

THE CONVERGENCE OF THE THEORY OF DISCOURSE WITH THE THEORY OF PERFORMANCE IN POSTHUMANIST CONTEXTS

Felix NICOLAU

The University of Lund, Sweden

Abstract: In recent times, pragmatics has made more and more room for the theory of discourse. The switch in emphasis was triggered, amid other phenomena and theories, by the flourishing of the communication theory, with its tenet that the process of communication is quite unstable and unpredictable. It is not only the context the one which distorts the transmission of messages, but also the mood of those involved in the process of communication, or what is called subtle communication. In my article, I am especially interested in the repercussions of the theory of discourse on another blooming theory, namely the theory of the performative acts, or the theory of performance. Thus, my research is inter-theoretical but it does not trespass the borders of other paradigms. It will maintain itself within the frontiers of this versatile and morphotic paradigm: the paradigm of discourses with its intersemiotic skeleton.

Keywords: pragmatics, theory of discourse, theory of performance, subtle communication.

1. Introduction

The linguistic turn seemed to have ended majestically within the confines of pragmatics. But then, a fresh semi-turn took place, back to the social context. Discourse theory shuffled linguistic tenets with all sorts of ideologies camouflaged in culture. Cultural Studies has been in the limelight for a while now and it accentuated, apart from other aspects, the necessity of interdisciplinarity.

My paper studies the developments suggested by performativity and posthumanism, although their multiple meanings have generated misunderstandings and suspicion. However, every species performs its identity and proposes its specific language. One of the essential components of posthumanism is the transspeciesism. It follows that – due to the abolishment of the Enlightenment anthropocentrism – we need to take heed of every data attainable for obtaining a sustainable translation of the contexts characteristic of the post-industrial society. Hybridity, vagueness, queer theory, intermediality, and remediation are the present-day coordinates of our environment and all these are the source of new types of agency. But first of all, we should establish what “our” means.

2. The pragmatic turn

There are state-of-the-art studies about practices, utterance interpretation and processing, and acts of speech. The pragmatic inferences begin to rely more on analyses of non-assertive acts of communication. The pragmatic turn, as we know, values sentences in communication more than sentence structure. The new developments in the realm of the philosophy of language connect it overtly to communication theory. The phenomenon is closer to continental European pragmatics

than to the Anglo-American one. The former is interested in macro-pragmatics, which includes socio-pragmatics, cross-cultural and intercultural communication, and ideology. This integrative development is very useful for hermeneutics, especially when, allegedly, the researcher tries to clarify Gricean implicatures, which are haphazard sayings or meanings without a limpid expression, or “the speakers implicate while readers infer” (Allan and Jaszezolt 2012, 4).

If linguistics is informed by idealizations, then applied linguistics is accountable for linking languages to thinking in matter-of-fact everyday life situations. The same happens with literature: the reader-response approach is preoccupied with the transaction between the artefact and its readership in relation to the context wherein this is accessed.

Postmodernism showed that literature and language are not self-contained, neutral systems, but politicised forms of thinking and feeling. In order to identify and understand these cultural ingredients we need multifunctional hermeneutics. Noam Chomsky pleaded for a universal grammar but nobody could plead for a uniform reception and assessment of literary products. The mediated discourse analysis posits that all actions are mediated through cultural tools. It results that our discourses are both *situated practices*, tied to quantitative and qualitative configurations, and *community practices*, tied to various communities within particular disciplinary narratives (Hyland and Paltridge 2011,13). Through entextualization we reify language as *text*, much in the same vein as the structuralist approach. Structuralists were more preoccupied with the structures of language which made possible linguistic performance than with the actual performance in its multiple representations. *Langue* was more important than *parole*. Signs, in the Saussurean tradition, generated sense through reciprocal reference and not through interaction with an external and hybridized world. Selection and combination were realized strictly syntagmatically (Barker and Galasinski 2001, 4). It was Roland Barthes the one who understood to subsume all cultural practices to semiotic analysis.

2.1. Types of discourses

For the literary discourse to function at all levels, Grice’s cooperative principles are still standing: the maxim of quantity (quantity of information), the maxim of quality (adequate evidence), the maxim of relation (relevance), and the maxim of manner (coherence, concision). But, of course, they are imperative only at the communicative level, otherwise, the literary discourse would surrender to redundancy, deformation, irrelevance and prolixity or ambiguity. However, the phatic function would not be annihilated through these tactics, only diminished in terms of a thinned public.

Contemporary literature covers more and more frequently the full spectrum of linguistics signs (organized by C.S. Peirce into a triad: iconic, indexical and symbolic). Peirce’s type of semiotics, as we know, is processual, paying attention to protean contexts, whereas Saussure’s was linguistically oriented and based on the arbitrariness of linguistic sign. A triadic paradigm was opposed to a dyadic one. Then, with the advent of poststructuralism, the conditions of truth became loose, if not evanescent.

2.2. Vagueness and felicity conditions

The *epistemic theory of vagueness* contends that there is no firm borderline between disciplines. Accordingly, a reality is neither true, nor false, everything depending on context. Thus, this theory uses concepts and ideas as “contextuality” and “accommodation”, in the wake of Grice (1975), cooperative principle and the associated conversational maxims. The levels of specificity will vary depending on the situation (Connor and Upton 2004, 1).

Again, language in use flexes itself in relation to the status of language users, to the context of interactions, and to the communicative goals pursued by communicators. Truth-conditional semantics analyses sentence meaning in the light of formal rigour and logical plausibility, but in compliance with evolving states-of-affairs. To these, the meaning supplied by other sources has to be added. Language theories may enlarge their scope when they confront with the use-centred, social-interactionist views on language. We get closer hereby to speech acts and their intentionality. In much complex interactions, the speakers adjust their utterances to suit the hearers while also being mindful of the context and of the assumed shared background knowledge, otherwise hearers tend to become overhearers. From the point of view of pragmatics, an overhearer may misinterpret the message for want of appropriate contextual information. In this equation, a locutionary act is followed an illocutionary one which also assumes a performative dimension. Finally, the perlocutionary act evades the intentionality of pragmatics and enters the sphere of the theory of discourse. As we know, pragmatics includes the study of speaker meaning, of contextual meaning, and how speakers communicate more than they say. This involves presuppositions, conversational implicatures, references, deixis or “pointing”, and speech acts. Modern developments of linguistic studies confirmed Ferdinand de Saussure’s conception that language is not an organism developing its own accord but a collaborative construct belonging to linguistic communities. Theory welded to individual functional acts could create what Searle coined in 1969 as “felicity conditions”. According to these, the speaker will provide that valuable (sincere) information which is desired by the hearer.

The “social turn” in language studies and the parallel “turn to discourse”, occurred towards the end of the 20th century in the social sciences, redirected researchers and theorists towards the “processual”, “constitutive” and “ideological” aspects of the language. Culture has become gradually understood as cultures which include also institutions and mentalities. Linguistics accepted connections to ethnoanthropology in what was called the “postmodern turn”. Consequently, a cross-fertilization of discourse analysis and linguistic pragmatics became possible. The result was *discursive pragmatics*, a concept theorized by Jan Zienkorovski, Jan-Ola Ostman and Jef Verschueren in their eponymous book published at John Benjamin’s Publishing House Company in 2011. The accent falls on points of convergence, eclectic studies of real-life discourses and interdisciplinarity. Ethnomethodological conversation analysis also focuses on common-sense reasoning and social action work.

2.3. Discourse and interdisciplinarity

These new perspectives understood individual agency and power structures as dialectically interrelated. The same type of tension persists in Discourse Studies:

appeared as a reaction to structuralism in anthropology and linguistics, the discipline includes both a theory of social life and of language. Ethnomethodology preceded conversation analysis which confined itself to the study the “here and now” of interactions, which mainly described rules governing interactional patterns, that is to say turn-taking structures and specifics of relevant conversations. Umberto Eco also referred to the importance of the Dynamical Object as a *terminus a quo*, meaning of course the language in action, as a flux between interpretants (Eco 1999, 3).

French poststructuralism postulated that the social space is a *discourse* containing sub-discourses which organize regimes of power and inequality. Unequal opportunities, social-leverage and marked identities are pointed and legitimated through ideologies. It is basically what Foucault understood by the historical nature of discursive practices. If there is no discourse free of ideology, free of paradigm, then it is obnoxious to speak about objectivity, progress and neutrality. From this relativism or skepticism a more comprehensive and sincere perspective may ensue. Grammaticality is not the same with acceptability, the latter being related to the speaker’s performance.

In Chomsky’s vision, an acceptable sentence must appear natural and appropriate in a given text, besides it being grammatically irreproachable (*Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, 1965). Acceptability has to take into account ambiguity and vagueness, concepts which have preoccupied for a while now semanticists and pragmatists.

Discourse theory may run the risk of reifying language by insisting on some ideologised stance. Preventively, inter-discourse communication constitutes an integrative and moderating paradigm. If we were to surpass the binary impasses of literature versus language, structural versus communicative approaches, language elitism versus language populism, and language versus culture, we should accept that languages are an issue of social justice (Philipps and Gonzales, 2004, XV). This means that the processes of communication and selection involve additional aspects besides competence and performance. The paradigm shift stresses the “hyphenated areas” of research, which means both interdisciplinarity and disciplinary delimitations (May 2001, 5).

2.4. Performativity and agency

During the eighth decade of the past century, Victor Turner and Richard Schechner enlarged the sphere of the concept of performativity by showing that events, rituals, alongside with daily life were all regulated by a code of performance. Performance theory describes a signal-system (clothes, conversations, food etc.) that has a semiotic function in our lives. We transmit messages by every action we perform and the contexts we cross decode them in accordance with their particularity. If we all rehearse a performance, it results that we all crave for a reception of our role-playing.

Performances can be rebellious or observant. In a certain degree, we all evolve inside the carnivalesque sphere Mikhail Bakhtin described. Judith Butler theorized the notion of “performativity” in connection to the discourse used in identity formation and law-making. It means that language has the ability to resist or assist individuals.

For Judith Butler, everything in society is verbalized and distributed into discourses. She reclaims herself from the phenomenological theory of “acts” as it was

exposed by Edmund Husserl, Maurice Merleau-Ponty and George Herbert Mead. This theory tries to explain the way in which social agents constitute social realities through language and symbolic social signs. (Butler 1988, 519-531). One issue to be inferred from this approach is that gender is not a stable identity constituted through a stylized repetition of acts (Idem, ibidem).

Consequently, our identities would be performative accomplishments, or “stylized repetitions of acts through time” (ibidem, 520). As our environment is biased, then our protean identity can be perceived as an “object of belief” (idem, ibidem) socially sanctioned. Not only is our language (verbal or non-verbal) an embodiment of historical and cultural possibilities, but also our body (ibidem, 521). Basically, Judith Butler dramatizes a theory of embodiment which highlights the importance of a progressive, even Darwinian perspective.

2.5. Approaching performativity

Performance and reception are time-space sequences. Different “stagings” will communicate different qualities of a work of art and the response of the public will be every time renewed, surprising. Some texts are more performative than others and automatically they will elicit a richer response. From the point of view of Performance Studies, texts are transformable sign/symbol systems. Texts are re-textualized. Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett is an outstanding promoter of Performance Studies, understanding it as a syncretic result of many disciplines. Blurring boundaries between arts would dematerialise the art object and approach the condition of performance (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1995, 410-433). Thus, the debate on discourse, representation and identity is enriched. Ray Birdwhistell stated that “Performance is an inherent constituent of all communication” (in Sullivan 1986, 7).

In 1980, at New York University, Richard Schechner advocated the *Broad Spectrum Approach*. In his view, performance is perceived as a means of tackling historical, cultural and social processes. This understanding was labelled as inclusionary, non-canonical, democratic and counter-elitist (Pelias, Ronald and VanOosting 1987, 221). In tune with cultural studies, the notion of literature in terms of textual possibilities was enlarged so that it could comprise not literature only, but also “cultural texts”.

Not just an umbrella covering multiple disciplines, Performance Studies, in its theoretical profile, embraces the post-disciplinary approach and questions the relationship between disciplinary subjects and their objects of study. As such, the culturally specific divisions of the arts are abolished in light of an inclusionary and welcoming vision.

Performance acts like an organizing and responsive idea which shows receptivity towards new technologies. Virtual and augmented realities are considered opportunities to increase precision. Digital technologies, media, e-learning, m-learning, and communication techniques all contribute to an enhanced creativity and entextualization. Consequently, cultural awareness is heightened and the various theories of embodiment find points of convergence. Increased attention to objecthood and materiality in the era of information and virtuality saves lots of artefacts from being museumified.

Intercultural performance is attuned to problems of place, cultural citizenship, equity, and personhood. New theories of heritage as a mode of cultural production in various contexts are developed. The shifting configurations of the local and global find a flexible, welcoming and reflecting medium in Performance Studies.

Performance studies colludes interdisciplinary approaches in the attempt to generate a new discourse out of the intersection of heterogeneous discourses. The components of identity shape an "inter-discipline" or a "post-discipline" with the help of a blend of research methods.

Richard Schehner, author of *Performance Studies: An Introduction*, splits performances in two categories: *artistic* and *cultural*. The first one includes solo-performance, performance art, performance of literature, storytelling, plays, and performance poetry. The second category assimilates events belonging to everyday life: community festivals, performances of social and professional roles, individual performances of race, gender, sexuality and class, and all varieties of rituals.

2.6. Stages of intermediality

Performance Studies has developed under the auspices of intermediality, a trend which incorporates media and digital technology. The result is the blurring of boundaries and the generation of crossover and hybrid performances.

Intermedial reality is positioned between performer and audience, but also between a few conceptual frameworks and humanist movements. This is called the space of *in-betweenness* wherein softened boundaries allow the blending of spaces, media and realities.

Intermediality has developed its own discourse and has crossed several stages. The first one was the *pre-intermediality debate* and was a sub-domain of *classical film theories*. Christopher Balme isolated three understandings of intermediality. The first is the *transposition of subject matter* from one medium to another one. The second is described as a *specific form of intertextuality*. The third records the *recreation of aesthetic conventions* of a certain medium within a different medium (Balme 2001, 154-156).

Jens Schröter, in his turn, identified four types of discourses on intermediality. The first is *synthetic intermediality* and it describes the convergence of different arts and media into fresh art or media forms. The second is *formal and trans-medial intermediality* which regards the transfer of aesthetic conventions between varieties of media. The reverse of transformational intermediality is *ontological intermediality*. This is the fourth distinguished type and it postulates that a medium cannot define its own ontology and specificity in an autarchic way; it necessitates the comparison with another medium. The limitations of intertextuality are abolished at this level, as transformational representations involve awareness of the ontology of the medium.

In 1999, Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin published the book *Remediation*. Their thesis is that remediation existed as artistic practice since the Renaissance (p. 45). Different forms of remediation are digitizing older media objects (ranging from photographs and painting to printed literary texts), assimilating an older medium completely and so on (ibidem, 45-49). Remediation can assume new trends: adoption and improvement of the methods of representation used by previous media; changing

the methods of representation of the older media (like incentivising film and television through digital technology).

Remediation deploys concepts like *immediacy*, *hypermediacy* and *transparency*. Immediacy or *transparent immediacy* strives to determine the viewer to ignore the presence of the medium and, thus, focuses without intermediaries on the object. The contrast to immediacy is hypermediacy, wherein viewers' attention is completely absorbed by the medium itself. In order to suggest an authentic real experience, immediacy and hypermediacy can interact.

The intermedial discourse maps a new theoretical territory wherein media are included too. We arrive at the cultural logic of media and the cultural logic of the computer. These new types of logic take us further to the realms of posthumanism and transhumanism.

2.7. Posthumanism and Cyborg theory

Posthumanism is a theory with many sub-branches. It refers to a condition which differs from the Renaissance anthropocentrism and contains issues of interdisciplinarity, language and trans-species communication, social systems and many others. The human is re-conceived so as to embrace a fluid identity. Instead of a formed ontology, the posthuman stance defends an emergent ontology which allows multiple and heterogeneous perspectives. In contrast with pre-Renaissance humanist philosophy which worshipped the rational, unified, autonomous and free-willed human nature, posthumanism invokes the transformational performativity of human nature.

Posthumanism accuses advanced capitalism of exploiting unscrupulously all the resources and all the species of the planet. In this view, technological advancements serve a limited purpose: profit. Combination of technologies such as psychopharmacology neural interfaces, information, management tools, memory-enhancing drugs, implanted computers, genetic engineering and others are instruments of control and ideology. As some humans are no longer confined to the database of their species, they see themselves as posthuman gods. Reality and science fiction join forces to shape a hyperreality.

Donna Haraway's *A Cyborg Manifesto* from 1984 propounds the trespassing of all barriers, especially those between animate and inanimate. The synthesis of human and machine is the cyborg, perceived as a hybrid existence completely free of any human complexes (the Oedipus complex, for instance).

Apart from posthumanism, this manifesto prizes unconditionally the technological nature and criticizes the identity politics supported by feminism. Haraway encourages the coalition through affinity. At the beginning of the 21st century, affinities are no longer elective, but selective, in the sense that only some empowered individuals can access them. Haraway's intentions are, however, democratic. She fights against the "antagonistic dualism" specific to the Western discourse – e.g. the confrontation between the One and the Other. High-tech culture would be an opportunity to put away essentialisms. Haraway's manifesto belongs to the feminist lineage as it contests the shallowness of perfect communication which buttresses the dogma of phallogocentrism. The hybridized posthumanism of techno-science acknowledges the general deficit of innocence and the privileged epistemological positions of some categories. The utopian vein of the manifesto is represented by the

hope for a “monstrous world without gender”. Haraway rejects categorizations and taxonomy, not even the label of post-genderism satisfying her. Queer theory implications can be felt instantly in this manifesto.

Cyborg theory originated in mythological figures like Frankenstein (Mary Shelley’s 1818 novel *Frankenstein*), or in the modern Prometheus replica created by Shelley Kackson in *Patchwork Girl*. This is a piece of digital literature built as a hypertext. Readers, or users, have to click on the body of a naked female body sewn together along a clothed lime. They can follow its link to whatever section of the text. The Patchwork Girl is an aborted female monster manufactured by Victor Frankenstein in Mary Shelley’s novel. She is part male, part female, part animal and is 175 years old. The monster will be finally sewn back together by Marry Shelley herself and will become her lover. The issues are related here to physical multiplicity and reproductive politics (Haraway 1991).

Interdisciplinarity and the enlargement of the scientific frame have become emblems of a new cultural paradigm. For instance, central concepts for posthumanism and transhumanism are *artificial intelligence* and *technological singularity*, or ultra-fast roads towards superhuman intelligence. This posthuman development espouses the vision of biological engines in continuous transformation and able to self-improve their condition. The method would be that of applied reason.

The new cultural shock is the merge of life sciences with reproductive, genetic, and neuro-technology. Biotechnology announces the fracture of *nature’s lottery*, the possibility of at least the human species to influence its own blueprint and structure. This is the optimistic view which is countered by the pessimistic one: the new technological developments are perceived by others as technological hubris leading to an inhuman future (Tamar Sharon “Philosophy of Engineering and Technology”, in *Human Nature in an Age of Biotechnology. The Case for Mediated Posthumanism* 2014: 12-13). The sceptical ones are the bio-conservatives and they warn about the possible forms of inequality and discrimination. All in all, the bio-conservatives fight for the *givenness* of human nature, whereas the transhumanists fight for the *transformative* essence of this nature. Two ontological models which erect a dualist paradigm! But a third paradigm emerges and proposes a human-technology hybrid encompassing the mediating entities between the *dystopic* and the *liberal* posthumanism, the old canonizing principles belong to the dual, antithetic paradigm. The mediating approach endorses a contemporarily fashioned canon, without rejecting any productive/organizing medium.

As a starting point for discussing the implications of posthumanism, Neil Badmington picked up the formula *Alien Love*. He highlighted that many oppositions (human versus inhuman, us versus them, real versus fake) are hierarchical and induce a harsh sense of “versus” (Badmington 2004, 3).

Posthumanism would be the first theoretical trend that does not resort to binary oppositions. The Alien has now the chance to be welcomed and loved, thing which signifies the end of Renaissance humanism. The 1950s inclination towards *alien hatred* is nowadays only a historical record.

Cyberpunk also is assimilated into the larger riverbed of posthumanism. Science fiction novels, manga, anime and all genres of films found inspiration in this trend. For instance, *AKIRA* manga is a graphic novel that contains more than two thousand pages. It was serialized in *Young Magazine (Yangu Magajin)* from December 20, 1982,

until June 25, 1990. The story begins in 1982, when a quasi-nuclear bomb explodes above Kantō region of Japan, where the cities of Tokyo and Yokohama are located.

In his book from 2013, *An Inquiry into Modes of Existence*, Bruno Latour exposed his own version of actor-network theory. This takes into account another dichotomous classification of types of posthumanism. There will be, thus, a *deconstructive* or *anti-ontological* posthumanism and another one proposing *alternative ontologies* which are preoccupied with various exclusions exerted in the name of the human. The former decentres the subject, whereas the latter, even bolder, declare that there are many other sources of agency besides humans.

Latour signalled the existence of a privileged locus of action, occupied by only one species of actants. The new understanding of agency implies a network of heterogeneous actants – neither human, nor object, but hybrid (Chagani 2014: 426). We assist to the formation of two new types of agency. Microbes, baboons, machines and others receive now appropriate representation after centuries of denial. So far, they have been denied any creativity and have been treated as “the hapless bearers of symbolic projection” (Latour 2003: 10).

Posthumanism is, among other options, about suturing species and technologies. Its concern is not with human or with interracial breeding, but with inter-species and inter-regna developments. Humanism, as inheritor of the Western metaphysics and supporter of the Same, is considered a thing of the past. In fact, posthumanism tries to quickly solve the decades-long disputes related to *sameness* and *difference*. In this new world, there is no *absolute otherness* or *radical alterity*. Correspondingly, canons must embrace a perspective free of the anxiety provoked by unbridgeable differences and dangerous similarities (Weinstone 2004, 3-5).

At the end of postmodernism, we are confronted with a hyper-capitalist and hyper-technologized society. A new hegemonic project is foreseeable, this time dominated by the destructive creativity. The social-democratic utopia is progressively pushed to the wall by neoliberalism. The transnational capitalism has subjugated the State and now it liquefies it by privatising the public services and planning the transition to the global market-obsessed society. The Third World and the Fourth World are neglected, whereas capitalism is interested in the most competitive segments of world economy. The borderless global network feeds both on speculative capital and on black-market capital. The world of the financial capitalism acquired the profile of a casino, especially since The United States gave up the convertibility of dollar in gold. Everybody targets speculation and almost nobody questions the origins of the plus-value. If the speculative capital does not need work any longer to reproduce itself, it has to transform the worker into a loyal consumer. The story of the new type of capitalism approaches consumers as its protagonists: they have to be seduced by aestheticized, wrapped up, and fetishized commodities. Aesthetics now serves the art of marketing, the beautified merchandise. Culture itself is a collection of co-isolated bubbles which strives to liquefy everything. Consumers are gratified with the illusion of uniqueness while the serial production of goods (even cultural) levels every piece of differentiation. (Vanderberghe 2006, 12). Illusionary distinctions are maintained only by the increased quality of some commodities, whereas they still come under the umbrella of a certain fashion. The spanner between the rails/layers is the price; necessarily, it targets quantitative, not qualitative parameters.

One of the premises of Posthumanism is the disputation of the predominance of humanity in the natural order. So, the prefix “post”, in this sense, does not imply to

move further from the non-enhanced humanity. This bio-conservative trend in Posthumanism questions the Enlightenment centring of humanity as it has been implemented and motivated for more than two centuries now (Gordjin and Chadwick 2007, 2).

But the anthropocentric discourse has a much more remote origin. The Bible itself cumulates the characteristics of a species dominion over the whole creation. The posthumanist discourse tries to destabilize this hegemonic discourse by attacking speciesism and the human exceptionalism rooted in biblical mythology. But this line of action would be dishonest if it denied that Hebrew Scriptures are permeated by an undercurrent of compassion which is closer to stewardship than to dominion (Koosed 2014, 3). This heritage reminds us that J. Derrida, in *Spectres of Marx* (1994), coined the term *hauntology* to describe the way in which the past informs the present and influences the future.)

Posthumanism started as a post-theorization, but in time it managed to get rid of the hyphenated *post-*, especially that its dystopian side succeeded in implementing the term *natureculture* that surpasses the Cartesian dualisms: mind-body, human-animal.

Posthumanism is, at its bottom, an expansion of the concept of identity. For its representatives, consciousness is an epiphenomenon whereas its container, the body, is only a prosthesis that must offer the possibility to be repaired or even changed. What really matters is the goal of existence.

Posthumanism is also a link between the strong points of view formulated by Renaissance humanism and of transhumanism. Its malleability rejects anthropological universals and addresses questions of ethics and trans-species communication. By preferring questioning to answering, posthumanism is related to nominalism.

The new modalities of constructing the canon ignore most of the time the lack of homogeneity and ideological and aesthetic fragmentation which lead to a multitude of artistic languages. The builders of the canon have to refresh their cultural paradigm. In this respect, posthumanism reformulates individuality and records whatever angles and points of view the artist wants to assume.

3. Conclusion

The present article stresses the obsolescence of binary oppositions and raises ethical issues concerning colonialist translations. Sameness and difference are offered a broad spectrum of interference and cross-breeding in the discourse theory. As the end of postmodernity is marked by *hyper*-ideologies – which are a source of conflict -, interdisciplinarity, intercultural communication, and transpecism are means of strengthening the *natureculture*. Posthumanism – as a counterbalance to transhumanism - enlarges the sphere of performativity and proposes new approaches to discourse theory. Future researches will have to tackle the ruptures between/overlaps of posthumanist and transhumanist discourses.

References

1. Allan, K. & Jaszczolt, K. M. (eds.). 2012. *The Cambridge Handbook of Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. Badmington, N. 2004. *Alien Chic. Posthumanism and the Other within*. USA-Canada: Routledge.

3. Barker, C. and Galasinski, D. 2001. *Cultural Studies and Discourse Analysis. A Dialogue on Language and Identity*. USA: SAGE Publications.
4. Balme, Christopher. *Einführung in die Theaterwissenschaft*. Erich Schmidt Verlag, Berlin,.
5. Butler, J. 2008. "Performative and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory". In *Theater Journal*, vol. 40, No. 4 (Dec. 1988), pp. 519-531. Published by The Johns Hopkins University Press. Accessed: 06/ 08/ 2009.
6. Chagani, F. 2014. "Critical political ecology and the seductions of posthumanism". In *Journal of Political Ecology*, vol. 21, pp. 424-436.
7. Connor, U. and Upton, T.A. 2004. *Applied Corpus Linguistics. A Multidimensional Perspective*. The Netherlands: Rodopi.
8. Eco, U. 1999. *Kant and the Platypus. Essays on Language and Cognition*. San Diego, New York, London: A Harvest Book, Harcourt Inc.
9. Gordjin, B. and Chadwick, R. 2007. *Medical Enhancement of Posthumanity*. New York: Routledge.
10. Haraway, D. J. 1991. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge.
11. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. 1995. "The aesthetics of everyday life". In *Conversations before the End of Time*. Suzi Gablik, ed. New York: Thames and Hudson.
12. Latour, B. 2013. *An Inquiry into Modes of Existence*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.
13. May, J. L. 2001. *Pragmatics. An Introduction*. USA: Blackwell Publishing, Second Edition.
14. Pelias, R. J. and VanOosting, J. 1987. "A paradigm for Performance Studies". In *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, no. 73, pp. 219-231.
15. Philipps, A. and Gonzales, M. 2004. *Modern Languages Learning & Teaching in an Intercultural Field*. London: Sage Publications.
16. Sharon, T. 2014. *Human Nature in an Age of Biotechnology. The Case for Mediated Posthumanism*. Dordrecht: Springer.
17. Vanderberghe, F. 2006. *Complexités du Posthumanisme. Trois essais dialectiques sur la sociologie de Bruno Latour*. Traduit de l'anglais par Henri Vaugrand. Paris : L'Harmattan.
18. Weinstone, A. 2004. *Avatar Bodies. A Tantra for Posthumanism*. USA: University of Minnesota Press.