

1900841-Critical Review

by Lauren Elizabeth Hopkins

Submission date: 26-Feb-2021 06:48PM (UTC+0000)

Submission ID: 145633260

File name: 17064_Lauren_Elizabeth_Hopkins_1900841-Critical_Review_326588_12448810.odt (10.55K)

Word count: 1783

Character count: 9292

Critical Review of Article

This is better written but is still very cumbersome and repetitive: I have suggested some changes in the introduction to show you how to streamline your writing.

In Tel Hazor Israel, a bronze statue of a seated male was found, that possibly was the god Ba'al, who was the god of storms; which dates back to the late Bronze Age. The statue is discussed in an article by professor Tally Ornan, called "Let Ba'al Be Enthroned": The Date, Identification, and Function of a Bronze Statue from Hazor" (Ornan, 2011, p.253). Professor Tally Ornan works in the Institute of Archaeology at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem (The Institute of Archaeology, 2021). Where the Professor specializes in a wide range of subjects from the ancient Near East, for instance, Near Eastern art, iconography of Israel/Palestine in Bronze and Iron Age, Near Eastern Glyphic Art, metal statuary and visual arts (The Institute of Archaeology, 2021). The article is similar in context to other works of Professor Ornan, "The Long Life of a Dead King: A Bronze Statue from Hazor into its Ancient Near Eastern Context" Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 2012. The Bronze statue article, "Let Ba'al Be Enthroned" will be analyzed in depth to determine the relevance and usefulness to my investigation of the statue, in relation to the location in which it was found and to determine if there is a link between the object and the sacred area of Tel Hazor as a religious site. Professor Ornan would have acquired the statues and mythological texts via museums and the inscriptions from photo archives. These sources were used as evidence to support her arguments which were her interpretations drawn from the statue found in Tel Hazor. *None of this is relevant. You don't need to tell me in a review of an article that you will be analysing the article (that is the whole point of the exercise). Better to get straight onto highlighting what the key arguments of the article are and outlining the contents.*

Arguments

A bronze statue of a seated male was found in Tel Hazor in Israel in 1996. The article has four arguments, for example the first argument was the attire and accessories of the statue, could indicate the statue represented the Canaanite god Ba'al and could also convey the time period it was manufacture in. The second argument was to demonstrate the links between the New Kingdom time period of Egypt and Middle Bronze Age II time period of Canaan. The third argument were their links between the statue and mythological texts from Ugarit. The fourth and final argument was, was there a hierarchy of seated and standing divine figures in Canaanite religion. The aim is to determine the identity of the statue through the Canaanite religious and cult ideology from the middle of the 2nd millennium BC (Ornan, 2011, p.253).

This is not adding anything to your review

~~Professor Ornan had compiled several arguments to support her hypothesis with the first two arguments being the main points and the later two being more sub-hypothesis which were rather basic. However, these sub-headings were included in order to support her overal hypothesis.~~

you are not drawing out the arguments, but simply repeating your previous paragraphs

The first argument presented was to identify the bronze statue as the Canaanite god Ba'al, via the dresses and accessories present upon the statue (Ornan, 2011, p.253). Which were similar to the characteristics of other Canaanite bronze statues conclusively identified as Ba'al (Ornan, 2011, p.253).

perhaps outline these

In addition, the second argument was to demonstrate the “reciprocal relationships” between the New Kingdom period of Egypt and Canaan (Ornan, 2011, p.253). In essence, the author describes the similarities between Egyptian and Canaanite culture and religion through iconography on inscriptions (Ornan, 2011, p.253).

Additionally, the third argument which was a sub argument, which discusses the statue has links to the mythology of Ugarit which was in the form of textual depictions (Ornan, 2011, p.253). This argument seeks to illustrate the likeness between the mythology from Tel Hazor and that of the Ugarit despite them being two distinct cities and with Ugarit being further north (Ornan, 2011, p.523).

The fourth and final argument, Ornan had written about was that in Canaanite religion there was a distinct theme (Ornan, 2011, p.523). These themes were similar to that of other cultures, where the deities would have been depicted either in a seated or standing position and this would have been depicted in a way that would show their importance to the Canaanite people (Ornan, 2011, p.253). Ornan discusses this subject in order to demonstrate her opinion that the statue was of a deity and that deity was Ba'al (Ornan, 2011, p.523).

Evidence

The evidence Professor Ornan used to support her hypothesis were rather substantial and each argument has several examples connected to them. The evidence presented originated from both Canaanite and Egyptian culture.

For the first argument, there are four pieces of evidence that Ornan discusses, the first was the statue of the deity and specifically examining the features of the statue, particularly of the facial features and body characteristics (Ornan, 2011, p.258). The second and third pieces of evidence was the drees and accessories of the statue (Ornan, 2011, p.260). Lastly, the headdress of the

statue with the “Tree and Horned Animals”, which was a popular ancient Canaanite component of religious iconography of deities (Ornan, 2011, p.64).

For the second argument, there was another four pieces of evidence Ornan had used, these pieces of evidence focus on the Egyptian examples of religion. Ornan discusses the Narmer Palette as an example to support the argument about the meaning of dress and accessories in religion and in particular the sandals that Narmer wore on the palette (Ornan, 2011, p.261). The Professor used this palette to illustrate the similarities between both sets of sandals that Narmer and the statue has (Ornan, 2011, p.262). In addition, a wall painting from the tomb of “Nebamun the Physician” was used, to demonstrate the attire of the statue (Ornan, 2011, p.262). The third piece of evidence was temple inscriptions from Ramesses III temple at Medinet Habu, and this is used to further illustrate the interpretations Ornan possessed (Ornan, 2011, p.262). The fourth piece of evidence was the chariot box of Thutmose IV, where it depicts the Egyptians conquering the Canaanites and where the inscriptions depict their attire (Ornan, 2011, p.262).

Additionally, for argument three, there was three pieces of evidence Ornan had used, which are mythological based and what pertains to Ba'al. The first piece was a myth from Ugarit called the Throne Room Scene, this talked about Ba'al returning from battle and “resting” in the throne (Ornan, 2011, p.276). Ornan discusses the posture of the deity Ba'al and had used this as a basis for her argument (Ornan, 2011, p.276). Furthermore, the second piece of evidence was the artefact “Ba'al au Foundre” stele, also from Ugarit (Ornan, 2011, p.273). This artefact was used to illustrate the posture Ba'al was depicted on this stela to compare with the stature (Ornan, 2011, p.273). The third, and last piece of evidence for this argument was the “El Figurine Negbi” which was a Canaanite statue of the god Negbi (Ornan, 2011, p.279). Even though, this statue was of a entirely different deity, Ornan used it to demonstrate the typical way in which divine entities were depicted in Canaanite religion (Ornan, 2011, p.279).

Furthermore, for argument four, the evidence Ornan compiled has four pieces; all these pieces she had used to support her idea of the statue being Ba'al and the importance in the way he was depicted to the Canaanites. The first piece was the Ba'al cycle, a term ascribed to the collections of textual myths and these convey Ba'al's “quest” for divine kingship (Ornan, 2011, p.278). This was used to illustrate Ba'al's appearance, ascribe it to the statue and to indicate the importance of the statue to the Canaanites. The second piece was the Throne Scene, this was used to signify the importance of the statue (Ornan, 2011, p.276). The third and final piece of evidence was the statue its-self to indicate the statue represents Ba'al (Ornan, 2011, p.276).

Observations

The main purpose of the article was to identify the statue as the god Ba'al, to determine the links between Canaanite and Egyptian culture, specifically in the Egyptian New Kingdom time period and to show-case Canaanite religious and cult ideologies (Ornan, 2011, p.253). Ornan had conducted detailed observations and descriptions of the statue, most was indeed fascinating and the Canaanite culture in general (Ornan, 2011, p.253).

However, the background information she provided was sketchy at times. For instance, she mentioned the Narmer Palette was in the New Kingdom which was incorrect. It was actually created in the Early Dynastic period of Egypt (Wilkinson, 2013, p.XIV). Although, the other aspects of Egypt that Ornan mentions were correct. In addition, the dresses depicted in Canaanite religion do indeed resemble Egyptian attire, which can suggest cultural hybridity, this is where cultures take inspiration from each other incorporate aspects of that culture in their own.

Another observation of the article was the location Tel Hazor where the statue was found; was hardly mentioned and only in the context of the "find spot". It would have been beneficial to include some information on the site to illustrate the statue's presence, as this may have aided in accurately determining the statue as a cult object. This leads into the next observation, Ornan discusses the object in detail, in regards to her interpretation of the statue as being Ba'al, a small section on what the object was used for in Tel Hazor may help the reader to understand her interpretations better. In regards, to the structure of the article, it was well written, the formation of sentences were clear and easy to read. However, as there was so much descriptive detail this has made the article a rather long and dense read.

surely that was the point of the article?

The article was a intriguing read, proposed many fascinating ideas and observations that will no doubt be useful in my own investigation. The comparisons between Egyptian and Canaanite iconography of deities was fascinating and for the most part accurate. The arguments were exceptional examples of keen observation and analysis. In addition, the thinking and methods that was used to draw these observations were rather scientific, elaborate. These made the article very persuasive and rather strong. In regards to, the evidence, there were no gaps of major faults with the evidence and only slight dating errors. However, the arguments and observations are mostly the

interpretations of Ornan, so in theory other readers or scholars could have an entirely different interpretation of the statue. Although, with all this in mind the article's observations and arguments was useful, relevant and would aid in my own research.

Reference List:

Ornan, T. (2011). *"Let Ba'al Be Enthroned": the Date, Identification, and Function of a Bronze Statue from Hazor*. In *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem Press.

The Institute of Archaeology. (2021). *Staff Profiles: Professor Talay Ornan*. Available at: www.archaeology.hujo.ac.il, accessed: 24/02/2021.

Wilkinson, T. (2013). *The Rise and Fall of Egypt: The History of a Civilization from 3000 BC to Cleopatra*. Surrey: Bloomsbury.

FINAL GRADE

54/100

GENERAL COMMENTS

Instructor

There is some improvement in your writing (grammar and structure). However, there is still quite a bit of work to do.

There is so much from Ornana's article that you fail to convey - for example the discussion of the manufacture and the very detailed discussion of the intricacy of the object. Indeed - from reading your review I would have no idea that this is in fact well served by illustrations.

You present information in a very laborious fashion and you are very repetitive. This means you use up words which would be better used to really summarise and critique this as a piece of work.

There was however a real attempt to write a critique and to think about the main arguments presented by Ornan.

Try to be in class more and try to talk more about the readings - in more detail, You will find that this helps you with your assignments.

PAGE 1

Text Comment. This is better written but is still very cumbersome and repetitive: I have suggested some changes in the introduction to show you how to streamline your writing.



Comment 1

A bit clunky: A bronze statuette of a seated male, was found at Tel Hazor, Israel. This has been identified as the god Ba'al (ref), and dates to the Late Bronze Age.

Statue suggests life sized



Comment 2

presumably the whole article discusses this statueete?

Strikethrough.

Text Comment. and

Strikethrough.



Comment 5

aspects of Near Eastern art and representation....

Text Comment. None of this is relevant. You don't need to tell me in a review of an article that you will be analysing the article (that is the whole point of the exercise). Better to get straight onto highlighting what the key arguments of the article are and outlining the contents.

Strikethrough.

Text Comment. repetitive: see how you can further streamline your writing



Comment 7

no subheadings in an article review

Text Comment. :

Strikethrough.



Comment 9

manufactured

Strikethrough.



Comment 11

concerns possible links

Strikethrough.

Strikethrough.

Strikethrough.



Comment 15

whether there was



Comment 16

in

PAGE 2

Text Comment. This is not adding anything to your review

Strikethrough.

Text Comment. you are not drawing out the arguments, but simply repeating your previous paragraphs

Text Comment. perhaps outline these

QM

Frag.

Fragment:

A sentence fragment is a phrase or clause that is in some way incomplete. Such fragments become problematic when they attempt to stand alone as a complete sentence. The most common version of this mistake occurs when a writer mistakes a gerund (a verb that acts like a noun) for a main verb, as in the following sentence: "In bed reading Shakespeare from dusk to dawn."

Strikethrough.



Comment 19

you have jumped from a singular to plural themes



Comment 20

explain - this is not clear

Strikethrough.



Comment 22

subject verb agreement.

Evidence is singular: should be "was"

PAGE 3



Comment 23

she mentions Narmer to demonstrate that sandals as a sign of importance date back to 3000 BC

PAGE 4

Strikethrough.

Text Comment. repetitive



Comment 25

no she does not - she dates the Narmer palette very clearly to c. 3000 BC



Cite your sources

Cite your sources



Run-on

Run-on sentence:

The sentence contains two or more independent clauses. Separate the clauses with a period or semicolon.

Strikethrough.



Comment 27

? I am not sure that I agree - she is very clear on the context of the object. The whole point of this article is as an object analysis, which she does beautifully



Comment 28

why the semicolon?



Comment 29

better to note that the article was clearly written and straightforward...

Text Comment. surely that was the point of the article?



Comment 30

contradicts your previous point!



Comment 31

?

PAGE 5

PAGE 6
