**ENGLISH 781**

**Research Project**

**30 points**

**semester two**

**2018**

**Seminars:** Thursday 9am-11am

**Location: please consult SSO on day of first class**

**Convenor:**  Eluned Summers-Bremner (es.bremner@auckland.ac.nz)

**Supervisors**: Alex Calder

 Lisa Samuels

 Eluned Summers-Bremner

 Sophie Tomlinson

This is a required 30-point course for all BA (Hons) students in English (unless they have been granted approval to undertake a dissertation) and an optional course for 240 pt MA students and PGDAR students. The semester-long course is designed as an intensive experience with collective and solo learning opportunities, including one-on-one supervision. By actively engaging in this course you can:

* expand your knowledge of those methodologies and forms of analysis that underwrite the contemporary field of English;
* enhance your research skills, including those of discovery, analysis, written and oral presentation
* understand the principles and practice of scholarly citation;
* learn how to participate in structured peer review;
* develop an understanding of the mutual expectations of supervision;
* produce an independent research project.

This paper is an ideal preliminary course of study for students intending to go on to a Masters thesis or dissertation or PhD. It can also contribute to your acquiring those skills which are valued by employers of Arts graduates, namely the ability to conceive and implement a project to completion, to conceptualize and clarify a problem and to cogently present the results.

**Assessment:**

**10,000 word Research Project (100%)**

Please note that 781 operates outside of the standard submission and examination timeline. Students have longer to complete the work, and the internal and external assessment process is extended accordingly. We anticipate that final grades will become available to students during December; it is not expected that all grades will be available at the same time.

**Due date: Friday 2 November at 4pm**

**Two hardcopies of your research project must be submitted to the Arts Assignments Centre in the Human Sciences Building by 4pm on Friday 2 November.** **To assist with the assessment process, an electronic copy of your project must also be submitted to the convenor (****es.bremner@auckland.ac.nz****) and copied to your supervisor at this time. You must also submit an electronic copy of your research project to turnitin, via Canvas, by the deadline.**

**There is no possibility of an extension unless a student can evidence exceptional circumstances**

Students unable to meet the deadline due to evidenced exceptional circumstances must formally apply to the Head of Disciplinary Area for an extension, submitting the necessary documentation and a statement of support from their assigned supervisor. Please note that any extension beyond ten days’ duration will require permission from Faculty as well as the Head of Disciplinary Area and will incur additional fees. Students applying for any extension must contact the convenor (Eluned Summers-Bremner) in the first instance.

**HOW ENGLISH 781 WORKS:**

**Full attendance is required.** Across the semester (weeks 1, 3 and 6), specialist-led seminars will cover different aspects of research method and technique, including the writing process from preliminary conception to final presentation.

4 research areas are on offer from 4 supervisors. They are (outlines included pp. 9-18):

Making an Edition: *Landfall* 1947-1966 Alex Calder

Visionary Writing Lisa Samuels

Words and Things: Reliquary Modes and Materialities Eluned Summers-Bremner

Adventures in Adaptation Studies Sophie Tomlinson

The cohort will be divided into 4 peer research clusters.

**How the assignment to research clusters works (Week 1 explained):**

Students are expected to familiarize themselves with the research area outlines and may like to consult sample readings over the inter-semester break. In addition to its focus on time management and project management, our introductory session in Week 1 will supplement the core topic information contained in this document by ensuring that students have an opportunity to put questions to supervisors. **By 6pm on Friday of Week 1 (20 July)**, **students must submit** to the convenor (Eluned Summers-Bremner), via email, an academic transcript and an MS Word document (max 2 x A4 pages) that ranks the available research areas by order of preference. Students must annotate these rankings, detailing the rationale for the rankings, and how students’ current skill sets and interests relate to each research area. All of this information will be taken into account when assigning students to research clusters. While every effort will be made to accommodate student preference, students should be aware that it will not be possible for everyone to be assigned their top choices of research areas. **Students who do not submit their rankings by 6pm on 20 July will be disadvantaged in the allocation process. The outcome of the assignment process will be posted under ‘files’ on Canvas by 9pm on 20 July. As the first class concludes at 11am on Thursday 19 July, students are advised to have a provisional version of their rankings completed prior to class.**

**Starting from Monday of Week 2 (23 July):**

Peer research clusters will be organized around the different research areas, and these student groups will continue to meet with the supervisor in the Thursday morning timeslot (or at a mutually agreed time) in weeks 2, 4 and 5, unless/and until replaced by individual supervision sessions. The course cohort will reconvene in week 3 and week 6, and for the oral presentations of work-in-progress in week 7. As the course progresses, the emphasis will shift to one-on-one supervision. Supervision will come to an end in the week of 22 – 26 October to allow students to prepare essays for final submission at the end of the following week. Students should anticipate meeting individually with supervisors at least three times during the course of the semester. The frequency, length and format of supervision meetings should be agreed between student and supervisor at their first meeting.

**Week 2 is an intense week**, where students need to make as much headway as possible with primary readings for/explorations of their research area. Students should devise for themselves a heavy workload for 23 - 27 July. **By the Wednesday of Week 4 (8 August), students are required to have submitted a mini proposal to their supervisor (250-500 words max)**, outlining the focus of their research project. Written feedback from supervisors is due by email by the end of Monday of Week 5 (13 August). It is expected that proposals will be discussed in the peer cluster meeting in Week 4 and/or in brief individual meetings in Week 4 or 5.

**Schedule for Presentations of work-in-progress** will be confirmed on Monday of Week 6 (20 August): the final week before the mid-semester break. There will be up to ten presentations after the mid-semester break in week 7. Each student will give an 8 minute presentation and field approximately 3 minutes of questions from a staff and peer audience. Our intention is to proceed in quasi-conference conditions, and attendance is strictly required. Presentations should be carefully timed not to exceed 8 minutes, and should contextualize the project, profile research questions or key issues the project will explore, and outline the chosen methodology and the provisional shape of the project. Strategic use of power point is encouraged but not required. The use of sound or video files is restricted to a maximum of 2 mins per presentation. In addition to developing presentation skills, the purpose of the presentations is to ensure that research projects develop in a timely manner.

**By 5pm on Friday of Week 10** (5 October), students need to have loaded a copy of 3,000 words of their current draft into the **peer review tool Aropa** (this is a programme designed by the University of Auckland; no one outside of authorized persons within ENGLISH 781 has access to your material; instructions are available on pp. 19 – 20 of this document). Students will be assigned one submission to peer review. Peer review will be anonymous, and will consist of responses to the following questions:

* What are the strengths of this piece?
* Is the overall organization clear and effective? Might it be improved? If so, where and how?
* Briefly summarise the argument of the piece. Are there specific instances where the clarity of thought/argument suffers? If so, please detail.
* Is the writing clear and effective? If not, are there particular habits that affect the clarity?
* Other comments

No student is to spend longer than 2.5 hours on this review exercise. The purpose of this exercise is to increase your own criticality at a crucial time. By deploying an editorial eye on the work of one of your peers, you will refresh your eyes with regard to your own work as well as provide valuable feedback to your peer. **The deadline for completion of the peer review exercise** **is 4pm Wednesday of Week 11** (10 October).

**Students and supervisors should agree the schedule of submission of draft work across the second half of the semester.**

**No draft work may be submitted to supervisors after 5pm on Friday 19 October (Week 12).**

**Supervision must conclude by the end of the week of 22 - 26 October,** **with final written feedback provided by supervisors** **(in relation to draft work submitted at least one week previously) by the end of that week**.

**Milestone summary:**

* Submission of research area rankings, 6pm Friday Week 1 (20 July)
* Assignment to research clusters, 9pm Friday of Week 1 (20 July)
* Submission of research project mini proposal (250-500 words max), no later than Wednesday of Week 4 (8 August), feedback from supervisors by end of Monday of Week 5 (13 August)
* Presentation of work-in-progress to the whole 781 class in an 8 minute time-period (followed by approx. 3 minutes of questions) under quasi-conference conditions in Week 7
* Submission of 3,000 word draft extract to Aropa by 5pm, Friday of Week 10 (5 October)
* Completion of peer review exercise via Aropa peer review tool, 4pm Wednesday of Week 11 (10 October)
* Final submission of draft work to supervisor before 5pm Friday of Week 12 (19 October)
* Final written feedback from supervisor (in response to work submitted at least one week previously), by end of week 22 - 26 October
* Submission: 4pm Friday 2 November

**Expectations of Academic Performance**

At this level (NZQA 8), academic achievement involves demonstration of the following skills and abilities through self-directed learning and advanced study:

 intellectual independence, analytic rigour, and the ability to understand and evaluate new knowledge and ideas

 the ability to identify topics for research, to plan and conduct research, analyse results, and communicate the findings to the satisfaction of subject experts.

**2018 schedule including required general reading**

**Week 1 [whole class session]**

 **Introduction: Project Management and Research**

 **(facilitators: Summers-Bremner, with Q&A with supervisors: Calder, Samuels, Summers-Bremner and Tomlinson)**

* + - * Introduction and Q&A re: 2018 research areas
			* “thinking versus working”
			* Project management and time management: Weekly Review & Action Plan, Mini Project Plan

 **background reading** (available on JStor)

 Peter Stallybrass, “Against Thinking,” *PMLA* 122.5 (2007): 1580-7.

 Jane Gallop, “The Historicization of Literary Studies and the Fate of Close Reading,” *Profession* (2007): 181-6.

 Please bring copies of Weekly Review & Action plan and Mini Project Plan (in course reader) [under “files” on Canvas]

**Friday 6pm week 1: STUDENTS TO NOMINATE RESEARCH AREAS TO CONVENOR**

**Friday 9pm week 1: STUDENTS ASSIGNED TO RESEARCH AREAS**

**Week 2 peer research cluster meetings with Calder, Samuels, Summers Bremner and Tomlinson**

**Week 3 [whole class session]**

**“research and the writing process”**

**(facilitators: Calder and Summers-Bremner)**

* + - * how we research and write
			* writing as a staged process
			* the purpose of citation

**background reading**

Peter Elbow, ‘The Need for Care: Easy Speaking onto the Page is Never Enough’.

*Please google the above for access*

**Week 4 peer research clusters with Calder, Samuels, Summers Bremner and Tomlinson**

**MINI PROPOSALS DUE WITH SUPERVISORS BY WEDNESDAY WEEK 4**

**Week 5 peer research clusters with Calder, Samuels, Summers Bremner and Tomlinson**

**Week 6 [whole class session]**

**“supervision, peer review and oral presentations”**

 **(facilitators: Samuels, Summers-Bremner)**

* + - * supervision protocols and practice
			* how to give and take constructive criticism
			* oral presentation skills

**background reading**

Expectations in supervision worksheet (see “files” on Canvas)

 Peer review guidelines. Adapted from Martin Maner, *The Research Process: A Complete Guide and Reference for Writers*, second edition (Mountain View, CA: Mayfield, 2000). (see “files” on Canvas)

Oral presentation on-line tutorial, Cain Project in Engineering and Professional Communication, Rice University. Available at:

<http://www.ruf.rice.edu/~comcoach/>

**MID-SEMESTER BREAK (27 August – 7 September incl.)**

**Weeks 7-13 individual supervision (as arranged: baseline recommendation is three meetings in response to three submissions of draft work)**

**Week 7 oral presentation of work-in-progress (streams TBA)**

**Thursday 13 September**

**Week 10 submission of current draft to Aropa for peer review by 5pm Friday**

**Friday 5 October**

**Week 11 completion of peer review exercise by 4pm Wednesday**

**Wednesday 10 October**

**Week 12 final submission of draft work to supervisor before 5pm Friday**

**Friday 19 October**

**Week 13 supervision concludes; final written feedback from supervisor by end of week**

**Friday 26 October**

**Friday 2 November submission of research project by 4pm**

**Important University Notices (Research Area Information Begins on Next Page)**

**Students are urged to discuss privately any impairment-related requirements face-to-face and/or in written form with the course convenor and supervisor.**

**Plagiarism**

The University of Auckland will not tolerate cheating, or assisting others to cheat, and views cheating in coursework as a serious academic offence. The work that a student submits for grading must be the student’s own work, reflecting his or her learning. Where work from other sources is used, it must be properly acknowledged and referenced. This requirement also applies to sources on the world-wide web. A student’s assessed work may be reviewed against electronic source material using computerised detection mechanisms. Upon reasonable request, students may be required to provide an electronic version of their work for computerised review.

For further information see: <https://www.auckland.ac.nz/en/about/teaching-learning/academic-integrity/tl-about-academic-integrity.html>

**Complaint procedure**

In the first instance, students or the class representative should take any concerns they have with their course delivery or assessment to the supervisor or convenor concerned. In the event that the matter is not resolved satisfactorily at an informal level, students or the class representative should approach the Head of Disciplinary Area with a formal statement of their complaint. For advocacy and advice see the AUSA Student Advice Hub.

**Other Sources of Learning and Assistance**

**CANVAS**

YOU MUST HAVE CANVAS ACCESS FOR THIS CLASS

**The responsibility for receiving CANVAS announcement lies with the student.**

**Email is now an official source of communication between the university and the student. The University does not accept the excuse that you did not receive messages.**

**Copyright Warning Notice**

**Copyright material is protected by copyright and has been copied by and solely for the educational purposes of the University under licence for use. You may not sell, alter or further reproduce or distribute any part of this material to any other person. Where provided to you in electronic format, you may only print from it for your own private study and research. Failure to comply with the terms of this warning may expose you to legal action for copyright infringement and/or disciplinary action by the University.**

**Research Area 1: Making an Edition: *Landfall*, 1947-1966**

**Facilitator: Alex Calder**

Otago University Press have recently issued a digital archive of the first twenty years of the New Zealand literary magazine, *Landfall,* edited by Charles Brasch. It covers the years 1947 to 1966.

<http://www.landfallarchive.org/omeka/exhibits/show/landfallthefirsttwentyears/landfallthefirsttwentyears>

Your main research output will be to produce a scholarly edition of your choice based on a selection of this material. Your edition might cover all the works by a single author or contain a selection of authors; it might focus on a genre or a theme; it might examine the terms of a debate from or about the period; it might deal with writers who have become canonical or those who have been forgotten; it might be interested in ephemera (such as letters to editors or notes on current affairs) or the first appearance of a work or works of enduring value.

Your edition will require original research into the circumstances and contexts of your chosen texts, a bibliographical note with an explanation of any principles of selection, an introductory essay, a carefully proofed version of the text, along with explanatory annotations for the general reader.

As a result of doing this project, you will understand the principles and practices of scholarly editing, you will be able to prepare material to a standard ready for publication, you will develop a general knowledge of New Zealand Literature of the period and an in-depth knowledge of some aspect of it.

**Key readings:**

Besides the archive itself, you will need to be familiar with critical writing on the period (see in particular books by Patrick Evans, Alex Calder, John Newton, and Peter Simpson as well as the literary histories edited by Terry Sturm and, more recently, Mark Williams). You should know what anthologists have made of material from this period. You should check out biographies, journals (especially those of Charles Brasch) and editions of letters by writers from this period.

**Key output:** an introduced, fully annotated critical edition or anthology. The edition may be of any length but it must be suitable for the task at hand. Your own written work on the edition should amount to 10,000 to 12,000 words, at least half of which should form a critical introductory essay. While the finished edition should be of a publishable standard, you should be aware that copyright restrictions may limit your further use of the material.



**Research Area 2: Visionary Writing**

**Facilitator: Lisa Samuels**

Choose Option 1 or 2 and one of the texts indicated. Students develop their research focus within the topical opportunities provided by their chosen text.

**Option 1**

Contemporary life writing experiments by women, including autography and spiritual autobiography and cultural identity. Option 1 focuses on the self performed in and as words, non-verbal images (illustrations, e.g.), location and displacement, genre and transgenre effects, and identity in contest. Text options:

Gloria Anzaldúa, Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza (1987). Translingual (English with some Spanish) essays and poetry (USA/Mexico/Mestiza).

Don Mee Choi. *Hardly War*. Wave Books 2016. Multi-media, multi-genre, some translingualism, political-conflict emphasis (South Korea).

Emelihter Kileng. My Urohs. Kahuaomānoa Press 2008. Translingual poetry (Micronesia/Pohnpeian).

Lyn Hejinian, *My Life.* 1987; 2nd ed. Green Integer 2002. Prose poetry/procedural form, part of the 1970s-1980s “Language poetry” movement (USA).

Lisa Robertson, *Lisa Robertson’s Magenta Soul Whip*. Coach House 2005. Poetry (Canada).

Leslie Scalapino, *Dahlia’s Iris: Secret Autobiography and Fiction*. Fiction Collective 2003. Experimental fiction blended with the Tibetan “secret autobiography” form (USA).

**Option 2**

The text as visionary experience: poetry and mixed-genre texts that seek to establish new bases for relations between language and social myths. Text options:

Johannes Heldén and Håkan Jonson, *Evolution* (2014), bilingual digital literature (Swedish and English) in the appearance of a book form, at <http://www.textevolution.net/> (Sweden).

David Kārena-Holmes, *From the Antipodes* (Maungatua 2002, revised 2003). Poetry (Aotearoa/New Zealand).

Nathaniel Mackey, *Whatsaid Serif*. City Lights, 1998. Poetry focused in Dogon cosmology and stutter-rhythms (USA).

Laura Riding, *The Life of the Dead* (1933, images & English/French poems). Translingual poetry & ekphrasis (USA/transAtlantic).

Gertrude Stein, *Tender Buttons* (1914; new Broadview edition 2018 edited by Leonard Diepeveen). Prose poetry involved with perception and phenomenological encounter (USA/transAtlantic).

William Carlos Williams, *Spring & All* (1923). Prosimetra (prose and poetry) (USA/Puerto Rico).

**Skills**

Define a project’s parameters and central research question

Create and use a critical research bibliography

Develop an understanding of styles in and distinctions among literary genres, other artistic forms, and academic expositions

Research as part of a team and as a self-directed scholar

Produce a well-written 10-12K-word explication with an abstract of 100-150 words

**Writing style specifications**

The majority of the project must be produced in the style of normative academic prose that launches and develops a focused argument. Regulatory requirements permit a maximum of 2,000 words of this thesis to be “creative.”

Use the “three levels of criticality” below to organize and evaluate the different layers of your academic prose exposition.

**Detail**: the level of close attention. A critical writer who specializes in detail reading shows a strong ability to move patiently through a sample of relevant work and demonstrate clearly how aspects of that sample are relevant to the analytic, evaluative, or scholarly questions of the essay topic. The aspects attended to in such detail work might include (but are not limited to) diction, syntax, grammar, images, symbols, close point of view, page area, line length, language sounds, material, paratext(s), local structure (phrases, lines, work at and within the level of the paragraph or single image or sound, for example), formal genre manifestations, typography, screen restriction, codework, haptics (aspects of the feel of the codex or the responsiveness of a screen, e.g.), translingual examples and more.

**Middle ground**: the level of context, comparison, overall production. A critical writer who specializes in middle ground work can elucidate relevant details about the production of a particular work or type of work. Such a writer has strength in perceiving how cultural or technical circumstances can give rise to and can be perceived in certain kinds of work. A middle ground critical sensibility often finds interesting stories to tell about cultural movements/circumstances or bibliographic/other technological aspects of a work or type of production. Middle ground work can also involve comparatives or generalisations across one whole work (how verbs are used, how paragraphs function, how interfaces are set up, etc) and/or between one work and another for a particular writer or situated genre, and/or the ability to generalize about genre and/or techne shifts in a time and place and/or for a particular writer or collaborative enterprise.

**Big picture**: the overall effect of your engagement with the text(s) at hand in the context of the essay topic. In research essays, big picture thinking is particularly important at two moments: in brainstorming, in early stages of formulating your research essay, you can imagine what your “big picture” implications might be – you can hypothesize without deciding exactly, you can have a fuzzy big picture. Later, when you are drafting your essay having decided your approach and emphases, your big picture should become state-able. This state-able big picture is sometimes called a thesis, although your big picture implications may not be as singular as a one-sentence thesis statement. Whatever your essay organization, when you come to the end of your full essay draft, you should be able to summarize your big picture implications with a few sentences.

This process is why – for the advice given in this supervision – you should write introductions LAST, after you have shaped the essay as a whole and begun to get big picture clarity. In revision, the big picture is probably the zone in which a cool head and readiness to describe the implications of your work is most important. The delight of open critical thinking is turned to the stage of a single critical production and its performed boundaries, and you are able to (re)shape your detail work and middle ground work in accordance with increased big picture clarity.

**Research Area 3: Words and Things: Reliquary Modes and Materialities (Medieval and Contemporary options)**

**Facilitator: Eluned Summers-Bremner**

A reliquary is normally understood as a material structure (box, purse, shaped body part, or shrine) containing another thing of significant value, such as the bone of a saint or dust or air from a tomb. Yet reliquaries embody contradiction, as many of the things they contain are seldom, if ever, seen. In the European Middle Ages the lavishly jewelled exterior of a reliquary teaches viewers that the object it contains is more precious than this—a strange claim, to us, given that the object is usually in some physically decomposed, or decomposing, form. The medieval reliquary’s component parts offer complex lessons not only about the object they contain, however, but also about how to read the reliquary itself. In this respect reliquaries are self-interrupting, or self-reflexive, things.

Since for medieval writers and artists, letters—and, by implication, words—are things invented to help us remember other things (Isidore of Seville), a poem can also function, if not as a reliquary, then in a reliquary mode or manner. Activities poems routinely do, such as give a material entity a strange new shape or property, or stimulate our imaginations by saying what a thing is not so we will imagine alternative forms, are also enacted by medieval and pre-medieval reliquaries. Our word invention, associated in the post-Romantic era with the work of poets and artists, means, at root, ‘a finding’, and derives from the surprising actions relics may perform.

This topic offers the opportunity to read the work of one of three poets (one fourteenth-century, two twentieth- and twenty-first-), with reference to the principles of reliquary construction, in which word and/or image frames offer a variety of ways in which to envisage or encounter objects, and often raise questions about what kinds of material beings living humans are, in turn.

You may choose from the following suggested text options. **It may be possible to work on another writer in consultation with me.** Your investigation of the writer’s work should be supported by research into some aspects of the operation of relics and reliquary texts. You might, for instance, consider some of the poems in Simic’s *Dismantling the Silence* with reference to contact relics, in which an ordinary object is transformed by its encounter with another object now absent. Or you might consider how the opaque forms of description in some of Graham’s poems reconfigure or ‘stage’ our access to a natural object or element, and, in doing so, change our understanding of its form.

**Option 1: Geoffrey Chaucer**

***The House of Fame* (1379-80)**

Amidst the violence of Richard II’s London, Chaucer writes *The House of Fame*, an unfinished poem in which architectural, pictorial, verbal and dream narrative frames open onto a scene in which words attack humans, and the authority who might explain the poem’s meaning does not appear. Although a secular work, *The House of Fame*, like a reliquary, invites us to consider what a material object is, by referring to or dramatising objects whose materiality is strange or difficult for fourteenth-century listeners to understand, including glass, ice, words, clouds, winds and hail. Researchers taking this option might study the contemporaneous properties of any of the materials the poem describes, and will need to address some aspect of the relation between frame and object. It is not necessary to be proficient in reading Middle English in order to take this option, as the poem can be read in modern verse translation.

**Option 2: Charles Simic**

**Poems from *Dismantling the Silence* (1971), *Weather Forecast for Utopia and Vicinity: Poems 1967-1982* (1983)**

As Richard Howard writes, ‘in Simic’s poetry we do not concern or belong to each other or even ourselves, but to our objects—shoes, food—which know our bodies as only the spoon can know the mouth’ (Preface to *Dismantling the Silence*). Additionally, Simic’s early poetry radically defamiliarises the world by making things we are not accustomed to regard as things—such as wind, gravity, a forest, or silence—into objects requiring certain actions of us. Researchers taking this option might investigate any aspect of the relation between words and matter in the early poetry, incorporating some form of address to the history of relics and/or reliquary texts.

**Option 3: Jorie Graham**

**Poems from *The Errancy* (1997), *Swarm* (2000), *The Dream of the Unified Field: Selected Poems 1974-1994* (2002)**

Readers note that Jorie Graham creates many frames pertaining to vision in her poetry, and relentlessly complicates or deconstructs them so that the event or object so framed takes on strange new qualities. Yet in her belief that linguistic forms have, over time, come to represent an imperialist logic that threatens our habitation of the planet, Graham might also be described as an apocalyptic—or perhaps anti-apocalyptic—poet. The power of the reliquary form in the medieval west is sometimes described similarly. The prospect of likely eternal damnation produces fear, hope and wonder in believers and generates a prolific re-animation of the world, in which past, present and future are reconfigured, often in the face of cataclysmic natural or supernatural events. Researchers who take this option might explore any aspect of the relation of matter or event to frame in Graham, with reference to some aspect of reliquary form or method.

**Skills developed:**

- Defining a project’s parameters and central research questions

- Creating and deploying a critical research bibliography

- Developing an understanding of the distinctions between current or recent and historically earlier artistic forms

- Developing an understanding of the distinctions between current or recent and pre-modern models of learning and perception as they inform the non-literary texts relevant to the topic

- Working effectively as part of a team and as a self-directed scholar

**Preliminary Recommended Reading (bolded entries sample reading for pre-semester review):**

Martina Bagnoli et al (ed.), *Treasures of Heaven: Saints, Relics and Devotion in Medieval Europe* (London: British Museum Press, 2011).

Claire Barbetti, *Ekphrastic Medieval Visions: A New Discussion in Interarts Theory* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp. 48-79.

Robert Bartlett, *How Can the Dead Do Such Great Things? Saints and Worshippers from the Martyrs to the Reformation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013).

Peter Brown, *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981).

Caroline Walker Bynum, *Christian Materiality: An Essay on Religion in Late Medieval Europe* (New York: Zone Books, 2011).

Michael Camille, *The Gothic Idol: Ideology and Image-Making in Medieval Art* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

Seeta Chaganti, *The Medieval Poetics of the Reliquary: Enshrinement, Inscription, Performance* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), pp. 1-18.

Geoffrey Chaucer, ‘The House of Fame’, in *The Riverside Chaucer*, 3rd edn., ed. Larry D. Benson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 347-74.

Modern verse translation available at:

[*http://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/English/Fame.htm*](http://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/English/Fame.htm)

Charles Freeman, *Holy Bones, Holy Dust: How Relics Shaped the History of Medieval Europe* (New Haven, CT.: Yale University Press, 2011).

Jorie Graham, *The Errancy* (New York: Ecco Press, 1997).

\_\_\_\_\_\_, *Swarm* (New York: Ecco Press, 2000).

\_\_\_\_\_\_, *The Dream of the Unified Field: Selected Poems 1974-1994* (New York: Ecco Press, 2002).

**Cynthia Hahn, *Strange Beauty: Issues in the Making and Meaning of Reliquaries, 400-circa 1204* (University Park, PA.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2012). [available library]**

V. A. Kolve, ‘God-Denying Fools’, in *Telling Images: Chaucer and the Imagery of Narrative II* (Stanford, CA.: Stanford University Press, 2009), pp. 226-39.

Robyn Malo, *Relics and Writing in Late Medieval England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013).

Charles Simic, *Weather Forecast for Utopia and Vicinity: Poems 1967-1982* (Station Hill, NY: Ecco Press, 1983).

\_\_\_\_\_\_, *Dismantling the Silence* (New York: Braziller, 1971).

Gustaf Sobin, ‘Relics’, in *Ladder of Shadows: Reflecting on Medieval Vestige in Provence and Languedoc* (Berkeley, CA.: University of California Press, 2009), pp. 35-43.

A. C. Spearing, *Medieval Dream Poetry* [1976] (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 73-89.

Willard Spiegelman, ‘Jorie Graham’s “New Way of Looking”’, in *How Poets See the World: The Art of Description in Contemporary Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

**Daniel Tiffany, ‘Lyric Substance: On Riddles, Materialism, and Poetic Obscurity’, *Critical Inquiry* 28.1 (2001), pp. 72-98. [available through library website]**

Marion Turner, *Chaucerian Conflict: Languages of Antagonism in Late Fourteenth-Century London* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Bruce Weigl, ed., *Charles Simic: Essays on the Poetry* (Ann Arbor, MI.: University of Michigan Press, 1996).

**Research Area 4: Adventures in Adaptation Studies**

**Facilitator: Sophie Tomlinson**

**Background**

‘It is one brain, literature’, mused Virginia Woolf in a letter to Vita Sackville-West . . . ‘Literature is all one brain.’[[1]](#footnote-1) To put it in a more literary-critical way, ‘Authors . . . do not really create in any literal sense, but rather produce texts through complex processes of adaptation and transformation’.[[2]](#footnote-2) Some of the most compelling fictions of recent decades - novelistic, dramatic, musical and cinematic - are premised upon creative reworking or generic mutation. Of particular interest and importance for us are what Julie Sanders describes as adaptations’ and appropriations’ ‘capacity for creativity, and for comment and critique’ (160).

**Task**

In consultation with Sophie, students will choose a substantial work (or cluster of works) from those listed below and examine ‘the intertextual relationships between appropriations and their sources’ (Sanders 160).If you have a burning desire to write on a specific cluster of texts other than those listed, I am open to suggestion. Shakespeare, Marlowe, Middleton etc. are my primary field of expertise, so I am happy to consider adaptation projects in this area: for ideas, consult the anthology *Adaptations of Shakespeare*, ed. Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier (Routledge, 2000), or email me with your thoughts.

**Skills developed**

In her New Critical Idiom study *Adaptation and Appropriation*, Julie Sanders makes the point that the discipline of English Literature ‘thrives on the practices of reading ‘alongside’, of comparison and contrast, and of identifying intertexts and analogues’ that are central to Adaptation Studies (160). In this module, you will extend and develop those practices in relation to a primary source (in some cases, this is history itself) and its creative offshoots in novels, plays, poetry, films, musical, and opera. Obviously you will need to select texts and offshoots with which you feel comfortable: however, although several of the works are musical in form, *this topic is literary in emphasis* – you do not need special skills of musical analysis to write intelligently about opera, although if you do have such skills (or simply an appreciation of music), they will undoubtedly inform and enhance your research project. Beyond the practices described above by Sanders, this project will entail construction and critical deployment of a research bibliography; critical thinking and argumentation about intertextuality and influence; close reading and interpretation of written, cinematic or musical texts; effective oral and written presentation of critical and documentary materials.

**Novels**

Jane Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, 1813

Geraldine Brooks, *Year of Wonders: A Novel of the Plague*, 2001

Charles Dickens, *Great Expectations*, 1861

Lloyd Jones, *Mister Pip,* Penguin, 2006

Sarah Laing, *Mansfield and Me: A Graphic Memoir*, Victoria University Press, 2016

Bill Manhire, *The Brain of Katherine Mansfield*, Auckland University Press, 1988

Ian McEwan, *Atonement*, 2001, Anchor Books, 2003

Herman Melville, *Billy Budd, Sailor*, posthumously published 1924

Sue Roe, *Estella, Her Expectations*, Harvester, 1982

C. K. Stead, *Mansfield*, Vintage, 2004

**Plays**

‘Biyi Bandele, *Oroonoko*, Amber Lane Press, 1999, adapting Aphra Behn’s novella *Oroonoko, or The Royal Slave: A True History*, 1688 (Norton, 1997, ed. Joanna Lipking)

Bertolt Brecht, *The Life of Galileo*, 1937-9

Vincent O’Sullivan, *Jones & Jones*, VUP, 1989

Claire Tomalin, *The Winter Wife* (London: Hern, 1991), play about the relationship between Katherine Mansfield and her friend Ida Baker (L.M.), who was in love with her.

Timberlake Wertenbaker, *Our Country’s Good*, 1988, based on the novel *The Playmaker* by Australian Thomas Keneally, 1987

**Poetry**

T.S. Eliot, *Old Possum’s Book of Practical Cats*, first illustrated edition, Nicholas Bentley drew the pictures, Faber and Faber, 1940

**Films**

Andrew Adamson (dir. and screenwriter), *Mr. Pip*, 2012

Gurinder Chadha (dir.), *Bride and Prejudice*, 2004

Claire Denis (dir.), *Beau Travail*, 1998, French film loosely based on Melville’s *Billy Budd*

Michael Grandage(dir.), *Billy Budd*, Glyndebourne Festival Opera (2010, 2 DVD set)

Peter Ustinov (dir. and screenwriter, with DeWitt Bodeen), *Billy Budd*, 1962, adapted from Melville’s novel, *Billy Budd*

Andrew Lloyd Webber (dir. and composer), *Cats,* musical to video,1998

Joe Wright (dir.), screenplay by Christopher Hampton, *Atonement*, 2007

**Musical / Opera**

Benjamin Britten (composer), E.M. Forster and Eric Crozier (librettists), *Billy Budd*, 1951, revised 2-act version first broadcast 1960, produced 1964

Witi Ihimaera (librettist) and John Rimmer (composer), *Galileo,* produced at the University of Auckland, 1998, 2002. Parts of this work can be accessed via the SOUNZ Centre for New Zealand Music website <http://sounz.org.nz/works/show/15991>. CDs of the electroacoustic music, a PDF of the vocal score with libretto, the visuals and a video documentary may be borrowed by members of the Sounds New Zealand Library (join via the SOUNZ website). See also Ihimaera’s contribution to *Are Angels OK? The Parallel Universes of New Zealand Writers and Scientists,* ed. Paul Callaghan and Bill Manhire (VUP, 2006), pp. 135-96. There is an earlier opera, *Galileo Galilei* (2002) by American composer Philip Glass.

Trevor Nunn (dir.), Andrew Lloyd Webber (composer), *Cats*, 1981

Tim Watts, *Kepler’s Trial: An Opera,* based on historian Ulinka Rublack’s book *The Astronomer and the Witch* with film elements by Aura Satz, performed at the Cambridge University Festival of Ideas, 2016; see keplers-trial.com and festivalofideas.cam.ac.uk. The latter website mentions an online film of the Cambridge production. There is an opera based on Kepler’s life and work by Philip Glass (*Kepler*, 2012).

**Further Reading**

Brian Boyd, ‘Making Adaptation Studies Adaptive’ in *The Oxford Handbook of Adaptation Studies*, ed. Thomas Leitch (OUP, 2017)

Judith Dale, ‘Performing Katherine Mansfield’, *Landfall* 172 (1989), 503-11.

Linda Hutcheon, *A Theory of Adaptation,* Routledge, 2006, second edition, 2013

Thomas M Leitch, *Film Adaptation and its Discontents*, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007

Brian McFarlane, *Novel to Film: An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation,* Oxford University Press, 1996

Sanders, Julie Sanders, *Adaptation and Appropriation*, New Critical Idiom, Routledge, 2006

Sophie Tomlinson, ‘Mans-Field in Book Form, *Landfall* 156 (1985), 465-89.

— Editorial, *Landfall* 172 (1989), 391-6.

**AROPA INSTRUCTIONS**

**To do in week 9 [please do not attempt this before week 9]**

In preparation for the commencement of the peer review exercise in week 10, it is important that any IT problems are sorted in week 9. To ensure you have the necessary access to the system, please undertake the following steps. Please note that you will need to use firefox or safari as your internet browser.

* Please log on to https://aropa.auckland.ac.nz/aropa.php placing your upi in the first box and ENGLISH781 (all one continuous entry) in the second box.
* When you log in the first time, you will be asked to change your password. Please do so immediately so that you can secure your account.

If you have used aropa before, you will not be able to log in using ENGLISH781 as a temporary password.  You will need your existing password, which is likely to be your standard password for Canvas. If your standard password does not work, and you have forgotten your existing aropa password, please notify Eluned Summers-Bremner who will arrange for your password to be reset.

Once you have changed your password (or successfully logged in as an existing user), you will see a page that contains an active link to ENGLISH 781 2018. When you click on this it will take you to a link to the peer review exercise, which will then take you to an upload page.  If anyone has problems getting to the upload page, please let Eluned know before the end of week 9.

**Submissions/uploads are due by 5pm on the Friday of week 10 (5 October).**

**To do in weeks 10-11**

When you click on ENGLISH 781 2018 and ‘peer review exercise’, it will take you to the upload page. The system will not allow you to submit work after 5pm on Friday 5 October.

Uploads must be in the form of MS Word or PDF documents.

From 6pm on Friday 5 October, you will be able to access a randomly assigned submission. Aropa works on a principle of ‘passing to the left’. This means that the review of your work is not conducted by the person whose work you review.

From 6pm on 5 October, when you click on ‘peer review exercise’, you will be able to access both the assigned submission and the response template. You will be asked to respond to the questions identified on p. 3 of this course document.

Remember that no one is to spend more than 2.5 hours on this entire review exercise (hence the 3,000 word limit on the draft material submitted).

You are strongly advised to write your response in MS Word and then copy and paste into Aropa when you are happy with it. Remember that Aropa is not compatible with google chrome or internet explorer. If you are using firefox as your browser, rather than safari, you will need to use ‘ctrl v’ to paste your peer review response into Aropa.

Clicking “save” on the review page will mark the review as complete. However, you can still modify your review until the reviewing period ends (4pm Wednesday 10 October).

If you experience any problems accessing your partner’s submission or the response fields, you must notify Eluned ASAP.

**Reviews are due 4pm Wednesday Week 11 (10 October)**

1. *Letters of Virginia Woolf*, ed. Nigel Nicolson, vol. 4, 1929-31, Hogarth Press, 1978, 8 Jan 1929 (p.4). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Mark Rose, *Authors and Owners: The Invention of Copywright* (1993), p.8. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)