

1: How does Descartes define God in his Ontological argument? [3 Marks]

Errors
<ul style="list-style-type: none">❖ Referring to not having imperfections rather than having all perfections❖ Using Anselm's definition ("greatest conceivable being")❖ Writing out the whole of Descartes' argument (this counts as redundancy)

Example top band response:

2: Outline St. Anselm's Ontological argument [5 Marks]

Errors
<ul style="list-style-type: none">❖ Blurring with Descartes' argument (use of "supremely perfect" or similar)❖ Saying a fool/atheist/unbeliever can conceive of/imagine "God" - not precise enough – they can conceive of the "greatest conceivable being".❖ Stating it is "better" to exist rather than "greater" to exist, or omitting "greater to exist than not exist" completely (for the argument to work existence has to link to greatness)❖ Jumping straight from "It is greater to exist than not to exist" to "God exists" - for a complete argument you need to have an intermediate conclusion (eg "The greatest conceivable being must exist" or "If God existed in the mind alone then God would not be the greatest conceivable being" or similar).❖ Bringing in counterarguments (eg Gaunilo, Hume, Kant) - this counts as redundancy as the question doesn't ask for it.❖ Mixing up "perceive" (using senses) with "conceive" (in the mind)

Example top band response:

3: Explain Kant's objection to the Ontological argument that existence is not a predicate. [5 marks]

Errors
<ul style="list-style-type: none">❖ No explanation of what is meant by "predicate"❖ Not making clear that "existence" can therefore not be demonstrated <i>a priori</i>/deductively etc, but that the only confirmation of existence is via experience (knowing that there is a thing in the real world which corresponds to the concept)❖ Responses were helped with a relevant example (including Kant's own example of 100 coins)❖ Confusing the word "predicate" with "perfection".❖ Saying that Kant thinks existence is a feature/property of God – this is the exact opposite of his point. Existence does not alter our concept of what God might be, and therefore cannot be a feature.

Example top band response:

4: Outline Malcolm's Ontological argument and how an empiricist could object to a priori arguments for existence [12 marks]

Errors
<ul style="list-style-type: none">❖ Some people wrote nothing for this – surprising as it was very clear this was one of the three arguments you needed to know.....❖ In outlining Malcolm's argument:<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ No mention of "contingent existence" (just jumping straight to necessary or impossible).➤ Incorrect explanation of contingent existence, contingent existence has nothing to do with logical possibility (you need to state that contingent existence relies on some other cause).➤ Some responses said "contingent existence" means able to go in and out of "time". This makes no sense – we have contingent existence and cannot do that.➤ No explanation of <i>why</i> God's existence is not impossible (that concept of God is not self-contradictory).❖ In explaining empiricist responses:<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Just stating that existence is judged entirely from experience or a matter of fact, without stating why it cannot be <i>a priori</i> (you need to explain Hume's point that the non-existence of anything can never be a contradiction, therefore the

statement "X exists" can never be analytically true, and can only be contingently true (or an *a posteriori* statement)

- It's not enough just to state that "God exists" is not a tautology or analytically true, you need to explain Hume's point that the non-existence of anything can never be a contradiction, therefore the statement "X exists" can never be analytically true, and can only be contingently true (or an *a posteriori* statement).
- Confusing 'matter of fact' and 'relation of ideas'

Example top band response: