COURSE UNIT (MODULE) DESCRIPTION

Course unit (module) title	Code
Literary Theory and Practice **Literatūros teorija ir praktika**	

Lecturer(s)	Department(s) where the course unit (module) is delivered
Coordinator: Dr. R. Šlapkauskaitė **Other(s):**	English Philology Faculty of Philology

Study cycle	Type of the course unit (module)
BA	Compulsory

Mode of delivery	Period when the course unit (module) is delivered	Language(s) of instruction
Lectures and seminars	Autumn (5)	English

Requirements for students	
Prerequisites: A very good command of English (B2/C1)	**Additional requirements (if any):** Introduction to Literary Theory

Course (module) volume in credits	Total student's workload	Contact hours	Self-study hours
5	150	32+16+2 (exam)	100

Purpose of the course unit (module): programme competences to be developed
This reading-intensive course introduces students to debates around issues, perspectives, and critical practices concerning the study and theorising of the nature and status of literature as a textual and cultural phenomenon. The course will introduce the students to key questions in contemporary theory and their historical roots and to seminal works by philosophers, creative writers, and literary scholars who have largely defined the Western idea of literary and critical discourse (e.g. Plato, Aristotle, neoclassical, Romantic, and modern thinkers). While by no means exhaustive, the course will examine a range of methodological approaches to poetic language and critical discourse (e.g. Formalism, Structuralism, Phenomenology, Hermeneutics, Deconstruction, New Historicism, Reader Response theory, Ecocriticism) and invite the students to rethink and discuss different views as well as measure their limitations in the analysis of selected literary texts. Last, but not least, the course aims to *skill up* the students in creative modes of thought and critical engagement that prepares them for the challenges of the regenerative economy, biosphere stewardship, and ecological responsibility which the Anthropocene calls for.

Learning outcomes of the course unit (module)	Teaching and learning methods	Assessment methods
Generic competences: 1. ability to set goals, choose and use resources necessary for the completion of a task, plan their time and follow deadlines; 2. ability to take responsibility for their work / study results and learn from mistakes. 3. ability to work in a team by setting common goals, sharing information, and looking for solutions together; 4. ability to motivate other team members to achieve common goals. 5. ability to understand the specifics of different cultures and to analyse and assess cultural	Problem-oriented; historical-cultural; comparative analysis; engaging lecture; seminar;	Written exam Possible points for seminar work (at the instructor's discretion)

contexts;

6. ability to study, work, and communicate with people from different cultural backgrounds and develop awareness, respect, and openness to cultural diversity;
7. ability to identify problems by finding, analysing, and critically assessing relevant information, generate new ideas, choose the most optimal solutions.
8. familiarity not only with the changes taking place in their field of interest, but also their causes, challenges, opportunities;
9. openness to new ideas, strive to change, and be creative and innovative;
10. ability to evaluate the quality of their actions and achievements and will strive to acquire the competencies necessary for future change.

Subject-specific competences Students 1. should know, understand and be able to describe literature as a phenomenon and properly use and interpret the basic concepts and terms of literary studies; 2. should acquire knowledge of the main branches and methods of literary studies. 3. should be able to analyse, interpret and evaluate the phenomena of English literature in the wider context of world literature, using appropriate terminology and methods. 4. should be able to use modern information technologies, data resources and research resources to conduct linguistic and literary analysis of English texts and present the results of analysis and/or interpretation to the public in order to contribute to the practical applicability of English philology studies (corpora, dictionaries, term banks and glossaries, thematic websites, literature maps, etc.).	Individual work: • Reading of research articles • Reading of primary texts • Written assignments Work in class: • Thought mapping • In-class discussion • Tasks on writing (e.g. building an argument) • Peer-evaluation tasks	

Content: breakdown of the topics	Contact hours							Self-study work: time and assignments	
	Lectures	Tutorials	Seminars	Exercises	Laboratory work	Internship/work placement	Contact hours	Self-study hours	Assignments
1. The aims and scope of the course. The problem of literary discourse. M. H. Abrams's types of literary theory: mimetic, expressive, pragmatic, objective	4		2						**Lecture references**: M. H.

theories. Mimetic theory: Plato and Aristotle. The notion of *mimesis*: imitation and representation. Plato's *Republic*. The allegory of the cave. Plato's critique of poetry. Plato's *Ion*: poetry and rhapsody. Divine possession vs. Harold Bloom's *anxiety of influence*. Plato's legacy and challenge to literary theory. Aristotle's *Poetics* and defence of *mimesis*. History vs. poetry. The primacy of plot: the principle of necessity, probability, and inevitability. Episodic plot vs. Aristotelian plot: *post hoc* vs. *propter hoc*. The structure of the tragic plot. Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex* and *hamartia*. *Catharsis*: purgation, purification, clarification. Aristotle's legacy: system of genres, notion of *decorum*, poetic ranking. Contemporary rethinking *mimesis*: René Girard's notion of *mimetic rivalry* and the social origin of violence.										Abrams, "Orientation of Critical Theories" (p. 3-29) Book IX from Plato's *Republic;* (pp. 344-362) René Girard on the concept of *mimesis*: "Introduction" and "Chapter 17" from *A Theatre of Envy. William Shakespeare*. (p. 3-7; 152-159). **N.B.** Revise Aristotle's *Poetics* as read in Year 1. **Seminar texts:** Umberto Eco, "On Some Functions of Literature" from *On Literature* (p. 1-15);
2. Neoclassicism and the legacy of classical thought. Mimetic theory vs. pragmatic theory. Aristotle's *Poetics* and Horace's *Ars Poetica*. Poetry vs. criticism. The notion of *decorum*. *Dulce et utile*. Horace's rules for drama and for the poet. Horace's legacy. Longinus' *On the Sublime*. Longinus' rules for poetry and poet. The notion of *techne*. Longinus's critique of Plato. Philip Sidney's *An Apology for Poetry*: defence of literature and rebuttal of Plato's critique.	3									**Lecture references**: Longinus, *On the Sublime;* (p. 99-158) Horace, *Ars Poetica* (http://www.poetryfoundation.org/learning/essay/237830) Philip Sidney "An Apology for Poetry" (p. 3-49).
3. Edmund Burke and Immanuel Kant: subject vs. object; perception and aesthetic response; imagination vs. judgment; synthesis vs. analysis. Longinian *sublime* vs. Burkean *sublime*. The notion of aesthetic taste. The *sublime* vs. the *beautiful*. Kant's *Critique of Judgment*. Cognitive judgment vs. aesthetic judgment. The notion of *purposeless purpose*. The beautiful vs. the pleasurable. The beautiful vs. the good. Aesthetic judgment as a subjective universality. The Kantian	3									**Lecture references:** Edmund Burke, *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Sublime and Beautiful*

catharsis. Sianne Ngai and contemporary aesthetics: *cute*, *interesting*, *zany*.										(p. 13-73); Immanuel Kant, "Analytic of Aesthetic Judgement" from *Critique of Judgement* (p. 35-164)
4. The origins of Romanticism: Rousseau's *Confessions*, the French Revolution (1789), Wordsworth and Coleridge, *Lyrical Ballads*. Schiller's "aesthetic education": German Romanticism vs. English Romanticism. Romantic epistemology and its contradictions: mimesis vs. transformation. Wordsworth's notion of defamiliarization and "the real language of men". Coleridge's idea of "the willing suspension of disbelief". Edgar Allan Poe's "The Philosophy of Composition". Keats's notions of "the egotistical sublime" and "negative capability". Shelley's *Defence of Poetry* and his rebuttal of Plato's critique. Death and art: Federico Garcia Lorca's notion of *duende*.	3									**Lecture references**: William Wordsworth, "Preface to *Lyrical Ballads*" (p. 241-272); Percy Bysshe Shelley "A Defence of Poetry" (p. 225-255); Edgar Allan Poe, "Philosophy of Composition" (p. 1-8) Federico Garcia Lorca, "Theory and Play of the Duende" (p. 3-23).
5. New Criticism and objective theories. Matthew Arnold as poet and critic. "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time": creative vs. critical faculties; epoch of expansion vs. epoch of concentration. Arnold and Eliot as precursors of objective theories. Literature as a "disinterested endeavour" and Kant's *purposeless purpose*. The idea of literary canon. Eliot's "Tradition and the Individual Talent" and the critique of the Wordsworthian sensibility. Objective correlative and the theory of depersonalisation. American New Criticism: John Crowe Ransom, Cleanth Brooks, W. K. Wimsatt. The primacy of language and the poetic form. Poetry as the language of paradox. The intentional fallacy and the affective fallacy.	3	2								**Lecture references**: Matthew Arnold, "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time" from *Essays in Criticism* (p. 1-30); T.S. Eliot, "Tradition and the Individual Talent" (p. 293-301); "Hamlet and His Problems" (p. 137-143); W.K. Wimsatt and M.C.

	5									Beardsley, "The Intentional Fallacy" (p. 468-488); "The Affective Fallacy" (p. 31-55); **Seminar texts:** Viktor Shklovsky, "Art as Technique" (p. 17-23); Cleanth Brooks, "The Language of Paradox" (p. 28-39);
6. Modern literary theory and the study of signifying systems. Formalism, Structuralism and Semiotics. Saussure's notion of the linguistic sign. Langue vs. Parole. Synchrony vs. diachrony. Signifier vs. signified. Syntagmatic relations vs. paradigmatic relations. Relational value. Russian Formalism and the linguistic turn: Moscow and Prague. Literariness. Parody. Deviation. Roman Jacobson's functions of language. The poetic function. Literature as purposeless purpose. Paranomasia. Form vs. content. The principle of equivalence. Structure and binarism. Structuralism and the study of narrative. Plot vs. story (cf. Aristotle). Vladimir Propp and *Morphology of the Folktale.* Jonathan Culler and the notion of *literary competence*.	4		2							**Lecture references:** Roman Jacobson, "Linguistics and Poetics" (p. 351-377); Vladimir Propp, *Morphology of the Folktale* (p. 1-45); Jonathan Culler, "Literary Competence" (p. 113-130). **Seminar texts:** Roland Barthes, "The Death of the Author" (p. 2-6); Michel Foucault, "What is an Author?" (p. 299-314); Jorge Luis Borges, "Borges and I" (p.1)

7. Mikhail Bakhtin's revision of Structuralist poetics. *Dialogism* and *heteroglossia*. Post-structuralism and the critique of binary logic. Logocentrism and Western metaphysics. Jacques Derrida's "Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences". The transcendental signified and the logic of presence. The logic of supplementarity. Deconstruction and the notion of différance. The floating signifier. Aporia. Reading as misreading. Poststructuralism and Cultural Studies: feminist, postcolonial, queer perspectives.	3		4							**Lecture references**: Mikhail Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel" from The Dialogic Imagination (p. 259-422); Jacques Derrida, "The Strange Institution Called Literature" (p. 33-75) from *Acts of Literature*; Jacques Derrida, "Che cos'e la poesia?" (1988; trans. 1991) (p. 287-290) from *The Lyric Theory Reader*; Hillis Miller, "Critic as Host" (p.439-447); Derek Attridge, "Introduction to *Acts of Literature*" (p. 1-27); Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar, from *The Madwoman in the Attic* (pp. 596-609) Helen Tiffin, "Postcolonial Literatures and Counter-discourse" (pp. 95-98) John McLeod, "From Commonwealth to Postcolonial" (pp. 6-34)

	7									**Seminar texts:** Stephen Greenblatt, "Resonance and Wonder" (p.217-244);
8. Phenomenology. Consciousness and perception. Edmund Husserl and the notion of the *intentional consciousness*. Perceiving and constituting. Immanence and transcendence. Body as an object of the phenomenological analysis. Self vs. Other. Phenomenological reduction (i.e. *epoche*) and eidetic abstraction. Martin Heidegger's "The Origin of the Work of Art". *Dasein* and the world. Human existence as dialogue. *Dasein* and understanding. The notion of handiness. Charles Simic's poem "My shoes" and Van Gogh's painting *A Pair of Shoes*. Defamiliarisation and phenomenological truth. Language and being. Language and hermeneutics. Language and intersubjectivity.	5		4							**Lecture references:** Martin Heidegger, "The Origin of the Work of Art" (p. 15-86); **Seminar texts:** Derek Attridge, "Innovation, Literature, Ethics" (p. 20-31); Stanley Fish, "What Makes an Interpretation Acceptable?" (p.338-355).
9. Hermeneutics and the significance of the written tradition. Medieval exegesis. St. Paul and typological reading. The aims of hermeneutics. Hans Georg Gadamer's *Truth and Method*. Philosophical hermeneutics. Gadamer's critique of Kant. Art and understanding. Interpretation and the structures of pre-understanding. Meaning as dialogue. Tradition and historical distancing. The concepts of *play* and *horizon*. Hermeneutical circle. Analysis of Stéphane Mallarmé's *Salut*. Wolfgang Iser and the reader response theory. Reading as a build-up of meaning. The notion of competence and indeterminacy. Aesthetics of reception. Horizon of expectations. Iser's notion of *gaps* and *implied reader*; Umberto Eco's *model reader*.	4		2							**Lecture references**: Hans-Georg Gadamer, from *Truth and Method* (p. 102-172; 268-371); Wolfgang Iser, "The Reading Process" (p. 279-299) Hans Herbert Jauss, "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory" (p. 3-45); Umberto Eco, "Between

	8								author and text" (p. 67-88). **Seminar texts:** Jonathan Bate, "What are Poets For?" (p. 243-283)
10. Exam		2							
Total	32	2	16				100		

Assessment strategy	Weight,%	Deadline	Assessment criteria
All of the seminar texts as well as some optional reading sources will be uploaded onto the VU Moodle system: www.emokymai.vu.lt Students who choose to not attend the seminars accept the responsibility for mastering the course material on their own. No individual consultations will be provided. Should there be questions related to the material or the final exam, the students have to tackle these issues before the exam date. The instructor reserves the right to not answer research-related questions – those sent by email included – once the course has been completed and the exam period has begun. **N.B.** The course instructor reserves the right to turn class assignments into home assignments in case of a conference, lecture, library visit, or any other unforeseen circumstances, such as *force majeure*, pandemic, quarantine, etc. The contents of the course will not be measured only by the contents of the lectures. It is the responsibility of the students to "fill in the gaps" by studying the theoretical material provided in the reading lists. Needless to say, any reputable source of literary theory not mentioned in the course description may be useful as well. The students should be well advised to NOT use Internet sources (e.g. Shmoop, Wikipedia, Cliff Notes, etc.) as intellectually reliable sources.			Consistent participation in seminars, good use of metalanguage, argumentative, critical thinking, error-free language. The students may be given the opportunity to volunteer to read a lecture or moderate a seminar on a given subject matter – this offer is given at the course instructor's discretion. Provided the students attend to this task responsibly, they may be given an additional point as part of their final grade.
Final written exam	100		The course ends in a written exam, which consists of several closed and open-ended tasks based on the material covering during the course.

| | | | | 10- **Excellent**. All the tasks have been carried out in such a way that the answers show the student's academic excellence and an astute understanding of the main issues under discussion. Apt use of the necessary critical and theoretical terms. Full understanding of the relation between form and content. Solid grasp of the discursive contingencies and their contradictions. Excellent, almost effortless, ability to conceptualise and substantiate one's reasoning. Independent and creative thinking. Fluent and error-free academic English. |
| | | | | |

10- Excellent. All the tasks have been carried out in such a way that the answers show the student's academic excellence and an astute understanding of the main issues under discussion. Apt use of the necessary critical and theoretical terms. Full understanding of the relation between form and content. Solid grasp of the discursive contingencies and their contradictions. Excellent, almost effortless, ability to conceptualise and substantiate one's reasoning. Independent and creative thinking. Fluent and error-free academic English.

9- Very good. The tasks have been very well carried out but lack the edge of excellence. Mostly apt use of the necessary critical and theoretical terms. A very good understanding of the relation between form and content. A reliable grasp of the discursive contingencies and most of their contradictions. A consistent, though not excellent, ability to conceptualise and substantiate one's reasoning. Independent, though not always creative, thinking. Fluent and error-free academic English.

8 – Good. The tasks have been well carried out, but without razor-sharp intelligence or creativity. Mostly apt use of the necessary critical and theoretical terms. A good, though predictable, understanding of the relation between form and content. A limited grasp of the discursive contingencies and their contradictions. An inconsistent, and varying in degree of success, ability to conceptualise and substantiate one's reasoning. Coherent and logical thinking derived from learned sources. Mostly fluent and error-free academic English.

7 – Average. The tasks have been carried out selectively and without much cognitive labour. A tendency towards inept use of critical and theoretical terms. A predictable and limited understanding of the relation between form and content. An amateurish grasp of the discursive contingencies and their contradictions. An inconsistent, mostly inadequate, ability to conceptualise and substantiate one's reasoning. Struggle with logic and coherence of thought, as made manifest in reproduction of the ideas of others. Some instances of relying on Internet sources may be detected. Lack of fluency and correct grammar in the use of academic English.

6 – Satisfactory. The tasks have been carried out selectively and with little cognitive labour. Inept use of critical and theoretical terms. An inconsistent, and largely inadequate, understanding of the relation between form and content. A weak and amateurish grasp of the discursive contingencies and their contradictions. Lack of ability to conceptualise and substantiate one's reasoning. Struggle with logic and coherence of thought, as made manifest in reproduction (not always successful) of the ideas of others. Multiple instances of relying on Internet sources may be detected. Lack of fluency and correct grammar in the use of academic English.

5 – Poor. The tasks have been carried out selectively and poorly. Irresponsible and/or incompetent use of critical and theoretical terms. Lack of understanding of the relation between form and content. A poor grasp of the discursive contingencies and their contradictions. Lack of ability to conceptualise and substantiate one's reasoning. Struggle with logic and coherence of thought, as made manifest in poor reproduction of the ideas of others. Prevalent instances of relying on Internet sources. Poor use of academic English.

4-0 – Fail. None of the tasks has been adequately carried out to show the student's intellectual competences developed in the course.

N.B. In case of suspicion of plagiarism or the authorship of the research, the student will be asked to account for his or her research in a form of viva voce defense in the Department of English Philology.

Author	Year of	Title	Issue of a periodical	Publishing place and house

	publication		or volume of a publication	or web link
Compulsory reading				
Aristotle	1997	*Poetics.*		London: Penguin Books.
Aristotle. Horace. Longinus.	1965	*Classical Literary Criticism.*		London: Penguin Books.
Attridge, Derek.	1999	"Innovation, Literature, Ethics" in *PMLA*.	Vol. 114, No. 1	
Barthes, Roland.		"The Death of the Author".		http://www.tbook.constantvzw.org/wp-content/death_authorbarthes.pdf
Bate, Jonathan.	2001	"What are Poets For?" from *The Song of the Earth.*		London: Picador.
Culler, Jonathan.	2002	"Literary Competence" from *Structuralist Poetics*.		London and New York: Routledge.
Derrida, Jacques.	2014	"Che cos'e la poesia?" from *The Lyric Theory Reader.*		Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
Derrida, Jacques.	2014	"The Strange Institution Called Literature" from *The Lyric Theory Reader.*		Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
Eagleton, Terry.	2005	*Literary Theory. An Introduction*.		Oxford: Blackwell.
Eco, Umberto.	2006	*On Literature*.		London: Vintage.
Eco, Umberto.	2002	"Between Author and Text" from *Interpretation and Overinterpretation.*		Cambridge: CUP.
Eliot, T.S.	1950	"Tradition and the Individual Talent"; "Hamlet and His Problems" from *Selected Essays*.		London: Faber and Faber.
Fish, Stanley.	1980	"What Makes an Interpretation Acceptable?" from *Is There a Text in this Class?*		Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Foucault, Michel.		"What is an Author?"		http://artsites.ucsc.edu/faculty/Gustafson/FILM%20162.W10/readings/foucault.author.pdf
Gilbert, Sandra and Susan Gubar,	2001	"The Madwoman in the Attic" in *Modern Literary Theory*.		London: Arnold.
Greenblatt, Stephen.	2007	"Resonance and Wonder" from *Learning to Curse.*		London and New York: Routledge.
Hirsch, Edward.	2014	*A Poet's Glossary.*		Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt
Hyde, Lewis.	2007	"The Commerce of the Creative Spirit" from *The Gift: Creativity and the Artist and the Modern World.*		London: Vintage.
Iser, Wolfgang	1972	"The Reading Process" from *New Literary History.*	Vol. 3, No. 2	
Jackson, Virginia Yopie Prins.	2014	*The Lyric Theory Reader. A Critical Anthology.*		Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
Jacobson, Roman.		"Linguistics and Poetics"		http://pubman.mpdl.mpg.de/pubman/item/escidoc:2350615/component/escidoc:2350614/Jakobson_1960_Linguistics_poetics.pdf
Plato	1994	*Republic.*		Oxford: OUP.
Rivkin, Julie and	2004	*Literary Theory. An Anthology.*		Oxford: Blackwell.

Michael Ryan (eds.)				
Shklovsky, Victor.		"Art as Technique" in *Modern Literary Theory: A Reader*, edited by Philip Rice and Patricia Waugh.		London and NY: OUP.
Wimsatt, W.K. and M.C. Beardsley.	1947	"The Intentional Fallacy" in *The Sewanee Review.*	Vol. 54, No. 3	
Wimsatt, W.K. and M.C. Beardsley.	1949	"The Affective Fallacy" in *The Sewanee Review.*	Vol. 57, No. 1	
Optional reading				
Abrams, M.H.	1971	"The Orientation of Critical Theories" from *The Mirror and the Lamp.*		Oxford: OUP.
Arnold, Matthew.	1865	"The Function of Criticism at the Present Time" from *Essays in Criticism.*		New York: A.L. Burt Company.
Attridge, Derek.	2005	*The Singularity of Literature.*		London and New York: Routledge.
Attridge, Derek (ed.)	1992	*Acts of Literature.*		London and New York: Routledge.
Bakhtin, Mikhail.	2004	*The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays.*		Austin: University of Texas Press.
Bloom, Harold.	1997	*Anxiety of Influence.*		Oxford: OUP.
Brooks, Cleanth.	1947	*The Well Wrought Urn.*		New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
Heidegger, Martin.	2001	"The Origin of the Work of Art" from *Poetry, Language, Thought.*		New York: Harper Perennial.
Jauss, Hans Robert.	1982	*Toward an Aesthetic of Reception.*		Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Kant, Immanuel.	2008	*Critique of Judgement.*		Oxford: OUP.
Lorca, Federico Garcia.		"Theory and Play of the Duende"		https://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/Spanish/LorcaDuende.php
McLeod, John.	2000	*Beginning Postcolonialism.*		Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Miller, Hillis.	1977	"The Critic as Host" from *Critical Inquiry.*	Vol. 3, No. 3	
Ngai, Sianne.	2012	*Our Aesthetic Categories.*		Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Said, Edward.	1979	*Orientalism.*		New York: Vintage.
Schiller, Friedrich.	2004	*On the Aesthetic Education of Man.*		Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, Inc.
Tiffin, Helen.	1995	"Postcolonial literatures and Counter-discourse" in *The Postcolonial Studies Reader.*		London and New York: Routledge.
Woolf, Virginia.	2000	*A Room of One's Own* and *Three Guineas.*		Oxford: OUP.

Dalyko aprašas atnaujintas 2023-08-31