"A Logical and Desirable Synthesis of Science and Theology Through Reinterpretation of the Bible and Scientific Theory"

Review

Thesis identification: "However, the potential for an appealing fusion of these two seemingly conflicting sides that does not insult the principles of both science and religion is still possible through the careful reinterpretation of Scripture and of scientific discovery." This is a really good thesis. The idea is great, but it is a little wordy. I had to read it through twice to understand it completely

Quality of arguments. Beginning → end? Your arguments to support your thesis are very strong, and you reach the conclusion you set out to reach. However, your conclusion is too brief compared to the depth of your main paragraphs (I understand that this may be because you ran out of room). Three sentences in conclusion do not do your argument justice.

Allow speculation… appropriate? Your essay clearly falls under the second question category, and it offers an appropriate analysis of the questions asked there

Larger structure. Discontinuities? Although the ideas flow smoothly, the first sentences in some of your paragraphs do not flow well. For example, the first sentence in the second paragraph is, "In order to construct such a synthesis as the one described above, it is necessary to pinpoint exactly where Gosse failed in his synthetic attempt."

The first phrase is, for the most part, unnecessary. The reader has just read about the synthesis in the previous line, they already know that it is above and they just read the description. Some of the other paragraphs have similar issues.

Terms defined before use: You do an excellent job here. All of the terms you use are very well explained and therefore easily understood. Also, any abstract ideas outside of common knowledge are explained well.

Comment on language. Concise? Excess modifiers? You have no problem with excess modifiers. However, the language in your sentences is off sometimes. An example is the following sentence (found near the bottom of page 2): Due to these reasons, specific communities such as scientists and theologians were repelled by Gosse's synthesis as well as a large part of the general public." This sentence needs to be rephrased. "A large part of the general public" needs to be modified in the same place as "scientists and theologians" because they were both "repelled by Gosse's synthesis" Although moving the general public to the end of the sentence is grammatically correct, it takes away from the power of the sentence. There were a few others like this.

Sentences: intent clear? For the most part, the intent of your sentences is clear. There are no unnecessary sentences. The sentences that did have problems were the ones that lacked in conciseness (see above)

Clear transitions? As I talk about above, you transition well with ideas.

Correct word usages? From what I can see, you use all of your words properly. When it comes to diction, you do a great job as well, but there was one instance when you overused a word. The word "antithetical" to me seems very rare, and you use it twice. You could choose a synonym for it, and it wouldn't take away from the paper.

Too informal? This paper has no issue with formality. From the title, to the structure, to the arguments, to the general look…this paper is golden. There is one instance of you using a word that really took away from the formality of the paper. Toward the end of the first and the beginning of the second page, you use the word "trickster" twice within two sentences. A trickster brings up a visual of the joker from batman. Not necessarily what you wanted I am guessing.

Mechanics: Your paper is pretty mechanically sound from the point of view of a college freshman… The only thing I would check on is your citation.

Appearance: As stated earlier, this paper is very structurally sound and very well written. From the get go, I knew this paper was going to be good because of the very strong title.

Great Job!