

## Annotated Bibliography

Each student will write one report (an annotated bibliographical entry) on a critical, scholarly article. The purpose of this assignment is to provide yourself and other students with authoritative information about these books. Therefore, we will post this material on Canvas, and you must present your report in class on the assigned day (or have 2 points deducted from the final total); please bring a hard copy for the instructor to evaluate. After reading, digesting, and thinking critically about your assigned essay, answer the following questions, in about 1 to 2 pages: 1) What is the author's argument? 2) How does the author support this argument? What kinds of evidence does she use? 3) What does the author hope to accomplish by writing this piece? What kind of **bias** might the author have? 4) Who is the author's audience? To what kind of scholarly debate is she contributing? 5) How does this research change your perspective on the primary work?

IMPORTANT EVALUATION NOTE: You must distinguish between your ideas and those of the authors you are reporting on. You must cite every time you report an author's ideas, not only by citing page numbers, but also by indicating through words and phrasing ("According to Smith's book *Literature . . .*"; "The author of this article argues . . .") that you are reporting second-hand information. Failure to do so could result in a 0 on this paper, because pretending another's ideas are your own constitutes plagiarism. The synopsis should conclude with a Works Cited, of both the article you summarize, and the primary text to which it refers. If you turn the synopsis in on time, then I usually give the option of revising it for a new grade in a week's time.

---

Wendy C. Nielsen

### Example of an Annotated Bibliography

In her 2012 article, “‘Banished His Country, Despised at Home’: Cavalier Politics, Banishment, and Rape in Aphra Behn’s *The Rover*,” Susan Olivier engages in the scholarly debate over the significance of rape in Aphra Behn’s Restoration comedy, *The Rover*. In contrast to scholar Anita Pacheco, Olivier argues that “Behn condemns rape in its various manifestations even though she does not entirely condemn the figure of the cavalier” (Olivier 57). Olivier bases her argument on the interpretation that *The Rover* represents Behn’s defense of Charles II and his cavaliers; she cites recent scholarship on the play such as Derek Hughes’ book, *The Theatre of Aphra Behn* (2011), and evidence from the play such as staging. In her reading, “the cavaliers' attempts to rape are presented as a way to regain authority and power by possessing women as property, compensating for lost English territories” (Olivier 62). The title of the journal in which the article appears, *Restoration & 18th Century Theatre Research*, suggests that Olivier writes for an audience that is extremely knowledgeable about Behn, *The Rover*, and Restoration-era scholarly debates; so she likely writes for an audience of academics in the field of Early Modern Studies. Olivier’s bias may lie in her need to distinguish her analysis of rape culture in *The Rover* from Pacheco’s famous essay. This essay is helpful

in understanding the role that rape in *The Rover* plays in elucidating the politics behind Behn's portrayal of Willmore, Frederick, and Don Pedro.

#### Works Cited

Hughes, Derek. *The Theatre of Aphra Behn*. Chippenham, Wiltshire, UK: Palgrave, 2001. Print.

Olivier, Sarah. "‘Banished His Country, Despised at Home’: Cavalier Politics, Banishment, and Rape in Aphra Behn's *The Rover*." *Restoration & 18th Century Theatre Research* 27.1 (2012): 55–74. Print.

Pacheco, Anita. "Rape and the Female Subject in Aphra Behn's *The Rover*." *ELH* 65.2 (1998): 323-345. Print.

Ex. is also available as a pdf: <http://msuweb.montclair.edu/~nielsenw/behn-abe.pdf>

---

#### Outcomes and Assessment

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Close Analysis features</b>	<b>Nomenclature</b>	<b>Informal Assessment</b>
98-100 A+; 93-97 A	answers all of my questions with correct citations. Free of any stylistic errors.	Excellent	Check plus
90-92 A-	some of the above qualities, with some stylistic errors.	Great	Check plus
87-89 B+	some attention to most of my questions Very few stylistic errors.	Very good	Check plus/Check
83-86 B	some of the above qualities, with more stylistic errors.	Good	Check
80-82 B-	slightly uneven or incomplete answers to my questions. Likely contains stylistic errors.	Fine	Check
77-79 C+; 73-76 C; 70-72 C-	some of the above qualities, to a greater degree.	Okay	Check/Check minus
67-69 D+; 63-66 D; 60-62 D-; 0-59 F	does not answer all of my questions, and has a lot of stylistic errors.	Poor	Check minus

**Please note that when your turn in your draft, I will use the informal assessment and nomenclature above, and that the points you receive for participation are based on your timely completion of the assignment, and participation within your group and in the class.**