Faculty of Classics: Plagiarism Guidelines

University definition of plagiarism (c.f. www.admin.ox.ac.uk/epsc/plagiarism):

Plagiarism is the copying or paraphrasing of other people’s work or ideas into your own work without full acknowledgement. All published and unpublished material, whether in manuscript, printed or electronic form, is covered under this definition.

Collusion is another form of plagiarism involving the unauthorised collaboration of students (or others) in a piece of work.

Cases of suspected plagiarism in assessed work are investigated under the disciplinary regulations concerning conduct in examinations. Intentional or reckless plagiarism may incur severe penalties, including failure of your degree or expulsion from the university.

These guidelines (which are adapted from those adopted by the English Faculty) are particularly directed towards Finalists writing theses, but many of them have relevance to the writing of essays throughout your undergraduate career.

i. Plagiarism is the use of material appropriated from another source or from other sources with the intention of passing it off as one’s own work. Plagiarism may take the form of unacknowledged quotation or substantial paraphrase. Sources of material include all printed and electronically available publications in English or other languages, or unpublished materials, including theses, written by others. The Proctors regard plagiarism as a serious form of cheating for which offenders can expect to receive severe penalties, possibly including disqualification from the examination process or expulsion from the university (as stated in the box above). Plagiarism in tutorial essays or other work which is not formally examined is a disciplinary matter for Colleges, who may choose to apply a range of severe penalties, including rustication or even sending down. You should be aware that there are now sophisticated electronic mechanisms for identifying plagiarised passages, and you should also be aware that anyone writing a reference for you in the future who is aware that you have plagiarised work may feel obliged to mention this fact in their reference.

ii. Your work will inevitably sometimes involve the use and discussion of material written by others with due acknowledgement and with references given. This is standard critical practice and can be clearly distinguished from appropriating without acknowledgement material produced by others and presenting it as your own, which is what constitutes plagiarism.

iii. A thesis is essentially your view of the subject. While you will be expected to be familiar with critical views and debates in relation to the subject on which you are writing, and to discuss them as necessary, it is your particular response to the theme or question at issue that is required.

iv. When you read the primary texts that you will be discussing, it is a good idea to find your own examples of episodes, themes, arguments, etc. in them that you wish to discuss. If you work from your own examples, you will be much less likely to appropriate other people’s materials.

v. When you are taking notes for your thesis from secondary sources, a) Always note author, title (of book or journal, and essay or article title as appropriate), place of publication (for
books), and page numbers. b) If you copy out material word for word from secondary sources, make sure that you identify it as quotation (by putting inverted commas round it) in your notes. This will ensure that you recognise it as such when you are reading it through in preparing your thesis. c) At the same time always note down page numbers of quoted material. This will make it easier for you to check back if you are in doubt about any aspect of a reference. It will also be a necessary part of citation (see 6 below).

vi. When you are writing your thesis, make sure that you identify material quoted from critics or ideas and arguments that are particularly influenced by them. There are various ways of doing this, in your text and in footnotes: see Section 9 above. If you are substantially indebted to a particular critic’s arguments in the formulation of your materials, it may not be enough to cite his or her work once in a footnote at the start or the end of the essay. Make clear, if necessary in the body of your text, the extent of your dependence on these arguments in the generation of your own – and, ideally, how your views develop or diverge from this influence.

vii. Example: This is a passage from A. Barchiesi, Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and Other Latin Poets (London, 2001), 54:

‘Something similar might be observed in a “pure” elegiac text, antipodal to epic, such as Amores 3.6. This elegy is a long appeal addressed to an obstinate little stream obstructing Ovid’s path to his love. The erotic situation lies completely in the background, abstract and vague; Ovid turns his whole attention to the obstacle and to the strategies aimed at overcoming it. The river is described in essentially “anti-Callimachean” terms: it has muddy banks (3.6.1), abundant and even filthy waters (v. 8: et turpi crassas gurgite volvis aquas). These features accord well with the narrative function of the stream that obstructs the amorous quest of the elegiac poet. But what is intriguing are the arguments Ovid uses to appease the flood. To honour the unnamed stream, the poet lists lofty examples of great rivers which have felt the power of love . . . He then goes on to develop a long narrative example, the story of a river in love, but, significantly, the story is of epic provenance: Mars’ rape of Ilia, who afterward was offered consolation by the Anio. The entire story . . . appeared in a prominent position at the beginning of Ennius’ Annales. This episode, though transcribed by Ovid in his own manner and in the style of elegy, is indeed an unforeseen guest in a poem of the Amores.’

A. Plagiarism:

‘Amores 3.6 is addressed to a river which is stopping Ovid from getting to his love. Ovid leaves the love-situation in the background, and turns his whole attention to the river, and strategies for overcoming this obstacle. The description of the river makes it essentially “anti-Callimachean”: it has muddy banks and dirty waters. These features fit the narrative function of the stream that obstruct the elegiac love-poet’s quest. Ovid’s arguments to the river are very interesting. He lists lots of lofty examples of rivers in love, and then develops a long narrative of a story about a river in love from epic. This story concerns the river Anio, which offered his love to Ilia after Mars’ rape of her. The whole story had a prominent position at the beginning of Ennius’ epic poem the Annales. Ovid treats it in his own manner and in elegiac style; but it still comes as a surprise in the Amores.’

This version adds almost nothing to the original; it mixes direct appropriation with close paraphrase. There is no acknowledgement of the source; the writer suggests that the argument and the development of it are his or her own.
B. Legitimate use of the passage:

‘Amores 3.6 forms part of the intensified conflict between genres which marks Book 3 of the Amores. In the first poem of Book 3, Tragedy and Elegy vie for Ovid’s soul; in the last, he wistfully abandons elegy for tragedy. In this poem, addressed to a river that prevents the speaker from reaching his beloved, Ovid moves into the prolonged narration of a story that comes in epic: the river Anio’s winning and wooing of Ilia after Mars has raped her. This story came in the first book of Ennius’ Annales. Barchiesi has pointed out that the river seems “anti-Callimachean” in its size and dirtiness.¹ The relation with epic may, however, be more elaborate and complicated. Within the Iliad, Achilles’ heroic advance is halted by a river; he fears an ignominious and rustic death (21.279-83). The situation of Am. 3.6 as a whole could be seen to mimic, on a lower level, an episode already generically disruptive. And the Anio’s speech to Ilia (53-66) sounds very like a love-poem – which naturally does not work as persuasion. Epic, then, does not simply interrupt elegy in Amores 3.6; and the poem is part of a larger design, not just a curious surprise.

¹ A. Barchiesi, Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and Other Latin Poets (London, 2001), 54.

This version uses an acknowledged paraphrase of part of the passage in forming a wider argument, with some fresh points. (The footnote is sound scholarly practice, but its omission would not be a matter of plagiarism.) The reference to the Annales, though originally derived from Barchiesi, does not require acknowledgement, since the writer can reasonably suppose it to be common scholarly knowledge. The final phrase echoes Barchiesi’s, while disagreeing with it; but no explicit acknowledgement is required, least of all after the earlier mention.