

**Part C**  
**New Functions and Structures**  
**in a Changing Europe**

## I Western Europe

# 12

## Proliferation and Differentiation of National Theatres in France

*David Whitton*

Given the decentralizing tendency to scatter the epithet 'national' like confetti, identifying the contours of France's National Theatre today is not as simple as it might once have been. Although the Comédie-Française is still considered by many French people (not to mention tourists and other foreigners) as the repository of national theatrical identity, it is currently only one of five National Theatres maintained by the French State. The latter, in turn, are flagships in an operation involving more than one hundred spoken-drama institutions which the Ministry of Culture designates as 'national' within a three-tier classificatory system.

One tier is represented by the five National Theatres (*Théâtres Nationaux*): the Comédie-Française, Théâtre National de Strasbourg, Théâtre National de Chaillot, Odéon-Théâtre de l'Europe and Théâtre National de la Colline. These are public institutions which are created, owned and capable of being dissolved by the State and are placed under the direct control of a Minister of State. Their directors are appointed by Presidential decree on five-year contracts and their administrators by the Minister of Culture. (Similar conditions apply to the Opéra National and the Opéra Bastille, which will be excluded from consideration in what follows). Each of them occupies a particular evolutionary niche in France's theatrical ecology, a niche which has been fashioned by an interaction of tradition, political agendas articulated through statutes and ministerial intervention, and creative personnel. Their artistic missions are defined by statute, but in somewhat vague and general terms, allowing them to change over time in response to shifting circumstances and political priorities. These constitute the officially designated National Theatres of France. Examining what that designation signifies in terms of the national interests they represent is one of the purposes of what follows.

A second tier comprises approximately forty National Dramatic Centres (*Centres Dramatiques Nationaux*, usually abbreviated to CDN), plus four *Centres Dramatiques Nationaux Pour l'Enfance et la Jeunesse* (CDNJE), dedicated to children's and youth theatre. These are distributed throughout the regions of France, including the Paris region. Some of them originated as

regionally-based private theatre companies which were adopted by the State either during the post-war push towards decentralization, or more recently. Now, they are created and maintained as partnerships between the Ministry of Culture and the relevant municipal and regional authorities. They generally comprise both a building and a theatre company (the legal status of which can vary widely according to whether they are in the public or private domain) and a mission which includes producing theatre, receiving visiting productions, and regional outreach. They include the Théâtre National Populaire (TNP) which, since its relocation from Paris to Villeurbanne in 1972 has been administered as a CDN. The TNP is one of a number of CDNs which rather confusingly have the words 'Théâtre National' in their name but are not actually National Theatres in the full sense. This is because certain CDNs (of which the TNP is one) are further defined by the oxymoronic title of Regional National Theatres (*Théâtre National de Région*), i.e. regionally-implanted theatres whose zone of cultural activity is defined by statute as extending to the whole of metropolitan France.<sup>1</sup>

Thirdly there are the National Stages (*Scènes Nationales*), at present numbering approximately sixty, brought into existence when the system of *Maisons de la Culture* created by Malraux under De Gaulle was rationalized under Mitterrand. The original polyvalent mission and multi-purpose premises of the *Maisons de la Culture* had often been found to be impractical and a number of them were converted to operate primarily or exclusively as theatres. Others were built from scratch. With a permanent administrative and technical staff but no resident company, their function is to provide a venue for touring productions or local producing agencies.

As is clear from the above, in France a theatre (whether a building or a company or both) may be designated as 'national' either because it operates at a national level, or because it participates in a nationwide infrastructure of regional or local provision. Clearly both can be said to represent national interests, but in different ways. Decentralization is as integral to postwar French national policy as sustaining a cohesive internal and external national identity. From one perspective, therefore, it would be possible to regard the totality of this distributed structure of publicly-financed companies and stages as constituting France's National Theatre. In that case, however, it would logically be necessary also to include other centrally-supported components which do not happen to be called 'national' but which play complementary roles in the maintenance of France's cultural state. These range from Regional Dramatic Centres (*Centres Dramatiques Régionaux*), through accredited theatres (*Théâtres Missionnés, Scènes Conventionnées*), to the five hundred or so state-subsidized private companies. The latter include Ariane Mnouchkine's Théâtre du Soleil and Peter Brook's company at the Bouffes du Nord whose high international visibility makes them of national strategic importance for the projection of French cultural prestige.

Alternatively – and this will be the approach adopted in this chapter – it can make more sense to focus on the institutions statutorily identified as National Theatres while recognizing that their role can only be understood in the context of a State which is profoundly implicated in the provision of theatre at all levels. The shorthand expression by which this broader phenomenon is known is *théâtre public*,<sup>2</sup> implying that theatre is a function whose importance justifies it being treated as a public service and whose provision must ultimately be assured by the State. As Loren Kruger reminds us elsewhere in this volume, the concept has a lineage reaching back to the Revolution, though its practical incorporation into government action is a twentieth-century phenomenon. Its trajectory – pluralist rather than unitary, decentralized rather than metropolitan – was mapped out during the Fourth Republic in the late 1940s and 1950s. In recent decades, although the French State has maintained a marked reluctance to withdraw from the public sphere and leave things to the market, considerable uncertainty has surrounded the purpose(s) which the cultural state's infrastructure is meant to serve. To explore the perceived crisis currently affecting public theatre would take us too far from the primary interest of this chapter.<sup>3</sup> But it is important to note that it would be difficult to interpret the current arrangements for the National Theatres without reference to the ongoing debate in which they are imbricated about the function of *théâtre public*. A further caveat applies. It may be a mistake to attribute too much conscious intentionality to the existing formations. In part they are the product of opportunistic reforms, reactions to crises, accommodations to the preferences of individual directors, or *post hoc* formalizations of haphazard developments. The tension between the desire of all French administrations for Napoleonic orderliness and their pragmatism in response to eventualities seems to be a contributory factor in the complexities and anomalies of a system which one frustrated insider has described as combining the worst features of Mediterranean-style chaos and Germanic regimentation ('le bordel latin et l'institution à l'allemande').<sup>4</sup>

Nevertheless, even allowing for the vagaries of events, a marked shift in priorities can be seen in the evolution of the National Theatres since 1968 when Jack Lang, the future socialist Minister of Culture, published his doctoral thesis on theatre and the French State.<sup>5</sup> At that time France possessed three National Theatres: the Comédie-Française, the Théâtre de France, more commonly known as the Odéon, which at that time was being operated under concession by Jean-Louis Barrault's (private) company, and the TNP, as the former Théâtre National Populaire had been titled since Vilar became its director in 1951. Thus, the State was supporting two complementary houses of high culture – one devoted to preserving the classical repertoire, the other to prestigious contemporary theatre forms – together with a third, demotic house which in turn complemented the others with its mission to disseminate the best of the classical and modern repertoire to the widest possible audience.<sup>6</sup> In principle, this tri-partite arrangement translated the nation's

cultural priorities in supposedly appropriate, or at least satisfyingly symmetrical, proportions. In reality, all three were about to plunge into crisis and the assumptions supporting the structure as a whole were becoming untenable. The TNP had emerged during the Fourth Republic (1946–58) as one of the most socially progressive theatres in Europe but by 1968 it had lost its way. The ultra-conservative Comédie-Française had reluctantly started to make concessions to modernity in the mid-1960s by admitting the occasional living writer to the repertoire and inviting directors from outside to stage the occasional production, but the pressures to modernize properly were becoming irresistible. And the Théâtre de France, instead of completing the picture by bridging an elitist Comédie-Française and a populist TNP, in reality occupied an ambiguous hinterland with no clearly discernible national mission in respect of either repertoire or audience.<sup>7</sup>

Comparing this snapshot of 1968 with the current landscape, the most striking transformation is the disappearance in all but name of the TNP as a locus of French national identity, and the appearance of at least two (and arguably three) National Theatres with a European orientation.

As regards the TNP, the political consensus that led to it successfully challenging the Comédie-Française's historic claim to represent the nation theatrically was a short-lived product of the postwar climate. France emerged from the Occupation dangerously exposed to factional conflict. While De Gaulle set about constructing an acceptable historical narrative to account for the so-called *années noires*, the dark years between 1940 and 1944, it was politically imperative to employ every means, culture included, to promote a sense of national unity (*l'union sacrée*) in order to bridge economic and ideological differences and heal the bitter divisions caused by the recent past. The TNP, whose origins lay in earlier socialist-inspired movements to democratize theatre-going, became one of the prime beneficiaries of the postwar investment in cultural infrastructure. For a brilliant period in the 1950s, the TNP succeeded in assembling a socially mixed audience, including many who would never have normally had access to legitimate theatre. To many observers it seemed a beacon of democratic theatre culture. Even at the time, however, the humanist belief in a shared culture that underpinned Vilar's artistic policy was identified by some as paternalistic and escapist, a view which was irrefutably vindicated by the events of 1968. Following Vilar's resignation in 1963, the haemorrhaging sense of purpose, aggravated by the government's failure to support his successors, meant that in the years leading up to 1968 the TNP was in more or less permanent budgetary and artistic crisis. In the post-1968 shake-out the government's preferred option was to bring in one of the TNP's most outspoken critics, Roger Planchon, as the only director with the political credibility to restore its sense of mission. Planchon's reluctance to move to Paris led to a second option – decentralizing the TNP by re-locating it to the Théâtre de la Cité, Planchon's theatre in the Lyon suburb of Villeurbanne. Planchon, however, did not wish his company

to be nationalized either. Hence the eventual outcome, which was to create a National Dramatic Centre at Villeurbanne operating with the TNP name and logo and under the co-directorship of Planchon, Patrice Chéreau and Roger Gilbert. In the short term this was a satisfactory outcome: the TNP was reinvigorated and decentralized, which was entirely in the spirit of the operation, while its directors remained in charge of an independent company. In the long term, despite the TNP's subsequent 'promotion' to status of Regional National Theatre, it may have made it easier for successive governments to focus their priorities and funding elsewhere.

A corollary to this outcome was to leave the former TNP premises in Paris vacant. The theatre in the monumental Palais de Chaillot is a notoriously difficult building situated in an unpromising location in the 16th arrondissement. In principle, its function has always involved popular outreach, the precise meaning of which has mutated over time. In the 1920s it meant trickle-down dissemination of high culture. Firmin Gémier, the first director of the Théâtre National Populaire, used it to bring productions from the Comédie-Française and the Opéra into a big house where they could be seen and enjoyed by mass audiences at relatively low cost. In the 1950s the company assembled by Vilar generated tailor-made productions whose style and content were appropriate to a people's 'Palace of Culture'. When the TNP moved out, the Chaillot found itself not only without a director and company but also in need of a new justification for existing. Jack Lang who was appointed to run it in 1973, diagnosed a need to stay within the spirit of Vilar's idea of a theatre of contemporary social relevance, but modernizing it with a contemporary aesthetic. One of his first actions was to commission a reconstruction to create a flexible 'black box' theatre, a costly, fraught and endlessly complicated building programme which blighted his tenure. His successor Antoine Vitez (1981–88) also tried to bring 'popular' and 'experimental' into alignment, using his actors and the vast stage, in a conventional configuration, to mount probing explorations of classical and contemporary texts. He famously (but not entirely convincingly) claimed this style of theatre to be 'an elitist art for everyone'.<sup>8</sup> In utter contrast to Vitez, his successor (1988–2000) was the showman Jérôme Savary, founder of the Grand Magic Circus, whose irreverent and hugely popular production of Molière's *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme* was disapprovingly likened to Dali's painting of the Mona Lisa with a moustache. With Savary's appointment as artistic director, 'people's theatre' (*théâtre du peuple*) could be said to have shed all its former high-minded civic connotations. It was now primarily understood as populist, with an emphasis on musical theatre and spectacle within a mixed economy which also included a significant proportion of co-productions and visiting productions. The iconoclast Savary succeeded beyond expectations in exploiting the Chaillot's two stages to capacity by doubling its audience figures. Successes of this sort are almost entirely dependent on the personality of the administrator, a factor which most recent governments have recognized

and positively encouraged as a strategy for all the National Theatres. Savary's successor since 2000, Ariel Goldenberg, for example, was appointed partly because of his track record in blending dance and theatre and his known appeal to younger audiences.

Of the five National Theatres, the Chaillot appears to have the most demographically mixed constituency. Its audience base includes a substantial proportion of tourists from other parts of France and abroad. The latter of course also visit the Comédie-Française in significant numbers, albeit for different reasons and with different expectations.

Equally emblematic of shifting national priorities since 1968 is the mutation of the Odéon-Théâtre de France into the Odéon-Théâtre de l'Europe. Barrault's company, which ran the second National Theatre from 1959 to 1968, was tailor-made for the job. As the leading exemplar at the time of high-quality theatre in the studio tradition of Jouvett and Dullin, a touch avant-garde (but not enough to frighten the bourgeoisie), with impeccably French credentials and held in high international esteem, it was the ideal showcase for the prestige culture which De Gaulle and Malraux wished to display to the world. International outreach formed a significant part of the mission, and this involved tours to Russia, the USA, the Edinburgh Festival, South America and so on. Rather than being linked to France's European aspirations within what was still a primarily economic union, it contributed to the global projection and protection of francophone culture which was a mainstay of Gaullist *politique de grandeur*.

In contrast, the current Odéon-Théâtre de l'Europe reflects a re-focusing of France's foreign policy to prioritize her role within the European Union. Its installation in the Odéon is not without significance. Whereas the Comédie-Française is first and foremost a company, and the TNP an idea, the Odéon is an ancient monument in which numerous National Theatres have taken shape. As a result, its identity and mission have been unstable, but it still retains the particular prestige of being the second National Theatre. Inaugurated in 1782 as a royalist playhouse, it was shortly to be transformed into a key site for the enactment of the Revolution. Periodically during its varied history, the stage has belonged to the Comédie-Française but it has also been a neighbourhood theatre, a boulevard theatre, a musical theatre, and a site for serious drama under the directorships of Antoine and Ligné-Poe. Some of its rich history can be read in its regular changes of name under successive political regimes: Théâtre Français (1782), Théâtre de la Nation (1789), Théâtre de l'Égalité (1794), Odéon (1796), Théâtre de l'Impératrice (1808), Second Théâtre Français (1819). Under more recent administrations it continued to be treated as a political football. In the postwar reconstruction it was given as a second house to the Comédie-Française, only to be taken away in 1959 by Malraux (reportedly as a punishment after an argument with the latter's administrator) who installed Jean-Louis Barrault to run it as the Odéon-Théâtre de France. After the student occupation in May



1968 and the subsequent expulsion of Barrault's company, it became a fiefdom of the Comédie-Française once more. That arrangement was revoked after the election of a socialist government in 1981 when Mitterrand's Minister of Culture, Jack Lang, identified the Odéon as the preferred base for the European theatre which he hoped to establish in Paris under the directorship of Giorgio Strehler. (The Odéon had already been used in the 1960s as the base for the international Théâtre des Nations.) The Comédie-Française fought hard to hold on to it, resulting in an uneasy compromise whereby the two operations shared the building for six months each year. Strehler's foothold was threatened during the right's temporary control of the legislature (1986–8) but restored when Lang returned to the Ministry in 1988. Moreover, Strehler then persuaded him to sign over another historic playhouse, the Vieux-Colombier, as a base for an international acting school to work in partnership with the Théâtre de l'Europe. A year later, Lang decreed that the Odéon would be given over entirely to the Théâtre de l'Europe. As a *quid pro quo*, the Vieux-Colombier would be entirely renovated and handed to the Comédie-Française.

The Odéon-Théâtre de l'Europe has now operated under three administrators (the Italian Strehler, the Catalan Lluís Pasqual, and Georges Lavaudant) and seems currently well established as one of two European theatres maintained by EU member states (the other is the Piccolo Teatro–Teatro d'Europa in Milan). It is one of the twenty member-theatres of the Union of European Theatres. Like the other French National Theatres, its statutory mission is defined in deliberately vague terms, in this case, 'fostering joint projects with stage directors, actors, playwrights and other figures involved in the dramatic arts in Europe, to present new works and breathe new life into Europe's artistic heritage'.<sup>9</sup> In practice this means a mix of foreign-language productions produced in-house or imported, and foreign works in French translation. At the time of writing (2006) the Odéon is undergoing a major renovation and refit at a projected cost of 30 million Euros.

The scale of capital and recurrent investment in the Odéon-Théâtre de l'Europe is just one manifestation of France's desire to provide cultural leadership in the enlarged European Union. Another is the promotion of the former Centre Dramatique de l'Est (CDE) to the status of Théâtre National de Strasbourg (TNS) in 1971. The original CDE was a classic product of the first postwar wave of decentralization when a number of independent companies operating in the provinces were adopted by the Ministry of Culture. The fact that the Centre Dramatique de l'Est, alone among the original five CDNs created at that time, has achieved National Theatre status is mainly attributable to its location on France's eastern border in a region which for centuries had been a European theatre of war. After the Second World War Alsace ceased to be a militarized buffer zone and was placed at the geographical heart of the Franco-German project for Europe, automatically conferring a particular strategic significance on any theatre that was established in the

region. There is also a symbolic resonance in the fact that the edifice converted to accommodate the theatre was originally built in 1892 to house the Parliament of Alsace-Lorraine. During the 1990s a major capital investment programme was undertaken, confirming the importance which successive governments have attached to maintaining a high profile bi-lingual theatre in close proximity to the French seat of the European Parliament.

The TNS is singular in several respects. It is the only National Theatre to be established outside the capital and the only one to have a local as well as national identity (none of the other four draws an audience from its immediate locality). Secondly – and not surprisingly given its strategic location – its reach is further extended by a supra-national mission under a charter which supposedly guarantees it ‘the resources needed to pursue a regional, national and European mission’.<sup>10</sup> Reconciling these is obviously a tall order and in practice none of its directors has succeeded in giving equal weight to the three strands of mission. Most have found it expedient to cut down on regional touring in order to concentrate on the last two. Thirdly, the TNS’s national profile is reinforced by having a fully-integrated national theatre school, based on the acting school originally created by Michel Saint-Denis. The Ecole Supérieure d’Art Dramatique is one of only two national theatre schools (the other being the Paris Conservatoire) and the only one to provide training in directing and design as well as acting. The European mission is reflected in programming. Typically, of the 15–20 productions presented each year, 4 or 5 will be by the resident company, 3 or 4 will be co-productions with other European theatres, and the remainder will be visiting shows, including a number of foreign-language productions.

Last of the five National Theatres in order of foundation, the Théâtre National de la Colline, inaugurated in 1989, offers further evidence of a shift in national priorities since 1968. In its previous incarnation as the TEP, this National Theatre, like the TNP, also had its origins in policies designed to achieve better geographical and demographic distribution of theatre. Decentralization was not solely concerned with irrigating *le désert* (as the provinces were sometimes referred to) but aimed also to establish theatres in parts of the Paris region and within the capital itself where none existed. In the 20th arrondissement, this led to the award of special subsidized status to an independent company led by Guy Rétoré which later (1963) became the TEP (Théâtre de l’Est Parisien) with CDN status and which eventually (1972) acquired full National Theatre status.

From its earliest days as an amateur company, the TEP was strongly embedded in its neighbourhood, producing work that reflected the people, their history and the issues that concerned them, in a district with a predominantly working-class and immigrant population. Despite the recognized quality of its work, the TEP was the poor cousin among National Theatres, receiving the smallest subsidy and inadequately housed in a converted cinema. The last deficiency was addressed in 1989 with an impressive (if undersized) new

David Whitton 161

theatre constructed on the site of the old one – along with a new director, name and mission. (The TEP has remained in existence, reverting to its former status as a subsidized independent theatre and operating as a neighbourhood theatre in nearby premises provided by the Ministry.)

Thus, while the Théâtre National de la Colline was not exactly created *ex nihilo*, the transformation is so radical that it really merits being seen as an entirely new National Theatre, the first to be brought into existence in thirty years. The focus on local and participatory action has completely gone. The new and undoubtedly more prestigious mission is to stage an exclusively modern and contemporary repertoire, French and non-French. The creation of a National Theatre dedicated to writing might be seen as part of a reaction against the powers acquired by directors and the big-budget, big-concept productions which the funding structures for *théâtre public* encouraged in the 1980s. Under its first director, Jorge Lavelli (1989–96), the programme showed a bias towards the Spanish or Latin-American writers (Lorca, Arrabal, Copi, Valle-Inclán) with whom Lavelli himself had made his directorial mark. But there was much more besides, and it has been rightly observed that Lavelli built up ‘a wide-ranging and discriminating picture of the twentieth-century repertoire’.<sup>11</sup> Lavelli’s successor since 1996, Alain Françon, has modified this profile by bringing a commitment to contemporary writing to the fore. Françon has developed close working relationships with Michel Vinaver and Edward Bond (he is, in fact, the leading producer of Bond and inaugurated his tenure at the Colline with a revival of Bond’s *In The Company of Men*). Françon, who is particularly keen to involve living writers rather than promoting recent classics, has proved more adventurous than his predecessor when it comes to staging new work and has established a series of publications allowing writers to comment on their work in performance.

As for the Comédie-Française, it would be possible to write in extended detail about the reforms it has undergone since 1968. However, the feverish excitement generated within the company by any challenge to the *status quo*, coupled with the theatre’s singular prestige, tends to lend an exaggerated importance to the minutiae of its internal affairs. The broad reality is that it has withstood the tenure of reforming administrators-general (notably Jean-Pierre Vincent and Antoine Vitez, though Jacques Lassalle might also be mentioned) and remains fundamentally the Comédie-Française. The progressive introduction of more modern and non-French drama has diluted, without destroying, its identity as the repository of the classical heritage, and without removing the impression of an institution which (perhaps properly) does not rush headlong to embrace modernity. Thus, it is perfectly possible for its supporters to claim that it has been transformed beyond recognition and for detractors to claim that the pace of change is glacial. The acquisition of a second house (the Vieux-Colombier) on the left-bank, and then the construction of a 136-seat Studio Theatre (1996) has enabled it to continue to extend the range and volume of its activity. The latter are certainly

162 *Proliferation and Differentiation of National Theatres in France*

impressive features (commentators like to invoke the metaphor of a beehive) and are often invoked to justify the fact that the Comédie-Française receives over 40 per cent of the total sums allocated to the five National Theatres. Equally, there is often a feeling that it is impossible for the Comédie-Française to satisfy anyone, exposed as it is to criticism both when it adheres to its traditions and when it deviates from them. This may explain the paradox that at a time when France's National Theatres have proliferated in order to reflect the plurality and diversity of their particular constituencies, its most venerable National Theatre has itself been intent on diversifying its own profile.

The French National Theatre today is a multi-layered product of numerous overlapping processes. One way to summarize it would read as follows. At the start of the twentieth century, the French State owned three theatres – the Comédie-Française, the Odéon, and the Opéra. The historic and traditional character of these institutions indicates how the State at that time perceived its mandate, i.e. in terms of conserving the most culturally prestigious elements of the performing arts heritage. The twentieth century witnessed a massive expansion of the State's cultural territory, both quantitatively and conceptually. Its field of responsibility extended first into dissemination, then to geographical and demographic penetration, in some cases associated with strivings towards a more enabling, participatory view of culture. An important impetus towards change, affecting National Theatres and the whole spectrum of *théâtre public* alike, was a commitment to change the distribution of cultural capital among French citizens. Extending conceptually over a period of roughly one hundred years from 1870 to 1970, and fuelling a concentrated burst of activity after 1947, this impetus enabled the TNP to serve briefly as an important site of national identity. It also resulted in an extensive nationwide system of buildings and companies which is in place today and in which the National Theatres are embedded. This infrastructure is not a straightforward product of an impulse to democratize culture but also results from a Gaullist ambition, shared by Presidents Pompidou, Mitterrand and Chirac, to build a cultural state comparable in importance to that created by Richelieu and Louis XIV, albeit one inspired by republican rather than monarchical rhetoric. That domestic ambition runs in parallel with another long-term national policy objective involving France's external presence in the world. Impacting particularly on the National Theatres, this is currently focused on affirming France's role within the Europe of the twenty-first century.

### Notes

1. Other Regional National Theatres include Théâtre National de Marseille, Théâtre National de Bordeaux en Aquitaine, Théâtre National de Bretagne, Théâtre National de Nice, Théâtre National de Toulouse Midi-Pyrénées, etc.

2. The expression was given widespread currency by Bernard Dort who used it with a deliberate allusion to Vilar's advocacy of theatre considered as a public service comparable to the nationalized water and gas utilities.
3. See David Whitton (2001), pp. 53–71.
4. J-M Hordé (1997), *Le Journal du Théâtre* (March): 5.
5. Jack Lang (1968), *L'État et le théâtre* (Paris: Bibliothèque de Droit Public).
6. Lang classified the three National Theatres along two axes – repertoire and audience – using terms such as *conservation/découverte/création* ('classical/dissemination of new works/creation of new works') and *théâtre de prestige/théâtre de diffusion* ('hegemonic/popular').
7. Or, as Lang put it: 'Ni tout à fait théâtre de prestige, ni véritablement théâtre populaire, il joue dans la vie théâtrale un rôle imprécis' (Lang, *op. cit.*, p. 115).
8. Antoine Vitez (1980), 'Vitez on Molière: freeing the actors', *Performing Arts Journal*, V (1980): 86.
9. [http://www.theatre-odeon.fr/new/en/the\\_theatre/presentation/accueil-f-8.htm](http://www.theatre-odeon.fr/new/en/the_theatre/presentation/accueil-f-8.htm) (accessed January 6, 2007).
10. Raymonde Temkine (1992), *Le Théâtre en l'état* (Paris: Editions Théâtrales). p. 134 (my translation).
11. David Bradby and Annie Sparks (1997), *Mise en scène. French Theatre Now* (London: Methuen Drama), p. 153.