

General assessment guidelines for

ENG2167/4167: Linguistics and literature in English

Reading

A selection of papers and book chapters made available on Canvas. Only the obligatory reading is listed here (in the order encountered in the course):

- Chapter 1 of Chapman, R. (1982). *The Language of English Literature*. London: E. Arnold.
- Leech, G. (1985). Stylistics. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse and Literature* (pp. 39–57). Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.
- Chapter 10 (pp. 255–281) of Leech, G. N. & Short, M. (2007). *Style in Fiction : A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose* (2nd ed.). New York: Pearson Longman.
- Chapter 1 (pp. 5–31) “Narrating” of Wood (2008) *How Fiction Works*. London: Jonathan Cape
- Chapman, S. (2014). ‘Oh, do let’s talk about something else-’: What is not said and what is implicated in Elizabeth Bowen’s *The Last September*. In S. Chapman & B. Clark (Eds.), *Pragmatic Literary Stylistics* (pp. 36–54). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wilson, D. & Sperber, D. (2012). Explaining irony. In *Meaning and Relevance* (pp. 123–145). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, D. (2011). Relevance and the interpretation of literary works. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics*, 23, 69–80.
- Clark, B. (2009). Salient inferences: Pragmatics and *The Inheritors*. *Language and Literature*, 18(2), 173–212.
- Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (2008). A deflationary account of metaphors. In R. W. Gibbs (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought* (pp. 84–108). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cave, T. & Wilson, D. (2018). Preface. In T. Cave & D. Wilson (Eds.), *Reading Beyond the Code : Literature And Relevance Theory* (pp. v-ix). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Banks, K. (2018). ‘Look again’, ‘Listen, listen’, ‘Keep looking’: Emergent properties and sensorimotor imagining in Mary Oliver’s poetry. In T. Cave & D. Wilson (Eds.), *Reading Beyond the Code* (pp. 129-146)
- Chesters, T. (2018). The lingering of the literal in some poems of Emily Dickinson. In T. Cave & D. Wilson (Eds.), *Reading Beyond the Code* (pp. 149-163).
- Fabb, N. (2016). Processing effort and poetic closure. *International Journal of Literary Linguistics*, 5(4).

Learning outcomes

The exam (term paper) tests the following learning outcomes as specified in the course descriptions (<https://www.uio.no/studier/emner/hf/ilos/ENG2167/> and <https://www.uio.no/studier/emner/hf/ilos/ENG4167/>)

ENG2167

After completing this course you will have:

- be familiar with the application of some linguistic theories to the analysis of literary texts
- have knowledge of some theoretical accounts of figurative speech and poetic effects
- have some insight into the contested notion of the meaning of a literary text
- have skills in scholarly writing that applies one or more linguistic theories to literary texts

ENG4167

After completing this course you will have:

- be familiar with the application of linguistic theories to the analysis of literary texts
- have knowledge of theoretical accounts of figurative speech and poetic effects
- have insight into the contested notion of the meaning of a literary text
- have advanced skills in scholarly writing that applies one or more linguistic theories to literary texts

Assessment guidelines

The term paper tests the students' depth of knowledge of the chosen topic and of the syllabus, and the degree to which the students are able to apply relevant theory to concrete cases or examples.

Specifically, students are to show that they can apply linguistic theory to literary texts and/or examples chosen from literary texts, with the goal of providing a convincing reading of the text and/or testing linguistic theory against data from literary texts.

Knowledge and abilities that will receive credit include, but are not limited to:

- Knowledge of notions from stylistics – in particular, primary/secondary/tertiary deviation and foregrounding; different types of speech/thought presentation, including Free Indirect Discourse – and the ability to apply such notions to the analysis of literary texts.
- Knowledge of Gricean pragmatics – in particular the Cooperative Principle and Conversational Maxims and the notion of implicature – and the ability to apply Grice's theory to the analysis of literary texts.
- Knowledge of relevance theory – in particular the relevance-theoretic accounts of figurative speech, including irony, metaphor, and hyperbole – and the ability to apply relevance theory to the analysis of literary texts.
- Knowledge of debates about the meaning of literary texts and how and whether it relates to the author's intentions, and the ability to discuss these issues not merely in the abstract, but illustrating them with examples from literary texts.
- Knowledge of criticism of the use of linguistic theory in literary studies and responses made by relevance theorists, and the ability to discuss these issues not merely in the abstract, but illustrating them with examples from literary texts.

The best papers are not merely descriptive, but engage in linguistic and academic discussion of the topic treated.

The students are expected to choose a literary text or texts and data from within that/those texts to analyse.

The quality of the candidates' own written academic English is also assessed, as is the structure of the term paper. The term paper must comply with the rules for correct use of sources and citations.

Grades are awarded according to the national qualitative descriptions of letter grades (<https://www.uio.no/english/studies/examinations/grading-system/index.html>):

Symbol	Description	General, qualitative description of evaluation criteria
A	Excellent	An excellent performance, clearly outstanding. The candidate demonstrates excellent judgement and a high degree of independent thinking.
B	Very good	A very good performance. The candidate demonstrates sound judgement and a very good degree of independent thinking.
C	Good	A good performance in most areas. The candidate demonstrates a reasonable degree of judgement and independent thinking in the most important areas.
D	Satisfactory	A satisfactory performance, but with significant shortcomings. The candidate demonstrates a limited degree of judgement and independent thinking.
E	Sufficient	A performance that meets the minimum criteria, but no more. The candidate demonstrates a very limited degree of judgement and independent thinking.
F	Fail	A performance that does not meet the minimum academic criteria. The candidate demonstrates an absence of both judgement and independent thinking.

More specifically, since the work is a term paper, the following criteria apply:

The term paper will be assessed as a whole, with no specific percentage of marks for any one aspect. Instead, the examiner(s) will be making an overall judgement of the quality of the piece of work as a whole. Weaknesses in one area of the criteria may be compensated for by particular skill in another.

Very good (A or B):

1. Work at the highest levels will assert an argument, through the use of a thesis statement which is argumentative (i.e. it could also be disputed), specific (it is not overly general or vague) and substantiated (there is evidence to support it). It will offer a sense of why the topic in question is significant, and the implications of exploring the texts in this way, in relation to linguistic theory or literary criticism or both.
2. The argument is delivered through the use of a clear, logical essay structure. The student considers the flow of the argument from paragraph to paragraph and sustains the argument throughout. The various points made are all relevant to the topic and argument under consideration in the essay, and that relevance is made explicitly clear.
3. The essay engages in detailed textual analysis, considering literary strategies and/or linguistic phenomena that can be identified in the texts considered, and relating these strategies to the essay's overall argument.

4. The essay engages in a detailed way with academic literature, building on or challenging existing critical viewpoints to situate itself firmly in a wider critical debate.
5. The essay is written in formal English of a high standard, with no mistakes of grammar or spelling and in a suitable register for academic work. It adopts an objective, but persuasive academic tone which reinforces the argument that the student is making.
6. The essay references academic literature in a correct and consistent format, with complete footnotes/in-text references and bibliography.

Good (C):

1. The essay includes an argument, which is for the most part sustained throughout.
2. The essay adopts a clear structure and the points made are relevant to the topic under consideration throughout.
3. The essay engages in detailed analysis, with some use of relevant academic material.
4. The essay attempts to engage with academic work, but may not build on or challenge it to a great extent.
5. The essay is written for the most part in correct English, with only minor mistakes of grammar or spelling.
6. The references and bibliography are, for the most part, correctly formatted and sufficiently detailed.

Poor (D or E):

1. The argument is excessively general or lacks substantiating evidence.
2. The structure lacks logic, and the points made are occasionally irrelevant to the topic and argument under consideration.
3. The essay engages in some analysis. The essay makes only occasional use of examples from literary texts.
4. The essay does not engage with academic sources to a significant degree. It may use one or two examples but does not explain why these are important or build on them.
5. There are errors in grammar and spelling, though these do not prevent understanding of the essay text.
6. The bibliography and references are incorrectly formatted or lack essential information.

Unacceptable (F):

1. The essay lacks an argument.
2. The structure is illogical and confusing. The points made lack relevance.
3. The essay lacks analysis and doesn't engage with textual and linguistic features.
4. The essay makes little or no use of academic sources.
5. The essay is poorly written with numerous errors of grammar and spelling. The tone may be excessively colloquial.
6. The bibliography and references are non-existent or incomplete.