

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY

9774/02

Paper 2 Key Texts and Topics in Philosophy and Theology 1

May/June 2013

2 hours

Additional Materials: Answer Booklet/Paper

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

If you have been given an Answer Booklet, follow the instructions on the front cover of the Booklet.

Write your Centre number, candidate number and name on the work you hand in.

Write in dark blue or black pen.

Do not use staples, paper clips, highlighters, glue or correction fluid.

Choose **one** of Topics 1 to 4.

Answer **two** questions.

You must answer **both** parts of the question in Section A and **one** question from Section B for the Topic you have chosen.

You should divide your time equally between the questions you attempt.

At the end of the examination, fasten all your work securely together.

The number of marks is given in brackets [] at the end of each question or part question.



This document consists of **6** printed pages and **2** blank pages.



Choose **one** of Topics 1 to 4.

Answer **two** questions.

You must answer **both** parts of the question in Section A and **one** question from Section B for the Topic you have chosen.

You should divide your time equally between the questions you attempt.

Topic 1 Epistemology

Answer Question 1 **and** either Question 2 **or** Question 3.

Section A

- Philonous Does the reality of sensible things consist in being perceived? Or, is it something distinct from their being perceived and that bears no relation to the mind?
- Hylas To *exist* is one thing and to be *perceived* is another.
- Philonous I speak with regard to sensible things only; and of these I ask whether by their real existence you mean a subsistence exterior to the mind and distinct from their being perceived?
- Hylas I mean a real absolute being, distinct from and without any relation to their being perceived.
- Philonous Heat, therefore, if it be allowed a real being, must exist without the mind.
- Hylas It must.
- Philonous Tell me, Hylas, is this real existence equally compatible to all degrees of heat which we perceive, or is there any reason why we should attribute it to some and deny it others? And if there is, pray let me know that reason.
- Hylas Whatever degree of heat we perceive by sense, we may be sure that the same exists in the object that occasions it.
- Philonous What! The greatest as well as the least?
- Hylas I tell you, the reason is plainly the same in respect of both: they are both perceived by sense; no, the greater degree of heat is more sensibly perceived and, consequently, if there is any difference, we are more certain of its real existence than we can be of the reality of a lesser degree.
- Philonous But is not the most vehement and intense degree of heat a very great pain?
- Hylas No one can deny it.
- Philonous And is any unperceiving thing capable of pain or pleasure?
- Hylas No certainly.
- Philonous Is your material substance a senseless being or a being endowed with sense and perception?
- Hylas It is senseless without doubt.
- Philonous It cannot therefore be the subject of pain.
- Hylas By no means.
- Philonous Nor consequently of the greatest heat perceived by sense, since you acknowledge this to be no small pain.
- Hylas I grant it.
- Philonous What shall we say then of your external object; is it a material substance or not?
- Hylas It is a material substance with the sensible qualities inhering in it.
- Philonous How then can a great heat exist in it, since you admit it cannot in a material substance? I desire you would clear this point.
- Hylas Hold on, Philonous, I fear I was wrong in yielding intense heat to be a pain. It should seem rather that pain is something distinct from heat and the consequence or effect of it.

- Philonous Upon putting your hand near the fire, do you perceive one simple uniform sensation or two distinct sensations?
- Hylas But one simple sensation.
- Philonous Is not the heat immediately perceived?
- Hylas It is.
- Philonous And the pain?
- Hylas True.
- Philonous Seeing therefore they are both immediately perceived at the same time and the fire affects you only with one simple or uncompounded idea, it follows that this same simple idea is both the intense heat immediately perceived and the pain and, consequently, that the intense heat immediately perceived is nothing distinct from a particular sort of pain.
- Hylas It seems so.
- Philonous Again, try in your thoughts, Hylas, if you can conceive a vehement sensation to be without pain or pleasure.
- Hylas I cannot.
- Philonous Or can you frame to yourself an idea of sensible pain or pleasure in general, abstracted from every particular idea of heat, cold, tastes, smells, etc.?
- Hylas I do not find that I can.
- Philonous Does it not therefore follow that sensible pain is nothing distinct from those sensations or ideas in an intense degree?
- Hylas It is undeniable, and, to speak the truth, I begin to suspect a very great heat cannot exist but in a mind perceiving it ... [it] cannot exist without the mind.

[Extract from **George Berkeley**: *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous in Opposition to Sceptics and Atheists*: Cahn, 720–721]

- 1 (a) Explain how Philonous attempts to persuade Hylas that heat exists only in the mind, and not in material substances. [10]
- (b) Evaluate Berkeley's account of material substance. [15]

Section B

- 2 Critically examine doubts raised by philosophers about the success of both empiricism and rationalism in understanding the world. [25]

OR

- 3 Critically assess different phenomenalist theories of perception. [25]

Topic 2 Philosophical and Theological Language

Answer Question 4 **and** either Question 5 **or** Question 6.

Section A

We understand scientific hypotheses, and the terms that occur in them, by virtue of the relation of the whole system of hypotheses to empirically observable facts; and it is the whole system of hypotheses, not one hypothesis in isolation, that is tested for its truth-value against experience. So there are good precedents, in the empiricist way of thinking, for considering a system of religious assertions as a whole, and for examining the way in which the whole system is used.

If we do this the fact that a system of religious assertions has a moral function can hardly be denied. For to deny it would require any passage from the assertion of a religious system to a policy of action to be mediated by a moral assertion. I cannot pass from asserting a fact, of whatever sort, to intending to perform an action, without having the hypothetical intention to intend to do the action if I assert the fact. This holds however widely fact is understood – whether as an empirical fact or as a non-empirical fact about goodness or reality. Just as the intention-to-act view of moral assertions is the only view that requires no reason for my doing what I assert to be my duty, so the similar view of religious assertions is the only one which connects them to ways of life without requiring an additional premiss. Unless a Christian's assertion that God is love (*agape*) – which I take to epitomize the assertions of the Christian religion – be taken to declare his intention to follow an agapeistic way of life, he could be asked what is the connection between the assertion and the intention, between Christian belief and Christian practice. And this question can always be asked if religious assertions are separated from conduct. Unless religious principles are moral principles, it makes no sense to speak of putting them into practice.

[Extract from **Basil Mitchell**: *The Philosophy of Religion*: IV: 'An Empiricist's View of the Nature of Religious Belief.' (R.B. Braithwaite): 81]

- 4 (a) Explain how Braithwaite supports his view that religious principles are moral principles. [10]
- (b) Critically examine Braithwaite's claim that, "Unless religious principles are moral principles, it makes no sense to speak of putting them into practice". [15]

Section B

- 5 Assess the implications of the verification principle for the philosophy of religion. [25]

OR

- 6 Evaluate the claim that Wittgenstein's theory of language games solves the problem of the meaningfulness of religious language. [25]

Topic 3 Philosophy of Religion

Answer Question 7 **and** either Question 8 **or** Question 9.

Section A

We now have before us the two historical types of Christian theodicy. I shall summarize the main points of contrast between them, and then take notice of certain convergent tendencies, working for the most part beneath the surface, which qualify these contrasts and even suggest the possibility of a common future development. But first the contrasts:

1. The main motivating interest of the Augustinian tradition is to relieve the Creator of responsibility for the existence of evil by placing that responsibility upon dependent beings who have wilfully misused their God-given freedom. In contrast the Irenaean type of theodicy in its developed form, as we find it in Schleiermacher and later thinkers, accepts God's ultimate omni-responsibility and seeks to show for what good and justifying reason He has created a universe in which evil was inevitable ...

3. The Augustinian theodicy, especially in Thomist thought ... sees God's relation to His creation in predominantly non-personal terms. ... According to the Irenaean type of theodicy, on the other hand, man has been created for fellowship with his Maker and is valued by the personal divine love as an end in himself ...

4. The Augustinian type of theodicy looks to the past, to a primal catastrophe in the fall of angels and/or men, for the explanation of the existence of evil in God's universe. In contrast, the Irenaean type of theodicy is eschatological, and finds the justification for the existence of evil in an infinite (because eternal) good which God is bringing out of the temporal process. ...

Despite these very large differences there are also points of agreement between the two types of theodicy ...

1. The aesthetic conception of the perfection of the universe in the Augustinian tradition has its equivalent in the Irenaean type of theodicy in the thought of the eschatological perfection of the creation. ...

2. Both alternatives acknowledge explicitly or implicitly God's ultimate responsibility for the existence of evil. ...

5. The Augustinian tradition affirms, whilst theodicies of the Irenaean type need not deny, the reality of a personal devil and of a community of evil powers. ...

[Abbreviated extract from **John Hick**: *Evil and the God of Love*: 238–240]

7 (a) Explain points of contrast and agreement that Hick makes between Augustinian and Irenaean types of theodicy. [10]

(b) Evaluate Hick's Irenaean-type theodicy. [15]

Section B

8 'The existence of morality does not prove the existence of God.' Discuss. [25]

OR

9 Critically examine religious responses to scientific theories about the origin of the universe **and** of life on earth. [25]

Topic 4 New Testament: The Four Gospels

Answer Question 10 **and** either Question 11 **or** Question 12.

Section A

28 Now about eight days after these sayings Jesus took with him Peter and John and James, and went up on the mountain to pray. ²⁹And while he was praying, the appearance of his face changed, and his clothes became dazzling white. ³⁰Suddenly they saw two men, Moses and Elijah, talking to him. ³¹They appeared in glory and were speaking of his departure, which he was about to accomplish at Jerusalem. ³²Now Peter and his companions were weighed down with sleep; but since they had stayed awake, they saw his glory and the two men who stood with him. ³³Just as they were leaving him, Peter said to Jesus, 'Master, it is good for us to be here; let us make three dwellings, one for you, one for Moses, and one for Elijah' – not knowing what he said. ³⁴While he was saying this, a cloud came and overshadowed them; and they were terrified as they entered the cloud. ³⁵Then from the cloud came a voice that said, 'This is my Son, my Chosen; listen to him!' ³⁶When the voice had spoken, Jesus was found alone. And they kept silent and in those days told no one any of the things they had seen.

[Luke 9: 28–36]

- 10 (a)** With reference to the passage above, outline the debate about who Jesus was. [10]
- (b)** 'Jesus never taught about discipleship, he made his followers work it out for themselves.' Critically examine this claim. [15]

Section B

- 11** Discuss the relationship between the four Gospels. [25]

OR

- 12** Examine critically the significance and historicity of the resurrection accounts. [25]

BLANK PAGE

Copyright Acknowledgements:

- Question 1 © George Berkeley; *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous in Opposition to Sceptics and Atheists*; Hackett Publishing Co.; 1990.
Question 4 © Basil Mitchell; *The Philosophy of Religion*; Oxford University Press; 1971.
Question 7 © John Hick; *Evil and the God of Love*, Revised Ed.; Macmillan Press; 1966.
Question 10 © New Revised Standard Version of the Bible; Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA; 1989.

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.