

## 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.

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.

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.