

Review 2:

I. General Thoughts:

A) The Good:

- 1) Good, clear thesis. I know from the beginning what your essay is going to try to prove.
- 2) The outside sources and the way you cite them in the footnotes shows that you really worked hard on this essay.
- 3) Well-written, convincing

B) The Bad:

- 1) There are a couple of nit picky typos and errors throughout the paper which made it hard to follow.
- 2) At times, the paper seems to wander. Although everything you say makes sense and is convincing, it doesn't seem to follow a logical order at times with random interjections and thoughts here and there.

II. Specific Thoughts:

Paragraph 1:

- 1) BROAD opening sentence. It is not good stylistic form to open a sentence with a broad, encompassing sentence.
- 2) Wordiness (fluff) – “We realize” instead of “We come to realize”.
- 3) Second sentence: “Seems” is not a very strong verb. Just use “is” instead.

Paragraph 2:

- 1) Awkward wording in the first part of the second sentence with “does not limit”. Instead, “is not limited to”
- 2) The dependent clause attached onto the last sentence in the paragraph is not necessary. It shows emotional charge (“unfortunately”) and does nothing for the essay but to show bias. Remain as objective as possible.

Paragraph 3:

- 1) You reference a very vague and general “other dividing-boundary synthesis”. I have no idea what any “other dividing-boundary synthesis” are, so this serves no purpose for me. If you reference one that is well know then maybe. And in this context “synthesis” needs to be plural “syntheses”. But I recommend taking it out.

2) "Failed" is in the past tense. Try to keep verbs in the present in your essay because the synthesis continues to fail to this day.

3) "Obviously" -Strong emotional charge. Stay objective.

4) Wordy-Last sentence take out "There are" and "that" and change "requires" to "require"

5) "Science and Religion are not independent" Do not feel like you have to end a paragraph with an all-encompassing sentence that restates what you just proved. 1) Its awkward. 2) You already proved it, now get on with the essay.

Paragraph 4:

1) Grammar mistakes (According to recent surveys.): "scientist" needs to be "scientistS"

Paragraph 5:

1) I do not see how you link the Omphalos hypothesis to determinism. Perhaps I do not know enough about the Omphalos hypothesis, but then again the casual reader probably does not either.

Paragraph 6:

1) You deviate from the thesis with this paragraph. Your thesis seeks to examine why the two aforementioned syntheses fail. This paragraph just explains why its hard to find a synthesis today. It's brilliant and it makes sense. It just seems thrown in there for good measure.

Paragraph 7:

1) I think you mean "During Medieval times" not "During Medieval"

2) Emotional charge word again : "pompously"

Paragraph 8:

1) What exactly are "Scholarly attempts"? Too vague.

2) Stick a "the" in front of "American public"

3) In general, I do not follow this paragraph. It does not follow much of a logical order and seems like a mixture of ideas thrown in there that you wanted to get out.

Paragraph 9:

- 1) Why do you wait until the conclusion to mention the Uncertainty principle? That should be back in the paragraph where you mention the conflict between determinism/free will.

Overall:

- 1) Great paper. It was very insightful, and though it wandered at points, you wrapped it up well at the end.
- 2) Just give it a little tweaking and you will do well.