

Marking Criteria Guidance

The School of Classics marks across a range of criteria on a scale that is consistent across all levels of study. The level of achievement required of students to achieve a mark in any grade boundary differs by level study.

Under this system, an essay that received a first class mark at level 4 would not receive a first class mark if submitted at level 5. This system is designed to reflect the development of students' capabilities and skills throughout their degrees.

Certain types of assessment have their own specified marking criteria, outlined below.

For the return of work students will see a grading rubric from TurnItIn which provides generic feedback in each category according to level. The rubric will replace the more generalised overall summary written feedback that has been provided in the past.

Students will also receive comments on up to 3 areas on which to improve.

The categories of achievement in each aspect are as follows:

Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
-----------	--------------	---------	----------	------	-----------	-----------	-------------

The aims of the marking criteria outlined below represent outstanding achievement in all areas.

Inclusion of source material (S1)	The work makes reference to all relevant materials for the piece of work, including complementary evidence.
Inclusion of modern scholarship (MS1)	The work demonstrates awareness of scholarly developments over time and inclusion of up to date material, including foreign language scholarship, and takes into account interdisciplinary concerns.
Active use of source material (S2)	The work provides a detailed discussion of all relevant source material in support of the argument and/or analysis.
Engagement with modern scholarship (MS2)	The work provides detailed discussion of relevant scholarship in support of the argument and/or analysis. There is evidence of thoughtful selection.
Critical Engagement with source material (S3)	The work: demonstrates critical in-depth discussion of all relevant sources and material; is fully aware of the problematic nature of the evidence available; takes into account the original text(s), as far as can be supported by e.g commentaries, facing translation, or

	modern scholarship; critically discusses scholarship on the relevant primary source(s) (e.g. Mss, archaeological evidence, inscriptions).
Critical Engagement with Scholarship (MS3)	The work: demonstrates a consistently critical attitude to scholarship; provides an engaged and informed discussion of relevant debates and schools of thought; demonstrates clear and relevant engagement with theoretical approaches and models; provides (a)clearly motivated statement(s) of own position in relation to scholarship.
Argument (Argue)	The work: clearly motivates why the question(s) should be addressed; Presents a clear and coherent position that is independently and logically developed on the basis of the material and taking into account modern scholarship; achieves a high level of sophistication throughout.
Structure (Struc)	The work: includes an appropriate introduction providing sufficient guidance for the reader; has a clear and coherent structure throughout, which supports the argument; specifically contextualises the argument; includes conclusion, which clearly states the outcomes of the work and concludes the argument.
Relevance (Rel)	The work clearly and specifically relates throughout to the title of the work, and there are no digressions and no inclusion of irrelevant or tangential material.
Analytical Approach (AA)	The work has a well thought out and justified methodological approach consistently applied throughout, taking into account the relevant scholarly approaches and evidence. The whole of the work represents an in depth evaluation of the issues and material under discussion.
Originality (Orig)	The work: provides new interpretations of evidence or provides new approach(es) to the issue under discussion; prompts new direction(s) in scholarship; provides a genuine contribution to scholarship.
Referencing (Ref)	There is inclusion of consistent referencing at all relevant points throughout the work, including comparative material where motivated. The use of footnotes is supported by automatic footnotes in Microsoft Word (or relevant word processing program).

Readability, Coherence, and Written Style (RCWS)	The work: - achieves excellent clarity allowing the reader to focus on content; - achieves stylistic excellence; - there are no proof reading errors whatsoever; - achieves a tone appropriate for the type of communication.
Adherence to guidelines (AG)	The work adheres to: - the subject referencing guidelines, ; - the word limit and publication of word count; - the individual module guidance on spacing e.g. margin font type spacing.

Essays and Essay Based Exams

Level 4 Marking Criteria (Essay/Essay Based Exam)										
	1-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Inclusion of source material (S1)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Inclusion of modern scholarship (MS1)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Active use of source material (S2)				Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Engagement with modern scholarship (MS2)				Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Critical Engagement with source material (S3)					Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good
Critical Engagement with Scholarship (MS3)					Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good
Argument (Argue)					Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good
Structure (Struc)					Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good
Relevance (Rel)					Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good
Analytical Approach (AA)					Effort At	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good
Originality (Orig)									Effort At	Very Limited
Referencing (Ref)				Effort At	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Readability, Coherence, and Written Style (RCWS)		Effort At	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Adherence to guidelines (AG)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding

Level 5 Marking Criteria (Essay/Essay Based Exam)										
	1-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Inclusion of source material (S1)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Inclusion of modern scholarship (MS1)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Active use of source material (S2)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Engagement with modern scholarship (MS2)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Critical Engagement with source material (S3)				Effort At	Very Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Critical Engagement with Scholarship (MS3)				Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Argument (Argue)				Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Structure (Struc)				Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Relevance (Rel)				Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Analytical Approach (AA)					Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good
Originality (Orig)								Effort At	Very Limited	Limited
Referencing (Ref)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Readability, Coherence, and Written Style (RCWS)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Some	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Adherence to guidelines (AG)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding

Level 6 Marking Criteria (Essay/Essay Based Exam)										
	1-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Inclusion of source material (S1)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Inclusion of modern scholarship (MS1)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Active use of source material (S2)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Engagement with modern scholarship (MS2)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Critical Engagement with source material (S3)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Critical Engagement with Scholarship (MS3)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Argument (Argue)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Structure (Struc)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Relevance (Rel)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Analytical Approach (AA)				Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Originality (Orig)							Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate
Referencing (Ref)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Readability, Coherence, and Written Style (RCWS)	Effort at	Very Limited	Limited	Some	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
Adherence to guidelines (AG)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding

Level 7 Marking Criteria (Essay/Essay Based Exam)										
	1-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Inclusion of source material (S1)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Inclusion of modern scholarship (MS1)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Active use of source material (S2)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Engagement with modern scholarship (MS2)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Critical Engagement with source material (S3)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Critical Engagement with Scholarship (MS3)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Argument (Argue)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Structure (Struc)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Relevance (Rel)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Analytical Approach (AA)				Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Originality (Orig)							Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Good
Referencing (Ref)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Readability, Coherence, and Written Style (RCWS)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Adherence to guidelines (AG)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding

Presentations

Additional Presentation Marking Criteria

Presentations have a set of criteria additional to that of a normal essay or exam.

Presentations	
Engagement with Audience (EA)	The presenter(s) achieve highly effective audience engagement throughout.
Presentational Aids (PA)	The presenter(s) achieve excellent and interactive use of presentational aids.
Time Keeping (TK)	The presentation does not deviate from the specified time limit.

Level 4 Marking Criteria (Presentations)										
	1-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Engagement with Audience (EA)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Presentational Aids (PA)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Time Keeping (TK)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding

Level 5 Marking Criteria (Presentations)										
	1-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Engagement with Audience (EA)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Presentational Aids (PA)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Time Keeping (TK)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding

Level 6 Marking Criteria (Presentations)										
	1-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Engagement with Audience (EA)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Presentational Aids (PA)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Time Keeping (TK)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding

Level 7 Marking Criteria (Presentations)										
	1-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Engagement with Audience (EA)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Presentational Aids (PA)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Time Keeping (TK)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding

Group Work

Group-based work has a set of criteria additional to that of an individual written or oral piece of work.

Group-based work	
Group co-operation (G1)	The group showed highly effective co-operation throughout the period of the project, including the preparation period.
Group-based work integration (G2)	The group-based work is clearly the work of the group, and the individual parts/responsibilities have been integrated together closely and effectively.

Additional Group-based work Marking Criteria

Level 4 Marking Criteria (Group-based work)										
	1-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Group co-operation (G1)				Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Group-based work integration (G2)				Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Level 5 Marking Criteria (Group-based work)										
	1-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Group co-operation (G1)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Group-based work integration (G2)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding

Level 6 Marking Criteria (Group-based work)										
	1-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Group co-operation (G1)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Group-based work integration (G2)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding

Posters

Inclusion of source material (S1)	Making reference to all relevant materials for the piece of work, including complementary evidence
Inclusion of modern scholarship (MS1)	Awareness of scholarly developments over time and including up to date state of the art including foreign language scholarship, and interdisciplinary concerns
Active use of source material (S2)	Detailed discussion of all relevant source material in support of the argument and or analysis
Engagement with modern scholarship (MS2)	Detailed discussion of relevant scholarship in support of the argument and or analysis. Evidence of thoughtful selection.
Critical Engagement with source material (S3)	Critical in-depth discussion of all relevant sources; being fully aware of the problematic nature of the evidence available; taking into account of the original as far as can be supported by e.g commentaries, facing translation, or modern scholarship; critical discussion of scholarship on the relevant primary source send their problems (e.g. Mss, archaeological evidence, inscriptions)
Critical Engagement with Scholarship (MS3)	A consistently critical attitude to scholarship; engaged and informed discussion of relevant debates and schools of thought; clear and relevant engagement with theoretical approaches and models; evidence of thoughtful selection; clearly motivated statement of own position in relation to scholarship
Argument (Argue)	Motivation of why the questions should be addressed; clear and coherent, independently developed position logically developed on the basis of the material and taking into account modern scholarship; achieving a high level of sophistication throughout the work
Visual Structure (VS)	A clear and coherent structure within individual posters and across poster exhibitions which supports the argument; specifically contextualising the argument; conclusion which clearly states the outcomes of the work and concludes the argument
Relevance (Rel-C)	Clearly and specifically relates throughout to the title of the work; no digressions and no inclusion of irrelevant or tangential material. The work is specifically suited to the audience it will be presented in or according to the specific guidelines provided (ex. Academic audience, lay audience, etc.)
Analytical Approach (AA)	A well thought out and justified methodological approach consistently applied throughout the work, taking into

	account the relevant scholarly approaches and evidence; the whole of the work represents an in depth evaluation of the issues and material
Originality (Orig)	Provides new interpretations of evidence or provides new approach to the issue under discussion; prompts new direction in scholarship; genuine contribution to scholarship
Referencing (Ref)	The inclusion of consistent referencing at all relevant points throughout the work, including comparative material where motivated.
Readability, Coherence, and Written Style (RCWS)	Achieving excellent clarity allowing the reader to focus on content; stylistic excellence; no proof reading errors whatsoever; achieving a tone appropriate for the type of communication
Adherence to guidelines (AG)	Adhering to subject referencing guidelines; adhering to word limit and publication of word count; adhering to individual module guidance on visual presentation e.g. margin font type spacing.
Visual Presentation (VP)	Stylistically excellent visual presentation supporting the structure of the argument with appropriate visual material included in a visually pleasing fashion.

Level 4 Marking Criteria (Posters)										
	1-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Inclusion of source material (S1)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Inclusion of modern scholarship (MS1)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Active use of source material (S2)				Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Engagement with modern scholarship (MS2)				Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Critical Engagement with source material (S3)					Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good
Critical Engagement with Scholarship (MS3)					Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good
Argument (Argue)					Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good
Visual Structure (VS)					Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good
Relevance (Rel)					Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good
Analytical Approach (AA)					Effort At	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good
Originality (Orig)									Effort At	Very Limited
Referencing (Ref)				Effort At	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Readability, Coherence, and Written Style (RCWS)		Effort At	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Adherence to guidelines (AG)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Visual Presentation (VP)		Effort At	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding

Level 5 Marking Criteria (Posters)										
	1-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Inclusion of source material (S1)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Inclusion of modern scholarship (MS1)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Active use of source material (S2)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Engagement with modern scholarship (MS2)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Critical Engagement with source material (S3)				Effort At	Very Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Critical Engagement with Scholarship (MS3)				Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Argument (Argue)				Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Visual Structure (VS)				Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Relevance (Rel)				Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Analytical Approach (AA)					Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good
Originality (Orig)								Effort At	Very Limited	Limited
Referencing (Ref)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Readability, Coherence, and Written Style (RCWS)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Some	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Adherence to guidelines (AG)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Visual Presentation (VP)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Some	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding

Level 6 Marking Criteria (Posters)										
	1-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Inclusion of source material (S1)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Inclusion of modern scholarship (MS1)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Active use of source material (S2)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Engagement with modern scholarship (MS2)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Critical Engagement with source material (S3)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Critical Engagement with Scholarship (MS3)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Argument (Argue)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Visual Structure (VS)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Relevance (Rel)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Analytical Approach (AA)				Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Originality (Orig)							Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate
Referencing (Ref)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Readability, Coherence, and Written Style (RCWS)		Very Limited	Limited	Some	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
Adherence to guidelines (AG)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Visual Presentation (VP)	Effort at	Very Limited	Limited	Some	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent

Scholarly Replies

The aims of the marking criteria outlined below represent achievement in all areas.

Inclusion of source material (S1)	The work makes reference to all relevant materials for the piece of work, including complementary evidence.
Inclusion of modern scholarship (MS1-A)	The work demonstrates awareness of scholarly developments over time and inclusion of up to date material, including foreign language scholarship, and takes into account interdisciplinary concerns, as specifically relevant to the issues raised in the article.
Active use of source material (S2)	The work provides a detailed discussion of all relevant source material in support of the argument and/or analysis.
Engagement with modern scholarship (MS2-A)	The work provides detailed discussion of relevant scholarship in support of the argument and/or analysis. There is evidence of thoughtful selection, above and beyond the scholarship mentioned in the article itself.
Critical Engagement with source material (S3)	The work: demonstrates critical in-depth discussion of all relevant sources and material; is fully aware of the problematic nature of the evidence available; takes into account the original text(s), as far as can be supported by e.g commentaries, facing translation, or modern scholarship.
Critical Engagement with Scholarship (MS3-A)	The work: demonstrates a consistently critical attitude to the article itself, and to relevant scholarship beyond the article and the article's references; provides an engaged and informed discussion of relevant debates and schools of thought; demonstrates clear and relevant engagement with theoretical approaches and models; provides (a)clearly motivated statement(s) of own position in relation to scholarship beyond the article itself.
Argument (Argue-A)	The work: presents a clear and coherent position in support or against the main argument in the article, that is independently and logically developed on the basis of the material and taking

	into account modern scholarship beyond the article itself; achieves a high level of sophistication throughout.
Structure (Struc)	The work: includes an appropriate introduction providing sufficient guidance for the reader; has a clear and coherent structure throughout, which supports the argument; specifically contextualises the argument; includes conclusion, which clearly states the outcomes of the work and concludes the argument.
Relevance (Rel-A)	The work clearly and specifically relates throughout to the argument as intended either in support or against the main argument in the article, and there are no digressions and no inclusion of irrelevant or tangential material.
Analytical Approach (AA)	The work has a well thought out and justified methodological approach consistently applied throughout, taking into account the relevant scholarly approaches and evidence. The whole of the work represents an in depth evaluation of the issues and material under discussion.
Originality (Orig)	The work: provides new interpretations of evidence or provides new approach(es) to the issue under discussion; prompts new direction(s) in scholarship; provides a genuine contribution to scholarship.
Referencing (Ref)	There is inclusion of consistent referencing at all relevant points throughout the work, including comparative material where motivated. The use of footnotes is supported by automatic footnotes in Microsoft Word (or relevant word processing program).
Readability, Coherence, and Written Style (RCWS)	The work: achieves excellent clarity allowing the reader to focus on content; achieves stylistic excellence; there are no proof reading errors whatsoever; achieves a tone appropriate for the type of communication.
Adherence to guidelines (AG)	The work adheres to: the subject referencing guidelines; the word limit and publication of word count; the individual module guidance on spacing e.g. margin font type spacing.

Level 6 Marking Criteria (Scholarly Replies)										
	1-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Inclusion of source material (S1)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Inclusion of modern scholarship (MS1-A)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Active use of source material (S2)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Engagement with modern scholarship (MS2-A)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Critical Engagement with source material (S3)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Critical Engagement with Scholarship (MS3-A)				Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Argument (Argue-A)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Structure (Struc)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Relevance (Rel-A)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Analytical Approach (AA)				Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Originality (Orig)							Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate
Referencing (Ref)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Readability, Coherence, and Written Style (RCWS)		Very Limited	Limited	Some	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
Adherence to guidelines (AG)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding

Level 7 Marking Criteria (Scholarly Replies)										
	1-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Inclusion of source material (S1)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Inclusion of modern scholarship (MS1-A)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Active use of source material (S2)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Engagement with modern scholarship (MS2-A)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Critical Engagement with source material (S3)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Critical Engagement with Scholarship (MS3-A)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Excellent
Argument (Argue-A)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Structure (Struc)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Relevance (Rel-A)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Analytical Approach (AA)				Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Originality (Orig)							Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Good
Referencing (Ref)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Readability, Coherence, and Written Style (RCWS)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Adherence to guidelines (AG)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding

Wiki Reply

The aims of the marking criteria outlined below represent achievement in all areas.

Inclusion of source material (S1)	Making reference to all relevant materials for the piece of work, including complementary evidence
Inclusion of modern scholarship (MS1)	Awareness of scholarly developments over time and including up to date state of the art including foreign language scholarship, and interdisciplinary concerns
Active use of source material (S2)	Detailed discussion of all relevant source material in support of the argument and or analysis
Engagement with modern scholarship (MS2)	Detailed discussion of relevant scholarship in support of the argument and or analysis. Evidence of thoughtful selection.
Critical Engagement with source material (S3)	Critical in-depth discussion of all relevant sources; being fully aware of the problematic nature of the evidence available; taking into account of the original as far as can be supported by e.g commentaries, facing translation, or modern scholarship; critical discussion of scholarship on the relevant primary source send their problems (e.g. Mss, archaeological evidence, inscriptions)
Critical Engagement with Scholarship (MS3)	A consistently critical attitude to scholarship; engaged and informed discussion of relevant debates and schools of thought; clear and relevant engagement with theoretical approaches and models; evidence of thoughtful selection; clearly motivated statement of own position in relation to scholarship
Argument (Argue-B)	Clear and coherent, independently developed position in support or against the main argument in the wiki or wiki part, which is logically developed on the basis of the material and taking into account modern scholarship and ancient material beyond the wiki/wiki part itself; achieving a high level of sophistication throughout the work
Structure (Struc)	Appropriate introduction providing sufficient cent guidance for the reader; a clear and coherent structure throughout the essay which supports the argument; specifically contextualising the argument; conclusion which clearly states the outcomes of the work and concludes the

	argument
Relevance (Rel-A)	Clearly and specifically relates throughout to the argument as intended either in support or against the main argument in the wiki/wiki part; no digressions and no inclusion of irrelevant or tangential material.
Analytical Approach (AA)	A well thought out and justified methodological approach consistently applied throughout the work, taking into account the relevant scholarly approaches and evidence; the whole of the work represents an in depth evaluation of the issues and material
Originality (Orig)	Provides new interpretations of evidence or provides new approach to the issue under discussion; prompts new direction in scholarship; genuine contribution to scholarship
Referencing (Ref)	The inclusion of consistent referencing at all relevant points throughout the work, including comparative material where motivated. Use of footnotes supported by automatic footnotes in Microsoft Word (or relevant word processing program).
Readability, Coherence, and Written Style (RCWS)	Achieving excellent clarity allowing the reader to focus on content; stylistic excellence; no proof reading errors whatsoever; achieving a tone appropriate for the type of communication
Adherence to guidelines (AG)	Adhering to subject referencing guidelines; adhering to word limit and publication of word count; adhering to individual module guidance on spacing e.g. margin font type spacing.

Level 5 Marking Criteria (Wiki Reply)										
	1-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Inclusion of source material (S1)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Inclusion of modern scholarship (MS1)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Active use of source material (S2)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Engagement with modern scholarship (MS2)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Critical Engagement with source material (S3)				Effort At	Very Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Critical Engagement with Scholarship (MS3)				Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Argument (Argue-B)				Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Structure (Struc)				Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Relevance (Rel-B)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Analytical Approach (AA)					Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good
Originality (Orig)								Effort At	Very Limited	Limited
Referencing (Ref)			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Readability, Coherence, and Written Style (RCWS)		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Some	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Adherence to guidelines (AG)	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding

Additional Marking Criteria

Abstract: An abstract that is of professional quality and correctly and clearly summarises the proposed research with a clear and nuanced presentation of the main argument and relevance to scholarship										
	1-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Level 5			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Level 6		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Level 7	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding

Bibliography: A bibliography that covers all of the ancient sources and evidence and the majority of the essential modern scholarship relevant to the proposed research, presented in strict accordance to the referencing guidelines of the School of Classics.										
	1-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Level 5		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Level 6	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Level 7	Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding

Draft Plan Structure: A draft structure that carefully and clearly presents the structure and all arguments of the proposed research in a nuanced and professional manner with full reference to ancient sources and modern scholarship.

	1-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Level 5			Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding
Level 6		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding
Level 7		Effort At	Very Limited	Limited	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Outstanding

Marking Criteria for Advanced and higher Language exams

Language Marking for All Levels of Study

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 (they 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.

Marking Criteria for Translation/Commentary

Language Marking for Intermediate/Intensive Greek and Latin II

Translation Component (20%)

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.

Commentary Component (80%)

Candidates should always ask themselves: ‘Why has the module coordinator 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 (they will clearly vary from text to text, author to author, and genre to genre). The candidate must discuss the relationship between their translation and their commentary.

Relationship between Commentary and Text:

- How does the translation render the original text?
- Why are particular words chosen to express meaning?

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.

L7 Prose composition marking criteria

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 covered at the time of assessment; achieves a stylistically consistent translation; 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; consistent and independent in style.

(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 covered at the time of assessment; correctly recognises the major problems posed in the translation exercise and attempts to solve them although 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 covered at the time of assessment; translation is largely accurate, but may not make entirely continuous sense, may be unidiomatic, employ rare or unsuitable vocabulary and/or constructions; recognises and attempts to solve most of the major problems of the translation (if not always successfully).

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 covered at the time of assessment; translation likely to make only intermittent sense and exhibit reliance on guesswork; translation demonstrates that major problems posed in the translation exercise have not been recognised; 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.