PL 340
Long Paper assignment
First long paper due before Christmas recess

1. Papers should be 6-8 pages long (assuming something like 300 words per page).

2. In the papers, students will make and defend some significant claim about the text. In defending such a claim, one must rely in part on references to and quotations from the text, as well as on one’s own reasoning.

3. Grades will reflect how well a claim has been both presented and supported. In supporting your claim, you should also consider and respond to objections to your interpretation/evaluation. (See reverse for (a bit) more detail.)

4. The claim made might, among other things, involve
   a. offering an interpretation of a particularly difficult part of the text or
   b. evaluating the success of some important argument in the text.

5. In quoting or paraphrasing the Sophist, please refer to the Stephanus page numbers. Parenthetical citation is recommend; for example:

   The Visitor asserts that the people he calls “friends of the forms” “distinguish coming-to-be and being and say that they are separate” (248a).

6. Please do not consult outside sources concerning the Sophist.
Yancy Hughes Dominick
rough outline of grading standards

**essays:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>reasoned evaluation, i.e. defense of own view, plus detailed discussion of support and criticisms of relevant conclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| B     | detailed discussion of support, along with discussion of relevant criticism of relevant conclusion  
  
  or, reasoned evaluation plus flawed discussion of support and criticism of relevant argument  
  
  or, reasoned evaluation plus discussion of support and criticism of irrelevant argument |
| C     | correct representation of thinker's main support for relevant conclusion  
  
  or, correct representation of irrelevant argument, along with discussion of criticism  
  
  or, flawed representation of support and criticism of relevant conclusion |
| D     | correct identification of thinker's relevant conclusion  
  
  or, flawed representation of support and criticism of irrelevant conclusion |

**short response papers:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>response to section of reading, plus attempt to characterize thinker's support for some claim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4/5   | attempt to characterize thinker's support for some claim  
  
  or, response and attempted characterization of wrong material |
| 3/5   | none of the above  
  
  or, attempted characterization of wrong material |