

Examiners' Report
June 2015

GCE Religious Studies 6RS03 01

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

ResultsPlus

Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

June 2015

Publications Code UA042530

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

Introduction

There was a range of quality from the excellent to the less than satisfactory, although very few candidates gained only Level 1 or 2 in their responses. Most candidates showed a range of knowledge and understanding and the ability to evaluate well, with many typical references being made to the standard material (though a good number provided more original responses). It was however obvious at times that a specific style or use of references had been rote learnt, this being especially apparent in introductions. A large number of answers were well rehearsed and although rich in content they were not always targeted at the question. This was particularly apparent in question 2(a)(i) where some candidates struggled with the specific focus on 'Compare and contrast'. Most papers were legible, but a large percentage of answers were incomplete whilst a surprising number of candidates failed to use the spaces in the answer book correctly.

The overall standard showed a further increase on last year's, suggesting that centres and candidates are now confident with the demands of the topics and the questions. It is clear that pertinent use of resources has given candidates across the ability range the confidence to tackle A2 in an appropriate manner. This has levelled the playing field somewhat compared with previous years, with a knock-on effect on grade boundaries.

Philosophy and ethics have continued to be the most popular options, with philosophy still holding the edge over ethics. New Testament answers remain the third most prevalent, with answers on Islam topics the fourth most popular. All philosophy questions were equally popular whilst Deontology was paramount in the ethics section. Although many candidates only wrote one New Testament answer, all were well represented, with Purpose and Conflict particularly popular.

Question 1

1(a) Ontological Argument

There were many very competent responses to this question and a high proportion of students were aware of the strengths of the argument especially with regards to Anselm & Descartes, but also intellectual use of Plantinga. Other students used a pre-determined structure for their essays, usually beginning with Anselm and then Guanilo before moving on to Descartes. This approach did not lend itself to the set question and candidates became confused in places when they were tying Guanilo's critiques to the strengths of the ontological argument.

The answers did not need to cover all of the philosophers described above to achieve level 4 but were characterised by a detailed exploration of how the arguments chosen contributed to the strengthening of the ontological position, rather than a description of the relevant individual's contribution to the discussion.

Weaker answers would often lack the necessary breadth of scope, or the length to effectively address the range of issues presented by the question. Answers would describe the content of a form of the ontological argument without exploring how this contributed to strengthening it as a proof for God. On occasions answers would be inaccurate.

In part (ii) most candidates focused on the ontological argument rather than opting to write about the non-existence of God, but the best answers were a delight to read and they expertly evaluated the ontological argument in relation to the statement "There is no God".

Some answers offered a lengthy interaction with the question, often dealing first with critiques of the ontological argument before discussing key critiques of the theistic position. A range of scholarly input was taken to inform and advance the argument within the question, rather than being repeated to tick a box.

Weaker answers lacked the necessary depth of argument to achieve higher than level 2. There would be a brief summary of critiques of the ontological position, although this would often be in the form of a brief summary of Guanilo's opposition without directly answering the question at hand.

Some candidates took the opportunity to consider arguments for the non-existence of God, particularly drawing on contributions from Marx and Freud. These responses were characteristically strong, although in some cases candidates appeared to have gambled on a full question on this topic and were not able to provide an answer to part (i) on the Ontological Argument.

In the box, state whether you are answering part (a) or part (b).

a)

1) The ontological argument was put forward by St Anselm, who was a Platonist. It seeks to prove the existence of God and it is in the form of a prayer. The word ontology is concerned with the branch of metaphysics which deals with the nature of being. The ontological argument originates in two forms: Prosligion 2 (which is the main argument) and Prosligion 3 (which is the reply to Gaunilo). Anselm presents the argument as follows.

Premis 1: God is a being that which nothing greater can be conceived.

Premis 2: Existence in reality is greater than existence in mind.

Conclusion: Therefore, God exists in reality.

It is visible that Anselm begins with a definition of God. Anselm describes God as being the 'Greatest'.

The second version of the ontological argument was put forward by Descartes, who was a French influential thinker. He reformulated the ontological argument in terms of the 'perfect being'. He describes God as being 'perfect' in comparison to Anselm who describes God as being the 'Greatest'. In short, ~~Anselm describes~~ summary, Descartes says: "A perfect being must exist in order to be perfect. Therefore, a perfect being exists." Descartes believes existence to be a predicate of God, which is criticised by Kant who disapproves of existence as being a predicate.

The ontological argument is an a priori argument. It is based on logic and reason and progresses onto a sound conclusion. All A priori arguments are based upon analytic and deductive proofs, which strengthen the argument. The ontological argument seeks to prove the existence of God via deductive means by stating, "God is a being that which nothing

greater can be conceived, and that which nothing greater can be conceived must exist. Therefore, God must exist". If the premises are accepted then the argument provides proof not probability. If one way to accept the premises, then for that person, the ontological argument proves the existence of God. This argument supports analytics means because it is not based upon, or dependent on experience, rather premises which lead to a sound conclusion.

Guarilo was a famous monk who endeavored to efficaciously condemn Anselm's argument which to a degree of certainty he failed. Guarilo uses the example of the perfect island to contradict the ontological argument. Anselm ~~was~~ ^{indicates} apparent to Guarilo

that he has misunderstood the argument and his conception is incorrect. Anselm makes apparent to Guarilo that his argument can only be applied to non-contingent things i.e. God whereas, everyone's idea of 'the perfect island' can be unequivocally different.

Thomas Aquinas is another failed critic who fails to criticise the argument. His ~~alteration~~ alteration is that "we cannot know the nature of God". Also he disagrees of Anselm's definition about God as being the 'Greatest'. Contrary to this who wouldn't define God as being the 'Greatest being'.

Norman Malcolm provides a modern version of the ontological argument. He rejects Prolegomena 2 justifiably with the idea that Kant's criticism destroys it, but goes on to provide a compelling development of Prolegomena 3. He uses the example of "Necessary Existence": His argument

is believed not to be criticised till this day.

Anselm's ~~argument~~ argument can be applied to both believers and non-believers. He believes, non-believers to be facts ~~and~~ as he accepts the definition of God in his

mind as being that which nothing greater can be conceived, but reject the existence of God in reality. Therefore a fool is a fool because for God to be the greatest, he must exist in reality not just the mind alone.

~~How~~ The roots of the ontological argument link with religious beliefs, hence you will state "A creed or phrase which Muslims use through out their Daily prayer is "God is Greatest". It is the ontological argument, implying that God is a being that which nothing greater can be conceived.

In conclusion, the ontological has many strengths and very few weaknesses as seen above. Critics like Thomas Aquinas, Anselm ~~has~~ have attempted but failed to criticize the ontological argument. The roots of the ontological argument are strengthened through its correlation with religious beliefs, uplifting its prominence.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

An extensive first part of the essay which justifies full marks.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Including a wide range of scholarly contributions has helped this candidate keep gaining marks as they write

Question 1

1(b) The argument from religious experience

Candidates were very much at home with this topic and were able to offer very good answers though the focus on 'three fundamental ideas' left a disparity between the length & depth of some answers –for example, some took Swinburne's Principles of Testimony & Credulity as separate 'fundamental ideas' whereas other candidates took these principles as one. There was also a lack of focus by some candidates in addressing the aspect of the question which asked for religious experience as an argument for the existence of God. However, the more able candidates tackled this very well and avoided listing types of religious experience at the expense of tackling the argument from religious experience. Interestingly, there was little use made of Peter Donovan's article and concepts of intuitive knowledge through experience although many candidates must have prepared this for 6RS04.

The most common features that candidates reported on were the types of religious experiences, Swinburne's principles, the inductive/a posteriori argument for the existence of God and the cumulative argument. William James and Swinburne were the most well reported scholars with other candidates referencing Hardy, Schleiermacher, Buber, Greeley as well as religious experients such as St Teresa, Mohammed, Moses and St Paul.

In part (ii) some of the best responses were those who examined the alternatives to religious experience and evaluated the work of Marx, Freud, Persinger and Dawkins to name but a few. It was, however, not necessary to approach the answer from this direction and there were also many excellent responses that examined the critiques of religious experience rather than focusing on specific alternatives e.g. a psychological explanation. On the whole candidates seemed comfortable arguing both sides regarding alternative solutions to religious experiences for the existence of God and were able to reach a balanced conclusion.

In the box, state whether you are answering part (a) or part (b).

B

A religious experience is an encounter with the divine where God is a personal reality that cannot be explained by ordinary methods of empiricism. This a posteriori, subjective experience is very personal and is such a strong experience that for many can convert someone to believe in God.

A first fundamental idea within religious experience is the ^{validity} ~~definition~~ of a religious experience, which to William James has to possess 4 categories: passivity (the experience is not

conjured (brought on), transiency (experience is temporary, it must give the recipient some form of noetic quality (or knowledge) and must be in some way credible (conceivable to be explained). We can therefore apply

this to famous religious experiences to assess ~~their~~ the strength of the argument of the existence of God for example Saul's conversion to Paul. The experience can be seen to ~~be~~ have been passivity as he was ^{simply} walking to Damascus and noetic quality as after the conversion Saul became St Paul preaching the word of God to many. The issue lies however in the ideas of the experiences transiency as although the blinding light hence was short, he was blind for 3 days and whether or not the experience is credible - as it is explained in the Bible. - This suggests that ~~as a~~ a religious experience can be used to show God's existence without passing all 4 characteristics but is more credible and substantial when it does contain all 4.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The candidate has read the question and is aware that they need to identify fundamental ideas of the argument. They have taken an appropriate approach by explaining key concepts of religious experience in the first paragraph then choosing the specific feature of validity, going on to illustrate it by way of William James' study.

Question 1

1(b) The argument from religious experience

Candidates were very much at home with this topic and were able to offer very good answers though the focus on 'three fundamental ideas' left a disparity between the length & depth of some answers – for example, some took Swinburne's Principles of Testimony & Credulity as separate 'fundamental ideas' whereas other candidates took these principles as one. There was also a lack of focus by some candidates in addressing the aspect of the question which asked for religious experience as an argument for the existence of God. However, the more able candidates tackled this very well and avoided listing types of religious experience at the expense of tackling the argument from religious experience. There was little use made of Peter Donovan's article and concepts of intuitive knowledge through experience, although many candidates must have prepared this for 6RS04.

The most common features that candidates reported on were the types of religious experiences, Swinburne's principles, the inductive/a posteriori argument for the existence of God, and the cumulative argument. William James and Swinburne were the most well reported scholars with other candidates referencing Hardy, Schleiermacher, Buber, Greeley as well as religious experients such as St Teresa, Mohammed, Moses and St Paul.

In part (ii) some of the best responses were those who examined the alternatives to religious experience and evaluated the work of Marx, Freud, Persinger and Dawkins, to name but a few. It was, however, not necessary to approach the answer from this direction and there were also many excellent responses that examined the critiques of religious experience rather than focusing on specific alternatives, e.g. a psychological explanation. On the whole candidates seemed comfortable arguing both sides regarding alternative solutions to religious experiences for the existence of God and were able to reach a balanced conclusion.

In the box, state whether you are answering part (a) or part (b).

a

(i) Resurrection a) The body is a monistic theory this is where the body and soul are linked in a psycho-physical unity. When the person dies rather than the body and soul separate the soul body finds itself in a connection with a new form of the body that will live on for eternity. This body is different to that of the physical world. Rather than be made of flesh and blood it is believed that the body is now beyond life and death, it is spiritual. If we look at the resurrection of Jesus we can see how the body of Jesus still remained similar. He could touch, eat and drink with his disciples. He could show them his scars but he was beyond the physical world as he would appear and disappear to people. This theory is one that many Christians believe.

candidates took the opportunity to respond to the challenges of verification and falsification and showed great confidence in dealing with the arguments from R M Hare and Basil Mitchell.

There was some suggestion that many answers were pre-planned, but most candidates were able to adapt to and respond to the question.

but is widely seen outside the religion as flawed. For example disabilities and deformities raise the issue of whether or not they are carried over to the resurrected spiritual body. Many would wish for these deformities to not afflict them in the afterlife, but surely this is what makes them who they are. If everyone was perfect no one would be themselves. The belief of immortality of the soul and its dualistic beliefs is that you are not bound by the capabilities of the body as the soul separates from the body at death. Another issue with resurrection is if you are resurrected how are you to be punished or rewarded in the afterlife for your sins or dedication to religion.

John Hick created the replica theory to resolve some of these problems. He states that if a replica of someone looks the same and acts the same are they the same? He teaches that as God is omnipotent he can place the thought and characteristics into that person replica. Rather than these replicas he heard by the problems of earth they are sent to a "replica world inhabited only by replicated people". He uses the evidence of the book of revelations to support his claim. "I saw a new heaven

and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth passed away."

Similar to Resurrection the Immortality of the soul theory does provide an idea of a eutopia for those who do well in the physical life. The main difference between the separation of the soul at death ~~in~~ Dualism was first thought of by Plato where he used the analogy of a charioteer and horses to show the separation and bond of the body and soul. The horses and cart ~~shows~~ depict the body, and the charioteer the soul. The body is what drives the soul through the physical world and the soul is what makes all conscious and moral decisions.

Descartes went on to expand on Plato describing the body as spacial and non-conscious and the opposite to this for the soul. Descartes famous quote "~~I think~~ Cogito ergo sum" or I think therefore I am can be used to explain Plato's idea of the soul making conscious and moral decisions.

Although there is no biblical teaching for Immortality of the soul it is something many Christians believe, maybe

because they desire an afterlife ~~or~~ and fear death. Thomas Aquinas a theistic scholar supported the idea of the soul separating the body but wanted to show the significance of the body in getting the soul to the afterlife and how the body was needed to ~~after~~ transport the soul to either heaven hell or purgatory.

(ii) Many believe in life after death because they desire it. This could be due to the fact they are scared of death, hope there is more to existence or want there to be a system for rewarding the good and punishing the bad. However just because we desire something does not mean it exists. Both immortality of the soul and resurrection of the body are both highly supported theories but both have their flaws. For example with resurrection of the body in the example of Jesus, his body is taken from his tomb yet many theories suggest that the body we are placed into after death is not one of flesh and blood but spiritual. Also Jesus' disciples did not recognise him at first, many people do not wish to be unrecognisable by their loved ones for eternity.

Also the idea the God is replicating
the body concerns many. Is he really
only replicating once or is he doing it
many times, are we truly individual? But
Paul Davis states that he is not consolidated by
the idea of a replica he is still dead.
While the immortality of the soul theory is not
so restricted by these criticisms, many still
see it as flawed. For example are we
supposed to act morally correct in the
physical life purely out of fear for the
afterlife. Also there is no biblical teachings
for a soul, many believe man gained a
soul when "God breathed life into Adam" but
there is no actual evidence in the bible that
souls exist.

David Hume also disagrees with Plato
and Descartes theory that just because we
can think and make moral decisions
does not mean we have a soul. Surely
minds can think and make decisions to even
if to a lesser degree. Does this mean
animals do have souls?

Immanuel Kant criticises the idea of
both the Hume as immoral of God, ~~the~~
Kant states that to believe in certain

Way out of fear of the afterlife is inaction. We should only act how we wish morally and through our own choice.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

A competent review of resurrection and immortality of the soul. The candidate offers a scholarly-based evaluation in part (ii)

In the box, state whether you are answering part (a) or part (b).

b

Religious language is concerned with statements about God, for example "God is love". The problem with religious language is that believers see God as infinite (eternal), however they use words often associated with finite forces to describe him. This causes the issue of ambiguity - to what degree can attributes used for finite describe God, and does this then make God meaningless. This is the problem of with religious language.

Religious language falls into two categories - cognitive/realist and non-cognitive/anti-realist. Cognitive/realist language is factual and can be proven objectively, empirically, as opposed to non-cognitive/anti-realist language which one subjective interpretation.

Logical positivists are concerned with the link between language and knowledge and religious language. The logical positivists were founded in Vienna in 1920, and were influenced by the work of Ludwig Wittgenstein. Wittgenstein said that language that is meaningful to human beings is connected with what we know through our senses.

The logical positivists took and asked how can religious language be united with sense experience when God is a meta-physical transcendent who is unable to be physically verified, for this reason religious ~~to~~ philosophers such as the logical positivists reject religious language.

Religious language is also rejected by other philosophers such as A.J. Ayer who supported the verification principle. The verification principle demonstrated two ways in which propositions can be proven to be meaningful or true or false. Analytic propositions are true by definition and mathematics, for example, ~~the word~~ ^a ~~bat~~ batchelor is an unmarried man, or $2 + 2$ equals 4. Synthetic propositions are true by senses, for example, using our eye to observe that the sky is blue. Religious language and God fall into neither categories and for this reason ~~is~~ A.J. Ayer deemed it as meaningless. A.J. Ayer, however, came up with two forms of the verification principle - the strong form and the weak form. The strong form of the verification ^{principle} was observed through our

senses. The central aim of the verification principle was using secondary evidence for example eye-witness accounts.

However, once again religious language was unable to fit into the strong verification principle, and for this reason

A. J. Ayer rejected religious language. The falsification principle is the reverse of the verification principle.

The falsification principle was proposed by Anthony Flew. Flew argued that for any positive claim we must be able to deny or disprove its negation.

Flew believed that language is meaningful if we are able to extract evidence that counter-argued language. However,

Flew's problem with religious language

is that it doesn't allow for falsification of statements such as "I know God loves me in such a way that human understanding and wisdom cannot fathom." For this reason

Flew argued that religious believers do not allow for criticism against the existence of God, but rather religious believers attempt to qualify and explain God when they are unsure about why bad things occur

for instance, natural disasters and infant mortality. If there is a God who is all loving and all powerful why are these things happening.

But Religious language looks at religious statements and terminology. Many attempts from the verification principle and falsifiability principle have tried to deem religious language as meaningless and not useful, however, philosophers such as Ludwig Wittgenstein and Theologian Paul Tillich argue that religious language has profitable uses.

Theologian Paul Tillich argues that symbols surpass mere facts, they provide a non-cognitive meaning that allows for interpretation, not only by the eyes but by the

soul. For example looking at a piece of art, individuals will be able to provide a paraphrase about what a great piece of art is, similarly, in religious terms, the religious cross has the same use, it acts a powerful statement. Symbols draw Christians in beyond their reality for example the Christian cross prompts prayer and meditation and worship, it is a constant reminder

of words come to us. Myths also have a justifiable use, they reveal the truths when people are uncertain about biblical history, for example the virgin birth is a reminder to Christians to remain pure just like Jesus is, the nativity story also depicts ~~the~~ the birth of Jesus as significant and also reminds Christians to be pure, steadfast and diligent in the things of God.

St Thomas Aquinas also attempted to explain ^{that} religious language has justifiable use. For Aquinas, ~~an~~ analogy was the best way of providing explanation, ~~the~~ analogy allows for comment about the spiritual realm to be expressed using finite expressions. Analogy of

proportions allows us to acquire knowledge about what we don't know by likening it to something we do know, for example Payley's water.

Furthermore, after influencing the logical positivist, Ludwig Wittgenstein attempted to prove that religious language serves as a justifiable use and is a great function. Wittgenstein introduced the concept of

language games; understanding statements and terminology that are a part of your game/group, for example doctors will be able to understand medical terminology as they are familiar with that game however a gardener will not be able to understand the terminology as they are not part of that game. For ~~but~~ Ludwig games are like conversations, there is a right way to do things and the wrong way to do things, similarly in religious language there is a conventional way of understanding language and an unconventional way of understanding language.

Richard Swinburne also criticises the verification principle and says that there are some non-religious statements that can't be verified but this does not make them meaningless, for example the idea of toys in a cupboard being around and moving around and returning to their exact positions. Although this cannot be empirically verified it is wrong to dismiss the idea.

John Hick also ~~provides~~ dismisses the verification principle as the one

unable to verify God using the principles or methods of verification however, John Hume believed in Eschatological verification - we can't be able to verify the God in the future, if and when there is an after life

R.M Hume offers to the concept of blinks against the verification principle. A blink is a unique way of seeing the world which cannot be disproven, Hume used the example of a student who is convinced that his philosophy teacher is trying to kill him. Despite there being no evidence to prove this, one can see that the teacher is very good at concealing his or her inner motives, either way does not make his belief meaningless.

Furthermore Basil Mitchell rejects the view that Blinks are groundless but rather argues that religious believers allow criticisms of the existence of God but do not allow it to waver their faith, he used the example of the leader of a resistance movement, who sometimes helps the enemy but always returns back to his camp to help his fellow men. This shows that religious

believers acknowledge alternative ideologies but always remain faithful to their own. In conclusion, Wittgenstein has proved that language is a useful function as it allows people to understand one another's genes and terminology.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

An excellent, full response to the topic.

In the box, state whether you are answering part (a) or part (b).

a

One of the key features of Deontology, an ethical theory devised in the 18th century by the German philosopher Immanuel Kant, is that it is an intentionalist, objective, secular theory, which therefore focuses only on a person's intentions, ^{is based upon} logic and reason; in addition to the theory being an autonomous, not heteronomous theory, and thus encourages people to become moral not for a reward or to avoid a punishment, but rather because it is your "duty" to be a moral person. For instance, Kant criticised much of the teachings of the Bible due to the fact believers only followed moral commands such as "Honor thy mother and father" to receive the reward of going to heaven, or avoid the punishment of going to hell.

Another key idea within deontology, is Kant's belief that we were all born with an innate sense of morality, with this morality being god-given, and thus everyone has the ability to tell right from wrong and make moral decisions - with good will being of intrinsic value, with Kant asserting that "Good will shines forth like a precious jewel". Moreover, the heart of deontology is the 'Categorical Imperative'; an absolute and universal sense of moral duty which directs a person to make a moral decision in difficult situations. For instance, the first 'formula', the 'Formula of the Universal Law of Nature' seeks to universalise moral laws by asserting that, before committing to an action, individuals should ask themselves whether or not they would want everyone in the world to act in exactly the same way as them, if yes then they should ~~proceed~~^{proceed}, and if no, it would be wrong to proceed. Furthermore, within this formula, there is the sub-formula of the "Contradiction of the Will" and the "Logical Contradiction" - with the former occurring when you wouldn't want a law to be universalised, with Kant giving the example of lying (as you wouldn't want to live in a world where everybody lied to each

other, and therefore, you should never lie), with the latter occurring when a law can't be universalized, with Kant giving the example of murder (as murder cannot be universalized due to the fact that if we lived in a world where everyone killed each other, the human race would eventually cease to exist) and therefore such acts are also wrong.

Moreover, another key formula of the categorical imperative is "treat humans as ends in themselves" which essentially means that it is immoral to use people to get what you want, rather we should value and respect individuals as ends in themselves. For instance, sweatshops are a clear violation of this formula due to the fact that they exploit individuals for capital gain; with the final formula being "act as a legislating member of the kingdom of ends" - whereby everybody follows the rules established in the categorical imperative and thus understands the significance of the role they play in creating moral laws themselves, with this "kingdom of ends" being a idyllic perfect society that is created as a result of following the categorical imperative whereby, everyone is making autonomous

moral actions and treating people with equality and respect.

Finally, another important idea within Deontology is that, despite the fact that Kant asserts that Deontology is an autonomous ethic, he asserts that logically, moral behaviour leads to the "Summum bonum", which is the union of virtue and happiness in the afterlife. However, it's important to note that the Summum bonum is not a reward for moral behaviour, nor should it be a person's motivation for being a moral person, it is merely a positive consequence of doing your duty.

ii) It's clear that Deontology does have lasting value for moral decision making due to the fact that it is a humanitarian ethic that promotes equality and ^{dignity for} human life, and therefore is compatible with much human rights legislation - such as the UK's 1998 Human Rights Act, the European Convention on Human Rights, and the 1948 UN Declaration of Human Rights.

However, arguably Deontology is not an ethic with lasting value due to the fact that there

established protocol to follow for if your duties happen to conflict. For example, if you were in Nazi Germany and were hiding a Jewish family in your house, and a Gestapo officer asked you "Are you hiding anyone?" what do you do? Do you lie? As lying is a "contradiction of the will" or do you tell the truth and thus failing to uphold the "logical contradiction" as murder cannot be universalised? Thus, a clear flaw with Deontology is that it is an easy to follow ethic in theory, but not in practice.

However, arguably this flaw was debunked by the British philosopher W.D. Ross, who established "prima facie" or "at first glance" duties with vary from situation to situation — with Ross asserting that the most important duty was "harm-prevention", and thus, if your duties ever do happen to conflict, protecting innocent life should always take precedence, and thus, in the aforementioned situation, you should in fact lie to protect that innocent Jewish family.

However, another flaw of Deontology and thus another reason it is not a lasting heavy for

making moral decisions, is due to the fact that it is an intentionalist theory and thus can be used to justify immoral consequences, so long as there was a moral intention. For instance, if it was your teacher's birthday and you bought them a box of chocolates, that's a good intention, and thus it doesn't matter that said teacher turns out to become diabetic, as the thought was there. However, more shockingly, Deontology could actually be used to justify atrocities, so long as those committing them had a good intention^{such as Hitler and this is a hole}. Therefore, a major flaw with the theory.

However, arguably this weakness can be ignored due to Deontology's basis on logic and reason - as it is an objective theory, it therefore doesn't allow followers to become engulfed by emotion, such as Situation Ethics with agape love, and Utilitarianism and pleasure, nor personal interest or cultural bias, and thus is truly a long lasting ethic for making moral decisions as it ensures that decisions are always aimed at by logical judgement and reason.

However, arguably the reason why Deontology is not a long lasting ethical theory with value in regards to making moral decisions, is that the whole argument is hypocritical and contradictory due to the inclusion of the summum Bonum, which essentially is a reward for moral behaviour. Therefore, undermining the whole of the argument's basis on making autonomous decisions, as the argument itself is heteronomous.

Therefore, despite the clear strengths of the argument, it is clear that Deontology does not have lasting value for moral decision making as it is too highly flawed with its inclusion of the summum bonum, and its intentionalist basis.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

A very strong response showing clear understanding of the principles of deontology, good use of technical language and appropriate exemplification.

6

In the box, state whether you are answering part (a) or part (b).

i) Natural Moral Law is an ethical theory based on morality. Established by Aquinas, he believed that the basis of the theory is 'Duty to God' in *Summa Theologica*. Aquinas describes Natural moral law (NML) as 'a moral code existing within the purpose of nature.' NML is a set of principles as a basis of human conduct.

NML is Absolute: it provides fixed moral truths that do not justify immoral acts. Cicero believed 'one eternal & unchangeable law valid for all nations at all times.'

NML is objective & unchangeable, providing concrete reason to be moral. It provides clear consistent moral values. The play 'Antigone' by Sophocles proved that our moral law & obligations is higher than State law. NML is universal as it can be applied to everyone & seen attractive for countries suffering intercultural strife & disharmony.

NML contributes to ethical thinking as it provides purpose: it defines what is right & wrong & what we should / shouldn't do. Aquinas says our purpose in life is to attain fellowship to God. This can be fulfilled through the 5 primary precepts: 1 - To worship God 2 - to live in society 3 - to educate children 4 - Reproduction 5 - Self preservation & preservation of the innocent. Abortion would be seen as wrong as it goes against the 5th precept. The purpose of human genitals is reproduction & masturbation would be seen as wrong as it does not lead to new life, fulfil its purpose of glorify God. Homosexuality & contraception would also be seen as wrong by Aquinas as it does not lead to reproduction. Secondary precepts deduce from primary precepts: 1 - Do not murder 2 - Do not abort the unborn 3 - Defend the defenceless 4 - Do not commit suicide. The purpose of do not murder is self preservation. Purpose is a way of life & structures society.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

A neat and clear introduction lays the foundation to a competent essay and wins the examiner's confidence.

ii) To what extent can this claim be refuted.

G.E. Moore tried to solve the problems of ethical ~~language~~^{language} with his theory of intuitionism. Moore maintained that we all have an infallible knowledge ^(our intuition) of what is right and what is wrong, and our intuition is what should be really guiding us. Moore works on the idea of common morality, as a lot of people intuit in the same way. For example, if you ~~witnessed~~^{witnessed} someone being raped, you would know innately that this was wrong, without having to review moral arguments.

However, Moore's theory is weak as not every intuit in the same way. If the moral decision isn't unanimous, then someone's intuition will have to be chosen in order for a moral decision

to be reached. Moore provided no rules as to whose ~~are~~ intuition is more superior than others, making it hard to distinguish which ~~best~~ person's intuition should be followed. He also failed to realise that ~~per~~ as people have different intuitions they can use it as an excuse to carry out terrible acts, for example a murderer could claim that their intuition told them it was the right thing to do.

~~Emotion~~. Emotivism is another theory which is put forward to try and solve the problems of ethical language. It is also called the 'boo/hurrah' theory, as Ayer stated that saying 'abortion is wrong' is just like saying 'boo to abortion'. Emotivism is, therefore, ~~an ethical~~ theory which ~~state~~ ^{maintains} ethical statements are just people expressing their personal emotions or preference. Ayer states 'exhortations are not propositions but merely ejaculations', meaning that they are ~~just~~ just an expression of ~~an~~ emotion. C. L. Stevenson adds

to Ayer's theory, stating there are 2 ways to use language; ~~dynamically~~ ^{descriptively} and ~~persuasively~~ ^{dynamically}. Descriptive language is claiming something based on facts, whereas dynamic language is saying something in such a way as to prescribe your feelings into it, in order to persuade the person you are talking to to agree with you.

Emotivism too undergoes criticism, as Peter vardy calls it 'an ethical non theory' as it doesn't fit the criteria of a classical theory at all. It also seriously undermines terrible events like the Holocaust, as it states that someone saying 'the Holocaust was wrong' is just like saying 'boo to the Holocaust', stripping it ~~off~~ off its intense moral wrongness. R. M. Hare states that doing this is very bad ~~to~~ as it reducing it too much, in a theory he ~~calls~~ calls reductionism.

In conclusion, both intuitionism and emotivism try but fail to solve the problems

with ethical language. There will always be a debate between whether ~~it~~^{use} or it should be objective or subjective, good will always have many meanings and thus, problems with ethical language will remain vastly unresolved.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Full marks justly awarded to this candidate for an excellent evaluative response.

Question 4

4(b) Ethical Language

These answers show how well-prepared many students are. Some presented superbly balanced and well-resourced debates; and even the weaker ones showed relevance and awareness of the problems of ethical language. Some wide-ranging visits to versions of emotivism were saved for part (ii), though a full range of answers were argued for the claim's refutability.

Many centres have taken on board Examiners' comments of a few years' ago, and redressed the criticism that not enough acknowledgement was made of the contribution of 'Hume's fork' which underpins the debate. Most candidates addressed the question widely, discussing Moore, the open question argument, the naturalistic fallacy, and Ayer's VP.

In part (ii) candidates tended to choose both Moore's intuitionism and Ayer's emotivism to discuss how these ideas could be refuted, with many discussing whether they are successful or not. Many acknowledged the difference between Moore and Ayer in terms of objective truth.

Question 5

5 (a) The Edicts of Ashoka

This was a popular question, but the reference to the edicts seemed to confuse some students. Some candidates read the question literally and tried to recall what was written on the edicts. The question asked for 'significant messages'. The consequence of this was that some students found it difficult to provide a substantive answer for (i), but then used material suitable for AO1 in AO2. The better responses considered a number of the key elements found on the edicts and some chose these knowing they would be making reference to them again in AO2. For part (ii) the scholarship was mixed. Some candidates explored with great effect the extent to which the edicts made no mention of specific Buddhist doctrine. They wanted to argue that Ashoka was using Buddhism as a form of social control. Others made reference to the Buddha's teachings to Sighala, to show that Ashoka was using Upaya in these edicts. Others analysed the impact Ashoka's patronage had on Buddhism within India and the region.

Question 5

5 (b) (i) Pure Land Buddhism

This was not a popular question. Those who did it tended to display a detailed understanding of the key emphases of Pure Land. Candidates answered part (ii) with confidence, many arguing convincingly that Pure Land and Zen are as far apart as is possible in terms of practice, if not philosophy.

Question 6

6 (a) Key features of anatta

This was a popular question and the quality of answers improved on previous years. While most scripts located anatta within the 3 marks, some simply provided a simple descriptive response of each, while others gave a more critical analysis of the relationship between the three. For example, some wanted to argue that the key features of anatta necessarily involved dukkha and anicca. Some outstanding responses used Nagarjuna to argue that anatta has had different emphasis in different traditions.

The Questions of King Milinda

For part (ii) students used a range of references from King Milinda. Most used the chariot analogy. However, the quality of analysis varied considerably. Some weaker responses simply retold the analogy and commented on how it provided suitable explanation. Other responses provided a deeper analysis of the text. Some students approached it textually and explained how the analogy was 'the answer' to a specific question, which demonstrated ignorance of the Buddhist position. Others wished to take the analogy further and began to explore how the parts of the chariot themselves are mere concepts, which led neatly into

In the box, state whether you are answering part (a) or part (b).

A

(ii) The three marks of existence were identified by the Buddha and they affect all things, animate or inanimate. These marks are: dukkha which is dissatisfaction, anicca which is impermanence and anatta which is the doctrine of no soul. Both anicca and anatta cause a person dukkha. Therefore we need to accept them to eliminate all dukkha and therefore progress towards nirvana. As these three things mark all existing things then it is essential to understand them in order to become enlightened.

Anatta is the doctrine of no soul and a direct rejection of the Vedic idea of a permanent soul, called the jiva atman. Nothing has its own inherent existence,

which is seen by the Buddhist teaching of the two different levels of reality. On the conventional level of reality, labels of convenience like 'I' and 'mine' are acceptable but the Buddhist practitioners must remember that these conventions hold no ultimate reality and should not cling to them. On the ultimate level of reality, ~~things~~ ^{nothing} has inherent existence and everything is made of constituent parts which is seen in the analogy of the chariot. Buddhists accept the labels on the conventional level of reality but realise that they hold no ultimate reality.

Because people have no inherent existence, Buddhists teach that people are made of constituent parts that are known as the 5 skandhas. These are: physical body, sensations, ~~mind~~ perceptions, experience and person. The physical body is the literal makeup of the body so what a person looks like etc. sensations are how people experience things through their senses, Buddhists consider the mind a 6th sense. Perception filters the way ~~we~~ ^{we} look at the world therefore they can alter the words in

which we meet in different situations. Experience also affects the way in which we react ^{to} and receive different situations. Persons connects the aggregates together and it is how they interlink. It is important for a person to not get attached to a single aggregate as this ~~could~~ ^{steps them} can hamper progressing towards Nirvana. Anatta also applies to ~~an~~ inanimate objects because ^{all} things are made of constituent parts. Tables have not created tables but rather a mix of separate objects therefore tables are not self existing.

To be able to fully understand anatta, one must understand annica as anatta is a direct result of it. Annica is the teaching that all things are in a constant state of change therefore nothing is truly permanent. ~~There are two levels of change, momentary and gross change. momentary change can be seen by the naked eye on a day to day basis. It includes things like writing on what was a blank sheet of paper, more rapid forms of decay and growth. gross change however, cannot be seen on a day to day basis and it may take some time before it can be seen. This includes~~ ^{There are two levels of change, momentary and gross change. momentary change can be seen by the naked eye on a day to day basis. It includes things like writing on what was a blank sheet of paper, more rapid forms of decay and growth. gross change however, cannot be seen on a day to day basis and it may take some time before it can be seen. This includes}

things like aging ^{and} decay are they are not immediately visible to the eye but the change is still occurring. The story of the mustard seeds from the wife of the Buddha exemplifies how not accepting change causes a person dukkha. A woman was frantic about the death of her ~~husband~~ ^{baby} and demanded what the Buddha brought her back to life and the Buddha promised to do so if she could collect a mustard seed from the house of anyone who had not lost someone. When she returned empty handed, the Buddha explained that all things are ~~impermanent~~ ^{impermanent} and that we should not ~~be~~ ^{be} so attached to them.

Dukkha literally translates to dissatisfaction and it is the dissatisfaction that comes with being human. It should be noted that a lot of dukkha that we experience is self-inflicted due to wrong perceptions. There are three levels of dukkha, ordinary dukkha, dukkha caused by change and dukkha caused by conditioned states. Ordinary dukkha is things that we as individuals cannot



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

A substantial response to this popular question

Question 7

Q7 (a) Liberation Theology

Most candidates who did this question provided a good analysis of the key themes of Liberation Theology, how it emerged, what it responded to, how it promoted action, and the reception it received. Many focused on key teachings as a way of describing its development which was done well. Part (ii) was less strong overall but some very good responses in terms of political vs theological and practical impact and legacy were still offered.

Ecumenical Movement

Not many chose this option but most answers were clear and systematic. Part (ii) allowed for some good responses in terms of impact today, relations with the Roman Catholic Church, the work of the ecumenical movement and the World Council of Churches today.

Question 7

In the box, state whether you are answering part (a) or part (b).

B

"Ghandi is the greatest reformer Hinduism has ever seen" (Zaehner). Born in 1869 in the West Coast of India, most people will recognise the name of this social ~~and~~ political reformer. He was alive during a time where India was under British rule and the ~~country~~ ^{country} was left fragmented. Ghandi sought to ~~unite~~ unite India and fought against inequalities - such as caste. He based his ideas and protests around Jain concepts such as Brahmacharya; self control, Satyagrah; adherence to truth and Apathyagrah; greedlessness. However ~~he~~ he did not always adhere to these concepts. Particularly in his younger years Ghandi did not follow the claim 'my life is my message'.

A first teaching of Gandhi was Brahmacharya. This is devotion to a simple life. He said "you should live a disciplined, celibate life avoiding intoxication" (Dunison). The idea originated from Jainism which was the religious belief of Gandhi's mother. It's purpose is to search for Brahman whilst realising one's self. Gandhi was against drinking as he believed attention should be focused on seeking for Brahman. Gandhi himself took a vow of Brahmacharya at 37. From then ^{on he} ~~he~~ abstained from worldly desires such as alcohol, sex and possessions. To prove his celibacy, he spent a night sleeping next to his young niece. This ~~demonstrated~~ ^{demonstrated} utter self control. Gandhi's also taught asceticism - separation from material desires. When he died Gandhi had less than 10 possessions including his glasses, a pocket watch and eating bowl.

A second teaching, key teaching of Gandhi was Aparthigraha. This is greedlessness. Gandhi taught that you should live your life in service to others. Lacey says "what really places Gandhi in the India of

19th century is his devotion to others". Gandhi dedicated much of his life to attempt to eradicate caste inequalities. "Gandhi fought tirelessly for the rights of Dalits" (Smith). The Dalits were the lowest caste who received the poorest treatment. They were given ~~dirty~~^{dirty}, low paid jobs no one else wanted, such as dealing with the deceased. Gandhi ~~renamed~~^{re-named} his caste 'Harijans' meaning 'children of god'. He was grossly against the term 'untouchables' which suggested an impure nature. To prove his greedlessness Gandhi went on a 7 day fast whilst in prison to bring attention to the mistreatment of Dalits. Gandhi even lived as a Dalit for a ~~but~~ small amount of time to show how love was present throughout all castes. Gandhi set up Ashrams - communities to help perpetuate his teachings. Here Gandhi included Dalits making sure they played crucial roles.

A final key teaching of Gandhi was Satyagrah. This is the "insistence of truth against any oppositor" (Smith). Gandhi taught that if you were on the side of truth

you could not lose. He believed it gave power to the powerless. It is said that Gurus strength and authority is those who use it. Hindus believe that this is an aspect of Brahman in the Upanishads. Gandhi used this concept to create social reforms. Gandhi's first Satyagraha protest was in 1913, when the Transvaal government invalidated Indian marriages. Gandhi led a non-violent, peaceful protest and the law was eventually corrected when the government realised how effective it was. This idea ties in with Gandhi's concept of Ahimsa which is non-violence. ~~Some~~ ^{Most} Hindus today will still follow this by abstaining from meat because of the relation that every living thing is worthy of respect and non violence. Some Hindus in rural India will sweep the floor in front of them so not to kill any insect because of this belief in truth and non violence.

ii) Most people today, Hindu and non-Hindu think of Gandhi as a holy man. An ideal figure who lived how he wished others would. He famously says "be the change you wish to see in the world". However he

didn't always live by his message.

In Gandhi's ^{20s} younger life he was educated in England. "He threw himself enthusiastically into London life" (Smith). While he was ~~there~~ ^{there} he drank alcohol, ate meat and had many material possessions. This ~~contradicts~~ contradicts his teachings in later life. Thus Gandhi didn't always lead by example. As well as this there was one instance where Gandhi abandoned his dying father to have sex with his pregnant wife. His lack of self control and non-adherence to his Brahmacharya teachings here is evident. ~~As~~ Later however his child died and Gandhi took this as a punishment. A final case where Gandhi is seen to not follow the claim "my life is my message" is when he advised a women's church minister not to leave his teaching of Ahimsa as a way to destroy Hitler ^{during WW2}. Gandhi actually advised against use of his Ahimsa concept claiming it wouldn't work.

However this was all in Gandhi's younger years. From his view of Brahmacharya

at 37 abandoned a clean life. To prove his
greedlessness when Gandhi was invited to
have lunch with the King in the ~~1930s~~ 1931
he wore plain, simple robes. When asked if
he was going to charge Gandhi claimed
"The King had enough on for the both of us".
Gandhi attempted his own protests, following by
example. Many view him as an inspirational
role model ~~to~~ and an example of how to
live a ~~more~~ agreeable life. His continuing
popularity and status of the figure all around
India show how he did live out his
message.

To conclude we can see that while Gandhi
devoted in his teens and twenties, he
grew into an influential figure. His concepts
are still followed today and without the
rejection of caste discrimination may still be
legal in India. He did much to ~~be~~ ^{live} by
example to create change. "Without
Gandhi Hinduism will never be the
same" (Zaehner)



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

A superb response achieving full marks in both parts.

Question 9

Question 9b)i) Key teachings of Gandhi

In contrast to previous years the answers given for this question tended to concentrate on the ideas and philosophy of Gandhi rather than getting lost in irrelevant biographical detail. As a consequence the overall standard of answers given to this question was very high indeed. Candidates considered a wide range of key teachings, such as satyagraha, sarvodaya, aparigraha, lokasangraha, ahimsa, with great skill. The diversity of responses was impressive. This was particularly true of discussions concerning the quotation in part ii).

Question 10

10a)i) Interpretations of atman and Brahman

A range of interesting ways of considering different interpretations of atman and Brahman were undertaken. Some concentrated on the early development of Hindu schools such as Samkhya, others considered the variety of ideas expressed in the Vedas and Upanishads while others leaned more towards a consideration of different schools of Vedantic thinking. All of these approaches were valid and some splendid and interesting answers were given. An impressive level of knowledge and analysis was demonstrated. Part ii) of this question was less well (though not badly) answered. More attention to detail regarding the variety of approaches to and means of worship, philosophical understandings of the purpose and destiny of the individual, types of sacred text and social ethics, would have enriched the responses.

Qu 10(b) Key beliefs from the Bhagavad Gita

This was a much less popular question. Indeed, only a few candidates tackled part b).

However, those that did so showed a solid knowledge and understanding of the *Bhagavad Gita*. The analysis of the importance of this text for Hindus in part ii) was very well handled by most.

Question 11

11(a) Differences between Sunni and Shi'ah Islam

i) This was the more popular question of the two and was generally attempted competently. Those candidates achieving marks in the higher levels were able to explain the comparisons and contrasts between Sunni and Shi'ah well. Other answers reflected an awareness of some of these but made reference to them rather than examining them. A few candidates limited their answers by only describing the time of the caliphs and the Sunni and Shi'ah split.

ii) Many answers to this part were generally weak. Only a few candidates who achieved marks in the higher levels were able to successfully discuss the view that the differences between Sunni and Shi'ah are more significant than their similarities. Many struggled to answer the question directly and others repeated examples of differences already given in i) without forming a view.

In the box, state whether you are answering part (a) or part (b).

A

The division between the Sunni and Shi'ah Muslims developed over the question over of leadership and authority within the Ummah. It was rooted in their early history when they faced the question of who should succeed after Muhammad's sudden, untimely death. Daniel Brown claims that, for Shi'ah's, 'the failure of the early church to recognise the claims of Ali or to accord special status to the prophet's family was at best a grievous error. At worst, apostasy.' This shows just how strongly they felt about Ali not coming immediately into power.

Shi'ah's supported Ali, Muhammad's cousin. They came to see authority,

~~both~~ ~~both~~ both religious and political, as being vested in divinely appointed leaders. ~~By~~ beginning with Ali. By contrast Sunnis took a more political pragmatic approach. The Sunni theory of Caliphate required that the leader of the Muslim community be male, a member of the prophet's tribe of Quraysh, and meet certain basic qualifications for fitness. Ultimately, it was up to the community to decide.

Sunnis believed that their Caliphs, while upheld religious values, could not give religious doctrine. For them, this came only from the Quran. Sunnis have always believed the Quran was uncreated and human history was predetermined, a theory known as Asharism. Scholar Karen Armstrong comments 'Asharism became a predominant philosophy of Sunni Islam. It was obviously not a rationalist Creed but more a mystical and contemplative discipline.' In comparison, Shiah's began to believe in free will and the temporal creation of the Quran. Loyalty to the House of the

prophet became central and this is known as Mutazilism.

Scholar Daniel Brown states 'many other differences in law, ritual, attitudes to suffering and eschatology grew out of this basic difference.' For instance, there were some ritual changes to the pillars including the fact that, during Salah, Shiah Muslims prostrate onto a piece of baked clay from Karbala and only pray three times a day. However, these changes were to reflect the importance of the family of the prophet and did not change the significance of any of the pillars.

~~Sunni Muslims~~ Shiah Muslims rejected the Sunni principle of consensus and in its place put the doctrine of the Imam. Sunnis ~~followed~~ believed that if there was a matter that was not dealt with directly by the Quran ~~they~~ then the view held by the majority of the community would be the rightly guided view. Therefore, they have 4 law schools - Hanafite, Malkite, Shafite, Hanbalite. ^{Every} ~~Each~~ Sunni must belong to one of these law schools and this is dependant on their

geographical position in the world. The consensus does not refer to the whole Sunni Community but to the doctors of the law schools.

Shi'ah's reject this and believe that in every age there is an infallible Imam who God has entrusted the guidance of his servants. All Shi'ah's must believe in all Imams, particularly that of their time.

Sunnis have stayed a cohesive community dominating most of the Muslim world, whereas Shi'ah's have divided into sub-sections. Imamis or twelvers are the most important sub-section because they believe that the 12th Imam Muhammad-al-Muntazar did not die but went into hiding to return at Madhi. All Shi'ah's share this hope but differ on who will return. For example Ismailis or seveners believe Ismail, the seventh Imam, will return at Madhi.

There are numerous differences between Sunni and Shi'ah Muslims, including leaders, prayer and.

opinions on infallibility. However as
Scholar David Waines says 'there is
more that unites than ~~sp~~ separates
them.'



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

A very clear and detailed response to part (i)

Question 11

11(b) Modern Muslim state(s)

This was not a popular question and only a few candidates achieving marks in the higher levels related their information concerning a modern Muslim state to the actual questions in i) and ii).

Question 12

12 (a) Key Islamic beliefs about revelation

i) This question was not the most popular of the two but was generally answered competently with candidates using material from the set texts to good effect. Those gaining marks in the higher levels examined the key Islamic beliefs required in i) and used the texts to draw out the key issues relating to interpretation of revelation within Islam in ii), whilst most weaker scripts were able to demonstrate some knowledge of the set texts.

12(b) Key emphases of Sufism.

i) This was the more popular question of the two and candidates achieving higher marks, clearly and fully examined a range of key emphases in Sufism. Weaker answers tended to be descriptive and lacked tight focus on the question.

ii) A few candidates used supporting evidence to explain their view of how 'Sufism enriches Islamic belief and practice' but others did not engage with this part of the question. Some agreed or disagreed that Sufism was acceptable to Islam, but did not discuss, as required by the question, the view that Sufism enriches Islamic belief and practice.

Question 13

Insufficient number of answers to provide comment

Question 14

Insufficient number of answers to provide comment

Question 15

Insufficient number of answers to provide comment

Question 16

Insufficient number of answers to provide comment

Question 17

Q17(a) Kingdom of God or Prologue

Candidates' responses to the Lucan material were good overall, with students showing evidence they had learnt the material well. Answers were broad rather than deep and generally covered all the key aspects. The best responses in Luke made broad and judicious use of scholarly opinion, used key terms like eschatology and salvation history as well as displaying a knowledge of the Jewish background to the teachings of Jesus. The strongest answers on the Prologue reflected a confident understanding and deployment of terms like Logos, children of God, light and dark, along with replacement theology.

Fewer candidates over-did the 'scholars' contribution' to the theme as in previous years and showed more knowledge of the Fourth Gospel and of Jesus himself. The best candidates knew the textual sources well and deployed them appropriately. Answers based on Luke were 'shallower' than those for John although many of the best answers were on Luke with some candidates able to unpack four and five key teachings concerning either the KoG or the Prologue, showing the required range and depth for higher level writing.

Weaker candidates couldn't make the connection between the key concepts they had outlined from the Prologue in part i to the rest of the Gospel. They began to introduce other themes from the rest of the Gospel not linked to the Prologue/KoG. Stronger candidates were able to draw connecting lines between the themes of the Prologue/KoG and the rest of the Gospel using evidence and examples rooted in the texts themselves. Where candidates failed to get into level four it was usually due to an absence of clear evaluative opinions of their own based on scholarly contributions.

Question 17

Q17(b) Purpose of the gospel

Candidates generally gave full and well ordered accounts here for both John and Luke. The depth of Lucan answers was somewhat less than for John. Candidates were able to demonstrate greater knowledge and depth of ideas and technical vocabulary in relation to John than Luke where the 'tone' of answers was 'lighter'. Some candidates found difficulty getting out of level two since they didn't move from narrative description to a statement of theological principle. Again the better candidates had the wording of the question clearly in focus throughout their answers.

For part (ii) quite a number of candidates here lacked the skill of 'evaluation' and 'weighing up' one view against another. They were too often content to 'list' the options. The vast majority of candidates however did reach level three. For both level three and four a balanced conclusion, reflecting a weighing up of the evidence and based on their own opinion or on that of scholars, was required but not always present.

In the box, state whether you are answering part (a) or part (b).

a

"The overall intent of the prologue is clear; to give an insight into the historical context of Jesus Christ and his ministry" (Kiddesbos). With this in mind it is clear that the prologue is of vital importance to the fourth gospel, with examining many key themes, such as that of light and dark imagery, which are prevalent throughout the gospel, and the bible as a whole.

The gospel prologue begins, 'in the beginning' (1), which immediately causes relation to Genesis 1 and the creation narrative. The word of the world is integral to the gospel as a whole as it provides emphasis on the relationship between God and the world (ie Jesus Christ), as them being 'not separate entities but part of the same God head' (Tosker).

~~The Word in the OT~~ It also ~~also~~ aligns Jesus with creation, as the word represented the father in the OT and was also representative of ~~these~~ redemption and creating. Therefore, it is important when considering Jesus' mission within his ministry, as he who has come to provide salvation for mankind, ^{and} also as he who has been present from the beginning of time, now came in flesh form.

The original ~~word~~ translation of the Prologue sees the 'word' as 'logos' - a key Hellenistic term. This is significant as it suggests that John's intended audience would already have had an understanding of the meaning of logos, and thus shows that the fourth gospel was not written solely for a Jewish audience; 'it shows significance for not just the Christian, but for the Hellenistic thinker too' (Marsh).

~~Another key theme is that of light and dark, an~~
~~and key idea present from early in the OT, & this~~
~~Hellenistic idea is carried forward here as it~~

Another key theme presented is that of light and dark imagery; in the OT, light was synonymous with God's salvation, and this is carried on through the NT. The Hellenistic undertones are carried through here, as in Isaiah 49 v 6 states ~~that~~ 'I will give you as a light

to the Gentiles'. This is a clear foreshadowing of the word coming as the 'light of all men' - not merely bringing salvation for the Israelites, but for all of mankind. It also foreshadows what it to come in John 8, as Jesus claims to be the 'light of the world'. This is best understood not as knowledge that darkness was symbolic of God's wrath, and that the 'light came to the darkness but the darkness has not overcome it' (vii). In John 8 Jesus is rejected and scorned by the Israelites but Buttman notes that the 'light is that by which man understands himself' - Jesus not only comes into ~~the~~ the darkness, but offers man a way out of it.

Kruse claims that the Prologue is set up with a 'chiastic structure', meaning that each stanza is mirrored ~~and~~ presenting the same idea. This would mean that the ~~central~~ central idea of the prologue is ~~is~~ the incarnation (vii). The incarnation is of especial importance as it points to the fact that Jesus Christ was both fully God and fully man; 'if man misunderstands the nature of the person of Jesus, the whole incarnation is nonsense' (Carson). Furthermore, the incarnation is reflective of the duality of God within the OT, in the tabernacle, as the word's ~~can~~

had the same translation. This is key as, as Kostenberger points out, the incarnation is 'God came to man in a more personal way than ever', even above that of the tabernacle in ~~the~~ the wilderness, where God's glory was said to dwell. Thus, this highlights that fact that there is a new level of personal relationship available between God and man through Christ, in order to gain ultimate salvation.

Moreover, the fact that Jesus is said to be 'made flesh' (v14), 'an almost crude term' (Kostenberger), serves to dispense docetic heretics who claimed that the entire incarnation was an illusion, and Christ was not, in fact, real.

Finally, the idea of the gifts of God, especially one presented in the Prologue, especially becoming a 'child of God' (v8). The Jewish race thought that being a child of God came through lineage, but as Carson notes 'being a descendent of Abraham is ^{worth} nothing without Abraham's faith'. This section of the prologue serves to prove that, as a teacher that no one can become a child of God without the unique relationship with God that is required, but also that there are no other requirements for this: anyone who comes to God can be accepted. This also foreshadows the passage of Nicodemus in John 3, in which

Jesus tackles the Jewish misconception of faith and teaches him that he must be born again, 'not of his mother's womb' (v3), but of 'flesh and the spirit' (v6). Finally it clearly supports the idea of supersessionism, in which ~~the~~ the Jewish covenant has been replaced by Jesus and so ~~a~~ now there is only one unique way to God; belief in Jesus Christ (John 10, 30).

ii) ~~The~~ Many of the themes presented in the Prologue ~~are~~ ^{one} ~~are~~ found to be further explored within the rest of the fourth gospel. For example, the theme of light and dark is carried throughout John's gospel, and the prologue gives necessary ~~explanation~~ ~~of~~ understanding of this in order to allow for a fuller understanding of the gospel as a whole. Without ~~the~~ ~~prologue~~ these themes it is ~~very~~ difficult for the gospel to be understood at all, without considerable misunderstanding.

This is furthered in the representation of the incarnation. Without the incarnation the gospel cannot be understood as that is the most integral aspect of the gospel and the bible as a whole in order to gain

a firm reality of Christianity, and as such is the central premise around which the gospel is formed. Thus, it is emphasised strongly throughout

However, there are themes such as the logos, which are never again mentioned throughout the rest of the gospel.

In this sense, they ~~are~~ it seems nothing more than the emphasis of the gospel ~~is~~ as a whole. However, the characteristics of the logos find themselves in the characteristics of Jesus Christ ~~in~~ within the gospel (Barnett) and as such are relevant for the gospel, with the entire emphasis of the gospel being on Jesus Christ himself.

Nevertheless, if as the whole the themes presented in the prologue are utilised effectively and accordingly throughout the whole gospel to ultimately provide the 'characteristic emphasis' that the evangelist desired.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

High levels of scholarly knowledge and understanding carry this candidate through

Question 18

Q18(a) Conflict

Most candidates scored well here whether using Lucan or Johannine material. They knew political aspects well, especially details about Pilate's role in Jesus' death. Better candidates noted that some religious leaders actually supported Jesus, e.g. Nicodemus. Candidates showed good knowledge of the Old Testament background in answering this question. Very few candidates were able to express a view as to the theological implications of why Jesus had to die which had they have done so would have strengthened their responses.

Most candidates could give at least a basic outline of Pilate's actions and motives in dealing with Jesus. The best candidates were able to 'consider critically' the various options and come to a reasoned conclusion for themselves. Most candidates made good use of the texts but surprisingly not many made much of Pilate's three declarations of innocence. Rivkin was quoted or cited by the stronger candidates and this would have helped weaker candidates to get a better mark.

In the box, state whether you are answering part (a) or part (b).

a

Throughout the course of Jesus' ministry, ~~Jesus~~ there was conflict between Jesus and the Religious Authorities (RA); no sooner had he read from the scroll in the Synagogue we see him engaged in conflict when he healed the Paralytic man.

Highlighted in the Paralytic, Jesus commits blasphemy when he said "Friend your sins are forgiven", this found in the book of Deuteronomy caused the Pharisees to question "Who is this fellow who speaks blasphemy? Who can forgive sins but God alone?" Jesus already at the beginning of his ministry had committed an act punishable by death causing conflict between himself and the RA.

Furthermore, on many occasions Jesus declared to be the "Son of Man" and also in the book of Daniel highlights that the Son of Man is a divine representation of God. In Daniel "Son of Man is Sovereign over the Sabbath", therefore giving himself the authority of a God. Morris notes this is a staggering claim for the Sabbath divine institution. To be Lord of ~~the Sab~~ a divine ordinance is to have a very high

place indeed."

In addition Jesus was found to ignore the law of Moses' particularly on the Sabbath when he allowed his disciples to pick corn and healed a man with a shrivelled hand. This angered the RA and they would "watch Jesus to see if he would heal on the Sabbath". Jesus knew this and so healed a man with a shrivelled hand emphasising "which is lawful on the Sabbath to do good or evil: Save a life or destroy it?" ~~This further challenge to their authority angered them, here still not understanding that "he has not come to call the self-righteous but sinners to repentance."~~

The RA began to criticise the actions of Jesus for associating with sinners, here still not understanding his mission "I have not come to call the self-righteous but sinners to repentance". This explains "insiders becoming outsiders, grace for unexpected people" as those who are marginalised by social status are accepted as they have received the unexpected grace, Joel B Green notes "The very people excluded from the table of holy he welcomes". This¹³ further highlighted in Zacchaeus when Jesus concludes "Today salvation has come to this house" and a woman who was a sinner as those who know them would not have accepted them leaving them to be outsiders.

Card comments; "with their strict rules and ceremonial purity, it was unthinkable that they would have ate with such people as Levi and his associates."

~~Furthermore Jesus directly challenged the RA in~~

~~In the story of Jesus cleansing the Temple he was~~

angered by what he saw, and so directly challenged the RA in "the Heart of Judaism". The Temple was a central place the Jewish leaders domain and to be challenged by a blaspheming man was highly dishonourable, especially one being a carpenter's son. Through Jesus' anger showed that the RA had not listened to God and as a result implies that their teachings are wrong. Jesus explained "God does not want burnt offerings but worship and repentance from a contrite heart."

It is not surprising that the conflict between Jesus and the RA reaches a climax towards the end of the Gospel, as the RA would "watch Jesus very closely to try and find something to use against him". This ultimately lead to them to "discuss what they might do with Jesus" and "to try and kill Jesus". However Jesus sees through their trick but this makes no difference the RA are determined to arrest Jesus at night. This is "The reign of Darkness".

ii) Pilate played an important role in the death of Jesus. This is because he alone could give the death penalty, and so when he gave 'his verdict' that ultimately decided whether Jesus was to live or die.

In Jesus' first meeting with Pilate he was accused by the RA that he was "subverting our nation, told us not to pay taxes to the emperor and claiming to be Christ a king". Due to Pilate being Pagan any religious accusation would not have been of

interest to him, but due to the RA changing them to being more political it ~~enhanced~~ enhanced the chance of Jesus being put to death, as the RA wanted.

However Pilate found Jesus innocent ~~3~~ three times and yet the crowd was displeased to find his innocence. As the crowd's "voices prevailed" Pilate sent Jesus to Herod where he to "found no guilt within this man". Again Pilate announced to the crowd he would be "flogged then released" but the crowd's hostility increased to the point of asking for the release of Barabas. As the crowd's "voices prevailed... Crucify him!" Pilate gave 'his verdict' that Jesus would be put to death. Luke illustrated Pilate as a weak leader as due to the crowd's hostility he feared the Jewish rebellion, therefore priding himself before the trial.

However we cannot ignore the role of the RA as without them to be 'reign of darkness' and telling Pilate false accusations against Jesus "Subverting our nation, not to pay taxes to Caesar, to be Christ a king," this shows without their input Jesus would not have been sent to Pilate.

Ellis Rivkin observes "without a Roman imperial system, Jesus would have had to deal with verbal buffeting, skillful texts, but stood no trial and be affixed to no cross," therefore highlighting that although the RA enforced Jesus to be killed but without Pilate he could possibly still lived.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

A solid answer covering a range of conflict scenarios.

Question 18

Q18(b) Crucifixion and Resurrection

Most candidates knew the details of the crucifixion well. Candidates displayed an impressive knowledge of the OT background to the crucifixion and to its symbolism. Not many candidates reflected knowledge and understanding of the historical details surrounding the crucifixion with, for example, few candidates referring to women at the foot of the cross or of the spear thrust into Jesus' side. For the best marks a few candidates only were able to show how the evangelists' contribution was distinctive and different from other accounts and why.

Most candidates were able to explain the significance of the resurrection mostly in terms of how it was important to complement the death of Christ as the basis of salvation with some going on to explain how it vindicated Jesus' claims to be the Son of God. Hardly any made the connection between the resurrection, the gift of the Spirit and the experience of the early church. Many candidates were able to come to a definite conclusion and offer opinions of their own based on the evidence of the relevant gospel.

Paper Summary

Based on the performance on this paper, candidates are advised to:

- Be flexible in their approach - don't assume questions will always take exactly the same format
- Be suitably prepared to be able to write three full length, complete essays
- Use scholarship wisely, not for its own sake, but to add something of value
- Make clear that they are answering the question as set
- Avoid cliches and rote learned material which is not adaptable to the real demands of the exam

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.