MODULE SYLLABUS

HIGHER ADVANCED LATIN: VERSE
CLLA6/7009

Module Code:	CLLA6/7009
Credit points:	20
Pre-requisites/restrictions:	Standard of Greek/Latin Intermediate II, or Greek/Latin A Level or equivalent.
Taught:	Semester 1
Lecturer:	Dr Magdalena Ohrman
Distance tutor:	Dr David Noy

This module booklet offers information for students on campus and for distance students. Please note that not all information may be applicable to both groups.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Students will study a work of Latin literature in the original language; this semester's set text is Lucan's *De Bello Ciuili* Book 2 (edited by Elaine Fantham; see bibliography). The amount of text covered at Higher Advanced level will be 1087 lines; we will be reading the entirety of Book 2 together and students will also cover Book 1.1-351 independently. All set text prescription will normally be translated in class; distance learners will submit set sections of translation and commentary for tutor comments. Detailed language work will be combined with the development of skills of literary criticism and attention to the historical context of the works studied. In order to help students translate with greater skill and accuracy the module contains an unseen translation component to continue linguistic teaching at an advanced level. Students in this module are taught in the same group as students in Advanced Latin: Verse and Higher Advanced Latin: Verse.

AIM(S)

To enable students:

- to translate accurately the Latin language of a poetic text at an advanced level;
- to develop further knowledge of Latin grammar and syntax through translation of the poetic text studied and unseen translation work;
- further develop skills of literary analysis and interpretation, gain an understanding of the text's historical, cultural and literary context as reflected both in the text studied and relevant modern scholarship.

LEARNING OUTCOMES

By the end of this module all students should be able to:

- demonstrate advanced knowledge of Latin grammar and syntax through translation of the text studied and unseen translation work;
- demonstrate sound knowledge of the text studied and modern scholarship on this text in literary and linguistic analysis.

OFFICE HOURS / HOW TO CONTACT ME:

Please feel free to come and see me if you would like to discuss any problems you may have concerning this module. Try, if at all possible, to come during my office hours. My office hours are Tuesday 11-12; Wednesday 9-10; Thursday 2-3. If you come to see me at another

time and I am not in because of teaching or other commitments, please email (m.ohrman@tsd.ac.uk). You can also ask questions (not confidential) on the discussion board available in the Moodle space for this course.

If you are taking this module as a distance student, Dr David Noy will be your tutor. David can be contacted at d.noy@tsd.ac.uk or by phone at 01296 714247 preferably between 16:00 and 19:00.

COURSE MATERIALS AND MOODLE

All information regarding this course, including class handouts, this module syllabus, assessment details and grammar podcasts will be available in the Moodle space for this course. Further, the Moodle space for this course will offer you a discussion board, where you can ask questions and discuss aspects of the course with your fellow students and me.

This 20 credit module meets three times a week. Arrangements for distance learners are set out below. For residential students, all classes take place in LR 6. Classes are held on:

- Tuesday 14.15-15.05
- Tuesday 16.15-17.05
- Thursday 16.15-17.05

Because of the intensive nature of this module, attendance at all classes is compulsory. A register will be taken. If you cannot make a class because of illness or other good reason, you need to inform me in advance about this. It is your responsibility to ensure that you familiarise yourself with the work covered during any class missed.

Arrangements for distance students:

In order to ensure that you maintain the same pace as on-campus students as far as possible, you are required, supplementary to independent learning, to submit the following non-assessed assignments to your distance tutor:

In addition, please feel free to ask the distance tutor's advice if you are stuck on, or have a question about, a passage not listed here. Even though only some of the translation is covered by the non-assessed assignments, you should aim to complete the required amount of text: this will prepare you for the exam which could contain any passage from this selection from the set text. Non-assessed work will usually be returned within one week.

NB: For the passages which you are asked to comment on, you may if you wish also submit a translation.

Non-assessed assignments for distance learners:

Assignment No.	Translation	Comment	Submission Date
1	1-42	45-63	18 October
2	134-185	249-274	8 November
3	285-325	338-349	22 November
4	416-477	526-549	6 December
5	650-679	709-736	16 December

You may submit non-assessed work by email attachment (d.noy@tsd.ac.uk).
Questions about the translation and non-assessed commentaries should be addressed to David Noy; questions concerning the module as a whole should be addressed to Magdalena Ohrman.

PLEASE NOTE
If you are not taking the exam on campus, you will be expected to make arrangements for your own invigilation and appropriate location as set out in the Academic Quality Handbook 13.9. (Available in full from: http://www.trinitysaintdavid.ac.uk/en/qualityassuranceunit/). You will also be required to take any examination at the same time and date as on-campus students. You shall receive information regarding such arrangements through Registry. If you have any queries or problems concerning venue and time for your exam, please contact Ms Caron McKee-Hands (c.mckee-hands@tsd.ac.uk) in the Registry: and the Registry team will be able to help.

ASSESSMENT

1. Coursework (50%):
a. One 3,000 word critical commentary or essay

1. *Examination* (50%)
a. One two-hour exam

Course work
One 3,000 word critical commentary or essay
To be submitted 4 December no later than 3 pm, returned by 28 January. For this module, please submit through the submission link on the module moodle page.

You should choose ONE of the following essay titles and write an essay of 3,000 words (worth 50% of your final mark).

1. Write a comprehensive, critical commentary on Lucan *De bello Civili* Book 2.139-195.
2. Write a comprehensive, critical commentary on Lucan *De bello Civili* Book 2.680-736.
3. Evaluate the possible motivations for the lack of inclusion of a divine apparatus in Lucan's *De Bello Civili*; use relevant examples from Book 2 to illustrate your discussion.
4. Discuss critically Lucan's use of technical, military vocabulary and its combination with vocabulary frequently used by epic authors such as Vergil and Ovid.

General assessment information:
Coursework submission for this module will be through Moodle. Please follow the instructions on the module's Moodle page for how to submit your work. The deadline for submission will be at 3 pm on the day given above. You will also need to retain a second electronic copy of your work to be submitted, if deemed appropriate, to the module convenor.

If you are taking this module at a distance, please see the Postgraduate Programmes of Study handbook for information on submission.

Word count
Please be aware that if you go significantly over or under the word limit (i.e. more than 10%), you may be penalised.

REMEMBER that the word count includes everything apart from the bibliography, titles or captions. You must provide the word count clearly on the cover sheet.

Welsh First language
If your first language is Welsh and you would like to submit any assessed coursework in Welsh, please see the School Office as soon as possible to make arrangements for this.

Special needs / requirements
If you have any special needs (e.g. dyslexia, visual impairment) that need to be taken into account for the teaching of this module, please make sure that our Welfare Officer, Dr Kyle Erickson (k.erickson@tsd.ac.uk), is made aware of this so that we can make sure that we fully support you in your studies.

Returning of work
Detailed feedback is given on the essay cover sheet but if you would like to discuss your work in more detail, do come and see me during one of my office hours (see times given above).

Extensions
Extensions for the submission of coursework will only be granted in exceptional circumstances; for more information please consult the Student Guide (or the *Academic Quality Handbook* 7.2.16 pages 180-181). In order to request an extension, you will need to fill in an extension request form, available on the Faculty Office Moodle page, and submit it in good time before the coursework submission deadline to the co-ordinator of your programme of study. NB: Dr Magdalena Ohrman is the programme co-ordinator for BA Classics, Classical Studies (including JH with Classical Studies) and for MA Classics, Classical Studies and Postgraduate Diploma Greek/Latin.

Please note that if you are given an extension, there may be a corresponding delay to the return of your work.

Some extra assignment/essay guidelines
Help for the writing of coursework is available on the Study Skills section of the School of Classics website and in the TSD and School of Classics Reference Guides. You are advised to read the relevant sections carefully.

Marks will be deducted if your piece of coursework is not presented properly (e.g. double-spacing, font 12 is needed). Note that all coursework needs to be word-processed; hand-written work will not be accepted. Assessment criteria can be found in the Programme of Study Handbook and at the back of this Module Syllabus.

***** You need to watch plagiarism whenever you use secondary literature (please read carefully the plagiarism section in the Student Guide – ALL suspect coursework will be submitted to a Turn-It-In analysis).** Please consult the Classics Reference Handbook for advice on how to reference secondary literature.

In case of problems….
Do come and see me during office hours if you have any problems with the writing or planning of your piece of coursework. You are also welcome to see your personal tutor for advice.

Bibliography
A bibliography is provided in the Moodle space for this course. Please note that the books mentioned there are only recommendations. You should also make use of the relevant class notes and handouts and do some independent research.

Unless they are available in electronic format, all items for the reading list have been placed on library-only or short loan and are kept behind the library counter. Note that all these items can be reserved via the computerised catalogue – a very useful device that allows you to plan ahead with your reading for the essay.

EXAM
The exam, which constitutes 50% of your final mark, will last 2 hours and will occur during the final week of Semester 1 (7-25 January). Please bear in mind that the exam may be scheduled any time during the exam period. Information about the format of the exam will be given during the course and a copy of a past paper will be provided for practice.

PRESCRIBED TEXTS:

Essential

Morwood, J. (2005), *Oxford Latin Desk Dictionary*, Oxford.
Smith, W. and J. Lockwood (1992), *Latin-English Dictionary*, Chambers.
Lewis, C. T. (1962), *Elementary Latin Dictionary*, Oxford.

Plus
Fantham, E. (1992) *Lucan De Bello Ciuili Book 2*, Cambridge.

Recommended

Lewis, C. T. and C. Short (1956 or later) *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford.
Glare, P. (1983 or later) *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Oxford.

For further bibliography, please see the course Moodle page.

Undergraduate Marksheet

	0-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-100%
Basic descriptor	• Work of an unacceptable and unsatisfactory level.	• Work of a satisfactory standard.	• Work of a good standard.	• Work of a very good standard.	• Work of an excellent or exceptional standard.
Focus on question	• Little or no focus on the question.	• Discernable focus on the question.	• Generally good focus on the question.	• Sound focus on the question.	• Acute and relevant focus on the question.
Approach to task	• Lack of ability to identify and solve problems. • Poor knowledge and understanding of the subject.	• Some attempt at identifying and solving problems. • Little or no evidence of analysis.	• Ability to identify and solve problems. • Some awareness of the wider philosophical dimensions of the subject. • Reasonable, but not always complete response. • Measure of analysis,	• Ability to understand and solve problems. • Sound awareness of the wider philosophical dimensions of the subject. • Wide coverage of topic. • Thoughtful analysis.	• Ability to understand and solve problems. • Excellent awareness of the wider philosophical dimensions of subject. • Analytical and critical appreciation. • Subtle and perceptive analysis.
Written style	• Response brief and under-developed.	• Argument lacks structure and/or relevance. • Work tends to be descriptive in nature. • Need for attention to writing.	• Solid level of argument, though not always relevant. • Satisfactory written style. May be some disjointed arguments. • Attempt at originality or critical appreciation.	• Well-developed and structured argument. • Coherent writing. • Some originality and/or critical appreciation of the subject.	• Cogent and structured argument. • Fluent writing and clarity of expression • Subtlety and/or originality
Evidence of reading	• Insufficient reading.	• Evidence of a limited range of reading	• Evidence of a range of reading.	• Evidence of thorough reading and preparation.	• Evidence of wide and thorough reading.
Presentation	• Poor presentation with many spelling and grammar errors. • No, or few, references and examples.	• Need for attention to presentation. Spelling and grammar errors. • Some references and examples.	• Sound presentation. Some spelling or grammar errors. • Limited use of examples or references.	• Clear and careful presentation. • Work well documented and referenced.	• Presentation to a high scholarly standard. • Argument is fully documented and well referenced.

Postgraduate Marksheet

	39% or less	40-49%	50-69%	70% and above
Basic Descriptor	• Unsatisfactory work	• Work of a satisfactory standard	• Work or a good standard	• Work of an exceptional standard
Focus on task	• Little or no focus on task set	• Discernable focus on task set	• Sustained focus on the subject	• Acute and relevant focus on task set
Approach	• Lack of ability to identify and solve problems • Response brief or under-developed	• Some attempt at identifying and solving problems • Work may be descriptive in nature	• Ability to identify and solve problems • Convincing analysis of other scholars' views • Awareness of wider philosophical dimensions of subject	• Ability to understand and solve problems • Subtle and perceptive analysis • Analytical and critical appreciation
Written style	• Poor or little knowledge or understanding of subject shown • Lacking structure	• Satisfactory written style • A reasonable argument	• Clear and well written style • Persuasive and even sophisticated level of argument • Some originality	• Fluent writing and clarity of expression • Cogent, structured and persuasive argument • Genuine originality
Evidence of reading	• Insufficient or irrelevant reading	• A range of reading evident • In need of more research	• Broad and relevant range of reading • Good level of research	• Wide and thorough reading • Comprehensive research
Presentation	• Unclear and poor presentation • No or hardly any relevant references and examples	• Presentation may be lacking in some areas • Some relevant references and examples	• Good presentation • Relevant examples and references	• Presentation to a high scholarly standard • Argument fully documented and well referenced

Marking Criteria for seen and unseen translations and gobbets

Prepared Translations

First (70%+): completes the translation very well, with only a few minor slips or one major error; demonstrates a command of the Latin/Greek exceptional for the level; demonstrates excellent grasp of grammar and syntax; generally good English of an appropriate register; independent work.

Within this class the following bands should also be distinguished:
(**80-89%**): fulfils the above criteria to an outstanding degree; extremely accurate and independent translation, with no major and only a few minor slips; English deployed in such a way as to communicate the nuances and tone of the original.
(**90-100%**): fulfils the above criteria to an exceptional, virtually publishable, degree.

Upper second (60-69%): completes the translation well, with no more than 2 or 3 major errors and a few minor ones; demonstrates a sound grasp of the Latin/Greek and of grammar and syntax; gives good sense of the original, though may be rather literal in places.

Lower second (50-59%): completes the translation satisfactorily, with no more than 5 or 6 major errors and some minor ones; demonstrates a fair grasp of Latin/Greek and of grammar and syntax; translation is largely accurate, but may not make entirely continuous sense, may be unidiomatic, or depart significantly from the original in the direction of paraphrase; does not bring out overall sense of original, but most of the important elements are discernible.

Third (40-49%): at least half of the translation is rendered satisfactorily; demonstrates deficiencies in the grasp of Latin/Greek and of grammar and syntax; translation likely to make only intermittent sense and exhibit reliance on guesswork; general line of narrative or argument is left obscure and important elements of original are not brought out.

Fail (0-39%): less than half of the translation is rendered satisfactorily; demonstrates inadequate or no understanding of Latin/Greek and widespread ignorance of grammar and syntax.

Within this class the following bands should also be distinguished:
(20-39%): some attempt has been made to translate the passage, but less than half of the translation is rendered satisfactorily, and the translation shows little or no understanding of grammar and syntax.
(0-20%): no attempt has been made to translate the passage, or only a few isolated words have been translated correctly.

Unseen Translations

First (70%+): completes the translation very well, with only a few minor slips or one major error; demonstrates a command of the Latin/Greek exceptional for the level; demonstrates excellent grasp of grammar, syntax, and vocabulary, and possibly stylistic sensitivity both in Latin/Greek and in English.

Within this class the following bands should also be distinguished:
(**80-89%**): fulfils the above criteria to an outstanding degree; extremely accurate and independent translation, with no major and only a few minor slips; English deployed in such a way as to communicate the nuances and tone of the original.

(**90-100%**): fulfils the above criteria to an exceptional degree.

Upper second (60-69%): translation is largely accurate, although with intermittent errors; demonstrates a sound grasp of the Latin/Greek and of grammar, syntax, and vocabulary; demonstrates a degree of fluency.

Lower second (50-59%): translation is accurate in parts, but may show substantial misunderstandings in others; demonstrates a fair grasp of Latin/Greek and of grammar, syntax, and vocabulary; may not make entirely continuous sense, may be unidiomatic.

Third (40-49%): at least half of the translation is rendered satisfactorily; may not make continuous sense; likely to exhibit reliance on guesswork; demonstrates some knowledge of Latin/Greek and of grammar, syntax, and more common vocabulary, but also substantial deficiencies.

Fail (0-39%): less than half of the translation is rendered satisfactorily; makes only occasional sense, is lacunose, and exhibits heavy reliance on guesswork; demonstrates inadequate or no understanding of Latin/Greek and widespread ignorance of grammar, syntax, and even common vocabulary.

Within this class the following bands should also be distinguished:
(20-39%): less than half of the translation is rendered satisfactorily; the translation may show a few of the more positive qualities of third class work, but not in any sustained way.
(0-20%): no attempt has been made to translate the passage, or only a few isolated words have been translated correctly.

Gobbets

Candidates should always ask themselves: 'Why has the examiner chosen *this* passage? What requires explanation in it?' In addition, things which will usually, or may, require comment or analysis include, but are not limited to the following (which will clearly vary from text to text, author to author, and genre to genre):

Context:
- What has just happened?
- What is happening?
- What is about to happen?
- Are there any clues in the passage which relate to its context?
- Who is speaking/narrating?
- To whom are they speaking/narrating?
- Why are they speaking/narrating to them?

Content: (normally carries more weight;)
- Themes (metamorphosis, murder, love, etc.)
- Language, metre, style, points of grammatical interest
- Characterisation
- Tone (humorous, tragic, etc.)
- Imagery (fire, colours, etc.)
- How do the contents of the gobbet compare/relate to those of the wider text?

First (70%+): answer shows excellent knowledge of the context of the passage and can relate its contents to that context thoroughly and intelligently; shows awareness of, and deals intelligently with, the majority of the important aspects of the content of the passage.

Within this class the following bands should also be distinguished:
(**80-89%**): fulfils the above criteria to an outstanding degree.
(**90-100%**): fulfils the above criteria to an exceptional degree.

Upper second (60-69%): answer shows good knowledge of the context of the passage and can relate its contents to that context; shows awareness of, and deals with, a good number of the important aspects of the content of the passage.

Lower second (50-59%): answer shows some knowledge of the context of the passage, but may do little more than paraphrase in places; shows awareness of, and attempts to deal with, some of the important aspects of the content of the passage, but may also tend towards paraphrasing the contents.

Third (40-49%): answer shows a little knowledge of the context of the passage but may show some evidence of reliance on guesswork; shows awareness of, and attempts to deal with, a small number of the important aspects of the content of the passage, with a tendency towards the paraphrasing or translating the contents and also some misunderstanding of the text.

Fail (0-39%): answer shows almost no knowledge of the context of the passage and may show evidence of reliance on guesswork; shows almost no awareness of any of the important aspects of the content of the passage, and has difficulty in demonstrating understanding of the text.