

Bibliography

Arthur, B.

(1968). "Reading literature and learning a second language." *Language Learning* 18 (3 - 4): 199 - 210

Cuddon, J .

(1979). *A Dictionary of Literary Terms*. New York: penquin

McKey, S.

(1982). "Literature in the classroom." *TESOL Quarterly* 16(4): 529 - 536.

Povey, J.

(1972). "Literature in TESL Programs: the language and the culture" in Allen and Campbell (eds.) 1972

Sartre, J.

(1947). *Qu'est-ce que la litterature?* [Persian translation]

Spach, R.

(1985). "Literature, reading, writing, and ESL: Bridging the gaps." *TESOL Quarterly* 19(4): 703 - 725

Stevick, E.

(1980). *Teaching Languages: A Way and Ways*. Rowley, Mass., Newbury House.

language or literature. The term is often mistakenly held synonymous with all the qualities contained within any form of mystical writing filled with obsolete words and archaic syntax. This is, as already discussed, usually not the case; literariness is that overall quality of a text which makes it different from samples of ordinary language. Definitely, the striking quality of literature that makes it different is the reader's response to it: literary experience (Spack, 1985, and Arthur, 1972).

One principal argument in the adoption of literature in ELT is that the literariness of the text should be maintained in the process of teaching it. There is discrepancy over how this main should be attained. The traditional view is that literariness is only maintained when the original intention of the writer of a work is elaborated and clarified (and probably injected) in the class. No ambiguity or divergence of opinion is left in this approach. In other words, no reader/writer interaction occurs in this approach. Hence, hardly any form of literary experience is achieved or even encouraged in this procedure.

The ultimate goal of literature is more than merely exhibiting eloquent words in pleasant structures; it is the communication of a feeling. Accordingly, the ultimate goal of language is the communication of a feeling or idea through the same means employed in literature: words and structures. The only difference is that literature, if correctly selected and handled in the class, would be more enjoying for the learners. And as long as learners are joyfully engaged in literary experience, literariness is being maintained, of course, for every individual learner in his own personal way: the one-to-one reader/writer interaction.

to know the learners in the class to a certain extent⁽¹⁾. A useful tip in this situation is that the teacher could resort to those literary texts which are less controversial and not too abstract. This is especially useful in the case of the multi-cultural class. There are some stories which are shared among many cultures in different forms and versions. In my opinion, they are very good selections to start with, particularly in lower classes. Some may argue that they do not really encourage the learners to become involved in them since they already know them. Quite the contrary, I believe - and have observed it practically - that the learners get a special kind of pleasure once they read a text and recall the time that they read this story in their own native language a long time ago, perhaps when they were at school: "We used to read this stuff in our own language when we were kids at school." It gives them a warm human feeling, a feeling of togetherness which may open those great big doors surrounding the foreign language and gradually permit the learner inside the new sociolinguistic arena taking away the debilitating feeling of alienation.⁽²⁾

As stated earlier, the first selection taken to class plays the decisive role in making the learner interested in literature. If the first text is suitable, the major step has already been taken, and the effect of a future *mis-selected* text would not be so colossal, that is, it could be compensated.

E. Maintaining literariness

By definition, *literariness* is the quality of being or resembling written

1 - Of course, there is no such thing as ultimate achievement of human communication in practice. However, some of it may be attained in the classroom between the teacher and the learner who have grown accustomed to one another. I presume that this level of human understanding would help the teacher make a correct guess about what may interest the learners.

2 - In Earl Stevick's words, "the language classroom can be a place of alienation for student and teacher alike." Human communication is simultaneous with the process of abolishing alienation; teaching, as one form of human communication, requires that the learner and the teacher who is the symbol of the foreign language get closer to one another.

very extreme changes: what used to be nothing but trivial absurdity to me in my adolescence is at present the verbal embodiment of a world to come. George Orwell's *All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others* is yet another example of an utterance that was simply an interesting conglomeration of words assembled in a witty way to me fourteen years ago; now, it is the practical philosophy of life: the inborn discrimination of nature itself, the inevitability of the essence of segregation even in the concept of egalitarianism in the universe around us, These experiences are not very unique, that is, I am not the only person you could find around yourself who has undergone these kinds of experiences; they happen frequently to different individuals.

Literature is not created by a writer: it starts *from* the writer and is ended *in* the reader. To say that the writer must communicate with the readers, or vice versa, is simply a fallacy: the reader and the writer must share a mutual communication. To both understand and enjoy literature, the intellect and emotions should be focused on the story, this focus can only come about if the reader and the writer share the same background and experiences. As Bradford Arthur (1972) writes, the literary quality of writing is the quality of the reader's response leading to a literary experience which is a spontaneous experience that comes about in the process of the reader's total intellectual and emotional involvement with the writer's cause in the process of approaching the work. *Therefore, literature is not merely a product of the writer, it is a process in which the reader is as interactive as the writer in establishing it as a work of art.* In other words, one cannot talk, about a work of literature with the sole reference to the writer of that work. Literature only finds its righteous place when categorized and analyzed along the lines of the writer/reader interaction. In this sense, *King Lear* can be adored as the true manifestation of literary glory, or merely another boring old book filled with "thy" and "hath" (of course, depending on the reader). The

There has been an on-going debate in literary circles over the priority of form or substance in literature. As a matter of fact, the origin of this debate goes back at least twenty-five hundred years in time to the era of the Greek Sophists. There are there different approaches regarding this matter. The first view is that literature is primarily substance, that is, literature - like all other arts - is first and foremost the expression of a thought, view, etc, through an esthetic form. Hence, form is considered as the means which contributes to the accomplishment of the main aim of literature: communicating an idea to other humans. Jean-Paul Sartre (1905 - 1980, French philosopher and founder of Existentialism) argued that the purpose of literature is struggling for the achievement of awareness, the liberation of truth, and the freedom of human, and that a writer is to be held responsible for the material that he writes since writing is in actuality performing an act. Sartre's view, which was also held by some other prominent writers such as Shaw and Brecht, is known as committed or *engagé* literature which is defined as the writer's dedication to the advocacy of certain beliefs. A good example of the extreme version of commitment in literature is the works of post-revolutionary Russia (Gorky, Sholokhov, etc). Consequently, a writing is not to be evaluated on purely esthetic grounds, rather, the message conveyed in the work is to be considered. It is this very view that categorizes literary works as being constructive or corruptive for the reader.

The second view maintains quite the opposite of the first one. The advocates of this approach make a stand for the priority of form to substance: the idea itself is not of primary value, it is the writing's being pleasant or not which counts. Associated with this viewpoint are the followers of estheticism, a school of philosophy and literature that emerged after the publication of *Aesthetica*, a treatise on the criticism of taste considered as a philosophical theory, by A. T. Baumgarten in 1750. This cult that won global attention in the 19th century entailed the point of view that art is self-sufficient and need

comparing to S2? Is it the choice of the words? It seems very unlikely. Consider the following examples:

3. *I had my tooth extracted two days ago but the pain still lingers on.*
4. *We built a fire on the beach but the flames are all long gone.*

Although S3 and S4 contain some of the same lexical choices of S1, they do not seem to demonstrate much literary beauty. Therefore, lexical selection is not the major criterion. Esthetic appeal is not an entirely syntactic matter either:

5. *The clerks have all left but the boss still stays on.*

S5 is structurally synonymous with S1; its literary value (if you can find any) is hardly comparable with that of S1's, though it may be an interesting managerial maxim! However, there is no denying the fact that the lexical choice and the syntactic structure of a sentence do play a key role in making a sentence excellent in form since form, itself, primarily consists of the interaction of words and syntactic rules.

The second aspect determining the esthetic value of a writing is its substance, that is, the point that it is trying to make. This point is usually ideological, political, social, moral, etc. For example, the substance of a writing may be highlighting poverty among a social class or the ruthlessness of a war. Substance is often developed with didactic intentions, that is, the writer may pursue the aim of teaching or inducing an idea, thought, or emotional status. Hence, he is employing literature only as a means of propagating whatever he has to say.

B. Commitment and the "Art for art's sake" view

The term literature in its more common usage refers to the body of written works produced in a particular language nation, age, etc, that contain excellence of form or expression and present ideas of permanent or universal interest. The second denotation of the term, which is found generally in academic circles, is the body of writings on a particular scientific subject. In the context of our discussion, the latter meaning is not of much relevance, it is the first category that is to be analyzed here.

Two integrative aspects are enveloped in the definition of literature: form and meaning (in actuality, these two constitute any kind of writing). It is a common belief that literature should consist of fine forms, that is, one way or another it should appeal to the senses in such a way that it would arouse appreciation.

*Of all those arts in which the wise excel
Nature's chief masterpiece is writing well*
(JOHN SHEPHERD, 1692)

In more technical terms, the first criterion with which a piece of writing may be evaluated as being literature or not is its esthetic value. Consider the following two sentences:

1. *The flames are all long gone but the pain lingers on.*

(ROGER WATERS, 1979)

2. *Although the war is over, its disturbing memories and effects still exist.*

As it is evident, the two sentences convey almost the same kind of linguistic message, ie, they are semantic paraphrases of one another. Yet the first sentence enjoys a construct which is more attractive than sentence two (if you are not convinced, ask yourself this question: which of the two would you like to go over again?). What is it that makes S 1 more esthetically approved of

ADOPTING LITERATURE IN THE EFL CLASSROOM

HAMID MARASHI

There is much controversy at the moment over the adoption of literature in an English language teaching classroom. Whether or not we should include literature as part of the curriculum for ELT has been a source of inquiry to both teachers and theoreticians. A major reason for this incertitude is the seemingly inconsistent relationship of literature with the present goals of ELT, ie, practical communicative skills. This paper consists of two separate yet consecutively complementary parts. First, There is a brief discussion over the definition of literature itself, trying to understand what a literary text is. Secondly, there is a review of some of the on-going major arguments for and against the adoption of literary texts in the ELT classroom. Towards the end of the paper, the writer elaborates his opinion about maintaining literariness while usign a literary text in the EFL classroom.

I. Identifying Literature

A. Form and substance

In its broad sense, literature comprises two different categories of writing.