

# Living with Liberation: Quebec Drama in the Feminist Age

Jane Moss  
Colby College

## ABSTRACT

Responding to feminism, Quebec male dramatists have re-examined sex roles and the relationships between the sexes in the 1980s. The antifeminist reactions of the 1970s have given way to reluctant acceptance of women's equality and serious *reconsiderations* of masculinity. The male critique of patriarchy has led to new forms of male dramatic discourse. This paper focuses on Jean Barbeau's 1983 play, *Les Gars*, as an example of how the presentation of Quebec men has changed in the feminist age.

## RÉSUMÉ

Répondant au féminisme, les hommes dramaturges du Québec ont examiné de nouveau les rôles sexuels et les rapports entre les sexes dans les années 80. Les réactions antiféministes des années 70 ont cédé à une acceptation sans enthousiasme de l'égalité des femmes et à des remises en cause de la masculinité. La critique mâle du patriarcat a abouti à la création de nouvelles formes du discours dramatique masculin. Ce texte analyse *Les Gars*, pièce de Jean Barbeau montée en 1983, comme exemple du changement dans la présentation des hommes québécoise depuis l'avènement de l'âge féministe.

Since the mid-seventies, the women's liberation movement, women's theatre and feminist criticism have emerged as powerful forces in the social and intellectual life of Quebec.<sup>1</sup> In the wake of feminism, men have had to re-examine the whole issue of sex roles and relationships between the sexes. Male playwrights have responded to feminist criticism and women's theatre in various ways. Sardonic antifeminist reactions have given way to reluctant but good-humoured acceptance of women's equality and serious reconsiderations of masculinity. Recently, some men dramatists have begun to question traditional male roles and to experiment in new forms of male dramatic discourse. In this paper, I would like to take Jean Barbeau, a playwright now in his forties who has figured prominently in Quebec theatre for close to twenty years, as an example of how men's theatre has reacted to feminism.

Jean Barbeau has been hailed by critics as a prime mover in the new Quebec theatre movement of the late 60s-early 70s. Certainly the plays he wrote during this period (*Le Chemin de Lacroix*, *Joualez-moi d'amour*, *Ben-Ur*, *Le Chant de Sink*, *La Brosse*, *Goglu*) did spotlight the oppression of the Québécois working man. The political, social, and economic oppression of a society dominated by Anglophone capitalists was matched by the cultural, psychological, and sexual oppression exerted by the intellectual elite, the church, and domineering women. In inter-

views, Barbeau has said that during his childhood his mother was the strong figure of the family, his father a resigned, ineffectual, almost absent character.<sup>2</sup> Clearly, this personal experience is reflected in Barbeau's plays. I would even suggest that the playwright's resentment of women is reflected not only in the negative female characters of his plays but also in antifeminist attacks. Annoyed by criticism of his portrayal of women as prostitutes, uncultured, dim-witted bimbos and ex-nuns, Barbeau decided to take on feminists in a theatrical debate. The result is *Citrouille*, first staged in May, 1975, in Sherbrooke by the Theatre du Nouveau Monde.<sup>3</sup> In this play, three radical feminists lure a male chauvinist philanderer to a remote cabin where they intend to get even with men ("régler les comptes avec les hommes," p. 31) by humiliating and sexually abusing him. The three women have little in common other than their hatred of men. Mado is a simple-minded country girl who supposedly chose to become a lesbian after being forcibly seduced by a neighboring farmer. Rachel, the middle-class educated woman who presents the intellectual feminist arguments, is portrayed as a violent hysteric. The gangleader is Citrouille, whose vulgar slang reflects her urban, working-class origins. Her nickname, the play's title, refers to her disillusionment with the Cinderella myth. When her Prince Charming turned out to be a drunken, pizza-delivery boy, this ragged Cinderella transformed herself into a radical

feminist, taking the pumpkin nickname to emphasize her refusal to be an "attendeuse de prince charmant" (p. 78).<sup>4</sup>

Barbeau's man-hating feminists argue their case against men by complaining about the economic and sexual exploitation of women, the myths which devour them, the biological determinism and biblical stories used to justify women's inferior status. Clearly, Barbeau is well versed in the rhetoric of the women's liberation movement. However, his lack of sympathy for feminism and women's liberation should be equally clear to us. None of the feminist criticisms are accepted by Michel who, despite his perilous position, laughs at the women, belittles their arguments and demeans their objectives. Compared to their strident, exaggerated misogyny and misguided sexual violence, Michel's cool and witty male chauvinism seems acceptable. The feminists are called witches, hysterics, crazy and sick. Their guerilla war against male prejudice degenerates into a sadistic orgy; when the victim changes position with the oppressor the result is perversion rather than liberation. That Barbeau portrays feminists as unsympathetic, fanatical terrorists, suggests his deep-seated resentment of strong women and of the feminist movement.

It is astonishing that many critics have failed to deal with Barbeau's antifeminism. The majority of male critics have been blind or insensitive to the negative presentation of feminism. Jean-Cléo Godin notes that the central subject of *Citrouille* is the feminist struggle against male supremacy, but he finds it merely paradoxical that the aggressive feminists are not presented as heroines! He describes the play as a heavily didactic feminist discourse.<sup>5</sup> Laurent Mailhot calls the play a demonstration of sex role reversal that becomes ambiguous and unbearable.<sup>6</sup> Jonathan Weiss, in a brief allusion to *Citrouille*, remarks that the feminists ape the worst characteristics of their oppressors, chauvinist males.<sup>7</sup> Elaine Nardocchio at least recognizes that the male chauvinist, Michel, appears as a level-headed, superior individual compared to the hysterical, militant feminists. Nardocchio's understated conclusion is that "the play was not considered a particularly positive contribution to the women's movement."<sup>8</sup> Only Alonzo LeBlanc's review of the 1978 production of *Citrouille*, by the Théâtre du Bois de Coulouge, emphasizes the antifeminist nature of the play.<sup>9</sup>

Perhaps it is necessary to gloss over the negative treatment of feminism in Barbeau's theatre in order to preserve his reputation as defender of the Québécois Everyman. The antiheroes, who made Barbeau's theatre a poignant statement of Quebec's nationalist aspirations in the early

1970s, could blame the Church and the English-Canadian Establishment for many of their problems. As economic and educational opportunities improved in the 1970s, and as social and political injustices were being corrected, Barbeau had to rethink his theatre. In the late seventies and early eighties, when women writers and playwrights were attracting the attention of the Quebec public, Jean Barbeau was out of the spotlight. When he did make his comeback, it was primarily as a writer of light comedies for summer theatres (for example, *La Vénus d'Emilio*, 1984, *Coeur de papa*, 1986). One play which does not qualify as light comedy may shed some light on Barbeau's evolution. In *Les Gars*, the lower-class antiheroes of the early plays have evolved into middle-aged, middle-class men whose problems are domestic rather than socio-economic or political. This play, first staged in April, 1983, by the Compagnie Jean Duceppe at Montreal's Place des Arts,<sup>10</sup> reveals that a decade after *Citrouille*, Barbeau is still obsessed by the battle between the sexes and by the women's liberation movement. What is interesting is that rather than satirizing feminism as he did in *Citrouille*, Barbeau analyzes the impact of women's liberation on men. In effect, he has gone from an antifeminist position to a male critique of patriarchy.

*Les Gars* begins as a casual poolside conversation over cold beers on a hot Friday afternoon and ends several hours later in soul-searching confessions about conjugal problems and personal inadequacies. The three male protagonists have little in common other than being neighbors in the same middle-class suburb. Gustave Lemay, the host of this patio pizza party, is a loud-mouthed salesman in his forties with a seventh-grade education and a penchant for locker-room humour. He explains that he is alone on this Friday night because his wife, Colette, is having dinner with her mother. Gus is almost a cartoon male chauvinist pig: he jokes about women drivers and mothers-in-law, he buys pornographic men's magazines and boasts about his sexual prowess. He is homophobic and antifeminist. By contrast to Gus, Henri Dumas is a well-dressed, well-mannered social worker in his late thirties who comes across as sensitive and vulnerable. Being a husband and father means a lot to him and he respects women for their capacity for tenderness and communication. Because he does not subscribe to the Playboy/Penthouse philosophy, Henri is mockingly called "L'Abbé-Dumas" and "mémère." Dumas has only accepted Gus' hospitality while waiting for his wife and three children to return home so they can begin their camping vacation. The third neighbor, Robert "Bob" Guindon, is a university professor in his mid-thirties who has adopted the rhetoric of leftist intellectuals along with that of the sexual

and women's liberation movements. Robert's live-in girlfriend, Marie-Line, is an ardent feminist activist who, on this particular evening as on so many others, is off attending a women's group meeting. Toward the end of Act I, two messages reveal that both Gus and Henri have been deserted by their spouses. When a tow truck arrives with Gus' car and a note from Colette announcing she will not be home at all that night, Mr. Macho confesses that he does not know his wife's whereabouts. In his anger, Gus threatens to beat her up when she returns and he also lashes out at Robert for suggesting that she has the right to go off by herself. The shock of Colette's departure is followed by another unwelcome surprise: the news that Mariette has taken the children to her mother's and flown off alone. Gus tries to comfort Henri by suggesting that they are both victims of a female conspiracy cooked up by Robert's feminist girlfriend. As the three men talk, rib each other and argue in Act II, it becomes clear that the playwright intends to undermine both the antifeminist, reactionary pose of the "macho" male and the pro-feminist, leftist intellectual pose of the "liberated" male. In between these extremes Barbeau places the truly sensitive man who wants not only better relationships with women but also more meaningful relationships with men and a deeper understanding of men's inner feelings.

Between the vulgar Neanderthal and the coolly detached intellectual, Henri should elicit our sympathy because of his openness and honesty. He seems to represent the true feminist male, struggling to accept women's rights and struggling to understand his emotions and his "male condition." Before receiving the bad news, he speaks about changing roles with his wife, Mariette. He would like to have the opportunity to stay at home, garden, raise the children, take up new hobbies while Mariette pursues a career (pp.68-69). After the shocking news, he wants to have a meaningful conversation with Gus and Robert but all they can discuss are banal topics. Exasperated he says:

Vous pourriez pas changer de sujet de conversation, non? On dirait que nous autres, les gars, tout ce dont on est capable de parler, c'est de voiture, de sport, de sexe, de nos maudites jobs (p. 103).

Playing on the homonym "mal-mâle" (malady-male), the witty Robert labels this "le mâle dur siècle. Ou le mâle de vivre" but Henri insists:

Tant qu'à faire autant de vent pur de insignifiances, on ferait ben mieux de parler do nous autres, de ce

qui nous fait vivre de ce qu'on espère, de quoi on a peur. Ben non! Voiture, sport, sexe, job . . . (p. 103)

Put off by the immature sexual attitudes of Gus, he mocks his phallic obsession by quoting Lacan (and Louky Bersianik): "Pauvre Gustave! Tout passe par là. Hors du phallus, point de salut" (p. 117). Equally put off by Robert's superficiality and mocking tone, he complains repeatedly about men's inability to have a real conversation:

. . . Parlon-en plus. Vous voyez? On vient de commencer quelque chose. Mais on est pas capables de se rendre au bout. On se réfugie derrière des explications toutes faites. (p. 111)

Nous autres, on se dit toujours des choses seulement quand on est choqués. Comme si on pouvait pas s'exprimer autrement. (p. 120)

Pourquoi nous autres les gars, on est pas capables de se parler? (p. 121)

Pourquoi nous autres, on peut pas se parler . . . comme les femmes font? (p. 123)

Vous voyez? On parle de rien, nous autres. On creuse rien. On est pas capables. On est trop orgueilleux. Mange ta claque mais fais semblant que ça fait pas mal. Des sacs à vent vides les gars? C'est ça qu'on est? (p. 125)

Henri's persistent prodding finally pays off. Robert admits that his "open," liberated relationship with Marie-Line is no happier than the old-style marriage in which the man wore the pants. Old male roles and new male roles are equally unacceptable:

Les hommes, ils m'ont toujours déçu. Avant, J'les trouvais insensibles, vaniteux, superficiels. Aujourd'hui, je les trouve écorchés, mièvres et toujours aussi superficiels, même si le discours sonne plus profond. Pour pas dire creux. J'ai jamais voulu les porter, moi, les pantalons. L'univers des hommes, c'était pas mes limites. Mais. . . on me les a fait enfiler, les pantalons, de force. Etre susceptible, je dirais que c'est quasiment de viol. . . (p. 128)

Robert feels victimized, not by "le fameux système," but by his feminist companion who holds him responsible for all male violence against women:

...J'suis fatigué d'être un coupable avant jugement, quelqu'un qui vaut ni plus ni moins que le reste du troupeau d'abrutis masculins dont elle se sert souvent comme exemple. (p. 129)

Taking literally the slogan "le privé est politique" (p. 130), Marie-Line has made their domestic life into a mini-battle in the feminist war against male supremacy. She has become frustrated, hard and doctrinaire. Hurt by the effect of her conversion to feminism, Robert speaks to his absent lover in his own defense:

. . . j'ai jamais régné, moi. J'ai toujours refusé de le faire. Je t'ai jamais enfermée dans une maison, moi. Je t'ai jamais rabaissée, humiliée. Moi. Moi. Moi. Pas le troupeau. (p. 131)

Eventually, Robert started to act like the male chauvinist he was accused of being, having brief flings with other women (presumably, his students). Marie-Line reacted by having affairs with other women, one way of avoiding the moral dilemma of fraternizing with the enemy. In fact, on this Friday night she is with a woman lover.

Robert's glibness, his irony and mocking self-righteousness mask his true feelings. Naturally sympathetic to women's liberation, he feels unjustly condemned by the anti-male rhetoric of radical feminism and he resents the effect Marie-Line's militant activism has had on their relationship. However, he has not given up waiting for her return.

Gustave has not lost hope for Colette's return either. After Robert, it is his turn to confess his conjugal problems and his sense of inadequacy. Gustave begins by admitting that his tough talk, his threats of violence, are just part of an act. He cannot keep up the act now that his career as a salesman has turned sour. Unable to keep up with younger competitors and uneducated for office work, he sees nothing but darkness in his future and he is too proud to ask Colette for help. He describes himself as a victim of old role models, of his paternalistic conditioning:

. . . moi, j'ai été élevé à penser que c'est aux gars à faire vivre les femmes, à leur bâtir un château pour qu'elles soient confortables, pour qu'elles aient pas de soucis. . . ou pas les nôtres, en tout cas. J'ai été élevé à penser que l'amour que t'as pour une femme, ça se voit, ça touche, ça reste sur une belle rue, dans une belle maison, avec des beaux meubles comme dans les magazines. Pis elle, elle te fait la vie. . . douce. J'suis en train de me neyer. Elle, elle ben tenu

sa part de contrat pis moi. . . mois j'ai pas su tenir notre barque dans le courant. J'suis en train de me neyer. J'ai honte. J'veux pas que Colette le sache. J'serais pas un vrai homme à mes yeux...même si j'ai toujours prétendu que j'en étais un. Ça fait que je crie, j'me débats. . . (p. 144)

Gus admits that despite all his swagger he has never hit anyone and never cheated on his wife. Soon after this humbling confession, Colette calls to say that she has taken a job at the hospital where she is now working a night shift. Gus, like the other men, will have to swallow his pride if he wants to remain part of a couple in the feminist age.

All three of the men must make behavioural adjustments and compromises to survive. All three must recognize women's equality and deal with their own emotional problems because myths of manhood and the male mystique have harmed them all. Henri blames the patriarchal system for psychologically mutilating men when he says:

. . . j'suis pas tellement à l'aise dans le monde des hommes. . . Ça manque de tendresse, d'indulgence, de tolérance. Nous autres, on est des handicapés, des amputés. Mais on a pas toujours été comme ça. Regarde. . . regarde les enfants. Y'a quelqu'un ou quelque chose qui a fait que, dans le passage de notre enfance à notre vie d'homme, on soit. . . mutilés. (pp. 134-135)

In *Les Gars*, Jean Barbeau seems to be suggesting that men must help each other learn to express themselves, to improve self-understanding and relationships with others. While in earlier Barbeau plays female characters functioned to reveal the true nature of male characters,<sup>11</sup> in *Les Gars* the key women figures (Colette, Mariette and Marie-Line) are absent. The only female character is the fifteen year-old babysitter, Sylvie, who brings Henri messages from his wife. Sylvie's two strange visits in Act II may shed some lights on Barbeau's still ambiguous attitude toward women. At the beginning of the Act, Sylvie comes back to the pool for a moonlight swim. Her conversation with Henri, highlighted by a change in the stage lighting and the frozen positions of the two other men, is a Lolita seduction fantasy. Henri sums up the unreal image of female eroticism in these words:

Dans la tête de bien des hommes, t'existes. . . comme maintenant. T'es un rêve de beauté, d'innocence. . . pis en même temps de. . . de perversité. . . Une sorte

d'Ève, de première femme. . . qui ressemble à aucune autre femme, mais qui les résume toutes. (p. 98)

Toward the play's ending, Sylvie returns but this time instead of acting seductive, she repulses Henri's advances. Her brutal reply makes it clear that she will not be the consoling female of Romantic poetic myth: "J'suis ni votre p'tite fille ni votre p'tite pute, ni celle qui va vous consoler." (p. 147) After delivering the message that Mariette will return in two weeks, Sylvie tells him that he must accept his wife's brief absence and grow up emotionally: ". . . j'suis pas votre gardienne, à vous. . . Ça fait que. . . conduisez-vous pas comme un enfant. Vous me faites pitié." (p. 149) Her parting insult, "Ça pue le renfermé icitte dans!" (p. 150) repeated by Henri as the play's closing line (p. 153), suggests that men must break out of old patterns of behaviour. They must go beyond old images of women and grow out of emotional dependency. In other words, they must learn to live as equal partners in the feminist age which, while denying them the old illusion of male supremacy, allows them greater psychological freedom.

The difficulty of making the transition from old, outmoded patriarchal relationships between men and women to new equal partnerships, accounts for the ambiguous tone of the play. Barbeau's own struggle to accept the change in male-female relationships may also explain why Gus, the proletarian Mr. Macho, comes across as the most authentic character in the play. Reviewing *Les Gars for Le Devoir*,<sup>12</sup> Robert Levesque calls Henri and Robert weak characters because Barbeau created them for the purpose of expressing male attitudes which he does not truly understand or believe in. According to Levesque, in this group portrait of men in the eighties, only the vulgar, sexist Gus rings true. Perhaps this comment reflects the talent of the actors or Mr. Levesque's own prejudices. However, I think we must credit Barbeau with an attempt to come to grips with social changes.

Barbeau's move from negative stereotypes of women though an antifeminist reaction to a male critique of patriarchy represents an extreme example of a common phenomenon in Quebec theatre. The progress of the women's movement and the prominence of feminist writers in the past decade have forced many male playwrights to reconsider sex roles. In the last five years, a number of Quebec and Franco-Ontarian plays have explored new concepts of masculinity, paternity, and male sexuality in what seems to be an effort to redefine men's roles. I believe that this is a response to women's theatre which has done much to dramatize the rejection of old female stereotypes,

to explore female sexuality, and to renew bonds of friendship and bonds of erotic or maternal love between women.

This theatrical exploration of new male roles has led to diverse results. Bertrand B. Leblanc, a retired businessman in his fifties, who has published several plays in the last five years, has taken a good-humored look at traditional men learning to breakdown restrictive modes of behaviour. In *Faut divorcer!* (1981),<sup>13</sup> a retired railroad worker with conservative political, religious and social attitudes is positively transformed by his wife's liberation which opens his eyes to the debilitating repressiveness of his old ideas. In *Faut se marier pour. . .* (1985),<sup>14</sup> Leblanc presents a reactionary father learning to accept his eighteen year-old daughter's sexual liberation and, more importantly, learning to express his paternal love. A 1982 piece called *Roméo & Julien* by Jacques Girard and Reynald Robinson<sup>15</sup> is a series of humorous sketches on the question of masculinity. *Cowboys*, a father-son pair, buddies, young boys, pre-teens, a man and his penis—these are just some of the male characters used to explore various aspects of the male condition. Robert Marinier, a young Franco-Ontarian actor/playwright, took a comic look at the Freudian anxiety produced by the prospects of paternity in a 1983 play entitled *L'Inconception*.<sup>16</sup> In collaboration with Jean Marc Dalpé and Robert Bellefeuille, two other Franco-Ontarian actor/writers, Marinier created *Les Rogers* (1985),<sup>17</sup> a slapstick comedy about three men trying to adjust to their "new male" roles in the feminist era. Reminiscing about the old days when a real man (*un vrai Roger*) spoke with his fists, the three friends lament that nowadays a man has to change diapers and cook to be a trendy "gars libéré." The nostalgia for the good old days and jokes about feminism cannot be taken seriously in the farcical look at the contemporary men.

In a more serious vein, poet Guy Cloutier's first play, *La Statue de fer* (1982),<sup>18</sup> examines the relationship between virility, power and violence in rural Quebec. The published version of the play includes the transcript of a discussion between Cloutier and two feminist theatre professionals, playwright Jovette Marchessault and director Michelle Rossignol. While admitting the influence of feminist thought on his own work, Cloutier maintains that men's theatre cannot be an imitation of women's theatre without running the risk of being neutered. Talking about male dramaturgy in the feminist age he says:

Ce qui est sûr, c'est qu'à côté de toute cette exploration, cet inventaire. . . ces paroles de femmes qui ont émergé, il y a toute une série de spectacles, de livres qui veulent faire, pour reprendre l'expression de

Jean-Claude Germain, des Shows-de-gars-de femme . . . Des spectacles où des gars essaient de s'exprimer comme des femms, comme s'il n'y avait pas de différences; essayer de dire, en imitant les femmes, leur intériorité, etc. . . . Ce qui est une façon de neutraliser une parole essentielle. (pp. 152-153)

Jean-Raymond Marcoux's 1983 drama, *Bienvenue aux dames, ladies welcome*<sup>19</sup> almost seems to respond to Cloutier's warning against emasculating male dramatic discourse in the wake of feminism. In this play, a number of workers living temporarily in a small inn near a remote construction site face individual life crises which challenge them to make compromises between their male egos, financial realities, and emotional needs. Marcoux's portrayal of these blue collar men rings true: they are hard-working, hard-talking, hard-drinking men for whom being feminine is having big breasts and being masculine is driving a big bulldozer. What seems new in this dramatic portrait of Québécois is the way in which they talk about male solidarity, their wives and families and their anxieties. What seems old is the stereotyping of women: One saucy, sexy waitress who services the men in more than one way and one nagging anal-compulsive wife. Marcoux's next play, *Les Mensonges de papa* (1985), deals with a father-son relationship. In this comedy, a forty year-old divorced man tries to understand his teenage son, his own sexuality, and the new roles of men in the eighties.<sup>20</sup>

While an analysis of homosexual theatre in Quebec is beyond the scope of this study,<sup>21</sup> it should be noted that gay playwrights such as Michel Tremblay, Normand Chaurette, René-Daniel Dubois, and Michel Marc Bouchard have questioned socially constructed models of gender role behaviour in much the same way that feminist theatre has. Just as women's theatre has broken the silence and dramatized female sexuality, so homosexual theatre has dramatized homoeroticism and the experience of sexual difference. In so doing, these playwrights are formulating a new kind of male dramatic discourse made possible by the feminist movement.

The challenge to male playwrights in the feminist age is to replace stock gender models and outmoded patterns of relationships with new characters who can declare a truce in the battle of the sexes without losing their distinctive

masculine voices. In taking a broader view of human sexuality, Quebec drama will reflect social reality more accurately and have a liberating effect on its audience.

## NOTES

1. See my article, "Women's Theatre in Quebec" in *Traditionalism, Nationalism and Feminism: Women Writers of Quebec*, ed. Paula G. Lewis (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1985), 241-254.
2. Jean Barbeau interviewed by Donald Smith, *Lettres québécoises*, 5 (Winter 1977), 34.
3. Jean Barbeau, *Citrouille* (Montréal: Leméac, 1974). A foreword by the playwright expresses his resentment of the criticism of his female characters. All textual references are to this published edition of the play.
4. It is interesting to note the different treatment of the Cinderella motif in collective creations by feminist theatre groups. In 1974, Paule Baillargeon, Suzanne Garceau, and Luce Guilbeault produced the first *spectacle de femmes*, entitled *Un jour, mon prince viendra*. In 1975, an amateur women's group from Theford Mines presented *Si Cendrillon pouvait mourir!* Both of these plays dramatize the negative effect of fairy tales which tell women that their role in life is to be pleasing and subordinate to men.
5. Jean-Cleo Godin in Godin et Laurent Mailhot, *Théâtre québécois II*, (Montréal: Hurtubise HMH, 1980), 91-93.
6. Laurent Mailhot, "Letters in Canada: Théâtre" in *University of Toronto Quarterly*, XVI, 4 (Summer 1976), 365-366.
7. Jonathan M. Weiss, *French-Canadian Theatre* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1986), 55.
8. Elaine F. Narocchio, *Theatre and Politics in Modern Québec* (Edmonton, Alberta: University of Alberta Press, 1986), 98.
9. Alonzo Le Blanc, "Bois de Coulonge"/été 78 *Citrouille*, *Jeu* 12 (été 1979), 191-193.
10. Jean Barbeau, *Les Gars* (Montreal: Lemeac, 1984). All textual references are to this edition.
11. *Godin*, 93.
12. Robert Levesque, "Michaud sauve Les Gars," in *Le Devoir* 13 avril 1983, 14.
13. Bertrand B. Leblanc, *Faut divorcer!* (Montréal: Leméac, 1981).
14. ———, *Faut se marier pour. . .* (Montréal: Leméac, 1985).
15. Jacques Girard et Reynald Robinson, *Romeo & Julien* (Québec: Editions du Théâtre du la Borde, 1982). See review by Adrien Gruslin in *Jeu*, 28 (1983.3), 159.
16. Robert Marinier, *L'Inconception* (Sudbury, Ontario: Prise de parole, 1984).
17. Robert Mariner, Jean Marc Dalpé et Robert Bellefeuille, *Les Rogers* (Sudbury, Ontario: Prise de parole, 1985).
18. Guy Cloutier, *La statue de fer* (Montreal: VLB éditeur, 1982).
19. Jean Raymond Marcoux, *Bienvenue aux dames, ladies welcome* (Montreal: VLB éditeur, 1985).
20. See review of Jean-Raymond Marcoux's "Les Mensonges de papa" in *Lettres québécoises*, 39 (automne 1985), 59.
21. See my article, "Sexual Games: Hypertheatricality and Homosexuality in Recent Québec Plays" in *American Review of Canadian Studies*, XVII, 3 (Autumn 1987), 287-296.