Between Performative and Performance: Translation and Theatre in the Canadian/Quebec Context

BARBARA GODARD

One of the most fecund, as well as the most under-articulated, of such crossings has been the oblique intersection between performativity and the loose cluster of theatrical practices, relations, and traditions known as performance.

— Parker and Sedgwick 1

Translation and theatre. The relations between these two spheres of activity are fraught, embedded as they are in profound contradictions generated by the long-standing tension between literal and figurative that haunts all representation with the paradox of the unlike likeness. The representational paradox informs the (im)possibility of translation within theories of equivalency and fidelity even as it fosters an understanding of theatre as event, albeit as simulation. What emerges as an issue in both spheres of representation is the problematic relation of truth-telling to action. Does truth inhere in repetition? How does sign relate to event? Beyond the complications *within* each of these systems of signification, the contradiction complicates any theorization of the relation *between* them, especially of translation *in* theatre. Translation is increasingly cast in the metaphor of theatre: for instance, Hans Sahl, a theoretician of theatre, writes that "[t]ranslating is staging a play in another language" (qtd. in Pavis, *Theatre* 147). Conversely, metaphors of translation are frequently used to describe performance of a text: Pirandello rages about the pain he feels when attending rehearsal where the "translation [of his text] into material reality" does not correspond to his own conception (qtd. in Bassnett, "Still Trapped" 91). In this essay, I want to explore these entangled practices through the categories of the performative and performance that, within the so-called "linguistic turn" and a subsequent "cultural turn" (both aspects of a semiotic turn), have introduced paradigms for the discursive constitution of reality and, conversely, for the non-verbal unfolding of social behaviours. I shall then follow their turns and

twists in some cases of French to English translation for the theatre in the Canadian/Quebec context.

TRANSLATION AND THEATRE: BEYOND CORRESPONDENCE THEORIES

Metaphor drives attempts to make correspondences between these different fields of activity, metaphor that, as figure for forging resemblances across differences, derives from *metapherein*, Greek for "translation." Repetition is one point of contact: drama and translation have converging paradigms in which repetition performs simultaneously a critical and a creative process. Repetition as reflexivity and transformation challenges the descriptive fallacy of language, its purported ability to adequately (re)present the world in language. In both theatre and translation, repetition entails a movement from one medium into a different one in a process with affinities to "mapping," Umberto Eco's term for the social labour of sign production (semiosis) that results from a network of interacting forces (246). "[T]wice-behaved behavior" is how Richard Schechner describes performance (36). "Strips of behavior" from everyday life are framed, edited, rehearsed, and otherwise worked over in ritual or theatrical performances. As a process of "deconstruction/reconstruction" (33), such repetition combines negativity and subjunctivity in a liminal space-time where temporary transportation may become a permanent transformation. The liminality of an in-between that both is and is not has affinities with the "trace" archived in translation, according to Jacques Derrida (*L'oreille de l'autre* 210). "Through translation, a lived experience is transformed into another" (182).[1] Even as "transformation" (210), translation retains the memory of what it has effaced in a kind of intersemiotic "crypto-translation" (144). Consequently, translation is a "fictional practice" (209) in the subjunctive mode of "as if." Through the "work of repetition," translation is both connected to and disconnected from "re-citation" (209). This poststructuralist embrace of a Nietzschean over the Platonic repetition that informed traditional mimetic theories of meaning has advanced an understanding of translation as a self-legitimating performative (a "promise") linking languages in regard to language's self-referentiality, not in relation to an external truth (Derrida, " Tours de Babel" 200). Translation now is perceived not as a copy governed by rules of correspondence in a restricted economy of loss but as an original and creative act, "a proper symbolic event" (200), within a general economy of differentiated proliferation.

What, though, does the performative of speech-act theory have to do with performance, generally held today to be the crucial element of theatricality, whether as "translation" or as "fulfillment" of the playtext (see Carlson)? Performance as translation, translation as performative – translation is the third term linking performative and performance. These two terms have gained

wide critical currency over the last decade. Though philosophy and theatre now share "performative" as a common term, its connotations diverge greatly, so that the "*introversion* of the signifier" in the former field works at cross-purposes to the "*extroversion* of the actor" in the latter (Parker and Sedgwick 2, original emphasis). So widely have these terms been taken up in contemporary theory that it seems as if there are no limits to performativity. It has been applied to complex citational processes across a myriad of practices ranging from ritual and scripted behaviours to philosophical essays and translations. In its generalized deconstructive usage, performativity connotes self-referential "absorption" separating cause and effect between the signifier and the world (Parker and Sedgwick 2), thus emphasizing the exclusively linguistic aspect of speech acts. On the other hand, when used in respect to the staging of the performing arts, performativity signals theatricality, thus placing greater stress on the process of playing with behaviour to produce social effects. Language and action draw closer together within ritual and other forms of conventional acts, for it is in regard to convention that repetition is put to the test of social assessment as to how felicitously a convention has been observed – the test of performativity.

Any event, action, or behaviour may be examined "as" performance. Approached as performance, a phenomenon or convention may be considered as a process changing over time, not as a bundle of fixed inherent qualities. Behaviour examined in a semiotics of movement as performance reveals its constructedness in that identities are played with, performed, in social rituals. In this sense, gender is said to be "performatively produced" as a coherent effect through the repetition of regulatory fictions (Butler 24). However, as Judith Butler's concept of the performativity of gender has become a critical commonplace, its productivity stems more from iterability (or repetition) and citationality (or self-referentiality) than from the perlocutionary force of a social relation. Identity cannot escape its discursive construction in iteration, though a counterpressure may be exerted by performance to make it stutter infelicitously. The turn to self-performativity characterizes a deconstructivist sense of the performative in which, as Derrida writes, its productivity "constitutes its internal structure." The performative "produces or transforms a situation" and "effects" but does not describe anything outside of or prior to language (Derrida, "Signature" 13). Translation, for Derrida, is just such a performative, carrying out relativizing operations within language, through its repetitions, that hold out the promise of a reconciliation of literal and figurative beyond any connection to material practices of culture in a messianic openness to the future. Language is transformed through its very transcendence of context. And this constitutes a marked change from the performative of speech-act theory formulated by J.L. Austin, in which the performance is not felicitous by virtue of language alone but always in response to a social context, with its changeable conventions.

Whereas the Derridean performative has affinities with the locutory, Austin's performative is neither exclusively linguistic (locution) nor, on the other hand, does it accord primacy to the non-linguistic (perlocution), which would make language subordinate to action, hence representational. With his focus on the middle term, the illocutionary, Austin eludes such binaries. A speech act is performative to the extent that it felicitously observes the conventions. Yet the illocutionary status of an utterance may have perlocutionary (unconventional, unique) effects. But such perlocutionary force in a specific objective situation does not necessarily have an effect on the illocutionary force of an utterance. A queen's christening of a boat (illocutionary) remains in effect even if a revolutionary uprising (perlocutionary) beheads the queen. And, while conventions are subject to failure, those presently in place determine what saying does. For speech acts are inextricably verbal and social, both formal and pragmatic at once, in Austin's view of the interaction of language and the conditions of utterances. In this lies language's productive force, the way it makes things happen. This force is not the exclusive property of certain precise formal features, for it depends on conventional, not linguistic, substance. Ultimately, for Austin, all utterances are means of action and effects as "constatives" (words that report what other words and people do – spoken action) and "performatives" (words that enact what they say – speech-in-action) are blurred. Performative rhetoric does not appeal to given audiences but names a new public as an audience takes up an utterance and is in turn taken hold of and constituted as subject by this process.

In such a transformation, where the situation of enunciation produces the identity of the speakers along with the force of speech, the performative intersects with performance, in Schechner's sense of it as repetition through "restored behavior" (33) that works the space in-between in a binding and releasing of transformative energy. Actors and spectators are transported out of the ordinary when a performance takes hold, though social transformation proceeds more slowly. Like Victor Turner, Schechner notes the persistent theatricality of human cultures and posits performance as a mode of signification akin to language. Rituals are to be understood as one of a range of theatrical acts through which change occurs by the activity of performing. Most cultures have been found to use them as spaces where ordinary social relations are suspended. In this liminal space-time, a culture may not only reflect upon its processes but, possibly, alter them. Consequently, performance becomes a process for interrogating the force of repetition, the way words perform in interaction with the social, the conditions of their illocutionary force. As Ross Chambers observes, "the fundamental subject of dramatic narration is the illocutionary relationship, communicational exchange between a sender and a receiver in a given context. [...] [T]he special vocation of the theatre is to explore the consequences of this intuition that 'doing is saying' and 'saying is doing.'" (401–2). Performative and performance come together in their preoc-

cupation with convention or habit in the situation of enunciation or speech act. Whereas the idea of performance as "illustration" posited the text as organic unity, metaphors of fulfilment elevate performance to a "position of authenticity" (Carlson 6, 8). As translation, though, performance is still considered secondary to the written text, while as fulfilment, performance alone achieves organic unity (8). These metaphors separate text from performance, Carlson contends: "supplement," however, would force "an adjustment of perception in both directions." Exposing a lack in the written text, performance reveals a "potentially infinite series" of performances, each a supplementary mediation (10). In reformulating translation, I shall also open performance to a potential series, but by emphasizing the additive productivity of cultural difference and collective interaction with those of its multiple systems of signification, and so posit contingent as well as continuous transformation, metonymic combinations rather than metaphoric substitutions.

In performance, semiotic systems of movement, gesture, music, costume, space, architecture, come together with language to create something much more than a verbal text to be translated. How, then, does "speech-in-action" relate to "spoken action," the repetition of a set of prior authoritative practices to the utterance of a text (Pavis, *Theatre* 152)? For Patrice Pavis, the relation between conventions and concretization links language to action. In the *mise en jeu* of the source text, a particular gestural and rhythmic enunciation is associated with a text. A visual image of a "language-body" is then sought that fits with the target language. Translation does not necessarily produce such a fit, however. A disjunction between "language-body" and "language" may result from asymmetries in power between languages paired in translation, as the Canadian/Quebec context demonstrates. The apparent connection between the performative and performance, I would suggest, has complicated rather than facilitated analysis of translating drama, where one of the main theoretical problems remains the relation between verbal and non-verbal sign systems. In enlarging its horizons to encompass everyday life and identity formation, Performance Studies has failed to clarify the relation between dramatic texts and performances. Dramatic performance in theatres, moreover, seems to be a threatened species as it abandons the black box for the street and daily routine (Worthen 1096). The reciprocal metaphor of performance as translation draws its force from a different set of contingencies, from what is, in fact, a problem in translation: the absence of an English cognate for a term in common currency in other languages, such as the French *mise en scène* to specify the process of putting on a performance by manipulating a written text.[2] Transposition is the more general category encompassing both interlingual (translation) and inter-semiotic (*mise en scène*) processes of repetition, as Roman Jakobson distinguished them. While transposition underscores the transformation process that accompanies movements between sign systems, it minimizes the productive tension between figurative and literal in translation,

derived from the Latin *translatare*, a term for metaphor as well as for transportation, a conveyance for transcending any boundary.[3]

Yet it is precisely the power of metaphor to bridge differences that has brought the fields of translation and theatre together in a charged relation, one, moreover, that has had a marked influence on the analysis of translating theatre texts. The tendency in English to confound the act of translating a play-text across different "national" languages with the act of transposing a written text onto the stage has resulted in what Susan Bassnett calls a "paucity of theoretical work on the relationship between the written text and performance" ("Still Trapped" 95). Certainly there are fewer analyses of theoretical work on theatre translation than on poetry translation, in English at any rate. This is symptomatic of a more general failure in English to attend to the translative act and its implications where it constitutes "scandals," according to Larry Venuti, "cultural, economic, and political" (1). Translation courts scandal, he contends, because of its potential to question the "authority of dominant cultural values and institutions" and to embarrass them by calling attention to their contradictions and exclusions as they move to dominate the global cultural economy powered by translation. While the hegemony of English helps render invisible its linguistic and cultural others, this relative indifference to translation is also fostered by a theory of language dominating Anglo-American analytic philosophy. This Lockean position holds language to be a mere instrument for conveying ideas from the mind of one person to another and so orients translation around "naturalizing" strategies that camouflage the translator's labour in the transfer. An opposing position, derived from the German Romanticism that underlies much continental post-Saussurean theory, emphasizes how languages uniquely structure the way we perceive and act in the world and so are central to identity. Often, in this scenario, a "foreignizing" translation strategy is advocated, in view of the importance accorded to difference in the dialectics of alterity through which innovation (trans-creation) occurs. These theories have given rise to competing accounts of the nation-state as contractual and cultural, the former conceived in universalist and individualist, the latter in particularist and collective terms, abstractions of rules and rights contrasting with thick citizenship. In Canada, these conflicting views of the nation have pitted anglophone proponents of a federalist "civic" nation divorced from cultural particularity against francophone advocates of a so-called ethnic nation in which embedded relations of culture, most pre-eminently of language, constitute a "distinct society." Translation, for the latter, has been an instrument of domination that has worked to transfer political principles conceived in English into the French language, making francophones a translated people whose unique way of thinking has been excluded from the imaginary of the social collectivity.

Theatre translation, however, along with gender, has been the most fully theorized field of translation activity in the Canadian context, where franco-

phone critics and theoreticians such as Jean Delisle, Jane Koustas, Louise Ladouceur, and, most eminently, Annie Brisset have examined the social effects of translated theatre texts in the political relations of Quebec and the rest of Canada from the perspective of the margin constituted by the national and global hegemony of English.[4] Theatre is the genre most translated in Quebec, and these critics have scrutinized different textual corpora for the ideological slanting inscribed in specific discursive choices in the act of translating that create or contest a subordinate identity. What their work has made clear is the way in which an economy of translation is bound within the political economy of cultural exchanges, informed by specific social and historical constraints. These pressures bear more heavily on, and consequently are more visible in, the culture so minoritized. Language comes to represent the uncertain spaces of cultural difference, the issues of geopolitical power and dominance. That these issues have been addressed forcefully in regards to theatre translation has much to do with the role of theatre in the circulation of social discourse: because theatre as a social art is an enunciation addressing a group in a particular time and place, it must conform more closely to the values of the collectivity and so is linked more directly with the social imaginary and its symbolic representations than other genres (Brisset 27). Theatrical dialogue has strong affinities with the discourses of a society: translating this dialogue, the translator is subject to double constraints, not only those of a given source text but also those of the pragmatics of the target milieu. For, as double-voiced re-enunciation, the text in translation is constrained by demands for relevance and pertinence to the doxa of the target culture in the selection of a text and in the determination of specific translation strategies. The target culture, however, draws on the external prestige of the text to be translated in order to legitimate its own social and institutional authority. The "perlocutionary force" of translation (Brisset 253) – its performativity – derives from the spectatorial involvement in this reworking of a text's presuppositions (ideologemes), generated through manipulation of the situation of enunciation when translator-function doubles author-function. Translation, then, is the mediated re-enunciation of a translator/subject situated within a particular sociopolitical milieu. The decision to translate in one way rather than another is "full of ideological implications" (Petrilli 256).

THE SOCIAL LABOUR OF COMPLEX MEDIATIONS

By introducing ideology here, I draw attention to a recent paradigm shift in translation theory, the so-called cultural turn, concerned with historical and cultural difference as these inflect power dynamics in the production of meaning (Bassnett and Lefevere 5). This shift has given rise to "Translation Studies," which, along the lines of Cultural Studies, analyses the ideological transvaluation occurring in cross-cultural relations. The new problematic has

been advanced through analyses of drama as social discourse (Brisset), of gender in translation (Godard, "Translating and Sexual Difference"; von Flotow), and, more recently, postcolonialism (Bassnett and Trivedi). Increasingly, relations between languages are conceptualized within a "historicized pragmatics" (Godard, "Writing Between Cultures" 56) under conflicting and changing sociohistorical contingencies rather than as an abstract ideal of cosmopolitan communicability in the openness to alterity of a "universal pragmatics" (Habermas).

A cultural turn has also had a significant impact on Performance Studies in opening a space for considering translation within a general concern with cross-cultural encounters. Here, too, culture is not singular, nor a static given, but, rather, a concatenation of dynamic processes of making and becoming. Cultures use theatrical moments and rituals as spaces in which ordinary social relations are suspended so that a culture may see itself, reflect upon its processes, and potentially alter, as well as affirm, its social structures. In turn, "culturalist premises" have overturned the positivism of signs in Performance Studies, according to Patrice Pavis (*Theatre* 8). Clifford Geertz's readings of culture as text have influenced the shift of new historicism to cultural poetics (Worthen 1098).[5] To Lotman's semiotic conception of culture as a secondary modelling system that is both the sum of many partial signifying systems and a means of generating them, as the fictionalization of the referential illusion is filtered through social contexts, has been added a theory of ideology and of history that underscores cultural difference (Pavis, *Theatre* 12). A polyphonic system of enunciations is then conceptualized as a complex mediation of the imbrication of enunciating instances ordered by particular modalities of exchange or inter-cultural transfer (13). As a complex articulation or reworking, translation, within the new cultural paradigm, constitutes a theory of mediation.

The metaphors of "labyrinth" and "crossroads" proposed by Bassnett and Pavis respectively attempt to conceptualize the complexity of the mediations between systems that are simultaneously relativized with respect to each other and constrained by the contingencies of any specific interaction. Theirs are only two among many metaphors generated by the conceptual shift that has occurred with the realignment of translation, semiotics, and ideology. Semiotics, which I have hitherto addressed only indirectly, is nonetheless a crucial term, for the cultural paradigm has emerged in both Translation and Performance Studies following critiques of the positivism and ahistoricism of structuralist semiotics, with its closed system and typologies. However, both Saussurean and Peircian formulations of semiotics posit meaning-making – signification and semiosis, respectively – as an activity of relating. According to Saussure, language is a system of relational differences with no positive terms, bound only by the conventions of a social collectivity that arbitrarily connect a signifier to a signified in a specific situation of enunciation. Peirce's

theory of the tripartite sign stresses the interpretant (thirdness) or relationality itself. Semiosis, when an interpretant forges a relation for a *representamen* to an object in respect to a ground, effects change in affective, intellectual, or kinesic habits. Reciprocal "*replaceability*" is thus the "*necessary condition*" of semiosis or meaning-making: signs subsist only in relations of reciprocal substitution among themselves, so there is no autonomous or antecedent "original sign" but only infinite semiosis (Petrilli 234; original emphasis). Translation becomes synonymous with semiosis for the Peircian school: as Peirce's correspondent Victoria Welby phrased it, signification is a kind of "translative thinking [...] in which everything suggests or reminds us of something else" (qtd. in Petrilli 233). Welby conceptualizes translation as a method of investigation and discovery for both knowledge creation and critique. "Translatability" is how Hjelmslev (23), too, characterizes semiosis. Reworking Saussure's theory of systemic relations as the exchange of values (Saussure 115), Hjelmslev posits a "general calculus" of interdependences in sign systems understood as "abstract transformation systems" (108–9). "Relata" are the basic "units of language," he argues, not sounds or characters or meanings (27). Concerned pre-eminently with a system of relations, with the general commutability of the sign, semiotics is, consequently, a theory of translation. Jakobson subsequently distinguished among the operations of intra-lingual, inter-lingual, and intersemiotic translation. Within a theory of translation as semiosis, word-for-word (literal) and sense-for-sense (figurative) transfer of one language/sign into another are replaced by a polysystems approach in which a complex shift in the relations among multiple semiotic systems produces transformations within the social.

It is not my intention to trace the history of semiotics. But it is important to note the interaction of semiosis as translation with the emerging semiotic paradigm in Performance Studies, which has produced new relations between performance and translation as meaning-making praxes. As a critique of the positivism and ahistoricism informing structural semiotics led to the rejection of sign classifications and binary relations, the emergent socio-semiotics elaborated more complex models of dynamic interactions that emphasize relationality and productivity. Decisive in this process of moving beyond language as formal system, according to Pavis (*Theatre* 82–3), was Bakhtin's shift in philosophical orientation to focus on correlations among sign systems concretized as collective enunciations (ideologemes) imbued with meaning from social and ideological forces. Through the dialogical principle of answering from an outside, these complex arrangements of enunciative positions submit to the labour of mediation that reworks and refracts them according to the values of the different social contexts. Bakhtin's theory has had a major impact on Translation Studies. Introduced by Bassnett through "intertextuality," Julia Kristeva's reworking of dialogism (subsequently termed "transposition"), and by André Lefevere through "rewriting," his rewording of Bakhtin's "rework-

ing," this theory underlines the polyphony of any source text already subject to cultural rewritings. Translation engages more than linguistic operations when the texts so manipulated are situated within their "networks" of complex articulations – literary systems, institutionalized practices, and discursive formations (Bassnett and Lefevere 12). What vanishes in this model of multiple relations is that chimerical *tertium comparationis*, hovering somewhere invisibly as a kind of pure language, guarantor of the equivalency between source and target languages (3). Perhaps the greatest impact of Bakhtin's theory on translation has been in Canada, where a greater emphasis has been placed on the socially embedded, conflictual enunciative act than on a dialogized correlation among systems. Language is understood as contingent as well as continuous transformation, rather than as bounded entity. And translation facilitates such becomings. This has informed not only my own invocation of the double-voiced enunciation but also Barbara Folkart's theorization of translation as re-enunciation or reported speech, Annie Brisset's theorization of the ideologeme as the horizon of acceptability for translation choices, Betty Bednarski's analysis of exotopy, or outsidedness, in both source and target cultures, and Sherry Simon's investigation into cultural hybridity (heteroglossia) in multilingual texts (Godard, "Translation as Culture"). This emphasis on social discourse and relations of power challenges the universal abstraction of polysystems theory, which has also advanced a theory of translation as the dynamic interaction of systems.

The trajectory in drama and Performance Studies has moved through related steps, drawing first on the work of the Prague School semioticians, whose analyses of various cultural practices, including drama, produced classifications of the multiple sign systems interrelated as components in dramatic performance. Here, too, verbal text became only one of a network of latent theatrical signs realized in performance. Indeed, as Schechner reworked semiotic theory in an anthropological approach to ritual, the verbal text all but vanished from analysis of performance.[6] Consideration of the relationship between written text, rehearsals, and performances, in all their differentiations, dispelled the concept of invariance, and with it that of the hegemony of written text, along with source language, which had established a distinction between text and performance, form and content (Bassnett, "Problems" 51). The notion of a stable original was further troubled by the multiple meanings of costumes and props, compounding those of language. Working with such categorizations of the numerous sign systems that constitute dramatic performance, Pavis emphasized what he called the "concretization," or process of selection and rejection among the variables, in producing a *mise en scène*. With his later turn to the analysis of inter-cultural performance, Pavis elaborates such concretization in terms of a movement between "heterogeneous cultures and situations of enunciation that are separated in space and time" (*Theatre* 136). A *mise en scène,* like a translation, is the

mediated re-enunciation of a subject situated within a sociopolitical milieu. At the crossroads of cultures, translation becomes one of a "series of concretizations" through which the dramatic text is transformed as it is "written, then translated, analysed dramaturgically, staged and received by the audience" in a different language and culture (138–39). Translation, though comparable, is not the *mise en scène*, according to Pavis, but, rather, a means of making it possible (145) that he terms a "*mise en jeu*," whereby the translator works with all the components of a situation of enunciation, including the non-verbal, to produce a translation in the target language (148).[7] How we assess this target culture performance has less to do with what has been retained of the source text than with what has been done to it – and what it does to an audience who takes it up in the theatrical event, conferring dramatic force. The text is produced, in such a reworking, as an effect of the labour of transfer, though such mediation is frequently overlooked in the analysis of a performance's illocutionary force.

In Bassnett's persisting concern with "performability" in speech-rhythms easily produced in the target language ("Still Trapped" 95) and in Pavis's emphasis on the "language-body" in which word-presentation matches thing-presentation (*Theatre* 152) there linger conventional theories of equivalence that privilege target or source performance respectively. However, the general tendency in theorizations of the interaction of multiple sign systems outlined above emphasizes the continuous chain of variations or the unfinalizability of potential relations negotiated from different situations of enunciation and underscores the complexity of theatre's illocutionary force across such differences, given the collective, social nature of the interaction. Performances may be taken up by spectators in many different ways. New metaphors have been introduced to conceptualize an open system of heterogeneous and complex relations undergoing constant reworking in the production of alternate configurations of the social: "continuum" of contexts (Bassnett, "Still Trapped" 93), "network" of embedded texts (Bassnett and Lefevere 12), Bourdieuxian "field" of cultural production (Pavis, *Theatre* 83–84), Deleuzian "deterritorialized" or "rhizomatic" "series" of concretizations (Pavis, *Theatre* 80, 90, 138), and, most recently, the orderly disorder of "chaos" theory (Hébert and Perelli-Contos 14). With its aleatory processes and dissipative structures, chaos theory has been invoked in relation to the "multidisciplinarity and multiculturalism" of contemporary Quebec theatre, where, as Hébert and Perelli-Contos argue, a "model of interaction" has succeeded earlier twentieth-century models of spectatorship as "identification," "distanciation," or "participation" (47).[8] In this ruin of representation, a "*mixis*" of fragments in "continuous creation" has replaced the repetitive illusion of *mimesis* (38). A theory of performance as productive action (poesis) has displaced one of representational reproduction (mimesis).

TRANSLATING WORDS? OR GESTURES?

What does all this mean with regard to the translative act? When saying is doing and doing is saying, does one translate a word or a gesture? Certainly the task of the translator has been rendered more difficult, given current understandings of the complexity of interactions among sign systems (re)configuring the social. Within a field of multiple possible relations, translation orients itself towards neither source nor target language or performance style but cuts back and forth across them in unpredictable combinations. Translation's transitivity disembeds texts and behaviour strips from their habitual location: a subject is not simply put forward but is reworked by its enunciation and yet again by its re-enunciation. That the position of the verbal has decreased in the new emphasis on multidisciplinary and inter-cultural performances has done nothing to simplify the problem of the relation of verbal to non-verbal systems in translation. What is the impact of a particular word choice on the *mise en scène*? Does word choice depict or produce action? Responses to these questions are imbricated in another: What is the place of the verbal text within the different theatre institutions and cultural systems paired in a specific translation and theatre event? Or, for that matter, the place of the gestic text? Studies of interlinguistic interpretation have increasingly centred on the many forms of non-verbal expressiveness in such communicative elements as silence, timing, paralinguistic gestures, proxemics, and kinesics – all of which carry culturally specific values and expose the limitations of words in the embodied encounters in which interpretation occurs (see Poyatos).[9] While such somatic elements play a lesser role in the translation of written texts, they are a factor in the translation of theatre, where the text is delivered orally by actors in the presence of a live audience. With the recent privileging of performance as the realization of complex interactions of multiple systems as Performance Studies has attracted more interest among theatre practitioners and theoreticians, the criterion of performability or playability has often been invoked to determine the adequacy of a translation over any verbal or propositional equivalence between textual versions. But the demand for a speakable text can easily become problematic when it fosters simplification of the rhetoric or phrasing in order to create speech rhythms that target-language actors can speak fluently – translation as naturalization to target-cultural norms in a gesture of domestication or cultural homogenization (Pavis, *Theatre* 143).

Paralinguistic matters of rhythm, duration, and accent, significant in the emotional impact of a text, relate to the gestural system in the economy of the performance text and so to the exchange between word and body. Such gestural systems carry a heavy burden of meaning in the case of Mark Medoff's play *Children of a Lesser God* (1980), translated by René Dionne as *Les enfants du silence* for Montreal's Théâtre du Rideau Vert (1983), in which hearing and deaf actors collaborated in a mixing of spoken and sign language

(Delisle 5). How these non-verbal systems are addressed in translation depends on the theatre conventions of the target culture as well as on its translation conventions. An adaptation, suggests Jean Delisle, contrasts with a translation in that it is a rewriting that focuses on "an emotional correspondence" beyond any lexical formulation and renders it in fluent dialogue to achieve a "concordance of dramatic effects" (3). Translation accords a higher priority to the written text and the transfer of verbal meanings. One line of theorization of acting from Stanislavski through Brecht formulates the concept of a gestic inner text that will be excavated by actors and realized in performance. To attempt a gestural translation, a translator would need to be trained in gestic readings in both theatrical systems, as well as having knowledge of the languages spoken. While Susan Bassnett considers this an "impossible" situation for the translator ("Still Trapped" 92), Patrice Pavis notes examples of translators who have attempted to keep the "rhythmic impulse" (Desprats, qtd. in *Theatre* 154). However, he observes, this is often reduced, as with Brecht, to an "ideological norm" rather than the specific enunciation linking spoken "text and gesture" (153–54). Translation, Pavis concludes, occurs not where one expects, in words, but in the "gestures" and "the social body" (156).

The search for a deep gestic subtext is implicitly linked to an aesthetic of "psychological realism" with ideas of character consistency and is hence culture bound, counters Bassnett ("Still Trapped" 107). Theatrical conventions of physical movement and the horizon of audience expectation differ radically in different places and at different times. And, as Nicholas Round contends, it is this "unspeakable" context, a series of non-linguistic codes and set of dramatic functions, that operates as co-text in any theatrical speaking. A translation needs to convey something of the material conditions of possibility of this rhetoric, not by following the "precise syntactic contours of the original," as advocated by a theory of language "as message-carrier," but by taking into account the theatrical relationship of performance and audience – the "dramatic function" – within a speech-act theory of language as action in social context. "Dramatic language is speakable," Round contends, "to the extent that the speech acts achieve their work in context" and are taken up by spectators (121). The translator is often caught in a liminal space between two such contexts and sets of sociopolitical relations, between two equally unacceptable alternatives, that of acculturation into the target system and that of producing an esoteric or exotic language for a few initiates. "Traduire ou ne pas traduire?" as Jane Koustas asks ("Traduire"). Translate or adapt or mimic? These options constitute a veritable double bind for the translator, the contradiction that entraps her still in the labyrinth, for as yet little theoretical attention has been given to "the translation of drama as acted and produced" (Bassnett and Lefevere, qtd. in "Still Trapped" 95).

What may be noted as a preliminary step in such theorization is how the

cross-cultural problematic and translation complicate the dialectic relationship of written text and performance advanced by the culturalist paradigm, with its premises of relativism. The greater the distance between cultures, the greater the challenge of calibrating the relations of dramatic text to performance text in translation. Historical changes would produce further separation between text and performance, exacerbating the inter-cultural transfer of the text/performance dynamic (Carlson 6). While Translation Studies increasingly takes into account the asymmetrical relations of verbal languages in a clash of cultures (Bassnett and Lefevere), Performance Studies has not fully assumed the implications of conflicting non-verbal systems, possibly because analysis has focused primarily on translation among more equally related European cultures (Bassnett, "Still Trapped" 105). When Performance Studies does engage with non-European conventions, it is often in an "imperialistic" gesture where borrowings stress the universality of sounds and movements displaying emotions. These "affective aspects" of theatre, observes Schechner, commenting on the practice of Eugenio Barba and Peter Brook, are "less in need of translation than literature" (27) – an assertion that the Canadian/Quebec context qualifies. How do the diverse theatrical sign systems function together? Are they hierarchized? And, if so, according to what principle? The focus on performance as fulfilment has merely displaced the site of equivalence from word to body, from text to performance, without as yet assimilating the implications of multiple possible combinations, each with its different modality of transposing or reworking gestures according to the social context. Such complex relational models, entailed in theories of open systems such as chaos theory, Bakhtinian dialogism, and Deleuzian rhizomatics, with their concepts of multiple potential combinations linked to context, have displaced correspondence theories, with their one-to-one relations of structural homology. And this complexity, I propose, needs to be introduced into a consideration of translation to account for the many potential aggregations of verbal and non-verbal reworkings in the translation of performance.

TRANSLATING FOR THE THEATRE IN THE CANADIAN/QUEBEC CONTEXT

In the Canadian context, theorization of the production of translations has been initiated by Linda Gaboriau, who, as dramaturge and translator, has been responsible for the majority of the English versions of Quebec plays performed on Canadian and American stages. A more thorough study of these texts and their histories of performance would contribute further to the theorization of performance in the concretization of translation. I shall limit myself here to a couple of examples showing a range of configurations in which word and body are dynamically interconnected. In this way I hope to disentangle the problematic of theatre as translation/translation as theatre from translation

in theatre; that is, to distinguish the performativity of translation from translation in performance, of iterability from the enunciative force of a theatre event. As Sherry Simon notes in a foreword to Gaboriau's "The Cultures of Theatre," Gaboriau stresses the primacy of language as "the main character of Quebec plays" (83). In this she echoes the observation of Lise Gauvin regarding the "surconscience linguistique" – the hyperconsciousness of language – notable in Quebec writers' "langagement" (Gauvin 8). Gaboriau's choice to "capture the distinctive theatrical voices of the playwrights," rather than adapting the texts to the target English-Canadian culture, poses difficulties (Gaboriau, "Cultures" 83). A foreignizing strategy of moving the audience to the text, it must negotiate the considerable cultural differences separating Quebec and English-Canadian theatre institutions, which have their roots, respectively, in symbolism/surrealism and in realism, with their different evaluations of language. Gaboriau rejects the naturalizing strategy of adaptation to the target culture as both condescending to the audience and underestimating their "cultural curiosity" for knowledge of the Other (84). In this foreignizing aim, she adheres closely to the ethnographic impulse driving English-Canadian translation of Quebec texts, according to Simon, with its responsiveness to the call to make more widely understood what Quebec wants.

The effects of this translation strategy are often dismaying in their concretization in English performance. As Gaboriau summarizes the clash of theatrical cultures, English-Canadian directors and actors receive a North American training in psychological theatre: "They're not as comfortable, for instance, with flights of language, with poetry, or lyrical, rhetorical material" (84). These, however, are the very elements that have dominated Quebec theatre since the 1970s. For English-Canadian actors, such "rhetorical *sorties*," belonging to a tradition that, since Racine, has been nourished by classical rhetoric and lyricism, are "quite difficult to handle," since they demand a very different performance style (84). A more frequent translation strategy adopted by English-Canadian translators of Quebec texts has been to tame such rhetorical flourishes by condensing the written text, shortening the speeches by eliminating repetitions, lengthy elaborations, even extended discussions of emotions, which will possibly be manifested through facial expression or gesture in performance but will not be analysed or agonized over verbally in the English version.[10] When the translator does not adopt such a hypertextual strategy of conforming to the target culture's performance conventions, the results "can be quite awful," according to Gaboriau, "something like the effects of a dubbed movie, when the gestures don't always match the intonations of the language. The audience is seeing one play and hearing another" (84). Consequently, the translation has difficulty implanting itself in the new social context with dramatic force – at least within a model of theatre spectatorship as identification or participation.

Through her work with the Montreal-based Centre des auteurs dramatiques

(CEAD), Gaboriau has often been involved in workshops and exchanges between playwrights where translations are discussed. Playwright and translator both attend the first two days of rehearsal, during which they focus primarily on clarifying and understanding the script, not on analysing the appropriateness of treatment for the *mise en scène*. For a long time Gaboriau could only dream about a workshop that would focus on the issues of acting style, set design, and the choice to be made among "naturalistic, expressionistic [or] hyperrealistic" styles ("Cultures" 86). Translator and playwright would be involved in this cultural mediation. Such complex inter-cultural and multidisciplinary interactions between translated script and stage performance have only recently been organized in the Canadian context. Not quite on the scale envisaged by Gaboriau, the CEAD has recently run two two-week residencies at Tadoussac, each involving four writers being translated and four writers translating. Not included, however, are the directors and actors who participate later in decisions about *mise en scène* when the translations are workshopped at the CEAD or in various theatres.[11] A distinctive feature of the translation residencies has been that all participants are established playwrights and that, therefore, the translators bring to the practice of translation their skill in writing for live stage performance and their knowledge of English-Canadian actors and audiences. While it might be expected that the playwrights-turned-translators would impose their own style on the translated playtext, this has been the case in only one of the eight pairings, reports Gaboriau (Beauchamp and Knowles, "Servant" 44). In the other cases, the playwright–translators have followed what has been not only Gaboriau's own long-standing practice but that of English-Canadian translators more generally (Mezei) and attempted to carry across the vision and voice of the source language text into the target language. Significantly, even Judith Thompson, in her reworking of Serge Boucher's *Motel Hélène*, billed as an adaptation – an "English version ... from a translation by Morwyn Brebner" – elected to keep the swear words in French as a gesture of respect to Quebec identity, since, as far away as the southern United States, the Québécois are sometimes known as "Tabernacos" (from the Québécois swear word "Tabernacle"). Boucher himself felt that this decision resulted in a misleading archaism for resolutely contemporary characters and a culture that is more secular than English Canada, a position also advocated by Gaboriau (Beauchamp and Knowles, "Servant" 44). The issue of lexis was debated significantly in relation to source text and culture, not with regard to the demands of performability.

As Don Druick has described the collaborative process initiated by the Tadoussac residencies, it entails a complex mixture of synchronicity in the pairing of playwright and translator, intense dialogue between them to clarify the details of theatrical vision and linguistic connotation, and a subtle grasp of the nuances of the two languages in question so as to select the precise word necessary to convey in the target language the emotional pitch of a character's

speech or the implicit shifts in temporality that are dramatically significant ("Tender Translations" 40). Larry Tremblay's identification of his text as a grim Noh play resonated strongly with Druick's own interest in Japanese theatre conventions in *Where Is Kabuki?* (Toronto, Buddies in Bad Times 4-Play Festival, April 1989), which oriented his understanding of "dramatic significance." Druick's translation strategies derive from such conventions, with their great attention to the non-verbal, though he cites Roland Barthes, whose attentiveness to the "grain of the voice" exceeding the verbal meaning of a text theorizes a quality in performance that Druick prizes (40). Barthes's reformulation, in *The Grain of Voice,* of Kristeva's theory of the semiotic preconscious drives erupting in the structured syntax of utterances and revolutionizing language (see Kristeva, *Revolution*) links this excess directly to the body and, consequently, to the embodied situation of performance. Performance ultimately evaluates the felicity of the translation of a dramatic text, according to Druick, quoting another participant in the residency, Pol Mag Uidhir. When "the audience laughed and cried in the right places" (Mag Uidhir, qtd. in Druick 40), the very "shudder of catharsis" (Diamond) had been translated. Theatricality's illocutionary force worked in translation when it took hold on the target language audience, touching and moving it. In this instance, as in Gaboriau's ideal context, equivalence remains a goal in translation, though it is measured in the audience's affective response to a rhythmically parallel text. Such equivalence is secured through an affinity of poetics between playwright and translator.

A CLASH OF SYSTEMS IN PERFORMANCE

Gaboriau's discourse about her own translation practice has changed somewhat over the last decade in its orientation towards source text or performance. She has repeatedly stated that her goal in translation is to transform English-Canadian performance conventions: nonetheless, the way in which she initially formulated this objective posits the translated script as a template for action rather than as speech in action. Text, she implies in "The Cultures of Theatre," should guide performance, rather than performance style determining translation strategy. In this privileging of the source culture and the function of the translator, Gaboriau aligns herself with the dominant practices in Canada, which favour literal translations (Mezei) and the ethnographic aim of producing knowledge of the other for the dominant culture (Simon). A review of her translations reveals many examples where translation choices have established templates for decisive lines of action. There are, for instance, the examples much discussed with regard to the politics of gender in translation in her version of Nicole Brossard's highly abstract and poetic monologue "L'écrivaine," from the collective creation *La nef des sorcières,* performed at Montreal's Théâtre du Nouveau Monde (1976), which Gaboriau rendered,

tellingly, as *A Clash of Symbols* for its Toronto production by the Alumnae Theatre (22 November 1979). The conflict identified was not only cultural, in the loss of pertinency of the semantic field of witches (*sorcières*) as social outcasts through the standard English translation of that topos as "the ship of fools," but also gendered, in its evacuation of the feminist challenge to dominant cultural discourses, conveyed by Gaboriau in more abstract terms as symbolic conflict. Gender is an issue for translation in the individual monologues as well, but especially in Brossard's "L'écrivaine," the woman writer. Gaboriau's selection of "without opening my legs" for Brossard's "ce soir j'entre dans l'histoire sans relever ma jupe" more forcefully frames the gender power dynamics of cultural representation than does David Ellis's version, "without pulling up my skirts." But her choice also foregrounds the body and the gestural text, offering a template for more energetic movement to the actor and director. Indeed, the connection between language and body is reinforced by her rendering of "les mots affluent autour de clitoris" as "the words gather around the clitoris," in contrast to Ellis's "the words flow by the clitoris" (qtd. in Godard, "Translating and Sexual Difference" 14). Gaboriau's diction captures the persona's desire more concretely, and this affect may incite different gestures from the actor than Ellis's version would.

The director of Gaboriau's translation of Jovette Marchessault's *The Saga of the Wet Hens* certainly responded to such indications in the dramatic script, staging an extraordinarily dynamic ritualized performance with exaggerated movement in which Marchessault's lyric flights functioned as speech in action, creating effects of spectacle through their rhythm and duration as stylized ritual rather than through any oppositional conflict among psychologized characters. Indeed, *Saga* eschews conventional dramatic conflict to bring together the different aesthetic styles of four major Quebec women writers in the mythic space-time of the circle within which they share a ritual meal and celebrate the powers of creativity. Much of the dramatic force of the play depends on the contrast between the published writings of these women and the characters Marchessault writes for them, giving each one a totemic animal as the symbol of her secret desires. Although Gaboriau, uncharacteristically, cut out in her translation a number of passages of literary analysis of the women's writing,[12] English language critics had difficulty following the dialogue.[13] Michelle Rossignol, in directing the play at the Tarragon Theatre in Toronto (18 February 1982), drew on her knowledge of Marchessault's mythic prose writings, as well as on her own training in Quebec theatre conventions, to orchestrate a close correlation of verbal, kinesic, and proxemic systems. Some of Gaboriau's translation choices encouraged such staging decisions, as in her selection of "witches who careen through the heavens" (*Wet Hens* 105) to render the French "volaient" (Marchessault, *Poules mouillées* 136), more commonly translated as "fly," in a dramatically significant passage when the four writers decide to collaborate on writing a text together

in defiance of the conventional constraints of time and space.[14] "Tonight everything must rise to the surface. Work its way up from the depths. We'll emerge, we'll soar to the heights, like birds and the witches who careen through the heavens" (Gaboriau, *Wet Hens* 105). Toronto critics responded to the performance dismissively: Harrs viewed the production as "a triumph of pyrotechnics over content" in which spectators are allowed only "briefly into the psyche of each woman" and are confused under the bombardment "with weighty symbolism and abstract images" (E9). Symptomatic of the "torontocentrisme" of anglophone critics, according to Robert Wallace (12), this reception manifests the relative authority of English in the Canadian context. Audiences, however, were more enthusiastic in their response to this highly imagistic theatre.

Performances of her translations of Marchessault's scripts have not always had such a starkly divided reception, Gaboriau confides in her analysis of the Victoria performance by the Belfry Theatre of *The Magnificent Voyage of Emily Carr* (1 December 1992). Gaboriau claims not to have made Marchessault's dialogue "conversational" but to have retained its lyricism and philosophical bent for Carr's monologues reflecting on the nature of painting ("Cultures of Theatre" 85). In contrast to her practice with *Saga of the Wet Hens*, Gaboriau made no cuts to the dialogue to accommodate differences in cultural knowledge, counting, perhaps, on the familiarity of Carr's hometown audience with both her biography and her artwork. Joan Orenstein, in the title role, gave what Gaboriau considers "an uncanny performance," in part because of her strong visual resemblance to the older Carr but also because of her delivery of the dialogue (84). This delivery was undoubtedly facilitated by Gaboriau's excellent ear for speech. Indeed, precise colloquial dialogue has been the hallmark of all her translations.[15] The production, according to Gaboriau, "was another thing" because the actors playing the other characters "had the feeling of psychological drama, and the text sounded as if it were coming from somewhere else ..." (85). Such a disjunction between verbal, gestural, and spatial systems provokes the attacks of Canadian critics who accuse Quebec playwrights of using "theatre as a forum" for "pretentious," "abstract and very wordy" plays (85). Is this clash of systems itself the subject of performance? Or should the translator prune the script into a shape more in keeping with the performance conventions of the English-Canadian theatrical institution? Should the director work to expand the repertoires of performance styles in order to create a *mise en scène* that would produce fewer disjunctions? In translating, do the demands of *mise en scène* take precedence over those of verbal dramatic text? These are precisely the double binds that haunt any translation praxis, but they are more powerfully felt in translation for the theatre, where the demands of many systems other than the verbal must be translated across cultures into a concrete situation of enunciation.

Gaboriau's response to the necessity of selecting among contradictory pos-

sibilities has shifted more recently, possibly as a result of the more intensive collaboration made possible by the residencies. But the shift is in keeping with what appears to be a changing attitude towards language and a new trend in theatre translation in English Canada favouring versions speakable by actors in Canadian English.[16] The changing orientation of translation to give primacy to its speakability may well be shaped by economic transformations that are making Canadian theatres more driven by market demands and less responsive to the political considerations of national unity (with a requisite recognition of Quebec's particular identity). In 1990, Gaboriau described her desire for her translation to be more than just a cultural intermediary. Her great interest in the uniqueness of individual testimonies informed her sense of responsibility to "capture and transmit the voice of the individual artist," to search out an author's "personal style" so as to "translate the author's genius" ("Traduire" 45). A decade later, Gaboriau's concern is no longer primarily to convey the many different styles of Quebec writers in a source-oriented approach to translation, but to meet the demands of actors in performance. Like all drama, a translation, she says in a long interview, "is like a score written for an instrument, the actors" (Beauchamp and Knowles, "Servant" 46). The musical analogy is significant, for it is the timing and rhythm of speech, speech in action, that now preoccupies her. Increasingly, she takes into account the feel of the line and the actor's need to catch his or her breath, as well as the way the words "roll off the tongue." Working with Gratien Gélinas helped make her aware how a script is "*embodied*" (46). He wanted to be able to stamp his foot at the same place in the same line in English as in French. Moreover, he insisted that the flow of the sentence produce laughter at the same volume in response to the same line in both versions. This demand for equivalence of dramatic effect still privileges the source culture, but it is oriented more towards creating parallels between staged performances than to creating parallel dramatic texts. In view of the cultural differences in performance styles noted by Gaboriau as these are imbricated in a hierarchy of languages placing English over French, such demands may be impossible to meet.

With later translations, Gaboriau has adopted a target language approach, changing the names of people and places, as well as the cultural references, to meet the demands of performance in the target culture. She introduced a lengthy paraphrase into a translation of Michel Marc Bouchard's *Down Dangerous Passes Road* because "*tourtière*" "tripped up the actor" as well as not clicking with the audience (Beauchamp and Knowles, "Servant" 45). In her translation of Daniel Danis's play *Stone and Ashes* (Toronto, Factory Theatre, 9 November 1994), for which she was awarded the Governor General's Award, Gaboriau experimented with translation-adaptation and transplanted the scene of action.[17] In this regard, Gaboriau manifests greater concern with eliciting the audience's aha! as they take up the spectacle in the social deter-

mination of felicity that makes the performance performative, but audience response is predicated upon mimetic verisimilitude. Still, she respected Danis's poetic style, with its striking images and the alternating long monologues in verse more abstract and wordy even than Marchessault's lines. The novelty of Danis's use of words in the recent *Thunderstruck* or *Song of the Say-Sayer* (One Yellow Rabbit, Calgary, 2000), which deals with another infernal quartet, seemed at first "untranslatable" to Gaboriau (McLaughlin). After losing their adoptive parents in a lightning storm, the four characters are in a state of altered development, with a childlike language stylized like nursery rhymes yet sensorially concrete, a sing-song rhythm combined with phenomenological observation. Gaboriau captures this unique style in such evocative neologisms as the "say-sayer" for "dire-dire," the strange object to which the siblings address their words, speaking through it to each other. For once, the production matched the stylized verbal text with a sharply choreographed and highly physical gestural system in which one of the brothers was played by a cross-dressed female actor, so heightening the artifice of the *mise en scène*.[18]

TRANSLATING CULTURAL CONVENTIONS OF PERFORMANCE

The work of Robert Lepage, in which a multilingual text is performed without translation, offers another example from the Canadian context that manifests a contradiction between translation of verbal and nonverbal systems, but in a different relation of text to performance in inter-cultural transmission than the lyric scripts translated by Gaboriau. Translation, in Lepage's case, is practised by the minoritized, not the dominant, culture, and the choice not to translate in his performances constitutes, in itself, a strategy with ideological implications. French is put into global circulation. Moreover, there is a very different dynamic of language in Lepage's performances, where the verbal system plays a relatively minor role in the spectacle, than in the work of Marchessault – ironically, considering the latter's training in the visual arts. In Lepage's *La Trilogie des dragons* (Théâtre Repère, Montreal, 6 June 1987), for instance, there is written script of only six pages for a performance that lasts six hours and moves back and forth between three languages.[19] Actors' bodies and stage objects become the major sign systems of this imagistic theatre. In contrast to Marchessault's poetic flights, Lepage creates minimalist, banal dialogue in broken English, French, and a smattering of Chinese. Nor does this dialogue work to create dramatic conflict in conversations between characters in the mode of naturalism, which stages language in the same register as spoken action. Language itself is put into performance as sign and object of cultural pluralism, but not in the mode of other Quebec plays about the cultural conflicts and struggles over the legitimacy of certain languages occasioned by immigration (as in Marco Micone's work with Italian, French, and English),

or by political conquest (as in David Fennario's work on French–English relations). Culture and language, for Lepage, are less sites of struggle over power to order the "real" than of display in the performance of a border identity. Lepage's deployment of the verbal system as speech in action depends less on its communicative function than on the paralinguistic systems of intonation and accent, those of the fractured English produced by francophone actors playing the roles of Chinese migrants.

While the accents do indeed function mimetically in what is a narrative of immigration, as Sherry Simon observes (156), the performance of multilingualism as aural difference, compounded with the multiplicity of signs of foreignness and with the sheer multiplicity of non-verbal systems interacting in performance, highlight, rather, a process of "deterritorialization" in this mangling of the international *lingua franca*, English (160). Among the exemplary forms of deterritorialized "minority" discourses listed by Deleuze and Guattari in *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, it should be noted, Quebec French figures prominently alongside Czech German and Afro-American "black-english" (Deleuze and Guattari, *Mille Plateaux* 116–38). This multiplicity of idioms, framed within a dialectic of local and international, makes palpable the tensions of inter-cultural encounters, according to Simon (161), who considers Lepage's plays exemplary manifestations of hybridity and cultural diversity. So, too, through their technological inventions and constant shattering of images that enact "perpetual transformation" (50), his performances contribute to the renewal of theatre by means of a self-metamorphosis that, for Chantal Hébert and Irène Perelli-Contos, heralds the arrival of a new culture marked by the "impurity" of complex intersections among sign systems and cultures (38). The unpredictability of this flux of continual transformations, extended in Lepage's constant revisions of his productions, which remain ever works-in-progress, makes them, along with the work of Gilles Maheu, exemplary of the aleatory processes of chaos theory with its new model of spectator-actor interaction (Hébert and Perelli-Contos 18). The changing context of each performance effects a new relation among the theatrical sign systems, making possible many different moments for audiences' laughter and tears. The performance's illocutionary force is not translated so much as continually displaced and defamiliarized under the contingencies of new social relations of address.

Yet, in the critical celebration of Lepage's work for its hybridity and its emphasis on aural, visual, and tactile systems, which move performance away from any firm anchorage in literature's textuality or in cultural specificity, another kind of translation is overlooked. Non-translation is a key element in the non-communicative, hypertextual usage of language when Lepage's texts are performed in a francophone context, for the greater part of his text for the *Trilogie* is in fractured English. This minoritizing of English carries particular political force in nationalist Quebec, where English is as foreign as, but more

imperializing than, Chinese. As Lorraine Camerlain writes, for the Québécois, "l'anglais, c'est du chinois" (87). Staged for an anglophone audience, or for an audience for whom English is the favoured second language, these texts do not have the same shock effect of the foreign and may function more as spoken action than as patterned sound, as verbal reference more than oral rhythm. Within a mixture of language fragments, the non-translation of English gives the performance considerable mobility, enabling it to circulate easily in a global economy. Simon rightly points out that these performances "do not pose the same dilemmas for translation as do productions in which the text asserts itself with linguistic density" (164). The problems, though, emerge elsewhere, in the translation of cultural styles of performance. Non-translation of the verbal system makes the six-hour-long performances available for global cultural appropriation, where the spectacle is easily consumable by an international audience, just as the non-linguistic performances of food and dance promoted by Canadian multiculturalism constitute them as the assimilable other of the same, not the other of the other, in a policy of containing ethnic diversity. So, too, Lepage's non-translation of the gestural system into Chinese performance practices contributes to the perpetuation of Orientalism, to the longstanding Western identity-construction through such a process of othering. For the *Trilogie* does not negotiate the differences between the two performance cultures of francophone Quebec and China. The narrative trajectory of the *Trilogie* from Quebec westward, through Toronto, to Vancouver conveys the difficulty of implanting a Chinese community in Quebec soil and the migrants' attempt to get closer to Asia again, albeit with their Quebec family in tow. Whether the patterns of social resolution in this narrative follow more closely the fourfold European phases from breach through crisis and redressment to reintegration, rather than the Asian patterns of climax, slow phase, and new slow phase (Schechner 14) that are implied in the movement between the three cities, I have been unable to ascertain. Certainly, Lepage's "performance sequence[s]" (Schechner 16), as these involve the preparation of Quebec actors for performance, differ from Chinese practices. The length of his productions and the mixture of genres – dance and acrobatics, in particular – are vestigial connections to Chinese performance conventions. Yet there was a very active Chinese theatre in Montreal earlier in this century that maintained the performance traditions of the Cantonese opera, traditions on which Lepage might have drawn more directly (Bourassa and Larrue 84–90). More recently, Chinese-Canadian writer Sky Lee has used such performance traditions to develop plot and characterization in her novel of Vancouver, *Disappearing Moon Café*.

In Lepage's performance, cross-cultural casting is unidirectional. The actors playing the roles of the Chinese immigrants are Québécois, and the role of Chinese language in the text is scant. Moreover, the signs of Chineseness juxtaposed in the visual system are conventional and limited. Indeed, the

prominent position given to opium, in this and others of Lepage's texts that invoke the Orient, perpetuates the stereotypes of Chinese criminality that were part of the "yellow scare" mounted earlier in the century to rationalize a keep-Canada-white immigration policy. Rather than move a Canadian audience towards the gestural system of Chinese performance conventions in a veritable inter-cultural *mise en scène*, the *Trilogie* presents yet another Western image of "the Orient," albeit of the Orient as it exists in the West. There is consequently considerable irony in the prominent position accorded Lepage as a leader in the emergence of a theatre of heterogeneity in Quebec based on his complex orchestration of signifying systems in performance, since it is in this dimension that the inter-cultural imbrication of enunciating systems has been least thought through.

The tension between linguistic heterogeneity and non-verbal homogeneity in Lepage's imagistic production contrasts greatly with the choices made in a translation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* into Japanese in which verbal system and performance style reinforce each other. The Japanese National Theatre's version of *Hamlet* (Tokyo, August 1991) is fully Japanesed, the script translated and performed according to kabuki conventions. Among many pertinent translations in the *mise en scène*, that of Hamlet's death illustrates most forcefully the difference in gestural systems between performance traditions. Hamlet took fully forty-five minutes to die in the kabuki version, including ten minutes for the veneration of his head.[29] This spectacle powerfully affected the audience, and so the performativity of the performance, its illocutionary effect, was sustained through translation even though the relation of stage to audience was radically different in the performance of English and Japanese versions. The Japanese translation of Hamlet was ethnocentric in its domesticating strategy of bringing text to audience. It contrasts with the productions of both Marchessault's and Lepage's texts, characterized in very different ways by disjunctions between signifying systems, each with its different rendering of verbal and gestural signs in the movement between cultures as these are caught up in the dialectics of local and global.

THE POLITICAL VECTORS OF TRANSLATION

Lepage exhibits all the contradictions in the concept of culture: both a recognition of the plurality of cultures, with their many minorities, and a universalization of culture involving a return to ritual and ceremony in a search for common meaning across cultural boundaries in affective response to bodies in motion. These are contradictions that Marchessault's work also embodies, in its own different way, in divergences in cultural response to the interrelation of verbal and gestural patterning. These performances are caught up in the politics of language in which English and French are positioned locally and globally. Whereas Gaboriau's translations into English are carried out in a

movement of supraduction from the position of the dominant language within Canada, itself the hegemonic language globally, Lepage's texts in fractured English are produced by the minoritized culture in Canada, launching itself into the global in a movement that makes supraduction simultaneously infraduction in its opening to minoritizing variation. The difference in these vectors of translation with respect to power confers a different evaluation on the disjunctions between verbal and gestural systems, a sign of the lack of recognition accorded Quebec performance conventions in the former case and of the greater recognition garnered by these conventions in the latter, where the gestural carries the burden of meaning-making. In both cases, we might speak more in terms of a confrontation between text and performance than in terms of a subordination of one to the other, a confrontation exacerbated by the performativity of translation in the force of its reworking both dramatic text and performance conventions. The *mise en scène* creates the contexts of enunciation within which exchanges between verbal and non-verbal elements take place. With translation for a new production, the advent of another *mise en scène* relativizes every production as one possibility among a series of others in the process of making selections for a specific concretization in performance. This reworking by a contingent situation of enunciation fosters recognition of the tangible network of relationships in which humans and their signs are always embedded and of the collective social determinants that produce the identity of speaking subjects along with the force of their speech. What performs is the word's and the body's interaction with a social order.

I have only hinted at further complexities in the productive reception by audiences and their concretizing transformations, through which performance becomes socialized and hence performative. So, too, I have neglected the economic constraints on theatrical institutions that may facilitate one *mise en scène* over another and so establish particular performance conventions that orient translation strategies. Attention to these factors shaping translation in the theatre would reinforce my conceptualization of the relations of languages and cultures, of word and gesture, as layered and contextualized, not hierarchical or transcendent, interactions. A translation strategy that regards a text as a dynamic intersection of signifying surfaces, rather than as a point of fixed meaning – that is, as dialogue among several writings and rewritings, among (re)writers and their various interlocutors, and as reciprocal reworkings of earlier and contemporary contexts, of scripts and their concretizations – will search out logics and conditions of possibility under which something new may be produced rather than assessing truth in relation to some origin or end in logics of validity or causality. Such a *poesis* of making possible disembeds from habitual situations and structures and works through, alongside, and even against the discontinuous, the unpredictable, and the contingent to do something otherwise, to shock or entrance with alternative formations. The performativity of performances, their dramatic force as they take hold on and

are taken up by audiences, offers different possibilities for spectators' interactions across languages and cultures. Translation, then, works as transformational operation, modifying relations between socially situated signs, opening the way for the affirmation of many possible worlds within differentiated relations to power.

NOTES

1 Unless otherwise indicated, all translations from French-language texts are my own.

2 *Mise en scène* is untranslated in Pavis's *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture*.

3 While literal translation aims for word-for-word correspondence, figurative translation, like metaphor, aims for the communication of meaning transcending any specific verbal or material medium. Transposition, according to Egil Törnqvist, connotes a number of types of systemic shift between sign systems, including rewriting and editing, but primarily "transformation" in shifting a "play from a verbal semiotic system to an aural, visual or audiovisual one" in a study of film, TV, and radio versions of texts. Despite his title, he focuses less on "translation," which designates the transposition of drama from one language to another (7).

4 Special issues of periodicals have emphasized translations of plays for the Quebec stage. These include *Circuit* 12 (1986), *Jeu* 56 (1990), and, most recently *Canadian Theatre Review* 102 (2000), the first in English, which nonetheless highlights translation into French. Annie Brisset's study analysed all theatre translation into *québécois* for its circulation of social discourse, noting a tendency towards identificatory (domesticating) translation practices that would help in the creation of a national literature. Louise Ladouceur's thesis "Separate Stages" (1997) focuses on Quebec translations of English-Canadian theatre and has given rise to a number of publications, including Ladouceur's "Le sujet en question: *I am Yours* de Judith Thompson, version québécoise" (1998). Among many publications on translation of Quebec theatre into English, Jane Koustas has focused on Tremblay translations in "From Homespun to Awesome: Translated Theatre in Toronto" (1995).

5 It was at a lecture by Geertz that Richard Schechner first met Victor Turner, starting a dialogue between theatre and anthropology that led to Performance Studies (Schechner xi).

6 Among the semioticians Schechner draws upon, Pavis's analysis of the multiple processes of concretizaton influences his understanding of the many texts with their various languages "braid[ed]" in performance (Schechner 23).

7 *Mise en scène* is, according to Pavis, the interrelation between systems of performance, especially the link between dramatic text, composed by the author, and performance, the ensemble of stage systems including the text. The theatrical text is the text "in a concrete situation of enunciation," while the theatre event is "the totality of the unfolding production of the *mise en scène* and of its reception by the

public." The performance text is the *mise en scène* of a reading and any account of this reading by the spectator (Pavis, *Languages* 160, qtd. in Schechner 21).

8 Chaos theory focuses on the quality of irregular and unpredictable movement, as in the butterfly effect, where the hypothetical fluttering of butterfly wings produces a hurricane at some remote location.

9 "Interpretation" here refers to the activity of oral translation, not to hermeneutics.

10 This generalization is based on my reading of many Quebec theatre texts in translation as a member of juries for the Canadian Governor General's Award in translation, but the tendency is especially marked in John Van Burek and Bill Glassco's translations of Michel Tremblay.

11 The Tarragon Theatre in Toronto, for example, has performed John Murrell's translation of Carole Frechette's *The Four Lives of Marie* and Judith Thompson's version of Serge Boucher's *Motel Hélène* (12 April 2000) and workshopped Don Druick's translation of Larry Tremblay's *Les mains bleus* (26 November 2000).

12 While Gaboriau elected to retain historical details of Quebec customs (98–99; Marchessault, *Poules mouillés* 126–28), she omitted details of literary history, as she did again on page 103 in regards to the censorship of Quebec women's writing (Marchessault, *Poules mouillés* 134). This omission minimized the drama-theory element of Marchessault's play, which was similar in its critique of gender and genre to the works of "fiction-theory" produced by Quebec feminists.

13 Harrs, for instance, protests the association of the "gentle, loving work" of Gabrielle Roy with the crow dangling in a birdcage from the ceiling (E9). Trickster in the prairie Amerindian cultures, the crow here contrasts with the water hens of the play's title (and in the title of one of Roy's celebrated novels), to highlight the creative and transformative work carried out by Roy, her toughness, and the fierce desire to soar that spurred her on as a writer. As caged bird, however, she is caught in the feminine condition, in caged suspension like the notorious La Corriveau, who was cast out of Quebec society, hanged as a witch, and left dangling in a cage as warning.

14 The entire passage is an excellent example of Gaboriau's translation practice, with its precise colloquial diction. Her changes in syntax to less convoluted English convention also have the effect of speeding up the rhythm and stressing the energy of this coming together, as in the repetition of the abbreviations and the shifting of "work" from noun to verb:

> ANNE Ce soir, il faut que tout monte à la surface. Le lent travail des profondeurs. Puis nous émergerons nous prendrons de l'altitude comme les oiseaux, comme les sorcières qui volaient dans les airs! (Marchessault, *Poules mouillées* 136)

15 An example from Gaboriau's translation of *The Magnificent Voyage of Emily Carr* shows her selection of concrete over abstract diction, which emphasizes the speaker's embodiment, as in this brief line from the end of the play when Emily is directed toward writing when she is physically no longer able to paint: "Tout ce

que j'écrirai sera fragmentaire *en regard* de ceux qui l'ont vécu" (Marchessault, *Voyage* 108, emphasis added); "Everything I write will be fragmentary in the *eyes* of those who experienced it" (Gaboriau, *Magnificent Voyage* 103, emphasis added). The emphasis on the eyes underscores the importance of the embodied vision in Emily's attaining transcendence and, consequently, the narrative trajectory of the playtext from the earthly to the cosmic. These dual registers are also co present in Gaboriau's inspired choice of "Soul Tuner" for "L'Accordeur," the kind of muse or angel that is Emily's chief interlocutor.

16 This new orientation to target performances in recent English-Canadian theatre translation is evident in the practices of a number of established playwrights turned translators of classic European texts. Adaptations is more properly the term for the versions they are producing for the stage from literal translations made by someone else. It is not their linguistic skills and knowledge of the source culture that are valued, but their familiarity with Canadian audiences and performance conventions. The goal of these new translations is to make the classics "accessible." This is not so much modernizing the plays as Canadianizing them, "putting them in language that contemporary actors can speak comfortably" and "turning the phrases into ones that would sound comfortable for Canadian audiences" (Taylor R1). Translating Brecht was, for Jason Sherman, a "great lesson in dramaturgy" (Taylor R5), not quite the nationalist domesticating adaptation-translation produced in Quebec in the 1960s and 1970s but nonetheless a borrowing of the prestige of these canonical European plays to enhance the authority of English-Canadian theatres (and attract a larger audience?). These translation practices differ from those developed earlier for Quebec theatre, highlighting the power differential of continental Europe over Quebec.

17 So that the main character's nickname could be translated and convey the rich stone imagery working at many levels of action, characterization, and poetic vision, yet maintain the regional uniqueness, she transplanted the setting of the play from the francophone North Shore near Trois-Rivières to the Eastern Townships, where francophone and anglophone Quebeckers live side by side and English names would not be surprising.

18 While the production received positive notice at the Edinburgh Festival, Toronto critics remained cool to the performances at Factory Theatre (16 November 2000). Glen Sumi noted the "potent themes buried" in its "dreamlike, hypnotic quality," but he found the performance "deadening, like watching grad students parody," because its language – "quasi-poetic faux-hick" – was "impossible for audiences to grasp" (87).

19 The written text of the Prologue to the *Trilogie* and a number of essays analyzing the performance are published in *Jeu* 45 (1987).

20 I attended a special performance of the play for delegates at the International Conference of the Comparative Literature Association in August 1991, on which occasion I timed Hamlet's death. Through a reduction in the number of characters, among other changes, the emphasis of the play was shifted onto Hamlet's revenge of his father's honour and reverence of his ghost.

WORKS CITED

Austin, J.L. *How to Do Things with Words.* Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1962.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination.* Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981.

Barthes, Roland. *The Grain of Voice: Interviews 1962–1980.* Trans. Linda Coverdale. Berkeley: U California P, 1985.

Bassnett, Susan. "The Problems of Translating Theatre Texts." *Theatre Quarterly* 10.38 (1980): 47–55.

———. "Still Trapped in the Labyrinth: Further Reflections on Translation and Theatre." *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation.* Ed. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 1998. 90–108.

Bassnett, Susan, and André Lefevere, eds. *Translation, History, and Culture.* London: Pinter, 1990.

Bassnett, Susan, and Harish Trivedi, eds. *Post-Colonial Translation: Theory and Practice.* London: Routledge, 1999.

Beauchamp, Hélène, and Ric Knowles. "A Servant of Two Masters: An Interview with Linda Gaboriau." *Canadian Theatre Review* 102 (2000): 41–47.

Bednarski, Betty. *Autour de Ferron: Littérature, traduction, altérité.* Toronto: Groupe de recherche en études françaises, 1989.

Brisset, Annie. *Sociocritique de la traduction: Théâtre et altérité au Québec (1968–1988).* Longueuil, QC: Préambule, 1990.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature.* Ed. Randal Johnson. New York: Columbia UP, 1993.

Bourassa, André G., and Jean-Marc Larrue. *Les Nuits de la "Main": Cent ans de spectacles sur le boulevard Saint-Laurent, 1891–1991.* Montreal: VLB, 1993.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* New York: Routledge, 1990.

Camerlain, Lorraine. "o.k. on change!" *Jeu* 45 (1987): 83–97.

Carlson, Marvin. "Theatrical Performance: Illustration, Translation, Fulfillment, or Supplement?" *Theatre Journal* 37.1 (1983): 5–11.

Chambers, Ross. "Le Masque et le miroir. Vers une théorie relationnelle du théâtre." *Etudes littéraires* 13 (1980): 397–412.

Danis, Daniel. *Cendres de Cailloux.* Montreal: Leméac; Paris: Actes Sud, 1992.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature.* Trans. Dana Polan. Minneapolis: U Minnesota P, 1986.

———. *Mille plateaux.* Paris: Minuit, 1980.

Delisle, Jean. "Dans les coulisses de l'adaptation théâtrale." *Circuit* 12 (1986): 3–8.

Derrida, Jacques. *L'Oreille de l'autre: Otobiographies, transferts, traductions: Textes et débats avec Jacques Derrida.* Ed. Claude Lévesque and Christie McDonald. Montreal: VLB, 1982.

———. "Des Tours de Babel." Trans. Joseph Graham. *Difference in Translation*. Ed. Joseph Graham. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1985. 165–207.

———. "Signature, Event, Context." *Limited Inc*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP, 1988. 1–23.

Diamond, Elin. "The Shudder of Catharsis in Twentieth-Century Performance." Parker and Sedgwick, *Performativity and Performance* 152–72.

Druick, Don. "The Tender Translations of Tadoussac." *Canadian Theatre Review* 102 (2000): 38–40.

———. *Where Is Kabuki?* Toronto: Playwrights Canada, 1991.

Eco, Umberto. *A Theory of Semiotics*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1976.

Folkart, Barbara. *Le Conflit des énonciations: Traduction et discours rapporté*. Montreal: Balzac, 1991.

Gaboriau, Linda, trans. *A Clash of Symbols*. By the *nef des sorcières* collective. Toronto: Coach House, 1979.

———. "The Cultures of Theatre." *Culture in Transit: Translating the Literature of Quebec*. Ed. Sherry Simon. Montreal: Véhicule, 1995. 83–90.

———, trans. *The Magnificent Voyage of Emily Carr*. By Jovette Marchessault. Vancouver: Talonbooks, 1992.

———, trans. *The Saga of the Wet Hens*. By Jovette Marchessault. Vancouver: Talonbooks, 1983.

———, trans. *Stone and Ashes*. By Daniel Danis. Toronto: Coach House, 1995.

———. "Traduire le génie de l'auteur." *Jeu* 56 (1990): 43–48.

Gauvin, Lise. *Langagement: L'écrivain et la langue au Québec*. Montreal: Boréal, 2000.

Godard, Barbara. "Translating and Sexual Difference." *Resources for Feminist Research* 13.3 (1984): 13–16.

———. "Translation as Culture: A Canadian School of Translation Theory?" *Translation and Multilingualism in Post-Colonial Context: Indian and Canadian Experiences*. Ed. Shanta Ramakrishna. Delhi: Pencraft, 1997. 157–82.

———. "Writing Between Cultures." *TTR* 10.1 (1997): 53–97.

Habermas, Jürgen. "What is Universal Pragmatics?" *Communication and the Evolution of Society*. Trans. Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon, 1979. 1–68.

Harrs, Norma. "Magic of Wet Hens Misdirected." *Globe and Mail* [Toronto] 20 Feb. 1982: E9.

Hébert, Chantal, and Irène Perelli-Contos, eds. *Théâtre, multidisciplinarité et multiculturalisme*. Quebec: Nuit Blanche, 1997.

Hjelmslev, Louis. *Prolegomena to a Theory of Language*. Trans. Francis J. Whitfield. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1969.

Jakobson, Roman. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." *Selected Writings*. Vol. 2. The Hague: Mouton, 1971. 260–66.

Koustas, Jane. "Traduire ou ne pas traduire le théâtre? L'approche sémiotique." *TTR* 1.1 (1988): 127–38.

———. "From Homespun to Awesome: Translated Theatre in Toronto." *Essays on*

Modern Quebec Theatre. Ed. Joseph Donohue Jr. and Jonathan M. Weiss. East Lansing: Michigan State UP, 1995. 81–109.

Kristeva, Julia. "Word, Dialogue and Novel." *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Ed. Leon S. Roudiez. Trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia UP, 1980. 64–91.

———. *Revolution in Poetic Language*. Trans. Margaret Waller. New York: Columbia UP, 1984.

Ladouceur, Louise. "Separate Stages: La traduction du théâtre dans le contexte Canada/Québec." Diss. U of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, 1997.

———. "Le Sujet en question: *I am Yours* de Judith Thompson, version québécoise." *TTR* 11.1 (1998): 89–112.

Lotman, Yuri. *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. Trans. Ann Shukman. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1990.

McLaughlin, Gord. "Digging Deep for an Honest Translation." *National Post* [Toronto] 15 Nov. 2000: A26.

Marchessault, Jovette. *La Saga des poules mouillées*. Montreal: Éd. de la pleine lune, 1981.

———. *Le Voyage magnifique d'Emily Carr*. Montreal: Leméac, 1990.

Mezei, Kathy. "The Scales of Translation: The English-Canadian Poet as Literal Translator." *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa* 52.2 (1984): 63–84.

Parker, Andrew, and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick. "Introduction: Performativity and Performance." *Performativity and Performance* 1–18.

———, eds. *Performativity and Performance*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Pavis, Patrice. *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture*. Trans. Loren Kruger. London: Routledge, 1992.

———, ed. *Languages of the Stage: Essays in the Semiology of the Theatre*. New York: Performing Arts Journal Pub., 1982.

Peirce, Charles S. *Collected Papers*. 8 vols. Ed. Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1931–58.

Petrilli, Susan. "Translation, Semiotics and Ideology." *TTR* 5.1 (1992): 233–64.

Poyatos, Fernando. "The Reality of Multichannel Verbal–Nonverbal Communication in Simultaneous and Consecutive Interpretation." *Nonverbal Communication and Translation: New Perspectives and Challenges in Literature, Interpretation, and the Media*. Ed. Fernando Poyatos. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1997. 249–82.

Round, Nicholas G. "The Speakable and the Unspeakable." *Prologue to Performance: Spanish Classical Theater Today*. Ed. Louise and Peter Fothergill-Payne. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell UP, 1991. 113–35.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics*. Ed. Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye. Trans. Wade Baskin. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Schechner, Richard. *Between Theater and Anthropology*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1985.

Simon, Sherry. *Le Trafic des langues: Traduction et culture dans la littérature québécoise*. Montreal: Boréal, 1994.

Sumi, Glenn. "No Lightning." *Now* 23–29 Nov. 2000: 86–87.

Taylor, Kate. "New Voices for the Classics." *Globe and Mail* [Toronto] 7 Dec. 2000: R1+.

Törnqvist, Egil. *Transposing Drama: Studies in Representation*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan, 1991.

Turner, Victor. *From Ritual to Theatre*. New York: Performing Arts Journal Publ., 1982.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London: Routledge, 1998.

von Flotow, Luise. *Translation and Gender: Translating in the "Era of Feminism."* Ottawa: U of Ottawa P; Manchester, UK: St. Jerome, 1997.

Wallace, Robert. "D'où cela vient-il? Réflexions sur la réception critique du théâtre francophone récent à Toronto." Trans. Michel Vaïs. *Jeu* 49 (1988): 9–21.

Worthen, W.B. "Drama, Performativity, and Performance." *PMLA* 113 (1998): 1093–1107.