**Commentary Patch Rubric**

**Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Student ID: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Letter Grade: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Mark /25: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Patch # \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Task: Write a line-by-line commentary that explains the set passage at a close textual level. You can consider:**

* Grammar & syntax
* Vocabulary
* Stylistic and literary features (e.g., similar, sound effect)
* Metre, rhythm, sound effects
* Structure of the overall piece
* Themes, characterisation, imagery
* Relationship to earlier and/or later literature (broad connections, genre, specific quotations, and intertextual allusions)
* Social, historical, political, artistic background.

***Note bene:* specify if your commentary targets beginner-intermediate students, or advanced researchers. If the first, you can focus more on some basic grammatical matters to help your reader out. If the latter, only explain grammar and basic word meanings if there is something significant about a point of grammar (e.g., a mood, tense, or case used very unusually) or word meaning (e.g., a word used in a sense outside its usual range of meaning).**

**Set Latin:**

You must agree with the teacher which Latin lines you plan to examine. As a rough guide, 10-20 lines is a good amount for this size commentary.

**WORD COUNT, EXCLUDING BLOCK QUOTES OF LATIN TEXT, CITATIONS, AND BIBLIOGRAPHY:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **LATIN 201** | **LATIN 301** | **ANCIENT 745** |
| **1,200** | **1,400** | **1,600** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area** | **Above Standard**  **(A range)** | **Meets Standard**  **(B range)** | **Bare Pass**  **(C range)** | **Below Standard**  **(D Range)** |
| **Use of scholarship and commentaries**  **(see sample at end of rubric for referencing and citation guide).** | Consistently uses at least 5 scholarly resources throughout to great effect in the commentary.  Seamlessly integrates views of scholars into the analysis.  **At Honours level A range answers use significantly more resources, of a wide range of types (e.g., articles, books, and commentaries), to make astute references of both micro and macro elements in the poem(s).**  References scholars’ views appropriately throughout.  Provides a full, error-free bibliography of all sources. | Uses at least 5 scholarly resources to build the analysis in the commentary.  Makes frequent, appropriate use of scholarship and commentaries to make relevant observations.  May rely on scholars so much that independent analysis is less apparent.  References scholars’ views appropriately throughout.  Provides a full bibliography; may have a small number of minor errors. | Uses at least 5 scholarly resources to build the analysis in the commentary but references to scholars are infrequent.  May not fully understand or develop the implications of the arguments in the scholarship.  There may be minor errors in referencing throughout.  There may be errors in the bibliography, but sources can still be identified. | Does not demonstrate use of scholarly research.  Refers to scholarship but consistently fails to cite it appropriately or does not cite scholarship.  Does not provide a bibliography.  Or provides a bibliography where sources cannot be identified and verified. |
| **Independent analysis** | Frequently provides independent analysis of the poem(s) which is coherent and convincing.  Analyses multiple significant aspects of the text (as relevant to the particular poem(s): style, vocabulary, any notable grammar, literary references, historical reference).  Combines views of scholars with own analysis.  **At Honours level, A range answers consistently display critical engagement with scholarship, and independent conclusions**. | Provides some independent analysis of the poem which is coherent and convincing.  Analyses some significant aspects of the text (as relevant to the particular poem(s): style, vocabulary, any notable grammar, literary references, historical reference).  May not address all the significant aspects of the texts or may be stronger in some parts of the analysis. | Makes a clear attempt to analyse the poem independently.  Analyses a small number of significant aspects of the text (as relevant to the particular poem(s): style, vocabulary, any notable grammar, literary references, historical reference) but misses multiple significant elements of the poem(s).  Some conclusions may be more convincing than others / some argumentation is not fully thought out. | Describes rather than analyses.  Contains significant errors in understanding and/or analysis. |
| **Accuracy and clarity of writing** | Consistently uses clear, formal academic writing.  Deploys varied vocabulary.  **At Honours level, A range answers use clear, formal, and polished academic writing.** | Generally uses clear, formal academic writing but there are occasional colloquialisms and/or overly-wordy sections. | Generally intelligible but regularly lapses out of formal academic writing (e.g. with colloquialisms). | Portions of the whole work are not intelligible. |
| **Lemmata (chunking of text), format and layout** | Formatting of the piece, including *lemma* (chunks of text) chosen, always reflects appropriate divisions and/or breaks in the chosen poem(s).  **At Honours, A range responses contain additional information about the *apparatus criticus* and/or manuscript issues and uses formatting to convey this information.** | Formatting of the piece, including *lemma* (chunks of text) chosen, generally reflects appropriate divisions and/or breaks in the chosen poem(s). | Formatting reflects an attempt to break up the text into chunks but there are some formatting choices or choices of where to break up the text that do not reflect an obvious sense/line/syntax break.  Shows a clear attempt to format the piece like a scholarly commentary on a Latin text, but layout and/or formatting hinders readability. | Break-up of text fails to reflect the poem(s) sense/line/syntax break.  Commentary is not formatted like a recognisable scholarly commentary on a Latin text.  Format and layout make the commentary hard to read and detract from the content. |
| Piece is clearly laid out and formatted in a manner that resembles a scholarly commentary on Latin literature.  Layout and formatting make the analysis very easy to read and to follow. | |
| **Other notable features that contributed to the mark** |  |  |  |  |

**REFERENCING – how to**

* You will need to consult the commentaries and some scholarship for this patch.
* When you use material from the commentaries or scholarship you must cite it appropriately.
* **This means providing enough information that the marker can track down the precise part of the source that you have used.**
* In a footnote, this can be limited to **Author** and **Pages** as long as you provide the full details of the work in your **bibliography**.
* E.g., **Fordyce 32** is sufficient for the footnote, but the bibliography must provide all the details:

**Fordyce, C. J. *Catullus: A Commentary.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.**

* Please note, in Latin research you can refer to multiple sources in a single footnote, and you can include extra words to show how you have used each source. This can be used to demonstrate your critical thinking, without e.g.**:**

**“Fordyce 32, Skinner 120, and Greene 4 all discuss Catullus’ use of Sappho in this line”.**

**“Fordyce 32 and Skinner 120. See also Greene 4 who connects this issue to poem 11 as well.”**

**“Fordyce 32. Skinner 120 and Greene 4 take the opposite position, but Fordyce convinced me because X [insert your reasons].**

**WHAT ARE SUFFICIENT DETAILS FOR THE BIBLIOGRAPHY?**

For a **book** this means: Author’s name, date, *title*, place published, publisher (see Fordyce above).

For an **article** it means: Author’s name, date, title, journal name, journal volume, full page range.

## E.g., Young, Elizabeth M. ‘[Catullus's Phaselus ( C. 4): Mastering a New Wave of Poetic Speech](http://librarysearch.auckland.ac.nz/primo_library/libweb/action/display.do?frbrVersion=2&tabs=detailsTab&ct=display&fn=search&doc=TN_museS1080650411100026&indx=1&recIds=TN_museS1080650411100026&recIdxs=0&elementId=0&renderMode=poppedOut&displayMode=full&frbrVersion=2&dscnt=1&scp.scps=scope%3A%28Standard_record%29%2Cscope%3A%28Combined_record%29%2Cprimo_central_multiple_fe&frbg=&tab=everything&dstmp=1374284342952&srt=rank&mode=Basic&dum=true&tb=t&vl(freeText0)=young%20catullus%20arethusa&vid=UOA2_A).’ Arethusa 44 (2011): 69-88.

For a **chapter from an edited book,** it means: Author’s name, date, title of chapter, name of book editors, title of book, full page range (of chapter).

E.g., **Butrica, J. L. ‘History and Transmission of the Text.’ In M. B. Skinner (ed.) *A Companion to Catullus*. Malden MA: Blackwell, 2007. 13-34.**

* **Format / Referencing Style –** You may use any referencing style that fits into the guidelines above of providing the precise part of a reference (i.e. page number). You can’t use all styles, e.g., APA does not require page numbers, so it is not precise enough. You must be consistent throughout the assessment (i.e., do not switch between Harvard style bibliography and Chicago within the one document).