

Conference Reports LiLT in Kyoto, a festival of ideas

Different Types of Difficult

John Fawsitt

Kibi International University

fawsitt@kiui.ac.jp

Teaching an English literature class of about twenty-three students with a steep gradient of abilities and interest, I was puzzled as to how present real literature that while accessible, would be interesting and could cater for all the class members' needs and levels.

Having come across Raymond Carver's works some years ago, I thought that they would be suitable for at least some of my students as they are written in a very sparse style. In my hunt I was lucky to come across two of his stories that might be uniquely suited to teaching English literature in an EFL context.

Carver's two short stories, "A small good thing" and "The Bath" are very similar. They both are about people struggling to deal with sudden tragedy in their lives, and have the same basic plot, events, and characters. "The Bath" is much shorter at twelve hundred words than "A small good thing" at about eight thousand, and is written in a terse unadorned style that creates a sense of unreality and non-comprehension almost as if certain of the senses have been stunned or numbed. "A small good thing" is written with far more detail and discursion; the events are lived rather than observed, characters more minutely drawn and emotions more elaborately expressed. These two stories can meet the challenge of teaching students who are interested in English literature but have not yet acquired the skills to read it unaided.

Using these stories also provided me with an insight into what constitutes "difficulty" to the student and obstacles to their enjoyment of foreign literature. I had thought that the more unadorned the language the easier it would be for the students to enjoy, however a questionnaire distributed among the students brought this assumption into question. The bulk of the students found that the lack of detail in "The Bath" prevented them from following the progression of the story and from

becoming engaged with the characters. They said they enjoyed the much longer and seemingly more more complex, “A small good thing” more. Despite this, I find it hard to believe that they would have been able to penetrate “A small good thing” without having read the simpler version of the story first.

As literature in the current EFL context is in danger of being marginalized and as teachers are increasingly required to show the practical applicability rather than the intellectual or artistic aspirations of their teaching, and taking the above into account, using two versions of a text can help us bridge this gap. Through comparison we can illustrate the effect of vocabulary choices and the different structural options available to express a single meaning. We can teach the mechanics of language. At the same time we can enjoy the aesthetic effect of the original while maintaining a communicative English environment in the classroom with the aid of the “simpler” text. In the current vogue for graded readers offered as substitutes, we have been provided with a wide range of simplified, and by no means inferior, texts that used in conjunction with the originals or extracts thereof might provide a gangplank to board for a voyage toward a fuller experience of literature for the student.

Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* Via Literary Darwinism: LiLT in Kyoto Presentation

John F. Maune

Hokusei Gakuen University Junior College

jfmaune@gmail.com

Abstract

As evolutionary theory has become such a cornerstone of biology, it has been incorporated across many disciplines with consilience, for some, the desired goal. Literature is no exception: the thought being that human evolution has shaped our behavior, thus our literary preferences. Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* revolves around aggression and love and is full of examples that illustrate a wide range of evolutionary concepts. Zeffirelli's film version of the play is first viewed by students in a content-based Life Science course. The text of various scenes is analyzed giving intuitive examples that hold a mirror up to our nature.

進化論が生物学の礎となり、異なる分野が分野を越えて学説などの合意に至り一体化してきた。それはある分野には望ましい結果となった。文学においても例外ではない：人間の行動は進化の過程で形作られてきたように、文学嗜好も同じように進化してきたのである。シェイクスピアのロミオとジュリエットの激しい攻撃性や愛といった題材を熟考していくと、それは幅広い進化論の概念で解説することが出来るのだ。ゼフィレリ監督のシェイクスピアは、初めてライフサイエンスの分野から学生に考察されることとなった。様々なシーンの表現は、直感的に我々の本質を映し出す鏡として解析されるのである。

Shakespeare is the cornerstone of the western literary canon (Bloom, 1995) and is performed and revered all over the world. He has been praised by many to the extent that he is revered as a god with his own religion that some call bardolatry. His universal appeal is due to his profound grasp of human nature — “a mirror held up to nature” as Hamlet states. Never one to shy away from controversy, Bloom (1998) has argued that Shakespeare pushed the bounds of what it means to be human, expanding and enlightening our intellectual possibilities. It has been argued Shakespeare is a product of western imperialism — a white male foisted upon the impressionable minds of students by the ivory tower of western academia, and that human nature is a myth (Greenblatt, 1980, O'Toole, 2012, and Taylor, 1991). This relates to culture wars and the nature vs. nurture debate: is the mind a blank slate that is written upon by your environment, or do genes influence our behavior (Pinker, 2002)?

My view is that as human nature is coded into all of us, Shakespeare penned his characters accordingly, and, perhaps more importantly, spending valuable class time on this white western male is time well spent. In my experience most Japanese EFL students have heard of him, and are receptive to learning about this cultural icon; the Shakespeare industry (i.e., the vast cultural, academic, and economic forces that exist to perpetuate Shakespeare) has done its job. Using *Romeo and Juliet* to highlight biological characteristics is also a fillip aimed at cultural determinists as well as support for literary Darwinism (Carroll, 2011).

Reasoning

This is not a literature course, but a content-based (CB) course: Life Science (LS). CB courses should hold students' interest via the subject matter. However, this is not applicable as very few LS students admit to much interest in science. *Romeo and Juliet* and love do interest the students. Zeffirelli's award winning film engages them more than a standard science text will. Also, by nature, humans are interested in narrative and drama which leads to more efficient learning and memory retention (Boyd, 2009, and Gottschall, 2012).

Course

Zeffirelli's *Romeo and Juliet* is watched with a few interruptions in order to provide some background of details found in the play but not in the film. Luhrmann's party and balcony scenes are also viewed. Portions of the film and corresponding text from the play are discussed to introduce biological topics: aggression, love, sexual dimorphism, kin selection, parental investment, human universals, mate selection, and finally the adaptive value of art.

The play opens with a brawl that introduces the feud between the two houses: Montague and Capulet. Tybalt illustrates aggression in young males well. I use his wide-eyed angry facial expression when confronting Benvolio to introduce Ekman's universal facial expressions (1971). Students are asked which sex is more aggressive—more inclined to violent crime—and what age range with six age groups for each sex. Students each year correctly and unanimously choose young males. In order to impress that all discussions of human behavior relate to probabilities, not certainties, I relate a personal story: my daughter at age two during a beach outing smashed me in the face with a plastic shovel (not a tiny shovel, but almost one meter in length) when not allowed to drink any of my tea. Extrapolate at your own risk.

Capulet illustrates aggression in middle aged men, particularly his talk with Paris following the Prince's edict that the feud with Montague must end, and at the party. His demand that Tybalt not "in his house do Romeo disparagement" segues to Brown's (1991) human universals—hospitality is found in every culture ever studied.

The feud and the unthinking vehement adherence by each household to it ties into Hamilton's theory of kin selection called inclusive fitness, (Hamilton 1964). This concept is — like knowing that young males are the most aggressive group — intuitively grasped, but the underlying genetic benefits are not. Dawkins's (1976) selfish gene theory follows. It is stressed that humans do not consciously calculate their future returns and genetic benefits, but that our adapted minds (Barkow, Cosmides, & Tooby, 1992) function in order to do so. Our minds are products of millions of years of evolution in which some mental functions were more favorable than others in negotiating the savannahs and more importantly the treacherously savage politically charged societies of humans. Success meant progeny.

Sexual conflict and parental investment are illustrated by how Juliet and the nurse worry about whether Romeo's intentions are honorable or not. Juliet must be sure that she chooses her mate wisely or face dire consequences. Such is not the case for males. Here, the students compare the parental investment of a female and male and how such influences behavior. Other species such as rabbits are discussed. Of particular interest are sea horses and birds of the genus *Phalaropus* where the males rear the young. The pronounced effects that this reversal of parental investment causes are discussed in detail.

I discuss mate selection which leads to what is important in a mate for Yanomamo women — unokai (Chagnon, 1968). Unokai men have more status than non-unokai, and father more children. To become unokai a male warrior must kill an enemy. We are all products of our nature and nurture.

Romeo's lustful infatuation with Rosaline and Luhrmann's portrayal of Romeo ingesting the "love drug" ecstasy prior to the party (the students have always missed this) leads to neurotransmitters, and the stages and chemistry of love (Fisher, 2004). Also, the implications of Romeo falling in love with Juliet while tripping on ecstasy provide fruitful discussion: students must think about the ethical ramifications and support their thoughts, and are also curious about such culture. I next discuss the chemical nature of our brain in which all of our reality is interpreted or hashed together.

Some lines from the balcony scene are examined for how emotive they are. I explain that poetry has the power to move us, but what are the survival benefits of creating poetry or any kind of art; how is art adaptive? An artist spends time creating imaginative pieces, time that could have been spent procuring food or a mate. Art (e.g., music, drama, and literature) is a human universal (Brown, 1991), so there must be some biological payoff. Various competing theories of why humans value art are discussed (Barash, 2012, Boyd, 2009, Dissanayake, 2012, Miller, 2000, and Pinker, 1997), though the naughty thumb of science has not demystified the art riddle: yet.

Author's Note

John Frederick Maune's interests include evolutionary psychology, literary Darwinism, and mind, brain, and education. He has presented on various topics therein, recently at NeMLA 2016, Atiner 2016 Conference on Literature, JALTCALL & the Brain 2016, and HBES 2016.

References

- Barash, D. (2012). *Homo mysterious: Evolutionary puzzles of human nature*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Barkow, J., Cosmides, L., & Tooby, J. (Eds.). (1992). *The adapted mind: Evolutionary psychology and the generation of culture*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Bloom, H. (1995). *The western canon: The books and school of the ages*. New York, NY: Riverhead Books.
- Bloom, H. (1998). *Shakespeare: The invention of the human*. New York, NY: Riverhead Books.
- Boyd, B. (2009). *On the origin of stories : Evolution, cognition, and fiction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brown, D. E. (1991). *Human universals*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Carroll, J. (2011). *Reading human nature: Literary Darwinism in theory*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Chagnon, N. (1968). *Yanomamö: The fierce people*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Dawkins, R. (1976). *The selfish gene*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Dissanayake, E. (2012). *Art and intimacy : How the arts began*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- Ekman, P. & Friesen, W.V. (1971). Constants across culture in the face and emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 17 (2), 124-129.
- Fisher, H. (2004). *Why we love: The nature and chemistry of romantic love*. New York, NY: Henry Holt and Company.

- Gottschall, J. (2012). *The storytelling animal: How stories make us human*. Boston, MA : Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Greenblatt, S. (1980). *Renaissance self-fashioning, from More to Shakespeare*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hamilton, W. D. (1964). The genetical evolution of social behaviour. I and II. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 7, 1–52.
- Miller, G. (2000). *The mating mind: How sexual choice shaped the evolution of human nature*. London, UK: Vintage.
- O'Toole, E. (2012, May). Shakespeare, universal? No, it's cultural imperialism. Guardian. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2012/may/21/shakespeare-universal-cultural-imperialism>
- Pinker, S. (1997). *How the mind works*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- Pinker, S. (2003). *The blank slate*. London, UK: Penguin Books.
- Taylor, G. (1991). *Reinventing Shakespeare: A cultural history from the restoration to the present*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.