

EÖTVÖS LORÁND TUDOMÁNYEGYETEM

TANÁRI KÉPZÉS SZAKDOLGOZATA

Teaching Shakespeare in the EFL Classroom

Shakespeare tanítása az idegennyelv-órán

Témavezető:

Dóczy Brigitta

Tanársegéd

Készítette:

Vince Máté

*Angol nyelv és
irodalom szak*

Budapest, 2005

Contents

1. Introduction	52
1.1. Reasons for Teaching Literature	52
1.2. Approaches to Teaching Literature	53
1.3. Teaching Literature: Teaching Shakespeare	54
2. Problems to be Considered before Teaching Shakespeare	56
2.1. Which Group?	56
2.2. The Problem of Language	57
2.3. Choosing the Texts	59
3. Teaching Shakespeare	61
3.1. Teaching Shakespeare's <i>Sonnet CXXXVI</i>	61
3.2. Teaching selected parts from <i>Hamlet</i>	65
4. Conclusion	72
References	73

1. Introduction

1.1. Reasons for Teaching Literature

Since the middle of the 1980s, increasing attention has been given to the possibility of teaching literature in EFL/ESL classes, after a long period of neglect (Duff & Maley, 1991). Today its inclusion into the curriculum is made possible again through remarkable changes in what is understood under “teaching literature”. These revised principles are the consequences of thorough reflection on why former theories on language teaching excluded literature from the classrooms.

Thus, today teaching language through literature is essentially viewed as teaching language through any other written material (Carter & Walker, 1989). Therefore, any standard activity that is used with non-literary texts, can be used with literature as well, such as *rewriting*, *prediction activities*, *role-playing* and so on (Carter & Walker, 1989). As opposed to earlier methods, this attitude entails manipulated literary texts (e.g. cut into lines, acted out), language-based student centeredness to involve students with the text, or pair/group work instead of one-way communication dominated by the teacher (Carter & Walker, 1989). Teaching literature also means that “[t]exts may also be presented in fresh contexts by juxtaposition with other texts or media, or made to serve purposes for which they were not originally intended” (Duff & Maley, 1991, p. 6), as it will be seen in some of the exercises presented below.

The logical question that follows from the previous arguments is why should, then, literature be specifically taught if it is not essentially different from other texts. (Carter & Walker, 1989: p. 6) The answer methodologists agree on is that besides being as good as any authentic material, it provides surplus in many respects. Its content is not provided in a trivial way, but through complexities and subtleties that cannot be found in other types of material (Carter & Walker, 1989). Furthermore, it has the special advantages of being *universal*, involving *personal relevance*, *variety*, *interest*, *economy* and *suggestive power* (Maley, 1989), and its *ambiguities* and *indeterminacies* provide natural opportunity for discussions and different interpretations to be

expressed, which is among the central goals of communicative language teaching (Carter & Walker, 1989).

We can capitalize on motivation arising from the intrinsic interest of literary texts, and can tailor activities to the level of our students. Our primary concern will be to ensure that students interact with the text and each other in ways which promote language learning. (Maley, 1989, p. 11)

And, probably the most obvious advantage is that literature provides unmatched enjoyment for the students (Carter & Walker, 1989).

However, it may be another objection against teaching literature that, especially from the point of view of language competence, it is too difficult for students and teachers alike. It is to be admitted that the teacher has to be aware of the proficiency of the students when choosing the material. For each piece of literature an “appropriate level of proficiency is required” (Carter & Long, 1991, p. 6), as well as familiarity with certain literary conventions (Maley, 1989). Nevertheless, what at first sight appears to be a difficulty may turn out to be, on the contrary, a motivating element. “This kind of experience and enjoyment need not always be inhibited by linguistic difficulty since an exciting or moving text can itself be an incentive to overcome some of the linguistic or cultural barriers in the text.” (Carter & Long, 1991, p. 6)

1.2. Approaches to Teaching Literature

Methodological literature differentiates between three approaches to teaching literature: the *language-based* model, the *literature as content or culture* model, and the *literature as personal growth or enrichment* model (Lazar, 1993; Carter & Long, 1991). The exercises presented in the second part of this paper are designed in a way that they draw on all three approaches to teaching literature.

The main aim and method of the *language-based* model is to help students make meaningful interpretations and enhance the general awareness of English by drawing on the knowledge of familiar grammar, lexical and discoursal categories. These, in turn, help the students to make sensible aesthetic judgement based on the text (Lazar, 1993). This approach is

characterised by constant reference to the relationship between linguistic form and literary meaning (Carter & Long, 1991). The method is also useful in providing an interesting context to exposure to, or revision of, grammar and vocabulary. However, linguistic material should not be excessive, because it would mar the pleasure of reading literature (Lazar, 1993). The solution for that problem (as it is also employed below) is that linguistic explanation is used only as far as it is inevitable for making the text comprehensible, or further only if the students are especially interested in it.

The *literature as content/culture* approach sees literature as a means to introduce students to certain aspects of the target culture, such as History, Literary History, theory of genres, biography of the author (Carter & Long, 1991; Lazar, 1993). This method will be used mostly in the discussion exercises, however, not in a straightforward way. The aim of these exercises presented below will be to provide an opportunity for the students to explore as much as they like from the cultural background, and not to teach cultural information just for its own sake. This is the consequence of the fact that it is a strongly debated issue in literary theory if such background information helps in the genuine understanding of literary works. Of course, information, for instance, on the sonnet form or certain pieces of intertextual information is indispensable and thus will have to be provided.

Finally, the *literature as personal growth/enrichment* approach draws on personal experience and involvement to motivate students to participate (Carter & Long, 1991; Lazar, 1993). It works through the intellectual and emotional involvement of the students to give an opportunity to appreciate literature while using English. This approach will be used during role-playing exercises and class discussions of certain literature related topics.

1.3. Teaching Literature: Teaching Shakespeare

Teaching Shakespeare in an EFL classroom is an extremely difficult task, but it is just as rewarding. Although it demands unusual efforts from both the teacher and the students, it may prove extremely motivating as well, because it gives the possibility to read in original the works of an author who is not only one of the most important in the English language, but probably the

most acknowledged writer in the Western literary canon. Therefore, the teaching of Shakespeare is worth the extra effort from the teacher. In the ensuing pages (Section 2.), an attempt will be made to address some of the difficulties and the several points that have to be taken into consideration concerning the teaching of Shakespeare, in order to offer possible solutions and to give inspiration as to how the task may be accomplished. The final section of the paper contains suggestions for exercises that may be employed in teaching Shakespeare.

2. Problems to be Considered before Teaching Shakespeare

2.1. Which Group?

The question that needs to be answered first is “To which group can Shakespeare be taught in order to make it effective and productive?” The response can be given after considering the following aspects:

1. What language proficiency is needed?
2. What age group is suitable?

As Shakespeare’s Early Modern English poses difficulties even to an experienced reader, it evidently requires a high level of the knowledge of English from the group. A solid and *reflective knowledge of syntactic rules* of present day English is inevitable for the comparison with the earlier period of the language (this will be dealt with in detail in the next section), in order for the texts to be comprehensible and not to lead to confusion in normal language usage. Moreover, an extensive and varied *vocabulary* is also necessary to provide for the ability to infer new meanings for otherwise known words. Without such a vocabulary, furthermore, the amount of new material to be learned would be so enormous that it would make students unmotivated, and would take away the pleasure of the task.

The age that is suitable for teaching Shakespeare is a question that can be addressed more directly. For the successful and enjoyable utilisation of the material offered below, it is useful if the students have already studied about Shakespeare in some other class. It is also advantageous in making Shakespeare acceptable and enjoyable for students if their English classes are no longer dominated by the rush to “finish the material on time”, that is, when most people in the group have already reached their objectives in learning English and therefore they (and their parents) do not demand a new grammatical structure on every class.

Consequently, in practical terms, the group has to be at least on the intermediate (or rather upper-intermediate) level, preferably containing students with language proficiency exams.

Taking into consideration that, and the general literary studies, the optimal group to teach Shakespeare to consists of students in the 11–12th grade.

2.2. The Problem of Language

The first and probably most demanding difficulty with the teaching of Shakespeare is the linguistic gap between the text and the everyday English that students speak. Shakespeare's works are written in the so-called Early Modern English period which has some characteristics that are very different from Present Day (or Modern) English. The changes that occurred since Early Modern English pertain to practically all fields of linguistics: phonetics/phonology, semantics, morphology and syntax.

Nevertheless, the knowledge that students can gain implicitly, or even almost unnoticed, while being introduced to certain aspects of Early Modern English is also enormous. Through studying the literature of an earlier linguistic period, not only cultural, but language awareness can be enhanced as well. The brief discussion of linguistic phenomena that differ from the modern usage inevitably involves the constant reference to present day language. Thus reading Shakespeare can, as already hinted at in Section 1.2, also serve as a good occasion to revise or enlarge the students' knowledge about, for instance, pronunciation rules and peculiarities, or certain syntactic structures. Therefore, what first might have seemed an unwanted difficulty, may turn out to be, in fact, useful in solidifying the students' knowledge of English.

The changes in phonetics/phonology, namely those that involve alteration in pronunciation, do not pose significant problems. Shakespeare's lines can be read with present day pronunciation, as it is done in performances and movie versions (even if thus they do not sound authentic), with the exception of some very few instances. Examples for that are lines that should rhyme, but the pronunciation of one or both of the involved syllables has undergone such a change whose result is that the consonance is no longer audible. If it is necessary at all to deal with rhymes (that is, when a certain exercise, or students' questions require it), the fact of the transformation and the former consonance can be addressed at the particular lines, without any

further reference to the general process of phonetic change. (Such an instance will be dealt with in Section 3.1.)

Semantic changes, in contrast, may result in serious problems that have to be addressed with thorough circumspection. On the one hand, several words have undergone significant semantic change that may lead to complete misunderstanding (consider for example “gay”), or in certain cases may make the text incomprehensible (cf. the case of ‘which’ referring to a person or the wider use of ‘that’). On the other hand, the change in the meaning attached to certain sentence structures has the same consequences (e.g. the *shall/will* distinction). There are, nevertheless, a number of solutions available to overcome such difficulties. Some of those will be dealt with in detail in the later sections of this thesis, therefore it is sufficient for now to mention only a few methods in general. The most obvious aid for the students is to gloss expressions or even full sentences that the teacher believes may cause difficulties on the material handed out. Such paraphrases are given in many editions of Shakespeare’s works, but they are also available on the internet, just like the Modern English “translations” of the pieces, which are also very useful tools for the teacher. A good example for what kinds of glosses or remarks may be needed is given by Lazar (1993), demonstrated on Marc Antony’s famous monologue. Another method in helping the students to comprehend the texts is to offer explanations or paraphrases while working on them in class. This is also useful when the teacher would like to enhance the linguistic knowledge of the students in a straightforward manner by raising their language awareness. It may also prove effective to make slight alterations in the text, for instance, by adding punctuation marks, italicise items in a meaningful way, or even to change some of the words. The methods mentioned here can be applied separately or in a way that they complement each-other, but the one aspect that should not be disregarded is that they all demand from the teacher a strictly principled reflection in advance on the linguistic knowledge of the students *and* the linguistic requirements of the text(s): this is an inevitable pre-condition for the successful and meaningful treatment of the material.

Lastly, the problem concerning morphology and syntax is very similar to that of semantics. Many morphological and syntactical phenomena that are still observable in Early

Modern English are obsolete in Modern English, which leads to the incomprehensibility of the text. To mention just a few, such cases should be taken into consideration as the several *conjugated verb forms*, the *you/thou* distinction with all their separate forms, the difference in the *usage of conjunctions*, or the wider scope of the *use of the subjunctive*. Such problems can be overcome by similar methods to those already mentioned in connection with Semantics, and the gain is probably even bigger in amount, as the syntactic phenomena that need discussion or explanation concern a variety of aspects of regular language usage.

2.3. Choosing the Texts

The topic of this transitory section is the consideration of *what* to teach by Shakespeare. The subject of the thesis to which this methodological thesis is a supplement, is *Macbeth*, therefore it would appear obvious to deal with that play in what follows. However, *Macbeth* is probably one of the most difficult plays from the perspective of language. There is not enough place here, and probably no need, to prove that in detail, therefore let it suffice to refer to the many puzzled comments in interpreting linguistically various lines of the play, made by Shakespeare scholars ranging from Samuel Johnson to Robert S. Miola, the editor of one of the most recent editions of the play. Thus, it seems more sensible to choose other works that contain some more easily comprehensible passages. Consequently, in the later sections of the paper, the activities will be offered mostly in connection with two pieces: one is *Sonnet CXXXVI.*, the other is *Hamlet*.

The teaching of a sonnet involves some obvious advantages. The first is its length: it is easier to talk about a piece of literature that can be read in a few minutes during the class. As another consequence of the brevity, it can also be mentioned that even one or two classes can be considered sufficient to deal with the poem. Moreover, many of the sonnets are witty, and sometimes slippery, which may prove quite appealing to the age group that was chosen in Section 2.1. Furthermore, the sonnet is also a topic that is likely to surface on the regular literature classes in most of the cases, which provides a good background to refer to or to compare with.

The other Shakespearean work dealt with below is *Hamlet*. This, beyond its being one of the best-known pieces of literature, is extremely rich in material to make use of. First, it is a great advantage that it is almost certain students have learnt about *Hamlet*, or have seen it; therefore it is possible to discuss selected scenes without reading the whole play. Secondly, *Hamlet* has several movie versions, consequently the teacher has an opportunity to screen short pieces (or even the whole play) after choosing an interpretation that supports best what s/he would like to present from the play to the students. The various movie versions of the play can also be used to compare how scenes or certain characters are depicted in the different interpretations. Lastly, Tom Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* and the movie based on the play are extremely helpful in interpreting *Hamlet*, as well as provide occasion for several interesting and motivating tasks.

Of course, the linguistic considerations or the types of activities offered below are not exceptionally applicable to the works for which they are employed here. On the contrary, the purpose of the present paper is to describe two *examples* of teaching Shakespeare in order to give some guidelines as to how this extremely difficult but rewarding material can be handled. Therefore, the methods can be transferred to other plays or sonnets as well.

3. Teaching Shakespeare

3.1. Teaching Shakespeare's Sonnet CXXXVI¹

The chosen example on which it will be demonstrated how a sonnet might be taught in EFL classes, is *Sonnet CXXXVI*. (two of its translations is also quoted here for later reference). Depending on the teacher's purpose and the time available, it is possible to select from the following exercises so that they comprise the material of one, two or three classes.

CXXXVI.

IF thy soul cheque thee that I come so near,
Swear to thy blind soul that I was thy will,
And will, thy soul knows, is admitted there;
Thus far for love my love-suit, sweet, fulfil.
'Will' will fulfil the treasure of thy love,
Ay, fill it full with wills, and my will one.
In things of great receipt with ease we prove
Among a number one is reckon'd none:
Then in the number let me pass untold,
Though in thy stores' account I one must be;
For nothing hold me, so it please thee hold
That nothing me, a something sweet to thee:
 Make but my name thy love, and love that still,
 And then thou lovest me, for my name is 'Will.'

¹ The author of the present thesis had the opportunity to try out these tasks in two consecutive classes.

136.

Ha sok-sok villid, vágy, álom, szeszély,
 Szíd miattam, mondd: én is az vagyok,
 S villi – tudják – szívedben joggal él:
 Védd bennem a szabad akaratod.
 E bűvös játék kéjünk leple; óh,
 Mily boldog áldás, mily tündéri kegy:
 Ha már a villik száma millió,
 A milliók közt eltűnik az egy.
 S még tovább tűnik! Tánctrillákra tilt
 Perdülni az ész: bűvök; de tekints
 Szívedbe, ott rejtőzöm; s néha nyílt
 Színen az gyönyör, a titok, a kincs.
 Nevem szeresd csak, és e szerelem
 Engem szeret, hisz Willy a nevem.

Szabó Lőrinc's translation

136.

Ha lelked fedd, hogy ily közel jutottam,
 Mondd, én saját akaratod vagyok:
 S megérti majd hogy így helyem van ottan;
 Ezt megtagadni, kedves, nincsen ok.
 A vágy szerelmed kincsét majd betölti:
 Ám töltsd be vágygyal s hozzá vágyam' add:
 Midőn a szám a nagynak mérvit ölti;
 A sokhoz egynek jutni még szabad.
 Így számba-vétlen végy föl engemet,
 Hadd légyek egy a számsor rendiben!
 Tarts semminek, de mégis meglehet
 Lesz a mit megszeretsz e semmiben.
 Szeresd nevem', s ha ezt tetszést arat,
 Ugy már szeretsz, mert nevem: akarat.

Győry Vilmos's translation

The main reason why *Sonnet CXXXVI.* was chosen as demonstration is its wittiness. As the two translations show, this poem is practically untranslatable as a consequence of the pun that runs through the whole piece. The speaker uses the word “*will*” in several meanings (as an auxiliary verb, as ‘what somebody wants’, as ‘male and female sexual organ’, and as the short form of ‘William’), which the students can only recognise if they read (and understand) the original English poem. The consequence of such a reading is that it gives the experience to the students that they were able to understand something in an English text, which would have been lost if they only knew the Hungarian.

An introductory exercise to deal with the poem is to ask the students to list as many meanings of a word with several senses as they can (a good example is e.g. ‘board’), and after that, to ask them to do the same with the word ‘will’. The meanings of ‘will’ should be written on the blackboard and left there the whole time so that during the subsequent tasks they should be able to recognise and acknowledge the multiple meanings of the word in the poem.

As a second lead-in task, the teacher can elicit what the students know about the sonnet form: what it looks like, what subject it has, what is its usual rhyme scheme (and what is the difference between Petrarchan and Shakespearean sonnets), and what is special in its ending. This is done frontally, but if the students can recall at least some of the basic points to remember about sonnets, it does not have to last very long. Nevertheless, it is useful on the one hand for the further exercises, and on the other hand, it conveys relevant information about English-

speaking cultures, though going into detail about its role in the literary history is probably unnecessary.

The first exercise connected directly with the poem is carried out in group work. The students are asked to form small groups of 3 to 5 people, and a copy of the poem cut up in lines is handed out to each of the groups. While the groups are working, the teacher should walk around, monitor the group work, and give clues if needed, for example by reminding the students of the rhyme scheme and telling them that the pairs *prove–love* and *near–there* formed rhymes at the time of the composition of the poem. After a few minutes each group is asked to read out what they managed to produce.

After, that the poem is distributed to every student in the following layout, together with Szabó Lőrinc's translation (which is not reproduced here again):

<i>Shakespeare: Sonnet CXXXVI.</i> ²	
<u>IF thy soul cheque thee</u> that I come so near,	cheque: megfűkezz; that =because
Swear to thy <u>blind soul</u> that I was thy will,	swear to sy that: megesküszik vkinek, hogy
<u>And will,</u> thy soul knows, <u>is admitted there;</u>	
Thus far for love <u>my love-suit,</u> <u>sweet,</u> <u>fulfil.</u>	suit: per, bírósági kereset fulfil: teljesít, eleget tesz, kielégít
' <u>Will</u> ' <u>will fulfil</u> the treasure of thy love,	
<u>Ay,</u> <u>fill it full with wills,</u> and my will: one.	Ay / al /: igen, de bizony
<u>In things of great receipt with ease we prove:</u>	great receipt =great amount
<u>Among a number</u> one is reckon'd none;	reckon: vminek számít vmit
<u>Then in the number</u> let me pass untold,	number =great amount of things untold =unnoticed
<u>Though in thy stores' account</u> I <i>one</i> must be;	
<u>For nothing hold me,</u> so it please thee, <u>hold</u>	so it please thee =if you like
<u>That nothing <i>me,</i></u> a something sweet to thee:	
<u>Make but my name thy love,</u> and love that still,	but =only, at least still =always
<u>And then thou lovest me,</u> for my name is 'Will.'	

² The punctuation is changed at a few points and italics are added to make the poem more comprehensible.

The students are given a short time to run through the text (and the translation) and look for any other unknown words. If it is not asked by students the teacher inquires about the meaning of “*thy*” and “*thee*” in line 1. If nobody knows, the teacher tells the students that they stand for certain conjugated forms of ‘you’ and makes them infer it from the context which ones they are equivalent with.

The next task is the rough translation of the poem line by line. The teacher calls the attention of the student to the glosses and to the fact that in one line the underlined and the non-underlined sections form separate parts of the sentence. When the same style of underlining is used at the end of one line and at the beginning of the next, those parts belong together. The translation is done frontally, one student doing one line, except for the cases where two lines cannot be translated without each-other (lines 7–8 and 11–12). The teacher helps if necessary, preferably in English in order not to force his/her interpretation on the students. However, s/he calls the attention to the ambiguity hidden in the words “*will*”, “*admitted*”, “*fulfil*”, “*hold*”, and tries to make students give a translation that reflects the ambiguity if it is possible. When the rough translation is finished, the teacher asks one or more students to repeat the translation, dividing it now into 4+4+4+2 lines.³

The next task is the discussion of the poem involving general questions and the close reading of certain parts. The aim is to help them appreciate the word-plays on “*will*” and “*(some/no)thing*”, which finally brings in the sexual meaning underlying the puns. The teacher’s initial questions may include for instance:

Is it a love poem? In what sense?

What is the speaker’s aim?

What situation can you imagine around the poem?

The answers will probably describe an innocent love poem. The next step is to point out certain expressions that can be understood as contradicting to the “spiritual” concept of love. Possible questions include:

³ Győry Vilmos’s translation is quoted above because it is a word for word translation closer to the original, therefore, at certain points during the process of translation, checking it may prove helpful.

What does “*come so near*” mean? Should it be understood in literal (physical) or abstract sense?

Why is the soul “*blind*” if it was able to stop the two approaching lovers?

Where is ‘I’ = ‘thy will’ admitted into?

What is the “*treasure of love*” that can be fulfilled (in the sense of ‘filling it until it is full’) with “*will*”?

At this point it is practical to distribute the pair of this poem, *Sonnet CXXXV*, which varies the same subject and puns, but with more explicit sexual references. After giving some time to the students to scan through the poem, the teacher calls their attention to the lines: “*Wilt thou, whose will is large and spacious, / Not once vouchsafe to hide my will in thine?*” (Words and word forms such as “*wilt*”, “*vouchsafe*”, and “*thine*” have to be explained.) Students can be asked to picture what they read, but these lines are so straightforward that after the questions put earlier, there will be at least some students who will have got the meaning by now. The teacher should ask them to explain those two lines to the rest of the class, and then return to *Sonnet CXXXVI*. Asking them to consider that these two poems follow each-other and vary the same puns and topics, the students can be asked to reinterpret the meaning of “*come so near*”, “*admit*” and “*will*”. A final topic for discussion may be to find out whose “*will*” (or “*Wilt*”) is the persona talking about: is it the addresser’s, the addressee’s, or of both? Another task that can be addressed is to compare Szabó Lőrinc’s translation to the interpretation the students reached.

3.2. Teaching selected parts from Hamlet

As it was argued above in Section 2.3. Hamlet is chosen as a good means to teach Shakespeare in EFL classes, on the one hand, because almost undoubtedly every student knows the play in some way, and, on the other hand, because it offers an opportunity for a variety of exercises. The types of tasks to be outlined here aim at all four basic skills of language learning: *writing, reading, listening and speaking*. They include *in-class dialogue writing and acting, individual presentation* based on easy research, *listening and group discussion* of read and

watched scenes. Most of the tasks below can be used either during a longer period of time, as they are partly based on each-other, or separately, just as a part of one class, or as individual and separate classes. Therefore, tasks are numbered here only for clearer organisation and easier reference, and not to suggest any inviolable order in the sequence of their application (unless it is otherwise indicated).

Task 1. – Introduction to Shakespeare’s plays: Famous Quotes

In this exercise (not strictly connected to Hamlet) students’ cultural awareness is raised in a two-way manner. On the one hand they are acquainted with sayings originating from Shakespeare that are used in everyday language (some of them in more elevated discourses, but some in newspapers or in the simplest conversation as well), both in English and in Hungarian. On the other hand, they are made aware of the differences that occur in some quotes (and titles) between English and Hungarian. This task may also serve as a basis of the individual research exercises described in Task 2.

Each student is given a slip of paper with a quotation from Shakespeare either in English or in Hungarian. In fact, pairs of quotations are distributed, therefore the task of the students is to find their partner, that is, who has the same quotation in the other language. Some possible quotations are presented in the table below with their standard Hungarian translation that is easily recognisable because of its being in everyday use.

Shakespearean Quote/Title	Standard Hungarian Translation	Origin of Quote
<i>To be, or not to be: that is the question</i>	Lenni, vagy nem lenni: ez itt a kérdés	<i>Hamlet</i> (III, i, 56–61)
<i>The rest is silence</i>	A többi, néma csend	<i>Hamlet</i> (V, ii. 373)
<i>Get thee to a nunnery</i>	Menj kolostorba	<i>Hamlet</i> (III, i, 122)
<i>Frailty, thy name is woman!</i>	Gyarlóság, asszony a neved	<i>Hamlet</i> (I, ii. 146)
<i>Though this be madness, yet there is method in't</i>	Bolond/Órült beszéd, de van benne rendszer	<i>Hamlet</i> (II, ii. 206)
<i>Something is rotten in the state of Denmark</i>	Valami büzlik Dániában/Rohadt az államgépben valami	<i>Hamlet</i> (I, iv. 90)
<i>Jealousy, .../ the green-eyed monster</i>	A féltékenység... a zöldszemű szörny	<i>Othello</i> (III, iii. 165–166)
<i>A horse! a horse! my kingdom for a horse!</i>	Országomat egy lóért!	<i>King Richard III</i> (V, iv. 7)

<i>Brave new world</i>	Szép új világ	<i>The Tempest</i> (V, i. 205)
<i>Let me play the lion too</i>	Ide nekem az oroszlánt is	<i>A Midsummer Night's dream</i> (I, ii. 64)
<i>All the world's a stage, / (And all the men and women merely players)</i>	Színház az egész világ	<i>As You Like It</i> (II, vii. 139–140)
<i>O Romeo, Romeo! wherefore art thou Romeo?</i>	Ó Romeo, miért vagy te Romeo?	<i>Romeo and Juliet</i> (II, ii. 33)
<i>(Friends, Romans, countrymen, lend me your ears!) / I come to bury (Caesar), not to praise (him).</i>	(Barátaim, rómaiak, földieim, figyeljete rá!) Temetni jöttem (Caesar), nem dicsérni	<i>Julius Caesar</i> (III, ii. 78–79)
<i>The winter of our discontent.</i>	Rosszkedvünk tele	<i>King Richard III</i> (I, i. 1)
<i>All that glitters is not gold.</i>	Nem mind arany, ami fénylik	<i>The Merchant of Venice</i> (II, vii. 67)
As You Like It	Ahogy tetszik	
Much Ado About Nothing	Sok hűhó semmiért	
All's Well that Ends Well	Minden jó, ha a vége jó	

The next task is to write a short dialogue in pairs using the quotation the pair has. After a short time, the dialogues are acted out and the rest of the group has to guess what the quotation was. The English quotes are put on the black-board, possibly together with the Hungarian (this can be made easier with pre-made sheets of papers containing the lines), and as a follow-up exercise, when all the dialogues have been listened to, several questions can be put to the students:

What is common in the 'sentences' on the black-board?

Do you know other famous quotations from Shakespeare in English or in Hungarian?

Do you know any other Shakespeare plays? Their titles in English?

Task 2. – Hamlet Recalled: Home 'Research'

In this exercise students have to find lines or short passages from a play/plays and on another occasion they have to summarise the situation in which the quotation occurs. This exercise presupposes several things that have to be taken into consideration. First, summarising a scene can be done in a sensible way only if the student knows the whole play. Therefore, the quotations should be taken from a play that the students have read or seen, thus it is advisable to

consult with their literature teacher. Secondly, finding a line in a play takes time, therefore this task is most suitable as homework, moreover, probably not from one day to the other but leaving a longer period for preparation. It also has to be noted, thirdly, that as it is not the main objective of this exercise to make students scan through thousands of lines just to find one, teachers should encourage the use of electronic resources, if the students have access to them. The internet abounds with pages containing several versions of Shakespeare's plays, and CD-ROMs are also available, or can be made available by the teacher. Encouraging the students to consult the internet is useful also because while they are searching, they will inevitably open some of the well-designed and user-friendly websites that contain important, and for the interested, exciting material on Shakespeare. Moreover, the students unavoidably *use* their English in a meaningful way, which is the aim of learning English.

For this exercise, some of the quotations given in Task 1. can be employed, but it is more sensible to choose lines or passages that are placed in some of the major scenes of a play the teacher would like to deal with. On the next occasion students are asked one by one to briefly summarise the scene which contains their line. For that, of course, students should be allowed to use the Hungarian translation of the play, because reading Shakespeare in English without help is too demanding a task, and the main aim of this exercise is, on the one hand, the (re)reading of scenes from a play, on the other, the summarisation of the dialogue in their own words. If the quotations are chosen from the same play, it is also possible to ask the students to reconstruct the plot of the play from the scenes they summarise to each-other.

Task 3. Introduction to Hamlet: The Dumb Show.

A good introductory exercise to teaching *Hamlet* is to watch the first of the two dumb-show scenes from *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*. In somewhat less than six minutes, it summarises the *events* of *Hamlet*. Before watching the scene, students are asked to try to find out which play the dumb show acts out. After the screening, the students are asked to write short pieces in small groups relating the story. A different style is given to each group, for instance, TV

coverage, police-announcement, commentary, feature article, theatre review. Later the pieces are read/acted out.

Another task that can be connected to the scene from *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* is a discussion on how well students think the dumb show represents *Hamlet*. Do they think that every important event is included? Are there any unnecessary ones? Do they remember the two characters hanged up in the end? What is the difference between a play and a dumb show?

Task 4. "Where's Polonius?": Gap Filling

This exercise is built on watching a shorter scene from *Hamlet*, by Laurence Olivier. The purpose on the one hand is to promote the appreciation of comic scenes in tragedies, and on the other hand, to develop listening skills by way of a series of quick exchange. One very suitable scene is the conversation between Claudius and Hamlet after the latter has killed Polonius.

Students are first asked to watch the scene (in the Olivier version it is somewhat longer than 1 minute), and make notes to be able to summarise what they were talking about. Hungarian subtitles should be made invisible for this task. After the screening and a brief summary by students, the conversation is handed out to them with certain expressions and phrases deleted (represented below by crossing out). Their task is to fill in the missing words during another (or if necessary, more than one) screening.

King. Now, Hamlet, where's Polonius?
Ham. ~~At supper.~~
King. ~~At supper!~~ where?
Ham. Not where he eats, ~~but where he is eaten:~~ a certain convocation of politic worms are e'en at him. Your worm is your only emperor for diet: we fat all creatures else to fat us, and we fat ourselves for worms: your fat king and your lean beggar is but variable service, -- ~~two dishes,~~ but to ~~one table:~~ that's the end.
King. Alas, alas!
Ham. A man may fish with the worm that hath eat of a king, and eat of the fish that hath fed of that worm.
King. ~~What dost thou mean by this?~~
Ham. Nothing but to show you how a king may go a progress through the guts of a beggar.
King. Where is Polonius?
Ham. ~~In heaven:~~ send thither to see: if your messenger find him not there, seek him i' the other place yourself. But, indeed, if you find him not within this month, you shall ~~lose~~ him as you go up the stairs into the lobby.
King. Go seek him there. [To some Attendants.]
Ham. ~~He will stay till you come.~~

After the task sheet has completed, checked and understood, a short discussion may be conducted on what students think the function of comic scenes in tragedies were, why they are surprising for the present day audience (if they are), and what this scene in particular shows about Claudius and Hamlet that could not have been presented in a tragic one.

Task 5. Find it in English

This task is a variation of the previous one. The students have to find the original English expressions, sentences for what is underlined in the Hungarian translation of the ‘To be or not to be’ monologue. It makes the task more applicable if the translation used is a modern one (for example Eörsi or Nádasdy), because Arany’s version has become difficult to understand.

First the students watch the monologue without subtitles (in Olivier’s version: 3.45 minutes). Then the translation is handed out, with certain expressions underlined. Students are given some time to read it, and then the scene is played again (more than once, if necessary). This exercise also gives opportunity for raising language awareness if after the screening the original text is handed out and students are asked to look for anything odd in the text (orthography, word choice, sentence structure, morphology). To help the discussion the teacher can afterwards hand out a modern ‘English translation’ of the text.

Task 6. Two sides of the same coin

This task aims at class discussion of possible interpretations of the same scene. The part chosen for that purpose is the climax of the tragedy, the closing scenes of the play. The main aim of the exercise is to compare the two very different versions of the ending in Laurence Olivier’s movie and in *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*. The two differ in a lot of aspects, the most important being that in *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*, the emphasis falls on the fate of the two minor characters, and the duel of Hamlet and Laertes is only hinted at; while

in Olivier's version, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are left out completely, the film ending before the arrival of the messenger and Fortinbras.

To support the discussion, a preliminary group-work exercise may be conducted. After summarising the last scenes, the groups have to decide on how they would direct them, including e.g. scenery, or even cuts. Then screening of the two versions (Olivier: 15 minutes, Stoppard: 9 minutes) takes place, followed by a discussion of what differences the students saw, why they were important, which version did the students prefer.

4. Conclusion

The topic of the thesis, teaching Shakespeare in the EFL high-school class, may appear too ambitious at first sight. However, by carefully selecting and editing short parts of Shakespeare's work, it is possible to give an unmatched experience to the students. Teaching Shakespeare demands serious preparation on the part of the teacher, but the inestimable amount of movie versions of the plays can make it an easy, as well as a rewarding task. Richard III, depicted as a Nazi leader, Romeo and Juliet, placed in present day Verona Beach, or Hamlet seen through the eyes of two "Nobodies" provide excellent occasion for a great variety of exercises, facilitated by personal involvement.

Therefore, in this thesis, some basic guidelines were provided to promote the inclusion of at least parts of Shakespeare's plays and, optionally, some of his Sonnets in the EFL curriculum. First, a short overview was given on articles and books on teaching literature in general. Second, the problems of the appropriate age group, the difficulties in the language, and the questions of choosing the right texts were addressed. In the final section of the thesis, some hints and ideas were also outlined as to what kinds of exercises are applicable for the material to make it enjoyable as well as instructive. Hopefully, more and more teachers will recognise the importance of teaching literature, and they will also venture to include Shakespeare among the authors brought in to the EFL classrooms.

References

- Carter, R. & Long, M. N. (1991). *Teaching Literature*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.
- Carter, R. & Walker, R. (1989). Literature and the Learner: Introduction. In: R. Carter, R. Walker & C. Brumfitt (eds.): *Literature and the Learner: Methodological Approaches*. (pp.1–9). Modern English Publications and the British Council.
- Duff, A. & Maley, A. (1991). *Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lazar, Gillian (1993). *Literature and Language Teaching. A guide for teachers and trainers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maley, A. (1989). Down from the Pedestal: Literature as Resource. In: R. Carter, R. Walker & C. Brumfitt (eds.): *Literature and the Learner: Methodological Approaches*. (pp. 10–24). Modern English Publications and the British Council.