HON 101-A: PAPER ASSIGNMENT


Due: Tuesday, November 19, 2013 (There will be a penalty of five points for each class day late.)

Requirements:

- The paper must be at least 1500 words in length, excluding footnotes, bibliography and quotations of more than five words. (Please provide an adjusted word count at the end of the paper, i.e. total word count minus words in footnotes, bibliography, and quotations.)
- The paper must be produced by computerized word processing using 12-point type, Times New Roman font, double spacing, and 1-inch margins.
- The paper must be documented with footnotes and bibliography in Chicago/Turabian style, as shown in the style guides posted on the Library’s LibGuides page. This link takes you there: [http://andersonuniversity.libguides.com/content.php?pid=192007&sid=2617475](http://andersonuniversity.libguides.com/content.php?pid=192007&sid=2617475). (Click on Chicago Manual of Style Online and go to Chapter 14: Documentation I: Notes and Bibliography; or click on the Chicago-Style Citation Quick Guide.) For special instructions on how to cite Lactantius and Eusebius, see bottom of page 4 below.
- The bibliography must include only the sources cited in the paper. It must contain a minimum of four print sources, three of which must be non-reference works. Online sources other than those listed on p. 4 may be used only if accompanied by an addendum to the paper showing the name and credentials of the author and/or editor of the source and identifying the organization or institution that sponsors the site where the source was found.
- Students must submit both a hard copy of the paper to the instructor and an electronic copy to turnitin.com via the portal posted on the HON 101-A Moodle page.

Library books and online resources: Books have been placed on reserve for this assignment in the Thrift Library and may be checked out for building use only at the circulation desk. A list of those books, along with some recommended online sources, appears on pages 3 and 4 below. If you use sources other than those listed, you must turn in photocopies of the title page and pages cited along with your paper.

Objectives and assessment: The assignment is to write an essay on the document (*Lactantius, On the Deaths of the Persecutors*, chapter 44) in which you demonstrate the following skills:

- **The ability to develop a thesis and to support it with logical argumentation and reliable evidence (25%).** The thesis is the main claim of your paper, what you want your reader to believe about the document. It should be the answer to an important question, one that asks how or why rather than who, what, where, or when. It should be a conclusion you have reached about the meaning, purpose, reliability, and historical significance of the document and it ought to claim something that is not immediately obvious to your reader. Whatever approach you take, the thesis must (1) keep the focus of your paper on the document and (2) connect the content of the document to the context of the document. This means that the evidence for the thesis must come from both the document itself and from the background material. In other words, you are asking your reader to believe something that depends on a careful analysis of the document and a thorough knowledge of its historical background, and not on personal opinions or beliefs that cannot be supported by historical evidence. Also remember that you are presenting your own assessment of the document and not simply restating the author’s thesis. Finally, a clear and concise thesis statement should appear in bold type at the end of the introductory paragraph(s) of the paper.
• **The ability to engage in analysis of the evidence that relates it to the thesis of the paper (25%).** The evidence supporting your thesis will come from (1) the document itself, i.e. the selection from Lactantius; (2) other primary sources, especially Eusebius’ *Life of Constantine*, chapters 27-32; and (3) secondary sources about the document, its subject, its author, and the period in which it was written. Your analysis of the document is especially important, since it is the topic of the paper. Your paper must include a full summary of the document that shows you clearly understand its meaning. It should also show that you are aware of the author’s assumptions, purposes, and biases.

• **The ability to make connections to larger contexts that illuminate the thesis of the paper and show the contributions of the discipline of history (25%).** The primary context is the period in which the document was written. Support your thesis with relevant facts about the author’s life and times, his sources, his audience, and the issues he addresses as they would have been understood by his contemporaries. Compare his account with other contemporary accounts of the same event. The secondary context is the future generations who read the document, including our own. Support your thesis by citing the work of modern historians and by showing the relevance of your findings to issues that transcend the document’s primary context.

• **The ability to write a paper that is well structured and observes the mechanics of grammar, punctuation, spelling, sentence structure, and citation style (25%).** The paper should be well organized and clearly understandable. Keep the focus of the paper on your thesis, introduce each paragraph with a strong topic sentence, and use smooth transitions as you move from point to point. Carefully proofread your paper to catch grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors and faulty sentences (sentence fragments, comma splices, fused or “run-on” sentences). Use and cite sources correctly: acknowledge all sources, both quoted and unquoted; accurately transcribe quoted material and put it in quotation marks; and summarize non-quoted material in your own words to avoid paraphrasing too closely.

Your paper will be graded using a rubric based on that found in Patrick Rael, *Reading, Writing, and Researching for History: A Guide for College Students* (Bowdoin College, 2004), which can be found at [http://academic.bowdoin.edu/WritingGuides/grading%20rubric.htm](http://academic.bowdoin.edu/WritingGuides/grading%20rubric.htm).

**Warnings!**

- Make certain you understand what constitutes plagiarism. “Plagiarism is the presentation of someone else’s words, ideas or data as one’s own work. When a student submits work for credit that includes the words, ideas or data belonging to or produced by others, the source of that information must be acknowledged through complete, accurate, and specific footnote or ‘in-text’ references, and, if verbatim statements are included, through quotation marks as well. By placing his/her name on work submitted for credit, the student certifies the originality of all work not otherwise identified by appropriate acknowledgements” (Anderson University Student Development Guide). A *paper that does not accurately acknowledge all sources or that falsifies acknowledgements will automatically receive a failing grade on the grounds of academic dishonesty.*

- Each student is expected to research and write his/her own paper without collaboration with other students. Safeguard your work! Be careful not to leave your paper on the hard drive of a computer to which other students have access, or to make your notes or drafts available to other students in any form. *Two papers enough alike in style and content to warrant the conclusion that their authors collaborated or that one was copied from the other may both receive a failing grade on the grounds of academic dishonesty.*
BOOKS ON LIBRARY RESERVE FOR THIS ASSIGNMENT


*The Cambridge Ancient History, Vol. XXI: The Imperial Crisis and Recovery, A.D.193-324* (1965) – see chapter 20 for the conversion of Constantine; also look up Eusebius and Lactantius in the index.

Henry Chadwick, *The Early Church* (first published 1967; revised edition 1993) – see chapters 3, 4, and 8 for the conversion of Constantine and its aftermath, with references to Eusebius and Lactantius.


*Michael Grant, *Greek and Latin Authors, 800 B.C.-A.D.1000* (1980) – articles on both Eusebius and Lactantius

Robert Grant, *Augustus to Constantine* (two editions on reserve: one published in 1970, with the subtitle *The Thrust of the Christian Movement into the Roman World*; the other published in 1990, with the subtitle *The Rise and Triumph of Christianity in the Roman World*) – see chapter XVIII: “Constantine and the Church”

Robert Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian* (1980) – concerned primarily with Eusebius’ *Church History*, but there is some discussion of his *Life of Constantine* (see index, part 1, under *Vita Constantinii*) and his treatment of miracles in chapter 12.


*The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* (1991) – article on Eusebios [note Greek spelling!] in vol. 2; this source is not on reserve but is shelved in the reference collection of the library (DF521 .O93 1991)

David Potter, *Constantine the Emperor* (2012) – an important new work that the library has recently ordered; you will be notified when it arrives!


Paul Stephenson, *Constantine: Roman Emperor, Christian Victor* (2009) – an important new work; for Constantine’s conversion, see chapter 7 and the pages on chapter 7 in the bibliographical essays at the end of the book

* The asterisk denotes a reference work. Please remember that you must cite a minimum of three non-reference print sources.
SOME SUGGESTED ONLINE SOURCES

Shaye I.D. Cohen, et al., “Legitimization Under Constantine,” PBS Frontline (1998) – a sampling of the views of several modern scholars on Constantine’s role in the success of Christianity: his conversion, his “imperial Christianity,” his portrayal by Eusebius, the implications of his conversion, etc. This appears on the website for the 1998 PBS Frontline series, “From Jesus to Christ: The First Christians.”

Eusebius, Life of Constantine, Book I, Chapters 27-32 – another fourth-century account of the conversion of Constantine: http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/2502.htm


Benjamin Wiker, “Constantine’s Gift to Christianity,” The Catholic World Report (October 26, 2012) – an appreciation and critique of the significance of Constantine’s conversion written by a Catholic scholar who, at the time this article was written, was Visiting Associate Professor of Theology at Franciscan University of Steubenville:

IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS!

Here’s how to footnote the selection from Lactantius the first time you cite it. (You may copy and paste this into your footnotes. Just be sure you modify the date you accessed the site!)


Here’s how to cite the selection from Lactantius after you’ve footnoted it once as shown above. Instead of footnoting it again, simply insert a parenthetical citation in the text of your paper at the end of the sentence where you have referenced it. (Remember, you must cite the source whether you quote it or not. Note also that the closing punctuation comes after the parenthetical citation, not before.)

Maxentius remained in Rome because of the warning of a soothsayer (Lactantius 44).

According to Lactantius, when the Senate bestowed the title of Maximus on Constantine, his rival Daia “grew outrageous…and made his title of the Greatest a theme of abuse and raillery” (Lactantius 44).

For citations to Eusebius, you will create a footnote identical in format to the one above, simply changing the author, title, chapter number, translator, and source information (found at the end of the text). For your bibliography, you must convert all the information in the footnote into bibliography format as shown in the style guide.