

# Cambridge Pre-U

---

**PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY****9774/02**

Paper 2 Topics and Key Texts in Philosophy and Theology 1

**October/November 2020**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 50

---

**Published**

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This syllabus is regulated for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

---

This document consists of **19** printed pages.

**Generic Marking Principles**

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:**

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:**

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:**

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:**

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:**

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

**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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broad knowledge and understanding of a wide range of philosophical/religious issues.</li> <li>• Insightful selection and application of ideas and concepts.</li> <li>• Complete or near complete accuracy at this level.</li> <li>• Good evidence of wide reading on the topic beyond the set texts.</li> <li>• Confident and precise use of philosophical and theological vocabulary.</li> </ul>
Level 4 7–8 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge is accurate and a good range of philosophical/religious issues are considered.</li> <li>• Systematic/good selection and application of ideas and concepts.</li> <li>• Response is accurate: the question is answered specifically.</li> <li>• Some evidence of reading on the topic beyond the set texts.</li> <li>• Accurate use of philosophical and theological vocabulary.</li> </ul>
Level 3 5–6 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge is generally accurate and a fair range of issues are considered.</li> <li>• Reasonable selection and application of ideas and concepts.</li> <li>• Response is largely relevant to the question asked.</li> <li>• Reasonable attempt to use supporting evidence.</li> <li>• Reasonable attempt to use philosophical and theological vocabulary accurately.</li> </ul>
Level 2 3–4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some accuracy of knowledge. More than one issue is touched upon.</li> <li>• Attempts to select and apply ideas with partial success.</li> <li>• Response is partially relevant to the question asked but may be one-sided.</li> <li>• Some attempt to use supporting evidence.</li> <li>• Philosophical and theological vocabulary is occasionally used correctly.</li> </ul>
Level 1 1–2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some key points made. Possibly repetitive or short.</li> <li>• Explores some isolated ideas related to the general topic.</li> <li>• Response is limited or tenuously linked to the question.</li> <li>• Limited attempt to use evidence.</li> <li>• Philosophical and theological vocabulary is inaccurate or absent.</li> </ul>
Level 0 0 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No relevant material to credit.</li> </ul>

**Table B: Generic Marking Scheme for 15 mark questions**

Level 5 13–15 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insightful selection and application of ideas and concepts.</li> <li>• Excellent critical engagement and detailed evaluation of the wider implications of the question.</li> <li>• Complete or near complete accuracy at this level.</li> <li>• Argument is coherent, structured, developed and convincingly sustained.</li> <li>• Employs a wide range of differing points of view and supporting evidence.</li> <li>• Shows good understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate.</li> <li>• Confident and precise use of philosophical and theological vocabulary.</li> </ul>
Level 4 10–12 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Systematic/good selection and application of ideas and concepts.</li> <li>• Good critical engagement and evaluation of the implications of the question.</li> <li>• Response is accurate: the question is answered specifically.</li> <li>• Argument has structure and development and is sustained.</li> <li>• Good use of differing points of view and supporting evidence.</li> <li>• Shows competent understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate.</li> <li>• Accurate use of philosophical and theological vocabulary.</li> </ul>
Level 3 7–9 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable selection and application of ideas and concepts.</li> <li>• Some critical engagement and evaluation of the question.</li> <li>• Response is largely relevant to the question asked.</li> <li>• Argument has some structure and shows some development, but may not be sustained.</li> <li>• Considers more than one point of view and uses evidence to support argument.</li> <li>• May show some understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate.</li> <li>• Reasonable attempt to use philosophical and theological vocabulary accurately.</li> </ul>
Level 2 4–6 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempts to select and apply ideas with partial success.</li> <li>• Attempts to evaluate though with partial success.</li> <li>• Response is partially relevant to the question asked but may be one-sided.</li> <li>• Some attempt at argument but without development and coherence.</li> <li>• Some attempt to use supporting evidence.</li> <li>• Philosophical and theological vocabulary is occasionally used correctly.</li> </ul>
Level 1 1–3 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some key points made. Possibly repetitive or short.</li> <li>• Explores some isolated ideas related to the general topic.</li> <li>• Argument is limited or confused.</li> <li>• Response is limited or tenuously linked to the question.</li> <li>• Limited attempt to use evidence.</li> <li>• Philosophical and theological vocabulary is inaccurate or absent.</li> </ul>
Level 0 0 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No relevant material to credit.</li> </ul>

**Table C: Generic Marking Scheme for 25 mark questions**

Level 5 21–25 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broad knowledge and understanding of a wide range of philosophical/religious issues.</li> <li>• Insightful selection and application of ideas and concepts.</li> <li>• Excellent critical engagement and detailed evaluation of the wider implications of the question.</li> <li>• Complete or near complete accuracy at this level.</li> <li>• Argument is coherent, structured, developed and convincingly sustained.</li> <li>• Employs a wide range of differing points of view and supporting evidence.</li> <li>• Good evidence of wide reading on the topic beyond the set texts.</li> <li>• Shows good understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate.</li> <li>• Confident and precise use of philosophical and theological vocabulary.</li> </ul>
Level 4 16–20 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge is accurate and a good range of philosophical/religious issues are considered.</li> <li>• Systematic/good selection and application of ideas and concepts.</li> <li>• Good critical engagement and evaluation of the implications of the question.</li> <li>• Response is accurate: the question is answered specifically.</li> <li>• Argument has structure and development and is sustained.</li> <li>• Good use of differing points of view and supporting evidence.</li> <li>• Some evidence of reading on the topic beyond the set texts.</li> <li>• Shows competent understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate.</li> <li>• Accurate use of philosophical and theological vocabulary.</li> </ul>
Level 3 12–15 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge is generally accurate and a fair range of issues are considered.</li> <li>• Reasonable selection and application of ideas and concepts.</li> <li>• Some critical engagement and evaluation of the question.</li> <li>• Response is largely relevant to the question asked.</li> <li>• Argument has some structure and shows some development, but may not be sustained.</li> <li>• Considers more than one point of view and uses evidence to support argument.</li> <li>• May show some understanding of the links between different areas of study where appropriate.</li> <li>• Reasonable attempt to use philosophical and theological vocabulary accurately.</li> </ul>
Level 2 8–11 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some accuracy of knowledge. More than one issue is touched upon.</li> <li>• Attempts to select and apply ideas with partial success.</li> <li>• Attempts to evaluate though with partial success.</li> <li>• Response is partially relevant to the question asked but may be one-sided.</li> <li>• Some attempt at argument but without development and coherence.</li> <li>• Some attempt to use supporting evidence.</li> <li>• Philosophical and theological vocabulary is occasionally used correctly.</li> </ul>
Level 1 1–7 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some key points made. Possibly repetitive or short.</li> <li>• Explores some isolated ideas related to the general topic.</li> <li>• Argument is limited or confused.</li> <li>• Response is limited or tenuously linked to the question.</li> <li>• Limited attempt to use evidence.</li> <li>• Philosophical and theological vocabulary is inaccurate or absent.</li> </ul>
Level 0 0 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No relevant material to credit.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p><b>With reference to this passage, explain Hume’s view that all of our ideas derive from sense experience.</b></p> <p>The passage constitutes part of Hume’s account of the origin of ideas, culminating in the copy principle. The key point in the extract is that while the thought of man seems to possess unbounded liberty, in practice it’s confined within very narrow limits. He has previously referred to the ability of the imagination to form monsters and join incongruous shapes and appearances and develops the point in the extract via examples of golden mountains and virtuous horses. Our ability to imagine and create consists of nothing more than manipulating (compounding, transposing, augmenting, diminishing) ideas gained through both the inner and outer senses. Candidates going beyond the extract are likely to refer to one or both of his proofs of the copy principle: how we form the idea of God, why a blind man has no idea of colour or a deaf man of sounds.</p>	10
1(b)	<p><b>Critically examine Hume’s account of the relation between impressions and ideas.</b></p> <p>This is likely to be viewed as a classic exposition of concept empiricism and candidates might supplement it with similar accounts e.g. Locke’s view of the mind as a tabula rasa. There may be considerable support for empiricism generally, although that does not imply that Hume’s account of the relationship between impressions and ideas is correct.</p> <p>Hume does not have an impression of being either blind or deaf so on his own account he cannot know which ideas a blind man or deaf man can or cannot have. There are two of everything e.g. an impression of jealousy and an idea of jealousy, and Hume gives two accounts of how we identify which is the impression and which the idea: primogeniture (the impression comes first) and force and liveliness (the impression is more forceful). However, these accounts are not necessarily symmetrical: the nth time one experiences e.g. jealousy may be more forceful and lively than the 1st. There is an issue concerning generic ideas: what impression gives rise to the idea of ‘mankind’? Is such an idea a result of some kind of passive copying process or does the mind have to do some active editing in order to arrive at such an idea? There could be references to ideas that Hume seems to struggle with e.g. causation (or necessary connection) in which the impression and idea seem to blur together. There may also be references to views holding that some ideas are innate.</p>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>'Material things must be definable in terms of sense-contents.'</b> <b>Critically assess Ayer's linguistic phenomenalism.</b></p> <p>Candidates are likely to link linguistic phenomenalism to Ayer (although they may also begin by tracing phenomenalism back to Berkeley or Mill – 'matter is the permanent possibility of sensation'). According to Ayer we need to employ a technical language (a language based on sense contents) when describing our perceptual experience: such a language would be logically equivalent to statements about physical objects and, as such, there would be no gap between experience and reality. Scepticism is defeated through a reduction of the way things are to the way they seem: physical object statements are analysed in terms of, and reducible to, statements about (actual and possible) sense experiences. Thus, physical objects are logical constructions out of sense data.</p> <p>However, there are a host of problems with phenomenalism. 'Phenomenalese' is difficult to use: e.g. if describing Charing Cross station at 5.30pm on a Monday; sense data are imprecise (there would be an actual number of people there rather than 'lots'; would a train arriving be one sense datum getting larger or a stream of different sized sense data? Sense data underdetermine the nature of reality (a rectangular, yellowish patch of colour could refer to a white envelope under yellow light or a yellow envelope under white light). Some form of realism may better explain the ordered pattern of experiences. It is difficult to 'ground' possible sensory experiences e.g. if you were to visit Hyde Park on a Sunday morning you would see... 'Hyde Park', 'you', 'Sunday morning' all need differentiating from Green Park, me, Wednesday afternoon etc. It is difficult to specify a sensory route through which certain sense contents would occur. Historical claims would be difficult, if not impossible, to translate. Most importantly, perhaps, a material object proposition (such as there is a chair in the next room) could be true while the corresponding phenomenal statement could be false (i.e. you may not necessarily notice it). Consequently, it is doubtful that physical object statements can be reducible to statements about sense experience.</p> <p>Credit any relevant line of argumentation.</p>	25



Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>To what extent is philosophical doubt a useful tool in the search for knowledge?</b></p> <p>It is likely that answers will focus on the methodical doubt employed by Descartes. There may be references to Descartes analogy of emptying a basket of apples, examining them all one by one and then placing the good ones back whilst discarding the rotten ones. Alternatively, candidates may link the method of doubt to foundationalism and/or the attempt to place knowledge on secure non-inferential foundations. The stages of Descartes' argument from doubt and the links between demonstrate how the conclusions he draws grow stronger.</p> <p>Descartes is not a sceptic: rather he is employing sceptical arguments in an attempt to find a proposition that resists scepticism. A version of the cogito is the foundation he arrives at.</p> <p>Whether this provides a useful foundation from which to build from is an issue that raises various questions. Has he doubted everything? He does not appear to doubt the language he is thinking in, but how could an isolated thinker (solipsist) develop a language? Is it possible to doubt everything? Is the use of 'I' legitimate? Is it merely a grammatical convenience? There might be discussions of whether there is any circularity in his arguments linking the cogito to the general rule and the existence of God.</p> <p>Descartes links knowledge to certainty but doubt may have a more significant role in the search for knowledge if certainty is not the aim. For example, Popper's claim that scientific laws must remain tentative forever as scientific method is a search for disproof. The extent to which doubt has generated argumentation in other philosophical fields of enquiry.</p> <p>Credit any relevant line of argumentation.</p>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	<p><b>With reference to this passage, explain Hick’s claim that verification and falsification may not be symmetrically related.</b></p> <p>Hick begins by referring to Flew’s contribution to the ‘University’ debate in which he employs a version of an example of ‘seeing as’ given by John Wisdom. In Flew’s version, the claim by one explorer that a clearing in a jungle is tended, so there must be a gardener, is tested in a number of ways but no gardener is detected. His point is that continuing to hold the belief that there must be a gardener, without evidence for the belief, is unfalsifiable. Hick appears to be claiming that Flew is assuming that verification and falsification are symmetrical in the sense that an unverifiable statement is also unfalsifiable (and meaningless).</p> <p>Hick’s own example – of a belief that there will be three successive 7’s in the decimalisation of pie – is employed to show that a statement may be verifiable if true but unfalsifiable if false (assuming that pie is never rounded off). Hence, verification and falsification do not always work symmetrically.</p> <p>There may also be brief references to Hick’s example of travellers with different beliefs about what awaits them at the end of the road (as it follows this extract).</p>	10
4(b)	<p><b>Critically examine Hick’s claim that God’s existence is, in principle, verifiable.</b></p> <p>There could be some repetition of material employed in part (a) – if the example of the travellers is employed in answers to the part (a) question – as it is likely that Hick’s example of travellers on the road to the celestial city will form the basis for responses to this question. The point of the example – that the existence of the city is open to verification but not to falsification – should be clear. The notion of eschatology, via references to an ‘end state’, should also be clear.</p> <p>Evaluation could take different forms. For example, candidates may focus their discussion on whether this view depends on faith more than reasoned argument or the extent to which reason supports faith. Alternatively, discussion might centre on the coherence of the idea of surviving bodily death; on the question of what survives bodily death and, if an immortal soul, whether this provides personal identity; or, if the resurrection of the body in the last days and at the end of history, whether this view is even open to philosophical enquiry and analysis.</p>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
5	<p><b>Evaluate the claim that moral judgements are prescriptions that we are prepared to universalise.</b></p> <p>Prescriptivism is the non-cognitive view that moral judgements are not purely descriptive – although they do possess a descriptive content – but also expressive. When we claim that an action is good we are commending the action and prescribing it as an action that ought to be taken. Hare argues that prescriptivity requires us to search for moral values we can commit to and universalizability requires that these genuinely are moral values. Moral judgements have a necessary logical form but a contingent content. Moral thinking requires reason and consistency. There are logical relations between commendations: if x is good because it is y then z is good if it is also y. Moral progress consists of increased consistency.</p> <p>The main strength of this approach, however, is probably the link between moral views and actions (we are more likely to act in accordance with principles we are strongly committed to).</p> <p>Difficulties include whether there is a clear distinction between descriptive and prescriptive meaning: descriptions of states of affairs, if provided by experts, may guide actions, similarly prescriptions offered by those lacking expertise may not. It is not clear that this approach marks morality out as a specific sphere of discourse (different to e.g. politics, film reviews etc.). Moral consistency seems to matter more than moral correctness. More importantly, perhaps, while Hare can distinguish between moral and non-moral judgements it is not clear that he can distinguish between moral and immoral views.</p> <p>Credit any relevant line of argumentation.</p>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
6	<p><b>'To be religious is to involve oneself in a form of life with its own language game.'</b> Critically examine this claim.</p> <p>This view is associated with Wittgenstein and others influenced by Wittgenstein (e.g. Phillips). Language generates meaning through its use in a particular context – or 'form of life'. Consequently, a statement can be meaningful for a particular group without being meaningful (or verifiable or falsifiable) for others outside of the group who are not playing the same language game. Each language game/form of life has its own internal coherence and/or its own rules governing the use of terms.</p> <p>Religious discourse is therefore self-contained. The beliefs and practices of religious groups are not meaningful to outsiders. Some might see this as a strength of the view: the use of familiar terms (e.g. 'father') in unfamiliar symbolic, metaphorical or analogous ways. However, a major worry concerns whether this approach robs religion of its substantive content. Christians, Rastafarians and Wiccans are all engaged in a distinctive form of life but realists among them would surely want to posit some substantive truths.</p> <p>Credit any relevant line of argumentation.</p>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
7(a)	<p><b>With reference to this passage, explain Polkinghorne's support for the view that natural theology is an essential study.</b></p> <p>Two features of the extract require explanation. Firstly, the rejection of deism and the implication that God is intimately involved with His creation; secondly, that science has raised questions about the world – questions concerning the structure of the world, its' interlocking and tightly knit character and intelligibility – that are all beyond the power of science to address. Polkinghorne defines natural theology as the search for knowledge of God by the exercise of reason and the inspection of the world. The inability of science to address the kind of question referred to above requires the employment of natural theology in order to reach a complete explanation – which would demonstrate the creation, purpose and self-disclosure of God.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
7(b)	<p><b>Evaluate Polkinghorne’s claim that the God of the Gaps is dead.</b></p> <p>Polkinghorne notes that the role of the ‘God of the Gaps’ – which he regards as a kind of demiurge – was to explain what was scientifically inexplicable at a given point in time. He describes the role of natural theology in the middle ages and beyond as bridging the gulf between the sensible world and the intelligible world. He refers to two earlier ‘flowerings’ of natural theology: the first in the middle ages – associated with Anselm and Aquinas (and classic versions of ontological, teleological and cosmological arguments) – the second, based more firmly on an inspection of the world, associated with Paley and undermined by Darwin. Polkinghorne claims that each of these ‘flowerings’ occurred during periods in which dualistic thought was prevalent.</p> <p>Polkinghorne’s view – supported in the extract – is that science has closed many previously troubling ‘gaps’ but in doing so has raised other questions beyond the power of science to address. (References to wider reading are possible here – Swinburne for example). Physics has demonstrated both the ‘tightly knit’ character of the fundamental forces of nature, their strengths and the corresponding constants of nature (electromagnetism, gravity, strong and weak nuclear forces), as well as our ability to comprehend these features of the universe. The fact that our powers of thought conform to the complex physical structure of the world is a fact that needs explaining. Fine-tuning of the cosmic knobs by a loving and rational creator is an explanation.</p> <p>However, it has been suggested that we should not be surprised that the universe has the structure that it does, if it did not we would not be around to be surprised. Furthermore, other properties may be present, but we can only observe properties compatible with our existence. Humans (explanation seeking creatures) may view structures supporting their existence as ‘special’. The many worlds thesis is an alternative explanation. Polkinghorne rejects the many-worlds or multiverse response as metaphysical speculation (as opposed to science). Although theism is also metaphysical it is a more economical hypothesis and is therefore preferable. Argumentation could also centre on whether this approach is very different from that of the ‘God of the Gaps’. Are questions that are allegedly beyond the power of science to address genuine questions? Different views may refer to the notion of a ‘brute fact’ requiring no explanation or to matter as possessing properties that provide – or will eventually provide – a full explanation.</p>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
8	<p><b>'The existence of moral evil, and the suffering it produces, is perfectly consistent with the view that God is both omnipotent and wholly good.' Evaluate this claim.</b></p> <p>The phrasing of the question may suggest a focus on the logical problem of evil – specifically in respect of moral evil – although the evidential problem is equally significant. A range of theodicies and defences, from Augustine through to Swinburne, Hick and Plantinga, are relevant and some may draw a distinction between a theodicy and a defence.</p> <p>Argumentation may focus on whether God's creation was initially perfect or simply the best of all possible worlds in which suffering is a means to a range of higher goods such as courage, sympathy and fortitude. References to a 'vale of soul-making' and spiritual maturity are likely to be made. There could be some attempt to justify both the extent and distribution of suffering.</p> <p>Human free will feature as the cause of moral evil and the suffering resulting from this and defences based on free will – for example, Swinburne, Hick and Plantinga – discussed. Critics include Flew and Mackie. The dispute between Mackie and Plantinga, due to its' complexity, could take up the bulk of some responses.</p> <p>Some may refer to 'horrendous' evil and, possibly, protest theology.</p> <p>Credit any relevant line of argumentation.</p>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
9	<p><b>'The idea of society is the soul of religion.'</b> Critically examine sociological understandings of religious belief.</p> <p>Durkheim argued that a society without religion was impossible. Religious rituals, ceremonies and assemblies serve two important functions: social integration (bringing people together around sacred signs) and moral regulation (guidance concerning appropriate and inappropriate behaviour). Given this approach, however, more or less anything could qualify as a religion: sport, the shopping mall, celebrity culture etc. In pluralist societies, religion may become a divisive rather than cohesive force (although there would still be ideas concerning how society should be). In a similar vein, some feminist theists have focused on re-interpreting or replacing some sacred signs with others that may be more empowering for women.</p> <p>There is a sense in which Marx agrees – insofar as 'religious distress is a sign of real distress' as it emerges from society and specifically capitalist society – although Marx also emphasises that a 'critique of religion' is required before a 'critique of society' can be made. His view was that politics should replace religion so that real happiness could replace illusory happiness.</p> <p>Weber viewed Calvinism as the (protestant) ethic underpinning the practice of capitalism. Religion is not simply the sigh of the oppressed, it also provides comfort to the wealthy e.g. Wesley's exhortation to Christians to become rich. This appears to reverse the view in question: religious beliefs and practices e.g. the hard work and frugality emphasised in Calvinism leads to profit, investment and more profit. In this sense, religious beliefs and practices drive society.</p> <p>Credit any relevant line of argumentation.</p>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
10(a)	<p><b>Examine what this passage contributes to the debate about who Jesus was.</b></p> <p>The answer of the disciples to Jesus' question – 'Who do the crowds say that I am?' – has appeared already in verses 7– 9, where some said that John had been raised from the dead, some that Elijah had appeared, and others that one of the old prophets had arisen; and these were surmises that had been heard by Herod. Peter now confesses that Jesus is the Christ of God. This declaration is regarded by many as the fundamental statement of Christology, and in the parallel passage in Matthew 16:17, Jesus says that Peter's knowledge of who Jesus is has been revealed by Jesus' Father in heaven, so Jesus announces that he is the Christ and the Son of God, and then goes on to announce that Peter will become the rock on which Jesus will build his Church. Further, in Luke 19:21 Jesus raises the theme of the messianic secret, which for many is a device copied from Mark in order to explain why Jesus was not accepted openly as the Messiah despite his miracles. Verse 22 then links Jesus' messianic status with the central theme of the Passion narrative: that Jesus will suffer many things, be rejected by the Jewish authorities, killed, and then be resurrected on the third day, so Christology is linked with soteriology: belief in Jesus as the Messiah and Son of God saves people from sin and death.</p> <p>Comment will focus on these and other themes, for example: the titles 'Son of God' and 'Son of Man' in relation to the development of messianic ideas within Judaism; Jesus as Christ; the relevance of Luke 9:18-22 (and its parallel passages) for modern perspectives about Jesus; the debate about Jesus in the Early Church; the major theme that Jesus brings salvation through his life, death and resurrection; Jesus' definition of 'the Christian life.'</p>	<b>10</b>



Question	Answer	Marks
10(b)	<p><b>'Understanding what Jesus taught is more important than understanding who Jesus was.' Evaluate this claim.</b></p> <p>Seen within the total picture of the Christian religion, Jesus is not just a gifted teacher: he is the subject of a world religion, so first and foremost he is the object of worship and devotion as portrayed for example in the Nicene Creed. Christians look for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come, and these are offered to Christians because Jesus is God incarnate, and as such he is the route to salvation. Jesus' teachings are found in the Gospels and the Epistles. A Christian who believes that Jesus is divine will accept his teachings as having divine authority and as being morally binding, even when some teachings might not appear sensible. For example, in Matthew's Gospel, where Jesus tells people that they must not resist an evil person who attacks them, and must love their enemies and be perfect, such actions challenge normal human behaviour; nevertheless many Christians today are pacifists because of such teaching: the teaching is authoritative for them precisely because Jesus commanded it. This might be looked at in the light of messianic Judaism and what would be expected of the Messiah. Some might look at the messianic consciousness of Christ as perceived in the gospels; the Early Church debate about Jesus; and Christology in general. In relation to Luke 9:18-22, some might argue that Jesus himself, in claiming to be the Christ of God/the Son of God and the 'Son of Man' is concerned to emphasise his status: given such credentials, what Jesus says, particularly his teaching concerning the right way to live, has ultimate authority from God.</p> <p>Some might consider that understanding precisely who Jesus was cannot be known. It is a perfectly valid interpretation of the New Testament that Jesus was a gifted (but not divine) teacher whose teachings have the power to change the world even if we abandon ideas about his divinity. Fletcher's Situation Ethics, which can be understood in this light, generalises the message of Jesus in terms of personalistic and situational agapeic love, in the context of which it is legitimate to abandon all rules and teachings in order to do the right thing in a situation. The approach of Situation Ethics (and of liberal Protestantism in general) can be taken without any need to accept Jesus' divinity.</p> <p>Some are perhaps likely to discuss the question of whether Paul teaches justification by faith or justification by works (with reference also to the Letter of James), a debate which became particularly important in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, when the Catholic Church decided (at the Council of Trent) that the doctrine of justification was predicated upon both faith <i>and</i> works; and this might be the conclusion offered by some candidates. Faith and works go hand in hand, so understanding who Jesus was and obeying his commands cannot be separated.</p>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
11	<p><b>Critically examine the claim that Jesus’ relationship with the Pharisees was one of conflict.</b></p> <p>The Pharisees emerged during the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE, and became known as ‘the separated ones’ (separating themselves from Gentile ‘sinners’ and resisting Hellenisation). They emphasised the importance of keeping the Law of Moses in order to maintain the status of the Jews as the chosen people. In doing this, they buttressed the Mosaic laws with additional precepts and customs designed to make it very difficult to violate them. To some extent, their oral tradition obscured the laws they were trying to protect. The standard interpretation includes their rejection of Jesus as the Messiah, since they expected a human Davidic Messiah. There are a number of ‘conflict narratives’ recorded in the Gospels, and it seems as if the antagonism ran deep. Matthew 23 contains eight so-called ‘woes’ addressed by Jesus to the Pharisees. For example, he accuses them of tithing mint, dill and cumin but neglecting the really important matters of law, justice, mercy and faith. Also, they cleanse the outside of a cup and plate but inside are full of extortion and rapacity. They appear outwardly righteous to other people, but within are full of hypocrisy and sin. How are such a viper’s brood to escape being sentenced to hell? In turn, the Pharisees accused Jesus of breaking the oral Torah, e.g. by eating with sinners and being a glutton and a drunkard. They were astonished that he ate with uncleaned hands; that he broke Sabbath law by gleaning corn and by healing the sick, and in particular that he committed blasphemy by claiming to be able to forgive sins.</p> <p>How accurate is this picture? Paul himself appears to have been a Pharisee, and Acts 15:5 records that some of the Pharisees had joined the Christians, so how serious was the antipathy really? The Pharisee Nicodemus was evidently well-disposed towards Jesus and helped Joseph of Arimathea with the embalming and entombment of Jesus; and John 3 records that he was willing to debate with Jesus. Some argue that the NT depiction of the Pharisees is anachronistic (dating from friction between the Pharisees and the Christian sect after AD 70), or that it is an attempt to present the Christians as more acceptable to the Romans. Moreover, although the account of Jesus’s Sabbath healing of the man with the withered hand ends with the Pharisees and Herodians jointly planning to destroy Jesus (Mk 3), there is no known Rabbinic rule that would have labelled the healing as a Sabbath violation. It is even possible that Jesus’ disputations with the Pharisees are examples of the Talmudic disputational form employed as part of the search for truth, suggesting that Jesus himself had Pharisaic connections. Where Jesus emphasises the rule of love / love for one’s neighbour (Lk 10, Mk 12, Matt 25), he is echoing the teaching of the school of Hillel the Elder. The Pharisees were the populist party, so Jesus would inevitably have been associated with them in some way: they invited him to read in the synagogue, for example (Luke 4). Jesus was not, moreover, averse to dining with a Pharisee, as in the case of Simon (Luke 7).</p> <p>A reasonable conclusion might be that we simply do not know whether or not the total NT portrait of the Pharisees reflects Jesus’s dealings with the Pharisees or else reflect the concerns of the NT authors.</p> <p>Credit any relevant line of argumentation.</p>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
12	<p><b>The narrative of Jesus' arrest and trial is theological, not historical.' Critically examine this claim.</b></p> <p>Candidates might begin with a résumé of the solutions to the synoptic problem establishing the priority of Mark's Gospel. Given that the narratives concerned appear in all three Synoptic Gospels, it would be a reasonable assumption that Mark's account has historical priority insofar as any part of the material represents an historical account. The crucifixion of Jesus by the Romans is embedded in the Christian tradition, being described both in the Synoptics and John, although the references to it in extra-biblical sources (such as Tacitus and Josephus) are disputed. Since the crucifixion requires Jesus to have been executed by the Romans, then Mark's account of how Jesus was arrested and tried by the Sanhedrin, and then sentenced by the Roman governor, Pontius Pilate, to be scourged and crucified, would appear to be basically historical.</p> <p>Further, Mark's account of Jesus's arrest in the Garden of Gethsemane is distinctive. It focuses on the failure of the disciples to understand Jesus's plight, falling asleep rather than supporting him. It also focuses on Jesus's humanity, recording the level of his distress, and details such as these might be considered as historically accurate. The same might be said about the episode in 14:51-52 about the young man with the linen cloth who ran away naked: some take this to be an eyewitness account, possibly coming from Mark himself.</p> <p>On the other hand, there is some reason to think that the accounts of Pilate are in some respects anachronistic constructions designed (like the introduction to Luke's Gospel) to make Christianity more presentable to the Romans. The Gospel accounts portray Pilate as being reluctant to crucify Jesus, giving in only when the crowds become unruly. In Matthew's account, Pilate washes his hands to indicate his lack of responsibility in sending Jesus for crucifixion. In Luke's account, Pilate accepts that Jesus had not conspired against Rome. Further, Luke adds a scene of Jesus before Herod Antipas in which Herod mocks Jesus and sends him back to Pilate, after which Herod and Pilate became friends. Details such as these seem to have been constructed to avoid giving offence to Rome. Pilate appears to have been a very cruel prefect of Judea: he was removed and sent back to Rome because from the start he ignored the religious sensibilities of the Jews and crushed a Samaritan uprising with excessive force. The notion that he was concerned to be so fair with Jesus seems unlikely to say the least, as does Matthew's suggestion that Pilate's wife spoke to him on Jesus's behalf after a dream. John's Gospel, probably much later than the Synoptics, has Jesus telling Pilate that his Kingdom is not of this world, and that he came into the world to testify to the truth, whereupon Pilate asks, 'What is truth?' and announces that he finds no case against Jesus, yet hands him over for crucifixion. Would Pilate really have been so subservient and so philosophical to the Jewish crowd? Again, some might argue that all this is a later rationalisation to present the Jews as the enemy of Rome and of the Christians and to show Rome that Christianity was no threat to its governance.</p> <p>Credit any relevant line of argumentation.</p>	25