

SCIENCE AND RELIGION
GRADED PAPER 2 REVIEWS
KATIE BYRNE

Paper 1

The structure of your review was not particularly helpful. You present a text-ordered critique, where comments on the content of arguments are intermingled with observations about erroneous grammar. Substantive objections are not clearly separated from nit-picks. Reviews should be organized such that the most important problems are easily identified and absorbed.

More importantly, you miss the forest for the trees. This paper had no clearly identifiable thesis. The central argument, as best it could be identified, was trivial. The “arguments” were repetitions of existing history, with no new content offered, and no citations for the source of this history. This paper was deeply flawed, and the author missed an opportunity to hear from you about the deep problems with the writing.

(1) Really? What was the thesis? Of what were you persuaded? The paper was a recitation of history that we had already covered, with no identifiable thesis and no novel arguments or assertions.

Grade: B

Paper 2

This review is thorough and helpful. In places, you are sloppy with your own grammar, and it would take little effort to provide a more technically correct presentation.

You provide comments on almost every level from grammar to argument content. You might have been a bit more specific with the grammatical and other syntactic errors by pointing the author to specific examples. Otherwise, a good review.

Grade: A

Paper #1

Christianity's crippling fight for power

Title is attention grabbing but maybe something could be added to it about how it fails to withstand such power in the face of science.

Intro:

The introductory paragraph is interesting and mostly good, it would just be better to make more specific statements to get your points across more strongly. For example, explain whether or not Christianity is forced to adopt scientific view and if they actually do, even if it proves it wrong. It seems as though "observation of the natural world" and scripture and its interpretation" are different approaches, maybe you are trying to say they are different approaches to solve similar questions? Back up your statements that "documents only proof needed to explain universe" are scriptures- what about religious scientists? Explain further how this "proof that does not appear in scripture" weakens Christianity's base and define what the "important points" are. "Fleshed out reasons" should be changed to a more formal expression, and "happenings in the world" is too vague- needs to be defined. Clarify what time period you are talking about- Christianity doesn't still label outside scientific evidence as heretical as it used to. "Through science new evidence's validity is noted over and over leaving need for an explanation" is awkward and needs to be reworded. Explain what the broader source science draws from is.

Huh?
Awk.

In the second paragraph, you should clearly state what the "notion of the earth as a sphere" is an example of. Define what church you are talking about and how the notion of the earth as a sphere was an attack on the scripture. The sentence "At first science itself was attacked" seems out of place, doesn't flow, and doesn't explain how science was attacked. Good examples of the religious viewpoint and arguments the early Church used to support scripture, since we can now see that they are ridiculous, but state how scientific theory overturned them. In the statement "it is said that any who did not hold this idea," clarify who decided this- the church. Describe how the "great men of the time" came to accept the idea that the earth was a sphere and how the church had to alter their theories. You said that the church changed its theories then "but still according to interpretations of the bible the earth must be flat," which is contradictory. Also, define what "undeniable scientific evidence" proved it to the church. This paragraph needs a stronger concluding sentence- is "mode" the best word choice?

In the third paragraph, you should explain what the theory of the antipodes is before you elaborate on its implications. In some places, more formal language is needed, for example, don't say "and so on." Explain what "like denouncing science" refers. What does it denounce about science? You need to clarify the tense of your writing and the chronological order- "it is still believed that the antipodes do not exist"- people believe in antipodes now. Your definition and description of religious principle and pointing out their arguments is good, but you should show more of the scientific refutations of these arguments- more scientific evidence and fact.

In the fourth paragraph, combining shorter sentences into compound sentences will help your argument flow better. Define "end of the pestilence"- talk more about disease and filth. Change "papal bull" to something more clear. Which religions fed into Christianity and how did they view witches? Change "result of nature" to clearer factors that initiated disease. Good reference to Robert Boyle- specific scientific reasons help to strengthen argument. "He attempted to reconcile disease as a punishment with disease as something that could be prevented."- Fix this sentence, I have a feeling one of those diseases isn't supposed to be there. Good information, be sure to clearly draw the conclusion that the pious people were the most unclean and therefore the most disease. Once again, some scientific evidence about how dirt caused disease.

In the concluding paragraph, it might be a tad drastic to claim "that science and religion are enemies." Either use a different word for "evidences" or be more specific about which evidence. You don't much about how these evidences fell out of favor for a while in the body of the essay- maybe use some more examples of that. Language in this paragraph is too informal, use more formal language, especially in concluding your essay- change "first go", etc. Fix the sentence: "But as science moves forward it leaves Christian though further and further behind..." Strong conclusion, good analysis from paper, but maybe summarizing the main points/paragraphs of your paper in the conclusion would help.

①

Overall, the paper is clear and persuasive. There are only minor spelling and grammatical errors and it generally flows well, but a few transitions wouldn't hurt. There are a few spots where the writing could be more formal, but overall it is well written. Most things are clear, but there are a few terms or explanations that could be more defined or more deeply defined to make your argument stronger and increase the clarity. Knowledge of religious arguments is persuasive, but deeper understanding and more scientific arguments would increase the strength of your argument.

Be grammatical.

Paper #2

Inevitable Changing of Church Doctrines

The Title should be more interesting and specific to your paper and thesis. It is unclear within the paper itself whether you think church doctrines do change. For example, in the introductory paragraph, you state: "It may seem that Christians change their doctrines to conform to the conflicting views of science, but these discoveries help create new interpretations of scripture..." Your paper shouldn't contradict its own title.

The introduction was unclear and didn't tell me the focus of your paper directly. It would help to define things such as what about "our understanding of the natural world" changes, which "doctrines of the church" it is "inevitably forced to adapt and change," and what "differences in certain doctrines" you are talking about. Avoid using language such as "in stating this" and "it may seem." You refer to the "geocentric model of the universe" as a "notion of science" but later say that it is a Christian doctrine and a fault of both Christianity and science. Please clarify your views on the geocentric model. Thesis: "It may seem that Christians change their doctrines just to conform to the conflicting views of science..."? Make your thesis clearer and more developed. ✓

The "contradiction between the church doctrine and scientific evidence" needs to be clarified. What was the scientific evidence? It would help to state the religious and scientific bases for the geocentric theory and how it was overturned. Also, clarify the scripture you are referring to and what it says- Explain: why did scripture originally lead them to believe in geocentrism? How can it be looked at in a new perspective to accommodate scientific theory? Also, avoid useless adjectives such as "numerous" and "plentiful." ✓

In the third paragraph, it is a good point that religion has confirmation bias, in that they take things to mean what they want rather than in the real context of the scripture, but your argument could be a lot stronger. It would be better to use an example that actually has to do with religious doctrines and scientific discovery. Your example supporting this argument seems unrelated to your thesis, and it is not clear how it connects to the conclusion you want to draw from it. What about the "context of the scripture" makes it "obvious" that these "interpretations are not what the verse was intended to suggest"? There isn't a clear connection between this example and how it "proves that honest mistakes in taking scripture out of context can provide alternative implications." Be more specific about which church doctrine you are referring to—the geocentric theory, church doctrines in general, etc. It is unclear whether you are trying to say that scripture shouldn't be interpreted literally or that the definition of scripture was formerly misinterpreted. *awk sentence*

In the fourth paragraph, your argument needs to be much more specific and based in fact. Wasn't the start of the geocentric theory derived from religious texts and backed up by religious texts and the scriptures? Explain how scientists proved the

geocentric theory to be true and "came to the formation of this principle," explain how religion adopted the idea from science, and how science eventually overturned the belief. It is unclear what point you are trying to make by saying that "all science was not put to shame or deemed 'unbelievable'." Are you trying to say that it should have been? Or draw a conclusion about religion being "put to shame" without enough reason? Also, you say that in science, people "believe all things in that area to be true," but many people within the scientific community have varying viewpoints and most scientific discoveries are not referred to as fact but as "theories" and "hypotheses." This paragraph also does nothing to prove your concluding statements of it- are you stating that they are both at fault? ~~Say what you mean.~~ (obvious) ✓

In the fifth paragraph, you need to define what you mean by the "Christian Doctrine." It is unclear whether you are referring to general Christian beliefs, a specific belief, or the same doctrine you discussed earlier. "This is one of inevitable scientific evidence deals with the logical contradictions of animals" doesn't make sense and needs to be reworded. Discuss why the gathering of animals on the arc "logically does not make sense in the scientific eye." The argument that the scientific and religious viewpoints don't conflict on this does not make sense; scientists wouldn't take "latching onto other animals" or "divine intervention" as a logical solution. Last sentence does not make sense and the argument that it is irrefutable is unconvincing.

In the sixth paragraph, it would be extremely helpful to have an example of an instance "where neither side is wrong nor right." Clarify what power religious leaders had, how they were losing it, and examples of their reluctance to change. Also explain what doctrines which church said you had to believe in to avoid damnation and connect the idea to show how they "give a bad image for the reliability of the doctrines." Also, it is unclear whether you are saying there is no "scriptural evidence" for the "certain doctrines" or that you will be condemned if you don't follow them.

In the last paragraph, your statement that "The issue becomes whether or not that church deserves to be criticized for false or misleading doctrines" is off topic from your thesis, and you should try not to introduce new problems in your concluding paragraph. Explain how science says, "that beliefs cannot evolve and learn from previous experiences" and who these "scientists" are that "say that the change in the doctrines were only due to science" ...use examples. You need to define this "argument that only science is true" before you attempt to draw conclusions disproving it. You also need to define these "original doctrines" and which "scientific probabilities" you are referring to. Fix "cannot be disprove that it would not happen"- too many negatives. You need to explain how "arguments like that of Noah's ark" were attempted to "be used to diminish the Christian doctrine" before you can refute it. You show no examples of Christian doctrines that "remain true even if there is an evolution", and there is no clarity how these Christian doctrines change and remain the same. Also, you say that "there is nothing that proves that

Christian doctrines cannot change and yet still be true," when throughout history, Christian doctrines have been blatantly overturned by scientific evidence. Are you trying to say that Christianity is still true and misinterpretations of the past don't change the religion?

600

Overall, this paper is rather vague and doesn't flow, and the argument is unclear and unpersuasive. Many sentences and phrases are awkwardly worded and unclear. A lot of rearranging and rewording would help you to get your point across much more clearly. There are also a lot of grammar, punctuation, and spelling errors throughout that can easily be fixed- omission of commas, fragments, etc. It doesn't give you a real sense of focus on a thesis, and individual paragraphs need to state their conclusions and points more directly. Also, many key terms essential to understand the meaning of this paper are left undefined throughout- such as Christian doctrines. Many of your points and refutations would be more convincing if they were backed up by factual information and appropriate examples, because right now they are weak and the way they are presented seems hypocritical. It appears as though you are either unsure of what your major points are or that you just are not stating them directly, which is hurting the strength of your argument. In the second paragraph, a lot of the language is not formal enough and there are a lot of grammar/ spelling errors. Many sentences should be reworded to sound less awkward and read more fluidly- maybe add some better transitions.