

English 363W

Jonathan Burton, ENGL 363W, Spring 2008

English 363W: Also by Shakespeare
Professor Jonathan Burton

Office: 231 Colson Hall

Email: jburton4@wvu.edu

Office Hours: T 2:30-4 and by appointment

In this writing-intensive section of Shakespeare 2, we will focus on some of Shakespeare's lesser-known works. In examining these works, we will consider how and why a canon of popular Shakespearean plays emerged, not only in the theater but also in secondary and higher education. Our approach to Shakespeare's work will be two-fold: Initially you will work as apprentice scholars, reading four of Shakespeare's works along with recent scholarship. This component of our class will culminate in an 8-page research paper synthesizing scholarly essays and developing your own original argument. Following the spring break we will turn our attention to Shakespeare in performance and you will work as apprentice thespians, creating your own performances of brief scenes from the plays and reviewing the productions of your classmates.

Assignments and Grading

3 x 500-word reports on critical essays	15 %
Annotated Bibliography	15 %
Peer Review	5 %
8 + page Research Paper in drafts	25 %
3-page Performance Review	10 %
Performance Project and 5-page Narrative	30 %

Course Policies

1. Attendance: You are granted a maximum of three absences during the course of the semester. Final grades will be reduced by 4% for each additional absence, and 3 tardies are counted as an absence. A perfect attendance record will earn an additional 4% on the final grade.

2. Paper Submission: Papers are to be typed in 12-point Times Roman, double-spaced, with one-inch margins. Papers should reflect careful reading and thinking about your subject, and should not summarize the plot of a work, or rephrase class discussion. Papers submitted any time after class on the due date will be penalized by a full grade (i.e. a B+ will become a C+) for each day late. Days late are determined not by the calendar but by the 24-hour period following the start of class on the due date. Late submissions may be made by email within 3 days of the due date. After 3 days the assignment will be assigned 0 points.

3. Revision: Research Papers that have gone through peer editing and final drafting are eligible for a final re-write in response to the instructor's comments. Students who wish to complete such

revisions must notify the instructor within one week of the paper's return and submit the revision within two weeks of the paper's return.

Scholastic Honesty

Plagiarism will not be tolerated in this course and will result in failure. Plagiarism is defined as follows in the WVU Undergraduate Catalog: "To take or pass off as one's own the ideas, writings, artistic products, etc. of someone else; for example, submitting, without appropriate acknowledgment, a report, notebook, speech, outline theme, thesis, dissertation, or other written, visual, or oral material that has been knowingly obtained or copied **in whole or in part**, from the work of others." If you have any questions regarding plagiarism, documentation of sources, or related issues, please feel free to ask.

Learning Environment WVU is committed to social justice. I support that commitment and expect to maintain a positive learning environment based on open communication, mutual respect and non-discrimination. Our University does not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, age, disability, veteran status, religion, sexual orientation, color or national origin. Any suggestion as to how to further such a positive and open environment in this class will be appreciated and given serious consideration. If you are a person with a disability and anticipate needing any type of accommodation in order to participate in this class, please advise me and make appropriate arrangements with Disability Services (293-6700).

Schedule of Assignments

January

15 Introduction

17 "The Rape of Lucrece" to line 1078

22 "The Rape of Lucrece"

24 Sara E. Quay, "'Lucrece the Chaste': The Construction of Rape in Shakespeare's 'The Rape of Lucrece'" *Modern Language Studies* 25: 2 (Spring, 1995), pp. 3-17 (JSTOR)

29 *The Comedy of Errors* 3.2

31 *The Comedy of Errors*

February

5 Report on 2 critical essays: (1) Parker, Patricia, "The Bible and the Marketplace: *The Comedy of Errors*, in *Shakespeare from the Margins: Language, Culture, Context* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), ch. 2 (Handout); (2) Martine Van Elk, "Urban Misidentification in *The Comedy of Errors* and the Cony-Catching Pamphlets" *SEL: Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 43: 2, Spring 2003, pp. 323-346 (JSTOR).

7 *Titus Andronicus* 2.1

12 *Titus Andronicus* 4.4

14 *Titus Andronicus*

19 Report on 2 critical essays: (1) Francesca T. Royster, "White-Limed Walls: Whiteness and Gothic Extremism in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 51:4 (Winter, 2000), pp. 432-455 (JSTOR); (2) Tina Mohler, "What Is Thy Body but a Swallowing Grave ...?": Desire Underground in *Titus Andronicus*" *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 57:1. (Spring, 2006), pp. 23-44 (JSTOR).

21 *King John* 2.2

26 *King John*

28 **Report on 2 critical essays:** (1) A. R. Braunmuller, "*King John* and Historiography" *English Literary History* (ELH) 55: 2 (Summer, 1988), pp. 309-332 (JSTOR); (2) Virginia Mason Vaughan, "Between Tetralogies: *King John* as Transition" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 35:4 (Winter, 1984), pp. 407-420 (JSTOR).

March

4 Research Day

6 Annotated Bibliography Due

11 *Cymbeline*

13 Draft of Research Papers Due for Peer Review

18 *Cymbeline*

20 Research papers due

April

1 Stephen Orgel, "Cymbeline at Santa Cruz," *Shakespeare Quarterly*. 52: 2 (Summer, 2001), pp. 277-285 (JSTOR); (2) Valerie Wayne, "Kneehigh's Dream of Cymbeline" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 58: 2 (Summer 2007), pp. 228-237 (Project Muse).

3 *The Merry Wives of Windsor*

8 *The Merry Wives of Windsor*

10 ***The Merry Wives of Windsor* Performance**

15 *Troilus and Cressida*

17 *Troilus and Cressida*

22 ***Troilus and Cressida* Performance**

24 *All's Well that Ends Well*

29 *All's Well that Ends Well*

May

1 ***All's Well that Ends Well* Performance**

Assignments

3 x 500-word reports on critical essays: In each of these three brief reports you are to identify the central argument of the two assigned critical essays and put the two into conversation. What ideas do these essays share and where do they differ? Indicate if one indicates a blind spot of the other or complicates its argument.

Annotated Bibliography: The first component of your research paper, the annotated bibliography will compile information on 7 secondary sources relevant to any one our assigned texts. No source should be older than 1980, and at least two of your sources must come from books (e.g., a monograph chapter, a chapter from a collection of essays, or the introduction to an edition separate from our course text). Bibliographies should be prefaced by a 3-4 paragraph introduction to the central questions or issues binding these sources. Annotations to each item should indicate (1) the main argument of the source; and (2) how/where the source engages with issues raised in one or more of the other items in your bibliography. Annotated bibliographies may include previously-assigned sources, but annotations for these sources must engage with at least one of your newly-located sources.

Research Paper in drafts: In this paper you will develop an original argument concerning a single one of our assigned texts. Your argument should draw on and engage with the sources in your annotated bibliography, but the bulk of your paper should develop your own close-reading and interpretation of the play. Title page and list of works cited do not count toward the minimum of 8 pages.

Peer Editing

Each student is required to come to class on March 13 with a completed draft of his/her paper on the assigned editing dates. Failure to attend with a completed draft of the required length will result in an immediate loss of credit. Peer editing will involve worksheets with guiding questions distributed by the instructor.

Performance Narrative (5 pages): Discuss the performance of your group's scene while answering the following questions: What ideas did this performance seek to convey about the scene, and by extension about the play? How were blocking, expressions, costuming, and/or

props used to develop those ideas? What readings of character, action, and so on were enabled (or disabled) by your choices? What are the most important lines or speeches? How should they be said? How does this scene develop the themes of the play? How does this play develop, complicate, or even contradict themes found elsewhere in Shakespeare's plays? In retrospect, how might you change your performance and why? (Due one week following the performance date.)

Performance Review (3 pages): Discuss the performance of another group's scene, beginning with a very brief summary of the action (no more than a paragraph), and followed by a lengthy discussion of the thematic drive of the performance. What themes did this performance emphasize and how? What were the particular successes of this performance? What changes in blocking, costuming, or prop use might have made this performance more successful? You should not comment on the quality of the acting except where you find it to be particularly excellent. (Due one week following the performance date.)

All's Well group reviews Merry Wives
Merry Wives group reviews Troilus
Troilus group reviews All's Well