

Candidate Marks Report

Series : 6 2018

This candidate's script has been assessed using On-Screen Marking. The marks are therefore not shown on the script itself, but are summarised in the table below.

Centre No :	Assessment Code :	H573
Candidate No :	Component Code :	01
Candidate Name :		

Total Marks :

In the table below 'Total Mark' records the mark scored by this candidate.
'Max Mark' records the Maximum Mark available for the question.

Question Part

2		<p>Hume & successfully argues that observation does not prove the existence of God to a very ^{good} great ^{but} extent ^{well}. This is because the arguments of Paley along with Aquinas works better ^{do less} to disprove ^{do better} prove the existence of God through observation via their teleological arguments. David Hume is a enlightenment period philosopher. who considered</p>
		<p>William Paley orig Paley put forward the teleological argument for the existence of the universe by using an analogy of a watch on a heath. He & outlined a scenario in which we found a rock on a heath firstly, on this heath. We looked at it then put it down as it is too simplistic and we automatically assume it has already been there forever. Then we find a watch and we know that it has had a creator as it has been the for not been there forever as ^{since} as it has features of complexity that a rock doesn't. These include motion, multiple components and that it has multiple components.</p>



Question Part

~~Then he raises the~~ and, most importantly, that it has a purpose. Then he raises the example of an eye. It also has all of these components so we must also assume that it has a ~~creator~~ ~~creator~~. ~~The~~ ~~idea~~ of Paley can be disproved through the arguments of Hume. Hume attempts to disprove Paley's idea. Aquinas also Hume attempts to disprove the Paley's argument and uses the example by saying that there is a categorical imperative here and that ~~we are~~ a Paley is assuming that there a creator wrong in assuming that it is a Christian God who is the creator of ~~this~~ our world. Surely it is jumping a step to say that God shows himself through created all of this around us. Also, if Paley's surely it is not the same to compare a watch, something that is ~~a~~ ~~an~~ infinitely simpler, ~~than~~ ~~the~~ to the universe, something that is supposedly ~~un-~~ unlimited in its scope and magnitude. However, I believe Paley here does a much better job than Hume as, since the universe ~~is~~ ~~is~~ while



Question Part

Hume may be right in saying that they are not the same and Paley may be jumping a step, surely if the ~~is~~ universe is much grander that is all the more reason for there to be a creator for all of this. Therefore showing that Hume argues to a weak extent.

Aquinas also argues for the ~~proving~~ proving of God through observation as he says that ~~see~~ everything in this universe has a purpose. This is something that he has observed in the universe. For example, ~~the~~ the purpose of an arrow ~~need~~ is to hit a target. However, these being things need something more powerful to guide them to their purpose. In this case an arrow need an archer. Aquinas is saying humans need guidance to, in the form of God. Hume also tries to disprove this by saying that he is ~~just~~ assuming that humans need this guidance and that they have a purpose in life like everything else. If we have a purpose like an arrow does then



Question Part

what is it? ~~the~~ You could also argue that certain things in the universe do not need such guidance. For example, ~~we did not need God~~ plants do not need guidance to perform their purpose. However, I believe that Aquinas overcomes this because God provides a ~~a~~ ~~g~~ satisfactory answer to ~~as~~ an explanation for what is guiding anything that does not have a clear guide. Therefore highlighting Hume's weakness through Aquinas' strength.

In conclusion, while Hume provides us with reasonable explanations for ~~the~~ why ~~the~~ teleological arguments are false. I strongly believe Paley and Aquinas do a better job simply due to the nature of God and the importance of faith in

3. Boethius puts forward the view that God is an eternal being. This means that God is outside of space and time and ~~is~~ rather than seeing things as they happen, as



Question Part

with an everlasting God, he sees the past present and future all at once. ~~While~~ this may some find issue in this as they argue that this limits human free will. However Boethius' view that this does is not the case is convincing. ~~as the~~

~~Boethius puts forward the view that God is eternal and~~ The idea of God being eternal is a view that is common in many religious communities. ~~It~~ It is within God's nature that he is infinite, and however it is up for debate whether he experiences time with us or if he has already experienced what ~~is~~ has happened and what is going to happen. ~~It is~~ This suggests that there is only one possible outcome for everything that ~~has~~ happened and will happen, and that sole outcome is the one that does occur. Therefore, this idea that nothing else could have happened or can happen ~~is~~ means that we actually had no free



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN.

Question Part

will in the matter. However, Boethius overcomes this by saying that it is still within our free will to do these actions, just because God does know what will happen, it doesn't mean that he decided that it was going to happen, it is still within our power. Boethius is correct as this idea of an eternal God is in line with God's omniscience. But while it does ~~may~~ to some extent go against God's omnibenevolence, ~~it is still supported~~ this is not the case as it is our free will, and God not doing anything to stop this only works to further prove Boethius' point that it does not limit our human free will.

However, you can ~~disprove~~ ^{go against} Boethius' ~~theory~~ view by arguing for the idea of an everlasting God. This is the idea that God exists within space and time. This is good as it is 100% certain that God



Question Part

humans have free will as even God doesn't know what will happen next. This is good as it is in line with the God of the Bible, who reacts and interacts with his creation. However, this goes against the idea that God is perfect as he is constantly changing as he is seeing what happens. It also goes against the idea of an omnipotent God as he is limited by the barrier of our space-time and time. There. There. However, it is better than an eternal God as an ~~eternal~~ God cannot ~~be~~ outside of space and time cannot ~~be~~ interact with physical creation. However, with an everlasting God, there is ~~no physical~~ must be a physical place where God resides, scientific evidence points to the contrary.

In conclusion, Barthius is very successful in explaining that free will is not a problem with an eternal God, instead the problems lie with the idea of an everlasting God who is constantly changing.



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

Question Part

1. The Cataphatic way, or via negativa is the approach that says we cannot describe God through what he is and his attributes, but rather through what he is not. It is not the best approach to understanding the religious language. That title belongs to A.J. Ayer's Apophatic way, other-wise known as the via positiva.

The via negativa is the view that we cannot know God truly, or we cannot know his true nature, however we do have knowledge of what God is not. For example, God is not hateful. Therefore This provides us with an explanation of God that does not limit him to our human understanding of these words. For example to say that God is something suggests that God has to meet the criteria of what that thing is and not the opposite. This therefore limits God to and says that God must be something which is



Question Part

not adequate for something which is supposedly the greatest conceivable being. The problem with this then is that saying what God is not does not help us to get any closer to what God is. Saying God isn't ~~a~~ Also, I would argue that this goes against the bible as the Bible as ~~this goes against the~~ does not describe God as ~~a~~ what he isn't. Therefore, highlighting the futility of the euphaphatic way.

A.J. Ayer provides a different approach. Saying rather that God should be described using only positive terms. Such as God is merciful. This is ~~a~~ potentially a bad approach as it possibly brings God down to our level, which could be seen as blasphemy. However, if it is good as it does not ~~a~~ talk badly about God.

In conclusion, The *via positiva* is more useful as it only works to empower our idea of God.



Question Part



