PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY (PRINCIPAL)	**9774/02**
Paper 2 Topics and Key Texts in Philosophy and Theology 1	**For Examination from 2016**
SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME	
	2 hours

MAXIMUM MARK: 50

This document consists of **18** printed pages.

CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

[Turn over

Assessment objectives (AOs)

AO1	Demonstrate knowledge and understanding; identify, select and apply ideas and concepts through the use of examples and evidence.	40%
AO2	Provide a systematic critical analysis of the texts and theories, sustain a line of argument and justify a point of view. Different views should be referred to and evaluated where appropriate. Demonstrate a synoptic approach to the areas studied.	60%

In the textual questions AO1 and AO2 are assessed separately.

AO1 and AO2 are both to be considered in assessing each essay.

The **Generic Marking Scheme** should be used to decide the mark. The essay should first be placed within a level which best describes its qualities, and then at a specific point within that level to determine a mark out of 25.

The **Question-Specific Notes** provide guidance for Examiners as to the area covered by the question. These question-specific notes are not exhaustive. Candidates may answer the question from a variety of angles with different emphases and using different supporting evidence and knowledge for which they receive credit according to the Generic Marking Scheme levels. However, candidates must clearly answer the question as set and not their own question. Examiners are reminded that the insights of specific religious traditions are, of course, relevant, and it is likely that candidates will draw on the views of Jewish, Christian or Islamic theologians, as well as those of philosophers who have written about the concept of God from a purely philosophical standpoint. There is nothing to prevent candidates referring to other religious traditions and these must, of course, be credited appropriately in examination responses.

Table A: Generic Marking Scheme for 10 mark questions

Level 5 9–10 marks	• Broad knowledge and understanding of a wide range of philosophical/religious issues. • Insightful selection and application of ideas and concepts. • Complete or near complete accuracy at this level. • Good evidence of wide reading on the topic beyond the set texts. • Confident and precise use of philosophical and theological vocabulary.
Level 4 7–8 marks	• Knowledge is accurate and a good range of philosophical/religious issues are considered. • Systematic/good selection and application of ideas and concepts. • Response is accurate: the question is answered specifically. • Some evidence of reading on the topic beyond the set texts. • Accurate use of philosophical and theological vocabulary.
Level 3 5–6 marks	• Knowledge is generally accurate and a fair range of issues are considered. • Reasonable selection and application of ideas and concepts. • Response is largely relevant to the question asked. • Reasonable attempt to use supporting evidence. • Reasonable attempt to use philosophical and theological vocabulary accurately.
Level 2 3–4 marks	• Some accuracy of knowledge. More than one issue is touched upon. • Attempts to select and apply ideas with partial success. • Response is partially relevant to the question asked but may be one-sided. • Some attempt to use supporting evidence. • Philosophical and theological vocabulary is occasionally used correctly.
Level 1 1–2 marks	• Some key points made. Possibly repetitive or short. • Explores some isolated ideas related to the general topic. • Response is limited or tenuously linked to the question. • Limited attempt to use evidence. • Philosophical and theological vocabulary is inaccurate or absent.
Level 0 0 marks	• No relevant material to credit.

Table B: Generic Marking Scheme for 15 mark questions

Level 5 13–15 marks	• Insightful selection and application of ideas and concepts. • Excellent critical engagement and detailed evaluation of the wider implications of the question. • Complete or near complete accuracy at this level. • Argument is coherent, structured, developed and convincingly sustained. • Employs a wide range of differing points of view and supporting evidence. • Shows good understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate. • Confident and precise use of philosophical and theological vocabulary.
Level 4 10–12 marks	• Systematic/good selection and application of ideas and concepts. • Good critical engagement and evaluation of the implications of the question. • Response is accurate: the question is answered specifically. • Argument has structure and development and is sustained. • Good use of differing points of view and supporting evidence. • Shows competent understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate. • Accurate use of philosophical and theological vocabulary.
Level 3 7–9 marks	• Reasonable selection and application of ideas and concepts. • Some critical engagement and evaluation of the question. • Response is largely relevant to the question asked. • Argument has some structure and shows some development, but may not be sustained. • Considers more than one point of view and uses evidence to support argument. • May show some understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate. • Reasonable attempt to use philosophical and theological vocabulary accurately.
Level 2 4–6 marks	• Attempts to select and apply ideas with partial success. • Attempts to evaluate though with partial success. • Response is partially relevant to the question asked but may be one-sided. • Some attempt at argument but without development and coherence. • Some attempt to use supporting evidence. • Philosophical and theological vocabulary is occasionally used correctly.
Level 1 1–3 marks	• Some key points made. Possibly repetitive or short. • Explores some isolated ideas related to the general topic. • Argument is limited or confused. • Response is limited or tenuously linked to the question. • Limited attempt to use evidence. • Philosophical and theological vocabulary is inaccurate or absent.
Level 0 0 marks	• No relevant material to credit.

Table C: Generic Marking Scheme for 25 mark questions

Level 5 21–25 marks	• Broad knowledge and understanding of a wide range of philosophical/religious issues. • Insightful selection and application of ideas and concepts. • Excellent critical engagement and detailed evaluation of the wider implications of the question. • Complete or near complete accuracy at this level. • Argument is coherent, structured, developed and convincingly sustained. • Employs a wide range of differing points of view and supporting evidence. • Good evidence of wide reading on the topic beyond the set texts. • Shows good understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate. • Confident and precise use of philosophical and theological vocabulary.
Level 4 16–20 marks	• Knowledge is accurate and a good range of philosophical/religious issues are considered. • Systematic/good selection and application of ideas and concepts. • Good critical engagement and evaluation of the implications of the question. • Response is accurate: the question is answered specifically. • Argument has structure and development and is sustained. • Good use of differing points of view and supporting evidence. • Some evidence of reading on the topic beyond the set texts. • Shows competent understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate. • Accurate use of philosophical and theological vocabulary.
Level 3 12–15 marks	• Knowledge is generally accurate and a fair range of issues are considered. • Reasonable selection and application of ideas and concepts. • Some critical engagement and evaluation of the question. • Response is largely relevant to the question asked. • Argument has some structure and shows some development, but may not be sustained. • Considers more than one point of view and uses evidence to support argument. • May show some understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate. • Reasonable attempt to use philosophical and theological vocabulary accurately.
Level 2 8–11 marks	• Some accuracy of knowledge. More than one issue is touched upon. • Attempts to select and apply ideas with partial success. • Attempts to evaluate though with partial success. • Response is partially relevant to the question asked but may be one-sided. • Some attempt at argument but without development and coherence. • Some attempt to use supporting evidence. • Philosophical and theological vocabulary is occasionally used correctly.
Level 1 1–7 marks	• Some key points made. Possibly repetitive or short. • Explores some isolated ideas related to the general topic. • Argument is limited or confused. • Response is limited or tenuously linked to the question. • Limited attempt to use evidence. • Philosophical and theological vocabulary is inaccurate or absent.
Level 0 0 marks	• No relevant material to credit.

Topic 1 Epistemology

Section A

[Extract from **George Berkeley**: *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous in Opposition to Sceptics and Atheists*: Cahn, 745]

1 (a) Explain Berkeley's use of the idea of God in the *Dialogues*. **[10]**

Berkeley wanted to show that philosophy could demonstrate the existence of God. After the passage given above, Berkeley (Philonous) tells Hylas that men commonly believe that all things are known or perceived by God because they believe the being of a God, whereas he immediately and necessarily concludes the being of a God because all sensible things must be perceived by him. Berkeley arrives at this conclusion by an unusual approach to empiricism – 'to be is to be perceived' – it is not possible to know that an object exists, because all we can know is our perceptions, not the object itself. To call these objects 'matter' is misleading, because it implies that matter exists whether we perceive it or not, which (apart from being one of the central features of epistemological debate) cannot be shown. It is obvious to us that our perceptions are consistent, and this holds for objects that are not being perceived – for example a fire that is no longer perceived when somebody goes out of the room will be found to have burned down on that person's return. Since it cannot be shown that the objects of sense perception are held thus in my mind, there must be a being in whose mind this consistency is maintained. This guarantor must exist everywhere – an omnipresent, all-perceiving mind who contains and supports the world we perceive by our senses. This is God. All ideas must exist in the mind of God, since to suppose that such a being is influenced, directed, or put in mind when and how he is to act, by any unthinking substance, is to derogate from his attributes. Candidates might go on to discuss other issues raised by Berkeley, e.g. whether or not God by his perceptions causes sin, or whether he knows pain.

(b) Critically assess Berkeley's idealism in the *Dialogues*. **[15]**

Berkeley's 'subjective idealism' holds that realism cannot make sense of the nature and existence of material objects. Berkeley's empirical aim, as we have said, is to show that I can only have perceptions of material objects, so I cannot know that they exist outside my mind. Material objects are therefore ideas that exist only inside the mind. To the objection that if material objects do not exist outside my mind, then what *causes* perceptions, Berkeley replied that there are three possibilities: ideas, my mind, and another mind. Ideas are passive and do not cause anything; my mind cannot cause perceptions, because our perceptions happen to us; so they must be caused by another mind. The only likely cause of the systematic and consistent perception we experience is God. This disposes (according to Berkeley) of the objection given in 1 (a), that when material objects are not being perceived, they should cease to exist, whereas they clearly do not (as with the fire) – it is God who guarantees that consistency. Berkeley has to deal with illusions. Illusions are mis-perceptions, which implies that there must be a difference between my illusion and the 'real' world, so the real world must exist – if I see a stick that appears to be bent in water, then there must be a real world in which the stick is not bent. Berkeley's response is that there just is not a real world – all there is is my perception, in which the stick looks bent. Candidates are free to develop any arguments they like – for example it is often held that it is not legitimate to replace external causation with an unknown factor (God); and that a simpler explanation of the apparent effects of material objects is to assume that they exist. Berkeley's incipient phenomenalism seems to suffer from the objection to phenomenalist theories in general – that material objects (on phenomenalist accounts) seem to be sitting around waiting to be perceived in such a consistent manner (as in an archaeological dig, for example) that it is simplest to believe that they have really existed all along.

Section B

2   **Examine critically Descartes' use of philosophical doubt in his search for a secure
     foundation for knowledge.** **[25]**

According to Descartes, empirical knowledge is always uncertain: our senses deceive us, as
where distant objects look different when seen close up; blood looks red to the naked eye, but
looks quite different under a microscope. True knowledge can accordingly come only from
reason. The job of reason is therefore to take doubt to its extreme in order to find something that
reason cannot doubt, which can then be used as the basis for constructing an accurate picture of
reality. Descartes argues that he can be deceived about even something so basic as sitting in his
chair and holding a piece of paper in his hand: he has often dreamed of such a thing, so how can
he be sure that he is not dreaming now? It is even possible that there is no God who is the
sovereign source of truth, but instead some evil demon has made him believe, wrongly, that he
has no hands, eyes, flesh, blood or senses. However the demon cannot deceive him in one thing,
namely in the fact that he exists: doubt is a kind of thinking, so if he attempts to doubt that he is
thinking, he is in fact thinking. Hence there is one thing that cannot be doubted – 'I think,
therefore I am.' With this argument, Descartes believed that he had shown that he was a thing
whose sole essence was thinking/consciousness. Doubting, however, is not as good as knowing,
so Descartes concluded that he was not perfect, and hence was not God; nevertheless he had
the concept of a perfect being which could only have come from such a being, so God must exist.
Given the fact that our senses can often be wrong, Descartes drew a distinction between facts
and opinions, for example we can be factually sure about the measurable quantities of things, but
not so sure about their qualities.

A common critique of Descartes' epistemology is that it relies on a confusion over Leibniz's Law
(*If A is numerically identical to B, then every property possessed by A is possessed by B, and
vice versa*) – so if there is at least one property possessed by A which is not possessed by B,
then A cannot be identical to B. Descartes appears to be saying:
· *I can doubt that my body exists*
· *I cannot doubt that I exist*
· *Therefore (by Leibniz's Law) I am not identical to my body*.

This can be refuted by constructing a parallel case:
· *I can doubt that Charles Dodgson wrote Alice in Wonderland*
· *I cannot doubt that Lewis Carroll wrote Alice in Wonderland*
· *Therefore Charles Dodgson is not one and the same as Lewis Carroll.*

The confusion is over the fact that I do not know that Charles Dodgson and Lewis Carroll are in
fact one and the same. Equally it may be that 'my body' and 'I' do refer to the same person, but I
simply do not know it. The confusion arises over intentional psychological states, where verbs
such as '*believe, know, imagine, dream and doubt*' are exceptions to Leibniz's law because they
have no reality that corresponds to them. I might *believe* that fairies exist, but that does not mean
that they do.

Criticisms can be directed at several aspects of Descartes' ideas, not least his Ontological
Argument.

OR

3   Critically assess reliabilism.   [25]

Reliabilism is an attempt to move away from foundationalism in epistemology, shifting the emphasis away from finding supposed foundations or coherence patterns in knowledge towards thinking about the agent's place in the world/how the agent relates to the world/what is known to have been reliable in the past. The emphasis is not about finding evidence for belief, but on whether or not it is appropriately related to other beliefs, by looking at reliable (and unreliable) ways of collecting beliefs. There are good and bad ways of collecting beliefs. Faulty ways include wishful thinking, confused reasoning and guesswork, because most of the time these methods tend to produce false beliefs. Reliable ways include standard perceptual processes, memory, good reasoning and introspection, since most of the time these produce true beliefs. The requirements for reliable justification thus include (if S is the subject, and P the proposition): S knows P if (if and only if) (i) S believes P, and (ii) S's belief is produced by a reliable process.

Since foundationalism seems to show that infallible justification is not possible, reliable methods have to be fallible. This gives an immediate problem: how reliable? A computer that crashes once in a thousand starts might be considered reliable; a plane that does so would be deeply worrying. Moreover we can gain reliable information from false beliefs (e.g. sailors used to navigate reliably by the erroneous belief that the sun rotates around the earth). For this reason, some seek an external justification outside the person who knows P: 'I have a damaged disc' can be reliably diagnosed by a doctor as well as by my own experience of back pain. External reliabilism tracks the causal chains that confirm my beliefs about the world, and excludes what might be known by luck or any other unreliable process (such as navigational ones). Some prefer an internalist form of reliabilism – for example, some medical conditions are known better internally than externally (such as 'I feel sick'). There are issues with both forms: externalist reliabilism has to rely on the attention that S gives to the causal chains being tracked (not paying attention gives unreliable data), so cannot avoid incorporating internalist features. Internalist reliabilism seems circular: each method I use to check on reliability is itself subject to a check for reliability: where do I stop? Perhaps both externalist and internalist features are needed, one to incorporate knowledge of the way the world really is, and the other to include external justification of it. Reliabilism seems robust at fending off attacks, and is seen by many as the most promising method of justification.

Candidates might also answer this question by comparing reliabilism with other methods of justification, i.e. foundationalism and coherentism. Foundationalist theories are often rejected because of the difficulty in finding an agreed foundation (infallible or otherwise), either through sense experience or through what is self-evident. Coherentist theories are generally attacked by the suggestion that a claim to justified knowledge may be entirely coherent yet entirely false (e.g. Creationism).

Topic 2 Philosophical and Theological Language

Section A

[Extract from **Basil Mitchell**: *The Philosophy of Religion*: III: 'Theology and Verification' (John Hick): 59–60]

4   (a)   **With reference to *The Parable of the Celestial City*, explain the reasoning behind Hick's claim that the existence of God is verifiable eschatologically (i.e. after death).**
[10]

Hick's claims about eschatological verification are in response to the agenda of the logical positivists, particularly their challenge that religious statements are meaningless because they are not verifiable (even in principle) in sense experience. Candidates can unpack the meaning of the Parable, i.e. as a reference to the vicissitudes of life experienced and interpreted differently by a theist and an atheist. Hick maintains that religious statements are verifiable at death, where their truth or falsity will be demonstrated – or, rather, if true they will be shown to be true; if false they will not be falsified, since the falsifier will not be conscious. Hick admits that this is problematic, since it involves asymmetrical verification; normal verification having the symmetry of being demonstrable, whether true or false. For example, 'There is a table in the cupboard' will always be verifiable (by observation) if true, or falsifiable if false. Hick suggests that asymmetrical verification is acceptable in the case of religious statements, and gives an example of another acceptable asymmetrical statement – 'There are three successive sevens in the decimal solution of *pi*.' The decimal solution of *pi* is probably an infinite calculation, so if three sevens do occur, then the prediction will be verified, but if they do not, the statement can never be falsified. By means of the parable, Hick then seeks to show that religious statements are not experimental, because when the road runs out, '… it will be apparent that one of them has been right all the time and the other wrong. Thus although the issue between them has not been experimental, it has nevertheless from the start been a real issue.'

    (b)   **Evaluate Hick's further claim that resurrection of the body is logically possible.   [15]**

The suggestion that resurrection of the body is logically possible follows on, in Hick's reasoning, from his view that religious predictions can justifiably be accepted even if they turn out to be non-falsifiable in fact. Given that it is possible to conceive of some logically coherent world in which Hick's claim would be true, then that claim is coherent. It makes no difference even if it is concluded that resurrection of the body is not logically possible in *this* world, so long as it is possible to conceive of such a possibility in another world, and Hick's claim is precisely that there could be a resurrection world in which resurrection of the body occurs. Hick goes on, however, to justify claims about verification of such a claim *post mortem*, and this claim is alleged to be valid as a claim requiring asymmetrical verification. Hick's example of asymmetrical verification is the prediction that there will be three successive sevens in the decimal solution of *pi*, but this is dubious, since there are several occurrences of four successive sevens in its solution to 10,000 decimal places, and Hick offers no further examples of valid asymmetries. His demonstration of the logical possibility of bodily resurrection may amount to a statement that there is nothing inherently illogical in that notion, which, given the fact that an omnipotent God would be able to resurrect persons, might amount to nothing more than a simple tautology. This begs the question of whether or not the resurrected person is really the 'same person' as the one who died. Candidates should be able to show Hick's reasoning, using his three successive scenarios of Mr X, who, in the third scenario, finds himself in a spatio-temporal location not related to 'normal' space in this universe, and becomes aware that he is in a *post mortem* state of existence. Hick describes this state as a 'replica', which raises the obvious problem that a replica is not the same as the original. Candidates might claim that this is acceptable, since the body at any

two stages of its life (particularly contrasting childhood with old age) can hardly be said to be identical, yet we still talk in such cases as if the individual were the same person. Brain structures are presumably capable of duplication by God, so the notion of God resurrecting a brain pattern into a reconstituted physical body is intelligible. Nevertheless many regard it as insolubly problematic – if God could in theory replicate a human any number of times, then again, all concept of 'identity' would be lost.

Section B

5   Examine critically responses to the challenge of the falsification principle.   [25]

Candidates might begin with Popper's ideas about falsification, extrapolated from his analysis of scientific procedures: e.g. his distrust of philosophies that are inherently non-falsifiable and therefore inherently meaningless, such as those of Plato and Marx. Answers might be confined to the Flew/Hare/Mitchell symposium in Mitchell's *Philosophy of Religion*. Flew re-states the Falsification Principle by means of Wisdom's *Parable of the Gardener*, which concludes that a Gardener (God) who is invisible, intangible and eternally elusive is no different from an imaginary Gardener, or in fact from no Gardener at all. Flew then analyses theological assertions such as, 'God loves us as a father loves his children,' applied particularly to the case of the child dying from inoperable throat cancer, to conclude that these assertions 'die the death of a thousand qualifications'. Hare rejects this, using his example of the lunatic who thinks all Oxford dons are out to kill him, concluding that religious talk does not amount to *explanations* about the world, but to a series of non-cognitive assertions that are nevertheless meaningful. Flew seems right to reject this, since believers do believe that their assertions are factual. Mitchell uses yet another parable – that of the Stranger – to counter this, suggesting that non-falsifiable religious assertions are factual (on the analogy of trust in the Stranger/God) and do count as explanations. For example the problem of evil has a potential solution in the mind and purposes of God, yet that solution is non-falsifiable. In the same way that the authenticity of the Stranger's credentials are eventually verified, Mitchell presumably looks towards verification post-mortem, but that raises the same problems as Hick's doctrine of eschatological verification, namely that that doctrine is an asymmetrical one (verified if true, not-falsified if false) that Hick thinks acceptable, but which seems unacceptable. Some candidates might refer to Swinburne's story of the toys in the toy cupboard; others to Braithwaite's argument that religious assertions are conative and non-cognitive – they function as statements of moral intention, and are in fact normally verifiable and falsifiable by observing the believer's behaviour. Flew still requires recognition that there can be no excuses for an omnipotent and omniscient God, but that depends rather on how successful one thinks the theodicies are in showing that God allows evil for a justifiable reason.

Candidates are at liberty to discuss falsification in a wider context, e.g. Kuhn's view that science has increased its body of knowledge through 'paradigm shift' rather than by explaining reality in terms of rules of method or through confirmation, falsification, etc.

OR

6   **Critically examine the use of myth, symbol and analogy to express human understanding of God.** **[25]**

No particular balance of treatment is required here. For myth, a myth is a story with a point to it, and mythopoeic literature in the ancient world was a well-defined literary form, covering in particular the questions asked by early societies about the age-old problems of where the world came from, what the fate of humans will be, and how human life interacts with the supposed realm of the gods invoked to explain both natural phenomena and the metaphysical questions. Genesis contains a collection of aetiological myths, particularly those of creation and flood, and candidates might discuss these in terms of archetypal ideas, poetic expression, and the like. In terms of understanding God, it might be said that myths are 'windows into the nature of God', i.e. as creator, preserver, sustainer, redeemer, warrior, and so on. These have value at least for the history of ideas, although taking them as being in any way literally true (beyond a supposed focus of extrapolation from nature) is problematic, as modern creationism shows. The story of Jesus might be seen as another instance of the myth of the dying and rising God.

Candidates are likely to refer to Tillich's discussion of symbol. It is not difficult to illustrate the potency of symbols in different walks of life, not only religion. According to Tillich, symbols are non-cognitive, apart from the cognitive fact of God himself, although the basis on which Tillich claims this is not at all clear. God is the ground of our being (which may or may not be true), and faith our ultimate concern (although if there is no God, then this would turn out to be an attempt to root human psychology in metaphysical hope).

Analogy might be discussed in a number of ways, although perhaps the most likely is Aquinas' discussion of the analogies of attribution and proportion: analogy being preferable to univocal and equivocal usage of language about God. Aquinas' exposition is, as ever, lucid, but he does not really address the point that if language about God is analogical, then we still have to read it univocally in order to understand it.

Topic 3 Philosophy of Religion

Section A

[Extract from **John Hick**: *Evil and the God of Love*: 201]

7 (a) Explain Hick's reasons for concluding that the Augustinian theodicy fails to resolve the problem of evil. **[10]**

Hick has great admiration for the Augustinian theodicy as an intellectual achievement, since, as he says, it has been the main response of Western Christendom to the problem of evil. Nevertheless it is but one of the various possible interpretations of the Genesis 3 narrative. Probably the earliest Hebraic attempt to account for sin is the tradition of the angel marriages in Genesis 6. Augustine's is an adaptation of that of St Paul. In other words, the Augustinian theodicy can lay no claim to truth – it is merely an interpretation. Moreover it condemns most to hell, which presents a portrait of an unloving God who metes out disproportionate punishment. Augustine's tradition embodies the philosophy of evil as non-being, with its neo-Platonic accompaniments of the principle of plenitude, the great chain of being, and the aesthetic vision of the perfection of the universe as a complex harmony. It looks to the past, at a catastrophic fall from grace by angels and humans. This doctrine 'presents the wanton paradox of man (or the angels) being placed as finitely perfect creatures in a finitely perfect environment and then becoming the locus of the self-creation of evil *ex nihilo*.' Only a 'drastic compartmentalisation of the mind' could enable people today to believe in a literal historical fall. Humans have never lived in a pre-fallen or unfallen state, in however remote an epoch. Hick accepts Augustine's view that evil is a privation of good as 'the only possible account of the ontological status of evil in a universe that is the creation of an omnipotent and good God'. Candidates might pick up on a number of Augustine's other ideas that Hick likes less.

(b) Evaluate Hick's soul-making theodicy. **[15]**

Hick's soul-making theodicy is the product of combining 20th-century and 2nd-century thinking, the latter being from the writings of Irenaeus. Humans were created imperfect, in the image of God (with potential) with the capacity to develop into the likeness of God, and to take their place, finally perfected, in God's Kingdom. The world is a vale of soul-making where heaven is achieved by all. Christ's sacrifice shows what the human spirit can achieve. Humans are created at an epistemic distance from God, since the prerequisite for all this is the gift of freedom, through which, by coming to see the value of the good, humans will in the end learn best from what is freely chosen/earned, and not from what otherwise might be handed to them on a plate. There are several aspects of Hick's ideas that might attract a positive review, for example: his position in the debate against Mackie, in particular, where Hick makes the point that human freedom can be achieved only against the backdrop of real epistemic freedom/his insistence that soul-making requires a long process of experience as opposed to an instantaneous process of manufacture/his emphasis on the enduring benevolence of God/his abandonment of the literal concept of a human 'fall', etc.

Hick's theodicies might be challenged on a number of counts. The distinction Irenaeus makes between the image and likeness of God is not implicit in the Hebrew, so is speculative. If all achieve heaven, some might think this unfair on behalf of those who always strive to do good by comparison with those who do not. Some object that Irenaeus/Hick make the sacrifice of Jesus irrelevant, since if all are saved, there was no need for Jesus to die such a horrible death. Natural evil makes sense as the instigator of higher-order good in humans, since the sympathy and empathy engendered by observing the victims of natural disasters provide a learning curve for humans to value the good. Some object that the sheer amount of evil in the world is not worth the end-product, and that God's omniscience, seeing the future results of what he was about to create, should have caused him not to create the

universe in the first place. Moreover, what of those who die at birth, or when they are young, or who are mentally unable to make free moral choices – in what lies their learning curve towards becoming perfected beings? It might be argued that Hick's views match better with a world view based on reincarnation, in which things would at least balance out over a large number of lifetimes. Not least, Hick's theodicy, like that of Augustine, maintains a real-terms stony silence over animal suffering, which by comparison is incalculable.

Section B

8   **Critically assess the claim that the anthropic principle is the strongest form of the design argument.** **[25]**

Answers to this will naturally depend on the design arguments used, which will probably include Paley and Swinburne alongside the anthropic principle. Design arguments that centre on the anthropic principle and the notion of the boundary conditions that govern the universe, do not appear particularly strong. If this is the only universe that exists, then the anthropic principle is almost certainly correct in detecting the hand of a designer; but we have no means of telling how many universes there may have been in the past, and how many might exist now in alternative spaces. However remote the chances are of a universe being life-bearing purely by chance, if there are enough universes, then those odds will be met, purely by chance.

For Paley, candidates might prefer the simplicity of his approach, although Paley's analogical argument is often held to be discredited by Darwin's theory of evolution, in so far as non-random evolution by natural selection offers a mechanism for design improvements in biological species that does not require the guiding hand of God. Hence Dawkins observes that the universe betrays no sign of a benevolent creator, but displays only a blind, pitiless indifference. Hume's critique of design arguments is often held to be damning to all of them, e.g. his principle that like causes demand like effects, so how do we know that the designer of the universe is omnipotent, omniscient and omnibenevolent? How do we know that the designer has not died, or that there was only one designer as opposed to many? The world is more like a giant vegetable than a machine, and vegetables are self-reproducing (whereas, in relation to Paley), watches are not. Candidates might include responses from Swinburne and Davies to Hume's objections. Swinburne attempted to re-draft the argument in terms of spatial and temporal order: the latter provides a powerful rebuttal of those who reject design in favour of evolution by natural selection. Swinburne points out that evolution is not self-directing – it, like the universe as a whole, displays large amounts of temporal order – in other words, evolution rigidly obeys the laws of biology and genetics, so is law-abiding. Some will suggest that this is the major strength of Swinburne's argument from temporal order, although others will insist that Swinburne's shift to God as the designer is not legitimate.

For the higher levels, the word 'strongest' needs to be addressed. Anthropic arguments are often held to be the weakest, since the intelligibility of the universe needs to be a given before any inference to design can be made. Others might argue that based on what we can actually observe, anthropic arguments are stronger than other design arguments, although that conclusion might not amount to an endorsement of design arguments.

OR

9   **Examine critically the implications of psychological understandings of religious belief. [25]**

Candidates may select any psychological understandings of religious belief that they choose. Most are likely to focus on Freud and Jung. Freud's essential thesis is that religion and religious belief are neurotic. The function of religious belief is to protect the individual from the fear of death, and to offer security in an otherwise hostile universe. Thus far, perhaps so good, although Freud's developed reasoning in support of these conclusions seems strange. In books like *Moses and Monotheism*, and *Totem and Taboo*, Freud adduces a number of supplementary themes by which he explains the development of the religious neurosis. Thus the Christian version of the disease is deeply disturbing, being based on the supposed treatment of Moses, who met a fate described by Freud but not described elsewhere. This produced a national neurosis – guilt – which surfaced in the teaching of the prophets, and eventually burst upon the world in the form of Paul's theology of the atonement, where the killing of Jesus, commemorated by the communion meal during which communicants eat the body and blood of Jesus, atones for the ancient crime of the fathers. Most philosophers of religion point to the absence of evidence for Freud's themes and ideas here.

Jung's approach to religious belief is generally held to be more sympathetic to religion than that of Freud, but this isn't obviously the case. Jung's theory of archetypes is a useful diagnostic tool for understanding religious symbolism, but the downside is that the question of whether or not religious belief has any factual content seems unimportant to Jung, who is concerned principally with its health-giving aspects.

Others might look at the writings of Marx or Nietzsche, for example. The former presents a complex account of the power of religious psychology. Nietzsche interpreted religious belief in terms of the will to power, and regarded the power-base built up by the church as an instrument of control through psychological compulsion. Nietzsche had much to say on the psychology of the religious individual, and candidates might explore some of his views.

Topic 4 New Testament: The Four Gospels

Section A

[Extract from Matthew 14: 13–21]

10 (a) Examine different interpretations of this miracle. **[10]**

> This question is open to a wide range of different responses. Lower-level responses will address the question without reference to biblical critical approaches and may focus on whether the gospels record a miracle or an event of sharing. Anticipate close analysis of the narrative using source, form and redaction criticism from the stronger candidates. Commentary may include recognition that the literary source of this *pericopae* in Matthew (and Luke) is Mark. Some may examine the literary form of this miracle (Vincent Taylor/Dibelius) and the original *sitz im leben* of it, both in the life of Jesus and in the early community. Expect some commentary on how its use in the early church as an inspiration for faith and a tool of evangelism might have affected the recording of the events. Some candidates may discuss the difference between a miracle as *dunamis and semeion* and analyse which interpretation is most appropriate for this miracle story. One interpretation sees the miracle stories as signs of the arrival of the Kingdom. Also expect commentary on the use to which each of the gospel writers has put this miracle. Matthew – Jesus is presented as a new Moses. Some may examine interpretations of this narrative in the light of other texts, such as the temptation narrative in which Jesus refused to turn stones into bread and the Last Supper narrative/Eucharistic words. Whilst the Johannine sign is not set for study full credit must be given for those who show understanding of the bread of life discourse and John's spiritual interpretation of Jesus as the Bread of Life.

10 (b) 'Jesus' miracles have no basis in fact.' Evaluate this claim. **[15]**

> This is an opportunity for candidates to widen their scope of enquiry beyond The Feeding of the 5000 and failure to do this will be self penalising. Accept reference to the resurrection as a miraculous event if used. Reference to a selection of other miracle stories is expected. Expect candidates to be aware of the views represented by scholars such as Rudolf Bultmann, who believed that almost nothing could be known concerning the life and personality of Jesus. This view would hold that the gospels are legendary and that the early church invented material to suit its purpose. It is claimed that it would have been necessary for the early church to invent miracles for Jesus in order to justify claims about his identity and to compete successfully against other religious figures, such as Moses.

> For higher-level achievement alternative views, represented by scholars such as Günther Bornkamm, need to be offered. These argue that the primitive tradition of Jesus is so unique, powerful, enduring, spiritually uplifting and inspirational that it must be brimful of history.

> Other high-level candidates will comment on the strength of some traditions over others – The Feeding of the 5000 may be used as an example of a miracle with a strong claim to a basis in fact. It is not only in the triple tradition, but also in John. There are multiple accounts of it in Mark (Chapter 8 records the Feeding of 4000) and it has a resonance with other Gospel traditions. Other miracles it may be argued have less of a claim to a basis in fact.

> Top-end candidates will be aware of the nature of salvation history and conclude accordingly.

Section B

11 Critically examine Jesus' relationship with the Pharisees and Sadducees.   [25]

Candidates will need to establish early on in their essay that they understand the difference between these two parties, within Judaism at the time of Jesus. (Sadducees: political, priestly, aristocratic, centred on Temple worship, no belief in life after death, rejected oral tradition and interpretation of Torah. Pharisees: centred in synagogues, men of the people, sympathy with the poor, rejected Hellenisation, emphasised importance of Torah and Law of Moses, worked on interpreting the Law for the people.) Candidates who fail to make distinctions between the two will be limited in their ability to score highly. Expect a series of examples of co-operation and conflict between Jesus and the Pharisaic party and between Jesus and the Sadducees. Analysis concerning the similarities and differences between Jesus and these parties is essential without which evaluation marks may not be credited. All traditions agree that the Pharisees and Sadducees co-operated to have Jesus killed but the catalyst for this decision is a matter of debate.

In the synoptic tradition Jesus appears to have been in general agreement with the life and work of the Sadducees. He visits Jerusalem regularly and attends Temple rites. The tension between Jesus and the Sadducees emerges relatively late in the synoptic narrative, during Holy Week, on the day of questions and at the trial. The critical moment in the synoptic tradition appears to have been the cleansing of the Temple when the Sadducees suddenly took an interest in Jesus. In John the cleansing of the Temple is recorded in Chapter 2, along with Jesus' claim that he will himself replace the Temple. This does not appear to have created a great problem and the Sadducees only come to the party to conspire against Jesus after the raising of Lazarus. The tension between Jesus and the Sadducees appears to have been generated largely by their desire to keep the peace and please their political masters.

The tension between Jesus and the Pharisees seems to have been based largely on the question of authority. Jesus was not a Pharisee but preached and did healings, both of which challenged their authority. The Pharisees were challenged to put aside the letter of the law to understand the spirit as well as to see Jesus' true identity. Expect commentary on any of the numerous accounts which record tension between Jesus and the Pharisees with close reference to the text. Parables, such as *The Wedding Feast* and *The Tenants of the Vineyard* and other veiled claims to be the Son of God, appear to have sealed Jesus' fate for the Pharisees.

Analysis of these tensions is critical for high-level scores. Evaluation of those tensions which might have been tolerated within Judaism and those which meant Jesus became intolerable need to be explored.

Analysis of the very different motives of the Sadducees and Pharisees – desire to avoid tension with Rome vs authority of the Law is also required for higher-level scores. High-level essays will draw on biblical criticism to note the role of the early church in the formation of these traditions and will show how the cultural milieu appears to have affected the record.

OR

12 **Examine critically the historicity and interpretation of the arrest and trial narratives.** **[25]**

Responses should focus on Mark 14:43–15:15 and parallel passages but use of additional related passages is to be credited. Candidates may address the question in a number of ways. It is anticipated that the two most popular approaches will be either to examine in turn the events of the arrest and trial(s), or to examine in turn the account found in each gospel.

Whatever approach is used examiners must note carefully whether the full remit of the question is covered. Mature responses will use the tools of biblical criticism to address the issue of historicity. The question of interpretation can be dealt with at the level of the gospel writers 'interpreting the events', the early church 'interpreting the events', biblical critics' 'interpretation of the events' or the interpretation of the events made by modern-day Christians. Any of these approaches is singularly acceptable for the highest level.

Historicity

The following may be included. The four source hypothesis would give priority to the Markan narrative. Mark records the arrest in the Garden of Gethsemane in a distinctive way with a focus on the failure of the disciples and Jesus' humanity. The historical veracity of the narrative is added to by the events recorded at 14:51–52, with some believing this to be an eye-witness account, possibly of Mark himself. Mark records the Jewish 'trial' by night, which was against Jewish law, interwoven with the story of Peter's denials. Whilst Jesus was condemned to death by the Roman Procurator, Mark is interested in proving that Jesus is innocent, that even Pilate 'wondered' and that the Jews are the real villains. There is clearly an apologetic motive behind this version of events which could cast doubt upon the historicity. Peter's denials do cohere with the Markan theme of the disappointing disciples but it seems hardly credible to suggest that this is apocryphal, given the place Peter assumed in the early church. The basic events recorded by Mark are agreed upon by all the gospel writers and there are only relatively minor additions/ omissions. Matthew adds the name of the High Priest, Judas is paid 30 pieces of silver, there are some Old Testament quotes, Pilate's wife has a dream of Jesus' innocence, Pilate washes his hands as a sign of his reluctance to condemn Jesus, and there is some additional apocalyptic commentary. Luke says that Jesus heals the man whose ear was cut off in the Garden of Gethsemane and places more stress on Jesus needing strength through prayer. Luke also adds a trial before Herod and a number of direct statements about Jesus' innocence. Additions to the trial narrative by Luke and Matthew serve to strengthen the Markan themes. Arguably the least convincing arrest narrative is found in John, where Jesus is presented as completely in charge of events, goes out to meet the soldiers, freely identifies himself, and insists upon the terms of his arrest. John's trial before Pilate further strengthens the innocence of Pilate with the blame even more firmly laid upon the Jews – 19:6 records that Pilate hands Jesus over to the Jews to be crucified. However John's account unusually follows the same sequence of events as the synoptic tradition which strengthens the historical claim. The embarrassing fact that Jesus was condemned under Roman law, by a Roman Procurator, and was subjected to a distinctly Roman punishment also testifies to the historical nature of these narratives.

Interpretation

Candidates should show awareness that these events are claimed to be historical but also reveal theological truths. They are part of the core events upon which the Christian religion is founded. Whilst there is no such thing as pure history and each record reveals the understanding of the writer and their community, these historical events are believed to contain eternal truth. Interpretation is thus unavoidable and essentially theological.

Candidates might focus on the claim of each gospel writer, and each subsequent Christian community, that there is only one way to interpret these events – as the work of God in history.

Mark's Gospel reaches its climax in Jesus' answer to the High Priest's question, 'Are you the Messiah?' and that is precisely the question with which each gospel writer challenges their reader. Alternative interpretations, such as that provided by Albert Schweitzer, that Jesus was a deluded individual convinced that the Kingdom of God was coming and that when it did not appear he willingly went to his death believing that this would force its appearance, as well as atheistic interpretations, are all acceptable and to be judged on the quality of the argument presented.