effects of this exorcism, he holds an apocalyptic vision of its consequences. He goes so far as to claim that the defenders of the Quebecois language are accelerating the English assimilation process: “Speaking such a language, they marginalize themselves and they hasten the moment we will only speak English in North America” (Régime A-7). Jean-Louis Roux displays the attitude of an adult who after a recess returns to find teenagers having fun. He wants to bring the frivolity to an end.

Concerning the language Michel Tremblay has used in his plays and novels, which is still the model for translation in Quebecois, Roux suggests that “we need to snap out of it, now” (Charge A-3).
The defenders of the Quebecois language and its detractors have recently found new ground for this confrontation. In November 1992, the *Dictionnaire québécois d'aujourd'hui* was released by the French publisher Robert, causing a great debate about the legitimacy of the Quebecois language. In numerous pro and con articles, newspapers gave much attention to the status given to the spoken tongue of Quebec by a serious dictionary.

In her 1992 article, Paule des Rivières summarized the various points of view concerning the pro-universal French camp and the pro-Quebecois language faction. She quoted three writers: André Major, Michel Tremblay, and Gilles Vigneault.

Major, a strong opponent to the dictionary, states in the article that

*Au-delà de la langue, ou plutôt au travers elle, c'est une crise profonde qui se trouve ainsi dévoilée: celle d'un peuple victime d'une sorte d'anémie culturelle et qui faute d'affirmer autrement sa différence, se replie sur l'infantile: *Dis-le dans tes mots, maman va comprendre...* (Deux camps B-4)

Beyond language, or rather through it, a deep crisis is unveiled: that of a people victim of a cultural anaemia of sort and that for lack of otherwise asserting its difference, withdraws on the infantile: *Say it in your own words, mommy is gonna understand...* (Deux camps B-4)

Major believes that the use of Quebecois language offers only a limited capacity for the populace's self-expression. He correctly identifies the desire for a national language in Quebecois as a quest for identity but finds the means futile and reductive. He takes the side of the defenders of French universality and defends the discipline needed to develop correct skills in learning to use a strong linguistic tool.
In the same article, Michel Tremblay defends the dictionary and introduces the question of class-consciousness. In the resistance to the dictionary Tremblay sees the bourgeoisie attempting to reclaim its elitist power. To go back to the recess metaphor, one observes Tremblay wanting more than ever for the Quebecois culture to play “outside.” He strongly feels that

Les opposants (au dictionnaire) font beaucoup de bruit pour rien. Mais les tenants du bon parler français, qui à mon avis est éminemment bourgeois, ne lâchent pas prise. Ils ont peur lorsqu’ils voient un nouveau mot. Toute cette notion du bon français renvoie à une élite qui veut imposer une belle langue et ça me fait suer profondément. (Deux camps B-4)

The opponents (to the dictionary) make a lot of noise for nothing. But champions of the well spoken French, who are I think eminently bourgeois, do not let go. They are frightened when they see a new word. All this notion of good French brings us back to an elite which wants to impose a beautiful tongue and that makes me sweat a lot. (Deux camps B-4)

There is a certain annoyed tone in Tremblay’s argument. He is chagrined that the struggle for a linguistic identity, which he himself helped to bring to the forefront of Quebecois consciousness, has never been regarded in a positive light, as if the Quebecois language could never escape its pejorative connotation as jargon or regionalist practice.

Gilles Vigneault goes beyond Tremblay’s position. With a poetic bent, he claims that “the dictionary seems to me a tree nursery and each word a rooting place in the real country’s humus” (Deux camps B-4). For Vigneault, who has been nurturing regionalisms throughout his poetic and singing career, it is quite obvious that the only way for a people to express itself is through its own texturing of language.

From Vigneault’s perspective, the Quebecois language is already a reality and an accepted fact. It is the language of the people of Quebec. It is the language of everyday
life exchanges. Even if it has ties to France, it has North American ramifications and a life of its own. Vigneault declares: “The spoken tongue of Quebec’s vast majority of the population is Quebecois and not French . . . The Quebecois people has built on a French grammatical and syntactic basis a particular speech, vivid and colored and which first quality is to be utilitarian” (O’Neil B 3).

Vigneault’s utilitarian approach assumes that the Quebecois language, in its Americanity, is much more suitable for the North American French population than French from France. Such a view justifies the translation and adaptation of foreign texts into Quebecois. This is the view held by the Quebecois theatre artists when working on foreign plays.

Still, resisting the blossoming of the Quebecois language, there is the resurgence of a nostalgia for the well-spoken, well-written French of the past. The movement is strong enough to be virulently attacked by those who defend Quebecois speech in everyday life and in literature. The contest is essentially an ongoing battle between high and low culture. O’Neill writes:

Les critères du bon parler, selon les normes du français international, telles qu'établies par un groupe élitiste très fortement minoritaire au Québec, groupe dit de la nouvelle droite culturelle, ne tiennent pas compte de la réalité et du vécu de madame et de monsieur-tout-le-monde. (B 3)

The criteria of the well spoken language, following the international French norms, as established by an elitist group very strongly in minority in Quebec, group designated as the new cultural right, do not take into account the reality and life of everyday people. (B 3)

In this light, defending international French represents a conservative action. Those advocating change argue that language (and literature and art) needs to stay close to the
people of a given culture as that culture advances. This argument will be used prominently by the defenders of Quebecois translation for the theatre.

Theatre, being a popular art, seeks to reach the widest audience possible, a feature that justifies the Quebec's rejection of the standard French language, which according to O'Neill is no more than "big words told with a rhythm and a musicality that are completely foreign to us" (B 3). More than any other facet (be it grammatical, syntactical, or orthographical), this notion of foreign rhythms and musicality occupies the mind of the Quebecois translator. It is at the core of the theatrical work. If the audience does not respond instinctively to the musicality and rhythm of the production, the communication is cold and arid. If the translator wants to touch the audience, he has to take into account the rhythm and musicality of the language. Those qualities, it is argued, are more enhanced when vernacular language is used, not formal literary expression. This demand of the theatre gives translators in Quebec the permission and authority to translate in Quebecois.

The preceding discussion shows the difficulty of the choices facing the Quebecois translators. Caught in a struggle for national identity, the translator recognizes that his grammatical and semantical choices cannot be neutral. His translation will always be read within the nationalist Quebecois point of view; nevertheless, at the same time aesthetic constraints of verisimilitude and plausibility will be at stake. It is necessary for the reader to keep this situation in mind when considering the evolution of Miller's plays in translation in Montreal.
CHAPTER 2

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THEATRE TRANSLATION IN QUEBEC

Most of the work done on the evolution of translative practices in Quebec assumes that the main impetus for change has been socio-political in nature. Scholars have focused chiefly on the nationalistic aspirations of Quebec's society as the primary factor in the evolution of translative practices. Although reductive, this approach still dominates scholarship now as it has for the last thirty years. The prevalence of this approach speaks to its importance. However, this approach does not exhaust our understanding of how the evolution of Quebecois translation has progressed. This dissertation will thus note and examine the assumptions of this scholarship; the study will also introduce the views and visions of the artists involved in the actual production of translated plays. Discussion will consequently focus on the demands and rigor of the theatre event and the interactive relationship of the actor and audience in the performance moment.

Quebecois artists and scholars generally identify three periods in the evolution of appropriating foreign texts. The first period includes all foreign plays presented on the Quebecois stage before 1968. During that period, all foreign plays mounted in Montreal were presented in their European French (Parisian) translation. The year 1968 represents a somewhat magical date. It is the year when Michel Tremblay's play Les Belles-soeurs was first produced. This play, written in "Joual,"\(^5\) was regarded by theatregoers as a revolutionary event. For the first time in the legitimate professional theatre in Montreal,  

\(^{5}\) Joual is the dialect talked by the working class of Montreal. It could be compared to the British cockney or the American slang.
the language of the people was spoken on stage. Even though this “history” is not totally accurate (as we will discuss in the next chapter), the staging of the play was important enough to generate a wide-spread movement of national affirmation in the theatre. That movement influenced the form and complexion of original plays as well as translations of foreign works.

The second period falls between the first presentation of Les Belles-soeurs and the Parti Québécois loss on the referendum concerning the independence of Quebec in 1980. This period was characterized by a very strong impetus toward nationalistic affirmation. The Quebecois drama freed itself from its traditional French constraints and developed its own sense of identity. Translative practice followed the same pattern. Foreign plays were translated in Quebec and put forward in a Quebecois dialect. The practice of that time was fueled by an appropriation-at-all-cost attitude.

The importance of this second period can be questioned. It is often approached as if the Quebecois language had never been heard on stage before a point that is not based in fact. This view also assumes that French translations were rarely presented on the Montreal stage during the period; this too is false, as the history of the translation of the Arthur Miller’s work will show. The strongly independentist tone of the period has lead Quebecois scholars to overlook and minimize various key elements involved in the translative process, such as the matters of Americanity, identification and verisimilitude.

The third period extends from 1980 to the present. It has been a period of open-mindedness toward the world. Having gone through a period of struggle to assert themselves and having lost the dream of founding a new French Nation in North America,
Quebecois theatre artists have stopped being so self-absorbed and have begun looking to international horizons. They have found a new sense of identity as international artists (mainly through international festivals). Quebecois translative practice has become well established. Some excesses of the identification period have, however, been questioned. The necessity of translating in Quebec remains, but the level of the language to be used has become a matter of debate. Artists have explored the possibility of an international instead of a regional translation. Translating has ceased to be a tool for national definition. It is now regarded as an invitation to visit a foreign work and to gain access to the culture it represents.

PLAYS IN TRANSLATION BEFORE 1968

Before 1968, foreign plays brought to Montreal’s audiences were always produced in their European French translation. Actors and directors of that time had mainly been trained in France or in Quebec by French actors. The artistic models advocated followed Copeau’s, Dullin’s, Jouvet’s and Pitoeff’s views of the theatre. To Montreal theatre artists, success was gained only when audiences felt that the show they had witnessed was as good as a Parisian one. The local theatre milieu of that time took the posture of a colonized subject, fearful of the master’s disapproval. Following the push for independence in the political arena, accompanied by the development of a strong Quebecois literature rooted in the realities of everyday life, a shift in translation practices occurred. Theatre companies became aware that it was increasingly difficult to present in some truthful way texts whose language did not seem connected with the evolution and development of a strong nationalist drama. A malaise set in. With the 1968 presentation
of Michel Tremblay’s play *Les Belles-soeurs*, the Montreal theatre-going audience underwent a transformation and wished to find a life on stage they could recognize as their own. At this point, an American play presented in a Parisian argot or a geographically neutral literary French became unacceptable. Such a translation created an alienating effect. That impression was much more strongly felt with American plays than with other foreign works. The territorial proximity of the U.S. and the Quebecois audience’s familiarity with American culture brought every mistake, flaw and counter-meaning generated by the French translators to light. French translations often generated “gross misinterpretations resulting from a lack of knowledge of American idioms” (Delisle 3).

While not everyone agreed that translation in Quebecois should be the rule (and French translations continued to be used), as of 1968 translating foreign plays into Quebecois became the norm.

**PLAYS IN TRANSLATION BETWEEN 1968 AND 1980**

Although we can assume that French translators were producing good translations for their French audiences, their work was in the 1970s not seen as pertinent for the Quebecois public. This suggests that theatre-going had ceased to be understood by Montreal audience as merely an expedition into high culture—a quest for beauty removed from life—and had started to become a vehicle for collective identification, that is, one stopped going to the theatre to see others and began to look for the self in the theatrical representation. In this context, the translation conventions (imported from France) prominent in the fifties and the sixties became obsolete. The audience as well as the theatre practitioners began to expect that “not only the meaning of a word or sentence
must be translated, but also the connotations, rhythm, tone and rhetorical level, imagery and symbols of association” (Zuber, Problems 92). It was then felt that the viability of these elements could only be guaranteed through indigenous translative practice. Although driven by a political context, the rational for such an attitude was highly practical. Informed by pragmatics of theatre-making.

Given that “a play is dependent on the immediacy of the impact on the audience” (Zuber, Problems 92), European French translations seemed remote to Quebecois audiences. Understanding that the “reality” was not coming through, Quebecois theatre artists took upon themselves the task of translating foreign plays. They became adamant in this task and felt particularly free to appropriate American drama. In actuality, Quebecois artists had for some time “corrected” what was in their views the most obvious mistranslations in French adaptations. Putting the French translations aside thus seemed natural and legitimate when they began translating from the original source text. In fact, what the Quebecois translators undertook was what the French translators had done for quite some time, that is:

to transpose the play in such a manner, that the message of the original and the dramatist's intention be adhered to as closely as possible and be rendered, linguistically and artistically, into a form which takes into account the different traditional, cultural and socio-political background of the recipient country. (Zuber, Problems 95)

While the Quebecois audience had long been exposed to translations designed for a French European audience, more texts appeared on Montreal stages translated for a North American French audience. This shift made the relation between the characters and audiences of the plays more intimate. This practice increased the significance of the staged
plays, clarifying the subtexts while at the same time eliminating the linguistic irritants always present in French translations. Staging an American play in Montreal was no longer the matter of putting forward the French version of a story set in the U.S.; it became “the process of transposing the translated text into a speakable and actable performance, including the translation of nonverbal signs” (Towards a Typology 490) suitable for the Quebecois audience.

During this period, excesses were committed, and translations often became adaptations. Using the local language, translators were tempted to change the location of plays to make them fit the Quebecois dialect. Translators adapting Neil Simon plays, for instance, often moved the setting from New York to Montreal. One of the most extreme examples of adaptation occurred with Robert Lalonde’s version of Chekhov’s Three Sisters, where the play was set in a region in Northern Quebec and the sisters dreamed of moving to Montreal.

It is also important to note that the Quebecois translations practices were not standardized. Analysts of the period found it difficult to define how foreign works were transposed. Various terms were used to explain the practices of the period: “translation, adaptation, version, paraphrase, transtranslation, and (we are tempted to add) treason” (Lefebvre, L’Adaptation théâtrale 32). Certain concerns were raised at the time regarding the translator’s faithfulness to the original text. However, liberal translative approaches still prevailed. Behind such efforts was the quest to regenerate the contact between the Quebecois audience and its theatre artists through the vehicle of foreign plays. In essence,
translation became a means for the community (Quebec) to express and recognize itself through another.

That attitude allowed the translators of the 1970s a great deal of freedom. Arguing truthfulness to the spirit of the source text, they often changed the location, period, and sometimes the situation of the play. Although the intention was to transmit the play as precisely as possible, the desire for the comprehension of the work by the target audience was prioritized. The work of the foreign playwright was to be respected, but it had to be made suitable for its new audience. As Jean Delisle explains: "Any adaptation is made on behalf of authenticity, respect for the spirit of the work, the preservation of its original flavor but also, and perhaps especially, on behalf of the public to which the adaptation is directed" (6). Therefore, the key determinant of a successful translation was its effectiveness with the audience. In other words, the effectively translated play was one with which the Quebecois audience in search of itself could identify.

The wide range of approaches permitted a new attitude toward foreign plays. The referential culture was no longer that of European French; it was that of North American French. This shift permitted the development of an approach defined by three elements, three operating principles linked to the translation/adaptation practices of the seventies:

1- The translator should not be faithful to the words but to the spirit of the play. (Lefebvre, L’Adaptation théâtrale 43)
2- The translator should not only be faithful to the spirit of the play, but he must take into account the relationship uniting the play and the public.

(Lefebvre, L’Adaptation théâtrale 44)

3- To keep in a play the same text/audience connection, it is necessary, if popular language is used, that it be the audience’s. (Lefebvre, L’Adaptation théâtrale 45)

Point one justifies the great freedom claimed by the translators when confronted with foreign plays. With point two, the translator could dismiss the use of the traditional French language. Since the European French translators were not in rapport with the Montreal audiences, they could not speak effectively to the Quebecois public. Quebecois translators, who were assumed to be more in touch with the Quebecois spectators, were thus endowed with new authority. Finally, with point three, the use of popular language in the translation of foreign plays was justified. That attitude, although generally recognized in most countries, was still revolutionary in the Montreal theatre milieu of that period. For the first time, what was translated in a stage work was “first and above all the emotions, the dramatic force of the work, in a nutshell, its theatricality” (Delisle 5). Such an attitude gave priority to the emotions. It also emphasized the necessity of conveying the theatricality of the work translated for the target audience. The translators/adaptors claimed a freedom from the source text, the right to transmit the drama as a whole, in its social, poetical, and theatrical entirety. Such practice served to give back to the theatre its social role, that of speaking to the social concerns of the audience. Foreign theatre then
found an intimacy with the Montreal audience not experienced when European translations were used. Here again we note, not a political but a theatrical argument.

Of all the plays translated in Quebec during that period, the American repertoire proved dominant. Works written by O'Neill, Miller, Williams, Mamet, Shepard, and less popular playwrights easily withstood the translation into “Joual.” This success was in part due to what Annie Brisset noted as the “socio-cultural affinity the public feels regarding their themes and the language that they use” (Vive 10). For Brisset, “translation announces itself as a *reterritorialisation* that will annex the foreign work to the host society” (Vive 10). In essence, the foreign work became Quebecois. The American texts were made relevant to the Quebecois culture by translative choices. Such efforts gave the aspirations of the Quebecois people a legitimacy. Canons of international and American dramaturgy served “the mission to legitimate the Quebecois as national language.” Brisset emphasizes this point: “we charge them also to reflect the life of the public that speaks such language” (Vive 10). The vitality of the translation and its sense of closeness were wrongly linked to the political agenda of the artists involved in the translative process. This political analysis is reductive. Beyond the quest for national identity, artists exhibited a will to make American drama more effective, that is more accessible and relevant for the Quebecois audience. This quest more than nationalism (although the two feed one on another), distinguishes the period and informs the aims of translation practice during the time.

By the end of the 1970s and the early 1980s, the adaptation practices by which foreign plays were transformed to fit the Quebecois context were deemed dangerous. This
sort of criticism reflects how Quebecois language, because of its dialectal status, was perceived as geographically rooted. Therefore, it was assumed that a person speaking Quebecois could not portray a character from any geographic origin but Quebec. Thus, this limitation made it necessary to transfer the location of the translated play to Quebec, which was obviously restrictive. Lefebvre relates:

Une certaine catégorie de spectateurs et de traducteurs/adaptateurs semblent bloqués en entendant un dialogue en québécois dans une pièce dont l'action se situe dans un autre pays. C'est donc qu'ils considèrent leur langue comme incapable de traduire un langage étranger de niveau équivalent. On a là une étonnante relique d'un colonialisme culturel. (Lefebvre, L'Adaptation théâtrale 46-47)

A certain kind of spectators and translators/adaptors seem stunned by hearing a dialogue in Quebecois in a play in which the action is situated in another country. It is because they consider their tongue incapable of translating a foreign language on an equivalent level. We have here a surprising relic of cultural colonialism. (Lefebvre, L'Adaptation théâtrale 46-47)

To conclude, the will to translate and to translate only in Quebecois became a tool of social affirmation but also of theatrical development. Quebecois became a language capable of transmitting complex realities, a language as versatile and as rich as the French used in the European translations; it as well could express levels of social status and modes of reality drawn from any foreign culture. The goal of the translation/adaptation practice of the seventies was thus to elevate Quebecois language, its culture, and the sense of audience pride; it also, on most fundamental level, aimed to render the theatrical event more effective, capable of bringing foreign realities to accurate life on stage.
PLAYS IN TRANSLATION FROM THE 1980s UNTIL NOW

A danger exists when translating foreign plays with the intention of bringing the works close to the target audience. The text can be adapted so closely to the new culture that it loses its original qualities. Although true of any translation, this situation was sharply felt in the theatre community of the early 1980s. When translating American plays for a Quebecois audience, if the translator is not prudent with retaining what is American in the fabric of the play, many particularities may be lost. This is the very practice the French were accused of following with their translations of American plays.

Although Quebec culture and American culture are close in nature, geographically and socially, a myriad of differences exist between the two. Religious, economic, and historical differences distinguish the cultures, and a translator must certainly keep these variances in mind if he wants the translation to stay faithful to the original.

Translation at root represents a dialogue between two cultures. When an indigenous language is used in translation the audience gains contact with a foreign culture. In that process, the translator must nevertheless be cautious. If this familiarity erases too much of the source culture's distinctiveness, the theatrical experience may be impoverished. Gershon Shaked writes:

Cultural awareness therefore implies a dialogue in which one acknowledges what is different and struggles over what is similar. This is the principal process of grappling with any foreign text, and in this lies the enormous power of the theatre, which possesses extra-textual resources permitting it to emphasize the similarity of what is different without foregoing the differentness.

Anyone pretending to have completely deciphered the alien simply does not acknowledge its strangeness and differentness. On another hand, anyone closing himself off from the possibility of approaching what is alien
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remains shut up within his own four walls. He is unable to compare his world with others, enriching it by a constant process of analogy and metaphorization between himself and his fellow man outside himself. The function of every theatre, and of the director as an intermediary, is to preserve that balance between bringing foreign cultures closer and preserving their identity. (14)

This going back and forth between the source and host cultures gives a translated text its strength and fascination. It creates a significant communicative network between the playwright (through the translator) and the audience. In this light, “the encoded message is seen as existing in a never-ending dynamic relationship with the audience” (Fotheringham 33). In Quebecois theatre, this dynamic could not exist, at least not as forcefully as it does now, when the translated texts came from France. The cultural differences, not to mention the language, were so great between European and North American culture that French translations diminished any real communication between the American playwrights and the Quebecois audience. The audience thus felt alienated from the core of the American work. Since “we decode messages not according to individual but culturally based codes and conventions” (Fotheringham 35), the French encoding and inflections blurred the reception of American plays, rendering in fact the experience of the play’s Americanness neutral. That was, of course, before Quebecois translators and adaptors took the matter in their own hands. And, following the phase in which translation was perceived as chiefly a tool for the affirmation of a Quebecois identity, theatre translation has become a means of moving Quebec toward other cultures, a tool to open Quebecois culture to the world.
Through the 1980s and 1990s, adaptation fell out of favor with Quebecois artists. Distancing itself from the “Joual,” Quebecois language found a wider expressive potential. Limiting language too restrictively by geographical location was seen as futile. It consequently became possible to use the Quebecois language “without in any way transplanting German or English characters in Mauricie”6 (Denis 9). But it took almost twenty years of translation maturity before Quebec could arrive at this point. During recent years, something of a coherent and consistent practice has emerged. Translators have realized that between the street language (Joual), regarded as the base for the Quebecois dialect, and the elevated form of literary French, considered as the standard translative language in France, there may be several levels of language available to translators, all forms of expression respectful of the North American Francophone practice.

It is now held that a faithfulness to the original work cannot be assured in the adaptation process. Some observers have become suspicious of a “too familiar” language, and we thus note how the excesses of the 1970s have generated a new conservative position in the politics of translative practice. A move back to a more traditional approach to translation (although still using Quebec language) has become the norm. Such a move represents

une nouvelle approche plus respectueuse de l’Autre. Il ne s’agit plus uniquement de s’approprier [la part de l’autre], le discours de l’étranger, d’usurper son identité, mais bien plutôt de reconnaître sa différence

6. La Mauricie is a region North of Trois-Rivières in central Quebec.
radicale, inaliénable, d’approcher au plus près, de chercher à transmettre son essence propre. (Lavoie, Traduction théâtrale 8)

a new approach, more respectful of the other. It is no longer a question solely of appropriating [the essence of the other], the stranger’s discourse, of usurping its identity, but rather to recognize its radical inalienable difference, to approach as close as possible, to seek to transmit its own essence. (Lavoie, Traduction théâtrale 8)

This approach cannot be linked to the situation that prevailed in the 1960s. Even if the language is less popular than in the 1970s, it is still rooted in the Americanity of the Quebecois culture. It is far from the foreignness created by the French translations of the long gone past.

The evolution of translation practice has led to an optimistic stance where the translator has become “rather open to the juxtaposition of two worlds” (Lavoie, Traduction théâtrale 8). This signals quite a switch from what was sometimes happening in the 1970s, when Quebecois translation “instead of revealing the foreign work, charged the former to proclaim the Quebecois existence” (Brisset, Ceci n’est pas 13). In the new context, Quebecois culture has become mature and self-assured. Foreign works can now exist for themselves, outside of a nationalistic identification process. As Annie Brisset has explained in a debate, “the translation loses its specular and reterritorializing function” (Sixièmes Assises 47).

In examining the changes that have occurred in the translative practice since 1965, one cannot help but recognize the fluid nature of translation. Before 1968, the French version of a work was the only version considered stage-worthy; this has changed. Translation is now highlighted in its dynamic aspects, linked to the place and time of its
presentation. Consequently, former translations can become outdated and outmoded. Permission is now given to the translator to re-read the foreign play with each new production. He can define its relevance at the moment of its staging with the director's vision and the actors' perceptions in mind. The translator is now part of an artistic team, and he can adjust his work to the situation of each new creative collaboration.

During this evolution, importantly, the Quebecois language has achieved a new status, a new versatility, capable of transmitting all the nuances of any source language, respectful enough to always "render as precisely as possible the tongue of the source-text" (Denis 17). The Quebecois language now enjoys a trust with the source-text; it can carry the texts meaning, form, and style. Quebecois translators have thus found a confidence both in language and in themselves, one that permits them to respect the internal structure of the source-text. The audience, therefore, experiences not so much a Quebecois version of the foreign text and but a foreign text acted in Quebecois.

Although it would be unwise to ignore the political realities of Quebec from the 1970s through the 1990s, the second part of this dissertation will argue that theatrical necessities (mainly those of verisimilitude and plausibility) were far more important than a political agenda in the transformation of translative practice in Montreal. This point will be demonstrated in the work of Arthur Miller.

His plays have been presented mainly during the first and third periods of Quebecois recent translation history, a point that shows the dubiousness of the traditional divisions (the three translative periods) that have dominated scholarly discussion of the subject. Miller's work in Quebec, as we will see, demonstrates that adaptations of
American plays were evident prior to the beginning of the second period. It also shows that the use of a French translation for an American play occurred as late as 1975, a fact that challenges the traditional view that all theatrical presentations of the period were inspired by the Quebecois political struggle of the time.

It is telling that Miller's plays were never adapted to the Quebecois setting. The translators were compelled to keep Miller's plays in their original setting, proving that the strength and structure of his work were regarded as resilient enough to resist adaptation. Translations of his plays have indeed maintained the duality between the familiar and the foreign in the translating process, a feature that argues that Quebecois theatrical artists have always been more concerned with the theatrical transfer of a work (from a source culture to a target culture) than with any political appropriation at-all-cost agenda.
CHAPTER 3

A LONG HABIT OF APPROPRIATION

Before examining how Arthur Miller’s work was appropriated by Quebecois artists, it is necessary to have a closer look at the historical realities of appropriation in Quebec. This outlook will show how, outside of political circumstances, Quebecois appropriation has been an active artistic practice over a long period of time. It will also show how Quebecois life is rooted in an Americanity that permits Quebecois translations of American texts to be more accurate than French translations.

The people of the province of Quebec, although proud of their French roots, are conscious of their geographical realities. Being a minority of a little more than six million francophones on a continent inhabited by close to two hundred and twenty million anglophones, the Quebec population has often found its lifestyle stigmatized. Since the Quiet Revolution, which initiated Quebec’s modernization in the 1960s and concluded with the questioning of the movement’s accomplishments at the beginning of the 1980s (Linteau et al. 421-423), the Quebecois mind-set and lifestyle have moved unceasingly closer to that of its neighbors to the south. With urbanization and suburbanization, Quebecois culture, mainly evident in the larger cities, has become more Americanized. With the use of cars, the development of highways, the adoption of fast-food chains, and the abandonment of the Catholic religion, the Quebecois outlook has drawn near to an American perspective and value-system.

Although the Americanization of Quebec is present in all spheres of activities, its effects have been felt more strongly in the cultural domain.
La Révolution tranquille crée plus que jamais un climat propice au rejet des modèles traditionnels et à l'adoption de nouvelles pratiques de consommation culturelle, où l'influence des États-Unis joue un rôle déterminant. (Linteau et al. 751)

The Quiet Revolution creates more than ever a propitious climate for the rejection of traditional models and the adoption of new practices of cultural consumption, where the U.S. influence plays a determining role. (Linteau et al. 751)

In Quebec, this Americanization has, however, not led to anglicization. In fact, linguistic laws and the extent of the French population (in a proportion of six to one over the English) have led to widespread appropriation practices toward the American culture. There is a tradition of adapting American material in Quebec, a remarkable one that speaks to the will of survival of the French language in North America. In short, as will be shown when we turn to Miller's work, the Quebecois are assimilating American culture while keeping and developing their own.

There are three cultural fields where this assimilation of American material has been obvious: in popular music, television programming, and the burlesque theatre.

Americans are often fascinated when they hear a popular rock song in Japanese, Italian, or Spanish. This for the Quebecois is quite normal. In the Quebec of the 1960s, "half to three quarter of the hit parade songs were translations [in fact we should say adaptations] of American songs" (Paquin 14). French-Canadian versions of American hits were so popular, and interpreters, who had generally translated the songs themselves, were so comfortable with the material that the appropriation seemed natural. In fact, the Quebecois audience member of today may be surprised to learn that a hit of his youth was indeed an American song. This situation, perceived by some as an obstruction to the
development of an indigenous music, has also been praised as a catalyst for the recording industry, which was still embryonic in the 1960s. But the most revealing comment on the usefulness of the translation of American songs in Québécois may come from Denise Meloche, the “chef de répertoire” at la Société des droits d’exécution du Canada (SDE), who in 1986 explained: “It was a way to make the French speaking audience appreciate the American and the English music” (Paquin 14). Significantly, this observation does not search for a political or a social cause to justify the process of translation. Meloche appeals to an artistic impulse, a wish to make the music available. This sort of musical borrowing is useful for the topic at hand. Can it be that—notwithstanding any political, cultural or social agendas—artists working on American material may simply wish to share a passion? Can it be that they want to bring to audiences, who are not fluent in English, something of the Americanity they share (outside of language) with the rest of North America? Is it that, through the work of American artists, Québecois artists are evolving toward a new maturity? Can we find in Miller’s work in Montreal the same passion to share an American artwork with the Québecois audience?

Another cultural field where borrowing from the Americans has been considerable is television. Ever since the advent of television in the 1950s, American shows in French versions have been broadcasted on the various French channels and networks. From Father Knows Best, to Dragnet, to I Dream of Jeannie, to Batman, to the most recent Colombo, Dallas, or Doogy Houser M.D., (even Baywatch and Seinfeld), the American world view has been introduced into Québecois living rooms. Even the afternoon soaps are now translated for Québecois audience consumption. Television has also brought
most of the American feature films to the French-speaking audiences of Quebec. And now, pay-TV in French, with its penchant for new releases, makes accessible almost any movie produced in the U.S. There has been a reign of popularity for American game shows. Quebecois adaptations of *The Price is Right* and *Family Feud* have been watched by multitudes of viewers at dinner time. Obviously, Quebecois television programmers are saving money. Translating an episode of *The Simpsons* costs less than producing an original Quebecois cartoon. Nonetheless, the interest of the Quebecois audiences in American TV, and American culture at large, justifies the abundance of American programming.

Although the Quebecois appropriation witnessed in television and in recording indicates a long-standing habit of consuming American culture, it does not explain why it has been possible for theatre artists in Quebec to break free of the French (from France) influence. How has it been possible to develop a Quebecois mentality that is in touch with American culture? During the sixties, in songs and on television, language followed a normative pattern and stayed close to an international French standard; in theatre, however, the language of the stage had been closer to the popular linguistic habits of the people. As will be shown with Miller's work, even when French translations were used on the Montreal stage, the language and accent of the characters were transformed by the actors to suit the audience ear. This difference is clearly seen in the conventions of live theatre events, mainly in the traditional performances of the burlesque shows.
The burlesque spectacular tradition evinced a tolerance for jargon and vernacular language that long predates the revolutionary presentation of Les Belles-soeurs in 1968. Jean-Cléo Godin relates:

Le public des années 40 a préféré au “grand” répertoire, perçu comme le véhicule d'une langue et d'une culture étrangère [sic] la saveur et la spontanéité de ses mots de tous les jours, comme s'il s'identifiait plus volontiers aux Baptiste et Catherine de son terroir qu'à tous les comtes, bourgeois et femmes du grand monde. (qtd in Hébert, Sur le burlesque 31)

The public of the 40's has preferred to the “grand” repertory, perceived as the vehicle of a language and a foreign culture [sic] the flavor and the spontaneity of its everyday words, as if it identified more easily with the Baptistes and Catherine of its roots than to all counts, bourgeois and women of the high society. (qtd in Hébert, Sur le burlesque 31)

This observation of Jean-Cléo Godin highlights the dichotomy between high and low culture that has long existed in the Quebecois theatre. While there was a literary theatre imported from France (including the translations of the international and American repertoire) which attracted the educated elite, there was also, starting in the twenties, a popular theatre rooted in the American Burlesque tradition, an art that held no literary pretensions and readily made itself available to the tastes of the uneducated population. This form's success, depending largely on the bond of identification established between its audience and its répertoire, developed from an oral tradition. According to Chantal Hébert:

Plusieurs des "bits" et des grandes comédies jouées au Québec furent donc des traductions ou des adaptations de pièces américaines . . . le travail de répétition commençait en même temps que celui de métamorphose plus ou moins partielle du canevas. Les acteurs improvisaient à partir de gags retenus lors de la lecture de la pièce, en personnalisant les canevas et en les ajustant au public québécois. C'est ainsi que durant les répétitions et
pendant cinquante ans, ce répertoire d'origine américaine s'est transmis chez
nous, de bouche à oreille, d'une génération de comédiens à une autre. (Sur le burlesque 26)

Several of the bits and the great comedies played in Quebec were therefore
translations or American plays adaptations . . . the rehearsal work began at
the same time as the more or less partial metamorphosis of the canvas.
Actors improvised from gags retained during the reading of the play, by
personalizing canvas and by adjusting them to the Quebecois public. Thus,
during rehearsals and during fifty years, this American repertory was
transmitted to us, orally, from a generation of actors to another. (Sur le
burlesque 26)

This habit of appropriating American material may presage (and explain on some
level) the importance American drama will assume in the Quebecois répertoire of the
seventies, eighties and nineties. It may also illuminate the liberty taken by the translator in
transposing source material so as to maximize its appeal for the Quebecois audience.

We may therefore assert that the practice of appropriating the American repertoire
for the Quebecois stage was established long before the period studied in the dissertation.
However, prior to the late sixties and early seventies, such theatre was not recognized as
legitimate due to its form (orality) and its repertoire (Burlesque). The difference between
Tremblay and his burlesque predecessors lies in the fact that Tremblay was recognized as a
legitimate writer. “He was able to prove that he knew how to write [even though in
Joual], he was able to position himself in the literary camp, to break free from the
“Varieta” artists who did not have the same competence” (Hébert, De la Rue 49). The
translators who have followed in the footsteps of Tremblay have likewise displayed their
work in the legitimate theatre circuit.
The acceptance of popular language on stage, although political in motive—of posing the vernacular to normative language in an opposition based in class struggle—was also based in aesthetics. The impact of the stage image was heightened by the reality of the language, a familiar language, as it had been on the burlesque stage since the early twentieth century. The effect of Tremblay's practice, which followed the burlesque tradition, created a space where playwrights and translators alike were able to work with fewer constraints, changing the face of theatrical practice in Quebec. This brought onto the stage a living language: "the language of the street, of the public place, the *populo minuto*" (Hébert, De la Rue 52).

The positive attitude of the artists regarding the use of popular language has had a direct influence on the verisimilitude of the stage representation. It has widened the scope of recognition for the audience. As an art form theatre has been too often linked with the elite, and the use of vernacular language has permitted a wider circulation of stage plays. It has invited a broader range of audiences into the theatre experience. Chantal Hébert writes:

Dans un théâtre plutôt écrit "comme on parle" et dans lequel comme au théâtre burlesque ou chez Tremblay, les personnages ne parlent plus "comme dans les livres", la société imaginaire de la scène n'occulte plus la société réelle. Entre le personnage social et le personnage scénique subsiste une relation qui est garantie de la communication de l'oeuvre. De la rue à la scène, et contrairement à ce que nous avait habitué notre tradition scolaire, on ne déménage plus pour ainsi dire. Les personnages parlent la langue qu'ils habitent. (De la Rue 52-53)

In a theater written "as one speaks" and in which like the burlesque theater or Tremblay, the characters no longer speak "as in books", the imaginary society of the stage no longer occults the real society. Between the social characters and the scenic characters subsists a relationship that guarantees
the understanding of the work. From the street to the stage, and contrary to what our scholastic tradition has accustomed us to, one isn't relocated anymore. Characters speak the language they live in. (De la Rue 52-53)

This notion of relocation, of moving the foreign culture closer to home, runs throughout my discussions with the directors, translators and actors who have worked on Miller's plays in Quebec. For the majority of these artists, the main argument for Quebecois translation appropriation issues from the need for audiences to feel at home when they go to the theatre.

While burlesque artists of the early twentieth century had the freedom to adapt and transform American material—they borrowed "cultural artefacts, canvas, from a neighboring society, the American society" (Le Burlesque québécois 12)—recent Quebecois translators have had to face questions concerning their faithfulness to the source script. As Quebecois versions of American plays proliferated after 1968, many formats were utilized in appropriating foreign drama in Quebec—from free adaptations (changing locations to make the play feel more Quebecois), to translation in an almost normative Quebecois (different from French from France only in rhythms and regionalism). These practices show how Quebec, in its quest for an original language, has maintained its Americanity through the translative process of foreign plays. The Quebecois artists have thus reappropriated plays, making them more real for their target audience, and the work of Arthur Miller has been at the core of this process.
PART 2
ARTHUR MILLER IN MONTREAL

Since many American plays have been produced in translation by professional theatres of Montreal, I determined that my study of the cultural transfer of American plays in Quebec would benefit by focusing on the work of a single playwright. For that purpose, Arthur Miller's plays present an ideal corpus. Beyond the reasons stated in the introduction (personal interest, number of translations available, political content), the plays of Arthur Miller have enjoyed a renewed interest in Montreal during the 1990s. In fact, it has been Miller's work, more than that of any other American playwright, that has appeared in translation on the Quebecois stage (save Neil Simon).

The multiple versions of Miller's plays that have been produced moreover highlight the dynamic nature of translation practice in Quebec. This feature also justifies an analytical approach that questions the political aspect as a translative motive. If the reason for translating Miller's plays into Quebecois was solely political, then one Quebecois version of each play would have sufficed. But the quest for an original artistic vision (though always respectful of Miller's work) has rendered it necessary to revisit Miller's work and retranslate it for each new staging. The answer to the question—"Why translate Miller into Quebecois over and over again?"—is connected to the persistent desire for the most respectful and accurate transposition of Miller's work for the Quebecois audience.

Part 2 of the dissertation opens with a brief biography of Miller, coupled with a chronology of the staging of his plays in Montreal. It is followed by a discussion of the political dimension (or lack thereof) in Miller's work and its assessment by reviewers and
artists. Two sets of materials are used to support the discussion: first, written materials—
the reviews and articles surveying the plays, published in various newspapers and journals,
and the program notes accompanying each production; second, oral materials—the
summary of interviews held with translators, directors, and actors involved in staging
Miller’s plays over the last thirty years. Those interviews lasted between an hour and an
hour and a half and were held informally in cafés, offices, or houses of the interviewees. 7

Since the written materials were published during the same time period as the
respective staged productions, they give a clear historical sense of the evolution of Miller’s
treatment in Montreal. These materials will be analyzed first. These documentary
materials will show how the plays were intended to be received by the Montreal audience
without political inflection. They will permit a reevaluation of the political interpretation
of translative practice and will show the Montreal theatre’s great respect for Miller’s work
and its artistic, social, and political relevance. Furthermore, the emergence of more than
one Quebecois version of a Miller play will show how the quest for the respectful
treatment of the playwright’s themes and ideas has led translators, directors, and actors to
make various translative choices (independent of nationalistic motive). The analysis of the
written materials will follow the chronology of Miller’s production history in Montreal.

7. I wanted to include set, light and costume designers in the survey but, after
talking with a few, it became obvious that their preoccupations were independent from the
translated text. Often, they worked, according to the indications of the director or from
the original English text. Therefore, I chose to use only the directors’, translators and
actors’ visions of the translated work.
Although the interviews were conducted in 1993, they reflect the present attitude of the interviewees toward translation as they document the translat ive attitudes of the last decades. They reflect both idealism and nostalgia and are divided thematically. It will thus be possible to identify which elements, apart from political motivations, have informed the Quebecois artists' preoccupation with transferring a dramatic work from a foreign culture (American in this instance) to the Quebecois stage. The information gathered during this second section should clarify and corroborate the elements identified in the discussion of the written materials. In this way the written materials are confirmed by the living memories of artists still involved in the theatrical process.

By the end of the discussion, it will be clear that the history of Quebecois translations of Miller's plays offers a picture of translat ive practice that differs considerably from the historical version advanced by the theatre commentators and practitioners in Montreal during the same period. This knowledge of how Miller has been treated in Quebec should thus shed new light on the more general matter of how foreign works have been dealt with by Quebecois translators and theatre artists of the last three decades.
CHAPTER 4

ARTHUR MILLER: A SHORT BIOGRAPHY* COMBINED WITH A CHRONOLOGY OF THE PRESENTATION OF HIS PLAYS IN MONTREAL

Born in Manhattan on October 17, 1915, Arthur Miller grew up in a family blessed with considerable wealth. However, with the onset of the Depression, his father’s clothing business declined, and the family moved to Brooklyn. This ordeal affected Miller deeply and influenced his highly sensitive social conscience. From that time on, he was always keenly aware and critical of the flaws of the capitalist system.

In 1934, Miller entered the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, where he earned a B.A. in 1938. During his undergraduate schooling, he started writing plays. With Honors at Dawn (1936), he won the Avery Hopwood Award, an honor that he received again for They Too Arise (1937). With this second play, he also received the Theatre Guild Bureau of New Plays prize. Both works were staged at Ann Arbor.

After graduation, Miller was involved as a playwright with the Federal Theatre Project. He also wrote short stories, radio plays, and a first film script, The Story of G.I. Joe (1944). All these experiences led to The Man Who Had All the Luck (1944), his first Broadway play. Even though it won the Theatre Guild National Prize, the play was not considered a great success.

In 1947, All My Sons was produced in New York and won the New York Drama Critics’ Circle Award. With its story about the industrial exploitation of the war and its

8. For a complete biography, see Welland, Dennis. Miller the Playwright.
effect on the social and familial fabric, the play established him as one of the most important social and political playwrights of his generation.

In 1947, *Death of a Salesman* overwhelmed New York audiences and critics, earning him a New York Critics' Circle Award for a second time and the Pulitzer Prize. From that time on, Miller became an internationally acclaimed playwright. His acute vision of the American way of life and his obsession with the "tragedy of the common man" found resonance in post World War II societies all around the world.

Two other remarkable successes followed on the heels of *Death of a Salesman*: *The Crucible* (1953) and *A View from the Bridge* (1955-56). During that time, Miller had difficulties with the State Department and the House Un-American Activities Committee. In March 1954, he was denied a passport to attend the Brussels' opening of *The Crucible*. On June 21, 1956, he appeared before the HUAC. In May 1957, he was convicted of contempt of Congress for refusing to name suspected Communists, though he was never sentenced. In that period of political turmoil, he divorced his first wife and married Marilyn Monroe (they divorced in 1961).

In 1962, Miller married Inge Morath, a reporter and photographer, with whom he still lives. Now 83 (in 1998), he has never stopped writing even though his later plays have not achieved the success of his early works. His work has become more introspective, with increased concern for World War II and the Jewish identity. Plays such as *After the Fall* (1964), *Incident at Vichy* (1964), *Playing for Time* (1980), and even the more recent *Broken Glass* (1994) are all concerned with the war and what it means to be Jewish in the twentieth century. Other plays like *The Price* (1968), *The Ride Down
Mount Morgan (1991) and The Last Yankee (1994) cast a critical look on family life and the “tragedy of the common man” themes that have been important for Miller since the beginning of his career.

The first of Arthur Miller’s plays produced on the Montreal stage was The Crucible (Les Sorcières de Salem) at Le Théâtre du Nouveau Monde in 1966, in a Marcel Aymé translation. In the same year, A View from the Bridge (Vu du Pont) followed at La Poudrière, in a French adaptation also from Marcel Aymé. Both plays were more than ten years old and had met success in their original runs; the Montreal productions were directed toward a bourgeois audience who knew about the playwright’s work. Both were presented in a French version (from France) since Quebecois artists had not yet distanced themselves from established translative practice. They both followed the translation practice of the time.

Two years after it opened in New York and a few months after its Paris debut, The Price (Le Prix) was produced in Montreal at Le Théâtre du Nouveau Monde (1970). Although it was presented after the pivotal year 1968, the version used was a French translation by Thierry Maulnier. Bringing The Price to the Montreal public so close to its opening in New York changed the perception of Miller for the audiences and artists. Miller was no longer seen as an important artist of the past but a contemporary writer whose most recent work was worthy of critical attention.

Surprisingly, Death of a Salesman (La Mort d’un commis voyageur) was not presented on a Montreal stage before 1974, twenty seven years after it was first presented in New York. The problem of finding an actor capable of playing Willy Loman can
explain the reluctance of the Montreal theatre companies to put on the play. Eventually, however, the play found its actor, Jean Duceppe. Monsieur Duceppe played the role in Montreal on three different occasions: in 1974 and in 1975 (in a French version by Thierry Maulnier) and in 1983 (in the first Quebecois translation of a Miller play). The translation of the latter was done by Michel Dumont, who was to become one of the major translators of American plays in Montreal. The link between Jean Duceppe and La Mort d'un commis voyageur has been so strong that the founding of the Compagnie Jean-Duceppe owes much to that presentation. Duceppe has in fact become so closely associated with the part of Willy Loman that no actor in Montreal has since dared take on the role.

The presentations of Le Prix and La Mort d’un commis voyageur indicate a discrepancy between the generally accepted historical evolution of Quebecois translation and the production history of Miller’s work. Far from being an exception Miller’s work shows that the Quebecois transaltive practice has indeed met resistance. Not withstanding the political context of the 60s and 70s, many translated works, as those of Miller, did not reflect the appropriation at-all-cost attitude. Only in the 1980s did it become obvious that the plays needed to be translated into Quebecois, and this was due not so much to political concerns as to matters of plausibility and Americanity.

In the 1980s and early 1990s, a number of revivals of Miller’s plays were presented, all in Quebecois versions: A View from the Bridge at La Nouvelle Compagnie Théâtrale in a translation by René Gingras, in 1986; The Crucible at La Compagnie Jean-Duceppe in a translation by Michel Dumont and Marc Grégoire, in 1989; A View from the Bridge by Le Théâtre Populaire du Québec, in a new Quebecois translation by
Dumont-Grégoire, in 1990 (the same show was presented in 1993 at La Compagnie Jean-Duceppe); The Price at La Compagnie Jean-Duceppe in a translation by Dumont-Grégoire, in 1991. During this period, an appropriation practice towards Miller’s work was developed and regularized. With A View from the Bridge, the first of Miller’s plays to be adapted in Quebecois, translation practice became linked with the directorial vision of the play. This feature cannot be overemphasized; a translation used by one director would not necessarily prove acceptable for another. Quite simply, each new presentation of the play demanded a new translation.

In the 1990s, the number of Miller’s plays made available to the Montreal audience widened: All my Sons (Ils étaient tous mes fils) played at La Compagnie Jean-Duceppe in a Dumont-Grégoire version in 1991; Some Kind of Love Story (Comme une histoire d’amour) was presented by Le Grand Théâtre Ordinaire in a René Gingras’ translation in 1993; and, After the Fall (Après la chute) played at La Compagnie Jean-Duceppe in a Dumont-Grégoire translation in 1994. All these productions were Montreal premieres of the respective plays. They showed different aspects of Miller’s work and exhibited a curious respect for the playwright that went beyond the fame of his most recognized plays.

The work of Arthur Miller has always been well received in Montreal, not only the commercially successful plays but also those less known and less accessible. Surprisingly, some of his important plays have not been produced in Montreal. Incident at Vichy, The Archbishop’s Ceiling, The American Clock, Playing for Time and the more recent The Ride Down Mount Morgan and Broken Glass have not yet found a theatre producer willing to take the risk of presenting them. One hopes that the encounters between Miller
and the Québécois theatre artists will continue and will be enriched by Miller’s wide-ranging corpus.

In the spring of 1998, the Théâtre du Nouveau Monde staged *The Crucible* (*Les Sorcières de Salem*) in a new version by René Gingras. Furthermore, a revisiting of *Death of a Salesman* (*La Mort d’un commis voyageur*) in a new Michel Dumont version is part of La Compagnie Jean-Duceppe plans for next season.

Looking at the standard views of the evolution of theatre translation history in Quebec, one sees that Arthur Miller’s work easily fits with the trends and dispositions of the first and the third periods. Early on productions used French translations; in the third period theatre artists indeed took liberties with Miller’s work. As for the time frame of the second period, an era supposedly more affected by political turmoil, Miller’s work seems out of sync with the general scholarly assessment of the period. This irregularity does not make Miller an exception in the evolution of translative practice in Montreal. On the contrary, it shows that the conventional classifications and evaluations of the theatrical and translative practice in Quebec must be questioned and reevaluated. If exceptions are found in the translative practice history of the second era, a rethinking of that view is warranted, one that questions the importance of nationalism in the theatrical practice of the time.
CHAPTER 5

PERCEPTION OF ARTHUR MILLER’S WORK IN MONTREAL

WRITTEN MATERIALS

The written materials available concerning the staging of Arthur Miller’s plays in Montreal will underline how the Quebeqois perception of his work has evolved over the last decades. Although presented chronologically, this survey will indicate recurrent elements of interest in Miller’s work. This section will also draw attention to themes that will be discussed at length when I analyze the interviews of the artists involved with the production of Miller’s plays in Montreal since 1966. The themes of importance include the following: the geography of language and culture (French from France vs. French from Montreal); High art vs. Popular art; the universality of Miller’s work; Americanity (Quebec being part of North America); verisimilitude and plausibility; identification; and, to a lesser extent, politics and nationalism. The chronological approach adopted will also underline how the treatment of Miller’s work has favored a greater respect for the playwright while remaining close to the sensibility of the Quebeqois audience.9

From the first Montreal staging of his work, Miller has been considered a member “of the great contemporary repertoire” (Théâtre du Nouveau Monde, Program notes 14) and an eminently political writer. His background with the Federal Theatre Project and his appearance at the HUAC hearings has lent him great credibility as a political artist. And

9. A casting list of each production will be found in appendix 3.
given the turmoil of the "Quiet Revolution," Miller’s plays and their political positioning have seemed the perfect vehicle for the Quebec of the time.

Produced in Montreal in 1966, Les Sorcières de Salem was used to put forth the question of Quebec’s affirmation and identity. In an allegorical manner, the play was made to address the alienation of the Quebecois society of the time. The program of the production boldly stated: "The Crucible tells the tale of an authentic case of witchcraft which resonates with a troubling actuality" (Languirand 8). The alienation and destruction depicted in the play was thus linked to the condition of Quebecois society in the Canadian nation. Importantly, the production utilized a translation from France. It was therefore the thematic content of the play and not its linguistic, translative content which was underlined in that production as challenging and provocative.

Reviewer Jean Basile, while finding the play weak, opined that the director "jumped into a satire obviously too happy to find in the play many references to the French-Canadian context" (Les Sorcières... au TNM 6). Basile disapproved of the recuperation of the play for the service of a nationalistic cause. This, he felt, strained the meaning of Miller’s text.

The staging of this French version did not undercut the will of Montreal artists who wanted to make Miller’s plays immediate and relevant to the audience. Straightaway, certain critics began to voice their dislike of the traditional translative practice. While no one found the use of standard French completely alienating, it was clear that the play’s meaning shifted from that which Miller intended. The director of the Les Sorcières de Salem production, wishing to connect the play to the audience’s own situation, was
criticized for being heavy handed. Theatre reviewer Basile notes: the director "forgets to put on stage what I find to be the most important conflict of the play and what is to me its true beauty, its true generosity: the case of conscience of John Proctor" (Les Sorcières . . . au TNM 6). Basile’s comment is clearly a dramaturgical one. Already with the first production of a Miller play in Montreal, we find a reviewer asking the director to respect the play (instead of forcing an artificial social relevance upon the audience).

In this first production of a Miller play in Montreal, the need to appropriate the situation, that is, the dramatic and metaphorical structure of the play, seemed more important than the need to translate the language of the play. Miller was hence used as a tool of political struggle for the Quebecois people some time before Quebecois theatrical translation practices developed, a point that challenges the generally accepted time frame of Quebecois translative practice.

In opposition to the production approach of Les Sorcières de Salem, which was obsessed with the correspondences between the context of the play and Quebecois culture, the first production of Vu du Pont in Montreal (1966) kept the work totally removed from Montreal’s social context. The difference in the treatments of the two plays indicates the range in the theatrical practice of the time regarding the appropriation of foreign plays. In the program notes of Vu du Pont, La Poudrière gave little information about the play and its content. The notes did not discuss the translation and expressed satisfaction with Marcel Aymé’s French version. It is noteworthy that La Poudrière, a very bourgeois institution, considered its mission a noble one, dedicated to bettering of society through art. It was a theatre where art was spelled with a capital "A," and an elevation of spirit
was expected. The theatre company boldly stated: “It is the noble function of dramatic art to contribute to the promotion of a social and moral order” (Poudrière 10). For that reason, it often took on grand and ambitious projects, such as the staging of Aeschylus’ *Oresteia*.

Not only was Miller considered an heir of Aeschylus, his stature was compared in the program notes to that of Ibsen, Sophocles and Aristotle. Miller was thus relevant to the Montreal audience because he was universal. Like the drama of his illustrious predecessors, his writing spoke to the tragic nature of the world. The interest in Miller stemmed from this faith in the universality of his message. His plays needed no specific resonance with the immediate society surrounding La Poudrière. Audience members did not attend the theatre to question their lives and their society; they were present to see “Art.”

Such an attitude was supported by Martial Dassylva, the critic of *La Presse*. In his review of the play, Dassylva stated: “this new production is of very high quality, technically and visually” (Le Drame d’Eddy Carbone 62). The review essentially emphasized aesthetics. The journalist was not concerned with what was said or discussed in the play but with how *artistically* the piece was done. In Dassylva’s estimation (and in this he shares the point of view expressed in the program notes), “*Vu du Pont* is an authentic tragedy and, as such, Miller’s work certainly truly emerges in existential metaphysic” (Le Drame d’Eddy Carbone 62). The reviewer’s observations put forward a general rhetoric of greatness and avoided challenging the comforting value system of the bourgeois audience.
Surprisingly, it was an English review that identified and questioned the text-representation dichotomy. Although the reviewer, Zelda Heller, was unaware of this at the time, she was voicing and pointing to the dialectic that would necessitate translating Miller's plays in Quebecois some seventeen years later.

Heller was very supportive of the language in the translated text, which shows that her point of view was not prejudiced against French translations. Heller wrote: "Marcel Ayme’s supple French translation masterfully comes to grips with the poetic colloquialisms of the text, which is so suited to the environment of the characters and still carries an overtone more profound than its words" (Heller 24). Although satisfied with the language of the play, she expressed reservations about the work's locality. She stated: "In this play the atmosphere is the transplanted Sicily of a great North American City. There must be both Sicily and America in it. But neither one is satisfactorily established in this production" (Heller 24). The critic continued with negative comments, identifying some set design errors, and, in the end, declared her major objection with the Poudrière's production: "The women in their chic skirts and restrained shirts look more like Parisiennes than immigrants. This is particularly true of the wife, who seems overwhelmingly French" (Heller 24).

Although Heller did not link the French translation to the absurdities she noted with the costumes, it is important to understand how a play set in America could look like a play set in Paris in the theatrical practice of the Montreal theatre of the time. In years following, artists would correlate the language and the visual inaccuracies in the staging of translated texts and would fight against both. In 1966, only a slight discomfort evidenced
itself, though this later would become a chief matter of the translative and production enterprise. Obviously, Zelda Heller, an English reviewer with an English newspaper, could not have held a nationalistic agenda for her seemingly anti-French comment. She simply took a position that favored verisimilitude and plausibility when confronted with a play set in North America that looked like a play set in France. Moreover, the harshness demanded by Miller's dramatic world was toned down by the sophistication of the actors and the mise en scène. Such differences between the original script and the translated text later caused Quebecois artists to disavow the use of French translations. Such versions undercut the level of reality needed to render effectively the world of Miller's play on the Montreal stage.

By the end of the 1960s, we find that the approach toward Miller's plays was one that either emphasized the poetical or the political, depending on the producing company. Importantly, the origin of the translated text was not identified as a relevant element in terms of the texture of the production and its final look and effect on the local audience. Nevertheless, despite a sense of respect for the playwright, the productions labored under a sense of inaccuracy. The plays never looked quite right in their staged presentation. The precision of Miller's original work did not transfer satisfactorily in those first two plays shown to the Montreal public.

At the beginning of the second translative period, the staging of *Le Prix* in 1970 indicates the malaise that had fallen upon the presentation of foreign plays in the Montreal theatre scene. Since 1968 Quebecois translations had become the norm in Montreal theatres, *Le Prix*, however, used not only a French translation but also a French actor,
Claude Dauphin (who was hired to play Solomon). Mr. Dauphin had created the role in Paris. In a period when Quebecois theatre was supposed to have been appropriating foreign plays for political reasons, not only did Jean-Louis Roux, the artistic director of the TNM at the time and director of the production, take the translation of the play from Paris; he found the performer for his lead role there also. Such a choice must have had a great influence on the rendering of lines, since it would have been ludicrous to ask a French actor to play with a Quebecois accent.

In Martial Dassylva’s review of the play, we find strong signs of the persistence of French cultural colonialism in Montreal, a continuance of the first translative period attitude. To give some weight and credibility to Miller, Dassylva indicates early in his article that Miller’s plays “have been performed by many repertory companies in Europe” (Arthur Miller au TNM 30). The critic’s position clearly indicates that the two previous presentations of Miller plays in Montreal were not sufficient to give to Miller’s work the credit it already deserved. He also supports the view that Miller’s acclaim in New York was not enough to guarantee his reputation; Miller needed a Parisian seal of approval. To reinforce his comments, Dassylva quotes Benoîte Groulx, who had published an analysis of the play in L’Avant-Scène, a French drama journal.

Le Prix, as it was staged, seemed a drawback, a reaction against the movement of quebecisation supposedly sweeping the Montreal stage at that time. Every element of the show renounced attempts to anchor the play in the Quebecois context. Rather, the play was situated in French culture, a choice supported by the theatre critic of La Presse. Its situation questions the appropriation at-all-cost theory developed for the period.
As with Le Prix, the 1973, presentation of Jean Ducespe’s La Mort d’un commis voyageur in Montreal challenges the standard history of theatre translation in Quebec. The production was a direct result of the success the play enjoyed in Quebec City, where it was staged at the Trident in 1972. It is important to note that the terrific box-office success of La Mort d’un commis voyageur allowed for the founding of the Compagnie Jean-Duceppe, a company unrivaled in Montreal as a supporter of Arthur Miller’s plays.

La Mort d’un commis voyageur, in the words of commentator Roger Scully, “sadly hasn’t been played in the Marcel Dubé version [produced by Paul Blouin for Radio-Canada television in 1963] but its official French translation was freely adapted” (15). Although a French-Canadian10 version of the play was available at this time (1973), Paul Hébert, the director, chose to use the French version. It is important to stress that the Dubé version was itself quite French, since he was not inclined to write plays in Quebecois. Furthermore, his translation was directed to a television audience, which had exerted another pressure toward the normalization of the language. Still, Scully’s comment indicates that the practice of appropriation was well on its way; he positively accepted the fact that the actors had freely adapted the French text.

In 1973, five years after the presentation of Les Belles-soeurs, the Quebecois language was commonly used on stage, and commentators could sense the uneasiness of

10. The expression "Québécois" will be used only after the creation of Les Belles-soeurs in 1968 and will replace French-Canadian used until then. Marcel Dubé was the last French-Canadian playwright. He was very successful and his plays had very strong social content. His writing style had certain similarities with Miller’s. Although his themes were deeply rooted in the Quebecois culture, his writing stayed close to the normative French used on the Montreal stage of the time.
the actors still working with French translations. That is precisely what occurred during
the run of *La Mort d’un commis voyageur*:

Parfois peu à l’aise dans la traduction trop française de Kahane, Duceppe (Willy Loman) se reprend toutefois dans les moments d’intense émotion ou de profonde gravité. À tel point que ce diable de comédien sait être, le cas échéant, aussi prenant lorsqu’il se tait que lorsqu’il tirade . . . (Dassylva, Bluff 51)

Often not at ease in the too French translation by Kahane, Duceppe (Willy Loman) pulls himself together in the moments of intense emotion and of deep gravity. To such an extent that this devil of an actor knows how to be, when need be, as poignant when he is silent as when he monologues . . . (Dassylva, Bluff 51)

As the critic rightly observed, the problem of using French translations in Quebec had by this time reached a level of absurdity. In essence, the actor was more effective and poignant when silent. The foreignness of the language found in the French translations so disturbed the actor’s work that he opted for gesture over speech when deep emotions needed to be conveyed. We discern how the actors tried to bring the essence of the text closer to the local audience. This produced an emotional binding, a link between the actors and the audience forged by the spirit of Miller’s play. The argument made against the use of French translation in not political but exclusively theatrical.

The Montreal audience felt a closeness to Miller. Quebecois audiences and artists experienced a “recognition” when confronting Miller’s work. Scully’s comment underscores this point:

Paul Hébert a senti en quoi le Brooklyn d’il y a vingt-cinq ans ressemble aux quartiers canadiens-français d’aujourd’hui. . . . Jean Duceppe, élevé dans l’est de Montréal, n’est pas loin, dans son langage et son humour, ses forces et ses faiblesses, de Willy Loman. (Scully 15)
Paul Hébert felt how the Brooklyn of twenty-five years ago looks like today's French-Canadian neighborhoods. Jean Duceppe, raised in the East end of Montreal, is close, in his language, his humor, his strengths and weaknesses, to Willy Loman. (Scully 15)

In the program notes, Paul Hébert declares: "Willy Loman is struggling in a North American context which is ours" (Brie 10). Quebecois audiences consequently found much with which to identify in Miller's play.

However, a dichotomy arose in the production of La Mort d'un commis voyageur. While the characters, the plot, and the context of the play were familiar to the audience, reinforcing the Americanity felt by the Francophones of Quebec, the production's unwillingness to appropriate the language of the play created a block for the audience, preventing total identification with the play. The ludicrousness of having the French translation on North American soil was felt more acutely than ever before. Still, to this day, the play is considered a huge success and is regarded as one of the finest plays ever presented on the Montreal stage.

La Mort d'un commis voyageur was revived in 1976, with the same cast, set, costumes, and lighting. Jean Duceppe was credited for the direction of the play, but it was still Paul Hébert's mise en scène that was offered to the public. Again, the text was in a French version, a facture that did not accord with the political appropriation identified with the period.

It took fifteen years, after the appearance of Michel Tremblay's work in 1968, before Quebecois artists dared to appropriate one of Miller's plays and produce it with no French influence. Not surprisingly, Death of a Salesman was the first Miller play to be
translated into Quebecois. Michel Dumont identified the differences between this 1983 text and the one used in the 1973 and 1976 productions:

En 1975, on était parti de la traduction de Kahane. Forcément, en la montant, on a adapté des choses, ça a penché davantage vers le côté québécois. Mais, quand j’ai décidé de l’adapter, je l’ai franchement placée au niveau québécois; on a donc tous le même niveau de langage.

(Brousseau D 1)

In 1975, we started from Kahane’s translation. Inevitably, working on it, we adapted things, and it tilted toward a Quebecois texture. But, when I decided to adapt it, I frankly placed it at a Quebecois level; we all used the same texture of language. (Brousseau D 1)

Artistically, the new translation helped immensely. Every character spoke the same language. The play became more plausible. The translation heightened the dramatic world’s level of reality. The truthfulness of the language played to the Quebecois audience. As Dumont declared, “these Americans are like us!” (Brousseau D 2).

The translator wanted to eliminate the inadequacies of prior scripts. He also wanted to affirm that whether in Montreal or New York the life of the simple folk was the same. Dumont also felt that he had corrected numerous awkwardnesses found in the French translation. He explained how in rehearsals he and Jean Duceppe often went back to the text they had used ten years earlier, and how they realized that they had performed “not exactly what’s written” (Brousseau D 2) in Miller’s original text.

The translation was well received by the critics. Elizabeth Bourget found it “very effective” (152). Robert Lévesque, who did not join in the unanimous praise of the production, conceded that Dumont showed “an immense subtlety, a respectful sobriety” (La Mort d’un commis voyageur 9). Commentators pointed to the accuracy of the
translation. Using the Quebecois translation conveyed the impression that the artists in performance had disappeared behind the work. One critic astutely wrote: “As a director, Claude Maher has been able to let Miller’s play speak while others would surely have tried to speak through it” (Dassylva, À la Compagnie Jean-Duceppe A 12).

In sum, this production achieved a rare eloquence. During the heart of this period in which Quebecois artists were presumed to be abusively appropriating foreign drama, we recognize a new staging of an American play, with a new translation, that restored a feeling of harmony and truthfulness. In all the program notes and reviews, emphasis was put upon what Miller wanted to achieve when writing the play. No nationalistic agenda was mentioned.

However, Elizabeth Bourget’s review indicates that a certain appropriation may have altered the play slightly. Citing the final confrontation between Biff and Willy, accounted as remarkable by most commentators, she expresses the concern that the father/son conflict as presented betrayed “the period and locale of the play” (152). Feeling so much at home with the script, Duceppe (Willy) and Dumont (Biff) may have brought their relationship to life so truthfully that the New York context and its American puritanism may have been diminished, supplanted by a Montreal behavior with its Latin and catholic effervescence. Such distortion notwithstanding, after the 1983 staging of La Mort d’un commis voyageur, every Miller script staged in Montreal used a Quebecois version, a practice that accords with the disposition of the third translative period.

Along with Dumont, René Gingras has emerged as the second important translator of Miller’s plays. For Gingras, the goal of the translator is clear: “Bring to the
artists involved in the new production the same text that he [the playwright] must himself have brought, at the time, to the artist of the original production, with the difference that we do it . . . in another language” (3). According to Gingras, the transfer should be only linguistic. The meaning of the play should not be altered by the translator. The translation should faithfully give to the target audience what was intended for the original public. Although commendable on some points, such a position does not take into account the reality of translation. Gingras is not naive; he is aware that despite his faithful goal,

traduire une oeuvre d’une langue à une autre, c’est forcément lui faire faire un petit voyage, sinon toujours d’un pays à un autre, à tout le moins d’un milieu socio-culturel donné à un autre. . . . Une réalité de là-bas, entendue ici, ne connotera pas forcément exactement la même chose. Et l’accumulation de ces légères différences de perception peut faire qu’au bout du compte une oeuvre honnêtement traduite sera quand même comprise tout de travers. (3)

translating a play from a language to another, necessarily makes it travel a little, if not always from one country to another, at least from a given socio-cultural milieu to another. . . . A reality from there, heard here, will not necessarily bear the same connotations. And the accumulation of these slight differences of perception can lead to a work which, while honestly translated, will in the end be misunderstood anyway. (3)

An awareness of the difficulty in creating an accurate translation, coupled with the knowledge that even an accurate translation can be misleading, suggests that one be prudent when locating direct correlations between the original and target cultures in the process of translating a play. Yet, with Vu du Pont, produced in 1986, Gingras seems to have succeeded in staying close to Miller’s original text. The critic Solange Lévesque confirms this point: “Miller never moves away from the language of simple folks, which is skillfully rendered by René Gingras’ translation [adaptation]” (183). With his bold
linguistic choices, Gingras helped the actors connect with their parts, bringing them closer to the play. Actor Gilles Renaud, in fact, credits Gingras’ work with orienting his performance: “To play Eddy, René Gingras’ translation helps me a lot” (Gilles Renaud in Lefebvre, Gilles Renaud: Vingt ans de théâtre 26). Familiar with the language provided by Gingras, the actors experienced the freedom to create truthful characters, something that was not always possible with earlier translations. A more natural interpretation was created, and with it a sharper level of theatrical reality materialized on stage.

Gingras in his translation of View from the Bridge took a risk. He tried to use a low vernacular language to match the ineptness of Italian Americans struggling to communicate in English. In doing so, he opened himself to some criticism. While his actors (and some commentators) agreed with the intent of staying as close as possible to the intended texture of the original play, some commentators, like Robert Lévesque, saw in his translation an over-trivialization of the tragedy. Gingras may have brought the play too close to everyday life, thus reducing its tragic dimension. Lévesque found the translation “simplistic.” He condemned the entire production: “what is left is a boulevard’s purée in a translation making all the characters [the Carbones who lived in Brooklyn for generations and the newly arrived Italians] talk as if they had raised pigs at Saint-Pie-de-Bagot11” (Vu du pont à la NCT 5).

Lévesque brought to light, in a virulent way, the problems of verisimilitude involved in translating American or foreign plays into Quebecois. How can characters

11. Saint-Pie-de-Bagot is a small village far away in the country with a typical dialect hard to understand.
speaking a language strongly rooted geographically be living in New York or in any other foreign city? It is a matter of sustaining the level of disbelief. While Gingras suggested that a translator should attempt to recreate the atmosphere of the original script and make the transfer as complete as possible, Lévesque argued that the translator should be prudent and avoid too narrow an actualization of the play's geographical aspects.

Such conflicts over language and locale typified the discussions of translation at the end of the 1980s. Quebecois translators had found great liberty in wholesale adaptation but began to retreat from this approach, hoping to render a more accurate version of the original script. Simultaneously, there was a backlash against translating every foreign play into the popular language of Quebec. The two positions prefigure the tentative and fragile equilibrium that would eventually emerge between appropriation and respect for the original work, and between generic Quebecois jargon and mythic universal French typical of the third period.

There are only two short references as to the quality of the translation of The Crucible found in the written evidences concerning the 1989 production. Gilles Lamontagne described it as "an honest translation" (Des sorcières D3); Robert Lévesque "a non inspired translation" (Quand Brassard 1). Both comments may be read as euphemisms, masking a general lack of interest toward the translation. At that point in time, Quebecois translation was taken for granted and the Quebecois version seemed to be an obvious choice, regardless of the quality of the play's production.

Commentaries on Les Sorcières de Salem were more concentrated on how, outside of the context of the Salem witch hunt and McCarthysm, the play spoke about
social and political issues. For the director, André Brassard, “this approach is not in contradiction with Arthur Miller’s intentions” (Compagnie Jean-Duceppe, Les Sorcières 9). Miller’s social vision and philosophy proved the basis for the director’s work and the reviewers’ comments. Critics read the play with a strong dramaturgical emphasis, trying to understand the script beyond its metaphorical setting.

Rita Lafontaine (Abigail) and Gilles Renaud (Proctor) could not resist finding parallels between events in the play and repressive events in Quebecois history (Lamontagne, Rita Lafontaine D 1). The production’s program notes made the same point (Compagnie Jean-Duceppe, Les Sorcières 16). The play was also analyzed on a broader scale, discussed in conjunction with Salman Rushdie’s Satanical Verses as works dealing with religious repression. Quebec artists had matured enough by this time to look at foreign drama with less provincialism, with less emphasis on their own experience. Even if the local allusions were still very useful in making the play relevant to the audience, the production admitted an intercultural texture. For that reason it can be said that “Les Sorcières de Salem stands on the side of the involved theatre which, in a forceful way, sends back the spectator his own prejudices and forces him to question his own tendencies to ostracism” (Vigeant 215). The reviewer’s comment could certainly be applied to any production of The Crucible anywhere in the world, in any language. In his negative review of the play, Robert Lévesque recalled the 1966 TNM production of the play as a “memorable” one (Quand Brassard 1).

With the 1990 and 1993 stagings of Vu du Pont, Miller was for the first time re-translated in Quebecois. The new Dumont\Grégoire version was far less rooted in dialect
and jargon than Gingras’s previous translation. The new version was also less
geographically inflected. While Gingras’ translation had made it almost impossible to
associate the characters of the play with their Brooklyn environment, Dumont\Grégoire’s
script accomplished that association quite easily.

The aesthetic stance and mission of the Théâtre Populaire du Québec required “a
different approach to the levels of language” (Lefebvre, Traduire pour le théâtre 15); given
the company’s point of view, the work of Gingras had over stressed the transfer of
location. The new sensibility emerging on the Montreal stage of the early 1990s re-
affirmed that there were many possible ways of translating a foreign piece into Quebecois.
At this juncture a new flexibility emerged. According to Paul Lefebvre, “a translator does
not translate the words and the sentences as much as he tries to bring to his own language
the emotional relationship that existed between the play and its original audience”
(Traduire pour le théâtre 15).

Although such a point of view is close to the one advanced by Gingras in 1986, it
effected a totally different texture in the translation of Dumont\Grégoire. This shows how
relative and fluid arguments about verisimilitude can be. While Gingras transferred the
language into a Quebecois structure, Dumont and Grégoire were more restrained. They
used a less typical Quebecois speech, with less jargon and less dialectical forms. However,
they introduced some English and Italian expressions to suggest the jargon of the play’s
Italian immigrants. Granting a limited vocabulary to the less educated characters, the
translators constructed an original language that permitted the work of Miller to come
through more effectively. Their work was less anthropological than imaginative. As a
result, spectators identified with the characters. The translators' choices also allowed the
action to be set in Brooklyn. The convention was easier to accept with
Dumont\Grégoire's version. In the view of one critic, "this new translation better
expresses than René Gingras’ [produced at the N.C.T. in 1986] the clear gap between the
sustained language level of Alfieri and the popular level, filled with English idioms, of the
other characters" (Latendresse 173). What Dumont\Grégoire accomplished (and in a
certain way what Gingras failed to do) was not unlike what the British actors did in the
Peter Brook production of the play in 1956:

There being no way for them [the British actors] to learn a deep Sicilian-
American accent, Anthony Quayle, Mary Ure, and the rest of the cast
worked out among themselves an accent never heard on earth before, but
as it turned out, it convinced British audiences that they were hearing
Brooklynes. (Miller, Timebends 431)

Analysis of Miller's plays in Montreal shows how the objectives of the Quebecois
artists changed. They no longer needed to show spectators an image of themselves; they
could concentrate on rendering an image of others. We can qualify such an attitude as
new, as Quebecois artists had formerly not been confident in themselves.

The Montreal public took pleasure in being confronted with a culture other than its
own. Even the director restrained his intrusions in order to let Miller's text talk.
Commenting on the play's direction, one reviewer wrote: "His fidelity is explained by the
richness of Miller's text [beyond the seemingly banality of the dialog] to which the
excellent direction of the actors gives all its relief" (Latendresse 173). Less concerned
with proving that its own culture had value, the Montreal audience could in 1990 start
opening itself to the culture of others.
The relevance of the translation of *The Price* (1991) to local audiences was never discussed in the various reviews and articles concerning the play. What is found, however, is a great respect and admiration for the work of the playwright, for this drama that contains a poignant story and provides strong confrontations for actors. In 1991, Miller was admired for his artistic and human qualities as a playwright. Compared to the strained 1970 staging, this revisiting of the play by Quebecois artists in 1991 was convincing and had a stronger impact on its audience and the general theatre milieu.

Since the production of *Ils Étaient tous mes fils* in 1991, Miller has been considered the playwright of La Compagnie Jean-Duceppe. As the press release of the company observes, "his theatrical work represents the ideal of the Compagnie Jean-Duceppe for a theatre close to everyday life, a theatre that permits, through emotions, to better understand our own lives" (Dossier 2). While retaining his Americanity, Miller has become a household name in Montreal. People in Quebec feel close to his work. People look forward to engaging his mind in the theatre, especially in the work of La Compagnie Jean-Duceppe. Audience members have "learned to know themselves and to recognize themselves" (Dumont, Revue-Théâtre 3) in Miller's plays. A sympathetic relation exists between the Montreal audience and the playwright. It is not so much that Quebec has brought Miller to its culture; rather, Quebec has found and assumed its own Americanity. Such Americanity was felt in the production of *Ils Étaient tous mes fils*. Serge Denoncourt, the director, explains: "Through it, Miller talks about the American man who carries with himself all his hopes and his contradictions. Through it, he talks about us, talks of what we have been and of what we still are" (Dumont, Revue-Théâtre 5).
short, the reception of Miller’s plays in Montreal was evidence for the evolution of
Quebecois society in its quest for identity.

Surprisingly enough, criticism on the inaccuracy of the translation resurfaced with
the staging of *Ils Étaient tous mes fils*. Reviewers indeed voiced strong reservations about
the translation. It seemed that the bourgeois social setting of the play suffered some
flatness when translated into a too heavily-inflicted Quebecois dialect. Even though
Dumont\Grégoire’s translations have the reputation of being moderate, language-wise,
they still used too popular a language for an adequate representation of the Kellers’ social
level. The words of the translation did not vibrate, and the language equivalences lacked
sharpness (Le meilleur C 11). Robert Lévesque found "the language rather dreadful,
bastardised and *jouallisante*" (simplement émotif B 3).

No one has yet been able to define clearly what comprises a good translation. For
that reason, it is difficult to grasp why one translation approach can be admirable during a
certain period and detestable some time later. The key, however, seems to involve the
matter of verisimilitude. While the Quebecois language seemed a very appropriate vehicle
for Miller’s characters in the past, the social setting of *Ils Étaient tous mes fils* demanded a
different level of language. Without adjusting for class distinctions, the language proved
doubtful, sometimes ludicrous, and destroyed the realism intended for the play.

In 1993, for the second time in twenty years, a play of Arthur Miller launched the
founding of a new theatre company. Raymond Cloutier, the artistic director of Le Grand
Théâtre Ordinaire, explained why the American playwright was the perfect figure for the
company’s inauguration: “Miller, who refuses to compromise, permits us to play reality
and to reveal ourselves" (Comme une histoire). Such comment reveals Miller as a source of inspiration, for a truthful theatre. His works create a powerful theatrical reality that gives the actor the necessary tools for the discovery of the self.

It is necessary here to quote at length the program note (which is almost a manifesto) of Raymond Cloutier, the founder of Le Grand Théâtre Ordinaire and the director of Comme une histoire d’amour (he was also at the time director of le Conservatoire d’art dramatique de Montréal). His argument to support the existence of the company and to justify the use of a Miller play is illuminating; it also clarifies the esteem with which Quebecois theatre artists have regarded the American dramatist.

Reading Cloutier, one almost feels that he is reading Timebends or The Theater Essays of Arthur Miller or Arthur Miller and Company or Conversations with Arthur Miller, all books in which Miller explains his vision of what theatre should be.

Je prétends depuis longtemps que le théâtre ne trouve tout son sens que lorsqu’il y a une rencontre unique, dangereuse, privilégiée entre des acteurs et des spectateurs. Pour cela, il nous faut quitter le terrain de la reproduction, de la représentation de la mémoire, de ce qui a été prévu, préparé. Il nous faut, nous acteurs, autant que faire se peut, vivre un projet ouvert où il y a risque, danger, aventure nouvelle. Il me fallait un outil de travail où le moment présent est le lieu de la représentation. Bien sûr, nous répétons, beaucoup même, mais autrement. Nous cherchons pendant longtemps, nous creusons, nous inventorions pour arriver à une destination que j’appelle notre réel, à l’intérieur de l’objet dramatique choisi. Lorsque ce réel est nôtre, il y a de grandes chances qu’il rencontre le réel, la vérité intime, l’identité du spectateur. . . . Arthur Miller nous permet d’inventorier dans ce “réel”. (Cloutier 2)

I have been saying for a long time that theatre finds all its meaning only when there is a unique encounter, dangerous, a special encounter between actors and spectators. To achieve that, we must leave the realm of reproduction, of representation of the memory, of what has been planned, prepared. It is necessary for us, actors, as much as possible, to live an open
project where there is a risk, a danger, a new adventure. I needed a working tool with which the present could be the place of the representation. Obviously, we rehearse, a lot, but differently. We seek at length, we dig, we inventory to arrive at a destination that I call our reality, within the chosen dramatic object. When that reality is ours, the odds are great that it will meet the reality, the intimate truth, the identity of the spectator. . . . Arthur Miller allows us to explore that “reality.” (Cloutier 2)

Cloutier was on a quest when he staged Comme une histoire d’amour. He searched in Miller’s work for what he could not find on the local stage. Talking to a journalist from Le Devoir, he explained: "I do not recognize myself on our own stages" (Baillargeon C 6). And that sense of want was reconfirmed in an interview with the theatre critic from La Presse; Cloutier stated: “I would have liked to put on a Quebecois play” (Beaunoyer, L’Homme discret A 10). However, he claimed he could not find a work that suited his vision of theatrical reality. Cloutier wanted to use Miller as an example for Quebecois playwrights. For Cloutier, Miller was more Quebecois in his thematic structure than any of the local playwrights writing more directly on topical and immediate issues.

Having adopted such an attitude, Raymond Cloutier opened himself to criticism. Montreal reviewers found Comme une histoire d’Amour weak. Jean Beaunoyer based his assessment and comparisons on very strong and successful Quebecois plays in order to ridicule Cloutier’s aspirations:

Ce texte supporte très mal la comparaison avec Being at home with Claude de René Daniel Dubois et La Déposition de Hélène Pednault. Ces deux œuvres allaient à la limite de la confrontation et fouillaient l’âme comme Miller n’a jamais réussi à le faire . . . le théâtre québécois nous a habitué à plus d’originalité, plus d’intensité et surtout à des expériences plus significatives dans le monde de l’imaginaire. (Quel Risque? D 8)
This text does not compare with René Daniel Dubois' *Being at home with Claude* or Hélène Pednault's *La Déposition*. These two plays went to the limit of confrontation and explored the soul like Miller has never been capable of doing... with the Quebecois theatre we have gotten used to more originality, more intensity and, mainly, we have gotten used to experiences more significant in the imaginary realm. (Quel Risque? D 8)

In the review, the national dramaturgy was advantageously compared to the foreign dramaturgy; yet, it was obviously unfair to compare two of the best plays of the last five years in Montreal with a minor work of a playwright of international renown.

Gingras' translation was also questioned. He had, as with *View from the Bridge*, chosen a strong Quebecois dialect to underline the lower class environment of the characters. Robert Lévesque wrote: "René Gingras' translation does not help the delicacy of the situation" (Un Débutant B 8). Again, Gingras was chided for shifting the play's setting too closely to a Quebecois context. He transgressed the new practice of respecting the internal integrity of foreign plays and was associated with the repudiated practice of adaptation.

*Après la chute* (1994) was the last Miller play to have been professionally produced in Montreal. Due to the autobiographical nature of the play, commentators focused their attention on the personal content of the play. They were all too happy that the play gave the audience insight into Miller's life, especially his relation with one of the legendary figures of the twentieth century, Marilyn Monroe. The play, unsuccessful when

12. In the spring semester of 1996, I directed *Playing for Time* for the Département de théâtre of L'Université du Québec à Montréal. The play had been translated by Pierre Legris and was acted and produced by a group of second-year students. Since it was not a professional production, it will not be analyzed here.
first produced in New York, was identified by some critics as signaling the decline of Miller’s writing career.

Agreeing that the play was not a very good one, the commentators credited the direction of Yves Desgagnés as important and original. Without the craft of the director, it was assumed, the production would not have worked. And, for the first time, a director was praised for cutting one quarter of the original text. We see that in 1994 Quebecois culture was strong enough to take on the task of “reconstructing” Miller’s work. The Quebecois director proved competent enough to transform the unsuccessful original text into a very effective theatre representation. The director “felt that Miller, at the time of the original production of the play, wanted to be sure to be understood, which led him to overemphasize the answer, to the detriment of the questions, which, on the other hand, keep all their relevance” (David, De la Difficulté C-10). In short, Après la Chute was given a retooling.

Desgagnés, very respectfully in fact, embraced the allegorical and metaphysical aspects of Miller’s play. The director commented: “Miller implies that, since we have been thrown out of Eden, and even more since the death camps, nobody can claim innocence anymore” (David, De la Difficulté 10). We detect not a word about the social and political conditions of Quebec in Desgagnés’ argument for the directing of the play. Desgagnés (and by extension the Quebecois society) did not need to justify the territorial specificity of Quebec or North America to relate to the theme of the play. Though he took liberties in cutting the play, Desgagnés seemed tuned into and respectful of Miller’s work.
While the play's direction was applauded, the translation of the work fared less successfully in the critics' eyes. The play represented various translating difficulties for Dumont\Grégoire. The piece is set in a dream-like world, in Europe, with one of the lead roles being German. The action is not rooted in everyday life. The translation employed too much of the vernacular and brought the play too close to life; the dream-like and foreign qualities of the play were undermined. The spectators were confronted with a translation "that tends to the lowest level of the anti-grammatical Quebecois" (Lévesque, Tentative B 8).

Again, Quebecois translation found itself at a crossroads. Bringing the text close to the language patterns of the public was no longer viewed as sufficient. This practice served neither the text nor the public. Since local translation had become totally legitimate, each translator had to find for each translation a texture of language that would best serve the source text. It was not enough to bring the text close to the audience's ear; the original tone of the play had to be recreated each time.

ORAL MATERIALS

While the written materials examined in the preceding section show the evolution of translative practices in Quebec between 1965 and 1997, the oral evidences presented in this chapter will emphasize the actual perceptions of various theatre artists. Even though the individuals interviewed talked candidly about their experiences with Miller's plays, their memory was dependent on their attitude toward and experience with translative practices. Through these interviews, one can delineate the various approaches toward language and the level of appropriation needed when working on a foreign play in
Montreal. It also becomes clear that the Quebecois theatre artists have developed a great trust in regard to translative practice. While the interviewees acknowledged an openness on the part of the Quebecois artists toward foreign works, they also recognized the importance of engaging foreign cultures with Quebecois linguistic and cultural tools. Finally, all interviewees were convinced that cultural confidence welcomes the encounter with foreign plays, generating an intercultural space. This permits the theatrical experience to be fuller and truer than when Montreal was viewing only made-in-Paris presentations of American plays. The interviewees also confirmed certain discrepancies between the three period division of theatrical translative practice already identified above.

The oral materials are divided into three sections. The first gives the points of view of the translators; second, the directors; and the third, the actors, all of whom were involved with the presentation of Miller's plays on the Montreal stage. The commentary assembled sheds a new light on the evolution of translation detailed in the analysis of the written materials. Through the works of Arthur Miller the commentary shows that habits of appropriation existed before 1968. It shows that political reasons are rarely at the forefront of the argumentation justifying Quebecois translation. It also shows that translation is an ever evolving process that questions each new translation of a foreign work.
The translators

Although the texture of the language they use and the results they accomplish when translating the plays of Arthur Miller vary greatly, Michel Dumont and René Gingras share similar opinions when asked why it is necessary to translate Miller’s work in Quebec.

They both take a strong stance concerning the viability of the Quebecois tongue as a spoken language and as a legitimate branch of the French language. They stress its relevance for translating Miller, whose works are rooted in North America. Because of the shared territoriality, there is a rhythmical connection between the American language and its Quebecois translation (this rhythm is lost in a European French translation). Both Dumont and Gingras agree that thought-language is related to geography and that, for a play to be successful, the work needs to generate a feeling of closeness or intimacy with the target audience.

For both translators, the use of a Quebecois translation brings the Quebecois spectator closer to the thematic and dramatic realities of the plays. In Quebecois, the plays are not only an art object, but they carry a comment about society. For local audiences, reality of the action is therefore heightened in Quebecois, and the theatrical experience is more complete.

At the core of their position is the expressed need to identify and recognize the target culture when it differs for the source culture. With Miller, this recognition is easy to

13. Marc Grégoire, co-translator of many plays with Michel Dumont, declined the invitation to be interviewed.
achieve. Dumont explains: "People recognize themselves and find themselves likeable." To be able to achieve this recognition, the translator needs to give an accurate French rendering of the English original.

Both translators exhibit a social, political, and artistic maturity toward language and Quebecois society. They both feel that the language they use in their translations is a legitimate form of French and should be recognized as such. René Gingras is more articulate on that topic than Michel Dumont and is hence quoted at length:

My philosophy is to stick to the playwright’s message. Unless important circumstantial evidence prevail, I think that adapting is not a valid choice. It is true that a translation has a tendency to age more rapidly than the original work and that here, in Quebec, we tended to adapt more than translate, for political reasons. It was a way to affirm a type of French
compared to another that had been imposed upon us. For me, it is not an ongoing problem. Besides, the question is no longer relevant. I don’t feel like I am translating into Quebecois. I translate in French and I think that the French we speak here is as legitimate a French as the one spoken elsewhere. Obviously, the more we play with the levels of language, the closer we come to the popular and realistic idioms, the more French exists in various ways.

But, in Miller’s case, there is no real problem. For example, with Comme une histoire d’amour, the question of language is very interesting because the characters use a very low level of language. It is very dynamic, very tense. An enormous tension exists between the characters and it is written in a very harsh language, without taking extravagant liberties in regard to the English norm, let’s say. I tried to do the same thing in French . . . I stayed close to the Quebecois French that I have in mind as translator and playwright.

For both translators, the Quebecois language is not a dialect but a branch of the French language, one as acceptable and as expressive as any other form. Such an attitude grants the Quebecois culture the right to express itself without any guilt or apology. Quebec does not need to justify its culture. The Quebecois people possess a French tool of expression and use it legitimately to talk to themselves. According to Gingras, translating “is solely a change of language.” In the translative process, the translator is not intervening in the plot or the content of the translated script. In fact, translation should not lead to any transformation, save that on the obvious linguistic level.

With that approach in mind, “the first difficulty in translation is truthfulness. It has to hook, to be perceived as real” (Dumont). Plausibility becomes an essential element of translation. Since Montreal is closer to New York than Paris, it seems obvious to the translators that the Quebecois translation should be more appropriate; at least, for the Quebecois audience. Moreover, common sonorities justify a North American French translation of Miller’s plays. Through television and films, the Quebecois spectator has
become accustomed to the American sonorities. The vocabulary of the characters in Miller’s plays has to suit the ear of the spectator for the language to sound plausible. As Dumont reminds us, “when we perceive that an element is not plausible, we do not get hooked.” That is exactly the problem encountered when standard French translations were employed.

For both translators, the evolution of the translative practice in Quebec must be understood in its historical context. The function of theatre in Quebec has changed, and the expectations of the audience toward plays have evolved. “During the first presentations of La Mort d’un commis voyageur, language was not such an important issue in the theatre, people were less concerned” (Dumont). Going to the theatre was principally an enlightening social experience. “One was going to the theatre to hear well constructed language” (Dumont). Before theatre was regarded as a socially relevant event, audience identification with characters was hard to establish. A palpable distance divorced the audience from the staged occurrences. That distance was mainly created by the inappropriateness of the language used by the characters. Dumont explains: “There should not be a distance between the characters and the audience’s language.” Since the characters were using a language from another continent (Europe), the immediacy of the communication was harder to establish and achieve. It is important to note that Dumont talks about the mid-1970s, a period in which the Québécois translation was supposed to be the norm. In this comment Dumont shows that the time frame of the second historical period can be questioned.
The changes in texture brought about by the actualization and re-territorialization of the language have not always been accepted by Montreal’s bourgeois audience. “There is still some reluctance when the characters are cursing on stage” (Dumont). Questions of acceptability and decorum, more than question of politics, are still very strongly raised by a significant segment of the public. Furthermore, the elevation of the spirit and the soul is assumed to be achieved only with a proper language. “People resist, some spectators feel that when a play is translated into Quebecois, our good old French language is deeply hurt” (Dumont). Michel Dumont attacks this position adamantly. He is inexhaustible on that subject:

Quand je suis dans une salle et que j’écoute une pièce traduite par un Français, j’ai l’impression que c’est une langue étrangère. L’accent de cette langue-là, la structure de cette langue-là, la façon d’être, de s’exprimer, de penser qu’elle véhicule; pour moi cela c’est en français. Et, sauf pour l’affinité linguistique, c’est différent de nous.

Quand les gens ont entendu Le Commis voyageur... dans une langue ordinaire dans ma traduction, ils se reconnaissaient. Ça aide les gens à aller d’emblée vers les personnages et à ne pas sentir qu’il y a une barrière linguistique.

When I am sitting in a theatre and I attend a play translated by a Frenchman, I feel that a foreign language is spoken on stage. The accent, the structure of the language, the way to be, to express thoughts, the vehicle, to me, is French. And, except for the linguistic affinities, it is different from us.

When people heard the Salesman in the ordinary language of my translation, they recognized themselves. It helps the people to get closer to the characters and not to feel a language barrier.

When using French translations, in the first translative period, the actors and directors involved in the projects often took liberties with the written words. They were often tempted to transform the chosen translation, to adapt it in order to clarify certain
parts. Repeated transformations often led to a blurring of the text's original meaning. Therefore, after transforming the French translations, often beyond recognition, it seemed logical, if not natural, to start translating the plays from the original directly into Quebecois.

Both translators have never considered adapting Miller. For both, it is clear that their work must be limited to translation without adaptation of any kind. Using La Mort d’un commis voyageur as an example, Dumont explains:

Il ne fallait pas l’amener au Québec. Il ne fallait pas que ce qui se passe dans la pièce se passe au Québec. Les circonstances de la pièce (Rêve américain, voyages sur de grandes distances, New York, Boston, fils joueur de football) sont tellement américaines que si on l’amène au Québec, quelque part on va la diminuer. Il y a quelque chose de typiquement américain, pis on voulait la laisser comme ça.

We did not want to bring it to Quebec. What was happening in the play should not be transferred to Quebec. The circumstances of the play (American dream, traveling long distances, New York, Boston, son football player) are so American that if we bring it to Quebec, we belittle it. There is something typically American that we had to preserve.

Faithful to that approach, both translators very humbly put themselves at the service of the playwright. There is no sign of abusive appropriation in their attitude as was often present in French translations. In their mind, Miller’s work stands on its own and should not be adapted. As Gingras clearly states: “I do not have the authority to transform Miller’s text. I did not ask for permission to make the text fit a different idea of theatricality.” Such an attitude toward Miller’s theatre has allowed the translators to create a flowing communication system between the house and the stage, thus bringing a new understanding and vitality to Miller’s work.
For these translators, the thematic strength of Miller’s drama renders the adaptation of his plays unnecessary. “Miller’s themes seem so close to us . . . But, in fact, it is only that he is universal” (Dumont). Both translators are fascinated by how Miller’s plays seem familiar and open their audiences up to the world at large. In this light, Miller becomes a tool for the Quebecois audience to understand both itself and the world.

Miller has also been a tool for the affirmation of the Quebecois identity and its difference. “There is a rhythm in the North American tongue that is much shorter than the length of the French thought” (Dumont). The Quebecois language is linked to the American language, obviously not so much in its semantic structure, but in its sonority and rhythmical structure. 14 This justifies the fact that “it is not necessary to adapt Miller; on the other hand, if we can eliminate with the translation the perception that it is a foreign play, the audience’s reception is facilitated” (Dumont). The translators’ goal is to eliminate the perception that Miller’s plays are distant, while simultaneously respecting the setting of the play that the translation should keep true to the original work.

Translating in Quebecois has become a means of bringing the audience members closer to Miller and his work, sharpening the level of truthfulness found in the original and freeing the aspirations of the Quebecois theatre artists. As Dumont relates, “This way to translate has permitted actors to come closer to truth in a way that did not exist before.” And this truthfulness is achieved in a fashion respectful of the essence of Miller’s work, his

14. Alfred Tomatis in Nous sommes tous nés Polyglottes uses at length a socio-medical approach to explain the relationship between geography and language.
thoughts on the moral, social and political implications of modern life come through more clearly. "In Quebec, we ponder a lot on our society and this is probably why we are interested in Miller" (Gingras). We can therefore conclude that in Miller’s work the social preoccupations are close to the preoccupations of Quebecois society. Seen from this angle, his ever-growing popularity on the Montreal stage is easy to explain. However, for this social resonance to operate the theatrical event must be a plausible one. To attain that plausibility, the use of a Quebecois translation is imperative.

For Dumont and Gingras, the evolution of Quebecois translative practice seems divided in only two parts, one dominated by French translation, the other dominated by Quebecois translation. According to both translators, when French translations were used Miller’s work seemed remote and foreign. When Quebecois translations emerged, a new relationship was created between the playwright and his audience. The translators’ discussion of Quebecois translation was mainly rooted in theatrical necessities and rarely mentioned political matters.

The directors

Talking with the various directors who have been involved with Miller’s work in Quebec, I noted that a generation gap appeared. First, the older directors, those who worked with the French versions of the texts, still felt that they were adequate. Second, the directors who were the first to work with the Quebecois translations still felt strongly about the absolute necessity of never using a French translation of an American play on the Quebecois stage. Third, more recent directors, those of the new generation, have taken the Quebecois translations of American texts for granted; their approach is more aesthetic
and conceptual. They are the ones who have started asking for new Quebecois translations when the ones already available do not fit their directorial vision or project. This division is grossly equivalent (although time frames vary slightly) to the traditional divisions of translative practice. Plus, there is Raymond Cloutier, who has a vision of his own; he will be discussed separately.

This evolutionary generational structure shows a developing theatrical practice, one that has been questing for a more refined approach toward the creation of theatrical reality. All the arguments, regardless of their generation, eventually lead to a desire for greater verisimilitude when presenting Miller’s work to a given public.

**When French translations were the norm**

There are three directors highlighted in this section: Albert Millaire, Paul Hébert, and Jean-Louis Roux. To those three, Jeanine Beaubien, the former artistic director of the Théâtre la Poudrière, has been added since Florent Forget, director of *Vu du Pont* in 1966, is now deceased. Although they have approached Miller’s work in Montreal differently, they all agreed that their experience with the standard French translations was satisfactory. And they all still question the necessity of systematically using Quebecois translations of foreign plays.

Albert Millaire, for one, refused to even talk about Quebecois translation in his interview. During one telephone conversation, he made it very clear that he considered the habit of translating foreign plays into Quebecois preposterous. For him, the French translations from Europe, with their fine literary qualities, are more appropriate for the
Montreal theatre than their Quebecois counterparts. For him, the use of Quebecois translations is, in the case of Miller, reductive and should not be encouraged.

All of the interviewees of this section agreed that using Quebecois versions have made Miller’s plays appear too local. Believing that Miller’s work is wide in its meaning, they declared that Miller’s work should not be “reduced to a local everyday life language rooted in Montreal” (Hébert). For all of them, the French version was true to the spirit of the play. They thereby implied that new Quebecois versions, bringing the play too closely to Quebecois culture, betray the original text.

Even though these directors all bow to the relevance and pertinence of the standard French translations, they paradoxically admit that in each production (Les Sorcières de Salem, Vu du Pont, Le Prix, La Mort d’un commis voyageur), the actors were asked to tone down the French texture of the translation to make the play more accessible, more real for the Montreal audience. Beaubien confessed: “The actors were creating the nuances with the accents they were using. They kept a proper French mode accentuating the consonances a little. It was all in the nuances of the accent.”

There have been many forms of adaptation of the French translations presented on the Montreal stage. Le Prix, directed by Jean-Louis Roux, starred the French actor Claude Dauphin in the role of Solomon. Dauphin had played the role in Paris the year before. Concerning the question of plausibility, one can only wonder how Quebecois the other actors could appear when they had to act with a French actor like Mr. Dauphin.

Nevertheless, slight adaptations of French translations represented the standard practice of the time. This was necessitated when the original text used slang or popular
language. In France such was translated in “argot.” And the question was rightfully asked by the artists: “Why use a foreign argot, when we could transpose the popular expressions in our own language?” (Roux).

The Quebecois theatre artists of that period, according to the directors, went from adapting the accent of a standardized language to adapting aspects of its vernacular to suit the Quebecois realities. As Paul Hébert explains: “We were making corrections as we went along, finding the most natural way to express ourselves. It was not a treason [of the French translation]. It was just a softening of the angles.” It is important to mention that Paul Hébert preferred to work on La Mort d’un commis voyageur with the French translation of Erik Kahane than with the French-Canadian version of Marcel Dubé. In his opinion, the European version served more accurately the universal meaning of the play. So, even in 1973, it was possible to prefer a French translation to a local one, notwithstanding the few “softening of the angles” necessary to make the play believable.

What made Miller’s plays relevant to the Montreal audience in that context was obviously not the language, but the recognition of the Americanity of the Quebecois audience. Since, Quebec’s society, during the 60s and 70s, was growing more and more North American in its way of life, this recognition came almost instantaneously. That evolution also explains why the directors of the time never felt the need to adapt Miller. It never seemed necessary to them to change the location and time of the plays, even if it was becoming a common practice in Quebecois theatre at the time. As Jean-Louis Roux explained, the link between the Quebecois audience and Miller’s work is rooted in geography: “What we have in common with Miller is North America.”
There is a revealing anecdote told by Paul Hébert that illustrates the level of identification existing between Miller's characters and the Quebecois audience. Here is what happened one night during a performance of *La Mort d'un commis voyageur*:

At the theatre, there was a man who had walked out and was crying. I asked him if I could help him. He answered "no". He pointed toward the stage and told me: "That guy there, it's me." And he went back to his seat.

Such expressions of recognition frequently occur when Quebecois audiences are in contact with Miller's work.

Despite all the above considerations, the first directors of Miller's plays in Montreal did not want to bring him too close to Quebec's everyday life because they respected the broadness of Miller's work. Roux declares: "He is really a playwright and his characters go beyond many U.S. prototypes." In fact, Jean-Louis Roux is so convinced of the scope of Miller's work that he cannot see how an adaptation of one of his plays could ever be situated in Quebec.

To that contention, Paul Hébert added some clarifications. If he were to produce *La Mort d'un commis voyageur* now, he would ask for a Quebecois translation. But he would prefer a translation that would be the result of a collective effort between the actors, the director and the translator. He would want to stay as close as possible to the original text. This caution expressed by the directors of this first generation comes from a distrust of current translation practice, which is perceived by those older artists as too
eager to adapt, to please. According to Hébert: “Today, a good translation from Quebec would be needed, but a respectful one.”

This respect comes from the position Miller occupies in the theatre world. No Quebecois playwright has attained the stature of Miller. Consequently, as a model, his plays should keep being produced respectfully. Hébert explains: “There is a lack of maturation with our playwrights, which makes Miller necessary.” To make Miller too Quebecois would belittle his stature—that is the opinion shared by the first generation of directors. They indeed find in the more recent translative practices flaws that are typically associated with the second translative period.

The plays must be translated into Quebecois

The two directors presented in this section are Claude Maher and Jean-Luc Bastien. As opposed to their predecessors, who had been trained in Europe, both were trained in Quebec. For that reason they developed a strong sense of geographical belonging, and, in their careers, they both defended a strong Quebecois approach to translation.

Monique Duceppe joins Bastien and Maher in this section, because, although not a director of Miller’s plays, she is the daughter of Jean Duceppe and was a close collaborator. Mister Duceppe, who founded the eponym company, is now deceased. His daughter, who was involved with many of Miller’s productions in Montreal, transmits her father’s vision.

In this section, because of the great interest he showed toward the topic and because he is the first director who dared to direct a play by Miller that had been translated
into Quebecois, Claude Maher will be given prominence. The comments of Monique Duceppe and Jean-Luc Bastien will be used to complement Maher's argumentation.

Even though he directed *La Mort d'un commis voyageur* in 1983, Claude Maher expresses an attitude that matches perfectly the attitude developed by the Quebecois artists during the 1970s. It is fascinating to realize how passionate he still is about the subject of translating foreign plays into Quebecois and how inappropriate he feels the French translations of American plays are for the Quebecois artists. He explains: "It is a question of utmost importance to me. I mean, do we bring the plays here, or do we leave them elsewhere when we translate?" Of all the artists interviewed, Maher is the least reluctant about calling for adaptation. At the same time, he knows how ludicrous strong adaptations (changing time, location, social status of the characters) can be. So, he strongly defends the practice of at least translating foreign plays into Quebecois. He sees it as the only way to work on a foreign text. He bases his judgement on what he feels is the ineptitude of the French to translate accurately the American texts.

This realization of the inappropriateness of French translations of American plays came to Maher when he was studying a Miller text (*Les Sorcières de Salem*) during his years of training as an actor. Studying his role in the French translation, he tried to find the rhythm of the scene and could not. He went back to the original English text and had what he called a revelation: "The French had taken liberties with the text and, foremost, had built a poetical tone . . . while the English text, although poetical, seemed much harsher, much more real, much closer to our [Quebecois] sensibility." For him the love
scene between Abigail and Proctor, where the audience must recognize that they really
want to make love, had become a dream-like sequence leading to platonic love.

Such nuances in meaning concerned Maher when American plays were presented
in Montreal in their French translation. Following the established practice of confronting
the French text with a “fixing as we go” attitude, Maher explains: “We ended up with
versions where the rhythm was French with Quebecois expressions and even some
American English idioms.” For Maher and the Quebecois theatre artists of the time,
contrary to the attitude of their predecessors, it was urgent to find new ways to deal with
foreign plays. They became convinced that foreign plays should always be translated into
Quebecois.

Monique Duceppe confirms that her father shared Maher’s dissatisfaction with the
French translations. She explains that at La Compagnie Jean-Duceppe they tried to invent
a popular language that could be identified as such while keeping the aesthetic structure of
Miller’s work intact. It was a question of giving back to Miller’s text the texture that was
lost when played in a transformed French version. She relates: “The language of the play
had to be respected. The language, the color, the rhythm of the play had to be reclaimed.”
This is what Jean Duceppe and his contemporaries tried to achieve.

Resulting from all of the Quebecois translations of the 1980s was a new
understanding of Miller’s work. With the increased familiarity came increased pleasure.
Directors and actors experienced revelations when confronted with the new Quebecois
versions. They realized that “there were big parts of the characters missing in the French
translations” (Maher). Because they did not share North American realities, French
translators were cutting or transforming (adapting) large sections of the original text, breaking Miller's rhythm with long, metaphorical sentences, transforming his meaning with eradications and omissions.

With the appropriation of Miller's work by Quebecois artists, a new familiarity with and a new knowledge of the work emerged. This brought a heightened awareness of Miller's technical demands on the actors. The level of reality necessary to play Miller was made an utmost aim. The sort of contact experienced between text and audience changed. As Bastien remarks: "From the moment these plays were worked on by the Quebecois artists, came a total identification."

A wonderful type of recognition occurred for the artists and the public when Miller was translated in Quebecois. Duceppe reminds us that "Miller's writing is not intellectual." It is close to the people. It is a popular theatre, not a theatre of the elite. It speaks to the middle class. Duceppe explains:

On a améné les gens à découvrir un auteur qui leur parlait simplement. Parce que souvent le théâtre qu'on avait avant était perçu comme trop intellectuel. Puis, t'as eu des gens comme Miller qui sont arrivés avec des thèmes plus quotidiens et c'est peut-être pour ça que ça parlait plus aux gens.

We brought people to discover an author who talks to them simply. Because the theatre we had before was often perceived as intellectual. Then, there were people like Miller who brought more everyday life themes and that's why it was talking more to the people.

All three interviewees agreed that, notwithstanding the political atmosphere of the time, their arguments justifying Quebecois translations were mainly artistic. Bastien asserts: "Between Jean Anouilh and Arthur Miller, the [theatrical] line is clear. That was
our frustration. Miller was translated as if he was Anouilh.” The re-territorialization of the work through Quebecois translations brought a new respect for Miller.

According to these directors, now that it is no longer necessary to prove the validity of translating Miller’s plays into Quebecois, one must stay attentive to the demands Miller’s plays impose upon the creative teams. Miller’s work needs to be treated as a modern classic. The Quebecois texture needs to subordinate itself before the demands of the original script. This is what those pioneers of the second generation of directors are expecting from the new generation. Miller’s craftmanship commands new directorial visions. And while the work needs to be done in Quebecois, Duceppe calls for several constraints:

1- Trust his writing.
2- Respect the structure of the plays.
3- Respect the themes of the plays.
4- Admit no adaptation.

Arthur Miller beyond language transfer

It may seem awkward to place André Brassard (the usual director of Michel Tremblay’s plays) in this section instead of the preceding, but his attitude and approach toward Miller’s work are closer to that of Serge Denoncourt and Yves Desgagnés (both representatives of a new generation of directors) than to Claude Maher’s or Jean-Luc Bastien’s. The three directors of this section take for granted that a play written by Miller and performed in Montreal should be in a Quebecois version. But they can and will always question the quality of the translation and confront it with their own interpretive vision of the play. All three also back away from the assumption that Quebecois culture is
similar to American culture. They acknowledge wide gaps between the two ways of life. For them, when identification occurs in the audience reception of Miller’s plays in Quebec, it is more due to the thematic strength of Miller’s work than the Americanity of the Quebecois audience. This distance allows the directors to explore Miller plays anew, to explore their structure for new interpretative keys. In doing so, these directors do not feel tied to a geographically-bound attitude towards the work.

When André Brassard directed Les Sorcières de Salem, he was not satisfied with the results. The language used in the translation was not precise enough, a feature that brought him great frustration. He feels that, by 1990, the use of the Quebecois language on the stage was experiencing a backlash. What had become a formula seemed apparent and constraining. A movement demanding a finer use of language in translation was emerging.

Due to the circumstances of The Crucible and the time frame in which the play is set, the Quebecois translation never achieved any level of plausibility for the Montreal public. At the same time, it was impossible for the translators to use an appropriate rural dialect rooted in the past. Moreover, since television had exploited that side of the Quebecois culture, using an archaic language at the time would have been perceived by the audience as corny and totally inappropriate. Brassard relates: “Miller had worked carefully on the language and the period and Dumont/Grégoire decided not to take it into account.” The play needed a dramaturgical approach to effect the level of reality that Miller had accomplished, one created by mixing biblical patterns of speech with archaic
expressions in a modern rhythm. Miller’s choices were not followed by the Quebecois translation.

An example of dramaturgical ineffectiveness is seen in the translation of the play’s title: *Les Sorcières de Salem*, not *Le Creuset* (*The Witches of Salem* instead of *The Crucible*). This change, inherited from the first French translation from France, “was putting the focus on the witches instead of the conscience debate of John Proctor” (Brassard). This shift, therefore, changed the meaning of the play.

Serge Denoncourt shares a similar critical attitude toward Quebecois translations. For that reason, when he directed *Vu du Pont* in 1990, he did not use the recent translation of René Gingras (1986). He asked for a new one. He regarded Gingras’ translation as too nationalistic. He wanted a material more in tune with the artistic intent of Miller. In justifying his choice Denoncourt explains:

I felt that the first translation, René Gingras’, focused on making us recognize ourselves, which gave the impression that it was set in St-Léonard [an Italian neighborhood in Montreal]. That displeased me very much because the play was set in New York, at a precise time; I found that we were falsifying all the givens, cultural, social, the period, time and place. That is why we asked Michel [Dumont] and Marc [Grégoire] to work on a new translation. They worked on the Italian rhythm. In that production,
you feel that they speak Italian, while they speak a kind of French slightly Quebecois and it is in the rhythm that they found the texture of the play, while René had found it in the choice of the words.

The all-out-Quebecois aspect of Gingras’ version created confusion regarding both location and plot and blurred the social implications of the play. The language was too familiar. It diminished the potential impact of the play. Therefore, a new Quebecois translation was needed.

For Brassard, Desgagnés, and Denoncourt, recognition and identification between the spectators and characters are the principal elements of the theatrical experience. However, this experience is not created through any anthropological approach to language. On the contrary, a creative Quebecois language needs to be devised to support the originality of Miller’s language. Too often, translations fail to transmit the reality and the originality of the source text. But such a quest has started, and the translators are sharpening their tools. Denoncourt comments: “They know that Miller’s language is impossible to translate. So, they invented a language which became their own Miller.” The goal for the directors is to find a translation that allows for as much of Miller’s originality and texture as possible to be saved.

To reaffirm Quebecois specificity and originality, the directors take their distance from American culture, as their predecessors did from French culture. Desgagnés asserts: “We will never be American and we will never act like the Americans.” But there is also an injunction to direct Miller’s plays respecting Miller’s artistic spirit. One can “work on Miller like on Lear; there are no limits” (Denoncourt). Miller thus represents an ultimate challenge for the theatre artists. Denoncourt adds: “It is a theatre desperately real. That
is why it is difficult to put on, to translate, to act.” Miller is one of the elite who redefine theatre and the way it should be done; he consequently provides a stimulating theatrical challenge to any director. “The construction of his plays is extraordinary” (Desgagnés).

With Miller, theatre becomes a forum where, while respecting the differences between cultures, the Quebecois people can recognize, as though from a distance, its own aspirations. For that reason, Miller’s plays should never be adapted, and the translations of his work should always be reevaluated and revisited.

Arthur Miller, a Quebecois Playwright?

Of all the directors interviewed who have worked on a play written by Arthur Miller, one has shown a very different approach from that of his colleagues. With Comme une histoire d’amour, Raymond Cloutier wanted to shake the foundations of the Quebecois theatre. He wanted to bring a new degree of reality to acting, and his 1993 project represents a hiatus in the way Miller’s work has been presented in Montreal. While it had previously been performed in large theatres, the play was staged in a small experimental space. The essence of the translation did not focus on the problem of language but on the level of theatrical reality. Cloutier explains:

Le théâtre pour moi n’est pas une affaire de langue, c’est une affaire de jeu. Donc, la langue c’est un des outils du jeu. Je sais qu’on peut mener le projet de la langue jusqu’à la musique, mais pour moi, c’est un instrument de représentation la langue. Donc, à partir de là, je me suis toujours étonné comme acteur et comme Québécois de me reconnaître plus au cinéma américain et souvent à la télévision américaine qu’au cinéma québécois et à la télévision québécoise; et de me reconnaître encore plus facilement, au théâtre américain qu’au théâtre québécois. Et je pense, et c’est là tout le propos que je veux tenir avec Miller sur le plan d’artiste, j’ai l’impression qu’on a évité au Québec de passer à travers une phase réaliste.
For me, theatre is not a question of language, it is a question of acting. Language then is a tool to be able to act. I know that some projects can bring language to musical levels, but for me, language is only one of the elements of the performance. So, starting there, I am always amazed, as actor and as Quebecois, to recognize myself more in the American cinema and television than in the Quebecois cinema and television; and to recognize myself even more in the American theatre than in the Quebecois theatre. And, I think, and that is what I want to say with Miller on the artistic level that in Quebec we avoided passing through a realistic phase.

Although for Cloutier this reality on the stage is highly social and political, it is also the expression of an artistic project. Communication between the actor and spectator can only be achieved through shared reality. Cloutier states: “What I’m interested in with the actor is to explore that realistic universe that will help the Quebecois rediscover himself, identify himself, because the actor will have sought how to express that reality. So, the one I choose is Miller.” In Cloutier’s hands, Miller becomes a privileged artistic tool with which the actor can express himself.

Surprisingly, the search for this theatrical reality does not lead Cloutier into adaptation. He does not want to bring Miller towards the audience. He wants to make believe that even if the drama is happening in French, it is happening in English. The translator, René Gingras, was asked “to find a correspondence that could create after a few seconds the illusion that the characters were in fact speaking English” (Cloutier).

Cloutier’s radical positioning reflects an extreme dissatisfaction with the actual Quebecois theatre. The local theatre is perceived as superficial and narcissistic, with no relation to reality. Cloutiers complains: “It is at a point where an actor is not believable even when acting Dubé. We cannot even play our own reality.” In opposition to the three
preceding directors, Cloutier feels in perfect sympathy with America. He feels completely American and perceives no border.

Cloutier’s project was very ambitious, for he wanted to shake the complacent habits of the Quebecois artists and to attain a truer theatre. To do so, he explained, “we will develop a kind of acting never seen here. It is an exploration toward rendering things more and more real . . . We use Miller because there is no Miller here. We will not reach the tragic if we do not pass through reality first.” Oddly, in Cloutier’s hands, Miller becomes a champion calling for a new Quebecois theatre.

This approach is extreme and does not reflect the actual state of the presentation of Miller’s work in Montreal. But it shows how important the playwright is in the Quebecois theatre, how admired and respected he is by the Quebecois theatre community and how stimulating he is to the general theatrical milieu.

The actors

While Germain Houde and Gérard Poirier have acted in only one play of Arthur Miller; Lionel Villeneuve, Gilles Renaud, and Guy Provost have acted in several. Still very active on the Montreal theatre scene, all of them have also acted in various foreign plays translated in various ways. Even though they are familiar with the translative practices of the past, discussions with these actors moved much more toward the acting practice currently used when confronting foreign plays.

While Lionel Villeneuve and Gérard Poirier defended the pertinence, relevance, and effectiveness of Miller’s plays in their French translations, Guy Provost, Gilles Renaud, and Germain Houde strongly supported the Quebecois artists’ appropriation of
Miller's work, as it had been done in the recent past. On the one side, some actors felt that the Quebecois translations have diminished the audience impact of the plays and that the linguistic rendering of the character should be the responsibility of the actor. Such a position implies that a translator should limit himself to transmitting a faithful version of the work in correct French. It is the actor's job to color the play with a regional tone when needed.

Before plays were translated into Quebecois, communication between the stage and the audience, according to these performers, was good or at least satisfactory. The effort to present the Quebecois language on stage was not strong in the mainstream theatre milieu. Spectators did not share this want, a fact that probably goes to explain why Quebecois translation has often met strong resistance.

For Villeneuve and Poirier, one cannot assume that an American play translated in North American French will be any better than its European French equivalent. Villeneuve, for example, considers Éric Kahane's translation of The Crucible very good: "That translation was better than Dumont's. It was more effective. It became dull when transformed into Quebecois." According to this view, language is rooted in a territory, and the Quebecois language gives too precise of a geographical location--this gets in the way of the original locale and thematic content of the work. This problem is more complex for Villeneuve with a play like Les Sorcières de Salem since the language is two hundred years removed from the present; given this feature of the text and the biblical style of the writing, the use of a Quebecois dialect seems preposterous to Villeneuve.
Villeneuve and Poirier’s vision is slightly tainted with nostalgia; they are both very happy with the new translative trend in Montreal. This is because current practice is less anchored in dialectical usage and moves toward a normative linguistic approach. With this new attitude, they feel that Quebecois translative practice is earning a new credibility, proving that France does not hold a monopoly on the French language. Therefore, they are both at ease when working with “a French that we own” (Villeneuve), because the current translative practice is less aggressive than it was in the late 70s early 80s. “There is no doubt that we feel more at ease now with the versions from here... Now, even the spectators would have difficulties accepting versions from France,” explains Poirier. A new standard is emerging, one that may be thought of as the standard Quebecois French. It is more versatile and can be adapted to a wider spectrum of characters from various social backgrounds. Their vision seems in tune with the traditional tripartite division of theatrical translation, but their arguments always revolve around the issue of plausibility and never around politics.

On the other side, Gilles Renaud, Guy Provost, and Germain Houde strongly defend the necessity of always translating American plays into Quebecois. They see the translative practice in Quebec as an ever evolving system, demanding constant re-invention of the expressive spectrum of the local culture. Like Claude Maher, they defiantly defend the Quebecois translations and challenge the resistance it encounters from certain quarters. “When actors speak in French, they are in New York. It is a translation. If they speak in Quebecois, it is not plausible? What is the problem?” (Renaud). Such a forced dichotomy
seems absurd, and for these actors the experiences of the last twenty years should have established the legitimacy of the Quebecois practice.

The advent of Quebecois translation is perceived as a great artistic liberation and an improvement in the quality of the communication between actors and spectators. Moreover, this new appropriation of texts has allowed for a new down-to-earth understanding of the American drama. Guy Provost claims: “American drama was stirring ideas, emotions and feelings that were closer to us than French theatre did.” The issue here is one of verisimilitude. American rhythms are close to the Quebecois rhythms; the sonorities are similar. So when a French translation is used in Quebec, an alienation occurs. The Quebecois translation avoids that problem. Provost continues: “It has to sound right for the Quebecois audience . . . the foreign work has to pass through our own sensibility. To accomplish that, we need a vehicle which is ours.” Through the appropriation of the language, an emotional appropriation is achieved, one that merits legitimating because it facilitates the contact between the play and the public.

Even if certain linguistic abuses have occurred in the past, the Quebecois translation practice of Miller’s work has always tended to respect the work of the playwright. The attitude has involved “finding the social level of the characters’ language, how they speak in the source text, then, finding the [Quebecois] correspondence” (Houde). The goal is to identify the correspondence between the linguistic patterns of the American characters and their Quebecois counterparts, while avoiding a full adaptation of the play. Only linguistic transfers should occur: a translation should stay close to the American text “without embellishing or adding local colors” (Houde).
Both groups of actors agree that the artistic goal consists in bringing Miller’s work closer to the audience without changing the essence of the plays. Villeneuve, Poirier, Houde and Provost concur that the actor should avoid assuming that American and Quebecois cultures are alike. For these four actors, there is one obvious prerequisite: “The U.S.A. is not Quebec” (Villeneuve). American plays are foreign and must be treated as such.

These artists advocate that Miller’s work should be approached through its thematic qualities. If the Quebecois audience feels close to the play, an emotional identification results, creating a level of reality that can touch any human being. No direct connection should be made from one culture to the other. Miller creates “a different reality which reaches us through tears, and the depth of the human soul . . . It is not working at the words level but at the emotional level” (Villeneuve). If the actors are not vigilant, they always run the risk of shifting the play in a direction different from the one Miller intended.

C’est un problème énorme que de jouer du repertoire américain . . . Il y a des choses qui nous viennent des Américains et qui n’ont pas de contrepartie ici. Ce n’est pas la même civilisation, ou les mêmes gens, ou les mêmes moeurs non plus, et je crois que les acteurs doivent être conscients de cela aussi, tout comme le metteur en scène. (Poirier)

To play the American repertoire represents an enormous problem . . . Being of the same continent, we can assume that we are very close to American usage, but we have to be careful. There are things coming from the Americans that have no equivalent here. It is not the same civilization, nor the same people, nor even the same customs, and I think that the actors have to be conscious of that, the directors as well. (Poirier)
In contrast to his colleagues, Gilles Renaud feels that many shared cultural elements bring Quebecois and American cultures close to one another. He believes that the Quebecois actor should nurture these cultural similarities as much as possible when working on a Miller play.

Le théâtre de Miller, on va toujours le jouer au Québec. Parce qu’il nous ressemble. On dirait qu’il est québécois . . . Il parle de l’homme nord-américain et un québécois c’est un nord-américain . . . La présence de la religion rapproche le spectateur de la pièce. Et ce combat pour la survie, ça sonne une cloche au Québec. *Vu du Pont*, c’est un milieu social familier . . . les amérindiens n’ont pas de frontière, notre frontière est absurde.

We will always play Miller’s drama in Quebec. Because he is like us. It is as if he was Quebecois . . . He talks about the North-American man and a Quebecois is a North-American man . . . The presence of the religion brings the spectator closer to the play. And this combat for survival, it rings a bell in Quebec. *Vu du Pont*, is a familiar social milieu . . . The American Indians know no borders, our borders are absurd. (Renaud)

But, as with the other actors interviewed, Gilles Renaud is not absorbed in the socio-linguistic struggle to determine who is the most competent to translate Miller’s work. He is rather fascinated by the work itself, the capacity of the playwright to write modern tragedies, and the very artistry of Miller. For Renaud, Miller can create “a dimension of realism that explodes, opening on to tragedy.”

To summarize these interviews, I would stress that the actors were all impressed by Miller’s craftsmanship. They trust the quality of the plays’ mechanics, which permit a free flow of emotions. For these actors, the plays are complete, solid. Provost explains: “Under an everyday life tone, everything falls into place, is made clear. Everything is brought to the attention of the public.” The actors are all impressed at how Miller’s plays work as effective and powerful tools of communication. Miller also enchants the actors.
and the Quebecois audiences with his talent for strong story telling. "He possesses a gift to carry you into a beautiful story and only afterward do you realize that it is a work deeper than what you thought; a work with social content. He underlines the greatness of the simple people and that is rare" (Houde). That apparent simplicity, leading to a tragic vision of humanity, is what brings the Quebecois theatre artists back to Miller time and time again.

All the discussions about translating Miller’s work in Montreal revolved around the question of efficiency and respect. If the traditional three-phase time period was corroborated in the comments of the interviewees (mainly the directors), it more concerned the theatrical usage of language and its different levels than any hidden political agenda to be found in the work of the theatre artists.
CONCLUSION

ARTHUR MILLER IN MONTREAL:
TERRITORIALITY AND VERISIMILITUDE

Even though Michel Tremblay is identified as the playwright who brought Quebecois vernacular language onto the Montreal stage, this movement had already begun before 1968. That practice was not limited to the burlesque theatre and the variety shows, where French-Canadian was the norm (as often shown by Chantal Hébert), but it was also used in the mainstream theatre where, in January of 1968 for example, Éloi de Grandmont introduced elements of Quebecois language in his translation of Bernard Shaw’s Pygmalion (Lefebvre adaptation 32). In his interview, Lionel Villeneuve made it very clear that actors often, without changing the words of the French translations, worked in a Quebecois accent to make the plays more understandable to the audience. The changes instigated by Tremblay, while not denying their importance, can be seen as part of a linguistic movement already in place. This point thus leads us to challenge the generally accepted three divisions of Quebecois theatre translative practice and to favor a model that highlights a continuous theatrical process independent of, or at least parallel to, the political history of Quebec.

As we can see, in their quest to explain the evolution of foreign texts’ appropriation—particularly regarding Quebecois language on stage—scholars have often mistaken transformations and adaptations of foreign works with translation practices. For example, the two productions most commonly used to illustrate translative practices in Quebec are Michel Garneau’s Macbeth (Shakespeare) and Robert Lalonde’s Les Trois...
These two examples of extreme adaptation are often used to criticize the translation practice in Montreal. They are also used as evidence to prove that Quebecois theatre artists have a tendency to betray foreign works, when the original work is subordinated to a reductive nationalistic agenda, one that approaches the source-text in parasitic fashion. But, this is not what generally happens to American drama, as this study of Miller’s work illustrated.

There is a clear difference between translation and adaptation or tradaptation or transliteration. And, as opposed to the scholars who have preceded me in this field, I believe, based on my research, that translation (respecting the source-text) is the normal and dominant practice on the Montreal stage. As shown through the work of Arthur Miller in Montreal, the goal of Quebecois artists when confronted with foreign work has not been (with few exceptions) abusive appropriation but respectful translation.

I have also realized that French translations of American plays, in particular the work of Miller, are relevant for the French public. For the Quebecois audience, they, however, have crossed the Atlantic Ocean “one time too many.”16 In fact, French translators, like Quebecois translators, take whatever means to convey the text and its meaning in order to make it accessible to their target audience.

16. Both of these works are important appropriations of very famous works. Garneau transformed Shakespeare into a medieval French poet while Lalonde made Chekhov a provincial Quebecois writer whose characters want to leave a region of Quebec to move to Montreal.

17. The expression is from Serge Denoncourt’s interview.
Even though we can admit that the political context of national identification has played a great role in the legitimation of the translation of foreign plays in Quebecois, it is not the principal consideration that has led artists of the Quebecois stage to produce local translations and to reject foreign (i.e., French) translations. It is much more a secular spirit concerning the matters of verisimilitude, of identification (territoriality) and of theatrical efficiency that has made the Quebecois directors demand local translations and renounce Europeans ones.

The production of Miller’s plays in Montreal can be divided into the three generally accepted translative periods: the pre-Tremblay period, the post-Tremblay\pre-referendum period, and the post-referendum period. But, these divisions need to be reassessed according to aesthetic and not just political determinates.

Two Miller plays were staged during the pre-Tremblay period: Les Sorcières de Salem, directed by Albert Millaire at the Théâtre du Nouveau Monde, and Vu du Pont, directed by Florent Forget at La Poudrière. Both texts were translated by Marcel Aymé. While no reviews and no program notes of the time mention the European nature of the translations, commentators made efforts to emphasize connections between Miller’s characters and the French Canadian audience—a shared Americanity was stressed. And the actors admitted taking liberties, if not with the texts, at least with the accents to make the plays more understandable to the Montreal audiences. This occurred because of no political agenda but due to the need to bring the plays closer to the audience. Therefore, as early as 1966, two years before the Tremblay revolution, directors, actors and critics
expressed a collective desire for foreign plays to be performed in a translation that had direct resonance for the Montreal public.

During the second phase, the post-Tremblay\pre-referendum period, one would suppose that transformations and adaptations of Miller's work flourished. This, however, was not the case. Le Prix, directed by Jean-Louis Roux at le Théâtre du Nouveau Monde, clearly represented a step back in the Quebecisation of the Montreal theatre. In addition to using the Parisian text, the director hired a French actor to play the lead role. In short he resorted to a theatre practice that exemplified the worst colonial behavior of the past. The history of Miller's productions in Montreal in fact shows a great reserve concerning the all-out theatre appropriation that was held to be occurring in the Quebecois theatre of the 1970s.

The presentations of La Mort d'un commis voyageur in 1973 and 1975, under the Jean Duceppe\Paul Hébert direction, illustrate the confusing state of the translation practice at the time. The production transformed the French translation (instead of using an existing indigenous translation considered too French). And critics like Roger Scully began demanding Quebecois translations of foreign plays. Although freely adapted versions of French translations were welcome at that time, it became obvious that Quebecois translations were preferred for plausibility's sake.

The Montreal audience had to wait until 1983 during the post-referendum period (and fifteen years after the first presentation of Les Belles-soeurs), a relatively calm period politically, to get its first Quebecois translation of a Miller play. Michel Dumont justified his translation of La Mort d'un commis voyageur by arguing that the text must be
“perceived as real” by the public. He criticized the French translation for being totally inadequate. Here again the translative drive was much more practically-based than political.

While one would have thought that, with the advent of Quebecois translations, Miller’s texts would have found a definite French form, this has not been the case. Each mounting of a Miller play seems to demand a new translation. This explains why there are two versions of La Mort d’un commis voyageur (Marcel Dubé, Michel Dumont), of Vu du Pont (René Gingras, Michel Dumont\Marc Grégoire) and of Les Sorcières de Salem (Michel Dumont\Marc Grégoire, André Ricard). A third translation of the play, by René Gingras, was recently produced at the T.N.M.. A third translation of La Mort d’un commis voyageur (the second version by Michel Dumont) is also in the making for a presentation in Spring 1999.

To conclude, Quebecois directors read American plays in the original English texts and their directing projects are born from an intimate contact with the works. They expect from translators a French text that matches the impression they receive from the source-text. They want the Montreal audience to be moved by the reality of the translated text, just as the American public has been moved by the original. They expect language to be real and strong. For that reason, with each new opportunity to engage American drama, it is necessary to retranslate the source text in the actual words of the North American French. It is an artistic necessity not a political posture.
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March 31, 1993

Jeanine Beaubien  
April 8, 1993

André Brassard  
April 14, 1993
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March 30, 1993

Serge Denoncourt  
March 26, 1993

Yves Desgagnés  
April 8, 1993

Monique Duceppe  
March 25, 1993

Michel Dumont  
August 25, 1993

Germain Houde  
March 29, 1993

René Gingras  
March 31, 1993

Paul Hébert  
May 5, 1993

Claude Maher  
May 4, 1993

Gérard Poirier  
April 1, 1993
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May 7, 1993
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April 7, 1993

Jean-Louis Roux  
March 31, 1993

Lionel Villeneuve  
May 10, 1993
APPENDIX 2

LIST OF MILLER'S PLAYS PRODUCED IN MONTREAL (INCLUDING CASTING)

Les Sorcières de Salem (1966)

Théâtre du Nouveau Monde

French text: Marcel Aymé
Director: Albert Millaire
Set and costumes design: Robert Prévost
Music: François Morel
Lights: Yves d'Allaire

Révérend Samuel Parris: Jacques Galipeau
Betty Parris: Isabelle Avril
Tituba: Marie-Josée Azur
Abigael Williams: Monique Joly
Suzanna Walcotts: Micheline Herbart
Ann Putnam: Jeannine Sutto
Thomas Putnam: Yvon Dufour
Mercy Lewis: Rita Imbeault
Mary Warren: Marthe Mercure
John Proctor: Lionel Villeneuve
Rebecca Nurse: Marthe Thiery
Giles Corey: Marc Favreau
Révérend John Hale: Léo Iliai
Elizabeth Proctor: Hélène Loiselle
Ezéchiel Cheever: Marc Cottel
Willard: Guy l'Ecuyer
Un paysan: Edmond Grignon
Francis Nurse: Claude Grisé
Le juge Hathorne: Raymond Royer
Danforth: Jean Gascon
Mary Walcotts: Geneviève Dubuc
Eva Barrow: Marie-Anik
La petite Jenny: Nicole L'épine.
Vu du Pont (1966)

La Poudrière

French adaptation: Marcel Aymé
Director: Florent Forget
Set Design: Jean-Claude Rinfret
Lights: Marcel Du Plessis
Stage Manager: Gilles Provost

Alfieri: Henri Norbert
Béatrice: Huguette Oligny
Eddie: Jean-Pierre Masson
Catherine: Louise Marleau
Marco: Lionel Villeneuve
Rodolfo: Jacques Brouillet
1er inspecteur: Georges Carrère
Mike: Gabriel Vigneault
Peter: Edmond Grignon
2ième inspecteur: Alpha boucher
Tony: Gilles Provost
**Le Prix** (1970)

Théâtre du Nouveau Monde

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Cast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French adaptation:</td>
<td>Thierry Maulnier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director:</td>
<td>Jean-Louis Roux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set design and lights:</td>
<td>Robert Prévost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costume design:</td>
<td>Lydia Randolph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor:</td>
<td>Jacques Godin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther:</td>
<td>Monique Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salomon:</td>
<td>Claude Dauphin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter:</td>
<td>Gérard Poirier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
La Mort d'un Commis voyageur (1974)

Compagnie Jean-Duceppe in collaboration with Le Trident (a Québec City based company)

Translation: Eric Kahane
Director: Paul Hébert
Set design and costume design: Paul Bussières
Lights: Denis Mailloux

Gilles Cloutier
Jean Duceppe
Michel Dumont
Diane Guérin
Suzanne Langlois
Roger LeBel
Marc Legault
Monique Lepage
Yves Létourneaux
Ginette Morin
Jean-René Ouellet
Lionel Villeneuve

NOTE: It was impossible to retrieve the original casting list, only an actor’s list presented in alphabetical order was available.
La Mort d'un commis voyageur (1975)

Compagnie Jean-Duceppe

Translation: Eric Kahane
Director: Jean Duceppe
Set design and costume design: Paul Bussières
Lights: Pierre Villeneuve

Collette Brossoit
Gilles Cloutier
Thomas Donohue
Jean Duceppe
Michel Dumont
Roger Lebel
Denise Morelle
Ginette Morin
Jean-René Ouellet
Yvan Saintonge
Hélène Trépanier
Lionel Villeneuve

NOTE: It was impossible to retrieve the original casting list, only an actor’s list presented in alphabetical order was available.
La Mort d'un commis voyageur (1983)

Compagnie Jean-Duceppe

Translation: Michel Dumont
Director: Claude Maher
Set design: Denis Rousseau
Costume design: François Barbeau
Lights: Guy Simard
Props: Manon Desmarais
Sound track: Richard Soly
Assistant director: Monique Duceppe

Willy: Jean Duceppe
Linda: Béatrice Picard
Biff: Michel Dumont
Happy: Jean Deschêne
Charley: Roger Le Bel
Ben: Victor Desy
Bernard: Marcel Girard
Mlle Francis: Sophie Clément
Howard: Marc Grégoire
Stanley: Louis De Santis
Mlle Forsythe: Louison Danis
Jenny: Johanne Seymour
Vu du Pont (1986)

Nouvelle Compagnie Théâtrale

Translation: René Gingras
Director: Jean-Luc Bastien
Set design: Martin Ferland
Costume design: Anne-Marie Tremblay
Lights: Luc Prairie
Music: Pierre voyer
Stage manager: Kiki Nesbitt

Alfieri: Gilles Pelletier
Eddie: Gilles Renaud
Mike et l'inspecteur: Jacques Rossi
Catherine: Linda Sorgini
Angela: Sophie Clément
Marco: Raymond Legault
Rodolfo: Patrice l'Ecuyer
Neveu de Lipari: Stéphane Côté
Les Sorcières de Salem (1989)

Compagnie Jean-Duceppe

Translation: Michel Dumont
Marc Grégoire

Director: André Brassard
Marc Grégoire

Set Design: Claude Goyette
François Barbeau

Costume Design: Luc Prairie
Jean Sauvageau

Lights: Normand Blais

Music: Lou Fortier

Props: Claude Prefontaine

Assistant director: Sylvie Ferlatte

Tituba: Nefertari Bélizaire
Pascale Montpetit

Betty Parris: Benoit Girard
Linda Sorgini

Revérend Parris: Julie Burroughs

Abigail Williams: Frédérique Collin

Susanna Walcott: Claude Préfontaine

Mme Putnam: Sylvie Ferlatte

Thomas Putnam: Adèle Reinhardt

Mercy Lewis: Gilles Renaud

Mary Warren: Béatrice Picard

John Proctor: Lionel Villeneuve

Rebecca Nurse: Michel Dumont

Giles Corey: Rita Lafontaine

Revérend John Hale: Jean-Louis Paris

Elizabeth Proctor: Normand Lévesque

Francis Nurse: Jean Deschénes

Ezekiel Cheever: Gilles Provost

Marshall Herrick: Guy Provost

Juge Hathorne: Sophie Léger

Vice-gouverneur Danforth: Dominique Leduc

Eva Burroughs: Frédérique Collin

Mary Walcott:

Sarah Good:
Vu du Pont (1990-1993)

Théâtre Populaire du Québec (1990)
Compagnie Jean-Duceppe (1993)

Translation: Michel Dumont
Director: Marc Grégoire
Set Design: Serge Denoncourt
Costume Design: Richard Lacroix
Lights: Luc J. Bélanger
Sound track: Jocelyn Proulx
Props: Claude Lemelin
Assistant director and Stage Manager: Sylvain Racine

Alfieri: Yves Massicotte
Mike and un officier: Jean Harvey
Louis and un officier: Jacques Calvé
Eddie Carbone: Germain Houde
Catherine: Annick Bergeron
Béatrice: Monique Miller
Marco: Paul Dion
Rodolfo: Normand D'Amour

The 1993 revival of the 1990 production kept sensibly the same cast. Here is a list of the changes.

Louis and un officier: Jean Harvey
Mike and un officier: Jean Descheênes
Alfieri: Guy Provost

Assistant director: Monique Duceppe

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
**Le Prix** (1991)

**Compagnie Jean-Duceppe**

**Translation:**
Michel Dumont
Marc Grégoire

**Director:**
Yves Desgagnés

**Set design:**
Martin Ferland

Costume design:
Anne Duceppe

**Lights:**
Claude Accolas

Props:
Normand Blais

Sound track:
Claude Lemelin

Assistant director:
Monique Duceppe

Walter:
Michel Dumont

Esther:
Patricia Nolin

Solomon:
Gilles Pelletier

Victor:
Gilles Renaud
Il était tous mes fils (1991)

Compagnie Jean-Duceppe

Translation: Michel Dumont
Director: Marc Grégoire
Set design: Serge Denoncourt
Costume design: Louise Campeau
Lights: François Barbeau
Props: Claude Accolas
Sound track: Normand Blais
Assistant director: Claude Lemelin

Joe Keller: Guy Provost
Jim Bayliss: Raymond Legault
Frank Lubey: Jean-Guy Viau
Sue Bayliss: Jasmine Dubé
Lydia Lubey: Annick Bergeron
Michael Keller: Denis Bernard
Bert: Francis Renaud or
Kate Keller: Etienne Trépanier-Boulay
Ann Deever: Béatrice Picard
Ted Deever: Danielle Lépine
Ted Deever: Yves Desgagnés
**Comme une histoire d'amour** (1993)

Grand Théâtre Ordinaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Cast Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>René Gingras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Raymond Cloutier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenography</td>
<td>François Pilotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Manager</td>
<td>Sabrina Steenhaut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant director</td>
<td>Diane Langlois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Man</td>
<td>Guy Tauvette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Woman</td>
<td>Danielle Proulx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Apres la chute (1994)

Compagnie Jean-Duceppe

Translation: Michel Dumont
Marc Grégoire

Director: Yves Desgagnés

Set design: Martin Ferland

Costume design: Anne Duceppe

Lights: Michel Beaulieu

Props: Normand Blais

Sound track: Diane Leboeuf

Assistant director: Claude Lemelin

Quentin
(The role was separated in two parts): Michel Dumont
Gilles Renaud

Mickey: Denis Bernard

Dan: Benoît Dagenais

Maggie: Maude Guérin

la mère: Andrée Lachapelle

Felice: Sylvie Léonard

Holga: Sophie Lorain

Lou: Michel Poirier

le père: Guy Provost

Louise: Louise Turcot

Elsie: Julie Vincent
VITA

Bernard Lavoie completed his baccalauréat en art dramatique at l'Université du Québec à Montréal in 1981. In 1984, he completed a master of fine arts degree in directing at University of California at Los Angeles. He completed his doctoral course work at Louisiana State University in 1991.

Since 1985, Bernard Lavoie has taught acting, directing, drama and theatre history at l'Université du Québec à Montréal, l'Université de Montréal, l'Université du Québec à Chicoutimi, l'Université d'Ottawa, the CEGEP de St-Hyacinthe and the CEGEP Lionel Groulx. He is currently chargé de cours in the Art Dramatique program of l'Université du Québec à Montréal and professeur à temps partiel in the professionnal theatre program at the CEGEP Lionel Groulx.

Bernard Lavoie is also involved professionnaly in Montréal, where he has been acting as director, assistant director and dramaturg for various productions.

Bernard Lavoie has published various articles in different journals (mainly Jeu and L'Annuaire théâtral). He has read papers in conferences (to be noted a paper on Miller in Montréal, Canada and in Madras, India). He also has collaborated with Le Théâtre de Quat'Sous, La Compagnie Jean-Duceppe, L'Espace Go and La Nouvelle Compagnie Théâtrale where he has published program notes for many plays.
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