

The Forensic

of Pi Kappa Delta

Published since 1915

LIBRARY - OTTAWA UNIVERSITY
OTTAWA, KANSAS

V. 84

#4

Research Articles:

The Impact of Intertextuality, Textual Layering, and
Performance Studies: Does the Text Have Any Integrity Left?
JOHN PERLICH

Forensics as Preparation for Participation in the Academic World
KATHERINE STENGER

Book Review:

Cohen, J.R. (1998). Communication criticism:
Developing your critical powers (Rhetoric and Society,
volume 2).
KENNETH HADA

Editor's Notes



Pi Kappa Delta National Forensic Honorary Society

National Council

SCOTT JENSEN, PRESIDENT

School of Communication, Webster University
St. Louis, MO 63119 314-968-7439

GLENDA TREADAWAY, PRESIDENT ELECT

Communication, Appalachian State University
Boone, NC 28608 704-262-2222

BILL HILL, Jr, SECRETARY-TREASURER

Communication Studies, University of North Carolina-Charlotte
Charlotte, NC 28223 704-547-4217

JOEL HEFFLING, IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT

Communication, South Dakota State University
Brooking, SD 57007 605-688-4390

MICHAEL BARTANEN, EDITOR OF THE FORENSIC

Communication and Theatre, Pacific Lutheran University
Tacoma, WA 98447 253-535-7764

SUSAN MILLSAP, NATIONAL COUNCIL

Speech Communication, Otterbein College
Westerville, OH 43081 614-823-1753

MARK HICKMAN, NATIONAL COUNCIL

Communication Studies, West Chester University
West Chester, PA 19383 610-436-6942

EDDIE SKAGGS, NATIONAL COUNCIL

Communication, Cameron University
Lawton, OK 73505 580-581-2555

RICHARD GORKA, NATIONAL COUNCIL

Communication and Theatre, Pacific Lutheran University
Tacoma, WA 98447

BROOK SMITH, NATIONAL COUNCIL

Communication, Boise State University
Boise, ID 83725

R. DAVID RAY, HISTORIAN

PO Box 2882, University of Arkansas-Monticello
Monticello, AR 71655 501-460-1078

NATIONAL OFFICE - PI KAPPA DELTA

125 Watson St., P.O. Box 38
Ripon, WI 54971

Phone: 920-748-7533
Fax: 920-748-9478

The Forensic

of Pi Kappa Delta

Research Articles:

- 1 The Impact of Intertextuality, Textual Layering, and Performance Studies: Does the Text Have Any Integrity Left?
JOHN PERLICH
- 13 Forensics as Preparation for Participation in the Academic World
KATHERINE STENGER

Book Review:

- 24 Cohen, J.R. (1998). Communication criticism: Developing your critical powers (Rhetoric and Society, volume 2). Beverly Hills: Sage.
KENNETH HADA

Editor's Notes

The *Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta* invites authors to submit manuscripts related to scholarship, pedagogy, research, and administration in competitive and non-competitive speech and debate. The Editorial Board will consider manuscripts employing any appropriate methodology and is particularly interested in historical-critical studies in forensics and forensics education. Manuscripts submitted by undergraduate students and previously unpublished scholars will also receive serious consideration.

The journal reflects the values of its supporting organization. *Pi Kappa Delta* is committed to promoting "*the art of persuasion, beautiful and just.*" The journal seeks to promote serious scholarly discussion of issues connected to making competitive and non-competitive debate and individual events a powerful tool for teaching students the skills necessary for becoming articulate citizens. The journal seeks essays reflecting perspectives from all current debate and individual events forms, including, but not limited to: NDT, CEDA, NEDA, Parliamentary, Lincoln-Douglas debate; and NIET, NFA and non-traditional individual events.

Reviews of books and other educational materials will be published periodically. Potential reviewers are invited to contact the editor regarding the choice of materials for review.

All works must be original and not under review by other publishers. Authors should submit three print copies conforming to APA (4th ed.) guidelines plus a PC-compatible disk version. Manuscripts should not exceed 25 double-spaced typed pages, exclusive of tables and references; book and educational material reviews should be between 4-5 double-spaced pages. Submitted manuscripts will not be returned. The title page should include the title, author(s), corresponding address and telephone number. The second page should include an abstract of 75-100 words. The text of the manuscript (including its title) should begin on the next page, with the remaining pages numbered consecutively. Avoid self-identification in the text of the manuscript. Notes and references should be typed double-spaced on pages following the text of the manuscript. Tables should be clearly marked regarding their placement in the manuscript.

Manuscripts should be submitted to the editor: Michael Bartanen, Department of Communication and Theatre, Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, WA 98447. 253-535-7764. BARTANMD@PLU.EDU. Authors will have an editorial decision within three months.

Review Editors

Sandra Alspach, Ferris State University

David Frank, University of Oregon

Steve Hunt, Lewis & Clark College

Jaime Meyer, University of Mary

C. Thomas Preston, Missouri-St. Louis

Margaret Greynolds, Georgetown College, Review Editor

Donna Beran, University of Dayton

Jeff Gentry, Southwestern Oklahoma

Glenn Kuper, University of Puget Sound

Mabry O'Donnell, Marietta College

Glenda Treadaway, Appalachian State

THE FORENSIC OF PI KAPPA DELTA (ISSN: 0015-735X) is published four times yearly, Fall, Winter, Spring and Summer by Pi Kappa Delta Fraternal Society. Subscription price is part of membership dues. For alumni and non-members the rate is \$30.00 for one year, \$60.00 for two years and \$75.00 for three years. Second class postage paid at Ripon, WI. Postmaster and subscribers: please send all changes of address requests to: PKD, 125 Watson Street, P.O. Box 38, Ripon, WI 54971. THE FORENSIC OF Pi Kappa Delta is also available on 16 mm microfilm, 35 mm microfilm, or 100 mm microfilm through University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106.

The Impact of Intertextuality, Textual Layering, and Performance Studies: Does the Text have any Integrity Left?

JOHN PERLICH*

This essay explores the influence of modern interpretation and postmodern performance philosophies on intercollegiate forensic competition. The author of this essay contends that contemporary forensic competition is engaged in a paradigmatic revolution regarding literary performance. The implications of the current paradigmatic shift and future directions for the activity are discussed.

Within the last decade, with reference to the disciplines of acting, interpretation, and the performance of text, the field of communication studies has witnessed a sharp decline in the use of the term "oral interpretation," and a dramatic increase in the use of the term "performance studies" (Pelias & VanOosting, 1987). Such renaming calls to mind recent debates leading to the "ferment in the field" of communication studies (Ferment and Fragmentation in the Field, 1983). This ferment in the speech communication domain is a reaction to and extension of Kuhn's (1970) challenge that all mature disciplines must embrace one paradigm of thought and inquiry. Does the inability of communication scholars-more specifically members of the forensics community-to settle on a term that aptly describes what our students do when they perform a text indicate, as Kuhn (1970) might argue, immaturity within our practice? Does the change in terminology demonstrate an evolutionary development, a philosophical shift, or the birth of new practice and theories in performance? At the very least, "such double naming calls into question the nature and scope of a discipline in transition" (Pelias & VanOosting, 1987, p. 219).

The purpose of this paper is to make sense of recent shifts in interpretation/performance theory, philosophy, and practice as they pertain to competitive forensic speaking at the intercollegiate level. While the thesis of this paper is quite narrow, the issues mentioned within this essay have far-reaching implications for all levels of forensic competition, performers, and the communication studies disci-

* JOHN PERLICH is an Assistant Professor of Communication Studies in the Department of Communication Arts, Economics, and Business at Hastings College in Hastings, NE. A version of this paper was presented in November, 1998, at the National Communication Association Convention in New York, NY.

pline in general. While I believe, like Pelias and VanOosting (1987), that performance is a paradigmatic term with specific implications for the future direction of intercollegiate forensics, I also recognize that performance is essentially a contested concept (Strine, Long, & Hopkins, 1990). As a contested term, performance "is bound up in disagreement about what it is, and . . . disagreement over its essence is itself part of that essence" (Strine, Long, & Hopkins, 1990, p. 183). Thus, I recognize that others will not only disagree with the arguments within this essay, but that such disagreement is unavoidable and healthful. For, I contend, the goal of scholarly inquiry should not be to silence opposing parties but to nurture dialogue in an effort to gain a sharper image of all positions and, therefore, a greater understanding of what we do (Strine, Long, & Hopkins, 1990).

Unfortunately, many coaches, competitors, and scholars practice intercollegiate forensics pedagogy with seemingly little concern for a greater understanding of what it is that we do. Kirch and Zeidler (1998, p. 12) for example, argue that contemporary practice in individual events forensics competition represents a "New Elocutionism." My argument is that the birth of neo-Elocutionism in intercollegiate forensics derives from the same atheoretical practice that gave Elocutionism a negative connotation in the early twentieth century (Lee & Gura, 1997). In other words, intercollegiate forensics tends to emphasize style and practice with little thought regarding the philosophical and theoretical assumptions that justify or refute performance choices.

The question posed in the opening of this paper, "Does the text have any integrity left?" is purposely evocative and accusatory. For those who approach forensic competition from a modern philosophy, the educator's fundamental goal is to help students realize the ideals of oral interpretation. Those who use the term "performance studies" approach the forensic competition from postmodern philosophies. Perhaps in no area is the debate between these two camps more obviously manifest than in the notion of authorial integrity, control, and intent. In an attempt to sort out the arguments between the two paradigms, this essay examines three areas. First, what are the philosophical and paradigmatic tenets of oral interpretation and performance studies?; second, what is meant by the conflicting terms "work" and "text"?; and finally, what are the future directions of the field if coaches and competitors begin to embrace the performance paradigm?

Oral Interpretation vs. Performance Studies

Space prevents me from fully detailing the historical and philosophical circumstances that accompanied the birth of both oral interpretation and performance studies. In essence, during the early years of this century, oral interpretation was characterized by a narrow body of both theory and practice (Taft-Kaufman, 1985). From its earliest years, oral interpretation was viewed by its practitioners as a unique

school of thought-distinct from acting and, in later years, performance. However, recent shifts in philosophy have made the field of performance studies as broad in scope as the early years of oral interpretation were narrow. While current typologies usually place the subject of oral interpretation within the rubric of performance studies-in some cases treating the two as synonymous (Pelias & VanOosting, 1987)-the two areas differ in several fundamental assumptions.

The conversation between scholars of oral interpretation and performance studies involves more than new terminology. In fact, "the case presumes that the field . . . is changing and that the newer term 'performance studies' represents more than a renaming, more even than the ordinary evolution of an academic field" (Pelias & VanOosting, 1987, p. 219). Pelias and VanOosting go on to explain:

Performance studies asserts a theoretical orientation framed squarely within the discipline of human communication and enriched by such fields as anthropology, theatre, folklore, and popular culture. Within speech communication, performance studies [pulls from] the interpretation of literature and focuses on the performative and aesthetic nature of human discourse. It is based in art, carries epistemological claims, posits methodological procedures, and calls for new pedagogical approaches (p. 219).

Consequently, while the work of performance theorists derives from oral interpretation, it also relies upon a number of different fields and areas for its epistemic foundation. Performance studies draws from oral interpretation-it is not the renaming of oral interpretation. Indeed, the two disciplines are quite different.

"Work" vs. "Text"

Fundamental to the debate between scholars of oral interpretation and performance studies is the distinct usage of the terms "work" and "text." During the late 1950's and early 1960's, the emphasis in oral interpretation as a form of literary study was clearly on maintaining the integrity of an author's work (Taft-Kaufman, 1985). By the end of the sixties, oral interpretation had established itself as a field in which "the principle model of scholarship was [work]-centered . . . focused on the study of the writings of particular authors and literary genres" (Strine, Long, & Hopkins, 1990, p. 182). The emphasis on authorial works in the field of oral interpretation can be traced back to the earliest years of this century, when the goal of speech teachers was to clearly delineate oral interpretation from its "closest competitor," acting (Taft-Kaufman, 1985, p. 158). Clark (1915) was one of the first champions of this cause. In achieving the desired rift between the two fields, Clark (1915) attempted to "distance interpretation from the negative image of elocution by downplaying the entire concept of delivery" (Taft-Kaufman, 1985, p. 158). This drive for disciplinary uniqueness witnessed in the early twentieth-century seemed to create

an ongoing air of academic xenophobia which may, to this day, be preventing many traditional oral interpretation theorists from joining in the rich pedagogical dialogue that is currently defining the future of the field.

Among others, Lee and Gura (1997, p. 4) have articulated the work-centered orientation of oral interpretation:

The writer of the literary selection is a creative artist who orders ideas, words, sounds, and rhythms into a particular form. The interpreter brings personal experience and insight to bear on the printed symbols the author has given, and assumes the responsibility of recreating this written [work].

Assumed within their definition of the oral interpretation process are several assumptions, including (1) the schism between author and performer, (2) the primary goal of preserving the canonical work. The work-centered emphasis of oral interpretation is most clearly demonstrated in the following definition: Interpretation is the art of communicating to an audience a work of literary art in its entirety (Lee & Gura, 1997). The roots of the work-centered emphasis of traditional oral interpretation scholars can be traced back nearly a century. However, as academic institutions urge scholars to engage in dialogue, strive for interdisciplinary links, and work toward one curriculum, the usefulness of these roots may be subject to increasing scrutiny (Wolff, 1992).

While the roots of the oral interpretation discipline are grounded in modernist philosophy and theory, recent postmodernist emphasis on "the nature of texts and their complex interrelationships" has challenged all of the human sciences, "including the field of oral interpretation" (Strine, Long, & Hopkins, 1990, p. 184). Specifically, performance studies takes as its root orientation "a noncanonical attitude toward texts" (Pelias & VanOosting, 1987, p. 221). Scholars who subscribe to postmodern philosophy and the field of performance question "the privilege of academic authority by including all members of a speech community as potential artists, all utterances as potentially aesthetic, all events as potentially theatrical, and all audiences as potentially active participants" (Pelias & VanOosting, 1987, p. 221). Given these conditions, text is seen not just as a literary work, but as the conjunction of performer, text, and audience, within a context. Essentially, while traditional oral interpretation scholars embrace the notion that art and reality differ significantly, postmodern performance theorists subscribe to the belief that the genres, lines, and boundaries which separate realities are neither clear nor sacred (Taft-Kaufman, 1985, p. 160).

Performance theorists take a liberal and occasionally unorthodox position toward what constitutes text (Pelias & VanOosting, 1987, p. 222). One of the earliest performance scholars to suggest that communication researchers shift from the traditional conceptualization of "work" to "text" was Campbell (1971), who rejected the notion that

performance should be limited to the study of authorial works, stating, "Far from limiting dramatic discourse to literature, I wish to consider it as a dimension of language in which we create and recreate ourselves in relation to the 'real' world around us and in which we use those imaginative or artistic events (originated by ourselves or others) to become new beings or personae" (Campbell, 1971, p. 269). Thus, performance studies envisions speech acts for interpretation that go beyond the traditional proscenium or arena.

Perhaps the greatest implication of the debate between usage of the operative words *work* or *text* centers upon the purpose of the performer/interpreter. As Pelias and VanOosting (1987, p. 223) point out, performers ask "not only what happens artistically in the event," which they contend is the goal of an interpreter, "but also what political or psychosocial changes may occur as a result." The goal of the performer is critical inquiry, emancipation, and change, not recitation, memorization, and presentation. Rather than focusing upon one authorial voice, performers place equal emphasis on a number of voices during performance, and upon the interaction between these voices—a concept known as *intertextuality* or *textual layering*. These voices are located within the self, other, and the larger cultural milieu. *Intertextuality* is "less a name for a work's relation to particular prior texts than a designation of its participation in the discursive space of culture: the relationship between a text and the various languages or signifying practices of a culture and its relation to those texts which articulate for it the possibilities of that culture" (Strine, Long, & Hopkins, 1990, p. 194). Thus, as Pelias and VanOosting (1987, p. 224) note, "performance studies allows for broader conceptions of the theatrical event, just as it embraces a wider catalogue of performance texts."

Metaphorically (and to some extent reductionistically) speaking, the debate between traditional oral interpretation and postmodern performance theory is similar to the goals, process, and performances of a classical symphony (oral interpretation) versus a jazz improvisation (performance). Like the orchestra performing a symphony, Taft-Kaufman (1985, p. 163) argues that the goal of oral interpreters is "imitation," or the faithful recreation of the composer's vision. Jazz improvisation, however, relies upon a composition for foundation, yet incorporates the nuances of the individual performer, encourages audience interaction with the musician, and in many instances, textually layers in bits of other pieces composed and/or performed by the musician. The line between works, performers, creators, and audience blur during a jazz improvisation; during a classical symphony, these same lines are nurtured and preserved.

Future Directions

In previous sections of this paper I have attempted to provide a succinct yet comprehensive survey of the debate between those who embrace modernist notions of literary study through oral interpretation and scholars of the postmodern performance paradigm. To what

extent does the discourse between scholars of oral interpretation and performance impact the intercollegiate forensics circuit? The answer to this question must be decided by those who coach and compete in forensics, embrace notions of authorial intent and canon, and advocate performance studies as a method of actualizing change in the new millennium. At present, the rules for both the American Forensics Association and the National Forensics Association situate our identity as firmly encamped within the school of thought most reflected by the traditional scholar of oral interpretation. While post-modern performance theorists argue that philosophical shifts have lead to generic instability, the national intercollegiate forensics organizations fervently embrace formalized genre within the definition of competitive events. Further, by defining forensic performance as "interpretation," the default operating assumption is a work-based style of performance that de-emphasizes the role of performer, audience, and interaction with a larger cultural milieu. Finally, texts that go beyond the traditional proscenium or arena are both implicitly and explicitly discouraged for performance by intercollegiate forensic competitors.

Regardless of how steeped in oral interpretation tradition intercollegiate forensic performance may seem, the competitive community has been, albeit without formal recognition, taking steps towards endorsing a performance paradigm. In no event is this more evident than in the category of program oral interpretation (POI). While the rules of this event do not explicitly call for methods of intertextuality and textual layering in performance, the mixing of authorial, performer, and generic voices has indeed become the norm. It is this trend, in fact, that raises the question, "Does the text have any integrity left?" As previously stated, performance studies practitioners are encouraged to "transcend the restrictions of canonical authority" (Pelias & VanOosting, 1987, p. 222). Within the performance paradigm, no longer is the performer's goal "communicating to an audience a work of literary art in its entirety" (Lee & Gura, 1997, p. 3). The role of author/creator may be questioned, rejected, challenged, and redefined by some performers. As Pelias and VanOosting (1987, p. 220) suggest, "recent literary theories have advanced arguments authorizing the reader in the construction of textual meaning." In light of this idea, what is the relationship between work and performer? Is the job of the forensic performer to present a literary work in its entirety, or does the literary work take on a new meaning in the creation of the performers personae? Is the duty of the performer to preserve or challenge authorial intent? The contrasting notions of representation versus reappropriation are at the heart of the oral interpretation/performance studies debate.

Several avenues are appropriate for the future development of forensic speaking that extend upon the idea of text versus work. Strine, Long, and Hopkins (1990) offer a taxonomy for critic researchers to use when creating performance. This taxonomy might, with slight modification, offer new genres (or more appropriately,

pseudo-genres) for forensic performance. The eight modified criteria used in the construction and evaluation of performances within a new paradigm could include aesthetic, content, jouissance, cultural memory, ritual, criticism, political action, and psychological probe.

Aesthetics: Texts that are designed to be aesthetic offer entertainment as an end in itself (Strine, Long, & Hopkins, 1990, p. 186). Such opportunities resemble "musical concerts that offer terminal values (Beardsley, 1980; Strine, Long, & Hopkins, 1990, p. 186; Taft-Kaufman, 1983). Stand-up comedy, humorous cuttings, and improvisation all can offer performers the chance to experiment with notions of aesthetics.

Content: The primary question asked by performers interested in content is, "What ideas are mobilized in the performance?" (Strine, Long, & Hopkins, 1990, p. 184). Performances of this type are situated as a site of intellectual inquiry. An example of this type of performance is discussed by Strine, Long, & Hopkins (1990), who explain how performers have combined personal narrative, interviews with the author, and literary texts to provide inquiries into an author's life and work.

Jouissance: Those who have read Burkean poetry know that the great philosopher placed much importance in the notion of play. The idea of play or game playing is captured for the performance artist by the French term, "jouissance." Riddles, picture-poems, and devices that break with convention "are all texts that invite performers to play, to engage in gaming" (Strine, Long, & Hopkins, 1990, p. 186). Play, or jouissance, invites the performer and audience to take part in perspective taking, to shake things up simply for the benefit of seeing things from a fresh perspective. This, in itself, can be one important goal of performance.

Cultural memory: Just as performances might encourage entertainment, intellectual inquiry, and play, so might they be designed to share in cultural memory. Examples of texts designed to explore cultural memory include such nontraditional artifacts as oral histories, narratives, quilts, and songs (Strine, Long, & Hopkins, 1990, p. 187). Audiences and performers of such texts find themselves "experiencing a past they may have lived or known only through stories" (Strine, Long, & Hopkins, 1990, p. 187).

Ritual: Ethnographic researchers have argued for more than a decade that participatory rituals are a site of performance (Conquergood, 1986; Fine, 1984; Myerhoff, 1984; Speer, 1985). Rituals are stories that people tell themselves about themselves (Geertz, 1971, p. 5). Performance of any family ritual, for example, reveals dense layers of meaning about who we are, what it means to be a member of our culture, and the values held sacred within the two.

Criticism: Events that criticize are designed to make an argument. Such performances have as a primary goal "the shaping and sharpen-

ing of attitudes to the point of at least incipient action" (Strine, Long, & Hopkins, 1990, p. 188). These performances are designed to achieve attitudinal change.

Political action: Some performances go a step beyond attitudinal change and become "sites of political action" (Strine, Long, & Hopkins, 1990, p. 188). These performances attempt to help actuate behavioral change in society. Such performances might, for example, be "based on taped interviews and personal narratives of troubled or oppressed groups" (Strine, Long, & Hopkins, 1990, p. 188). Performances of this type have caused legislative bodies to enact laws to address dramatized problems (Hartman & Alho, 1979).

Psychological probe: Zahner-Roloff (1986, p. 19) calls this type of performance "the curing of psyche by the making and sounding of image." Therapy in this sense is derived through composing poems and reading poems to others. Healing and therapy are achieved for performer, audience, and author.

Of the eight categories within Strine, Long, and Hopkins' (1990) typology, some more than others lend themselves to useful adaptation within intercollegiate forensics competition. Some, in fact, are already being incorporated. By extrapolating Strine, Long, and Hopkins' (1990) typology, possible avenues for future exploration within the field of performance include several opportunities. These recommendations include the use of nontraditional texts and openness toward alternate genres of literature; performance as therapy; and (perhaps the most contested and ethically charged suggestion) play.

The use of nontraditional texts: Because performance scholars question the distinct boundary between author, performer, and text, as well as challenge the notion that certain types of text are to be "privileged," our gradual (implied) acceptance of postmodern performance suggests that the forensic community must become receptive toward nontraditional texts¹. Personal narratives are but one example of performable texts in the performance studies paradigm. If the forensics community continues to shift toward performance studies as the dominant paradigm, the acceptance of personal original texts seems not only logical, but also likely². Such an occurrence is filled with ethical, logistical, and philosophical implications. Further, the very integrity of existing texts is called to question within a performance paradigm. Intertextuality implies the blending of narrative voices within the performance. At what point does performer voice end and author voice begin? Is the distinction between author and performer real or artificial and to what extent should the distinctness

¹ For example, the use of intertextuality and textual layering in Program Oral Interpretation.

² For an excellent discussion of narrative as performance see Stern, C. & Henderson, B. (1993). *The Personal Narrative and the Performance of Ethnography*. Performance: Texts and contexts. New York, NY: Longman.

of voice be preserved? Such issues remain to be answered as forensic pedagogy continues to explore the performance paradigm.

Performance as therapy: For the last decade, the idea that performance is a potential site for catharsis and personal cleansing has been well-documented (Stern & Henderson, 1993). While the potential for therapy performance exists in forensic competition, it is not recommended. The fact that forensics judges are trained in speech acts, not as therapists, is enough to warrant extreme caution when moving toward this type of performance shift. Still, when handled carefully between coach and student, the potential for constructing a performance selection that allows a student to constructively work through personal issues may have advantages. However, the future of this type of performance is not encouraging in forensic pedagogy. Nonetheless, therapy performance is one example of the possibilities that performance study has begun to explore.

Play: The greatest potential ethical dilemma is presented to forensics educators when pondering the idea of play or epistemological jouissance in performance. In the most basic sense, a performance studies paradigm encourages performers to challenge existing canon and genre, reject the privileging of certain texts, and explore new modes of relation between author, text, and audience. Like criticism and political action, play encourages performers to challenge authority, question rules, and explore alternative methods of performance. Consequently, the notion of textual integrity may be moot within a performance paradigm. If there is no separation between author/reader/text, then it is inevitable that the reader and author's voices will merge to become one new voice. For the performance scholar, the separation of either voice is both undesirable and impossible. It is in the merging of texts (both author and reader as distinct "texts") that new possibilities emerge. Consequently, performance may become a site of resistance. A place where old canon and law might be challenged, questioned, and interrogated in the act of performance. Such resistance, argues Foucault (1980), is a natural state of being, stifled by social forces that encourage conformity.

One example of jouissance, or experimenting with the original authorial intent of a traditional literary work, can be witnessed in the off-Broadway production of "R & J"; an all-male adaptation of the Shakespearean classic, "Romeo and Juliet." In an interview with Shteir (1998), director Joe Calarco describes his adaptation of Shakespeare's play as an exploration of the strain between homosexual and heterosexual cultures. Calarco states, "To help maintain that tension, even reading 'Romeo and Juliet' becomes a dangerous act in 'R&J'" (Shteir, 1998, p. 2). Shteir (1998, p. 2) describes the reappropriation of Shakespeare's drama:

When, shortly after the play begins, the young men dare to venture out of the Orwellian school, they soar into a Bacchanalian world, becoming the play's characters and experiencing moments of forbidden love. [Calarco] also

added two Shakespeare sonnets and an erotic wedding scene. "Shakespeare never lets you see the lovers getting married," he said-increasing the play's emotional tension. "This is no sweet romance," Mr. Calarco said. "The lovers are nuts; they're insane. When Romeo says, 'Come death, and welcome, Juliet wills it so,' that's insane." The ceremony shows two young men getting married and kissing passionately. Is there a homoerotic subtext?

Calarco's intent was to emphasize the tensions between heterosexual and homosexual cultures through his adaptation of the play-an intent that most certainly transcended Shakespeare's goal when writing the drama. For the modern oral interpreter, such reappropriation of a literary work to express one's standpoint might be considered taboo, yet this performance undoubtedly provided a unique mode of expression for the director, performers, and many in the audience.

Regardless of the direction performance theorists, forensics coaches, and student competitors wish the activity to take, resistance to change is likely. Yet, such resistance may tell us much about what we are already implicitly doing. "Students' choices of texts-and of performance styles, as well-may be telling us far more than we recognize about affirmations as well as denials of values" that we, as individuals, consciously or unconsciously hold or reject (Strine, Long, & Hopkins, 1990, p. 193). In my own classes, for example, it is not surprising that Eurocentric males (and, for that matter, those who have internalized that gaze) subscribe to schools of thought designed to preserve authority and canon, rather than embrace postmodern notions of text and jouissance that may require them to reject it.

In this essay I briefly explored the philosophical positions of modern oral interpretation and postmodern performance studies, delineated the distinction between "work" and "text," and ultimately explored some implications for our gradual shift toward performance theory in intercollegiate forensics. While our discipline continues to experience growing pains as a result of Kuhn's (1970) challenge it seems clear that the implicit epistemic and paradigmatic shift within current forensics practice is not without consequence. Many of the questions posed in this essay remain unanswered, yet the answers will come with time as intercollegiate forensics continues along its current trajectory. I hope that this essay will aid the reader in contributing to the ongoing dialogue resulting from the shifts already evident in current forensics practice and pedagogy.

Works Cited

- Beardsley, M. C. (1980). Right readings and good readings. *Literature in Performance*, 1, 10-22.
- Campbell, P. N. (1971). Communication aesthetics. *Speech Teacher*, 20, 263-274.
- Clark, S. H. (1915). Interpretation of the printed page. In C. Lee & T. Gura (Eds.), *Oral interpretation*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Conquergood, D. (1986). Performance and dialogical understanding: In quest of the

- other. In J. Palmer (Ed.), *Communication as performance*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University.
- Ferment and fragmentation in the field. (1983). *Journal of Communication*, 33.
- Fine, E. C. (1984). *The folklore text: From performance to print*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1980). Truth and subjectivity. In J. Miller, *The passion of Michelle Foucault*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- Geertz, C. (1971). *Myth, Symbol, and Culture*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Hartman, B., & Alho, B. (1979). The power of common experience: The living text. *Readers Theater News*, 7, 5-6, 18, 48.
- Kirch, M. & Zeidler, T. (1998, November). Performance style vs. textual substance: Elocutionism reincarnated in the contemporary practice of oral interpretation. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Communication Association.
- Kuhn, T. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolution*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lee, C., & Gura, T. (1997). *Oral interpretation*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Myerhoff, B. (1984). A death in due time: Construction of self and culture in ritual drama. In J. J. MacAloon (Ed.), *Rite, drama, festival, spectacle: Rehearsals toward a theory of cultural performance*. Philadelphia, PA: Institute for the Study of Human Issues.
- Pelias, R. J., & VanOosting, J. (1987). A paradigm for performance studies. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 73, 219-231.
- Shteir, R. (June 14, 1998). Making Juliet one of the guys in a macho Verona. *The New York Times* (Section 2; Page 6; Column 1).
- Speer, J. (1985). Walking o' the web: Women's folk performances in the Scottish isles. *Literature in Performance*, 6, 24-33.
- Stern, C., & Henderson, B. (1993). *Performance: Texts and contexts*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Strine, M. S., Long, B. W., & Hopkins, M. F. (1990). Research in interpretation and performance studies: Trends, issues, priorities. In G. Phillips & J. Wood (Eds.), *Speech communication: Essays to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Speech Communication Association*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Taft-Kaufman, J. (1983). Deconstructing the text: Performance implications. *Literature in Performance*, 4, 55-59.
- Taft-Kaufman, J. (1985). Oral interpretation: Twentieth-century theory and practice. In T. Benson (Ed.), *Speech communication in the twentieth-century*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Wolff, J. (1992). Excess and inhibition: Interdisciplinarity in the study of art. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson, and P. Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural Studies*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Zahner-Roloff, (1986). *The therapies of performance: The Dionysian, Hermetic, and Apollonian archetypes of poetry therapy*. Unpublished manuscript.



Missing